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Abstract
This study aims to find out and complement existing information related to the influence of e-trust, e-satisfaction, and social influence on purchase intention mediated by e-value. This is a survey research that uses quantitative methods with data collection techniques through online questionnaires which were distributed to 700 marketplace consumer respondents who had purchased cell phones or gadgets from January 2023 to June 2023. There were 700 questionnaires distributed and 233 returned, but only 155 were used according to this study's criteria. This research was carried out through a validity test and a reliability test through the MSA test with the KMO and Bartlett tests. The hypothesis test used SEM through SmartPLS 3.3.9 software. The results showed that four of the seven hypotheses proposed in this study were proven positive and significant: the effect of e-trust on e-value and purchase intention, the effect of social influence on e-value and purchase intention, while the other hypotheses which could not be proven (not significant) were the effect of e-satisfaction on e-value and purchase intention, and the effect of e-value on purchase intention. In addition, indirectly, e-value plays a role in mediating the effect of e-trust and social influence on purchase intention because it is able to change (weaken) the significant effect to be insignificant. As for mediating the effect of e-satisfaction on purchase intention, the e-value variable is unable to mediate (strengthen) because the results are not significant or the same as the direct effect of e-satisfaction on purchase intention.
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INTRODUCTION
Trading or selling and buying products via the internet (e-commerce) has increased since Covid-19 was declared as a pandemic around March 2020 until the end of 2021 (Laming, 2020). A number of marketplace sites have sprung up on various digital platforms, such as Tokopedia, Shopee, Lazada, Bukalapak, OLX, and others (Hernikawati, 2021). In addition, there are also several digital marketing platforms in the form of social media marketing (social commerce) with features and products offered, including via Facebook, Instagram, WhatsApp, Twitter, Tiktok, and others (H. Juliana et al., 2023). The increase in purchase intention was not only influenced by the social restrictions that were imposed. This phenomenon cannot be separated from various factors that can influence it, including some of which is the level of trust (Aloysius Rangga Aditya Nalendra et al., 2021). Another purchase intention factor is satisfaction with the services provided (Apriyansyah et al., 2021).
Social influence is also a factor in purchase intention (Yuan & Lou, 2020). In addition, another purchase intention factor is the value obtained (Zeqiri et al., 2022), as well as other internal and external factors related to marketing effectiveness, especially consumer purchase intention (Handayani et al., 2022). Several of these factors have led to increasingly fierce competition dynamics with an increasing number of similar platforms offering the same product marketing concept (Maia et al., 2019). These factors and the dynamics of competition cause some marketplace services that have triumphed in the pandemic period began to feel the impact after the pandemic level experienced a global decline towards the middle of 2022 and was declared ending in the end of 2022. Entering the first quarter of 2023, these signs were seen starting from the mass layoffs of several e-commerce companies, such as JD.ID, Bukalapak, GoTo (Tokopedia), SayurBox, Shopee Indonesia, as written by Solabel and Elevania (Medcom, 2023).

Based on several previous studies, the results show that there are several factors that influence purchase intention, such as perceived value (Aurelia & Nawawi, 2021); perceived value and e-satisfaction (Yulianto, 2022). Perceived value has a significant influence on purchase intention and functions as an intermediary between social commerce features and repurchase intention (Guo & Li, 2022). Perceived value and popularity affect satisfaction and purchase intention (Apriyansyah et al., 2021). Another purchase intention factor is related to social influence, namely the perception of trust from influencers (Wang et al., 2022). Perceived influencer trust influences the purchase intention of certain recommended brands (Puteri Lefina & Hidayat, 2022). Purchase intention is positively and significantly influenced by e-trust (Firman et al., 2021). Online purchases are positively influenced by prices and e-trust (Aloysius Rangga Aditya Nalendra et al., 2021). e-Trust has a positive impact on purchase intention, and even e-trust on sellers in particular has a more significant influence than e-trust on products, which in turn influences purchase intention (Wang et al., 2022).

Furthermore, a positive and significant influence is generated by customer satisfaction on purchase intention (Hafiz & Maulida, 2023). Consumer e-satisfaction has an influence on repurchase intention in e-commerce (Prasetyo & Yusran, 2022). e-satisfaction has proven to have a significant effect on e-trust. Satisfaction felt by consumers from using e-commerce website applications increases consumer confidence in using the website, thereby increasing purchases. Therefore, e-trust has a significant effect on purchase intention (Anggorogiri, 2022). While related to e-value factors, there is a positive relationship between e-trust and e-value (Pradhana et al., 2021). Influencer trust influences the expected brand or product value or brand expected value (Puteri Lefina & Hidayat, 2022). Customer trust has a positive and significant influence on perceived value (Jyoti Gogoi & Shillong, 2021).

