ABSTRACT
Community empowerment activities through research results. This article is to investigated the influence of Hedonic Value and Utilitarian Value against Customer Satisfaction with moderating Personality has impacted to Behavioral Intentions on valuable bag. This research using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) with Smart PLS 3.0 software. Data collected directly from respondents who meet the specified characteristics of population by distributing questionnaires. This study uses a sample of respondents who ever buy or use specific brand of bag. The samples used in this study were 100 respondents. The research findings indicate that hedonic and utilitarian values had a direct effect on customer satisfaction and have direct effect on behavioural intentions. In addition, customer satisfaction directly influenced behavioural intentions. The role of personality as the moderate variable in this study were able to amplify between customer satisfaction and perceived value.
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INTRODUCTION
The development of fashion in Indonesia is very rapid, followed by a changing trend. In 2015, the creative economy has contributed 7.05 percent of Indonesia's total Gross Domestic Product (thejakartapost.com) with the largest contribution coming from three subsectors, one of which is fashion with a percentage of 27.9%. (industri.kontan.co.id) With a market value of 180 trillion rupiah per year, the fashion industry is one of the largest contributors to Indonesia's economic growth from the creative economy sector. The potential prediction is huge not only for the domestic market, but also the overseas market (Ferreira, K. J., 2016). In the techinasia.com survey, in Indonesia there are 3 fashion items that are most often purchased, namely clothes with a percentage of 79.2%, shoes 56.4% and bags 17.9%. Based on the data, one of the most sought after fashion items is bags.

According to the official website of topbrand-award.com there are 3 bag products that are most in demand by consumers can be seen from the results of the Top Brand Index (TBI) in the past three years, based on the results of the official website survey topbrand-award.com, as follows:
Based on the results of top brands for three years from 2014-2016 comparing the top three brands image position, JanSport and Eiger always occupy the same position every year with a percentage that always rises. JanSport and Eiger annually experience an increase in the percentage of TBI (Top Brand Index), but always in the same position every year that can not beat the Export that becomes the market leader every year. JanSport can only maintain the behavior of a number of its customers, without being able to raise its brand image. It is therefore important for JanSport to increase interest in its consumer behavior. This discussion will bring highlight the variables regarding valuable bag management to find strategy how to develop and maintain their business.

CONSUMER BEHAVIOR

According to Solomon (2013) stated that marketing strategies aim to influence consumers, but the opposite is also the case, namely consumer behavior can also affect marketing strategies. By knowing and understanding consumer behavior, manufacturers will be able to attract the hearts of consumers (Schiffman & Kanuk, 2010). When the company knows and understands consumer behavior, it will be easy for the company to create a good marketing strategy. Consumer behavior relates to how consumers make buying decisions that help marketers know what consumers need and want.

According to Kotler & Keller (2012), consumer behavior is "The study of how individuals, group, and organization select, buy, use, and dispose of goods, services, ideas, or experiences satisfy to their needs and wants." How individuals, groups, and organizations choose, purchase, use, and dispose of goods, services, ideas, or experiences to meet their needs and desires. The main factors that influence consumer behavior according to Kotler & Armstrong (2014), namely: Cultural factors, social factors, personal factors, and psychological factors.

PERSONALITY

Consumer behavior can be influenced by several factors, one of which is Personality. This is supported by Kotler & Armstrong's statement (2014), that one of the factors of consumer behavior is influenced by Personality. The Psychological Science study states, "that advertisements can be more effective when they are tailored to the unique Personality profiles of potential consumers." It can be concluded that if the company wants to increase its profit, then the company must overcome the market potential by mastering personality from consumers.

According to Moon (2016) Personality is one of the dispositional factors consisting of a set of
characteristics that are stable and have tendencies that determine each individual has similarities or differences in thoughts, feelings, and actions. According to Kreitner and Kinicki (2014) personality (Personality) is a combination of stable physical and mental characteristics that give identity to the individual. By knowing the Personality of the company's consumers will better understand the value of what consumers want, so that the company can determine the right marketing strategy. A good standard for knowing personalities in the academic world is known as the top five, which classifies personalities in five dimensions: Openness to experience, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness and neuroticism (Nahaï, 2015).

