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Abstract

This study aims to examine what factors influence online buying behavior. The factors are availability, low price, promotion, comparison, convenience, customer service, perceived ease of use, attitude, time consciousness, trust, and variety seeking. The methodology of this research is to test the research hypothesis. Sampling with a questionnaire of 250 respondents who are consumers who have shopped online in the past year. Non-probability sampling technique using a purposive sampling method. The analysis tool is the structural equation model (SEM). The results of this study indicate that low price, convenience, perceived ease of use, attitude, time consciousness, trust, and variety-seeking service are factors that can directly influence online buying behavior. Whereas availability, promotion, comparison, and customer service are not factors that can directly influence online buying behavior. This research implies that managers can increase the factors that can influence purchasing behavior online, and this research can also be a reference for marketers to implement appropriate strategies to increase their sales.
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INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the development of online retail in Indonesia has shown remarkable growth. The development of online shop business is increasingly increasing along with the increase of internet users in Indonesia (APJII or Asosiasi Pengguna Jasa Internet Indonesia, 2016). The increase has an impact on the shifting of the product marketing system or method from the classic way or face to face to the application of an online shop system, wherein the online system consumers shop by interacting with computers (Chae & Lee, 2013). By using the internet, consumers can find information and make purchases on the products or services they want (Forsythe, Liu, Shannon & Gardner, 2006). The shopping system through the internet (online shop) provides many benefits such as: making it easier for consumers to shop without being limited by time and place in a sense anytime and anywhere, at a more affordable price because consumers can compare prices with other online shops. Also, sellers can communicate with consumers anywhere (Iqbal, Rehman & Hunjra, 2012).

Consumer behavior in making purchases online or online buying behavior is behavior that is owned by consumers both positive and negative in seeking information and making transactions to purchase products or services through the internet (Hsiao, Lin, Wang, Lu, & Yu, 2010). Online buying behavior itself, according to Jadhav and Khanna (2016), is influenced by many factors, namely availability, low price, promotions, comparison, convenience, customer service, perceived ease of use, attitude, time consciousness, trust, and variety seeking.

Availability is the availability of products that consumers want to buy at the online store. Consumers consider the availability of products sought as something good. Low price is an attraction for consumers, because buying at an online store is more practical, saves more money, and is usually cheaper than retail stores. Promotions are sales promotions used by online stores in the form of consumer promotion tools such as samples, coupons, offers of cash, or discount returns. Comparison, one of the main attractions for online shopping is where consumers can compare prices, promotions, services offered, and others, from products or services they are interested in shopping from online stores. Convenience, online shopping is widely known as a convenient way to shop. Consumers do not need to leave their homes or travel to find and obtain the items they want. Customer service includes a variety of services that are often provided by
most online stores, such as answers to consumer questions, timeliness of delivery, better return policies from offline retail stores, and free shipping. Perceived ease of use refers to the extent to which someone believes that using a particular system (internet) is not difficult, in the sense that it is easy to do, easy to pay, and does not have to be cash. Attitude is the attitude of consumers to online purchases refers to the extent to which consumers make positive or negative evaluations about online purchases. However, many consumers feel that they enjoy shopping on the internet, but some consumers are disappointed. Time consciousness refers to the extent to which consumers have high expectations for the time needed to solve problems, so consumers prefer to shop online rather than shopping offline because it saves time and can be done anytime. Trusts are providing a subjective measure of assurance that e-vendors do good, and can be trusted, behave as promised, where consumers choose to shop only on trusted and well-known online stores. Variety seeking refers to the tendency of individuals who prefer the diversity of goods or services they will choose, in the sense that the products vary and all brands exist in one place.

If all of these factors, namely Availability, Low Price, Promotion, Comparison, Convenience, Customer Service, Perceived Ease of Use, Attitude, Time Consciousness, Trust, and Variety Seeking, can be well received by consumers, it is expected that this will result in the formation of behavior in shopping online or online buying behavior. Considering that youth, especially students, is a large proportion of online users with an increase in internet usage and online shopping, this study focuses on students as internet users.

