

# Consumer Willingness to Purchase One District One Product (ODOP) Among Students of the National University of Laos

Somchith Sompaseuth<sup>1\*</sup>; Moukthida Seesothone<sup>1</sup>; Manivone Insomphou<sup>1</sup>;  
Noyphouvanh Syaphay<sup>1</sup>; Keoladda Lianepaseuth<sup>1</sup>; Anousone Phonesavanh<sup>1</sup>;  
Souksakhone Sichantha<sup>1</sup>; Bounvilai Sichanthala<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Business Management, Faculty of Economics and Business Management,  
National University of Laos, Vientiane, Lao PDR

Corresponding Author: Somchith Sompaseuth<sup>1\*</sup>

Co-Author: Moukthida Seesothone<sup>1</sup>; Manivone Insomphou<sup>1</sup>; Noyphouvanh Syaphay<sup>1</sup>; Keoladda  
Lianepaseuth<sup>1</sup>; Anousone Phonesavanh<sup>1</sup>; Souksakhone Sichantha<sup>1</sup>; Bounvilai Sichanthala<sup>1</sup>

Publication Date: 2026/08/18

**Abstract:** Grounded in the Theory of Planned Behavior, perceived-value theory, and marketing-mix theory, this study examined consumer willingness to purchase One District One Product (ODOP) goods among students of the National University of Laos, addressing a gap in the largely Thailand- and China-centered literature on willingness to purchase locally distinctive products. The study pursued two objectives: to assess students' level of opinion toward ODOP products across seven dimensions and to assess their level of willingness to purchase these products. A quantitative, cross-sectional survey design was employed with a population of 4,551 students from three faculties—Economics and Business Management, Architecture, and Environmental Sciences—and a sample of 368 respondents determined using Yamane's (1967) formula and selected through convenience sampling. Data were collected using a structured closed-ended questionnaire and analyzed with IBM SPSS Statistics using frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation. Most respondents were male (55.7%), aged 21–23 years (46.7%), and had previously purchased ODOP products (63.6%). Opinions toward ODOP products were high overall (mean = 3.76), led by packaging and design (mean = 3.79), while willingness to purchase was also high overall (mean = 3.77), led by intention to recommend to others (mean = 3.85), a pattern comparable to related studies in China and Thailand. These results extend planned-behavior and perceived-value theory to a heritage-branded local-product context and suggest that ODOP producers and policymakers should prioritize packaging quality, fair pricing, and word-of-mouth channels such as campus ambassador programs to strengthen student demand for Lao ODOP products.

**Keywords:** One District One Product (ODOP); Purchase Willingness; Consumer Perception; University Students; Lao PDR.

**How to Cite:** Somchith Sompaseuth; Moukthida Seesothone; Manivone Insomphou; Noyphouvanh Syaphay; Keoladda Lianepaseuth; Anousone Phonesavanh; Souksakhone Sichantha; Bounvilai Sichanthala (2026) Consumer Willingness to Purchase One District One Product (ODOP) Among Students of the National University of Laos. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 11(8), 788-799. <https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26aug488>

## I. INTRODUCTION

The One District One Product (ODOP) initiative promotes locally made goods that draw on indigenous skills, wisdom, creativity, and local resources, and that carry a distinctive cultural identity. In the Lao PDR, ODOP goods span handwoven textiles, basketry, wood carving, metal and precious-metal crafts, pottery, food and beverages, and traditional medicines. Strengthening demand for these products supports local producers, reduces dependence on

imported goods, and reinforces consumer loyalty to Lao products.

The ODOP concept traces its origins to Japan's One Village One Product (OVOP) movement, launched in Oita Prefecture in 1979 under then-governor Morihiro Hiramatsu as a strategy for revitalizing rural economies through locally distinctive, high-value-added goods (Japan International Cooperation Agency, n.d.). The approach was subsequently adapted across Asia, most influentially by Thailand's One

Tambon One Product (OTOP) programme, and was introduced to the Lao PDR through a feasibility study in 2005 that catalogued traditional handicrafts, foodstuffs, and other locally distinctive goods with commercial potential (2AL, 2018). The Lao government formalized the initiative through the Ministry of Industry and Commerce's 2017 decision on national ODOP goods, which set out selection criteria requiring production by small enterprises, family businesses, or cooperatives using local raw materials and indigenous know-how (Ministry of Industry and Commerce, 2017). National ODOP goods in the Lao PDR are grouped into handicrafts (woven textiles, basketry, wood carving, metalwork, and pottery), food and beverages, and traditional medicines, alongside a services category covering locally distinctive hospitality and cultural offerings.

Despite this policy backing, Lao ODOP producers continue to face competitive pressure from imported goods, limited marketing capacity, and uneven consumer awareness, which together constrain the initiative's contribution to local livelihoods and poverty reduction (Ministry of Industry and Commerce, 2017). Much of the empirical literature on willingness to purchase locally distinctive or sustainability-oriented products has been generated in Thailand and China (e.g., Khunkom, 2020; Phothimat & Ngamsak, 2022; Siriworaphan et al., 2024; Li et al., 2025), leaving the Lao consumer market, and the university-student segment in particular, comparatively underexamined. This gap is consequential because evidence on which product attributes actually move a young, price-sensitive consumer segment to buy is precisely what ODOP producers and policymakers need to design effective marketing and pricing strategies.

University students represent an important consumer segment: they are future decision-makers, a source of new ideas for product development, and active participants in everyday purchasing. Understanding how students perceive ODOP products and how willing they are to buy them can help entrepreneurs improve their offerings, address marketing problems, and manage ODOP products more effectively. Against this background, this study investigated consumer willingness to purchase ODOP products among students of the National University of Laos.

The findings are intended to serve two further audiences beyond the immediate research objectives. For ODOP entrepreneurs and prospective business operators, the results offer an evidence base for planning, revising, and developing marketing strategies that respond more precisely to student consumers' preferences, and for setting price levels appropriate to this segment's purchasing power. For future researchers, the study provides a validated instrument and baseline findings that can be extended to other student populations or broadened into inferential designs that formally test the determinants of willingness to purchase ODOP products.

The study pursued two objectives: (1) to assess the level of students' opinions toward ODOP products, and (2) to assess the level of students' willingness to purchase ODOP products at the National University of Laos.

