

SOCIAL MEDIA MARKETING, PRICE, AND BRAND IMAGE AS DRIVERS OF PURCHASE DECISIONS AND CONSUMER LOYALTY: EVIDENCE FROM SKINTIFIC ON SHOPEE

Ganis Maulana Rahmawan^{1*}, Iha Haryani Hatta², Agustinus Miranda W³

Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Pancasila, Jakarta, Indonesia

*Corresponding author: ganis.maulanar@gmail.com

Informasi Artikel	Abstract
Vol: 3 No : 8 August 2026 Halaman : 8-15 Keywords: Social Media Marketing; Price; Brand Image; Purchase Decision; Consumer Loyalty; Shopee	<i>This study examines the effects of social media marketing, price, and brand image on purchase decisions and consumer loyalty, while testing purchase decisions as a mediating mechanism among consumers of Skintific skincare products on Shopee. A quantitative cross-sectional survey was conducted with 100 Indonesian consumers selected through purposive sampling. Data were collected through a closed-ended questionnaire using a 1–5 response scale and analyzed with Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) in SmartPLS 4.0. The measurement model satisfied convergent validity, discriminant validity, and reliability requirements. Social media marketing ($\beta = 0.357$; $p < 0.001$), price ($\beta = 0.441$; $p < 0.001$), and brand image ($\beta = 0.335$; $p < 0.001$) positively affected purchase decisions. Social media marketing ($\beta = 0.235$; $p = 0.002$), price ($\beta = 0.287$; $p < 0.001$), brand image ($\beta = 0.306$; $p < 0.001$), and purchase decisions ($\beta = 0.385$; $p < 0.001$) positively affected consumer loyalty. Purchase decisions partially mediated the effects of social media marketing, price, and brand image on loyalty, with VAF values of 36.8%, 37.2%, and 29.7%, respectively. Price was the strongest direct predictor of purchase decisions. The findings underline the joint importance of digital engagement, value-aligned pricing, brand reputation, and positive purchase experiences in strengthening consumer loyalty in skincare e-commerce.</i>

Abstract

Penelitian ini menganalisis pengaruh Social Media Marketing, Harga, dan Citra Merek terhadap Keputusan Pembelian dan Loyalitas Konsumen, sekaligus menguji peran mediasi Keputusan Pembelian pada konsumen produk skincare Skintific di Shopee. Penelitian menggunakan pendekatan kuantitatif dengan desain survei potong lintang terhadap 100 konsumen di Indonesia yang dipilih melalui purposive sampling. Data dikumpulkan menggunakan kuesioner tertutup dengan skala 1–5 dan dianalisis melalui Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) menggunakan SmartPLS 4.0. Model pengukuran memenuhi kriteria validitas konvergen, validitas diskriminan, dan reliabilitas. Social Media Marketing ($\beta = 0,357$; $p < 0,001$), Harga ($\beta = 0,441$; $p < 0,001$), dan Citra Merek ($\beta = 0,335$; $p < 0,001$) berpengaruh positif terhadap Keputusan Pembelian. Social Media Marketing ($\beta = 0,235$; $p = 0,002$), Harga ($\beta = 0,287$; $p < 0,001$), Citra Merek ($\beta = 0,306$; $p < 0,001$), serta Keputusan Pembelian ($\beta = 0,385$; $p < 0,001$) berpengaruh positif terhadap Loyalitas Konsumen. Keputusan Pembelian memediasi secara parsial pengaruh ketiga variabel eksogen terhadap Loyalitas Konsumen dengan nilai VAF masing-masing 36,8%, 37,2%, dan 29,7%. Harga merupakan prediktor langsung terkuat terhadap Keputusan Pembelian. Temuan menegaskan pentingnya integrasi pemasaran media sosial, harga yang sepadan dengan nilai, penguatan citra merek, dan pengalaman pembelian yang positif untuk meningkatkan loyalitas konsumen pada e-commerce skincare.

Kata Kunci: Social Media Marketing; Harga; Citra Merek; Keputusan Pembelian; Loyalitas Konsumen; Shopee

INTRODUCTION

Digital commerce has changed how consumers search for product information, compare alternatives, and complete purchases. In the Indonesian context, the expansion of digital transactions has reinforced e-commerce as an important channel for both firms and consumers. Shopee is one of the platforms through which skincare brands can communicate product information, offer promotional programs, and facilitate transactions without requiring consumers to visit physical stores. This environment creates a highly information-intensive purchase process in which consumers can simultaneously encounter brand content, price promotions, ratings, reviews, and competing products. As a result, understanding the determinants of purchase decisions is important not only for explaining immediate transactions but also for clarifying how those decisions may develop into longer-term consumer loyalty (Rachmat et al., 2023).

