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#### Abstract

This study is conducted to verify existing differences in consumer attitude according to distributor type and PB product type. Pre-test was conducted for this study in order to select the distributor and to classify the product type, FGI was conducted with 10 graduate students of K university in Kyong-gi. This study survey housewives, office workers, and university students excluding the participants in the pre-test. In the final analysis, research hypothesis is verified through the data of 280 answers in Korea.

This research is conducted with a factor design of 3 types of distributors -department store, discount store, convenience store-and 2 types of product -utilitarian product, hedonic product. To verify the hypotheses, ANOVA is carried out. Reliability test of each measurement variables, Cronbach $\alpha$ coefficient is used. For each analysis, SPSS Windows 15.0 statistical program is used.

The findings suggest that First, according to the size and characteristics, distributors are classified into department stores, discount stores, and convenience stores and it is verified whether if there are differences in consumers' attitude (product attitude, brand attitude and purchase intention) by the effect of different distributors. Results showed that product attitude is statistically significant. Second, product type is classified by two categories according to whether the product seeks for practicality or emotional pleasure - Utilitarian product and Hedonic product. In this context, the result after verifying whether if there is difference in the attitudes -product attitude, brand attitude, and purchase intention - in accordance with the product types is shown that utilitarian products makes bigger difference compared to hedonic products. Third, it is confirmed that there is interaction effect between product attitude and purchase intention according to the distributer type and product type. However, we find that in terms of brand attitude, there is no interaction effect. The implications of this research is as the following. First, we propose the need of PB product development and marketing strategy, which considers the product types in accordance with the scale and


[^0]features of each distributor. Second, PB products should break away from the simplicity of standardized products and consider the different features of distributors. Distributors will be in need of a strategy to build a compelling brand that can differentiate itself from other distributors. This will contribute to the improvement in reliability and formation of product value.
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## I. Introduction

The overall opening of Korea's distribution market in 1996 lead the entry of advanced distribution enterprises in Korea and brought radical changes in the distribution industry. This globalization of enterprises brought increase in income levels, diversification in consumer needs, and change in lifestyles, and thus caused changes in consumer's purchasing behavior and intensified competition in retail distribution market. Hence, as a source of competitiveness, distribution enterprises are developing private brands and extending their field. Especially, diversification of distributor types has created competition not only between different distributor types but also between the same types too, and it is even transferring into a social issue. Thus, distribution enterprises are concentrating more on private brand development and they are enlarging product categories.

A private label brand(also called reseller, store, house, or distributor brand) is one that retailers or wholesalers develop(Kotler \& Keller, 2006). Retailers such as Benetton, The Body Shop, and Marks and Spencer carry mostly own-brand merchandise. In the United States, private brands now account for one of every five items sold, reached up to $\$ 51.6$ billion turnover in 2005, according to the Private Label Manufacturers' Association. In Britain, the largest food chains, Sainsbury and Tesco, sold $45-50 \%$ store-label goods, respectively. In Korea, early department stores adopted PB mainly for clothes and most of them failed. PBs for department stores, which used to focus on low price brands that are mostly single items, are now focusing on high price PB strategies befitting to the recent high-end image strategy and VIP marketing strategy. Moreover there are many PBs in the form of imported brands, and for some items in the category of clothes, sundries, household items, PB goods are increasing but the portion in overall sales is still very small. This can be due to absence in marketing strategy of PB products, product planning, and/or
risk merchandising.
Discount stores have developed PB products mainly focusing on groceries and necessaries and have managed them successfully. Especially after the opening of Shinsegae E-Mart in 1993, discount stores have been spreading rapidly throughout the country to more than four-hundred(2009) in number and has grown to be the biggest retailer over department stores. From 2005, discount store market became saturated and had already attained to maturity in terms of market size. Moreover, as price competition among discount stores became intense they faced the market limit. As a result, they set out to develop PB products in order to make new profit and differentiate the stores. PB products of discount stores has expanded gradually, and based on 2008 data, the sales portions are as follows: E-mart $19 \%$, Lotte-mart $17 \%$, and Homeplus $24 \%$. Number of items are up to five thousand three hundred(Korea Foods Industry Association; KFIA, 2008). Even for convenience stores which started developing PB products at a comparatively late time, PB product items are becoming diversified.

