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Abstract: The internet changes people’s consumption patterns and shopping behavior. Online shopping activities can be done without leaving the house and can be done at any time. Online purchases are increasing during the pandemic due to Covid-19. Organic food business players can use internet marketing activities to attract more consumers, and one way that can be used is a marketing mix. This study analyzes the effect of the marketing mix on consumer trust and satisfaction in purchasing organic food online to increase repurchase intention. The population in this research is organic food consumers. The sample was taken using a purposive sampling method that targets consumers who live in the Jabodetabek area through an online questionnaire survey. Respondents who meet the criteria are 200 consumers. Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) was used in data processing and analysis. The results showed that the product and place had a significant effect on consumer satisfaction. Trust has a significant impact on satisfaction but had no significant effect on repurchase intention. Satisfaction had a significant effect on the repurchase intention of organic food. The suggestion for further research needs to analyze the types of organic rice, vegetables, and fruits purchased by consumers in more detail.
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Indonesia is the fourth most populous country globally, with around 270.20 million (BPS 2021). The people of productive age (between 15 to 64 years) dominate in society around 67.7%. This makes Indonesia one of the countries with large market potential for marketing various goods and services. Internet user penetration is also quite high, reaching 73.7% (Irawan et al., 2020). This is due to advances in internet technology that make it easier for humans in their daily lives. The massive use of the internet has triggered changes in people’s lives.
The internet changes people’s consumption patterns and shopping behavior from offline to online. Online shopping activities can be done without leaving the house when you need the desired item and can be done anytime, so it is more practical. The rapid development of the internet has influenced various goods and services, including organic food. Online purchasing activities have increased during the pandemic due to Covid-19.

Organic food business players can use marketing activities via the internet to attract more consumers and remain competitive in competing in existing markets (Ishak, 2012). Marketers expect their marketing activities to be acceptable, and one way that can be used to attract consumers is to use a marketing mix. The marketing mix combines various marketing decision variables used by companies to market goods and services. McCarthy (1960) divides the marketing mix activities into four groups known as 4Ps: product, price, promotion, and place. Companies have widely adopted this concept in implementing marketing strategies, and it is still relevant today.

Organic consumer behavior and online marketing channels to increase interest in buying organic food need to be understood further. Previous research describes the marketing mix, satisfaction, trust, or repurchase intention in online supermarket trade and online food buying (Chang et al., 2014, Moriuchi and Takahashi, 2016, Tariq et al., 2019). The novelty of this research is a specific analysis of the 4P’s marketing mix on consumer trust and satisfaction in purchasing organic food online and its effect on repurchase intention. Based on this background, the objectives of this study are to identify consumer characteristics in online purchasing of organic food, analyze the effect of the marketing mix on consumer trust and satisfaction of organic food, and analyze the effect of consumer trust and satisfaction on repurchase intention in organic food. The results of this study can provide information on consumer behavior in online purchasing of organic food so that business players can plan marketing activities that impact increasing sales and economic growth.

LITERATURE REVIEW
Organic Food and Online Purchasing

Organic food includes food products free from artificial chemicals such as fertilizers, antibiotics, herbicides, pesticides, and genetically modified organisms (Adamtey et al., 2016). Chan (2001) described organic food as local, fresh, natural, and pure, which is perceived as healthier than conventional food. Organic food is the most successful product category on the market that supports ethics and sustainable products (Juhl et al., 2017). The motto you are what you eat has been adopted by many consumers, increasing the demand for organic products and increasing awareness of environmental health protection (Norman et al., 2000, Yin et al., 2010). The consumption of organic products has been widely accepted in Europe, North America, China, and India (Paul et al., 2016).

The AOI survey (2017) organic products sold in the mainstream market (general or primary market) range from rice, vegetables, and processed food. Supermarkets and public markets provide mostly organic rice, while organic vegetables are very minimal in quantity. On average, local organic products circulating in supermarkets have been certified and have the Organic Indonesia logo. Organic processed foods such as baby food are generally imported brands and certified according to USDA standards. Organic chickens and eggs are starting to be found in the public market, although the numbers fluctuate. Rice is the favorite product in the mainstream market. However, vegetables are the most consumed food at the consumer level. Most consumers shop for organic products not at supermarkets but other places such as exhibitions, live gardens, or unique markets.