This study refers to previous research conducted by Jadhav and Khanna (2016) who have conducted qualitative research to find out what factors influence the behavior of online purchases, and in this study try to qualify these factors quantitatively.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Online buying behavior or online buying behavior is indicated by the activity of purchasing products or services using the internet (Close & Kukar-Kinney, 2010). Shopping online can be done by consumers through interaction with computers (Chae & Lee, 2013). Through the internet, besides consumers can compare prices with other online stores, consumers can also shop easily, anywhere, anytime, and at more affordable
prices (Iqbal, Rahman, and Hunjra, 2012). Consumers around the world are increasingly switching from crowded stores to one-click online shopping formats (Vijay & Balaji, 2009).

Based on research conducted by Jadhav and Khanna (2016), online buying behavior is influenced by several factors, namely availability, low price, promotions, comparison, convenience, customer service, perceived ease of use, attitude, time consciousness, trust, and variety seeking.

**Availability**

Jadhav and Khanna (2016) say that availability is access to a product or brand in the store at the time of purchase. When products are available for purchase, consumers usually find them as a good thing, and when not available, there are potentially negative consequences (Steinhart, Mazursky, & Kamins, 2013). Marketers have considered product availability as a key feature in triggering sales (Hausman & Siekpe 2009). The effectiveness of the internet as a marketing tool depends on availability, operational efficiency, and performance (Ghobakhloo, Arias-Aranda, & Benitez-Amado, 2011). Saffu, Walker, and Mazurek (2008) argue that because geographical or national boundaries do not determine e-commerce boundaries, consumers will benefit from a variety of vendor and product choices, including wider availability of products that are difficult to find.

**Low Price**

According to Beldona, Morrison, and O’Leary (2005) research, lower prices were identified as one of the main drivers of online purchases. Granados, Gupta, and Kauffman (2008) have noted the existence of prices in Internet-based sales as a strategic choice in the seller’s section. According to Barkhi and Wallace (2007), low prices, the availability of various types of products and brands as well as low costs in seeking information might contribute to consumers’ perceptions of the usefulness of buying clothing from online stores, compared to purchases from traditional stores. Reibstein (2002) shows that online consumers generally look for price information from different retailers for the same product to make the most favorable economic decisions. Also, in the context of online shopping, low prices can attract price-sensitive customers (Reibstein, 2002).

Vijayasarathy and Jones (2000) found that savings in transaction costs that lead to better price quotes can positively influence consumer attitudes to the intention to shop online. Ahuja et al. (2003) also consider
that better prices are one reason that motivates US consumers to make purchases online. The internet has made it easier for consumers to find the best price when it is most important because of the large number of traders on the Web (Brynjolfsson and Smith 2000). Brynjolfsson and Smith (2000) found that the prices of products sold online in the US are usually 9 to 16% lower than products sold in traditional retail stores.

Promotions
Sales promotion is a collection of various motivational tools, designed to stimulate consumers to buy many products or services in a short time (Kotler & Keller, 2016). The aim is to provide a direct effect on consumer purchasing behavior (Blattberg & Neslin, 1989). Stimulation of sales promotions and design features of online stores is a significant antecedent of consumers’ online purchases. Stimulation of sales promotions such as sales (e.g., price reductions, clearing), promotions (e.g., cash discounts, one free buy-one, gift certificates), advice (such as bundling), and purchase ideas (e.g., purchase of new products and stop shopping) can persuade consumers to buy impulsively (Dawson & Kim, 2010).

Many studies have identified sales promotions as a means to increase the customer base gradually. For example, in the US, the number of homes that use online coupons for online shopping has increased suddenly (Forrester, 2014). According to Palazon and Ballester (2011), planned and effective sales promotions also provoke consumers’ buying intentions. Badgaiyan and Verma (2015) also suggest that sales promotion remains one of the longest and most preferred modes for increasing sales. Internet connectivity has provided a means for mass customization of sales promotions by targeting individual buyers on the seller’s website (Kannan & Kopalle 2001). Online price promotions are usually used by local traders to increase sales (Li, 2016; Lu et al., 2013). Given the online environment, where shopping comparison is as easy as clicking a button, he argues that economic motivation is very relevant (Yaoyuneyong et al., 2014)

Comparison
In the context of online shopping, some customers compare prices, promotions, services offered, from products or services that they intend to shop from online stores (Jadhav & Khanna, 2016). The main shopping motivation when getting goods and services is the desire to reduce financial risk, or excessive spending risk for the benefits needed.
For this reason, consumers use online stores to make comparisons between stores to get optimal prices (Joines et al., 2003). Given the online environment, where shopping comparison is as easy as clicking a button, he argues that economic motivation is very relevant (Yaoyuneyong et al., 2014). Online shoppers can be motivated to shop through the internet because of their utilitarian benefits such as convenience, availability of various products, price, and discount comparisons; they can also search for hedonic benefits such as pleasure and pleasure (Childers, Carr, Peck, & Carson, 2001).