Manufacturers are helping the growth of PB by supplying quality PB products at a reasonable price to the distributers(Soberman \& Parker, 2006). For manufacturers, sales can be more stable through a discount store, which is the huge distributor. For distributors, they can raise high profit by cutting down the middle step of distribution. Lastly for the consumers, they have more advantage to purchase products of good quality with low price. As a result, PB products are increasing continuously in the discount stores.

It is proven that in order for the company to survive in the intensely competitive environment, rather than making new customers, it is more effective to keep the current customers from leaving and raise customer preference. Therefore, most of the companies are performing diverse strategies and marketing tactics to maintain their customer preference(Fornell, 1992).

To increase the customer preference for PB customers, customer attributes should be understood in step ahead of PB development. Moreover, customer satisfaction can be achieved by fulfilling the quality expectation that the customers have rather than the price, and customer satisfaction will lead to customer credibility and customer preference. The research on the relations between customer preference(attitude and purchase intention) and antecedent variables will enhance the overall understanding of the relationship and will be able to provide a useful guideline when planning strategies and implementing the PB products.

Therefore the purpose of this study is, first, to ascertain the different effects of the distributer types on consumer attitude according to department stores, discount stores and convenience stores; second, to ascertain the different effects that utilitarian products and hedonic products - two different product types - have on consumer attitude; and third, to ascertain what interaction effects there are in consumer attitude according to distributer types and product types.

## II. Literature review and Research Hypotheses

## 1. Concept of PB (Private Brand)

A private label brand(also called reseller, store, house, or distributor brand) is one retailers and wholesalers develop(Kotler \& Keller, 2006). The trademarks of distribution enterprises (PB: Private Brand) is when the distribution enterprise develops a product either independently or in cooperation with manufacturers and put the distribution enterprise's logo. This is called PB (Private Brand) or PL(Private Label), and it is referred to the products that are sold through their own stores alone. The contrary concept is NB(National Brand) which is the manufacturer's label, which is when the manufacturers put their own logo on a new product. Meanwhile, Lewison(1997) has said that distribution enterprise's label is a contrary concept to manufacturer's label; the distribution enterprise owns the authority; and that it is a product or service that are sold through market pioneering. Lee (2007) defines PB as an own-brand product that is independently developed through cooperation between the distributer and manufacturer, and that it $10 \sim 30 \%$ less expensive compared to National Brand.

## 2. Literature review on the PB

Academic attention and research has started in earnest from the 60s. Such as 'Are Private Brand Prone Grocery Customers Really Different?(Frank \& Boyd 1965; Rao, 1969), Consumer Perceptions of Generic Brands(Bellizzi et al. 1981) and recently, success factors of private label brands(Batra \& Sinha, 2000), positioning of store brands(Sayman, Hoch \& Raju, 2002), Antecedents of Private label Attitude and National Brand promotion Attitude-Similarities and Differences(Garretson, Fisher \& Burton, 2002).

### 2.1. Distributor and private brand products type

Arnould et al.(2002) has presented that in cases of same brand in department store selling, people have tendency to give a more favorable estimation compared to discount store selling, and that favorable attitude towards the store has positive influence to their attitude towards the relevant product. Macintosh, Lockshin(1997) also presented that store credibility has direct influence in customer attitude development. Yu et al.(2008) saw that not only distributer and manufacturer credibility influences the evaluation and purchase intention, but knowledge level on PB also influences the purchase of PB products. That is, they have shown that the higher credibility the customer has over the distributer and manufacturer and the higher knowledge level for PB, the more tendency they have in buying PB products. The foregoing findings lead to the following hypothesis

Hypothesis 1. There will be difference in the consumer attitude(product attitude1, brand attitude2, purchase intentions) towards PB products in accordance with distributor types.

### 2.2. Product Type

Several researchers distinguish utilitarian products from hedonic products(Bridges \& Florsheim, 2008; Jones et al. 2006; Overby \& Lee, 2006)

Holbrook \& Hirshman(1982) emphasized the pleasurable aspect of consumer experience brought up by emotions such as joy or pleasure, and suggested two product types. First is utilitarian products, which has tangible and objective characteristics; and second is hedonic products, which has intangible characteristics such as arousing customers' pleasurable response.

Park et al.(1986) said that utilitarian products are consumed in order to satisfy the functional need; and the main objective of hedonic products are to satisfy consumers' senses or their social, psychological, symbolic needs.

