

Analysis of factors That Influence Buying Decisions in The Covid-19 Pandemi Era

Sarbullah¹, Yovita Mumpuni Hartarini², Tri Cahyadi³

College of Economics (STIE) Semarang

E-mail: sarbullah@gmail.com

Article History:

Received: 18 Desember 2022

Revised: 25 Desember 2022

Accepted: 25 Desember 2022

Keywords: Product quality, price, promotion, testimonials, purchase decision

Abstract: This study aims to determine Analysis of Factors That Influence Buying Decisions in The Covid-19 Pandemi Era (Case Study in Bear Brand Drinking Milk Beverage Products). This type of research was s quantitative correlation with a cross-sectional approach. Data collection techniques using questionnaires. The analysis technique used was multiple regression analysis. The independent variables were product quality, price, promotion, and testimonials and the dependent variable was buying decisions. Methods of data analysis using multiple linear regression with the SPSS 25.0 program. Based on the data analysis shows that: (1) It was found that the Product Quality variable (X1) in buying decisions (Y). It was known that the Sig value for the effect (X1) on (Y) was $0.211 > 0.05$ and the tcount value was $1.262 < t \text{ table } 2.000$, so it can be concluded that H1 was rejected which means there was no effect (X1) on (Y). (2) Price (X2) on buying decisions (Y) It was known that the Sig value for the effect (X2) on (Y) was $0.913 > 0.05$ and the tcount is $0.110 < t \text{ table } 2.000$, so it can be concluded that H1 was rejected which means there was no effect (X2) against (Y). (3) It was known that the Sig value for the effect (X3) on (Y) was $0.043 < 0.05$ and the tcount was $2.061 > t \text{ table } 2.000$, so it can be concluded that H1 was accepted which means there was an effect (X3) on (Y). (4) It was known that the Sig value for the effect (X4) on (Y) was $0.478 > 0.05$ and the tcount was $0.714 < t \text{ table } 2.000$, so it can be concluded that H1 was rejected which means there was no effect (X4) on (Y). Product quality was needed to increase consumer attractiveness. The importance of optimizing affordable prices to be able to compete in the trade market. Attractive promotions can lure customers to always use the same product. Testimonials in an interesting manner by conveying relevant.

INTRODUCTION

The surge in cases of Corona virus disease (COVID-19) in Indonesia has resurrected the phenomenon of panic buying in society. This was due to the community action that bought up one of the products from PT. Nestle Indonesia, namely Bear Brand milk or better known as bear milk. The Covid-19 pandemic has not completely caused a downturn in all industrial sectors. One of Nestle's mainstay products, Bear Brand, was currently on the rise among the public.

Many food observers say that amidst the large number of dairy products on the market there were very few buyers, but this has not happened with *Bear Brand milk beverage products*, now many people were looking for Bear Brand milk because it was believed to be able to provide health, especially during times of anxiety over exposure to the Covid-19 virus. so that it becomes a blessing for PT. Nestlé Indonesia. The virality of *Bear Brand* milk was more authentic, because it occurs spontaneously and triggers large purchases among the public. From this statement it can be concluded that social media and society were an inseparable unit. The media also plays an important role in providing information from various sources that were accurate and reliable. Realizing that the impact was very broad and reaches all levels of society, the media has positive and negative impacts.

There was various method which could conducted by company for create interest buy Public to product which offered. Wrong only one was learn and notice factors which affect it. Some consumers assume that a brand the most superior would occupy the first position in their minds. Even a number of consumer will To do purchase repeat to something product if the price of the product according to the quality offered. In To do purchase, consumer always notice factors which affect it, so that consumer interested for To do purchase. The buying decision process was influenced by various factors, among others factor the was price perception, quality product, promotion and testimony.

Research results by Sumara & Salim (2020) shows that the *brand trust variable* has a significant effect positive and significant to *customers satisfaction*. *Customers value* no effect to customers satisfaction. *Brands trust* no take effect in a manner direct to *repurchase intention*. *customers value* positive but not significant effect on repurchase intention. *customers satisfaction* take effect in a manner positive and significant to repurchase intention.

