Quest Journals Journal of Software Engineering and Simulation Volume 10 ~ Issue 11 (2024) pp: 32-43 ISSN(Online) :2321-3795 ISSN (Print):2321-3809 www.questjournals.org

**Research Paper** 



## Faktor-Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Keputusan Pembelian Pada Mr. Diy Jakarta

Aang Syahdni<sup>1</sup>,Shintawaty<sup>2</sup>, Ammar<sup>3</sup>,Saraswati Nurdewi<sup>4</sup>, Rachima Azahra<sup>5</sup>,Margaretha Suherman<sup>6</sup>

Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi Y.A.1<sup>1,2,3,4,5,6</sup> Copyright(c) 2024Aang Syahdina<sup>1</sup>Shintawaty<sup>2</sup> Correspondingauthor:Shintawaty

#### Abstract

The aim of this research is to find out how much influence product displays, product diversity and service quality have on purchasing decisions at MR. DIY Jakarta. This type of research is survey research with a quantitative approach. This research used a sample of 100 samples using the convenience method with data analysis techniques using SEM-PLS 4.0. The research results show that the product display variable has a positive influence on customers' decisions to shop at MR. DIY Jakarta, product diversity has the same positive and significant influence on purchasing decisions, as well as service quality which has a positive and significant influence on purchasing decisions at MR. DIY Jakarta. From the research results, the implication that can be conveyed is that shop owners can develop a more attractive shop atmosphere, pay attention to the diversity of products displayed and provide services to achieve customer expectations. Improvements to these three aspects are expected to result in better prices and shopping experiences for customers.

#### *Received 28 Oct., 2024; Revised 06 Nov., 2024; Accepted 08 Nov., 2024* © *The author(s) 2024. Published with open access at www.questjournas.org*

#### I. INTRODUCTION

Economic growth and the increasing needs of society drive the complexity and diversity of the business world. Businesses, especially in the retail sector, require a high degree of innovation as they deal directly with end consumers. One of the most interesting retail businesses today is those selling daily necessities, whether in the traditional or modern category. Traditional retail is characterized by small-scale stores with limited locations, minimal product variety, simple management, and unpredictable prices. In contrast, modern retail offers spacious and comfortable locations, a wide variety of products, better management, fixed prices, and a supermarket-style shopping experience for consumers.

MR. DIY (Mister Do It Yourself) is an example of a modern retail company originally based in Malaysia. MR. DIY divides its products into 10 categories, including hardware, electronics, furniture, accessories, sports equipment, toys, gifts, computer accessories, jewelry, and cosmetics. As of March 2024, MR. DIY had expanded its operations in Indonesia with approximately 751 stores spread across the country. MR. DIY has grown significantly due to the product variety it offers, allowing customers to find everything they need in one store without the need to shop elsewhere. This has positioned MR. DIY as a leader in the market compared to similar stores. To assist customers, MR. DIY places signage in the middle of the aisles for each category, improving the visibility of its product displays. The variety, quality, and product displays influence customers' purchasing decisions.

Purchasing decisions refer to the actions or behaviors of consumers regarding how individuals, groups, and organizations select, buy, and even use goods, services, ideas, or experiences to meet their needs and desires (Kotler & Armstrong, 2020). Furthermore, according to Tjiptono (2019), purchasing decisions are the process by which consumers recognize a problem, seek information about a specific product or brand, and evaluate the available alternatives, leading to a purchase decision.

A product display can be defined as a strategy used by companies to promote products, whether old or new, by making them more visible to consumers. Through displays, consumers can find the products they need (Rafli et al., 2024). Careful consideration of displays is important because they initiate consumer purchasing decisions. According to Aryati et al. (2023), product displays have a positive and significant

## Faktor-Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Keputusan Pembelian Pada Mr. Diy Jakarta

influence on purchasing decisions for Anita Frozen Food.

Next is product variety, which refers to the completeness, breadth, and quality of products offered and their availability in every store. This variety is one of the key reasons consumers become loyal customers. Product variety is also a critical factor in retail competition. It refers to the availability of different quantities and types of products, offering a wide range of choices for consumers. During shopping, consumers often decide to purchase items that were not originally on their shopping list. They tend to prefer stores that offer a wider and more complete range of products. As a result, they feel more comfortable and have an easier time choosing the products they desire. This research builds on previous studies (Jatmika et al., 2022), which found a positive and significant influence of product variety on purchasing decisions in the Shopee marketplace.

