Social Media Promotion Effect on Product Purchase Decisions through Word of Mouth Marketing

Wursan
Faculty of Economics and Business, Siliwangi University, Indonesia

Lucky Radi Rinandiyana
Faculty of Economics and Business, Siliwangi University, Indonesia

Tine Badriatin
Faculty of Economics and Business, Siliwangi University, Indonesia

Abstract---This study aims to describe: (1). Promotion uses social media to influence purchasing decisions (2). Promotion with social media so that it can influence the word of mouth market (3) Promotion of word of mouth market in influencing product purchases (4) Promotion using social media word of mouth market in influencing product purchases. The method uses Quantitave, data collection techniques with questionnaires, samples with purposive sampling with a total of 150. Conclusions: (1) Social media promotion has an effect on product purchases with t-count = 8,664 value 0.000 < 0.05, coefficient value = 0.792, (2) Social media promotion affects word of mouth with, t-count = 4.395 with value = 0.000 <0.05, coefficient value = r 0.395, (3). Word of mouth market has an influence on product purchases, with t-count = 4.821 with a value = 0.000 <0.05, coefficient = 0.440 (4). Social media promotion affects purchasing decisions, with a coefficient = 0.0906 value = 0.0217 <0.05.

Keywords---product purchase, promotion, social media, word of mouth marketing.

Introduction

Marketing with promotions through social media to be able to increase sales widely, in order to reduce marketing costs (Mangold & Faulds, 2009; Alsalami & Al-Zaman, 2021). Where consumers will easily find information on all products they want to buy directly (Kotler & Armstrong, 2008). Data reported by the site www.sigmanews.us, with some of the most popular social media sites in 2015,

Facebook took the first position, followed by Twitter, Google, MySpace, LinkedIn, Friendster, and finally Pinterest. In addition, the number of Indonesian internet users continues to increase significantly every year.

Meanwhile, Indonesia is the second country with the most Facebook users after India. According to data from http://the-marketeers.com, internet access via smartphones now amounts to 58 million people. According to Markplus Insight's research, around 58 million internet users in Indonesia access the internet via mobile devices such as mobile devices or smartphones, personal notebooks, netbooks, and tablet PCs (Swastha & Handoko, 2004). Three out of ten netizens admitted to changing their cellphones in the past year, and one in ten netizens admitted to changing their laptops or netbooks in the past year (Azwar, 2009).

Seeing the large number of access to social media in Indonesia through smartphones, it can be a good business opportunity, one of which is in the digital printing industry, one of which is Garskin (Zarella, 2010). Garskin serves to cover the HP casing, protecting the HP casing from scratches which usually occur due to human accident (Harjadi & Dewi, 2008). In addition, Garskin is used to enhance the appearance of smartphones to make them more attractive. One of the companies that make garskin is SayHello. SayHello sells its products without a fixed shop or kiosk, SayHello prefers to sell its products through its Facebook account and Twitter account (Hilary & Dumebi, 2021).

Buyers generally know Garskin products through the info on their Twitter account or from the tagged photos of their products on Facebook. With the rapid development of very sophisticated technology that supports word of mouth marketing promotions (Najua, 2012). With promotion through social media, either by telephone or using the internet. Coupled with the lifestyle of today's people who tend to use their smart devices which are already known as smartphones to be able to access the internet (Stephen, 2016; Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010).

Method

The research method uses a quantitative descriptive analytical approach through statistical mathematics (Jogiyanto, 2004). The technique of collecting data is through questionnaires distributed to respondents who are collected via email and watchup.

Data analysis technique

- Statistics Description, in this section, the compiler will analyze the data one by one based on the respondents' answers which were compiled based on the questionnaire that had been filled out by the respondents during the research.
- The classical assumption test consists of a normality test, which is used to show samples taken from a normally distributed population, using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov.
- Linearity Test, which aims to determine the two variables that have a linear relationship that is not significant. Testing using SPSS on Test for LinearityMulticollinearity test, multicollinearity test can be detected by

calculating multiple coefficients and comparing them with correlation coefficients between independent variables.

- Heteroscedasticity test, scatterplot method is used to test heteroscedasticity. Heteroscedasticity occurs in regression if the error variance (ei) is not constant for some values (x). Constant detection of error variance is done by drawing a graph between (y) and residual.

