United International Journal for Research & Technology
Volume 05, Issue 06, 2024 | Open Access | ISSN: 2582-6832

Students Perceived Purchasing Intentions Toward Counterfeit Clothing

Arniel P. Bangalao[1], Lorie Mae M. Cadavez[2], Marco Ray M. Ruanto[3], Marymae D. Suminguit[4], and Japeth A. Villanueva[5]
[1,2,3,4,5]Faculty, PHINMA-Cagayan de Oro College, College of Education

***Abstract*—** This research investigates the factors influencing students' purchase intentions for counterfeit clothing, focusing on demographic variables such as age, sex, allowance, and preference. Through a comprehensive analysis of survey data from 391 respondents, the study examines the demographic profile of participants and identifies key factors influencing their purchasing intentions. Findings reveal that while age does not significantly affect price considerations, it does influence brand preferences among respondents. Sex, however, does not significantly impact purchasing intentions related to counterfeit clothing. Income levels significantly influence both price considerations and brand preferences. Additionally, individuals' preferences for counterfeit or non-counterfeit clothing significantly influence their purchasing intentions. These insights underscore the importance of tailored marketing strategies that consider demographic variables and consumer preferences in the counterfeit clothing industry. Recommendations are provided for businesses, marketers, students, future researchers, and educational institutions to better understand and address the complexities of consumer behavior in this market.

***Keywords*—** Brand Factor, Counterfeit Clothing, Price Factor, Purchase Intention

I. INTRODUCTION

Fashion has changed throughout human history to reflect changes in culture, economic status, and cultural standards. The development of fashion has not been kept up by intellectual property laws. One of the two primary problems in the fashion business caused by a lack of intellectual property safeguards is counterfeit goods. Counterfeit is an unauthorized close copy of labels, or other unique symbols for sale. If a designer owns all the required intellectual property rights, designers can try to recover damages from a counterfeit product.

Fashion Law, pioneered in 2010 by Professor Susan Scafidi and supported by industry leaders, addresses the legal protections and challenges facing designers, leading to the establishment of the Fashion Law Institute and the world's first master's degree program in Fashion Law. The proposed Innovative Design Protection and Piracy Prevention Act aimed to provide sui generis protection to fashion designs under copyright law, covering various apparel and accessories, but faced criticism for potential harm to independent designers and concerns about enforceability.

Moreover, current laws governing fashion design protection under intellectual property present significant challenges for designers seeking legal recourse for infringement. Trademarks offer brand identity protection but are time-consuming and costly to obtain, often leading to confusion issues. Design patents have limited applicability to fashion due to the functional nature of clothing, and copyrights are difficult to obtain for utilitarian designs. Furthermore, securing protection is costly, time-consuming, and not always successful, with applications frequently denied. Intellectual property laws vary across jurisdictions, further complicating global protection efforts.

This trend has been seen in that clothing that is counterfeit is becoming more noticeable in everyone's day-to-day fashion. Especially in the school community, students are observed as of consumers buying counterfeit products. As indicated in the study of Mayasari et al. (2022) that one of the target markets of counterfeit clothing is young consumers who prefer popular global brands.

Students may view buying counterfeit clothing positively because of factors like affordability, trendy designs, and the perceived resemblance to authentic brands. As Navarro (2020) stated, factors like personal preferences, brand perception, culture, and economics shape purchasing intentions.

Understanding consumer intention is crucial as it allows businesses to tailor marketing strategies, improve products, and enhance customer experiences effectively. The analysis of buying behavior is essential for companies to stay competitive, build brand loyalty, and achieve long-term success. Moreover, educational institutions can use insights into students' spending habits to improve campus services and create a more

All rights are reserved by **UIJRT.COM.**

student-centric environment. In essence, understanding students' purchasing behavior empowers both businesses and institutions to make well-informed decisions that positively influence their engagement with this influential consumer segment.

According to Indriastuti (2021), purchase intention is a consumer's understanding of their want to really purchase a specific good or service after having realized their desire to do so. Purchasing has become a necessary component of business because it is hard to determine why a customer purchases a product. Purchase intention refers to a customer's capacity or willingness to decide on a future purchase of a specific good or service (Chiu et al., 2018). Understanding the reason and intent of a purchase is crucial, especially from the seller's perspective in the apparel sector.

There are plenty of reasons why consumers still purchase counterfeit clothing. Consumers may want to follow the latest trend but do not have enough money to buy one. When consumers cannot afford to purchase authentic well- known brand products, they continue to demand counterfeit goods at a lower cost. As stated in the study of Yunos and Lasi (2020), 80% of respondents strongly believe that pricing influences consumers' decisions to buy fashion-related products. One of the many variables proved the positivity of the respondents, as they cannot purchase the products at a higher price, which could convince the customer to switch to counterfeit products that carry the same brand. On the other hand, one's lifestyle influences their desire to buy counterfeit goods. Accordingly, those who buy luxury brands of products concentrate on improving both their outward look and social standing at the same time as uttered by Yunos and Lasi. It is believed that a brand brings value to its consumers the reason why consumers who are interested in fashion put the brand first into their consideration before purchasing apparel aside from price.

Although a considerable amount of research has been done on the relationship between price, brand, and purchase intention in a variety of consumer contexts, there is still a significant lack of research specifically examining these relationships in the context of the distinct demographic and cultural background of PHINMA- Cagayan de Oro College students. Most research has provided information about consumer behavior in general, but little is known about the complex viewpoints and goals of this particular student body.

This study seeks to address this research gap by focusing on the intention to purchase counterfeit apparel among PHINMA-Cagayan de Oro College students. By concentrating only on this specific group of students, the research hopes to provide more detailed information about the variables driving their purchasing intentions in this particular academic setting, as well as insights that go beyond general market trends. For the purpose of creating interventions, regulations, and marketing plans that are specifically tailored to the tastes and characteristics of PHINMA-Cagayan de Oro College students, this kind of focused research is essential.

II. THEORITICAL FRAMEWORK

In the context of this study, it is grounded on Tajfel and Turner's (1979) theory of Social Identity Theory (SIT). It explains how individuals categorize themselves and others into social groups based on shared characteristics, subsequently shaping their self-concepts and social identities. Through processes of social categorization, identification, and comparison, individuals derive a sense of belonging and esteem from their group memberships, striving to enhance the status of their in-groups relative to out-groups. These attributes emphasize similarities within the group and distinctions between different groups (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Additionally, self-identity has been proposed as an additional determinant of intention (Hogg, 2016).

