



**The Effect of Brand Equity, Brand Trust and Country of
Origin Image to Purchase Intention.
Case Study: Crocodile Brand**

Mr. Ekkasit Khemngwad

**Faculty of Business Administration
Thai-Nichi Institute of Technology
Academic Year 2016**

Research Title The Effect of Brand Equity, Brand Trust and Country of Origin Image to Purchase Intention. Case Study: Crocodile Brand

Researcher Mr. Ekkasit Khemngwad

Date May 2017

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research is to understand how Brand trust and Country of Origin Image effect to purchase intention of the Crocodile and 'L' brand by focusing on Thai consumer.

Although there are many characteristics that consumers consider when they want to buy something, such as brand, color and design, researchers cannot ignore external factors like country of origin. The international marketing literature shows that consumers use this external factor for evaluating products. In other words country of origin is a higher risk for international trade because it reflects consumer intention. In brief, in respect of other studies and the literature, country of origin is usually abbreviated as "COO", which refers to the country that manufactures designs or assembles a product or brand with which it is associated.

From the analysis result in this study, most of our hypotheses were right by Pair-T test analysis, Crosstab analysis and Chi-square analysis, which were:

The Ability of produce being significant relate to thinking that Thailand better than Vietnam in every part such as thread quality, production standard high skilled and ability labor, trusted production, and good quality controlled.

Design, creative, and consistency of product is significant relate that Thailand better than Vietnam in every part such as creative a product, representative a magnificent design, representative creativity.

Technological progress being significant different that Thailand better than Vietnam in every part such as reliability in production, reliability in production standard, trademark have reliability in product information, trademark have reliability in sustainable brand.

Reliable brand is significant different in 'L' better than Crocodile in every part such as trademark have reliability in product information, trademark have reliability in sustainable brand, reliability in production, reliability in production.

Honest brand to customer being significant of 'L' better than Crocodile in every part such as attention on customer demand, attention on production standard, attention on quality of product, raining sales employee, intent to give information, solve a problem for customer.

Brand consistency to customer is significant related consistency of 'L' better than Crocodile in every part such as always create a good quality product, always control the process to be high standard, always control the product to be high standard, honesty to make reliability to customer, and always remain the high quality product.

Purchase intention of customer is significant different that 'L' better than Crocodile in every part such as purchase intention, buying by confident, if the product is expensive, specific buying, and demand of customer.

Product reliability is being significant different that the person who wants many of Crocodile products (high purchase intention) have more product reliability than the person who doesn't want many of Crocodile products (low purchase intention).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This research was fully supported by Thai-Nichi Institute of Technology. I would like to thank our dean, Asst. Prof. Rangsan Lertnaisat, for always giving me support and encouragement. I hope that this will be beneficial to the organization, to the sme and will be used in my class for further study.

TABLE of CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	a
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	c
TABLE of CONTENTS	d
LIST of TABLES	f
Chapter 1	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Research's Objectives	5
1.3 Research Hypothesis	5
1.4 Expected Benefits	7
Chapter 2	8
2.1 Theory of Branding	9
2.2 Benefits of Branding	10
2.3 Expectations from Brands	11
2.4 Brand Origin	12
Chapter 3	18
3.1 Research Design	18
3.2 Survey instrument	18
3.3 Population and research group	19
3.4 Research Analysis Methodology	19
Chapter 4	20

4.1 Hypothesis Testing	20
Chapter 5	44
References	49

LIST of TABLES

	Page
Table 1: Mean differences between countries' production ability regarding thread quality, production standard, high skilled labor and dependable production and good quality control	20
Table 2: Mean differences between countries' production ability regarding design, creative, and consistency of product	22
Table 3: Mean differences between countries' production ability regarding reliability in production, reliability in production standard, trademark have reliability in product information, trademark have reliability in sustainable brand	24
Table 4: Mean differences between brands regarding reliability in product information, reliability in sustainable brand and reliability in production.	25
Table 5: Mean differences between brands regarding attention on customer demand, attention on production standard, attention on quality of product, raining sales employee, intent to give information, solve a problem for customer	27
Table 6: Mean differences between brands regarding consistency	29
Table 7: Mean differences between brands regarding purchase intention, buying by confident, if the product is expensive, specific buying, and demand of customer	31
Table 8: Table shows relationship between product's reliability and purchase intention regarding Crocodile brand	32
Table 9: Table shows relationship between product's reliability and purchase intention regarding 'L' brand	33
Table 10: Table shows relationship between product trust and purchase intention regarding Crocodile brand	34
Table 11: Table shows relationship between product trust and purchase intention regarding 'L' brand	35
Table 12: Table shows relationship between product information trust and purchase intention regarding Crocodile brand	37

Table 13: Table shows relationship between product information trust and purchase intention regarding 'L' brand	38
Table 14: Table shows relationship between product trust in sustainability and purchase intention regarding Crocodile brand	39
Table 15: Table shows relationship between product trust in sustainability and purchase intention regarding 'L' brand	40
Table 16: Table shows relationship between product trust in standard price and product specific demand regarding Crocodile brand	41
Table 17: Table shows relationship between product trust in standard price and product specific demand regarding 'L' brand	42

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Background

Thailand is a country located in the southeast of Asia, with a small developing economy, 67.01 million inhabitants and few natural resources. The gradual trend towards liberalization of the Thai economy, especially since the 1990s has been a major factor in its progressive shift toward a global economy and a market open to foreign brands. Imports come from many countries across the world, particularly from Europe and Asia, as a result of trade agreements and the reduction of trade barriers (Center for International Trade, 2015) and the globalizing influence of such associations as the Asian Economic Community. There is currently a lack of concrete information on consumers' attitudes; preferences and market place behavior with respect to foreign products in competition with domestic alternatives in developing countries in general (Chao, 1993, 1998; Lee, Suh and Moon, 2001; Peterson and Jolibert, 1995; Saffu and Scott, 2009). The society has changed, when the growth in science and technology has, it makes Thailand to become the growth country. The branded consumption gets started popular in Century 21 (Kapferer & Bastien. 2009) that give very valuable specific in fashion. Now, many brands have happened by the driving force of economic development, trade in new forms and the increase in spending etc. From this driving force, people in many countries were familiar with its global brands. Usually, rich people want to be overspending life and want others to know about their riches by having a lot of brand name things.

The country of origin effect has been recognized as an important factor in consumers' purchasing decisions (Schooler, 1965). In fact, it has drawn great attention in

the consumer buying behavior literature since the 1960s (Ditchter, 1962; Schooler, 1965). Despite over forty years of research, the COO effect has been criticized as one of the least understood phenomena (Verlegh & Steenkamp, 1999). Furthermore, in an age of increasing international competition and globalization, the concept of country of origin has come under great criticism (Thakor & Kohli, 1996).

Recently, some scholars have argued that the concept of country of origin should be replaced with the concept of brand origin (Thakor & Kohli, 1996). Recent studies have shown that brand origin could be a more influential cue than country of origin in determining consumer purchasing behavior due to the increase in global supply chains in today's marketplace (Lim & O'Cass, 2001).

