REFERENCES

Ahn, S., Kaplan, G., Moll, B., Winberry, T., & Wolf, C. (2018). When Inequality Matters for Macro and Macro Matters for Inequality. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3023784

Ajina, A. S. (2019). The perceived value of social media marketing: An empirical study of online word of mouth in Saudi Arabian context. *Entrepreneurship and Sustainability Issues*, *6*(3), 1512–1527. https://doi.org/10.9770/JESI.2019.6.3(32)

Alexander, N. (2013). Brand authentication: Creating and maintaining brand auras. *European Journal of Marketing*, *43*(3), 551–562.

Ansary, A., & Hashim, N. M. H. N. (2018). Brand image and equity: the mediating role of brand equity drivers and moderating effects of product type and word of mouth. *Review of Managerial Science*, *12*(4), 969–1002. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11846-017-0235-2

Asshidin, H. N., Abidin, N., & Borhan, H. B. (2016). Consumer Attitude and Uniqueness towards International Products. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, *35*, 632–638.

Bazi, S., Filieri, R., & Gorton, M. (2020). Customers' motivation to engage with luxury brands on social media. *Jurnal Bus. Res*, *112*, 223–235. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.02.032

Berger, J. (2014). Word of mouth and interpersonal communication: A review and directions for future research. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, *24*(4), 586–607. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JCPS.2014.05.002

Berthon, P. R., Pitt, L. F., Parent, M., & Berthon, J. (2009). Aesthetics and Ephemerality: Observing and Preserving the Luxury Brand. *California Management Review*, *52*, 45–66.

Bian, Q., & Forsythe, S. M. (2012). Purchase intention for luxury brands: A cross cultural comparison. *Journal of Business Research*, *65*, 1443–1451.

Bougie, R., & Sekaran, U. (2019). *Research methods for business : a skill-building approach*.

https://books.google.com/books/about/Research_Methods_For_Business.html?id=ikI6EAAAQBAJ

Brightlocal. (2016). *Local consumer review survey*.

Bushara, M. O. E. (2023). *The Influence of Parents Behaviour and Practice on Their Family Health*. https://doi.org/10.20944/PREPRINTS202302.0504.V1

Calabuig, G. J., Río, J. F. M. Del, & Barquero, D. G. (2015). 5th Generation mobile networks: a new opportunity for the convergence of mobile broadband and broadcast services. *IEEE Communications Magazine*, *53*(2), 198–205.

Cao, J., Li, J., Wang, Y., & Ai, M. (2022). The Impact of Self-Efficacy and Perceived Value on Customer Engagement under Live Streaming Commerce Environment. *Security and Communication Networks*, *2022*. https://doi.org/10.1155/2022/2904447

Central Bureau of Statistics. (2018). *Rasio Penerimaan Pajak Terhadap PDB*.

Chan, F. T., Macisaac, H. J., & Bailey, S. A. (2015). Relative importance of vessel hull fouling and ballast water as transport vectors of nonindigenous species to the canadian arctic. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, *72*(8), 1230–1242. https://doi.org/10.1139/cjfas-2014-0473

Chapman, A., & Dilmperi, A. (2022). Luxury brand value co-creation with online brand communities in the service encounter. *Journal of Business Research*, *144*, 902–921.

Chattalas, M., & Shukla, P. (2015). Impact of value perceptions on luxury purchase intentions: a developed market comparison. *Luxury Research Journal*, *1*, 40–57.

Chen, Y. S., & Chang, C. H. (2012). Enhance green purchase intentions: The roles of green perceived value, green perceived risk, and green trust. *Management Decision*, *50*(3), 502–520.

Chin, W. (1998). *The Partial Least Square Approach for Structural Equation Modelling*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Choi, J., Lee, M., Lee, J. K., Kang, D., & Choi, J. Y. (2017). Correlates associated with participation in physical activity among adults: A systematic review of reviews and update. *BMC Public Health*, *17*(1).

https://doi.org/10.1186/S12889-017-4255-2

Choo, H. J., Moon, H., Kim, H., & Yoon, N. (2012). Luxury customer value. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management*, *16*(1), 81–101. https://doi.org/10.1108/13612021211203041/FULL/XML

Christodoulides, G., Michaelidou, N., & Li, C.-H. (2009). Measuring perceived brand luxury: an evaluation of the BLI scale. *Brand Management*, *16*, 395–405.

Chu, S. C., Kammal, S., & Kim, Y. (2019). Re-examining of consumers' responses toward social media advertising and purchase intention toward luxury products from 2013 to 2018: a retrospective commentary. *J. Glob. Fash. Mark*, *10*(1), 81–82.

Cole, M., Lindeque, P., Fileman, E., Halsband, C., & Galloway, T. S. (2015). The impact of polystyrene microplastics on feeding, function and fecundity in the marine copepod Calanus helgolandicus. *Environmental Science and Technology*, *49*(2), 1130–1137. https://doi.org/10.1021/es504525u

Cristancho, S. M., Goldszmidt, M., Lingard, L., & Watling, C. (2018). Qualitative research essentials for medical education. *Singapore Med Journal*, *59*(12), 622–627.

Dachyar, M., & Banjarnahor, L. (2017). Factors influencing purchase intention towards consumer-to-consumer e-commerce. *Intangible Capital*, *13*(5), 946–966. https://doi.org/10.3926/ic.1119

Danks, N. P., & Ray, S. (2018). Predictions from partial least squares models. In *Applying Partial Least Squares in Tourism and Hospitality Research*. Emerald Group Publishing Ltd. https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-78756-699-620181003

Danziger, P. N. (2005). *Let Them Eat Cake: Marketing Luxury to the Masses – As Well as the Classes*. Kaplan Business.

Dommer, S. L., & Swaminathan, V. (2013). Explaining the endowment effect through ownership: The role of identity, gender, and self-threat. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *39*(5), 1034–1050. https://doi.org/10.1086/666737

Durkin, J., Usher, K., & Jackson, D. (2018). Embodying compassion: A systematic review of the views of nurses and patients. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, *28*(9),

1380–1392. https://doi.org/10.1111/jocn.14722

Farkas, J. (2022). News on Fake News: Logics of Media Discourses on Disinformation. *Journal of Language and Politics*.

Farzin, M., & Fattahi, M. (2018). eWOM through social networking sites and impact on purchase intention and brand image in Iran. *JAMR*, *15*(2), 161–183.

Filho, E. J. M. A., Simões, J. D. S., & Muylder, C. F. De. (2020). The low effect of perceived risk in the relation between hedonic values and purchase intention. *Journal of Marketing Management*, *36*(1), 128–148. https://doi.org/10.1080/0267257X.2019.1697725

French, B. H., Lewis, J. A., Mosley, D. V., Adames, H. Y., Chavez-Dueñas, N. Y., Chen, G. A., & Neville, H. A. (2020). Toward a Psychological Framework of Radical Healing in Communities of Color. *Counseling Psychologist*, *48*(1), 14–46. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000019843506

Gallaugher, J., & Ransbotham, S. (2010). Social media and customer dialog management at Starbucks. *MIS Q. Exec.*, *9*(4), 197–212.

Gan, C., & Wang, W. (2017). The influence of perceived value on purchase intention in social commerce context. *Internet Research*, *27*(4), 772–785. https://doi.org/10.1108/INTR-06-2016-0164/FULL/XML

García-Fernández, J., Gálvez-Ruíz, P., Fernández-Gavira, J., Vélez-Colón, L., Pitts, B., & Bernal-García, A. (2018). The effects of service convenience and perceived quality on perceived value, satisfaction and loyalty in low-cost fitness centers. *Sport Management Review*, *21*(3), 250–262. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2017.07.003

Garson, G. D. (2016). *Partial Least Squares: Regression & Structural Equation Models*. Statistical Associates Publishing.

Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. (2009). *Educational Research Competencies for Analysis and Applications*. Pearson.

Ghozali. (2018). *Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate Dengan Program IBM SPSS 25*. Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.

Ghozali, I., & Latan, H. (2015). *Partial Least Square: Konsep, Metode, dan Aplikasi Menggunakan SmartPLS 2.0 M3*. Badan Penerbit Universitas

Diponegoro.

Gogoi, B. (2013). Study of antecedents of purchase intention and its effect on brand loyalty of private label brand of apparel. *International Journal of Sales & Marketing*, 73–78.

Grandviewresearch.com. (2022). *Discover how Grand View Research can help your business*.

Gunawardane, N. R. (2015). Impact of BrandEquity towards Purchasing Desition: ASituation on Mobile TelecommunicationServices of Sri Lanka. *Journal of Marketing Management*, *3*(1), 100–117.

Hair, J. F., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2019). Pls-Sem: Indeed A Silver Bullet. *The Journal Of Marketing Theory And Practice*, *19*(2), 139–152.

Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (2018). *Multivariate Data Analysis: 40 Years Later*. Printice-Hall.

Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2014). *Multivariate Data Analysis, New International Edition*. Pearson.

Hair, J. J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2017). A Primer on Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM). In *Sage* (Second Edi). SAGE Publications, Inc.

Han, Q., Rossow, W. B., Chou, J., & Welch, R. M. (2000). Near-global survey of cloud column susceptibilities using ISCCP data. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *27*(19), 3221–3224. https://doi.org/10.1029/2000GL011543

Han, Y. J., Nunes, J. C., & Dreze, X. (2010). Signaling status with luxury goods: The role of brand prominence. *Journal of Marketing*, *74*(4), 15–30.

Haque, A., Anwar, N., Yasmin, F., Sarwar, A., Ibrahim, Z., & Momen, A. (2015). Purchase intention of foreign products: A study on Bangladeshi consumer perspective. *SAGE Open*, *5*(2), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244015592680/ASSET/IMAGES/LARGE/10.1177_2158244015592680-FIG2.JPEG

Hassan, S., Husic-Mehmedovic, M., & Duverger, P. (2015). Retaining the allure of luxury brands during an economic downturn. *Journal Fash. Mark. Manag*, *19*, 416–429. https://doi.org/10.1108/JFMM-03-2015-0030

Hassan, S., Husić-Mehmedović, M., & Duverger, P. (2015). Retaining the allure of luxury brands during an economic downturn: Can brand globalness influence consumer perception? *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management*, *19*(4), 416–429. https://doi.org/10.1108/JFMM-03-2015-0030

Hauck, W. E., & Stanforth, N. (2007). Cohort perception of luxury goods and services. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management*, *11*(2), 175–188. https://doi.org/10.1108/13612020710751365

Hennig-Thurau, T., Gwinner, K. P., Walsh, G., & Gremler, D. D. (2004). Electronic word-of-mouth via consumer-opinion platforms: What motivates consumers to articulate themselves on the Internet? *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, *18*(1), 38–52. https://doi.org/10.1002/dir.10073

Hennigs, N., Wiedmann, K.-P., Klarmann, C., & Behrens, S. (2013). Sustainability as Part of the Luxury Essence: Delivering Value through Social and Environmental Excellence. *Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, *52*. https://doi.org/10.9774/GLEAF.4700.2013.de.00005

Hennigs, N., Wiedmann, K. P., Klarmann, C., Strehlau, S., Godey, B., Pederzoli, D., & Taro, K. (2012). What is the value of luxury? A cross-cultural consumer perspective. *Psychology & Marketing*, *29*(12), 1018–1034. https://doi.org/1018–1034

Henningsen, L. (2012). Individualism for the masses? Coffee consumption and the Chinese middle class' search for authenticity. *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies*, *13*(3), 408–427.

Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2015a). A New Criterion for Assessing Discriminant Validity in Variance-Based Structural Equation Modeling. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, *43*, 115–135.

Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2015b). A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, *43*(1), 115–135. https://doi.org/10.1007/S11747-014-0403-8/FIGURES/8

Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2016). Using Pls Path Modeling In New Technology Research : Updated Guidelines. *Industrial Management & Data*

Systems, *116*(1), 2–20.

Hsu, C. L., & Lin, J. C. C. (2015). What drives purchase intention for paid mobile apps? – An expectation confirmation model with perceived value. *Electronic Commerce Research and Applications*, *14*(1), 46–57. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ELERAP.2014.11.003

Hsu, L., Mayorga, E., Horsburgh, J. S., Carter, M. R., Lehnert, K. A., & Brantley, S. L. (2017). Enhancing Interoperability and Capabilities of Earth Science Data using the Observations Data Model 2 (ODM2). *Data Science Journal*, *16*(4), 1–16.

Hu, T., Zhang, D., & Wang, J. (2015). A meta-analysis of the trait resilience and mental health. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *76*, 18–27. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.PAID.2014.11.039

Hu, X., & Ha, L. (2015). Which form of word-of-mouth is more important to online shoppers? A comparative study of WOM use between general population and college students. *Journal of Communication and Media Research*, *7*(2), 15–35.

Huang, W. (2021). Combined Light and Electron Scattering for Exploring Proximity Effects on Hydrogen Absorption in Vanadium. *Energies*, *14*(24).

Hung, K., Chen, A. H., Peng, N., Hackley, C., Tiwsakul, R. A., & Chou, C. (2011). Antecedents of luxury brand purchase intention. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, *20*(6), 457–467. https://doi.org/10.1108/10610421111166603

Husain, R., Paul, J., & Koles, B. (2021). The role of brand experience, brand resonance and brand trust in luxury consumption. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, *66*(2). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2021.102895

Husain, R., Paul, J., & Koles, B. (2022). The role of brand experience, brand resonance and brand trust in luxury consumption. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*.

Hussain, S. T., Lei, S., Akram, T., Haider, M. J., Hussain, S. H., & Ali, M. (2018). Kurt Lewin's change model: A critical review of the role of leadership and employee involvement in organizational change. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*, *3*(3), 123–127. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JIK.2016.07.002

Hwang, G. J., & Wu, P. H. (2014). Applications, impacts and trends of mobile technology-enhanced learning: A review of 2008-2012 publications in selected SSCI journals. *International Journal of Mobile Learning and Organisation*, *8*(2), 83–95. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJMLO.2014.062346

Iwata, B. A., DeLeon, I. G., & Roscoe, E. M. (2015). Reliability And Validity Of The Functional Analysis Screening Tool. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, *46*(1), 271–284. https://doi.org/10.1002/jaba.31

Jebarajakirthy, C., Das, M., Rundle-Thiele, S., & Ahmadi, H. (2022). Communication strategies: encouraging healthy diets for on-the-go consumption. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*.

Jin, T., Prentice, C., & Shao, W. (2021). Identifying antecedent conditions for luxury brand purchase. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, *60*.

Johnson, B. A., & Nunes, P. E. (2002). Target the almost rich. *Harvard Business Review*, *80*(6), 22–24.

Johnston, R., & Kong, X. (2011). The Customer Experience: A Road Map for Improvement. *Managing Service Quality*, *21*(1), 5–24. https://doi.org/10.1108/09604521111100225

Johry, A., & Srivastava, S. (2015). Relationship betweem body image and self-esteem among college going girls. *Asian Journal of Home Science*, *10*(1), 208–214.

Joung, Y. S., Ge, Z., & Buie, C. R. (2016). Bioaerosol generation by raindrops on soil. *Nature Communications*, *8*.

Kamal, S. S. L. B. A. (2019). Research Paradigm and the Philosophical Foundations of a Qualitative Study. *PEOPLE: International Journal of Social Sciences*, *4*(3), 1386–1394. https://doi.org/10.20319/pijss.2019.43.13861394

Kankam, P. K. (2019). The use of paradigms in information research. *Library & Information Science Research*, *41*(2), 85–92.

Kapferer, J.-N., & Laurent, G. (2016). Where do consumers think luxury begins? A study of perceived minimum price for 21 luxury goods in 7 countries. *Journal of Business Research*, *69*(1), 332–340.

Karpova, E., Nelson-Hodges, N., & Tullar, W. (2007). Making sense of the market:

an exploration of apparel consumption practices of the Russian consumer. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management*, *11*(1), 106–121.

Kautsarina, Hidayanto, A. N., Anggorojati, B., Abidin, Z., & Phusavat, K. (2020). Data modeling positive security behavior implementation among smart device users in Indonesia: A partial least squares structural equation modeling approach (PLS-SEM). *Data Brief*.

Kawa, S., Ueno, T., Iijima, A., Midorikawa, T., Fujimori, Y., Tokoo, M., Oguchi, H., Kiyosawa, K., Imai, Y., Kaneko, G., Kuroda, T., Hashizume, K., Osamura, R. Y., & Katakami, H. (2013). Growth Hormone-Releasing Hormone (GRH)-Producing Pancreatic Tumor with No Evidence of Multiple Endocrine Neoplasia Type 1. *Digestive Diseases and Sciences*, *42*, 1480–1485.

Kim, H. and Choi, B. (2013). The Influence of Customer Experience Quality on Customers' Behavioral Intentions. *Services Marketing Quarterly, 34*, 322–338. https://doi.org/10.1080/15332969.2013.827068

Kim, D. J., Ferrin, D. L., & Rao, H. R. (2008). A Trust-Based Consumer Decision-Making Model in Electronic Commerce: The Role of Trust, Perceived Risk, and Their Antecedents. *Decision Support Systems*, *44*, 544–564.

King, R. A., Racherla, P., & Bush, V. D. (2014). What we know and don't know about online word-of-mouth: a review and synthesis of the literature. *Journal Interact. Market*, *28*, 167–183. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intmar.2014.02.001

Ko, E., & Megehee, C. M. (2019). Fashion marketing of luxury brands: Recent research issues and contributions. *Journal of Business Research*, *65*(10), 1395–1398.