Chaudhuri \& $\operatorname{Holbrook}(2001)$ also said that hedonic products has intangible or symbolic benefits and there are high possibility of positive emotions. This is because the more positive emotions (such as pleasure) there are for product category itself, the higher possibility there are to experience positive emotions for the brand also. The foregoing findings lead to the following hypothesis

Hypothesis 2. There will be difference in the consumer attitude(product attitude, brand attitude, purchase intention) toward PB products in accordance with product types.

### 2.3. Distributor type, Product types and Interaction effect

Research on the influence that PB products or its attributes have on consumer choice is continuously in progress. In the study of Richardson, Dick \& Jain(1996), price and quality was compared, and they clarified that the reason for the lack of purchase for PB products is because they are acknowledged to have low quality. Thus, they claimed that it is more important to raise the quality awareness of PB products, rather than simply providing low price products.

In the study of Ailawadi et al.(2001), it was found that buyers of distributor brands are more sensitive with price and that consumers who are more sensitive with quality do not purchase distributor brands. Therefore, to overcome the perception that PB products have price competitiveness but the quality cannot follow NB products, there is ongoing research on successful alliance with manufacturers.

Richardson et al.(1996) says preference for PB products is how much the consumer actually wants to purchase the PB product, and if the attitude toward PB is positive, it leads to specific purchase intention.

Kemf \& Smith(1998) claimed that consumers' purchasing behavior becomes different according to different product types, and that the product's information value influences product purchase. Moreover, they also claimed that the products' hedonic attributes and utilitarian attributes influence the consumers in the process of product purchase, and that hedonic products are used to satisfy the consumers' emotional needs and utilitarian products are used to satisfy more of the cognitive needs of the consumers.

Research on socio-economic variables such as quality, price, familiarity, store loyalty, income, level of education, life style which are
acknowledged as the factors that influence purchase intention has been conducted(Richardson et al. 1996). In shopping places, study of the factors that influence purchase intention shows in various ways. It can be summarized mostly to product cognition, shopping experience, customer service, consumer's risk following purchase, and so on(Jarvenpaa \& Todd, 1997). However, there are not as many studies on investigating the influence of trust on purchase intention or buying decision. This is due to a lack of theoretical basis and measurable tool, despite the fact that trust is relevant to the determinant of customer attitude that leads to buying behavior.

The foregoing findings lead to the following hypothesis; hypothesis 3. There will be interaction effect in the consumer attitude(product attitude1, brand attitude2, purchase intention3) toward PB products in accordance with distributor and product types.

## III. Research Methodology

## 1. Research respondents and Design

This study is conducted to find out whether if there are differences in consumer attitude according to distributer type and PB product type. Pre-test was conducted for this study -in order to select the distributer and to classify the product type, FGI was conducted with 10 graduate students of K university in Kyong-gi. This study surveyed housewives, office workers, and university students excluding the participants in the pre-test. In the final analysis, research hypothesis is verified through the data of 280 answers, excluding non-response and insincere answers.

This research is conducted following the factor design of 3 types of distributors (department store / discount store / convenience store) and 2 types of products (utilitarian product / hedonic product). The map of research subjects are as <Table $1>$.
<Table 1> Respondents Design

| Distributor | Department <br> store | Discount <br> store | Convenience store |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Utilitarian product | 48 | 46 | 47 |
| Hedonic product | 49 | 45 | 45 |

## 2. Pre-test

Pre-test FGI was conducted for this study with 10 graduate students of K university in Kyong-gi, in order to select the distributor, product type, and brand name. Pre-test results are as the following. First, Lotte Department Store, Lotte Mart and Lotte convenience store(Seven Eleven) - which have both the characteristics and scale of distributors - were selected. Second, product category check and selection was to be made since consumer behavior can change according to product type. As a result, umbrella, tissue, milk were selected
for utilitarian products and cosmetics, perfume, and wine was selected for hedonic products. Third, Mitchell(1986) asserted that in order to draw out a more natural response from the research subjects, it is advised to make a new professional material rather than imitating when going through the research. Brand names for the existing PB products have familiarity in advance and thus to eliminate the exogeneous variable we used a newly made brand name, "Pomile". The name "Pomile" is the combination of point and mileage, which is the characteristics of PB products.

