The Influence Of Product Quality, Brand Image And E-Word Of Mouth On The Decision To Purchase Online Clothing Products Notbrand.Co In Dki Jakarta

Rani Yulia[1], Resti Hardini[2], Kumba Digdowiseiso[3]*
[1,2,3]Faculty of Economics and Business, National University, Indonesia
Email: [1]raniyulia@gmail.com, [2]resti.hardini@civitas.unas.ac.id, [3]kumba.digdo@civitas.unas.ac.id*

Abstract:

This study aims to determine the effect of the t-test on the variables of product quality, brand image, and e-word of mouth on purchasing decisions for online clothing products notbrand.co in DKI Jakarta. The sample in this study was 96 respondents who made purchasing decisions on social media based on the Anderson formula. This study uses primary data with data collection methods through questionnaires distributed to 96 respondents. The data analysis technique was using inferential analysis with multiple linear regression and using the Statistical Product and Service Solution (SPSS) version 26.0 program. From the results of the t test, it shows that the product quality variable (X1) has an influence of 2.764% or 27.64%, the brand image variable (X2) has an influence of 4.878 or 48.78%, and the e-word of mouth variable (X3) has an influence of 2.351% or 23.51% on purchasing decisions. Thus, it can be concluded that product quality, brand image and e-word of mouth variables influence purchasing decisions.

Keywords: Product Quality, Brand Image and E-Word Of Mouth.

INTRODUCTION

In today's economic development, the number of products and services is increasing. Companies demand that all companies have the right strategy to win the competition. Technological and scientific changes and advances are accelerating, and, competition between companies to sell products and services is increasing. Competition in the business world, is very fierce and to be able to compete with other companies in global business companies must have a competitive advantage. Marketing aims to identify the needs and desires of consumers in the target market and satisfy them through exchange while maintaining all parties and objectives related to interests.

There are products sold online, namely beauty products, fashion, household appliances etc. One of the fashion products that are in great demand is online clothing products Notbrand.co. Notbrand.Co is one of the fashion brands from Indonesia that   prioritizes quality and design. Notbrand.co one of the local products in Indonesia that has been established since 2016. The company has different characteristics, target markets, and segmentations. The product

Notbrand.Co one of the local brands made in Indonesia. By way of sales through e-commerce (online selling). Notbrand.co using e-commerce, namely social media such as Instagram, and marketplaces such as Shopee, bukalapak, this is done in an effort to reach the target market, namely teenagers.

The following will be displayed notbrand.co clothing products in the last 3 years. The following will be displayed notbrand.co product sales in online or e-commerce product sales from 2019 to 2021.

Purchasing decision is a process that comes from the customer and understands the problem, seeks information about a particular product or brand and assesses the product or brand how well each alternative can solve the problem, which then a series of processes lead to the purchase decision Tjiptono, (2014)

Product quality affects Arifin's (2009) purchasing decision. According to Kotler and Amstrong, (2008) product quality is the strength of a product to be implemented. Features such as reliability, durability, ease of use and updates, and attribute values. Product quality must increase so that there are more and more purchasing decisions.

Brand image affects the purchase decision of wicaksono, (2007). A well-managed brand image will have a positive impact. Creating an impression is one of the basic characteristics in modern marketing goals, namely through the provision of increased care and the creation of a strong brand. The connection of these things makes the brand of a product create an image of the product itself in the minds of customers and realize the basic motivation for customers in choosing a product. Vranesevic Aaker, (2003) Brand image is what consumers think and feel when hearing or seeing a brand and what consumers learn about the brand. So it can be concluded that brand image is a combination of brand associations that consumers can feel and think about that are created and maintained by marketers to form in the minds of consumers. The more the brand image of the product improves, it will improve purchasing decisions.

E-Word of Mouth influences consumer purchasing decisions Priansa (2016), Jatmika (2014) and Oktavianto (2014) who explain that E-Wom has a positive and significant influence on consumer purchasing decisions to shop at Lazada. Also supports research. In research (Adeliasari et al., 2014) that variables (intensity, valence of opinion, and content) e-WOM have a positive and significant influence on purchasing decisions.

According to Goldsmith in Priansa, (2016) electronic word of mouth (EWOM) is social communication on the internet where web browsers send and receive information related to products online

Based on the description of the background above, researchers are interested in understanding and discussing the **"Influence of Product Quality, Brand Image and E-Word of Mouth on Notbrand.Co Online Clothing Purchasing Decisions in DKI Jakarta"**

RESEARCH METHODS

The research method described above refers to systematic steps to carry out a thesis research. The research object identified was the decision to purchase clothes online in DKI Jakarta,

Rani Yulia[1], Resti Hardini[2], Kumba Digdowiseiso[3]

focusing on the influence of product quality, brand image, and e-word of mouth. The main data source is obtained from respondents through the distribution of questionnaires.