Today consumers are starting to rely on the internet for daily activities, such as searching for information, shopping, and conducting business transactions. Products and services offered online have changed consumer habits. The internet has a transformational impact in the business context that creates a new paradigm in digital marketing (Chandra, 2001). Along with the spread and wide-
spread use of the internet, online shopping is getting more attention from every social community as a new way of consumption.

E-commerce businesses can take the potential for increased demand for organic food by providing new channels for organic sales, including providing information on organic food products online (Yue et al., 2017). Explicit information about organic food has a greater influence on consumer purchasing decisions than the appearance and navigation of a website or application (Tariq et al., 2019). Social media has also developed into a place to provide information on health-related topics to generate awareness about a better quality of life. Marketers can use social media to share organic product information because the channel can connect users with the same interests. This method allows companies to provide value to organic products while increasing consumption and consumer loyalty (Chen et al., 2017).

**Trust, Satisfaction, and Repurchase Intention**

Trust is the foundation for social life (Luhmann, 1979). Buyers and sellers need to trust each other to mitigate the uncertainty of their interactions in online transactions (Ha and Stoel, 2008). For consumers, trust in the seller means accepting the risks that may occur in the transaction. For sellers, consumers who believe can increase purchase interest. Sellers must maintain their reputation and brand to win consumers’ trust (Fang et al., 2008).

Consumer satisfaction is often used to measure business performance (Szymanski and Henard, 2001). Kotler (2000) defined consumer satisfaction as a person’s feeling of pleasure or disappointment resulting from comparing the product’s perceived performance against expectations. Chang et al. (2014) defined consumer satisfaction as consumer expectations of goods or services. If the goods or services are following expectations, consumers will be satisfied and lead to repurchase intention. The cost of acquiring new consumers will be lower for companies that succeed in achieving high satisfaction levels (Fornell, 1992).

Repurchase intention is an interest in buying based on the buying experience that has been done in the past. High repurchase intention reflects a high level of satisfaction from consumers when deciding to adopt a product. The decision to adopt or reject a product arises after a consumer tries a product and then he likes or dislikes the product. The high interest in repurchasing will positively impact the success of the product in the market (Sartika, 2017).

**HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT**

**The Effect of Product on Consumer Trust and Satisfaction**

The product is an element of the marketing mix. Products sold to consumers must be of high quality to satisfy and trust the seller (Deliana, 2012). In online purchases, buyers cannot see and feel the products being sold firsthand, and they only see pictures and brief descriptions of these products. Consumers can compare products sold among options when making online purchases, and they can even compare sellers from ratings and comments on e-commerce. Sellers who already have well-known product brands have a competitive advantage so that consumers don’t switch to other brands. If the organic food products purchased are as described, consumers will be satisfied with the purchase. For unilateral claims of organic food products that have not been certified, consumers believe that the seller has used adequate organic farming principles. Therefore, the hypothesis proposed is as follows.

a) **Hypothesis 1a:** The quality of organic food products has a positive significant effect on consumer trust in online purchases.

b) **Hypothesis 1b:** The quality of organic food products has a positive significant effect on consumer satisfaction in online purchases.

**The Effect of Price on Consumer Trust and Satisfaction**

Price is an important component in attracting consumer interest. Consumers tend to look for cheap product prices. The price of a product is often used to differentiate product quality. Products that have better quality tend to have a higher price. Premium brands promise high-quality products and provide a positive image for their users. Organic business
actors need to understand the advantages and positive impacts of organic food products being sold so that they can provide prices that are acceptable to consumers. Consumers believe that the product being sold will provide benefits and quality following the price given. Consumers who get benefits according to the price to be paid will be satisfied with the product (Su and Huang, 2011). The hypothesis proposed is as follows.

a) Hypothesis 2a: The price of organic food has a positive significant effect on consumer trust in online purchases.

b) Hypothesis 2b: The price of organic food has a positive significant effect on consumer satisfaction in online purchases.

