

The Effect of Brand Images and Brand Preferences on Decision to Buy Collection Power School Equipment Products

Eny Rachmawati^{1*} Sudjilah²

1.Faculty of Economics Universitas Mayjen Sungkono, East Java, Indonesia
2.Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi Indonesia (STIE Indonesia) Malang, Indonesia

Abstract

This study aims to examine the influence of brand image and brand preferences of the decision to buy a school uniform products Power Collection. Researchers propose a conceptual framework for influencing the brand image buying decision. Further connecting the brand image with the decision to purchase indirectly through the brand preference. Research conducted on 100 consumers as purposive sampling and empirical tests using path analysis supported the research hypothesis. The results showed a significant influence on independent variables on the dependent variable. While the nature of the brand image against the decision is stronger than the indirect effect. The immediate effect is greater than the indirect effect, indicating that a good brand image in the short term to improve buying decisions.

Keywords: brand image, brand preferences, purchase decision, Path Analysis

1. Introduction

Marketing is the spearhead of business activities carried out by companies, especially companies that have a goal to earn profits, increase sales volume, want growth, have a market share that continues to increase and satisfy while creating loyal customers. In a relationship approach, the focus of attention is directed at how to know the strength and loyalty of customers towards the use of products. In the latest marketing concepts, consumers are placed as a central concern. Marketers must be able to provide a high level of customer satisfaction by offering superior value to customers through more unique benefits. According to Sigmund Freud (in Ferrinadewi, 2008) humans have the will and intelligence, so there is always motivation in every behavior.

Brand is one of the important factors in marketing activities because the activity of introducing and offering products cannot be separated from a reliable brand. Market share (market share) one effective way to create differentiation that is unique and relatively durable is to use a brand strategy (brand strategic). In the concept of Aaker (2004), showing that brand image creates an image of a brand that is considered an association that connects consumer thinking to a brand name, a strong, good and unique brand association enhances the level of preference for the probability of choosing a brand.

A brand is not just a name, term, sign, symbol or combination; but the brand is the company's promise to consistently provide features, benefits and services to customers (Kotler & Keller, 2007).

A brand will give a sign to consumers and producers and competitors who try to provide products that look identical (Aaker 2004) The brand preference is said to be a tendency towards a brand that is based on strong (prominent) customer trust. Buying decisions are the process of selecting a brand through a pattern where someone will form an idea or belief in several alternatives, build a preference, then based on information on trust and preferences, consumers will take action to buy decisions and brands can be used as indicators of quality products in reducing purchasing risk (Moonroe & Suri 2003)

Research on brands has been done so far, including brand research associated with consumer choice and consumer attitudes towards attributes. Also brand research that is associated with elements of marketing mix, for example Yudo Baskoro (2004) examines the relationship between elements of the marketing mix with the creation of brand equity. Brand image is an image of a brand that is considered as an association group that connects consumer thinking to a brand name. Brand trust is a consumer's willingness to generally depend on brand ability (Chaudhuri & Holbrook 2001). Brand preference is said to be a tendency towards a brand that is based on strong customer trust (Aaker 2004).

This study is intended to continue the research gap from the research of Aaker (1990) and Melaniarti Tjandra (2005) suggesting that the brand image that began to form proved to be enough to influence brand preference. The strength of design, product quality and competitive prices are part of the brand's uniqueness and pride, which can create a brand strength. Where consumers have a low level of involvement but understanding the product is high, different handling methods are needed

Some empirical studies as stated above present different components. The research gap is the main reason for researchers to examine more deeply about brand preference influenced by brand image, then the brand preference is very influential on the decision to buy consumers for the products of the Mojokerto Daya collection school uniform, then the hypothesis can be formulated, namely:

1. The more positive the brand image, the higher the frequency of buying decisions
2. The more positive brand image raises top of mind, the more positive it will lead to higher brand preferences,

the higher the frequency of buying decisions

3. The more positive the brand image, the higher the intensity of the advertisement, leading to higher brand preference, the higher the frequency of buying decisions

4. The more positive brand image raises higher word of mouth, raises higher brand preferences, the higher the frequency of buying decision.

2. RESEARCH METHODS

The approach used in research is a quantitative approach. The type of research used is survey research, which is research conducted on the population, but the data studied is data from samples taken from the population (Sugiono, 2009).