## 3. Measurement Scales and Analysis

To see consumer attitude toward the product, four questionnaires that were used by Lee(1990) were used which are appropriate for this study. Survey measure are measured 'I like the product', 'the product is interesting and likeable', 'the product will be useful', 'the quality will be high' with the Likert 5points scale(1; totally disagree, 5 ;totally agree). Reliability toward the product attitude is confirmed 0.855 .

Brand attitude toward the product means general evaluation for a brand(Peter \& Olson, 1994). Questionnaires we use to see brand attitude toward the product, were used by Atkin \& Block(1983). We choose 4 questions that are appropriate for this study. Survey measure were measured 'the brand is good', 'the brand is in my favor', 'prefer the brand', 'the brand is satisfying' by the Likert 5points scale( 1 ; totally disagree, 5;totally agree). Reliability toward the brand attitude is confirmed 0.906 .

Purchase intention toward the product is an indicator of consumer purchase behavior. To see purchase intention toward the product, two questions are used which are appropriate for this study, used by Yoon(1992). Survey measure are measured 'can be purchase', 'likely purchase'. the Likert 5point scale(1: totally disagree, 5: totally agree). Reliability toward the purchase intention was confirmed 0.882 . Survey measure are confirmed which are appropriate for this study.

To find out the main and interaction effect toward PB product in accordance with distributor type and product type, ANOVA is carried out. Reliability test of each measurement variables, Cronbach $\alpha$ coefficient is used. Each analysis instrument is used SPSS Windows 15.0 statistical program.

## 4. Results of Hypothesis Test

4.1. Consumer attitude toward PB products in accordance with distributor type
In order to find out whether if there is difference in the attitude toward PB products in accordance with distributor types - department stores, discount stores, and convenience stores -ANOVA is carried out. The result is as <Table $3>$. The results on attitude towards PB products for department stores, discount stores, and convenience stores showed that there is statistically significant $(\mathrm{F}=4.743, \mathrm{p}<.01)$. Looking at the mean and standard deviation for consumer attitude according to distributor type, it is shown that discount store $(\mathrm{M}=3.07 / \mathrm{SD}=.82)$ was the highest, then department $\operatorname{stores}(\mathrm{M}=2.90 / \mathrm{SD}=.71)$, and lastly the
convenience store $(\mathrm{M}=2.74 / \mathrm{SD}=.73)$ as the lowest. This result supports the hypothesis 1-1 that according to distributor types there will be difference in consumer attitudes(product attitude) toward PB products.
<Table 2> Mean and Standard deviation of Consumer attitude toward PB products in accordance with distributor type

| Distributor type | Product type | mean | Standard deviation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Department store | Utilitarian | 2.75 | .66 |
|  | Hedonic | 3.04 | .73 |
| Discount store | Utilitarian | 3.31 | .78 |
|  | Hedonic | 2.82 | .79 |
| Convenience store | Utilitarian | 2.91 | .66 |
|  | Hedonic | 2.55 | .75 |

<Table 3> Two-way ANOVA of consumer attitude toward PB products in accordance with distributor type and product type

| source | 3th type <br> Mean Scare <br> total | Degree of <br> freedom | Mean Scare | F |
| :---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Distributor <br> type | 5.089 | 2 | 2.545 | $4.743^{* *}$ |
| Product <br> type | 2.451 | 1 | 2.451 | $4.568^{*}$ |
| Distributor <br> type <br> Product <br> type | 8.312 | 2 | 4.156 | $7.746^{* *}$ |
| Error | 147.004 | 274 | .537 |  |
| Total | 2517.375 | 280 |  |  |

* $\mathrm{p}<.05, \quad * * \mathrm{p}<.01, \quad$ *** $\mathrm{p}<.001$
4.2. Consumer attitude toward PB products in accordance with distributor type