Facing with massive abundance of products that are similar in terms of quality and shape, Consumers' purchasing decisions will be push towards brand without considering the characteristics of the products [3]. In the markets, which products and services, increasingly overlap and adapt, a strong brand can be the only show characteristic that differentiate a product or service offerings from competitors [4]. To achieve this goal, one of the most popular marketing concepts, which over the past twenty years, from academics and marketers, have been studied, the brand equity. "Brand equity" Refers to the tremendous value that the brand name brings to the producers, retailers and consumers of the brand. The equity of a brand is the result of consumers' perception of it which is influenced by many factors. Brand equity cannot be fully understood without carefully examining its sources, that is, the contributing factors to the formation of brand equity in the consumers' mind. Most of the brand equity research focuses on the marketing mix variables such as advertising, distribution, and price and product quality as the contributing factors [5]. However, not much attention is given to the non-marketing mix factors. In the process of buying, consumers

are not only concern about the quality and price of a product but also other factors such as the brand's country-of-origin.

The study reported here therefore analyzed data gathered from consumers in Thailand, as a contribution to the very limited research literature relating to attitudes to countries of origin among consumers in developing countries. Its conclusions should be helpful to both local and foreign companies in their formulation of marketing strategies by offering a better understanding of how foreign brands are likely to be perceived in relation to domestic products and those originating from other countries competing in this market. The findings will also contribute the body of knowledge relevant to country of origin available to local manufacturers, importers and prospective investors, as an input to their trade and investment strategies.

International trade and the development of the global market have grown considerably. Companies and international marketers are also looking for more opportunities in the global market and multinational firms, which causes international competition between companies. There are many factors that have an impact on this growth as well as consumer products and services evaluation, such as brand name and perception of country. Among the many characteristics, country of origin is one of the most important affecting this competitive market. Studies show that country of origin (COO) is one of the factors that most concern marketers in respect of its impact on consumer purchase intention (L. Y. Lin & Chen, 2006).

There are many magazines concerning nationalized, and the understanding of different nations goes back to the 1930s. Country of origin was an interesting issue for marketing examiners in the 1960s, and researchers have debated that focusing on difference and the same options for people all over the world is one of the factors of success for them. Studies show that the country of origin of products is an indicator of

its quality. Country of origin is an exciting subject for marketing managers (Roth & Diamantopoulos, 2009). The impact of country of origin on the buyer's intention dates back over three decades and purchase intention is one of the main issues considered in purchase behavior and the international business literature (Ghazali, Othman, Yahya, & Ibrahim, 2008).

Although there are many characteristics that consumers consider when they want to buy something, such as brand, color and design, researchers cannot ignore external factors like country of origin. The international marketing literature shows that consumers use this external factor for evaluating products. In other words country of origin is a higher risk for international trade because it reflects consumer intention. In brief, in respect of other studies and the literature, country of origin is usually abbreviated as "COO", which refers to the country that manufactures designs or assembles a product or brand with which it is associated (J. K. Lee & Lee, 2009).

According to clothing brand-name, Crocodile, Thaveekit adjust the tiered strategy 'Crocodile' by the parent company deflect punches teenage full capacity by 400 million baht to expand compressed events and launches Photoshop CS, SR. To upgrade to a more modern brand recently launched 'Wear Crocodile drive Toyota' image that Toyota will build credibility and expand its customer base. The goal is the first year that the proportion of teenagers moving from 10% to 50%, with total sales of close to 350 million baht.

Although we will not collect the market value brand-name clothes is clear, but it is known that the competition in this business is very severe because there are both old and new competition. So, every brand must create new strategy to leverage all responded and to compete for sales and maintaining a stand in the mall. Particularly,

competitors have same brand's positioning and the same target. They have to make a difference to win consumers.

“The former, we were weak in communications and marketing. But this year, Crocodile do aggressive marketing to highlight targets teenager aged 20 years and over due to a potential buyer and purchasing behavior with emotion.” Somsak said.

1.2 Research's Objectives

The objectives of this research is to study the effect of brand trust and country of origin image to purchase intention by using an apparel brand name called 'Crocodile' and its competitor, Brand 'L', as a case study.

1.3 Research Hypothesis

Hypothesis 1: This participants think about ability of produce of Thailand better than Vietnam in every part such as thread quality, production standard high skilled and ability labor, trusted production, and good quality controlled.

Hypothesis 2: This participants think about design, creative, and consistency of Thailand better than Vietnam in every part such as creative a product, representative a magnificent design, representative creativity.

Hypothesis 3: This participants think about technological progress of Thailand better than Vietnam in every part such as reliability in production, reliability in production standard, trademark have reliability in product information, trademark have reliability in sustainable brand.

Hypothesis 4: This participants think about reliability of 'L' better than Crocodile in every part such as trademark have reliability in product information, trademark have reliability in sustainable brand , reliability in production , reliability in production.

Hypothesis 5: These participants think about honest of 'L' better than Crocodile in every part such as attention on customer demand, attention on production standard, attention on quality of product, skilled sales employee, intent to give information, solving problem skills.

Hypothesis 6: These participants think about consistency of 'L' better than Crocodile in every part such as always create a good quality product, always control the process to be high standard, always control the product to be high standard, honesty to make reliability to customer, and always remain the high quality product

Hypothesis 7: These participants think about Purchase intention of 'L' better than Crocodile in every part such as purchase intention, buying by confident, if the product is expensive, specific buying, and demand of customer.

Hypothesis 8: Purchase intention, who wants many products of Crocodile, has more product reliability than Purchase intention, who doesn't want many products of Crocodile.

Hypothesis 9: Purchase intention, who wants many products of 'L', has more product reliability than Purchase intention, who doesn't want many products of 'L'.

Hypothesis 10: Purchase intention, who wants many products of Crocodile, has more standard price than Purchase intention, who doesn't want many products of Crocodile.

Hypothesis 11: Purchase intention, who wants many products of 'L', has more standard price than Purchase intention, who doesn't want many products of 'L'.

Hypothesis 12: Purchase intention, who wants many products of Crocodile, thinks that give some information of Crocodile more than Purchase intention, who doesn't want many products of Crocodile.

Hypothesis 13: Purchase intention, who wants many products of 'L', thinks that give some information of 'L' more than Purchase intention, who doesn't want many products of 'L'.

Hypothesis 14: Purchase intention, who wants many products of Crocodile, thinks that give some sustainable of Crocodile more than Purchase intention, who doesn't want many products of Crocodile.

Hypothesis 15: Purchase intention, who wants many products of 'L', thinks that give some sustainable of 'L' more than Purchase intention, who doesn't want many products of 'L'.

Hypothesis 16: person, who is high specific brand of Crocodile, thinks that Crocodile has standard price more than person, who is low specific brand of Crocodile.

Hypothesis 17: person, who is high specific brand of 'L', thinks that 'L' has standard price more than person, who is low specific brand of 'L'

1.4 Expected Benefits

We would like to offer the result of this research to be a source of data to develop quality of brand image of crocodile.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

The following literature review provided the study a generalized view regarding the topic of brand equity and various aspects of brand management. The literature review started with the description of the term “brand” and its origins and the brief evolution of branding in the subject of clothing and fashion. It also reflected the basis of branding and its results on the sales and marketing aspect of the industry. This review dealt with the important aspect of consumers’ attachment to brands and the perceived notion of possessing a certain brand and the psychological aspirations of the customers.

The following literature review mentioned various old studies on the similar topic done by researchers from various universities. There was tried to cover the preceding concept of managing a brand and the effective communication involved to make the brand a success in the competitive market. The important aspect of this literature review was the detailed informative study on the choice of market.

