MEASURING CUSTOMER-BASED BRAND EQUITY ON SPORTSWEAR MARKET IN BANGKOK METROPOLITAN AREA



A THEMATIC PAPER SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF MANAGEMENT COLLEGE OF MANAGEMENT MAHIDOL UNIVERSITY 2014

COPYRIGHT OF MAHIDOL UNIVERSITY

Thematic paper entitled MEASURING CUSTOMER-BASED BRAND EQUITY ON SPORTSWEAR MARKET IN BANGKOK METROPOLITAN AREA

was submitted to the College of Management, Mahidol University for the degree of Master of Management

> on August 24, 2014

> > Mr. Wattanapong Ratchatasap Candidate

Asst. Prof. Kannika Leelapanyalert, Ph.D. Advisor Dr. Detlef Reis, Ph.D. Chairperson

Assoc. Prof. Annop Tanlamai, Ph.D. Dean College of Management Mahidol University

Asst. Prof. Dr.Prattana Punnakitikashem, Ph.D. Committee member

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research could not have been done without the support of researcher beloved family with understanding and encouraging throughout his study.

Special thanks goes to Miss Sarinthorn Inpoomma for her encouragement and support throughout the researcher's study.

The researcher wishes to thanks his thematic paper adviser, Dr. Kannika Leelapanyalert for her suggestions and advices.

Sincere thanks goes to all participants who took part in this research.



MEASURING CUSTOMER-BASED BRAND EQUITY ON SPORTSWEAR MARKET IN BANGKOK METROPOLITAN AREA

WATTANAPONG RATCHATASAP 5549294

M.M. (MARKETING AND MANAGEMENT)

THEMATIC PAPER ADVISORY COMMITTEE: ASST.PROF. KANNIKA LEELAPANYALERT, Ph.D., DETLEF REIS, Ph.D., ASST.PROF.PRATTANA PUNNAKITIKASHEM, Ph.D.

ABSTRACT

There have been several previous studies aiming to measure customer-based brand equity in various aspect such as sportswear market in China. The purpose of this study is to examine the practicality and applications of a Brand Equity model in the Thai sportswear market. Based on Aaker's Brand Equity framework, this study aim to investigate the relationships of four dimensions of brand equity in the sportswear market. Quantitative questionnaire survey has been use as a tool to collect primary data from 204 actual consumer sample from capital city of Thailand, Bangkok. The findings conclude that three dimension are the main contribution to brand equity which are Brand Loyalty, Brand Association and Brand Awareness but Perceive Quality was found to be weak support. The paper suggest sportswear brand manager to primary focus on building brand loyalty and brand image. Further research should be conduct in order to expand into other area in Thailand to reduce the regional gaps.

KEY WORDS: Brand equity / Sportswear / Consumers / Bangkok

33 pages

CONTENTS

		Page
ACKNOWLED	OGEMENT	ii
ABSTRACT		iii
LIST OF TABI	LES 71 11 A	vi
LIST OF FIGU	RES	vii
CHAPTER I	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	Rationale for the Study	1
1.2	Thailand Sportswear Market	2
1.3	Research Question	2
CHAPTER II	LITERATURE REVIEW	3
2.1	Brands	3
2.2	Brand Equity	4
	2.2.1 Perceive Quality	4
	2.2.2 Brand Awareness	5
	2.2.3 Brand Association	5
	C 2.2.4 Brand Loyalty	6
CHAPTER III	RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	9
3.1	Research Strategy and Design	9
3.2	Samples Selection	11
3.3	Brand Selection	11
3.4	Survey Instrument	11
3.5	Data Collection	12
3.6	Data Analysis	13
CHAPTER IV	RESEARCH FINDING	14
4.1	The Analysis of Demographic Information of Samples	14
4.2	The Analysis of Brand Equity and Brand Equity Dimension	16
4.3	The Analytical Results for Hypothesis Testing	19

CONTENTS (cont.)

		Page
CHAPTER V	CONCLUSION AND LIMITATION	22
5.1	Conclusion	22
5.2	Limitation of the Study	23
REFERENCES		24
APPENDICES		27
APP	ENDIX A: Questionnaire	28
BIOGRAPHY		33

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
2.1 Literature Review Summary	7
4.1 Frequency and Percentage of Demographic Information from Samples	15
4.2 The Mean (\overline{X}) and Standard Deviation (S.D.) of Perceived Quality	16
4.3 The Mean (\overline{X}) and Standard Deviation (S.D.) of Brand Awareness	16
4.4 The Mean (\overline{X}) and Standard Deviation (S.D.) of Brand Association	17
4.5 The Mean (\overline{X}) and Standard Deviation (S.D.) of Brand Loyalty	17
4.6 The Mean (\overline{X}) and Standard Deviation (S.D.) of Overall Brand Equity	18
4.7 Perceived Quality, Brand Awareness, Brand Association, Brand Loyalt	20
 4.8 Hypothesis Testing Result 	21

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure

2.1 Conceptual Framework of This Paper



Page

7

CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION

1.1 Rationale for the study

The market research have report and forecast that the global sportswear industry will generate additional US\$55 billion in new sales by 2017 especially in sports apparel and footwear as the sale growth 6% already in 2012 (Market Wire, 2013). The health conscious trend is the main stimulation for consumers doing more fitness and athletics and the result was showing by it category growth already, Asia Pacific also recorded as largest gains in sale beside North America (Market Wire, 2013). The global competition has driven the company in this industry invest heavily in branded area as the branding still created competitive advantage for the company (Tong and Hawley, 2009). When choosing sports apparel and footwear, customers' purchasing choice usually driven by the sports superstar or the team they like and the brand they aspire to wear (Tong and Hawley, 2009). As a result, most of brand manager using brand equity for a strategy-based motivation in order to gain competitive advantage from competitors and brand has become the most valuable asset for company for improving market productivity since then (Keller, 1993). Also it is the duty for the company and brand manager to maximizing brand equity for long run profitable which come from the right design and implement of brand equity measurement system (Keller and Lehmann, 2003)

Despite the viewed for the important of brand equity from many literature and academician (Aaker 1991; Farquhar 1989; Keller 1993) with a lot of journal from practitioners related to other industries, less of them are involving with brand equity toward sportswear industry (Tong and Hawley, 2009). Although it has been research that Thailand market has positive potential for further growth in sportswear market (*Euromonitor International*, 2013) the topic of how sportswear company should builds brand equity still not discover yet. As it has been test by using the most popularly adopt brand equity dimension toward Chinese market, they have conclude that brand association and brand loyalty are influential dimensions of brand equity (Tong and Hawley, 2009). This study aims to test empirically and design the effective dimension of brand equity for sportswear market in Thai sample. The end result of this study will provide a deeper understanding of the brand equity as a part of sportswear industry which can be used as a guideline for practitioners working and interesting in Thai sportswear industry.