In order to find out whether if there is difference in the attitude(brand attitude) toward PB product brand in accordance with distributor types-Department store, Discount store, Convenience store-ANOVA is carried out. The result is as $<$ Table $5>$. The results showed that Discount store $(\mathrm{M}=2.92 / \mathrm{SD}=.83)$ is the highest, then Convenience $\operatorname{store}(\mathrm{M}=2.76 / \mathrm{SD}=.86)$ and lastly Department store $(\mathrm{M}=2.72 / \mathrm{SD}=.71)$, as the lowest. But this result showed that is not statistically significant. The hypothesis 1-2 that according to distributor types there will be difference in consumer attitudes(brand attitude) toward PB products, is not supported.
<Table 4> Mean and Standard deviation Consumer attitude toward PB products in accordance with distributor type(brand attitude)

| Distributor type | product type | Mean | Standard <br> deviation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Department store | Utilitarian | 2.65 | .77 |
|  | Hedonic | 2.79 | .65 |
| Discount store | Utilitarian | 3.08 | .94 |
|  | Hedonic | 2.75 | .67 |
| Convenience store | Utilitarian | 2.94 | .74 |
|  | Hedonic | 2.57 | .94 |

<Table5> Two-way ANOVA of brand attitude toward PB products in accordance with distributor type and product type

| source | 3th type Mean Scare total | Degree of freedom | Mean Scare | F |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Distributor type | 2.049 | 2 | 1.025 | 1.635 |
| Product type | 2.410 | 1 | 2.410 | 3.846* |
| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Distributor } \\ \text { type } * \\ \text { Product type } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 3.840 | 2 | 1.920 | 3.064 |
| Error | 171.700 | 274 | . 627 |  |
| total | 2370.560 | 280 |  |  |

* $\mathrm{p}<.05, \quad$ ** $\mathrm{p}<.01, \quad * * * \mathrm{p}<.001$
4.3. Purchase intention toward PB products in accordance with distributor type
In order to find out whether if there is difference in purchase intention toward PB products in accordance with distributor type(Department store, Discount store, Convenience store), ANOVA is carried out. The results are as $<$ Table $7>$. The results show mean and standard deviation for purchase intention according to distributor type: Discount store $(\mathrm{M}=2.74 / \mathrm{SD}=1.05)$, Department store $(\mathrm{M}=2.67 / \mathrm{SD}=.98)$, Convenience $\operatorname{store}(\mathrm{M}=2.65 / \mathrm{SD}=.93)$. However, this result showed that is not statistically significant. The hypothesis 1-3 that according to distributor types there will be difference in purchase intention toward PB products, is not supported.
$<$ Table 6> Mean and Standard deviation for Purchase intention toward PB products in accordance with distributor type and product type

| Distributor type | Product type | Mean | Standard <br> deviation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Department <br> store | Utilitarian | 2.58 | .99 |
|  | Hedonic | 2.76 | .97 |
| Discount store | Utilitarian | 2.95 | 1.17 |
|  | Hedonic | 2.52 | .89 |
| Convenience <br> Store | Utilitarian | 2.87 | .91 |
|  | Hedonic | 2.42 | .89 |

<Table 7> Two-way ANOVA of Purchase intention PB products in accordance with distributor type and product

| Source | 3th type <br> Mean Scare <br> total | Degree of <br> freedom | Mean Scare | F |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Distributor <br> type | 372 | 2 | .186 | .195 |
| Product <br> type | 3.827 | 1 | 3.827 | $4.017^{*}$ |
| Distributor <br> type * <br> Product <br> type | 5.878 | 2 | 2.939 | $3.085^{*}$ |
| Error | 261.032 | 274 | .953 |  |
| Total | 2290.500 | 280 |  |  |

