

THE INFLUENCE OF PRODUCT QUALITY, CONTENT MARKETING, ELECTRONIC WORD OF MOUTH ON BRAND TRUST AND PURCHASE DECISION FOR SKIN1004 SKINCARE PRODUCTS

1st Wahida¹, 2nd Finnah Fourqoniah²
{wahidakhairun07@gmail.com¹, fourqoniah@fisip.unmul.ac.id²}

Business Administration Departement, Faculty of Sosial and Political Sciences, Mulawarman University^{1,2}

Abstract. This research examines how product quality, content marketing, and electronic word of mouth affect brand trust and Skin1004 skincare product purchases in Indonesia. The quantitative technique included a questionnaire for 100 responses. Purposive sampling and SmartPLS 4.0 with PLS-SEM are utilized for data analysis. The research found that product quality positively affects brand trust but not purchase choices. Content marketing favorably affects purchase choices and brand trust but not significantly. However, electronic word-of-mouth boosts brand trust and buying choices. Brand trust affects purchases somewhat but not significantly. Brand trust cannot moderate the impact of product quality, content marketing, and electronic word of mouth on purchase choices.

Keywords: product quality; content marketing; electronic word of mouth; brand trust; purchase decision

INTRODUCTION

Changes in people's lifestyles now show a significant shift, especially in terms of self-care. The concept of self-care is no longer considered a luxury, but has become an important part of maintaining physical and emotional health (Covarrubias et al., 2024). One tangible example of this trend is the growing interest in skincare. The skincare sector is expanding quickly, marked by the large number of local as well as international products being marketed through e-commerce. According to Statista data cited by Fitriarningsih et al., (2025), the beauty and personal care industry in Indonesia is estimated to reach 142 trillion rupiah in 2024, with an annual growth rate of 4.02%. This indicates that skincare is no longer just a trend but has become a primary need for society.

The rapid growth of the skincare industry, driven by increasing public awareness of self-care, has also created new challenges for businesses. While the wide range of products available gives consumers more choice, it has also led to increasingly fierce competition among skincare brands, both local and international. One skincare product that is now well-liked by Indonesians is Skin1004 (Setyanie et al., 2025). This skincare brand is known for its high quality and natural ingredients, such as Centella Asiatica, which attract consumers from various skin types (Arifah et al., 2025). Skin1004 designs its products to suit various skin types, from dry, oily, to sensitive skin, and is formulated to help overcome problems such as acne and hyperpigmentation. However, even though Skin1004 is currently popular in Indonesia, this brand still faces challenges amid fierce competition with various other Korean skincare products. Consumers are often faced with numerous options, so purchasing decisions can be influenced by factors such as product quality, marketing strategies through content, and reviews from other users on social media. The problem of counterfeit items on marketplaces has also made buyers examine brand credibility before buying.

Puspita & Rahmawan, (2021) discovered that product quality positively and significantly influenced Garnier product purchases. Syamsidar et al., (2024) found that content marketing significantly influenced MS Glow product purchases. Electronic word of mouth favorably and considerably influences Alzena skincare product purchases, according to (Setiyadi et al., 2022). In addition, (Gunawan & Pertiwi, 2022) found that brand trust positively and significantly affects Safi skincare product purchases. On the other hand, there are differences in the results found by Supriyadi et al., (2017) where purchase decision unaffected by product quality. Then, research by Amin & Yanti,

(2021) found that purchase decision unaffected by electronic word of mouth for Nature Republic products. Furthermore, another study conducted by Satiawan et al., (2023) also shows different results, where purchase decision unaffected by content marketing. The gap between previous studies has prompted researchers to review the relationship between variables.