To achieve those goals, this paper will provide a brief introduction to Thailand's sportswear market, also a review of relevant theoretical literature together with the framework of this study. Then about the methodology used for study and discussion. Lastly, conclusion and managerial implication at the end.

1.2 Thailand Sportswear Market

The risen of health-conscious trend in Thailand still growth further as Thai people are becoming more aware of health and fitness, the evidence are the growing number of health, fitness, sport clubs and soccer field which turn to be a part of urban working people as they usually spend one hour after work for exercise before heading back home. This reason lead to the increasing in demand for sportswear and giving positive signal for retail volume and value growth in 2012 (*Euromonitor International*, 2013). For Southeast Asia, Thailand still remain one of the most important for sportswear market with forecast of US\$ 165.96 billion in 2015 for retail sales follow the recovery of personal income (*PwC*, 2012).

Thailand as a middle range Asian economy for last five year consistently represent to the high number of urban working people which made branding and product image become more important for Thai consumers than a price especially in the medium and premium segment (Parkvithee and Miranda, 2011). This reason drive most company in Thai's sportswear market compete on brand building rather than price.

1.3 Research Question

Does every brand equity dimension affect Thai sportswear consumer in Bangkok metropolitan area?

CHAPTER II LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Brands

Brand play the important role since in the ancient history. They were used as a sign and a symbol in order to create a personal and social identity especially using for representing the owner of something e.g. slavery's mark and trademark (Farguhar, 1989). The word brand originally derived from the word 'brandr' which mean 'to burn' (Keller, 1998). After that it has been developing to use for commercial purpose as in the early sixteen century, Whisky distillers shipped their products in wooden barrels with the producer's name burned into the barrel to show the consumer trust of product quality. In 1835, a brand of scotch whiskey called "Old Smuggler" using this method to represent quality reputation develop by Bootleggers who used a special distilling process (Aaker, 1991).

In the twentieth century branding became a central of attention for every company as it can help consumers to simplify which one is in their brand repertoire this will help consumers to narrow down the process of decision when they choose one product over another. Brand will come from different form for example a 'name' which is associated with one or more items in the product line that is used to identify the source of the items (Kotler, 2000). On the other hand brand can be define as a specific name, symbol or design or usually the combination of these which is used to distinguish a particular seller's product (Doyle, 2002). Therefore brand can be showing customer in term of familiarity and credibility about the product they have used (Fatt, 1997), customers will use it as a cues for decisions whether trying or purchasing the product (Ger et al., 1993).

2.2 Brand Equity

Since 1988, brand equity has received many attention from academician and marketing's practitioners such as Aaker (1991) and Keller (1996) which state about the relationship between brand, product and consumers by research that are relevant to brand. Still the definition of brand equity itself is not clear enough for understanding as it always develop from time through time. The similarity which has been confirm by many marketers is that brand equity is a unique characteristic of the product combine with the value added resulted from the company investment in building brand (Keller, 1988)

The most popularly adopted brand equity dimensions is from Aaker (1991). He defines it as a set of assets (and liabilities) linked to a brand's name and symbol that add to (or subtract from) the value provided by a product or service to a firm and/or that firm's customers (Aaker, 1991). Aaker (1991, 1996) grouped brand equity dimension into five categories: perceived quality, brand loyalty, brand awareness, brand association, and other proprietary brand assets such as patents, trademarks, and channel relationship. Tong and Hawley (2009) stated that the first four dimension of brand equity is represent customers' evaluations and reactions to the brand that customer can interact with. Thus, it have been widely used to measure customer-based brand equity should have high brand awareness with attractive brand image to drive customer perceive the brand is of high quality and at last loyal to the brand. The relationship between brand equity and its dimensions together with the hypothesis for constructing the framework will be discuss further.

2.2.1 Perceived Quality

Perceived quality is one of the core dimension of brand equity framework (Aaker, 1996). It is not mean for the objective quality of the product or service only, as company will serve customer on different aspect depend on the what type of product or service do company offer to the customer but it extent to the customer's perception of the overall quality or superiority of the product or service with respect to its intended purpose with relative to alternatives (Tong and Howley 2009). Perceive quality attached value to the brand in several dimension: influence on purchase decision especially when

a buyer rarely have enough information to make a rational decision they will use their perceive quality in mind as a cues to help because high quality gives them a good reason to buy the brand as it differentiate itself from the competitors, support company charging for premium price and create basis for brand extension (Aaker, 1991). According to these reason many marketers paid a lot of attention to perceive quality for strategic brand decision as it related to company profitability especially in ROI (Aaker, 1996; Morton, 1994; Tong and Hawley 2009). Based on the above suggestion in the literature, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H1. Peceived quality has a significant positive direct effect on brand equity.

2.2.2 Brand Awareness

Brand Awareness is consider as an important component of brand equity which consists of brand recognition and brand recall (Aaker, 1996; Keller, 1993). Keller (1993) define brand recognition as the ability to confirm previous exposure to the brand, do they able to recognize the brand as one to which they have already purchase before? The company should communicate customer since product's attribute associated to brand name at last. For brand recall, refer to consumers ability to retrieve the brand from memory when specific product or service category have been given. In summary the brand awareness can represent to a sign of quality and commitment from the company to the consumers which can help them consider it at the point of purchase (Tong and Howley, 2009). As consumers always have their consideration set in mind, rising brand awareness can lead company's product or service become a member of their consideration set (Keller, 1993). Hence, the following hypothesis of the relationship between brand awareness and brand equity is constructed:

H2. Brand awareness has a significant positive direct effect on brand equity.