According to Krisnawati in Putri et al. (2021), service quality refers to a company's ability to meet customer expectations in the services they receive or experience. Jatmika et al. (2022) adds that service quality refers to actions provided by a company to make it easier for consumers to make purchases. In every business process, whether it involves providing goods or services, consumers should be offered the best service, as this is closely related to their purchasing decisions. With many competitors in the market, one way to surpass other companies is by offering superior service quality.

Good service quality can be determined by comparing the perceptions held by consumers with the reality they experience when making a purchase and interacting with the store or business. If the service consumers receive exceeds their expectations, it means the company is providing good quality. Conversely, if the service falls below their expectations, it indicates poor quality service, which often results in customers being reluctant to make repeat purchases at the same store (Oktavia et al., 2019). This study is also based on findings by Aryati et al. (2023), which showed a positive and significant influence of service quality on purchasing decisions in the Shopee marketplace.

Based on the background above, the researcher is interested in conducting a study titled "The Influence of Product Displays, Product Variety, and Service Quality on Purchasing Decisions at MR. DIY Jakarta."



Hipotesa1

 $H_{01}$  : It is suspected that there is no significant effect of product display on purchasing decisions. Ha<sub>1</sub> : It is suspected that there is a significant influence between product display and purchasing decisions.

Hipotesa2

 $H_{02}$  : It is suspected that there is no significant influence of product diversity on purchasing decisions.

 $\mathrm{Ha}_2$  : It is suspected that there is a significant influence between product diversity and purchasing decisions.

Hipotesa3

 $H_{03}$  : It is suspected that there is no significant influence of service quality on purchasing decisions. Ha<sub>3</sub> : It is suspected that there is a significant influence between service quality and purchasing decisions.

#### **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY** II.

Based on the existing issues, the research method used in this study is explanatory research. According to Sugiyono (2018), explanatory research aims to explain the position of the variables being studied as well as the relationship between one variable and another. The researcher employs a descriptive method through a quantitative approach. According to Ghozali (2016), the quantitative method is defined as a method based on the philosophy of positivism, used to study a specific population or sample, with data collection using research instruments, and statistical data analysis with the aim of testing predetermined hypotheses.

This study uses a quantitative analysis method processed using SMART-PLS version 4.0. The variables used by the researcher include Product Display Variable (X1), Product Diversity (X2), and Service Quality (X3) on the Purchase Decision Variable (Y) at MR. DIY Jakarta. Quantitative research is a study that uses numerical data as a tool to analyze what needs to be understood. This method is used to study the sample and population by collecting samples through questionnaires to obtain primary data directly from respondents within the predetermined population.

#### **Data Description and Variable Operation**

The variables in this study consist of three independent variables (X), namely product di splay (X1), product variety (X2), and service quality (X3), while the dependent variable is purchase decision (Y). The following descriptions provide definitions of each variable to elaborate on the variables that arise in a research study for a more detailed understanding.

|                                     | Elements of Statement and Measurement of Variable Indicators   |                          |  |  |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|--|
| Variabel                            | Indikator  | Modelskala<br>pengukuran |  |  |
|                                     | A wide selection of products for sale  | Likert                   |  |  |
|                                     | Good product quality   | Likert                   |  |  |
| Purchase Decision                   | Good service from distributor  | Likert                   |  |  |
| (Y)                                 | The number of products that suit different wantsThe number of products that suit different wants                         | Likert                   |  |  |
|                                     | Consumer decisions in choosing the time of visit   | Likert                   |  |  |
|                                     | Purchasing decisions are influenced by the technology used in the purchase transaction.                                  | Likert                   |  |  |
|                                     | Highly organised and easy to see   | Likert                   |  |  |
|                                     | Easy to find products in the store   | Likert                   |  |  |
| Product Display                     | Consumers can comfortably take products from shelves or <i>L</i> displays in the store                                   |                          |  |  |
| (A)                                 | Consumers can buy products that are attractively displayed<br>compared to products whose presentation is less attractive | Likert                   |  |  |
| Product Diversity (X <sub>2</sub> ) | Each type of packaging and size is in accordance with consumer desires   | Likert                   |  |  |
|                                     | Large selection of products available to fulfil needs  | Likert                   |  |  |
|                                     | Consumers tend to buy products that are available with various types of materials  | Likert                   |  |  |
|                                     | Product design options available to meet needs   | Likert                   |  |  |
| Variabel                            | Indikator  | Modelskala<br>pengukuran |  |  |
|                                     | Overall positive shopping experience   | Likert                   |  |  |
|                                     | Good customer service  | Likert                   |  |  |
| a                                   | The company's ability to provide the best service for customers  | Likert                   |  |  |
| Service Quality                     | Deliver promised services promptly, accurately, and satisfactorily   | Likert                   |  |  |
| (A3)                                | Provide services that are responsive to all customer wants and needs   | Likert                   |  |  |

| Tabel1   |
|--|
| Elements of Statement and Measurement of Variable Indicators |

| Good communication, extensive knowledge, to polite and      | Likert |
|---|--------|
| courteous attitude to customers                             |        |
| Helping customers to know the specific needs and desires of | Likert |
| customers   |        |