The Effect of Promotion on Consumer Trust and Satisfaction

Promotion is an important marketing tool for stimulating purchases quickly and widely over some time (Kotler, 1999). Sales promotion can increase brand preference (DelVecchio et al., 2006). Consumers can recognize a product from the promotion carried out by the company. Promotions carried out by companies are usually persuasive invitations and positive images for the product. Products that are widely known to the public can attract consumers to buy these products. Promotions received by consumers show that they trust the information on the product being sold. Information received will be proven by making a purchase. If the thing consumer feel when receive the product is following what is being promoted, the consumer will be satisfied. The hypothesis proposed is as follows.

a) Hypothesis 3a: Promotion of organic food has a positive significant effect on consumer trust in online purchases.

b) Hypothesis 3b: Promotion of organic food has a positive significant effect on consumer satisfaction in online purchases.

The Effect of Place on Consumer Trust and Satisfaction

Place or distribution in the marketing mix shows the distribution of products from sellers to consumers. The seller must meet the demands of all buyers scattered in various regions for purchases made through online channels (Tariq et al., 2019). Information about consumers is sometimes limited and business players must be able to provide adequate service. Speed in processing orders and punctuality in sending orders must be followed by product quality that can last as previously informed. Consumers find it easy to get products without leaving the house when making online purchases and can get products that are not available near where consumers live. Consumers who buy organic products online trust that the products being sold can be immediately delivered and received well. Consumers who buy organic products will be satisfied if the products purchased can get to them as promised by the seller. The hypothesis proposed is as follows.

a) Hypothesis 4a: The distribution of organic food has a positive significant effect on consumer trust in online purchases.

b) Hypothesis 4b: The distribution of organic food has a positive and significant effect on consumer satisfaction in online purchases.

The Effect of Trust on Consumer Satisfaction

Anderson and Narus (1990) suggest that trust is a driver of satisfaction. Consumers who trust the seller will accept the risks that may occur in the transaction and tend to be satisfied with the results received. Yoon (2002), Ribbink et al. (2004), and Horppu et al. (2008) indicated that there was a positive relationship between satisfaction and trust. The hypothesis proposed is as follows.

Hypothesis 5: Trust has a positive significant effect on consumer satisfaction to organic food in online purchases.

The Effect of Trust and Consumer Satisfaction on Repurchase Intention

Sellers and consumers must build a relationship of mutual trust and satisfaction (Moriuchi and Takahashi 2016). Business players must try to gain consumer trust so that consumers are willing to make purchases online. If that trust increases, consumers will not hesitate to make repeat purchases. Likewise, consumers who are satisfied with the pur-
chases that have been made tend to make repeat purchases. Band (1991) says that consumer satisfaction is a level where consumer needs, wants, and expectations can be fulfilled or exceeded through a transaction that will result in repeat purchases or continued loyalty. The hypothesis proposed is as follows.

a) Hypothesis 6: Consumer trust has a positive significant effect on the repurchase intention of organic food in online purchases.

b) Hypothesis 7: Consumer satisfaction has a positive significant effect on the repurchase intention of organic food in online purchases.

**METHOD**

The research was conducted for four weeks, from mid-September to mid-October 2020. The data collected in this study were primary data obtained from a questionnaire survey in Indonesian. The questionnaire was distributed via a Google Form link using a Likert scale of 1 to 5, which indicates (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) neutral, (4) agree, and (5) strongly agree. Filling out the questionnaire by respondents was done voluntarily. The sampling method used was purposive sampling. To obtain appropriate respondents, selection criteria or requirements were made to fill out a questionnaire. Respondents who do not meet the criteria will be directed directly to the last page of the survey. Respondents taken were consumers who live in the areas of Jakarta, Bogor, Depok, Tangerang, and Bekasi (Jabodetabek) and have bought organic food online at least twice and consumed it in the last six months, which started from the outbreak of Covid-19 in Indonesia (March to August 2020).

The research was conducted using quantitative analysis methods. SPSS 24 was used to enter data and AMOS 24 was used in data processing and structural equation modeling (SEM) analysis. Assessment of the feasibility of a model indicates the comparison between the specified model and the covariance matrix between indicators or observed variables. If the goodness of fit model assessment results is good, then the model can be accepted. The model that has been accepted based on the goodness of fit assessment will be interpreted to answer the problems that have been developed in the research. The initial research model is shown in Figure 1 and operational research variables are defined in Table 1.

