THE INFLUENCE OF COUNTRY OF ORIGIN TOWARDS BRAND EQUITY DIMENSIONS AND PURCHASE INTENTION OF CHINESE SMARTPHONE BRAND

Edy Kalme Haganta Sinulingga¹, Jean Richard Jokhu²

¹Jurusan Manajemen, Universitas Presiden Bekasi
Email: hagasinulinggaars@gmail.com
²Jurusan Managemen, Universitas President Bekasi
Email: jean.richard@president.ac.id

ABSTRACT
This study aimed to find out: the influence of country of origin towards brand equity dimensions and purchase intention of Chinese smartphone brand which is Xiaomi. The variables that used in this study are: country of origin, brand awareness, brand association, brand loyalty, perceived quality, and purchase intention. This study used quantitative methods with convenience sampling method. Data collection in this study used primary data by distributing a questionnaire to 302 respondents who are ever use chines smartphone. The data analysis technique in this study used Structural Equation Model (SEM) with SmartPLS 3.0 software. Based on the analysis that has been done, the result of this study shows (1) there are significant influence of country of origin on brand awareness, brand association, brand loyalty and perceived quality. (2) There are significant influence of brand awareness, brand loyalty, and perceived quality towards purchase intention. (3) There are no significant influence of country of origin and brand association towards purchase intention.
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1. INTRODUCTION
In this globalization era, geographical boundaries are no longer an obstacle to establishing communication between individuals. People can know information, news, and situation on other continents in a very short amount of time. This situation occurs because information and technology are growing rapidly. The fastest development today is the use of the internet network called smartphones. Smartphones are phones with high-level functions, and sometimes their functions are similar to computers (Computerhope.com, 2021). Smartphones today have become a basic necessity. People use their phones for almost all of their activities like socializing, reading, watching videos, listening to music, even making online transaction. Therefore, having a smartphone is important for everyone.
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According to Statista.com, smartphone users worldwide is increasing year after year. There are 3.3 billion of 7.51 billion people on earth recorded as smartphone users in 2019. It means that 43.9% of the world population already become a smartphone market and still potentially increasing. This amount of market has triggered the long-establish and new information and technology companies to compete in selling their best product. This phenomenon also affects Indonesia. According to Countriestoday.com, in 2018, Indonesia has become the 6th Country with the most smartphone users in the world. A large number of smartphone users in Indonesia drives a lot of technology and telecommunication companies to enter the Indonesian smartphone market competition.

Indonesia's mobile phone market has several big brands from several countries of origin. Counterpoint issued a recent report that recorded the movement of smartphones in Indonesia during the second quarter of 2020. The five smartphone brands with the most sales during April - June 2020 are Vivo, Oppo, Samsung, Xiaoami, and Realme. These five smartphone brands dominate more than 90% of total sales during the quarter in Indonesia. Vivo leads the market with a 21.2% of market share in Q2 2020, followed by Oppo with 20.6% and Samsung with 19.6%. Chinese mobile phone leads Indonesia's smartphone market with 73.3% combined. This data is also supported by research conducted by IDC.com that stated Chinese mobile phone has 79.1% of Indonesia mobile phone market share.

The need and demand for smartphones have created intense competition between smartphone manufacturers from various countries. And this creates more and more options for buyers to choose from. Chinese manufacturers often have a poor perception of their brand and the quality of their products (Kreppel & Holtbrugge, 2012). China has started positive growth as the world's top producer, but product quality is still considered low (Yunus & Rashid, 2016). Wicaksana (2018) stated that Indonesian customer perception of a non-Chinese product is better than Chinese product. But this is not reflected in the market share chart issued by counterpointresearch.com, where 4 Chinese smartphone brands are in the top 5 brands that have the largest market in Indonesia with 73.3% of market share. This situation is also contradictory with previous research which Berlianto (2019) said that COO has a significant effect on brand equity and purchasing intention where people tend to buy a product from the Country that has a positive image rather than a product from the Country that has a deficient image, but Chinese products are still salable in the Indonesian market.