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

### ➤ *Theory of Planned Behavior*

The Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) is the principal behavioral framework guiding this study. Ajzen (1985, 1991) proposed that behavioral intention—and, through it, actual behavior—is jointly determined by attitude toward the behavior, subjective norm (the perceived social pressure to perform or not perform the behavior), and perceived behavioral control (PBC, the perceived ease or difficulty of performing the behavior), the last of which extended the earlier Theory of Reasoned Action (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975; Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980) to account for behaviors that are not fully under volitional control. Ajzen (2002, 2012) further clarified that PBC combines self-efficacy (confidence in one's own capability) with perceived controllability (the availability of resources and opportunities), both of which are directly relevant to a student consumer's confidence in locating, affording, and choosing ODOP products. Subjective norm, in turn, is shaped by normative beliefs about how reference groups—family, friends, and increasingly social media—expect one to act (Bearden, Netemeyer, & Teel, 1989), which motivates this study's treatment of social influence as a discrete opinion dimension. TPB has been widely applied to purchase-related behavior, including alcohol consumption (Conner, Warren, Close, & Sparks, 1999), tourism intentions (Wang, Zhang, Yu, & Hu, 2018), and—closest to the present context—green and sustainability-oriented purchase intentions (Rakuša & Milfelner, 2025), which supports its suitability for explaining willingness to purchase locally distinctive ODOP goods.

### ➤ *Perceived Value Theory*

Perceived-value theory complements TPB by explaining how evaluations of price and quality combine to shape consumer judgments. Zeithaml (1988) defined perceived value as the consumer's overall assessment of a product's utility based on perceptions of what is received relative to what is given up, positioning price and quality as the two central inputs to that trade-off. Dodds, Monroe, and Grewal (1991) showed experimentally that price, brand, and store information jointly influence perceived quality, perceived sacrifice, and ultimately willingness to buy, while Monroe (1990) and Campbell (1999) established that perceptions of price fairness—whether a price is reasonable relative to comparable offerings—moderate how favorably consumers judge a transaction. Garvin (1987) additionally identified reliability, durability, and conformance to standards as core dimensions of perceived quality, informing this study's perceived-product-quality items. Together, these perspectives justify treating perceived product quality and price fairness as separate but related opinion dimensions in the present framework, consistent with their use in comparable studies of green and organic product purchase intention (Chen & Chang, 2012; Khunkom, 2020).

### ➤ *Marketing Mix Theory*

Marketing-mix theory situates product-related decision variables that a firm can control to influence consumer response. Borden (1964) first conceptualized the marketing

mix as the set of controllable elements a firm blends to meet market demand, which McCarthy (1960) later condensed into the widely used 4Ps: product, price, place, and promotion (see also McCarthy & Perreault, 1993). Kotler and Keller (2016) extended this framework to emphasize packaging and design as an increasingly important product-related cue, particularly for goods—such as ODOP handicrafts and foodstuffs—whose visual presentation signals authenticity and craftsmanship, and to treat accessibility and convenience of purchase as a place-related determinant of consumer response. Empirical work applying the 4Ps to purchase intention in adjacent Asian markets (Chen, 2025) similarly finds packaging, price, and accessibility to be significant predictors of consumer willingness to buy, supporting their inclusion as opinion dimensions in this study's conceptual framework.

#### ➤ *Willingness to Purchase*

Willingness to purchase (PW) is the study's dependent construct. Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) defined behavioral intention—of which purchase intention is a specific case—as the subjective probability that an individual will perform a given behavior, making it the most proximal antecedent of actual behavior. Building on this, Crosno, Freling, and

Skinner (2009) described willingness to buy as the likelihood that a consumer will select a given product the next time a purchase occasion arises, while Bennett (1995) and Howard (1994) characterized it as a concrete behavioral plan—for example, an expressed intention to buy again in the future—that can be measured directly through self-report. Kim and Pysarchik (2000) showed that such willingness need not depend solely on objective product attributes but can also be shaped by country-of-origin and cultural-identity cues, which is particularly relevant to ODOP goods whose value proposition rests partly on local heritage. Consistent with Zeithaml, Berry, and Parasuraman (1990), Porral and Lang (2014), and Tariq, Nawaz, and Butt (2013), this study operationalizes willingness to purchase as a composite of intention to buy, intention to buy in the near future, preference for ODOP over imported alternatives, intention to recommend to others, and intention to buy when the opportunity arises—capturing both the behavioral-intention core of the construct and its word-of-mouth and repeat-purchase extensions (Kim, Galliers, Shin, Han, & Kim, 2012).

#### ➤ *Comparative Review of Previous Studies*

Table 1 Summary of Related Previous Studies on Willingness to Purchase

| Study                                           | Context (n)                                                         | Key dimensions (mean, SD, level)                                                                                                                                                                          |
|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Chen (2025)                                     | Hailan House, Shanghai, China (n = 400)                             | Product quality 3.84/0.87 (high); accessibility 3.65/0.86 (high); willingness to purchase 3.45/1.03 (high); price fairness 3.29/0.97 (moderate)                                                           |
| Li, Xaysy, & Kaiyavong (2025)                   | Liuzhou, Guangxi, China — green products (n = 469)                  | Willingness to purchase 3.75/0.80 (high); environmental awareness 3.64/0.69 (high); social influence 3.56/0.72 (high); price fairness 3.34/0.79 (moderate)                                                |
| Rakuša & Milfelner (2025)                       | Green products via TPB, Slovenia (n = 216)                          | Willingness to purchase 3.45/0.84 (high); attitude 3.37/0.75 (moderate); perceived behavioral control 3.34/0.97 (moderate); social influence 3.16/0.84 (moderate)                                         |
| Siriworaphan et al. (2024)                      | Environmentally friendly products, Chonburi, Thailand (n = 400)     | Willingness to purchase 4.16/0.50 (high); product quality 4.16/0.49 (high); perceived behavioral control 4.12/0.47 (high)                                                                                 |
| Songsinsa-at (2023)                             | Reusable products (TPB + moral norms), Chonburi, Thailand (n = 400) | Attitude 4.18/0.98 (high); willingness to reuse 4.10/0.85 (high); perceived behavioral control 3.93/1.01 (high); social influence 3.34/1.06 (moderate)                                                    |
| Phothimat & Ngamsak (2022)                      | Dietary supplements, Khon Kaen, Thailand (n = 120)                  | Perceived behavioral control 4.07/0.46 (high); attitude 3.83/0.53 (high); social influence 3.79/0.48 (high); willingness to purchase 3.78/0.56 (high)                                                     |
| Ahmed, Streimikiene, Qadir, & Streimikis (2023) | Green products, United States (n = 896)                             | Product quality 3.96/1.12 (high); attitude 3.89/1.01 (high); packaging/design 3.84/1.05 (high); accessibility 3.83/1.04 (high); willingness to purchase 3.79/1.08 (high); price fairness 3.50/1.04 (high) |
| Khunkom (2020)                                  | Local organic products, Bangkok, Thailand (n = 400)                 | Willingness to purchase 4.27/0.58 (highest); attitude 3.47/0.80 (high); social influence 3.39/0.61 (moderate); price fairness / perceived behavioral control 3.30/0.79 and 3.30/0.70 (moderate)           |

Source: Compiled by the Authors from the Cited Studies.