![Figure 1. Initial research model](image-url)
Respondent Characteristics

Respondents in this study were consumers who live (domiciled) in the areas of Jakarta, Bogor, Depok, Tangerang, and Bekasi (Jabodetabek) and have bought organic food online and consumed it at least twice in the last six months. Respondents who filled out the questionnaire were 331 respondents. Those who met the criteria and answers to the questions and statements in the questionnaire were analyzed for 200 respondents (response rate = 60.4%). Table 2 presents the summary of the characteristics of respondents.

Table 1. Operational Research Variables

| Variable          | Indicator                                                                 | Source                                      |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| a. Product        | 1) Quality impression                                                    | Meilani and Simanjuntak (2012); Pastikarani and Astuti (2016) |
|                   | 2) Compliance with specifications                                         |                                             |
|                   | 3) Safe for consumption                                                   |                                             |
|                   | 4) Durability                                                             |                                             |
| b. Price          | 1) Competitive price                                                      | Meilani and Simanjuntak (2012); Prasitio (2012) |
|                   | 2) Price according to quality                                             |                                             |
|                   | 3) Price keeps the product desirable                                      |                                             |
| c. Promotion      | 1) Advertising exposure                                                   | Moriuchi and Takahashi (2016); Sartika (2017) |
|                   | 2) Persuasive of advertising                                              |                                             |
|                   | 3) Giving discounts                                                       |                                             |
| d. Place          | 1) Time-saving                                                            | Moriuchi and Takahashi (2016)               |
|                   | 2) Delivery on time                                                       |                                             |
|                   | 3) Reliability of delivery service                                        |                                             |
|                   | 4) Trust delivery staff                                                   |                                             |
| e. Trust          | 1) Trust in the seller                                                    | Moriuchi and Takahashi (2016)               |
|                   | 2) Label or certification                                                 |                                             |
|                   | 3) Transaction process                                                    |                                             |
|                   | 4) Transaction certainty                                                  |                                             |
| f. Satisfaction   | 1) Comparison between expectation and reality                            | Moriuchi and Takahashi (2016); Pastikarani and Astuti (2016) |
|                   | 2) Product selection                                                      |                                             |
|                   | 3) Satisfaction with service                                              |                                             |
|                   | 4) The overall satisfying online shopping experience                      |                                             |
| g. Repurchase intention | 1) The need for the product                               | Sartika (2017)                             |
|                   | 2) The desire to repurchase                                               |                                             |
|                   | 3) The interest to keep using                                             |                                             |

RESULTS

Respondent Characteristics

Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA)

Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) is used to find out whether the variables (construct) used have dimensions or not. The EFA test is carried out on each indicator for each variable. This is because the indicators for each variable have been determined so that the EFA results will see if there are dimensions in each variable. The results of the EFA test on each variable showed that all indicators are combined into one component so that each variable used only had one dimension.
Table 2. Characteristics of Research Respondents