The Likert scale is used to measure attitudes, opinions, and perceptions of an individual or a group of people regarding social phenomena. With the Likert scale, the variable to be measured is broken down into variable indicators, which serve as the basis for creating items for the instrument, which can be in the form of statements or questions.

Tabel 2 Skala*Likert* 

| Question answer         | Score |
|-------------------------|-------|
| Strongly agree (SS)     | 5     |
| Agree (S)               | 4     |
| Disagree (KS)           | 3     |
| Disagree(TS)            | 2     |
| Strongly Disagree (STS) | 1     |
| Source:Sugiyono(2016)   |       |

Referring to the above provisions, data processing was carried out using a questionnaire, presented in tabular form, and analyzed using descriptive analysis. This was followed by classification of the total scores of respondents, which were then used to calculate validity and reliability.

The quantitative data analysis from the questionnaire was processed using SEM-PLS version 4.0. Ghozali (2015) states that the purpose of SEM-PLS is to build and develop theories (prediction-oriented). The Partial Least Square (PLS) method is described as a variable-based structural model capable of depicting latent variables (which cannot be directly measured) and measured using indicators (manifest variables). SmartPLS version 4.0 employs a bootstrapping method for random sampling. The analysis of SEM-PLS version 4.0 consists of two sub-models: the measurement model (outer model) and the structural model (inner model).

#### III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

#### **Outer Model**

#### A. Validity Test

1. Outer loading is the initial stage in the validity test, with the criterion that it must be greater than 0.7 for the indicator to be considered valid. If it is not valid, the indicator must be removed from the model. In this study, the outer loading analysis is presented in the form of a figure based on the processed data, and the results of the validity test are as follows:



|                          | Tabel 3.                    |                           |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|
| Validit                  | y Test Results Before Elimi | ination (display product) |
| Point                    | Result                      | Description               |
| Product Display 1        | 0.722                       | Valid                     |
| Product Display 2        | 0.713                       | Valid                     |
| Product Display 3        | 0.726                       | Valid                     |
| Product Display 4        | 0.741                       | Valid                     |
| Product Display 5        | 0.705                       | Valid                     |
| Product Display 6        | 0.739                       | Valid                     |
| Product Display 7        | 0.816                       | Valid                     |
| Product Display 8        | 0.761                       | Valid                     |
| Product Display 9        | 0.517                       | Tidak Valid               |
| Source: data diolah, 202 | 21                          |                           |

Based on the data in the table above, the conclusion from the validity test indicates that not all questions in the questionnaire are considered valid. Statement number 9 is deemed invalid because it is less than 0.7.

|                     | Tabel 4.                 |  |
|---------------------|--------------------------|--|
| Results of Valid    | lity Testing Before Elim | ination ( <i>Product Variability</i> ) |
| Point               | Result                   | Description                            |
| Product diversity 1 | 0.692                    | Invalid                                |
| Product diversity 2 | 0.807                    | Valid                                  |
| Product diversity 3 | 0.830                    | Valid                                  |
| Product diversity 4 | 0.807                    | Valid                                  |
| Product diversity 5 | 0.795                    | Valid                                  |
| Product diversity 6 | 0.706                    | Valid                                  |

Based on the data in the table above, the conclusion is that in the validity test, not all questions in the questionnaire are declared valid. Statement number 1 is declared invalid because it is less than 0.7.