Comparison of prices, convenience, and lower prices are identified as the three main reasons why internet users buy travel products online (Starkov & Price, 2003). The internet facilitates price comparisons, and internet buyers often look for alternatives when shopping because of lower shopping search costs on the Internet (Donthu & Garcia 1999). So that the price comparison is transparent, and consumers can find different prices on the market quite easily (Laudon & Traver 2008). Internet shoppers spend less time and money searching for the desired product at the desired price. With their product search capabilities, online shoppers are considered as knowledgeable consumers (Hoffman & Novak 1997).

**Convenience**

E-retail is widely promoted as a convenient way to shop. Consumers do not need to leave home or travel to find and obtain goods online. They can also search for items by category or online shop (Szymanski & Hise, 2000). Prasad and Aryasri (2009) identify that factors such as convenience, webshop environment, enjoyment of online shopping, and customer service affect consumers’ willingness to shop on the Internet.

Darian (1987) identified five types of convenience for shopping at home: reducing spending time, the flexibility of time, saving physical effort visiting traditional stores, saving aggravation, and providing opportunities to engage in impulsive purchases, or respond directly to an ad. Besides that, convenience has proven relevant in the acceptance of the internet as a shopping medium, and its findings show that in the context of online shopping, consumers no longer need to worry about parking, transportation, crowds, and weather conditions (Clemes, Gan, & Zhang, 2014). Consumers who value convenience tend to make purchases over the Internet more often and spend more money on online shopping (Swaminathan, Lepkowska-White, & Rao, 1999). Because consumers
obtain utilitarian values from efficient and timely transactions, both time and effort savings have a positive effect on customers' online purchase intentions (Childers et al., 2001).

**Customer Service**

Customer service generally refers to an organization's ability to meet customer needs and desires (Howardell 2003). Prasad and Aryasri (2009) identify that customer service is a factor that influences consumers' willingness to shop on the Internet. According to Hermes (2000), 72% of online buyers answer that customer service is an important factor in shopping satisfaction.

Customer service must be considered a high priority because it has an impact on long-term relationships between customers and internet retailers (Harris & Goode 2004). Shopping online can be a frustrating and challenging experience without the help of salespeople (Levy, 2000). Interactive services are an important aspect of online stores (Jarvenpaa & Todd 1997).

**Perceived Ease of Use**

Perception of ease of use refers to the extent to which a person believes that using a particular system will be free of effort (Davis, 1989). Davis (1989) suggests, ease of use as a direct determinant of the use of technology. When consumers feel that purchasing from a virtual store is easy to understand and do, they usually continue to interact with the site (Barkhi & Wallace, 2007). Mortazavi et al. (2014) showed that clients with "perceived ease of use" tended to have higher intentions to buy goods from virtual stores.

**Attitude**

Consumer attitudes towards online purchasing are defined as the extent to which consumers make positive or negative evaluations about online purchases (Andrews et al., 2007). Previous research has shown that attitudes are predictors of intention to buy online (eg, Doolin et al., 2005; Hernandez et al., 2010; Ha & Stoel, 2009). The higher the quality of online retailer websites, the more positive the consumer attitude towards online retailers (Zhou, 2011). Jeong and Lambert (2001) found that a good attitude towards lodging sites was a significant predictor of the user's decision to buy accommodation online.
**Time Consciousness**

Time awareness is the tendency of someone to consider time as a scarce resource, and plan its use carefully, interact with benefits and specific costs (Kleijnen et al., 2007). Internet customers have higher expectations for the time needed to solve problems than offline consumers (Lee et al., 2003). Speed and time efficiency are often positioned as the main benefits that can be achieved by consumers through the use of technology in retail (Roulac, 2001).

Kleijnen et al. (2007) argue that time-conscious consumers are more vulnerable to recognizing the scarcity of time as a resource when they engage in goal-directed behavior, these consumers will look for shopping options that offer opportunities to take advantage of their time. Moreover, time-conscious consumers more easily accept "smart" delivery service channels and develop service needs that focus on direct satisfaction (Kaufman et al. 1991).