Kotler (2009) customer satisfaction was the goal and means of marketing for a customer-centered company, whereas according to Tjiptono (2015) customer satisfaction was a measure of an organization's total product performance compared to a set of customer requirements. The importance of measuring the influence of several factors on buying decisions has been carried out by various studies. The research results of Pastikarani & Astuti (2016) prove that product quality has a positive and significant effect on repurchase intention. Bahar & Sjahrudin (2015) proved that product quality has no positive and significant effect on repurchase intention. Research by Dianah & Welsa (2017) proves that product quality has a positive and significant effect on customer satisfaction, while Rahayu & Utami (2012), proves that product quality has no positive and significant effect on customer satisfaction.

Based on the background of this problem and several previous studies which showed that the results of research on these factors were inconsistent and varied, the authors were interested in conducting another study with the title "Analysis of Factors That Influence Buying Decisions in The Covid-19 Pandemi Era (Case Study in Bear Brand Drinking Milk Beverage Products)".

LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESIS FORMULATION

Buying decisions were thoughts where individuals evaluate various options and decide on

a choice of a product from many choices. This behavior appears as a response to an object that can indicate a consumer's desire to repurchase a product with an interest in repurchasing a product due to the satisfaction received by the consumer. According to Schiffman & Kanuk (2014) buying decisions were defined as a choice of more than two years of alternative choices. According to Peter & Olson (2000), which states that consumers make repeat purchases because there was information and encouragement to make purchases directly which can provide loyalty to what they feel was in accordance with what the consumer wants. According to Kotler (2012) consumer repurchase intention was a behavior where consumers have the desire to choose or buy a product, based on the consumer's experience in using, selecting and consuming or even wanting a product.

In the decision-making process, consumers choose which goals or behaviors to do to achieve these goals. Thus this can help solve the problem. Furthermore, it was explained that problem solving was a continuous flow of reciprocity between environmental factors, processes, and actions and behavior. The first stage was an understanding of the existence of a problem, and an evaluation of the existing alternatives and the most appropriate action chosen. In the next stage, the purchase was expressed in action, in the end the selected or designated item will be used and the consumer will re-evaluate the decision he has made. From this understanding, it can be concluded that buying decisions were a decision-making process that begins with the introduction of a problem, then evaluates it and decides on the product that best suits the needs and desires of consumers.

Consumer behavior was the basis for consumers to make buying decisions. This was the process and activity when a consumer deals with searching, selecting, purchasing, using and evaluating products and services to meet needs and wants.

According to the description of repurchase intention above, it can be concluded that buying decisions were stages of buying behavior tendencies by consumers on a product or service that was carried out repeatedly for a certain period of time and actively likes or has a positive attitude towards a product or service. which was based on personal experience that consumers have made in the past. Purchasing decision behavior for most products was just a routine activity in the sense that the needs that have been fulfilled will be satisfied through repurchasing the same product. If there was a price change (product, service, price), then the buyer will repeat the decision process again. Based on the several definitions mentioned above, it can be concluded that consumer behavior was all action activities, as well as psychological processes that encourage these actions before buying, using, spending products and services after evaluating activities.

Kotler (1996) divides the stages of the buying decision process into 5 stages which were divided into recognition of needs and problems, information search, evaluation, alternatives, purchase decisions, and post-purchase behavior. The stages in the purchase decision used in this study were the information search stage. The process of purchasing needs does not end with a purchase but continues until the buyer becomes a customer for consumers in using the product purchased. This experience will be taken into consideration for future buying decisions.

Kotler (2004) product quality was a product's ability to perform its functions. This ability includes reliability, durability, resulting accuracy, ease of repair and operation and other attributes that were valuable to the product as a whole. According to Kotler & Kellerr (2009) which states product quality as everything that can be offered to the market in order to attract attention, use, acquisition, or consumption that can satisfy wants and needs. According to Yamit (2013) product quality was a dynamic condition related to services, processes, products, people,

and also the environment that can meet and exceed expectations. The quality of a product does not only emphasize the aspects of the end result, such as products and services, but also concerns the quality of the process, human quality, and also the quality of the environment. Based on the definition above, it can be concluded that product quality was a product offered to consumers who have high quality selling points to be able to meet the needs and expectations of consumers and also be able to fulfill the goals of an organization.