After reviewing the literature available on the topic, a research model was developed and then based on further analyses, hypotheses were acquired. The essential premise of this literature review is to provide the reader an old study of brand analyses and its various factors and why there is a need of brand analyses in the research about brands in respective countries and studying the various aspects of consumers which affect the growth of the brand. The literature review also attempts to find out a reasonable pursuit to the concept of brand analyses and its effect on the consumer study which would prepare the market for the entry of new global brands and also enable the domestic brands to correct their problem areas and to focus more on quality and customer retention.

2.1 Theory of Branding

There are brands and logos present all around us, starting from the wine we consume to the clothes we wear, in the billboards along the street, to the advertisements which don the buses, subway and yellow cabs (Hampf & Lindberg-Repo, 2011). Branding has proven to be an essential strategy for marketing even in noncommercial organizations like political outfits and charities. It can be utilized for improving the profitability of actors, sports personalities, celebrities and also cities (Moor, 2007). Branding is considered as a separate industry which acts as a key mechanism to enable the smooth functioning of a market-oriented economy (Moor, 2007; Henderson & Arora, 2010). Some brands of specific countries are considered superior to others in countries which raised the question of effect on homogenization of culture (Moor, 2007; Bastos & Levy, 2012) but the brands help create a working identity for a product influencing consumers' purchase intention.

Brand and advertising walks in continuum with each other creating a composite industrial environment; this continued focus on advertising has given rise to a functioning cultural economy at the expense of other forms of promotion (Du Gay & Pryke, 2002). Branding converts a certain commodity into a self-promotional form which creates an insatiable desire among consumers who want to procure it (Lury, 1993). Before delving into further discussion about brands and how they help to generate revenue for brands and corporations, we should understand the proper definitions.

A brand is a name, term, design, symbol, or any other feature that identifies one seller's good or service as distinct from those of other sellers (American Marketing Association Dictionary, 1960). The word "brand" is derived from the Old Norse brand means "to burn" which refers to the practice of producers burning their mark (or brand)

onto their products. The concept of brands is not new but comparatively branding a brand is a product derived from the start of modern globalization at the end of the Cold War. It was actually during the 1990s, that a previously essential set of practices – product design, retail design, point-of purchase marketing came together to be known as branding (Bastos & Levy, 2012). The effects of branding caught the unfettered attention after the publication of Naomi Klein's (2000) *No Logo* which created interest among scholarly circles to research more and more on this concept. Promotional activities of brands and corporations have always been subjected to public criticism and activism. There is another definition which also defines brand as a unique property of a specific company which has been developed over a certain time period enabling it to comprise a defined set of values and characteristics which meaningfully helps a consumer identify products otherwise would resemble the similar characteristic (Murphy, 1990). The perpetual rise of branding can be characterize a method of a more reflexive capitalism (Thrift, 1997) where a market is created for the product to make the consumers slowly but steadily conform to the structures presented in the concept expected by the certain company or brand.

2.2 Benefits of Branding

Proper branding can result in higher sales of not only one product, but on other products associated with that brand (Bennett & Hill, 2012). Some people distinguish the psychological aspect; brand associations like thoughts, feelings, perceptions, images, experiences, beliefs, attitudes, and so on that eventually become linked to the brand from the experiential aspect (Hislop, 2001). The experiential aspect invariably consists of the sum of all points of contact with the brand and is known as the brand experience (Brakuset.al, 2009) which is a brand's action perceived by a person. Brand experience as

a concept is defined as certain, feelings, cognitions, and behavioral responses evoked by brand-related stimuli which arise as part of a brand's design and identity, packaging, communications, and environments (Brakus et.al, 2009). The psychological aspect, sometimes referred to as the brand image, is a symbolic make created within the minds of people, consisting of all the information and expectation connected with a product, service or the company that is providing them (Engel, Blackwell & Miniard, 1995; Dacin & Mitchell, 1986).

2.3 Expectations from Brands

People engaged in branding seek to align the expectations behind the brand experience, creating the impression that a brand connected with a product or service has certain qualities or characteristics that make it special or unique. A brand is therefore one of the most valuable elements in an advertising theme, as it demonstrates what the brand owner is able to offer in the marketplace. So we can posit that the art of creating and maintaining a brand is called brand management. "In marketing research, seven brand management approaches have been identified during 1985–2006: the economic approach, the identity approach, the consumer-based approach, the personality approach, the relational approach, the community approach and the cultural approach. These approaches reflect a development where the focus has shifted from the sending end of brand communications in the first period of time; have then turned their attention to the receiving end in the second period; and finally have addressed contextual and cultural influences on the brand to the global understanding of brand consumption" (Heding, Knudtzen & Bjerre, 2008, p.15). Careful brand management seeks to make the product or services relevant to the target audience. Lastly, brands should be seen as more than the difference between the actual cost of a product and its

selling price as they represent the sum of all valuable qualities of a product to the consumer (Duncan & Moriarty, 1997).

2.4 Brand Origin

2.4.1 Brand origin and country of origin

The marketplace is always changing; so consumers are forced to make judgments about the quality of a product or a brand with incomplete information about that specific product or brand (Thakor & Kohli, 1996). Therefore, consumers often use secondary cues to form the associations needed to create images of a product or a brand (Keller, 1998). According to Keller (1998), the examples of secondary cues are country of origin, brand origin, distribution channels, or a spokesperson of the product (Keller, 1998). This study particularly focuses on brand origin as a potential cue that consumers use to evaluate apparel product quality. To understand the role of brand origin, however, the concept of country of origin must be discussed as it has been used as the precursor of brand origin.

2.4.2. Evolution of country of origin into brand origin

The term country of origin has been defined in many ways throughout the literature. At first, country of origin was considered the country where the final assembly of the good took place, the country of manufacture (COM), or the country that appeared on the 'made-in' label (Bilkey & Nes, 1982; Han & Terpstra, 1988; Lee & Schaninger, 1996; Papadopoulos, 1993; White, 1979). Over the years, other concepts have progressively emerged in the country of origin related literature, such as country of design (COD), referring to the country where the product was designed and developed (Jaffé & Nebenzahl, 2001).

With the growth of hybrid products with multinational production, there is a growing difference between COMs and CODs. Moreover, global companies tend to manipulate brand names to suggest particular origins; thus the concept of brand origin or country of brand (COB) has appeared (Thakor & Kohli, 1996). Consequently, country of origin is increasingly being considered the country that consumers typically associate with a product or brand, regardless of where the product was actually manufactured (Johansson, Douglas & Nonaka 1985).

Defining the concept of country of origin has become difficult in the past years due to the increasingly increased global economy (Phau & Pendergrast, 2000). The increase in international trade has resulted in the emergence of hybrid or bi-national products, which has provided a new momentum to country of origin research (Han & Terpstra, 1988). Products with multi-country affiliations questioned the role and relevance of the construct of country of origin. More importantly, as the borders between countries blur and international trade increases a new product evaluation tool is needed (Thakor & Kohli, 1996). This study accepts that the concept of brand origin best reflects today's increasingly global economy. So, brand origin is more important factor in determining consumers' perception of product quality attributes than is country of origin.

Thakor and Kohli (1996) defined brand origin as "the place, region or country to which the brand is perceived to belong by its target consumers". Thakor and Kohli (1996) suggest that the brand origin association is among the "most salient personality characteristics" of brands because it is part of the brand personality. Thakor and Kohli (1996) consider brand origin to be a demographic variable; thus, brands can be described in terms of their origins (e.g., Vosges Haut as American chocolate, Pizza Baffetto as Italian pizza.)

