

# The Influence of Convection Group Marketing Through Social Media on Brand Equity and Consumer Behavior Through Purchase Intent as an Intervening Variable

Ifah Zuliarti<sup>1</sup>, Abid Muhtarom<sup>2</sup>, Titin<sup>3</sup>

Postgraduate Study Program in Management, Lamongan Islamic University, Lamongan, Indonesia

## ARTICLE INFO

### Keywords:

Social Media Marketing, Brand Equity, Consumer Attitude, Purchase Intention, Garment Industry, PLS-SEM

## ABSTRACT

This study aims to analyze the influence of garment group marketing through social media—encompassing online promotion (X1), price (X2), and marketing activities (X3)—on brand equity (Y1) and consumer attitude (Y2) with purchase intention (Z) as an intervening variable. The study employs a descriptive quantitative approach with 30 consumers who had purchased through Facebook within the past 6 months, selected via purposive sampling. Data were collected through Likert-scale questionnaires (1–5) and analyzed using PLS-SEM with SmartPLS 3. Results indicate that: (1) online promotion does not significantly affect brand equity ( $p=0.201$ ), consumer attitude ( $p=0.347$ ), or purchase intention ( $p=0.545$ ); (2) price does not significantly affect brand equity ( $p=0.921$ ) or consumer attitude ( $p=0.073$ ), but significantly affects purchase intention ( $p=0.000$ ); (3) marketing activities significantly affect brand equity ( $p=0.021$ ), consumer attitude ( $p=0.000$ ), and purchase intention ( $p=0.022$ ); (4) purchase intention significantly affects brand equity ( $p=0.018$ ) and consumer attitude ( $p=0.039$ ); (5) price affects brand equity and consumer attitude through full mediation by purchase intention. These findings imply that garment groups need to optimize integrated marketing activities and set competitive pricing to stimulate purchase intention, which in turn enhances brand equity and positive consumer attitudes.

### Email :

ifahzuliarti@unisla.ac.id  
abid@unisla.ac.id  
titin@unisla.ac.id

Copyright © 2024 Jurnal JEAMI .All rights reserved is Licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution- NonCommercial 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0)

## INTRODUCTION

The social media revolution has changed the way businesses communicate and interact with consumers. Online platforms like Facebook have become an effective marketing tool due to their ability to reach consumers widely at a relatively low cost (Alam & Khan, 2019). For small and medium-sized businesses such as convection groups, social media opens up opportunities to build a brand and expand the market beyond traditional geographical boundaries.

The convection group that is the object of this research is a group of companies engaged in the manufacture of school clothes and have used social media—especially Facebook—as the main marketing platform. In increasingly fierce competition, the ability to

*The Influence of Convection Group Marketing Through Social Media on Brand Equity and Consumer Behavior Through Purchase Intent as an Intervening Variable- Ifah Zuliarti et.al*

build brand equity and influence consumer behavior through digital marketing activities is key to business success. According to Alam & Khan (2019), brand communication on social media can contribute to the dimension of brand equity, namely brand awareness, functional brand image, and hedonistic brand image which ultimately influences consumer purchase intention.

Rosyad explained that purchase intentions arise in response to consumers' positive perceptions of the products and brands offered. The better the marketing strategy is carried out and the higher the consumer trust in the brand, the greater the purchase intention that consumers have.

Research on social media marketing and brand equity is still dominated by studies on large companies, while the context of small businesses in the form of convection groups is still very limited. This research aims to: (1) determine the influence of online promotions, prices, and marketing activities on brand equity; (2) to determine the influence of these three variables on consumer attitudes; (3) to know its influence on the purchase intention; and (4) analyze the role of purchase intent as an intervening variable between social media marketing and brand equity and consumer attitudes.

## **Literature Review and Problem Formulation**

### **Social Media and Digital Marketing**

Social media is an online platform that provides facilities for users to communicate, collaborate, and share content (Herdiyani et al., 2022). In the context of marketing, social media includes two main types of content: firm-created content and user-generated content. Both contribute differently to the dimension of brand equity (Alam & Khan, 2019). The marketing variables measured in this study included: (1) online promotion—advertising, public relations, and digital word-of-mouth; (2) price—affordability, elasticity, and comparison with competitors; and (3) marketing activities—advertising, public relations, and online and offline activities.