2.2.3 Brand Association

According to Aaker (1991), brand association is anything linked in memory to a brand itself. It contain the meaning of the brand for consumers which can be represent through any forms, reflecting features of the product or others aspect of the products itself (Tong and Howley, 2009). Brand association can be strengthen by two factor which are the personal relevant to the brand and consistency which it present overtime by the company (Keller, 1993). Usually brand association will organize and come in a set with a meaningful way of representing as a brand identity which create value to both company and consumer by helping them process/retrieve information, differentiate the brand, create positive attitude and feeling, provide a reason to buy and provide a basis for extension in the future (Tong and Hawley, 2009). Thus, the following hypothesis of the relationship between brand association and brand equity is proposed:

H3. Brand association has a significant positive direct effect on brand equity.

2.2.4 Brand Loyalty

Brand loyalty is consider to be the heart of brand equity even it has been exclude from many conceptualization of brand equity (Aaker, 1991). Oliver (1997) has define the brand loyalty as "the tendency to be loyal to a focal brand as demonstrated by the intention to buy it as a primary choice". Highly loyal customer can be expected to generate a very predictable sales and profit stream to the company, also it is expensive to find new customer in the market rather than to keep existing one. Other benefit is loyal customer also act as entry barrier to competitor, therefore it adds considerable value to a brand and/or its firm because it provide a repurchase for a long period of time (Aaker, 1991). In conclusion the loyal customer are less likely to switch to other competitors because of price related issue; they also make more frequent purchases compare to non-loyal customers (Tong and Hawley,2009). According to this, the following hypothesis of the relationship between brand loyalty and brand equity is proposed:

H4. Brand loyalty has a significant positive direct effect on brand equity

From the hypothesis which have been discussed already, the conceptual framework in this study is proposed by using four dimension from Aaker (1991) conceptual framework for brand equity to retest the measurement of brand equity with sportswear brands in Thailand market, which is shown in Figure 2.1



Figure 2.1 Conceptual framework of this paper

Table 2.1	Literature Review Summary	-
Table 2.1	Literature Review Summary	1

Theory and Concept	Logic	Main Aspect	Example of Study
	U.S.	Attaches value to	
		the brand by give	
		customer a cue,	
		reducing their	
	Customer's	consideration time	
	perception of	before purchasing	(Aaker, 1991;
Perceive quality	overall quality of	as high quality	Morton, 1994;
I creerve quanty	product or	gives them a good	Tong and Hawley,
	service from	reason to buy. Also	2009)
	particular brand.	help company to	
	N 817	charge for	
		premium price and	
		create basis for	
		brand extension.	
Brand awareness	Refer to ability	Helps customers'	
	of the customers	consideration at	
	to recognize or	the point of	
	recall a brand in	purchase as a firm	$(\Lambda_{a})_{aar} = 100C$
	their	communicates the	(Aaker, 1990; Kallar, 1002; Tana
	consideration set	product's attributes	Keller, 1995, 1011g
	of a certain	and brand name	and Hawley, 2009)
	product/service	which give them	
	category.	familiar with the	
		brand.	

Theory and Concept	Logic	Main Aspect	Example of Study
Brand association	Anything which is linked in customer's memory to a brand and contain the meaning of the brand for them.	Creates value to the firm and the customers by differentiate the brand, provide a reason to buy and create positive attitudes or feelings.	(Aaker, 1991; Keller, 1993; Tong and Hawley, 2009)
Brand loyalty	Refer to both customer's repeat purchase overtime and consider the brand as a primary choice rather than the competitor in the same product/service category	Provides value to the brand by giving a set of habitual buyers who are less likely to switch to competitor and make more frequent purchase of the firms' product/service	(Aaker, 1991; Oliver, 1997; Tong and Hawley, 2009)

UN M

 Table 2.1
 Literature Review Summary (cont.)

CHAPTER III RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The main purpose of this chapter is to introduce the methods and techniques used to collect the primary data required in this research. It will emphasize the data collection process and reasons why quantitative method is used rather than qualitative methods as well as the explanation of each type. As data collection and its analysis have an important influence on the quality of the research, it is imperative to carefully define each step of the process which can classify into:

- 3.1 Research Strategy and design
- 3.2 Samples selection
- 3.3 Brand Selection
- 3.4 Survey Instrument
- 3.5 Data collection
- 3.6 Data analysis

3.1 Research Strategy and Design

When conducting a research, selecting the right methodology is imperative for the research as it will affect the relevant information extract from the data. From previous studies, it is clear that there are numerous methods that may be used to carry out a research. Masayavanij (2007) explained that research is 'a systematic, controlled, empirical and critical investigation of hypothetical propositions about the presumed relations among natural phenomena'. Normally, the two most widely used methods by researchers to collect data are qualitative and quantitative method.

According to McDaniel and Gates (2002), qualitative research is a research which findings are not obtained from quantitative or quantification analysis and usually uses to examine the attitudes, feelings, and motivations of the respondents. The simple techniques which has been used in qualitative method is to set up in-depth interviews or conduct a small number of focus groups in order to gain consumers' insights. However, there are some drawbacks for this method. First, since only small samples are normally used in qualitative research, it is strongly rely on the researcher's subjectivity and interpretation which is hard to make it reliable that much. As a result, the research findings can be biased and clear-cut answer is hard to provide by this approach (McDaniel and Gates, 2002). In contrast, quantitative research is concerned with mathematical analysis aiming to classify features, counting, and contrast statistical models in an attempt to explain what is observed which the data collected are in form of number and statistics (McDaniel and Gates, 2002). Quantitative research often involves the use of structured questions where the response options have been predetermined and a large number of respondents are involved. Furthermore, quantitative research searches for implication from a larger population, giving a result that illustrates statistical analysis capability with high reliability (Sae-Jiu, 2007).