# Tabel 5. Results of Validity Testing Before Elimination (Service Quality)

| Point           |   | Result | Description |
|-----------------|---|--------|-------------|
| Service Quality | 1 | 0.854  | Valid       |
| Service Quality | 2 | 0.882  | Valid       |
| Service Quality | 3 | 0.824  | Valid       |
| Service Quality | 4 | 0.854  | Valid       |
| Service Quality | 5 | 0.756  | Valid       |

Data source: Processed by the author

Based on the data in the table above, the conclusion is that in the validity test, all questions in the questionnaire are declared valid, exceeding 0.7.

|                            | Tabel6.  |
|----------------------------|--|
| <b>Results of Validity</b> | <b>Testing Before Elimination</b> ( <i>Purchase Decision</i> ) |

| Point                                   | Result | Description |
|---|--------|-------------|
| Purchase Decision 1                     | 0.851  | Valid       |
| Purchase Decision 2                     | 0.841  | Valid       |
| Purchase Decision 3                     | 0.769  | Valid       |
| Purchase Decision 4                     | 0.822  | Valid       |
| Purchase Decision 5                     | 0.842  | Valid       |
| Purchase Decision 6                     | 0.828  | Valid       |
| Purchase Decision 7                     | 0.824  | Valid       |
| Data source: Processed by the authority | Dr     |             |

DOI: 10.35629/3795-10113243

Based on the data in the table above, the conclusion from the validity test indicates that all questions in the questionnaire are declared valid, exceeding 0.7. After conducting a retest by removing the invalid questions, the following results were obtained:

#### Gambar 2. Loading Factor After Elimination

| Tabel7. |                    |                 |                     |                    |             |
|---------|--------------------|-----------------|---------------------|--------------------|-------------|
| The R   | esults Of The Load | ling Factor For | The Research Varial | oles After Elimina | ation.      |
|         | Purchase           | Product         | Product diversity   | Service            | Description |
| Y1      | 0.851              | Display         |                     | Quality            | Valid       |
| Y2      | 0.841              |                 |                     |                    | Valid       |
| Y3      | 0.769              |                 |                     |                    | Valid       |
| Y4      | 0.822              |                 |                     |                    | Valid       |
| Y5      | 0.842              |                 |                     |                    | Valid       |
| Y6      | 0.828              |                 |                     |                    | Valid       |
| Y7      | 0.824              |                 |                     |                    | Valid       |
| X1.1    |                    | 0.722           |                     |                    | Valid       |
| X1.2    |                    | 0.713           |                     |                    | Valid       |
| X1.3    |                    | 0.726           |                     |                    | Valid       |
| X1.4    |                    | 0.741           |                     |                    | Valid       |
| X1.5    |                    | 0.705           |                     |                    | Valid       |
| X1.6    |                    | 0.739           |                     |                    | Valid       |
| X1.7    |                    | 0.816           |                     |                    | Valid       |

| X1.8 | 0.761 |       |       | Valid |
|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| X2.2 |       | 0.807 |       | Valid |
| X2.3 |       | 0.830 |       | Valid |
| X2.4 |       | 0.807 |       | Valid |
| X2.5 |       | 0.795 |       | Valid |
| X2.6 |       | 0.706 |       | Valid |
| X3.1 |       |       | 0.854 | Valid |
| X3.2 |       |       | 0.882 | Valid |
| X3.3 |       |       | 0.824 | Valid |
| X3.4 |       |       | 0.854 | Valid |
| X3.5 |       |       | 0.756 | Valid |

#### Source: Hasil Pengolahan SEM-PLS

Conclusion: The final results of the outer loading in this validity test are valid, as all indicators are above 0.7, and several previously invalid indicators have been removed or eliminated.

2. Validity and Reliability of Constructs = The results of this test are evaluated based on AVE (Average Variance Extracted). AVE is a value used in convergent validity testing because the value obtained from the convergent validity output. The criteria that AVE must meet is >0.5, and in this study, the AVE values for each variable are above 0.5, as explained in the label below.

# Tabel8. Validity and Reliability Testing of Constructs. Average variance systemated (AVE)

|                   | Average variance extracted (AVE) | Description |
|-------------------|----------------------------------|-------------|
| Product Display   | 0.556                            | Valid       |
| Purchase Decision | 0.681                            | Valid       |
| Service Quality   | 0.698                            | Valid       |
| Product diversity | 0.713                            | Valid       |

Source : Data processing results SEM-PLS

The results of the validity and reliability tests for the constructs show that all AVE values are valid, as the variable values are above 0.5. This indicates that the indicators used can effectively explain the constructs being measured and can proceed to the reliability test.

#### Validitas Diskriminan (Discriminant Validity)

Discriminant validity is used to measure a latent variable that shares more variance with its underlying indicators than with other latent variables in the same model. Discriminant validity can be assessed using the Fornell-Larcker criterion, where if the square root of the AVE (Average Variance Extracted) for each latent variable is greater than the correlation values among other latent variables, it can be interpreted that the latent variable has good discriminant validity.