### **Brand Equity**

Brand equity is a set of assets and liabilities associated with a brand that can increase or decrease the value of a product for customers (Pandiangan et al., 2021). The dimension of brand equity in this study refers to overall quality and interest (Agarwal & Rao in Gil, 2007). High brand equity reflects positive consumer perceptions and leads to preferences and purchase intent (Civelek & Ertemel, 2019).

### **Consumer Attitudes**

Consumer attitudes are a thorough evaluation of the brand generated by brand awareness and brand image (Alam & Khan, 2019). Consumer attitudes in this study were measured through three components: cognitive (knowledge), affective (feeling/comfort), and conative (tendency to recommend) referring to Suryani (2008).

### **Purchase Intent**

Buying intent is the most influential behavior according to planned behavior theory and is used as a measure of predictive of actual purchasing activity (Civelek & Ertemel, 2019; Kim & Lee, 2023). Indicators of purchase intent include recognizing needs, seeking

information, evaluating alternatives, making decisions, and evaluating post-purchase (Kotler, 2009).

### Research Hypotheses

Based on a literature review and conceptual framework adapted from Alam & Khan (2019), the research hypothesis is formulated as follows:

- H1: Online promotion has a significant effect on brand equity.
- H2: Price has a significant effect on brand equity.
- H3: Marketing activities have a significant effect on brand equity.
- H4: Online promotions have a significant effect on consumer attitudes.
- H5: Price has a significant effect on consumer attitudes.
- H6: Marketing activities have a significant effect on consumer attitudes.
- H7: Online promotions have a significant effect on purchase intent.
- H8: Price has a significant effect on buying intent.
- H9: Marketing activities have a significant effect on purchase intent.
- H10: Buying intent has a significant effect on brand equity.
- H11: Purchase intention has a significant effect on consumer attitudes.

### METHOD

This study uses a descriptive quantitative method with questionnaire instruments. The object of the study was consumers from convection groups in Lamongan and Bojonegoro Regencies, including Tajir Convection, Arifin Convection, Seven Star Convection, and Albab Convection. Sample criteria: (1) have a Facebook account, (2) have made a purchase through social media, and (3) have made a purchase in the last 6 months. The sampling technique used is purposive sampling (non-probability). The determination of the number of samples using the Slovin formula with a population of 43 buyers and a margin of error of 10%, resulted in a sample of at least 30 respondents.

Variable measurements use a Likert scale of 1–5 (1=Strongly Agree to 5=Strongly Agree). The study variables consisted of: online promotion (X1, 3 indicators), price (X2, 3 indicators), marketing activities (X3, 3 indicators), purchase intention/Z (5 indicators), brand equity (Y1, 2 indicators), and consumer attitude (Y2, 3 indicators). Data were analyzed using Partial Least Square Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) with SmartPLS version 3, which included evaluation of the outer model (validity and reliability) and the inner model (R-square and hypothesis testing through bootstrapping).

### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

#### Respondent Profile

Of the 30 respondents, the gender composition was balanced, namely 50% men and 50% women. All respondents were aged 20-30 years old (100%), and all had booked convection at least once. This profile reflects active young consumers who are familiar with social media as a shopping platform.

**Validity and Reliability Test (Outer Model)**

The convergent validity test showed that the entire outer loading was  $> 0.7$  and the AVE value was  $> 0.5$  for all variables, so it was declared valid. The results of the reliability test are presented in Table 1.

