*Jurnal Mantik, 7 (2) (2023), ISSN 2685-4236 (Online)*

Published by:Institute of Computer Science (IOCS)

Jurnal Mantik

Journal homepage: www.iocscience.org/ejournal/index.php/mantik

# The direct and indirect effect on online purchase decision through consumer satisfaction

Agus Nakkok Simanjuntak[1], Leonardo Davidsi Sipayung[2], Sri Ida Royani Simanjuntak[3], Orlando Steven[4], Lasma Lenida Rosinta Sianipar[5]

[1,2,3,4,5]Management/Faculty of Economics and Business/Management, HKBP Nommensen University

A R T I C L E I N F O

*Article history:*

Accepted Aug 16, 2023
Revised Aug 21, 2023
Accepted Aug 24, 2023

*Keywords:*

Consumer Satisfaction;
Digital Marketing;
E-wom;
Online Purchase Decision;
Product Quality;
Promotion.

ABSTRACT

This study aims to analyze the effect of product quality, promotion, digital marketing and e-wom as independent variables on online purchasing decisions as the dependent variable through consumer satisfaction as a mediating variable. The test analysis model uses the outer model, inner model, direct effects, and specific indirect effects using the Smart PLS 4 application. Directly, the results of this study indicate that promotions, e-WOM, and consumer satisfaction have a positive and significant effect on online purchasing decision, while product quality and digital marketing have no significant effect on online purchasing decision. Digital marketing and e-wom have a positive and significant effect on consumer satisfaction, while product quality and promotions have no significant effect on customer satisfaction. Indirectly digital marketing and e-ewom have a positive and significant effect on online purchasing decision through consumer satisfaction. Meanwhile, product quality and promotion have no significant effect on online purchasing decision through consumer satisfaction.



*Corresponding Author:*

Leonardo Davidsi Sipayung,
Management/Faculty of Economics and Business/Management,
HKBP Nommensen University,
Karya Sepakat Street No. 2, Medan, North Sumatera, 20146, Indonesia.
Email: leonardo.sipayung@uhn.ac.id

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The development of an increasingly modern era has brought the role of technology today to develop massively and rapidly so as to bring changes to consumer behavior in meeting their daily needs. The emergence of a new paradigm has changed the flow of consumer behavior from conventional to online sales. This change in consumer behavior is due to the benefits obtained by consumers rather than online purchases which are more practical and efficient in time, effort and cost. The existence of online technology currently provides other benefits for consumers who do not have to bother leaving the house to buy their needs because all of this can be fulfilled through technological developments. Therefore, sellers must also be able to follow online market trends that are very popular with today's consumers. With the current online marketplace, it also helps sellers expand their marketing targets.

Factors that influence a person to make a purchase are very diverse. There are several factors that can influence consumer purchasing decisions, including product quality, promotions, digital marketing and recommendations from other consumers through online media or often called electronic word of mouth (e-wom). Without ruling out the role of other factors, these factors deserve special attention in product marketing because they are the main concern of consumers. Sellers must really be able to treat consumers well so that consumers feel valued, that way a good relationship will be established between sellers and buyers so that consumers will not move to another place.

The first factor that influences consumer decisions in making purchases is product quality. Consumers will compare the quality of online shop products with product quality by direct (ordinary) purchases. This comparison can provide answers as to which product quality is better, whether online shop products or regular products. Manufacturers are competing to improve their products so that they are of good quality, so that this makes consumers interested in purchasing these products (Kotler & Gary, 2016). Quality products have more opportunities to be glanced at by potential customers until these potential customers finally decide to buy (Kotler & Amstrong, 2018). The second factor that influences consumer decisions in making purchases is promotions carried out by company management. Promotion with advertising provides information on new products that are unique and interesting as well as promotions in giving discounts or giving coupons which are what consumers are waiting for. The right promotion can increase sales for the company as well as be a factor that influences consumers in purchasing decisions.

