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ABSTRACT

The research conducted by this researcher intends to analyze the effect of trust and ease of use on purchase decisions and repurchase intention. The data collection method in this study uses a questionnaire with 130 consumers who have purchased at an online store. The analytical method used is descriptive analysis, and the test instrument uses SEM AMOS. In this study using four variables, thirteen dimensions and twenty-six indicators. The results show that trust and ease of use have a significant effect on buying decisions and also have a significant effect on repurchase intention, and purchase decisions have a significant and significant effect on repurchase intention. So it can be said that trust and ease of use are the entry points that make consumers start to move to the next stage, therefore online store marketers need to pay attention.
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1. Introduction

In the world of online marketing as it is now, which is the development of a new era of online retail, it is present as a complement to offline retail (Kotler et al., 2019). Some consumers choose to shop at this place because of its many advantages (Suleman et al., 2019), it could also be because of the service (Suleman, 2014). This is a new place for solutions in a changing era. This shopping place has also attracted a lot of consumers so that it could be a new place to replace offline retail (Suleman, Ali, et al., 2020d). Consumers have already experienced and enjoyed using this new shopping place (Suleman, Ali, et al., 2020c). Coupled with the use of the internet that is already widespread and reaches half of Indonesia's population. The basis of the transaction, of course, cannot be separated from the feeling of trust in the seller, and here the seller has shown the details of the product being sold in detail, but in online trade, he believes not only with goods but also with sellers in certain media (Suleman et al., 2020) This trust is important because in the process it is an initial door and consumer perceptions to start entering and becoming consumers or users on certain platforms in online retail (Suleman et al., 2020). It is important to know how big the role of trust is even though we already understand at a glance that this role of trust is important (Suleman, 2018). Showing trust in consumers is the initial capital for sellers at online retail, this is because many transactions in the online world are suspected of fraud because sellers and buyers do not meet in person (Fortes & Rita, 2016). So that consumers need to be made to believe in order to start shopping. Technological advancement is also a blessing and also a problem for some consumers (Suleman et al., 2020). This is because some consumers find it easy and experience difficulty in using it (Zuniarti et al., 2020). The problem that occurs is not only consumers willing to transact, but there are also consumers who want but have difficulty using applications at an online retail. The point that online retail marketing pays attention to is whether the place where they sell products is easy to use by all consumers (Suleman, Ali, et al., 2020a). Because if it is difficult to use, consumers who have decided to shop online retail will choose to return to offline retail shopping (Suleman et al., 2019; Rusiyati et al., 2021). So it is almost said that consumers cancel buying just because the system is not easy of use (Suleman,
Ali, et al., 2020b) it is easy for all consumers, not only generation Y and Generation Z consumers but also generation X (Suleman et al., 2020d). The purchase decision becomes the end of the purchase process after consumers are faced with various kinds of alternatives (Philip & Keller, 2016). But it is also not the end because every seller wants consumers who have bought to buy back (Dutta, 2016). Consumers who have decided will have their own feelings about their online shopping experience (Suleman et al., 2020). And this is the capital for further buying interest (Suleman et al., 2019). Buy back is an effort that sellers need to think about so that online retail can be the main choice for consumer purchases. So that the factors for seeking repurchase interest may be the same as those that influence purchasing decisions.

2. Theoretical framework and hypotheses

In this study, researchers assume that it is important to know how an online retail can be a place that consumers decide to buy and how much the influence of trust and ease of use in this case and also its influence on repurchase interest because consumers who have purchased are expected to have an interest in buying it. buy back and become a loyal customer at online retail. Below is an explanation for building the hypothesis in this study as follows.
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After the researcher draws the framework used in the next study, an explanation of the basis for determining the hypothesis which is found from the results of previous research is as follows

2.1 Trust

Trust in many theories states that it is the main determining factor for consumer confidence in a transaction (Suleman et al., 2019). In several previous studies it was also stated that trust is the most important and major factor influencing consumer decisions as in research, (Bianchi & Andrews, 2012; Hsu et al., 2013; MH Hsu et al., 2014; Suleman et al., 2020). Then with regard to repurchase interest, there have been many studies which reveal that trust has a significant and significant effect on repurchase interest, including research (Bao et al., 2016; Setyorini & Nugraha, 2016; Liang et al., 2018; Tandon et al., 2020; Liang et al., 2018). Therefore, the researcher made the first and second hypotheses in this study as follows:

\( H_1: \) Trust has an influence and is significant on purchasing decisions.

\( H_2: \) Trust has an influence and is significant on Repurchase Intention.