The population of this study was online clothing buyers from Notbrand.Co in DKI Jakarta, and the samples were selected using Probability Sampling and Purposive Sampling techniques. A total of 96 respondents were considered a representative sample to represent the larger population.

The data collection process was carried out using the questionnaire method, with a Likert scale to measure respondents' responses to the variables studied. Then, data analysis was carried out descriptively and inferentially, using SPSS statistical software.

As part of the analysis method, the study also includes instrument tests to measure the validity and reliability of the data. Tests of classical assumptions, such as normality, multicollinearity, heterokedasticity, and autocorrelation, are also performed to ensure the validity of multiple linear regression analyses.

Multiple linear regression analysis is used to determine the relationship between the independent variable (product quality, brand image, and e-word of mouth) and the dependent variable (purchase decision). In addition, model feasibility tests, including the coefficient of determination test, F-test, and t-test, are performed to assess the extent to which the model can account for the variation of the dependent variable.

Thus, this study applies a quantitative approach using statistical analysis methods and following structured steps to achieve the research objectives that have been set.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
A. Test Instruments
1. Validity Test

The validity and reliability test that will be carried out in this study uses a sample of 96 respondents. The validity test was carried out to test the questionnaire items submitted as instruments in this study whether they were suitable for use. The calculation is to compare r_{count} with r_{table}. If r_{count} has a greater value than r_{table} where the correlation coefficient is more than 0.198 then the entire statement is declared valid so that it can be used in this study.

a) Product Quality (X_1)

Below are the results of the validity test calculation consisting of 6 (six) items of Product Quality variable statements (X_1) using the SPSS 26 program as a tool to calculate a sample of 96 respondents, so that the following results are obtained

Table 1. Product Quality Validity Test Results (X_1)

Questionnaire	r Calculate	r Table	Information
Point X1.1	0.648	0,198	Valid
Item X1.2	0.652	0,198	Valid

Point X1.3	0.616	0,198	Valid
Point X1.4	0.544	0,198	Valid
Point X1.5	0.637	0,198	Valid
Item X1.6	0.511	0,198	Valid

Source **:** Primary Data SPSS 26 Output Item-Total Statistic. Processed 2022

Based on the results of table 4.14 above, it can be seen that all questionnaires submitted have a greater Corrected Item Total Correlation value compared to the table r value in the 96th N sample, which is 0.198 which means that the entire $r_{is\ calculated} > r_{table}$. From the output of the Validity Test, the largest coefficient value of the Product Quality instrument ($X_{1) is found in the}$ second statement, which is 0.652, while the smallest value is found in the sixth statement with a value of 0.511.

From the output results of the overall validity test submitted using the SPSS 26 program as a calculation tool on the Product Quality variable (X_1), it is declared valid so that all statements from the Product Quality variable (X1) can be used for the next stage.

b) **Brand Image (X2)**

Below are the results of the validity test calculation consisting of 3 (three) items of Brand Image variable statements (X_2) using the SPSS 26 program as a tool to calculate a sample of 96 respondents, so that the following results are obtained:

Table 2. Brand Image Validity Test Results (X2)

Questionnaire	r Calculate	r Table	Information
Point X2.1	0.582	0,198	Valid
Point X2.2	0.572	0,198	Valid
Point X2.3	0.610	0,198	Valid

Source **:** Primary Data SPSS 26 Output Item-Total Statistic. Processed 2022

Based on the results of table 4.15 above, it can be seen that all questionnaires submitted have a greater Corrected Item Total Correlation value compared to the table r value in the 96th N sample, which is 0.198 which means that the entire $r_{is\ calculated} > r_{table}$. From the output of the Validity Test, the largest coefficient value of the Brand Image instrument X_2 is found in the third statement, which is 0.610, while the smallest value is found in the second statement with a value of 0.572.

From the output results, the overall validity test submitted using the SPSS 26 program as a calculation tool on the Brand Image variable (X_2), is declared valid so that all statements from the Brand Image variable (X2) can be used for the next stage.

c) **E-Word Of Mouth** (X3)

Below are the results of the validity test calculation consisting of 2 (two) items of E-Word Of Mouth (X3) variable statements using the SPSS 26 program as a tool to calculate a sample of 96 respondents, so that the following results are obtained:

Table 3. E-Word Of Mouth Validity Test Results (X3)

Rani Yulia[1], Resti Hardini[2], Kumba Digdowiseiso[3]

Questionnaire	r Calculate	r Table	Information
Point X3.1	0.728	0,198	Valid
Item X3.2	0.740	0,198	Valid
Point X3.3	0.614	0,198	Valid

Source : Primary Data SPSS 26 Output Item-Total Statistic. Processed 2022

Based on the results of table 4.16 above, it can be seen that all questionnaires submitted have a greater Corrected Item Total Correlation value compared to the table r value in the 96th N sample, which is 0.198 which means that the entire r is calculated $> r$ table. From the output of the Validity Test, the largest coefficient value of the E-Word Of Mouth (X3) instrument is found in the second statement, which is 0.740, while the smallest value is found in the third statement with a value of 0.614.