The third factor that influences consumers in making purchases is digital marketing. According (Rachmadi, 2020), digital marketing is a technology in marketing products and services that must use digital media. The media used for digital marketing are websites, social media, e-mail marketing, video marketing, advertising and search engine optimization (SEO). The successful implementation of correct digital marketing will have a positive impact in encouraging product or service dissemination to reach the company's target market. And the fourth factor that can lead to purchasing decisions is the positive or negative influence that exists in electronic media or what is called electronic word of mouth. The effectiveness of electronic word of mouth is more effective than word of mouth communication in the offline world, because of the great accessibility and high reach where consumers use internet media with the aim of sharing their own experiences with a brand, product, or service they have ever heard of. experience it yourself. (Irnandha, 2016), also explained that consumer satisfaction is a very decisive factor in marketing, otherwise customer disappointment in providing services can lead to the destruction of the company in the future. The level of consumer satisfaction with the products sold is very important for the company, because the interest in making purchases is strongly influenced by consumer satisfaction factors.

The difference between this study and previous research is that there is a mediating variable that connects the independent variables to the dependent variable, making online purchasing decisions indirectly. The mediating variable in this study is customer satisfaction. Based on previous studies, it has been concluded that there is a relationship between product quality, promotion, digital marketing, and e-WOM on online purchasing decisions through customer satisfaction. Therefore, the study in this research is the Effect of Product Quality, Promotion, Digital Marketing, and E-wom on Online Purchasing Decisions with Customer Satisfaction as a Mediating Variable.

## 2. RESEARCH METHOD

This study used a quantitative method by distributing questionnaires via google form to HKBP Nommensen Faculty of Economics and Business students who had made online purchases. The variables used in this research are product quality (X1), promotion (X2),

digital marketing (X3), and e-wom (X4) as independent variables. Online purchase decision (Y) as the dependent variable, and consumer satisfaction (Z) as a mediating variable. The scale used is a Likert scale, 5 categories of answers consisting of (1) strongly disagree (2) disagree (3) neutral (4) agree (5) strongly agree.

The sampling technique uses a nonprobability purposive sampling method. Determining the number of samples using the Hair formula because the size of the population is not known with certainty. According to (Hair et al., 2010) the number of representative samples depends on the number of indicators multiplied by 5 to 10. The number of samples in this study is the number of indicators (33) multiplied by (8) = 264, so the number of samples in this study is 264. Data analysis uses descriptive analysis and Partial Least Squares-Structural Equation Modelling (PLS-SEM). PLS-SEM analysis uses two models, namely the measurement model (outer model) and the structural model (inner model).

The measurement model (outer model) represents how the measured variable represents the construct or variable. If the variable measurement characteristics in the evaluation of the measurement model are acceptable, then proceed with the evaluation of the structural model. The steps for evaluating the measurement model in this study are convergent validity, discriminant validity, and reliability. Meanwhile, the structural model (inner model) reveals the dependency relationship between independent and dependent variables or constructs. In this study to evaluate the structural model is assessed based on the coefficient of determination ($R^2$) and hypothesis test.

## 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

### 3.1 Respondent Descriptive

The following table presents the descriptive results of the respondents. The characteristics of the respondents observed in this study included gender, majors, and frequently used online shop.

Table 1. Characteristics of Respondent based on Gender

| Gender | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Male | 60 | 23% |
| Female | 204 | 77% |
| Total | 264 | 100% |

*Source: Research results, 2023*

Table 1 presents 60 male respondents (23%) and 204 female respondents (77%). These results indicate that the majority of respondents are female.

Table 2. Characteristics of Respondent based on Majors

| Gender | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Management | 132 | 50% |
| Accounting | 114 | 43% |
| Tax Administration | 18 | 7% |
| Total | 264 | 100% |

*Source: Research results, 2023*

Table 2 presents 132 management majors (50%), accounting majors 114 (43%), and tax administration majors 18 (7%). These results indicate that the majority of respondents are majors in management.

Table 3. Characteristics of Respondent based on Frequently Used Online Shop

| Frequently Used Online Shop | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Bibli | 2 | 1% |
| Bukalapak | 54 | 20% |
| Tokopedia | 95 | 36% |
| Lazada | 6 | 2% |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Shopee | 107 | 41% |
| Total | 264 | 100% |

*Source: Research results, 2023*

Table 3 presents respondents who used the Bibli online shop as many as 2 people (1%), Bukalapak as many as 54 people (20%), Tokopedia as many as 95 people (36%), Lazada as many as 6 people (2%), and Shopee as many as 107 people (41%). These results show that the majority of respondents use Shopee.

