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#### Abstract

It has been widely speculated that buyer's product evaluation is based on the extrinsic cues ( Price, brand name and store name information) when they do not have enough time, knowledge and intrinsic cues information of product. This study examines the effect of price, brand name and store name information on perceived quality, perceived value and willingness to buy in the case of consumers of sandal in Ho Chi Minh City.


There are three independent variables( price, brand name and store name) to be tested with the three main groups of dependent variables ( perceived quality , perceived value and willingness to buy. The research uses experimental technique with applying the convenience sampling method all together 585 questionnaire are distributed to the buyer's of sandal product in Ho Chi Minh Market.

One_way ANOVA is used to test the effect of price, brand name and store name information on buyer's product evaluation. MANOVA is used to test the combine effect of price, brand name and store name on dependent variables

The research result shown that there is a positive relationship between price and buyer's perceptions of quality, value and willingness to buy.

A significant Brand name effect on those three dependent variables.. In contract , Store name have no effect on the perceived quality, value and willingness to buy.

In term of the combines effects, suggesting that the effect of price on perceived quality is greater in the single cue than multiple -cue, in contract the effect of price on perceived value and willingness to buy is not greater in single -cue than Multiple-cue . The result in brand effect on perceive quality, perceived value and willingness to buy all is greater in the single-cue than in multiple -cue and the effect of store on perceived quality is not greater in the single -cue(SC) than Multiple -cue(MC), for the perceived value ,the effect of store in SC is not greater in SC than all conditions but SC is greater than in Store and Brand conditions and willingness to buy is not greater in the single cue only than Multiple cue.

The research finding that the buyer's often use price and brand name information on their product quality evaluations and intend to buy when the buyer's are less familiar with a product lack of experience. This research finding out that the buyer are relied on price for their perceived quality but it is not for their perceived value and willingness to buy and the buyers of sandal are more rely on familiar information cues of brand name to assess the sandal ' s worth and purchase intentions.
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## Chapter 1. INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Back ground of study :

### 1.1.1 Definition of key terms:

The authors report a study of the effects of price, brand, and store information on buyer's perceptions of product quality and value, as well as their willingness to buy. This is what the empirical researchers defines the keys terms.

A brand name is a trademark that distinguishes the product from its competitors' product (Cheeseman, 1992). A brand name can represent a symbol or template in long-term memory where meaning and information concerning the brand name or the product associated with the brand name is processed and stored (Morris, 1982). The more the product information supports the benefits consumer seek, the greater the long-term performance of the brand through established consumer loyalty.

Like the product and brand, stores also have images. Establishment such as Bloomingdale's, Saks Fifth Avenue, Nieman Marcus projects very difference image than Target, Kmart, Wal-Mart . In select store the customer look for those that match their self -concept( Nessim Hana/Richard Wozniak.2000)

Price is an important to consumers buyer because it represents the sacrifice necessary to obtain good. Some researches have examined how price affect perceived quality and value. Overall when price was the only extrinsic cue available, the subject clearly to be related positively. Price is defines as the exchange value of a commodity; that is, the power of a commodity to command some other commodity, usually money, in exchange for itself. (Contemporary Microeconomics, 1986)

Some researchers examined the Perceived quality of the product base on the product cues ( price, brand, store ) as Zeithaml (1988) has been defined as the buyer's judgment of a product's overall excellence or superior, or an evaluation of a product
formed from extrinsic cues (Brand name, price.) that are not inherent parts of the product.

The value that the consumer perceived that a product has is hypothesized to be a function of many variable include its quality, price and perceived sacrifice of purchase and use by consumer as Dodds ,Monroe and Grewal (1991) define perceived sacrifice as the cognitive trade off between perception of quality and sacrifice results in perception of value

Value is a mount of money or goods which thing can be exchanged in open market The utility of an object in satisfying, directly or indirectly, the needs or desires of human beings, called by economists "value in use," or its worth consisting in the power of purchasing other objects, called "value in exchange." ( Black's Law Dictionary)

Value has been defined in term of performance versus price value unlike quality value involves a trade off between what is received as Dodds, (1991) defined perceived value is a link between the cognitive attitudes of perceived quality and perceived monetary sacrifice and the behavioral intention to buy.

Several authors have developed models in cooperating the concept of value, or more explicit perceived value. They study the relationship between perceptions of quality, price and sacrifice to perceive value which then linked the buyer's willingness to buy. Thus, Intention to buy is defined as a mental state that reflect the buyer's plan to buy some specific number of units of a particular brand in some specified periods. Intentions are form by the effects of the consumer's attitude towards film brands and their confidences in their judgment of its quality and low confidence is expected to have a negative effect. These are, of course, crucially important links in persuading consumers to buy.

Consumer Information Processing is defined as research in a variety of consumer behavior streams point to the influence of extrinsic and intrinsic cues in consumer decision making. Intrinsic cues are attributes or quality characteristics of products. Manufacturers may highlight these cues to affect consumers' decisions. Extrinsic cues refer not to the product's characteristics, but how the product is set up for consumer review. For example, these cues include the store where the product is sold, the price of the product, and the brand name of the product. When little information about a product is known, the consumer uses the external product environment (the extrinsic cues) to determine quality. However, when product information is known, the consumer focuses on the product quality level (the intrinsic cues) to determine quality (Monroe, 1990). Therefore, variables such as the product name, packaging graphics, and product price must be used to convey high quality when an unfamiliar product is introduced to the market.

Product quality has been defined as cue judgement of a product's overall excellence or superiority, from physical characteristic of the product and extrinsic cues. The concept of the perceived product evaluation are subjective which is judgments determine consumer response. That is consumer evaluation product quality influence subsequent purchase behavior. From a theoretical point of view, products can be conceived as a array of product-related cues. Each cue provides a basis for developing various impression of the product itself ( e.g.Darwar \& Parker 1994;Jacoby,Olson\& Haddock 1971; Richardson, Dick\& Jain 1994;Zeithaml ,1988)

### 1.1.2 Topic in the current literature:

Recently, Companies have become aware of the need for a market-driven definition of quality, instead of a firm-driven objective quality measure (Main1994).

To understand market-driven quality, companies much learn how consumers perceive and evaluate it instead of relying on firm-driven objective measures of
quality. Several researches have developed models of buyer's perception of value with particular emphasized on buyer's use of extrinsic cues ( such as price, brand name ) as indicators of quality and value (Dawar and Parker 1996;Dodds and Monroe 1985;Erisckson and Johanson 1985)

Dodds (1991) suggest that three extrinsic (price, brand name and store name) are associated with quality and value perceptions.

The present study focuses on three extrinsic cues that have been found to be the most important in customer's rating of product quality: Brand name, price and store. The simultaneous examination of the three extrinsic cues frequently used in the decision process provides a more accurate portrayal of evaluation process and yields a more in-depth understanding of cue usage in the consumer's decision process. Etgar and Malhotra (1981), for example, examined the effect of price on selected quality cues, such as price, on the comfort, durability, and style of running shoe to examine price- quality inferences. Thus, the literature supports for both a clear understanding of how consumers perceive quality and a generalizable typology of dimensions of quality that could be applicable to a broad range of consumer goods.

### 1.1.3 Introduction the case

The brand name, store name, and price are major marketing variable that influence buyer's product evaluation. A number of research studies support the view that consumers rely on price as indicator of product quality. Consumer user price as a surrogate indicator of product quality. If they have little information to go on or they have little confidence in their own ability to make the choice of product.
When consumer is familiar with brand name or has an experience with a product, price decline as a factor in product selection. Retail store have image of their own that serve to influence the perceived quality of product as well as the decision where to purchase.

Understanding how buyer utilize product information is an interesting for marketer in marketing plan. So that the marketer can decide what information to provide buyer in their effort to influence buyer's perception.

When buyer's capabilities to utilize intrinsic attribute information of product may be limited. Difficulty in understanding the information and lack of product experience. So that the buyer may use brand name, store name and price information to evaluate the product.

In this research, It is examined the role of price, brand name and store name information that can influence buyer's product evaluation on shoes in HCMC as supporting data.

As the marketers struggle in increasingly competitive product markets to differentiate the product, signal product quality. The growth in the use of product extrinsic information as a strategic tool is closely tied to consumer rising awareness of quality issues due to three reasons. First, the success of Vietnamese companies with their focus on product quality has led to consumers in general becoming much more qualities conscious. Second, as more busy society that lead the buyer have neither the time nor inclination to deal with product failures. Lastly, as product become increasingly complex, buyers are often unable to judge quality before buying a product, so they search for intrinsic cues (Menezes and Quelch 1990).

Concurrently, researchers have shown a growing interest in understanding the role extrinsic cues, such as price ,brand name, store name, play in the buyer decision process as a signal of product quality.

### 1.1.3.1 Vietnam Economic growth.

Vietnam embarked on its comprehensive reform from 1990s. The aim at to chance the centrally planning economy to the market oriented economy. The economic reform has brought many opportunities for domestic investors as well as
foreigner investors. Total investment capital has increased significantly and the number of enterprises have been emerged rapidly.

One of the characteristics of the market is competition for survival and development, and competition tends to become stronger and stronger. Many companies try to sustain and grow. Competition is taking place in every aspect of business : Price, quality, market, technology... The domestic companies have to compete not only with one another but with foreign companies, joint ventures which have many competitive advantages...Especially, Vietnam has become a member of ASEAN with prestige regional common treaty (AFTA). Whether or not domestically produced products can compete with the import products which are possibly sold with low prices and high quality will be a question to answer.

Recently, business environment is changing. Adapting to the fast changing environment is the common business philosophy strictly required for every enterprise. However, how to adapt to the environment and which strategies should be adopt to meet the changing requirement and sensitive market product perception of buyers are still critical questions for managers.

The 1991-1999 period recorded the highest GDP growth rate so far in Vietnam, and also a considerable growth rate in per capita GDP. Growth was no longer solely base on subsidies, large-scale foreign assistance and loans as was the case during the pre-novation period. This was indeed significant and reflects the economy's nascent capacity for self-generating growth. The fact becomes all the more obvious when we compare the GDP and the volume of final consumption .Prior to 1990, GDP was smaller than the volume of consumption. This means that during that period, Vietnam could not produce enough to meet its own need, and all its accumulation funds and a part of it volume of final consumption were provided by foreigner sources. From 1991 till now, GDP was bigger than the volume of final consumption and the country could accumulate saving thanks to domestic production and, what is more, the rate of savings increased quite rapidly.

Table 1.1. GDP growth rate (\% per annum)

| Year | Whole economy | Agriculture | Industry | Services |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1976-1980 | 0.2 | 2.0 | 0.6 | 1.9 |
| 1981-1986 | 6.0 | 5.2 | 8.9 | 1.5 |
| 1987 | 3.4 | 0.6 | 11.1 | 5.6 |
| 1988 | 4.6 | 3.9 | 3.3 | 8.9 |
| 1989 | 2.7 | 6.9 | 4.0 | 17.7 |
| 1990 | 2.3 | 1.5 - | 2.5 | 10.4 |
| 1991 | 6.0 | 2.2 - | 9.9 | 8.3 |
| 1992 | 8.6 | 7.2 | 14.6 | 8.6 |
| 1993 | 8.4 | 3.9 | 12.1 | 9.2 |
| 1994 | 8.8 | 4.1 | 13.5 | 9.0 |
| 1995 | 9.54 | 4.8 | 13.6 | 9.8 |
| 1996 | 9.34 | 4.4 | 13.5 | 8.9 |
| 1997 | 8.15 | 4.3 | 12.6 | 7.1 |
| 1998 | 5.83 万 | 2.7 \% | 10.3 | 4.2 |
| 1999 | 4.80 | 5.2 | 7.7 Incit | 2.3 |
| 1976-1986 | 2.5 * | 3.2 Ominia | 2.8 | 2.2 |
| 1987-1994 | 5.7 | $3,7$ | 7.2 g ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 9.1 |
| 1995-1999 | 7.5 | 4.3 \%าลย | 11.4 | 6.5 |

Source : Vietnam's General Department of statistics.

During the 1991-1992 period, all branches of the economy sustained growth, with industry having the highest growth rate, to be followed by services, and then by agriculture the growth rate of which was the lowest but nonetheless quite good.

Table1. 2. Economic structure by branches
(\% constant prices)

|  | 1991 | 1994 | 1998 | 1999 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GDP | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| Agriculture, forestry, <br> aqua-culture | 4.08 | 27.2 | 26.0 | 25.6 |
| Industry \& Construction | 22.8 | 28.8 | 32.7 | 33.7 |
| Services | 36.4 | 44.1 | 41.3 | 4.07 |

Source: Vietnam's General Department of Statistic.

Table 1.3 .Economic structure by economic components (\%)

|  | 1991 | 1994 | 1998 | 1999 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GDP | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| State enterprises | 29.25 | 40.12 | 40.17 | 40.20 |
| None-State enterprises( private <br> enterprises, Cooperatives, mixed <br> enterprises) | 7.075 | 53.47 | 50.01 | 49.40 |
| Enterprises with foreign invested <br> capital | SINCE |  | $*$ |  |

Source : Vietnam's General Department of Statistics.

### 1.1.3.2 Footwear industry overview:

The Vietnam leather and footwear industry is young and only became independent industry in 1987. However, for only short period of time from 1991 until now, it has been growing very fast to become one of the country's leading industry for export. It is capable of making 45 million pairs of shoes per years as of 1999.

In 1999 , the domestic footwear manufacturing base was worth USD 450 Million( 44 pair of shoes ). Manufactures substantially improved productivity and quality. Industry experts estimate that footwear production could growth by $5-10 \%$ in 2000. In 1999 retail sales of shoes increased significant over 1998.

In the first quarter of 2000 , industrial output grew by $13-14 \%$. Foreign invested firms saw growth of $9.8 \%$ during this period. The non state- owned and domestic invested sector saw growth of almost $18 \%$. During the same period in 1999, industrial growth was just under $11 \%$.

GDP was at $4 \%$ in 1999 and may reach 5 or $6 \%$ in 2000. According to the IMF, last year's $4 \%$ growth figure may have appear more positive than it really was. Meanwhile, the most promising source of industrial growth, the private sector, is just finding its feet. While the non-state sector grew around $18 \%$ in the first quarter of 2000 , much higher growth is needed if the sector is to truly bolster the economy.

### 1.1.3.3 Footwear Analysis and current status

The footwear industry in Yietnam has been developing very fast over the last ten years and it is today one of the Nation's main foreign currency earners.

In the 80 s the sector achieved a significant growth, although the quality and differentiation of the products were not particularly strong. Trade was carried out mainly with the former Soviet Union as well as with other COMECON countries. After the collapse of the Soviet bloc, the Vietnamese footwear industry suffered a severe crisis due to the disappearance of traditional importers from East Europe. With the implementation of the reform policy and a subsequent increasing influx of Foreign Direct Investment, the sector started to recover and found new markets. Between 1989 and 1997 Vietnam- along with other developing and newly industrialized countries to low labor cost areas, and the Vietnamese footwear industry registered a sharp growth.

In the year 2000 turnover was USD 1,468 billion, a $9.9 \%$ increase with respect to the '99 figures, cementing the footwear industry's position as Vietnam's third largest currency earner. The total number of employees is 500000 .

Vietnam proved itself as one of the most attractive countries for the production of low-value added shoes. On the other side a large portion of its export performance resulted as a mere assembling activity of imported components(i.e. upper, soles etc.). Therefore low value is domestically added to products and the domestic industry's profit share of the overall shoe export turnover is only around $30 \%$.

### 1.1.3.4 Trend and potential

The recent signature (July 2000) of the Vietnamese -US bilateral agreement on goods, services and investment ( BTA) brought a lot of expectations amorng the Vietnamese shoe makers. One the agreement is ratified by the two countries' parliaments ( most likely in the course of the years 2001), Vietnam will benefit from a dramatic drop of American custom duties' tariff for a large number of exported goods, including footwear. As far as the shoe industry is concerned the tariff already levied on the main products will be lowered from an average of $35 \%$ down to nearly $5.1 \%$. This will certainly result amount ( with respect to the potential size of the American market). Which is likely to double or even triple in the current year 2001. Moreover the foreseeable Vietnamese accession to the World Trade Organization will enhance the complete liberalization of all many more markets and will lead to the definitive ( although phased out ) elimination of remaining quota and non- tariff barriers for the export of Vietnamese shoe products.

The 10 year strategy drawn by the Vietnamese Government for 2001-2010 is very ambitious and aim at expanding footwear production and upgrading equipment through heavy investments totaling USD 380 million for the first 5 years and an additional USD 500 Million for the following 5 years.
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For the upcoming ten years LEFASO expects an incremental average annual growth of footwear export turnover so as to achieve USD 7 to 10 Billion in the year 2010, i.e $2 \%$ of the world market.

European enterprises have a clear interest in helping the establishment of a sound and seft-sustaining footwear industry in Vietnam. Europe should primarily encourage investment in machinery of European origin. The development of a local production of soles, upper materials, tanned leather and accessories, while creating new opportunities and higher revenues for Vietnamese enterprises, will give them better conditions for complying with European Union rules on locally manufactured components. European shoe makers should also provide assistance to Vietnamese enterprises, with special focus on the private sector, aimed at strengthening management capabilities, marketing knowledge and information on fashion trends. This could pave the way for an increasingly important participation of European footwear industry of which most are SMES ) in the direct management of Vietnamese companies.


In the first six moths of this year, HCM City's economic growth has been steady and the gross domestic increased by $9.3 \%$ over the same period last year and being the highest for the three years.

Most shoe executives agree that the future of the Vietnam footwear industry complex will require accurate understanding how consumers utilize the product information is interesting.

Certain aspects of quality are difficult to convey solely by intrinsic attribute information. For example, an shoe made in Vietnam may be inferior in quality compared to its counterparts such as Nike or Reebok, even though all have the same generic intrinsic attribute or features. The quality difference may be due to intangible attributes, such as technology, labor skill, and management. In these case, generic intrinsic information and consumers may use extrinsic attribute information for this purpose.