In this research, the researcher has separated into two steps: desk research and survey research. Tull and Hawkins (1984) posited that in any research, the first step is to search for secondary data which were conducted for some purposed in the previous study because these data provide relevant information and easily obtain for the researcher, helps to formulate a research design suitably. According to this, the desk research was conducted with the review of the relevant literature which are relating to global and Thailand sportswear market together with the brand equity and its dimension. The second step of the study is to gather primary data through a questionnaire-based survey method. Therefore, in order to answer the objectives of this research, the largescale sample is needed and after considering several benefits offered, quantitative survey research method is suitable for collect the primary data along with analyze the obtaining data for the study. Also to make a comparison with previous study within the same context.

3.2 Samples Selection

In this study that due to the time and research constraints the researcher relies on using nonprobability sampling method with convenience samples technique from correspondence who have purchased sportswear and currently residing in Bangkok.

3.3 Brand Selection

There are four sports shoe brands were selected as a product stimulus in this study including Nike, Adidas, Reebok and Puma. These brand are choose from the list of top 10 sportswear brands of the world 2012 which consider to be well known sportswear brand in Thailand as well (*mbaskool*, 2012). Respondents were first asked to choose one brand from the list which is consider to be their most familiar brand before survey process begin as a prerequisite in order to gain answer related to research objective.

3.4 Survey Instrument

The questionnaire composed of items for measuring the overall brand equity, components of brand equity and demographic question. Brand equity components were rated by respondents on a five-point Likert scale. Each questions scaled from Number 1 with the statement "Strongly Disagree" to number 5 with the statement "Strongly Agree". The questionnaire consists of 6 parts which came from previous research as followed:

Part1. Questions about Perceived Quality in a Likert scale. Based on Tong and Hawley (2009) the questionnaire was developed and modified for the context of measuring consumers' subjective judgments about a brand's overall superiority with a total number of 3 questions.

Part2. Questions about Brand Awareness in a Likert scale. Borrowed from Tong and Hawley (2009), the questionnaire was developed and modified for the context of measuring the strength of the band in a consumers' memory reflected by the ability to identify various element of it with a total number of 3 questions.

Part3. Questions about Brand Association in a Likert scale. Adopted from Tong and Hawley (2009), the questionnaire was developed and modified for the context of measuring the brand personality which are the ability of being uniqueness and favorable to the consumers with a total number of 4 questions.

Part4. Questions about Brand Loyalty in a Likert scale. Develop based on Tong and Hawley (2009), the questionnaire was developed and modified for the context of measuring consumer's overall commitment to be loyal to the brand with a total number of 5 questions.

Part5. Questions about overall Brand Equity in a Likert scale. Based on Tong and Hawley (2009) previous study, the questionnaire was developed and modified for the context of measuring the overall attitude toward particular brand and their intention to select the brand rather than its competitor with a total number of 3 questions.

Part6. Comprise of demographic information such as gender, age, monthly income, occupation. The questions are close-ended questionnaire and the answer of each question is check list type with a total number of 4 questions.

3.5 Data Collection

In this study, data used within this research comprise of two types of data which are secondary data and primary data.

1. Secondary data is the study and research from essays in scholastic journal, magazine, periodicals, newspapers, and internet. Considerate to be the prerequisite to the collection of primary data (Masayavanij, 2007)

2. Primary data is the data received from questionnaire instruments that has been self-administered by sample group which are customers who buy sportswear that are residing in Bangkok. Total number of questionnaire is 220 copies, as it has been originate by the researcher for the specific purpose of addressing the problem (Masayavanij, 2007).

3.6 Data Analysis

Total 204 surveys were considered valid and were used in the final analysis through the SPSS programing statistical analysis as follow:

1. Descriptive Statistics Analysis by using frequency and percentage to explain demographic data which consist of gender, age, monthly income and occupation.

2. The researcher used mean and standard deviation value to explain the level of Perceived Quality, Brand Awareness, Brand Association, Brand Loyalty and Brand Equity from samples group. For the measurement analysis, the author use mean and interval class formula to calculate the range of information in each level as followed; Interval class = $\frac{\text{Range (highest value-lowest value)}}{\frac{1}{2}}$

 $=\frac{(5-1)}{5}$

= 0.8

Number of row

Therefore, the average score can be translate as followed: Average score of 4.21 – 5.00 refers to a highest agree level. Average score of 3.41 – 4.20 refers to a high agree level. Average score of 2.61 – 3.40 refers to a medium agree level. Average score of 1.81 - 2.60 refers to a low agree level. Average score of 1.00 - 1.80 refers to a lowest agree level.

3. Using Multiple Regression method to analyze the relationship between Perceived Quality, Brand Awareness, Brand Association, Brand Loyalty and Brand Equity for predicting the level of magnitude between dependent variable and multiple independent variable according to the hypothesis proposed in order to answer research objective.

CHAPTER IV RESEARCH FINDING

In this chapter, the author presents the empirical study of the research along with an analysis of the empirical study. The analysis part will be conducted by using the framework of references from the second chapter and method given in the third chapter. The results of this research will be presented within 3 parts as followed:

4.1 The analysis of demographic information of samples

4.2 The analysis of brand equity and brand equity dimension

4.3 The analytical results for hypothesis testing.

4.1 The Analysis of Demographic Information of Samples

The distribution of demographic variable of the sample indicated that most of the respondents were young generation who working in private company with the moderate to high incomes. Among 204 respondents 50.5 percent were female (n = 103) and 49.5 percent were male (n = 101). More than 80 percent (n = 188) were under 35 years old, 53.9 percent (n = 110) had work in private company and 37.7 percent have income 15,001 to 30,000 baht per month. The percentage of respondents to select the brand was: 49 percent for Nike, 40 percent for Adidas, 5 percent for Reebok, 2 percent for puma and 4 percent for other brand such as New Balance. The detail of frequency and percentage also provide in Table 4.1.

Demographic and General Information	Frequency	Percentage
1. Sex		
Male	101	49.50
Female	103	50.50
Total	204	100.00
2. Age		
less than 18 years old	3	1.50
18 - 25 years old	58	28.40
26 - 35 years old	127	62.30
36 years old or above	16	7.80
Total	204	100.00
3. Income per month		
less than 15,000 Baht	25	12.30
15,001 - 30,000 Baht	77	37.70
30,001 - 45,000 Baht	43	21.10
45,001 - 60,000 Baht	29	14.20
60,001 - 75,000 Baht	14	6.90
75,001 - 90,000 Baht	75	3.40
more than 90,001 Baht 07 81	9	4.40
Total	204	100.00
4. Occupation		
Freelance	11	5.40
Student	45	22.10
Employee of state enterprise	11	5.40
Employee of private company	110	53.90
Business owner	22	10.80
Other	5	2.50
Total	204	100.00

 Table 4.1 Frequency and Percentage of demographic information from samples.