Research Population and Samples

This research was carried out in a large market in Mojokerto. The sample in this study were students aged 5 years to 18 years who used the Daya Collection school equipment products from one or more brands being studied, namely school uniforms, scout uniforms, uniforms, uniforms. The sampling method used is purposive sampling method. According to Malhotra (2005) suggest that the sample size taken can be determined by multiplying the number of indicator variables. That is 5 times the number of indicator variables. In this study there were 20 variable indicators, so the number of samples = 100

In this study questionnaires were divided into statement sentences. Respondents were asked to give their responses by choosing one of the answer choices in the form of a cross on the score of the answers provided. Answers from respondents who are qualitative are transformed into quantitative.

3. DATA ANALYSIS TECHNIQUE

Data analysis techniques used in this study are:

1. Descriptive Statistics Analysis

2. Inferential Statistical Analysis

Descriptive statistical analysis, which is the average number and perception index shows that the average consumer perception in each variable is classified as medium where the advertising and sales promotion variables reach low values and Word of Mouth (WOM) reaches the highest score, Top of Mind (TOM) shows medium average. In general, the decision to buy respondents for the Daya Collection school supplies is in the medium category

Testing the hypothesis in this study was carried out by path analysis. With path analysis, an estimation of the causal relationship between a number of variables and the hierarchy of position of each variable can be done in a series of causal relationships, both directly and indirectly (Solimun, 2002).

4. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Instrument Testing

Test Validity and Reliability Test

Validity testing based on the provisions of validity is calculated compared to the significance level of 5% if the calculated coefficient is smaller and the significance level, then the item is significant, this means that the measuring device is categorized as valid. Provisions of reliability according to Nunnally (1960) criteria in Imam Ghozali (2007) that Cronbach's Alpha is at least 0.6 so if Cronbach's Alpha count is greater than critical Cronbach's Alpha (0.6) then it can be categorized reliably, all variables used as research tools are valid and reliable so that it is feasible and reliable as an analytical tool

Path Analysis

Path analysis is done by standardizing regression. The software used is SPSS 14.0 Windows.

In the equation presented as follows:

$$1. Z_{x2} = P_1 Z_{X1} + \epsilon_1$$

$$\text{Top of Mind } Z = 0.673 \text{ Brand image} \\ R^2 = 0.477$$

$$2. Z_{x3} = P_2 Z_{X1} + \epsilon_2$$

$$Z \text{ ad intensity} = 0.770 Z \text{ brand image} \\ R^2 = 0.624$$

$$3. Z_{x4} = P_3 Z_{X1} + \epsilon_3$$

$$Z \text{ Word Of Mouth} = 0.887 Z \text{ brand image} \\ R^2 = 0.827$$

$$4. Z_{x5} = P_4 Z_{X2} + P_5 Z_{X3} + P_6 Z_{X4} + \epsilon_4$$

$$Z \text{ preferred brand} = 0.354 Z_{TOM} + 0.193 Z \text{ advertisement} + 0.654 Z_{WOM} \quad R^2 = 0.607$$

$$5. Z_y = P_8 Z_{X1} + P_7 Z_{X5} + \epsilon_5$$

$$Z \text{ per purchase} = 352 \text{ preferred brand} + 0.568 Z \text{ brand} \quad R^2 = 0.815$$

Table 2. Testing the Path of Direct Influence

Independent variable	Dependen variable	Decision
Brand Image	Top Of Mind	0,673 (P1) significant
Brand Image	Ad Intensity	0,770 (P2) significant
Brand Image	Word Of Mouth	0,887 (P3) significant
Brand Image	Keputusan membeli	0,352 (P8) Signifikan
Top Of Mind	Brand preference	0,354 (P4) significant
Ad Intensity	preference	0,193 (P5) significant
Word Of Mind	Brand preference	0,654 (P6) significant
Brand preference	Decision to buy	0,568 (P7) significant

Source: Primary (processed) data 2018

Table 3. Testing of Indirect Influence Pathways

Independent variable	Variable; Intervening		Dependent variable	Decision
	1	2		
Brand Image	Top Of Mind	Brand preference	Decision to buy	significant 0,148
Brand Image	Ad Intensity	Brand preference	Decision to buy	significant 0,083
Brand Image	Word Of Mouth	Brand preference	Decision to buy	significant 0,306