**PERCEIVED VALUE**

Personality is very closely related to the perceived value of consumers, where consumers often try to maintain, improve, change or expand their perceived value by buying products from a company that has a personality that matches itself, and tends to avoid products from companies that do not match their personality, by knowing the perceived value based on one's personality is able to determine an effective approach. (Sakamoto, Tong, Liu, Nakajima, & Akioka, 2014).

Perceived value as a function of product features, quality, delivery, service and price (Kumar, 2016; Kittilertpaisan and Chanchitpreecha, 2013). He also added that value is always determined by the consumer itself in terms of way, time, and efficacy and value is the perception, view, or misunderstanding consists of measurable components. In the marketing literature the concept of perceived value used is Hedonic Value and Utilitarian Value so Babin et al. (1994) introduced two types of shopping values by developing hedonic value and utilitarian value measurement scales obtained from the shopping consumption experience (Hanzaee & Rezaeyeh, 2013).

**HEDONIC VALUE**

Hedonic Value arises from the point of view of how humans think about the value of one of them is hedonism, which comes from the Greek hēdonē which is interpreted as pleasure or pleasure. According to Locke (1975), pleasure is a form of concept that cannot be described or specifically named, where one way to know it with certainty is from the human experience itself, in (Bagyarta & Dharmayanti, 2014).

Solomon (2013) says that hedonic value emphasizes subjectivity and experience. Consumers can rely on a product to meet the need for happiness, confidence, fantasy, and more. (Fuadiyah, Suharyono, & Hidayat, 2016 stated from Ailawadi et al. (2001) explained that there are several factors that affect consumers in maximizing the value of hedonics, namely in : Entertainment, exploration, and self expression.

**UTILITARIAN VALUE**

Solomon (2013) said that if a consumer buys a product based on its functional benefits or usefulness then that consumer considers its utilitarian benefits. Utilitarian values emphasize the objectivity and real form of a product. Consumers will be satisfied if they have obtained the product according to their needs in an efficient way.

The perception of Utilitarian Value can depend on what consumers want to achieve from the shopping activity. Consumers will be satisfied if they have obtained a product that suits their needs in an efficient way, especially in terms of time spent. This is characterized by deliberate purchases made by consumers to meet their needs in a short period of time (Tanojohardjo, Kunto, & Brahmana, 2014). Included in utilitarian values, among others: Cost Saving and Services. (according to Ferrand, et al., 2010 in Tanojohardjo, Kunto, & Brahmana, 2014)
CUSTOMER SATISFACTION

Fulfilling the needs of consumers appropriately will make consumers feel satisfied with the products or services consumed. According to research in the past that perceived value affects satisfaction and more than 30 articles concern satisfaction as important things in the business (Nugroho et al, 2019). Therefore, customer satisfaction today, is very concerned about the company in winning the competition. According to Schiffman & Kanuk (2010, p. 29) which states customer satisfaction is a consumer's assumption on the performance of a product or service that is in accordance with its expectations.

In Kotler and Keller's explanation (2012) which states that satisfied consumers will most likely buy back the product and will likely tell the goodness about the product it bought to others. Dissatisfied consumers will likely throw away or return the products they have purchased, as well as complaining to the company. Many benefits received by the company with the achievement of a high level of customer satisfaction, namely in addition to improving consumer loyalty but also can prevent the occurrence of consumer turnover, reduce consumer sensitivity to prices, reduce the cost of marketing failures, reduce operating costs caused by increasing numbers of consumers, increase the effectiveness of advertising, and improve business reputation.

BEHAVIORAL INTENTION

In understanding about consumer behavior will facilitate marketers in developing their products or services according to the needs and desires of consumers. The desire to behave consumers is based on the possibility of actions to be taken. According to Kotler & Keller (2012) The Behavioral Intention Scale measures the likelihood that consumers will act in a certain way in the future, such as buying the product again or recommending it to a friend. Behavioral Intention becomes important because consumers who have a positive Behavioral Intention towards an industry, will certainly have a good impact for the company.