Results and Discussion
Results

Based on field data and data collected through questionnaires, namely: (1). The data will be used as promotion through social media in order to make product purchase decisions (2). The data obtained can influence promotion through social media on word of mouth marketing of products (3) The data is processed according to the discussion procedure, can influence word of mouth marketing on decisions in product purchases and (4). Data from the field is used as a tool for promotion through social media as word of mouth marketing for product purchasing decisions (Rosid et al., 2020). Subjects in this study amounted to 150 people:

- Characteristics of respondents described through statistical analysis as follows: (1). Maximum value (2). Minimum value (3). Average value (4). Standard deviation. As a category of respondents' answers. The answers of each respondent are presented as follows.
- Characteristics of respondents in this study include: Gender, age, and online media as a description of the characteristics of respondents which are presented as follows: An overview of the characteristics of respondents based on gender is presented in the table below:

Table 1
Characteristics of respondents – gender

No	Gender	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1.	Man	51	34
2.	Woman	99	66
	Amount	150	100,0

(Source: Primary data 2020)

Based on the table above, there are 51 respondents (34%) male respondents with female sex as many as 99 people (66%). So it can be concluded that women make up the majority of respondents as many as 99 people (68.3%). As an illustration of the characteristics of respondents based on age, it is presented in the table below:

Table 2
Characteristics of respondents – age

No	Gender	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	15-18 years	28	18,67
2	19-21 years	31	20,67

| 3 | 22-26 years | 91 | 60,66 |
| | Amount | 150 | 100,0 |

(Source: Primary data 2020)

Based on the table above, it shows that respondents aged between 15-18 years are 28 people (18.67%), respondents aged between 19-21 years are 31 people (20.67%), and respondents aged 22-24. 26 years old as many as 91 people (62.8%). In conclusion, the majority of respondents are between 22-26 years old as many as 91 people (60.66%). The online media used, descriptions of the characteristics of respondents through online media using are presented in the following table:

Table 3
Characteristics of respondents - online media

No	Online media	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1.	Computer	20	13,33
2.	Hand phone	85	56,67
3.	Hand phone, Computer	30	20
4.	Hand phone, IPad/Tab, Computer	15	10
	Amount	150	100,0

(Source: Primary data 2020)

Based on the table above shows that respondents who use online media with computers are 20 people (13.33%), respondents who use online media with cellphones are 85 people (56.67%), respondents who use online media with cellphones, computers are 30 people (20%), and 15 people (10%). So it can be concluded that the majority of respondents use online media with cellphones to find information (56.67%).

Variable category description

The description of the variable category describes the respondents' responses regarding the effect of promotion through social media word of mouth marketing on product purchasing decisions (Chen & Yuan, 2020; Li & Du, 2011; Martin & Lueg, 2013). The research data are categorized as high, medium, and low groups. The categories are based on the mean and standard deviation of each variable.

Promotion through social media

The results of descriptive analysis for promotion variables through social media, obtained a minimum value = 20; maximum value = 40; mean = 30.7103, and standard deviation = 3.68729. Then the promotion data through social media is categorized by using the average score (M) and standard deviation (Dahnil et al., 2014; González-Bailón & Wang, 2016). The number of questions for the promotion variable through social media consists of 8 questions, each of which has a score of 5, 4, 3, 2, 1. The categorization for social media variables is presented in the table below.

Table 4
Categorization of promotion strategy variables through social media

No	Category	Score Interval	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1.	High	X ≥ 34, 39763	32	21,33
2.	Currently	27,02306 ≤ X < 34,39763	84	56
3.	Low	X< 27,02306	34	22,67
		Amount	150	100,0

(Source: Primary data 2020)

Based on the table, it shows that respondents who gave an assessment of the promotion strategy variable through social media in the high category were 32 people (21.33%), respondents who gave an assessment of the promotion strategy variable through social media in the medium category were 84 people (56 %), and respondents who gave an assessment of the promotional strategy variables through social media in the low category, namely 34 people (22.67%).

Word of mouth marketing

The results of the descriptive analysis of the word of mouth marketing variable obtained a minimum value of 27; maximum value of 46; the mean of 36.4966; and the standard deviation of 4.22480. Furthermore, word of mouth marketing data is categorized by using the mean score (M) and standard deviation. The number of questions for the word of mouth marketing variable consists of 10 questions, each of which has a score of 5, 4, 3, 2 and 1. The categorization for the word of mouth marketing variable is presented in the following table.