(Ken Kwong-Kay Wong., 2013).

|                   | Tabel 9.<br>Nilai Fornell-Larcl | ker                  |                      |                    |
|-------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
|                   | Product<br>Display              | Purchase<br>Decision | Product<br>diversity | Service<br>Quality |
| Purchase Decision | 0.789                           | 0.825                |                      |                    |

| Product Display   | 0.746 |       |       |       |
|-------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Product diversity | 0.718 | 0.822 | 0.844 |       |
| Service Quality   | 0.731 | 0.843 | 0.742 | 0.835 |
|                   |       |       |       |       |

Source : Data processing results SEM-PLS

The analysis results show that the AVE root values of each construct (the numbers on the diagonal) are greater than the correlations between that construct and other constructs (the numbers below the diagonal). This indicates that each construct in the model has good discriminant validity. In addition to the Fornell-Larcker criteria, discriminant validity can also be assessed using Cross Loading Factor. Cross loading evaluates that the loading value for the intended construct should be greater than the loading values for other constructs. (Henseler, J., Ringle, 2009).

| Tabel 10.<br>Cross Loading |                    |                   |                   |                 |  |
|----------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--|
|                            | Product<br>Display | Purchase Decision | Product diversity | Service Quality |  |
| X1.1                       | 0.725              | 0.571             | 0.490             | 0.494           |  |
| X1.2                       | 0.713              | 0.462             | 0.528             | 0.474           |  |
| X1.3                       | 0.721              | 0.584             | 0.650             | 0.596           |  |
| X1.4                       | 0.744              | 0.572             | 0.521             | 0.507           |  |
| X1.5                       | 0.703              | 0.506             | 0.390             | 0.539           |  |
| X1.6                       | 0.752              | 0.536             | 0.483             | 0.492           |  |
| X1.7                       | 0.830              | 0.659             | 0.584             | 0.580           |  |
| X1.8                       | 0.771              | 0.741             | 0.604             | 0.642           |  |
| X2.2                       | 0.539              | 0.699             | 0.805             | 0.566           |  |
| X2.3                       | 0.593              | 0.687             | 0.886             | 0.569           |  |
| X2.4                       | 0.668              | 0.677             | 0.886             | 0.675           |  |
| X2.5                       | 0.622              | 0.706             | 0.795             | 0.691           |  |
| X3.1                       | 0.633              | 0.688             | 0.571             | 0.854           |  |
| X3.2                       | 0.585              | 0.735             | 0.602             | 0.882           |  |
| X3.3                       | 0.563              | 0.659             | 0.611             | 0.824           |  |
| X3.4                       | 0.635              | 0.731             | 0.682             | 0.854           |  |
| X3.5                       | 0.632              | 0.700             | 0.629             | 0.756           |  |
| Y.1                        | 0.677              | 0.851             | 0.639             | 0.701           |  |
| Y.2                        | 0.687              | 0.841             | 0.709             | 0.665           |  |
| Y.3                        | 0.638              | 0.769             | 0.664             | 0.573           |  |
| Y.4                        | 0.584              | 0.821             | 0.622             | 0.666           |  |
| Y.5                        | 0.669              | 0.843             | 0.738             | 0.766           |  |
| Y.6                        | 0.690              | 0.828             | 0.698             | 0.730           |  |
| Y.7                        | 0.608              | 0.823             | 0.671             | 0.754           |  |

Source : Data processing results SEM-PLS

The analysis results can be summarized as follows:

1. Indicators X1.1 to X1.8 have high loadings on X1 (ranging from 0.703 to 0.830), and these loadings are higher compared to their loadings on X2, X3, and Y. This indicates good discriminant validity for X1.

2. Indicators X2.2 to X2.5 have high loadings on X2 (ranging from 0.795 to 0.886), and these loadings are higher compared to their loadings on X1, X3, and Y. This indicates good discriminant validity for X2.

3. Indicators X3.1 to X3.5 have high loadings on X3 (ranging from 0.756 to 0.882), and these loadings are higher compared to their loadings on X1, X2, and Y. This indicates good discriminant validity for X3.

4. Indicators Y.1 to Y.9 have high loadings on Y (ranging from 0.769 to 0.851), and these loadings are higher compared to their loadings on X1, X2, and X3. This indicates good discriminant validity for Y.

The cross-loadings table indicates that all indicators have the highest loadings on their respective constructs compared to other constructs. This demonstrates good discriminant validity for constructs X1, X2, X3, and Y in the analyzed model.