From the output results of the entire validity test submitted using the SPSS 26 program as a calculation tool on the E-Word Of Mouth (X3) variable, it is declared valid so that all statements from the E-Word Of Mouth (X3) variable can be used for the next stage.

d) **Purchase Decision (Y)**

Below are the results of the validity test calculation consisting of 5 (five) items of Purchase Decision (Y) variable statements using the SPSS 26 program as a tool to calculate a sample of 96 respondents, so that the following results are obtained:

Table 4. Purchase Decision Validity Test Results (Y)

Questionnaire	r Calculate	r Table	Information
Item Y1	0.771	0,198	Valid
Item Y2	0.744	0,198	Valid
Item Y3	0.690	0,198	Valid
Point Y4	0.618	0,198	Valid

Source : Primary Data SPSS 26 Output Item-Total Statistic. Processed 2022

Based on the results of Table 4.17 above, it can be seen that all questionnaires submitted have a Corrected Item Total Correlation value that is greater than the r value of the table in the 96th N sample, which is 0.198 which means that the entire r is calculated $> r$ table. From the output of the Validity Test, the largest coefficient value   of the Purchase Decision instrument (Y) is found in the first statement, which is 0.771, while the smallest value is found in the fourth statement with a value of 0.618.

From the output results of the overall validity test submitted using the SPSS 26 program as a calculation tool on the Purchase Decision variable (Y), it is declared valid so that all statements from the Purchase Decision variable (Y) can be used for the next stage.

2. **Reliability Test**

Reliability test is a test used to determine the consistency of measuring instruments, whether the measuring instrument can be relied on for further use. After the validity test is

declared valid, then a reliability test is carried out using the Alpha Cronbachs formula. Where an instrument can be said to be reliable (reliable) if it has a reliability coefficient or alpha of more than 0.6. The reliability test results are presented in the table below:

Table 5. Instrument Reliability Test Results Variable Product Quality (X $_1$), Brand Image (X$_2$), E-Word Of Mouth (X3) and Purchasing Decision (Y)

No.	Variable	Reliability	Alpha	Information
1.	Product Quality (X1)	0,814	0,6	Reliable
2.	Brand Image (X2)	0,753	0,6	Reliable
3.	E-Word Of Mouth (X3)	0,831	0,6	Reliable
4.	Purchase Decision (Y)	0,859	0,6	Reliable

Source : SPSS Primary Data 26. Output Reliability. Processed 2022

From the results of data processing carried out with the SPSS 26 program as a calculation tool, in table 4.18 above it can be said that the entire questionnaire item of each variable Product Quality (X $_1$), Brand Image (X$_2$), E-Word Of Mouth (X3) and Purchase Decision (Y) in this study is reliable which is shown in the value of Cronbach's alpha to all variablese has a good value above 0.6. So it can be interpreted that all values of this research variable are said to be good and acceptable, which is seen from the output of Realiability statistics, namely the value of Cronbach's alpha all variables above the good level.

1. **Classical Assumption Test**

   In this study, the classical assumption test was carried out with four tests, namely, normality test, multicollinearity test, heteroscedasticity test and autocorrelation test with a sample of 96 respondents.

 a) **Normality Test**

   One Sample Kolmogorov–Smirnov Test, or Normality Test is used to determine the distribution of the population, whether it follows the distribution theoretically (normal, poisson, or uniform). Which aims to test whether in the regression model, the bound variable and the independent variable both have a normal distribution. The distribution data is said to be normal if the level of significance value is > α = 0.05 and if the opposite is < α = 0.05 then it is said to be abnormal. Below is presented a table of results from the Normality Test in this study.

Table 6. Normality Test Output

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test		Unstandardized Residual
N		96
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	.0000000
	Std. Deviation	1.70586083
Most Extreme	Absolute	.088

Rani Yulia[1], Resti Hardini[2], Kumba Digdowiseiso[3]

Differences	Positive	.081
	Negative	-.088
Test Statistics		.088
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.061c
a. Test distribution is Normal.		
b. Calculated from data.		
c. Lilliefors Significance Correction.		
d. This is a lower bound of the true significance.		