3.2 Data Analysis

The measurement model or outer model is a model that shows where each indicator relates to its latent variable. In this study there are six latent variables that are measured by 33 indicators. Convergent validity testing is carried out to find out how far the latent variable explains the variance of the indicator. In this study, convergent validity was assessed by evaluating the outer loading of the indicators and the Average Variance Extracted (AVE). The minimum value set for outer loading must be greater than or equal to 0.7 (≥0.7), therefore it can be said to be valid and meets convergent validity. Meanwhile, convergent validity as measured by AVE must be at least 0.5 or higher (≥0.5). AVE value of 0.5 or higher indicates that on average the variable or construct can explain more than half of the variance of the indicators.

Table 4. The first Iteration Loading Factor Value

| Variable | Indicator | Outer Loading | Variable | Indicator | Outer Loading |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PRODUCT QUALITY | KP1 | 0,573 | E-WOM | EW1 | 0,784 |
| | KP2 | 0,696 | | EW2 | 0,867 |
| | KP3 | 0,598 | | EW3 | 0,835 |
| | KP4 | 0,739 | | EW4 | 0,878 |
| | KP5 | 0,646 | CONSUMER SATISFACTION | KK1 | 0,507 |
| | KP6 | 0,733 | | KK2 | 0,701 |
| | KP7 | 0,740 | | KK3 | 0,825 |
| | KP8 | 0,647 | | KK4 | 0,825 |
| | KP9 | 0,696 | | KK5 | 0,848 |
| PROMOTION | P1 | 0,897 | | KK6 | 0,783 |
| | P2 | 0,797 | ONLINE PURCHASE DECISION | KPO1 | 0,776 |
| | P3 | 0,785 | | KPO2 | 0,825 |
| | P4 | 0,904 | | KPO3 | 0,769 |
| DIGITAL MARKETING | DM1 | 0,826 | | KPO4 | 0,792 |
| | DM2 | 0,841 | | | |
| | DM3 | 0,644 | | | |
| | DM4 | 0,842 | | | |
| | DM5 | 0,708 | | | |
| | DM6 | 0,821 | | | |

*Source: Research results, 2023*

Table 4 shows that the majority of the indicators for each variable in this study have a loading factor value greater than 0.7 and are said to be valid. In addition, there are 8 indicators that have loading factor value of less than 0.7, in other words, if loading factor value has a low level of validity, so they need to be eliminated or removed from the model.

Table 5. The Second Iteration Loading Factor Value and AVE Value

| Variable | Indicator | Outer Loading | AVE Value | Variable | Indicator | Outer Loading | AVE Value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PRODUCT QUALITY | PQ4 | 0,841 | 0,718 | E-WOM | EW1 | 0,782 | 0,708 |
| | PQ6 | 0,847 | | | EW2 | 0,868 | |
| | PQ7 | 0,854 | | | EW3 | 0,836 | |
| PROMOTION | P1 | 0,769 | 0,625 | CONSUMER SATISFACTION | EW4 | 0,878 | |
| | P2 | 0,828 | | | CS2 | 0,799 | |
| | P3 | 0,774 | | | CS3 | 0,809 | |
| | P4 | 0,792 | | | CS4 | 0,850 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| DIGITAL MARKETING | DM1 | 0,814 | 0,676 | ONLINE PURCHASE DECISION | CS5 | 0,821 | 0,673 |
| | DM2 | 0,851 | | | CS6 | 0,823 | |
| | DM4 | 0,850 | | | OPD1 | 0,775 | |
| | DM5 | 0,739 | | | OPD2 | 0,805 | |
| | DM6 | 0,851 | | | OPD3 | 0,803 | |
| | | | | | | | 0,644 |
| | | | | | OPD4 | 0,826 | |

*Source: Research results, 2023*

Table 5 shows that all outer loading values for each indicator are greater than 0.7 and the AVE value is greater than 0.5, therefore all indicators in this study are declared valid. Discriminant validity testing is carried out to evaluate the extent to which a variable differs from other variables or constructs. In this study discriminant validity was measured by two measures, namely cross-loadings and the Fornell Larcker criterion. An indicator's outer loading on the related variable must be greater than any cross-loadings, (i.e., the correlations) on the other variables. Meanwhile, to meet the criteria for discriminant validity, the Fornell-Larcker criterion compares the square root of the AVE value with the correlation of latent variables.