**Table 1.** Construct Reliability and Validity Test Results

| Variable                  | Cronbach's Alpha | Composite Reliability | AVE   | Remarks  |
|---------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|-------|----------|
| Online Promotions (X1)    | 0,705            | 0,835                 | 0,629 | Reliable |
| Price (X2)                | 0,916            | 0,947                 | 0,856 | Reliable |
| Marketing Activities (X3) | 0,864            | 0,917                 | 0,787 | Reliable |
| Brand Equity (Y1)         | 0,932            | 0,967                 | 0,937 | Reliable |
| Consumer Attitudes (Y2)   | 0,873            | 0,922                 | 0,798 | Reliable |
| Buy Intent (Z)            | 0,958            | 0,968                 | 0,858 | Reliable |

Source: SmartPLS 3 (2024) processed data

Cronbach's Alpha values  $> 0.7$  and Composite Reliability  $> 0.7$  so that all variables are declared reliable. The discriminant validity test through cross loading showed that each indicator had the highest loading value in its respective construct.

**Structural Model Test (Inner Model)**

The results of the R-Square test (Table 2) show a strong predictive ability of the model. The  $R^2$  value of brand equity (Y1) is 0.892 (adjusted 0.874), consumer attitude (Y2) is 0.953 (adjusted 0.945), and buying intention (Z) is 0.928 (adjusted 0.919). All of these values are in the strong category ( $> 0.67$ ) according to Ghozali's criteria.

**Table 2.** R-Square Test Results

| Variable                | R Square | R Square Adjusted |
|-------------------------|----------|-------------------|
| Brand Equity (Y1)       | 0,892    | 0,874             |
| Consumer Attitudes (Y2) | 0,953    | 0,945             |
| Buy Intent (Z)          | 0,928    | 0,919             |

Source: SmartPLS 3 (2024) processed data

**Hypothesis Testing**

The results of testing the path coefficient hypothesis through bootstrapping are presented in Table 3, and the specific indirect effect in Table 4.

**Table 3.** Direct Influence Hypothesis Test Results

| Pathway                                                     | $\beta$ (O) | T-Stat | P-Value | T-Table | Verdict     |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|--------|---------|---------|-------------|
| Online Promotion (X1) $\rightarrow$ Brand Equity (Y1)       | -0,215      | 1,281  | 0,201   | 2,064   | H1 Rejected |
| Price (X2) $\rightarrow$ Brand Equity (Y1)                  | -0,019      | 0,099  | 0,921   | 2,064   | H2 Rejected |
| Marketing Activities (X3) $\rightarrow$ Brand Equity (Y1)   | 0,481       | 2,310  | 0,021*  | 2,064   | H3 Accepted |
| Online Promotion (X1) $\rightarrow$ Consumer Attitudes (Y2) | -0,092      | 0,942  | 0,347   | 2,064   | H4 Rejected |

| Pathway                                             | $\beta$ (O) | T-Stat | P-Value | T-Table | Verdict      |
|-----------------------------------------------------|-------------|--------|---------|---------|--------------|
| Price (X2) → Consumer Attitudes (Y2)                | 0,302       | 1,795  | 0,073   | 2,064   | H5 Rejected  |
| Marketing Activities (X3) → Consumer Attitudes (Y2) | 0,424       | 4,328  | 0,000*  | 2,064   | H6 Accepted  |
| Online Promotion (X1) → Purchase Intent (Z)         | 0,076       | 0,605  | 0,545   | 2,064   | H7 Rejected  |
| Price (X2) → Purchase Intent (Z)                    | 0,564       | 3,737  | 0,000*  | 2,064   | H8 Accepted  |
| Marketing Activities (X3) → Purchase Intent (Z)     | 0,365       | 2,298  | 0,022*  | 2,064   | H9 Accepted  |
| Buy Intent (Z) → Brand Equity (Y1)                  | 0,694       | 2,370  | 0,018*  | 2,064   | H10 Accepted |
| Buying Intent (Z) → Consumer Attitude (Y2)          | 0,369       | 2,070  | 0,039*  | 2,064   | H11 Accepted |