* $\mathrm{p}<.05, \quad$ ** $\mathrm{p}<.01, \quad$ *** $\mathrm{p}<.001$
4.4. Product attitude toward PB products in accordance with product type
In order to find out whether if there is difference in the product attitude toward PB products in accordance with product type-Utilitarian product, Hedonic product- ANOVA is carried out. The result is as $<$ Table $3>$. The results on product attitude towards PB products for Utilitarian product, Hedonic product shows that there is statistically significant $(\mathrm{F}=4.568, \mathrm{p}<.05)$. Looking at the mean and standard deviation for product attitude according to product type, it is shown that utilitarian product( $\mathrm{M}=2.99 / \mathrm{SD}=.74$ ) is higher than hedonic product $(\mathrm{M}=2.81 / \mathrm{SD}=.78)$. So the hypothesis $2-1$ is supported.
4.5. Brand attitude toward PB products in accordance with Product type
In order to find out whether if there is difference in the Brand attitude toward PB products in accordance with Product type-Utilitarian product, Hedonic product- ANOVA is carried out. The result is as <Table 5>. The results on brand attitude towards PB products for Utilitarian product, and Hedonic product, shows that there is statistically significant( $\mathrm{F}=3.846, \mathrm{p}<.05$ ). Looking at the mean and standard deviation for brand attitude according to product type, it is shown that Utilitarian product ( $\mathrm{M}=2.89 / \mathrm{SD}=83$ ) is higher than Hedonic prod$\operatorname{uct}(\mathrm{M}=2.71 / \mathrm{SD}=.77)$. So the hypothesis 2-2 is supported.
4.6. Purchase intention toward PB products in accordance with product type
In order to find out whether if there is difference in the Purchase intention toward PB products in accordance with product typesUtilitarian product, Hedonic product- ANOVA is carried out. The result is as $<$ Table 7$\rangle$. The results on purchase intention towards PB products for Utilitarian product, Hedonic product showed that there is statistically significant $(\mathrm{F}=4.017, \mathrm{p}<.05)$. Looking at the mean and standard deviation for purchase intention according to product type, it is shown that Utilitarian product $(\mathrm{M}=2.80 / \mathrm{SD}=1.03)$ is higher than Hedonic product $(\mathrm{M}=2.57 / \mathrm{SD}=.93)$. So the hypothesis $2-3$ is supported.
4.7. The interaction effect of product attitude toward PB product in accordance with distributor and product type
In order to find out whether if there is the interaction effect in the product attitude toward PB products in accordance with distributor and product types, ANOVA is carried out. The result is as <Table $3>$. The results on interaction effect of product attitude towards PB products for Utilitarian product, it is shown that Discount store $(\mathrm{M}=3.31 / \mathrm{SD}=.978) \quad$ is the highest, then Department store $(\mathrm{M}=2.75 / \mathrm{SD}=.66)$ and lastly Convenience $\operatorname{Store}(\mathrm{M}=2.92 / \mathrm{SD}=.67)$. In Hedonic product, Department store $((\mathrm{M}=3.05 / \mathrm{SD}=.73)$ is the highest then Discount store $(\mathrm{M}=2.82 / \mathrm{SD}=.79)$, and lastly Convenience Store $(\mathrm{M}=2.91 / \mathrm{SD}=.67)$. According to these results, the interaction effect is statistically significant $(\mathrm{F}=7.746, \mathrm{p}<.01)$. So, the hypothesis 3-1 is supported.

<Figure 1> The interaction effect of product attitude toward PB product attitude in accordance with distributor and product type
4.8. The interaction effect of brand attitude toward PB product in accordance with distributor and product type
In order to find out whether if there is the interaction effect of brand attitude toward PB product in accordance with distributor and product type, ANOVA is carried out. The result is as <Table 5>. The results on interaction effect of brand attitude toward PB products for Utilitarian product is shown that Discount store ( $\mathrm{M}=3.08 / \mathrm{SD}=.94$ ) is the highest, then Convenience store $(\mathrm{M}=2.94 / \mathrm{SD}=.74)$ and Department store $(\mathrm{M}=2.65 / \mathrm{SD}=.77)$. In Hedonic product is shown that Department store $(\mathrm{M}=2.79 / \mathrm{SD}=.65)$, Discount store $(\mathrm{M}=2.75 / \mathrm{SD}=.67)$, Convenience $\operatorname{Store}(\mathrm{M}=2.57 / \mathrm{SD}=.94)$. However, this result is not statistically significant. So that the hypothesis 3-2 is not supported.
4.9. The interaction effect of purchase intention toward PB product in accordance with distributor and product type
In order to find out whether if there is the interaction effect of purchase intention toward PB product in accordance with distributor and product type, ANOVA is carried out. The result is as $<$ Table $6>$. The results on interaction effect of brand attitude toward PB products for Utilitarian product is shown that Discount store( $\mathrm{M}=2.95 / \mathrm{SD}=1.17$ ) is the highest, then Convenience Store $(\mathrm{M}=2.87 / \mathrm{SD}=.91)$ and lastly Department store $((\mathrm{M}=2.58 / \mathrm{SD}=.99)$. In Hedonic product is shown that

Department $\operatorname{store}(\mathrm{M}=2.76 / \mathrm{SD}=.97)$ is the highest, then Discount store $(\mathrm{M}=2.52 / \mathrm{SD}=.89)$ and lastly Convenience $\operatorname{Store}(\mathrm{M}=2.42 / \mathrm{SD}=.87)$. This result is statistically significant $(\mathrm{F}=3.085, \mathrm{p}<.05)$. So, the hypothesis 3-3 is supported.