| Characteristics       | Total | Percentage (%) |
|-----------------------|-------|----------------|
| **Gender**            |       |                |
| Man                   | 84    | 42.0           |
| Woman                 | 116   | 58.0           |
| **Domicile**          |       |                |
| Central Jakarta       | 3     | 1.5            |
| North Jakarta         | 0     | 0.0            |
| East Jakarta          | 16    | 8.0            |
| South Jakarta         | 21    | 10.5           |
| West Jakarta          | 3     | 1.5            |
| Thousand Islands      | 0     | 0.0            |
| Bogor Regency         | 62    | 31.0           |
| Bogor City            | 28    | 14.0           |
| Depok City            | 13    | 6.5            |
| Tangerang Regency     | 1     | 0.5            |
| Tangerang City        | 2     | 1.0            |
| South Tangerang City  | 29    | 14.5           |
| Bekasi Regency        | 7     | 3.5            |
| Bekasi City           | 15    | 7.5            |
| **Age**               |       |                |
| under 21 years        | 6     | 3.0            |
| 21-30 years           | 65    | 32.5           |
| 31-40 years           | 86    | 43.0           |
| 41-50 years           | 27    | 13.5           |
| 51-60 years           | 16    | 8.0            |
| over 60 years         | 0     | 0.0            |
| **Profession**        |       |                |
| Student               | 2     | 1.0            |
| College student       | 19    | 9.5            |
| Government Agencies   | 76    | 38.0           |
| Employees             | 51    | 25.5           |
| Entrepreneur          | 18    | 9.0            |
| Professionals         | 9     | 4.5            |
| Housewife             | 23    | 11.5           |
| Retired               | 2     | 1.0            |
| **Last education**    |       |                |
| Not completed in primary school | 0 | 0.0 |
| Primary school        | 0     | 0.0            |
| Junior high school    | 0     | 0.0            |
| Senior High School    | 21    | 10.5           |
| Diploma               | 9     | 4.5            |
| Bachelor              | 99    | 49.5           |
| Master                | 58    | 29.0           |
| Doctor                | 13    | 6.5            |
| **Income/month**      |       |                |
| IDR 1,000,000 or below| 14    | 7.0            |
| IDR 1,000,001 – 3,000,000 | 15 | 7.5 |
| IDR 3,000,001 – 5,000,000 | 34 | 17.0 |
| IDR 5,000,001 – 10,000,000 | 88 | 44.0 |
| IDR 10,000,001 or above | 49 | 24.5 |

Note: n = 200

Test the Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA)

CFA test is used to determine the unidimensional, validity, and reliability of measurement models that cannot be measured directly (Gefen et al., 2000). Each variable (construct) was made as an independent variable and linked to one another (covariance was made). Determining the suitability or feasibility of the model is seen from the goodness of fit index. There were some bad fit criteria from the initial iteration, so that modification of the model was needed. During the modification process, ten indicators were removed. After the modification process, the criteria value of goodness of fit could be achieved.

Test the Structural Equation Modeling (SEM-AMOS)

After getting a good enough model based on the calculation of confirmatory factor analysis, the test was carried out for the entire hypothesis model. Based on comparing the goodness of fit value of the tested hypothesis model with the limit value, all parameters had been met so that the model can be considered feasible or appropriate (Table 3). Figure 2 is the SEM model used for testing the overall hypothesis.
Table 3. The Results of Testing the Feasibility of The Hypothesis Model

| The Goodness of Fit Index | Cut off Value | Result     | Criteria          |
|---------------------------|--------------|------------|-------------------|
| $\chi^2$ - Chi-Square     | Expected to be small | 90.453     | Good Fit          |
| Significance Probability  | $\geq 0.05$  | 0.081      |                   |
| Degree of Freedom / DF    | $> 0$        | 73         | Over Identified   |
| CMIN/DF                   | $\leq 2$     | 1.239      | Good Fit          |
| GFI                       | $\geq 0.90$  | 0.944      | Good Fit          |
| AGFI                      | $\geq 0.90$  | 0.907      | Good Fit          |
| TLI                       | $\geq 0.90$  | 0.980      | Good Fit          |
| CFI                       | $\geq 0.90$  | 0.986      | Good Fit          |
| RMSEA                     | $\leq 0.08$  | 0.035      | Good Fit          |

Figure 2. SEM Analysis of The Hypothetical Model
Test the Validity and Reliability of the Measurement Model

Convergent validity and model reliability are evaluated by looking at the significance of the loading indicator, the calculation of construct reliability (CR), and average variance extracted (AVE). Based on the AMOS output, all indicators were significant because they had \( CR \geq 1.96 \) or a \( P \)-value \( \leq 0.05 \). These indicators were also valid because they had a standard loading factor value \( > 0.5 \). Only the G3 and T1 indicators are slightly below the recommended values. The generally accepted level of reliability is \( \geq 0.70 \), while the reliability \( < 0.70 \) is acceptable for exploratory research. The recommended number for the variance extracted value is \( \geq 0.50 \), indicating that the amount of variance of the indicators extracted by the latent construct is more than the error variance (Haryono 2016). The results are in Table 4.