\*significant at  $p < 0.05$  | Source: SmartPLS 3 (2024) processed data

**Table 4.** Specific Indirect Effect Test Results

| Mediation Pathway                | $\beta$ (O) | T-Stat | P-Value | Types of Mediation |
|----------------------------------|-------------|--------|---------|--------------------|
| X1 → Z → Brand Equity (Y1)       | 0,052       | 0,513  | 0,608   | Non-Mediation      |
| X2 → Z → Brand Equity (Y1)       | 0,391       | 2,070  | 0,039*  | Full Mediation     |
| X3 → Z → Brand Equity (Y1)       | 0,253       | 1,708  | 0,088   | Non-Mediation      |
| X1 → Z → Consumer Attitudes (Y2) | 0,028       | 0,529  | 0,597   | Non-Mediation      |
| X2 → Z → Consumer Attitudes (Y2) | 0,208       | 1,993  | 0,047*  | Full Mediation     |
| X3 → Z → Consumer Attitudes (Y2) | 0,135       | 1,255  | 0,210   | Non-Mediation      |

\*significant at  $p < 0.05$  | Source: SmartPLS 3 (2024) processed data

## Discussion

### Online Promotion of Brand Equity, Consumer Attitudes, and Purchase Intent (H1, H4, H7 Rejected)

Online promotion had no significant effect on brand equity ( $p=0.201$ ), consumer attitudes ( $p=0.347$ ), and purchase intent ( $p=0.545$ ). This finding is different from Destiana (2022) who found a significant influence of online promotion on brand equity. This may be due to online promotional content that is not informative and attractive enough for convection group consumers, or the frequency and consistency of promotions that are not optimal. Consumers may be more influenced by the first-hand experience than the promotional content on social media.

### Price to Brand Equity and Consumer Attitudes (H2, H5 Declined); Price to Purchase Intent (H8 Accepted)

Price did not have a significant effect on brand equity ( $p=0.921$ ) or consumer attitudes ( $p=0.073$ ), but had a significant effect on purchase intent ( $p=0.000$ ;  $\beta=0.564$ ). This suggests that competitive price perceptions—including affordability and elasticity—directly drive

purchase intent, but are not enough to independently shape brand equity. Consumers value price as a factor that triggers purchase intent, but other factors such as brand quality and experience determine brand equity and overall attitude. These findings are in line with Gunarsih et al. (2021).

#### **Marketing Activities on Brand Equity, Consumer Attitudes, and Purchase Intent (H3, H6, H9 Accepted)**

Marketing activities had a significant effect on brand equity ( $\beta=0.481$ ;  $p=0.021$ ), consumer attitudes ( $\beta=0.424$ ;  $p=0.000$ ), and purchase intent ( $\beta=0.365$ ;  $p=0.022$ ). Integrated marketing activities—including advertising, public relations, and online and offline activities—proved to be the most consistent variable in influencing all three outcomes. These findings are consistent with Bilgin (2018) and Putra & Hadya (2021) who affirm the significant role of social media marketing activities on brand equity.

#### **Buying Intent to Brand Equity and Consumer Attitudes (H10, H11 Accepted)**

Purchase intent has a significant effect on brand equity ( $\beta=0.694$ ;  $p=0.018$ ) and consumer attitudes ( $\beta=0.369$ ;  $p=0.039$ ). This confirms that consumers who have high purchase intent tend to evaluate brands positively and form favorable attitudes. Purchase intent in this context is not only marketing output, but also strengthens brand perception through consumer cognitive and affective processes. These findings are in line with Bayu et al. (2019) and Indriyani et al. (2021).

#### **The Role of Buying Intention Mediation (Full Mediation Price $\rightarrow$ Y)**

The results of the mediation test showed that the purchase intention mediated the full mediation of the influence of price on brand equity ( $p=0.039$ ) and on consumer attitudes ( $p=0.047$ ). This means that price can only affect brand equity and consumer attitudes indirectly through the formation of purchase intent first. Meanwhile, online marketing and promotion activities were not proven to be mediated by buying intent in influencing both dependent variables (non-mediation). The practical implication is that convection groups need to design pricing strategies that effectively drive buying intent, which in turn will increase brand equity and improve consumer attitudes.