2.2 Ease of use

Ease of use is part of the TAM model (Cho & Son, 2019) which part of this model is commonly used in research related to the use of new technology (Zeba & Ganguli, 2016), where there are two variables studied, including ease of use. and usefulness in this model. So that even in this study the researchers used one of these variables which will use ease of use for online retail consumer decisions and many studies have been done and resulted in the conclusion that ease of use has a significant and significant effect on consumer decisions, some researchers have concluded this, among others (Yadav et al., 2016; Shabrina & Zaki, 2019; Suleman et al., 2020). Besides having an effect on purchasing decisions for ease of use, it also turns out that many were conveyed by several previous studies which stated that ease of use had an effect on buying back interest mentioned in the research (Dutta, 2016; Larasetiati & Ali, 2019; Gupta, 2020). Therefore, the researcher made the third and fourth hypotheses in this study as follows:

\( H_3: \) Ease of use has an influence and is significant on purchasing decisions.

\( H_4: \) Ease of use has an influence and is significant on Repurchase Intention.

2.3 Purchase Decision

The purchase decision is not the end of the consumer journey process (Philip & Keller, 2016) because it can be continued with the next process, namely repurchasing interest. The intensity to make a repurchase will be somewhere as much as two or more times, both for the same product or a different one. From several studies that have been conducted, it is stated that purchasing decisions have a significant and significant effect on repurchase interest as we can see in the results of the study, (Wen et al., 2011; Bulut, 2016; Bupalan et al., 2018). Therefore, the researcher made the fifth hypothesis in this study as follows:

\( H_5: \) Purchasing decisions has an influence and is significant on Repurchase Intention.
3. Research methods

3.1 Population and Sample

This research was conducted using a population of consumers who shop at online retail. Therefore, the population in this study is large and the number is not known with certainty. While the sampling technique in this research uses quota sampling where the researcher will take 130 respondents, which number is based on the basis that (Sugiyono, 2013) which refers to the number of samples needed is five times the number of indicators in the study. which in this study uses 6 variables, 13 dimensions and 26 indicators. Where each indicator becomes a statement submitted to respondents who are asked 26 questions to be answered and the results will be tabulated. Then the results of the data obtained will be processed with analysis tools using SEM AMOS 23.

3.2 Data analysis and result measurement items

In this study, the trust variable uses three dimensions with six indicators whose theory is taken from (Suleman et al., 2019) which has been adjusted. As for the ease of use variable using three dimensions with six indicators taken from research (Davis, 1989) which have been adjusted. Furthermore, consumer decision variables use four dimensions and eight indicators adapted from theory (Philip & Keller, 2016) which have been adjusted and then for the repurchase intention variable using three dimensions with six indicators adapted from research (Kotler & Amstrong, 2016) which are adjusted. Where the total of 26 indicators is measured using a scale of 1 “Strongly Disagree” to 5 “Strongly Agree”.

3.3 SEM AMOS analysis

3.3.1 Goodness of Fit (GOF) Analysis

After testing with the SEM AMOS tool, there are three results obtained and will be conveyed in the first GOF study which aims to determine whether the overall compatibility model will be compared between the data entered with the standards owned by Amos. The output of SEM AMOS results in the data output on the overall compatibility test are given in Table 1.

Table 1
The results of Goodness of FIT (GOF)

| Measure          | Good Fit | Marginal Fit | Measurement Result |
|------------------|----------|--------------|--------------------|
| Absolute fit Model |          |              |                    |
| Goodness of fit Index (GFI) | ≥ 0.90   | 0.80 - <0.90 | 0.86               | Marginal Fit |
| Root Mean Square Error (RMSEA) | < 0.08   |              | 0.047              | Good Fit    |
| Incremental Fit Model |          |              |                    |
| Comparative Fit Index (CFI) | ≥ 0.90   | 0.80 - <0.90 | 0.94               | Good Fit    |
| Normal Fit Index (NFI) | ≥ 0.90   | 0.80 - <0.90 | 0.90               | Good Fit    |
| Incremental Fit Index (IFI) | ≥ 0.90   | 0.80 - <0.90 | 0.95               | Good Fit    |
| Relative fit Index (RFI) | ≥ 0.90   | 0.80 - <0.90 | 0.84               | Marginal Fit |
| Parsimonious Fit Model |          |              |                    |
| Parsimonious normed fit index (PNFI) | ≥ 0.90   | 0.80 - <0.90 | 0.82               | Marginal Fit |