Besides Country of origin, a brand is an important factor for customers in choosing which product they will buy. According to the American marketing association in Kotler and Keller (2012), brands are designed to see a product or service or a group of sellers and distinguish it from its competitors. One way the company uses to introduce its brand and measure the presence of a brand in the market is known by brand equity. Kotler and Keller (2012) characterize brand equity as an additional incentive for goods and service that is pictured in how consumers think, feel, and behave on the brand and things related to the brand. According to Alam (2018), consumer-based brand equity is a multidimensional concept. Brand awareness, brand loyalty, perceived quality, and brand association are all aspects of brand equity. Menon (2016) shows that active brand equity can generate greater revenue, reduce costs, and increase profits, so that consumer-based brand equity is very important in brand management.

Based on the foregoing, the authors have used brand equity to explain the relationship between Country of origin and purchase intention. The theory of brand equity from Keller (1993) used for this research. Research in understanding the role of Country of origin toward brand equity
and purchase intention. The authors found a limited study about brand equity from a Country of origin perspective (Menon, 2016; Gabriella & Sonny, 2021). Therefore this study needs to examine the influence of the Country of origin on the brand equity scale and the influence of the brand equity scale on the purchase intention.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Purchase Intention
Purchasing intention is the desire of consumers to purchase or prefer the products to buy based on their need. Purchase intention may be defined as the eagerness to buy, and this is part of the mechanism leading to a purchase action made by a consumer. According to Artaji (2014), purchase intention is one type of motivation or intrinsic motivation that can encourage someone to be spontaneous, fair, easy, and without compulsive attention and selectively make a product purchase decision. Purchase intention is the willingness of a customer to purchase goods or services. When consumers get enough information about the product or service they want, the purchase intention will appear (Aryani & Usman, 2019; Almiahamed, 2019). Purchase intention is a factor that can influence the consumer's decision to buy the product.

Brand Equity
Brand equity is seen as a crucial marketing tool that can affect the success of the business (Alam et al., 2018). Karina (2015) argues that brand equity is connected to the tangible and intangible effect of a brand's negative or positive impact on the brand, its products and services, and the focus comes from the knowledge, perceptions, and experiences of customers about the company. There are several theories and tools that can measure a company's brand equity. Aaker (1991) and Keller (1993) proposed a method to measure consumer-based brand equity based on the four dimensions, including brand awareness, brand association, brand loyalty, and perceived quality (Menon, 2016; Manojkumar et al., 2018).

Brand Awareness
According to Sanfilipo (2017), consumers first need to be conscious of the brand in order to establish a collection of connections linked to the brand. The consumers can remember the brand when a need is evoked through brand recall or remember the need when the brand is evoked through brand recognition. In Sanfilipo (2017), Aaker notes that brand awareness is the willingness of prospective customers to identify or remember that a brand is in a certain category of product. Meanwhile, Kotler and Keller (2012) explain that Brand awareness is the potential of customers to distinguish brands in any cases, which is depicted in their brand identification or recall performance. In some industries that have common product categories, awareness provides a sustainable competitive distinction.

Brand Association
Based on their knowledge of the brand, consumers can evaluate the brand attributes and benefits. Defined as "anything related to brand memory" (Aaker, 1991), brand associations embrace the meaning of brands for consumers (Keller, 1993). According to Kotler and Keller (2012), the brand association is all the reflections, sentiments, understandings, images, encounters, beliefs, perspectives, etc., associated with a brand that connected to a brand node.

Brand Loyalty
According to Alam (2018), an important part of brand equity is brand loyalty. This method of measuring consumer loyalty can describe consumer actions whether to switch to another brand or not, especially when a brand experiences changes in price, design, and others. Based On
Manojkumar and Sharma (2018), willingness to repeat the purchase activity create trust among customer.

**Perceived quality**

Quality is essentially the consumer's driver since the customer takes the ultimate decision on the market about the quality of the goods. According to Karina (2015), Perceived quality is the perception of the quality of a good or service by the consumer. It is the desired result or comparing their perception of the quality of competitor's products. According to Saputro (2015), the notion of perceived quality can be interpreted as consumers' understanding of overall quality or the relative superiority of a product or service to alternative products in the same category according to the goals to be achieved. Therefore, it is not possible to determine perceived quality objectively because these perceptions of quality are perceptions that are influenced by things that are important to each customer.

**Country of Origin**

Saeed in Alam (2018) stated that Country of origin means the country where the product or manufacturer's brand is associated with the so-called 'home country' in International Business. Several other researchers said the image of the Country of origin is usually used as a general perception of consumers about the quality of products originating from that Country (Kotler, 2010; Gabriella & Sonny, 2021), while others view it as a definition of beliefs about the industrialization of a country and standard national quality (Srikatanyoo & Gnoth, 2002; Sharokh & Azodi, 2013) Thus, the Country in which a product is made can influence buyers’ impression of the product.

