

# THE FACTORS INFLUENCING PURCHASE INTENTION BY STUDENTS TO BUY COUNTERFEIT PRODUCTS



## RESEARCH

Submitted to the Faculty of Economics and Business  
Management International Program in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement of  
the Degree of **BACHELOR OF ECONOMICS** at Muhammadiyah University of  
Surakarta

Written by:

**RIFFAT VERLILA PONTO**

**B 100 112 002**

**MANAGEMENT INTERNATIONAL PROGRAM  
ECONOMICS AND BUSINESS FACULTY  
MUHAMMADIYAH UNIVERSITY OF SURAKARTA  
2015**

## LEGALIZATION

Hereby the supervisor of management international program has read and testified the final research entitled:

### **THE FACTORS INFLUENCING PURCHASE INTENTION BY STUDENTS TO BUY COUNTERFEIT PRODUCTS.**

*(Empirical case in counterfeits product of CROCS at Muhammadiyah  
University of Surakarta)*

Written by:

**RIFFAT VERLILA PONTO**

**B 100 112 002**

The final research has been accepted and approved.

Surakarta, 04 November 2014

Supervisor,





( Ahmad Mardalis, SE, MBA )

Approved by,

Dean of Faculty of Economics and Business

Muhammadiyah University of Surakarta



  
( Dr. Triyono, M.Si )

## **ABSTRACT**

Since there are many people in Indonesia that know and buy counterfeit products of *CROCS* and since this product is famous enough in society, the author wants to know the factors that can influence purchase intention by students to buy counterfeit products. The title of this research is *The Factors Influencing Purchase Intention by Students to buy counterfeit products*. The purpose of this research is to analyze the effect of brand personality, perceived product attributes, perceived benefits, product involvement and product knowledge toward purchase intention by students to buy counterfeit products. 125 respondents in this research are students of Muhammadiyah University of Surakarta. Technique sampling of research used was convenience sampling. The data in this research have fulfilled the normal distribution. The analysis results brand personality, product involvement and product knowledge were significant and supported while perceived product attributes and perceived benefits were not significant and not supported.

***Key words:*** *Brand personality, Perceived product attributes, Perceived benefits, Product involvement, Product knowledge and Purchase Intention.*

## **1. Introduction**

A global trend that has been increasing at an alarming rate is the production, distribution and consumption of counterfeit products. In spite of legislation intended to reduce the sale of counterfeit merchandise, industry leaders and designers all over the world have identified this as a growing problem, and are working with groups such as the International Anti-Counterfeiting Coalition (IACC) to protect their designs from being copied. Counterfeit products are those bearing a trademark that is identical to, or indistinguishable from, a trademark registered to another party and infringe the rights of the holder of the trademark (Bian, 2009). Since there are many people in Indonesia that know and buy counterfeit products of *CROCS* and since this product is famous enough in society, the author wants to know the factors that can influence purchase intention by students to buy counterfeit products.

## **2. Research Objectives**

Based on research problems above, the research objectives is to analyze the factors influencing purchase intention by students to buy counterfeit products. The specific research objectives can be derived into the following:

1. To analyze the influence of brand personality toward purchase intention by students to buy counterfeit products.
2. To analyze the influence of perceived product attribute toward purchase intention by students to buy counterfeit products.

3. To analyze the influence of perceived benefits toward purchase intention by students to buy counterfeit products.
4. To analyze the influence of product involvement toward purchase intention by students to buy counterfeit products.
5. To analyze the influence of product knowledge toward purchase intention by students to buy counterfeit products.