Table 1 shows the Overall Model Processing (GOF) result which is the SEM output from AMOS, the absolute fit size data model is found which aims to determine the level of predictions of all models (structural and measurement models) to the suitability of data consisting of RMSEA 0.047 <0, 08 (model fit) and a GFI value of 0.86. It can be concluded that all the models tested approach the absolute fit model testing criteria at a fairly good level of testing criteria. And for other model fit criteria, the Incremental Fit Model consists of several conformity test instruments, namely the value of CFI = 0.94; NFI = 0.90; IFI = 0.95 and RFI = 0.84, the results state that the structural equation model is said to be good because it is at a fairly good level of testing criteria and has met the requirements of the Incremental Fit Model. On the fit size, the stingy fit model can be seen in the results of PNFI = 0.82; From these results it can be concluded that the model is said to be at the level of testing criteria is quite good and meets the requirements of the parsimonious fit model.

3.3.2 Measurement Model

The second SEM AMOS output shows the following data results. According to (Ferdinand, 2018) the composite reliability of a measurement model is said to be good reliability to measure each latent variable if the construct reliability value (CR) is ≥ 0.7 or more than the value of the extracted variant (VE) is greater than 0.05, which states that In exploration reliability research between 0.5 - 0.6 can be accepted then in SEM AMOS a one-way test is carried out with a confidence level of 95%, the commonly used critical value (CR) ≥ 1.96 which means that the assumption of normality is rejected at the significance level (P ) <0.05 (5%). In Table 2, it can be seen that the data shows that the 26 indicators are valid and reliable because the number (CR) ≥ 0.7 or more and also the extract value of variance (VE) is greater than 0.05. Therefore, it can be concluded that all indicators used in this study are reliable and valid and can be used in research.

3.3.3 Match analysis of structural models or hypothesis testing

The third output of SEM AMOS is to test the structural model or hypothesis testing which is used to see the results of the hypothesis in this study which can be seen in the following Table 3.
Table 2
Construct reliability and variance extracted

| Constructs          | Item Code | Factor Loadings | (Error) | CR   | VE   |
|---------------------|-----------|-----------------|---------|------|------|
| Trust               | TR1       | 0.72            | 0.62    | 0.89 | 0.50 |
|                     | TR2       | 0.80            | 0.61    |      |      |
|                     | TR3       | 0.79            | 0.52    |      |      |
|                     | TR4       | 0.80            | 0.51    |      |      |
|                     | TR5       | 0.74            | 0.62    |      |      |
|                     | TR6       | 0.78            | 0.42    |      |      |
| Ease of use         | EU7       | 0.72            | 0.52    | 0.87 | 0.50 |
|                     | EU8       | 0.86            | 0.63    |      |      |
|                     | EU9       | 0.72            | 0.62    |      |      |
|                     | EU10      | 0.73            | 0.54    |      |      |
|                     | EU11      | 0.72            | 0.57    |      |      |
|                     | EU12      | 0.76            | 0.62    |      |      |
| Purchase Decision   | PD13      | 0.78            | 0.69    | 0.82 | 0.50 |
|                     | PD14      | 0.80            | 0.63    |      |      |
|                     | PD15      | 0.72            | 0.52    |      |      |
|                     | PD16      | 0.74            | 0.60    |      |      |
|                     | PD17      | 0.79            | 0.52    |      |      |
|                     | PD18      | 0.80            | 0.58    |      |      |
|                     | PD19      | 0.76            | 0.52    |      |      |
|                     | PD20      | 0.73            | 0.60    |      |      |
| Repurchase Intention| RI21      | 0.82            | 0.61    | 0.86 | 0.60 |
|                     | RI22      | 0.80            | 0.63    |      |      |
|                     | RI23      | 0.72            | 0.54    |      |      |
|                     | RI24      | 0.83            | 0.66    |      |      |
|                     | RI25      | 0.75            | 0.65    |      |      |
|                     | RI26      | 0.82            | 0.48    |      |      |

Table 3
Hypothesis test result

| No | No | Hypotheses                         | SLF1 | t-value | Conclusion |
|----|----|------------------------------------|------|---------|------------|
| 1  | H1 | Trust → Purchase Decision          | 0.64 | 7.3     | Supported  |
| 2  | H2 | Trust → Repurchase Intention       | 0.24 | 2.2     | Supported  |
| 3  | H3 | Ease of use → Purchase Decision    | 0.51 | 4.1     | Supported  |
| 4  | H4 | Ease of use → Repurchase Intention | 0.31 | 3.0     | Supported  |
| 5  | H5 | Purchase Decision → Repurchase Intention | 0.41 | 2.4   | Supported  |

In Table 3 above, it is found that the results of structural model testing in Sem Amos show that the results of hypothesis testing in this study are accepted, meaning that all hypotheses in this study are in accordance with what was hypothesized. In decision making, it is influential and significant based on the t-value > T-table 1.96 and α < 0.05, where the magnitude of the effect can be seen in the resulting SLF value which shows how much influence the independent variable has.