Beyond past research, this study integrates brand trust, content marketing, product quality, and electronic word of mouth to impact Skin1004 sales. Brand trust affects product quality, content marketing, electronic word-of-mouth, and Skin1004 skincare product sales. Innovatively, this research tests the direct relationship between Skin1004 product quality and purchasing choices. Until far, several studies have only looked at the direct correlation between electronic word-of-mouth and content marketing in relation to Skin1004 product purchases. In addition, the price variable is added as a control variable to test its relationship with purchasing decisions. Although studying this variable will shed further light on how much price influences customer purchase decisions, it is not part of the main hypothesis. Therefore, this study will offer a fresh viewpoint on the variables that may affect customers' decisions to purchase skincare products, particularly Skin1004.

This research examines how product quality, content marketing, and electronic word of mouth affect brand trust and Skin1004 skincare product purchases in Indonesia. Using this procedure, it is anticipated that the study will contribute knowledge and references in the field of marketing and offer useful advantages, particularly for companies operating in the skincare sector and for the Skin1004 brand in creating more successful marketing plans.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study employed a quantitative methodology, collecting data by distributing questionnaires to one hundred participants. Using the purposive sample approach, a non-probability sampling methodology, respondents were chosen according to specific standards pertinent to the study's goals. PLS-SEM method was then used to handle and analyze the acquired data using SmartPLS 4.0 software. This investigation comprised multiple testing phases, including examining the exterior and inner models as well as the instruments' reliability and validity.

RESULT AND ANALYSIS

1.1 Convergent Validity

An indicator is considered to have good convergent validity if its loading factor is greater than 0.70, while an adequate AVE value must be at least 0.50 (Hair et al., 2019).

Table 1. Outer Loading

	Product Quality	Content Marketing	Electronic Word Of Mouth	Purchase Decision	Brand Trust	Price
X1.1.1	0.823					
X1.1.2	0.779					
X1.2.1	0.829					
X1.2.2	0.726					
X1.3.1	0.842					
X1.3.2	0.846					
X1.4.1	0.732					

X1.4.2	0.781					
X1.5.1	0.776					
X1.5.2	0.800					
X1.6.1	0.791					
X1.7.1	0.797					
X1.7.2	0.786					
X2.1.1		0.816				
X2.1.2		0.710				
X2.2.1		0.744				
X2.2.2		0.791				
X2.2.3		0.762				
X2.3.1		0.807				
X2.3.2		0.724				
X2.3.3		0.776				
X2.4.1		0.802				
X2.4.2		0.818				
X2.5.1		0.827				
X2.5.2		0.843				
X2.5.3		0.787				
X3.1.1			0.871			
X3.1.2			0.853			
X3.2.1			0.837			
X3.2.2			0.878			
X3.3.1			0.737			
X3.3.2			0.850			
Y.1.1				0.808		
Y.1.2				0.797		
Y.2.1				0.834		
Y.2.2				0.824		
Y.3.1				0.860		
Y.3.2				0.817		
Y.3.3				0.867		
Y.4.1				0.757		
Y.4.2				0.819		
Z.1.1					0.857	
Z.1.2					0.811	

Z.2.1					0.811	
Z.2.2					0.762	
Z.3.1					0.821	
Z.3.2					0.822	
Z.4.1					0.773	
Z.4.2					0.832	
Z.5.1					0.833	
Z.5.2					0.886	
Z.5.3					0.833	
C.1.1						0.811
C.1.2						0.794
C.2.1						0.805
C.2.2						0.838
C.3.1						0.842
C.3.2						0.878
C.4.1						0.790
C.4.2						0.796

Source: Data processed using Smart PLS 4.0, 2025

Table 2. Construct Reliability and Validity

	<i>Cronbach's Alpha</i>	<i>Average Variance Extracted (AVE)</i>
Product Quality	0.951	0.630
Content Marketing	0.948	0.618
Electronic Word Of Mouth	0.915	0.704
Purchase Decision	0.939	0.674
Brand Trust	0.952	0.677
Price	0.930	0.672

Source: Data processed using Smart PLS 4.0, 2025

Six constructs are covered in this study, each containing three, four, five, and seven indicators on a 1–5 scale. All indicators in the constructs of product quality (X1), content marketing (X2), electronic word-of-mouth (X3), brand trust (Z), purchase decision (Y), and price (C) exhibit factor loading values over 0.70, according to the test results displayed in the above table. Furthermore, each construct's AVE value was found to be greater than 0.50. Consequently, it can be said that every construct utilized in this investigation satisfies the criterion for convergent validity.