**Trust**

Trust reflects the willingness to be in vulnerability based on positive expectations of the behavior of others in the future (Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman, 1995). Also, trust is a sense of hope formed by individuals or groups of individuals in combination with their beliefs and behavioral intentions, which in turn, can lead to a tendency to depend on reliable and valued transaction partners (Oh, Yoon, & Park, 2012). Whereas according to Soares, Pinho, & Nobre, (2012), trust is interpreted as a belief or hope that a trusted party can be relied upon.

Trust covers three dimensions: ability, integrity, and virtue (Zahedi & Song, 2008). Capability means that service providers have the knowledge and expertise needed to fulfill their duties. Integrity means that service providers keep their promises and do not deceive users. The meaning of virtue is that service providers care about the interests of users, not just their benefits.

Liu, Marchewka, Lu, and Yu (2005) stated that trust becomes more important in a high-tech environment. Grabner-Kräuter (2009) emphasizes that in the context of the Web, trust can refer to the Web site itself, Web vendors, or the Internet in general. Trust provides a subjective guarantee that e-vendors can make good deals, behave as promised, and truly care (Gefen, Karahanna & Straub, 2003). Soares et al. (2012) stated that trust reduces uncertainty and simplifies decision making and personal, social, and business relationships. Trust in organizations as the
second party in online transactions is seen as a facilitator for user involvement in online transactions, while a lack of trust leads to avoidance of transactions (Hoffman, Novak & Peralta, 1999).

Jarvenpaa, Tractinsky, and Vitale (2000) found that trust in online vendors positively affected consumer attitudes towards online vendors, which in turn affected their desire to buy. Online trust is seen as a determinant of success for online companies, electronic services, e-communication, or digital initiatives (Beldad, De Jong, & Steehouder, 2010). The perceived risks and beliefs associated with online transactions influence decision making and ultimately affect behavioral intentions (Benson et al., 2015).

Variety Seeking.

Variation seeking is defined as the tendency of individuals to look for diversity in their choice of services or goods (Kahn, 1995). Product choices lead to increased comparisons, and ultimately, better purchasing decisions (Keeney, 1999). Szymanski and Hise (2000) found that product variation is one of the important reasons why customers choose to shop online. Consumer perceptions of variation are influenced not only by the number of different products, but also by the frequency of repetition, organizational appearance, and attribute differences (Hoch, Bradlow, & Wansink, 1999; Van Herpen & Pieters, 2002).

Consumers usually prefer to be more diverse when choices are given (Khan & Lehmann, 1991). Various unique product offerings and product offerings are identified as important positive functional effects that are directly related to internet shopping (Cho, 2004). Sin and Tse (2002) found that, when compared to non-online buyers, internet buyers have a more positive evaluation of the various products available through online shopping.
Development of Hypotheses

Almost all online stores provide a variety of goods and services needed by consumers, and even according to Steinhart et al. (2013), 90% of what is available for consumers in online stores.

H1: Availability has a positive effect on Online Buying Behavior

In shopping, prices are one of the main determinants for consumers in buying (Kotler & Keller, 2016), so low prices are a factor that influences consumers to shop at online stores. In shopping online, consumers also pay attention to price issues, namely by looking for low prices to save money.

H2: Low Price has a positive effect on Online Buying Behavior

To attract consumers, online stores carry out promotions in various ways, both by offering better discounts and offers.

H3: Promotion has a positive effect on Online Buying Behavior

Also, consumers who shop via the internet often compare products or prices (comparison) from several different sites (Kotler & Keller, 2016).

H4: Comparison has a positive effect on Online Buying Behavior

Online shopping is also known as a convenient way to shop because online shopping provides convenience to consumers, where consumers do not need to leave their homes or travel to find and obtain goods online (Szymanski & Hise, 2000).

H5: Convenience has a positive effect on Online Buying Behavior
Online shopping also provides customer service services in various, including credit payments, free shipping services, and reliability of shipping time (Park & Kim, 2003).

H6: Customer Service has a positive effect on Online Buying Behavior

Shopping online in terms of perceived ease of use, is more practical, easy, and convenient, compared to conventional shopping (Nazir et al., 2012; Rehman & Ashfaq's, 2011). Also, online shopping makes it easier for consumers to find sellers so that less energy and effort are spent (Schaupp & Belanger, 2005).