Kock, N. (2015). Common method bias in PLS-SEM: A full collinearity assessment approach. *International Journal of E-Collaboration*, *11*(4), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.4018/IJEC.2015100101

Kozinets, R. V., Valck, K. De, Wojnicki, A. C., & Wilner, S. J. S. (2015). Networked Narratives: Understanding Word-of-Mouth Marketing in Online Communities. *Journal of Marketing*, *74*(2). https://doi.org/10.1509/jm.74.2.71

Kudeshia, C., & Kumar, A. (2017a). Social eWOM: does it affect the brand attitude and purchase intention of brands? *Management Research Review*, *40*, 310–

330.

Kudeshia, C., & Kumar, A. (2017b). Social eWOM: does it affect the brand attitude and purchase intention of brands? *Management Research Review*, *40*(3), 310–330. https://doi.org/10.1108/MRR-07-2015-0161/FULL/XML

Kumar, S., & Gautam, A. (2021). Country of Origin Effect on Purchase Intention Towards Italian Luxury Fashion: Mediating Role of Brand Perception and Social Status. *Https://Doi.Org/10.1177/09726225211030067*, *20*(1), 16–24. https://doi.org/10.1177/09726225211030067

Lamberton, C., & Stephen, A. T. (2016). A Thematic Exploration of Digital, Social Media, and Mobile Marketing: Research Evolution from 2000 to 2015 and an Agenda for Future Inquiry. *Journal of Marketing*, *80*, 146–172. https://doi.org/10.1509/jm.15.0415

Latan, H., & Ghozali, I. (2015). *Partial Least Squares: Concepts, Techniques and Applications using SmartPLS 3* (2nd ed.). Diponegoro University Press. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/283619375_Partial_Least_Squares_Concepts_Techniques_and_Applications_using_SmartPLS_3

Liao, S. H., Hu, D. C., Chung, Y. C., & Huang, A. P. (2021). Risk and opportunity for online purchase intention – A moderated mediation model investigation. *Telematics and Informatics*, *62*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2021.101621

Liu, X., Beyrend-Dur, D., Dur, G., & Ban, S. (2014). Effects of temperature on life history traits of Eodiaptomus japonicus (Copepoda: Calanoida) from Lake Biwa (Japan). *Limnology*, *15*(1), 85–97. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10201-013-0417-9

Loureiro, S. M. C., Jiménez-Barreto, J., & Romero, J. (2020). Enhancing brand coolness through perceived luxury values: Insight from luxury fashion brands. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, *57*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2020.102211

Luo, Q., & Zhong, D. (2015). Using social network analysis to explain communication characteristics of travel-related electronic word-of-mouth on social networking sites. *Tourism Management*, *46*, 274–282. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2014.07.007

Malc, D., Mumel, D., & Pisnik, A. (2016a). Exploring price fairness perceptions and their influence on consumer behavior. *Journal Bus. Res*, *69*, 3693–3697. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.03.031

Malc, D., Mumel, D., & Pisnik, A. (2016b). Exploring price fairness perceptions and their influence on consumer behavior. *Journal of Business Research*, *69*(9), 3693–3697. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.03.031

Malhotra, M. (2019). *Marketing Research: An Applied Orientation, Global Edition*. Pearson.

Malhotra, N. K., & Dash, S. (2016). *Marketing Research – An Applied Orientation*. Pearson India Education Services.

Martín-Consuegra, D., Faraoni, M., Díaz, E., & Ranfagni, S. (2018). Exploring relationships among brand credibility, purchase intention and social media for fashion brands: A conditional mediation model. *Journal of Global Fashion Marketing*, *9*(3), 237–251. https://doi.org/10.1080/20932685.2018.1461020

Matsuda, K., & Park, K. (2019). Recent Trend of Increasing Myopia Can Be Traced To Infancy. *Medical Hypothese Journal*, *1*(1).

Meeprom, S., & Silanoi, T. (2020). Investigating the perceived quality of a special event and its influence on perceived value and behavioural intentions in a special event in Thailand. *International Journal of Event and Festival Management*, *11*(3), 337–355. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEFM-09-2019-0043

Moran, G., Muzellec, L., & Nolan, E. (2014). Consumer moments of truth in the digital context: how "search" and "e-word of mouth" can fuel consumer decision making. *Journal Advert. Res*, *54*(2), 200–204.

Mousa, M. M. (2019). The Factors Affecting Luxury Brand Purchase Intention in Terms of Rational and Emotional Impact in Qatar. *Journal of Business Research-Turk*, *11*(3), 2191–2204. https://doi.org/10.1362/146934703771910071

Mrad, M., Majdalani, J., Cui, C. C., & El-Khansa, Z. (2020). Brand addiction in the contexts of luxury and fast-fashion brands. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, *55*.

Mukedzi, T. G. (2018). The journey to becoming teaching professionals in rural

South Africa and Zimbabwe. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, *38*(10), 83–104.

Nam, K., Baker, J., Ahmad, N., & Goo, J. (2020). Determinants of writing positive and negative electronic word-of-mouth: Empirical evidence for two types of expectation confirmation. *Decision Support Systems*, *129*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dss.2019.113168

Nazari, O., & Atai, M. R. (2022). An exploratory study of EAP teachers' coping strategies. *System*, *106*, 102764. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2022.102764

Ngoma, M., & Ntale, P. D. (2015). Percieved Brand Quality in Uganda's Pharmaceutical Industry: The Role of Country of Origin, Marketing Orientation and Brand Affordability. *Advances in Management & Applied Economics*, *5*(6), 1792–7552.

Nueno, J. L., & Quelch, J. A. (1998). The Mass Marketing of Luxury. *Business Horizons*, *41*(6), 61–68.

Nuzula, I. F., & Wahyudi, L. (2022). Effects of brand attitude, perceived value, and social WOM on purchase intentions in luxury product marketing. *Innovative Marketing*.

Okonkwo, U. (2009). The luxury brand strategy challenge. *Journal of Brand Management*, *16*(5), 287–298.

Park, H. J., Rabolt, N. J., & Jeon, K. S. (2008). Purchasing global luxury brands among young Korean consumers. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management*, *12*(2), 244–259.

Park, J., Hyun, H., & Thavisay, T. (2021). A study of antecedents and outcomes of social media WOM towards luxury brand purchase intention. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, *58*.

Park, J., Sen, K., & Thavisay, T. (2021). A study of antecedents and outcomes of social media WOM towards luxury brand purchase intention. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, *58*(2), 102272. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2020.102272

Park, K. (2017). Psychological park accessibility: a systematic literature review of perceptual components affecting park use. *Landscape Research*, *42*(5), 508–

520. https://doi.org/10.1080/01426397.2016.1267127

Petravičiūtė, K., Šeinauskienė, B., Rūtelionė, A., & Krukowski, K. (2021a). Linking Luxury Brand Perceived Value, Brand Attachment, and Purchase Intention: The Role of Consumer Vanity. *Sustainability*, *13*(12). https://doi.org/10.3390/su13126912

Petravičiūtė, K., Šeinauskienė, B., Rūtelionė, A., & Krukowski, K. (2021b). Linking luxury brand perceived value, brand attachment, and purchase intention: The role of consumer vanity. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, *13*(12). https://doi.org/10.3390/SU13126912

Pham, H. C., & Richards, B. (2015). The western brands in the minds of vietnamese consumers. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, *32*(5), 367–375. https://doi.org/10.1108/JCM-09-2014-1159

Phan, M., Thomas, R., & Heine, K. (2011). Social media and luxury brand management: the case of Burberry. *Jurnal Glob. Fash. Mark*, *2*(4), 213–222.

Ramayah, T., Ahmad, N. H., & Hong, T. S. (2012). An Assessment of E-Training Effectiveness in Multinational Companies in Malaysia. *Educational Technology and Society*, *15*(2), 25–137.

Ramayah, T., Cheah, J., Chuah, F., Ting, H., & Menon, M. A. (2017). Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) using SmartPLS 3.0. In *Pearson Malaysia Sdn Bhd* (First Edit, Issue July). Pearson Malaysia Sdn Bhd. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/312460772

Reyes-Menendez, A., Palos-Sánchez, P. R., Saura, J. R., & Santos, C. R. (2021). Revisiting the impact of perceived social value on consumer behavior toward luxury brands. *European Management Journal*.