1.2 Discriminant Validity

Based opinion by (Hair et al., 2019), cross loading values were used in the testing; if an indicator's loading value is larger in the targeted construct than in other constructs, it is considered to have strong discriminant validity.

Table 3. Cross Loading

	Product Quality	Content Marketing	Electronic Word Of Mouth	Purchase Decision	Brand Trust	Price
X1.1.1	0.823	0.686	0.637	0.654	0.757	0.626
X1.1.2	0.779	0.686	0.612	0.675	0.681	0.656
X1.2.1	0.829	0.698	0.575	0.664	0.724	0.651
X1.2.2	0.726	0.672	0.550	0.672	0.659	0.632
X1.3.1	0.842	0.719	0.718	0.735	0.777	0.706
X1.3.2	0.846	0.747	0.681	0.760	0.775	0.678
X1.4.1	0.732	0.616	0.578	0.561	0.621	0.551
X1.4.2	0.781	0.610	0.583	0.604	0.650	0.535
X1.5.1	0.776	0.695	0.609	0.673	0.709	0.641
X1.5.2	0.800	0.714	0.611	0.658	0.709	0.714
X1.6.1	0.791	0.731	0.621	0.681	0.657	0.568
X1.7.1	0.797	0.719	0.609	0.647	0.689	0.634
X1.7.2	0.786	0.712	0.630	0.680	0.655	0.573
X2.1.1	0.721	0.816	0.668	0.664	0.663	0.677
X2.1.2	0.552	0.710	0.460	0.550	0.508	0.518
X2.2.1	0.663	0.744	0.691	0.655	0.662	0.581
X2.2.2	0.729	0.791	0.693	0.701	0.682	0.653
X2.2.3	0.689	0.762	0.705	0.668	0.721	0.596
X2.3.1	0.672	0.807	0.585	0.629	0.621	0.541
X2.3.2	0.656	0.724	0.556	0.531	0.558	0.450
X2.3.3	0.619	0.776	0.548	0.586	0.579	0.592
X2.4.1	0.724	0.802	0.664	0.697	0.700	0.607
X2.4.2	0.711	0.818	0.714	0.686	0.744	0.610
X2.5.1	0.744	0.827	0.716	0.697	0.700	0.600
X2.5.2	0.752	0.843	0.698	0.659	0.704	0.637
X2.5.3	0.664	0.787	0.611	0.653	0.639	0.685
X3.1.1	0.609	0.628	0.871	0.663	0.683	0.536
X3.1.2	0.671	0.702	0.853	0.699	0.664	0.643
X3.2.1	0.675	0.682	0.837	0.692	0.637	0.528
X3.2.2	0.686	0.694	0.878	0.741	0.703	0.645
X3.3.1	0.638	0.735	0.737	0.661	0.622	0.573
X3.3.2	0.636	0.686	0.850	0.638	0.661	0.544
Y.1.1	0.725	0.670	0.703	0.808	0.683	0.646
Y.1.2	0.650	0.635	0.654	0.797	0.659	0.617