Comparable survey-based studies of willingness to purchase locally distinctive or sustainability-oriented products, mostly conducted in China and Thailand, provide a useful benchmark for the opinion and willingness levels reported in Section 4. Table 1 summarizes eight such studies

alongside their sampling context and headline descriptive statistics.

#### ➤ *Conceptual Framework and Hypotheses*

Synthesizing these perspectives, students' opinions toward ODOP products were operationalized across seven

dimensions: (1) attitude toward the product (ATT), (2) social influence (SI), (3) perceived behavioral control (PBC), (4) perceived product quality (PQ), (5) packaging and design (PD), (6) price fairness (PF), and (7) accessibility and convenience (AC). Willingness to purchase (PW) was measured as a single dimension capturing intention to buy, buy in the near future, choose ODOP over imported goods, recommend to others, and plan to buy when opportunities arise.

Consistent with this synthesis of the Theory of Planned Behavior (Ajzen, 1991, 2002), perceived-value theory (Zeithaml, 1988; Dodds et al., 1991), and marketing-mix theory (Kotler & Keller, 2016), and following the conceptual model summarized in Figure 1, the study proposes seven directional hypotheses linking students' opinions to their willingness to purchase ODOP products: H1, attitude toward the product is positively associated with willingness to purchase; H2, social influence is positively associated with willingness to purchase; H3, perceived behavioral control is positively associated with willingness to purchase; H4, perceived product quality is positively associated with willingness to purchase; H5, packaging and design is positively associated with willingness to purchase; H6, price fairness is positively associated with willingness to purchase; and H7, accessibility and convenience is positively associated with willingness to purchase. Because the study design is descriptive rather than inferential (Section 3.1), these hypotheses are evaluated qualitatively in the Discussion by comparing the relative rank and mean level of each opinion dimension against willingness to purchase, rather than through formal statistical significance testing; this scoping is revisited as a direction for future research in Section 6.

### III. METHODOLOGY

#### ➤ Research design

This study used a quantitative, survey-based design. A structured closed-ended questionnaire served as the data-

collection instrument, and IBM SPSS Statistics software was used to compute frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation in line with the research objectives. A descriptive, cross-sectional survey design was selected because the study's purpose was to describe the level of two constructs (opinion and willingness to purchase) in a defined population at a single point in time, rather than to test causal or moderating relationships among them.

#### ➤ Population and Sample

The population comprised 4,551 students from three faculties of the National University of Laos (Dongdok campus): Economics and Business Management, Architecture, and Environmental Sciences. Because the population size was known, the sample size was calculated using Yamane's (1967) formula,  $n = N / (1 + Ne^2)$ , with a 5% margin of error ( $e = 0.05$ ):

$$n = 4,551 / [1 + (4,551 \times 0.05^2)] = 367.7 \approx 368$$

This yielded a sample of 368 students, selected using convenience sampling. All 368 completed questionnaires were usable and included in the analysis.

#### ➤ Instrument and Measurement

The questionnaire comprised three parts: (1) respondent profile (sex, age, faculty, average monthly income, prior ODOP purchase, and ODOP product types known); (2) opinions toward ODOP products across the seven dimensions; and (3) willingness to purchase. Items in Parts 2 and 3 used a five-point rating scale. Mean scores were interpreted using equal-interval criteria, in which 3.41–4.20 denotes a “high” level.

To ensure conceptual clarity and comparability with the related studies in Section 2.5, Table 2 presents the operational definition applied to each construct, adapted from the definitions of terms developed for the underlying questionnaire.

Table 2 Operational Definitions of Study Constructs

| Construct                          | Operational definition                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Willingness to purchase (PW)       | The level of consumers' willingness or desire to choose ODOP products, now and in the future, including choosing ODOP as a substitute for comparable imported goods, planning a near-future purchase, and being willing to recommend the product to others. |
| Attitude toward the product (ATT)  | Positive or negative feelings and thoughts toward ODOP products, encompassing perceived benefit to the local community, pride of ownership, and perceived value relative to imported goods.                                                                 |
| Social influence (SI)              | Pressure or influence received from people around the respondent—family, friends, and other important individuals—including influence from social media and recommendations from others that generate interest in the product.                              |
| Perceived behavioral control (PBC) | The respondent's perception of their own readiness and capability to purchase ODOP products, including budget readiness, sufficient information to choose, and independence in the purchase decision.                                                       |
| Perceived product quality (PQ)     | Evaluation of ODOP products against standards of quality, reliability, safety of use or consumption, durability, and suitability for long-term storage.                                                                                                     |
| Packaging and design (PD)          | The external appearance of an ODOP product—visual appeal, modernity, and professionalism—including the clarity of information provided on the packaging.                                                                                                    |
| Price fairness (PF)                | The reasonableness of an ODOP product's price relative to its quality and the value received, and the appropriateness of that price level to the economic status of the student market.                                                                     |

|                                    |                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Accessibility and convenience (AC) | The ease of locating and purchasing ODOP products, including the availability of points of sale, the diversity of distribution channels, and the convenience of product availability when needed. |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

Source: Adapted by the Authors from the Study's Definitions of Terms.

#### ➤ Data Collection Procedure and Research Ethics

Content validity was established by submitting the draft questionnaire to the research advisor for review against the study's objectives and conceptual framework across two rounds of revision before distribution. Following approval, the research team obtained written permission from the academic affairs office of each of the three participating faculties, then distributed the questionnaire to respondents in person on campus and screened returned questionnaires for completeness before entering usable responses into the

analysis. Respondents were informed in a cover statement that participation was voluntary, that their responses would be used solely for the purposes of this research, and that no response would have any adverse effect on them, consistent with standard human-subjects protections for low-risk survey research. As reported in Section 3.3, standardized scale-interpretation criteria (mean ranges) were applied uniformly across all analyses to support comparability with the related studies summarized in Section 2.5.