Source: Primary (processed) data 2018

Indirect Path examination

1. Significant influence of brand image on consumer buying decisions through top of mind and brand preference
 $= P1 \times P4 \times P7$
 $= 0.673 \times 0.354 \times 0.568 = 0.148$
2. Significant influence of brand image on consumer buying decisions through advertising intensity and brand preference
 $= P2 \times P5 \times P7$
 $= 0.770 \times 0.193 \times 0.568 = 0,083$
3. Significant influence of brand image on consumer buying decisions through word of mounth and brand preference
 $= P3 \times P6 \times P7$
 $= 0.887 \times 0.654 \times 0.568 = 0.306$

Model Validation Examination Performed With Total Determination Coefficient:

1. Total determination coefficient. $= Rm^2 = 1 - Pe1^2 - Pe2^2 - \dots - Pep^2$

$$Pei = \sqrt{1 - Ri^2}$$

$$Rm^2 = 1 - (0,723)^2 - (0,5,88)^2 - (0,415)^2 - (0,626)^2 - (0,430)^2 = 0,99$$

This means that the diversity of data that can be explained by the model or path diagram is 99%, while the remaining 1% is explained by other variables not in the path diagram.

Hypothesis testing

Hypothesis Testing 1

The results of the study prove that there is a significant direct effect of the brand image variable (X1) on the buying decision variable (Y) with the coefficient standardize value = 0.352 and p-value = 0,000. This shows that the brand image significantly influences the buying decision. The more positive the image of a brand in the eyes of consumers, the higher the frequency of buying decisions

Hypothesis Testing 2

The results of the study prove that there is a significant indirect effect of brand image (X1) on buying decisions (Y) top of mind (X2) and brand preference (X5). The direct influence of brand image variables on top of mind variables is reflected in line P1. coefficient standardize value = 0.673 with p-value = 0,000. The direct effect of the top of mind variable on brand reference variables reflected in P4, the standardize coefficient = 0.354 with a p-value = 0,000. The direct influence of brand preference variables on buying decisions results in the standardize value of the coefficient = 0.567 with p-value = 0,000. Top of mind and brand preference variables are intervening variables between brand image variables and buying decisions, the total coefficient of influence is equal to direct influence + indirect influence. That is $0.352 + (0.673) (0.354) (0.568) = 0.487$. This shows that brand image influences top of mind and top of mind will influence brand preference, and ultimately will influence the buying decision.

Hypothesis Testing 3

The results of the study prove that the indirect effect of variable brand image (X1) is significant on buying decisions (Y) through advertising intensity (X3) and brand preference (X5). The direct influence of the brand image variable on the intensity variable of the advertisement is reflected in the path P2, the standardize value of the coefficient = 0.770 with p-value = 0,000. The direct effect of advertising intensity variable on brand

preference variables reflected in line P5, coefficient standardize value = 0.193 with p-value = 0,000. The direct influence of brand preference variables on consumer buying decisions produces a standardized value = 0.567 with p-value = 0,000. Advertising intensity variable and brand preference are intervening variables between brand image variables and buying decisions, the total coefficient of influence is equal to direct influence + indirect influence. That is equal to $0.352 + (0.770) (0.193) (0.568) = 0.436$. This shows that the brand image influences the intensity of the advertisement and the intensity of the advertisement will influence the brand preference, and ultimately will influence the buying decision.

Hypothesis Testing 4

The results of the study prove that there is a significant indirect effect of brand image (X1) on consumer buying decisions (Y) through word of mouth (X4) and brand preference (X5). The direct effect of brand image variables on the word of mouth variable reflected in line P3, the coefficient standardize value = 0.887 with p-value = 0,000. The direct effect of word of mouth variable on the brand preference variable reflected in line P6, the coefficient standardize value = 0.654 with p-value = 0,000. The effect of word of mouth variable on buying decisions results in the standardize value of the coefficient = 0.567 with p-value = 0,000. Word of mouth variable and brand preference is an intervening variable between the brand image variable and the decision to buy the total influence coefficient amounting to direct influence + indirect influence. That is equal to $0.352 + (0.887) (0.654) (0.568) = 0.681$. This shows that brand image influences word of mouth and word of mouth will influence brand preference, and finally brand preference will influence purchasing decisions.