Y.2.1	0.666	0.666	0.663	0.834	0.686	0.654
Y.2.2	0.705	0.672	0.677	0.824	0.713	0.738
Y.3.1	0.718	0.724	0.712	0.860	0.711	0.693
Y.3.2	0.711	0.696	0.659	0.817	0.684	0.732
Y.3.3	0.748	0.679	0.706	0.867	0.715	0.685
Y.4.1	0.575	0.591	0.550	0.757	0.577	0.528
Y.4.2	0.706	0.741	0.681	0.819	0.703	0.659
Z.1.1	0.756	0.734	0.673	0.694	0.857	0.723
Z.1.2	0.719	0.684	0.629	0.641	0.811	0.647
Z.2.1	0.721	0.668	0.611	0.700	0.811	0.698
Z.2.2	0.646	0.592	0.558	0.620	0.762	0.612
Z.3.1	0.763	0.707	0.671	0.723	0.821	0.708
Z.3.2	0.716	0.656	0.635	0.704	0.822	0.677
Z.4.1	0.668	0.654	0.667	0.649	0.773	0.645
Z.4.2	0.739	0.711	0.670	0.670	0.832	0.707
Z.5.1	0.689	0.694	0.647	0.627	0.833	0.639
Z.5.2	0.818	0.792	0.745	0.767	0.886	0.776
Z.5.3	0.717	0.654	0.625	0.716	0.833	0.693
C.1.1	0.638	0.635	0.526	0.642	0.684	0.811
C.1.2	0.592	0.573	0.530	0.590	0.592	0.794
C.2.1	0.662	0.652	0.589	0.664	0.666	0.805
C.2.2	0.672	0.625	0.615	0.677	0.717	0.838
C.3.1	0.680	0.621	0.548	0.723	0.731	0.842
C.3.2	0.707	0.675	0.602	0.764	0.767	0.878
C.4.1	0.611	0.609	0.503	0.577	0.635	0.790
C.4.2	0.630	0.600	0.610	0.640	0.652	0.796

Source: Data processed using Smart PLS 4.0, 2025

Each indication has a higher value on the construct that should be measured than on other constructs, as can be seen from the above table. These data demonstrate that all indicators meet discriminant validity standards.

1.3 Reliability

Table 4. Construct Reliability and Validity

	<i>Cronbach's Alpha</i>	<i>Composite Reliability</i>	<i>Composite Reliability</i>
Product Quality	0.951	0.952	0.957
Content Marketing	0.948	0.950	0.954
Electronic Word Of Mouth	0.915	0.916	0.934
Purchase Decision	0.939	0.941	0.949

Brand Trust	0.952	0.953	0.958
Price	0.930	0.934	0.942

Source: Data processed using Smart PLS 4.0, 2025

The table shows every build with a Composite Reliability rating over 0.70. Therefore, it can be said that all of the study's variables have a high degree of reliability.

1.4 R-Square (R^2)

R^2 values of 0.25 are low, 0.50 are moderate or decent, and 0.75 are high or considerable (Hair et al., 2019).

Table 5. R-Square

	R-Square
Purchase Decision	0.811
Brand Trust	0.808

Source: Data processed using Smart PLS 4.0, 2025

The table shows Y, the purchase decision variable, has an R^2 value of 0.811. This implies that product quality (X1), content marketing (X2), electronic word-of-mouth (X3), brand trust (Z), and pricing (C) explain 81.1% of purchase decision variability. Meanwhile, 18.9% are affected by elements not included by this study methodology. Thus, this R^2 score indicates significant explanation. Product quality (X1), content marketing (X2), electronic word-of-mouth (X3), and purchase choices (Y) account for 80.8% of brand trust (Z) variability, according to the R^2 value of 0.808. However, additional elements not included in this research have an impact on the remaining 19.2%. Consequently, a high or significant level of explanation is indicated by this R^2 score.

1.5 Predictive Relevance (Q^2)

Formula for predicting relevance value (Q^2): $Q^2 = 1 - (1 - R1) \times (1 - R2) = 0.963712$

Description :

Q^2 : Predictive Relevance Value

R1: The Purchase Decision variable's R Value Square

R2: The Brand Trust variable's R-Square value

With a Q^2 value of 0.963712, the model is predictively relevant. According to the computation findings, the Q^2 value is 0.963712, meaning that the structural model accounts for 96.37% of the data variation, with the remaining 3.63% additional elements not included in this research. It can be inferred that this model has substantial predictive relevance because the Q^2 value is near to one and greater than zero.