### **CONCLUSION**

The study concluded that out of the eleven hypotheses tested, five hypotheses were accepted and six were rejected. Specifically: (1) Online promotions do not have a significant effect on brand equity, consumer attitudes, or purchase intentions; (2) Price has a significant effect only on purchase intention, but not directly on brand equity and consumer attitude; (3) Marketing activities have a significant effect on brand equity, consumer attitudes, and purchase intentions; (4) Purchase intent has a significant effect on brand equity and consumer attitudes; (5) Purchase intent mediates the full influence of price on brand equity and consumer attitudes. The R-Square value of all endogenous variables is in the strong category ( $> 0.87$ ).

The implications of this study for the convection group are: first, optimizing integrated marketing activities (online and offline) because they are proven to be the most influential;

second, setting competitive prices to encourage purchase intent which will further build brand equity; Third, increase the creativity and consistency of online promotional content to more effectively influence consumer perception. Further research is suggested using a larger sample and exploring other social media platforms besides Facebook.

## REFERENCES

- Alam, M. S., & Khan, B. M. (2019). The role of social media communication in brand equity creation: An empirical study. *Advances in Global Business Research*, 11(1), 270.
- Bilgin, Y. (2018). The effect of social media marketing activities on brand awareness, brand image and brand loyalty. *Business and Management Studies*, 6(1), 128–148.
- Bayu, D. P., Bagus, I., & Sulistyawati, E. (2019). The influence of brand equity on consumer purchase intentions is mediated by brand preference. Udayana University.
- Civelek, M. E., & Ertemel, A. V. (2019). The role of brand equity and perceived value for stimulating purchase intention in B2C e-commerce web sites. *Business and Economics Research Journal*, 10(1), 233–243.
- Destiana, F. (2022). The influence of social media marketing on brand equity with online experiential as a mediating variable. *Target: Journal of Management and Business*, 4(2), 149–162.
- Gunarsih, C. M., Kalangi, J. A., & Tamengkel, L. F. (2021). The effect of price on consumer purchase decisions at Toko Pelita Jaya Buyungon Amurang. *Productivity*, 2(1), 69–72.
- Herdiyani, S., Barkah, C. S., Auliana, L., & Sukoco, I. (2022). The role of social media in developing a business: Literature review. *Journal of Business Administration*, 18(2), 103–121.
- Indriyani, R. M., Susanto, S., & Ningrum, N. K. (2021). The influence of attitudes on product purchase intentions is mediated by environmental knowledge and environmental concern. Udayana University.
- Kim, N., & Lee, K. (2023). Environmental consciousness, purchase intention, and actual purchase behavior of eco-friendly products. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 20(7), 5312.
- Kinski, N., Sari, R. L., & Ruslan, D. (2023). The influence of promotion on consumer behavior in purchasing decisions in e-commerce. *Scientific Journal of Educational Vehicles*, 2023(13), 435–443.
- Pandiangan, K., Masiyono, M., & Dwi Atmogo, Y. (2021). Factors that affect brand equity. *Journal of Applied Management Sciences*, 2(4), 471–484.
- Putra, J. P., & Hadya, R. (2021). The influence of marketing mix and brand equity on consumer decisions in buying coffee at Padang brewed coffee cafes. *Journal of Parenting*, 2(3), 459–472.
- Sadek, H., Elwy, S., & Eldallal, M. (2018). The impact of social media brand communication on consumer-based brand equity dimensions through Facebook in fast moving consumer goods. *Journal of Business and Retail Management Research*, 12(2).

- Suwarsih, N., Gunawan, T., & Istiharini, I. (2021). The influence of social media on brand image and purchase intent. *Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting (COSTING)*, 4(2), 712–730.
- Wijaya, E. (2020). The influence of social media communication on Nike's brand equity and purchase intent. *Atmajaya University Yogyakarta*.
- Yaseen, S., & Mazahir, I. (2019). Impact of corporate credibility, brand awareness, brand image and brand loyalty on purchase intention in the telecommunication sector of Karachi. *Global Management Journal for Academic & Corporate Studies*, 9(1).