The definition of price according to Kotler (2004) was the amount of money charged for a particular product. According to Swastha & Irawan (2005), "price was the amount of money (plus some goods) needed to get a number of combinations of goods and services". Price was the only marketing element that generates revenue while the other elements generate costs. Price was also one of the most flexible elements of marketing. Traditionally, price has been the main determinant of buyers' choices. According to McCarthy (1990), "Price was what was charged for something", which means, price was what we pay for something we get. Based on the definitions above, it can be concluded that price was the main tool for differentiating one product from another, which has a value or tariff charged as the main determinant of the buyer's choice.

(*sales promotion*) was the core of marketing campaigns which offer incentives to buy, consisting of a collection of incentive tools, mostly short term, designed to stimulate faster or greater purchase of certain products or services by consumers or trade according to Kotler & Keller (2009). According to Tjiptono (2015) promotion was a marketing element that focuses on efforts to inform, persuade, and remind consumers of the company's brand and products. According to Diyatma (2017), promotion was one of the elements in company marketing that was utilized to notify, persuade, and remind about the company's products. The main purpose of promotion was to modify consumer behavior, inform, influence and persuade and strengthen consumers about the company and the products or services it sells (Swastha & Irawan, 2005). The conclusion was that promotion was a way for companies to create awareness, share information, and influence buyers, either directly or indirectly, for goods or services produced in the hope that consumers will be interested and willing to buy the products offered.

Testimonials were records of customer or consumer expressions regarding products or services and services performed by online stores that were provided on web pages or social media. When viewed from the meaning of the word, testimony has several meanings, namely, a form of acknowledgment of a fact (testimony), a form of admiration (tribute), and a form of recommendation from one person to another. Still in the context of advertising, testimonials were contexts or ways of saying in delivery packaging. According to Abraham *et al.* (2014), testimonials were a way that marketers use to build customer trust. The information presented by a testimonial must be on the side of the crowd and not for personal gain.

Basically testimonials help consumers make decisions to use products or services because they get recommendations from third parties and will be more convincing if a customer who has used a product or service shares his experience.

Based on the description that has been put forward, the hypothesis formulated in this study is:

H₁: Quality product has a positive and significant to buying decisions *Bear Brands* drinking milk.

H₂: Price has a positive and significant effect on buying decisions *Bear Brand* drinking milk.

H₃: Promotion has a positive and significant effect on buying decisions *Bear Brand* drinking milk.

H₄ : Testimonials have a positive and significant effect on buying decisions *Bear Brand* drinking milk.

METODE PENELITIAN

Types of research

This type of research was quantitative correlation, namely research to determine relationships or influences based on numerical calculations (Sugiyono, 2016). The research approach uses *cross-sectional*, that is, the research was carried out only once during the research (Sugiyono, 2016).

Population, Sample, and Sampling Technique

The population was all consumers who bought Bear Brand dairy products at the Adabaru Salatiga supermarket in April 2021, totaling 190 buyers. The number of samples was 66 respondents. The sampling method in this study, namely by using accidental or incidental samples, was to determine a sample based on the needs of anyone who accidentally meets the researcher who can be used as a sample if it was deemed that the person met by chance was suitable as a data source (Sugiyono, 2016).

Research variable

The independent (independent) variables were product quality, price, promotion, and testimonials. The dependent variable (dependent) was the purchase decision.

Method of collecting data

This study uses primary data, namely data obtained by researchers directly or original data obtained directly from respondents by distributing research questionnaires.

Data analysis method

Methods of data analysis using multiple linear regression with the SPSS 25.0 program.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Result

Before testing multiple linear regression analysis of hypothesis study so researcher will To do requirements analysis which covers test normality, test multicollinearity, test hereroscedasticity as well as test autocorrection with the help of a computer SPSS 25 program *for windows*. And results test requirements analysis served as following:

Normality Test

The normality test aims to test whether this variable was in the regression bound and variable free both of them distributed normal or nope. Decision making with the One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov method, namely test if the probability was > 5%, then the variable was normally distributed. And results test normality can seen on table under this:

Table 1. Test Normality

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test		Unstandardized residual
N		66
Normal Parameters ^{a,b}	Means	.0000000
	std. Deviation	.93093131
Most Extreme Differences	absolute	.114

	Positive	052
	Negative	-.114
test Statistics		.114
asympt. Sig. (2-tailed)		.064 ^c

a. test distribution was Normal.

b. Calculated from data.

c. Lilliefors Significance Correction.