### Table 4. Result of Construct Validity and Reliability Test

| Variable         | Indicator | Standard Loading | Construct Reliability | Average Variance Extracted | Criteria                |
|------------------|-----------|------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| Product          | P1        | 0.750            | 0.639                 | 0.472                      | Moderate reliability    |
|                  | P4        | 0.617            |                       |                            | Valid                   |
| Price            | G2        | 0.736            | 0.544                 | 0.384                      | Moderate reliability    |
|                  | G3        | 0.476            |                       |                            | Valid                   |
| Promotion        | R1        | 0.771            | 0.749                 | 0.598                      | High reliability        |
|                  | R2        | 0.776            |                       |                            | Valid                   |
| Place            | T1        | 0.458            | 0.527                 | 0.370                      | Moderate reliability    |
|                  | T2        | 0.728            |                       |                            | Valid                   |
| Trust            | C1        | 0.770            | 0.826                 | 0.614                      | High reliability        |
|                  | C3        | 0.745            |                       |                            | Valid                   |
|                  | C4        | 0.833            |                       |                            | Valid                   |
| Satisfaction     | S1        | 0.835            | 0.769                 | 0.625                      | High reliability        |
|                  | S2        | 0.744            |                       |                            | Valid                   |
| Repurchase Intention | M2  | 0.960            | 0.875                 | 0.780                      | High reliability        |
|                  | M3        | 0.799            |                       |                            | Valid                   |

Of the seven latent variables (constructs) hypothesized, four constructs had high reliability, with \( CR \geq 0.70 \) and \( AVE \geq 0.50 \) as recommended, which were Promotion, Trust, Satisfaction, and Repurchase Intention. Meanwhile, Product, Price, and Place had moderate reliability. Since there were no indicators that can be removed, there was no negative variance value, appropriate goodness of fit values, significant and valid indicators, and the construct had moderate to high-reliability values, overall it could be stated that the proposed model could be used for hypothesis testing.
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Hypothesis Test

Based on the results of the SEM analysis on the hypothesis model, hypothesis testing can be done to answer the research questions. The results of hypothesis testing are shown in Table 5.

Table 5. The Results of Hypothesis Testing Using Structural Equation Modeling

| Hypothesis | Estimate | S.E. | C.R. | Result |
|------------|----------|------|------|--------|
| H1a Product → Trust | 0.166 | 0.339 | 0.491 | Not accepted |
| H1b Product → Satisfaction | 0.625 | 0.334 | 1.869 * | Accepted |
| H2a Price → Trust | 0.439 | 0.319 | 1.374 | Not accepted |
| H2b Price → Satisfaction | 0.151 | 0.273 | 0.554 | Not accepted |
| H3a Promotion → Trust | 0.089 | 0.083 | 1.074 | Not accepted |
| H3b Promotion → Satisfaction | -0.096 | 0.072 | -1.328 | Not accepted |
| H4a Place → Trust | 0.361 | 0.224 | 1.612 | Not accepted |
| H4b Place → Satisfaction | 0.480 | 0.232 | 2.069 ** | Accepted |
| H5 Trust → Satisfaction | 0.319 | 0.148 | 2.157 ** | Accepted |
| H6 Trust → Repurchase intention | 0.114 | 0.212 | 0.535 | Not accepted |
| H7 Satisfaction → Repurchase intention | 0.694 | 0.193 | 3.600 *** | Accepted |

Note: * P < 0.1; ** P < 0.05; *** P < 0.01

The Effect between Research Variables

The effect of a variable with other variables in the model can be seen from the direct effect, indirect effect, and total effect. This value can be seen in the AMOS output for standardized values. The direct effect between research variables in the model as in Table 6.

Table 6. The Effect between Research Variables

| Standardized Direct Effects | Standardized Indirect Effects | Standardized Total Effects |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Product → Trust | 0.151 | | 0.151 |
| Product → Satisfaction | 0.510 | 0.043 | 0.554 |
| Product → Repurchase intention | | 0.367 | 0.367 |
| Price → Trust | 0.442 | | 0.442 |
| Price → Satisfaction | 0.137 | 0.126 | 0.263 |
| Price → Repurchase intention | | 0.209 | 0.209 |
| Promotion → Trust | 0.123 | | 0.123 |
| Promotion → Satisfaction | -0.119 | 0.035 | -0.083 |
| Promotion → Repurchase intention | | -0.042 | -0.042 |
| Place → Trust | 0.225 | | 0.225 |
| Place → Satisfaction | 0.268 | 0.064 | 0.333 |
| Place → Repurchase intention | | 0.233 | 0.233 |
| Trust → Satisfaction | 0.286 | | 0.286 |
| Trust → Repurchase intention | 0.094 | 0.182 | 0.276 |
| Satisfaction → Repurchase intention | 0.637 | | 0.637 |
The product had the greatest direct effect on consumer satisfaction than the other marketing mix variables (value 0.510) in the marketing mix variable. This showed that consumers would feel more satisfied if they get quality organic food products compared to other marketing mix components. There is no significant direct effect of the marketing mix on the trust variable.