1.6 Hypothesis Testing

A 5% significance threshold (0.05) was used to compare the t-statistic value to the t-table value of 1.96. If the t-statistic is greater than 1.96, the external variable may impact the endogenous variable.

Table 6. Path Coefficient

	Original sample (O)	Sample mean (M)	Standard deviation (STDEV)	T statistics (O/STDEV)	P values	Description
Product Quality -> Brand Trust	0.583	0.576	0.109	5.338	0.000	Accepted

Content Marketing -> Brand Trust	0.155	0.161	0.109	1.423	0.077	Rejected
Electronic Word Of Mouth -> Brand Trust	0.209	0.207	0.095	2.207	0.014	Accepted
Product Quality -> Purchase Decision	0.244	0.249	0.159	1.532	0.063	Rejected
Content Marketing -> Purchase Decision	0.095	0.085	0.118	0.800	0.212	Rejected
Electronic Word Of Mouth -> Purchase Decision	0.302	0.292	0.127	2.372	0.009	Accepted
Brand Trust -> Purchase Decision	0.067	0.072	0.125	0.536	0.296	Rejected
Harga -> Purchase Decision	0.279	0.288	0.089	3.127	0.001	Accepted

Source: Data processed using Smart PLS 4.0, 2025

Having a significance level of 0.000, the data in the following table demonstrate that product quality significantly and favorably affects brand trust. Additionally, having a significance level of 0.063 ($P > 0.05$), product quality influences decisions to buy in a favorable but insignificant. Purchase decisions and brand trust are positively but insignificant impacted by content marketing, with significance values of 0.212 and 0.077. Despite its significance level of 0.014, electronic word-of-mouth boosts brand trust. Electronic word of mouth influences purchase choices positively, with a significance level of 0.009. A positive but minor effect of brand trust on purchase choices is 0.296 ($P > 0.05$). Price positively and significantly affects purchase choices ($p < 0.001$).

Table 7. Specific Indirect Effects

	Original sample (O)	Sample mean (M)	Standard deviation (STDEV)	T statistics (O/STDEV)	P values	Description
Product Quality -> Brand Trust -> Purchase Decision	0.039	0.043	0.075	0.521	0.301	Rejected
Content Marketing -> Brand Trust -> Purchase Decision	0.010	0.014	0.027	0.389	0.349	Rejected

Electronic Word Of Mouth -> Brand Trust -> Purchase Decision	0.014	0.012	0.028	0.501	0.308	Rejected
--	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	----------

Source: Data processed using Smart PLS 4.0, 2025

The table shows that brand trust cannot mediate product quality and purchasing choices with a significant value of 0.301 ($P > 0.05$). Brand trust does not moderate the association between content marketing and purchase choices ($P > 0.05$) or electronic word of mouth and purchase decisions ($P > 0.05$).

The Effect Of Product Quality On Brand Trust

Hypothesis testing reveals product quality boosts brand trust. People trust Skin1004 more when its products improve. This study supports Bangkit et al., (2025) findings that product quality affects brand trust.

The Effect Of Content Marketing On Brand Trust

According to the hypothesis test results, brand trust is positively but insignificant impacted by content marketing. This demonstrates that while Skin1004's content marketing approach generally has a favorable impact, it is insufficient to boost customer confidence in the company. According to study by Visentin et al., (2019), poorly managed content marketing can lower consumer trust. These findings are in line with that research.

The Effect Of Electronic Word Of Mouth On Brand Trust

Hypothesis test findings show that electronic word of mouth boosts brand trust. Thus, more positive digital media evaluations and ideas boost customer confidence in Skin1004. This study supports Putri et al., (2024) findings that electronic word of mouth affects brand trust.