4.2 The Analysis of Brand Equity and Brand Equity Dimension

Table 4.2 The Mean (\overline{X}) and Standard Deviation (S.D.) of Perceived Quality

Perceived Quality	x	S.D.	Interpretation
I trust the quality of products from the brand I choose	4.25	0.73	Highest
Products from the brand I choose would be of very good quality	4.24	0.69	Highest
Products from the brand I choose offer excellent features	4.05	0.74	High
Total	4.18	0.58	High

I trust the quality of products from the brand I choose was ranked as the high level (M = 4.25, S.D. = 0.73), Products from the brand I choose would be of very good quality was ranked as the high level (M = 4.24, S.D. = 0.696), and the last item is Products from the brand I choose offer excellent features was ranked as the high level (M = 4.05, S.D. = 0.74).

Table 4.3 The Mean (\overline{X}) and Standard Deviation (S.D.) of Brand Awareness

Brand Awareness	x	S.D.	Interpretation
Some characteristics of the brand I choose come to my mind quickly	4.16	0.83	High
I can recognize the brand I choose quickly among other competing brands	4.05	0.92	High
I am familiar with the brand I choose	4.05	0.91	High
Total	4.09	0.76	High

Some characteristics of the brand I choose come to my mind quickly was ranked as the high level (M = 4.16, S.D. = 0.83), I can recognize the brand I choose quickly among other competing brands was ranked as the high level (M = 4.05, S.D. = 0.92), and the last item is I am familiar with the brand I choose was ranked as the high level (M = 4.05, S.D. = 0.91).

Brand Association	x	S.D.	Interpretation
The brand I choose has very unique brand image, compared to competing brand	3.75	0.92	High
I respect and admire people who wear the brand I choose	3.34	1.06	Moderate
I like the brand image of the brand I choose	3.99	0.86	High
I like and trust the company, which makes products for the brand I choose	3.91	0.88	High
Total	3.75	.735	High

Table 4.4 The Mean (\overline{X}) and Standard Deviation (S.D.) of Brand Association

I like the brand image of the brand I choose was ranked as the high level (M = 3.99, S.D. = 0.86), I like and trust the company, which makes products for the brand I choose was ranked as the high level (M = 3.91, S.D. = 0.88), The brand I choose has very unique brand image, compared to competing brand was ranked as the high level (M = 3.75, S.D. = 0.92), and the last item is I respect and admire people who wear the brand I choose was ranked as the moderate level (M = 3.34, S.D. = 1.06).

Table 4.5 The Mean (\overline{X}) and Standard Deviation (S.D.) of Brand Loyalty

Brand Loyalty	x	S.D.	Interpretation
The brand I choose has very unique brand image, compared to competing brand	3.23	1.02	Moderate
I respect and admire people who wear the brand I choose	3.82	0.98	High
I like the brand image of the brand I choose	3.96	0.89	High
I like and trust the company, which makes products for the brand I choose	3.74	0.94	High

I would love to recommend the brand I choose to my friends	3.64	0.97	High
Total	3.68	0.73	High

Table 4.5 The Mean (\overline{X}) and Standard Deviation (S.D.) of Brand Loyalty (cont.)

I like the brand image of the brand I choose was ranked as the high level (M = 3.96, S.D. = 0.89), I respect and admire people who wear the brand I choose was ranked as the high level (M = 3.82, S.D. = 0.98), I like and trust the company, which makes products for the brand I choose was ranked as the high level (M = 3.74, S.D. = 0.94), I would love to recommend the brand I choose to my friends was ranked as the high level (M = 3.64, S.D. = 0.97), and the last item is The brand I choose has very unique brand image, compared to competing brand was ranked as the moderate level (M = 3.23, S.D. = 1.02).

Table 4.6 The Mean (\overline{X}) and Standard Deviation (S.D.) of Overall Brand Equity

Brand Equity	x	S.D.	Interpretation
Even if another brand has the same features as the brand I choose, I would prefer to buy it	3.67	0.94	High
If another brand is not different from the brand I choose in any way, it seems smarter to purchase	3.50	0.95	High
The brand I choose is more than a product to me	3.47	1.04	High
Total	3.55	0.82	High

Even if another brand has the same features as the brand I choose, I would prefer to buy it was ranked as the high level (M = 3.67, S.D. = 0.94), If another brand is not different from the brand I choose in any way, it seems smarter to purchase was ranked as the high level (M = 3.50, S.D. = 0.95), and the last item is The brand I choose is more than a product to me was ranked as the high level (M = 3.47, S.D. = 1.02).

4.3 The Analytical Results for Hypothesis Testing

The statistics used for the analysis is Multiple Regression Analysis. We use the value of the test statistic to make a decision about the null hypothesis. The decision is based on the probability of obtaining a sample mean, given that the value stated in the null hypothesis is true. If the probability of obtaining a sample mean is less than 5% when the null hypothesis is true, then the decision is to reject the null hypothesis. If the probability of obtaining a sample mean is greater than 5% when the null hypothesis is true, then the decision is to retain the null hypothesis (Mason and Perreault, 1991). In sum, there are two decisions a researcher can make:

1. Reject the null hypothesis. The sample mean is associated with a low proba-bility of occurrence when the null hypothesis is true.

2. Retain the null hypothesis. The sample mean is associated with a high proba-bility of occurrence when the null hypothesis is true.