### 1.1.3.5 Consumer's price perceptions.

Although many would regard price as an objective attribute, its subjective evaluation is highly influenced by the cultural context. From the consumer point of view, the concept of price contains both monetary and non- monetary aspects. The non- monetary price item is related to the cost of time it takes to effect a purchase, the cost of thinking and deciding what to buy and the cost of the physical effort to make the purchase and bring a product into use. Monetary and non- monetary cost and sacrifice in exchange for the satisfaction derived from the consumption experience. While monetary aspects of the price may be high in most of Asia and culture context also influence the way in which a price is perceived as a surrogate indicator of quality when consumers have little information or experience with the product concerned at the fifth country in the region.



Figure 1.1 Customer's association of higher prices with higher quality.

This research is based on the premise that marketers must understand how information cues important to consumer's purchase decision influence product acceptance in the targeted domestic market in order to develop effective product and marketing strategies.

The present study considers how the effect of extrinsic cues (brand, price, and store information on buyer's product quality evaluation in HCMC where is the largest population city in Vietnam for shoes product.

I chose this city market for two reasons. First, it represent rapidly growing potential consumer markets. Second, buyer's improved income and standard of living as well earlier policies for opening domestic markets for private enterprise and foreign investment into Vietnam. Another indicator of market exposure among HCMC
consumer is the large increase in using of luxury foreign goods such as Nike's product, Reebok's , Adidas'.. famous overseas brands because of HCM City consumer's preference for foreign brands. HCM is the largest city of Vietnam with a population has the highest purchasing power and consumption. Thus without any doubt it can be said that it is the biggest market of shoes in Vietnam.

Consider shoes industry in HCM City , the study will examine the effect of price, brand name and store name information with perceived quality, perceived value and buyer's willing to buy.

Consider two brands competing in the market. One brand (Gucci) offers high quality at a relative high price, while the other (Bitis's ) offers lower quality at a lower price and absence of brand information.

Consider two stores competing in the market. One store (Super Bowl) sale the high quality product and more luxury store, while the other (Coopmart ) sale the lower quality and more popular for lower standard of living people and absence of store name information.

The study will set the four level of price : Too high price ( 300000 dong/ pair of shoes), High price ( 150000 dong/ pair of shoes), Medium ( 70000 dong / pair of shoes) , low price ( 40000 dong / pair of shoes) and absent information of price.

### 1.2 Statement of problem :



Statement of problem benefits for the researcher to prepare a written statement that clarifies any ambiguity about what the research hopes to accomplish and what issues have to be resolved in the study. A problem could simply indicate an interest in an issue where finding the right answer might help to improve an existing good situation. Thus, it is fruitful to define a problem as any situation where a gap exists between the actual and the desired a problem as any situation where a gap existing between the actual and the desired ideal state. Basic researcher usually define their problem for investigation from this perspective (Sekaran ,1992).

Delivering quality product require an understanding of the cues that buyer use to judge quality. This study examine how key marketing variables such as price, brand name, and store name information affect buyer's judgment .To understand a market driven quality, companies must learn how buyer perceive and evaluate it instead of relying on firm-driven objective measures of quality.

In this study, the statement of problem is stated as follow:
To identify if there is any effect of price, brand and store information on buyer's perceptions of product quality, value and their willingness to buy

To measure the degree of effect of price, brand name and store name on buyer's perception and purchase intentions.

To analyze on the relative differential effect of price, brand name and store name on perceived quality, perceived value and willingness to buy.

### 1.3 Research objective:

We have to identify how do buyer perceive and evaluate quality. How do the marketing variables such as price brand name and store name information affect buyer's inference about perceived product quality. Though this study the research objective is stated as follow:

To determine how the effect of price, brand name and store name on buyer's perception of product quality and relationship between those cues and perceived value and willingness to buy in Ho Chi Minh City market in the case of sandal.

### 1.4 Scope of research:

The research is conducted to gain a better understanding of the dimensions of the extrinsic cues attribute in the buyer product evaluation. A key finding was that buyer search for price, brand name and store name information when judging quality of product and their willing to buy because the aspect of quality are difficult to convey by product attributes information so that buyer may use extrinsic attribute information for their product evaluation.

For doing this research, the study is established the experiment focus on the buyer's perceived quality, perceived value and their willing to buy base on information of brand name, store name and price in their decision making on sandal products in HCM City metropolitan area.

### 1.5 Limitation of research:

The research limitation of the study is that it examined only one product, one-time measurement and do not follow the experimental design to test the experimental group. But the study will being used the non- contrived of study setting for the sampling collect data. The questionnaires will be distributed by chance to the buyer's who are willing to help.

Another potential limitation was the sampling method employed. Even though data were collected from actual shoppers in HCMC market, the use of convenience sampling requires caution in generalizing the result it may be lack of representative sampling procedures.

The target group of experiment is only the buyer's who live in HCMC where have high potential buying power. There might be some limitation due to the income and lifestyle of consumers in HCMC are somewhat different from other provinces.

### 1.6 Significance of study :

This study intend to study the effect of price, brand name, and store name information on buyer's product evaluation.

The important study is to find out the effects of extrinsic cues information- price, brand name, store name- - on buyer's perception of quality, perceived value and their willing to buy. Specifically, the linkages between each of manipulated extrinsic and
perceived quality, perceived value and buyer's willing to buy and how buyers evaluate the product quality base on those extrinsic cues.

The important of the studying is decided for marketing. Marketers must decide what information to provide consumers in their effort to influence buyer perception. The companies will know what factors of extrinsic cues can strongly affect to buyer's product perceived quality and what information else that can not match with buyer's perception. So that they can change and improve the marketing or information advertising to meet buyer's perception.

The research will find out the extrinsic characteristic like price, brand name and store name information that which one can be strongly affect buyer's product perceived quality that may be brought up by advertising.

### 1.7 Glossary :

Brand name: When buyer repeatedly buy a certain brand, they quickly get a feeling for the quality and value for money they can expect from that brand (Susannah Hart \& John Murphy, 1998 ) "Made in" labels have little effect on famous and well- known brand names. The general perception is that well-known brand deliver on quality no matter where it is made- the brand name give them reassurance on authenticity.(Paul Temporal 2000). In this study is focus on high quality of brand name (Gucci) and the other is lower quality brand name (Biti's ) that were famous brand name in HCM City market.

Buyer: In this study, the buyer define who buyer the sandal products in the HCM City market within three months.

Buyer's willingness to buy: In this study, defined as the impact of each product cue ( brand name, store name, price on fcustomer perception of over all product quality value and intention to buy.

Extrinsic quality cues: Olson,(1977) defined extrinsic as the characteristics that are related to the product, but are not physically part of it .

Information: In this study the information is define as- the information about price, brand name and store name in difference levels and degree od each to test the buyer's product evaluation based on the given information.

Perceived quality: Zeithaml (1988) has been defined as the buyer's judgment of a product's overall excellence or superior, or an evaluation of a product formed from extrinsic cues (Brand name, price.) that are not inherent parts of the product.

## IVERSITy

Value: Power of a commodity to command other commodities in exchange for itself, as measured by the proportional quantities in which a commodity exchanges with all other commodities. (Contemporary Microconomics, 1986)


Perceived value: Dodds, (1991) defined perceived value is a link between the cognitive attitudes of perceived quality and perceived monetary sacrifice and the behavioral intention to buy.

Price: The distinction between price and valuation is important because the clients can not judge valuation on their monthly statement - only price. (Christopher T. May 1999)

Product evaluation: In this study, it defined as the perceived design was used to a greater extent by Customer in HCM city when form a purchase intentions

Sandal: in this study is defined as the shoes consisting of a sole strapped to the foot of representing for high quality brand and the other is represent for lower quality brand.

Store name: Like the product and brand ,stores also have images. Establishment such as Bloomingdale's, Saks Fifth Avenue, Nieman Marcus projects very difference
image than Target, Kmart, Wal-Mart . In select store the customer look for those that match their self -concept( Nessim Hana/Richard Wozniak.2000) In this study the brand name were selected as the luxury store (Super Bowl) and the lower quality product selling store ( Coopmart ).

Factorial design: Method of design stimuli for evaluation by generating all possible combination of levels. For example, a three -factor experiment with 5 levels of price, 3 levels of brand and three levels of store would result in 45 stimuli.

## Factors

Brand name
Store name

Price

## Levels

Bitis's, Gucci $=R S / / 7 /$
Super Bowl, Coopmart
300000 dong; 150000dong; 70000dong, 40000dong


## Chapter 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

As this study is aimed at studying the effect of Price, Brand name, and Store information on buyer's perceived quality, value and willingness to buy .The literature support the need for both a clear understanding of how buyer's perceived quality and a generalizable typology of dimension of quality that could be applicable to a broad range of consumer goods.

This chapter will consist of three sections reviewing all literatures relevant in building up a conceptual model. For the purpose of this study, the first section describe the literature on perceive price, quality and value. The second section emphasize on the relationship between perceived value and choice of product. The third section focus on price, brand name, and store effect on product evaluation and on source of regarding the study methodology from previous researches.

### 2.1. Perception of price, quality, and value :



Monroe and Kishnan (1985), using Monroe's (1979) conceptualization of perceived value, provided a model relating price, perceived quality, perceived sacrifice, perceived value and willingness to buy.

In that model, actual price is an objective external characteristic of a product that consumers perceived as a stimulus. Therefore, price have both objective external proprieties and subject internal representations that are derived from the perceptions of price, thus resulting in some meaning to consumers (Jacoby and Olson 1977).

Clearly, perceptions of the same price stimulus may across consumers and, for one consumer, across products, purchase situations, and time ( Cooper 1969b)

Price can be both an indicator of the amount of sacrifice needed to purchase a product and an indicator of the level of quality. Higher prices lead to higher perceived quality and consequently to a greater willingness to buy. At the same time, the high
price represents a monetary measure of what must be sacrificed to purchase the good, leading to reduced willingness to buy.

Consider theoretical and empirical suggests that price is often used by buyers as an extrinsic product- quality cue ( Bearden and Shimp 1982) ; Dodds and Moroe 1985; Dodds et al. 1991 ; Erickson and Johansson 1985; Lichtenstein, Block and Black 1988; Lichtenstein,, Ridgway, and Netemeyer 1993; Moroe and Kishnan 1985; Rao and Monroe 1989; Zeithaml 1988) .

Theoretical rationales underlying an expected positive price- quality linkage can be based on expected market forces_ high quality products often cost more to produce than low_ quality products and competitive pressures limit firm's opportunities to charge high prices for low- quality products ( Curry and Riesz 1988; Erickson and Johansson 1985; Lichtenstein et al. 1993) Complicating the extrinsic cue effect of price is that price also is an indicator of sacrifice (Dodds et al. 1991, Erickson and Johansson 1985 Grewal, Moroe and Kishnan 1998 Lichtenstein et al.1993, Zeithaml 1988)


Monroe and Kishnan (1985) developed a model which linked perceptions of quality, price and sacrifice to perceived value, which was then link to the purchase via the concept of willingness to buy.

Dodds (1991), based on a series of the research projects that he conducted, started that" perceived value is a link between the cognitive attitudes of perceived quality and perceived monetary sacrifice and the behavioral intention to buy". He represented the relationships of the perceived sacrifice, perceived quality and perceived value as nonlinear in the relationship to price. He also conclude that the " acceptable price range is not static but change through a variety of environmental stimuli, including changing perceptions of price and store name".

Research suggests that consumers, lacking other obvious cues, will judge quality on the basis of price. Numerous research studies support the general acceptance of a price-quality relationship (Monroe \& Kishnan, 1985)

Research indicates that perception of quality in the relation to a given price influence judgment of value or the acceptability the product price (Monroe \& Petroshius 1981).

Erickson and Johansson (1985) found that judgement of price influence-and are influence by-beliefs about a brand's quality. They report that high -price products are often perceived to possess high quality, and that high quality products may be perceived as higher price than they actually warrant.

Moreover, resent assessment of research studies involving price judgments suggest that little is known about the relationship between price and product quality, as the measure of quality remain suspect (Dodds, Monroe,\&Grewal,1991;Zeithaml,1988).

Though marketing managers are interested in what influence consumer's perceptions of value, researchers rarely have investigated or measure the concept of perceived value. One reason for this deficiency is that value is an abstract concept that is highly interrelated and frequently confused with the concepts of quality, benefits and price (Rockefeller 1986; Zeithaml 1988 ).

Several researchers have developed or tested models of buyer's perception of value with particular emphasis on buyer use of extrinsic cues (such as price and brand name) as indicators of quality and value (Dawar and Parker 1996; Dodds and Monroe 1985; Erickson and Krishnam 1985; Stores 1985; ZeithamI 1988).

Price can be a very important cue. Price can serve a dual role: as an indicator of quality and as an indicator of sacrifice. If perceived value equals perceived quality over perceived sacrifice, the question for retailers to answer is whether a noticeable price increase influences the perception of quality more than the perception of sacrifice, or vice versa, so that the perception of value increases (Monroe, 1990).

### 2.2. Perceived value and choice of product

The link between perceived quality, evaluation, and choice can be explained in part by the acceptable price range concept. Buyers generally have a set of price that are acceptable to pay for a considered purchase, rather than a single price (Monroe 1979,Monroe and Petroshius 1981).

Therefore, people not only may refrain from purchasing a product when they consider the price too high, but also may be suspicious of the quality of a product if its price is too much below what they consider acceptable( Cooper 1969).

The perception of value in turn directly influences willingness to buy. Szybillo and Jacoby (1974) suggested such a relationship when hypothesizing that value for the money would have a stronger relationship to perceived likelihood of purchase than would perceived quality. Hence, perception of value would increase as price increases from below the buyer's lower acceptable price limit to some acceptable price within their acceptable price range, perception of value would decline. Thus, the relationship between price and perceived value should also be curvilinear.

Erevelles (1993) also conducted a study looking at warranty perceptions, risk, price perceptions, attitude toward the product and purchase intentions. He also inclusion of perceived risk in a "perceived value model seems judicious and warranted. Many studies have shown that there is a direct relationship between perceived risk and a variety of behavioral factors including attitude, affect, value, purchase intention and behavioral attention. Applying the magnitude to consumer assessment approach. By assigning a price to judgments of quality, consumers indicate the price they are willingness to buy (Rosch ,1975)

Product attribute cues are major marketing variables that influence purchase decision of potential customer. Several studies ( Chang \& Wildt, 1989; Davis,1985;Dodds, Monroe, \& Grewal1991;Forsythe \& Cavender, 1993; Rao \& Monroe, 1989) have examine the potential impact of product cues on consumer's evaluation of product quality and subsequent purchase intention.

Much of this work examining buyer's product cue usage has focus on the effect of extrinsic cues (e.g., Brand name, price and store name) on product evaluations under the premise that these cues may be use as surrogate indicators of a product quality and value ( Dawar \& Parker,1994;Dodds,Monroe,\& Grewal,1991;Roe \& Monroe 1989).

Recently, little formal conceptual effort has been direct toward isolating theoretical reasons for the price- perceived quality relationship, or how such a relationship influences buyer's perceptions of value or their purchase intentions or choices( Moroe and Krishnam 1985); Moroe and Rao 1987, Zeithaml 1988).


### 2.3. Price, brand, store effects on product evaluation:

A review of the literature suggests that consumers rely on extrinsic cues such as price (Leavitt 1954),brand name ( Allison and Uhl 1962) ,Store name ( Wheatley,Chiu,and Goldman 1977) when making quality assessments. If price, as an external cue, is perceived differently than its " objective " characteristic, buyers are likely to use similar perceptual processes for both brand and store names. Therefore, we suggest that the external cues of price, brand name, and store name are three cues that influence perception of product quality and value and hence willingness to buy ( Zeithaml 1988).

Characteristics that are related to the product, but are not physically part of it ( Olson,19770) such as price, brand name, influence of store personal, advertising, are determined by marketing efforts(Steenkamp,1989).

Later studies considered the role of other cues as competing indicators of product quality( Olson \& Jacoby, 1972). These studies are often referred to as multi-cue studies because one or more cues, usually extrinsic cues, in addition to price were manipulated. Brand name and store name are two other -cue that are frequently examined.

The effects of the three cues have been studied with inconsistent statistical results, but with convergence on some relationships. Both price and brand name have been shown to have a significance but moderate effect on buyer's perceptions of quality, whereas store name has had a small and non-significant effect (Rao and Monroe 1989)

The primary effect of the additional cues of brand and store name is seemingly to enhance the effect of price on buyer quality perception. Monroe and Krishnan's (1985) meta-analysis found a more positive effect for price when brand information is present than it is absent The implication of their finding is not that brand name dominates the influence of price, but rather than brand name enhances the influence of price on quality perception.

Rao and Monroe (1989) found that multi-cue studies generate larger priceperceived quality effects than single cue studies, though the difference was statistically non-significant

One might expect that, with additional extrinsic information, buyers would rely less on price information for their quality judgments. The extent of such an effect depends on the degree to which the buyer are familiar with or knowledgeable of the product category( Rao and Monroe 1988) and the degree to which the extrinsic cues provide similar or dissimilar information about the product (Monroe and Rao 1987)

Three studies have specifically examined the individual and combined effect of price, brand name, and store name on quality perception( Andrews and Valenzi1971;Gardner 1974; Render and O'Connor 1976).

Research evidence indicates that brand name (Dodds and Monroe 1985; Stokes 1985) and store name( Wheatley and Chiu 1977) are extrinsic quality cues.

Empirical reported by Dodds et al.( 1991) indicated significant brand and store treatment effects on consumer's product evaluation.

Consumer's use of product quality signals studied include brand name ( Akerlof 1970,Darby and Karni 1973;Olson 1977; Ross 1988 ) or brand advertising (Milgrom and Robert 1986), product features ( Nelson 1970;Olson 1977 ),Price ( Leavitt 1954,Milgrom and Robert 1986;Olson 1972;Rao and Monroe 1989)., and store name ( Copper and ross 1985 ;Emons 1988'Olson 1977;Rao and Monroe 1989)

The impact of brand name on perceived product quality, along with price, is also explored in this study. Research indicates that brand name appears to serve as a "'shorthand" for quality by giving consumer a bundle of information about product ( Jacoby, Chestnut, Hoyer, Sheluga and Donahue 1978;Jacoby,Szybillo, and BusatoSchach 1977).

Studies show that brand name may be a stronger cues than price for evaluating overall quality (Gader 1971;Jaccby,Olson and Haddock 1971; Olson 1977;Smith and Broome 1966; Stores 1985).