Applied to the context of counterfeit clothing, SIT suggests that individuals' perceptions and behaviors regarding counterfeit products may be influenced by their social identities and group memberships, including factors such as age, sex, allowance, and preference (Hogg, 2016). For instance, younger consumers may identify with youth subcultures that endorse the purchase of counterfeit clothing as a form of rebellion or fashion statement, while older individuals may adhere to more traditional values and opt for authentic products (Munisha & Kaur, 2023). Ha et al. (2019) stated that sex differences may also exist, with males and females exhibiting varying preferences and attitudes toward counterfeit clothing. Furthermore, individuals' allowance or disposable income may influence their willingness to purchase counterfeit products, with those with limited financial resources being more inclined towards cheaper alternatives (Moneva & Tuñacao, 2020). Personal preferences, such as style preferences or brand loyalty, may interact with social identities to shape attitudes and behaviors towards counterfeit clothing, with some individuals prioritizing authenticity

All rights are reserved by UIJRT.COM.

while others prioritize affordability or perceived status (Mostafa & Kanzy, 2023).

Applied to the realm of counterfeit clothing, SIT suggests that students' perceptions and behaviors regarding counterfeit products may be influenced by their social identities, including factors such as age, sex, allowance, and preference. By integrating SIT into our theoretical framework, we aim to elucidate how students' social identities and group memberships influence their perceived purchasing intention towards counterfeit clothing, providing valuable insights into consumer behavior in this context (Salem & Salem, 2018).

Overall, SIT provides a framework for understanding the complex interplay between social identities, demographic factors, and consumer attitudes and behaviors toward counterfeit clothing. According to this theory, individuals perceive themselves as part of the same social category within a group and adopt the defining attributes of that category to understand and evaluate themselves.

III. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

In a crowded market of counterfeit products, the fashion industry is figuring out what influences consumers' choices in picking counterfeit clothing. This section introduces the conceptual foundation of the study, encompassing the elements influencing consumers' purchase intention in counterfeit apparel. The research investigates these key factors shaping this decision: purchase intention; price factor and brand factor serve as the dependent variable, while the independent variable includes demographics such as; age, sex, allowance, and preference.

Age is a demographic variable that influences attitudes and behaviors toward counterfeit apparel. Younger individuals may be more likely to engage in purchasing counterfeit products due to factors such as peer influence, fashion trends, and financial constraints. They may perceive counterfeit apparel as a more affordable alternative to authentic brands or as a means of expressing their identity and fitting in with certain social groups or subcultures (Moon et al., 2018).

Sex differences can also impact attitudes towards counterfeit apparel. Research suggests that males and females may have different motivations and preferences when it comes to fashion and consumer goods. For example, males may prioritize factors such as price and utility, while females may place more emphasis on brand image and style. These sex differences can influence attitudes towards counterfeit apparel and the likelihood of purchasing them (Gani et al., 2019).

Financial resources, including allowance for college students or income for working individuals, play a significant role in determining purchasing intentions regarding counterfeit apparel. Individuals with limited financial resources may be more inclined to consider counterfeit products as a cost-effective option compared to authentic brands. Conversely, those with higher disposable income or allowance may prioritize authenticity and quality over price, leading to a lower likelihood of purchasing counterfeit products (Moneva & Tuñacao, 2020).

Personal preferences, including brand and price factors toward counterfeit goods, shape individuals' decisions regarding counterfeit apparel. Some individuals may have a strong preference for authentic brands and perceive counterfeit products negatively due to concerns about quality, ethics, or legality. Others may be more open to purchasing counterfeit apparel if they perceive them as offering similar benefits at a lower cost (Kashif et al., 2019).

Figure 1 shows the initial independent variable is the demographic profile of the respondents; age, sex, allowance, and preference. Empirical evidence underscores the significance of age, sex, allowance, and preference in contributing to the intention to purchase counterfeit clothing as the price and brand factors being integrated (Munisha & Kaur, 2023; Ha et al., 2019; Moneva & Tuñaca, 2020; Park-Poaps & Kang, 2018).

The dependent variables of the study are the price factor and brand factor. According to Gani et al. (2019), price refers to any kind of material sacrifice an individual makes to acquire, possess, or utilize a product or service. The price is the primary aspect that influences buyers' decision to buy a counterfeit product. As a result, the item's price is the main element that strongly influences customers to consider buying counterfeit apparel (Gani et al., 2019). Brand factor significantly influences the customer's decision to make a purchase. As per Hashim et al. (2018), brand factor can be defined as the way consumers perceive a brand. Bian and Moutinho (2006, as cited in Hashim, 2018) state that consumers are more inclined to purchase counterfeit apparel when they perceive these counterfeits not merely as products but as brands, especially if they mimic well-known ones and are perceived to have positive qualities.

All rights are reserved by UIJRT.COM.

Statement of the Problem:

This study aims to identify the perception of PHINMA Cagayan de Oro College students to purchase counterfeit clothing.

Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

What is the student's demographic profile in terms of Age, Sex, Allowance; and Preference?

What are the factors that influence students to purchase counterfeit clothing?

Does the student differ significantly in their purchase intention for price and brand factor when grouped according to Age, Sex, Allowance; and Preference?

Hypothesis:

Problems 1 and 2 are hypothesis-free. On the basis of problem 3, the hypothesis below is tested at a 0.05 level of significance.

H0: There are no significant differences in purchase intention for both price and brand factors across different age groups.

H0: There are no significant differences in purchase intention for both price and brand factors between male and female students.

H0: There are no significant differences in purchase intention for both price and brand factors across different allowance categories.

H0: There are no significant differences in purchase intention for both price and brand factors between counterfeit and non-counterfeit.

IV. METHODS

Research Instrument:

This study employed the adapted-modified survey questionnaire from the study of Zulkilpi et al. (2023), "The Determinants Factor of Buying Online Fake Products: From UMK'S Student Experience," as the main tool for collecting data. The questionnaire included a carefully organized set of questions aimed at gathering information from participants.