Rodríguez, T. C., Dadafarin, S., Pratt, H. E., Liu, P. P., Amrani, N., & Zhu, L. J. (2021). Genome-wide detection and analysis of CRISPR-Cas off-targets. *Progress in Molecular Biology and Translational Science*, *181*, 31–43. https://doi.org/10.1016/BS.PMBTS.2021.01.012

Rouibah, K., Al-Qirim, N., Hwang, Y., & Pouri, S. G. (2021). The Determinants of eWoM in Social Commerce: The Role of Perceived Value, Perceived Enjoyment, Trust, Risks, and Satisfaction. *Journal of Global Information*

Management (JGIM), *29*(3), 75–102. https://doi.org/10.4018/JGIM.2021050104

Salehzadeh, R., & Pool, J. K. (2017). Brand Attitude and Perceived Value and Purchase Intention toward Global Luxury Brands. *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, *29*(2), 74–82. https://doi.org/10.1080/08961530.2016.1236311

Sangaji, R. (2021). *Indonesia's Luxury Goods Market During the Pandemic*.

Sarstedt, M., Hair, J. F., Nitzl, C., Ringle, C. M., & Howard, M. C. (2020). Beyond a tandem analysis of SEM and PROCESS: Use of PLS-SEM for mediation analyses! *International Journal of Market Research*, *62*(3), 288–299. https://doi.org/10.1177/1470785320915686/ASSET/IMAGES/LARGE/10.1177_1470785320915686-FIG2.JPEG

Sarstedt, M., Ringle, C. M., & Hair, J. F. (2021). Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling. In *Handbook of Market Research*. Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-05542-8_15-2

Schade, M., Hegner, S., Horstmann, F., & Brinkmann, N. (2016). The impact of attitude functions on luxury brand consumption: an age-based group comparison. *Journal Bus. Res.*, *69*(1), 314–322.

Sekaran, U., & Bougie. (2016a). *Research Methods For Business: A Skill Building Approach, 7th Edition*. New Jersey. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/254789319_Research_Methods_for_Business_A_Skill_Building_Approach_5th_Edition

Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2016b). *Research Methods for Business*. John Wiley & Sons.

Sevilmiş, A., Özdemir, İ., García-Fernández, J., & Zhang, J. J. (2022). Examining the Relationships Among Perceived Quality, Perceived Value, Customer Satisfaction, and Behavioral Intention in Turkish Fitness Centers. *Physical Culture and Sport, Studies and Research*, *96*(1), 40–54. https://doi.org/10.2478/pcssr-2022-0018

Shah, H., Aziz, A., Jaffari, A. R., Waris, S., Ejaz, W., Fatima, M., & Sherazi., K. (2012). The Impact of Brands on Consumer Purchase Intentions. *Asian*

Journal of Business Management, 105–110.

Shaikh, A. A., Karjaluoto, H., & Häkkinen, J. (2018). Understanding moderating effects in increasing share-of-wallet and word-of-mouth: A case study of Lidl grocery retailers. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, *44*, 45–53.

Sharma, R., Singh, G., & Sharma, S. (2020). Modelling internet banking adoption in Fiji: A developing country perspective. *International Journal of Information Management*, *53*(June 2019), 102116. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2020.102116

Shmueli, G., Sarstedt, M., Hair, J. F., Cheah, J. H., Ting, H., Vaithilingam, S., & Ringle, C. M. (2019). Predictive model assessment in PLS-SEM: guidelines for using PLSpredict. *European Journal of Marketing*, *53*(11), 2322–2347. https://doi.org/10.1108/EJM-02-2019-0189/FULL/XML

Shukla, M., Qureshi, S., & Candrawati. (2012). Post-Placental Intra Uterine Device Insertion - A Five Year Experience at A Tertiary Care Centre In North India. *Indian Journal Medical Research*, *3*(136), 432–435.

Shukla, P. (2010). Impact of interpersonal influences, brand origin and brand image on luxury purchase intentions: Measuring interfunctional interactions and a cross-national comparison. *Journal of World Business*, *46*(2). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2010.11.002

Shukla, S. (2018). *Research Methodology and Statistics*. Ahmedabad.

Siedlecki, S. L. (2020). Understanding Descriptive Research Designs and Methods. *Clin Nurse Spec*, *34*(1), 8–12.

Sileyew, J. (2020). Research Design and Methodology. *Intech Open*.

Silva, S. S. De, Seeley, E. L., Ongsakul, V., & Ahmed, Z. U. (2020). Conceptualizing a new model for luxury brand purchase intention in an emerging country setting. *Journal of Transnational Management*, *25*(2), 100–127. https://doi.org/10.1080/15475778.2020.1734419

Sinambela, M., Tarigan, K., Humaidi, S., & Situmorang, M. (2020). Classification of seismic signal by evaluating broadband networks station in sumatera fore-arc. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, *1*(1). https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1485/1/012054

Siqueira, J. R., Peña, N. G., Horst, E., & Molina, G. (2019). Spreading the word: How customer experience in a traditional retail setting influences consumer traditional and electronic word-of-mouth intention. *Electronic Commerce Research and Applications*, *37*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.elerap.2019.100870

Siyoto, S., & Sodik, A. (2015). *Dasar Metodologi Penelitian*. Literasi Media Publishing.

Srinivasan, B., Baratashvili, M., Van Der Zwaag, M., Kanon, B., Colombelli, C., Lambrechts, R. A., Schaap, O., Nollen, E. A., Podgoršek, A., Kosec, G., Petković, H., Hayflick, S., Tiranti, V., Reijngoud, D. J., Grzeschik, N. A., & Sibon, O. C. M. (2015). Extracellular 4′-phosphopantetheine is a source for intracellular coenzyme A synthesis. *Nature Chemical Biology*, *11*(10), 784–792. https://doi.org/10.1038/NCHEMBIO.1906

Srinivasan, S. R. (2015). Impact of education on purchase behaviour of luxury brands. *Bus. Manag. Rev.*, *5*, 66–80.

Statista. (2021). *Luxury revenue share of the apparel market in Indonesia from 2017 to 2025*.

Statista. (2022). *Luxury Goods*.

Statista. (2023). *Luxury Goods Market in The Asia Pacific Region*.

Stokburger-Sauer, N. E., & Teichmann, K. (2013). Is luxury just a female thing? The role of gender in luxury brand consumption. *Journal of Business Research*, *66*(7), 889–896. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2011.12.007

Sugiyono. (2017). *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Alfabeta.

Tien, D. H., Amaya Rivas, A. A., & Liao, Y. K. (2019). Examining the influence of customer-to-customer electronic word-of-mouth on purchase intention in social networking sites. *Asia Pacific Management Review*, *24*(3), 238–249. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.APMRV.2018.06.003

Tien, D. H., Rivas, A. A. A., & Liao, Y. K. (2019). Examining the influence of customer-to customer electronic word-ofmouth on purchase intention in social networking sites. *Asia Pacific Management Review*, *24*(3), 238–249. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmrv.2018.06.003

Tien, N. H., & Anh, D. B. H. (2019). High Quality Human Resource Development Approach of Vietnamese Enterprises. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Development International*, *6*(8), 84–88.

Torres, N., & Constain, J. (2009). A Columbian Journal for Teachers or English. *HOW, Journal*, *16*(1).

Tsai, A. C., Morton, S. C., Mangione, C. M., & Keeler, E. B. (2005). A meta-analysis of interventions to improve care for chronic illnesses. *Am J Manag Care*, *11*(8), 478–488.

Tungate, M. (2005). *Fashion Brands: Branding Style from Armani to Zara*. Kogan Page.

Tynan, C., Mckechnie, S., & Chhuon, C. (2010). Co-creating value for luxury brands. *Journal of Business Research*, *63*, 1156–1163.

Utkarsh, K., Trivedi, A., Srinivasan, D., & Reindl, T. (2017). A Consensus-Based Distributed Computational Intelligence Technique for Real-Time Optimal Control in Smart Distribution Grids. *IEEE Transactions on Emerging Topics in Computational Intelligence*, *1*(1), 51–60. https://doi.org/10.1109/TETCI.2016.2635130

Vickers, J. S., & Renand, F. (2003). The Marketing of Luxury Goods: An exploratory study – three conceptual dimensions. *The Marketing Review*, *3*(4), 459–478.

Wang, J. J., Wang, L. Y., & Wang, M. M. (2018). Understanding the effects of eWOM social ties on purchase intentions: A moderated mediation investigation. *Electronic Commerce Research and Applications*, *28*, 54–62. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.elerap.2018.01.011

Wang, S., Wang, J., Wang, Y., Yan, J., & Li, J. (2018). Environmental knowledge and consumers' intentions to visit green hotels: the mediating role of consumption values. *Https://Doi.Org/10.1080/10548408.2018.1490234*, *35*(9), 1261–1271. https://doi.org/10.1080/10548408.2018.1490234

Wang, Y., Sun, S., & Song, Y. (2012). Chinese luxury consumers: Motivation, attitude and behavior. *Journal of Promotion Management*, *17*(3), 345–359.

