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ABSTRACT

Focusing on three types of image congruence surrounding private brands, this study explores their relationships with and effects on attitudes toward private brands. According to results; (1) private brands’ images need to be created and maintained as target customers want, (2) product categories similar in image to their stores should be included in private brands, (3) retailers have to improve consumer attitudes toward stores by making their store images similar to consumers’ self images, and (4) retailers need to change value-oriented strategies for their private brands with quality-oriented strategies.

Private brands have accounted for a sizable fraction of sales in retailing. For example, private brands have accounted for 13% of US supermarket sales in 1991 and 20% of Canada supermarket sales in 1990 (Hoch and Banerji 1993). There is also a report that private brands are top sellers in 77 categories among 250 product categories sold in the US supermarket (Quelch and Harding 1996).

Popularity of private brands is expected to grow among retailers due to several reasons. First, private brands have a higher gross margin opportunity than national brands (Lewison 1994; Raju, Sethuraman, and Dhar 1995). Although private brands are typically priced 15–30% lower than national brands (Ailawadi, Neslin, and Gedenk 2001; Mason, Mayer, and Ezell 1994), lower marketing costs compensate for the lower prices and allow private brands to enjoy higher overall gross margins than national brands. Second, private brands help retailers to gain control in the channel power struggle between retailers and manufacturers. With private brands as a bargaining tool, retailers can ask national brand manufacturers for better trading terms such as cheaper prices, quicker deliveries, more promotional items, and others. (Ailawadi, Borin, and Farris 1995; Chintagunta, Bonfrer, and Song 2002; Narasimhan and Wilcox 1998). Third, retailers can build distinctive store image with their private brands (Grewal et al. 1998; Richardson, Dick, and Jane 1994; Sayman, Hoch, and Raju 2002). Kenmore and Craftsman are good examples. These two private brands help shape Sears’ image of economy and practicality. Fourth, private brands with strong and exclusive image can develop store traffic and loyalty (Corstjens and Lal 2000; Levy and Weitz 2001). Forenza and Hunters Run sold exclusively by The Limited store are powerful magnets for customers of the Limited.

Since the Frank and Boyd’s (1965) seminal paper, research on private brands has been performed on various issues. Earlier research on private brands explored socio-psychological and demographic characteristics private brand users have (Coe 1971; Frank and Boyd 1965; Myers 1967) or studied differences between national brands and private brands (Swan 1974). Research on private brands in the 80’s turned its focus on behavioral aspects of private brand users (Bellizzi et al. 1981; Cunningham, Hardy, and Imperia 1982). Studies on private brands in more recent years are mostly about factors and conditions related to market performances (Batra and Sinha 2000; Corstjens and Lal 2000; Dhar and Hoch 1997; Hoch and Banerji 1993; Raju, Sethuraman, and Dhar 1995; Richardson, Dick, and Jain 1994), positioning strategies (Ailawadi, Neslin, and Gedenk 2001; Sayman, Hoch, and Raju 2002), channel conflicts (Ailawadi, Borin, and Farris 1995; Narasimhan and Wilcox 1998), effects on retailers’ pricing strategy (Chintagunta, Bonfrer, and Song 2002), and so on.

Various images are related with forming attitudes toward brands. For example, symbolic qualities of brands or brand personalities are major determinants of brand evaluation and purchase. (Hirschman and Holbrook 1982; Solomon 1983). A consumer’s self image also has a certain effect on brand evaluation (Grubbl and Hupp 1968). Consumers prefer brands identifying with themselves, and their perception of a brand is organized along with their self images. Store image is another important factor in consumer brand evaluation. The image of a brand can be damaged if the brand is associated with a retailer having a less favorable image. For example, if Benetton apparel were sold in K-mart, Benetton would have difficulty in maintaining its high fashion image. Despite such importance, researchers did not have paid due attention to images related with private brands. Images or positioning problems of private brands are generally ignored by marketing literature (Sayman, Hoch, and Raju 2002).