Table 5
Word of mouth variable categorization

No	Category	Score Interval	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1.	high	X ≥ 40,72135	25	16,67
2.	Currently	32,27175≤ X < 40, 72135	95	63,33
3.	Low	X< 32,27175	30	20
		Amount	150	100,0

(Source: Primary data 2020)

The table shows that the respondents who gave an assessment of the word of mouth marketing variable in the high category were as many as 25 people (16.67%), respondents who gave an assessment of the word of mouth marketing variable in the medium category were 95 people (63.33%), and the respondents who gave an assessment of the word of mouth marketing variable in the low category were 30 people (20%).

Buying decision

The results of descriptive analysis for the purchase decision variable obtained a minimum value = 24; maximum value = 49; mean = 35.9310; and standard deviation = 4.97585. Furthermore, buying interest data is categorized by using

the mean score (M) and standard deviation. The number of questions for the purchasing decision variable consists of 10 questions, each of which has a score of 5, 4, 3, 2 and 1.

Table 6
Categorization of purchase decision variables

No	Category	Score Interval	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1.	hight	X ≥ 40,90689	28	18,67
2.	Currenty	30,95518≤X< 40.90689	98	65,33
3.	Low	X< 30,95518	24	16
		Amount	150	100,0

(Source: Primary data 2020)

Based on the table, it shows that the respondents who gave an assessment of the purchasing decision variables in the high category were 28 people (18.67%), respondents who gave an assessment of the purchasing decision variables in the medium category were 98 people (65.33%), and Respondents who gave an assessment of the purchasing decision variables in the low category were as many as 24 people (16%).

Normality test

Normality test can be done in order to find out the research variable data that is normally or not normally distributed. Normality test using Kolmogorov-Smirnov analysis with SPSS 13 windows calculation.
.

Table 7
Normality test

No	Variable	Significance	Description
1.	Promotion Through Social Media	0,304	Normal
2.	*Word Of Mouth Marketing*	0,418	Normal
3.	Buying decision	0,240	Normal

(Source: Primary data 2020)

The results of the normality test that have been discussed above can be generated on all variables, having a significant value, namely (sig> 0.05).

Table 8
Linearity test results

No	Variable	Significance	Description
1	Promotion Through Social Media	0,326	Linier
2	*Word Of Mouth Marketing*	0,059	Linier

(Source: Primary data 2020)

Multicollinearity test

Multicollinearity test was conducted to find out how big the intercorrelation between independent variables was in this study. If there is a correlation, it can be categorized as a multicollinearity problem, has a tolerance and a VIF value. With a tolerance value above 0.1 and a VIF value below 10, there is no multicollinearity.

Table 9
Multicollinearity test results

No	Dimensions	*Tolerance*	VIF	Conclusion
1.	Promotion Through Social Media	0,881	1,135	There is no multicollinearity
2.	*Word Of Mouth Marketing*	0,881	1,135	There is no multicollinearity

(Source: Primary data 2020)

Heteroscedasticity test

The heteroscedasticity test is used for regression testing, so there is an inequality of residual variables from the first observation to the next observation. A good and correct regression model is that there is no heteroscedasticity, as for knowing the presence and absence of heteroscedasticity, you can use the Glejser test.

Table 10
Heteroscedasticity test results

No	Dimensions	Sig.	Conclusion
1.	Promotion Through Social Media	0,762	There is no multicollinearity
2.	*Word Of Mouth Marketing*	0,979	There is no multicollinearity

(Source: Primary data 2020)

Hypothesis test

The hypothesis test in this study is that it can prove the influence of social media through word of mouth marketing on purchasing decisions.
The first hypothesis, with the results of regression analysis used to test the effect of promotion through social media on purchasing decisions.

Table 11
Results of social media promotion analysis on purchase decisions

No	Regression Coefficient	Constant	t-count	Sig.	*Adjusted* R^2
1	0,792	11,616	8,664	0,000	0,340

(Source: Primary data 2020)

The second hypothesis, with the results of regression analysis used to test the effect of promotional strategies through social media on word of mouth marketing, is presented in the table below:

Table 12
Social media promotion results on word of mouth marketing

No	Regression Coefficient	Constant	**t-count**	Sig.	*Adjusted* R²
1	0,395	24,358	4,395	0,000	0,113

(Source: Primary data 2020)