Perceived value in purchases through e-commerce is also positively and significantly affected by e-satisfaction (Aditi et al., 2021). There are 12 factors analyzed that affect perceived value, one of which is customer satisfaction (Shivany, 2013). Customer satisfaction is related to perceived value which strengthens consumer loyalty (Alkufahy et al., 2023). Social influence includes the media, family and friends (peers) which have a strong effect on shaping consumer behavior or orientation (Wang et al., 2022). Social influence also has a positive effect on brand engagement, brand expected value and also purchase intention (Erdiyana et al., 2022). Fashion brand attachment and perceived value are heavily influenced by social influence, especially in the marketing of Muslim fashion (Ahmed et al., 2018).

Apart from finding positive and significant influences, several gaps in findings from previous research results were also found, one of which is that e-trust has a positive and also significant influence on purchase intention, but has a negative effect on perceived risk (Jadil et al., 2022). Social factors, trust and website quality have no effect on online repurchase intentions (Hieronanda & Nugroho, 2021). Gap results from other previous studies show that in the context of live streaming, e-satisfaction does not have a significant effect on purchase intention (Chavee & Vongurai, 2023). Other research also explains that the impact of social influence on purchase intention is also insignificant when the e-trust factor is used as an intervening variable (Victoria & Purwianti, 2022). Social media influencers as a form of social influence or social factors and self-concept have no effect on purchase intention (Hermanda et al., 2019). Social influence has a direct impact on purchase intention, but has no effect if it is mediated by perceived value (Tjokrosaputro & Cokki, 2020). Social influence, habit
(habit) and hedonic motivation (fun) have a direct influence on purchase intention, but social influence and also hedonic motivation do not have a direct effect on purchase intention through habit formation (Rahmiati & Susanto, 2022).

Based on several problems and the results of several previous studies that have been conducted, the purpose of this research is to complete information and data related to the influence of e-trust, e-satisfaction, and social influence on purchase intention where the e-value variable acts as a mediating variable in the marketplace industry after the Covid-19 pandemic. The results of this research are expected to make a real contribution to the field of marketing management theoretically and practically. In addition, it is expected to provide managerial implications for efforts to increase consumer buying interest in a product that is sold in e-commerce through increasing trust, satisfaction, social influence, and value obtained by consumers.

METHODS

This study will apply measurements related to the variables which were being studied, which are adopted from previous studies. Data collection in this study was conducted through a survey method by distributing questionnaires online using the google form application. Measurements were made using a Likert Scale (from 5 strongly agree to 1 strongly disagree). The e-trust variable questionnaire consists of seven statements (Jadil et al., 2022), e-satisfaction six statements (Maia et al., 2019), social influence six statements (Wu & Huang, 2023), e-value six statements (García-Salirrosas et al., 2022), and purchase intention six statements (Wu & Huang, 2023), therefore the total for five variables consists of 31 statements.

The population of respondents in this study were consumers who have purchased cellphones or gadgets through the marketplace in the last six months (January 2023 to June 2023). The references in this research were Tokopedia, Lazada, and Shopee as the largest marketplace platforms in Indonesia. This research was carried out in June 2023. Researchers used a systematic sampling method by grouping responses based on several categories. One of the specific criteria for respondents is having their own income and buying a cellphone or gadget through the marketplace platform in the period from January 2023 to June 2023.

This research was conducted through a validity test for the questionnaire statement items. The validity test was carried out using Kaiser-Mayer-Olkin (KMO) and Measurement of Sampling Adequacy (MSA) with KMO and MSA criteria > 0.5; and Cronbach's Alpha reliability test with criteria ≥ 0.70; AVE ≥ 0.50; assisted by SPSS statistical software. After going through the validity and reliability tests, the questionnaires distributed to the intended research sample during the hypothesis testing were processed using a structural equation model (SEM-PLS) using the SmartPLS (Partial Least Square) statistical software version 3.3.9. provided that the t statistic ≥ 1.96 at a significance level of P Value < 0.05, as well as other supporting indicators (Hair Jr. et al., 2017; Henseler et al., 2014). The number of samples in this study was five times the total of 31 statements, so that the sample used in this study was 155 respondents.
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RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Respondents who contributed to this study were consumers of the Tokopedia, Lazada, and Shopee marketplaces. This research was distributed to 700 respondents and there were 233 respondents who answered the questionnaire, but only 155 respondents who answered the questionnaire according to the criteria in this study. From 155 respondents, the majority were women at 68.39%, when viewed from the area where the respondents lived, almost all of the respondents lived in the Greater Jakarta area (91.61%). The ages of the respondents who answered the questionnaire were almost the same, but with the majority aged between 26-35 years (33.55%) with the majority working as self-employed (37.42%) and with the highest level of education at the bachelor (S1) level (39.35%) and income between IDR 10-20 million per month (35.48%). Respondents have shopped at the marketplace in the last six months 4-6 times (29.05%).