The Effect Of Product Quality On Purchase Decision

Purchase decisions are positive but insignificant by product quality, according to the hypothesis testing results. This indicates that despite the high quality of Skin1004 items, this feature does not immediately influence customers to buy. This study supports Supriyadi et al., (2017), who discovered that product quality does not affect buying decisions.

The Effect Of Content Marketing On Purchase Decision

Content marketing influences favorable but negligible purchasing choices, according to hypothesis testing. This shows that Skin1004's enticing marketing content doesn't influence users to purchase the product. This study agrees with Satiawan et al., (2023), who found content marketing did not affect purchasing decisions.

The Influence Of Electronic Word Of Mouth On Purchase Decision

Electronic word-of-mouth positively and significantly affects buying decisions, according to the hypothesis test. This implies that user-generated suggestions and positive web site ratings may increase Skin1004 product interest. This study supports Apriliani & Setyawati, (2023), who discovered that electronic word of mouth affects buying decisions.

The Effect Of Brand Trust On Purchase Decision

Brand trust has a favorable but negligible effect on purchase decisions, based on the hypothesis test findings. This indicates that although the influence is in a favorable direction, brand trust is still not quite sufficient to persuade customers to buy Skin1004 items right away. The findings of this study are consistent with research by Khotimah, (2025), which demonstrates that brand trust has no discernible impact on purchasing decisions.

The Effect Of Product Quality On Purchase Decision Through Brand Trust

The hypothesis test showed that brand trust cannot moderate product quality-purchase choice relationships. This suggests that brand trust does not yet strongly influence customer purchases of Skin1004 goods based on product quality. This study supports Gunawan & Pertiwi, (2022) findings that brand trust does not affect product quality or buying choices.

The Effect Of Content Marketing On Purchase Decision Through Brand Trust

The relationship between content marketing and purchase decisions cannot be mediated by brand trust, according to the hypothesis test results. This suggests that consumer decisions to buy Skin1004 products and content marketing are not yet strongly mediated by brand trust. These findings concur with a research conducted by Saputra & Padmantyo, (2025), that found no discernible impact of content marketing on brand trust-mediated purchase decisions.

The Influence Of Electronic Word Of Mouth On Purchase Decision Through Brand Trust

Hypothesis test results reveal brand trust does not influence electronic word-of-mouth or purchase preference. This suggests that brand trust does not currently influence Skin1004 product purchases via electronic word-of-mouth. Komarudin et al., (2025) found no link between brand trust-mediated electronic word-of-mouth and purchases.

The Effect Of Price On Purchase Decision

The hypothesis test's findings indicated that purchase decision positive and significant effected by price. This indicates that customers are more inclined to buy Skin1004 products when the price of the product more closely reflects their opinion of its value. Price influences consumers' decisions to buy, even though it is merely a control variable in this study. The results of this investigation align with those of a study conducted by Firjatullah et al., (2023), which found that purchase decision effected by price.

CONCLUSION

1. Brand trust is positively and significantly impacted by product quality in Skin1004 skincare products.
2. Brand trust is positively and insignificantly impacted by content marketing in Skin1004 skincare products.
3. Brand trust is positively and significantly impacted by electronic word of mouth in Skin1004 skincare products.
4. Purchase decision is positive but insignificant impacted by product quality in Skin1004 skincare products.
5. Purchase decision is positive but insignificant impacted by content marketing in Skin1004 skincare products.
6. Purchase decision is positive and significant impacted by electronic word of mouth in Skin1004 skincare products.
7. Purchase decision is positive but insignificant impacted by brand trust in Skin1004 skincare products.
8. Skin1004 skincare product quality does not significantly impact purchase decisions based on brand trust.
9. Content marketing does not significantly impact Skin1004 skincare product purchases based on brand trust.
10. Electronic word-of-mouth does not significantly impact Skin1004 skincare product purchases via brand trust.