2.4.3 Country of origin effect- an extrinsic cue to quality

Although, the purpose of the study is to investigate the effect of brand origin, due to the lack of brand origin research and the strong tie with country of origin research, this section reviews previous country of origin research.

The phenomenon of consumers' dependency on country of origin information is referred to as the country of origin effect (Schooler, 1965). The country of origin effect refers to when consumers believe on country of origin information as a basis to consider the quality of a product (Schooler, 1965). For example, if a consumer would need to evaluate the quality of two shirts with different country of origins, the country of origin may play a factor in the evaluation process. If the first shirt was made in France, the consumer may believe it to be of higher quality than the second shirt that was made in China. This could be true because a consumer may have a preconceived notion that Chinese products are of poor quality than those created in France. So, without the complete examination of each shirt, the consumer may generalize that the Chinese shirt is of poorer quality because of where it was made. This rationale exists because people tend to make generalizations about countries due to personal experiences, prior consumptions of products from various countries, exposure to the media, and prior knowledge of a specific country (Han & Terpstra, 1988). Consumers then infer these generalizations to the quality of the products produced in that country (Bilkey & Nes, 1982; Han & Terpstra, 1988; Tse & Gorn, 1993).

2.4.4 Country of origin and brand origin effect research

Numerous studies have shown that country of origin has a significant effect on consumers' evaluations of products and brands. Schooler (1965) initiated the country of

origin effect research focusing on the determination of whether or not the construct of a country or origin effect actually existed. The study concluded that country of origin effect exists and consumers have a bias against products made in less developed countries. Reiersen (1966, 1967) researched consumers' perceptions on quality and found that the country of origin effect was present for general products, classes of products, and specific products. Additionally, Dickerson (1983) revealed that country of origin has a significant effect on consumers' evaluations of apparel products and that a majority of consumers took notice of whether clothing was imported and preferred to have domestically produced apparel. Dickerson (1983) also revealed that concern over imported apparel appears to be only a middle-socioeconomic class phenomenon.

Hong and Wyer (1989) compared the effects of product attributes and country of origin associations on consumers' product evaluations. Hong and Wyer (1989) study suggested that consumers' awareness of a product's country of origin has a direct influence on consumers' quality perceptions (Hong & Wyer, 1989). This is true because country of origin becomes a heuristic basis for inferring the product quality without considering other attributes (Hong & Wyer, 1989). Similarly, Chaiken and Maheswaran (1994) believed that consumers simplify judgments on product quality by retrieving pre-established evaluations from their memories. These pre-established evaluations act as shortcuts for judging the quality of a product. Therefore, consumers may use information, like country of origin, as the overall basis for judging the quality of a product (Chaiken & Maheswaran 1994).

Other studies (Maheswaran, 1994; Hong & Wyer, 1990) have suggested that favorable country of origin perceptions lead to favorable consumer perceptions of brand or product attributes, which ultimately lead to favorable evaluations of the brand or product by consumers. Thus, the authors further argued that companies may wish to

accentuate the country of origin information, if consumers are expected to infer specific perceptions and evaluations from these associations (Erickson, Johansson, & Chao 1984; Hong & Wyer 1989, 1990).

From a brand origin perspective, some studies have been done to investigate the relationship between brand origin and consumer quality perceptions. Thakor and Lavack (2003) studied the relationship between the brand origin cues found in brand names and consumer quality perceptions. Thakor and Lavack (2003) concluded that these perceived origin associations are a powerful source of brand appeal which marketers rely upon when focusing advertising on origin associations. Marketers use these associations in many product categories, particularly within categories where perceived origin or national identity is important to the product's image (e.g., the brands Channel and Tommy Hilfiger signify the France and United States, respectively to many consumers) (Thakor & Lavack, 2003). Although Thakor and Lavack (2003) revealed important insights into brand origin associations and consumer perceptions of quality, their study was limited to studying the quality of motorcycles and blenders, which are significantly different than apparel products. Moreover, the concept of judging the quality of apparel products is very different than judging the quality of other products (Hsu & Burns, 2002). Moreover, the process of judging apparel product quality is a very unique to each consumer (Hsu & Burns, 2002). Each consumer has different criterion for judging the quality of an apparel item. For one consumer, in evaluating apparel product quality, fit may be more important than the degree of stylishness and vice versa for other consumers. This suggested each consumer places the apparel product attributes in a different hierarchal order. Thus, Hsu and Burns (2002) presented the twelve criteria that consumers use to judge apparel product quality by compiling multiple apparel product

attributes, greatly simplifying consumers' apparel product quality evaluation (Hsu & Burns, 2002).

Chapter 3

Research Methodology

This research is designed to awareness how much influence the global brand has over the Thai consumers in comparison to domestic Crocodile brand and the competitiveness of the France origin 'L' brand. A survey was developed to collect data to empirically test the relationship between perceived brand and consumers' perceptions of apparel product attributes related to quality and future implications for the growth of Crocodile brands in Thailand. A quantitative research design is utilized for this study. This chapter will briefly describe the research design and population and sampling information, procedures which has been used, and instruments employed to study the sample.

3.1 Research Design

Descriptive survey research is a type of Mathematical analysis for data in figures can be interpreted as confidence in the brand and image of the country, sources that affect the purchase intention separate by personal factors of the respondents and influence effect.

It is a cross-sectional research survey which means to collect data at one particular time from a selected sample to describe a large population at a certain point of time. Use Primary data in research the actual space in the venue exhibition fair.

3.2 Survey instrument

A questionnaire survey is divided into 6 sections with a total of 7 pages. Each survey took approximately 7-10 minutes per questionnaire.

3.3 Population and research group

This study has utilized a self-administered survey questionnaire to sample size of 413 individuals.

In a part of population we refer to survey who have salary around 15,000-45,000 and more 45,000 baht and ages students until worker.

The Research groups we research by random emphasize age 35-55 and have high salary to enough power to buy of customer. we survey around current exhibition such as Saha Group Fair at Queen Sirikit National Convention Center, Central Chidlom and many commercial department stores around Bangkok.

3.4 Research Analysis Methodology

The study will be mainly analyzed by using t-test and Chi-square analysis technique in order to test any relationship between brand trust and country of origin image with the purchase intention.

Chapter 4

Research Analysis

4.1 Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis 1: Thai participants think about Thailand's production ability is better than Vietnam in every part such as thread quality, production standard, high skilled labor and dependable production, and good quality control.

Table 1: Mean differences between countries' production ability regarding thread quality, production standard, high skilled labor and dependable production and good quality control

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
1	QUALITY TH-VN	.4915	.8084	.0398	.4133	.5697	12.357	412	.000
2	STANDARD TH-VN	.525	.852	.042	.443	.608	12.535	412	.000
3	SKILL LABOR TH-VN	.438	.905	.045	.351	.526	9.838	412	.000
4	PRODUCTION TRUST TH-VN	.554	.836	.041	.474	.635	13.477	412	.000

*(If t-statistic > 0 mean the first variable is better than second variable in each topic)

From the table above, the opinion concerning thread quality that showed Thailand has better quality than Vietnam since p-value is 0.00 and t-statistic is 12.35

The opinion concerning production standard that showed Thailand has better quality than Vietnam since p-value is 0.00 and t-statistic is 12.53

The opinion concerning high skilled labor that can produce quality products showed Thailand has better quality than Vietnam since p-value is 0.00 and t-statistic is 9.83

The opinion concerning dependable production and good quality controlled that showed Thailand has better quality than Vietnam since p-value is 0.00 and t-statistic is 13.47

Hypothesis 2: Thais participants think about design, creative, and consistency of Thailand is better than Vietnam in every part such as creative a product, representative a magnificent design, representative creativity.