Testing in this study began with testing the validity of the instrument (construct) on the questionnaire statement items through factor analysis using the Kaiser Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy (KMO-MSA) and Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity and showing values > 0.50 for all research variables. Meanwhile, the MSA value based on anti-image correlation analysis for each indicator of each research variable shows a value of > 0.50. The two results of the analysis (extraction) recommend that all indicators or questionnaire statement items from each research variable totaling 31 indicators or statements can be used for further analysis and nothing has to be dropped or rotated (unrotated factor solution). Furthermore, the results of the construct reliability test through Cronbach’s Alpha analysis show that all indicators of each variable produce an alpha value of > 0.70. This means that indicators of all the variables in this study can be used for further analysis.

The results of the validity and reliability tests through factor analysis above are strengthened by the results of the validity and reliability tests of the reflective measurement model, these measurements were carried out based on recommendations from Hair et al. (2017) where the loading factor value required in SmartPLS 3.3.9 is ≥ 0.70. These results indicate that construct validity in this study is acceptable and valid, because all indicators for each variable have a loading factor value that exceeds 0.70.

Figure 2. Structural Equation Model (SEM)

Overall, the results of Composite Reliability (CR) and Average Variance Extracted (AVE) calculations in this study can be considered to meet the specified criteria. According to Hair et al.
(2017), the criteria that must be met are a CR or CA (Composite Alpha) value ≥ 0.70 and an AVE value ≥ 0.50. Calculation results from CR, CA and AVE for the variables e-Trust (CA=0.884; CR=0.909; AVE=0.585), e-Satisfaction (CA=0.883; CR=0.902; AVE=0.605), Social Influence (CA=0.872; CR=0.904; AVE =0.610), e-Value (CA=0.861; CR=0.8 95; AVE=0.588), and Purchase Intention (CA=0.869; CR=0.902; AVE =0.604). All indicators (observational variables) that affect each latent variable (e-Value, Purchase Intention, e-Trust, e-Satisfaction and Social Influence) as a formative model are declared valid because they have significant weight and there is no multicollinearity between indicators. The formative measurement model test can be seen in Appendix 6 Table 15. The t-Statistics and P-Value values are > 1.96 and < 0.05 respectively, and the collinearity statistics value or VIF < 5.

The Discriminant Validity test is stated to be valid because the AVE root value for each latent variable is higher than its correlation with other latent variables (Fornell-Larcker Criterion and HTMT). The indicators also show a higher correlation with the corresponding latent variable than with other latent variables (Cross Loading) (Henseler et al., 2015). Analysis of the first structural equation model test was carried out to measure the value of R² which indicates the extent to which the independent variable can explain the first dependent variable (e-Value) in its role as a mediator. The results of the analysis show that e-Trust, e-Satisfaction and Social Influence jointly affect e-Value with an R² value of 0.560 (R square adjusted for more than two independent/free variables). That is, 56.0% of the variance of e-Value by customers can be explained by e-Trust, e-Satisfaction and Social Influence, while the remaining 44.0% can be explained by other variables which were not examined in this study.

Analysis of the second structural equation model test was carried out to measure the value of R² which indicates the extent to which the independent variable can explain the second dependent variable (Purchase Intention). The results of the analysis show that e-Trust, e-Satisfaction and Social Influence jointly affect Purchase Intention with an R² value of 0.608 (R square adjusted for more than two independent/free variables). That is, 60.8% of the variance of Purchase Intention by customers can be explained by e-Trust, e-Satisfaction and Social Influence, while the remaining 39.2% can be explained by other variables which were not used in this study. Analysis of the direct effect of each independent variable (e-trust, e-satisfaction and social influence) on e-value and direct and on purchase intention can be explained based on bootstrapping data in the following tables.