A p value is the probability of obtaining a sample outcome, given that the value stated in the null hypothesis is true. The p value for obtaining a sample outcome is compared to the level of significance. Significance, or statistical significance, describes a decision made concerning a value stated in the null hypothesis. When the null hypothesis is rejected, we reach significance. When the null hypothesis is retained, we fail to reach significance. When the p value is less than 5% (p < .05), we reject the null hypothesis. We will refer to p < .05 as the criterion for deciding to reject the null hypothesis, although note that when p = .05, the decision is also to reject the null hypothesis. When the p value is greater than 5% (p > .05), we retain the null hypothesis. The decision to reject or retain the null hypothesis is called significance. When the p value is less than .05, we reach significance; the decision is to reject the null hypothesis. When the p value is greater than .05, we fail to reach significance; the decision is to reject the null hypothesis. When the p value is greater than .05, we fail to reach significance; the decision is to reject the null hypothesis. When the p value is greater than .05, we fail to reach significance; the decision is to retain the null hypothesis (Mason and Perreault, 1991). Therefore the model use in this research can be rewritten into statistical hypothesis as follow:

H₀: There is <u>*no*</u> positive influence found among Perceived Quality, Brand Awareness, Brand Association, Brand Loyalty and Brand Equity.

H_a: There is a positive influence found among Perceived Quality, Brand Awareness, Brand Association, Brand Loyalty and Brand Equity.

Independent Variables	В	Beta	t	sig
Perceived Quality	.071	.051	.874	.383
Brand Awareness	.117	109	-1.990	.048*
Brand Association	.427	.383	5.996	.000**
Brand Loyalty	.582	.518	9.245	.000***
Dependent variable: Brand Equity	111			
Adjust R ² : .621 df: 4, 199	F: 84.300) P=	.000	

Table 4.7 Perceived Quality, Brand Awareness, Brand Association, Brand Loyaltyinfluence toward Brand Equity

*Significant at .05 level

Results (see Table 4.3) shown that the model has a rather moderate prediction power 62.10% (R2=0.621, p<0.05) of total Brand Equity variance. Most important predictor variable is Brand Loyalty (β 0.582, p<0.05) which is positively related to Brand Equity. Then the predictor variable is Brand Association (β 0.427, p<0.05) which is positively related to Brand Equity and the last predictor variable is Brand Awareness (β 0.117, p<0.05) which is positively related to Brand Equity. The three independent variables meet the requirement of multi-collinearity and are statistically significant. The remaining independent variables (Perceived Quality) play no role in increasing the Brand Equity at the 0.05 significance level. The predictors of brand equity (y) are Brand Awareness, Brand Association, Brand Loyalty.The prediction equation can be written as y = -.013 + .582 (Brand Loyalty) + .427 (Brand Association) + .117 (Brand Awareness).

Therefore, researcher has reject H0 and accept Ha because Looking at the p values for each independent variables are less than alpha (0.05). After analyzing in detail the researcher found out that not all variables in Perceived Quality, Brand Awareness, Brand Association, Brand Loyalty has positive influence upon Brand Equity, therefore this led to another hypothesis (see table 4.4).

Table 4.8 Hypothesis Testing Result

H-m oth order	Hypothesis
Hypotnesis	Testing Results
H1: Perceived Quality positively influences Brand Equity.	Unsupported
H2: Brand Awareness positively influences Brand Equity.	Supported
H3: Brand Association positively influences Brand Equity.	Supported
H4: Brand Loyalty positively influences Brand Equity.	Supported



CHAPTER V CONCLUSION AND LIMITATION

This chapter discusses the purpose of this study that has the two objectives purpose in the beginning chapter which is to measure customer-based brand equity of sportswear's consumer in Bangkok metropolitan area.

5.1 Conclusion

This research aim to measure the brand equity dimension which are Perceived Quality, Brand Awareness, Brand Association, and Brand Loyalty toward Brand Equity for sportswear brands being sold in Thailand by examine and retest the adoption of Aaker's brand equity model which is the most widely used framework for the measurement of brand equity, on the sportswear market in a representative Thai sample. According to the literature review, Aaker (1991, 1996) posited that all of the dimension of the brand equity have a significant positive direct effect on brand equity. In contrast, the empirical evidence in this study found that for sportswear's consumer in Bangkok metropolitan area Perceive Quality does not have significant positive direct effect on brand equity which has gone in the same direction with Tong and Hawley (2009) previous study from the sportswear market in China.

Although the finding result are not supported all of dimension from Aaker's brand equity model, implications can still be made from this study. First of all, managers should put more effort on primary dimension which are brand loyalty, brand association and brand awareness which is more contribute to the brand equity. As the competition in sportswear market is very intense, the most effective way is to create a strong brand image differentiate itself from competitor which giving consumers' a reason to buy rather than product's research and development technology. If the consumers are being loyal then work to keep it and made them repurchasing again and again. Using celebrity endorsement, sports event sponsorships, different communication channel is the

effective strategies to build a strong brand image, gaining more awareness and made consumer become loyal rather than pricing (Tong and Hawley, 2009).

For Thai consumers it seem that perceive quality is not positively link to the brand equity model but high quality still trigger consumers to recognize a brand distinctiveness and superiority and leads to consumer satisfaction and loyalty (Tong and Hawley, 2009). Moreover, in previous research stated that Thai consumers in sportswear market have perceive quality associated with superior quality and advanced technology (Masayavanij, 2007). As a result, perceive quality dimension should not be undervalue by the manager when planning to build brand equity.

5.2 Limitations of the Study

This study has three major limitation. First, it is limited to the sportswear market in Thailand and focus only on people who residing in capital city which is Bangkok so the findings may not be applied broadly to all customers of Thailand that reside in another city. It should also being conduct an ongoing study in order to consider a long-term effectiveness of relationship and identify contributing elements between the four dimension which are perceive quality, brand awareness, brand association and brand loyalty toward brand equity. Secondly, the performance measurement and financial performance should be added to conduct for further research in order to strengthen this research in business implication. Lastly, the researcher decide to not conduct the factor analysis to find the correlation between variables and used the questionnaire component based on literature review and the past research.

REFERENCES

- Aaker, D.A. (1991). Managing Brand Equity. New York: Free Press.
- Aaker, D.A. (1996). *Managing Brand Equity Across Products and Markets*. New York: Free Press.
- Doyle, P. (2002). *Marketing Management and Strategy*, (3rd ed.) Pearson Education Ltd.
- Euromonitor International (2013, July). Sportswear in Thailand.