![Figure 2.2 Research Model](https://doi.org/10.24912/jmieb.v5i2.11443)
2. RESEARCH METHOD
The method used in this research is the quantitative method. The data to be tested in this study will be collected directly from the field by researchers. The authors' used previous research to explain Country of origin (Alam, 2018), Brand awareness (Sanfilipo, 2017), Brand association (Kotler and Keller, 2012), Brand loyalty (Artaji, 2014), Perceived quality (Karina, 2015), and purchase intention (Manojkumar et al., 2018; Almohaimed, 2018; Liu and Wang, 2019). The population of this Indonesian research citizen who has used Chinese smartphones and lives in the large city of Jakarta. This study uses the convenience sampling method. This means the researcher selects the respondent that is more readily accessible since the chance to anticipate is not equivalent for all eligible individuals in the target population.

Roscoe (1982) proposed that the sample size in the study should be between 30-500 samples. If the research model is multivariate, such as in correlation or multiple regression research, the number of possible participants should be at least ten times the amount of variables tested. (Roscoe, 1982). Since this research is multivariate research with five independent variables and one dependent variable, the minimum number of a sample that used in this sample is 6 x 10 = 60. The questionnaire was distributed to 393 people, and of the respondent, 302 respondents met the criteria. The researcher provides questions that will be answered by the respondent using a scale that intended to explain how strong the respondents approve with the five-point scale argument called the Likert scale (Sekaran and Bougie, 2016).

According to Sarwono & Narimawati (2015), compared to path analysis, factor analysis, and covariance analysis, SEM is used as a stronger alternative method, and SEM has features that can be used for analysis. Based on Jokhu and Armando (2019), partial least square (PLS) can be used to measure path analysis from the X – Y – Z relationship. In this research, hypothesis testing uses techniques of Structural Equation Model (SEM) analysis based on partial least squares (PLS), including outer and inner model.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

| Table 4.1 | Source: Questionnaire |
|-----------|-----------------------|
| Gender    | Total | Persentase (%) |
| Pria      | 124   | 41.1%          |
| Wanita    | 178   | 58.9%          |
| Age       |       |                |
| ≤ 20      | 56    | 18.5%          |
| 21-30     | 127   | 42.1%          |
| 31-40     | 61    | 20.2%          |
| 41-50     | 41    | 13.6%          |
| >50       | 17    | 5.6%           |
| Occupation|       |                |
| Student   | 94    | 31.1%          |
| Employee  | 138   | 45.7%          |
| Entrepreneur | 18 | 6%             |
| Civil servants | 9 | 3%             |
| Others    | 43    | 14.2%          |
| Monthly Income |       |                |
| ≤1,000,000 | 84 | 27.8%          |
| 1,000,001–5,000,000 | 96 | 31.8%          |
| 5,000,001–10,000,000 | 91 | 30.1%          |
| >10,000,000 | 31 | 10.3%          |
From the table above, it can be seen that the majority of the respondent in this research were female, with 178 respondents (58.9%) and followed by male with 124 respondents (41.1%). It is shown that most of the respondent is 21-30 years old with 127 respondents (42.7%). They were followed by ≤ 20, with 56 respondents (18.5%). It can be seen that most of the respondents of this research are a private employee with 138 respondents (45%) followed by a student with 94 respondents (31.1%), an entrepreneur with 18 respondents (6%), civil servant sith 9 respondents (3%), and the rest is others occupations. Most of the respondent of this research have a monthly income in the range of 1.000.001 – 5.000.000 with 96 respondents (31.8%), followed by 5.000.001 – 10.000.000 with 91 respondents (30.1%), ≤1.000.000 with 84 respondents (27.8%), and the rest are above 10.000.000 with 31 respondents (10.3).

To perform data analysis, researchers used a structural equation model assisted by SmartPLS 3.0. to consider every indicator and variable in this research are valid, it can be seen from the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) must be higher than 0.5, and the loading factor value has to be greater than 0.7 (Sarwono & Narimawati, 2015). To consider every variable in this research is reliable, it can be seen that the value of composite reliability has to be bigger than 0.7 (Sarwono & Narimawati, 2015). The validity and reliability test result of this research can be seen in table 4.2.