Social media marketing has become a central element of this process because skincare brands increasingly use Instagram, TikTok, YouTube, Facebook, and related platforms to disseminate information, build communities, stimulate interaction, and encourage content sharing. Social media also enables the participation of influencers and content creators whose reviews, demonstrations, and personal experiences can become additional information sources before consumers purchase skincare products (Herman et al., 2023; Kamil et al., 2024). Prior research indicates that social media marketing efforts can shape brand-related responses and consumer behavior, particularly when communication is interactive, accessible, and relevant to the audience (Godey et al., 2016). Evidence specific to Skintific on Shopee also indicates that social media marketing and brand awareness are associated with purchase decisions (Mahendra & Tobing, 2025).

However, digital promotion does not operate in isolation. Price remains a direct and visible consideration because e-commerce allows consumers to compare competing products and respond to flash sales, vouchers, free-shipping programs, and other promotions. Consumers do not necessarily interpret a low price as the best option; rather, the evaluation involves whether the price is affordable, competitive, fair, and proportional to expected product quality and benefits. In this sense, price is both an economic sacrifice and a signal that contributes to the perceived value of a skincare product (Tjiptono, 2018). Previous evidence shows that perceived price and brand-related evaluations can jointly influence purchase decisions (Anggraeni & Soliha, 2020; Hertanti & Giyana, 2025).

Brand image is similarly important in skincare because consumers must form judgments about product quality, reliability, reputation, and trust before actual use. On e-commerce platforms, these judgments are shaped not only by company-controlled communication but also by ratings, product reviews, prior customer experiences, and the broader reputation attached to the brand. A favorable brand image can reduce uncertainty and provide a basis for choosing one product over multiple alternatives. Studies on Shopee have reported that brand image, electronic word of mouth, customer ratings, and experiential factors contribute to purchase decisions (Maulidya et al., 2025; Nasution & Sari, 2021).

The relevance of these factors extends beyond the first purchase. Skincare consumers face numerous alternatives on the same platform, which makes brand switching relatively easy when a competing offer is perceived as more attractive. Consumer loyalty therefore represents an important post-purchase outcome because it reflects the tendency to repurchase, retain preference for the same brand, resist switching, and recommend the brand to others. Oliver (1999) conceptualizes loyalty as a deeply held commitment to repurchase a preferred product despite situational influences and competitive marketing efforts. In an e-commerce setting, loyalty is particularly valuable because transaction convenience also lowers the cost of searching for substitute brands. Research on cosmetics and e-commerce further suggests that brand loyalty, discounts, promotion, service quality, and repurchase behavior are connected to the continuation of consumer-brand relationships (Desfitriady et al., 2025; Marbun et al., 2022).

This study uses the Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) as its main theoretical foundation. TPB proposes that behavior is preceded by behavioral intention and is shaped by attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control (Ajzen, 2020). In the present model, social media marketing can contribute to informational and social influences, price can shape evaluations of affordability, risk, and value, and brand image can strengthen favorable beliefs and trust. These evaluations are expected to support purchase decisions. After purchase, a positive decision and experience can provide a behavioral basis for continued preference, repurchase, and advocacy, thereby contributing to loyalty. This framing links pre-purchase marketing stimuli with both immediate and post-purchase consumer outcomes.

Although previous studies have examined individual relationships among social media marketing, price, brand image, and purchase behavior, fewer studies integrate these antecedents simultaneously with consumer loyalty while positioning purchase decisions as a mediator. The current research addresses that issue in the context of Skintific skincare purchased through Shopee. It aims to examine the direct effects of social media marketing, price, and brand image on purchase decisions; the direct effects of those three variables and purchase decisions on consumer loyalty; and the indirect effects of social media marketing, price, and brand image on loyalty through purchase decisions. By testing these paths within a single PLS-SEM model, the study provides an integrated explanation of how digital marketing, value perceptions, and brand evaluations contribute to loyalty in skincare e-commerce.