Source : Data primary processed year 202 1

From the results of the normality test table 1 from testing with the One-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test could concluded that Asymp. Sig.(2-tailed) shows a value above 5%, which means it was greater than Alpha ($0.64 > 0.05$), so that could concluded that data distributed in a manner normal.

Multicollinearity Test

Test multicollinearity aim for knowing was occur intercorrelation (connection which strong) between variable independent. Model regression which was good was characterized by no intercorrelation between independent variables and no occur symptom multicollinearity. For knowing there was nope multicollinearity in the regression model, it can be seen from the *tolerance value* and *variance inflation factor* (VIP) value. If the VIP value < 10 and *tolerance* > 0.10 then there was no multicollinearity between variables in the regression model. And result test multicollinearity could seen on table under this :

Table 2. Test Multicollinearity

Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
	B	std. Error	Betas			tolerance	VIF
(Constant)	9,514	3.136		3,034	0.004		
Quality product	0.002	0.098	0.002	0.016	0987	0967	1035
Price	-0.049	0.101	-0.065	-0.486	0.628	0.866	1.155
Promotion	0.172	0.107	0.213	1,606	0.113	0.878	1,139
Testimony	0.091	0.127	0.095	0.714	0.478	0.872	1.147

a. dependent Variables: Buying decisions

Data source primary processed year 202 1

The results of the multicollinearity test can be seen in the *coefficient s* table of score *tolerance* and VIPs so could was known that score VIPs < 10 and *tolerance* > 0.10 , it can be concluded that the regression model has no symptoms multicollinearity.

Test Heteroscedasticity

Test Heteroscedasticity with Test Glejser aim for test was in model regression occur inequality variances from residual one observation to observation which other. If variance from score residual between fixed observations, this condition was called Heteroscedasticity. Regression models A good model was a homoscedastic model. To detect presence heteroscedasticity was by regressing the model with the log of squared residues as the dependent

variable. If from each independent variable more than 0.05, there was no heteroscedasticity in the model and the data results in a homoscedastic condition. And the results of the heteroscedasticity test can be seen in table in lower this :

Table 3. Test Heteroscedasticity

Coefficients ^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	std. Error	Betas		
1	(Constant)	-0.014	0.015		-0.965	0.339
	Quality product	0.057	0	0.407	1.105	0.274
	Price	0.082	0.053	0.387	1,557	0.125
	Promotion	0.057	0.059	0.239	0.959	0.341
	Testimonials	-0.012	0.063	-0.054	-0.185	0.854

a. dependent Variables: Abs_Res2

Source : Data primary processed year 2021

From the test data above it can be seen that the probability t, product quality, prices, promotions, and testimonials together indicate a value of over 5% which meaning greater than Alpha (> 0.05). So it can be concluded that no there was problem heteroscedasticity.

Test Autocorrelation

Autocorrelation (*autocorrelation*) was the relationship between the residuals of one observation with residual observation others. Wrong one method for test it there was no autocorrelation _ was with Test Durbin-Watson. And results test autocorrelation could seen on table under this :

Table 4. Test Autocorrelation

Model Summary ^b

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	std. Error of the Estimates	Durbin-Watsons
1	.245 ^a	0.06	-0.001	0.96097	1898

a. Predictors: (Constant), Product Quality, Price, Promotion, Testimonials

b. dependent Variables: Buying decisions

Data source primary processed year 2021

Information:

N = 66 K4

D	et c	du	4-dl	4-du
1898	1.4758	1.7319	2.5242	2.2681

From the data above it can be seen if $du < d < 4-du$ or $(1.7319 < 1.898 < 2.2681)$, then it can be concluded that the regression model in this study no there was problem autocorrelation.