## IV. RESULTS

#### ➤ Respondent Profile

Table 3 Respondents by Sex (n = 368)

| No. | Category     | Frequency (n) | Percentage (%) |
|-----|--------------|---------------|----------------|
| 1   | Male         | 205           | 55.7           |
| 2   | Female       | 163           | 44.3           |
|     | <b>Total</b> | <b>368</b>    | <b>100.0</b>   |

Source: Field Survey at the National University of Laos, March 2026.

As shown in Table 3, most respondents were male (205; 55.7%), followed by female (163; 44.3%). This near-even split suggests the sample was not distorted by strong gender-based self-selection into the survey, lending confidence that

the opinion and willingness findings reported in Sections 4.2 and 4.3 reflect a broadly representative cross-section of the student population rather than a single-gender viewpoint.

Table 4 Respondents by Age (n = 368)

| No. | Category           | Frequency (n) | Percentage (%) |
|-----|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| 1   | Under 18 years     | 12            | 3.3            |
| 2   | 18–20 years        | 169           | 45.9           |
| 3   | 21–23 years        | 172           | 46.7           |
| 4   | 24–26 years        | 11            | 3.0            |
| 5   | 27 years and above | 4             | 1.1            |
|     | <b>Total</b>       | <b>368</b>    | <b>100.0</b>   |

Source: Field Survey at the National University of Laos, March 2026.

Most respondents were aged 21–23 years (172; 46.7%), closely followed by those aged 18–20 years (169; 45.9%). Respondents under 18 (12; 3.3%), aged 24–26 (11; 3.0%), and 27 and above (4; 1.1%) formed small shares. This age concentration—more than 92 percent of respondents fell

between 18 and 23 years—closely tracks the university's typical undergraduate age profile, strengthening the applicability of the findings to the broader NUOL student population rather than to a narrow or atypical age band.

Table 5 Respondents by Faculty (n = 368)

| No. | Category                          | Frequency (n) | Percentage (%) |
|-----|-----------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| 1   | Economics and Business Management | 241           | 65.5           |
| 2   | Environmental Sciences            | 26            | 7.1            |
| 3   | Architecture                      | 101           | 27.4           |
|     | <b>Total</b>                      | <b>368</b>    | <b>100.0</b>   |

Source: Field Survey at the National University of Laos, March 2026.

Most respondents were from the Faculty of Economics and Business Management (241; 65.5%), followed by Architecture (101; 27.4%) and Environmental Sciences (26; 7.1%). This distribution mirrors the underlying population structure described in Section 3.2, in which the Faculty of

Economics and Business Management accounts for the largest share of the three participating faculties, so the sample's faculty composition is unlikely to bias the opinion and willingness results toward any single disciplinary perspective.

Table 6 Respondents by Average Monthly Income (n = 368)

| No. | Category                | Frequency (n) | Percentage (%) |
|-----|-------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| 1   | Below 1,000,000 LAK     | 119           | 32.3           |
| 2   | 1,000,001–2,000,000 LAK | 153           | 41.6           |
| 3   | 2,000,001–3,000,000 LAK | 45            | 12.2           |
| 4   | Above 3,000,000 LAK     | 51            | 13.9           |
|     | <b>Total</b>            | <b>368</b>    | <b>100.0</b>   |

Source: Field Survey at the National University of Laos, March 2026.

Most respondents reported an average monthly income of 1,000,001–2,000,000 LAK (153; 41.6%), followed by below 1,000,000 LAK (119; 32.3%), above 3,000,000 LAK (51; 13.9%), and 2,000,001–3,000,000 LAK (45; 12.2%). That more than seventy percent of respondents reported a

monthly income at or below 2,000,000 LAK underscores the price-sensitive character of this consumer segment, a pattern consistent with the salience of price fairness as an opinion dimension discussed in Section 4.2 and Section 5.

Table 7 Prior ODOP Purchase Experience (n = 368)

| No. | Category             | Frequency (n) | Percentage (%) |
|-----|----------------------|---------------|----------------|
| 1   | Has purchased before | 234           | 63.6           |
| 2   | Has never purchased  | 134           | 36.4           |
|     | <b>Total</b>         | <b>368</b>    | <b>100.0</b>   |

Source: Field Survey at the National University of Laos, March 2026.

Most respondents had previously purchased ODOP products (234; 63.6%), while 134 (36.4%) had not. Respondents who had never purchased ODOP products still completed the remaining sections, since the objectives covered the opinions and willingness of both prior and non-prior buyers. The nearly two-to-one ratio of prior buyers to

non-buyers indicates that ODOP products already enjoy meaningful market penetration among NUOL students, providing a base of first-hand experience from which the opinion ratings in Section 4.2 were most plausibly formed, while the sizeable minority of non-buyers (36.4%) represents an addressable segment for future demand growth.

Table 8 ODOP Product Types Known to Respondents (Multiple Response)

| No. | Product type                    | Frequency (n) | Percentage (%) |
|-----|---------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| 1   | Handwoven textiles              | 152           | 20.5           |
| 2   | Basketry                        | 119           | 16.1           |
| 3   | Wood carving                    | 110           | 14.9           |
| 4   | Metal and precious-metal crafts | 88            | 11.9           |
| 5   | Pottery                         | 78            | 10.5           |
| 6   | Food and beverages              | 125           | 16.9           |
| 7   | Traditional medicine            | 68            | 9.2            |
|     | <b>Total</b>                    | <b>740</b>    | <b>100.0</b>   |

Source: Field Survey at the National University of Laos, March 2026.

The most widely recognized ODOP category was handwoven textiles (152; 20.5%), followed by food and beverages (125; 16.9%), basketry (119; 16.1%), wood carving (110; 14.9%), metal and precious-metal crafts (88; 11.9%), pottery (78; 10.5%), and traditional medicine (68; 9.2%). That handicraft categories collectively accounted for the largest share of recognition, ahead of food and beverages

and traditional medicine, suggests that tangible, visually distinctive craft items are currently the most visible face of the ODOP brand among students—consistent with the strong performance of the packaging and design dimension reported in Table 13.