Retrieved August 5, 2014, from

http://www.euromonitor.com/sportswear-in-thailand/report

- Farquhar, P. H. (1989). Managing Brand Equity. Marketing Research, 1(3), 24-33.
- Fatt, J.P.T. (1997). Communicating a winning image, *Journal of Industrial and Commercial Training*, 29 (5), 158-165.
- Ger, G., Belk, R.W. & Lascu, D. (1993), The development of consumer desire in marketing and developing economies: the cases of Romania and Turkey, Advances in Consumer Research, 20, 103-107.
- Jarratt, D.G. (1996). A comparison of two alternative interviewing techniques used within an integrated research design: a case study in out shopping using semi structured and non-directed interviewing techniques. *Marketing intelligence* and Planning. 14 (6), 6-15.
- Keller, K.L. (1993). Conceptualizing, measuring, and managing customer-based brand equity. *Journal of Maketing*, 57 (1), 1-55.
- Keller, K.L. (1998). Strategic Brand Management: Building, Measuring and Managing Brand Equity. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall
- Keller, K.L., & Lehmann, D.R. (2003). How do brand create value. Journal of Marketing and Management, May/June, 26-31.
- Kotler, P. (2000). *Marketing Management*, (10th ed.) Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Market Wire (2013, February). Global Sportswear Industry to Generate Additional US\$55 Billion in New Sales by 2017, According to Euromonitor. Retrieved August 5, 2014, from

http://www.marketwired.com/press-release/global-sportswear-industry-generate-additional-us55-billion-new-sales-2017-according-1760511.htm

Masayavanij, P. (2007). An investigation into how consumer perceive domestic brands and global brands: Thai footwear (trainer) industry (Master Degree dissertation). Available from University of Nottingham Dissertation database.

Retrieved August 10, 2014, from

http://edissertations.nottingham.ac.uk/1258/1/07MSCLIXPM3.pdf

MBASkool (2012, November). Top 10 Sportswear Brand of The World 2012. Retrieved August 5, 2014, from

> http://www.mbaskool.com/fun-corner/top-brand-lists/3621-top-10sportswear-brands-of-the-world-2012.html?start=7

- McDaniel Jr, C., & Gates, R. (2002). *Marketing Research: The Impact of the Internet*, (5th ed.), New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- McDaniel Jr, C., & Gates, R. (2013). *Marketing Research: International Student Version*, (9th ed.), Singapore: John Wiley and Sons.
- Morton, J. (1994). Predicating brand preference. Journal of Marketing and Management, 2 (4), 32-44.
- Oliver, R.L. (1997). Satisfaction: A Behavioral Perspective on the Consumers. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Parkvithee, N., & Miranda M.J. (2013). Are consumers hesitant to purchase national brands manufactured in other countries? *Journal of Asia - Pacific Business*, 14 (3), 244.
- PWC (2011, December). 2012 Outlook for the retail and consumer products sector in Asia.

Retrieved August 5, 2014, from

http://www.pwccn.com/webmedia/doc/634593712079638863_rc_ap_prod ucts_outlook_2012.pdf Sae-Jiu, S. (2007). Consumer Perception and Attitude Towards Foreign Versus Domestic Apparel in Thailand (Master Degree dissertation). Available from University of Nottingham Dissertation database.

Retrieved August 10, 2014, from

http://edissertations.nottingham.ac.uk/954/1/07MSclixss27.pdf

- Tong, X., & Hawley, F. M. (2009). Measuring consumer-based brand equity: empirical evident from the sportswear market in China. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*.18 (4), 262-271.
- Tull, D.S., & Hawkins, D.I. (1984). *Marketing Research, Measurement and Method,* New York: Macmillan Publishing Company





APPENDIX A : Questionnaire

A Study of Brand Equity in Sportswear Market

This questionnaire is for Thematic paper of Collage of Management, Mahidol University. The purpose of this questionnaire is to study on brand equity toward sportswear market and purchase intention. Please select only one answer on each question. This may take 5 minutes of your time.

แบบสอบถามนี้เป็นส่วนหนึ่งของสารนิพนธ์ วิทยาลัยการจัดการมหิดล ซึ่งศึกษาเกี่ยวกับความเกี่ยว โยงระหว่างคุณค่าของตราสินค้าและความตั้งใจซื้อสินค้าในตลาดเครื่องสวมใส่กีฬา การตอบ แบบสอบถามนี้จะใช้เวลาประมาน 5 นาที

Please choose a sports shoe brand which you are most familiar

กรุณาเลือก<mark>ตราสินค้าของรองเท้</mark>ากีฬาที่คุณมีความ<mark>คุ้นเคยมากที่สุด</mark>

- o Nike ในกี้
- Adidas อดิดาส
- o Reebok รีบอค
- o Puma พูม่า
- o Other ອື່ນໆ

Perceived Quality

	Strongly	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly
	Disagree	ไม่เหนดวย	ເລຍໆ	เหนดวย	Agree
	ี เมเทนตายออ เง	-	10		เทนตายอยาง
	81	V	16		61
I trust the quality of	1917	19 15	5		
products from the brand I	201				
choose					
ฉันเชื่อมั่นในคุณภาพของสินค้าจากตรา					
สินค้าที่ฉันเถือก					
Products from the brand I					
choose would be of very					
good quality					
สินค้าจากตราสินค้าที่ฉันเลือกจะเป็นของ					
ที่มีคุณภาพ					
Products from the brand I					
choose offer excellent					
features					

สินค้าจากตราสินค้าที่ฉันเลือกมักจะมี			
คุณลักษณะที่ยอดเยี่ยม			

Brand Awareness

	Strongly	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly
	Disagree	ไม่เห็นด้วย	เฉยๆ	เห็นด้วย	Agree
	ไม่เห็นด้วยอย่าง				เห็นด้วยอย่าง
	ຍິ່າ				ຍິ່າ
Some characteristics of the					
brand I choose come to my	2	111.			
mind quickly		いい			
ฉันสามารถนึกถึงลักษณะเฉพาะของตรา					
สินค้าที่ฉันเลือกได้อย่างรวดเร็ว					
I can recognize the brand I					
choose quickly among				14.	
other competing brands				1	
ฉันสามา <mark>รถ</mark> จำแนกตราสิน <mark>ค้าที่</mark> ฉันเลือก		7.			
ออกได้ <mark>อย่า</mark> งรวดเร็วท่าม <mark>กลาง</mark> ตราสินค้า		ē.			
คู่แข่งอื่ <mark>น</mark> ๆ					
I am familiar with the brand	1000				
I choose		EZ			
ฉันคุ้นเ <mark>คย</mark> กับตราสินค้าท <mark>ี่ฉันเ</mark> ลือกเป็นอย่าง	N U A	2.19			
ดี		24			
	Pal	(CAN)			
Brand Association					
Brand Association					