Table 2: Mean differences between countries' production ability regarding design, creative, and consistency of product

Design Ability	Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
1 CREATIVE PRODUCT TH-VN	.639	.902	.044	.552	.726	14.401	412	.000
2 SHOW LUXURY TH-VN	.661	.882	.043	.576	.746	15.230	412	.000
3 SHOW CREATIVE TH-VN	.651	.911	.045	.563	.739	14.533	412	.000

*(If t-statistic > 0 mean the first variable is better than second variable in each topic)

From the most answerer, their opinion concerning creative a product that showed Thailand has better quality than Vietnam since t-statistic is 14.40

From the most answerer, their opinion concerning a product that representative a magnificent design that showed Thailand has better quality than Vietnam since t-statistic is 15.23

From the most answerer, their opinion concerning the product that representative a creativity that showed Thailand has better quality than Vietnam since t-statistic is 14.53

Hypothesis 3: This participants think about technological progress of Thailand better than Vietnam in every part such as reliability in production, reliability in production standard, trademark have reliability in product information, trademark have reliability in sustainable brand.

From table 3 below, answerer's opinion concerning reliability in production and the result showed Thailand have better than Vietnam since t-statistic is 10.977

From the most answerer, their opinion concerning reliability in production standard and the result showed Thailand have better than Vietnam since t-statistic is 10.879

From the most answerer, their opinion concerning trademark have reliability in product information and the result showed Thailand have better than Vietnam since t-statistic is 10.219

From the most answerer, their opinion concerning trademark have reliability in sustainable brand and the result showed Thailand have better than Vietnam since t-statistic is 11.515

Table 3: Mean differences between countries' production ability regarding reliability in production, reliability in production standard, trademark have reliability in product information, trademark have reliability in sustainable brand

		Paired Differences				t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower				Upper
1	TECHNOLOGY LEADER TH-VN	.484	.897	.044	.398	.571	10.977	412	.000
2	DEVELOP TH-VN	.465	.868	.043	.381	.549	10.879	412	.000
3	LEARN HIGH TECHNOLOGY TH-VN	.443	.881	.043	.358	.528	10.219	412	.000
4	USE TECHNOLOGY DEVELOP PRODUCT TH-VN	.499	.880	.043	.414	.584	11.515	412	.000
5	USE TECHNOLOGY IN PROCESS TH-VN	.518	.866	.043	.434	.602	12.157	412	.000

Hypothesis 4: This participants think about reliability of ‘L’ better than Crocodile in every part such as trademark have reliability in product information, trademark have reliability in sustainable brand , reliability in production , reliability in production.

Table 4: Mean differences between brands regarding reliability in product information, reliability in sustainable brand and reliability in production.

	Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference					
				Lower	Upper				
1	RELIABILITY PRODUCT CROC-LA	-475	.923	.045	-564	-.385	-10.449	412	.000
2	STANDARD PRICE CROC-LA	-412	.845	.042	-493	-.330	-9.902	412	.000
3	INFORMATION PRODUCT CROC-LA	-462	.899	.044	-549	-.376	-10.459	412	.000
4	SUSTAINABLE BRAND CROC-LA	-496	.949	.047	-588	-.405	-10.627	412	.000

From the most answerer, their opinion concerning reliability in production and the result showed 'L' have better than Crocodile since t-statistic is -10.44

From the most answerer, their opinion concerning reliability in production standard and the result showed 'L' have better than Crocodile since t-statistic is -9.90

From the most answerer, their opinion concerning trademark have reliability in product information and the result showed 'L' have better than Crocodile since t-statistic is -10.45

From the most answerer, their opinion concerning trademark have reliability in sustainable brand and the result showed 'L' have better than Crocodile since t-statistic is -10.62

Hypothesis 5: These participants think about honest of 'L' better than Crocodile in every part such as attention on customer demand, attention on production standard, attention on quality of product, raining sales employee, intent to give information, solve a problem for customer.

Table 5: Mean differences between brands regarding attention on customer demand, attention on production standard, attention on quality of product, raining sales employee, intent to give information, solve a problem for customer

		Paired Differences				t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower				Upper
1	ATTENTION ON CUSTOMER CROC-LA	-.300	.811	.040	-.379	-.222	-7.527	412	.000
2	PRODUCTION STANDARD CROC-LA	-.322	.836	.041	-.403	-.241	-7.825	412	.000
3	QUALITY PRODUCT CROC-LA	-.341	.834	.041	-.422	-.261	-8.315	412	.000
4	TRAINING EMPLOYEE CROC-LA	-.295	.850	.042	-.378	-.213	-7.059	412	.000
5	PROVIDE INFORMATION CROC-LA	-.375	.834	.041	-.456	-.295	-9.141	412	.000
6	SOLVE A PROBLEM CROC-LA	-.262	.812	.040	-.340	-.183	-6.543	412	.000

*(If t-statistic > 0 mean the first variable is better than second variable in each topic)

From the most answerer, their opinion concerning attention on customer demand and the result showed 'L' have better than Crocodile since t-statistic is -7.57 .

From the most answerer, their opinion concerning attention on production standard and the result showed 'L' have better than Crocodile since t-statistic is -7.82

From the most answerer, their opinion concerning attention on quality of product and the result showed 'L' have better than Crocodile since t-statistic is -8.31

From the most answerer, their opinion concerning training sales employee and the result showed 'L' have better than Crocodile since t-statistic is -7.05

From the most answerer, their opinion concerning intent to provide information and the result showed 'L' have better than Crocodile since t-statistic is -9.14

From the most answerer, their opinion concerning solve a problem for customer and the result showed 'L' have better than Crocodile since t-statistic is -6.54

Hypothesis 6: These participants think about consistency of 'L' better than Crocodile in every part such as always create a good quality product, always control the process to be high standard, always control the product to be high standard, honesty to make reliability to customer, and always remain the high quality product

Table 6: Mean differences between brands regarding consistency

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
1	ALWAYS GOOD QUALITY PRODUCT CROC-LA	-.329	.765	.038	-.403	-.255	-8.746	412	.000
2	CONTROL THE PROCESS CROC-LA	-.298	.795	.039	-.375	-.221	-7.614	412	.000
3	CONTROL PRODUCT STANDARD CROC-LA	-.324	.780	.038	-.400	-.249	-8.456	412	.000
4	HONESTY TO CUSTOMER CROC-LA	-.315	.829	.041	-.395	-.235	-7.717	412	.000
5	REMAIN HIGHEST QUALITY CROC-LA	-.278	.866	.043	-.362	-.195	-6.534	412	.000

*(If t-statistic > 0 mean the first variable is better than second variable in each topic)

From the most answerer, their opinion concerning always create a good quality product and the result showed 'L' have better than Crocodile since t-statistic is -8.76

From the most answerer, their opinion concerning always control the process to be high standard and the result showed 'L' have better than Crocodile since t-statistic is - 7.61

From the most answerer, their opinion concerning always control the product to be high standard and the result showed 'L' have better than Crocodile since t-statistic is - 8.45

From the most answerer, their opinion concerning honesty to make reliability to customer and the result showed 'L' have better than Crocodile since t-statistic is -7.71

From the most answerer, their opinion concerning always remain the highest quality product and the result showed 'L' have better than Crocodile since t-statistic is - 6.53

Hypothesis 7: These participants think about Purchase intention of 'L' better than Crocodile in every part such as purchase intention, buying by confident, if the product is expensive, specific buying, and demand of customer.