Three types of image congruence particularly draw our attentions in relation with attitudes toward private brands. They are image congruence between a private brand and a consumer’s self, image congruence between a store and a product category, and image congruence between a store and a consumer’s self. These three types of image congruence are derived from three essential components determining attitudes toward private brands: brands, stores, and consumers. Between brands and consumers, image congruence between a private brand and a consumer’s self is derived. Between stores and brands, image congruence between a store and a product category is derived. Between stores and consumers, image congruence between a store and a consumer’s self is derived. Focusing on these three types of image congruence, this study tries to find their relationships with and effects on attitudes toward private brands. Along with image congruence, this study also explores roles of attitudes toward stores which are closely related with attitudes toward private brands. Although effects of image congruence have been explored by many researchers (Bellenger, Steinberg, and Stanton 1976; Hirschman and Holbrook 1982; Solomon 1983), they have never been studied under an integrated framework nor the perspective of private brands.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Importance of image in consumer behavior has been well documented (Bellenger, Steinberg, and Stanton 1976; Dobni and Zinkhan 1990). Image provides a critical cue for customer perceptions of products, brands, salespeople, and stores. Through image, consumers perceive a brand as a symbol and form quick summary information about the brand’s quality and other related characteristics.

Image Congruence between a Private Brand and a Consumer’s Self

Consumers purchase a specific brand not only for functional utility but also for social meaning and images the brand is associated with (Solomon 1983). Consumers prefer a brand when its characteristics match their perceptions of themselves. Because consumers compare a brand’s personality and themselves, consumers’ preference of a brand might be due to image differences between brands (Grubbl and Stern 1971). It is quite natural for consumers to prefer brands that fulfill or enhance their self image. They try to maintain and affirm their worthiness as an individual. Through self-enhancing brands, they expect to heighten the value of themselves and to acquire social recognition (Kunda 2000). In fact, consumers tend to identify themselves with the brand they own. In a study employing two competing automobile brands,
Grubb and Hupp (1968) found that self concept and brand concept are closely related.

As in the case of national brands, there is a strong possibility that consumers’ attitudes toward a private brand are closely related to their self images. If consumers believe that a private brand is similar to themselves, they will evaluate the private brand more favorably. On the contrary, if consumers believe a private brand is unfit for their self images, the private brand will be evaluated less favorably. Theoretical supports for a positive effect on the evaluation of private brands by image congruence between private brands and consumer themselves could be found in categorization theory. According to categorization theory, category similarity has a positive effect on consumer evaluation of a new category (Rosch 1973). That is, if a new category matches an existing category, consumers’ attitudes toward the new category would be similar to their attitudes toward the existing category. Thus, if a consumer feels a private brand, a new category, similar to his/her self, an existing category, s/he would evaluate the private brand positively because s/he would normally have a positive attitude toward her/his self. Based on this reasoning:

H1: As image congruence between a private brand and a consumer’s self becomes higher, a consumer’s attitudes toward the private brand will be more favorable.

Image Congruence between a Store and a Product Category

Store image has considerable impact on the shopping decisions of the consumers (Zimmer and Golden 1988). Retailers maintain consistent store image to appeal to target segments. Store image consistent with the needs of the target market segment can lead to increased store loyalty, sales, and profit (Corstiens and Lal 2000). When they determine the merchandise mix of a store, retailers have to consider their store images. For example, a retail store trying to build high tech image should be equipped with high tech products. As an important element consisting of store image, merchandise mix should represent appropriate combinations of products fit for store image and customer needs. Because private brands are a part of store image, product categories associated with private brands are expected to reflect store image quite well. When they decide to include a new product category into its private brand, retailers need to carefully examine its effect lest it diminish the image consistency of the store.

A product category having similar characteristics to a store will make a good member for a private brand. For example, economic and utilitarian products are suitable for a discount store’s private brands. Because these products offer a close conceptual fit for the store, consumers would have favorable attitudes toward private brands associated with these products. In the same vein, luxurious or high fashion items are more appropriate for a department store or a specialty store’s private brands. If a new product category included into a private brand is unfit for store image, image incongruity between a store and a private brand will occur. For example, if Wal-Mart sells high fashion mufflers at very expensive prices under its own brand, Kathy Lee, consumers will be confused at the contradictory images the product brings in. In short, congruence between product image and store image will have a positive effect on a consumer’s attitudes toward a private brand. While consumers evaluate private brands containing product categories fit for store image favorably, they evaluate private brands containing product categories unfit for store image unfavorably. Based on this reasoning:

H2: As image congruence between a store and a product category becomes higher, a consumer’s attitudes toward a private brand associated with the product category will be more favorable.