Table 6. Cross Loading Value

| Indicator | Variable | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Quality Product | Promotion | Digital Marketing | E-wom | Customer Satisfaction | Online Purchase Decision |
| PQ4 | 0,841 | 0.467 | 0.548 | 0.446 | 0.351 | 0.306 |
| PQ6 | 0,847 | 0.405 | 0.528 | 0.499 | 0.413 | 0.346 |
| PQ7 | 0,854 | 0.477 | 0.539 | 0.521 | 0.423 | 0.308 |
| P1 | 0,604 | 0.769 | 0.682 | 0.582 | 0.499 | 0.467 |
| P2 | 0,403 | 0.828 | 0.504 | 0.614 | 0.486 | 0.524 |
| P3 | 0,292 | 0.774 | 0.437 | 0.555 | 0.429 | 0.500 |
| P4 | 0,371 | 0.792 | 0.531 | 0.513 | 0.439 | 0.482 |
| DM1 | 0,541 | 0.628 | 0.814 | 0.533 | 0.501 | 0.470 |
| DM2 | 0,564 | 0.631 | 0.851 | 0.578 | 0.582 | 0.446 |
| DM4 | 0,578 | 0.531 | 0.850 | 0.572 | 0.565 | 0.465 |
| DM5 | 0,388 | 0.474 | 0.739 | 0.513 | 0.463 | 0.394 |
| DM6 | 0,521 | 0.533 | 0.851 | 0.627 | 0.588 | 0.408 |
| EW1 | 0,504 | 0.638 | 0.638 | 0.782 | 0.551 | 0.489 |
| EW2 | 0,472 | 0.531 | 0.510 | 0.868 | 0.606 | 0.513 |
| EW3 | 0,496 | 0.616 | 0.597 | 0.836 | 0.552 | 0.527 |
| EW4 | 0,480 | 0.633 | 0.576 | 0.878 | 0.600 | 0.579 |
| CS2 | 0,435 | 0.432 | 0.584 | 0.534 | 0.799 | 0.495 |
| CS3 | 0,305 | 0.488 | 0.533 | 0.495 | 0.809 | 0.555 |
| CS4 | 0,424 | 0.495 | 0.532 | 0.597 | 0.850 | 0.604 |
| CS5 | 0,390 | 0.460 | 0.555 | 0.573 | 0.821 | 0.554 |
| CS6 | 0,370 | 0.530 | 0.503 | 0.612 | 0.823 | 0.601 |
| OPD1 | 0.380 | 0.506 | 0.469 | 0.550 | 0.630 | 0.775 |
| OPD2 | 0.324 | 0.507 | 0.454 | 0.513 | 0.521 | 0.805 |
| OPD3 | 0.200 | 0.464 | 0.297 | 0.451 | 0.461 | 0.803 |
| OPD4 | 0.292 | 0.522 | 0.466 | 0.490 | 0.572 | 0.826 |

*Source: Research results, 2023*

Table 6 shows that each indicator has the highest loading factor value for the intended construct compared to the loading factor value for other constructs, therefore all indicators in the study are declared valid.