The profitability of the company can increase in line with the presence of positive Behavioral Intention from consumers. Profitable behavioral intentions include word of mouth positives such as saying positive things and recommending services or products to others, paying more for more, and staying true to those companies or services. Instead, unfavorable Behavioral Intentions such as leaving the company, spending less money with the company, spreading negative words, and suing the company (Hanzaee & Rezaeyeh, 2013)

RESEARCH METHODS

In this study used a type of associative analysis. Associative research is a study that aims to find out the relationship between two or more variables (Sugiyono, 2010, p. 55). In this study, it can be known the relationship between variables Hedonic Value (X1), Utilitarian Value (X2) to Customer Satisfaction (Y), with Personality (M) as a moderator variable that has an impact on Behavioral Intention (Z). In the implementation of this research, which is used to use a survey or questionnaire. The analysis unit used is an individual, consumers who have purchased or used valuable bags. The research time used is Cross Sectional.

Sampling conducted by this study is using probability sampling. Sampling with probability sampling is a sampling technique that provides equal opportunities for each element (member) of the population to be selected as a sample member according to Sugiyono (2010, p. 117). In this study, disseminated questionnaires online to 100 intended respondents, consumers who have made purchases or used valuable bags. The scale used in this study was the Likert scale, where the answers were provided at intervals of 1-5. Scale 1 shows Strongly Disagree up to a scale of 5 which indicates Strongly Agree.
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Hypothesis testing in this study was conducted using SEM techniques. Statistical testing on sem model in this study was conducted using partial least square regression method. Data processing using smartPLS program.

1. Convergent Validity

Convergent Validity from measurement model with reflexive indicator can be seen from the correlation between score item/indicator with its construct score (Latan & Ghozali, 2012, p. 78).

Loading factor above 0.50-0.60 can still be tolerated as long as the model is still in the stage development.

|       | BI     | CS     | HV     | Personality | UV     |
|-------|--------|--------|--------|-------------|--------|
| BI01  | 0.931  |        |        |             |        |
| BI02  | 0.911  |        |        |             |        |
| BI03  | 0.909  |        |        |             |        |
| CS01  |        | 0.897  |        |             |        |
| CS02  |        | 0.964  |        |             |        |
| CS03  |        | 0.961  |        |             |        |
| CS04  |        | 0.980  |        |             |        |
| HV01  |        |        | 0.580  |             |        |
| HV02  |        |        |        | 0.911       |        |
| HV03  |        |        |        | 0.934       |        |
| HV04  |        |        |        | 0.809       |        |
| HV05  |        |        |        | 0.931       |        |
| P01   |        |        |        | 0.688       |        |
| P02   |        |        |        | 0.675       |        |
| P03   |        |        |        | 0.578       |        |
| P04   |        |        |        | 0.726       |        |
| P05   |        |        |        | 0.770       |        |
| P06   |        |        |        | 0.539       |        |
| P07   |        |        |        | 0.706       |        |
| P08   |        |        |        | 0.614       |        |
| P09   |        |        |        | 0.587       |        |
| P11   |        |        |        | 0.819       |        |
| P12   |        |        |        | 0.843       |        |
| P13   |        |        |        | 0.838       |        |
| P14   |        |        |        | 0.835       |        |
| P15   |        |        |        | 0.854       |        |
| P16   |        |        |        | 0.643       |        |
| P17   |        |        |        | 0.652       |        |
| P18   |        |        |        | 0.532       |        |
| P19   |        |        |        | 0.757       |        |
Based on the results of outer loadings above, the original samples of each indicator has shown a value of more than 0.50 – 0.60, so it can be said that all indicators have qualified for validity.

Table 3: Composite Reliability

| Composite Reliability | BI       | 0.941 |
|-----------------------|----------|-------|
|                       | CS       | 0.974 |
|                       | HV       | 0.923 |
|                       | HVP      | 1.000 |
|                       | Personality | 0.957 |
|                       | UV       | 0.944 |
|                       | UVP      | 1.000 |

The output results of the table above show where the composite reliability measurement results after being given moderating variables have been qualified i.e. values above 0.60.
3. Cronbach alpha

**Table 4: Cronbach's Alpha**

| Realibility measurement can also use the cronbach alpha standard where the requirement of the cronbach alpha measurement is where the value of each variable is said to be reliable if above 0.60 (Latan & Ghozali, 2012, p. 81). The following are the results of the size of cronbach alpha: | Cronbach's Alpha |
|---|---|
| BI | 0.909 |
| CS | 0.967 |
| HV | 0.921 |
| HVP | 1.000 |
| Personality | 0.967 |
| UV | 0.950 |
| UVP | 1.000 |

The output result of the table above shows where the measurement result Cronbach’s alpha after being given a moderate variable or has qualified a value above 0.60.