#### Uji Reabilitas (Outer Model)

The final step for model evaluation is to test the relationship or unidimensionality of the variables involved. This test is conducted using Cronbach's Alpha and Composite Reliability, each with its own criteria for reliability. Specifically, Cronbach's Alpha must be greater than 0.6, while Composite Reliability must be greater than 0.7 in order to be deemed reliable.

| Tabel 11.<br>Rehabilitation Test |                  |                          |             |  |
|----------------------------------|------------------|--------------------------|-------------|--|
| Variabel                         | Cronbach's alpha | Composite<br>reliability | Description |  |
| Product Display                  | 0.886            | 0.909                    | Reliabel    |  |
| Purchase Decision                | 0.922            | 0.937                    | Reliabel    |  |
| Service Quality                  | 0.891            | 0.920                    | Reliabel    |  |
| Product diversity                | 0.864            | 0.908                    | Reliabel    |  |

Source : Data processing results SEM-PLS

Based on the table above, the following values were obtained:

1. Cronbach's Alpha is greater than 0.6 (0.886) and Composite Reliability must meet the criterion of being greater than 0.7 (0.909). Therefore, the responses from the respondents for this research variable can be used for the study. This indicates that the items in this variable are consistent in measuring the same concept.

2. Cronbach's Alpha is greater than 0.6 (0.922) and Composite Reliability must meet the criterion of being greater than 0.7 (0.937). Therefore, the responses from the respondents for this research variable can be used for the study. This indicates that the items in this variable are consistent in measuring the same concept.

3. Cronbach's Alpha is greater than 0.6 (0.891) and Composite Reliability must meet the criterion of being greater than 0.7 (0.920). Therefore, the responses from the respondents for this research variable can be used for the study. This indicates that the items in this variable are consistent in measuring the same concept.

4. Cronbach's Alpha is greater than 0.6 (0.864) and Composite Reliability must meet the criterion of being greater than 0.7 (0.908). Therefore, the responses from the respondents for this research variable can be used for the study. This indicates that the items in this variable are consistent in measuring the same concept.

#### Structural Model Test" or "Inner Model Test

Structural models, or inner models, involve relationships between latent variables, comprising R-Square, F-Square, and estimates for path coefficients. These models examine the significance of the influence among variables by assessing parameter coefficients and the significance of T-Statistics.

#### 1) **R-Square**

R-Square R-Square is a value that is only possessed by endogenous variables (dependent variables). The R-Square test is useful for showing the extent of the influence of all exogenous variables (independent variables) on the endogenous variable or exogenous variable (Brahmanta, 2021). R-Square has the following criteria: 0.67 (strong), 0.33 (moderate), and 0.19 (weak) (Dikdoyo, 2023). In this study, the R-Square value is as follows:

|                          | Tabel 12.<br>R2 Test |                          |  |
|--------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|--|
|                          | <b>R-square</b>      | <b>R-square adjusted</b> |  |
| <b>Purchase Decision</b> | 0.820                | 0.814                    |  |

Source : Data processing results SEM-PLS

In the table, the R-squared value appears only for the variable that has an effect, which is the purchase decision (Y), with a value of 0.820. This means that the independent variables, namely product display, product variety, and service quality, explain 82% of the variance in the purchase decision. Consequently, the remaining 18% is explained by other variables outside the scope of this study. The obtained R-squared value is considered strong, as it exceeds 0.67.

2) F-Square

The f-Square function is used to determine the magnitude of the influence between variables using Effect Size

or f-square. (Rokhmah, 2024)

- a) f<sup>2</sup> value of 0.02: There is a small effect of the exogenous variable on the endogenous variable.
- b) Nilai f2 0,15 :  $f^2$  value of 0.15: There is a moderate effect of the exogenous variable on the endogenous variable.
- c) f<sup>2</sup> value of 0.35: There is a large effect of the exogenous variable on the endogenous variable.
- d) A value less than 0.02 can be disregarded or considered to have no effect.

#### Tabel 13. F2 Test

#### **Purchase Decision**

| Product Display   | 0.129 |
|-------------------|-------|
| Product diversity | 0.248 |
| Service Quality   | 0.347 |

Source : Data processing results SEM-PLS

e) Product Display  $0.129 \rightarrow$  has a small influence on Purchase Decisions.

f) Product Variety  $0.248 \rightarrow$  has a moderate influence on Purchase Decisions.

g) Service Quality  $0.347 \rightarrow$  has a moderate influence on Purchase Decisions.

#### Hypothesis Testing

This hypothesis test will state whether the independent variable has an effect on the dependent variable. For hypothesis testing, using statistical values, the t-statistic value used for an alpha of 5% is > 1.96. Therefore, the criteria for acceptance or rejection of the hypothesis are as follows: if the p-value of the effect is < 0.05 and the t-statistic > 1.96, then the hypothesis can be accepted, indicating a significant effect between the variables. Conversely, if the p-value > 0.05 and the t-statistic < 1.96, the hypothesis is rejected.