This study employed the Interval Scale with a 4-point Likert Scale technique. This form of the Likert scale allows researchers to generate 4 alternatives. With the following codes: (1) for "strongly disagree", (2) for "disagree", (3) for "agree", and (4) for "strongly agree", each respondent was asked to express their view on each of the statements that were presented in the survey questionnaire.

Validity and Reliability:

The questionnaire that was used in this study is a judicious adaptation and modification of the instrument originally developed by Zulkilpi et al. (2023), ensuring alignment with the context and objectives of our research. The modifications were made to tailor the questionnaire to the specific details of our study while retaining the essence of the original items. The validity of the instrument was proven by handing the questionnaire to a highly qualified professional, Ms. Vanna Mae M. Potestas, MBM. The scores and remarks strengthen the study more by applying the suggestions which increase its logic, simplicity, and grammatical structure.

Statistical Treatment:

The results of the study were statistically analyzed for proper treatment. Research question number (1) aims to ascertain the characteristics of the respondents by using descriptive statistics summarizing the age, sex, income, and preference and the frequency distribution to analyze respondent distribution. Then, (2) using means to assess the level of respondent's purchase intention scores and standard deviation to measure the variability. Lastly, (3) using the One-Way ANOVA Non-Parametric Test to see if there are any statistically significant differences between the means of three or more independent groups. The test compares the median values of the groups instead of the means and is used when the assumptions of parametric ANOVA tests are violated, such as when the data is not normally distributed or when the variances across groups are not equal. The Kruskal-Wallis test is a commonly used non-parametric alternative to the one-way ANOVA test for comparing group means.

V. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1. *Distribution of Respondents' Profile in term of Age*

Age	Frequency	Percentage
31 and above	1	0.26
26-30	12	3.07
21-25	200	52.15
20 and below	178	45.52
Total	**391**	**100%**

All rights are reserved by **UIJRT.COM.**

Table 1 illustrates the distribution of respondents' profiles based on age categories. Among the 391 respondents surveyed, the majority fall within the **age range of "21 - 25,"** comprising approximately **51.15%** of the total sample. Meanwhile, **respondents aged "26 - 30"** account for approximately **3.07%** of the sample, with a minimal representation of only 1 respondent aged **"31 and above."**

The findings illustrate that the age group with the highest frequency among respondents is **21-25 years old**, comprising **200 out of 391** respondents of the surveyed sample. This aligns with the findings of Zulkilpi et al. (2023), indicating that the majority of college students fall within this age bracket. On the other hand, reveals that the age group with the lowest frequency among respondents is **31 years old and above**, representing only **1 of 391** respondents in the surveyed sample.

These findings suggest that the study primarily encompasses younger individuals, particularly those in their early twenties, with fewer participants from older age brackets.

Table 2. *Distribution of Respondents' Profile in term of Sex*

Sex	Frequency	Percentage
Male	89	22.76
Female	302	77.24
Total	**391**	**100%**

Table 2 illustrates the distribution of respondents' profiles based on sex categories. Among the 391 respondents surveyed, the majority identify as **female,** comprising **approximately 77.24%** of the total sample. In contrast, **male respondents** represent a smaller proportion, accounting for **approximately 22.76%** of the total respondents.

The data indicates a notable sex disparity among respondents, with **females** comprising the **majority at 77.24%** compared to **males at 22.76%.** This aligns with findings from a study by Zulkilpi et al. (2023), which similarly observed a predominance of female students in college enrollments compared to males.

The findings suggest that the study population is predominantly composed of female individuals, with males constituting a smaller but still notable segment.

Table 3. *Distribution of Respondents' Profile in term of Allowance*

Allowance	Frequency	Percentage
8,001 and above	11	2.81
6,001-8,000	10	2.56
4,001-6,000	26	6.65
2,001-4,000	68	17.39
2,000 and below	276	70.59
Total	**391**	**100%**

Table 3 illustrates the distribution of respondents' profiles based on allowance categories. Among the 391 respondents surveyed, the majority have relatively lower allowances, with 70.59% reporting an allowance of "2,000 and below." This group represents the largest segment of the sample. In contrast, smaller proportions of respondents report higher allowances, with percentages ranging from 2.81% to 17.39% across the other allowance categories. Specifically, 17.39% of respondents fall within the "2,001 - 4,000" allowance range, followed by 6.65% in the "4,001 - 6,000" range, 2.56% in the "6,001 - 8,000" range, and 2.81% in the "8,001 and above" range.

The data on student allowances reveal a notable disparity, with the majority of 70.59% reporting allowances of 2,000 pesos and below monthly. Conversely, the lowest frequency is observed in the highest allowance bracket of 8,001 and above, comprising only 2.81% of the sample. This discrepancy underscores the financial constraints faced by many students, aligning with findings from Moneva and Tuñacao (2020), which suggest that students often receive limited allowances primarily intended for daily expenses and school needs.

The findings indicate that a significant proportion of the study population consists of individuals who have restricted financial means, highlighting the prevalence of limited financial resources among the surveyed students.

Table 4. *Distribution of Respondents' Profile in term of Preference*

Preference	Frequency	Percentage
Counterfeit	276	70.59
Non-counterfeit	115	29.41
Total	**391**	**100%**

Table 4 presents the distribution of respondents' profiles based on their preference for counterfeit and non-counterfeit products. Among the 391 respondents surveyed, the majority, comprising approximately 70.59% of the total sample, express a preference for counterfeit products. In contrast, a smaller proportion of respondents, approximately 29.41% of the total

All rights are reserved by **UIJRT.COM.**

sample, indicate a preference for non-counterfeit products.

The data indicates that a significant majority of college students surveyed, accounting for 70.59%, prefer counterfeit goods, while 29.41% opt for non-counterfeit items. According to Mostafa and Kanzy (2023), college students who seek counterfeit goods are influenced by their tastes, preferences, and the cost of similar products.

These findings suggest that a significant segment of the study population favors counterfeit products over their non-counterfeit counterparts, driven by various factors.

What are the factors that influence students to purchase counterfeit clothing?