Brand Association

	Strongly	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly
	Disagree	ไม่เห็นด้วย	ເລຍໆ	เห็นด้วย	Agree
	<mark>ไม่เห็นด้ว</mark> ยอย่าง	1 cl	N >		เห็นด้วยอย่าง
	ยิ่ง	O D			ຍິ່າ
The brand I choose has					
very unique brand image,					
compared to competing					
brand					
เมื่อเปรียบเทียบกับคู่แข่ง ตราสินค้าที่ฉัน					
เลือกมีภาพลักษณ์ที่แตกต่างอย่างชัดเจน					
I respect and admire people					
who wear the brand I					
choose					
ฉันเการพและชื่นชมกนที่สวมใส่ตรา					
สินค้าที่ฉันเลือก					

I like the brand image of the brand I choose ฉันชอบภาพลักษณ์ของตราสินค้าที่ฉัน เอือก			
I like and trust the			
company, which makes			
products for the brand I			
choose			
ฉันชอบและเชื่อถือบริษัทที่ผลิตสินค้า			
ให้กับตราสินค้าที่ฉันเลือก			

Brand Loyalty							
15	Strongly Disagree ไม่เห็นด้วย อย่างยิ่ง	Disagree ไม่เห็นด้วย	Neutral เลยๆ	Agree เห็นด้วย	Strongly Agree เห็นด้วยอย่าง ยิ่ง		
I consider myself to be loyal to the brand I choose ฉันพิจารณาว่าตัวฉันมีความภักดีต่อตรา สินค้าที่ฉันเลือก		Lost C					
When buying athletic shoes, the brand I choose would be my first choice เมื่อฉันเลือกซื้อรองเท้ากีฬา ตราสินด้าที่ฉัน เลือกจะเป็นตัวเลือกอันดับแรก	No.	S.					
I will keep on buying the brand I choose as long as it provides me satisfied products ฉันจะซื้อตราสินล้าที่ฉันเลือกต่อไป ตราบ ใดที่สินล้าของตราสินล้านี้ยังสร้างความพึง พอใจให้ฉันอยู่	181	N U	10				
I am still willing to buy the brand I choose even if its price is a little higher than its competitors ฉันยังกงยินดีที่จะซื้อสินก้าของตราสินก้าที่ ฉันเลือกฉึงแม้ว่าจะมีรากาสูงกว่ากู่แข่ง เล็กน้อยก็ตาม							
I would love to recommend the brand I choose to my friends							

ฉันชอบที่จะแนะนำตราสินค้าที่ฉันเลือก			
ให้กับเพื่อนๆของฉัน			

Overall Brand Equity

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree ไม่เห็นด้วย	Neutral	Agree เห็นด้วย	Strongly Agree
	 ไม่เห็นด้วยอย่าง	50511 M 1 30	***0	8111411 30	เห็นด้วยอย่าง
	ยิ่ง				ยิ่ง
Even if another brand has					
the same features as the	7	12/ 33			
brand I choose, I would		; V N			
prefer to buy it					
ฉันยังคงชอบที่จะซื้อสินค้าของ <mark>ต</mark> ราสินค้าที่					
ฉันเลือ ก ถึงแม้ <mark>ว่าสินค้าของตราสินค้าอื่นๆ</mark>					
จะมีคุณลักษณะแบบเคียวกันก็ตาม				14	
If another brand is not	Ü	5			
different from the brand I		4			
choose in any way, it seems		-			
smarter to purchase		***			
การซื้อ <mark>ตรา</mark> สิ <mark>นค้าที่ฉันเลือก</mark> มันดูเป็นการ	1000				
ซื้อที่ช <mark>าญ</mark> ฉลาด แม้ในก <mark>รณีที่</mark> ตราสินค้าอื่น	No.	EZ			
จะไม่แตกต่างกันเลยแม้แต่น้อย	N 2 4	2.19			
The brand I choose is more		100			
than a product to me	YPAN				
สำหรับฉัน <mark>ตรา</mark> สินค้ำที่ฉันเลือกเป็น	- Ve Ni	21		e/	
มากกว่าสินค้า				A.11	
			19	~//	
	1 61 -	¥ 61			
	01				

Demographic

- 1. What is your gender?
- o Male ชาย
- o Female หญิง
 - 2. What is your agerange?

o Less than 18 years old น้อยกว่า 18 ปี

- o 18 25 years old ระหว่าง 18 25 ปี
- o 26 35 years old ระหว่าง 26 35 ปี
- o 36 years old or above 36 ปีหรือมากกว่า

3. What is your income range per month?

o Less than 15,000 Baht น้อยกว่า 15,000 บาท
o 15,001 - 30,000 Baht ระหว่าง 15,001 - 30,000 บาท
o 30,001 - 45,000 Baht ระหว่าง 30,001 - 45,000 บาท
o 45,001 - 60,000 Baht ระหว่าง 45,001 - 60,000 บาท
o 60,001 - 75,000 Baht ระหว่าง 60,001 - 75,000 บาท
o 75,001 - 90,000 Baht ระหว่าง 75,001 - 90,000 บาท
o More than 90,001 Baht มากกว่า 90,001 บาท

- 4. What is your occupation?
- o Freelance รับจ้างอิสระ
- o Student นักเรียน/นักศึกษา
- o Employee of state enterprise พนักงานรัฐวิสาหกิจ
- o Employee of private company พนักงานบริษัทเอกชน
- o Business Owner เจ้าของกิจการ
- o Other อื่นๆ ___