Store Attitudes and Attitudes toward Private Brands

As a part of a retail store, private brands are significantly affected by the evaluation of the store (Dodds, Monroe, and Grewal 1991). Because private brands generally do not engage in extensive out-of-store marketing activities, consumers commonly depend on their attitudes toward the store or store image when they evaluate a store’s private brands. That is probably why consumers think sporty and urban images from ‘Hunters Run’ of the Limited and frugal and reliable images from Sam’s Choice of Wal Mart (Levy and Weitz 2001). To receive more positive evaluation for their private brands, retailers have to improve consumers’ attitudes toward stores through the development of specific store images that target customers want and prefer. Of course, consumers will not automatically evaluate private brands favorably even if they have favorable store attitudes. If, as mentioned in the previous section, inappropriate product categories are used for private brands, or if images of private brands do not fit well for store image, consumer evaluation of the private brands could remain unfavorable. Nonetheless, if all other conditions are equal, consumers with more favorable store attitudes would evaluate private brands more positively than consumers with less favorable store attitudes. Based on this reasoning:

H3: As a consumer’s attitudes toward a store becomes higher, his or her attitudes toward the store’s private brand will be more favorable.

Image Congruence between a Store and a Consumer’s Self

Effects on Attitudes toward Stores: Store image has a significant effect on consumers’ store loyalty (Martineau 1958). Many studies support that store image has positive effects on consumers’ purchasing in the store (Grewal et al. 1998; Zimmer and Golden 1988). Like a brand, consumers tend to select a store that has a personality consistent with their self images. Consumers prefer a store that provides self-enhancing opportunities (Kunda 2000). According to Bellenger et al. (1976), consumers’ store loyalty is related to congruence between store image and self image. Therefore, developing store images consistent with self image of target consumers can lead to more positive attitudes toward the store. As in the case of image congruence between a private brand and a consumer’s self, categorization theory again can be borrowed to explain the effect of image congruence between a store and a consumer’s self on attitudes toward a store. If a store matches well with themselves, consumers will evaluate the store more positively. If a store does not match well with themselves, consumers will evaluate the store less positively. Based on this reasoning:

H4: As image congruence between a store and a consumer’s self becomes higher, a consumer’s attitudes toward the store will be more favorable.

Effects on Attitudes toward Private Brands: While image congruence between a store and a consumer’s self has a direct positive effect on attitudes toward a store, it also seems to have a direct positive effect on attitudes toward private brands. As mentioned in the previous section, private brands are a part of store image. Therefore, if consumers believe a store fits themselves well, they will feel private brands of the store fit themselves well and evaluate private brands of the store more favorably. On the contrary, if they regard the store as not their type, they may evaluate private brands of the store less favorably. Based on this reasoning:
H5: As image congruence between a store and a consumer’s self becomes higher, a consumer’s attitudes toward the store’s private brand will be more favorable.

Figure 1 summarizes all the hypothesized relationships.

METHOD

Study Design
Two types of image are utilized for the current study: functional image and hedonic image. Two Korean retail stores are employed for the manipulation of store image. One is a department store (Lotte) and the other is a discount store (Mega Mart). Department stores represent hedonic image and discount stores represent functional image. Both stores are top contenders in each category. Perfumes and detergents are employed for the manipulation of product image. Perfumes are for hedonic image and detergents are for functional image. These two product categories were selected after a pretest. They had the most distinguishing image, either hedonic or functional, among eight product categories tested—earrings, crystals, perfumes, bracelets, cooking foils, detergents, toothpastes, shampoos. This manipulation of store image and product image resulted in a total of 4 different experimental cells: Lotte Perfumes, Lotte Detergents, Mega Mart Perfumes, and Mega Mart Detergents. For the current study, two real private brands—Charlotte from Lotte, Basquia from Mega-Market—are employed. They are utilized along with the assumption of new brand extensions into two product categories (i.e., perfumes and detergents). Details are explained in the following section. Consumer’s self image was not manipulated but simply measured.