References

- Amin, A. M., & Yanti, R. F. (2021). Pengaruh Brand Ambassador, E-WOM, Gaya Hidup, Country Of Origin dan Motivasi Terhadap Keputusan Pembelian Produk Skincare Korea Nature Republic. *INVEST : Jurnal Inovasi Bisnis Dan Akuntansi*, 2(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.55583/invest.v2i1.111>
- Apriliansi, H. N., & Setyawati, H. A. (2023). Pengaruh Electronic Word of Mouth, Brand Image, dan Brand Trust terhadap Keputusan Pembelian Produk Moisturizer Skintific. *Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa Manajemen, Bisnis Dan Akuntansi (JIMMBA)*, 5(3), 247–258. <https://doi.org/10.32639/jimmba.v5i3.448>
- Arifah, M., Dwihandoko, T. H., & Hartono, H. (2025). *PENGARUH CITRA MEREK, KUALITAS PRODUK, DAN HARGA TERHADAP KEPUTUSAN PEMBELIAN ULANG PRODUK SKINCARE SKIN1004 (SKIN CHEONSA)* [Universitas Islam Majapahit]. <http://repository.unim.ac.id/id/eprint/6305>
- Bangkit, H., Nursanti, A., Wildah, S. W., & Syamsuri, A. R. (2025). Pengaruh Kualitas Produk dan Electronic Word of Mouth (e-WOM) terhadap Keputusan Pembelian melalui Brand Trust pada Sneakers Merek VANS di Kota Pekanbaru The Influence of Product Quality and Electronic Word of Mouth on Purchase Decisions through Brand T. *BISNIS MAHASISWA*, 5. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.60036/jbm.733> Copyright
- Covarrubias, S., Molina, S., Javadi, E. K., & Lebares, C. C. (2024). *Understanding the Importance of Self-Care and Mental Health*. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-66011-5_25
- Firjatullah, T. S., Febrianti, L. V. N., Putri, S. N. P., Wainggai, D. H. M. L., & Nurcahyo, F. S. A. (2023). Pengaruh Harga Skincare Terhadap Keputusan Pembelian Secara Online Di Lingkungan Mahasiswi Universitas Negeri Surabaya. *Jurnal Pendidikan Tata Niaga (JPTN)*, 11(1), 36–42.
- Fitrianingsih, A., Bachri, S., Muzakir, & Farid. (2025). Pengaruh content marketing dan electronic word of mouth (E-WoM) terhadap purchase decision produk Skin1004 yang dimediasi oleh fear of missing out (FoMO) (studi kasus pada Gen Z di Kota Palu). *Entrepreneurship Bisnis Manajemen Akuntansi (E-BISMA)*, 6(1), 167–187. <https://doi.org/10.37631/ebisma.v6i1.1830>
- Gunawan, D., & Pertiwi, A. D. (2022). Pengaruh Label Halal, Electronic Word Of Mouth Dan Kualitas Produk Terhadap Keputusan Pembelian Skincare Safi Melalui Brand Image Dan Brand Trust. *Ilmiah Ekonomi Islam*, 8(01), 815–824. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.29040/jiei.v8i1.4508>
- Hair, J. F., Risher, J. J., Sarstedt, M., Ringle, C. M., Hair, J. F., Risher, J. J., Sarstedt, M., & Ringle, C. M. (2019). When to use and how to report the results of PLS-SEM. *European Business Review*, 3(1).
- Khotimah, N. S. H. (2025). Pengaruh Content Marketing, Customer Engagement Dan Brand Trust Terhadap Keputusan Pembelian Produk Kecantikan Merk Glad2Glow. *RIGGS: Journal of Artificial Intelligence and Digital Business*, 4(2), 4735–4741. <https://doi.org/10.31004/riggs.v4i2.1268>
- Komarudin, M., Kumala, D., & El Hasan, S. S. (2025). E-WOM dan Influencer Endorsement: Pengaruhnya terhadap Minat Beli Produk Travel Umrah dimediasi oleh Brand trust (Studi pada Niat Umroh Tour & Travel Bogor). *Riwayat: Educational Journal of History and Humanities*, 8(3), 2436–2447. <https://doi.org/10.24815/jr.v8i3.46926>
- Puspita, Y. D., & Rahmawan, G. (2021). Pengaruh Harga, Kualitas Produk dan Citra Merek terhadap Keputusan Pembelian Produk Garnier. *Jurnal Sinar Manajemen*, 8(2), 98–104. <https://doi.org/10.56338/jsm.v8i2.1644>
- Putri, S. A., Safitri, M., Yovita, L., & Oktavia, V. (2024). Pengaruh E-WOM terhadap Keputusan Pembelian Brand Uniqlo dengan Brand Image & Brand Trust sebagai Variabel Mediasi (Studi Kasus: Mahasiswa FEB Universitas Dian Nuswantoro Semarang). *Journal of Social Science Research*, 4(1), 5988–6003. <https://j-innovative.org/index.php/Innovative/article/view/8270>
- Saputra, A. S., & Padmantyo, S. (2025). THE INFLUENCE OF CONTENT MARKETING AND INFLUENCERS ON CONSUMER BUYING INTEREST MEDIATED BY BRAND TRUST.