METHOD

The study employed a quantitative, cross-sectional survey design. The population consisted of consumers in Indonesia who had purchased skincare products through the Shopee e-commerce platform. Purposive sampling was used so that respondents were consistent with the research context. The inclusion criteria were: having used Shopee to purchase skincare, using social media such as Instagram, TikTok, YouTube, or similar platforms, being at least 20 years old, and being aware of skincare price-promotion programs on Shopee such as flash sales, discount vouchers, and free-shipping programs. Following the sample-size rationale used in the thesis and considering

multivariate analysis requirements, 100 respondents were included in the final analysis (Roscoe, 1982; Sugiyono, 2019).

Primary data were collected through a closed-ended questionnaire distributed using Google Forms. Each indicator was measured on a five-point response scale, where higher values represented stronger agreement or a higher evaluation of the measured statement. The instrument operationalized five latent constructs. Social media marketing was represented by 10 indicators associated with community building, interaction, content sharing, and accessibility. Price was measured with eight indicators addressing affordability, price-quality fit, competitiveness, and clarity of price information. Brand image was measured with eight indicators reflecting recognition, reputation, brand personality, and trust. Purchase decision, the mediating variable, was measured with seven indicators related to product need, confidence in product choice, consideration of benefits and quality, and repeat-purchase willingness. Consumer loyalty was measured with six indicators reflecting repeat purchase, retention, advocacy, and emotional attachment.

Data analysis used Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) with SmartPLS 4.0. The analysis began with data screening and descriptive statistics, followed by assessment of the reflective measurement model. Convergent validity was evaluated using outer loading and Average Variance Extracted (AVE), with loading values of at least 0.70 and AVE values above 0.50 as the primary criteria. Internal consistency reliability was evaluated using Cronbach's alpha and Composite Reliability, both expected to exceed 0.70. Discriminant validity was assessed using the Fornell-Larcker criterion, cross-loadings, and the Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio (HTMT), with HTMT values below 0.90 indicating adequate discrimination among constructs.

After the measurement model was considered adequate, the structural model was evaluated through multicollinearity diagnostics, coefficients of determination (R^2), effect sizes (f^2), predictive relevance (Q^2), model fit, and path coefficients. Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) values below 5 were used as the criterion for acceptable collinearity. Predictive relevance was indicated by Q^2 values above zero. Model fit was evaluated using the Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR), with a value below 0.08 considered acceptable. Hypothesis testing used bootstrapping. A structural relationship was treated as statistically significant when the t-statistic exceeded 1.96 and the p-value was below 0.05. Mediation was evaluated from the significance of indirect effects and the Variance Accounted For (VAF); VAF values between 20% and 80% were interpreted as partial mediation.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Respondent Profile and Descriptive Overview

The sample consisted of 100 respondents. The largest occupational group was entrepreneurship/private-sector self-employment (40%), followed by private employees (36%), government employees (19%), and respondents who were not employed (5%). In terms of age, most respondents were 31–35 years old (47%), followed by 25–30 years old (40%), 35–40 years old (8%), and below 25 years old (5%). This profile indicates that the empirical model was tested primarily among working-age consumers who had practical exposure to online purchasing and digital promotion environments.

Table 1. Respondent Characteristics

Characteristic	Category	n	%
Occupation	Private employee	36	36
Occupation	Entrepreneur / self-employed	40	40
Occupation	Government employee	19	19
Occupation	Not employed	5	5
Age	<25 years	5	5
Age	25–30 years	40	40
Age	31–35 years	47	47
Age	35–40 years	8	8

Source: Primary survey data (2026).

Measurement Model

The reflective measurement model demonstrated strong indicator quality. Across the 39 indicators, outer loadings ranged from 0.841 to 0.921, exceeding the 0.70 criterion. AVE values ranged from 0.740 to 0.801, indicating that each construct explained more than half of the variance in its indicators. Cronbach's alpha values ranged from 0.939 to 0.972 and Composite Reliability values ranged from 0.952 to 0.976. These results confirm high internal consistency without relying on a single reliability index. Discriminant validity was also supported: the highest HTMT value was 0.713, which remained below 0.90. Thus, the constructs of social media marketing,

price, brand image, purchase decision, and consumer loyalty were empirically distinguishable and suitable for structural testing.