4. Average Variance Extracted (AVE)

Latan & Ghozali (2012, p. 78) validity of each construct value can also be tested with average variance extracted (AVE). Where a construct with good validity is required with a value must be above 0.50

**Table 5: AVE**

| (AVE) | √AVE |
|---|---|
| BI | 0.841 | 0.917 |
| CS | 0.905 | 0.951 |
| HV | 0.712 | 0.843 |
| HVP | 1.000 | 1 |
| Personality | 0.489 | 0.699 |
| UV | 0.774 | 0.862 |
| UVP | 1.000 | 1 |

Source: data processing (2017)

The results of the table below show that the RESULT AVE value of each construct is above 0.50 which means that each construct has good validity.
5. Path coefficients dan Indirect effect

The magnitude of direct and indirect influence between constructs by looking at output path coefficients and Output indirect effect for the magnitude of influence and t-statistical value greater than 1.65, then it can be said that the construct affects other constructs.

**Table 6: Output path coefficient**

| Construct | Original Sample (O) | Sample Mean (M) | Standard Deviation (STDEV) | T Statistics (|O/STDEV|) | P Values |
|-----------|---------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|----------|
| CS -> BI  | 0.352               | 0.350           | 0.130                       | 2.710             | 0.007    |
| HV -> BI  | 0.129               | 0.131           | 0.110                       | 1.171             | 0.242    |
| HV -> CS  | 0.462               | 0.453           | 0.077                       | 5.992             | 0.000    |
| HVP -> CS | 0.332               | 0.390           | 0.263                       | 1.988             | 0.048    |
| Personality -> CS | 0.176       | 0.224           | 0.086                       | 2.034             | 0.042    |
| UV -> BI  | 0.326               | 0.332           | 0.117                       | 2.788             | 0.006    |
| UV -> CS  | 0.391               | 0.371           | 0.082                       | 4.759             | 0.000    |
| UVP -> CS | 0.266               | 0.243           | 0.136                       | 1.695             | 0.051    |

**Table 7: Output Indirect Effect**

| Construct | Original Sample (O) | Sample Mean (M) | Standard Deviation (STDEV) | T Statistics (|O/STDEV|) | P Values |
|-----------|---------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|----------|
| CS -> BI  | 0.163               | 0.160           | 0.070                       | 2.328             | 0.020    |
| HV -> BI  | 0.324               | 0.381           | 0.209                       | 1.985             | 0.047    |
| HV -> CS  | 0.062               | 0.076           | 0.039                       | 1.577             | 0.115    |
| Personality -> BI | 0.062   | 0.076           | 0.039                       | 1.577             | 0.115    |
| Personality -> CS | 0.138       | 0.131           | 0.059                       | 2.327             | 0.020    |
| UV -> BI  | 0.221               | 0.204           | 0.077                       | 1.695             | 0.054    |
The following are the results of moderation testing between Customer Satisfaction against Hedonic Value, and Utilitarian Value where Personality as a moderator variable. The interaction between Personality and Customer Satisfaction strengthens Hedonic Value, and Utilitarian Value with signification values of 1.988 and 1.695. So it can be said that a moderation relationship or Personality variable is a moderation variable.

Table 8: Hypothesis Test Summary

| No | Hypothesis                                                      | Result     |
|----|-----------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| 1  | Hedonic Value to Customer Satisfaction                         | Significant|
| 2  | Utilitarian Value to Customer Satisfaction                     | Significant|
| 3  | Hedonic Value against Behavioral Intention                    | Significant|
| 4  | Hedonic Value to Behavioral Intention through Customer Satisfaction | Significant|
| 5  | Utilitarian Value to Behavioral Intention                     | Significant|
| 6  | Utilitarian Value to Behavioral Intention through Customer Satisfaction | Significant|
| 7  | Customer Satisfaction with Behavioral Intention                | Significant|
| 8  | Personality moderates the relationship between Customer Satisfaction and Hedonic Value | Significant|
CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Conclusion

Based on the results of research analysis that has been conducted on Hedonic Value, Utilitarian Value, Customer Satisfaction, Behavioral Intention and Personality in Valuable bag

1. Hedonic Value has a strong, direct and significant relationship to Customer Satisfaction. So it is concluded that most valuable bag consumers agree that with Hedonic Value can improve customer satisfaction.