Data Collection
A total of 283 Korean consumers participated in the study. Subjects were conveniently sampled from residential areas near each store. They were randomly assigned to each of 4 experimental conditions. Only subjects who are familiar with the store in the questionnaire were allowed to fill out the questionnaire. Eight trained research associates conducted the field survey. They received about $1 per response. Questionnaire items were arranged in the following order: 4 items measuring image congruence between store and product, 4 items measuring image congruence between store and self, 3 items measuring attitudes toward store, 3 items measuring product image, 4 items measuring image congruence between private brand and self, 3 items measuring store image, 3 items measuring attitudes toward private brand, and a couple of demographic items in the end. Among the above mentioned measures, both product image measure and store image measure were for the purpose of manipulation checks. Before measuring image congruence between private brand and self, following sentence was mentioned: “Recently, many big retailers sell their own store brands. Lotte (or Mega Mart) has Charlotte (or Basquia) as one of their store brands. Assume that Lotte (or Mega Mart) sells perfumes (or detergents) under their own store brand, Charlotte (or Basquia). Please indicate your opinion on an appropriate number below in relation with Charlotte (or Basquia) perfumes (or detergents),” Subjects spent 5-10 minutes to finish the questionnaire. Among 283 responses, 10 were deleted due to omission and other reasons, resulting in a total of 273 completed questionnaires.

Measures

Image congruence: Traditionally image congruence was measured indirectly using discrepancy scores (Sirgy 1982; Sirgy et al. 1991; Sirgy et al. 1997). Examples of traditional congruence measure models include simple difference model, weighted simple difference model, Euclidian distance model, absolute difference model, difference squared model, and so on. In this study, however, congruence was measured with a new direct method suggested by Sirgy et al (1997). Based on Sirgy et al’s (1997) self image congruence measures, items measuring a consumer’s holistic, gestalt-like perception about the image congruence were developed for each of three image congruence. For the measurement of each of three image congruence, four 1-5 strongly agree-strongly disagree Likert type scales were developed respectively. Measuring items for the case of Lotte perfumes are summarized in Table-1. The same sentences were applied for the cases of detergents and Mega Mart.

Attitudes: Three 5-1 bipolar scales with endpoints labeled “good-bad”, “like-dislike”, and “favorable-unfavorable” were developed for the measurement of attitudes. The same scales were used for the measurement of attitudes toward store and attitudes toward private brands.

Image: Two identical sets of 5-1 bipolar scales with end points labeled “functional–hedonic”, “rational–emotional”, and “problem solving–autotellic” were developed to measure hedonic and functional dimensions of store image and product image. They were developed based on previous studies (Hirschman and Holbrook 1982), and used for the manipulation checks.
RESULTS

Preliminary Data Analysis

Prior testing the proposed model, measurement models for exogenous variables (x) and endogenous variables (h) were tested with confirmatory factor analysis (Anderson and Gerbing 1988). Test results showed that while model fit for endogenous variables (h) was good ($\chi^2 = 13.27$ (d.f. = 6, $p = .039$), NFI = .99, CFI = 1.0, RMR = .041, GFI = .98, AGFI = .94), model fit for exogenous variables was not very good. Using modification index, one observed variable from each of three exogenous variables ($x_1$, $x_2$, $x_3$) was removed. The new measurement model for $x$ variables with three observed variables each produced a good model fit ($\chi^2 = 110.48$ (d.f. = 47, $p = .00$), NFI = .96, CFI = .98, RMR = .037, GFI = .94, AGFI = .91).

Descriptive statistics for product images and store images were calculated. Perfumes (i.e., hedonic products) were rated more hedonic than functional in both stores (m = 2.57 for Lotte; m = 2.43 for Mega Mart), and detergents (i.e., functional products) were rated more functional than hedonic in both stores (m = 3.88 for Lotte; m = 3.58 for Mega Mart). Lotte (i.e., a hedonic store) was rated more hedonic than functional in both product categories (m = 2.98 for perfumes; m = 2.71 for detergents), and Mega Mart (i.e., a functional store) was rated more functional than hedonic in both product categories (m = 3.75 for perfumes; m = 3.33 for detergents). To find no difference in mean image values between experimental manipulations mentioned above, t-tests were performed. Contrary to expectation, t-tests identified significant differences in three cases except the case of perfumes. That is, no difference was found only in mean perfume images between Lotte (2.57) and Mega Mart (2.43). Because mean image values appeared as expected (i.e., functional when it should be, and hedonic when it should be), however, appropriateness of manipulations was checked again with aggregate data based on product images and store images (Table 2). T-tests were performed to confirm differences in both product and store image manipulations. Test results showed that manipulations were successful. Table 2 summarizes t-test results for both product and store images.