Research has found that consumer often prefer brands and stores with images consistent with their own self- image ( Sirgy, 1981,1985,1986).

Brand choice and store selection are relevant to a wide range purchase decisions. Product quality, brand name and brand image are general attributes that may be significant in brand choice for a wide variety of product purchase. Convenience, image and location typify important retail store attributes on which shoppers may base their patronage. The brand and store evaluative criteria employed here were suggests by perceptual dimensions of product and store quality (Bonner and Nelson, 1985;Brucks and Zeithaml,1987).

Marketers must decide what information to provide consumers in their effort to influence buyers perception such as the consumer use extrinsic attribute in the product evaluations is observed in the market place. Further, consumer research shows that extrinsic attribute, such as Price (Monroe,1973; Olson ,1977) ,brand and store name (Rao and Moroe, 1989, are used by consumer in quality judgments.

Baker (1990) developed a variant of the Zeithaml (1988) model to reflect the impact of the physical environment (i.e. the retail store) on the perceived quality, price and value. Base on her research she found that:

As hypothesized, service quality was positively related, and sacrifice negatively related, to value, and value was significantly related to willingness to buy...thus the essence of Zeithaml's model was supported.

By taking a value of money orientation in the marketing of their store brands, retailers hope to instill the purchase

We extend a basic conceptualization of the price- product evaluation relationship( Dodds and Monroe 1985) to include the extrinsic cues of brand and store name, and report an empirical test of the effects of those three cues on perception of quality, value, and consumer's willingness to buy. An intricate experimental design and test are reported that replicate previous research and contribute new information on the effects of price, brand, and store information on buyer's product evaluation

On the basis of a meta -analysis of the results of empirical tests of the effects of extrinsic cues on consumer's perception of product quality (Rao and Monroe 1989), Dodds, Monroe and Grewal (1991) specified a model in which perceived quality and perceived sacrifice mediate linkages between (a) brand name, store name, and price and (b) perceive value. The model is based on two premises. First, consumer's perceptions of value are base on a trade -off between product benefits (e.g., product quality ) and monetary sacrifice. Second, buyer's perception of product quality and monetary sacrifice can be based, at least in part, on extrinsic cues.

Experimental design, price of the product, size of price range and cue availability have also been proposed as rationales for the mixed result of price- perceived product quality relationships ( Monroe and Kishnan 1985;Olson 1977, Rao and Monroe 1989)

The questionnaire contained measure for the endogenous variables follow by manipulation check measures. Perceived quality and perceived value were assessed
via seven item scales develop by Dodds et al (1991) Since Dodd did not measure perceived sacrifice.


## Chapter 3: RESEARCH FRAMEWORKS

### 3.1 Research overview:

Based on the different theoretical framework and studies depicted in the literature. This chapter encompassed the framework in section 2. The theoretical framework is the foundation on which the entire research project is based. It is logically developed, described, and elaborated network of associations among studied variables. These variable are deemed relevant to the problem situation( Sekaran,1992). In section 3 it explain information of concepts and variables operationalization of this research. In the section 4 it give the definition of all hypothesis statements which will be stated for this study and the section 5 it describe the expected outcome.

Review the conceptual framework of effect of Price, Brand, and Store information on buyer's product evaluations will be illustrated on this chapter in order to examine what we know about the extrinsic cues that can affect on buyer's perceived quality, perceived value and their willingness to buy and how important of brand name, price and store information for buyer base on to evaluation the products when there is lack of intrinsic information so that buyer may use the extrinsic information to justify the product.

This chapter will also include the definition of Hypothesis, the selected variable regarding measurement of buyer's product evaluations for conducting the hypothesis and the possible question used to gather the required information will be illustrated.

### 3.2 Conceptual framework :

Scitovszky (1945) observed that the use of price as an indicator of product quality is not irrational, but represents a belief that price in the marketplace is determined by the interplay of the forces of competitive supply and demand. Such forces would lead to a "natural" ordering of competing products on a price scale, resulting in a strong actual positive relationship between price and product quality. Thus, given the belief
that price and quality are positively related, it is natural that consumers would use price as indicator of quality. Subsequently, other economic and marketing theorists expand the argument to include other signals of product quality such as brand and store names and advertising expenditures.

The conceptual model examined in this study, which is diagrammed in the figure 3.1 suggest that quality and sacrifice perceptions mediate linkages between (a) antecedents of consumer's quality and sacrifice perception (e.g brand ,store and price ) and (b)consumer's perception of value which linkages to buyer willingness to buy.


Figure3.1: Conceptual model of the effect of price, brand name, and store name on product evaluations.

According to the conceptual model the research have three independent variables have been chosen as the information that effect buyer's product evaluation as following:

## Brand name:

The reason brand name is used by consumers to "infer" quality of unfamiliar product is because that brand name had built, based on its association with other quality products carry that name, a value; that is believe about quality have gone in to that name's value , as our model explicitly states (Brucks and Zeithaml,1991).

The second perspective is customer-based in that consumer response to a brand name is evaluated (Keller, 1993; Shocker et al., 1994).

Studies consider the role of other cues as competing indicators of product quality ( Olson \& Jacoby 1972). These study are often referred to as multi-cue studies because one or more cues, usually extrinsic cues , in addition to price were manipulated( absent/present vs. high/low ).Brand name and store name are two other cues can be indicators of product quality.

Some study have shown that actual self- image and ideal self image are about equally predictive of brand preferences (Dolich, 1969;Landon,1974;Ross 1971 ).

Researchers have developed and effectively tested accounting methods for appraisal of the asset value of brand name (Farquhar et al., 1991;Simon and Sullivan, 1992).

In particular, brand name is frequently used by consumers as an " informational chunk" that represents a composite of information about several attributes of the products(Olson 1976).

Researchers have viewed brand name as a "summary" construct ( Han 1989; Johansson 1989)or a "shorthand" cue (Zeithaml 1988) for quality because consumer can make product quality inference base on brand name.

The process can be explained via the "affect- referral " process discussed by Wright (1975) , which suggests consumers do not examine brand attributes every time they make brand choice decision; they simplify their decision-making process basing their judgments on brand attitudes( summary information) rather than on product attribute information.

Garvin (1987) proposed dimensions of " perceived quality " defined as image, and " aesthetics" our data also included references to brand image.

Mazursky and Jacoby (1985) finding that respondents want to know the brand name more frequently than any other information when judging the product quality.

Product brand and store name are often associated with quality perceptions (e.g,Bilkey and Nes,1982, Dodds, Monroe and Grewal ,1991).

Wright (1975) suggested that consumers simplify the decisional process with an affect-referral to the brand: When brand is used consumers shortcut the decision by avoiding the assessment of brand attributes.

Consumers often prefer a well known brand rather than an unknown brand because of its prestige or as a way to reduce risk in a purchase decision (Ettenson, 1993).

The brand recognition process helps consumers build both preference and confidence in buying of brand products. Brand association can give a product a higher sources of credibility because of the maker's implied reputation, quality, or warranty. With an unknown brand name, goodwill attached to the brand is absent and the consumer can not identify with the actual manufacture( Cordell,1993; Howard ,1994).

## Store name:

Birdwell, 1964; Dolich,1969;Grubb,1965; Grubb and Stern ,1971; Sirgy ,1985 suggest that consumers are often more likely to prefer product and retail store that
have images similar to their own self- image. Further, this relationship appears to hold with respect to the congruence between store image and actual self image

Retail stores have image of their own that serve to influence the perceived quality of products as well as the decision where to purchase. The positive relationship between image congruence and product preference has been demonstrated in research concerning retail stores (Stern,Bush, and Hair ,1977).

The retailer can influence the consumer's purchase decision through their supplementary promotional efforts. These efforts include merchandise offering, merchandise display and presentation, and reliable information. Analogous to the branding condition, the retailer can also present a higher sources of credibility, and implied warranty and guarantee. It has been reported that consumers perceived quality differences within various levels of retailer activity( Sternquist and David,1986).

## Price :



The use of price in the subject evaluation of product quality has been investigated by numerous of research (Monroe, 1973,Monroe and Krishnan 1985,Olson 1977)

Some single-cue studies examined the form of price- perceived quality relationship, and generally conclude that it is a monotonically curvilinear function with upper and lower bounds (Mc Connell, 1968;Monroe Della Bitta, \& Downey, 1977: Person, 1970; Perterson\& Jolibert 1976).

A number of research studies support the view that consumers rely on price as an indicator of product quality. Because price is so often considered to be an indicator of quality, some products deliberately emphasize a high price to underscore their claims of quality. Consumer use price as a surrogate indicator of quality if they have little information to go on, or if they have little confidence in their own ability to make the choice on other grounds.

Price is " probably the best known extrinsic indicator of quality " ( Ophuis and Van Teijp,1995,pg.179)

Beginning as early as the fifties, price has often been suggested as an extrinsic attribute that is consistently used by consumers to evaluated with quality perception( Leavitt,1954;Monroe, 1973,Olson 1977; Dodds and Monroe 1985; Chang and Wildt ,1996).

There has been many study in which the influence of price as a reliable indicator of quality. Price appears as a relevant cue when consumer do not have adequate information about intrinsic cues or when it only available cue( Zeithaml ,1988)

Price had a positive effect on perceived quality, but a negative effect on value and willing to buy ( William et al 1991; Akshay and Kent 1989).

Expected price his not only dependent on past prices, but is also affected by the frequency with which brand is promoted, economic condition, consumer characteristics and the type of store shopped (Mamnohar et al 1990).

Numerous studies have provided evidence that many consumers use the price cue as a signal to indicate product quality. To the degree price is perceived in the " positive role", higher prices positively affect purchase probabilities ( Tellis and Gaeth 1990 ; Zeithaml 1988).


## Perceived quality:

Schiffman and Kanuk (1994) mentioned that consumers often judge the quality of a product on the basis of a variety of informational cues that associate with the product. Some these cues are intrinsic to the product; others are extrinsic, such as price, store image, brand image and promotional message. Either singly or in composite, such cues provide the basis for perception of product quality.

Furthermore, consumer judgment about the product quality are formed from various informational cues about intrinsic of the product as well as extrinsic component of brand name(Lavenka ,(1989).

Although frequently, the extrinsic attributes do not effect direct functional product performance, consumers may use them in quality judgments for a variety of reason, including
1.The inability or lack of motivation to process available intrinsic attribute information (workmanship, fabric, performance.);
2. The perceived association of extrinsic with intrinsic attributes;
3. The existence of intangible function qualities that cannot be attributes, and
4. The existence of nonfunctional quality (e.g., symbolic quality or prestige quality) due to extrinsic attributes.

Consumer's capabilities to utilize intrinsic attribute information may be limited. Difficulty in understanding the information and lack of product experience are two factors that can hamper consumer's abilities to evaluate products. Moreover, even if consumers possess product knowledge and experience, lack of motivation could inhibit the process of intrinsic cues( Bettman ,1979).

In these case, extrinsic attribute cues may be easier to understand and process. These associations may lead consumers to believe that the certain extrinsic cues are efficient and accurate indicators of product quality(Bearden \& Shimp,1982;Rao \& Monroe 1989).

Consumers use quality to develop descriptive and inferential beliefs about products and their actual product choice can be a direct function of these mediating belief ( Olson 1978) .

Perception of quality play a significant role in consumer product evaluation and decision making( Stephen,Fox, and Leonard, 1985; Hugstad and Durr, 1986; Kraft and Chung,1992).

The perception of quality by consumer toward a product will increase consumer confidence in the product evaluations before arriving at a final choice (Rogers, Kaminski, Schoenbachler, and Gordon ,1994).

## Perceived value:

Test result reported by Dodds et al (1991) study (i.e., linkages involving perceived sacrifice) and by examining the degree to which perceived quality and sacrifice medicate relationships between the extrinsic cues and perceived value.

Value perception involves the consumer's overall assessment of the use of a product, based on what is received and what is given and linked to the perceived quality and monetary sacrifice for the purchase decision (Dodds 1991).

When consumer repeatedly buy a certain brand, they quickly get a feel for quality \& value for money they can expect from brand (Paul Temporal 2000).

If a brand desires to be distinctive, there is a virtually unlimited selection of distinctive options. The secret is to have the desire and passion to become a distinctive brand \& select or develop distinctive attributes that the brand 's customer will value (Duan E.E. Knapp 2000).


## Willingness to buy:

Monroe \& Krishnan(1985) developed a model which link perception of quality, price and sacrifice to perceived value, which then linked to purchase via the concept of willingness to buy.

Dodds and Monroe 1985 stated that the effect of price product evaluation relationship to include the brand, store name and report an empirical test of the effect of those three cues on perceptions of quality, value, and consumer willngness to buy.

The perception of value in turn directly influences willingness to buy.( Szybillo and Jacoby ,1974).

The brand offers a unique set of values and attribute which are appealing \& which people are prepared to purchase (Susannah Hart \& John Murphy 1998) .

### 3.3 Operational components:

Concept can be defined as abstract ideas generalized from particular facts. Without concept, there can be no theory (David and Cosenza,1993). In addition, concept is defined as a generalized idea about a class of objects, attributes, processes ( Zikmund,1997). In this research the concepts will be made operational so that can be measurable.

An operation definition gives meaning of a concept by specifying the activities or operations necessary to measure it (Zikmund,1997)Thus, the operational definition specifies what much be done to measure the concept under the investigation. Operational definition help the researcher specifies the rules for assigning numbers. The value assigned in the measuring the process can be manipulated according to certain mathematical rules. Once the variables of interest have been identified and defined conceptually, a specific type much be selected. This study applies nominal, and ordinal scale as the table shown below:

Table 3.3.1 Operational component of dependent and independent variables
$\left.\begin{array}{|l|l|l|l|}\hline \text { Labeling } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Definition term }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { O p e r a t i o n a l } \\ \text { Component }\end{array} & \text { Measurement } \\ \hline \text { Brand name } & \begin{array}{l}\text { A brand is a product, service, or concept } \\ \text { that is publicly distinguished from other } \\ \text { products, services, or concepts so that it } \\ \text { can be easily communicated and usually } \\ \text { marketed. A brand name is the name of }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text {. Absence } \\ \text { the distinctive product, service, or } \\ \text { concept } \\ \text { (http://whatis.techtarget.com/definition/ }\end{array} & \text { scale a l }\end{array}\right\}$

|  | Brand name, price.. )that are not inherent parts of the product . | . Durable |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Perceived value | Dodds, (1991) defined perceived value is a link between the cognitive attitudes of perceived quality and perceived monetary sacrifice and the behavioral intention to buy. | - Value perception <br> Economic to buy <br> A good buy <br> Acceptable price <br> Bargain | Likert scale |
| Willingness to buy | Monroe and Krishnan (1985) developed a model which linked perceptions of quality, price and sacrifice to perceive value, which was then linked to purchase via the concept of willingness to buy. | . Ability to buy <br> Buy at price shown <br> Consider price shown <br> Ability consider to buy <br> . Willingness to buy | Likert scale |
| 3.4 Hypothes |  |  |  |

A hypothesis is an assumption or guess that a researcher makes about some characteristics of the population under study (Mc Naniel and Goger,1996).

A hypothesis is defined as an unproven proposition or supposition that tentatively explains certain facts or phenomena; a probable answer to a research question. Hypothetical statement assert probable answers to the research questions (Zikmund ,1997).

This study extend by examining the role of extrinsic cue and by testing the degree to which perceived quality mediate the effects of the extrinsic cues on consumer's perceived value and their willing to buy- This study is examined relationship between the extrinsic cues and perceived value independent of the impact of the perceived
quality and perceived sacrifice mediating variables. According to the research framework as above ;

The preceding conceptualization, as well as the limited empirical evidence, suggests several direct relationship between price, brand name and store name and buyer's perception of product quality. We also suggest some indirect, but important, relationships between those cues and perceptions of value and willingness to buy ( $\mathrm{H} 1-\mathrm{H} 3$ ) .Finally, for the effect of an information cue on product evaluations and willingness to buy, we compare the result from a single- cue design with those from a multiple-cue design (H4-H6) as follow:

## IIVERSITY

H1o: As price increases from a low priced model to a higher priced model
(a) The relationship between price and perceived quality will be no positive .
(b) The relationship between price and perceived value will be no quadratic.
(c) The relationship between price and willingness to buy will be no quadratic.

H 2 o : When perceptions of brand name are more favorable
(a) Buyer's perceptions of quality are not higher
(b) Buyer's perception of value are not greater
(c) Buyer's willingness to buy is not greater

H 3 o : When perceptions of store name are more favorable
(a) Buyer's perceptions of quality are not higher
(b) Buyer's perception of value are not greater
(c )Buyer's willingness to buy is not greater
H 4 o : When other information is included with price information (i.e Price -Brand, Price-Store, Price-Brand-Store), the price effect is not stronger than in a Price-only condition( i.e Price)

H5o: When other information is included with brand information (i.e Brand- Price, Brand -Store, Brand-Price- Store), the brand effect is not stronger than in a Brandonly condition( i.e Brand )

## St. Gabriel Lobraty, Am

H6o: When other information is included with store information (i.e Store -brand, Store -Price, Price-Brand-Store), the store effect is not stronger than in a Store-only condition( i.e Store)

### 3.5 Expected outcome :

We believe that the hypothesis should be accepted according to the empirical literature supports. They also seem to be good with the common sense that price has a positive effect on perceived quality, but a negative effect on perceived value and willingness to buy. Vietnamese buyer's association of higher prices with higher quality. Favorable brand and store information positive influenced perceived quality , value and buyer's willingness to buy. To increasing the perception of product quality, value and buyer's willingness to buy the marketers are interested in what influence consumer's perception value. They should give enough the information of price, brand and store because the market fast moving, consumer in general become much more quality conscious and more busy working people in the new trend of industrial society, many consumers have not enough time to collect the information of product cues in product evaluation and purchase decision. So they may use extrinsic information to evaluate the product quality.

## Chapter 4 : RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this chapter is to provide an overview of the research methodology that is employed in this research study. Research methodology is defined as the part of the body of the report that explain the research design, sampling procedures, and other technical procedures used for collecting the data ( Zimund,1997). In section 1 Data source describe the target population and sampling procedure and research design .In section 2, Data collection describe the technique, which is used in this study and sample method. In section 3, it describes how the data measurement depend on the operation variables and the research instrument. In the section 4 , it discuss on the data analysis to specific the statistic used, the decision rule for interpretation and diagnosis of statistic methods.