Table 4.2
Source : SmartPLS

| Indikator         | Loading Factor | Composite Reliability | Average Variance Extracted |
|-------------------|----------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|
| Country of Origin |                |                       |                             |
| COO1              | 0.762          | 0.888                 | 0.615                       |
| COO2              | 0.775          |                       |                             |
| COO3              | 0.826          |                       |                             |
| COO4              | 0.826          |                       |                             |
| COO5              | 0.727          |                       |                             |
| Brand Awareness   |                |                       |                             |
| BA1               | 0.797          | 0.883                 | 0.609                       |
| BA2               | 0.752          |                       |                             |
| BA3               | 0.876          |                       |                             |
| BA4               | 0.758          |                       |                             |
| BA5               | 0.710          |                       |                             |
| Brand Association |                |                       |                             |
| BAS1              | 0.822          | 0.914                 | 0.698                       |
| BAS2              | 0.840          |                       |                             |
| BAS3              | 0.883          |                       |                             |
| BAS4              | 0.827          |                       |                             |
| BAS5              | 0.804          |                       |                             |
| Brand Loyalty     |                |                       |                             |
| BL1               | 0.886          | 0.942                 | 0.755                       |
| BL2               | 0.899          |                       |                             |
| BL3               | 0.882          |                       |                             |
| BL4               | 0.866          |                       |                             |
| BL5               | 0.810          |                       |                             |
| Perceived Quality |                |                       |                             |
| PQ1               | 0.891          | 0.938                 | 0.739                       |
| PQ2               | 0.882          |                       |                             |
| PQ3               | 0.845          |                       |                             |
| PQ4               | 0.895          |                       |                             |
| PQ5               | 0.779          |                       |                             |
| Purchase Intention|                |                       |                             |
| PI1               | 0.889          | 0.940                 | 0.739                       |
| PI2               | 0.907          |                       |                             |
| PI3               | 0.758          |                       |                             |
According to the research of Abdillah and Jogiyanto (2015), a structural model that is used to forecast causal interactions within latent variables is the structural model (inner model). Path coefficient is used to evaluate the structure of the model in this study, along with the coefficient of determination (R2). This test is used to see and confirm the correlation among variables that are built (Jogiyanto, 2009).

Table 4.3
Source: SmartPLS

| Variables              | Coefficient of Determination (R²) |
|------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Brand Awareness        | 0.202                            |
| Brand Association      | 0.330                            |
| Brand Loyalty          | 0.156                            |
| Perceived Quality      | 0.367                            |
| Purchase Intention     | 0.801                            |

Referring to Table 4.3, it can be shown that the brand awareness variable's R-Square value is 0.202. This value indicates that 20% of brand awareness can be interpreted by the Country of origin, while other factors not analyzed in this analysis can explain the remainder. The brand association variable's R-Square value is 0.330. This value indicates that 33% of brand association can be interpreted by the Country of origin, while other factors not analyzed in this analysis can explain the remainder. The brand loyalty variable's R-Square value is 0.156. This value indicates that 15.6% of brand loyalty can be interpreted by the Country of origin, while other factors not analyzed in this analysis can explain the remainder. The perceived quality variable's R-Square value is 0.367. This value indicates that 36.7% of perceived quality can be interpreted by the Country of origin, while other factors not analyzed in this analysis can explain the remainder. The purchase intention variable's R-Square value is 0.801. This value indicates that Country of origin, brand awareness, brand association, brand loyalty, and perceived quality can explain purchase intentions by 80.1% and 19.9%, which are explained by other variables not examined in this study.

Table 4.4
Source: SmartPLS

| Hypotheses                          | T Statistics | P Values | Result  |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|----------|---------|
| Country of Origin → Brand Awareness | 8.559        | 0.000    | ACCEPTED|
| Country of Origin → Brand Association| 11.701       | 0.000    | ACCEPTED|
| Country of Origin → Brand Loyalty   | 6.934        | 0.000    | ACCEPTED|
| Country of Origin → Perceived Quality| 13.290       | 0.000    | ACCEPTED|
| Brand Awareness → Purchase Intention| 4.016        | 0.000    | ACCEPTED|
| Brand Association → Purchase Intention| 1.326        | 0.185    | REJECTED|
| Brand Loyalty → Purchase Intention  | 12.327       | 0.000    | ACCEPTED|
| Perceived Quality → Purchase Intention| 4.934        | 0.000    | ACCEPTED|
| Country of Origin → Purchase Intention| 0.002        | 0.999    | REJECTED|

The next step is to measure for each relationship path; if the t statistic is greater than 1.96 (5% significance level) and P-value is lower than 0.05, then the hypothesis is accepted. The value of t statistics and p values can be obtained by bootstraping in SmartPLS.