#### ➤ Students' Opinions Toward ODOP Products

Table 9 Attitude Toward the Product (ATT)

| Item                                                    | Mean        | S.D.     | Level       |
|---------------------------------------------------------|-------------|----------|-------------|
| I have a good attitude toward ODOP products             | 3.76        | 0.98     | High        |
| ODOP products benefit the local community               | 3.80        | 0.77     | High        |
| Buying ODOP products is a good decision                 | 3.73        | 0.89     | High        |
| I feel proud to buy ODOP products                       | 3.71        | 0.81     | High        |
| ODOP products are valuable compared with imported goods | 3.85        | 0.94     | High        |
| <b>Overall</b>                                          | <b>3.76</b> | <b>–</b> | <b>High</b> |

Source: Field Survey at the National University of Laos, March 2026.

Attitude toward ODOP products was high overall (mean = 3.76). The highest-rated item was that ODOP products are valuable compared with imported goods (mean = 3.85), and the lowest was feeling proud to buy ODOP products (mean = 3.71). The narrow spread between the highest- and lowest-rated items (a range of 0.14 points) indicates that students

hold a fairly uniform positive attitude across the different facets of product evaluation, rather than a polarized view in which some attitudinal beliefs are strongly favorable while others lag—a consistency that lends qualitative support to H1 (Section 2.6), which anticipates a positive association between attitude and willingness to purchase.

Table 10 Social Influence (SI)

| Item                                                          | Mean        | S.D. | Level       |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|------|-------------|
| Friends encourage me to buy ODOP products                     | 3.64        | 0.96 | High        |
| My family supports buying ODOP products                       | 3.67        | 0.87 | High        |
| People important to me think I should buy ODOP products       | 3.68        | 0.93 | High        |
| Social media influences my ODOP purchase decisions            | 3.66        | 0.91 | High        |
| Others' recommendations increase my interest in ODOP products | 3.78        | 0.88 | High        |
| <b>Overall</b>                                                | <b>3.68</b> | –    | <b>High</b> |

Source: Field Survey at the National University of Laos, March 2026.

Social influence was high overall (mean = 3.68). Recommendations from others rated highest (mean = 3.78), while friends' encouragement rated lowest (mean = 3.64). Although social influence was the lowest-rated of the seven opinion dimensions overall (Table 16), the relatively higher standing of others' recommendations relative to direct encouragement from friends or family suggests that influence

in this market operates more through indirect, reputational channels than through explicit persuasion—a distinction consistent with the emphasis on normative beliefs in the Theory of Planned Behavior (Ajzen, 1991; Bearden et al., 1989) and with this study's finding that intention to recommend was the single highest-rated willingness item (Table 17).

Table 11 Perceived Behavioral Control (PBC)

| Item                                                    | Mean        | S.D. | Level       |
|---------------------------------------------------------|-------------|------|-------------|
| I can afford to buy ODOP products                       | 3.77        | 0.98 | High        |
| ODOP products are easy for me to find and buy           | 3.62        | 0.79 | High        |
| I have enough information to choose ODOP products       | 3.69        | 0.84 | High        |
| I can freely decide whether or not to buy ODOP products | 3.84        | 0.88 | High        |
| Buying ODOP products is entirely within my control      | 3.98        | 0.91 | High        |
| <b>Overall</b>                                          | <b>3.78</b> | –    | <b>High</b> |

Source: Field Survey at the National University of Laos, March 2026.

Perceived behavioral control was high overall (mean = 3.78). The perception that buying ODOP products is entirely within one's own control rated highest (mean = 3.98), while ease of finding and buying rated lowest (mean = 3.62). The comparatively higher standard deviations recorded for perceived behavioral control (0.79–0.98) relative to the attitude and product-quality items suggest more

heterogeneous views among students regarding their own capacity to purchase ODOP products, plausibly reflecting the income variation documented in Table 6; nonetheless, every item cleared the threshold for a "high" rating, indicating that even lower-income respondents did not perceive purchase as beyond their control.

Table 12 Perceived Product Quality (PQ)

| Item                                                      | Mean        | S.D. | Level       |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|-------------|------|-------------|
| ODOP products are of good quality                         | 3.80        | 0.89 | High        |
| ODOP products are reliable and trustworthy                | 3.68        | 0.81 | High        |
| ODOP products meet acceptable quality standards           | 3.77        | 0.84 | High        |
| ODOP products are safe to use or consume                  | 3.70        | 0.80 | High        |
| ODOP products are durable / can be stored for a long time | 3.84        | 0.87 | High        |
| <b>Overall</b>                                            | <b>3.75</b> | –    | <b>High</b> |

Source: Field Survey at the National University of Laos, March 2026.

Perceived product quality was high overall (mean = 3.75), with durability rated highest (mean = 3.84) and reliability/trustworthiness rated lowest (mean = 3.68). That durability and general product quality rated more highly than reliability and trustworthiness points to a specific, addressable gap: students appear more confident in the

physical robustness of ODOP goods than in the consistency of quality across production batches, an issue producers could address through more visible quality-assurance signalling, consistent with Garvin's (1987) treatment of reliability as a quality dimension distinct from durability.

Table 13 Packaging and Design (PD)

| Item                                              | Mean        | S.D.     | Level       |
|---------------------------------------------------|-------------|----------|-------------|
| ODOP packaging is attractive                      | 3.80        | 0.97     | High        |
| ODOP packaging looks modern and professional      | 3.72        | 0.83     | High        |
| Packaging design influences my purchase decision  | 3.76        | 0.87     | High        |
| ODOP packaging provides clear product information | 3.77        | 0.86     | High        |
| I prefer ODOP products with good packaging design | 3.92        | 0.86     | High        |
| <b>Overall</b>                                    | <b>3.79</b> | <b>–</b> | <b>High</b> |

Source: Field Survey at the National University of Laos, March 2026.

Packaging and design was high overall (mean = 3.79)—the highest-rated dimension. Preference for products with good packaging design rated highest (mean = 3.92), while a modern and professional appearance rated lowest (mean = 3.72). As the highest-rated of the seven dimensions, packaging and design appears to be the strongest current asset

in the ODOP value proposition for student consumers, consistent with Kotler and Keller's (2016) emphasis on packaging as a purchase-influencing product cue and with the comparably strong packaging ratings reported for green products in the United States (Ahmed et al., 2023; Table 1).