### **3. Literature Review**

a. Brand Personality. The brand personality factor enables a consumer to express his/her own self (Aaker, 1997; Moutinho, 2009) or specific dimensions of the self. It serves as a symbolic function and helps consumers differ from or integrate themselves with others (Keller, 1993; Moutinho, 2009). There has been little research conducted as to whether or not the brand personality of an original brand can be transferred to, or how and to what extent brand personality is transferred to. However, as symbolic attributes are captured by brand name and by its nature is not only a product, but more importantly it is a brand – a counterfeit one that bears a brand name of an original branded product, it is rational to assume that existing brand theory can be applied to. Thus, previous research found that when are perceived to process positive and favorable brand personalities they are more likely to be purchased.

b. Perceived Product Attributes. Keller's (1993; Moutinho, 2009) broad view of product attribute notion suggests that attributes are those descriptive features

that characterize a product. The consumer uses perceived attributes in the decision-making process (Puth, et al. 1999; Moutinho, 2009). A positive relationship between linkage of the brand and perceived product attributes and brand choice/preference has been found by many researchers (Nedungadi, 1990; Bian, 2009) the previous research indicates that the more positive the consumers perceptions of the product attributes of a specific brand are, the more chance there is of the branded product being purchased.

c. **Perceived Benefit.** Perceived benefit is what consumers think the product can do for them (Keller, 1993; Moutinho, 2009) it is associated with perception of product attributes and brand personality. Benefits are what consumers seek when purchasing a product/brand (Kotler, 1999; Puth et al. 1999; Moutinho, 2009). These benefits lead to certain end states or values that consumers wish to achieve (Kotler, 1999; Moutinho, 2009). Numerous previous studies have demonstrated a positive relationship between perceived benefit and consumer decision making (Cho, et al. 2002; Moutinho, 2009).

d. **Product Involvement.** The level of a consumer's interest in purchasing a certain product type and how committed they are to purchasing a given brand. Product involvement by consumers tends to be greater for goods that have a higher cost and are bought after considerable research and thought such as cars and computers. The involvement construct originates from the discipline of psychology. Bian and Moutinho (2011) discussed product involvement as Product involvement is the lasting insight about the product and considering the product is very important by the consumer based on inherent needs. Interest and values, If

there is high product involvement consumers are more willing to spend additional money on the specific brand. Pedersen and Nysveen (2013) studied product involvement and its relationship with the consumer purchase intention. They collected data from 874 respondents to determine the purchase intention of the customers and after taking several test and analysis they verified that there is direct positive influence of product involvement on consumer purchase intention.

e. Product Knowledge. Consumers with various levels of product knowledge differ in their perceptions of a product (Laroche et al., 2003). Implicitly, Peter (1994: 70-77) states that product knowledge is all the information that is contained in a product/service that is interpreted by consumers. Lin, Yeh, Chung, Wen. (2013) studied the relationship between product knowledge and purchase intention by collecting 292 responses and confirmed that the product knowledge has a significant positive relationship with the consumer purchase intention. Pedersen & Nysveen (2013) studied product knowledge and its influence on the consumer purchase intention. On the basis of 874 responses they were able to determine and prove that there is a direct positive influence of product knowledge on purchase intention. Moreover, Eze, Tan, Yeo (2013) studied product knowledge to find out its influence on the consumer purchase intention.

f. Purchase Intention. According to Keller (1993) purchase intention means a consumer prefers to buy a product or service because he/she finds that he/she needs a particular product or service, or even attitude towards a product and perception of product. In other words, purchase intentions means consumer will buy a product once again after she/he evaluates a product and finds out that the

product that the product worth buying. Purchase intention is positively inclined by some independent variables i.e. brand image, perceived product attributes, perceived benefits, product involvement and product knowledge.

#### **4. Research Methodology**

The sampling method used in this study is *convenience sampling* and *purposive sampling*. *Convenience sampling* refers to the collection of information from members of the population who are conveniently available to provide it. Instead of obtaining information from those who are most readily or conveniently available, it might sometimes become necessary to obtain information from specific target groups. This type of sampling design is called *purposive sampling*. The sampling here is confined to specific types of people who can provide the desired information, either because they are the only ones who have it, or conform to some criteria set by the researcher. (Sekaran, 2013)

To avoid duplication, each respondent was asked to fill out the major of the respondents. The samplings taken in this research were students of Muhammadiyah University of Surakarta who have a desire to buy counterfeit products.