5. DISCUSSION

Effect of Brand Image on Buying Decisions

The results of hypothesis testing prove that there is a significant effect of brand image (X1) on buying decisions (Y). The relationship coefficient on this path is 0.352 with a significance level of 0,000. The results of this test are consistent with the opinions of experts stating a strong, good and unique brand image will enhance buying decisions. The selection of a brand will go through a pattern where someone will form an idea of trust in several alternatives and build a decision (Aaker, 2004) This positive appears in the majority of the statements of buyers of Daya collection school supplies

The discussion of the results of the study and the implications of the descriptive analysis of each element of the brand image being tested are strong, good and unique brand association indicators. And if viewed from the three indicators of brand image, strong brand association indicators ranked first in respondents' preferences to provide answers agree with the average score of the value (mean) of 3.24 from the highest score 5. Which means that most respondents agreed to state that strong, good and unique brand associations are considered as an association group that connects consumer thinking to a brand name will increase the level of purchasing decisions towards the Daya collection brand.

Indirect Effects of Brand Image on Buying Decisions Through the Top of Mind and Brand Preference

The results of hypothesis testing prove that there is a significant indirect effect of brand image (X1) on buying decisions (Y) through top of mind (X2) and brand preference (X5). The relationship coefficient between the brand image variables on the top of mind variable is 0.673 with a significance level of 0.000. the coefficient of the relationship between the top of mind variable to the brand preference variable is 0.354 with a significance level of 0,000. The relationship coefficient between the brand preference variable towards the buying decision is 0.568 with a significance level of 0.000. If the top of mind variable and brand preference is an intervening variable between the brand image variable and the buying decision the total influence coefficient value is 0.487. This shows that the more positive a brand image, the higher the top of mind of a product brand, the higher the preference for the brand, the higher the frequency of buying decisions. This is supported by expert opinion stating that favorite brands in the minds of consumers will be very supportive in making buying decisions, brands that must be raised in the minds of consumers are things that must be communicated (Aaker & Joachimsthaler 2002). The effect of top of mind on buying decisions is quite high, it can be observed from the comments of buyers who on average have often heard and seen Daya collection school supplies

Indirect Effects of Brand Image on Buying Decisions Through Ad Intensity and Brand Preference

The results of hypothesis testing prove that there is a significant indirect effect of brand image (X1) on buying decisions (Y) through advertising intensity (X3) and brand preference (X5). The relationship coefficient between the brand image variables on the advertising intensity variable is 0.770 with a significance level of 0.000. The coefficient of the relationship between the advertising intensity variable to the brand preference variable is 0.193 with a significance level of 0,000. The relationship coefficient between the brand preference variable towards the buying decision is 0.568 with a significance level of 0.000. If the ad intensity variable and brand preference are intervening variables between the variable brand image and buying decision, the total coefficient value is 0.436. This shows that the brand image influences the intensity of the advertisement, the intensity of the advertisement will influence brand preference, and finally will influence the buying decision. The results of this study indicate that the intensity of advertising affects brand preference, communication effects (communication effects)

achieved through advertising will make a brand name firmly embedded in the minds of consumers and affect the decision to buy a brand, the effects of this communication appears from consumer knowledge about the new design and promotion program of collection power school supplies.

Indirect Effects of Brand Image on Buying Decisions Through Word Of Mouth and Brand Preference

The results of hypothesis testing prove that there is a significant indirect effect of brand image (X) on buying decisions (Y) through word of mouth (X4) and brand preference (X5). The coefficient of influence between brand image variables on word of mouth is 0.887 with a significance level of 0.000. The influence coefficient between word of mouth variables on brand preference variables is 0.654 with a significance level of 0,000. The coefficient of influence of the brand image variable on the buying decision is 0.568 with a significance level of 0.000. Word of mouth variable and brand preference are intervening variables between brand image variables and buying decisions, the total coefficient of influence is 0.681. This shows that the more positive the brand image, the more positive word of mouth, the more positive word of mouth will lead to higher brand preferences, then the higher the frequency of purchasing decisions in accordance with the opinion of experts who say that word of mouth is a process carried out by consumers in communicating or informing something about other consumers so as to accelerate the process of information exchange and very effective in increasing purchasing decisions The results of this study support the findings of Melaniarti Tjandra (2005) which states that consumers with low levels of involvement and high understanding needs use attribute-based prosseing strategy in making buying decisions. A consumer will be influenced by Word of mouth especially if the advice comes from friends, or family. In the product, the collection power of word of mouth is high, but its influence on the buying decision is classified as moderate.

6. CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATION OF RESEARCH

Conclusion

Based on the results of the research and discussion, it can be concluded several things as follows:

1. Brand image has a significant direct effect on buying decisions with a standardize coefficient = 0.352 and p-value = 0.000.
2. Brand image indirect effect on buying decisions through Top of mind and brand preference of 0.148
3. Brand image indirect effect on buying decisions through advertising intensity and brand preference by 0.083
4. Brand image indirect effect on buying decisions through word of mouth and brand preference of 0.306
5. Brand image indirect effect on buying decisions through brand preference of 0.148, 0.083 and 306 If associated with direct effects of 0.352 means the nature of the direct influence of brand image on buying decisions is stronger than indirect effects. Greater direct effects of indirect effects indicate that brand images in the short term can increase buying decisions.

Implications of Research Results

This study provides support for brand image and brand preference for buying decisions, both directly and indirectly. Therefore to improve buying decisions is strongly reinforced by theoretical concepts and empirical support regarding the factors that influence the decision to purchase collection power school uniform products. The findings of this study indicate that in general the biggest influence for consumers in making decisions to buy school equipment products Collection power is word of mouth and brand preference this can be seen from the regression weight of the causal relationship reaching the highest value. Thus this supports theoretical evidence which states that the purchasing process by consumers is how consumers select existing information sources and create subjective meanings of information sources. The decision to buy against a brand is a multi-strategy process that is often used where consumers in conducting elections will always try to enhance preferences,

Future research

Further research can be done by looking at the limitations of this study, namely:

Limitations regarding the object of research that only use consumer respondents who shop in the large market of Mojokerto, which can lead to a lack of control by researchers on each answer given by consumers.

The results of this study cannot be generalized to cases outside the object of research. Further research is also expected to be developed to increase the frequency of buying decisions.

References

- Aaker, David, A., and Keller, K.L. 1990. Consumer Evaluations of Brand Extensions, *Journal of Marketing*, 54 (1), pp. 27 - 41
- Aaker, David, A., 2004, *Strategy Portfolio Brand, Creating relevance, Differentiation, Energy, leverage and Clarity*, The free press London.
- Aaker, David, A., and Erich, Joachimsthaler, 2002, *Brand Leadership*, Free Press Business, London.
- Baskoro Yudo, et al. 2004. Relationship between elements of the Marketing Mix and Creation of Brand Equity. *Management Application Journal*, Vol 2, Department of Management FE Unibraw Malang, p. 369-391.
- Ferdinand, A. 2006. *Management Research Model: for Undergraduate Thesis, Masters Thesis and S3*

- Dissertation. Edition Dua, Diponegoro University Publishing Agency.
- Ferdinand, A. 2006. Structural Equation Modeling: In Management Research. Issue 4, Undip Publishing Board
- Ferrinadewi. E. 2008 Brands & Consumer Psychology: Implications for Marketing Strategies. First Edition, Graha Ilmu, Yogyakarta
- Ghozali, Imam. 2007. Application of Multivariate Analysis with SPSS Semarang Program: UNDIP
- Kotler, Philip., And Kevin Lane Keller. 2007. Marketing management for the 12 volume edition of Jakarta: Index
- Maholtra Naresh K 2005. Marketing Research Indonesian Edition Volume 1. Jakarta: Gramedia
- Solimun. 2002. Multivariate analysis of Structural Equation Modeliling (SEM) Lisrel and Amos. Malang University of Malang
- Sugiono, 2009. Business research methods. Bandung: CV. Alfabet
- Tjandra Melaniarti, 2005 Factors Affecting the Decision of Buying Baby Equipment Products Michelle Collection, Thesis of the University of Surabaya Management Masters
- Tjiptono, Fandy, 2007. Marketing Strategy, Second Edition. ANDI. Yokyakarta