**Table 1. Hypothesis Test Results for Structural Equation Model I**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Hypothesis Statements</th>
<th>T-Value</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H₁</td>
<td>e-Trust has a positive and significant effect on e-Value.</td>
<td>5,395</td>
<td>Hypothesis is accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂</td>
<td>e-Satisfaction has a positive and significant effect on e-Value.</td>
<td>0,664</td>
<td>Hypothesis is rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₃</td>
<td>Social influence has a positive and significant effect on e-Value.</td>
<td>4,987</td>
<td>Hypothesis is accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₄</td>
<td>e-Trust has a positive and significant effect on Purchase Intention.</td>
<td>3,805</td>
<td>Hypothesis is accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₅</td>
<td>e-Satisfaction has a positive and significant effect on Purchase Intention.</td>
<td>0,848</td>
<td>Hypothesis is rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₆</td>
<td>Social influence has a positive and significant effect on Purchase Intention.</td>
<td>4,140</td>
<td>Hypothesis is accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₇</td>
<td>e-Value has a positive and significant effect on Purchase Intention.</td>
<td>1,627</td>
<td>Hypothesis is rejected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the results of the hypothesis testing above, it is known that the four hypotheses have a t-statistics value of > 1.96 so that the data supports the research hypothesis that was built or in other words the proposed hypothesis is accepted. While the other three hypotheses are not accepted (rejected) because they have a t-statistics value <1.96. Furthermore, the results of the indirect analysis, the influence of independent variables (e-trust, e-satisfaction and social influence) on purchase intention mediated by e-value can be explained based on bootstrapping analysis data.
Table 2. Mediation Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Mediation Results</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>e-Trust has a positive and significant effect on <em>Purchase Intention</em> which is mediated by e-Value.</td>
<td>1.560</td>
<td>Mediation is rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>e-Satisfaction has a positive and significant effect on <em>Purchase Intention</em> which is mediated by e-Value.</td>
<td>0.511</td>
<td>Mediation is rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Social influence has a positive and significant effect on <em>Purchase Intention</em> which is mediated by e-Value.</td>
<td>1.516</td>
<td>Mediation is rejected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the indirect effect analysis above show that all t-statistics values are <1.96. Therefore, the three hypotheses proposed are neither accepted nor rejected. Referring to the results of Table 1 and Table 2 above, the e-value variable does not act as a perfect mediator mediating the effect of e-trust on the purchase intention variable. This happens because of a change from a positive and significant direct effect, to an insignificant positive or rejection of the hypothesis on the indirect effect of e-trust on purchase intention. Furthermore, on the indirect influence of social influence on purchase intention, e-value also does not act as a mediator. This is because the direct effect shows positive and significant results, while the indirect effect of social influence on purchase intention is not significant.

The results in Table 1 and Table 2 above also show that the e-value variable does not act as a mediator mediating the effect of e-satisfaction on purchase intention. This is due to no change in influence, either directly or indirectly, which is still not significant. The final analysis is the goodness of fit (GoF) test or the suitability of the proposed structural equation model. The results of the Quality Model test show a good fit. This can be seen from the value of Q Square Redundancy (Blindfolding Analysis) and SRMR. The complete data can be seen in Appendix 7 Table 17 and Table 18. The table shows that the total value of Q square redundancy (predictive redundancy) for the two structural equations of the mediating variable (e-Value) and the dependent variable (purchase intention) is 0.359 and 0.314 respectively. This means that the predictive relevance value is to show how well the resulting observation value (construct cross-validated redundancy) is met, which is > 0 (positive or good) (Hair, et al., 2017). Overall, the results of the structural model fit test (fit model) can be seen from the fit summary and rms_theta values, including those based on the Normed Fit Index (NFI) value of 0.722. This means that the proposed structural equation model is 72.2% close to middle fit which is almost in line with the results in Appendix 7 Table 16, namely 56.0% and 60.8% for each structural equation model for e-value and purchase intention.

This level of compatibility is also reinforced by the Standard Root Mean Square residual (SRMR) value of 0.071. This value is a standard measure obtained through the transformation of the sample covariance matrix and the predicted covariance matrix into a correlation matrix, this measure must meet the requirements that the value must be <0.08 (Hu & Bentler in Henseler et al., 2014). Furthermore, the rms_theta value is used to measure the extent of the residual correlation from the external model. The closer the value is to zero, the better the fit of the model or the correlation between the residual models outside is very small (close to zero or <0.12) (Henseler et al., 2014). Therefore, the proposed structural equation model is close to middle fit with an rms_theta value of 0.132.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the results and discussion above, four of the seven hypotheses proposed in this study have been successfully verified or proven, which were the effect of e-trust on e-value and purchase intention, the influence of social influence on e-value and purchase intention, while the other hypotheses which could not be proven (not significant) were the effect of e-satisfaction on e-value and purchase intention, as well as the effect of e-value on purchase intention. In addition, indirectly, e-value acts as a perfect mediation in influencing e-trust and social influence on purchase intention because it is able to change (weaken) the significant effect to be insignificant. As for mediating the effect of e-satisfaction on purchase intention, the e-value variable does not act as a perfect mediator (unable to strengthen), because the results are still not significant or the same as the direct effect of e-satisfaction on purchase intention.