Trust directly affected the satisfaction with a value of 0.286 and had an indirect effect on the repurchase intention with a value of 0.182. The direct effect of trust on repurchase intention was not significant. This showed that consumer trust does not directly increase consumer repurchase intention in organic products. Consumers who have trust in purchasing organic food online need to increase their satisfaction first so that it will affect repurchase intention.

The satisfaction had a direct effect on repurchase intention with a value of 0.637. This effect is the greatest among the direct effects of other variables. Besides, repurchase intention as the final target was given the greatest total effect from satisfaction. This showed that consumer satisfaction needs to be a top priority, especially for organic food business companies. Consumers satisfied with online purchases of organic food and are satisfied with consuming them will tend to make repeat purchases in the future.

**DISCUSSION**

The Effect of Product on Consumer Trust and Satisfaction

The result of testing Hypothesis H1a was rejected and Hypothesis H1b was accepted. The results obtained are slightly different from Deliana (2012), which states that a quality product would make consumers trust and be satisfied with the seller. Pastikarani and Astuti (2016) state that product quality had a significant effect on consumer satisfaction and it was following the proposed hypothesis. That is possible because in online purchases of organic food, consumers already trust the products sold, so it is not a top priority. However, if the food that has been purchased is not as expected, for example, the product is not fresh or damaged when received or will be consumed, it will affect the satisfaction of the consumers. During the outbreak of the Covid-19, consumers tend to choose good and healthy products.

The Effect of Price on Consumer Trust and Satisfaction

Hypothesis testing results of H2a and H2b were rejected. Su and Huang (2011) suggested that consumers who get benefits according to the price paid will be satisfied with the product. Moriuchi and Takahashi (2016) also stated the same thing. The inconsistency of the results of the hypothesis with these references is possible because the respondents in this study were used to consuming organic food and have a good income. Approximately 68.5% of respondents have an income above the provincial minimum wage (UMP) in DKI Jakarta, which in 2020 was set at around IDR 4.2 million and was the highest UMP in the Jabodetabek area. The purchase price of organic food online is not the primary concern of consumers.

The Effect of Promotion on Consumer Trust and Satisfaction

Hypothesis H3a and Hypothesis H3b test results are rejected. Promotion is an important marketing tool for stimulating purchases quickly and widely over some time (Kotler 1999). However, in this study, the promotion did not significantly affect consumer trust and satisfaction in purchasing organic food online. Public awareness of healthy living has begun to be realized and consuming organic food is expected to create a healthier and better quality of life. Consumers who have been accustomed to consuming organic food for a long time will not be too affected by existing promotions because they commit and try to consume them regularly. This can be seen from the composition of respondents who made purchases before the outbreak of the Covid-19 pandemic, which was 46.0% and on average, they purchased organic food online once every 1-2 months. Therefore, promotion is not a major concern.
The Effect of Place on Consumer Trust and Satisfaction

Hypothesis H4a test result was rejected and Hypothesis H4b was accepted. The hypothesis in this study is inverse to Moriuchi and Takahashi (2016), which stated that place (distribution) in the marketing mix had a significant effect on trust but did not have a significant effect on satisfaction. Sorting activities at the seller, packaging, and delivering to consumers in distribution activities are considered normal things by consumers. Organic food sellers must carry them out so that trust is not the main thing. What is of concern and effect in organic food distribution activities is how purchased organic food arrives at the consumer’s hands. Organic food, especially organic fruits and vegetables, must be delivered to consumers in a fresh condition. Likewise, other types of organic food must be in good condition when received. Well-received organic food can increase consumer satisfaction in online purchases. The seller needs to estimate the delivery time and condition of the organic food consumers buy in the distribution process. Online purchasing has increased during the outbreak of Covid-19 and sellers must anticipate this situation.