Wiedmann, K. P., Hennigs, N., & Siebels, A. (2009). Value-based segmentation of

luxury consumption behavior. *Psychology & Marketing*, *26*(7), 625–651.

Yu, S., Hudders, L., & Cauberghe, V. (2018). Selling luxury products online: the effect of a quality label on risk perception, purchase intention and attitude toward the brand. *Jurnal Electron. Commer. Res*, *19*(1), 16–35.

Yue, Z., Kratzwald, B., & Feuerriegel, S. (2021). Contrastive Domain Adaptation for Question Answering using Limited Text Corpora. *EMNLP 2021 - 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, Proceedings*, 9575–9593. https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.emnlp-main.754

Zhao, Y., Wang, L., Tang, H., & Zhang, Y. (2020). Electronic word-of-mouth and consumer purchase intentions in social e-commerce. *Electronic Commerce Research and Applications*, *41*. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ELERAP.2020.100980

Zhong, J., Chen, Y., Yan, J., & Luo, J. (2021). The mixed blessing of cyberloafing on innovation performance during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *126*(8). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2021.106982

Zhong, Z., & Chen, D. (2021). A Frustratingly Easy Approach for Entity and Relation Extraction. *NAACL-HLT 2021 - 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Proceedings of the Conference*, 50–61. https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.naacl-main.5

UNIVERSITAS PELITA HARAPAN

UNIVERSITAS
PELITA
HARAPAN

APPENDIX A

Questionare

Pengaruh Brand Attitude, Perceived Values, dan Social Media WOM terhadap Minat Beli Barang Mewah di Jakarta Indonesia

Dalam rangka penyelesaian Skripsi. Saya, Rionald Marcel Hermanto bermaksud melakukan penelitian ilmiah untuk penyelesaian skripsi dengan judul "Pengaruh Brand Attitude, Perceived Values, dan Social Media WOM terhadap Minat Beli Barang Mewah di Jakarta Indonesia". Kuesioner ini terdiri dari 44 pertanyaan dan membutuhkan waktu 5-10 menit. Data yang Anda isi bersifat pribadi dan dirahasiakan. Sehubung dengan hal tersebut Saya sangat mengharapakan ketersediaan Bapak/Ibu/Saudara/i untuk melungankan waktunya sejenak untuk mengisi beberapa pertanyaan pada kuisioner ini.

Atas perhatian dan kerja samanya, saya ucapkan terima kasih.

PERTANYAAN KUESIONER

Identitas partipan

1. **Nama**
2. **Penghasilan**
3. **Gender**
4. **Umur**
5. **Pekerjaan**

No	Pertanyaan	SKALA				
		STS	TS	Netral	S	SS
Perceived Value	**Social Value** 1. Owning luxury goods indicates a symbol of achievement. 2. Owning luxury goods indicates a symbol of wealth. 3. Owning luxury goods indicates a symbol of prestige. 4. Owning luxury goods help me to join private class. 5. Luxury goods make obtain first class facilities 6. Luxury goods are important to me because they make me feel that acceptable in my work circle. **Personal value** 1. Purchasing luxury goods increase my happiness. 2. Purchasing luxury goods make me confidence. 3. Wearing luxury goods make me comfortable.					

No	Pertanyaan	SKALA				
		STS	TS	Netral	S	SS
	4. It is important to me to own really nice luxury goods					
	5. When shopping for luxury goods, I am able to forget my problems.					
	6. When in a bad mood, shopping for luxury goods enhances my mood.					
	Functional value					
	1. I often buy luxury goods in such a way that I create a personal image that cannot be duplicated.					
	2. I like to own new luxury goods before others do.					
	3. I believe luxury goods are of superior quality.					
	4. I often by luxury goods that are exclusive.					
	5. In my mind, the higher price charged by luxury goods indicate higher quality.					
	6. In my mind the more					

No	Pertanyaan	SKALA				
		STS	TS	Netral	S	SS
	exclusive the items, the higher quality the items are					
Social media WOM	1. I often read other consumers' posts on social media to make sure I buy the right luxury fashion brands.					
	2. I often read other consumers' posts on social media to know what luxury fashion brands make a good impression on others.					
	3. I often read other consumers' posts on social media to gather information about luxury fashion brands.					
	4. I often read other consumers' posts on social media to have confidence in my buying decision for luxury fashion brands.					
	5. I often read other consumers' posts on social media to know high highly rewarded					

No	Pertanyaan	SKALA				
		STS	TS	Netral	S	SS
	are the goods.					
	6. If I do not read consumers' online product reviews when I buy a luxury fashion brand, I worry about my decision.					
Purchase Intention	1. If I were going to purchase a luxury product, I would consider buying this brand.					
	2. If I were shopping for a luxury brand, the likelihood I would purchase this luxury brand is high.					
	3. My willingness to buy this luxury brand would be high if I were shopping for a luxury brand.					
	4. The probability I would consider buying this luxury brand is high.					
	5. I am willing to buy the luxury items if it gives me more social benefits.					

No	Pertanyaan	SKALA				
		STS	TS	Netral	S	SS
	6. I am willing to buy luxury items if the price is worth.					

APPENDIX B

The definition of luxury goods proposed by previous studies

No	Questions	Result
1	Do you love luxury goods?	100%
2	Do you love international luxury goods?	100%
3	Do you possess luxury goods?	83.3%
4	Do you wish to buy luxury goods if they cost more than 100 million rupiah?	25%
5	Do you collect luxury goods?	41.7%

Studies	Definition	Important features
(Vickers & Renand, 2003)	Luxury items are markers of one's social and personal identity,	Status Symbol of identity

Studies	Definition	Important features
	and the status attached to them plays a significant role in this.	
(Tynan et al. 2010)	Luxury goods offer clients enough value to make up for the high cost. Luxury goods and services are characterized by their high quality, high price, rarity, exclusivity, prestige, and authenticity, which provide symbolic and hedonistic benefits through experiences.	Quality Price Rare Exclusive Authentic Symbolic values Prestige
(Y. J. Han et al., 2010)	Luxury items provide their owner a sense of exclusivity, regardless of their utility	Exclusiveness High Price
(Kapferer & Laurent, 2016)	Luxury items are scarce, expertly made, and	Rare Craftmanship

Studies	Definition	Important features
	expensive.	Exclusive
(Ko & Megehee, 2019)	A luxury good or service is of high quality, offers authentic value, is prestigious, worthy of a high price, and inspires a connection in the consumer.	Authenticity Quality Prestige
(Park et al., 2021)	Luxury brands can be defined as having characteristics that represent the customers' perceived luxury after purchasing, such as a premium image, quality, and enjoyable purchase and consuming experiences.	Premium image and quality Perceived luxury
(Chapman & Dilmperi, 2022)	Luxury goods provide high degrees of symbolic and	Authentic Emotional values Exclusive

Studies	Definition	Important features
	emotional/hedonic values through consumer experiences and seem to be uncommon, exclusive, distinguished, and authentic.	Symbolic values

Previous Research Findings

Previous Research	Contexts	Variables	Research findings
(Silva et al., 2020)	Emerging countries, luxury cars	Brand Consciousness, Brand Love, and Brand attitude	There have been positive effects of the three variables to purchase intention. Additionally, global luxury automobile manufacturers will be able to provide consumers of luxury cars better value by knowing consumer attitudes toward the characteristics of luxury.

Previous Research	Contexts	Variables	Research findings
			In order to build their marketing strategies in line with the shifting consumer perceptions, values, and attitudes that will impact the customer's buy intentions, global luxury manufacturers must first recognize the cultural variations present throughout the world. The consumers of luxury brands in these markets will also profit from this strategy since they will receive items that meet and surpass their expectations.
(Husain, Paul, & Koles, 2022)	Indian luxury markets	Social media marketing strategies, brand equity, trust, and status	The study's findings showed that brand equity and social media marketing had a beneficial impact on luxury brand purchase intentions,

Previous Research	Contexts	Variables	Research findings
		consumption	which were shown to be more significant in India, while brand trust and status consumption had an impact on Indian consumers' buy intentions.
(Jin et al., 2021)	Domestics and Foreign luxury products in China	Value perception, occasions, demographic characteristics, and personal values	The findings of regression analysis reveal that particular product values, such as functional value (i.e., economic value) and hedonic value (i.e., brand emotion) dimensions, were significant predictors of the intention to purchase of Chinese luxury brands. Hedonic values, on the other hand, such as brand sense and brand emotion, were what ultimately led people to buy luxury goods from

Previous Research	Contexts	Variables	Research findings
			outside. Moreover, certain personal values, such as individual (e.g., mood lifting) and overall luxury value perception (e.g., a sense of luxury), were significant for the purchase of domestic luxury brands, while individual (e.g., self-complacency, mood lifting) and social value (e.g., social acceptance) dimensions were significant for the purchase of foreign luxury brands. Additionally, Chinese and foreign luxury brands share the same special occasions and demographics. Particularly, highly educated married people with high-paying