H7: Perceived ease of use has a positive effect on Online Buying Behavior

Unlike the conventional shopping system, in the online shopping system, consumers shop by interacting with computers, there is no meeting between buyers and sellers (Chae & Lee, 2013). Therefore, the trust factor plays an important role. Akhlaq and Ahmed (2013), in his study, found that trust had a positive and significant impact on interest in internet use.

H8: Trust has a positive effect on Online Buying Behavior

According to Suh and Han (2002), trust is found as one of the most significant factors in explaining the attitude of customers in the application of the internet.

H9: Attitude has a positive effect on Online Buying Behavior

For consumers who value time or realize the importance of time (time consciousness), online shopping is the choice. They do not need to leave home or take a trip to find and obtain goods sought because all can be obtained online (Szymanski & Hise, 2000).

H10: Time Consciousness has a positive effect on Online Buying Behavior

Another thing that makes consumers interested in shopping online is because the online shop variety/variety of variety-seeking products is offered. In addition to its diverse products, there are more choices in online stores, and all brands are in one place.

H11: Variety Seeking has a positive effect on Online Buying Behavior
Previous research by Jadhav and Khanna (2016) shows that the factors mentioned above are factors that cause consumers to behave to make purchases online (Online Buying Behavior).

**METHODS**

This research uses hypothesis testing. Hypothesis testing is done by comparing p-values with a confidence level (alpha) of 5% (α = 0.05). The analytical method used in this study is the Structural Equation Model (SEM). SEM can measure indicators in these variables and also can manage the relationships between variables simultaneously. SEM is based on covariance analysis to provide a more accurate covariance matrix (Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson & Tatham, 2010). The program used is AMOS SPSS. The unit of analysis in this study is individual, and the type of data used is cross-sectional.

The data in this study were obtained by distributing questionnaires to 250 respondents. They were consumers who had shopped online in the past year. Indicators or statement items of all variables were adapted from Jadhav and Khanna (2016). All respondents’ answers to statement items were measured using a 6 (six) points Likert scale from 1 to 6, where 1 = strongly disagree, and 6 = strongly agree. The instruments in this study were tested for validity and reliability first. Basic decision-making testing validity with factor loading, if the factor loading is ≥ 0.35, then the statement item is valid (Hair et al., 2010).

| Table 1. Validity Test Results |
|-------------------------------|
| **Variable**      | **Item** | **Factor Loading** | **Decision** |
| Availability       | AV1      | 0.831              | Valid        |
|                    | AV2      | 0.693              | Valid        |
|                    | AV3      | 0.508              | Valid        |
| Low Price          | LP1      | 0.625              | Valid        |
|                    | LP2      | 0.833              | Valid        |
|                    | LP3      | 0.835              | Valid        |
|                    | LP4      | 0.787              | Valid        |
|                    | LP5      | 0.672              | Valid        |
| Promotions         | PROM1    | 0.671              | Valid        |
|                    | PROM2    | 0.536              | Valid        |
|                    | PROM3    | 0.742              | Valid        |
|                    | PROM4    | 0.729              | Valid        |
| Comparison         | COMP1    | 0.594              | Valid        |
|                    | COMP2    | 0.717              | Valid        |
|                    | COMP3    | 0.765              | Valid        |
|                    | COMP4    | 0.679              | Valid        |
| Convenience        | CONV1    | 0.599              | Valid        |
|                    | CONV2    | 0.656              | Valid        |
Table 1 shows that statement items that measure all variables are valid because they have a greater loading factor of 0.35, this means that all statement items can measure all variables well unless the attitude cannot be tested because it only has one item of question.

Based on table 2, the results of reliability testing can be concluded that the eleven variables have a Cronbach’s Alpha value higher than 0.60. So it can be concluded that statement items that measure each variable are accepted (reliable) or have consistency in measuring each variable.