### 4.1 Data source :

### 4.1.1 Target population and Sampling procedure :

Population refers to the entire group of people, events or things of interest that the researcher wished to investigate (Sekaran ,1992). Target population is the specific complete group relevant project (Zikmund,1991) and he also stated that population is defined as any complete group entities that share same common set of characteristics. David and Cosenza (1993) mentioned that population refers to the complete set of unit of analysis under investigation.

The target population of this study consist of buyer who in a metropolitan area of HCMC of Vietnam purchasing shoes within three months to achieve more accuracy affecting factors of the market moving. As the target population is individuals in the research, the sampling unit is the same as the population element for the short period of time collecting.

This research are studied the role of extrinsic cues that affect consumer's product evaluation. So it is apply the causal method to examine the cause of brand name, store
name and price to affect on perceived quality, perceived value and buyer's willingness to buy. Therefore it can understand each factors of independent variables (Price ,brand name, store name) to each of dependent variable( perceived quality, perceived value , and willingness to buy)..

The purpose of this study by using hypothesis testing . Researcher would like to understand effect size in different degree of independent variables that can affect on perceived quality, perceived value and willingness to buy. Moreover we would like to understand how the buyer evaluate the product quality base on above factors.

### 4.1.2 Research design:

(William G. Zimunds 1997) Research design is a master plan specifying the methods and procedures for collecting and analyzing needed information,

We tested the hypothesis by using a $5 \times 3 \times 3$ between-subjects factorial design with five price levels (low, medium, high, too high and absent) to price range in the market. The very high price were selected over price of the range, the high price were selected to be close to the upper ends of the range the middle for medium price and the low price close to the lower end. The objective was to obtain large differences in price levels while still using values perceived as realistic by respondents. ,three brand levels ( low ,high and absent)of shoe that the subjects have experience and familiarity with the product so as to gain cooperation and provide a realistic setting and three store levels( low, high and absent)that the subject known well as the luxury one and normal retail store. This design made possible a partial replication of previous priceperceived quality studies and a test of the hypotheses. In the questionnaire we divided 45 kinds of questionnaire for example for price (design D), price-brand (B), price store (C),,and price-brand-store( A), but in a situation where product, sample population and independent treatment were the same. Additionally, the design enabled us to examine the relative influence of brand and store information( E ), Brand only ( F ), and store only( G), in the absent of price information, on object's perception of product quality.

We were able to examine price, brand name, and store name effects in the presence of all possible combinations of brand and store cues in the table 4.1 below:

Table 4.1 Research design:

## Resign Design



This study led to the selection of shoes product on the specific sandal, two brand names Gucci( high quality product)and Bitis's ( lower quality product), two store name SuperBowl (luxury store ) and Coopmart ( lower quality store), and the four price determined to be perceptively different, yet within the subject's acceptable price ranges, were positioned as a very high price, a high price, a medium price and low price.

The price level selected for the sandal were 300000 dong, 150000 dong , 70000 dong, and 40000 dong. (Dong is monetary unit of Vietnam. Currency exchange rate is about 15000 Dong/ 1USD 10/2001)). They represented the very high price, high price, medium price and low price, respectively.

This study were assigned 45 treatment cells with difference the degree of brand, price and store information discretely as the table 4.2 as follow:

Table 4.2 : Discrete research design :

| 1.Super Bowl $+300000+$ Gucci | 16. Bitis's $+300000+$ Coopmart | 31.Super Bowl+300000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2. Super Bowl+150000+Gucci | 17. Bitis's+150000+Coopmart | 32. Super Bowl+150000 |
| 3. Super Bowl+70000+Gucci | 18.Bitis's+70000+Coopmart | 33. Super Bowl+70000 |
| 4. Super Bowl $+400000+$ Gucci | 19. Bitis's $+40000+$ Coopmart | 34. Super Bowl +40000 |
| 5. Super Bowl+Gucci | 20. Bitis's+Coopmart \%g] | 35. Super Bowl |
| 6. Coopmart $+300000+$ Gucci | 21.Gucci +300000 | 36. Coopmart +300000 |
| 7. Coopmart $+150000+$ Gucci | 22. Gucci +150000 | 37. Coopmart +150000 |
| 8. Coopmart $+70000+$ Gucci | 23. Gucci+70000 | 38. Coopmart +70000 |
| 9. Coopmart $+400000+$ Gucci | 24. Gucci +40000 | 39. Coopmart +40000 |
| 10. Coopmart +Gucci | 25. Gucci | 40. Coopmart |
| 11.Bitis's+300000+Supper Bowl | 26.Bitis's +300000 | 41.300000 |
| 12. Bitis's+150000+Supper Bowl | 27. Bitis's+150000 | 42. 150000 |
| 13. Bitis's+70000+Supper Bowl | 28. Bitis's+70000 | 43.70000 |
| 14. Bitis's+40000+Supper Bowl | 29. Bitis's+40000 | 44.40000 |
| 15. Bitis's+ Super Bowl | 30. Bitis's | 45.No information |

For dependent variables such as product quality, product value and willingness to buy will be measured with vary sub-variables

### 4.2 Data collection:

### 4.2.1 Research procedure:

In this study we use the experimental technique for gathering the information.
Experiments are defined as studies in which conditions are controlled so that one or more independent variable can be manipulated to test a hypothesis about a dependent variable. In other words, in experimental research the researcher manipulates the independent/experimental variable(s) and then measures the effect of this manipulation on the dependent variable(s).(Aaker/Kumar/Day, 1998).

The study was used to obtain buyer's evaluations of Sandal items where the price, brand name and store name were carefully manipulated. The relationship between these product cues and two evaluative variables(perceived quality and value) and the buyer's willingness to buy sandal product in HCMC market were tested.

The purpose of experimental research is to allow the researcher to control the research situation so that causal relationships among variable may be evaluated.( William G. Zikmund 1997). He also mentions that the experimentation is a research method that, by manipulating only one variable, allows evaluation of causal relationships among variables.

The experiment is a research technique in which information is gather from a sample of buyer by using the questionnaire, a method of self- administered questionnaire, a method of data collect base on communication with individual respondent.

For this study we use the method of self-administered questionnaire which is filled by the respondents rather than an interviewer. For this method we reply on the
efficiency of the written words rather than that of interviewer. There are some advantages of the self- administered questionnaire such as low cost, increase response rate by giving incentive, etc.( Donald. Cooper, Pamela S.Schidler 1998).

Surveys were administered in the respondent's native language ( Vietnamese).Questionnaire were translated from English to Vietnamese and then back translated to English to maintain consistency with the original meanings. To assess the impact of price on product evaluations, four price levels were specified to present realistic price points in HCMC market

The purpose of this experiment is to examine the effect or price, brand name and store information on buyer's product evaluation. To examine this, in the $5 \times 3 \times 3$ factorial design, we will distribute 585 questionnaire ( 13 subjects per cell) according to the previous study. The subjects took part in an experiment in which they evaluated product perceived, product evaluation and willingness to buy base on the degree of price, brand name and store information given, describe their own perception. Subjects were assigned by chance to one of 45 treatment cells for this sandal models.

Factor analysis, ANOVA and a path analysis are being employed to identify cues contributing significantly to buyer's quality and value evaluations and to purchase intentions.

### 4.2.2 Sampling method:



In this research study, non-probability sampling method is most appropriate for this research study. Non-probability sampling is defined as a sampling technique in which units of the sample are selected on the basis of personal judgment or convenience; the probability of any particular member of the population being chosen is unknown (Zikmund, 1997).

In non- probability sampling ,the element do not have a known or predetermined chance of being selected subjects, the element in the population do not have any probabilities attracted to their being chosen as sample objects. This mean that the
finding from the study of the sample can not be confidently generalized to the population (Sekaran ,1992).

Non-Probability sample is a sample that relies on personal judgement somewhere in the element selection process and therefore prohibits estimating the probability that any population element will be included in the sample (Churchill, 1979)

This research study is employed convenience-sampling technique, which is defined as the sampling procedure of obtaining this people or units that are most convenience available (Zikmund ,1997).

This technique is used because it seems simple and meets all necessary requirement of a non-probability sample. The primary reason for using this approach is that it is less time consuming, and is possible to accomplish with a limit budget.
This research base on the non-probability sampling design so it does not require a list of population so no sampling frame is required for this study.

### 4.2.3 Sample size :



The sample size is the size of sample; the number of observations or cases specified by the estimated variance of the population, the magnitude of acceptable error, and the confidence level (William G. Zimunds 1997), he also mention that the determination of sample size depend on the research question and the variability with in the sample.

In this study we apply the experimental technique with 45 treatment cells and 13 subjects per cell in the $5 \times 3 \times 3$ factorial design as following to the previous study. A minimum of 585 samples is required for collecting the primary data via questionnaires for this study.

### 4.2.4 Pre-testing :

A pretest will be done in Assumption University by distributing questionnaires to 10 new Vietnamese students who have just come from Vietnam within a month. The reason is that they have just come from Vietnam and have knowledge about current shoe market in Vietnam. The purpose of this work is to check if he/she understand the questionnaire and collect the feedback from them. Then the researcher will correct mistakes and adjust to make better questionnaire in term of good communication with respondents.

### 4.3 Data measurement :

### 4.3.1 Operationalization of variable :

The independent variables like brand name, store name and price are a concise $0,1,2$ for absence, low and high. For the purpose of this study, this selecting presents the selected variables regarding measure the manipulate of dependent variables perceived quality, perceived value and willing to buy base on the degree of independent variables.

The three variables can be assessed or absence in the questionnaire. It is measure through the nominal scale ranging from $0,1,2$ which the absence, low and high. For example store high mean that store sell high quality merchandise. The number is a state in which the numbers assigned to objects serve as labels for identification or classification.

The dependent variables like perceived quality, perceived value and willing to buy are concise multiple -item 7 points rating scale (Likert Scale ). For the purpose of this study, this section presents the select variable regarding measures of buyer's product evaluations. The three independent variables can be assessed across all buyer's by averaging their score on the statement making up base on the select degree of each dependent variables. The Likert Scale ranging from " 1 to 7 " From "Strongly

Disagree to Strongly Agree ". The gap scores can then be analyzed to assess the overall buyer's product evaluation.

The sub - variable for this study are grouped as the table 4.2 as follow :

Table 4.2 : Operational definition of sub-variables:

| Variables | Sub-variables | Operational Definition | Measurement |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brand name |  | High, Low, Absent | Nominal scale |
| Store name |  | High, Low, Absent | Nominal scale |
| Price |  | Very high, High, Medium, Low ,Absent | Nominal scale |
| Perceived quality | Reliability <br> Workmanship <br> Quality | Workmanship of this sandal model is good <br> The fabric quality of this sandal model is good | Likert scale |
|  | Dependability | The likelihood that this product is dependable |  |
|  | Durability | This sandal model would seem to be durable |  |
| Perceived <br> value | Value for money | This sandal model is very good value for the money | Likert Scale |
|  | Economical | At the price shown this sandal is very economical. |  |
|  | A Good buy | The sandal is a good buy |  |
|  | An acceptable price | The price shown for this sandal is acceptable |  |
|  | Bargain | This sandal appears to be a bargain |  |
| Willingness to buy | Purchasing | The likelihood of purchasing this sandal is high | Likert Scale |


| Buy product at price <br> shown | If I were going to buy this product , I <br> would consider buying at the price <br> shown |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| At price shown <br> consider $\quad$ At the price shown, I would consider <br> product | to buy the sandal |\(\left|\begin{array}{ll}Probability consider <br>

to buy\end{array} \begin{array}{l}The probability that I would consider <br>

buying the sandal\end{array}\right|\)| Willingness to buy | My willingness to buy the sandal |
| :--- | :--- |

### 4.3.2 The research instrument/ Questionnaire

Table 4.3.2: The parts of questionnaire


We test direct and indirect relationships between three extrinsic product cues price, brand name, store ) and two evaluative variables ( perceived quality and perceived product value ) as well as buyer's willingness to buy.

The design of the experiment also allowed analysis of the relative differential impact of Price brand name, store name on three dependent variables to test the relationship between :

Price and perceived quality
Price, perceived value and willingness to buy

Influence of brand name and store name Effect size (single cues vs. multiple cues )

The questionnaire consisted of fifteen questions for was used in gathering data in relation to the topic of study which apply close-ended question.

Each questionnaire in this study also consist of the personal information on personal, education, age gender, occupation ...characteristics of the buyers.

As all the above dependent variable, the structure of questions and scale customers will be applied. The attributed items will be listed for the buyer's to assign rating from 1 to 7 , ranging from "strongly disagree "to "strongly agree".

Base on the literature review concerning buyer's product evaluations through product perceived quality and perceived value with price, brand name, and store name information. In the $5 \times 3 \times 3$ factorial design. The subjects were non-contrived assigned 45 treatment cells which difference degree of brand name, store name and price for example high brand name, low store name and without price information.

The consumer will be asked to determine what really matter as the basic dimensions of perceived quality, perceived value and willingness to buy. The 15 attributes are tested based on the determination of its importance to the consumer as show below:


1----------------------------------------------------------------------------7

Perceived Quality Indicators:

| Q 1 | The likelihood that the sandal would be reliable is high | SD $\quad$ SA $1-2--3---4--5--6---7$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q 2 | The workmanship of the sandal would be very high | SD $\quad$ SA $1---2--3---4--5--6---7$ |
| Q 3 | This sandal should be of good quality | SD $\quad$ SA $1---2--3--4---5--6---7$ |
| Q 4 | The likelihood that this sandal model is dependable is high | SD $\quad$ SA $1--2--3---4--5--6---7$ |
| Q 5 | This product would seem to be durable | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SD } \mathrm{SA} \\ & 1--2 \cdots-3--4----6-7 \end{aligned}$ |

Perceived Value Indicators :

| Q6 | This sandal is a good value for money | SD $\quad$ SA $1--2---3--4--5--6--7$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q 7 | At the price show the product is economical | SD $\quad$ SA $1---2--3--4--5--6--7$ |
| Q 8 | The product is considered to be a good buy | SD SA <br> $1--269---7$  |
| Q9 | The price show for the sandal is acceptable | SD $\quad$ SA $1---2--3---4--5--6---7$ |
| Q 10 | This sandal appears to be a bargain | $\begin{array}{lr} \text { SD } & \text { SA } \\ 1---2--3--4--5---6--7 \end{array}$ |

Willingness to Buy Indicators:

| Q 11 | The likelihood of purchasing this product is high | SD $\quad$ SA $1---2--3---4---5--6---7$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q 12 | If I were going to buy this product ,I would consider buying this model at the price shown | SD $\quad$ SA $1---2--3---4--5--6 \cdots-7$ |
| Q 13 | At the price shown, I would consider buying the product | SD $\quad$ SA $1---2--3---4---5--6--7$ |
| Q 14 | The probability that I would consider buying the product is high | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { SD } \\ & 1-2-6-4 \end{aligned}$ |
| Q 15 | My willingness to buy the product is high | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SD } \\ & 1--2--3--4--5--6--7 \end{aligned}$ |

### 4.4 Data Analysis:

### 4.4.1 Statistic used:

When finishing collecting data, the Statistical Package for Social Science ( SPSS ) is utilized to process and interpret data. Data from questionnaires are coded into the symbolic form that can be used in SPSS software:

For dependent variables, every dependent variable have many sub-variables. Subject evaluated product quality, value, and willing to buy on multi-item 7 -point scales that were developed from previous research .As shown in the questionnaire, perceived value was operationalized in relation to monetary exchange. Thus, when brand and store information was given in the absent price, subject were asked to evaluate only the quality of the product.

Following the procedures suggested by Churchill (1979), we developed the indicators and assessed them for internal and external consistency by using

Cronbach's alpha coefficients to check the reliability between sub-variables to be the dependent variable perceived quality, perceived value and willingness to buy.

One-way ANOVA will be used to analyze the significant difference in the response of four price levels on the manipulation check, brand quality and store quality.

This statistical test of significance is designed to establish whether a significant difference exist among several sample means. Statically, it is the ratio of variance occurring between the sample mean to the variance between is larger than the variance within-usually indicates a significance difference .

MANOVA ( Multivariable Analysis of Variable) was used to test the hypothesized relationship between the extrinsic-cue variables ( brand, price, and store) in different levels include absent information as independent variables and the set of interrelated dependent variables ( perceived quality, perceived value and willingness to buy).The variability in the dependent variables is subdivided into two components : that attributable between groups ( the hypothesis sum of square matrix) and that attributable to variability with in groups (the error sums of squares matrix).Various test statistic that compare the magnitudes of these two matrix are computed( Marija J.Norusis 1990)


### 4.4.2 Decision Rule for interpretation:

## One way ANOVA:

Step 1: State null (Ho) and alternative ( Ha ) hypothesis
Hypothesis because they refer to the population, always contain population parameter symbol.

The Null Hypothesis ( Ho ) is a statement of no difference and contains the "equal to " $(=)$ sign. In the case of a test about the different between more than two population
means, if do not reject Ho, it can conclude that the population means are not significantly different from each other.

The Alternative Hypothesis (Ha) is a statement of difference. In the case of a test about the difference between more than two population means. If do not reject Ho it can conclude that the populations are significant different from each other.

Step 2 : Compute a test Statistic:

The formulas for computing the F test statistic are in the ANOVA table below. Go from left to right to calculate F and from that, the P -value. I refers to the number of groups in the comparison and $N$ is the sum of the sample sizes of all groups ( $N \Sigma n^{j}$ )

Analysis of variance formulas


Step 3 : Make a decision about the Null Hypothesis (Ho)

In this step, it will either reject or not reject Ho. When reject Ho, it can conclude that in favor of alternative Hypothesis ( Ha ) of significance difference. There are two decision rules you may follow.