The result from Table 4.19 above shows that the value of Asymp Sig. (2- tailed) is 0.061. Which means that the regression model in this study has a normal sample distribution based on its significance value > α = 0.05. So it can be said that the distribution of Purchase Decision results derived from Product Quality, Brand Image and E-Word Of Mouth is normally distributed at a significance level of α = 0.05.

b) **Multicollenearity Test**

The multicollinearity test is used to determine whether or not there is a deviation from the classical assumption of multicollinearity, namely the existence of a linear relationship or the value of variance inflation factor (VIF), if the Tolerance value > 0.1 or VIF < 10, then it can be said that multicollinearity does not occur in the model studied. To find out whether multicollinearity occurs can be seen in table 7 below:

Table 7. Multicollinearity Test Output

Coefficientsa								
		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			Collinearity Statistics	
Type		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	.240	1.328		.181	.857		
	Product Quality	.178	.064	.255	2.764	.007	.497	2.011
	Brand Image	.710	.145	.465	4.878	.000	.465	2.151
	E-Word of Mouth	.213	.090	.182	2.351	.021	.708	1.413

a. Dependent Variable: Purchase Decision

Source : SPSS Output 26. Coefficients, linear regression. Processed 2022

Based on table 4.20 (Coefficients) it can be seen that the variance inflation factor (VIF) of each independent variable has the following values:

1) The VIF value for the Product Quality variable (X_1) is 2.011 < 10 and the tolerance value is 0.497 > 0.10.

2) The VIF value for the Brand Image (X2) variable is 2,151 < 10 and the tolerance value is 0.465 > 0.10.

3) The VIF value for the E-Word Of Mouth (X3) variable is 1,413 < 10 and the tolerance value is 0.708 > 0.10.

Thus it can be concluded that the regression equation model does not occur multicollinearity and can be used in this study.

c) Heteroscedasticity Test

In a good Regression Heteroscedasticity test should not occur Heteroscedasticity, this test aims to test whether a regression model has an inequality of variance from one observation to another. A good regression model is one of homokedasticity, or no heteroscedasticity. In this study, researchers used the Heteroscedasticity Test with the glacier test where the test results can be seen in the table below:

Table 8. Glejser Test Output (Heteroscedasticity)

Coefficientsa

Type		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2.708	.859		3.152	.002
	Product Quality	-.005	.042	-.018	-.123	.903
	Brand Image	-.028	.094	-.044	-.294	.769
	E-word of mouth	-.081	.059	-.169	-1.392	.167

a. Dependent Variable: ABS_RES

Source : SPSS Output 26. Coefficients, linear regression. Processed 2022

Table 4.21 above explains that the results of each independent variable, namely Product Quality Innovation (X $_1$), Brand Image (X_2) and E-Word Of Mouth (X3) using the glacier model obtained significantly more results

Large than 0.05 which means that the data in this study does not occur heterokedasticity problems so that this research can be continued.

d) Autocorrelation Test

Rani Yulia[1], Resti Hardini[2], Kumba Digdowiseiso[3]

Autocorrelation is a state in which there is a strong correlation for observations between one and another observation arranged according to time sequence. The Autocorrelation Test aims to test whether in a linear regression model there is a correlation between confounding errors in the current period and confounding errors in previous periods. A good regression equation is one that has no autocorrelation. If there is autocorrelation, the equation becomes not good for production. One measure in determining the presence or absence of autocorrelation problems is to use the Durbin-Watson (DW) test. Where the results of autokeralsi testing can be seen in the table below:

Table 9. Autocorrelation Test Output

Model Summary^b

Type	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.782a	.611	.598	1.733	2.241

a. Predictors: (Constant), *E-word of mouth,* product quality, brand image

Variable Dependents: Purchasing Decisions

Source : SPSS Output 26. Coefficients, linear regression. Processed 2022

Based on table 9 it can be explained that the Durbin-Watson value is 2.241. Where the K value or number of independent variables is 3 and the N value or the number of respondent data = 96. So that the value of dL = 1.6039 and the value of dU = 1.7326 then the value of 4-dU = 2.2636. If included in the criteria so that the results of dU < DW < 4-dU (1.732 < 2.241 < 2.267) which means that the regression model obtained does not autocorrelate occurs.

1. **Multiple Linear Regression Analysis**

    Multiple linear regression analysis is a form of analysis that discusses the extent of the influence of the independent variable (X) on the dependent variable (Y). where for the independent variables Product Quality (X_1), Brand Image (X2) and E-Word Of Mouth (X3) and the dependent variable is Purchase Decision (Y). In calculating the regression coefficient in this study using the SPSS 26 program. Below are the output results presented in Table 4.19 as follows:

Table 10. Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

Coefficientsa

Type		Unstandardized Coefficients B	Unstandardized Coefficients Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	.240	1.328		.181	.857
	Product Quality	.178	.064	.255	2.764	.007
	Brand Image	.710	.145	.465	4.878	.000
	E-Word Of Mouth	.213	.090	.182	2.351	.021

a. Dependent Variable: Purchase Decision

Source : SPSS Output 26. Coefficients, linear regression. Processed 2022

Based on table 4.23, it is known that the multiple linear regression equation known in the Standardized Coefficient column is as follows:

$$Y = 0.255X_1 + 0.465X_2 + 0.182X_3$$

Information:

Y   = Purchase Decision

X1   = Product Quality

X2   = Brand Image

X3   = E-Word Of Mouth

The interpretation of the results of the equation is as follows:

a) The Product Quality Regression Coefficient has a contribution of 0.255 to the Decision variable, the higher the product quality, the purchase decision will increase.

b) The Brand Image regression coefficient has a contribution of 0.465 to the Purchase Decision variable. This means that the higher the brand image, the more purchasing decisions increase.

c) The E-Word Of Mouth regression coefficient has a contribution of 0.182 to the Purchase Decision variable. This means that the higher the e-word of mouth, the more purchasing decisions increase.

e) **Model Due Diligence**

To test the significance of the influence of the independent variable, namely Product Quality, Brand Image and E-Word Of Mouth on the dependent variable, namely Purchase Decision, the ANOVA test (Test F) was used. The test results using a significance level of 0.05 are as follows:

Table 11. Model Feasibility Test Output (Test F)

ANOVAa						
Type		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	434.460	3	144.820	48.195	,000 b
	Residuals	276.446	92	3.005		

Rani Yulia[1], Resti Hardini[2], Kumba Digdowiseiso[3]

	Total	710.906	95		

a. Dependent Variable: Purchase Decision

b. Predictors: (Constant), E-word Of Mouth, Product Quality, Brand Image

Source : SPSS Output 26. ANOVA. Processed 2022

As shown in the data output of the Anova Table in Table 4.24 above, it can be explained that the calculated F $_{value}$ is 48.195 with a sig value of 0.000. Based on the results of calculations assisted by the SPSS 26 program, the value of Sig = (0.000) is smaller than alpha or the error limit level obtained is 5% ($\alpha = 0.05$). The meaning of the Sig value in the Anova table, the model is said to be significant because it is below the specified alpha value limit of 0.000 < 0.05.

So it can be concluded that in this study the model is said to be significant and feasible to be used in this study based on the Sig value obtained, that all independent variables can explain any changes in the value of the dependent variable because it has a significant influence.

1. **Coefficient of Determination (R^2)**

Coefficient of Determination (R2) analysis is used to determine how much the ability of the independent variable developed in the study is able to explain the dependent variable.

Table 12. Output Coefficient of Determination (R^2) Model Summary^b

Type	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.782 a	.611	.598	1.733

a. Predictors: (Constant), E-word Of Mouth, Product Quality, Brand Image

b. Dependent Variable: Purchasing Decision

Source : SPSS Output 26. Model Summary. Processed 2022

In Table 4.25 above, it can be seen that the coefficient of determination ($R^{2)}$ is 0.59.8. This means that the relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable is 0.59.8% which means that 0.59.8% of the variation in Purchasing Decisions is influenced by Product Quality, Brand Image and E-Word Of Mouth while 0.33% is explained by other factors outside the regression model analyzed in this study.

2. **Test t (Research Hypothesis Test)**

This test is used to determine the significance of the effect of the independent variable partially or individually on the dependent variable. The effect can be estimated by the cynical value and t count obtained. To find out whether Product

Quality (X_1), Brand Image (X2) and E-Word Of Mouth (X3) have a significant effect on Purchasing Decisions (Y).

Test Criteria:

(1) If the value of sig. > 0.05 and t count < t table, then H0 accepted H1rejected.

(2) If the value of sig. < 0.05 and t count > t table, then H0 rejected H1accepted.

Table 13. Test t

Coefficientsa					
Type	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	.240	1.328		.181	.857
Product Quality	.178	.064	.255	2.764	.007
Brand Image	.710	.145	.465	4.878	.000
E-word Of Mouth	.213	.090	.182	2.351	.021

a. Dependent Variable: Purchase Decision

Source : SPSS Output 26. Coefficients, linear regression. Processed 2022

Based on the calculation results in table 4.26, it is explained as follows:

a) Product Quality Hypothesis Testing (X_1) Against Purchasing Decision (Y)

Based on the results of the test in table 4.26 above, it shows that the calculated t value in the Product Quality variable (X1) of 2.764 with a significant value of 0.007 must be found the table t value (α = 0.05) is 1.984, because the calculated t value (2.764 > 1.984) with a significant level (0.007 < 0.05), then Ho is rejected and Ha is accepted, which means that there is a positive and significant influence between Product Quality (X1) to Purchase Decision (Y).

b) Submission of brand image hypothesis (x_2) to purchase decision (y)