The suitability of the overall model (overall fit model) must be analyzed first before analyzing the hypothesis to ensure that the model can see the effect of causation (Hair et al., 2010).
### Table 2. Reliability Test Results

| Variable                  | Number of statements | N  | Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha | Cut off value | Decision   |
|---------------------------|----------------------|----|------------------------------|---------------|------------|
| Availability              | 3                    | 265| 0.701                        | 0.600         | Reliable   |
| Low Price                 | 5                    | 265| 0.865                        | 0.600         | Reliable   |
| Promotion                 | 4                    | 265| 0.764                        | 0.600         | Reliable   |
| Comparison                | 4                    | 265| 0.779                        | 0.600         | Reliable   |
| Convenience               | 9                    | 265| 0.888                        | 0.600         | Reliable   |
| Customer Service          | 5                    | 265| 0.754                        | 0.600         | Reliable   |
| Perceived ease of use     | 4                    | 265| 0.693                        | 0.600         | Reliable   |
| Time Consciousness        | 4                    | 265| 0.757                        | 0.600         | Reliable   |
| Trust                     | 2                    | 265| 0.708                        | 0.600         | Reliable   |
| Variety Seeking           | 6                    | 265| 0.854                        | 0.600         | Reliable   |
| Online Buying Behavior    | 2                    | 265| 0.635                        | 0.600         | Reliable   |

Source: Results of data processing using SPSS

### Table 3. The goodness of Fit Research Results

| Type of measurement | Measurement | Recommended acceptance limits (Hair et al. 2010) | Value       | Decision |
|---------------------|-------------|--------------------------------------------------|-------------|----------|
| **Absolute fit measures** | Chi-square | $\geq 0.05$ | $0.000$ | Poor fit |
|                     | RMSEA       | $\leq 0.10$ | $0.081$ | Good fit |
|                     | GFI         | $\geq 0.90$ or close to 1 | $0.692$ | Poor fit |
| **Incremental fit measures** | NFI        | $\geq 0.90$ or close to 1 | $0.660$ | Poor fit |
|                     | TLI         | $\geq 0.90$ or close to 1 | $0.719$ | Poor fit |
|                     | RFI         | $\geq 0.90$ or close to 1 | $0.627$ | Poor fit |
|                     | CFI         | $\geq 0.90$ or close to 1 | $0.668$ | Poor fit |
|                     | AGFI        | $\geq 0.90$ or close to 1 | $0.648$ | Poor fit |
| **Parsimonious fit measure** | CMIN/DF | Lower limit: 1.0 | $2.908$ | Good fit |
|                     |            | Upper limit: 2.0; 3.0 or 5.0 |            |          |

Source: Results of data processing using AMOS

Hair et al. (2010) state that if the results of one test are "fit," it can be concluded that the model used is fit. Based on Table 3 above, the test results are stated as the goodness of fit because it is seen from the values of RMSEA and CMIN / DF; the results are Good Fit, so the model is passed the goodness of fit test and the next testing phase can be done.
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

From the results of testing the first hypothesis (table 4), it can be seen that the significance value of the Availability relationship to Online Buying Behavior is 0.054 > 0.05, which means that there is no Availability effect on Online Buying Behavior. The estimated value obtained is -0.109. Therefore the first hypothesis in this study is not supported. The unsupported hypothesis is most likely due to the company still not paying enough attention to several things needed by consumers, such as the incomplete supply of products, especially in terms of size, and often companies do not provide information/signs of depleted products on products that are not available.

From the results of testing the second hypothesis (table 4), it can be seen that the significance of the Low Price relationship to Online Buying Behavior is 0.0345 < 0.05 which can be interpreted as having a Low Price effect on Online Buying Behavior, with an estimated value of 0.112 so that it was concluded that the Low Price effect on Online Buying Behavior was positive. Therefore the second hypothesis in this study is supported. The results of this study indicate that when online stores can provide low prices, provide the best prices, and prices at online stores are lower than in retail stores can increase Online Buying Behavior for consumers. Price is one of the important factors for consumers to be able to determine whether to buy in the online store or not. So if an online store can offer the best price and is cheaper when compared to retail stores, it can influence consumer behavior to make purchases online at online stores. The results of this study support the results of research from Jadhav and Khana (2016), which have shown that there is a positive influence from Low Price on Online Buying Behavior.

From the results of testing the third hypothesis (table 4), it can be seen that the significance value of the Promotion relationship to Online Buying Behavior is 0.2345 > 0.05 so it can be concluded that there is no influence between Promotion on Online Buying Behavior with an estimated value of -0.024. Therefore the third hypothesis is not supported. This result is likely due to the current online consumers no longer need promotion, so it is necessary to look for other ways that can further stimulate consumers at a price that is directly lower than just giving discounts and coupon prizes.