## Decision Rule 1 Instructions:

Find a P-Value and compare it to your significance level ( $\alpha$ ). P- Values are the probabilities associated with the test statistic (observed F) found in step 2. Finding the F test in table

Finding P-Value using table

| Test Statistic (observed F) | P-value |
| :---: | :---: |
| Look for F in the body of table | Given $\mathrm{df}_{\text {numerator ( I-1) in the table's }}$ <br> columns and df denominator (N-1) in the <br> table's row, find the probabilities ( this <br> may be a range) |
|  | mater |

Decision rule 1: If p-value(s) $<\alpha$, reject Ho ( accept alternative hypothesis in lieu) If P -value $(\mathrm{s})>\alpha$ do not reject Ho

## Decision Rule 2 Instructions:

The F score in the table associated with your level of significance $(\alpha)$

Finding Critical Value ( $\mathrm{F}^{*}$ ) using table

| Critical Value ( $\mathrm{F}^{*}$ ) |
| :--- |
| Given $\alpha, \mathrm{df}_{\text {numerator }}$ ( $\mathrm{I}-1$ ) in the table's columns and df denominator $(\mathrm{N}-1)$ in the table's |
| row, find the F value. |

Decision Rule 2 : If $\mathrm{F}>\mathrm{F}$ *, Reject Ho
If $\mathrm{F}<\mathrm{F} *$, Do not reject Ho

- Fratio/ANOVA was an appropriate test statistic, that was used to test the null Hypothesis .It compare the relative magnitude of the between-sample variability with the within-sample variability. A significantly large F value indicated that the variability within the sample, which in turn indicates that the null hypothesis should be reject. However, the sampling distribution of F was not easily obtainable when the research were sampling from arbitrary population .If the null hypothesis was true, however, and if the samples were independent and from normal population with equal variances, then the sampling distribution was an F distribution.

To interpret large F value and assess the statistic evidence against Ho, the researcher needed to compare the F value test statistic in the ANOVA table to a standard or critical F value. Beside that the researcher also needed to determine the tail probability ( $p$-value) of the $F$ distribution < significance $\alpha$ value.

If F value test statistic> critical F value ( $\mathrm{F}_{\alpha,(1, n-2)}$, Therefore, reject Ho, the sample mean were significant different.

## MANOVA effect size :

The study was applied the MANOVA with the Eta squared to test the effect size of independent variables that they can influenced the dependent variables.

The eta square mean the proportion of the variance in the dependent variable accounted for an independent variable. For instance, an eta square mean of .044 , it would indicate that $4.4 \%$ of the variance in the dependent variable is due to the influence of the independent variable.

Partial eta- square for factorial design, computing several effect size measures base on the eta - square statistic.

* A value close to 1 indicates that all of the total variability is attribute to different between groups.
* A value close to 0 indicates that the grouping variables explain little of total variability.


### 4.4.3 Diagnosis of statistic methods

## 4..4.3.1 Descriptive statistic:

Descriptive statistic consist of the frequency, percentage in order to describe the personal data of respondents. Distribution is the most significant theoretical distribution in statistics, It is a standard of comparison for describing distribution of sample data. The characteristic of location spread and shape describe distribution.

Their definitions, applications, and formulas fall under the heading of " Descriptive Statistic " (Cooper and Emony 1995).


Descriptive Analysis id the method of preliminary data analysis that helps summarize the general nature of variables included in among them (Parasursman,1992)

Descriptive Statistic are statistical indices that summarize and communicate basic characteristics of a distribution (Grimn, 1993).He also mention : Descriptive Statistics is an efficient means summarizing the characteristic of a large set of data, which can presented in frequency tables, bar charts, cross tabulation, histogram and percentages. In this study the researcher apply to describe respondents personal data to see the target of sample in the population and also preparing for the statistical test. Describing the data set is crucial in order to determine which statistical tests can be applied and how those result must be interpreted.

### 4.4.3.2 Inferential Statistics:

Inferential statistics is the method of data analysis that goes beyond the descriptive analysis, it involves verifying specific statements or hypothesis statements about population (David,1996).

- Reliability Test :

Reliability refers to the accuracy and precision of procedure. It is concerned with estimates of the degree to which a measurement is free of random or unstable error. Reliability testing is of significance and will be required solely in case the independent variables are interdependent and contain linkages in operationalization process.

Since the concepts of the independent variables are composite measures, an index measure technique is used. Reliability test of such concepts by "Cronbach alpha" value indicates the certain acceptance of whether such particular concepts are statistically applicable for further test with the dependent variables. Cronbach alpha is utilized the internal consistency of the measurement. Each scale is tested by SPSS to compute alpha value. If alpha is greater than or equal to $6 .$, it indicates a strong measure of reliability. Reliability of sub variables of dependent variables were assessed by the internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) method.

- Significant test :

A standard level of significance is establish as a benchmark with critical value of statistics; then the value of the statistic is calculated to see whether it meets that level. If the calculated value of the statistic exceeds the critical value, the result being tested is said to be statically significant at that level.

Generally, the symbol Ho is null hypothesis and the symbol Ha is alternative hypothesis. The purpose of hypothesis testing is to determine which one of the two hypothesis is accepted.

One way ANOVA was used for H1-H3 was used to test the hypothesized relationship between the extrinsic-cue variables ( brand, price, and store) in different levels include absent information as independent variables and the set of interrelated dependent variables ( perceived quality, perceived value and willingness to buy).

MANOVA was used for H4-H6 to check manipulate by Partial Eta-Square $\left(\eta^{2}\right)($ SPSS Inc.1997) to see the effect size of brand name, price , and store name on perceived quality, perceived value and willingness to buy.


## Chapter 5 : RESEARCH FINDING.

This chapter is purposed to focus on the data of this research study, which includes Descriptive Statistics in section 1, reliability test of index scale and Inferential Statistics in section 2 to test the hypotheses between independent and dependent variables.

### 5.1 Descriptive Statistics:

Descriptive statistics is a branch of statistics that provides researches with summary measures for data contained in all elements of a sample. The measure of central tendency and measures of dispersion are usually concerned (Kinnear, 1991)

When you analyze data, you are doing so for a reason. Presumably, you want to use the information collected from a sample data set to infer the nature of some larger set of data- the population. Since the ultimate goal of data examination may be to test a specific hypothesis or to examine particular inferences, it is important that you obtain familiarity with your data set, so that its limitations are known and its usefulness can be fully realized.

Descriptive Statistics use to investigate a data set you collect before beginning apply statistical tests from which you obtain results and make conclusions about your target population.

## Confirmation of target population :

Descriptive statistics is divided in to 2 parts:
1.Demographics of respondents and which are :

Age
Gender
Income
Occupation

Education.
Table 5.1 : Gender
Please specify your gender Please specify your gender

|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cumulative Percent |  |  |  |  |
| Valid | male | 230 | 39.5 | 39.5 |
| 39.5 |  |  |  |  |
|  | female | 353 | 60.5 | 60.5 |
|  | Total | 583 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

From table 5.1, there are 585 questionnaires were distributed but return only 583. The respondents who are female are higher of proportion than the respondents who are males. The percent of females is $60.5 \%$ while the percentage of males is $39.5 \%$.

Table 5.2 : Age
In what age level you are in?

|  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valid less than 20 | 105 | 18.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 |
| years old <br> $21-30$ year <br> old | 343 | 58.8 | 58.8 | 76.8 |
| $31-40$ year <br> old <br> $41-50$ year <br> old | 36 | 15.6 | 15.6 | 92.5 |
| over 50 year <br> old <br> Total | $8 *$ | 1.4 | 6.2 | 98.6 |

From table 5.2 the percentage of respondents aged less than 20 years old is $18 \%$, between 21-30 year old account for $58.8 \%$, from 31-40 year old is $15.6 \%$, aged between $41-50$ is $6.2 \%$ and the only $1.4 \%$ the respondent over 50 year old.

Table 5.3 : Income
What is your average total income per month?

|  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative <br> Percent |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valid | $<=1000000$ <br> dong | 341 | 58.5 | 59.0 | 59.0 |
|  | 1000001- <br> 2000000 dong <br> 3000001- <br> 4000000 dong <br> $4000001-$ | 164 | 28.1 | 28.4 | 87.4 |
|  | 13 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 95.0 |  |
| 5000000 dong <br> more than <br> 5000000 <br> Total | 7 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 97.2 |  |
| Missin | System | 578 | 99.1 | 100.0 | 98.4 |
| g Total |  | 583 | 100.0 | .9 |  |

From the table 5.3 the major of respondent average income is equal or less than 1000000 VN dong counted for $58.5 \%, 1000001-2000000$ dong count for $28.1 \%$, $3000000-4000000$ dong is accounted for $7.5 \%$ and above 4000000 dong is account for $7.9 \%$

Table 5.4 Occupation
What is your occupation?

|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | Cumulative Percent.


| others | 69 | 11.8 | 11.8 | 100.0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total | 583 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

From the above table, the majority of the respondent's occupation is student counted for $46.1 \%$ and government officer is $19.7 \%$, State enterprise is $7.4 \%$,business owner is $5.3 \%$, retired is $1,2 \%$, housewife is $.7 \%$ and others is $11.8 \%$.

Table 5.5 Education
What is your highest education?

|  | Frequency | Percent | Valid <br> Percent | Cumulative Percent |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valid | below <br> bachelor <br> degree <br> bachelor <br> degree | 242 | 58.7 | 58.9 | 58.9 |
|  | 233 | 40.0 | 40.1 | 99.0 |  |
|  | master <br> higher than <br> master | 4 | .7 | .7 | 99.7 |
|  | 2 | .3 | .3 | 100.0 |  |
| Total | 581 | 99.7 | 100.0 |  |  |
| Missing <br> Total | 2 | .3 |  |  |  |

From the table 5.5 , most respondents education level is at below bachelor degree $58.7 \%$, bachelor degree is account for $40 \%$, master is $.7 \%$ and above master $.3 \%$ respectively.
2. Conformation of target population by applying demographic characteristics to confirm the major segment by pie chart display.

Figure 5.1 Gender of repondents


Figure 5.2 Age of Respondents




Figure 5.3 Income of respondents 972 SINCE1969


What is your everage total imcome per month?


What is your occupation?


Figure 5.5 Education of respondents

## What is your highest education?

Missing


The target population for this study is both male and female aged less than 20 year old or above, who have ever purchase sandal and resides in Ho Chi Minh metropolis.

From the questionnaire collect period, the researcher distributed 585 copies of the questionnaire at different locations of HCM area within the selected target population. As referred to gender of the respondents, the respondents $39.5 \%$ are male and $60.5 \%$ are females.

Considering the target population base on age, the respondents only $18 \%$ aged below 20 year old, and $82 \%$ aged in 20-30 year olds and above, are the target population of this study.

For screening the respondents who have ever have knowledge and experience with Bitis's sandal and Gucci sandal and they also familiarity with the Coopmart Department store and Super Bowl, Firstly the researcher would ask the respondents whether they ever have experience with both brand names and both Department store
mentioned above or not to make clear that they really know well about the product on evaluation product quality.

### 5.2 Inferential Statistics:

### 5.2.1 Reliability test :

Reliability refers to the accuracy and precision of measurement procedure. It is concerned with estimates of the degree to which a measurement is free of random or unstable error. Reliability testing is of significance and will be required solely in case the dependent variables are interdependent and contain linkages in operationalization process. Since the concepts of dependent variables are composite measures, an index measure technique is used. Reliability test of such concepts by "Cronbach's Alpha" value indicates the certain acceptance of whether such particular concepts are statistically applicable for further test with independent variables. Table 5,6;5.7; 5.8 provide a result of test reliability of the scale used in the study calculating by the Cronbach's Alpha.


Cronbach's Alpha is utilized to assess the internal consistency of the measurement. Each scale is tested by SPSS to compute the Alpha Value. If alpha is greater than or equal to .6 , it indicates a strong measure of reliability.

Reliability of the perceived quality, perceived value and willingness to buy were assessed by the internal consistency (Cronbach's Alpha) method. Cronbach's Alpha for all 3 concepts of perceived quality, perceived value and willingness to buy ranged from .6 to .8 indicating a strong reliability.

Table 5.6 Reliability Test of perceived quality
****** Method 2 (covariance matrix) will be used for this analysis -

RELIABILITY ANALYSIS - SCALE (ALPHA)

$$
\mathrm{N} \text { of Cases }=583.0
$$



Above reliability analysis results alpha value .8574 which indicate that the scale is strongly reliability to test hypothesis. These five sub-variables will be merged into dependent variable, perceived quality, and used to test hypothesis

Table 5.7: Reliability Test of Perceived value
****** Method 2 (covariance matrix) will be used for this analysis
RELIABILITY ANALYSIS - SCALE (ALPHA)


Above reliability analysis results alpha value .6244 which indicate that the scale is strongly reliability to test hypothesis. These five sub-variables will be merged into dependent variable, perceived value, and used to test hypothesis

Table 5.8: Reliability Test of Willingness to buy
****** Method 2 (covariance matrix) will be used for this analysis ******

RELIABILITY ANALYSIS - SCALE (ALPHA)

N of Cases $=465.0$

Item Variances Mean Minimum Maximum Range Max/Min Variance $\begin{array}{llllll}3.2744 & 2.8640 & 3.5033 & .6393 & 1.2232 & .0721\end{array}$

Inter-item
Covariances Mean Minimum Maximum Range Max/Min Variance $\begin{array}{llllll}1.4442 & .8876 & 2.1198 & 1.2322 & 2.3884 & .1388\end{array}$

Inter-item
Correlations Mean Minimum Maximum Range Max/Min Variance $\begin{array}{ccccccc}.4391 & .2959 & .6122 & .3163 & 2.0688 & .0101 & \\ \text { Analysis of Variance } & & & & \\ \text { Source of Variation } & \text { Sum of Sq. } & \\ & \text { DF } & \text { Mean Square } & \mathrm{F} & \text { Prob. }\end{array}$

| Between People | 4199.6490 .464 SIN 9.0510 , वे |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Within People | $3690.4000 \quad 1860$ |  | 1.9841 | \% 19 |
| Between Measure | res 293.5 | 5501 | 4 $/ 773.3875$ | 40.0981 .0000 |
| Residual | 3396.8499 | 1856 | 1.8302 |  |
| Total 7 | 7890.0490 | 2324 | 3.3950 |  |
| Grand Mean | 4.9006 |  |  |  |

Reliability Coefficients 5 items
Alpha $=.7978 \quad$ Standardized item alpha $=.7965$

Above reliability analysis results alpha value .7978 , which indicate that the scale is strongly reliability to test hypothesis. These five sub-variables will be merged into dependent variable, willingness to buy, and used to test hypothesis

### 5.2.2 Significant test:

## The Hypothesis-testing procedure :

First, conjecture the statement of hypothesis. Then imagine what the sampling distribution of the mean would be if this hypothesis were true statement of the nature of the population. Next, take an actual sample and calculate the sample mean. If the observed sample value differs from the expected value, a conclusion may be drawn against the mean difference. However to conclude these result are improbable, the decision rule for determining the rejection of the null hypothesis and the acceptance of the alternative hypothesis.

For this study, the data are analyzed and summarized in a readable and easily interpretable from after the required data are collected. The Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) is utilized to summarize the data where needed. In this research study, there are three main groups dependent variable used for testing of single independent variable with three dependent variables( perceived quality, perceived value and willingness to buy. Each Independent variable with three dependent variables by using A one-way ANOVA and then use the MANOVA to test the effect size of each independent variable.

## Test of the Hypotheses

The preceding conceptualization, as well as the limited empirical evidence, suggests several direct relationship between price, brand name and store name and buyer's perception of product quality. We also suggest some important relationships between those cues and perceptions of value and willingness to buy (H1-H3).Finally, for the effect of an information cue on product evaluations and willingness to buy, we
compare the result from a single- cue design with those from a multiple-cue design (H4-H6) as follow:

H1o: As price increases from a low priced model to a higher priced model
(d) The relationship between price and perceived quality will be no positive .
(e) The relationship between price and perceived value will be no quadratic .
(f) The relationship between price and willingness to buy will be no quadratic.

For the Hypothesis 1 ,it is conjectured to test the effect of price on perceived quality, perceived value and willingness to buy. With this hypothesis, the one-way ANOVA test is applied to determine whether there is a relationship between independent price and three dependent variables.

Table 5.9 A one-way ANOVA to test the effect of price

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

|  | Levene <br> Statistic | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| perceived <br> quality <br> perceived <br> value | 8.525 | 4 | 578 | .000 |
| willing to <br> buy | 2.702 | 3 | 461 | .526 |

ANOVA

|  | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| perceived quality | 64.754 | 4 | 16.188 | 13.575 | . 000 |
|  | 689.262 | 578 | 1.192 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 689.262 | 578 | 1.192 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 754.016 | 582 |  |  |  |
|  | 754.016 | 582 |  |  |  |
| perceived Between value Groups | 19.212 | 4 | 4.803 | 1.721 | . 144 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| perceived Between | 19.212 | 4 | 4.803 | 1.721 | . 144 |


| Within <br> Groups |  |  |  | 1283.894 | 460 |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total | 1303.107 | 464 | 2.791 |  |  |
| willing to Between  <br> buy 16.807 <br> Groups  <br> Within  <br> Groups  <br> Total  | 823.122 | 4 | 4.202 | 2.348 | .054 |

For hypothesis 1.a. from the result in table 5.9 , the computed One-way ANOVA statistic F value is 13.575 and has an association probability ( p -value) . $000<.05$.Thus, at .05 level , the hypothesis of independence is rejected. When we reject Ho ,it can conclude that as the price increase from a low priced model to a higher price model
a) The relationship between price and perceived quality will be positive.

For hypothesis 1b. from the result in table 5.9 , the computed One-way ANOVA statistic $F$ value is 2.348 and has an association probability ( p -value) . $144>.05$.Thus, at the .05 level the hypothesis of independence is accepted. When we accepted Ho ,it can conclude that as the price increase from a low priced model to a higher price model
b) The relationship between price and perceived value will be no quadratic.

It mean that the price is not effect to the perceived value.

For hypothesis 1c. from the result in table 5.9 , the computed One-way ANOVA statistic F value is 1.721 and has an association probability ( p -value) . $054>.05$.Thus, at the .05 level the hypothesis of independence is accepted. When we accepted Ho ,it can conclude that as the price increase from a low priced model to a higher price model
c) The relationship between price and willingness to buy will be no quadratic.

It mean that the price is not effect to the willingness to buy.
$\mathbf{H} 2 \mathbf{0}$ : When perceptions of brand name are more favorable
(d) Buyer's perceptions of quality are not higher
(e) Buyer's perception of value are not greater
(f) Buyer's willingness to buy is not greater

For the Hypothesis 2 , it is conjectured to test the effect of price on perceived quality, perceived value and willingness to buy. With this hypothesis, the one-way ANOVA test is applied to determine whether there is a relationship between independent brand name and three dependent variables.