Based on the results of the test in table 4.26 above, it shows that the calculated t value in the Brand Image variable (X2) is 4.878 with a significant value of 0.000, it must be found that the table t value (α = 0.05) is 1.984, because the calculated t value (4.878 > 1.984) with a significant level (0.001 < 0.05), then H o is rejected and H a accepted, which means that there is a positive and significant influence between Brand Image has a positive influence and GIS on Purchase Decision (Y).

c) Submission of the E-Word Of Mouth Hypothesis (X3) To Purchasing Decision (Y)

Based on the results of the test in table 4.26 above, it shows that the

Rani Yulia[1], Resti Hardini[2], Kumba Digdowiseiso[3]

calculated t value in the E-Word Of Mouth (X3) variable is 2.351 with a significant value of 0.021, the table t value (α = 0.05) must be found is 1.984, because the calculated t value (2.351 > 1.984) with a significant level (0.021 < 0.05), then Ho is rejected and Ha is accepted, which means that there is a positive and significant influence between the E-Word Of Mouth (X₃) to the Purchase Decision (Y).

Discussion

The Influence of Product Quality on Purchasing Decisions

Based on the results of research conducted by researchers spss version 26, it was found that the Product Quality variables consisting of Performance indicators, Reliability, Additional Features, Conformance to specifications, durability and Aesthetics) has a positive and significant influence on Notbrand.Co Purchasing Decisions on Consumers in DKI Jakarta. This is evidenced from the test of t plus yaa----variable Product Quality to Purchasing Decision showing t_{count} of 2.764, regression coefficient of 0.255 and significant value of 0.007 which is smaller than 0.05. This can also mean that the higher the Product Quality, the more the decision to purchase notbrand.co clothing products in DKI Jakarta. The quality of the product has a positive and significant influence on purchasing decisions, especially shown through the Performance statement, I feel that Notbrand.co clothes have materials that are comfortable when worn so that they can be used for everyday product quality that is felt best by consumers who can influence purchasing decisions.

Product quality, the capability of a product, and quality are defined as the level of quality that is expected to meet consumer needs and control diversity to achieve that quality. Features such as durability, reliability, ease of use and correction, and value attributes. Kotler, (2008). According to research by Nathanael et al. (2021), there is a positive and significant influence between product quality on consumer purchasing decisions. Product quality is the ability of a product to perform its functions, including durability, reliability, accuracy, ease of use and other attributes. The higher the quality of the product, the higher the consumer's purchase decision

The results of this research are in line with previous research by Nugroho Aryo (2021) entitled "The Influence of Product Quality, Brand Image, and Online Marketing on Purchasing Decisions" Product quality partially has a positive and significant influence on Purchasing Decisions. In his research stated that product quality is known to have a significant influence on Purchasing Decisions.

The influence of brand image on purchasing decisions

Based on the results of research conducted by researchers, it was found that Brand Image consisting of product attribute indicators, consumer benefits and brand personality had a positive and significant effect on Notbrand.Co Purchasing Decisions for Consumers in DKI Jakarta. This is evidenced from the testing of the Brand Image variable t test on Purchasing Decisions showing t_{count} of 2.764, regression coefficient of 0.465 and probability value of 0.000 which is smaller than 0.05. This can also mean that the higher the brand image, the more the decision to purchase notbrand.co clothing products in DKI Jakarta. The brand image has a positive and significant influence on purchasing decisions, this can be seen through the statement of product attributes

(Product Attribute**).** In my opinion, Notbrand.co brand clothes have a good image through the excellence of the quality of the model and design so that it can influence purchasing decisions.

According to Kotler and Armstrong (2010: 275), Brand Image is a consumer understanding of a brand of a particular brand so as to give a positive impression in the minds of consumers, brand designs or a combination of all that shows a product or service identity of a seller or a group of sellers and distinguishes the product from competitors' products. Brand Image is a consumer understanding of a brand towards a particular brand so as to give a positive impression in the minds of consumers. According to research by Ayu Marini Sarasdiyanthi et al. (2016), brand image influences purchasing decisions positively and significantly. A good brand image is one of the reasons behind the purchase decision.

According to the average results, the mean of Brand Image (X_2) as a whole identifies that Brand Image gets a good score. In line with research conducted by Kurniawati (2020) in her research entitled "The Influence of E-Word Of Mouth and Brand Image on the Purchase Decision of Semarang City Makeover Cosmetic Products ", it shows that by giving as well as possible, a Purchase Decision will be created with the results of the study showing that the purchase decision of MakeOver cosmetics (Y) is influenced by X1 and X2

The Influence Of E-Word Of Mouth On Purchasing Decisions

Based on the results of research conducted by researchers, it was found that E-Word Of Mouth consisting of intensity, Valence of Opinion and content   (content) had a positive and significant effect on Notbrand.Co Purchasing Decisions in DKI Jakarta. This is evidenced by the testing of the E-Word Of Mouth variable t test on Purchasing Decisions showing t_{count} of 2.351, regression coefficient of 0.182 and probability value of 0.021 which is smaller than 0.05. This can mean that the higher the e-word of mouth, the more the decision to purchase notbrand.co clothing products in DKI Jakarta. The quality of e-word of mouth has a positive and significant influence on purchasing decisions. This can be seen through the statement of intensity (intensity) "I often look for information about Notbrand.co on online forums to help me in choosing Notbrand.co clothes before I buy them" so that it can influence the purchase decision.

