



















## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The current study has an assessment about the apparel retailers, which has moved their own brand to international markets, in terms of the point of view of consumers. The study has tested a model that integrates a series of variables relating to the purchase of retailer brands (namely perceived risk, hedonic and utilitarian value), as well as self-confidence as a personal trait, in which the variance in the consumer responses (affective-based and cognitive-based assessments) is explained. Responses shown by consumers to the shopping at these retail stores is viewed as a critical success factor for the owners of the retail brand in foreign markets as well as domestic markets. Thus, this study attempts to explore the factors that play a role in the formation of consumers' evaluative responding with respect to the purchase of a retail brand, which is aiming to provide useful knowledge for international apparel retailers in developing brand strategies that create and sustain competitive advantages. On the basis of the data received from two different samples, the analysis of the model above-mentioned leads to the following conclusions.

First, in clothing context, perceived risk is a major strategic asset for the retailers in its struggle for shaping consumers attitude toward the purchase of retail brands, regardless of evaluating response are either affection-based or cognition based. As the results revealed, it has direct and indirect effect on consumers' evaluating responses. For the direct effect, the risk associated with the purchase of the apparel retail brand is negatively effective on consumer responses. The effect of the risk in cognitive responses is found to be relatively higher than in affective responses. For the indirect effect, the risk influences both hedonic and utilitarian value perceived in shopping at this retail, which in turn influences consumer responses. As understood from the results, retailers can deliver more shopping value to consumer through reducing the risk associated with the buying of clothing under its own brand name. Then, when the value of retail brands it carries is perceived at higher level, consumers will show more favorable responses to the purchase of the brand. Almost all the results show the consistency between two groups of sample and/or two distinct retail brands with some exceptions. At this juncture, we also need to draw your attention the results varying between different samples in terms of the effect of utilitarian shopping value on evaluating responses. The utilitarian value is found to have an influence on women's affective responses while it has an influence on men's cognitive responses. However, the effect of utilitarian value perceived at shopping is not significant when evaluating responses is cognitive in nature for the sample of women and affective in nature for the sample of men. This is possibly due to the fact that the measure of utilitarian value is perceived by two groups of sample in different way. Another possible reason why such a difference exists is that distinct retail brands are offered to respond samples. As such, brand-specific perceptions of consumers might lead to the difference in the effect of utilitarian shopping value on their affection-based and cognition-based responses. Overall, successfully managing the risk perceived during shopping is necessary not only for achieving the creation of the high level of shopping value but also for enabling consumers to respond more favorably to a retail store at which they shop.

Next, we have witnessed that the relationship between hedonic shopping value and affective responses is stronger when compared with the relationship between hedonic shopping value and cognitive responses. The result consistent with our expectations is observed in both retail brands and/or samples. This provides deeper knowledge for us in regarding how to arouse emotions or affects in the buyers in ways that favor retailers. On the other hand, we cannot explain if there exists a difference in the effects of utilitarian shopping value attached to cognition-based and affective-based responses on account of non-significant relationships between them above-mentioned. Finally, in the present survey, consumers with low self-confidence (high self-confidence) are considered to perceive a greater purchasing risk (a lower purchasing risk) associated with the shopping at the retail store. The results are in accordance with this notion for two different brands and/or samples. Accordingly, retail strategists should take into account of the perceptions of consumer has about their own ability to shopping from the store before deciding on an appropriate marketing strategy for managing perceived risk at shopping.

The generalization of the results is limited since only a sample of university students and retail brands in clothing industry were used in the study. As the way to improve the generalizability of the results, future research is supposed to expand the sampling base of participants and the variety of industry. In addition, further research is required to develop measures of utilitarian shopping value consistent with this framework.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study was supported by grant encoded "FEN-D-110412-0107" from "Marmara University BAPKO Research Project Committee.