#### Tabel 14. Path Coefficient

|   | Original<br>sample (O) | Sample<br>mean (M) | Standard<br>deviation<br>(STDEV) | T statistics<br>( O/STDEV ) | P values |
|---|------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------|
| Product Display-<br>>Purchase<br>Decision   | 0.242                  | 0.244              | 0.093                            | 2.609                       | 0.009    |
| Product diversity<br>->Purchase<br>Decision | 0.342                  | 0.345              | 0.097                            | 3.525                       | 0.000    |
| Service Quality-<br>>Purchase<br>Decision   | 0.412                  | 0.408              | 0.091                            | 4.550                       | 0.000    |

Source : Data processing results SEM-PLS

Gambar 3. Kerangka Hasil Bootsrapping Inner Model

In the bootstrapping method, hypothesis testing results are evaluated based on the T-Statistic and P-Value. A T-Statistic value exceeding 1.96 indicates statistical significance, while a value below this threshold suggests otherwise. Meanwhile, a P-Value above 0.05 is considered to have a negative effect, indicating that the independent variable does not have a significant impact on the dependent variable. Conversely, a P-Value below 0.05 is deemed to have a positive effect, suggesting that the independent variable has a significant influence on the dependent variable (Ghozali, 2016). This combination of evaluations allows for the interpretation of the strength and direction of the relationship between variables in bootstrapping analysis.

#### Tabel 15. Hypothesis Testing

| nypoine                                  | sis results              |          |
|--|--------------------------|----------|
|  | T statistics ( O/STDEV ) | P values |
| Product Display->Purchase Decision       | 2.609                    | 0.009    |
| Product diversity ->Purchase Decision    | 3.525                    | 0.000    |
| Service Quality->Purchase Decision       | 4.550                    | 0.000    |
| Source : Data processing results SEM-PLS |                          |          |

Based on the table above, the results of the hypothesis testing indicate that each variable aligns with the hypothesis, namely:

1) The effect of Product Display (X1) on Purchase Decisions has a T-Statistic > T-Table, specifically 2.609 > 1.96, and a P-Value of 0.009 < 0.05. This indicates that Product Display has a positive and significant influence on Purchase Decisions.

2) The effect of Product Variety (X2) on Purchase Decisions has a T-Statistic > T-Table, specifically 3.525 > 1.96, and a P-Value of 0.000 < 0.05. This indicates that Product Variety has a positive and significant influence on Purchase Decisions.

3) The effect of Service Quality (X3) on Purchase Decisions has a T-Statistic > T-Table, specifically 4.550 > 1.96, and a P-Value of 0.000 < 0.05. This indicates that Service Quality has a positive and significant influence on Purchase Decisions.

#### Analysis and Discussion of Research Results

The analysis of this research was conducted to determine the influence of Product Display, Product Variety, and Service Quality on Purchase Decisions at MR.DIY Jakarta, after testing was performed using SEM-PLS 4.0.

1) Influence of Product Display on Purchasing Decisions.

The results obtained indicate that Product Display has a positive and significant influence on Purchasing Decisions. This is evidenced by a P-Value of 0.009, which is below 0.05. Additionally, the obtained T-Statistic value is 2.609, which is greater than the threshold value of 1.96. Thus, both indicators demonstrate that the relationship between Product Display and Purchasing Decisions is significant and positive. This research is also in line with studies conducted by Khayatun (2022), Suyanto (2021), and Aryati (2023), which state that Product Display positively and significantly influences the Purchasing Decisions of MR. DIY.

2) Influence of Product Variety on Purchasing Decisions.

The results obtained indicate that Product Variety has a positive and significant influence on Purchasing Decisions. This is evidenced by a P-Value of 0.000, which is below 0.05. Additionally, the obtained T-Statistic value is 3.525, which is greater than the threshold value of 1.96. Thus, both indicators demonstrate that the relationship between Product Variety and Purchasing Decisions is significant and positive. This research is also consistent with studies conducted by Agustin (2023), Lianardi (2019), and Rozi (2021), which state that Product Variety positively and significantly influences the Purchasing Decisions of MR. DIY.

3) Influence of Service Quality on Purchasing Decisions.