Hypothesis Tests

Hypotheses were tested through structural equation model using LISREL 8.30. The structural equation model is depicted in Figure 2. The structural equation model was estimated with Maximum Likelihood method after fixing the loading of one of the observed variables of each construct to 1. An acceptable model fit was generated ($\chi^2 = 257.14$ (d.f. = 77, $p = .0$), NFI = .94, CFI = .95, GFI = .90, AGFI = .84, RMR = .068), and hypotheses were tested with the analysis results (Table 3).

H1 is about the positive effect of PS(image congruence between a private brand and a consumer’s self) on PA(attitudes toward private brands). The gamma coefficient between PS and PA was negative and significant ($g_{21} = -.73$, $t = -11.25$, $p < .000$). Because smaller values in the image congruence measure mean higher congruity, a direct positive effect of PS(image congruence between a private brand and a consumer’s self) on PA(attitudes toward private brands) was observed. As the image congruence between a private brand and a consumer’s self becomes higher, a consumer’s attitudes toward a private brand become more positive. H1 was strongly supported.

H2 proposes that SP(image congruence between a store and a product) would have a positive effect on PA(attitudes toward private brands). The gamma coefficient between SP and PA was negative and significant ($g_{22} = .12$, $t = 2.24$, $p < .05$). As images between a store and a product become more similar, a consumer’s attitudes toward private brands become more positive. SP(image congruence

### TABLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image Congruence</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>store vs. product</td>
<td>SP1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SP2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SP3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SP4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>store vs. self= private brand</td>
<td>SS1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SS2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SS3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SS4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>private brand vs. self</td>
<td>PS1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PS2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PS3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PS4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* items removed from the final analysis
between store and product) has a direct effect on PA (attitudes toward a private brand). H2 was supported.

H3 is about the effect of SA (attitudes toward a store) on PA (attitudes toward a private brand). The beta coefficient between SA and PA was positive and significant ($\beta_{21}=.10$, $t=1.91$, $p<.05$). Attitudes toward a store have a direct positive effect on attitudes toward a private brand. In other words, consumer with more positive attitudes toward a store would have more positive attitudes toward a private brand. H3 was supported.

H4 suggests that SS (image congruence between a store and a consumer’s self) has a positive effect on SA (attitudes toward a store). The gamma coefficient between SS and SA was significant ($\gamma_{13}=-.44$, $t=-5.75$, $p<.00$). With the increase of similarity between a store’s image and consumers’ self images, consumers’ attitudes toward the store become more positive. H4 was strongly supported.

H5 is about the relationship between SS (image congruence between a store and a consumer’s self) and PA (attitudes toward a private brand). The gamma coefficient from SS to PA was significant ($\gamma_{23}=.19$, $t=2.78$, $p<.05$) but opposite to the hypothesized direction. Image congruence between a store and a consumer’s self has a direct negative effect on attitudes toward a private brand. As consumers feel themselves more similar to a store, their attitudes toward a private brand of the store become less positive. H5 was not supported.

**DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS**

This study shows that image congruence between private brands and a consumer’s self has a positive effect on attitudes toward private brands. In other words, as in the case of national brands, consumers compare private brands with their self-image when they form attitudes toward private brands. Therefore, retailers need to make their private brands deliver images that target customers want to attain. Reading customers’ minds more carefully and developing their private brands’ images in accordance with are what retailers need to do.