Table 7: Mean differences between brands regarding purchase intention, buying by confident, if the product is expensive, specific buying, and demand of customer

		Paired Differences				t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower				Upper
1	PRODUCT OCCUPIER CROC-LA	-.576	.946	.047	-.668	-.485	-12.377	412	.000
2	HIGH PRICE CROC-LA	-.511	.926	.046	-.600	-.421	-11.214	412	.000
3	BUY SPECIFIC PRODUCT CROC-LA	-.608	.988	.049	-.703	-.512	-12.497	412	.000
4	CONFIDENT CROC-LA	-.521	1.016	.050	-.619	-.422	-10.415	412	.000

*(If t-statistic > 0 mean the first variable is better than second variable in each topic)

From the most answerer, their opinion concerning demand of customer and the result showed 'L' have better than Crocodile since t-statistic is -12.37

From the most answerer, their opinion concerning if the product is expensive and the result showed 'L' have better than Crocodile since t-statistic is -11.21

From the most answerer, their opinion concerning specific buying and the result showed 'L' have better than Crocodile since t-statistic is -12.49

From the most answerer, their opinion concerning buying by confident and the result showed 'L' have better than Crocodile since t-statistic is -10.415

Hypothesis 8: Purchase intention, who wants many products of Crocodile, has more product reliability than Purchase intention, who doesn't want many products of Crocodile.

Table 8: Table shows relationship between product's reliability and purchase intention regarding Crocodile brand

		PRODUCT RELIABILITY OF CROCODILE		Total
		LOW	HIGH	
PURCHASE INTENTION	LOW	162 52.43%	147 47.57%	309 100%
	HIGH	27 25.96%	77 74.04%	104 100%
Total		189 45.76%	224 54.24%	413 100%

Chi-square Statistic 21.958

P-value 0.000

Of all 413 about crocodile product, People that have low occupier and low reliability with product are 52.43%, while the people who have low purchase intention but high reliability with product are 47.57%

On the other hand the people have high purchase intention but low reliability with product are 25.96% ,High purchase intention and high product reliability are 74.04%, This shows that the responses between Product occupier and Product Reliability of crocodile are significantly different from each other when measuring reliability of Crocodile brand.

Hypothesis 9: Purchase intention, who wants many products of 'L', has more product reliability than Purchase intention, who doesn't want many products of 'L'.

Table 9: Table shows relationship between product's reliability and purchase intention regarding 'L' brand

		PRODUCT RELIABILITY OF 'L'		Total
		LOW	HIGH	
PURCHASE INTENTION	LOW	56 28.72%	139 71.28%	195 100%
	HIGH	34 15.6%	184 84.4%	218 100%
Total		90 21.8%	323 78.2%	413 100%

Chi-square Statistic 10.399

P-value 0.001

From above the table, ‘L’ product have people who have low purchase intention and low reliability with product are 28.72% ,while low purchase intention but high product reliability are 71.28% ,High purchase intention and low product reliability are 15.6%.

For the high purchase intention and also high reliability with product are 84.4%. The calculated value of Chi-square test statistic 10.399 at a 95% level of confidence. This shows that the responses between purchase intention and product reliability of ‘L’ are significantly different from each other when measuring reliability of ‘L’

Hypothesis 10: Purchase intention, who wants many products of Crocodile, has more trust standard price than Purchase intention, who doesn’t want many products of Crocodile.

Table 10: Table shows relationship between product trust and purchase intention regarding Crocodile brand

		STANDARD PRICE OF CROCODILE		Total
		LOW	HIGH	
PURCHASE INTENTION	LOW	210 67.97%	99 32.03%	309 100%
	HIGH	44 42.31%	60 57.69%	104 100%
Total		254 61.50%	159 35.50%	413 100%

Chi-square Statistic 21.627

P-value 0.000

The questionnaire show that the crocodile customer who have high purchase intention but low trust with standard price setting are 67.97%, Low purchase intention but high trust with standard price setting are 32.03%, while the high purchase intention but low trust with standard price are 42.31%, The group that have high purchase intention and also high trust with standard price setting are 57.69%.The calculated value of Chi-square test statistic 21.627 at a 95% level of confidence. This shows that the responses between Purchase intention and stand price of crocodile are significantly different from each other when measuring standard price of Crocodile brand.

Hypothesis 11: Purchase intention, who wants many products of ‘L’, has more trust standard price than Purchase intention, who doesn’t want many products of ‘L’.

Table 11: Table shows relationship between product trust and purchase intention regarding ‘L’ brand

		STANDARD PRICE OF ‘L’		Total
		LOW	HIGH	
PURCHASE INTENTION	LOW	95 48.72%	100 51.28%	195 100%
	HIGH	64 29.36%	154 70.64%	218 100%
Total		159 35.50%	254 61.50%	413 100%

Chi-square Statistic 16.294

P-value 0.000

With 'L' product, the low purchase intention and low trust with standard price setting are 48.72%,

Low purchase intention but high trust with standard price setting are 51.28%, while the high purchase intention but low trust with standard price setting are 29.36%, The group that have high purchase intention and also high trust with standard price setting are 70.64%.

The calculated value of Chi-square test statistic 16.294 at a 95% level of confidence. This shows that the responses purchase intention and standard price of 'L' are significantly different from each other when measuring standard price of Crocodile brand.

Hypothesis 12: Purchase intention, who wants many products of Crocodile, thinks that give some information of Crocodile more than Purchase intention, who doesn't want many products of Crocodile.

Table 12: Table shows relationship between product information trust and purchase intention regarding Crocodile brand

		INFORMATION OF CROCODILE		Total
		LOW	HIGH	
PURCHASE INTENTION	LOW	165 53.40%	144 46.60%	309 100%
	HIGH	38 36.54%	66 63.46%	104 100%
Total		203 49.15%	210 50.85%	413 100%

Chi-square Statistic 8.850

P-value 0.003

The Effect of purchase intention to information of product of Crocodile, The People who have low purchase intention and low trust in product information are 53.40%, Low purchase intention but high trust in product information are 46.60%, while the high purchase intention but low trust in product information are 36.54%, The group that have high purchase intention and also high trust in product information are 63.46%

The calculated value of Chi-square test statistic is 8.850 at a 95% level of confidence. This shows that the responses purchase intention and information product of crocodile are significantly different from each other when measuring information of Crocodile brand.

Hypothesis 13: Purchase intention, who wants many products of 'L', thinks that give some information of 'L' more than Purchase intention, who doesn't want many products of 'L'.

Table 13: Table shows relationship between product information trust and purchase intention regarding 'L' brand

		INFORMATION OF 'L'		Total
		LOW	HIGH	
PURCHASE INTENTION	LOW	61 31.28%	134 68.72%	195 100%
	HIGH	42 19.27%	176 80.73%	218 100%
Total		103 24.94%	310 75.06%	413 100%

Chi-square Statistic 7.939

P-value 0.005

Regarding 'L' brand, Low purchase intention and low trust in product information are 31.28%, Low purchase intention but high trust in product information are 68.72%, while the high purchase intention but low trust in product information are 19.27%, for the people that have high purchase intention and also high trust in product information are 80.73%.