The Effect of Trust on Consumer Satisfaction

Hypothesis H5 testing result was accepted. Yoon (2002), Ribbink et al. (2004), and Horppu et al. (2008) indicated that there was a positive relationship between satisfaction and trust. Consumers who trust the seller will accept the risks that may occur in the transaction and tend to be satisfied with the results received. Sellers and buyers do not meet in person in online transactions. Therefore, trust is the main thing. To increase trust, potential buyers can ask questions through the features provided or see reviews and ratings that other buyers have given. Besides, sellers must maintain their performance and improve the services provided so that buyers will trust and make purchases. The trust that is formed will increase consumer satisfaction in making purchases.

The Effect of Trust and Consumer Satisfaction on Repurchase Intention

The results of testing Hypothesis 6 were rejected and Hypothesis 7 is accepted. Based on this research, the trust had a significant effect on consumer satisfaction, but trust did not significantly affect consumer repurchase intention. That is possible because consumers of organic food, after trusted and interested in purchasing organic food online, need to be satisfied with the purchases that have been made before making repeat purchases. Organic food is perceived as healthier than non-organic food, so if consumers are satisfied with this, they will repeat purchases. Organic food sellers who can increase consumer repurchase intention will get more consumers and benefit from the outbreak of Covid-19 because consumers are looking for healthy food such as organic food. Pastikarani and Astuti (2016) stated that consumer satisfaction positively and significantly affects repurchase intention. This statement is following Hypothesis 7 in this study.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the characteristics of respondents in this study, women dominate in buying organic food online. Most respondents are in 31-40 years of age, at least undergraduate education, and an income range of Rp 5,000,001 - 10,000,000.

Marketing mix variables that are product, price, promotion, and distribution, do not significantly affect consumer trust in purchasing organic food online. Product and place have a positive significant effect on satisfaction. Product has a greater direct effect on satisfaction than the place.

Trust has a positive significant effect on satisfaction but has no significant effect on repurchase intention. Satisfaction has a significant effect on repurchase intention. Trust does not directly increase repurchase intention in organic food online. Repurchase intention is given the greatest total effect from satisfaction than other variables.
IMPLICATIONS

The results and discussion can be obtained an insight into consumer behavior in online organic food purchasing. Consumers intend to have organic food quickly and in good condition or fresh for consumption. Fast delivery service or express delivery is necessary for consumers and must be accommodated by organic food sellers. Sellers can work with instant delivery applications such as GoFood and GrabFood to speed up delivery times and various types of courier services. Two-hour fast service for ordering fresh products such as vegetables and fruits can also be an option because consumers ignore the price in purchasing organic food. The cash on delivery (COD) category is starting to become a lot of choices because consumers can pay when the goods are received and without the hassle of making transfers or payments in advance.

Consumer satisfaction needs to be a major concern because it can encourage high repeat purchases. Sellers need to improve services provided to consumers to increase customer satisfaction, such as increasing interaction with consumers, providing knowledge and information about the products being sold, and providing loyalty and feedback services to listen to the wishes of consumers and the market.

LIMITATIONS

This study used respondents who live in the Jabodetabek area as a metropolitan area with adequate access, facilities, and characteristics. That may limit generalization before the same survey was conducted in other large cities in Indonesia. Furthermore, this study only focuses on organic food to not be concluded for all organic products. Then, the criteria for purchasing by respondents in this study were at the beginning of the outbreak of the Covid-19, so it might get different results if conducted in post-Covid-19.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Some suggestions can be given based on the research. First, further research is needed to know the influence of gender, especially women or housewives, purchasing organic food online. That is because more women were surveyed in this research and housewives were in the third-largest type of profession. Second, the kind of organic vegetables, fruits, and rice purchased by consumers needs to be examined in more detail. These three organic foods are the most purchased by respondents and are limited in organic food. Third, further research can be developed with wider coverage of the respondent area to better understand consumer and market of organic food in online purchases.
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