Table 5. *Mean and Standard Deviation of the Respondents' Purchase Intention for Price Factor*

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
I buy counterfeit clothing because original ones are more expensive	3.11	0.74	Agree
Affordability significantly influences my decision to purchase counterfeit clothing.	3.19	0.71	Agree
The prices offered by counterfeit clothing are more affordable than those of original products, causing me to choose over authentic ones.	3.25	0.69	Agree
I can afford to pay the price of counterfeit clothing instead of the original product.	3.22	0.69	Agree
If there are cheap branded clothing, maybe I will buy them.	3.20	0.77	Agree
The price factor is the primary reason that influences my purchase decision making.	3.33	0.67	Strongly Agree
My limited income causes me to purchase counterfeit clothing.	3.15	0.73	Agree
I have never purchased the most expensive branded clothing.	2.99	0.84	Agree
Total	**3.18**	**0.73**	**Agree**

Table 5 presents insights into the influence of price factors on students' decisions to purchase counterfeit clothing, highlighting several key indicators. Overall, respondents demonstrate a strong inclination towards agreeing with statements indicating the significance of price-related considerations in their purchasing intentions. The mean scores, ranging from 2.99 to 3.33, suggest a consistent level of agreement across various indicators.

As shown in the table, the highest mean score for the indicator "The price factor is the primary reason that influences my purchase decision making" with 3.33 indicates that respondents strongly prioritize price when deciding to purchase counterfeit clothing. This suggests that affordability plays a significant role in their decision-making process, likely due to factors such as limited budgets, perceived value, and societal influences. On the other hand, the indicator "I have never purchased the most expensive brand" with a mean of 2.99, having the lowest mean score suggests that fewer respondents strongly agree with this statement.

This suggests that some respondents have indeed purchased expensive branded items in the past. It indicates that while price is a significant factor, other considerations such as brand perception or personal preferences also influence purchasing intentions (Novianto et al., 2021). The overall mean of 3.18 and a standard deviation of 0.73 for the table indicate that the majority of respondents agree with the influence of price factors on their decisions to purchase counterfeit clothing. This suggests a strong emphasis on affordability and price considerations among respondents when making purchasing intentions. This is supported by the study of Khudhair (2019)

proclaiming the high level of agreement underscores the significant role of price in shaping consumer behavior towards counterfeit clothing purchases, highlighting the importance of offering competitively priced alternatives in the market.

The overall result reaching the level of "agree" rather than "strongly agree" could be attributed to several factors. Firstly, while price is a significant

All rights are reserved by **UIJRT.COM.**

consideration for respondents, it may not be the sole determinant in their decision-making process. Other factors such as brand perception, product quality, and personal preferences may also influence their purchasing intentions to varying degrees. Additionally, individual differences in attitudes, values, and financial situations may contribute to the variability in responses, leading to a broader range of agreement levels. Moreover, the wording of the survey questions and the context in which they were presented could impact respondents' interpretations and responses. Overall, the attainment of the "agree" level suggests a strong recognition of the importance of price in purchasing intentions, but it also implies that other factors may play complementary or mitigating roles in influencing consumer behavior towards counterfeit clothing purchases (Bakhshian et al., 2019).

Table 6. *Mean and Standard Deviation of the Respondents' Purchase Intention for Brand Factor*

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
I buy counterfeit clothing because quality is not important, but brands do.	2.64	0.88	Agree
I believe that counterfeit branded clothing increases my values.	2.77	0.82	Agree
I feel confident when wearing famous brands' clothing.	2.99	0.79	Agree
The perceived value of a brand of counterfeit clothing affects my purchase intension.	3.01	0.66	Agree
I purchase counterfeit clothing because of the luxurious image of the brand.	2.83	0.73	Agree
Physical appearance of clothing is appealing to me.	3.25	0.59	Agree
If people find out that I counterfeit clothing. I won't feel bad.	3.17	0.75	Agree
It makes no difference to me if I wear counterfeit clothing.	3.31	0.69	Strongly Agree
Total	**3.00**	**0.74**	**Agree**

Table 6 presents data on the influence of brand factors on the intention to purchase counterfeit clothing. Each indicator represents a statement related to brand perceptions and purchasing intentions, accompanied by its mean score and standard deviation (SD). The mean scores range from 2.64 to 3.31, with a mean of 3.00 overall, indicating agreement with the statements. The standard deviations range from 0.59 to 0.88, suggesting a moderate level of variability in responses across the indicators.

As shown in the table, the indicator "It makes no difference to me if I wear counterfeit" having the highest mean score of 3.31, suggests that respondents strongly agree with the statement, indicating a significant portion of respondents expressing indifference towards wearing counterfeit clothing. This could be attributed to various factors such as the desire to access branded products at lower costs, peer influences, or the belief that the physical appearance of the clothing is appealing regardless of its authenticity.

On the other hand, the indicator with the lowest mean is "I will buy counterfeit clothing because quality is not important, but brands do" with a mean of 2.64. This suggests that respondents are less inclined to prioritize brands over quality when purchasing counterfeit clothing. It indicates that while brand recognition may influence their decision to some extent, the perceived quality of the product still holds some importance in their purchasing intentions.

The overall mean of 3.00 and a standard deviation of 0.74 for Table 6 indicate that the majority of respondents agree with the influence of brand factors on their decisions to purchase counterfeit clothing. This suggests a significant emphasis on brand-related considerations, such as perceived value, image, and confidence, among respondents when making purchasing intentions in this context. The high level of agreement underscores the importance of brand perceptions in shaping consumer behavior toward counterfeit clothing purchases. It shows that for many

All rights are reserved by **UIJRT.COM.**

respondents, the appeal of counterfeit branded clothing lies not only in its physical appearance but also in the perceived value or status associated with wearing such brands. These findings are supported by the study of Yunos and Abdul Lasi (2020) proclaiming the need for brands to carefully manage their image and reputation to compete effectively in the market, as well as the importance of consumer education on the risks and implications of purchasing counterfeit.

While the overall mean of 3.00 indicates that most respondents "agree" with the influence of brand factors on their intention to purchase counterfeit clothing, several factors could contribute to the absence of a "strongly agree" level. Firstly, individual differences in attitudes and perceptions towards brands may lead to varying levels of agreement among respondents. Some individuals may strongly value brand associations and perceive counterfeit branded clothing as enhancing their personal value, while others may prioritize other factors such as authenticity or ethical considerations (Yunos and Abdul Lasi, 2020). Additionally, the wording of the survey questions and the context in which they were presented could impact respondents' interpretations and responses, influencing the overall level of agreement.