The regression equation shows that the coefficient value of the promotion strategy through social media (X) is 0.395, which means that if the promotion strategy through social media increases by one unit, the word of mouth will increase by 0.395 units. Coefficient of Determination (Adjusted R2). The magnitude of the influence of word of mouth marketing on purchasing decisions is 0.113; this means that word of mouth marketing is influenced by promotional strategies through social media by 11.3%, while the remaining 88.7% is influenced by other factors not included in this study. The third hypothesis with the results of regression analysis is used to test the effect of word of mouth marketing on purchasing decisions, presented in the table below:

Table 13
Results of the effect of word of mouth marketing on purchase decisions

No	Regression Coefficient	Constant	**t-count**	Sig.	*Adjusted* R²
1	0,440	19,858	4,821	0,000	0,134

(Source: Primary data 2020)

The regression equation shows that the coefficient of word of mouth marketing (M) is 0.440, which means that if word of mouth marketing increases by one unit, the purchasing decision will increase by 0.440 units:

- Regression significance test with t test, with the statistical results, after the regression test, the t-count is 4.821 with a significance value of 0.000, because the significance value is less than 0.05, it is obtained (0.000 <0.05), there is a positive regression coefficient that is = 0.440, then the hypothesis has a positive influence. mouth marketing on product purchasing decisions
- The coefficient of determination (Adjusted R2), the magnitude of the influence of word of mouth marketing on purchasing decisions is 0.134; this means that purchasing decisions are influenced by word of mouth marketing by 13.4%, while the remaining 86.6% is influenced by other factors not included in this study.

Discussion

- The Effect of Promotion through Social Media on Product Purchase Decisions. The results of the regression test statistic obtained t count = 8.664 with a significance value of 0.000, because the significance value is less than 0.05 (0.000 <0.05), and the regression coefficient = 0.792; then the hypothesis is that there is a positive effect of promotion through social media on product purchasing decisions on purchasing decisions = 0.340; purchasing decisions are influenced by promotion strategies through social media by 34%, while the remaining 66% is influenced by other factors.
- Impact and influence of Promotion Through Social Media Word Of Mouth Marketing on the product. The results of the statistical calculation of the regression test with t-count = 4.395 obtained a significance value of 0.000, with a significance value being (0.000 <0.05), and with the regression coefficient having a positive value = 0.395, then with the hypothesis obtained, it has a positive influence on promotion through social media word of mouth marketing, give influence word of mouth marketing on purchasing decisions of 0.113; this means that word of mouth is influenced by promotional strategies through social media by 11.3%, while the remaining 88.7% is influenced by other factors.
- Effect of Word Of Mouth Marketing on Product Purchase Decisions. Statistical results of the regression test obtained t count of 4.821 with a significance value of 0.000, because the significance value is less than 0.05 (0.000 <0.05), and the regression coefficient has a positive value of 0.440; then the hypothesis has a positive influence on word of mouth marketing on product purchasing decisions on purchasing decisions of 0.134; this means that purchasing decisions are influenced by word of mouth marketing by 13.4%, while the remaining 86.6% is influenced by other factors not included in this study.
- The Effect of Promotion Through Social Media through Word of Mouth Marketing on Product Purchase Decisions. The results of the Sobel test above show the influence of promotional strategies through social media mediated by word of mouth marketing on the decision to purchase, in this case the magnitude of the indirect effect is 0.0906 which makes the results of the statistical calculation of the coefficients b (MX) and b (YM.X) = 0.395 x 0.2293 = 0.0906. Then the coefficient value = 0.0906, has a significance value of 0.0217, so it has a value less than 0.05. Giving the effect of promotion through social media word of mouth marketing on product purchasing decisions (Suki, 2016; Macdonald & Sharp, 2000).

Conclusions and Impact
Conclusion

From the results of the above presentation, conclusions can be drawn as follows:

- Can have a positive influence on promotion through social media on product purchasing decisions. Based on statistical calculations with t-count = 8.664 with a significant value (0.000 <0.05), namely with a positive regression coefficient value = 0.792.
- Can have a positive influence on promotion through social media, as

product marketing by word of mouth. In accordance with the calculation of t-count = 4.395, with a significant value (0.000 <0.05), then the regression coefficient has a positive value = 0.395.

- Can have a positive influence, promotion through word of mouth marketing, on product purchasing decisions. In accordance with statistical calculations with t-count = 4.821 has a significant value (0.000 <0.05), and the regression coefficient has a positive value = 0.440.
- Can influence promotion through social media word of mouth marketing on product purchasing decisions. This is evidenced by the mediation coefficient = 0.0906 which is positive and has a significance of = 0.0217, less than 0.05. The calculation results have an indirect effect on promotional strategies through social media through word of mouth marketing on purchasing decisions = 0.0906. This means that the direct effect is greater than the indirect effect on purchasing decisions, namely = 0.7917, while the indirect effect is only 0.0906.