<Figure 2> The interaction effect of purchase intention toward PB product in accordance with distributor and product type

## IV. Discussion and Conclusion

According to various change of market situation, distributors are striving to conduct a marketing strategy for the reinforcement of competitiveness and needs satisfaction of consumers. In this context, distributors are reinforcing company competitiveness through developing PB products and providing consumers various products with low price. Thus, this study was to find out the different effects and interaction effect of distributor type and attributes, product attributes, utilitarian products, and hedonic products on PB. Results of this study is summarized as follow.

First, according to the size and characteristic, distributors were classified to department stores, discount stores, and convenience stores and it is verified whether if there are differences in consumers' attitude (product attitude, brand attitude and purchase intention) by the effect of different distributors. Results showed that product attitude is statistically significant. Discount store is the highest, then department store and lastly the convenience store. In contrast, brand attitude and purchase intention toward PB products in accordance with distributor types is found not significant. As it can be seen from the results, it is confirmed that the product attitude toward PB differs according to different distributors. It can be inferred that this is a result due to the fact that PB products at discount stores compared to department stores or convenience stores can easily achieve utilitarian needs satisfaction of consumers who want low price goods. Therefore, through building products that is befitting to the company characteristics, each distributors should set up a strategy that can bring out positive attitude of consumers toward PB products. It can be predicted that the effect of product attitude might spread out to purchase intention also.

Second, product type is classified by two categories according to whether the product seeks for practicality or emotional pleasure Utilitarian product and Hedonic product. In this context, the result af-
ter verifying whether if there is difference in the attitudes -product attitude, brand attitude, and purchase intention - in accordance with the product types was shown that utilitarian products makes bigger difference compared to hedonic products. The strength of PB products is that compared to manufacturer products, the quality is similar but lower in price, and thus, have price competitiveness. It can be inferred that this is a result due to the fact that rather than products for satisfying emotional and psychological needs, products that seeks for practical value have more similar characteristics to PB products, and consequently, utilitarian products have higher consumer attitude than hedonic products. Therefore, it will be necessary for distributors to consider the characteristic and types of PB products.

Third, it is confirmed that there is interaction effect between product attitude and purchase intention according to distributer type and product type. However, we find that in terms of brand attitude, there is no interaction effect. If we take a look at the interaction effect toward product attitude, discount stores are shown to be the highest, then department stores, and finally convenience stores. For hedonic products, the sequence is shown as department stores, discount stores, and convenience stores. There is no interaction effect shown in brand attitude in accordance with distributer type and product type. However, in purchase intention, it is shown to have interaction effect for two types, and for utilitarian products, the sequence is shown as discount stores, convenience stores, and department stores. For hedonic products, department stores are shown to have the highest purchase intention - discount stores and convenience stores are followed.

As we can see from the results above, in terms of product attitude, for practical products that are necessary in daily life, discount stores were shown to have high utility and favor for PB products. This result influenced purchase intention also and thus it was shown that purchase intention was also the highest for discount stores. Product attitude for hedonic products that brings emotional joy and pleasure were shown to be highest in department stores, and this result was also shown for purchase intention, too. This is considered a result from the luxurious and favorable image that department stores have. Third, Product attitude and purchase intention toward PB product in accordance with distributor and product type is the interaction effects.

The implications of this research is as the following. First, it could be clearly recognized that for PB products sold by distributers, consumer attitude differs from consumers centering on utilitarian to consumers centering on hedonic emotional satisfaction. Therefore, we propose the need of PB product development and marketing strategy, considering the product types in accordance with the scale and features of each distributor.

Second, PB products should break away from the simplicity of standardized products and consider the different features of distributors, and will be in need of a strategy to build a compelling brand that can differentiate itself from other distributor. This will contribute to the improvement in reliability and formation of product value.

The limits of this study and proposals are as follows. First, in this study, only the types of distributors and types of products were confirmed. However, consumer attitude will change according to vari-
ous psychological characteristics, and faith and motives that comes from individual difference. Thus, we propose that research that considers more of consumers' various psychological variables are necessary.

Second, consumer attitude towards PB products will differ depending on each individual's income level, job, age, and so on. Therefore, we would like to propose a need for new research considering demographic features.
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