Table 5.10 A one-way ANOVA to test the effect of brand name

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

| Levene <br> Statistic |  | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| perceived <br> quality <br> perceived <br> value <br> willing to <br> buy | 10.239 | 2 | 580 | .000 |

ANOVA

|  | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | $\mathrm{F}^{\text {a }}$ | Sig. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| perceived Between | 42.063 | 2 | 21.032 | 17.134 | . 000 |
| perceived quality |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 711.952 | 580 | 1.228 |  |  |
|  |  |  | SINCE | 969 | 68 |
|  | 754.016 | 582 |  |  |  |
| perceived <br> value | 45.822 | 2 | 22.9118 | 28.419 | . 000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1257.284 | 462 | 2.721 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1257.284 | 462 | 2.721 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1303.107 | 464 |  |  |  |
|  | 1303.107 | 464 |  |  |  |
| willing to Between buy Groups | 39.607 | 2 | 19.804 | 11.432 | . 000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| willing to buy | 39.607 | 2 | 19.804 | 11.432 | . 000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 800.323 | 462 | 1.732 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 800.323 | 462 | 1.732 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Total | 839.930 | 464 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

For hypothesis 2 a) from the result in table 5.10 , the computed One-way ANOVA statistic F value is 17.134 and has an association probability ( p -value) . 000 $<.05$.Thus, at the .05 level the hypothesis of independence is rejected. When we rejected Ho ,it can conclude that when perceptions of the brand name are more favorable
a) Buyer's perceptions of quality are higher,

For hypothesis 2 b) from the result in table 5.10 , the computed One-way ANOVA statistic F value is 8.419 and has an association probability (p-value) . $000<$ .05 .Thus, at the .05 level the hypothesis of independence is rejected. When we rejected Ho ,it can conclude that when perceptions of the brand name are more favorable
b) Buyer's perceptions of value are greater,

For hypothesis 2 c) from the result in table 5.10 , the computed One-way ANOVA statistic F value is 11.432 and has an association probability ( p -value) . $000<$ .05 .Thus, at the .05 level the hypothesis of independence is rejected. When we rejected Ho ,it can conclude that when perceptions of the brand name are more favorable
c) Buyer's willingness to buy are greater.

H 3 o : When perceptions of store name are more favorable
(a) Buyer's perceptions of quality are not higher
(b) Buyer's perception of value are not greater
(g) Buyer's willingness to buy is not greater

For the Hypothesis 3 ,it is conjectured to test the effect of store on perceived quality, perceived value and willingness to buy. With this hypothesis, the one-way

ANOVA test is applied to determine whether there is a relationship between independent store name and three dependent variables.

Table 5.11 A one-way ANOVA to test the effect of Store name

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

|  | Levene <br> Statistic | $\mathrm{df1}$ | df 2 | Sig. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| perceived <br> quality | .426 | 2 | 580 | .653 |
| perceived <br> value | .083 | 2 | 462 | .920 |
| willing to <br> buy | .139 | 2 | 462 | .871 |

ANOVA


For hypothesis 3 a) from the result in table 5.11, the computed One-way ANOVA statistic F value is 1.181 and has an association probability (p-value) . 308 $>.05$.Thus, at the .05 level the hypothesis of independence is accepted. When we
accepted Ho ,it can conclude that when perceptions of the store name are more favorable
a) Buyer's perceptions of quality are not higher

For hypothesis 3 b) from the result in table 5.11, the computed One-way ANOVA statistic F value is .995 and has an association probability (p-value) . 371 $>.05$.Thus, at the .05 level the hypothesis of independence is accepted. When we accepted Ho ,it can conclude that when perceptions of the store name are more favorable
b) Buyer's perceptions of value are not greater.

For hypothesis 3 c) from the result in table 5.11, the computed One-way ANOVA statistic F value is 1.383 and has an association probability (p-value) . 252 $>.05$.Thus, at the .05 level the hypothesis of independence is accepted. When we accepted Ho ,it can conclude that when perceptions of the store name are more favorable
c) Buyer's willingness to buy are not greater.

H 4 o : When other information is included with price information( i.e Price -Brand, Price-Store, Price-Brand-Store), the price effect is not stronger than in a Price-only condition( i.e Price)

H5o: When other information is included with brand information (i.e Brand- Price, Brand -Store, Brand-Price- Store), the brand effect is not stronger than in a Brandonly condition( i.e Brand )

H60: When other information is included with store information (i.e Store -brand, Store -Price, Price-Brand-Store), the store effect is not stronger than in a Store-only condition( i.e Store)

Table 5.12 : Effect size of price, brand name and store name

Multivariate tests

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

| Source | Dependent Variable | Type III Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Partial Eta Squared |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Corrected Model | perceived | 194.470 | 35 | 5.556 | 5.190 | . 000 | . 297 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | perceived value | 175.838 | 35 | 5.024 | 1.912 | . 002 | . 135 |
|  | willing to buy | 194.694 | 35 | 5.563 | 3.698 | . 000 | . 232 |
| Intercept | perceived quality | 13188.282 | 1 | 13188.282 | 12319.637 | . 000 | . 966 |
|  | perceived value | 10391.559 | 1 | 10391.559 | 3954.674 | . 000 | . 902 |
|  | willing to buy | 11133.543 | 1 | 11133.543 | 7402.398 | . 000 | . 945 |
| PRICE | perceived quality | 57.227 | 3 | 19.076 | 17.819 | $.000$ | . 111 |
|  | perceived value | - 19.262 | 3 | 6.421 | 2.444 | . 064 | . 017 |
|  | willing to buy | - 16.924 | 3 | 5.641 | 3.751 | $.011$ | . 026 |
| BRAND | perceived | 37.072 | 2 | 18.536 | 17.315 | . 000 | . 075 |
|  | quality perceived value | 46.971 | 2 | 23.485 | 8.938 | $\bigcirc$ | . 040 |
|  | perceived value | 46.971 | 2 | $23.485$ | $8.938$ |  | . 040 |
|  | willing to buy | 39.2947 | $\partial^{2} 2$ | $19.647$ | 13.063 | . 000 | . 057 |
|  | willing to buy | 39.294 | 2 | 19.647 | 13.063 | . 000 | . 057 |
| STORE | perceived quality | 2.575 | 2 | 1.287 | 1.202 | . 301 | . 006 |
| STORE | perceived quality | 2.575 | 2 | 1.287 | 1.202 | . 301 | . 006 |
|  | perceived value | 5.468 | 2 | 2.734 | 1.040 | . 354 | . 005 |
|  | perceived value | 5.468 | 2 | 2.734 | 1.040 | . 354 | . 005 |
|  | willing to buy | 4.405 | 2 | 2.202 | 1.464 | . 232 | . 007 |
|  | willing to buy | 4.465 | 2 | 2.202 | 1.464 | . 232 | . 007 |
| PRICE* | perceived | 21.813 | 6 | 3.635 | 3.396 | . 003 | . 045 |


| BRAND | quality perceived value willing to buy | 28.647 28.262 | 6 6 | 4.775 4.710 | 1.817 3.132 | .094 .005 | .025 .042 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PRICE * <br> STORE | perceived quality | 27.221 | 6 | 4.537 | 4.238 | . 000 | . 056 |
|  | perceived value | 30.219 | 6 | 5.036 | 1.917 | . 077 | . 026 |
|  | willing to buy | 35.751 | 6 | 5.959 | 3.962 | . 001 | . 052 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { BRAND } \\ & \text { * STORE } \end{aligned}$ | perceived | 12.122 | 4 | 3.031 | 2.831 | . 024 | . 026 |
|  | quality perceived value | . 445 | 4 | . 111 | . 042 | . 997 | . 000 |
|  | willing to buy | 15.563 | 4 | -3.891 | 2.587 | . 036 | . 024 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { PRICE * } \\ & \text { BRAND } \\ & \text { * STORE } \end{aligned}$ | perceived | 35.459 | 12 | 2.955 | 2.760 | . 001 | . 072 |
|  | quality |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | perceived value | 45.804 | 12 | 3.817 | 1.453 | $.139$ | . 039 |
|  | willing to | + 53.745 | 12 | 4.479 | 2.978 | . 001 | . 077 |
| Error | perceived | 459.248 | 429 | 1.071 |  | - |  |
|  | quality |  |  | 1.07 |  | 5 |  |
|  | perceived | 1127.268 | 429 | 2.628 | IEL | $\sum$ |  |
|  | willing to buy | 645.235 | 429 | 1.504 |  | $\checkmark$ |  |
| Total | perceived | 13869.720 | 465 | ommia |  |  |  |
|  | quality | -20 |  | NCE1969 | 96\% |  |  |
|  | perceived value | 11719.280 | 465 | าลัยอัล์ |  |  |  |
|  | willing to | 12007.520 | 465 |  |  |  |  |
|  | buy |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Corrected Total | perceived | 653.718 | 464 |  |  |  |  |
|  | quality |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | perceived value | 1303.107 | 464 |  |  |  |  |
|  | willing to | 839.930 | 464 |  |  |  |  |
|  | buy |  |  |  |  |  |  |

a R Squared $=.297$ (Adjusted R Squared $=.240$ )
b R Squared $=.135($ Adjusted $R$ Squared $=.064)$
c $R$ Squared $=.232($ Adjusted R Squared $=.169)$

For the effect size from the table 5.12

Price effect in single -cue versus multiple-cue designs ( H 4 ). The hypothesized price effect on perceptions of quality, were analyzed by MANOVA, the results in table 5.12 suggest that the effect of price on perceived quality is greater in a single cue ( SC ) design than in a multiple-cue (MC) design but the effect of price on perceived value and willingness to buy is not greater in SC than in MC.

1. For perceived quality $S C \eta^{2}=.111>M C$ price and brand $\eta^{2}=.045$, price and store $\eta^{2}=.056$ and price, brand and store $\eta^{2}=.072$ ). It can conclude that the effect of price on quality is greater in the SC than MC.
2. For perceived value $S C \eta^{2}=.017<\mathrm{MC}\left(\operatorname{PxB} \eta^{2}=.025 ; \operatorname{PxS} \eta^{2}=.026 ; \operatorname{PxBxS} \eta^{2}\right.$ $=.039)$. It can conclude that the effect of price on perceived value is not greater in the SC than MC .
3. For willingness to buy $\mathrm{SC} \eta^{2}=.026<\mathrm{MC}\left(\operatorname{PxB} \eta^{2}=.042 ; \operatorname{PxS} \eta^{2}=.052 ; \operatorname{PxBxS}\right.$ $\left.\eta^{2}=.077\right)$.It can conclude that the effect of price on willingness to buy is not greater in the SC than MC.

Brand effect in single -cue versus multiple-cue designs (H5). The hypothesized brand effect on perceptions of quality, were analyzed by MANOVA, the results in table 5.12 suggest that the effect of Brand on perceived quality, perceived value and willingness to buy is greater in a single -cue (SC) design than in a multiple-cue (MC) design but in the willingness to buy is not greater in the PxBxS.

1. For perceived quality $\mathrm{SC} \eta^{2}=.075>\mathrm{MC}$ price and brand $\eta^{2}=.045$, price and store $\eta^{2}=.026$ and price, brand and store $\eta^{2}=.072$ ). It can conclude that the effect of brand on quality is greater in the SC than MC.
2. For perceived value $\mathrm{SC} \eta^{2}=.040>\mathrm{MC}\left(\operatorname{PxB} \eta^{2}=.025 ; \mathrm{BxS} \eta^{2}=.000 ; \mathrm{PxBxS} \eta^{2}\right.$ -..039) .It can conclude that the effect of brand on perceived value is greater in the SC than MC .
3. For willingness to buy $\mathrm{SC} \eta^{2}=.057>\mathrm{MC}\left(\mathrm{PxB} \eta^{2}=.042\right.$; $\mathrm{BxS} \eta^{2}=.024$; $\operatorname{PxBxS} \eta^{2}=.077$ ). It can conclude that the effect of brand on willingness to buy is greater in the Brand only than BxP and BxS but not in BxPxS.

Store effect in single -cue versus multiple-cue designs (H6). The hypothesized Store effect on perceptions of quality, were analyzed by MANOVA, the results in table 5.12 suggest that the effect of Store on perceived quality, perceived value and willingness to buy is greater in a single -cue (SC) design than in a multiple-cue (MC) design but in the willingness to buy is not greater in the PxBxS.

1 For perceived quality $\mathrm{SC} \eta^{2}=.006<\mathrm{MC}$;Store and brand $\eta^{2}=.056$; price and store $\eta^{2}=.026$ and price, brand and store $\eta^{2}=.072$ ). It can conclude that the effect of store on quality is not greater in the SC than MC.
4. For perceived value $\mathrm{SC} \eta^{2}=.005<\mathrm{MC}\left(\operatorname{PxS} \eta^{2}=.026 ; \mathrm{BxS} \eta^{2}=.000 ; \operatorname{PxBxS} \eta^{2}\right.$ $=.039$ ). It can conclude that the effect of store on perceived value is not greater in the $S C$ than MC but $S C$ is greater in SxB.
3. For willingness to buy $\mathrm{SC} \eta^{2}=.007<\mathrm{MC}\left(\operatorname{PxB} \eta^{2}=.042 ; \mathrm{BxS} \eta^{2}=.024 ; \mathrm{PxBxS}\right.$ $\eta^{2}=.077$ ).It can conclude that the effect of store on willingness to buy is not greater in the store only than MC.

## CHAPTER 6: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

This chapter provides the conclusions of the result along with the discussion for the study. Section 1 will be the summary of the results from the hypothesis testing. Section 2 will be the discussion about the result, section 3 is concerning with the conclusion drawn against the research objective and the section 4 for recommendation

## 6.1 : Summary of results from hypothesis testing.

From all the sixth hypothesis which are being tested by A one-way ANOVA and effect size of MANOVA, by using the Significant in SPSS 10.1 program and the result of hypothesis testing at $95 \%$ of confidence level.

Table 6.1 Summary of hypothesis testing

| No | Hypothesis | Test <br> Statistics | Level of <br> Significant | Results |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | Hlo: As price increases from a low <br> priced model to a higher priced <br> model <br> (a) The relationship between price <br> and perceived quality will be no <br> positive . <br> (b) The relationship between price <br> and perceived value will be no <br> quadratic . <br> (c) The relationship between price <br> and willingness to buy will be no <br> quadratic. | a) .000 <br> c) | Rejected Ho <br> Accepted Ho |  |
| Accepted Ho |  |  |  |  |


| 2 | H 2 o : When perceptions of brand name are more favorable <br> (a) Buyer's perceptions of quality are not higher <br> (b) Buyer's perception of value are not greater <br> (c) Buyer's willingness to buy is not greater | A one-way ANOVA test | a) .000 <br> b) .000 <br> c) .000 | Reject H0 <br> Reject H0 <br> Reject H0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | H3o : When perceptions of store name are more favorable <br> (a) Buyer's perceptions of quality are not higher <br> (b) Buyer's perception of value are not greater <br> (c) Buyer's willingness to buy is not greater | A one-way ANOVA test | a) .308 <br> b) .371 <br> c) 252 | Accept Ho <br> Accept Ho <br> Accept Ho |
| 4 | H4 o: When other information is included with price information( i.e Price -Brand, Price -Store, Price-Brand-Store), the price effect is not stronger than in a Price-only condition(i.e Price) | Effect size of <br> MANOVA | - Perceived quality: <br> $\mathrm{SC} \eta^{2}>\mathrm{MC} \eta^{2}$ <br> - Perceived value $\mathrm{SC} \eta^{2}<\mathrm{MC} \eta^{2}$ <br> - Willingness to buy $\mathrm{SC} \eta^{2}<\mathrm{MC} \eta^{2}$ | Accepted Ho <br> Rejected Ho <br> Rejected Ho |
| 5 | H5o: When other information is included with brand information ( i.e Brand- Price, Brand -Store, Brand-Price- Store), the brand effect | Effect size of MANOVA | - Perceived quality: $\mathrm{SC} \eta^{2}>\mathrm{MC} \eta^{2}$ <br> - Perceived value | Accepted Ho <br> Accepted Ho |


|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { is not stronger than in a Brand-only } \\ & \text { condition(i.e Brand ) } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\mathrm{SC} \eta^{2}>\mathrm{MC} \eta^{2}$ <br> - Willingness to buy $\mathrm{SC} \eta^{2}>\mathrm{MC} \eta^{2}$ | Accepted Ho |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6 | H6o: When other information is included with store information (i.e Store -brand, Store -Price, Price-Brand-Store), the store effect is not stronger than in a Store-only condition(i.e Store) | Effect size <br> of <br> MANOVA | - Perceived quality: $\mathrm{SC} \eta^{2}<\mathrm{MC} \eta^{2}$ <br> - Perceived value SC $\eta^{2}<\mathrm{MC} \eta^{2}$ <br> - Willingness to buy $\mathrm{SC} \eta^{2}<\mathrm{MC} \eta^{2}$ | Rejected Ho <br> Rejected Ho <br> Rejected Ho |

## Summary of the findings :

The result from the test of effect of price, brand name and store name information from H 1 to H 3 :

Price effect (H1): The result support a positive relationship of price on buyer's perceptions of quality but the result do not support a quadratic trend of price on buyer's perceptions of value and willingness to buy. As price increase from a low price model to a higher priced model, the relationship between price and perceived quality will be positive, but the relationship between price and perceived value will be no quadratic and the relationship between price and willingness to buy also no quadratic.

Brand effect (H2): The results support a significant brand name effect on buyer's perceptions of quality, value and willingness to buy. When the perceptions of brand
name are more favorable, the buyer's perceptions of quality are higher, the buyer's perceptions of value are greater and the buyer's willingness to buy are also greater.

Store effect (H3) : The result do not support the effect of store name on Buyer's product quality, value and willingness to buy. When the perceptions of store name are more favorable the buyer's perceptions of quality are not higher, buyer's perceptions of value are not greater and the buyer's willingness to buy are not greater.

Price effect in single -cue versus multiple-cue designs ( H 4 ) : The results suggest that the effect of price on perceived quality is greater in a single -cue( SC) design than in a multiple-cue (MC) but the price on perceived value and willingness to buy is not greater in SC than MC.