The results obtained indicate that Service Quality has a positive and significant influence on Purchasing Decisions. This is evidenced by a P-Value of 0.000, which is below 0.05. Additionally, the obtained T-Statistic value is 4.550, which is greater than the threshold value of 1.96. Thus, both indicators demonstrate that the relationship between Service Quality and Purchasing Decisions is significant and positive. This research is also in line with studies conducted by Abdulmukti (2021), Suyanto (2021), Lianardi (2019), and Cesarina (2022), which state that Service Quality positively and significantly influences the Purchasing Decisions of MR. DIY.

## **IV. CONCLUSION**

Based on the research findings and discussions presented earlier, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. The variable of Product Display significantly influences purchase decisions. The analysis indicates that Product Display has a positive and significant impact on Purchase Decisions at MR. DIY, leading to the acceptance of Hypothesis 1.

2. The variable of Product Variety significantly influences purchase decisions. The analysis indicates that Product Variety has a positive and significant impact on Purchase Decisions at MR. DIY, leading to the acceptance of Hypothesis 2.

3. The variable of Service Quality significantly influences purchase decisions. The analysis indicates that Service Quality has a positive and significant impact on Purchase Decisions at MR. DIY, leading to the acceptance of Hypothesis 3.

Here are the implications based on the study regarding the influence of Product Display, Product Variety, and Service Quality on Purchasing Decisions at MR. DIY Jakarta:

1. **Product Display** has a positive and significant impact on purchasing decisions. This implies the importance of continuously developing an appealing store atmosphere and improving the arrangement of products. Therefore, if consumers have the ability to purchase, it will ultimately lead to purchasing decisions for the desired products.

2. **Product Variety** has a positive and significant impact on purchasing decisions. This suggests that it is crucial to pay attention to good product diversity and develop strategies to maintain customer trust and improve purchasing decisions.

3. **Service Quality** has a positive and significant impact on purchasing decisions. This indicates the necessity of providing high-quality service to consumers, such as meeting customer expectations, clearly explaining and providing information, responding quickly to consumer complaints, delivering excellent service, and understanding customer desires to enhance purchasing decisions.

#### REFERENCES

- [1]. Aryati, C., Akhmad, I., & Sulistyandari. (2023). PENGARUH DISPLAY PRODUK, HARGA DAN LOKASI TERHADAP KEPUTUSAN PEMBELIAN PADA FROZEN FOOD ANITA. Jurnal Ekonomi Kreatif Dan Manajemen Bisnis Digital, 2(1), 580– 589. https://doi.org/10.55047/jekombital.v1i4.507
- [2]. Ghozali, I. (2016). Aplikasi Analisis Moultivariate dengan Program IBM SPSS 23 edisi 8). Cetakan ke VIII.
- [3]. Jatmika, R. T. D., Dwiwarman, D. A., Nurjaya, N., Erlangga, H., & Abdurohman, D. (2022). Pengaruh Display Produk dan Kualitas Pelayanan Terhadap Keputusan Pembelian pada Alfamart Cabang Bintaro Tangerang Selatan. Jurnal Ekonomi Efektif, 4(2), 321–330.
- [4]. Kotler, P., & Armstrong, G. (2020). Principles of Marketing. In Early Greek Mythography, Vol. 1: Texts. https://doi.org/10.1093/oseo/instance.00295839
- [5]. Oktavia, Z. D., Setyowati, T., & Setaningsih, W. E. (2019). Pengaruh Iklan, Kualitas Produk, Dan Harga Terhadap Keputusan Pembelian Pada Susu Kental Manis Frisian Flag (Studi Pada Konsumen Susu Kental Manis Frisian Flag Di Jember Roxy Square) Program. Repository.Unmuhjember.Ac.Id/5883/, 1–16.
- [6]. Putri, N. D. P. D., Novitasari, D., Yuwono, T., & Asbari, M. (2021). Pengaruh Kualitas Produk Dan Kualitas Pelayanan Terhadap Kepuasan Pelanggan. Journal Of Communication Education, 15(1), 3857–3868. https://doi.org/10.58217/joce-ip.v15i1.226
- [7]. Rafli, M. A., Rochmawati;, & Agung, A. A. G. (2024). Analisis Kepuasan Dan Loyalitas Pelanggan Produkkue Brownies Menggunakan Perhitungan Net Promoter Score Berbasis Python. JiMEA | Jurnal Ilmiah MEA (Manajemen, Ekonomi, Dan Akuntansi), 8(3), 199–211.
- [8]. Sugiyono. (2018). Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D. Alfabeta.
- [9]. Tjiptono, F. (2019). Pemasaran Jasa: Prinsip, Penerapan dan Penelitian. January 2014, 5–6.