The primary data source is the data that collected first-hand from the source of the data obtained directly from respondents by the researcher (Sekaran, 2013). Primary data specifically collected by the researcher to answer the research



questions, the data obtained from the questionnaire given to students of Muhammadiyah University of Surakarta.

Purchase intention variable was measured with a *Likert scale*, with values respectively: strongly agree (score 5), agree (score 4), neutral (score 3), disagree (score 2), and strongly disagree (score of 1).

According to Ghazali (2005), the validity of the test is used to measure the validity of a questionnaire. According to Ghazali (2005), the reliability test is a tool used to measure the questionnaire. It is an indicator of the variables or constructs. A questionnaire said to be reliable if someone answers the consistent statement from time to time. Test equipment used is the *Cronbach alpha* method. More close to score 1.0, the highest of score consistency to answer questions gains or more and can be trusted. Reliability more than 0.6 is acceptable, 0.8-1 = good reliability, 0.6-0.79 = acceptable, 0.6 and below = poor reliability. (Sekaran, 2012). Normality test was conducted in order to determine the distribution of the data in the study model of normal or near-normal distribution. A good model is the model with the data distribution is normal or near normal. Linearity test is to determine whether the relationship between the independent and dependent variables be linear or not. Multicollinearity test is used to determine whether the independent variables occur multicollinear or not. t-test is the purpose of the test to determine the level of significant of each influence between dependent and independent variables. f-test was conducted in order to determine whether the independent variables simultaneously and significantly affect the dependent

variable. Multiple linear regression analysis was used to determine how the dependent variable can be predicted by independent variables. According to Gudono (2012:143) analyze coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ) was used to measure the proportion of variability Y decline as a result of the use of independent variables in the regression model.

## 5. Data Analysis

Table IV.1  
Respondent Characteristic Based on Experience to buys counterfeits product

| COUNTERFEIT  | Quantity   | Percent (%) |
|--------------|------------|-------------|
| YES          | 112        | 90%         |
| NO           | 12         | 9%          |
| U            | 1          | 1%          |
| <b>TOTAL</b> | <b>125</b> | <b>100%</b> |

*Sources: Primary data were processed in 2014.*

Based on the experience table IV.1 above, 112 respondents (90 %) bought counterfeit, 12 (9%) respondents never buy counterfeits product and 1 (1%) respondents did not answer. The result shows that 112 (90%) respondents bought counterfeits product.

Table IV.2  
Result of Validity Test

|      | <i>Corrected item total<br/>correlation</i> | r table |       |
|------|---|---------|-------|
| BP1  | .550  | 0.361   | Valid |
| BP2  | .652  | 0.361   | Valid |
| BP3  | .431  | 0.361   | Valid |
| BP4  | .791  | 0.361   | Valid |
| PPA1 | .688  | 0.361   | Valid |
| PPA2 | .705  | 0.361   | Valid |
| PPA3 | .785  | 0.361   | Valid |
| PPA4 | .738  | 0.361   | Valid |
| PPA5 | .713  | 0.361   | Valid |
| PB1  | .656  | 0.361   | Valid |
| PB2  | .561  | 0.361   | Valid |
| PB3  | .744  | 0.361   | Valid |
| PB4  | .668  | 0.361   | Valid |
| PV1  | .447  | 0.361   | Valid |
| PV2  | .743  | 0.361   | Valid |
| PV3  | .670  | 0.361   | Valid |
| PV4  | .781  | 0.361   | Valid |
| PV5  | .557  | 0.361   | Valid |
| PK1  | .633  | 0.361   | Valid |
| PK2  | .776  | 0.361   | Valid |
| PK3  | .652  | 0.361   | Valid |
| PK4  | .756  | 0.361   | Valid |
| PK5  | .748  | 0.361   | Valid |
| PI1  | .854  | 0.361   | Valid |
| PI2  | .764  | 0.361   | Valid |
| PI3  | .749  | 0.361   | Valid |
| PI4  | .773  | 0.361   | Valid |
| PI5  | .812  | 0.361   | Valid |

*Sources: Primary data were processed in 2014*

The result in table IV.2 above shows result that have been extracted and has loading factor values  $> 0.3$ , then all the item questionnaire brand personality, perceived product attribute, perceived benefit, product involvement and product knowledge above was valid.