3. Are the students differ significantly in their purchase intension when grouped according to:

3.1. Age;
3.2. Sex;
3.3. Allowance; and
3.4. Preference?

Table 7. *One Way ANOVA Non-Parametric Testing of Age*

Kruskal-Wallis

	X^2	df	p
Price Factor	5.25	3	0.154
Brand Factor	13.29	3	0.004

The Kruskal-Wallis test results indicate significant differences among age groups in terms of their influence on both the Price Factor and Brand Factor. For the Price Factor, the chi-square statistic ($\chi^2 = 5.25$, df = 3, p = 0.154) suggests that while there is some variability among age groups, this difference is not statistically significant at the conventional alpha level of 0.05. It is evident that when it comes to counterfeit clothing, cheap prices have a big influence on customers' intentions to make purchases (Novianto et al., 2021). However, there could be more considerations that buyers take into account in addition to price when purchasing counterfeit apparel. Conversely, for the Brand Factor, the chi-square statistic ($\chi^2 = 13.29$, df = 3, p = 0.004) reveals a significant difference among age groups, with a p-value less than 0.05. This indicates that age significantly influences perceptions related to brand preferences. Widyastuti (2023) states that a product's brand image is vital in enhancing a brand's awareness and relationship with customers, which in turn influences their decision to buy counterfeit clothing.

Therefore, it can be concluded that while age may not have a significant impact on their intention to purchase when it comes to the price factor, it does exert a notable influence on attitudes toward brand preferences among respondents.

The implication of these results can be explained in two. Firstly, regarding the Price Factor, the lack of significant differences among age groups suggests that price considerations may be relatively consistent across different age demographics. Marketers and retailers targeting diverse age groups may find it beneficial to focus on price-related strategies that appeal to a broad audience rather than tailoring pricing tactics specifically to different age segments. Secondly, the significant differences observed for the Brand Factor imply that age plays a crucial role in shaping perceptions and preferences related to brands. This highlights the importance of understanding the distinct preferences and values of different age groups when developing brand strategies and marketing campaigns.

Table 8. *Pairwise Comparisons of Age and on Brand Factor*

Pairwise Comparisons-Brand Factor

		w	p
20 and below	21-25	5.124	0.002
20 and below	26-30	0.081	1.000

All rights are reserved by UIJRT.COM.

20 and below	31 and above	-0.069	1.000
21-25	26-30	-1.285	0.800
21-25	31 and above	-0.821	0.938
21-25	31 and above	-0.577	0.977

The pairwise comparisons reveal that there is a significant difference in the influence of the Brand Factor between respondents aged 20 and below and those aged 21-25 (W = 5.124, p = 0.002), whereas no other age group comparisons show significant differences. This suggests that younger respondents, specifically those aged 20 and below and 21-25, exhibit distinct perceptions or preferences related to brand factors compared to older age groups. One possible explanation for this finding could be related to generational differences in consumer behavior and brand engagement. Younger individuals, particularly those in their late teens and early twenties, may be more susceptible to the influence of brand imagery, social media marketing, and peer perceptions, leading to stronger brand preferences or affiliations.

The presentation of pairwise comparisons in Table 8 offers valuable insights into the influence of age on respondents' perceptions of the Brand Factor. The significant difference observed between respondents aged 20 and below and those aged 21-25 underscores the importance of understanding how age demographics shape attitudes toward brands. By highlighting this distinction, the table emphasizes the need for targeted marketing strategies that cater to the specific preferences and perceptions of different age groups within the surveyed population. Moreover, presenting these comparisons allows for a detailed interpretation of the data, revealing potential generational differences in consumer behavior and brand engagement.

***Table 9**. Difference in Brand and Price Factors by Sex*

Independent Samples T-Test

		Statistic	df	p
Brand Factor	Student's t Mann-Whitney U	-0.3509 12701	389	0.726 0.429
Price Factor	Student's t Mann-Whitney U	0.0206 13264	389	0.984 0.852

Note. H_a μ Female ≠ μ Male

The table presents the results of independent samples t-tests conducted to compare the Brand Factor and Price Factor between male and female respondents.

For the Brand Factor, both the Student's t-test and Mann-Whitney U test yield non-significant p-values of 0.726 and 0.429, respectively, indicating no significant difference in brand perception between genders. Similarly, for the Price Factor, both tests produce non-significant p-values of 0.984 and 0.852, respectively, suggesting no significant difference in price considerations between male and female respondents.

This suggests that sex does not significantly impact the factors influencing purchasing intentions related to either price considerations or brand preferences among the respondents. Even if it is shown that women with lower incomes are more likely than men to purchase counterfeit clothing (Ha et al., 2019). Overall, these findings suggest that there are no significant differences in perceptions of brand or price factors between male and female respondents.

The implications of the non-significant differences between male and female respondents in terms of their influence on both the Price Factor and the Brand Factor are twofold.

Firstly, it suggests that sex-based marketing strategies may not be as effective in influencing purchasing intentions related to counterfeit clothing, in the context of the price and brand factors.

Secondly, it highlights the importance of considering other variables or factors that may have a more significant impact on purchasing intentions.

All rights are reserved by **UIJRT.COM.**

Table 10. *One Way ANOVA Non-Parametric Testing of Allowance*

Kruskal-Wallis

	X^2	df	p
Price Factor	9.28	4	0.050
Brand Factor	14.62	4	0.006

The Kruskal-Wallis test results indicate that there are significant differences in both the Price Factor (χ^2 = 9.28, df = 4, p = 0.050) and the Brand Factor (χ^2 = 14.62, df = 4, p = 0.006) among respondents grouped according to their allowance. This suggests that the amount of allowance or income available to individuals may influence their purchasing intentions, particularly in terms of price considerations and brand preferences for counterfeit clothing. According to Simangunsong (2018), people are more likely to spend money immediately if they have a strong desire for a specific product. Higher levels of allowance may lead to greater flexibility and willingness to spend on branded items or prioritize certain brand attributes, while lower levels of allowance may necessitate more budget-conscious choices.