Table 7. Fornell-Larcker Criterion

| Variable | Quality Product | Promotion | Digital Marketing | E-wom | Online Purchase Decision | Consumer Satisfaction |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Product Quality | 0.847 | | | | | |
| Promotion | 0.687 | 0.791 | | | | |
| Digital Marketing | 0.659 | 0.687 | 0.822 | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| E-wom | 0.531 | 0.627 | 0.686 | 0.842 | | |
| Online Purchase Decision | 0.635 | 0.579 | 0.469 | 0.378 | 0.803 | |
| Consumer Satisfaction | 0.681 | 0.717 | 0.587 | 0.624 | 0.529 | 0.821 |

*Source: Research results, 2023*

Table 7 shows that all AVE root values of all variables have the highest correlation values with other variables, so it can be concluded that the model in this study has a good discriminant validity value. Apart from being measured by assessing convergent validity and discriminant validity, the outer model can also be measured by looking at the composite reliability and Cronbach's alpha values. A latent variable can be said to have good reliability if the value of composite reliability and Cronbach's alpha is greater than 0.7.

Table 8. Reliability Test

| Variable | Composite Reliability | Cronbach's Alpha |
|---|---|---|
| Product Quality | 0,807 | 0,804 |
| Promotion | 0,801 | 0,800 |
| Digital Marketing | 0,884 | 0,880 |
| E-wom | 0,865 | 0,862 |
| Consumer Satisfaction | 0,880 | 0,879 |
| Online Purchase Decision | 0,818 | 0,816 |

*Source: Research results, 2023*

Table 8 shows that all latent variables measured in this study have composite reliability and cronbachs alpha values greater than 0.7, therefore it can be said that all latent variables are reliable. Next is testing the inner model (structural model). The inner model can be evaluated by looking at $R^2$ (indicator reliability) for the dependent variable and hypothesis test. The higher the R2 value means the better the prediction model of the proposed research model. The path coefficients value indicates the level of significance in hypothesis testing.

Table 9. $R^2$ Value

| Variable | $R^2$ |
|---|---|
| Consumer Satisfaction | 0,540 |
| Online Purchase Decision | 0,557 |

*Source: Research results, 2023*

Table 9 shows the $R^2$ value of the consumer satisfaction variable of 0.540 and the online purchase decision of 0.557. This explains that the variables of product quality, promotion, digital marketing, and e-wom have an influence on consumer satisfaction by 54% and 55.7% on online purchasing decisions, the remaining 46% and 44.3% are influenced by other variables outside this research. Path coefficients are used to show the direct effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable. Meanwhile, specific indirect effects are used to show the indirect effect of the independent variables on the dependent variable through mediating variables. A hypothesis can be accepted or rejected by paying attention to the significance value between variables, t-statistics, and p-values. These values are seen from the results of bootstrapping and the rules of thumb used in this study is the t-statistic > 1.96 with a significance level of p-value <0.05 (5%) and the beta coefficient is positive.

Table 10. Path Coefficients

| Relationship between Variable | Original sample (O) | T-statistics (\|O/STDEV\|) | P-values | Information |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Product Quality (X1) -> Consumer Satisfaction (Z) | -0.025 | 0.332 | 0.740 | No Effect |
| Product Quality (X1) -> Online Purchase Decision (Y) | -0.059 | 0.996 | 0.319 | No Effect |
| Promotion (X2) -> Consumer Satisfaction (Z) | 0.068 | 0.913 | 0.361 | No Effect |
| Promotion (X2) -> Online Purchase Decision (Y) | 0.305 | 4.449 | 0.000 | Take Effect |
| Digital Marketing (X3) -> Consumer Satisfaction (Z) | 0.341 | 3.719 | 0.000 | Take Effect |
| Digital Marketing (X3) -> Online Purchase Decision (Y) | -0.054 | 0.821 | 0.412 | No Effect |
| E-wom (X4) -> Consumer Satisfaction (Z) | 0.418 | 4.437 | 0.000 | Take Effect |
| E-wom (X4) -> Online Purchase Decision (Y) | 0.167 | 2.349 | 0.019 | Take Effect |
| Consumer Satisfaction (Z) -> Online Purchase Decision (Y) | 0.456 | 7.292 | 0.000 | Take Effect |

*Source: Research results, 2023*

Table 10 shows the direct effect of the independent variables on the dependent variable. The results conclude that digital marketing and e-wom variables have a positive and significant effect on customer satisfaction, while product quality and promotions have no significant effect on customer satisfaction. Furthermore, the promotion, e-word and consumer satisfaction variables have a positive and significant effect on online purchasing decisions, while product quality and digital marketing have no significant effect on online purchasing decisions.