Table IV.3  
Result of Reliability Test

| Variable                                 | Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items | Reliability     |
|--|------------------|------------|-----------------|
| <i>Brand Personality (BP)</i>            | 0.787            | 5          | <i>Reliable</i> |
| <i>Perceived Product Attribute (PPA)</i> | 0.893            | 5          | <i>Reliable</i> |
| <i>Perceived Benefits (PB)</i>           | 0.633            | 5          | <i>Reliable</i> |
| <i>Product Involvement (PV)</i>          | 0.816            | 5          | <i>Reliable</i> |
| <i>Product Knowledge (PK)</i>            | 0.857            | 5          | <i>Reliable</i> |
| <i>Purchase Intention (PI)</i>           | 0.922            | 5          | <i>Reliable</i> |

Sources: Primary data were processed in 2014

Based on the table IV.3 above shows reliability test, brand personality variable with *Cronbach alpha* > 0.787 means reliable, perceived product attribute variable with *Cronbach alpha* > 0.893 means reliable, perceived benefits variable with *Cronbach alpha* > 0.633 means reliable, perceived involvement variable with *Cronbach alpha* > 0.816 means reliable, perceived knowledge variable with *Cronbach alpha* > 0.857, and purchase intention variable with *Cronbach alpha* > 0.922 means reliable.

Table IV.4  
Result of One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

|  |                | BP     | PA     | PB     | PV     | PK     | PI      |
|--|----------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|
| <b>N</b>                               |                | 125    | 125    | 125    | 125    | 125    | 125     |
| <b>Normal Parameters<sup>a</sup></b>   | Mean           | 3.4272 | 3.1680 | 3.0080 | 2.7448 | 2.9720 | 2.9324  |
|  | Std. Deviation | .75649 | .86599 | .66933 | .79021 | .89738 | 1.05773 |
| <b>Most Extreme Differences</b>        | Absolute       | .118   | .103   | .093   | .080   | .096   | .091    |
|  | Positive       | .072   | .089   | .055   | .080   | .096   | .091    |
|  | Negative       | -.118  | -.103  | -.093  | -.061  | -.054  | -.061   |
| <b>Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z</b>            |                | 1.315  | 1.153  | 1.039  | .896   | 1.070  | 1.017   |
| <b>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</b>          |                | .063   | .140   | .231   | .398   | .202   | .252    |
| <b>a. Test distribution is Normal.</b> |                |        |        |        |        |        |         |

Sources: Primary data were processed in 2014

The table IV.4 above shows *Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z* value for purchase intention variable (Y) was 1.017 with asymp. Sig (2-tailed) 0.252 > 0.050 means the data are eligible for normal distribution.

Table IV.5  
Result of Linearity ANOVA

| No. | Variable                     | Standard Deviation | Sig.  | Result       | Relationship with Purchase Intention |
|-----|------------------------------|--------------------|-------|--------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1   | Brand Personality            | 0.975              | 0.498 | 0.498 > 0.05 | Linear                               |
| 2   | Perceived Product Attributes | 1.278              | 0.214 | 0.214 > 0.05 | Linear                               |
| 3   | Perceived Benefits           | 1.473              | 0.128 | 0.128 > 0.05 | Linear                               |
| 4   | Product Involvement          | 1.290              | 0.217 | 0.217 > 0.05 | Linear                               |
| 5   | Product Knowledge            | 1.151              | 0.311 | 0.311 > 0.05 | Linear                               |

Sources: Primary data were processed in 2014

The table IV.5 shows results means the relationship between Brand Personality, Perceived Product Attributes, Perceived Benefits, Product Involvement and Product Knowledge toward Purchase Intention are linear.