(H1) The test results show that trust has a positive and significant effect on purchasing decisions with an output t-value of 7.3 greater than table 1.96 and a standard coefficient of 0.64. Then (H2) Trust has a significant and significant effect on repurchase intention, obtained a t-value of 2.2 which is also greater than t-table (1.96) with a standard coefficient of 0.24. For (H3) ease of use was found to have a significant and significant effect on buying decisions where the T-value is 4.1 which is also greater than the table (1.96) with a coefficient of 0.51. And for (H4) ease of use has a significant and significant effect on repurchase intention t-count 3.0 which is also greater than t table (1.96) with a coefficient of 0.31. And finally, (H5) purchase decision on repurchase intention, the t-value 2.4 is obtained which is also greater than table 1.96 with a coefficient of 0.41.

4. Discussion and conclusion

After seeing the SEM output, it can be concluded that some good conclusions for the results obtained. Where the results of the study indicate that trust has a significant and significant effect on purchasing decisions and on repurchase intention. and also ease of use has a significant and significant effect on purchasing decisions and on repurchase intention. and purchasing decisions have a significant effect on repurchase intention. while trust is the variable with the greatest influence on consumer decisions, while the variable that has the most important influence on repurchase intention is ease of use. The results of the first study indicate that trust has a significant and significant effect on purchasing decisions. The results of this study reinforce previous research which has many of the same results plus that trust is the variable that has the greatest influence on consumer purchasing decisions at online retail which are also similar to the results of previous studies. This must be able to make attention to marketers, which in order to buy consumers must be made to believe in the place of sale, in this case online retail, what is the biggest thing is the seller’s benevolent efforts to want to help consumers in every transaction process that consumers go through where online sellers can be present and reliable when consumers face problems in the transaction process which, for example, the existence of customer services that are easily found by consumers on various media, for example (email, whatsapp, telephones, social media or chat rooms) will generate consumer confidence in an online shopping place. The second point that is not less important is that trust has a significant effect on repurchase intention. Where the role of trust is also in
the interest to buy back, which in each time you will make a transaction, of course you need a sense of trust in both the first or the second transaction, but indeed the trust will increase when you make the second purchase because the worry is lower than before. Therefore, even though the influence is not too high, trust must also be built so that consumers can have an interest in buying back into online retail. Third, it was found that ease of use had a significant and significant effect on purchase decisions. In this case, marketers must be able to create a website or online media platform that is easy to do in the sense that the platform must have ease of use, the easier it is, the higher the purchase decision can occur. The existing online shopping platform is already easy, but the convenience side must be regulated and considered for all consumers of all ages, in languages that are commonly used and easy to understand. And other facilities that are expected are the ease of transaction and payment processes where a good online retailer opens all existing access roads so that there are no limitations in payment, for example, they can use various transaction tools so that consumers easily decide to buy at the online retail. Fourth, ease of use has an effect and is significant on repurchase intention. An important consideration is also for marketers where consumer purchase expectations can be repeated and not only once in a transaction, therefore convenience in online platforms is also considered because this is the most influential factor for consumers to want to buy back on this e-commerce platform. It has been explained that more and more e-commerce is present coupled with various existing consumers, therefore this ease of competition becomes a point for consumers to decide to buy back on an e-commerce platform.

Finally, the five purchase decisions have an effect and are significant on repurchase intention. This result is also not the same as previous research which has stated that indeed consumers who have bought will have a high sense of trust and who will then have a sense of interest in buying back an item in an online retailer that they have chosen and made transactions there. Therefore the advertiser needs to be present and after the transaction process is successful and complete which is present in the sense of following up and informing about new things and new promos or sending thanks for transactions that have been done because this is a potential consumer who will come because they certainly have a taste believe and assume that this shopping place has entered the ease of use category.

5. Limitation

What has been done in this research, of course, there are still many shortcomings and limitations, therefore the suggestion of researchers for future researchers is to try new research models that will be developed in different generation classes or at different generation levels X, Y, and Z. as well as for research. Furthermore, you can add other variables such as enjoyment so that the variables used are more complete as in the study (Xiang et al., 2016).
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