Table 11. Specific Indirect Effects

| Relationship between Variable | Original sample (O) | T-statistics (\|O/STDEV\|) | P-values | Information |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Product Quality (X1) -> Consumer Satisfaction (Z) -> Online Purchase Decision (Y) | -0.011 | 0.330 | 0.741 | No Effect |
| Promotion (X2) -> Consumer Satisfaction (Z) -> Online Purchase Decision (Y) | 0.031 | 0.886 | 0.376 | No Effect |
| Digital Marketing (X3) -> Consumer Satisfaction (Z) -> Online Purchase Decision (Y) | 0.155 | 3.342 | 0.001 | Take Effect |
| E-wom (X4) -> Consumer Satisfaction (Z) -> Online Purchase Decision (Y) | 0.191 | 4.011 | 0.000 | Take Effect |

*Source: Research results, 2023*

Table 11 shows the indirect effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable through mediating variables. The results conclude that digital marketing and e-wom variables have a positive and significant effect on online purchasing decisions through customer satisfaction, while product quality and promotion variables have no significant effect on purchasing decisions through customer satisfaction.

Table 12. Summary of Hypothesis Testing Results

| | Hypothesis | Information | Previous Research | Information |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| H1 | Product quality has a positive and significant effect on consumer satisfaction | Rejected | (Sinollah et al., 2022) | Supported |
| | | | | Not Supported |
| | | | (Handayani & Hidayat, 2022) | Supported |
| H2 | Promotion has a positive and significant effect on consumer satisfaction | Rejected | (Nursaidah et al., 2022) | Supported |
| | | | | Not Supported |
| | | | (Utomo et al., 2023) | Supported |
| H3 | Digital marketing has a positive and significant effect on consumer satisfaction | Accepted | (Inkiriwang et al., 2022) | Supported |
| | | | | Not Supported |
| | | | (Fadjri & Silitonga, 2018) | Supported |
| H4 | E-wom has a positive and significant effect on consumer satisfaction | Accepted | (Mussalman & Madiawati, 2022) | Supported |
| | | | (Pangastuti & Tjahjaningsih, 2023) | Not Supported |
| H5 | Product quality has a positive and significant effect on online purchase decision | Rejected | (Nadiya & Wahyuningsih, 2020) | Not Supported |
| | | | (Sari & Harti, 2021) | Supported |
| H6 | Promotion has a positive and significant effect on online purchase decision | Accepted | (Monica & Bahrun, 2020) | Supported |
| | | | (Wintang & Pasharibu, 2021) | Supported |
| H7 | Digital Marketing has a positive and significant effect on online purchase decision | Rejected | (Sartika, 2022) | Supported |
| | | | | Not Supported |
| | | | (Yolandha et al., 2022) | Supported |
| H8 | E-wom has a positive and significant effect on online purchase decision | Accepted | (Kadi et al., 2021) | Supported |
| | | | | Not Supported |
| | | | (Sualang et al., 2023) | Supported |
| H9 | Consumer satisfaction has a positive and significant effect on online purchase decision | Accepted | (Cesariana et al., 2022) | Supported |
| | | | | Not Supported |
| | | | (Arinada & Kurniawati, 2022) | Supported |
| H10 | Product quality has a positive and significant effect on online purchase decision through customer satisfaction | Rejected | (Utomo et al., 2023) | Not Supported |
| | | | | Not Supported |
| | | | (Wijayanti et al., 2023) | Supported |
| H11 | Promotion has a positive and significant effect on online purchase decision through customer satisfaction | Rejected | (Utomo et al., 2023) | Supported |
| H12 | Digital Marketing has a positive and significant effect on online purchase decision through customer satisfaction | Accepted | (Utomo et al., 2023) | Supported |
| | | | (Wijayanti et al., 2023) | Supported |
| H13 | E-wom has a positive and significant effect on online purchase decision through customer satisfaction | Accepted | (Nur & Octavia, 2022) | Supported |
| | | | (Pranata, 2021) | Supported |

*Source: Research results, 2023*

Table 12 shows a summary of the results of hypothesis testing, with the results that it can be concluded that there were 7 hypotheses that were accepted, namely hypotheses 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 12, and 13, while there were 6 hypotheses that were rejected, namely hypotheses 1, 2, 5, 7, 10, and 11. Each hypothesis has previous studies that are either in line with the research results or not in line with the research results.