From the results of testing the fourth hypothesis (table 4), it can be seen that the significance value of the Comparison relationship to Online Buying Behavior is 0.4235 > 0.05. It can be concluded that there is no influence between Comparison of Online Buying Behavior with an...
estimated value of 0.004. Therefore the fourth hypothesis is not supported. Comparison is not an important factor that influences consumers in online shopping, because if consumers are interested in products in one online store, they usually do not compare with other stores, because often it is also challenging to do.

From the results of testing the fifth hypothesis (table 4), it can be seen that the significance value of the Convenience relationship to Online Buying Behavior is 0.0045 <0.05 which means Convenience influences on Online Buying Behavior, with an estimated value of 0.390 and it can be concluded that there are Convenience positive influence on Online Buying Behavior. Therefore the fifth hypothesis in this study is supported. So when online stores can provide convenience to consumers when accessing online store websites, consumers can buy products that are not in retail stores, and consumers can avoid the market hustle and traffic chaos by shopping online will affect consumers’ habits to shop online when consumers need something. The results of this study support the research of Jadhav and Khana (2016), which shows the positive influence of Convenience on Online Buying Behavior.

| Hypothesis                                      | Estimate | p-value | Decision          |
|------------------------------------------------|----------|---------|-------------------|
| H1: Availability has a positive effect on Online Buying Behavior | -0.109   | 0.054   | H1 is not supported |
| H2: Low Price has a positive effect on Online Buying Behavior   | 0.112    | 0.034   | H2 is supported    |
| H3: Promotion has a positive effect on Online Buying Behavior  | -0.061   | 0.234   | H3 is not supported |
| H4: Comparison has a positive effect on Online Buying Behavior | 0.015    | 0.423   | H4 is not supported |
| H5: Convenience has a positive effect on Online Buying Behavior| 0.374    | 0.004   | H5 is supported    |
| H6: Customer Service has a positive effect on Online Buying Behavior | -0.075   | 0.213   | H6 is not supported |
| H7: Perceived ease of use has a positive effect on Online Buying Behavior | 0.673    | 0.000   | H7 is supported    |
| H8: Trust has a positive effect on Online Buying Behavior       | 0.133    | 0.042   | H8 is supported    |
| H9: Attitude has a positive effect on Online Buying Behavior    | 0.138    | 0.024   | H9 is supported    |
| H10: Time Consciousness has a positive effect on Online Buying Behavior | 0.335    | 0.049   | H10 is supported   |
| H11: Variety Seeking has a positive effect on Online Buying Behavior | 0.168    | 0.0335  | H11 is supported   |

Source: Results of data processing using AMOS
From the results of the sixth hypothesis testing (table 4), it can be seen that the significance value of the Customer Service relationship to Online Buying Behavior is 0.2135 > 0.05. It can be concluded that there is no effect of Customer Service on Online Buying Behavior with an estimated value of -0.075. Therefore the sixth hypothesis is not supported. Customer Service is not a consideration for consumers in making online purchases, because most online stores do not free delivery services, do not make better returns than retail stores, and also do not make friendly returns.

From the results of testing the seventh hypothesis (table 4), it can be seen that the significance value of the Perceived Ease of Use relationship to Online Buying Behavior is 0.000 <0.05; which can be interpreted as having the effect of Perceived ease of use on Online Buying Behavior, with an estimate of 0.673. It can be concluded that there is a positive influence of perceived ease of use on Online Buying Behavior. Therefore the seventh hypothesis in this study is supported. The supported hypothesis shows that when online stores make it easier for consumers to shop online by making website layouts friendly to consumers, payment at these online stores is also easy, and there are several methods of payment such as Cash on delivering that can affect the enjoyment of consumers shopping online at the store.

From the results of testing the eighth hypothesis (table 4), it can be seen that the significance value of the Trust relationship to Online Buying Behavior is 0.042 <0.05. It can be concluded that there is no influence between Trusts and Online Buying Behavior with an estimated value of 0.133. Therefore the eighth hypothesis is supported. The supported hypothesis means that when online stores can provide quality services that make consumers believe, and advertisements that can make consumers feel familiar with the online store will have an impact on increasing consumer convenience in enjoying shopping online at the online store.