Table 14 Price Fairness (PF)

| Item                                                    | Mean        | S.D.     | Level       |
|---------------------------------------------------------|-------------|----------|-------------|
| ODOP products are reasonably priced                     | 3.82        | 0.94     | High        |
| ODOP products are worth their price                     | 3.74        | 0.81     | High        |
| ODOP product prices match product quality               | 3.68        | 0.83     | High        |
| ODOP prices are affordable for students                 | 3.72        | 0.84     | High        |
| I am willing to pay for ODOP products at current prices | 3.96        | 0.90     | High        |
| <b>Overall</b>                                          | <b>3.78</b> | <b>–</b> | <b>High</b> |

Source: Field Survey at the National University of Laos, March 2026.

Price fairness was high overall (mean = 3.78). Willingness to pay at current prices rated highest (mean = 3.96), while price-quality match rated lowest (mean = 3.68). Willingness to pay at current prices scoring markedly higher than perceptions of price-quality match suggests that students are not resisting current ODOP price levels outright, but some

remain uncertain whether that price is fully justified by product quality—a nuance consistent with Monroe's (1990) distinction between price acceptance and perceived price-quality congruence, and one that producers could address by making quality credentials more visible at the point of sale.

Table 15 Accessibility and Convenience (AC)

| Item                                                  | Mean        | S.D.     | Level       |
|-------------------------------------------------------|-------------|----------|-------------|
| ODOP products are easy to find                        | 3.76        | 0.91     | High        |
| ODOP products are sold in convenient locations        | 3.65        | 0.77     | High        |
| Online access makes ODOP products more appealing      | 3.78        | 0.84     | High        |
| ODOP products are always available when I want to buy | 3.78        | 0.87     | High        |
| Convenience of purchase influences my buying decision | 3.82        | 0.90     | High        |
| <b>Overall</b>                                        | <b>3.75</b> | <b>–</b> | <b>High</b> |

Source: Field Survey at the National University of Laos, March 2026.

Accessibility and convenience was high overall (mean = 3.75). Convenience of purchase rated highest (mean = 3.82), while availability in convenient locations rated lowest (mean = 3.65). The comparatively lower rating for availability at convenient physical locations, set against

higher ratings for online access and general availability, points to e-commerce and delivery channels as an underused lever for improving accessibility—an implication consistent with the recommendation in Section 6 to expand online availability.

Table 16 Summary of Opinions Toward ODOP Products Across Seven Dimensions

| Item                          | Mean | S.D. | Level |
|-------------------------------|------|------|-------|
| Attitude toward the product   | 3.76 | 0.58 | High  |
| Social influence              | 3.68 | 0.64 | High  |
| Perceived behavioral control  | 3.78 | 0.62 | High  |
| Perceived product quality     | 3.75 | 0.59 | High  |
| Packaging and design          | 3.79 | 0.62 | High  |
| Price fairness                | 3.78 | 0.62 | High  |
| Accessibility and convenience | 3.75 | 0.60 | High  |

|                |             |          |             |
|----------------|-------------|----------|-------------|
| <b>Overall</b> | <b>3.76</b> | <b>–</b> | <b>High</b> |
|----------------|-------------|----------|-------------|

Source: Field Survey at the National University of Laos, March 2026.

Overall, students' opinions toward ODOP products were high (mean = 3.76). Ranked from highest to lowest, the dimensions were packaging and design (3.79); perceived behavioral control and price fairness (3.78 each); attitude toward the product (3.76); accessibility and convenience and perceived product quality (3.75 each); and social influence (3.68). The narrow band separating the highest- and lowest-ranked dimensions (0.11 points) indicates that no single

opinion dimension dominates or lags markedly behind the others, suggesting that student opinion toward ODOP products is broadly and consistently favorable across attitudinal, social, control-related, and product-attribute considerations alike, rather than being driven by any single factor in isolation.

#### ➤ *Students' Willingness to Purchase ODOP Products*

Table 17 Willingness to Purchase (PW)

| Item                                                        | Mean        | S.D.     | Level       |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|----------|-------------|
| I am willing to buy ODOP products                           | 3.77        | 0.94     | High        |
| I am willing to buy ODOP products in the near future        | 3.74        | 0.84     | High        |
| I will choose ODOP products over imported goods             | 3.77        | 0.89     | High        |
| I will recommend ODOP products to others                    | 3.85        | 0.85     | High        |
| I plan to buy ODOP products whenever I have the opportunity | 3.77        | 0.93     | High        |
| <b>Overall</b>                                              | <b>3.77</b> | <b>–</b> | <b>High</b> |

Source: Field Survey at the National University of Laos, March 2026.

Willingness to purchase was high overall (mean = 3.77). The intention to recommend ODOP products to others rated highest (mean = 3.85), while willingness to buy in the near future rated lowest (mean = 3.74). The consistently high ratings across all five willingness items, together with comparatively wide standard deviations (0.84–0.94) relative to the opinion items in Table 9, indicate that while the average level of willingness to purchase is high, individual students vary somewhat more in their behavioral intentions than in their underlying opinions—an important nuance for producers, since it implies that a favorable opinion does not uniformly translate into an equally strong intention to buy for every student.

## V. DISCUSSION

The findings indicate that students at the National University of Laos hold favorable opinions toward ODOP products and are willing to purchase them, with all measured dimensions at a high level. Packaging and design emerged as the strongest dimension of opinion, underscoring the role of visual appeal and clear product information in shaping student preferences—consistent with marketing-mix perspectives (Kotler & Keller, 2016). The prominence of perceived behavioral control and price fairness aligns with the Theory of Planned Behavior (Ajzen, 1991) and perceived-value theory (Zeithaml, 1988; Dodds et al., 1991): students who feel able to afford and freely choose ODOP products, and who see prices as reasonable, express stronger favorable opinions.

Social influence, though still high, was the lowest-rated opinion dimension, suggesting that personal evaluation and product attributes weigh more heavily than peer or family pressure in this segment. Within social influence, recommendations from others carried the most weight. This connects to the willingness results, where the intention to recommend ODOP products to others was the strongest

expression of purchase willingness. Together, these patterns highlight word-of-mouth as a potentially powerful channel for expanding the ODOP consumer base among young Lao consumers.

The respondent profile—predominantly students with modest monthly incomes—helps explain the salience of affordability and price fairness. The high prior-purchase rate (63.6%) and broad awareness of handwoven textiles and food and beverages indicate that ODOP products already have meaningful market penetration among students, providing a foundation on which producers can build.