Table 2. Measurement Model Summary

Construct	Items	Loading Range	AVE	Cronbach α	Composite Reliability
Social Media Marketing	10	0.866–0.919	0.800	0.972	0.976
Price	8	0.876–0.921	0.794	0.963	0.969
Brand Image	8	0.870–0.919	0.801	0.964	0.970
Purchase Decision	7	0.841–0.886	0.740	0.941	0.952
Consumer Loyalty	6	0.853–0.908	0.767	0.939	0.952

Source: SmartPLS 4.0 output (2026).

Structural Model Quality

The inner-model VIF values ranged from 1.003 to 1.681, indicating that the predictor constructs did not exhibit problematic multicollinearity. The R^2 value for purchase decision was 0.405, meaning that social media marketing, price, and brand image jointly explained 40.5% of its variance. The R^2 value for consumer loyalty was 0.582, indicating that social media marketing, price, brand image, and purchase decision explained 58.2% of loyalty variance. Predictive relevance was supported by Q^2 values of 0.289 for purchase decision and 0.433 for consumer loyalty. The SRMR value was 0.055, below the 0.08 threshold, supporting an acceptable overall model fit. These indicators show that the proposed model had moderate explanatory power and positive predictive relevance for both endogenous constructs.

Table 3. Structural Model Evaluation

Indicator	Purchase Decision	Consumer Loyalty
R^2	0.405	0.582
Adjusted R^2	0.386	0.565
Q^2	0.289	0.433

Source: SmartPLS 4.0 output (2026). SRMR = 0.055.

Direct Effects

All seven direct structural paths were positive and statistically significant. Price had the strongest direct effect on purchase decision ($\beta = 0.441$; $t = 5.824$; $p < 0.001$), followed by social media marketing ($\beta = 0.357$; $t = 4.676$; $p < 0.001$) and brand image ($\beta = 0.335$; $t = 4.313$; $p < 0.001$). For consumer loyalty, purchase decision produced the largest coefficient ($\beta = 0.385$; $t = 4.730$; $p < 0.001$), followed by brand image ($\beta = 0.306$; $t = 3.984$; $p < 0.001$), price ($\beta = 0.287$; $t = 3.935$; $p < 0.001$), and social media marketing ($\beta = 0.235$; $t = 3.175$; $p = 0.002$). The f^2 results were consistent with this pattern: price showed the largest contribution to purchase decision ($f^2 = 0.326$), while the direct effects of social media marketing and price on loyalty were comparatively smaller ($f^2 = 0.105$ and 0.148 , respectively).

Table 4. Direct Effect Hypothesis Testing

Structural Path	β	t	p	Decision
Social Media Marketing → Purchase Decision	0.357	4.676	<0.001	Supported
Price → Purchase Decision	0.441	5.824	<0.001	Supported
Brand Image → Purchase Decision	0.335	4.313	<0.001	Supported
Social Media Marketing → Consumer Loyalty	0.235	3.175	0.002	Supported
Price → Consumer Loyalty	0.287	3.935	<0.001	Supported
Brand Image → Consumer Loyalty	0.306	3.984	<0.001	Supported

Structural Path	β	t	p	Decision
Purchase Decision → Consumer Loyalty	0.385	4.730	<0.001	Supported

Source: SmartPLS 4.0 output (2026).

Social Media Marketing and Purchase Decision

The positive effect of social media marketing on purchase decision indicates that consumers are more likely to choose Skintific when social media activities provide useful information, interactive communication, accessible content, and opportunities for community engagement. This result is consistent with the mechanism proposed in the thesis: social media can reduce information gaps before purchase and can strengthen consumers' confidence in the product. In a skincare context, educational content concerning product benefits, ingredients, and usage can be especially relevant because product suitability is part of the purchase evaluation. The finding is aligned with research showing that social media marketing contributes to purchase-related responses and brand evaluations (Ali & Naushad, 2023; Godey et al., 2016). It is also consistent with evidence on Skintific in Shopee, where social media marketing and brand awareness were found to contribute to purchase decisions (Mahendra & Tobing, 2025). From a TPB perspective, repeated exposure to informative and socially reinforced content can shape favorable attitudes and subjective norms, increasing the likelihood that consumers translate intention into a purchase decision.