Previous Research	Contexts	Variables	Research findings
			full-time jobs preferred to buy domestic luxury goods for their anniversaries, while full-time, middle-aged married people tended to buy foreign brands.
(Mousa, 2019)	International brand in Qatar	Avoidance of similarity, unpopular choice, creative choice, hedonism, conspicuousness, quality, materialism	The research councludes that consumers of luxury brands are heavily influenced by the demand for uniqueness (avoidance of similarity and creative choice), whereas the third subdimension, the unpopular decision, was left out of testing due to the issue's analysis. Additionally, the effects of hedonism, conspicuity, and quality were all the same. However, materialism didn't show a statistically

Previous Research	Contexts	Variables	Research findings
			significant impact on consumer purchase intention of buying luxury brands.
(Nuzula & Wahyudi, 2022)	Luxury product marketing in Indonesia	Brand Attitude, Perceived value, Social WoM	The findings indicate that Purchase Intention can be somewhat explained by the three variables. However, only perceived value and brand attitude—not social word of mouth—are the characteristics that have an impact on purchase intention. According to the study's findings, marketing innovation is essential for concentrating on the prestige of luxury product consumers through perceived value and brand attitude. Because consumers of luxury goods frequently have a low regard

Previous Research	Contexts	Variables	Research findings
			for products from other consumers, information from other users is not trustworthy enough to inspire buy intentions. However, they place greater faith in the alleged prestige.

APPENDIX C

Summary of the four-research paradigm

	Core idea	Research method	Objectives
Positivism	We can recognize laws of cause and effect that govern how the world works. Positivists focus on the validity of their observations, the reproducibility and rigor of their study, and the generalizability of their conclusions.	employ deductive reasoning to develop hypotheses that can be tested using a predetermined, rigid research design and objective metrics.	depict things that can be measured and observed directly
constructionism	The world is essentially mental or created by the mind.	Qualitative research	understand a specific case
critical realism	the observable world and the actual world are separated.	triangulate data from many incorrect and inaccurate methodologies, observations,	to advance in discovering the truth

	Core idea	Research method	Objectives
		and researchers.	
pragmatism	a method where concepts and meanings (theory) are generalizations of our past deeds and experiences, as well as of our interactions with our surroundings. It sees the present truth as unstable and evolving over time.	Practical and applied research	to gain an understanding of the world

Tax Revenue Ratio to GDP (in Percent)

Sources of Tax Revenue	Tax Revenue Ratio to GDP		
	2016	2017	2018
Income tax	5,37	4,76	4,99
Value added tax on goods and services and sales	3,32	3,54	3,62

of luxury goods			
Excise tax	1,16	1,13	1,08
Import duty	0,26	0,26	0,26
Property tax	0,16	0,12	0,13

Conceptual Definition and Operational Definition

Variables	Conceptual Definition	Operational Definition	Scale	Source
Perceived Quality	Consumers' perceptions of a brand's overall excellence are based on both intrinsic (performance and durability) and extrinsic (brand name) aspects (J. Park, Sen, et al., 2021).	1 The luxury items are dependable.	Likert	(Park et al, 2021)
		2. The luxury items would be reliable.		
		3. The luxury items would be durable.		
		4. The luxury items should be high quality.		
		5. The luxury		

Variables	Conceptual Definition	Operational Definition	Scale	Source
		items would be sophisticated.		
		6. The workmanship of luxury items would be high		
Social Value	The perceived benefits that people believe they receive from consuming goods or services that are valued within their own social group(s), such as conspicuousness and prestige value, which may have a significant impact on how people perceive and are likely to evaluate luxury brands (J. Park, Sen, et al., 2021)	1. Owning luxury goods indicates a symbol of achievement.	Likert	(Nuzula & Wahyudi, 2022); (J. Park, Sen, et al., 2021).
		2. Owning luxury goods indicates a symbol of wealth.		
		3. Owning luxury goods indicates a symbol of prestige.		

Variables	Conceptual Definition	Operational Definition	Scale	Source
		4. Owning luxury goods help me to join private class.		
		5. Luxury goods make obtain first class facilities		
		6. Luxury goods are important to me because they make me feel that acceptable in my work circle.		
Personal value	the consumer's orientation toward luxury purchasing and handles issues like materialism, hedonism, and self-identity value	1. Purchasing luxury goods increase my happiness.	Likert	(J. Park, Sen, et al., 2021)
		2. Purchasing luxury goods make me		

Variables	Conceptual Definition	Operational Definition	Scale	Source
		confidence.		
		3.Wearing luxury goods make me comfortable.		
		4. It is important to me to own really nice luxury goods		
		5. When shopping for luxury goods, I am able to forget my problems.		
		6. When in a bad mood, shopping for luxury goods enhances my mood		

Variables	Conceptual Definition	Operational Definition	Scale	Source
Functional value	the core benefit and fundamental necessities that fuel consumer-based luxury value, such as the product's quality, distinctiveness, usability, reliability, and durability (J. Park, Sen, et al., 2021)	1. I often buy luxury goods in such a way that I create a personal image that cannot be duplicated.	Likert	(Nuzula & Wahyudi, 2022); (J. Park, Sen, et al., 2021).
		2. I like to own new luxury goods before others do.		
		3. I believe luxury goods are of superior quality.		
		4. I often by luxury goods that are exclusive.		
		5. In my mind, the higher price		

Variables	Conceptual Definition	Operational Definition	Scale	Source
		charged by luxury goods indicate higher quality.		
		6. In my mind the more exclusive the items, the higher quality the items are		
Social media WOM	any testimonial—whether positive or unfavorable—from customers who have used a product or business before and has been made widely available to organizations and individuals online (J. Park, Sen, et al., 2021)	1. I often read other consumers' posts on social media to know what luxury fashion brands make a good impression on	Likert	(Nuzula & Wahyudi, 2022); (J. Park, Sen, et al., 2021)..

Variables	Conceptual Definition	Operational Definition	Scale	Source
		others.		
		2. I often read other consumers' posts on social media to make sure I buy the right luxury fashion brands.		
		3. I often read other consumers' posts on social media to gather information about luxury fashion brands.		
		4. I often read other consumers' posts on social media to have		

Variables	Conceptual Definition	Operational Definition	Scale	Source
		confidence in my buying decision for luxury fashion brands.		
		5. I often read other consumers' posts on social media to know high highly rewarded are the goods.		
		6. If I do not read consumers' online product reviews when I buy a luxury fashion brand, I worry about my decision.		
Purchase Intention	Purchase Intention is defined as customers'	1.If I were going to purchase a	Likert	(Nuzula & Wahyudi,

Variables	Conceptual Definition	Operational Definition	Scale	Source
	desire to trade connections with retailers online, including information sharing, sustaining business relationships, and doing business transactions (J. Park, Sen, et al., 2020).	luxury product, I would consider buying this brand.		2022); (J. Park, Sen, et al., 2021)
		2. If I were shopping for a luxury brand, the likelihood I would purchase this luxury brand is high.		
		3. My willingness to buy this luxury brand would be high if I were shopping for a luxury brand.		
		4. The probability I would consider		

Variables	Conceptual Definition	Operational Definition	Scale	Source
		buying this luxury brand is high.		
		5. I am willing to buy the luxury items if it gives me more social benefits.		
		6. I am willing to buy luxury items if the price is worth.		
Perceived Social Status	the place in the social system to which specific rights and obligations, specific expectations or norms, and the roles formed by them (Farkas, 2022).	1. I believe that purchasing luxuries is necessary for one to belong to high society.	Likert	(Farkas, 2022), (J. Park, Sen, et al., 2021)
		2. Buying luxury goods is a symbol of a		

Variables	Conceptual Definition	Operational Definition	Scale	Source
		higher standard of living		
		3. I get a special place in social gatherings because I own luxury goods		
		4. I get special influence because I have bought luxury goods		
		5. I feel the people around me respect me because I buy luxury goods		

Types of Scale	Characteristics	Level of Measurement	
		Central Tendency	Variability (Dispersion)
Nominal	Draw attention to distinctions and organize objects or people into categories.	Mode	Frequency
Ordinal	Ranking categories on a nominal scale adds to the information by providing an enhancement.	Mean	Cumulative percentage distribution
Interval	Nominal and ordinal features are included, but information on the magnitude of the difference in the variable is also	Median	Standard deviation and Range

Types of Scale	Characteristics	Level of Measurement	
		Central Tendency	Variability (Dispersion)
	included.		
Ratio	The strongest scale since it takes into account the three preceding scales (nominal, ordinal, and interval), not only the size of the differences indicated, but also the proportions.		