## REFERENCES

- Agarwal, S., and Teas, R. K. (2001), Perceived value: Mediating role of perceived risk, *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, Vol.9, No.4, pp.1–14.
- Ajzen, I. (1991), The theory of planned behavior, *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, Vol.50, pp.179–211.
- Babin B. J., Darden, W. R., and Griffin, M. (1994), Work and/or fun: Measuring hedonic and utilitarian shopping value, *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol.20, pp.644–656.
- Bagozzi, R. P. (1982), A field investigation of causal relations among cognitions, affect, intention, and behavior, *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol.19, No.000004, pp.562–583.
- Bagozzi, R. P., and Yi, Y. (1988), On the evaluation of structural equation models, *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol.16, pp.74–94.
- Bearden, W. O., and Shimp, T. A. (1982), The use of extrinsic cues to facilitate product adoption, *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol.19, No.000002, pp.229–239.
- Bentler, P.M., and Douglas G. Bonett. (1980), Significance tests and goodness of fit in the analysis of covariance structures, *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol.88, pp.588–606.
- Bruner II, G. C., Hensel, P. J., and James, K. E. (2005), *Marketing scale handbook, a compilation of multi-item measures for consumer behavior and advertising*. Chicago, Illinois USA: American Marketing Association.
- Carpenter, J. M., Moore, M., and Fairhurst, A. E. (2005), Consumer shopping value for retail brands, *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management*, Vol.9, No.1, pp.43–53.
- Chang, E., and Tseng, Y. (2010), Research note: E-store image, perceived value and perceived risk, *Journal of Business Research*, Available online 6 July 2011 from: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0148296311001998>.
- Chen, Z., and Dubinsky, A. J. (2003), A conceptual model of perceived customer value in e-commerce: A preliminary investigation, *Psychology and Marketing*, Vol.20, No.4, pp.323–347.
- Cox, D. F., and Rich, S. U. (1964), Perceived risk and consumer decision-making-the case of telephone shopping, *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol.1, No.000004, pp.32–39.
- Dube´, L., Cervellon, M., and Jingyuan, H. (2003), Should consumer attitudes be reduced to their affective and cognitive bases? Validation of a hierarchical model, *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, Vol.20, pp.259–272.
- Dursun, İ., Kabadayı, E. T., Alan, A. K., and Sezen, B. (2011), Store brand purchase intention: Effects of risk, quality, familiarity and store brand shelf space, *Journal of Global Strategic Management*, Vol.5, No.2, pp.113–123.
- Eagly, A. H., and Shelly C. (1993), *The psychology of attitudes*. USA: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers, (Chapter 1).
- Fiore, A. N., and Kim, J. (2007), An integrative framework capturing experiential and utilitarian shopping experience, *International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management*, Vol.35, No.6, pp.421–442.
- Fornell, C., and Larcker, D. F. (1981), Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement errors, *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol.18, pp.39–50.
- Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. F., Tatham, R. L., and Black, W. C. (1998), *Multivariate data analysis* (5th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, (Chapter 11).
- Hirsch, R. D., Dornoff, R. S., and Kernan., J. B. (1972), Perceived risk and store selection, *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol.9, pp.434–9.
- Kim, J., and Damhorst, M. L. (2010), The mediating effect of perceived service risk on perceived value of internet apparel shopping: from the quality-risk-value approach, *Journal of Global Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol.20, No.4, pp.307–318.
- Ligas, M., and Chaudhuri, A. (2012), The moderating roles of shopper experience and store type on the relationship between perceived merchandise value and willingness to pay a higher price, *Journal of*

- Liljandera, V., Polsa, P., and Rielb A. (2009), Modelling consumer responses to an apparel store brand: Store image as a risk reducer, *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, Vol.16, No.4, pp.281–290.
- Mieres, C. G., Martín, A. M. D., Antonio, J., and Gutiérrez, T. (2006), Antecedents of the difference in perceived risk between store brands and national brands, *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol.40, No.1/2, pp.61–82.
- Mitchell, V. W. (1999), Consumer perceived risk: conceptualizations and models, *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol.33, pp.163–195.
- Nunnally, J. C. (1978), *Psychometric Theory*. 2nd ed., NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Peter, J. P., and Ryan, M. J. (1976), An investigation of perceived risk at the brand level, *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol.13, pp.184–188.
- Ross, I. (1975), Perceived risk and consumer behavior: A critical review, in *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol. 02. In Schlinger, M. J. (Eds.), Association for consumer research (pp.1–20).
- Sánchez-Fernández, R., and Iniesta-Bonillo, M. Á. (2006), Consumer perception of value: Literature review and a new conceptual framework, *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, Vol.19, pp.40–58.
- Schaninger, C. M. (1976), Perceived risk and personality, *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol.3, No.2, pp.95–100.
- Sheth, N. J., and Parvatiyar, A. (1995), Relationship marketing in consumer markets: Antecedents and consequences, *Journal of Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol.23, No.4, pp.255–271.
- Simcock, P., Sudbury, L., and Wright, G. (2006), Age, perceived risk and satisfaction in consumer decision making: A review and extension, *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol.22, pp.355–377.
- Smith, J. B., and Colgate, M. (2007), Customer value creation: a practical framework, *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, Vol.15, No.1, pp.7–21.
- Sweeney, J. C., and Soutar, G. N. (2001), Consumer perceived value: The development of a multiple item scale, *Journal of Retailing*, Vol.77, pp.203–220.
- Sweeney, J. C., Soutar, G. N., and Johnson, L. W. (1999), The role of perceived risk in the quality-value relationship: A study in a retail environment, *Journal of Retailing*, Vol.75, No.1, pp.77–105.
- Tokatli, N. (2007), Networks, firms and upgrading within the blue-jeans industry: Evidence from Turkey, *Global Network*, Vol.7, No.1, pp.51–68.
- Tokatli, N., and Boyaci, Y. (1998), The changing retail industry and retail landscapes: The case of post-1980 Turkey, *Cities*, Vol.15, No.5, pp.345–359.
- Tokatli, N., and Kızılgün, Ö. (2004), Upgrading in the global clothing industry: Mavi jeans and the transformation of a Turkish firm from full-package to brand-name manufacturing and retailing, *Economic Geography*, Vol.80, No.3, pp.221–240.
- Zeithaml, V. A. (1988), Consumer perceptions of price, quality, and value: A means-end model and synthesis of evidence, *Journal of Marketing*, Vol.52, No.3, pp.2–22.
- Zikmund, W. G., and Scott, J. E. (1974), A multivariate analysis of perceived risk self-confidence and information sources, in *Advances in Consumer Research* Vol. 01. In Ward, S. and Wright, P. (Eds.), Association for consumer research (pp.406–416).