The significant differences in both the Price Factor and the Brand Factor among respondents grouped according to their allowance have several implications. Firstly, it suggests that marketers targeting consumers of counterfeit clothing should consider tailoring their pricing strategies and branding efforts based on the income levels of their target audience. For instance, offering discounts or promotions on counterfeit items may be more effective for individuals with lower allowances, while emphasizing the prestige or exclusivity of the brand may appeal more to those with higher allowances. Secondly, it underscores the importance of understanding the financial constraints and priorities of different consumer segments when designing marketing campaigns and product offerings.

Table 11. *Pairwise Comparisons of Allowance and on Price Factor*

Pairwise Comparisons-Price Factor

		W	p
2000 and below	2001-4000	1.375	0.868
2000 and below	4001-6000	-0.561	0.995
2000 and below	6001-8000	0.329	0.999
2000 and below	8001 and above	-3.989	0.046
2001-4000	4001-6000	-1.528	0.817
2001-4000	6001-8000	-0.34	0.999
2001-4000	8001 and above	-4.017	0.036
4001-6000	6001-8000	0.631	0.992
4001-6000	8001 and above	-3.268	0.141
6001-8000	8001 and above	-2.964	0.222

The pairwise comparisons reveal a significant difference in the influence of the Price Factor between respondents with an allowance of 2000 and below and those with an allowance of 8001 and above (W = -3.898, p = 0.046). No other allowance group comparisons show significant differences. This suggests that individuals with lower allowances, specifically those in the 2000 and below bracket have higher perception of price factor compared to the individual who has an income or allowance of 2001 up to 4000. Also, it may exhibit different purchasing behaviors influenced by price considerations compared to those with higher allowances. Possible reasons for this disparity could include varying financial constraints and priorities among different income groups. Individuals with lower allowances may prioritize affordability and seek out cost-effective options like counterfeit clothing, whereas those with higher allowances may prioritize quality and brand prestige, leading to differences in purchasing behavior.

The pairwise comparison highlights significant differences in purchasing behavior based on allowance levels, emphasizing the importance of tailoring pricing strategies to different income brackets. This insight

All rights are reserved by **UIJRT.COM.**

informs targeted marketing efforts and interventions, enhancing access to affordable options and promoting responsible consumer behavior within the clothing industry.

Table 12. *Pairwise Comparisons of Allowance and on Brand Factor*

Pairwise Comparisons-Price Factor

		W	p
2000 and below	2001-4000	3.2009	0.157
2000 and below	4001-6000	3.1991	0.157
2000 and below	6001-8000	2.3048	0.478
2000 and below	8001 and above	-2.4064	0.433
2001-4000	4001-6000	0.9153	0.967
2001-4000	6001-8000	0.8747	0.972
2001-4000	8001 and above	-3.1838	0.161
4001-6000	6001-8000	0.0253	1.000
4001-6000	8001 and above	-3.4947	0.097
6001-8000	8001 and above	-3.2653	0.142

The Kruskal-Wallis test for the Brand Factor yielded a significant result with a p-value of 0.006, indicating that there are significant differences between groups overall. However, upon closer inspection of the pairwise comparisons, we find that none of the specific group-to-group differences have p-values less than 0.05, suggesting that these differences are not statistically significant when considered individually. This discrepancy could be due to the overall significance detected by the Kruskal-Wallis test being driven by larger differences between some groups that are counterbalanced by non-significant differences between other groups. In other words, while there are differences between groups when looking at the data as a whole, some specific group comparisons may not show statistically significant variation.

The pairwise comparisons serve a crucial role in complementing the overall significance detected by the Kruskal-Wallis test. While the test indicates significant differences between groups for the Brand Factor, the pairwise comparisons provide a more granular understanding by examining specific group-to-group differences.

In this case, although the overall test yielded significance, the pairwise comparisons reveal that individual group comparisons do not reach statistical significance. Thus, presenting these pairwise comparisons is essential for discerning detailed variations within the data and understanding the specific group dynamics driving the overall result.

Table 13. *Difference in Brand and Price Factors by Preference*

Independent Samples T-Test

		Statistic	df	p
Brand Factor	Student's t Mann-Whitney U	4.17 12102	389	<.001 <.001
Price Factor	Student's t Mann-Whitney U	5.71 10250	389	<.001 <.001

Note. H_a μ Counterfeit ≠ μ Non-counterfeit

The table provides the results of independent samples t-tests conducted to compare the Brand Factor and Price Factor between respondents preferring counterfeit and non-counterfeit clothing. For the Brand Factor, both the Student's t-test and Mann-Whitney U test yielded highly significant p-values of less than .001 (t = 4.17, U = 12102), indicating significant differences in brand perceptions between the two preference groups. Similarly, for the Price Factor, both tests produced highly significant p-values of less than .001 (t = 5.71, U = 10250), suggesting significant differences in price considerations between respondents preferring

All rights are reserved by UIJRT.COM.

counterfeit and non-counterfeit clothing. This suggests that individuals' preference for either counterfeit or non-counterfeit clothing significantly influences their considerations related to price and brand when making purchasing intentions. The study of Mostafa and Kanzy (2023), found that there is a positive connection between the price of the original brand and customers' inclination to purchase counterfeit items. Overall, these findings suggest that there are significant differences in perceptions of brand or price factors between counterfeit and non-counterfeit.

The significant differences in both the Price Factor and the Brand Factor among respondents grouped according to their preference for counterfeit or non-counterfeit clothing have significant implications for marketers and retailers in the apparel market. Firstly, it underscores the importance of recognizing and understanding the distinct preferences and motivations of different consumer segments. Individuals who prefer counterfeit clothing may prioritize affordability and the perceived brand image associated with counterfeit brands, while those who prefer non-counterfeit clothing may place more emphasis on factors such as authenticity and quality.

V. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of Findings:

The summary of findings is presented according to the sequence of presentation of data.

There are significant differences among age groups in terms of their influence on purchasing intention for Brand Factors. However, there are no significant differences among age groups in terms of their influence on purchasing intention for Price Factor.

There are no significant differences between males and females influencing their purchasing intentions related to either price or brand factors.

There are significant differences in purchase intention for both price and brand factors across different allowance categories.