From the results of testing the ninth hypothesis (table 4), it can be seen that the significance value of Attitude’s relationship to Online Buying Behavior is 0.024 <0.05 which can be interpreted as having an Attitude influence on Online Buying Behavior, with an estimated value of 0.138, and it can be concluded that there is a positive influence on Attitude on Online Buying Behavior. Therefore the ninth hypothesis in this study is supported. The supported hypothesis shows that when consumers enjoy shopping online, it will have an impact on increasing consumer habits in online purchases. The results of this study support the research of Jadhav and
Khana (2016), which shows a positive Attitude influence on Online Buying Behavior.

From the results of the tenth hypothesis testing (table 4), it can be seen that the significance value of the Time Consciousness relationship to Online Buying Behavior is 0.049 > 0.05. It can be concluded that there is an influence of Time Consciousness on Online Buying Behavior with an estimated value of 0.335. Therefore the tenth hypothesis is supported. The supported hypothesis means that if consumers feel shopping at an online store can save time because online stores can be accessed at any time, shopping at online stores can be faster when compared to retail stores. Online stores are always ready 24 hours a day, or in other words, if the store online can increase the Time consciousness, it will have an impact on increasing people's habits in online buying behavior. The results of this study support the research of Jadhav and Khana (2016), which have shown that there is a positive influence of Time Consciousness on Online Buying Behavior.

From the results of the eleventh hypothesis test (table 4), it can be seen that the significance value of the Variety Seeking relationship to Online Buying Behavior is 0.0335 <0.05, which can be interpreted as affecting Variety Seeking towards Online Buying Behavior, with an estimated value of 0.168. It was concluded that there were positive effects of Variety Seeking on Online Buying Behavior. Therefore the eleventh hypothesis in this study is supported. This shows that when online stores provide better product variations, have a broad product portfolio, provide all brands, and offer diverse products will have an impact on increasing consumer habits for online shopping. The results of this study support research from Jadhav and Khana (2016) who showed a positive influence on Variety Seeking towards Online Buying Behavior.

**CONCLUSION**

Based on the results of the above research, it can be concluded that Low Price, Convenience, Perceived Ease of Use, Attitude, Time Consciousness, Trust, and Variety Seeking Service are factors that can directly influence Online Buying Behavior. Whereas Availability, Promotion, Comparison, and Customer Service are not factors that can directly influence Online Buying Behavior.

This study has several managerial implications; namely, the online store website management needs to emphasize the stores that use the
website to provide low prices by selecting stores that are registering to become members of the online store and looking for distributors of goods sold by the majority of members and advise all members to take goods from these distributors. Online store management needs to pay attention to the convenience of websites and applications used by consumers by maintaining websites and applications for consumers regularly, providing protection on websites and applications that consumers use to avoid viruses, minimizing pop up adverts that appear when consumers access via the web and application. The online store management needs to make it easier for consumers to shop on websites, by making or modifying the website layouts, and applications to make it easier to find items they need until consumers want to make payments. Also, add payment features that can be used by consumers, such as making a special balance in each consumer account, payment using a debit card by inputting the card number, name of the owner, the date the card runs out, and the number on the debit card. Online store management can increase consumer trust by paying more attention to the security of consumer transactions. The online store website management needs to include the address of the shop owner on the online store website; online store management needs to validate store data that registers to become a seller on the online shop, online store websites need to keep data about consumers who transact in the company. Online store management needs to provide timely and faster delivery times to consumers by way of online shop management can work with freight forwarding companies, so that goods to be sent are a priority, online shop website management can consider working with motorcycle taxi companies online for shipping within the city. Online shop management must provide different products offered from conventional retail stores. Management has to update information about product products more often that are not yet available in the domestic market, and management can give gifts to stores that are members of online shops when selling products that have not circulated in the domestic market. Online shop management must improve Availability, Promotion, Comparison, and Customer service aspects. Consumers still do not feel these four aspects well, so that if the management can improve these four aspects, it is expected to lead to better online shopping behavior in the minds of consumers.

This study has limitations, including this research only carried out on customers from online stores found on the Online Shopping website in Jabodetabek. Besides that, this research is only limited to variables that
directly affect Online Buying Behavior without seeing any mediating factors. Suggestions for future researchers can consider conducting research not only on online stores that have websites, but also online stores on social media such as Instagram, Kaskus and Shopping online using one of the features in online transportation such as Go-shop, Go-Tix, and Go-Mart and GRAB-food. Also, further research needs to include variables perceived risk and trust as mediating variables that influence online buying behavior (Benson et al., 2015).
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