Types of Scale

Summary of Outer and Inner Model Rule of Thumb

Convergent Validity	Loading Factor with the value > 0.7	Valid
	Average variance Extracted (AVE) with the value > 0.5	

Discriminant Validity	Cross Loading	Valid
	HTMT with the value > 0.9 (Henseler et al., 2015a)	Valid
Reliability	Cronbach's Alpha with the value > 0.7	Valid
	Composite Reliability with the value > 0.7	
Common Method Bias (CMB)	VIF value < 5	Well-fitting
Goodness of Fit (GoF)	Value of 0.10 indicated	Small
	Value of 0.25 indicated	Medium
	Value of 0.36 indicated	Large
R-Square	Value of 0.19 indicated the model	Weak
	Value of 0.33 indicated the model	Moderate
	Value of 0.67 indicated the model	Strong
Predictive Relevance (Q^2)	$Q^2 > 0$ shows the model	Have Predictive Relevance
	$Q^2 < 0$ shows the model	Lacks predictive relevance
Significance (two-tailed)	t-value conditions of 1.645 (significance level + 10%)	T-statistics value >T-value for significance measurement
	1.96 (significance level = 5%)	
	2.58 (significance level = 1%)	

P value	P-value < 0.005	Significance statistically

Convergent Validity Pre-Test Result (Perceived Quality)

Perceived Quality Convergent Validity			
Variable	Factor Loading	Rule of Thumb	Result
PQ1	0.724	0.7	Valid
PQ2	0.528		Invalid
PQ3	0,850		Valid
PQ4	0,796		Valid
PQ5	0,501		Invalid
PQ6	0,343		Invalid

Convergent Validity Re-Analysis Result (perceived Quality)

Perceived Quality Convergent Validity			
Variable	Factor Loading	Rule of Thumb	Result
PQ1	0.724	0.7	Invalid
PQ3	0,850		Valid
PQ4	0,796		Valid

Cross-loading pretest

	FV	PI	PQ	PSS	PV	SMW	SV
FV2	0,654	0,567	0,164	0,472	0,644	0,403	0,442
FV3	0,672	0,245	0,589	0,149	0,369	0,221	0,282
FV5	0,733	0,572	0,096	0,444	0,414	0,404	0,385
FV6	0,767	0,535	0,198	0,329	0,366	0,336	0,299
PI1	0,610	0,911	0,214	0,546	0,615	0,544	0,503
PI2	0,553	0,901	0,152	0,579	0,616	0,473	0,497
PI3	0,576	0,865	0,210	0,576	0,610	0,445	0,496
PI4	0,506	0,778	0,045	0,395	0,493	0,457	0,347
PQ1	0,262	0,122	0,821	0,005	0,178	0,285	0,110
PQ2	0,179	-0,048	0,732	-0,051	0,045	0,215	0,041
PQ3	0,381	0,206	0,807	0,065	0,293	0,215	0,215
PQ4	0,434	0,187	0,845	0,092	0,251	0,375	0,199
PQ6	0,139	0,078	0,533	-0,026	0,061	0,255	0,021
PSS1	0,441	0,525	0,185	0,811	0,590	0,359	0,646
PSS2	0,423	0,584	-0,022	0,808	0,542	0,368	0,660
PSS3	0,384	0,386	0,043	0,834	0,479	0,414	0,707
PSS4	0,357	0,495	0,036	0,903	0,568	0,408	0,733
PSS5	0,339	0,515	-0,015	0,818	0,510	0,445	0,672
PV1	0,494	0,634	0,275	0,488	0,852	0,430	0,620
PV2	0,508	0,588	0,237	0,578	0,818	0,416	0,713
PV3	0,492	0,386	0,269	0,491	0,743	0,319	0,526

	FV	PI	PQ	PSS	PV	SMW	SV
PV4	0,506	0,522	0,195	0,574	0,790	0,274	0,572
PV5	0,504	0,513	0,132	0,537	0,798	0,380	0,562
PV6	0,546	0,588	0,154	0,464	0,798	0,351	0,487
SMW1	0,354	0,475	0,432	0,321	0,385	0,799	0,402
SMW2	0,425	0,495	0,217	0,376	0,405	0,785	0,516
SMW3	0,437	0,449	0,264	0,373	0,358	0,840	0,390
SMW4	0,379	0,394	0,356	0,398	0,389	0,828	0,429
SMW5	0,421	0,483	0,313	0,476	0,379	0,872	0,508
SMW6	0,318	0,464	0,219	0,429	0,375	0,875	0,471
SV1	0,432	0,515	0,190	0,686	0,682	0,461	0,842
SV2	0,325	0,439	0,047	0,623	0,497	0,483	0,789
SV3	0,268	0,428	-0,099	0,677	0,443	0,475	0,721
SV4	0,392	0,380	0,214	0,644	0,620	0,330	0,801
SV5	0,345	0,338	0,208	0,646	0,473	0,358	0,811
SV6	0,542	0,442	0,331	0,631	0,723	0,473	0,805

Cronbach's Reliability Pre-Test Result

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha	Rule of Thumb	Result
Perceived Quality	0.829	0.7	Reliable
Social Value	0.884		Reliable

Personal Value	0.889		Reliable
Functional Value	0.675		Reliable
Social Media WOM	0.912		Reliable
Purchase Intention	0.887		Reliable
Perceived Social Status	0.884		Reliable

R-Square Output

	R-Square
Functional Value	0,023
Personal Value	0,074
Social Value	0,051
Social Media Word of Mouth	0,334
Purchase Intention	0,536

APPENDIX D

Gender Percentage

Gender		
	Frequency	Percent
Male	199	42.16%
Female	273	57,84%
Total	472	100

Age

Age		
	Frequency	Percent
20 - 24 year	27	5,70%
25-30 year	168	35,60%
31-35 year	219	46,40%
> 36 year	58	12,30%
Total	472	100,00%

Education Percentage

Education

	Frequency	Percent
SHS/VHS	45	9,50%
Diploma	38	8,10%
Undergraduate	297	62,90%
Postgraduate	92	19,50%
Total	472	100

Income Percentage

Income		
	Frequency	Percent
< Rp 3.000.000	5	1,1
Rp 3.000.000 - Rp 5.000.000	11	2,3
Rp 5.000.000 - Rp 7.500.000	246	52,1
Rp 7.500.000 - Rp 10.000.000	132	28
Rp 10.000.000 - Rp 25.000.000	53	11,2
> Rp 25.000.000	25	5,3
Total	472	100

Descriptive Statistics

	No.	Mean	Median	Min	Max	Standard Deviation
PQ1	1	3.604	4.000	1.000	5.000	0,65416667
PQ2	2	3.718	4.000	1.000	5.000	1.160
PQ3	3	3.811	4.000	1.000	5.000	1.066
PQ4	4	3.589	4.000	1.000	5.000	1.143
PQ5	5	3.922	4.000	1.000	5.000	0,62986111
PQ6	6	3.765	4.000	1.000	5.000	1.070
SV1	7	3.856	4.000	1.000	5.000	0,51944444
SV2	8	3.816	4.000	1.000	5.000	0,59513889
SV3	9	3.638	4.000	1.000	5.000	0,67569444
SV4	10	3.748	4.000	2.000	5.000	0,56736111
SV5	11	3.767	4.000	1.000	5.000	0,60347222
SV6	12	3.708	4.000	1.000	5.000	0,64861111
PV1	13	3.604	4.000	1.000	5.000	0,65416667
PV2	14	3.718	4.000	1.000	5.000	1.160
PV3	15	3.811	4.000	1.000	5.000	1.066
PV4	16	3.589	4.000	1.000	5.000	1.143
PV5	17	3.922	4.000	1.000	5.000	0,62986111
PV6	18	3.765	4.000	1.000	5.000	1.070
FV1	19	3.604	4.000	1.000	5.000	0,65416667
FV2	20	3.718	4.000	1.000	5.000	1.160
FV3	21	3.811	4.000	1.000	5.000	1.066
FV4	22	3.589	4.000	1.000	5.000	1.143
FV5	23	3.922	4.000	1.000	5.000	0,62986111
FV6	24	3.765	4.000	1.000	5.000	1.070
SMW1	25	4.210	4.000	1.000	5.000	0,50972222
SMW2	26	4.133	4.000	1.000	5.000	0,56666667
SMW3	27	4.186	4.000	1.000	5.000	0,53055556
SMW4	28	4.182	4.000	1.000	5.000	0,50972222
SMW5	29	4.214	4.000	1.000	5.000	0,52638889
SMW6	30	4.174	4.000	1.000	5.000	0,46736111
PI1	31	4.178	4.000	1.000	5.000	0,50625
PI2	32	4.180	4.000	1.000	5.000	0,56041667
PI3	33	4.081	4.000	1.000	5.000	0,54861111
PI4	34	4.186	4.000	1.000	5.000	0,49652778
PI5	35	4.197	4.000	1.000	5.000	0,47708333
PI6	36	4.301	4.000	1.000	5.000	0,40833333
PSS1	37	3.716	4.000	1.000	5.000	1.120