MAJAPAHIT JOURNAL OF ISLAMIC FINANCE AND MANAGEMENT, 5(2), 1157–1179.
<https://doi.org/10.36563/bemj.v3i2.1350>

Satiawan, A., Hamid, R. S., & Maszudi, E. (2023). Pengaruh Content Marketing, Influencer Marketing, Online Customer Review Terhadap Keputusan Pembelian dan Kepuasan Konsumen Di Tiktok. *Jurnal Manajemen Dan Bisnis Indonesia*, 9(1), 1–14.
<https://doi.org/10.32528/jmbi.v9i1.238>

Setiyadi, I. N., Alamsyah, A. R., & Rachmawati, I. K. (2022). Pengaruh Kualitas Produk, Social Media Marketing, E-WOM, Dan Promosi Terhadap Keputusan Pembelian Konsumen Produk Skincare Alzena Di Kabupaten Pati. *Jurnal Manajemen*, 8(2), 122–136.
<http://www.maker.ac.id/index.php/maker>

Setyanie, D., Putra, C. I. W., & Fikri, A. W. N. (2025). Pengaruh Brand Image dan Kualitas Produk terhadap Loyalitas Pelanggan pada Skincare SKIN1004 melalui Kepuasan Pelanggan sebagai Variabel Intervening (Studi Kasus pada Mahasiswa FEB Universitas Bhayangkara Jakarta Raya). *Indonesia Economic Jurnal*, 1(2), 864–880. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.63822/6h23g242>

Supriyadi, S., Wiyani, W., & Nugraha, G. I. K. (2017). Pengaruh Kualitas Produk Dan Brand Image Terhadap Keputusan Pembelian. *Jurnal Bisnis Dan Manajemen*, 4(1), 74–85.
<https://doi.org/10.26905/jbm.v4i1.1714>

Syamsidar, S., Amin, A. M., Musa, I., Hasbiah, S., & Aswar, N. F. (2024). Pengaruh Content Marketing dan Online Customer Review pada TikTok Shop Terhadap Keputusan Pembelian Produk MS Glow. *Jurnal Penelitian Ekonomi Manajemen Dan Bisnis*, 3(4), 252–263.
<https://doi.org/10.55606/jekombis.v3i4.4381>

Visentin, M., Pizzi, G., & Pichierri, M. (2019). Fake News, Real Problems for Brands: The Impact of Content Truthfulness and Source Credibility on consumers' Behavioral Intentions toward the Advertised Brands. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 45, 99–112.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intmar.2018.09.001>