Price and Purchase Decision

Price was the strongest predictor of purchase decision in the model. The coefficient of 0.441 and the largest f^2 value among predictors of purchase decision indicate that respondents placed substantial weight on whether Skintific's price was affordable, competitive, clear, and proportional to quality and benefits. E-commerce intensifies this evaluation because consumers can directly compare products and observe promotional mechanisms on the same platform. This result supports the thesis argument that price should not be interpreted solely as a low-cost signal; rather, consumers assess the value received relative to the sacrifice made. Tjiptono (2018) emphasizes the role of price in shaping consumer perceptions and purchase responses, while empirical studies also show that price perceptions and brand evaluations can influence purchase decisions (Anggraeni & Soliha, 2020; Hertanti & Giyana, 2025). The finding suggests that discounting alone is unlikely to be sufficient if consumers do not simultaneously perceive product benefits and quality as commensurate with the amount paid.

Brand Image and Purchase Decision

Brand image also had a positive and significant effect on purchase decision. Consumers who perceived Skintific as recognizable, reputable, trustworthy, and positively differentiated were more likely to decide to purchase the brand on Shopee. This supports the idea that brand image serves as a risk-reduction mechanism in product categories where consumers cannot fully evaluate performance before use. Online ratings and previous customer experiences may reinforce or weaken this image because prospective consumers can access large amounts of user-generated information before making a choice. The result is consistent with findings that brand image affects purchasing decisions on Shopee and other consumer-product settings (Maulidya et al., 2025; Nasution & Sari, 2021). It also reinforces evidence that brand image can work together with social media marketing and brand awareness in shaping purchase behavior (Suardana et al., 2024).

Direct Determinants of Consumer Loyalty

Social media marketing, price, brand image, and purchase decision all had significant positive effects on consumer loyalty. The direct effect of social media marketing suggests that digital communication has a role after the initial transaction as well as before it. Ongoing interaction, educational content, user-generated content, and community-oriented communication can keep the brand salient and create a sense of relationship continuity. This is consistent with the broader proposition that interactive social media activities contribute to brand-related responses and engagement (Ali & Naushad, 2023; Andriana & Manalu, 2026). Nevertheless, the relatively small f^2 value of 0.105 indicates that social media marketing alone is not the dominant mechanism of loyalty in this model. Its role appears more effective when complemented by product value, brand trust, and a favorable purchase experience.

Price also affected loyalty positively. Consumers who judged the price as reasonable relative to quality and benefits were more likely to maintain their preference for Skintific. This supports a value-based interpretation of loyalty: continued purchasing is more likely when the consumer believes that repeated expenditure remains worthwhile. The relatively small f^2 value for the price-to-loyalty path (0.148), combined with the stronger price-to-purchase-decision effect, indicates that much of the influence of price may first be expressed through the decision to buy. Brand image produced a stronger direct effect on loyalty ($\beta = 0.306$), indicating that reputation and trust provide a more durable basis for continued brand preference. In a market where consumers can easily switch products, a consistent positive image can reduce the attractiveness of alternatives and support retention.

Purchase decision was the strongest direct predictor of loyalty ($\beta = 0.385$). This result indicates that the act of choosing and buying Skintific is not merely the endpoint of pre-purchase evaluation; it becomes a behavioral foundation for subsequent loyalty. Once consumers have selected a product and obtained a satisfactory basis for continued use, repeat purchase, recommendation, and resistance to switching become more plausible. The finding is compatible with loyalty theory, which emphasizes the progression from favorable evaluation and repeated behavior toward stronger commitment (Oliver, 1999), and with prior work linking purchase decisions to repeated purchasing behavior (Marbun et al., 2022). Thus, the structural model places purchase decision at the center of the transition from marketing stimulus to sustained consumer-brand behavior.

Mediating Role of Purchase Decision

The indirect-effect analysis confirmed that purchase decision significantly mediated all three relationships between the exogenous variables and consumer loyalty. The indirect effect of social media marketing on loyalty was 0.137 ($t = 3.426$; $p = 0.001$), the indirect effect of price was 0.170 ($t = 3.792$; $p < 0.001$), and the indirect effect of brand image was 0.129 ($t = 2.820$; $p = 0.005$). Because the corresponding direct effects remained significant and the VAF values were between 20% and 80%, purchase decision functioned as a partial mediator rather than a full mediator. The strongest indirect effect was observed for price, which is consistent with the finding that price was the strongest direct determinant of purchase decision.