From table 4.4, it is known that the P-value which forms the influence of the Country of Origin towards Brand Awareness is 0.000 (<0.05), while the T-Statistics value is greater than 1.96 (8.559). Therefore, H1 is accepted. From Table 4.4, it is known that the P-value which forms
the influence of the Country of Origin towards Brand Association is 0.000 (<0.05), while the T-Statistics value is greater than 1.96 (11.701). Therefore, H2 is accepted. From Table 4.4, it is known that the P-value which forms the influence of the Country of Origin towards Brand Loyalty is 0.000 (<0.05), while the T-Statistics value is greater than 1.96 (6.934). Therefore, H3 is accepted. From Table 4.4, it is known that the P-value which forms the influence of the Country of Origin towards Perceived Quality is 0.000 (<0.05), while the T-Statistics value is greater than 1.96 (13.290). Therefore, H4 is accepted. From Table 4.4, it is known that the P-value which forms the influence of the Brand Awareness towards Purchase Intention is 0.000 (<0.05), while the T-Statistics value is greater than 1.96 (4.016). Therefore, H5 is accepted.

From Table 4.4, it is known that the P-value which forms the influence of the Brand Association towards Purchase Intention is 0.185 (>0.05), while the T-Statistics value is less than 1.96 (1.326). Therefore, H6 is rejected. From Table 4.4, it is known that the P-value which forms the influence of the Brand Loyalty towards Purchase Intention is 0.000 (<0.05), while the T-Statistics value is greater than 1.96 (12.327). Therefore, H7 is accepted. From Table 4.4, it is known that the P-value which forms the influence of the Perceived Quality towards Purchase Intention is 0.000 (<0.05), while the T-Statistics value is greater than 1.96 (4.934). Therefore, H8 is accepted. From Table 4.4, it is known that the P-value which forms the influence of the Country of Origin towards Purchase Intention is 0.999 (>0.05), while the T-Statistics value is less than 1.96 (0.002). Therefore, H9 is rejected.

4. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Through this research, the purchase intention of Xiaomi smartphone customers based on the Country of origin and brand equity can be predicted and determined. Country of origin, brand awareness, brand association, brand loyalty, and perceived quality are variables used to measure the purchase intention of Xiaomi smartphone customers. This study aims to determine the variables that significantly influence purchase intention. This research is a quantitative method using 302 respondents and SmartPLS as a tool to analyzing the data.

Based on the finding of this research, there are 7 hypotheses accepted and 2 hypotheses that rejected. This research found that Country of origin influence all of the brand equity dimensions. It means that the image of China as the Country of origin of Xiaomi affected the perception and impression of Indonesian citizen toward the Xiaomi brand. The result also found that the brand equity dimension (exclude brand association) affect the purchase intention of Xiaomi. The company have to make sure that their brand is well-known by the market in order to increase the purchase intention of the brand. The company also have to make sure that their product has a good perception by the markets so that can increase the intention to purchase.

The researcher found that brand association does not affect purchase intention significantly. It can happen because Xiaomi as an object of this research is already well-known and have a good perceived quality in Indonesia so that the buyer's concern about the other factor associated with the brand becomes lesser. The researcher also found that Country of origin does not affect the purchase intention significantly. Most consumers in Indonesia Most consumers in Indonesia have an opinion that Xiaomi smartphones already have a good and quality image. Besides, respondents in this study are generally adults and already understand smartphones because they have used smartphones, especially smartphones from China. This reason is in line with Purwanto & Wibisono (2019) research that the image of the Country of origin does not affect purchase intention. Because of the high degree of product information, when purchasing goods, buyers do not even concern about the reputation of the Country of origin.
This research only analyzed one product from one Country of origin. In future research, it is better to examine more than one brand from different countries to get results that can be highlighted. In future research, it is hoped that it can be applied to other research objects or areas in order to strengthen the external validity of the research. Future analysis is expected to choose other variables not discussed in this research.
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