## 4. CONCLUSION

From the results of the discussion, it can be concluded that product quality does not have a significant effect on customer satisfaction and online purchase decisions. Promotions do not have a significant effect on customer satisfaction, but have a positive and significant effect on online purchase decisions. Digital marketing has no significant

effect on online purchasing decisions but has a positive and significant effect on consumer satisfaction. E-wom has a positive and significant effect on both consumer satisfaction and online purchasing decisions. Consumer satisfaction has a positive and significant effect on online purchasing decisions. Indirectly product quality and promotions have no significant effect on online purchasing decisions through consumer satisfaction. Meanwhile, digital marketing and e-wom have a positive and significant effect on online purchasing decisions through customer satisfaction. The results of this study support that in the current era of globalization, sources of information easily reach the public through online media, and also have an impact on the world of marketing. Therefore, every online shop is expected to focus more on communication in influencing online purchasing decisions and consumer satisfaction through digital marketing and e-WOM. As for suggestions for future researchers to use data analysis techniques more than one software such as AMOS, LISREL, GSCA, and TETRAD. The results of inconsistent previous studies will be validated by comparisons using more than one software. Therefore, the variables that influence online purchasing decisions and consumer satisfaction will be more valid and more reliable.

REFERENCES


Arinada, R. E., & Kurniawati, O. (2022). The Effect of E-commerce and Customer Satisfaction on Purchase Decision at Ayam Geprek Mercon Surabaya. *Jurnal EKSEKUTIF*, *19*(2), 139–148.

Cesariana, C., Juliansyah, F., & Fitriyani, R. (2022). Purchase Decision Model through Customer Satisfaction in Marketplace: Product Quality and Service Quality (Marketing Management Literature Review). *Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Dan Ilmu Sosial*, *3*(1), 211–224. https://doi.org/10.38035/jmpis.v3i1

Fadjri, A., & Silitonga, P. (2018). The Influence of Product Quality, Price Perception and Digital Marketing on Customer Satisfaction at Pizza Marzano Pondok Indah Mall 2. *EDUTURISMA*, *3*(2), 1–20.

Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate Data Analysis* (7th ed.). Pearson.

Handayani, L. S., & Hidayat, R. (2022). The Influence of Product Quality, Price, and Digital Marketing on MS Glow Beauty Product Customer Satisfaction. *Jurnal IKRAITH-EKONOMIKA*, *5*(2), 135–145.

Inkiriwang, M. V, Ogi, I. W. J., & Djemly, W. (2022). The Influence of Digital Marketing, Product Quality and Emotional on Consumer Satisfaction of Pinky Kitty Shop Tondano. *Jurnal EMBA*, *10*(3), 589–596.

Irnandha, A. (2016). *The Effect of Service Quality toward Customer Loyalty through Customer Satisfaction of JNE Hijrah Sagan Yogyakarta Area*. https://pustakanet.

Kadi, D. C. A., Purwanto, H., & Ramadani, L. D. (2021). The effect of E-promotion, E-wom and Location on Customer Satisfaction through Purchase Decisions as Intervening Variable. *Management and Business Review*, *5*(2), 224–238. https://doi.org/10.21067/mbr.v5i2.5833

Kotler, P., & Amstrong. (2018). *Marketing Principles* (7th ed.). Salemba Empat.

Kotler, P., & Gary, A. (2016). *Marketing Principles* (9th ed., Vol. 1). Erlangga.

Monica, A., & Bahrun, K. (2020). The Influence of Product Quality, Price, and Promotion on Purchase Decision of Bay Tat Chanaya Cake in Bengkulu City. *Jurnal Manajemen Modal Insani Dan Bisnis*, *1*(2), 174–182.