PSS2	38	3.786	4.000	1.000	5.000	1.184
PSS3	39	3.682	4.000	1.000	5.000	1.135
PSS4	40	3.703	4.000	1.000	5.000	1.118
PSS5	41	3.608	4.000	1.000	5.000	1.130
Gender	42	1.578	2.000	1.000	2.000	0,34305556
Age	43	2.710	3.000	1.000	4.000	0,50069444
Education	44	2.998	3.000	1.000	4.000	0,51041667
Income	46	3.693	3.000	1.000	5.000	0,64305556

Outer Loading Test

	Functional Value	Perceived Quality	Perceived Social Status	Personal Value	Purchase Intention	Social Media Word of Mouth	Social Value
FV1	0,920						
FV2	0,859						
FV3	0,863						
FV4	0,923						
FV5	0,810						
FV6	0,891						
PI1					0,772		
PI2					0,722		
PI3					0,749		
PI4					0,702		
PI5					0,564		
PI6					0,359		
PQ1		0,907					
PQ2		0,879					
PQ3		0,875					
PQ4		0,897					
PQ5		0,828					
PQ6		0,898					
PSS1			0,878				
PSS2			0,868				
PSS3			0,888				
PSS4			0,896				
PSS5			0,889				

PV1				0,913			
PV2				0,869			
PV3				0,877			
PV4				0,913			
PV5				0,798			
PV6				0,900			
SMW1						0,744	
SMW2						0,652	
SMW3						0,709	
SMW4						0,634	
SMW5						0,745	
SMW6						0,719	
SV1							0,792
SV2							0,724
SV3							0,808
SV4							0,679
SV5							0,764
SV6							0,826

Discriminant Validity - Cross Loadings > 0.70 for Actual Tes

	Functional Value	Purchase Intention	Perceived Quality	Perceived Social Status	Personal Value	Social Media Word of Mouth	Social Value
FV1	0,921	0,263	0,061	0,007	-0,072	0,199	0,121
FV2	0,859	0,190	0,041	-0,003	-0,088	0,095	0,089
FV3	0,864	0,154	0,024	0,000	-0,057	0,121	0,067
FV4	0,919	0,285	0,059	0,043	-0,093	0,232	0,135
FV5	0,816	0,180	0,031	-0,038	-0,123	0,114	0,082
FV6	0,890	0,248	0,020	-0,011	-0,092	0,148	0,068
PI1	0,226	0,787	-0,019	0,215	-0,071	0,459	0,080
PI2	0,165	0,733	0,028	0,247	-0,010	0,436	0,124
PI3	0,222	0,783	0,064	0,265	0,032	0,454	0,191

PI4	0,182	0,725	0,079	0,243	-0,042	0,425	0,091
PQ1	0,035	-0,010	0,906	-0,151	0,096	-0,031	0,718
PQ2	0,055	0,049	0,880	-0,115	0,072	0,039	0,713
PQ3	0,076	0,081	0,875	-0,051	0,072	0,073	0,691
PQ4	0,078	0,040	0,897	-0,123	0,119	0,008	0,747
PQ5	0,018	0,049	0,828	-0,114	0,063	0,042	0,639
PQ6	-0,004	0,056	0,898	-0,048	0,099	0,018	0,731
PSS1	0,020	0,305	-0,096	0,878	-0,061	0,264	-0,084
PSS2	-0,005	0,274	-0,134	0,870	0,034	0,213	-0,106
PSS3	0,011	0,244	-0,143	0,887	0,022	0,241	-0,125
PSS4	0,017	0,262	-0,101	0,894	0,015	0,224	-0,083
PSS5	-0,012	0,317	-0,042	0,890	0,027	0,289	-0,041
PV1	-0,091	-0,081	0,075	0,002	0,913	-0,084	0,086
PV2	-0,091	-0,020	0,068	0,003	0,867	-0,026	0,120
PV3	-0,071	0,012	0,088	0,013	0,876	-0,021	0,139
PV4	-0,140	-0,058	0,109	-0,009	0,914	-0,074	0,138
PV5	-0,071	0,036	0,063	0,058	0,800	0,023	0,096
PV6	-0,033	0,008	0,103	0,002	0,901	-0,022	0,155
SMW 1	0,174	0,486	0,040	0,149	-0,034	0,785	0,099
SMW 3	0,146	0,442	0,016	0,170	0,016	0,723	0,110
SMW 5	0,118	0,466	-0,005	0,325	-0,087	0,780	0,051
SMW 6	0,132	0,376	0,032	0,216	-0,042	0,752	0,081
SV1	0,108	0,079	0,627	-0,149	0,060	0,040	0,794
SV2	0,081	0,081	0,510	-0,040	0,149	0,068	0,740
SV3	0,110	0,151	0,737	-0,075	0,097	0,100	0,824
SV5	0,097	0,139	0,538	-0,051	0,159	0,105	0,742
SV6	0,057	0,177	0,716	-0,063	0,112	0,124	0,847

Outer VIF Value

Perceived Quality		Social Value		Personal Value		Functional Value	
Indicator	VIF	Indicator	VIF	Indicator	VIF	Indicator	VIF

PQ1	4,038	SV1	1,863	PV1	4,038	FV1	4,038
PQ2	3,145	SV2	1,671	PV2	3,145	FV2	3,145
PQ3	3,114	SV3	2,062	PV3	3,144	FV3	3,114
PQ4	3,663	SV5	1,651	PV4	3,663	FV4	3,663
PQ5	2,388	SV6	2,257	PV5	2,388	FV5	2,388
PQ6	3,663			PV6	3,663	FV6	3,663

Social Media WOM		Purchase Intention		Perceived Social Status	
Indicator	VIF	Indicator	VIF	Indicator	VIF
SMW1	1,485	PI1	1,550	PSS1	2,756
SMW3	1,332	PI2	1,360	PSS2	2,731
SMW5	1,503	PI3	1,489	PSS3	3,296
SMW6	1,511	PI4	1,392	PSS4	3,426
				PSS5	2,987

Goodness of fit calculation of index

Variable	AVE	R-Square

Functional Value	0,772	0,002
Perceived Quality	0,776	
Perceived Social Status	0,781	
Personal Value	0,773	0,01
Purchase Intention	0,574	0,436
Social Media WOM	0,578	0,046
Social Value	0,625	0,645
Average	0,697	0,22773

R-square Value

	R Square	R-Square Adjusted
Functional Value	0,002	0,000
Purchase Intention	0,436	0,422
Personal Value	0,010	0,008
Social Media WOM	0,046	0,040
Social Value	0,645	0,644

Q square

Variable	Q^2
Functional Value	0.001
Personal Value	0.007
Purchase Intention	0,160
Social Media WOM	0.021
Social Value	0,273
Average	0,217013889

Hypotheses Testing

	Original Sample	T Statistics	P Values	Result
Perceived Quality -> Social Value	0,557	42.238	0,000	Supported
Perceived Quality -> Personal Value	0,069	1.969	0,025	Supported
Perceived Quality -> Functional Value	0,049	1.051	0,102	Not supported
Social Value -> Social Media Word of Mouth	0,099	2.468	0,010	Supported
Personal Value -> Social Media Word of Mouth	-0,045	0,548	0,149	Not supported
Functional Value -> Social Media Word of Mouth	0,120	3.524	0,000	Supported
Social Media Word of Mouth -> Purchase Intention	0,227	5.325	0,000	Supported

Comparison of Previous Research (J. Park, Sen, et al., 2021) and Present Research

	Previous Study	Present Study
Objects	Luxury brand	Luxury goods products including luxury fashions, luxury leather goods, and luxury apparel
Location	U.S	Jakarta
Sample	282 useable responses.	472

Respondents	U.S consumers	Indonesian People residing Jakarta
Data Collection	Online Survey	Electronic Questionnaire (Google Forms)
Software Analysis	Smart-PLS 3.0	Smart-PLS 3.0
Year	2021	2023
Variables	Perceived Quality, Perceived Social Value, Perceived Personal Value, Perceived Functional Value and Social Media WOM, Purchase Intention, Perceived Social Status, Consumers Demographics	Perceived Quality, Perceived Social Value, Perceived Personal Value, Perceived Functional Value and Social Media WOM, Purchase Intention, Perceived Social Status, Consumers Demographics
Result	H1: Supported H2: Supported H3: Supported H4: Supported H5: Supported H6: Supported H7: Supported H8: Not Supported H9: Not Supported	H1: Supported H2: Supported H3: Not Supported H4: Supported H5: Not Supported H6: Supported H7: Supported H8: Supported H9: Not Supported