Electronic word of mouth (EWOM) is a social communication on the internet where web browsers send and receive information related to products online. Thus it can be concluded that electronic word of is social communication carried out by consumers through the internet where consumers can convey information and receive information about a product or service. Goldsmith in (Priansa, 2016)

Electronic Word of Mouth (eWOM) is a form of marketing communication containing positive or negative statements made by potential customers, customers and former customers about a product or company, which is available to many people through internet media Hennig-Thurau, (2004)

The results of this study are also in accordance with the findings of research conducted by Amalia and Ruswanti (2016) entitled "The Influence of Product Quality, Brand Image, and Word Of Mouth on Purchasing Decisions (Case Study of Nesco Multicheck Consumers at Pt Hafidz Medika,

Rani Yulia[1], Resti Hardini[2], Kumba Digdowiseiso[3]

Central Jakarta)" The results show that X1 has a significant influence on Y, X2 has a significant influence on Y and$_{x3}$ has a significant influence on Purchasing Decisions (Y).

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of research and discussion on the Influence of Product Quality, Brand Image, and E-Word Of Mouth on the Purchase Decision of Notbrand.co online clothing products in DKI Jakarta, it can be concluded that all independent variables, namely Product Quality, Brand Image, and E-Word Of Mouth, have a positive and significant influence on Purchasing Decisions. That is, when product quality, brand image, and e-word of mouth increase, the decision to purchase Notbrand.co online clothing products in DKI Jakarta also increases. These findings demonstrate the importance of these aspects in shaping consumer preferences in making online purchase decisions, and contribute positively to marketing strategies and brand development Notbrand.co in the DKI Jakarta market.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adeliasari, Ivana, V., & Thio, S. (2014). Electronic Word-Of-Mouth (E-Wom) Dan Pengaruhnya Terhadap Keputusan Pembelian Di Restoran Dan Kafe Di Surabaya. *Jurnal Hospitality Dan Manajemen Jasa*, *2*(2), 218–230.

Amarazka, V., & Dewi, R. S. (2020). Pengaruh Kualitas Produk Dan E-Wom Terhadap Keputusan Pembelian Portobello Semarang. *Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi Bisnis*, *9*(4), 507–513. https://ejournal3.undip.ac.id/index.php/jiab/article/view/28791

Arif., M. (2021). Pengaruh Social Media Marketing, Electronic Word Of Mouth (EWOM) Dan lifestyle Terhadap Keputusan Pembelian Online. *SiNTESa Seminar Nasional Teknologi Edukasi Sosial Dan Humaniora*, *1*(1), 111–122.

Arifin, J. (2017). *SPSS 24 untuk Penelitian dan Skripsi*. Kelompok Gramedia.

Assauri, S. (2009). *Manajemen Pemasaran Konsep Dasar dan Strategi. Edisi Pertama*. PT Raja Grafindo Persada.Jakarta.

Ayu Marini Sarasdiyanthi, N. K., Sasrawan Mananda, I. G., & Suardana, I. W. (2016). Pengaruh Citra Merek Dan Persepsi Kualitas Pelayanan Pelayanan Terhadap Keputusan Pembelian Pada Online Travel Agent Airasia Go. *Jurnal IPTA*, *4*(2). https://doi.org/10.24843/ipta.2016.v04.i02.p02

Ferdinand, A. (2006). *Metode Penelitian Manajemen: Pedoman Penelitian untuk skripsi, Tesis dan Disertai Ilmu Manajemen*. Semarang: Universitas Diponegoro.

Ferdinand, A. (2014). *Metode Penelitian Manajemen*.

Gaspersz, V. (2008). Total Quality Control. In *Total Quality Control*. Jakarta: PT. Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Ghozali, I. (2016). *Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate. Semarang*. Universitas Diponegoro.

Ghozali, I. 2011. (2011). *Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate Dengan Program IBM SPSS19*. Semarang: Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.

Goyette I., Ricard, L., J., B., & F., M. (2010). e-WOM Scale: word-of-mouth measurement scale for e-services context. *E-WOM Scale: Word-of-mouth Measurement Scale for E-services Context*, 27(1), 5–23.

Hasan, A. (2010). Marketing dari Mulut ke Mulut. In *Marketing dari Mulut ke Mulut*. Marketing dari Mulut ke Mulut.