Analysis Regression Double

Multiple linear regression analysis was carried out by researchers using SPSS 25.0 for

know the direction relationship between variable independent and dependent variable was each variable independent relate positive or negative. This regression analysis also aims to improve the value of the dependent variable if score variable independent experience increase or decline.

Table 5. Results Analysis Regression Double

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	std. Error	Betas		
1	(Constant)	9,514	3.136		3,034	0.004
	Quality Product	0.002	0.098	0.002	0.016	0.987
	Price	-0.049	0.101	-0.065	-0.486	0.628
	Promotion	0.172	0.107	0.213	1,606	0.113
	Testimonials	0.091	0.127	0.095	0.714	0.478

a. dependent Variables: Y

Source: SPSS 25.0 for Windows, 2021

From results analysis regression could was known equality regression double as following:

$$Y = 9.514 + 0.002 X_1 + 0.049 X_2 + 0.179 X_3 + 0.091 X_4$$

Based on study the, so could explained as following:

1. Score constant as big 9.514 could interpreted if variable quality product, price, promotion and testimony considered zero, so buying decisions will as big 9,514.
2. Quality product (X1) to Buying decisions (Y). The product quality coefficient value for the variable (X1) was 0.002. That matter implies that every increase in product quality (X1) one unit then the purchase decision variable (Y) will increase by 0.002 with assumption that variable free which other from model regression was permanent.
3. Price (X2) to Buying decisions (Y). Score coefficient price for variable (X2) as big 0.049. Thing this contain meaning that every increase price (X2) one unit so variable buying decisions will go on as big 0.049 with assumption that variable free which other from model regression was permanent.
4. Promotion (X3) to the Buying decisions (Y). Score coefficient promotion for variable (X3) as big 0.179. Thing this contain meaning that every promotion increase (X3) one unit then variable buying decisions will go on as big 0.179 with assumption that variable free which other from model regression permanent.
5. Testimonials (X4) to Buying decisions (Y). Score coefficient promotion for variable (X4) as big 0.091. Thing this contain meaning that every promotion increase (X4) one unit then variable buying decisions will go on as big 0.091 with assumption that variable free which other from model regression permanent.

Test Partial significance (Test t)

The t test was a test to determine the significance of the effect of the independent variables (product quality, price, promotion and testimonials) partially or individually explain the dependent variable (purchasing decision). If t count > from t table then it can be stated that the independent variables individually have an effect positive on the dependent variable. If the t count significance value was less than 0.05 so could stated that variable independent in a manner individual take effect significant to variable dependent. Criteria taking decision with provision as following:

1. If t count > t table or -t count < -t table, so Ho rejected and Ha received.

2. If $t \text{ count} \leq t \text{ table}$ and $-t \text{ count} \geq -t \text{ table}$, so H_0 received and H_a rejected.

$Q \text{ table} = t(\alpha / 2 : nk-1) = t(0.025: 61) = 2,000$

Table 6. Results Test t

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	8,751	2,605		3,360	,001
X.1	,129	,103	,148	1,262	,211
X.2	-,011	,098	-,013	-,110	,913
X.3	,210	,102	,238	2,061	,043
X.4	-,024	,107	-,026	-,225	,823

a. dependent Variables: Y

Source: SPSS 25.0 for windows, 2021

Results analysis test t was by using SPSS 25.0 was as follows:

1. Quality Product (X1) to buying decisions (Y)

It was known that the significance value for the influence of (X1) on (Y) was big $0.211 > 0.05$ and score $t \text{ count } 1,262 < t \text{ table } 2,000$, so that could concluded that H_1 rejected which means there was no effect (X1) to (Y). So got concluded the quality of the product was not take effect to buying decisions.

2. Price (X2) to buying decisions (Y)

It was known that the significance value for the influence of (X2) on (Y) was as big $0.913 > 0.05$ and score $t \text{ count } 0.110 < t \text{ table } 2,000$, so could concluded that H_1 rejected which means there was no effect (X2) to (Y). So could concluded price no take effect to buying decisions.

3. Promotion (X3) to buying decisions (Y)

It was known that the Sig value for the influence of (X3) on (Y) was as big $0.043 < 0.05$ and score $t \text{ count } 2,061 > t \text{ table } 2,000$, so that could concluded that H_1 received which means there was influence (X3) against (Y). So it can be concluded that the price affects the buying decisions.