## Appendix A. Summary of the -8 Measurement Model

Measurement variables for latent factors	$\lambda$	$\alpha$	AVE	$r^2_{\max}$	CR
Affective responses (AFC): How do you feel about shopping at the retail store?					
AFC1: Entertaining	.80	.79	.55	.27	.79
AFC2: Pleasant	.70				
AFC3: Appealing	.73				
AFC4: Attractive	Extracted				
AFC5: Nice	Extracted				
Cognitive responses (COG): What do you think about shopping at the retail store?					
COG1: Reliable	.84	.85	.59	.20	.83
COG2: High-quality	.74				
COG3: Practical	.74				
COG4: Satisfactory	.75				
COG5: Competent	Extracted				
COG6: Needed	Extracted				
COG7: Value for money	Extracted				
Utilitarian shopping value (UTI)					
UTI1: I never have to go to another store for the product that I wanted which I could not find in this store.	Extracted	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
UTI2: I can find products I'm looking for in this store.	Extracted				
UTI3: There have been times that I left this store without buying things that I need. (reverse)	1.00				
Hedonic shopping value (HEDO)					
HEDO1: I enjoy being immersed in exciting new products in this store.	.71	.90	.52	.27	.90
HEDO2: Rather than other things I do, I truly enjoy spending more at this store.	.60				
HEDO3: Shopping at this store is truly enjoyable time.	.75				
HEDO4: While shopping at this store, I'm able to forget my problems.	.64				
HEDO5: While shopping at this store, I've a good time because I'm able to make a decision without having to think at all.	Extracted				
HEDO6: While shopping at this store, I'm really having fun.	.78				
HEDO7: I don't want to stop when start to shop at this store, not because I have to, but because I want to do so.	.68				
HEDO8: To spend the time on shopping at this store is enjoyable for me.	.82				
HEDO9: I enjoy shopping at this store, not only I want to buy something but also I feel good about myself.	.79				
Perceived risk (RSK)					
RSK1: Purchasing clothing from this store is risky.	.70	.75	.51	.15	.76
RSK2: Purchase of clothing from this store may cause some problems.	Extracted				
RSK3: The idea of purchase of clothing from this store worries me.	.70				
RSK4: Purchase of clothing from this store seems to be a wrong decision.	.74				
Self-confidence (SELF)					
SELF1: When I am shopping, I feel confident in choosing compatible clothing.	.74	.83	.49	.03	.83
SELF2: I can choose the right and fitted clothes for myself.	.65				
SELF3: I don't think I am a shopper who can choose the right clothing. (reverse)	.61				
SELF4: I'm not good at choosing clothing. (reverse)	.69				
SELF5: My self-confidence is high in selecting clothing.	.80				

### Fit Indices

Chi-square (881)=867.98, df=238, RMSEA=.055, CFI=.94, GFI=.92, NFI=.91, RMSEA=.055, AGFI=.90, SRMR=.050, IFI=.94, NNFI=.93.

Note: N.A.: Not available; It's due to the construct was added to the model as single-measure.

Abbreviations:  $\lambda$ : Standardized factor loading; AVE: Average variance extracted; CR: Composite reliability