Table IV.6  
Result of Multicollinearity test Correlations

|        |                     | absres | BP     | PA     | PB     | PV     | PK     | PI     |
|--------|---------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Absres | Pearson Correlation | 1      | -.099  | -.048  | -.134  | -.202* | -.104  | -.112  |
|        | Sig. (2-tailed)     |        | .273   | .594   | .136   | .024   | .249   | .212   |
|        | N                   | 125    | 125    | 125    | 125    | 125    | 125    | 125    |
| BP     | Pearson Correlation | -.099  | 1      | .726** | .730** | .557** | .657** | .699** |
|        | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .273   |        | .000   | .000   | .000   | .000   | .000   |
|        | N                   | 125    | 125    | 125    | 125    | 125    | 125    | 125    |
| PA     | Pearson Correlation | -.048  | .726** | 1      | .710** | .716** | .742** | .717** |
|        | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .594   | .000   |        | .000   | .000   | .000   | .000   |
|        | N                   | 125    | 125    | 125    | 125    | 125    | 125    | 125    |
| PB     | Pearson Correlation | -.134  | .730** | .710** | 1      | .658** | .729** | .683** |
|        | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .136   | .000   | .000   |        | .000   | .000   | .000   |
|        | N                   | 125    | 125    | 125    | 125    | 125    | 125    | 125    |
| PV     | Pearson Correlation | -.202* | .557** | .716** | .658** | 1      | .808** | .781** |
|        | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .024   | .000   | .000   | .000   |        | .000   | .000   |
|        | N                   | 125    | 125    | 125    | 125    | 125    | 125    | 125    |
| PK     | Pearson Correlation | -.104  | .657** | .742** | .729** | .808** | 1      | .826** |
|        | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .249   | .000   | .000   | .000   | .000   |        | .000   |
|        | N                   | 125    | 125    | 125    | 125    | 125    | 125    | 125    |
| PI     | Pearson Correlation | -.112  | .699** | .717** | .683** | .781** | .826** | 1      |
|        | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .212   | .000   | .000   | .000   | .000   | .000   |        |
|        | N                   | 125    | 125    | 125    | 125    | 125    | 125    | 125    |

\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

\*\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Sources: Primary data were processed in 2014

The above table IV.6 above shows that the value obtained intercorrelations for each variable are as follows, for the brand personality variable (BP)  $r_{\text{count}} = (-.099)$  ( $(-.099) < 0.80$ ), for the perceived product attribute variable (PPA)  $r_{\text{count}} = (-.048)$  ( $(-.048) < 0.80$ ), for Perceived Benefits (PB)  $r_{\text{count}} =$

(-.134) ((-.134) < 0.80), for Product Involvement (PV)  $r_{\text{count}} = (-.202)$  ((-.202) < 0.80), to the Product Knowledge (PK)  $r_{\text{count}} = (-.104)$  ((-.104) < 0.80), for the Purchase Intention (PI)  $r_{\text{count}} = (-.112)$  ((-.112) < 0.80 ). Then it can be concluded that the results of the regression analysis of data is not the case multicollinearity problem.

Table IV.7  
Analysis Regression R Square

| Model | R                 | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| 1     | .871 <sup>a</sup> | .758     | .748              | .53070                     |

a. Predictors: (Constant), PK, BP, PB, PA, PV

Sources: Primary data were processed in 2014

R Square also called the coefficient of determination. From the table IV.7 above value of R Square is 0.758 (the value of R Square is the square of the correlation coefficient (R), or  $0.871 \times 0.871 = 0.758$ ). This means that 75.8% purchase intention can be explained by the brand personality variable (BP), Perceived Product Attributes (PPA), Perceived Benefits (PB), Product Involvement (PV) and Product Knowledge (PK). While the rest ( $100\% - 75.8\% = 24.2\%$ ) is explained by other causes. R Square value ranges between 0 and 1, the smaller the value of R Square, the weaker the relationship between the variables.