The calculated value of Chi-square test statistic is 7.939 at a 95% level of confidence. This shows that the responses purchase intention and information product

of 'L' are significantly different from each other when measuring information of 'L' brand.

Hypothesis 14: Purchase intention, who wants many products of Crocodile, trust in sustainable of Crocodile more than Purchase intention, who doesn't want many products of Crocodile.

Table 14: Table shows relationship between product trust in sustainability and purchase intention regarding Crocodile brand

		SUSTAINABLE OF CROCODILE		Total
		LOW	HIGH	
PURCHASE INTENTION	LOW	164 53.07%	145 46.93%	309 100%
	HIGH	28 26.92%	76 73.08%	104 100%
Total		192 46.49%	221 53.51%	413 100%

Chi-square Statistic 21.391

P-value 0.000

Purchase intention relating to sustainable Crocodile brand, low purchase intention and low trust sustainable brand are 53.07%. Low purchase intention but high trust sustainable brand are 46.93%, high purchase intention but low trust sustainable brand are 26.92%, while the high purchase intention and also high trust sustainable brand are 73.08%.

The calculated value of Chi-square test statistic is 21.391 at a 95% level of confidence. This shows that the responses purchase intention and sustainable product of crocodile are significantly different from each other when measuring sustainable of Crocodile brand.

Hypothesis 15: Purchase intention, who wants many products of 'L', trust in sustainable of 'L' more than Purchase intention, who doesn't want many products of 'L'.

Table 15: Table shows relationship between product trust in sustainability and purchase intention regarding 'L' brand

		SUSTAINABLE OF 'L'		Total
		LOW	HIGH	
PURCHASE INTENTION	LOW	55 28.20%	140 71.80%	195 100%
	HIGH	35 17.68%	163 82.32%	198 100%
Total		90 21.79%	323 78.21%	413 100%

Chi-square Statistic 3.874

P-value 0.049

From above the table of 'L', low purchase intention and low trust sustainable brand are 28.20%. Low purchase intention but high trust sustainable brand are 71.80%,

high purchase intention but low trust sustainable brand are 17.68%, while the high purchase intention and also high trust sustainable brand are 82.32%.

The calculated value of Chi-square test statistic is 3.874 at a 95% level of confidence. This shows that the responses purchase intention and sustainable product of 'L' are significantly different from each other when measuring sustainable of 'L' brand.

Hypothesis 16: person, who is high demand specific brand of Crocodile, thinks that Crocodile has more trust standard price more than person, who is low specific brand of Crocodile.

Table 16: Table shows relationship between product trust in standard price and product specific demand regarding Crocodile brand

		STANDARD PRICE OF CROCODILE		Total
		LOW	HIGH	
BUY SPECIFIC BRAND	LOW	230 65.34%	122 34.66%	352 100%
	HIGH	24 39.34%	37 60.66%	61 100%
Total		254 61.50%	159 38.50%	413 100%

Chi-square Statistic 14.840

P-value 0.000

Regarding relationship between buying specific brand with standard price setting, The person who have low buying specific brand and low trust in standard price setting are 65.34%, Low buying specific brand but high trust in standard price setting are 34.66%, while high buying specific brand have low trust in standard price setting are 39.34%, For the group that have high buying specific brand and also have high trust in standard price setting are 60.66%.

The calculated value of Chi-square test statistic is 14.84 at a 95% level of confidence. This shows that the responses between buy specific brand and standard price of Crocodile are significantly different from each other when measuring standard price of Crocodile brand.

Hypothesis 17: person, who is high demand specific brand of 'L', thinks that 'L' has more trust standard price more than person, who is low specific brand of 'L'.

Table 17: Table shows relationship between product trust in standard price and product specific demand regarding 'L' brand

		STANDARD PRICE OF 'L'		Total
		LOW	HIGH	
BUY SPECIFIC BRAND	LOW	121 47.08%	136 52.92%	257 100%
	HIGH	38 24.36%	118 75.64%	156 100%
Total		159 38.50%	254 61.50%	413 100%

Chi-square Statistic	21.169
P-value	0.000

From 'L' brand's side, Low buying specific brand and low trust in standard price setting are 47.08% people, Low buying specific brand but high trust in standard price setting are 52.92%, while high buying specific brand have low trust in standard price setting are 24.36%, For age group that have high buying specific brand and also have high trust in standard price setting are 75.64%.

The calculated value of Chi-square test statistic is 21.169 at a 95% level of confidence. This shows that the responses between buy specific brand and standard price of 'L' are significantly different from each other when measuring standard price of 'L' brand.

Chapter 5

Conclusion

Our objective to understand how Brand trust and country of origin image effect to purchase intention of the Crocodile and 'L' brand by focusing on Thai consumer.

The country of origin effect has been recognized as an important factor in consumers' purchasing decisions (Schooler, 1965). In fact, it has drawn great attention in the consumer buying behavior literature since the 1960s (Ditchter, 1962; Schooler, 1965). Despite over forty years of research, the COO effect has been criticized as one of the least understood phenomena (Verlegh & Steenkamp, 1999). Furthermore, in an age of increasing international competition and globalization, the concept of country of origin has come under great criticism (Thakor & Kohli, 1996).

Although there are many characteristics that consumers consider when they want to buy something, such as brand, color and design, researchers cannot ignore external factors like country of origin. The international marketing literature shows that consumers use this external factor for evaluating products. In other words country of origin is a higher risk for international trade because it reflects consumer intention. In brief, in respect of other studies and the literature, country of origin is usually abbreviated as "COO", which refers to the country that manufactures designs or assembles a product or brand with which it is associated (J. K. Lee & Lee, 2009).

From the analysis result in this study, most of our hypotheses were right by Pair-T test analysis, Crosstab analysis and Chi-square analysis, which were:

The Ability of produce being significant relate to thinking that Thailand better than Vietnam in every part such as thread quality, production standard high skilled and ability labor, trusted production, and good quality controlled.

Design, creative, and consistency of product is significant relate that Thailand better than Vietnam in every part such as creative a product, representative a magnificent design, representative creativity.

Technological progress being significant different that Thailand better than Vietnam in every part such as reliability in production, reliability in production standard, trademark have reliability in product information, trademark have reliability in sustainable brand.

Reliable brand is significant different in 'L' better than Crocodile in every part such as trademark have reliability in product information, trademark have reliability in sustainable brand, reliability in production, reliability in production.

Honest brand to customer being significant of 'L' better than Crocodile in every part such as attention on customer demand, attention on production standard, attention on quality of product, raining sales employee, intent to give information, solve a problem for customer.

Brand consistency to customer is significant related consistency of 'L' better than Crocodile in every part such as always create a good quality product, always control the process to be high standard, always control the product to be high standard, honesty to make reliability to customer, and always remain the high quality product.

Purchase intention of customer is significant different that 'L' better than Crocodile in every part such as purchase intention, buying by confident, if the product is expensive, specific buying, and demand of customer.

Product reliability is being significant different that the person who wants many of Crocodile products (high purchase intention) have more product reliability than the person who doesn't want many of Crocodile products (low purchase intention).

Product reliability is being significant different that the person who wants many of 'L' products (high purchase intention) have more product reliability than the person who doesn't want many of 'L' products (low purchase intention).