Hennig-Thurau, T., Kevin P.G, G. W. and, & D.G., D. (2004). Electronic word- of_mouth via consumer opinion platform: what motives consumer to articulates themeselves on the internet. *Electronic Word-Of_mouth via Consumer Opinion Platform: What Motives Consumer to Articulates Themeselves on the Internet*, *18*, 38-52.

Jeong, E. and S. (Shawn) J. (n.d.). Restaurant experience triggering positive electronic word-of-mouth (eWOM) motivations. *Restaurant Experience Triggering Positive Electronic Word-of-Mouth (EWOM) Motivations.International*, *Vol. 30*, 356-366.

Kotler, P., & Armstrong, G. (2008). Prinsi-prinsip pemasaran jilid 1. In *Prinsi- prinsip pemasaran jilid 1*. Jakarta: Erlangga.

Kotler, P., & Keller, K. . (2012). *Manajemen Pemasaran jilid 1 edisi ke 12*. Erlangga.

Kotler, P. & Keller, K. L. (2012). *Manajemen Pemasaran* (rlangga). Erlangga. Kotler, Philip., Keller, K. L. (2013). *Manajemen Pemasaran, Jilid Kedua*. Jakarta: Erlangga.

Kotler, P. and G. A. (2008). *Prinsip - prinsip Pemasaran Edisi 12*. Jakarta: Erlangga.

Martono, N. (2010). Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif: Analisis Isi dan Analisis Data Sekunder. In *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif: Analisis Isi dan Analisis Data Sekunder* (Vol. 1, Issue 1).

Natanael, A., Santoso, T., & Siwalankerto, J. (2021). *Pembelian Pada Bisnis Makanan Online Bosse Ayam Panggang Khas Solo*. *9*(1).

Priyastama, R. (2017). Buku Sakti Kuasai SPSS Pengelolaan data dan Analisis data. Start Up. In *Buku Sakti Kuasai SPSS Pengelolaan data dan Analisis data. Start Up.*

Rangkuti, F. (2009). Strategi Promosi yang Kreatif dan Analisis Kasus Integrated Marketing Communication. In Jakarta : PT. Gramedia Pustaka Utama. (Ed.), *Strategi Promosi yang Kreatif dan Analisis Kasus Integrated Marketing Communication.*

Ratri, L. E. (2007). *Strategi Memenangkan Persaingan Pasar*. Jakarta: Salemba Empat.

Roslina. (2010). *Citra Merek: Dimensi, Proses Pemngembangan Serta Pengukurannya*. Jurnal Bisnis dan Manajemen.

Schiffman, L.G., & Kanuk, L., L. (2010). *). Consumer Behaviour (10th ed). New Jersey*. Pearson Prentice Hall.

Sugiyono. (2017). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif Kualitatif dan R & D*. Bandung : Alfabeta.

Sugiyono. (2018). *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D.* Alfabeta.

sugiyono. (2015). *Metode Penelitian Kombinasi (Mix Methods)*. Bandung: Alfabeta.

Sugiyono. (2012). Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif Kualitatif dan R&B. In *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif Kualitatif dan R&B*. Bandung: Alfabeta.

Sugiyono. (2013). Metode Penelitian Pendidikan Pendekatan Kuantitatif. In *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan Pendekatan Kuantitatif.* (p. 184). Bandung: Alfabeta, CV.

Rani Yulia[1], Resti Hardini[2], Kumba Digdowiseiso[3]

Sugiyono. (2016). Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif Kualitatif dan R&B. In *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif Kualitatif dan R&B*. Bandung: Alfabeta.

Sugiyono. (2017). Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D. In *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D.* Bandung: Alfabeta, CV.

Sunyoto, D. (2012). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Jakarta: PT Buku Seru.

Sunyoto, D. (2013). *Teori, Kuesioner & Analisis Data Untuk Pemasaran*. Jakarta: Ghalia Indonesia.

Supranto. & Limakrisna, N. (2011). *Perilaku Konsumen dan Strategi Pemasaran*. Mitra Wacana Media: Jakarta.

Swastha, B., & I. (2011). Manajemen Pemasaran Modern. In *Manajemen Pemasaran Modern*. Yogyakarta : Liberty.

Tjiptono, F. (2011). Service Management Mewujudkan Layanan Prima. In *Service Management Mewujudkan Layanan Prima* (Edisi 2). Yogyakarta: Andi.

Tjiptono, F. (2014b). *Pemasaran Jasa – Prinsip, Penerapan, dan Penelitian*. Andi Offset, Yogyakarta.

Umar, H. (2013). Metode Penelitian untuk Skripsi dan Tesis Bisnis. In *Metode Penelitian untuk Skripsi dan Tesis Bisnis.* Rajawali.

Vranesevic Aaker. (2003). *Riset perilaku konsumen*.