Table IV.8  
Analysis ANOVA

| Model | Sum of Squares | Df      | Mean Square | F      | Sig.   |                   |
|-------|----------------|---------|-------------|--------|--------|-------------------|
| 1     | Regression     | 105.216 | 5           | 21.043 | 74.716 | .000 <sup>a</sup> |
|       | Residual       | 33.516  | 119         | .282   |        |                   |
|       | Total          | 138.731 | 124         |        |        |                   |

a. Predictors: (Constant), PK, BP, PB, PA, PV

b. Dependent Variable: PI

Sources: Primary data were processed in 2014

The result of the ANOVA test or also called as f-test, from the table IV.8 is obtained by  $F_{\text{count}}$  of 74.716 with significant level of 0.000. Because of the probability (0.000) is smaller than 0.05, then the regression model can be used to

predict purchase intention. Therefore the Brand Personality variables (BP), Perceived Product Attributes (PPA), Perceived Benefits (PB), Product Involvement (PV) and Product Knowledge (PK) collectively influence on the Purchase Intention.

Table IV.9  
Analysis Coefficients

| Model | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients | t     | Sig.   |      |
|-------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|-------|--------|------|
|       | B                           | Std. Error | Beta                      |       |        |      |
| 1     | (Constant)                  | -.852      | .241                      |       | -3.533 | .001 |
|       | BP                          | .364       | .103                      | .260  | 3.518  | .001 |
|       | PA                          | .028       | .099                      | .023  | .283   | .778 |
|       | PB                          | -.031      | .122                      | -.019 | -.251  | .802 |
|       | PV                          | .406       | .108                      | .303  | 3.749  | .000 |
|       | PK                          | .480       | .105                      | .407  | 4.584  | .000 |

**a. Dependent Variable: PI**

*Sources: Primary data were processed in 2014*

Sig is smaller than the probability value of 0.05 or value of 0.001 < 0.05, brand personality has a significant influence on the purchase intention. Product involvement has a significant influence on the purchase intention. Product knowledge has a significant influence on the purchase intention.


Regression equation is:

$$Y = (-0.852) + 0.364 X1 + 0.028 X2 + (-0.031 X3) + 0.406 X4 + 0.480 X5 + e$$

- a) Constants are negative value (-0.852), mean if there is no Brand Personality (BP), Perceived Product Attributes (PPA), Perceived Benefits (PB), Product Involvement (PV) and Product Knowledge (PK), the Purchase Intention has the negative perception.

- b) Coefficient of regression X1 is positive values 0.364 mean that if perception of brand personality is increase, the purchase intention will increase too.
- c) Coefficient of regression X2 is positive values 0.028 mean that if perception of perceived product attribute is increase, the purchase intention will increase too.
- d) Coefficient of regression X3 is negative values (-0.031) mean that if perception of perceived benefits is decrease, the purchase intention will increase.
- e) Coefficient of regression X4 is positive values 0.406 mean that if perception of product involvement is increase, the purchase intention will increase too.
- f) Coefficient of regression X5 is positive values 0.480 mean that if perception of product knowledge is increase, the purchase intention will increase too.





- BP : Brand Personality (0.001) Influencing toward Purchase Intention.
- PPA : Perceived Product Attribute (0.778)
- PB : Perceived Benefits (0.802)
- PV : Product Involvement (0.000) Influencing toward Purchase Intention.
- PK : Product Knowledge (0.000) Influencing toward Purchase Intention.

The figure IV.1 shows that the brand personality, product involvement and product knowledge influence toward the purchase intention.