There are significant differences in purchase intention for both price and brand factors between counterfeit and non-counterfeit

CONCLUTION

Based on the findings of the study, several key insights emerge regarding the influence of demographic variables on purchase intentions related to counterfeit clothing. Firstly, while age does not appear to significantly impact intentions regarding price considerations, it does play a notable role in shaping attitudes towards brand preferences among respondents.

This underscores the importance of considering generational differences in marketing strategies targeting counterfeit clothing consumers. Similarly, sex does not seem to significantly affect purchasing intentions related to price or brand preferences, suggesting that sex-based marketing approaches may have limited efficacy in this context. However, individuals' income levels significantly influence their purchasing intentions, particularly regarding both price considerations and brand preferences for counterfeit clothing. This highlights the importance of tailoring marketing efforts to different income brackets to effectively target diverse consumer segments.

Additionally, respondents' preferences for counterfeit or non-counterfeit clothing significantly influence their considerations of both price and brand, emphasizing the need for detailed marketing strategies that cater to varying consumer preferences in the counterfeit clothing market. Overall, these findings provide valuable insights for clothing businesses and marketers seeking to understand and effectively engage with consumers in the counterfeit clothing industry, offering opportunities for targeted marketing interventions that consider the interplay of demographic variables with purchase intentions.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Business Clothing. Given the significant influence of factors such as brand perception and affordability on purchasing intentions for counterfeit clothing, businesses in the clothing industry should focus on building strong brand images and offering competitively priced alternatives. Investing in brand management strategies and market research to understand consumer preferences and perceptions can help businesses effectively target and engage with their desired consumer segments.

Marketers. Marketers should consider the detailed preferences and behaviors of different demographic groups, particularly regarding price considerations and brand preferences. Tailoring marketing strategies to resonate with specific age groups, sexes, income levels, and preferences can enhance the effectiveness of marketing campaigns and drive consumer engagement. Utilizing market segmentation techniques and conducting consumer surveys can provide valuable

All rights are reserved by **UIJRT.COM.**

insights for marketers seeking to optimize their strategies.

Students. For students, understanding the impact of demographic factors on purchasing intentions for counterfeit clothing can inform their own consumption behaviors and decision-making processes. Recognizing the influence of factors such as age, sex, income, and preferences can empower students to make informed choices aligned with their values and priorities. Additionally, education initiatives aimed at raising awareness about the ethical, legal, and social implications of purchasing counterfeit products can help students make responsible consumer decisions.

Future Researchers. Future researchers can build upon the findings of this study by exploring additional demographic or psychographic variables that may influence purchasing intentions for counterfeit clothing. Investigating factors such as cultural influences, peer group dynamics, and personality traits can provide deeper insights into consumer behavior in this context. Furthermore, conducting longitudinal studies to track changes in consumer preferences and behaviors over time can contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of the dynamics driving counterfeit clothing purchases.

REFERENCES

[1] Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. Organizational behavior and human decision processes, 50(2), 179-211.

[2] Alegria, G. (2019). A Fashion Phenomenon. How Lack of Intellectual Property Rights Impedes Innovation in the Fashion Industry.

[3] Bian, X. (2006). An examination of factors influencing the formation of the consideration set and consumer purchase intention in the context of non- deceptive counterfeiting (Doctoral dissertation, University of Glasgow).

[4] Bian, X., & Haque, S. (2020). Counterfeit versus original patronage: Do emotional brand attachment, brand involvement, and past experience matter?. Journal of brand Management, 27, 438-451.

[5] Bakhshian, S., Lee, Y. A., & Cao, W. (2019). Psycho-Demographic Determinants of Young Consumers' Purchase Intention toward Counterfeit Apparel in a US Counterfeit Capital. Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal, 47(4), 324-341.

[6] Cheng, S. I., Fu, H. H., & Tu, L. C. (2011). Examining customer purchase intentions for counterfeit products based on a modified theory of planned behavior. International Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 1(10), 278-284.

[7] Chetioui, Y., Benlafqih, H., & Lebdaoui, H. (2020). How fashion influencers contribute to consumers' purchase intention. Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management: An International Journal, 24(3), 361-380.

[8] Chiu, W., Kim, T., & Won, D. (2018). Predicting consumers' intention to purchase sporting goods online: An application of the model of goal-directed behavior. Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics, 30(2), 333-351.

[9] Gani, M. O., Alam, M. I., Chowdhury, S. A., & Faruq, M. O. (2019). Factors affecting consumers' purchase intention for counterfeit luxury goods in Bangladesh. Innovative Marketing, 15(4), 27.

[10] Ha, S., John, J., & Kim, J. (2019). Examining South Korean consumers' attitudes towards counterfeit luxury apparel. Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services, 49, 275-281.

[11] Hashim, N. M. H. M., Shah, N. U., & Omar, N. A. (2018). Does Counterfeit Product Quality Lead to Involvement and Purchase Intentions? The Moderating Effects of Brand Image and Social Interaction.

[12] Hawkins, D. L., Mothersbaught, D. L., & Best, R. J. (2007). Consumer Behavior: Building Marketing Strategy (10th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Irwin.

[13] Hogg, M. A. (2016). Social identity theory (pp. 3-17). Springer International Publishing.

[14] Huang, Y. A., Phau, I., Lin, C., Chung, H. J., & Lin, K. H. C. (2008). Allocentrism and consumer ethnocentrism: The effects of social identity on purchase intention. Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal, 36(8), 1097-1110.

[15] Indriastuti, H., & Maulana, M. I. (2021). Achieving of country image, perceived quality, and brand familiarity on purchase intention of samsung smartphone in Indonesia. International Journal of Management Excellence (ISSN: 2292-1648), 16(1), 2281-2288.

[16] Jamil, R. A., Qayyum, U., ul Hassan, S. R., & Khan, T. I. (2023). Impact of social media influencers on

All rights are reserved by **UIJRT.COM.**

consumers' well-being and purchase intention: a TikTok perspective. European Journal of Management and Business Economics.

[17] Kashif, M. T., Khurshid, M. K., Amjad, M., Anjum, A., & Jamil, K. A. (2019). Study on Causal Relationship between Counterfeit Products and Consumer Preferences. International Transaction Journal of Engineering, Management, & Applied Sciences & Technologies. Volume 11 No.1 ISSN 2228-9860

[18] Kotler, P. & Keller, K.L. (2006). Marketing management. New Jersey. Person Education, Inc.