The conclusions of this study results show that if e-trust is built as demonstrated it will increase consumer’s e-value towards the marketplace, thereby increasing the tendency of consumers to make purchase intention decisions for a product. Likewise, if the social influence that is built in the community...
shows positive opinion (information support), it will be able to increase consumer’s e-value towards the marketplace which in turn encourages greater purchase intention in the marketplace. In contrast, if e-satisfaction increases, it does not necessarily increase e-value and purchase intention, because there are functional dimensions and other dimensions that must be fulfilled from e-value or in other words, high e-satisfaction is the overall value obtained by consumers, both functionally and emotionally. Some of the conclusions obtained from the results of this study suggests that there may be some of them that should be discussed further to reinforce the conclusions reached and sharpen the arguments put forward. This is reasonable because this research is recognized to have certain limitations that need to be improved and corrected in subsequent studies.

First, this research was conducted on marketplace consumers who are mostly resided in Greater Jakarta, so it does not necessarily describe the condition of the marketplace as a whole in Indonesia. Therefore, further similar research in the future can be focused on more and more representative marketplaces with a wider range of respondents throughout Indonesia or at least the entire island of Java. Second, this study only looks at four aspects (independent variables) or purchase intention factors without considering the antecedents or other dimensions, both from the purchase intention itself and from each independent factor/variable. Therefore, future research can enrich this literature by adding another antecedent to purchase intention in the marketplace. Third, this study only focuses on identifying the effect of each independent variable on the dependent variable, either directly or indirectly through mediating variables, as well as completing scientific information about the interrelationships of these variables. Therefore, the results of this study recommend further research by adding other dependent variables to strengthen the results obtained, for example customer loyalty.

The results of this study provide several managerial implications that are expected to be applied to increase customer e-value and purchase intention. First, in addition to the marketplace industry (online shop website) or through various social media marketing applications, the results of this research are expected to be a guide in achieving offline sales effectiveness through traditional shops, outlets or outlets, and can be applied to the sale of various types of products and services. In this case, trust, satisfaction and forms of information support (opinion) from the public remain a reference in doing business to increase e-value and purchase intention. Second, sales through marketplaces show that electronic services play an important role in the digital marketing era. Therefore, companies need to create applications (websites) or other online services that are easy and inexpensive to access by customers, so that customers can easily find information that can increase the e-value of products and can increase purchase intention online. Information and terms & conditions imposed by the company regarding products must be complete, accurate and updated as well as provide space for customers to provide reviews, testimonials and complaints about the products offered, including guarantees of confidentiality and security of transactions and customer data, as well as e-trust and e-satisfaction which will increase purchase intention. Third, the results of this research can be input for marketplaces to offer products that do not only look at trends but also consider quality and benefits that can increase customer e-value. In addition, from the point of view of entrepreneurs who become merchants (sellers who open stalls in the marketplace in question), the marketplace must also be more selective by imposing terms and conditions, including strengthening stricter aspects of honesty (integrity) to maintain e-trust and e-satisfaction for all services provided.

Based on the description above and then also adjusting the existing hypotheses, a separate conclusion can be drawn that the hypothesis proposed by researchers in this study, of the 5 hypotheses, 3 hypotheses have been successful to prove, while the rest are not suitable, including psychological capital having an influence which is good or positive on work engagement and this is significant, then transformational leadership has a good and significant effect on work engagement, the last is work engagement has a good and significant effect on organizational citizenship behavior, for the remaining hypothesis is psychological capital which has an influence positive but not significant on organizational citizenship behavior and transformational leadership has a positive or good influence but equally insignificant on organizational citizenship behavior.

As for the above, it can be concluded that when psychological capital improves employees will be able to improve work engagement employees towards the company, and it is also able to increase
organizational citizenship behavior, indirect employees. But personal psychological capital is still not able to upgrade the organizational citizenship behavior of employees at the company. Likewise, when transformational leadership is upgraded will be able to improve work engagement among employees towards the company, and it is also able to increase organizational citizenship behavior and indirect employees. As well as psychological capital, transformational leadership is also not able to directly influence the increased organizational citizenship behavior of employees. But in this study work engagement plays an important role as an intermediary as well as directly in improving the organizational citizenship behavior of employees.
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