Standard price is being significant different that the person who wants many of Crocodile products (high purchase intention) have more trust standard price than the person who doesn't want many of Crocodile products (low purchase intention)

Standard price is being significant different that the person who wants many of 'L' products (high purchase intention) have more trust standard price than the person who doesn't want many of 'L' products (low purchase intention).

Information of product trust is being significant different that the person who wants many of Crocodile products (high purchase intention) have more trust in information of product than the person who doesn't want many of Crocodile products (low purchase intention).

Information of product trust is being significant different that the person who wants many of 'L' products (high purchase intention) have more trust in information of product than the person who doesn't want many of 'L' products (low purchase intention).

Brand sustainable trust is significant related that the person who wants many of Crocodile products (high purchase intention) have more trust in trust in sustainable than the person who doesn't want many of Crocodile products (low purchase intention).

Brand sustainable trust is significant related that the person who wants many of 'L' products (high purchase intention) have more trust in trust in sustainable than the person who doesn't want many of 'L' products (low purchase intention).

Standard price trust is significant different that the person who have high demand specific brand of Crocodile, They have more trust standard price more than the person who have low demand specific brand of Crocodile.

Standard price trust is significant different that the person who have high demand specific brand of 'L', They have more trust standard price more than the person who have low demand specific brand of 'L'.

Furthermore, our study also what were the factor that customer consider about choosing the clothing shop. The finder discover some interesting result from our interviewer, The most factor that they consider to choosing the clothing is favorite store , which attract them to come back to bought the cloth.

Research Limitation

There are a few limitations in this study. First, starting up to write English that we are not good with the English language write the English Research was doing by two research assistants who were able to write and understand and translate from Thai Research to English version, then by asking the English teacher in English Language Center at Thai-Nichi Institute of Technology to help out with revising the English research for correction version. Second, data collection in to doing research is difficult for the interviewer to answer the questionnaires because we have limit time, in the time that we have, That it not the right time for the interviewer to answer the questionnaire, Most of them are in the hurry time that is difficult for our team to done the questionnaire.

Further Research

There are a few research questions that researchers would love to continue and find out more from this kind of research by using factor analysis statistic to compile from

this study, especially the factors that can affect the way people decide to choose the brands or products. From this research, we found the factors but we couldn't run the statistics because of a lack of a good questionnaire and thus future research must ensure the research design in this particular part.

Future research can also include more other than country just Thailand and Vietnam, so we can discover more knowledge about how people in other countries perceive brand mascots as well. Also, most of the results in this research study were significant so questions relating to these variables could be examined in more detail in future research.

References

- Ahmed, Z. U., Johnson, J. P., Ling, C. P., Fang, T. W., & Hui, A. K. (2002). Country-of-origin and brand effects on consumers' evaluations of cruise lines. *International Marketing Review*, 19(3), 279-302.
- Balabanis, G. & Diamantopoulos, A. (2004). Domestic country bias, country-of-origin effects and consumer ethnocentrism: a multidimensional unfolding approach. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 32(1), 80-95.
- Bhakar, S.S., Shailja, B., and Bhakar, S. (2013), Relationship Between Country of Origin, Brand Image, and Customer Purchase Intentions, *Far East Journal of Psychology and Business*, 2013, vol. 10 No 2, issue 4, pages 25-47
- Bilkey, W. J., & Nes, E. (1982). Country-of-origin effects on product evaluations. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 89-99.
- Chan, Y.F.B., Lim, Y.M., Han, K.S (2013). A study on shopping orientation and online purchase intention: a comparison of university students among three races. *Journal of Human and Social Science Research*. Vol. 1, No. 1 (2013), 51-61
- Chao, P. (1998). Impact of country-of-origin dimensions on product quality and design quality perceptions. *Journal of Business Research*, 42(1), 1-6.
- Chrysochoidis, G., Krystallis, A. & Perreas, P. (2007). Ethnocentric beliefs and country-of-origin (COO) effect: Impact of country, product and product attributes on Greek consumers' evaluation of food products. *European Journal of Marketing*, 41(11-12), 1518-1544
- Fandos, C., Flavian, C., (2006). Intrinsic and extrinsic quality attributes, loyalty and buying intention: an analysis for a PDO product, *British food journal*, 108(8), 646-662
- Hanzaee, K. H., & Khosrozadeh, S. (2011). The Effect of the Country-of-Origin Image, Product Knowledge and Product Involvement on Information Search and Purchase Intention. *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*, 8(3), 625-636.

- Jalilvand, M., Samiei, N., Mahdavinia, S., (2011), the Effect of Brand Equity Components on Purchase Intention, *International Business and Management*, 2(2), 149-158
- Jin, B., Kang, J., H., 2011. Purchase Intention of Chinese Consumers toward a US Apparel Brand: A Test of A Composite Behavior Intention Model, *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 28(3), 187-199.
- Josiassen, A., Lukas, B. A., & Whitwell, G. J. (2008). Country-of-origin contingencies: Competing perspectives on product familiarity and product involvement. *International Marketing Review*, 25(4), 423-440.
- Kapfrr, J N. Strategic brand management. Cena translating Lu sir, missionaries Publications, Tehran, first printing. 2006
- Lampert, S. & Jaffe, E. (1998). A dynamic approach to country-of-origin effect. *European Journal of Marketing*, 32(1-2), 61-78.
- Lobb, A.E., Mazzocchi, M. &Traill, W.B. (2007). Modeling risk perception and trust in food safety information within the Theory of Planned Behaviour. *Food Quality and Preferences*, 18(2), 384-395.
- Michaelis, M., Woisetschlager, D. M., Backhaus, C., &Ahlert, D. (2008). The effects of country of origin and corporate reputation on initial trust: An experimental evaluation of the perception of Polish consumers. *International Marketing Review*, 25(4), 404-422.
- Piron, F. (2000). Consumers' perception of the country-of-origin effect on purchasing intentions of (in) conspicuous products. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 17(4), 308-321.
- Rafiee, S, Haghghi, M., Yazdani, HR. The impact of marketing mix on brand equity and corporate image software sector of IT industry. *Journal a new market research study*. 2012, 2 (4): 182- 195. [Article in Persian].
- Schaefer, A. (1997). Consumer knowledge and country of origin effects. *European Journal of Marketing*, 31(1), 56-72.

- Siti, N.J., Pan, E.L. and Mohaini, M.N. (2014). Consumers Perceptions, Attitudes and Purchase Intention towards Private Label Food Products in Malaysia. *Asian Journal of Business and Management Sciences*, 2(8), pp.74-78.
- Tariq, M.I., Nawaz, M.R., Nawaz, M.M., Butt, H.A., (2013), Customer perceptions about branding and purchase intention: a study of FMCG in an emerging market, *Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research*, 3 (2), 340-347
- Thakor, M.V. & Lavack, A. (2003). Effect of perceived brand origin on associations on consumer perceptions of quality. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 12(6), 394-407.
- Yasin, N., Noor, M., & Mohamed, O. Does Image of Country-of-Origin Matter to Brand Equity? *Journal of Product and Brand Management*. 2007, 16(1): 38-48.
- Yoo, B., Donthu, N., & Lee, S. An Examination of Selected Marketing Mix Elements and Brand Equity. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*. 2000, 28(2): 195-211.
- Zeithaml, V.A. (1988). Consumer perceptions of price, quality and value: A means-end model and synthesis of evidence. *Journal of Marketing*, 52(3), 2-22.