Brand effect in single -cue versus multiple-cue designs ( H5) : The results suggest that the effect of brand on perceived quality, perceive value and willingness to buy is greater in a single -cue( SC ) design than in a multiple-cue ( MC ).

Store effect in single -cue versus multiple-cue designs (H6) : The results suggest that the effect of store on perceived quality, perceive value and willingness to buy is not greater in a single-cue (SC) design than in a multiple-cue (MC).

### 6.2 Discussion:



The study was tested the relationships between product cues ( price, brand name and store name and two evaluative differential variables perceived quality and perceived value as well as buyer's willingness to buy. The design of the experiment also allowed analysis of the relative differential impact of price, brand name and store name on the three dependents variables. In this section was mention on the discussion of results.

## Price and perceived quality :

Overall, when was only extrinsic cue available, the respondents clearly perceived quality to be related positively to price. When other extrinsic information was presents, the results were less persuasive .For the sandal testing, the hypothesized positive relationship.

## Price, perceived value and willingness to buy:

Perceive value, as the price increase from a low price model to a higher price model, buyer's perceived value will not increase and then decrease. It mean that there is no effect of price to perceived value and willingness to buy.

## Influence of brand name and store name :

Brand name as hypothesized, had a positive effect on perceived quality, value and willingness to buy but the store names had no effect on the buyer's perceived quality, value and willingness to buy.

Effect Sizes ( Single -cue vs. Multiple-cue).

Table 6.2 : Average main effects of independent variables

| Independent <br> variables | Treatment <br> condition | Combined |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Effect size $\left(\eta^{2}\right)$ <br> quality | Perceived value | Willingness to <br> buy |
|  |  | .111 | .017 | .026 |
| Price | Alone | .045 | .025 | .042 |
|  | With brand | .045 | .026 | .052 |
|  | With store | .056 | .039 | .077 |


|  | store |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Brand | Alone | .075 | .040 | .057 |
|  | With price | .045 | .025 | .042 |
|  | With store | .026 | .000 | .024 |
|  | With price \& | .072 | .039 | .077 |
|  | store |  |  |  |
| Store | Alone | .006 | .005 | .007 |
|  | With price | .056 | .026 | .052 |
|  | With brand | .026 | .000 | .024 |
|  | With price \& | .072 | .039 | .077 |
|  | brand |  |  |  |

In this study, the combined price alone effect larger than any other combine price cue effect (in table 6 above)Though there is a large price-alone/ perceived quality effect, the effect of price with brand and price with store is small and the effect of price with brand and store is moderate.

The effect of brand name information on quality perceptions is large in all conditions. Indeed, the brand name effect is largest in the brand only condition and it is small with price or with store. Hence, price and store information together with brand image and augmented perceptions of product quality. This result provides strategic implications for brand management. However, store name has diminishes in effect only one condition and store name has a moderate effect on quality perception with all conditions.

Price have not strongly effect on perceived value when the price only condition compare with the multiple cue conditions but MC are still small influence.

Brand name have large effect on perceived value but small effect when together with price and no effect when together with store, it is moderate in the all conditions.

Store name condition have very small effect on perceived value when only store condition, even weak with brand and no effect with store condition effect. But it is better when store with all conditions on perceived value.

This results is consistent with positive brand equity brands competing effectively while charging a premium price. As expected, given these effects on perceptions of value, the relationship between the three independent variable and willingness to buy are similar in that brand and store information combine with price to provide small to moderate positive effects on buying intentions.

## 6. 3 Conclusions:

## IVERSITr

In the natural cycle of business, even the successful companies must understand on the buyer perceptions of product evaluation and their decision of buying in order to know what information to provide buyer to influence their perception for the marketing plan .


As stated in the chapter 1, there are three research objectives for this study:

1. To determine how the direct effect of price brand name and store name information on buyer's perception of product quality, value and willingness to buy.
2. To measure the effect of price, brand and store information on product evaluation.
3. To understand how the buyer's product evaluation in HCMC in the case of sandal.

## The product evaluation model

Such a conceptual framework lays the basis for isolating the theoretical reasons for when buyer use price ,brand and store information as indicators of quality, determining how quality perceptions influence value perceptions, purchase intentions and product choice and how monetary and no monetary perceived sacrifices influence value perceptions, purchase intentions and choice.

This research is a survey of effect of price ,brand name and store information on buyer's product evaluation. The study use the experimental technique to measure the manipulated with difference level of independent variables. Therefore cause and effect relationship is assumed. The buyer's product evaluation base on price, brand name information on sandal in Ho Chi Minh City market.

As mention in the previous part, this study finds out that the buyer's of sandal in HCMC market on product evaluation base on extrinsic cues.

By studying, the researcher found out that the buyer's evaluation base on the brand information and price more than store information. Referring to this research objectives We can determine that 15 factors to measure perceived quality, perceived value and willingness to buy base on the combine effect size of price, brand, and store information. According to the result the brand is most important information for the buyer's using as the indicators information of product evaluation.

Most important, buyer's vary on the use of price and brand name when evaluating the various dimensions of quality. As an example, we find that price was not selected often when respondents evaluated performance but also we find that high percentages of respondents requested price and brand name when assessing prestige.

Buyer's use of brand name and price when evaluating prestige raise important issues and the store name information the buyer's do not focus on. For this reason we assert that it is important for managers, researchers and public policymakers to understand what conditions of extrinsic cue the buyer's use to evaluation the product when lack of intrinsic cue information.. It behooves the manager to determine what dimensions of quality buyer's believed and whether price and brand name information are relevant cues for judgment the product evaluations.

This study addressed an important study on the buyer's product evaluation base on price, brand name and store name information by examine cue usage of buyers in Ho Chi Minh Market. The finding shown that the buyer's often use the price and brand
name as indicators in the product evaluation and purchase decisions. For example the perceived quality was important in evaluating overall quality and forming purchase intentions.

Although perceived price was use to evaluate product and form purchase intentions. Finally, presence of a brand label affect value perception for Ho Chi Minh buyers and their willingness to buy. Cue usage appears to be related to several factors including sensitivity to price and emphasis on quality stemming from amount of disposal income and consumption experience.

The price has a positive effect on perceive quality but a negative effect on perceived value and willingness to buy because Ho Chi Minh buyer's association of higher prices with higher quality. When the buyer's capabilities to utilize intrinsic attribute information of product may be limited or difficulty in understanding the information and lack of the product experience. So that the buyer use price, brand name information to evaluate the product, it mean that the buyer's do not pay much attention on store information on product evaluations. The growth in the usage of the product extrinsic cues information due to the buyer's rising awareness of quality conscious due to the success of Vietnamese shoe footwear companies has led buyer's much more quality justify, as more busy society that lead the buyer have no time to deal with the product failures, and as the product becomes increasingly complex with the foreign product which high quality. The buyer are often unable to judge quality before buying a product so they search for extrinsic cues information as a signal of product quality.

There are some limitations in this study. The study was conducted from November 2 to November 9, 2001. Hence its findings are only applicable around this period.

The second limitation is location. Since the research is conducted in Ho Chi Minh City, therefore the findings are only applicable in Ho Chi Minh City. There might be some limitation due to the income and lifestyle of buyer's in HCMC are somewhat different from other provinces.

The third limitation is only one product measurement. In this study the researcher only examined the sandal product it can not conclude that other product that the buyer's evaluation is the same.

The fourth limitation is that the research have to assume the sample consists of a relatively homongenerous groups of respondents in every different of 45 treatment cells. The researcher assume the significance of certain individual level factors and rejection of difference psychographic variables on evaluate the products. The context in which the respondents evaluated product may be unrealistic. The degree of and differences in subjects involvement in the justifying and subject $s$ experience on the product might impact the results. However the actual shoppers in the Supper Bowl and Coopmart to buy the Gucci and Bitis's products used is hoped to be representative of the actual situation but this study still have a problem such as demand characteristic.

The last limitation that study do not follow the experiment group. The study applied the questionnaire distributed, the use of convenience sampling requires caution in generalizing the result it may be lack of representative sampling procedures.

### 6.4 Recommendations:

### 6.4.1 Implications:

Referring to the results of the research, the price and brand name information has strongly effect on the buyer's product quality evaluation and their purchase intention. Besides, Marketing management knowledge and practices of managers in Vietnamese footwear companies and presently, the buyers have become much more product quality conscious and paid more attention to justify the product before making buying decision. The footwear companies should give enough information of price and brand image of their product for consumer to select and evaluate the product quality. The buyer select price or brand name information, they may be doing so to
reduce the amount of product attribute information they need to collect. Thus, simplifying the judgment task. Alternatively, buyers may use price and brand name to check their attribute- based judgments of product. When price and brand name information is available, the buyers will search for less product- related information or we can say that price and brand name is being used as a substitute for the product attribute.

Base on this finding, it is expected that both of price and brand name to be the important indicators of product evaluation and willingness to buy. The firms should focus on advertising their product image and building up the pricing strategy because a natural setting, buyer's reliance on price and brand name as cues to justify the product and intent to buy as hypothesized.

The most valuable concept that a brand or product managers can take away from this research is that buyer is often used of price when evaluating their perceive quality. In contract, the buyer do not use price for their perceived value and willingness to buy.


The study of brand name shown that the buyers often use brand name information of product to justify the product quality, value and willingness to buy. So we can say that buyers use of price and brand name when evaluating prestige raise important issue. For example in this study using sandal, high price signaled prestige to buyers. This effect could be the underlying reason behind positive relationship between price and perceived quality.

For this reason, researcher assert that it is important for footwear managers and public policy maker to understand under what conditions, the buyer's use price as a cue to prestige on perceived quality and they use brand name information as a cue to prestige on perceived value and willingness to buy.

This study raise another concern for marketers by the combine effect size result of price, brand name and store name with different level effect so that they can manage the exactly how many, and how much information of price, brand and store name
combine together to be the most effectiveness to buyers to stimulate the purchase decision.

The basic objective of marketing is to create and to keep consumer base. Marketers have to realize in the behavioral responses of buyer's toward the product in order to recognize the effect of needed information that buyer's like to know in helping their evaluation of the product and their purchase intention. This in turn helps the marketers to lay down marketing strategies plan for the footwear product to stimulate the purchase effectively. The suggestion in this study is suitable for some groups of buyer's especially the buyers of footwear products in Ho Chi Minh Market.

This research is aimed at to highlight on the effective of price, brand name and store name information on the buyer's product evaluations. The external factors associated with the product refer to price, brand name on the advertising of the product. The marketers should exploit opportunities to market the create the strong image of brand for footwear product in order to persuade purchasing decision.The price is also important that the buyer use to evaluate the product quality. The marketer should build the good brand image to buyers to perceive by providing the sufficient and important information of price and brand name of products. They should provide the products information, good service, attractive promotion such as, provide the price discounts, offer gift and coupons and build the equity brand image. Especially is plan a good advertising focus on image of the product brand and provide the buyer with suitable price. It may stimulate the purchase consumers.

The price that is charged for a product usually relate to the product quality, which in tum relates to the type of customer who are sought to buy the product. Buyer's use price as a surrogate indicator of quality if they have little information to go on, or if they have little confidence in their own ability to make the choice on the ground. When the buyer is familiar with a brand name or has experience with a product, price declines as a factor in product selection. However, when other cues are available like brand name there are sometimes more influential than price in determining perceive quality.

This study has several theoretical implications. First, prior studies have often focus on only one product cue and its relationship to evaluations of product quality. Some previous researches study on price and product quality or price and brand name but they did not examine the three extrinsic cue ( price, brand name and store name ) at the same time. The current study extend research on the three extrinsic cue at the same time and see how they effect the buyer's product evaluation in difference level by manipulated the effect of three extrinsic cues on buyer's perception of the product quality and value and on purchase intentions in Ho Chi Minh Market.

Second the current study's efforts to collect data in the actual retail setting and use actual products as stimuli allow for a more realistic examination of the impact of the extrinsic cues on buyer's perceptions and purchase intentions.

Third, the current study provides some evidence of differences in effect size of price ,brand and store information for this market and the marketers will understand well how the buyer's product evaluation and what information of product they have to give to the customers.

The growing challenge of meeting buyer's demand in the market suggest that more information is needed regarding extrinsic cues usage for sandal product evaluation and willingness to buy.

The study can help the marketers know well the size effect of extrinsic cue price, brand name information in order to make their marketing plan. Though the research, the firms will accurate understanding how the buyer's utilize the product information to evaluate and purchase intention so that they can improve their marketing plan properly to meet with the buyer's demand in the complex and fact growing market.

### 6.4.2 Further research :

Future research must meet the objectives of integrating knowledge from previous research efforts to establish the generalizability .

An issue that should be examined in the future research is the effects of quality and value cue on willingness to buy, and measure the interrelationship between these independent variables.

The future research can be find out the other extrinsic cues that can effect the buyer's product evaluation such as country of origin...

In conclusion, it is apparent that both price and brand name are important determinants of product quality perceptions and that the effect of store name, though positive, is small. The relative effect of these three variables on perceptions of value and purchase intentions clearly warrants additional research, as does their effect on actual choice.
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Questionnaire

This is one of 45 kinds of questionnaire mentioning in the research design

## Questionnaire

This questionnaire is designed as the partial fulfillment of thesis of MBA student, Assumption University of Thailand.

It would be much appreciated if you could kindly full-cooperation in responding to all items in this questionnaire which mentioning about " The effect of brand ,price and store information on buyer's product evaluation ".Thank you for your cooperation.

PART I : The relative effect of these three variables on perception of value and purchase intention.

Instructions: Base on your experiences as a buyer, please select the most applicable base on your perception .It ranking from "Strongly disagree" to "Strongly Agree" from 1 to 7. Circle the number 1 means that you are strongly disagree, circling 7 means that you are strongly agree you may circle any of the number in the middle that show how strong your feelings are. Please be reminded there are no right or wrong answers; We are interested in response that best show your perception about your product quality evaluation.

If you buy Gucci 's sandal with the price of 300,000 dong in Super Bowl Department Store. Base on your judgment please answer those questions in this part.

1. The Super Bowl Department Store is the luxury department store
2. Gucci brand is the high quality product brand
3. The 300.000 dong for one pair of sandal is very high price.
SD
$1-----2----3-----4-----5----6-----7$
SD SA
1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6------7

SD SA
1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7

Perceived Quality Indicators:

| 1 | The likelihood that the sandal would be reliable is | $\begin{array}{lr} \text { SD } & \text { SA } \\ 1-2--3--4--5--6---7 \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | The workmanship of the sandal would be very high | SD $\quad$ SA $1---2--3---4--5--6--7$ |
| 3 | This sandal should be of good quality | SD $\quad$ SA $1---2--3---4---5--6---7$ |
| 4 | The likelihood that this sandal model is dependable is high | SD $\quad$ SA $1--2--3---4--5--6--7$ |
| 5 | This product would seem to be durable |  |

Perceived Value Indicators:

| 6 | This sandal is a good value for money | SD $\quad$ SA $1---2--3--4--5--6--7$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7 | At the price show the product is economical | $\begin{array}{lr} \hline \text { SD } & \text { SA } \\ 1--2--3-4---7-7 \end{array}$ |
| 8 | The product is considered to be a good buy | SD SA <br> $1---2---3---4--5---6--7$  |
| 9 | The price show for the sandal is acceptable | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{SD} 969 \mathrm{SA} \\ & 1-2-3-4-5-7 \end{aligned}$ |
| 10 | This sandal appears to be a bargain | SD $\quad$ SA $1---2--3--4--5--6--7$ |

Willingness to Buy Indicators:

| 11 | The likelihood of purchasing this <br> product is high | SD <br> $1---2--3---4---5--6--7$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| 12 | If I were going to buy this product <br> I would consider buying this model | SD | SA |
| $1----2--3--4--5---6--7$ |  |  |  |


|  | at the price shown. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 13 | At the price shown, I would consider buying the product | SD $\quad$ SA $1---2--3-\cdots-4--5--6---7$ |
| 14 | The probability that I would consider buying the product is high | SD $\quad$ SA $1---2--3---4-----6--7$ |
| 15 | My willingness to buy the product is high | SD $\quad$ SA $1---2--3---4--5--6--7$ |



## PART II : Personal Data

Instructions : Please read the questions below and put ( $\sqrt{ }$ ) on the answer that is the most applicable to you.

1. Please specify your gender . Male

Female
2. In what age level are you in?

Less than 20 years old
20-30 years old
31-40 years old
41-50 years old Over 50 years old
3. What is your average total income per month?

Less than or equal to 1000000 dong 1000001-2000000 dong 2000001-3000000 dong

3000001-4000000 dong dong
4.What is your occupation?

Student
Business employee
Housewife
4000001-5000000 dong More than 5000000

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Government officer } \\
& \text { Business owner } \\
& \text { Unemployment }
\end{aligned}
$$

State enterprise
Retired
Others
5. What is your highest education level?

Below Bachelors degree
Bachelor's degree or equivalent

Master degree
Higher than Master

## End of questionnaire

ONCE AGAIN, THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR COOPERATION.

## Questionnair ( Vietnamese) BANG CAU HOI THAM DO

Bang cau hoi tham do nay nham de hoan thanh luan van tot nghiep Cao Hoc nganh Quan Tri Kinh Doanh cua sinh vien trong dai hoc Assumption of Thailand.

Viec Anh (Chi) tra loi giup nhung cau hoi trong bang tham do nay voi chu de la: " Nhung thong tin ve gia ca, ten giay va ten cua hang trong co anh huong rat lon den viec danh gia chat luong giaây cua nguoâi tieâu dung", co tam quan trong rat lon doi voi chung toi. Xin chan thanh cam on su hop tac cua Anh (Chi).

PHAN 1: Gia ca, hieu giay va ten sieu thi noi mua giay se anh huong rat lon trong viec chap nhan gia tri va de y mua chung.