2. Utilitarian Value has a strong, direct and significant relationship to Customer Satisfaction. So it is concluded that most valuable bag consumers agree that with the existing Utilitarian Value can increase customer satisfaction.

3. Hedonic Value has no significant influence on Behavioral Intention. From the results of the research, it can be said that consumers have their own pleasure when buying or using valuable bags, but it does not make consumers want to come back, come more often, and spread positive information about valuable products to others. This may be because consumers have a new pleasure in other products.

4. Hedonic Value significantly affects Behavioral Intention through Customer Satisfaction. This proves that the satisfaction obtained by consumers can connect Hedonic Value with Behavioral Intention that turns high. This can happen because the pleasure gained in valuable bags can lead to satisfaction that can apparently affect their behavior after they purchase or use Valuable bag.

5. Utilitarian Value has a significant effect on Behavioral Intention. It can be concluded, valuable bags consumers consider the functional benefits or uses so that consumers consider their utilitarian benefits to shape their behavioral intentions.

6. Utilitarian Value significantly affects Behavioral Intention through Customer Satisfaction. Consumers have obtained the product according to their needs in an efficient way and according to their needs will have an impact on the satisfaction felt by consumers, so that it can affect their behavior in the future after buying and using valuable bag.

7. Customer Satisfaction has a significant influence on Behavioral Intention. In this case it means that the more satisfied valuable bag consumers are, the more consumers will have behavior that is more favorable to the company. This is very beneficial for the company because it can reduce consumer behavior to move to other products better.

8. Personality moderates Customer Satisfaction has a significant influence on Hedonic Value and Personality moderates Customer Satisfaction has a significant influence on moderating Utilitarian Value. So it can be concluded that the interaction between Customer Satisfaction and Personality is able to influence every element of perceived value dimensions such as Hedonic Value and Utilitarian Value and prove personality from valuable consumers is able to strengthen between customer satisfaction to Hedonic Value and Utilitarian Value.
Suggestion

From the results of the analysis and discussion referred the suggestions that can be given to Management of Valuable bag are as follows:

1. When viewed in terms of Hedonic Value (as a greater value influence on consumer satisfaction), then valuable bag cooperates with a film production house to market its new product, where the product when launched in the market there is a signature of the film player or other attributes of the film, so that consumers will feel proud to use a valuable bag. Another thing can also be done by making unique motifs of high quality and high artistic value, this is able to attract consumers who basically have hedonic value will spontaneously want to buy it regardless of price.

2. Other results show that aspects of Utilitarian Value play a greater role in behavioral intentions. The products can focus on creating products that match the benefits and creating a variety of other models that aren't just backpacks, such as sash bags, totebags, and pouches tailored to the benefits of each product. This will allow valuable bag to launch various types of bags according to their needs and benefits.

3. From the results of this study shows Personality has a moderate role in Hedonic Value and Utilitarian Value in Customer Satisfaction. In this study, valuable bag’s consumers had the dominant properties of Openness to experience, Agreeableness and Conscientiousness. For consumers who have the dominant nature of openness to experience, valuable bag cooperates with local brands and issues limited edition products. Then to launch the valuable bag can create a music event where the event not only launches the latest products, but also as a creative platform for the target consumers. Another thing that can be done is to hold a photography competition during the event, where consumers can take pictures freely, then uploaded on the social accounts of the participants of the competition. That way other consumers will know the new products from valuable bag. They can also take advantage of social media influencers, where they are able to attract consumers to buy valuable products. The second is for consumers who have the dominant nature agreeableness, valuable determines a certain period in which at a certain time valuable makes new products with design motifs made by famous artists, at a more expensive price. The goal is to make the product attract consumers with a charitable program that can be donated to the needy. It is able to attract consumers who have the dominant nature of agreeableness, where the consumer will buy valuable products, because some of the proceeds from the sale will be donated to a particular community, such as the disability music community. The latter for consumers who have the dominant properties conscientiousness. Valuable bag can create a wide range of products that have special benefits and materials details in use. To attract consumers like this, valuable bag can also provide complete information and details about its products on marketing tools used, such as social media, websites and magazines.
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