## 6. Discussion

Based on table IV shows that unstandardized coefficients beta of brand personality (independent variable) toward purchase intention (dependent variable) is 0.364 with significant 0.001 ( $0.001 < 0.005$ ) or probability more smaller then 0.05, this means  $H_0$  rejected, coefficient regression significant or brand personality variable significant toward purchase intention. Table IV shows that unstandardized coefficients beta of perceived product attributes (independent variable) toward purchase intention (dependent variable) is 0.023 with significant 0.778 ( $0.778 > 0.005$ ) or probability bigger then 0.05, this means  $H_0$  accepted, coefficient regression significant or perceived product attribute variable not significant toward Purchase Intention. It can conclude that hypotheses 2 are not supported. Table IV shows that unstandardized coefficients beta of perceived benefits (independent variable) toward purchase intention (dependent variable) is (-0.019) with significant 0.802 ( $0.802 > 0.005$ ) or probability bigger then 0.05, this means  $H_0$  accepted, coefficient regression significant or perceived benefits variable not significant toward Purchase Intention. It can be concluded that hypotheses 3 is not supported. Based on table IV shows that unstandardized coefficients beta of product involvement (independent variable) toward purchase intention (dependent variable) is 0.303 with significant 0.000 ( $0.000 > 0.005$ ) or probability smaller then 0.05, this means  $H_0$  rejected, coefficient regression significant or product involvement variable significant toward Purchase Intention. It can be concluded that hypotheses 4 is supported. Table IV shows that unstandardized coefficients beta of product knowledge (independent variable)

toward purchase intention (dependent variable) is 0.407 with significant 0.000 ( $0.000 > 0.005$ ) or probability smaller than 0.05, this means  $H_0$  rejected, coefficient regression significant or product knowledge variable significant toward Purchase Intention. It can be concluding that hypotheses 5 are supported.

## **7. Conclusions**

Brand personality has influence toward purchase intention. This research is exactly similar with previous research by Bian and Moutinho (2009) who described brand personality influence positively toward purchase intention. Perceived product attributes did not influence toward purchase intention. Perceived benefits did not influence toward purchase intention. Product involvement has influence toward purchase intention. This research is match with research that has been made by Pedersen and Nysveen (2013) described product involvement influence positively toward purchase intention. Product knowledge has influence toward purchase intention. Lin, Yeh, Chung, Wen. (2013) described product involvement influence positively toward purchase intention. There are differences between the previous research and the research that the author has conducted perceived product attributes and perceived benefits. In previous research, both perceived product attributes and perceived benefits were significant and supported the hypotheses that the previous researchers made. In this research, the result is not significant and does not support the hypotheses that the author made.

## REFERENCES

- Aaker, D.A. and Keller, K.L. (1990), "Consumer evaluation of brand extension", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 54, January, pp. 27-41.
- Aaker, D.A. (1996), "*Building Strong Brands*", The Free Press, New York, NY.
- Aaker, J.L. (1997), "Dimensions of brand personality", *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 34, August, pp. 347-56.
- Amendolara, L. (2005), "Knocking out knock-offs: effecting the criminalization of trafficking in counterfeit goods", *Fordham Intellectual Property, Media and Entertainment Law Journal*, Vol. 15, pp. 789-836.
- Ang, S., Cheng, P., Lim, E. and Tambyah, S. (2001), "Spot the difference: consumer responses towards counterfeits", *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, Vol. 18 No. 3, pp. 219-350.
- Azoulay, A. and J.-N. Kapferer (2003). "Do brand personality scales really measure brand personality?", *The Journal of Brand Management* 11(2): 143-155.
- Bian, X. And Moutinho, L. (2009). "The role of brand image, product involvement and knowledge in explaining consumer purchase behaviour of counterfeits", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 1 No.1, pp. 9-26.
- Biel, A. (1992), "How brand image drives brand equity", *Journal of Advertising Research*, Vol. 32 No. 6, November/December, pp. RC6-RC12.
- Bloch, P., Bush, R. and Campbell, L. (1993), "Consumer 'accomplices' in product counterfeiting", *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, Vol. 10 No. 4, pp. 27-36.
- Chakravarti, A. and Janiszewski, C. (2003), "The influence of macro-level motives on consideration set composition in novel purchase situations", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 30 No. 2, September, pp. 244-58.
- Cho, Y., Im, I., Hiltz, R. and Fjermestad, J. (2002), "The influence of post-purchase evaluation factors on online vs offline customer complaining behavior: implications for customer loyalty", *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol. 29 No. 1, pp. 318-26.
- de Chernatony, I. and McDonald, M.H.B. (1998), "Creating Powerful Brands in Consumer, Service and Industrial Markets", *Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford*.
- Fazio, R.H. (1990), "Multiple processes by which attitudes guide behavior: the mode model as an integrative framework", in Zabba, M.P. (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol. 23, Academic Press, New York, NY, pp. 75-109.
- Freling, T. and Forbes, L. (2005), "An examination of brand personality through methodological triangulation", *Journal of Brand Management*, Vol. 13 No. 2, November, pp. 148-62.
- Ghozali, Imam. 2005. "*Statistik Non Parametrik Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate dengan program SPSS*". Semarang. Badan Penerbit UNDIP.
- Hem, L.E. and Iversen, N.M. (2002), "Decomposed similarity measures in brand extensions", *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol. 29 No. 1, pp. 199-206.
- Indriantoro, Nur. 1999, "*Metodologi Penelitian Bisnis untuk Akuntansi dan Manajemen*", Cetakan Pertama. Yogyakarta : BBFE