Table 5. Indirect Effects and Mediation

Indirect Path	Indirect β	t	p	VAF	Mediation
Social Media Marketing → Purchase Decision → Consumer Loyalty	0.137	3.426	0.001	36.8%	Partial
Price → Purchase Decision → Consumer Loyalty	0.170	3.792	<0.001	37.2%	Partial
Brand Image → Purchase Decision → Consumer Loyalty	0.129	2.820	0.005	29.7%	Partial

Source: SmartPLS 4.0 output (2026).

The mediation results provide an important explanation of how the three antecedents contribute to loyalty. Social media marketing can strengthen loyalty directly through continued interaction, but it also operates by making consumers more confident in choosing the product. Price can support loyalty directly when it is perceived as fair, yet its larger indirect role shows that price first helps consumers justify the purchase. Brand image similarly supports loyalty directly through trust and reputation while also increasing the probability of purchase. These dual pathways are consistent with the integrated framework developed in the thesis and clarify why loyalty cannot be explained only by post-purchase behavior. Loyalty begins with the quality of the consumer's pre-purchase evaluation and the decision that follows from it.

Theoretical and Managerial Implications

Theoretically, the results provide empirical support for the TPB-oriented logic used in the study. Social media information and interaction can contribute to social and attitudinal evaluations; price can influence perceptions of affordability, value, and control over the transaction; and brand image can strengthen favorable beliefs about the product. These factors are associated with purchase decision, which in turn contributes to loyalty. The partial mediation pattern shows that the antecedents retain direct relationships with loyalty while also operating through purchase decision. This extends a simple direct-effect interpretation by demonstrating that the consumer's decision process is an important behavioral mechanism linking marketing stimuli with longer-term brand outcomes.

Managerially, the results indicate that Skintific should not rely on a single marketing lever. Because price was the strongest predictor of purchase decision, the company needs to preserve a clear value proposition by maintaining competitive prices, transparent price information, and promotions that remain credible relative to product quality. Social media marketing should emphasize educational content, product-use guidance, authentic user-generated content, and interactions that allow consumers to ask questions and receive timely responses. Brand image should be strengthened through consistent product quality, reliable communication, recognizable positioning, and positive customer experiences. Finally, because purchase decision had the strongest direct effect on loyalty, the company should reduce friction throughout the buying process, provide complete product information, and support a positive post-purchase experience that encourages repurchase and advocacy.

CONCLUSION

The study demonstrates that social media marketing, price, and brand image are significant positive determinants of purchase decisions and consumer loyalty for Skintific skincare products purchased through

Shopee. Price is the strongest direct predictor of purchase decision, while purchase decision is the strongest direct predictor of consumer loyalty. The structural model explains 40.5% of the variance in purchase decision and 58.2% of the variance in consumer loyalty, with positive predictive relevance and acceptable overall fit. Purchase decision also partially mediates the effects of social media marketing, price, and brand image on loyalty, confirming that the path from marketing stimuli to long-term consumer behavior operates both directly and through the consumer's decision to purchase. These findings imply that loyalty is most effectively strengthened through an integrated strategy that combines informative and interactive social media communication, prices that are perceived as fair and proportional to product benefits, a credible and trustworthy brand image, and a purchase experience that supports repeat buying and recommendation. Future research can extend the model by incorporating product quality, customer satisfaction, trust, electronic word of mouth, service quality, and broader samples across other skincare brands or e-commerce platforms, as suggested in the thesis.