Positioned against the eight comparative studies summarized in Table 1, the overall willingness-to-purchase level found among NUOL students (mean = 3.77) falls within the upper-middle of the reported range, above the levels found for green and 4Ps-driven purchase intention in China (Chen, 2025, mean = 3.45; Rakuša & Milfelner, 2025, mean = 3.45; Li et al., 2025, mean = 3.75) but below the levels reported for environmentally framed products and dietary supplements in Thailand (Khunkom, 2020, mean = 4.27; Siriworaphan et al., 2024, mean = 4.16; Songsinsa-at, 2023, mean = 4.10). One plausible explanation is that ODOP products carry a cultural-heritage and community-benefit framing distinct from the environmental or health framing common to the comparator studies; students in the present sample rated ODOP products as benefiting the local community and being valuable relative to imported goods among the highest-scoring individual items (Table 9), suggesting that identity- and heritage-based value, rather than environmental or health value alone, is a salient driver of willingness to purchase in this market segment.

The comparison also lends qualitative support to several of the study's directional hypotheses (Section 2.6). As in Ahmed et al. (2023) and Chen (2025), perceived product quality and packaging/design were among the highest-rated

opinion dimensions in the present study, consistent with H4 and H5. Similarly, price fairness rated as 'high' here (mean = 3.78) rather than 'moderate' as in several comparator studies (Chen, 2025; Li et al., 2025; Rakuša & Milfelner, 2025; Khunkom, 2020), which is consistent with H6 and suggests that current ODOP pricing is comparatively well matched to this student market's ability and willingness to pay. Social influence was the lowest-rated dimension both in this study and in most comparators (Li et al., 2025; Rakuša & Milfelner, 2025; Songsinsa-at, 2023; Khunkom, 2020), a consistent pattern across contexts that is nonetheless compatible with H2, since social influence remained 'high' in absolute terms rather than negligible. Because the present design is descriptive rather than inferential, these comparisons support the plausibility of H1–H7 without constituting a formal test of them; regression- or structural-equation-based confirmation is identified as a priority for future research in Section 6.

From a theoretical standpoint, these findings extend the Theory of Planned Behavior and perceived-value and marketing-mix perspectives to a previously underexamined context—Lao university students' evaluation of a state-promoted local-product initiative—and suggest that heritage and community-benefit framing may function alongside, or in place of, the environmental and health framings that dominate the existing comparative literature. Practically, the results indicate that ODOP producers serving student consumers should prioritize continued investment in packaging and product-quality cues, maintain the current price-fairness positioning rather than assuming students are unable to pay, and treat word-of-mouth and recommendation behavior as the most promising lever for demand growth, given that intention to recommend was both the highest-rated willingness item in this study (Table 17) and a consistently influential mechanism across the comparative literature (Bearden et al., 1989; Crosno et al., 2009).

## VI. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study assessed students' opinions toward ODOP products and their willingness to purchase them at the National University of Laos, based on 368 respondents. Both opinions (overall mean = 3.76) and willingness to purchase (overall mean = 3.77) were at a high level. Packaging and design was the leading opinion dimension, and the intention to recommend ODOP products to others was the leading component of willingness to purchase.

These results point to several practical implications for ODOP producers and policymakers. First, continued investment in attractive, modern packaging and clear product information can further strengthen student preference. Second, maintaining fair, transparent pricing that matches perceived quality is important for a price-sensitive student market. Third, given the strength of recommendation intentions, encouraging word-of-mouth and social-media sharing—for example, through campus events and student ambassadors—may be an efficient way to expand demand. Improving accessibility, including online availability, would

address the comparatively lower ratings for convenient point-of-sale availability.

These findings also speak to the implementation of the Lao PDR's national ODOP policy (Ministry of Industry and Commerce, 2017). Because university students are a near-term, price-sensitive but brand-aware consumer segment, campus-based promotion—such as ODOP showcases, student ambassador schemes, and integration with university procurement or canteen services—represents a low-cost channel through which the policy's poverty-reduction and local-industry objectives can gain traction among a demographic that will shortly enter the workforce as consumers, and in some cases as entrepreneurs, with greater purchasing power.

The study is limited by its use of convenience sampling and its focus on three faculties at a single campus, which constrains generalizability. It is also descriptive, reporting frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations rather than testing causal relationships. Future research could employ probability sampling across a wider range of institutions and apply inferential techniques to examine the determinants of willingness to purchase ODOP products. Future studies should also apply inferential techniques—such as multiple regression or structural equation modeling—to formally test the seven directional hypotheses proposed in Section 2.6 (H1–H7) and to identify which opinion dimensions most strongly predict willingness to purchase, and should consider comparative designs that benchmark Lao ODOP products against the environmentally or health-framed products studied in China, Thailand, and the United States (Table 1) to determine whether heritage-based value operates differently from environmental or health value in driving purchase behavior.

### ➤ Author Contributions

Somchith Sompaseuth: Conceptualization, Supervision, Writing – review & editing. Moukthida Seesothone and Manivone Insomphou: Investigation, Formal analysis, Writing – original draft. Noyphouvanh Syaphay, Keoladda Lianepaseuth, Anousone Phonesavanh, Souksakhone Sichantha, and Bounvilai Sichanthala: Writing – review & editing. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

## DECLARATIONS

### ➤ Ethics Statement

This study followed standard ethical practice for low-risk survey research. Participation was voluntary, respondents were informed in a cover statement that their answers would be used solely for research purposes and would have no adverse effect on them, and no personally identifying information was collected from respondents (Section 3.4).

### ➤ Disclosure Statement

The authors report there are no competing interests to declare.

➤ *Funding*

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

➤ *Data Availability Statement*

The data supporting the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author (S. Sompaseuth) upon reasonable request.