Mussalman, M. M., & Madiawati, N. (2022). Analysis of the Influence of Experiential Marketing, E-wom and Social Media Advertising on Consumer Satisfaction through Decision to use Bibit Application. *YUME: Journal of Management*, *5*(1), 217–230. https://doi.org/10.37531/yume.vxix.344

Nadiya, F. H., & Wahyuningsih, S. (2020). Influence of Product Quality, Price and Brand Image on Purchasing Decisions Fashion 3Second in the Marketplace. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Unimus*, 1096–1104. http://prosiding.unimus.ac.id

Nur, D. S., & Octavia, A. (2022). The Influence of Electronic Word of Mouth on Purchase Decisions with Consumer Trust as Mediation in Marketplace Shopee in Jambi City. *Jurnal ManajemenTerapan Dan Keuangan (Mankeu)*, *11*(02), 387–399.

Nursaidah, M., Bastian, A. F., & Sukaesih, I. (2022). The Influence of Product Quality, Promotion, and Location on Customer Satisfaction (Case Study of Janji Jiwa Coffee Volume 35, Tangerang City). *Jurnal Ekonomi Bisnis (JEB)*, *28*(1), 149–162.

Pangastuti, C. C., & Tjahjaningsih, E. (2023). The Influence of E-wom and Knowledge on Customer Satisfaction and Their Impact on Loyalty to Scarlett Product Customers (Study on Scarlett Customers in Pati City). *Management Studies and Entrepreneurship Journal*, *4*(3), 2386–2395. http://journal.yrpipku.com/index.php/msej

Pranata, Y. A. (2021). *The Infuence of Web Quality and E-wom on Purchase Decisions with Trust as a Mediating Variable*.

Rachmadi, T. (2020). *The Power of Digital Marketing*. TIGA Ebook.

Sari, I. R., & Harti. (2021). The Influence of Product Quality, Price and Promotion on Purchase Decision.*AKUNTABEL*,*18*(3),444–451. http://journal.feb.unmul.ac.id/index.php/AKUNTABEL

Sartika, S. K. (2022). *The Effect of Digital Marketing, Product Quality, and Electronic Word of Mouth (E-wom) on Purchase Decision for Consumer of Batik Prawesty Bantul*. Universitas Pembangunan Nasional "Veteran."

Sinollah, Wahidah, S. M., & Khoiriyah, N. (2022). Analysis of Product Quality, Price and Service Quality on Mobile Customer Satisfaction. *Journal of Islamic Business and Entrepreneurship*, *1*(1), 1–6. https://doi.org/10.33379/jibe.v1i1.1596

Sualang, G. M. C., Mandey, S. L., & Ogi, I. W. J. (2023). The Influence of Electronic Word of Mouth (E-wom), Price, and Product Quality on Purchase Decisions at PT. Mandala Finance Tbk, Ratahan Branch. *Jurnal EMBA*, *11*(2), 335–344.

Utomo, J., Nursyamsi, J., & Sukarno, A. (2023). Analysis of the Influence of Products, Promotion and Digital Marketing on Purchase Decisions in Online Shopping with Customer Satisfaction as Intervening. *Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Manajemen (JEKMA)*, *2*(1), 100–116.

Wijayanti, D.-, Suyanto, S., & Sukesi, S. (2023). The effect of Digital Marketing, Service Quality, and Product Quality on Purchase Decision through Customer Satisfaction as Intervening Variable during Covid 19 Pandemic. *E-Jurnal Manajemen Universitas Udayana*, *12*(2), 117. https://doi.org/10.24843/ejmunud.2023.v12.i02.p01

Wintang, F. P., & Pasharibu, Y. (2021). Electronic Word of Mouth, Promotion through Instagram social media and Product Quality on Purchasing Decisions. *Jurnal Penelitian Dan Pengembangan Sains Dan Humaniora*, *5*(1), 115–124.

Yolandha, D. P., Setianingsih, W. E., & Nursaidah. (2022). The Influence of Digital Marketing, Electronic Word of Mouth and Price on Customer Purchasing Decision at UMKM Pia Gandrung Glenmore. *Business and Economics Conference in Utilization of Modern Technology*, 439–452. https://journal.unimma.ac.id.