This study also confirms that image congruence between a store and a product category has a positive effect on attitudes toward a private brand associated with the product category. Consumers facing image incongruence in a store due to a wrong product category may be confused about intentions of the store. Confusion in image by consumers will not only interrupt retailer’s store image fortification strategy but also have a detrimental effect on consumer’s

**TABLE 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image Type</th>
<th>classification</th>
<th>mean (n)</th>
<th>s.d.</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Product Image</td>
<td>Perfumes</td>
<td>2.4934 (152)</td>
<td>.7768</td>
<td>-12.923</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Detergents</td>
<td>3.7245 (121)</td>
<td>.7884</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store Image</td>
<td>Lotte</td>
<td>2.8611 (132)</td>
<td>.6408</td>
<td>-8.136</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mega Mart</td>
<td>3.5626 (141)</td>
<td>.7809</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1: hedonic, emotional, autotellic 5: functional, rational, problem solving)
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Before including a new product category into their private brands, therefore, retailers need to find product categories similar in image to their stores.

Attitudes toward a store, as expected, have a positive effect on attitudes toward a private brand. In other words, if consumer attitudes toward a store become favorable, consumer attitudes toward a private brand become favorable too. One precaution, however, is interpretation of the positive effect by attitudes toward a store on attitudes toward a private brand should be limited because the effect is not highly significant (t=1.91, p=.05). Of course, if all other things are equal, stores with better image or more positive attitudes will have higher chances to receive more favorable attitudes toward private brands.

Positive effects of image congruence between a store and a consumer’s self on attitudes toward a store were also confirmed. Because store attitudes have positive effects on attitudes toward a private brand, image congruence between a store and a consumer’s self also has positive effects on attitudes toward a private brand, though indirectly. Therefore, retailers are recommended to plan and develop store images appealing to and wanted by target customers, and to maintain the established store images the same.

Contrary to the hypothesis, image congruence between a store and a consumer’s self has negative effects on attitudes toward a private brand. That is, as consumers believe a store becomes more similar to their selves, they develop more unfavorable attitudes toward a private brand of the store. Although this result is somewhat unexpected, it could be understandable when we consider the negative perception many consumers have against private brands (Dunne and Narasimhan 1999; Richardson, Dick, and Jain 1994). If components of store image are grouped into two dimensions–positive and negative–and if consumers perceive private brands negatively, private brands, a component of store image, may belong to the negative dimension. If this is the case, even though consumers have positive attitudes toward the store, they may not have positive attitudes toward private brands that constitute the lowest class of merchandise in the store. As consumers feel the store more similar to themselves, their attitudes toward private brands could be all the more negative because private brands reflect negative aspects of the store. If this explanation is appropriate, this result means retailers to turn their value-oriented strategies into quality-oriented strategies to overcome consumers’ negative perceptions toward private brands in general. According to many recent studies (Corstjens and Lal 2000; Dhar and Hock 1997; Hoch and Banerji 1993; Sayman, Hoch, and Raju 2002), quality-oriented strategies are more viable than value-oriented strategies for the success of private brands in the long run. Consumers’ negative perceptions toward private brands seem to have been a barrier rather than a catalyst for the development and success of private brands in the market.

Limitations and Future Studies

This study has some limitations. First, this study lacks unique characteristics in its theoretical framework for a study of private brands. To overcome this weakness, future studies need to either develop a more unique theoretical framework or compare private brands with national brands simultaneously. Second, besides three types of image congruence, other types of image congruence can be considered in the model. For example, image congruence between a private brand and a store or image congruence between a store and a divided consumer’s self such as ideal self can be dealt with. Third, although this study explains the opposite test result of H5 with negative perceptions many consumers have against private brands, the explanation may not be enough. To solve this problem, more sophisticated studies are essential. Finally, this study was performed in Korean context. To verify and generalize the finding of current study, cross-cultural replications on this subject are required.
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Table 3: Structural Equation Model Estimation Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Test Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>γ₂₁</td>
<td>-0.73</td>
<td>-11.25*</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>γ₂₂</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-2.24**</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>γ₂₃</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>1.91**</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>γ₁₁</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>-5.75*</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>γ₂₃</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>2.78**</td>
<td>Not supported #</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.00, ** p<.05, # Significant, but opposite to the hypothesized direction.

Fit Indices: X²=257.14 (d.f=77, p=.00), RMR=0.068, GFI=0.90, AGFI=0.84, NFI=0.94, CFI=0.95