**REFERENCES**

- [1]. Ahmed, R. R., Streimikiene, D., Qadir, H., & Streimikis, J. (2023). Effect of green marketing mix, green customer value, and attitude on green purchase intention: Evidence from the USA. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 30(5), 11473–11495. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-022-22944-7>
- [2]. Ajzen, I. (1985). From intentions to actions: A theory of planned behavior. In J. Kuhl & J. Beckmann (Eds.), *Action control: From cognition to behavior*. Springer.
- [3]. Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179–211. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(91\)90020-T](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T)
- [4]. Ajzen, I. (2002). Perceived behavioral control, self-efficacy, locus of control, and the theory of planned behavior. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 32(4), 665–683.
- [5]. Ajzen, I. (2012). The theory of planned behavior. In P. A. M. Van Lange, A. W. Kruglanski, & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of theories of social psychology* (Vol. 1). Sage Publications.
- [6]. Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (1980). *Understanding attitudes and predicting social behavior*. Prentice-Hall.
- [7]. Bearden, W. O., Netemeyer, R. G., & Teel, J. E. (1989). Measurement of consumer susceptibility to interpersonal influence. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 15(4), 473–481. <https://doi.org/10.1086/209186>
- [8]. Bennett, P. D. (Ed.). (1995). *Dictionary of marketing terms* (2nd ed.). NTC Business Books.
- [9]. Borden, N. H. (1964). The concept of the marketing mix. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 4(2), 2–7.
- [10]. Campbell, M. C. (1999). Perceptions of price unfairness: Antecedents and consequences. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 36(2), 187–199.
- [11]. Chen, Y. S., & Chang, C. H. (2012). Enhance green purchase intentions: The roles of green perceived value, green perceived risk, and green trust. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 30(5), 502–520.
- [12]. Chen, Z. (2025). The influence of marketing mix (4Ps) and brand image on consumers' purchase intention: A case study of Hailan House in Xuhui District, Shanghai. *Siam University E-Research*.
- [13]. Conner, M., Warren, R., Close, S., & Sparks, P. (1999). Alcohol consumption and the theory of planned behavior: An examination of the cognitive mediation of past behavior. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 29(8), 1676–1704.
- [14]. Crosno, J. L., Freling, T. H., & Skinner, S. J. (2009). Does brand social power mean market might? Exploring the influence of brand social power on brand evaluations. *Psychology & Marketing*, 26(2), 91–121.
- [15]. Dodds, W. B., Monroe, K. B., & Grewal, D. (1991). Effects of price, brand, and store information on buyers' product evaluations. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 28(3), 307–319.
- [16]. Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, attitude, intention, and behavior: An introduction to theory and research*. Addison-Wesley.
- [17]. Garvin, D. A. (1987). Competing on the eight dimensions of quality. *Harvard Business Review*, 65(6), 101–109.
- [18]. Howard, J. A. (1994). *Buyer behavior in marketing strategy* (2nd ed.). Prentice Hall.
- [19]. Japan International Cooperation Agency. (n.d.). OVOP (One Village, One Product movement) expanding over the world—Aiming for community revitalization. [https://www.jica.go.jp/english/our\\_work/types\\_of\\_assistance/tech/projects/activities/activities\\_36.html](https://www.jica.go.jp/english/our_work/types_of_assistance/tech/projects/activities/activities_36.html)
- [20]. Khunkom, S. (2020). Attitude, trust, social influence, perceived behavioral control, brand positioning, and price affecting consumers' willingness to purchase local organic products in the Bangkok area [Independent study, Bangkok University].
- [21]. Kim, C., Galliers, R. D., Shin, N., Han, J., & Kim, J. (2012). Factors influencing Internet shopping value and customer repurchase intention. *Electronic Commerce Research and Applications*, 11(4), 374–387.
- [22]. Kim, J., & Pysarchik, D. T. (2000). Predicting purchase intentions for uni-national and bi-national products. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 28(6), 280–291.
- [23]. Kotler, P., & Keller, K. L. (2016). *Marketing management* (15th ed.). Pearson.
- [24]. Li, H., Xaysy, A., & Kaiyavong, S. (2025). Factors affecting willingness to purchase green products among consumers in Liuzhou, Guangxi, China [in Thai]. *Setthakit Paritat [Economic Review]*, 5(2), 996–1012. <https://so12.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/stw/article/view/2200>
- [25]. McCarthy, E. J. (1960). *Basic marketing: A managerial approach*. Richard D. Irwin.
- [26]. McCarthy, E. J., & Perreault, W. D. (1993). *Basic marketing: A global-managerial approach* (11th ed.). Irwin.
- [27]. Ministry of Industry and Commerce of the Lao PDR. (2017). Decision on national One District One Product (ODOP) goods [in Lao]. <http://www.moic.gov.la>
- [28]. Monroe, K. B. (1990). *Pricing: Making profitable decisions* (2nd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- [29]. Phothimat, P., & Ngamsak, T. (2022). Attitude toward behavior, social influence, and perceived behavioral control affecting consumers' willingness to purchase dietary supplement products in Khon Kaen Municipality [in Thai] [Thesis, Khon Kaen University].

- [30]. Porral, C. C., & Lang, M. F. (2014). Private labels: The role of manufacturer identification, brand loyalty and image on purchase intention. *British Food Journal*, 116(11), 1837–1853.
- [31]. Rakuša, N., & Milfelner, B. (2025). Cultural moderators of green product purchase intention: An examination through the lens of the theory of planned behavior. *SAGE Open*, 15(3), 1–20.
- [32]. Siriworaphan, S., et al. (2024). Factors affecting willingness to purchase environmentally friendly products among consumers in Chonburi Province [in Thai]. *Journal of Integrated Social Sciences*, Mahidol University.
- [33]. Songsinsa-at, C. (2023). Influence of planned behavior and moral norms on reusable-product reuse behavior among consumers in Chonburi Province [in Thai] [Thesis, Burapha University].
- [34]. Tariq, M. I., Nawaz, M. R., & Butt, H. A. (2013). Customer perceptions about branding and purchase intention: A study of FMCG in an emerging market. *Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research*, 3(2), 340–347.
- [35]. 2AL. (2018). Documentary: Lao National One District One Product in 2018 [Video]. YouTube. <https://youtu.be/bhEccCQwaw0>
- [36]. Wang, J., Zhang, D., Yu, X., & Hu, Y. (2018). The theory of planned behavior as a model for understanding tourists' behavioral intentions. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 27, 40–46.
- [37]. Yamane, T. (1967). *Statistics: An introductory analysis* (2nd ed.). Harper & Row.
- [38]. Zeithaml, V. A. (1988). Consumer perceptions of price, quality, and value: A means-end model and synthesis of evidence. *Journal of Marketing*, 52(3), 2–22.
- [39]. Zeithaml, V. A., Berry, L. L., & Parasuraman, A. (1990). *Delivering quality service: Balancing customer perceptions and expectations*. Free Press.