Impact

From these conclusions, it can be concluded as follows:

- Promotion through social media, which can have a positive impact on product purchase decisions.
- Promotion using social media, has a positive impact on word of mouth marketing products. With evidenced from t-count with a significant value, and the regression coefficient has a positive value.
- Promotion through word of mouth marketing, has a positive impact on product purchasing decisions. This can be proven from t arithmetic with a significant value and the regression coefficient has a positive value.

Promotion through social media, has an impact mediated by word of mouth marketing on product purchasing decisions. This can be proven from the mediation coefficient which is positive and has a smaller significance. The calculation results have an indirect impact on the strategy of social media promotion through word of mouth marketing on purchasing decisions. This gives a greater impact than the influence not on product purchasing decisions.

References

Alsalami, W. K. O. A., & Al-Zaman, Q. (2021). The role of media and public relations departments in effective tourism marketing in sharjah. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, *5*(S3), 133-143.

Azwar, S. (2009). Compiling psychological scale [Composing psychological scale]. Yogyakarta: Student Library.

Chen, Z., & Yuan, M. (2020). Psychology of word of mouth marketing. *Current opinion in psychology, 31*, 7-10. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2019.06.026

Dahnil, M. I., Marzuki, K. M., Langgat, J., & Fabeil, N. F. (2014). Factors influencing SMEs adoption of social media marketing. *Procedia-social and behavioral sciences, 148,* 119-126. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.07.025

González-Bailón, S., & Wang, N. (2016). Networked discontent: The anatomy of protest campaigns in social media. *Social networks*, *44*, 95-104. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socnet.2015.07.003

Harjadi, D., & Dewi, F. (2008). Word Of Marketing (WOM) Communication As A Creative Alternative In Marketing Communication. *Journal of Equilibrium, 4*(8), 72-78.

Hilary, I. O., & Dumebi, O.-O. (2021). Social Media as a Tool for Misinformation and Disinformation Management. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, *5*(S1), 496-505.

Jamilah. B. Najua. 2012. *The Effect of Brand Equity and Word Of Mouth on Purchase Decisions (Case Study on Roso Chocolate Consumers in Depok, Sleman, Yogyakarta).* Yogyakarta State University.

Jogiyanto, H. (2004). Business Research Methods. BPFE

Kaplan, A. M., & Haenlein, M. (2010). Users of the world, unite! The challenges and opportunities of Social Media. *Business horizons*, *53*(1), 59-68. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2009.09.003

Kotler, P., & Armstrong, G. (2008). Principles of marketing. 12. painos. *New Jersey, Person Education Inc.*

Li, F., & Du, T. C. (2011). Who is talking? An ontology-based opinion leader identification framework for word-of-mouth marketing in online social blogs. *Decision support systems*, *51*(1), 190-197. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dss.2010.12.007

Macdonald, E. K., & Sharp, B. M. (2000). Brand awareness effects on consumer decision making for a common, repeat purchase product: A replication. *Journal of business research*, *48*(1), 5-15. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963(98)00070-8

Mangold, W. G., & Faulds, D. J. (2009). Social media: The new hybrid element of the promotion mix. *Business horizons*, *52*(4), 357-365. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2009.03.002

Martin, W. C., & Lueg, J. E. (2013). Modeling word-of-mouth usage. *Journal of Business Research*, *66*(7), 801-808. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2011.06.004

Rosid, M., Pratikto, H. H., & Syihabudhin, S. E. (2020). Word of mouth (WOM), visitor experience, and destination attributes on revisit intention through perceived value a case of Penangguagan mountain, East Java, Indonesia. *International Journal of Business, Economics and Law*, *21*(5), 90-101.

Stephen, A. T. (2016). The role of digital and social media marketing in consumer behavior. *Current opinión in Psychology*, *10*, 17-21. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2015.10.016

Suki, N. M. (2016). Consumer environmental concern and green product purchase in Malaysia: structural effects of consumption values. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 132*, 204-214. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.09.087

Swastha, B., & Handoko, H. (2004). Consumer behavior. BPFE, Yogyakarta.

Zarella, D. (2010). The Social media Marketing Book. OReilly Media. *Inc. Sebastapol, CA.*