[19] Khudhair, R. B. (2019). Factors Effect on Positive and Negative Counterfeit Purchase Intention: An Empirical Study from Iraq. Department of Business, Business Administration Program.

[20] Kusmardianto, A. D., & Rahayu, F. (2023). Anteseden dan Konsekuensi dari Parasocial Interaction dada Produk Kosmetik Lokal. Jurnal Pendidikan Tambusai, 7(1), 992-1001.

[21] Kusumawardani, K. A., Widyanto, H. A., & Ulfayani, D. (2021). Understanding Indonesian Millennials Intention to Purchase Counterfeit Fashion Products. In Proceeding of the International Conference on Family Business and Entrepreneurship (Vol. 1, No. 1).

[22] Mayasari, I., Haryanto, H. C., Wiadi, I., Wijanarko, A. A., & Abdillah, W. (2022). Counterfeit purchase intention of fashion brands: the personal values and

[23] social aspect of consumers as determinants. Gadjah Mada International Journal of Business, 24(1), 1. https://doi.org/10.22146/gamaijb.54660

[24] Miao, M., Jalees, T., Zaman, S. I., Khan, S., Hanif, N. U. A., & Javed, M. K. (2022). The influence of e-customer satisfaction, e-trust, and perceived value on consumer's repurchase intention in the B2C e-commerce segment. Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics, 34(10), 2184-2206.

[25] Mishra, A. K., & Farooqi, R. (2021). Exploring Millennial Buying Motives through Needs Hierarchy and Situational Barriers Influencing Green Purchase Behaviour. IEOM Society International.

[26] Moneva, J., Tuñacao, M. (2020). Students' Level of Financial Support Satisfaction Towards Their Daily Allowance. IRA International Journal of Education and Multidisciplinary Studies (ISSN 2455-2526), 16(1), 15-23.

[27] Moon, M. A., Javaid, B., Kiran, M., Awan, H. M., & Farooq, A. (2018). Consumer perceptions of counterfeit clothing and apparel products attributes. Marketing Intelligence & Planning, 36(7), 794-808.

[28] Mostafa, E. A., & Kanzy, S. (2023). Understanding Egyptian Consumers' Preferences for Counterfeit and Generic Products: An Analysis of Influencing Factors. Contemporary Journal of Business and Entrepreneurship Research (CJBER), 1(1), 1-23.

[29] Munisha & Kaur, N.(2023). Examining The Influence of Demographics on Consumer Attitudes Towards Purchasing Counterfeit Clothing: A Study in the State of Punjab, India. Trade Journal of Seybold Publication. Vol. 18 Issue-6.

[30] Navarro, K. M. (2020). Consumer-Based Brand Equity and Purchase Intention towards Counterfeit Goods.

[31] Ndofire Pi, T. M., Chuchu, T., Maziriri, E., & Nyagadza, B. (2022). Examining the influence of price-quality inference and consumer attitudes on the inclination to buy non-deceptive counterfeit goods: evidence from South Africa. European Journal of Management Studies, 27(3), 317-339. https://doi.org/10.1108/EJMS-04-2022-0026

[32] Novianto, W., Zebua, A. M., & Mursal, M. (2021). Factors Influencing Decisions to Purchase Counterfeit Fashion Products: Brand Image, Price and Lifestyle (Literature Review Customer Behavior).

[33] Park-Poaps, H., & Kang, J. (2018). An experiment on non-luxury fashion counterfeit purchase: The effects of brand reputation, fashion attributes,and attitudes toward counterfeiting. Journal of Brand Management, 25, 185-196.

[34] Peter, J. P. & Olson, J. C., (2008). Consumer Behavior and Marketing Strategy, Singapore, McGraw- Hill/ Irwin.

[35] Rai, B. (2019). The effect of demographic factors on consumer purchase intention in buying television set in Kathmandu Valley: An empirical study. Pravaha, 25(1), 23-32.

[36] Rehman, Z. U., Shahbaz, M. S., Seman, N. A. A., & Mubarik, M. S. (2022). A Conceptual Action Plan for Reducing Environmental Pollution through Sustainable Clothing Purchase Intention and Behavior: A Systematic Review. Antecedents and Outcomes of Employee-Based Brand Equity, 219-242.

All rights are reserved by **UIJRT.COM.**

[37] Salem, S. F., & Salem, S. O. (2018). Self-Identity and Social Identity as Drivers of Consumers' Purchase Intention towards Luxury Fashion Goods and Willingness to Pay Premium Price. Asian Academy of Management Journal, 23(2), 161-184.

[38] Shahid, S., Islam, J. U., Farooqi, R., & Thomas, G. (2023). Affordable luxury consumption: An emerging market's perspective. International Journal of Emerging Markets, 18(2), 316-336.

[39] Simangunsong, E. (2018). Generation-Z Buying Behavior in Indonesia: Opportunities for Retail Business. MIX: Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen, 8(2), 243-253.

[40] Tajfel, H., Turner, J. C., Austin, W. G., & Worchel, S. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. Organizational identity: A reader, 56(65), 9780203505984-16.

[41] Villaneuva, J. A., Suminguit, M. D., & Valdehueza, M. S. (2023). Assessment on the Implementation of Gender-Responsive Basic Education Policy among Public School Teachers of Talakag District 2, Division of Bukidnon. International Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovative Research, ISSN:2349-5162, Vol.10, Issue 8, page no.d843-d894

[42] Widyastuti, P. (2023). Brand resonance and brand salience in luxury cosmetic products with symbolic value as the mediating variable. Journal.uin mataram.ac.id.

[43] Yunos, M. A. H. B. M., & Abdul Lasi, M. Bin. (2020). Factors Affecting Consumers' Intention to Purchase Counterfeit Products in the Fashion

[44] Industry. International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences. 10(10), 939-949.

[45] Zulkilpi, M. T., Mazlan, N. S., Mohammad, S. N., & Rasid, Z. M. (2023). The determinants factor of buying online fake products: From UMK'S student experience (Doctoral dissertation, Universiti Malaysia Kelantan).

UIJRT
ISSN: 2582-6832