Huong dan: Dua vao kinh nghieâm cua Anh (Chi) la nguoâi tieâu dung. Hay khoanh tron vao so ma Anh (Chi) cho la dung nhat voi Anh (Chi). Cau tra loi duoc sap thanh cac muc do, cap bac khac nhau tu 1 den 7 the hieân la tu khoâng " khoâng hoan toan dong y" den "hoan toan dong y". Neu Anh (Chi) khoanh tron so 1 thi co nghia la Anh (Chi) hoan toan khong dong y voi cau noi do. Con nieâu Anh (Chi) danh so 7 thi nghia la Anh (Chi) hoan toan dong y voi cau noi do. Va Anh (Chi) cung co the khoanh bat ky so nao tu 1 den 7 the hien muc do dong y hay khong dong y cua Anh (Chi). Cung xin luu y rang o day khoâng co cau tra loi sai hoaùc dung, ma chung toi chi muoân biet y kieân cua nguoâi tieâu dung nhu the nao ve vieäc dang gia chat luoâng giay. (dua vao gia ca, ten hang hay la cua hang mua no).

Neu nhu Anh (Chi) gaùp giaây Sandal hieu Gucci voi gia 300.000 dong o Super Bowl. Dua vao kinh nghiem cua minh Anh (Chi) hay danh vao nhung cau duoâi day theo muc do tu rat khoâng dong y (RK) den rat dong y (RD).

| 1.Giay Gucci thi chat luong cao | RK |  |  |  |  | RD |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2. Sieu thi Super Bowl la sieu thi cao cap | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|  | RK |  |  |  |  | RD |  |
| 3. Doi giay gia 300,000 dong thi rat mac | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|  | RK |  |  |  |  | RD |  |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

## Chap nhan chat luong:

| 1- Do tin cay vao loai giaây Gucci nay rat cao | RK |  |  |  |  | RD |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

2- Ky thuat va trinh do kheo leo cua giay nay thi cao

|  | RK |  |  |  |  | RD |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $3-$ Chat luoâng giaây Gucci rat tot | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|  | RK |  |  |  |  |  | RD |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

4- Do tin cay vao mau ma cua doi giaây Gucci nay thi rat cao


## Chap nhan gia tri:

6- Giay nay rat dang voi gia tien mua


7- Nhu gia dang bay ban thi loai Sandal nay rat kinh te

8- Giay nay rat dang de mua


9- Gia giay da dinh thi giay nay co the chap nhan duoc

|  | RK |  |  |  |  | RD |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 10- Gia giaây sandal nay thi rat phai chang | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|  | RK |  |  |  |  | RD |  |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

## Rat san long de mua:

| 11- Kha nang toi se mua loai giaây nay thi cao | RK |  |  |  |  |  | RD |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

12- Gia du toi sap mua loai giaây Gucci toi se xem xet mau ma va gia da duoc dinh san

13- Voi gia da dinh lam cho toi chu y va xem xet mua san pham voi gia do

| RK |  |  |  |  |  |  | RD |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |  |

14- Viec xem xet de mua doi giaây nay thi rat cao

|  | RK |  |  |  |  |  | RD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 15- Toi rat san long mua sang pham nay | RK |  |  |  |  |  | RD |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

## Phan II: Personal data

Huong dan: Xin vui long doc nhung cau hoi duoi day va danh dau vao o hop voi ban nhat.
1- Vui long cho biet gioi tinh cua ban:
$\square$ Nam
$\square \mathrm{Nu}$
2- Ban bao nhieu tuoi?
$\square$ Duoi 20 tuoi
$\square$ 20-30 tuoi
$\square 31-40$ tuoi
$\square$ 41-50 tuoi
$\square$ Hon 50 tuoi

3- Thu nhap trung binh moi thang cua ban la :
$\square$ Duoi 1.000 .000 dong $\square 1.000 .000-2.000 .000$ dong
$2.000 .000-3.000 .000$ dong $\square 3.000 .000-4.000 .000$ dong
$\square 4.000 .000-5.000 .000$ dong
Hon 5.000.000 dong
4- Nghe nghiep cua ban la gi?
$\square$ Sinh vien
$\square$ Cong nhan vien chuc
$\square$ Noi tro


5- Bang cap cao nhat cua ban la :
$\square$ Duoi bang cap Cu nhan
$\square \mathrm{Cu}$ nhan hoac tuong duong
$\square$ Bang Cao hoc
©BROTHER $\quad \square$ Cao hon Cao hoc

## Chan thanh cam on
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## Frequencies

Statistics

Please specify your gender

| N | Valid | 583 |
| :---: | :---: | ---: |
|  | Missing | 0 |

Please specify your gender

|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Valid | male | 230 | 39.5 | 39.5 | 39.5 |
|  | feruale | 353 | 60.5 | 60.5 | 100.0 |
|  | Tota! | 583 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |



## Frequencies

Statistics

In what age level you are in?

| N | Valid | 583 |
| :---: | :--- | ---: |
|  | Missing | 0 |

In what age level you are in?

|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valid | jess than 20 years old | 105 | 18.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 |
|  | 21-30 ycar old | 343 | 58.8 | 58.8 | 76.8 |
|  | 31-40 year old | 91 | 15.6 | 15.6 | 92.5 |
|  | $41-50$ year old | 36 | 6.2 | $=6.2$ | 98.6 |
|  | over 50 ycar old | 8 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 583 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

In what age level you are in?


## St. Gabriel Library, Au

## Frequencies

## Statistics

What is your everage total imeome per month?

| N | Valid | 578 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
|  | Missing | S |

What is your everage total imcome per month?

|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valid | $<=1000000$ dong | 341 | 58.5 | 59.0 | 59.0 |
|  | 1000001-2000000 dong | 164 | 28.1 | 28.4 | 87.4 |
|  | 3000001-4000000 dong | 44 | 7.5 | 7.6 | 95.0 |
|  | 4000001-5000000 dong | 13 | 2.2 | $=\quad 2.2$ | 597.2 |
|  | more than 5000000 | 7 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 98.4 |
|  | 6 | 8 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 99.8 |
|  | 7 | 1 | . 2 | . 2 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 578 | 99.1 | 100.0 |  |
| Missing | System | 5 | . 9 | $=$ |  |
| Total |  | 583 | 100.0 |  |  |

What is your everage total imcome per month?


## Frequencies

Statistics

What is your occupation?

| $N$ | Valid | 583 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
|  | Missing | 0 |

What is your occupation?

|  |  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Valid | student | 269 | 46.1 | 46.1 | 46.1 |
|  | government officer | 115 | 19.7 | 19.7 | 65.9 |
|  | state enterprise | 43 | 7.4 | 7.4 | 73.2 |
|  | Business employee | 45 | 7.7 | $=7.7$ | 781.0 |
|  | business owner | 31 | 5.3 | 5.3 | - 86.3 |
|  | Retired | 7 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 87.5 |
|  | housewife |  | . 7 | . 7 | 88.2 |
|  | others | 69 | 11.8 | 11.8 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 583 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

What is your occupation?


## Frequencies

Statistics

What is your highest education?

| N | Valid | 581 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
|  | Missing | 2 |

## What is your highest education?

|  |  | Frequency | Pcreent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vastid | below bachelor degree | 342 | 58.7 | 58.9 | 58.9 |
|  | bachelor degree | 233 | 40.0 | 40.1 | 99.0 |
|  | master | 4 | . 7 | .7 | 99.7 |
|  | higher than master | 2 | . 3 | - 3 | - 100.0 |
|  | Total | 581 | 99.7 | 100.0 |  |
| Missing | System |  | 3 |  |  |
| Total |  | 583 | 100.0 |  |  |

What is your highest education?


## Reliability

****** Method 2 (covariance matrix) will be used for this analysis ******
-

## RELIABILITY ANALYSIS - SCALE (ALPHA)

```
N of Cases = }\quad583.
```

| Item Means <br> Variance | Mean | Minimum | Maximum | Range | Max/Min |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| . 0191 | 5.3866 | 5.2453 | 5.5232 | .2779 | 1.0530 |
| Item Variances | Mean | Minimum | Maximum | Range | Max/Min |
| Variance | 2.0346 | 1.8109 | 2.2809 | .4700 | 1.2596 |
| .0312 |  |  |  |  |  |



| Between People | 3770.0782 | 582 | 6.4778 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| Within People | 2195.2000 | 2332 | .9413 |
| $\quad$ Between Measures | 44.5304 | 4 | 11.1326 |
| 12.0505 .0000 |  |  |  |
| Residual | 2150.6696 | 2328 | .9238 |
| Total | 5965.2782 | 2914 | 2.0471 |

Reliability Coefficients
Alpha $=.8574$

5 items
Standardized item alpha $=.8571$

## Reliability

****** Method 2 (covariance matrix) will be used for this analysis ******
-

$N$ of Cases $=\quad 465.0$

| Item Means | Mean | Minimum | Maximum | Range | Max/Min |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Variance |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 4.7329 | 4.4860 | 4.9613 | . 4753 | 1.1059 |
| . 0290 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Item Variances Variance | Mean | Minimum | Maximum | Range | Max/Min |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 7.0281 | 2.6666 | 13.7996 | . 1331 | 5.1750 |
| 34.1307 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Inter-item |  |  |  |  |  |
| Covariances <br> Variance | Mean | Minimum | Maximum | Range | Max/Min |
| Variance |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1. 7535 | 1.2581 | 2.1382 | . 8801 | 1.6996 |
| . 0691 | - |  |  |  |  |
| Inter-item | - |  |  |  |  |
| Correlations | Mean | Minimum | Maximum | Range | Max/min |
| Variance |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | +. 3575 | . 1594 | . 6698 | 5104 | 4.2021 |
| . 0201 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | LABOR |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1N1A |  |  |
|  |  | sis of Va | ance |  |  |
| Source of Variation |  | ox Sa. | - DF | n Squa | F |
| Prob. |  |  | P? |  |  |
| Between People |  | . 5329 | 464 | 14.0 |  |
| Within People |  | . 6000 | 1860 | 5.29 |  |
| Between Measures |  | 53.8985 | 4 | 13.4 |  |
| $2.5546 \quad .0373$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residual |  | 789.7015 | 1856 | 5.27 |  |
| Total Grand Mean |  | . 1329 | 2324 | 7.03 |  |
|  | 4.7 |  |  |  |  |

Reliability Coefficients
Alpha $=.6244$

5 items
Standardized item alpha = .7356

## Reliability

****** Method 2 (covariance matrix) will be used for this analysis ******
-

RELIABILITY ANALYSIS - SCALE (ALPHA)

N of Cases $=\quad 465.0$


| Reliability Coefficients | 5 items |
| :--- | :---: |
| Alpha $=\quad .7978$ | Standardized item alpha $=\quad .7965$ |

## Oneway

Descriptives

|  |  | N | Mean | Std. <br> Deviation | Std. <br> Error | 95\% Confidence Interval for Mean |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Minimu } \\ \mathrm{m} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Maximum |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Lower Bound |  |  |  | Upper Bound |  |  |
| perceived quality | Absent |  | 118 | 5.6051 | . 89269 | . 08218 | 5.4423 | 5.7678 | 3.00 | 7.00 |
|  | low | 117 | 4.8274 | 1.37111 | . 12676 | 4.5763 | 5.0784 | 1.20 | 7.00 |
|  | mediu m | 116 | 5.1810 | 1.22750 | . 11397 | 4.9553 | 5.4068 | 1.40 | 7.00 |
|  | high | 115 | 5.6278 | . 95030 | . 08862 | 5.4523 | 5.8034 | 2.00 | 7.00 |
|  | very <br> high | 117 | 5.6923 | . 93644 | . 08657 | 5.5208 | 5.8638 | 3.00 | 7.00 |
|  | Total | 583 | 5.3866 | 1.13823 | . 04714 | 5.2940 | 5.4792 | 1.20 | 7.00 |
| perceived value | Absent | 0 |  | - | . | . |  | . |  |
|  | low | 117 | 4.7624 | 1.52969 | . 14142 | 4.4823 | 5.0425 | 1.00 | 7.00 |
|  | mediu | 116 | 5.0466 | 1.86917 | . 17355 | 4.7028 | 5.3903 | 1.20 | 20.40 |
|  | high | 115 | 4.6226 | 1.94138 | . 18103 | 4.2640 | 4.9812 | 1.80 | 20.20 |
|  | very | 117 | 4.5009 | 1.24917 | . 11549 | 4.2721 | 4.7296 | 1.60 | 6.80 |
|  | Total | 465 | 4.7329 | 1.67583 | . 07771 | 4.5802 | 4.8856 | 1.00 | 120.40 |
| willing to buy | Absent | 0 | . | - |  |  | . |  |  |
|  |  | 117 | 5.0188 | 1.55807 | . 14404 | 4.7335 | 5.3041 | 1.00 | 37.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | m | 116 | 5.1207 | 1.22350 | . 11360 | 4.8957 | 5.3457 | 1.40 | 17.00 |
|  | high | 115 | 4.8435 | 1.24669 | . 11625 | 4.6132 | 5.0738 | 1.80 | 7.00 |
|  | very | 117 | 4.6205 | 1.28717 | . 11900 | 4.3848 | 4.8562 | 1.40 | 7-7.00 |
|  | high | 117 | 4.6205 | 1.28717 | . 11900 | 4.3848 | 4.8562 | 1.40 | $\square 7.00$ |
|  | Total | 465 | 4.9006 | 1.34543 | . 06239 | 4.7780 | 5.0233 | 1.00 | 7.00 |

Test of Homogeneity or Variances

|  | Levene Statistic | dfl | df 2 | Sig. |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| perceived quality | 8.525 |  | 4 | 578 |
| perceived value | .745 |  | 3 | .000 |
| willing to buy | 2.702 | 3 | 461 | .526 |

ANOVA

|  |  | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| perceived quality | Between Groups | 64.754 | 4 | 16.188 | 13.575 | . 000 |
|  | Within Groups | 689.262 | 578 | 1.192 |  |  |
|  | Total | 754.016 | 582 |  |  |  |
| perceived value | Between Groups | 19.212 | 4 | 4.803 | 1.721 | . 144 |
|  | Within Groups | 1283.894 | 460 | 2.791 |  |  |
|  | Total | 1303.107 | 464 |  |  |  |
| willing to buy | Between Groups | 16.807 | 4 | 4.202 | 2.348 | . 054 |
|  | Within Groups | 823.122 | 460 | 1.789 |  |  |
|  | Total | 839.930 | 464 | = |  |  |

## Oneway

Descriptives

|  |  | N | Mean | Std. <br> Deviation | Std. <br> Error | 95\% Confidence Interval for Mean |  | Minimum | Maximum |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Lower Bound |  |  |  | Upper Bound |  |  |
| perceived quality | $\begin{aligned} & \text { absen } \\ & t \end{aligned}$ |  | 193 | 5.0943 | 1.24851 | . 08987 | 4.9170 | 5.2716 | 1.20 | 7.00 |
|  | low | 195 | 5.7426 | . 89626 | . 06418 | 5.6160 | 5.8691 | 2.40 | 7.00 |
|  | high | 195 | 5.3200 | 1.15060 | . 08240 | 5.1575 | 5.4825 | 1.40 | 7.00 |
|  | Total | 583 | 5.3866 | 1.13823 | . 04714 | 5.2940 | 5.4792 | 1.20 | 7.00 |
| perceived value | $\begin{aligned} & \text { absen } \\ & t \end{aligned}$ | 154 | 4.6714 | 1.32895 | . 10709 | 4.4599 | 4.8830 | 1.20 | 7.00 |
|  | low | 156 | 5.1423 | 2.17434 | . 17409 | 4.7984 | 5.4862 | 1.60 | 20.40 |
|  | high | 155 | 4.3819 | 1.28495 | . 10321 | 4.1780 | 4.5858 | 1.00 | 7.00 |
|  | Total | 465 | 4.7329 | 1.67583 | . 07771 | 4.5802 | 4.8856 | 1.00 | 20.40 |
| willing to buy | absen | 154 | 4.8701 | 1.42866 | . 11512 | 4.6427 | 5.0976 | 1.40 | 7.00 |
|  | low | 156 | 5.2705 | 1.27665 | . 10221 | 5.0686 | 5.4724 | 1.00 | 7.00 |
|  | high | 155 | 4.5587 | 1.23640 | . 09931 | 4.3625 | 4.7549 | 1.00 | 7.00 |
|  | Total | 465 | 4.9006 | 1.34543 | . 06239 | 4.7780 | 5.0233 | 1.00 | 7.00 |


|  | Lovono Sutusise | dn | 318 | Sig. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| pencisol quality | 10.239 | 2 | 580 | . 000 |
| perecived ratuo | 1.079 | 2 | 4/2 | 341 |
| nilliag to buy | 3.047 | 2 | 462 | . 044 |

ANOVA

|  |  | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| perceived quality | Between Groups | 42.063 | 2 | 21.032 | 17.134 | . 000 |
|  | Within Groups | 711.952 | 580 | 1.228 |  |  |
|  | Total | 754.016 | 582 |  |  |  |
| perceived value | Between Groups | 45.822 | 2 | 22.911 | 8.419 | . 000 |
|  | Within Groups | 1257.284 | 462 | 2.721 |  |  |
|  | Total | 1303.107 | 464 |  |  |  |
| willing to buy | Between Groups | 39.607 | 2 | 19.804 | 11.432 | . 000 |
|  | Within Groups | $800.323$ | 462 | 1.732 |  |  |
|  | Total | 839.930 | 464 | - |  |  |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

|  | Levene Statistic | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| perceived quality | . 426 | 2 | 580 | . 653 |
| perceived value | . 083 | 2 | 462 | . 920 |
| willing to buy | . 139 | 2 | 462 | . 871 |


|  |  | Sum of Squares | df | Mcan Square | F | Sig. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| perceived quality | Between Groups | 3.059 | 2 | 1.530 | 1.181 | . 308 |
|  | Within Groups | 750.957 | 580 | 1.295 |  |  |
|  | Total | 754.016 | 582 | - |  |  |
| perceived value | Between Groups | 5.588 | 2 | 2.794 | . 995 | . 371 |
|  | Within Groups | 1297.519 | 462 | 2.808 |  |  |
|  | Total | 1303.107 | 464 |  |  |  |
| willing to buy | Between Groups | 5.000 | 2 | 2.500 | 1.383 | . 252 |
|  | Within Groups | 834.930 | 462 | - 1.807 |  |  |
|  | Total | ( 839.930 | 464 |  |  |  |

## General Linear Model



Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

a. R Squared $==.297$ (Adjusted R Squared $=.240$ )
b. R Squared $=.135$ (Adjusted R Squared $=.064$ )
c. R Squared $=.232$ (Adjusted R Squared $=.169$ )