- Kapferer, J-N. (1995), "Brand confusion: empirical study of a legal concept", *Psychology & Marketing*, Vol. 12 No. 6, pp. 551-69.
- Keller, K.L. (1993), "Conceptualizing, measuring, and managing consumer-based brand equity", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 57 No. 1, January, pp. 1-22.
- Kempf, D.S. and Smith, R.E. (1998), "Consumer processing of product trial and the influence of prior advertising: a structural modelling approach", *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 35 No. 3, August, pp. 325-38.
- Kotler, Philip and Armstrong, Gary. (2005), "*Dasar-dasar Pemasaran*", Jakarta : PT Indeks.
- Laroche, M., Bergeron, J. and Goutaland, C. (2003), "How intangibility affects perceived risk: the moderating role of knowledge and involvement", *Journal of Services Marketing*, Vol. 17 No. 2, pp. 122-40.
- Lefkoff-Hagius, R. and Mason, C. (1993), "Characteristics, beneficial, and image attributes in consumer judgements of similarity and preference", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 20 No. 1, pp. 100-10.
- Nedungadi, P. (1990), "Recall and consumer consideration sets: influencing choice without altering brand evaluations", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 17 No. 3, December, pp. 263-76.
- Peter, P.J. and Olson, J.C. (1994), "*Understanding Consumer Behavior*", McGraw-Hill/Irwin, Burr Ridge, IL.
- Phau, I., Prendergast, G. and Chuen, L.H. (2001), "Profiling brand-piracy-prone consumers: an exploratory study in Hong Kong's clothing industry", *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management*, Vol. 5 No. 1, pp. 45-55.
- Plummer, J.T. (2000), "How personality makes a difference", *Journal of Advertising Research*, Vol. 40 No. 6, November/December, pp. 79-83.
- Puth, G., Mostert, P. and Ewing, M. (1999), "Consumer perceptions of mentioned product and brand attributes in magazine advertising", *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, Vol. 8 No. 1, pp. 38-49.
- Schiffman, L.G. and Kanuk, L.L. (1991), "*Consumer Behavior, 4th ed.*", Prentice Hall International, London.
- Stokmans, M. (1991), "The Relative Importance of Product Attributes: Consumer Decision Theories in New-Product Development", *Delft University Press*, Delft.
- Sekaran, Uma. (2006), "*Metode Penelitian Bisnis*", Jakarta : Salemba Empat.
- Sekaran, Uma. (2013). "*Research Method for Bussiness: Metode Penelitian untuk Bisnis*", Edisi 6. Jakarta : Salemba Empat.