REFERENCES

- Ajzen, I. (2020). The theory of planned behavior: Frequently asked questions. *Human Behavior and Emerging Technologies*, 2(4), 314–324. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hbe2.195>
- Ali, I., & Naushad, M. (2023). Examining the influence of social media marketing on purchase intention: The mediating role of brand image. *Innovative Marketing*, 19(4), 145–157. [https://doi.org/10.21511/im.19\(4\).2023.12](https://doi.org/10.21511/im.19(4).2023.12)
- Ananda, T., Mulyadi, P., & Zulganef, Z. (2025). The effect of social media marketing on purchase intention through brand image and brand trust as mediating variables in local Bandung clothing. *JEMSI: Jurnal Ekonomi Manajemen dan Sistem Informasi*, 7(1), 480–490. <https://doi.org/10.38035/jemsi.v7i1>
- Andriana, M., & Manalu, G. (2026). Analisis kajian social media marketing dan customer engagement terhadap brand awareness platform e-commerce Shopee. *Jurnal Lentera Bisnis*, 15(2), 2443–2455. <https://doi.org/10.34127/jrlab.v15i2.2195>
- Anggraeni, A. R., & Soliha, E. (2020). Kualitas produk, citra merek dan persepsi harga terhadap keputusan pembelian (Studi pada konsumen Kopi Lain Hati Lamper Kota Semarang). *Al Tijarah*, 6(2), 96–107.
- Desfitriady, Waruwu, D. N., & Mursyidah, D. S. (2025). Pengaruh brand loyalty dan diskon terhadap keputusan pembelian kosmetik Wardah pada platform e-commerce Shopee. *Jurnal Ekonomi Manajemen Bisnis dan Akuntansi*, 4(1), 17–31.
- Godey, B., Manthiou, A., Pederzoli, D., Rokka, J., Aiello, G., Donvito, R., & Singh, R. (2016). Social media marketing efforts of luxury brands: Influence on brand equity and consumer behavior. *Journal of Business Research*, 69(12), 5833–5841. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.04.181>
- Herman, Maszudi, E., Hamid, R. S., Dewintari, P., & Aulia, A. (2023). Peran influencer marketing online customer review dan content marketing dalam keputusan pembelian pada sosial Instagram. *Jurnal Ekonomi & Ekonomi Syariah*, 6(2), 1348–1358. <https://doi.org/10.36778/jesya.v6i2.1059>
- Hertanti, A. W., & Giyana. (2025). Analisis persepsi konsumen terhadap citra merek dan harga dalam keputusan pembelian hand and body lotion Vaseline pada mahasiswa. *Jurnal Manajemen dan Ekonomi Kreatif*, 3(1), 229–242. <https://doi.org/10.59024/jumek.v3i1.531>
- Kamil, A. S., Barokah, I., Harahap, N. S., & Deni, A. A. (2024). Pemanfaatan media sosial sebagai strategi marketing UMKM di era digital. *DIALOKA: Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa Dakwah dan Komunikasi Islam*, 3(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.32923/dla.v3i1.4474>
- Mahendra, D., & Tobing, R. P. (2025). Pengaruh social media marketing dan brand awareness terhadap keputusan pembelian Skintific di Shopee. *Jurnal Penelitian Ilmu Ekonomi dan Keuangan Syariah*, 3(1), 166–187. <https://doi.org/10.59059/jupiekes.v3i1.2124>
- Marbun, M. B., Ali, H., & Dwikoco, F. (2022). Pengaruh promosi, kualitas pelayanan dan keputusan pembelian terhadap pembelian ulang (Literature review manajemen pemasaran). *Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan dan Ilmu Sosial*, 3(2), 716–727. <https://doi.org/10.38035/jmpis.v3i2>
- Maulidya, V. Z., Oetarjo, M., & Yulianto, M. R. (2025). The influence of brand image, e-WOM, and customer rating on purchase decisions on Shopee. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Kesatuan*, 13(1), 757–766. <https://doi.org/10.37641/jimkes.v13i3.3123>
- Nasution, W., & Sari, D. K. (2021). The influence of brand image, experiential marketing and word of mouth on purchase decisions at e-commerce Shopee in Sidoarjo. *Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidoarjo*, 4, 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.21070/acopen.4.2021.2608>
- Oliver, R. (1999). Whence consumer loyalty. *Journal of Marketing*, 63, 33–34. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1252099>
- Rachmat, Z., Pandowo, A., Rukmana, A. Y., Haryanti, I., Sasongko, Dimas Bayu Nugraha, J. P., Tawil, M. R., Putra, I. G. J. E., Harinie, L. T., Salam, R., Sukaesih, I., Utami, N. W., Hartelina, & Darmawan, I. M. D. H. (2023). *Digital Marketing Dan E-Commerce*. Padang: PT. Global Eksekutif Teknologi.
- Roscoe. (1982). *Research Methods For Business*. New York: Mc Graw Hill.
- Sugiyono. (2019). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D*. Alfabeta.

- Suardana, I. A. R. A., Mahyuni, L. P., Lestari, N. P. N. E., & Suardana, I. B. R. (2024). Impact of brand image, brand awareness, and social media marketing on purchase decisions: Mediating roles of purchase. *JBTI: Jurnal Bisnis Teori dan Implementasi*, 15(1), 56–71. <https://doi.org/10.18196/jbti.v15i1.2090>
- Tjiptono, F. (2018). *Strategi pemasaran prinsip & penerapan* (Edisi 1). CV Andi.