4. Testimonials (X4) to buying decisions (Y)

It was known that the Sig value for the influence of (X4) on (Y) was as big $0.823 > 0.05$ and score $t \text{ count } 0.225 < t \text{ table } 2,000$, so that could concluded that H_1 rejected which means there was no effect (X4) to (Y). So could concluded price no take effect to buying decisions.

Coefficient Determination (R²)

Coefficient determination (R²) the main thing was for measure how much far ability model in explained variation variable dependent. Score the coefficient of determination was between zero and one (Ghozali, 2018), the value of coefficient determination could seen on table as following:

Table 7. Coefficient determination (R²)

Model Summary^b

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted Square	std. Error of the Estimates
-------	---	----------	-----------------	-----------------------------

1	.935 ^a	0.800	0.866	0.00668
---	-------------------	-------	-------	---------

a. Predictors: (Constant), Quality Product, Promotion price, Testimonials

b. dependent Variables: Buying decisions

Source: SPSS 25.0 for windows, 2021

Based on table 7 it can be concluded that the magnitude of the coefficient of determination or adjusted R Square was 0.800 or 80%. It shows percentage independent influence Product quality (X1), Price (X2), Promotion (X3), Testimonials (X4), to variable dependent Buying decisions (Y) as big 80%. Whereas the rest as big 20% explained by v a variable other which no entered in study.

Discussion

This study aims to determine product quality, price, promotion, and testimonials on buying decisions for *Bear Brand dairy products* in supermarkets Adabaru Salatiga.

Influence Quality Product On Buying decisions Product Milk Bear Brands

The results showed that the product quality variable obtained a value t count as big 1,262 with score significance as big 0.211 more big from 0.05 ($0.211 > 0.05$) and coefficient regression have score as big 0.219 so study this proves the first hypothesis stated "Quality product no significant effect on buying decisions dairy products *Bear Brands* in Supermarket Adabaru." This was meaningful factor quality product no take effect to consumer for buy milk *Bear Brand* at the supermarket Adabaru Salatiga.

This factor was due to the impact of the government issuing policies imposition of restrictions on community activities (PPKM). impact of that all make people's purchasing power towards the purchase of dairy products *Bear Brands* the more decrease. According to Armstrong (2015) product quality was a product that has value that can satisfy consumers both physically and psychologically which shows the attributes or properties contained in something goods or results.

Influence Price To Buying decisions Product Milk Bear Brands

Results study show that variable price obtained score t count as big-0.110 with score significance as big 0.913 greater than 0.05 ($0.913 > 0.05$) and the regression coefficient has a value of-0.011, so this study prove the second hypothesis states "Price has no significant effect against decisions purchase product milk *Bear Brands* in Supermarket Adabaru." Thing this means factor price no take effect to consumer for To do purchase milk *Bear Brands* in supermarket Adabaru Salatiga. Factor this caused impact from The government issued a policy of imposing restrictions on activities community (PPKM).

The impact of all this has an effect on purchasing power society against product *milk Bear Brands* the more decrease. According to Kotler (2012) in a narrow sense, price was the amount that was billed for a product or service, more broadly the price was the sum of all value provided by the customer to benefit the owner which use something product or service.

The Effect of Promotion on the Decision to Return Bear Milk Products Brands

Results study show that variable promotion obtained score t count as big 2,061 with score significance of 0.043 smaller from 0.05 ($0.043 < 0.05$) and the regression coefficient has a value of 0.210 then this study prove third hypothesis state "Promotion significant effect against decisions purchase product milk *Bear Brands* in Supermarket Adabaru." Thing this means factor promotion take effect to consumer for To do purchase milk *Bear Brand* at the Adabaru supermarket Salatiga. In terms of promotion of *Bear's* dairy products *Brands* use promotional strategies, especially in advertising media.

Media advertisement Becomes media main for interesting consumer for buy *Bear Brand* dairy products. *Bear Brand* Milk puts their products as a product milk which prioritize quality, nutrition which good for health. According to Kotler & Keller in Simamora (2018), promotion was everything form of communication used to inform and remind target market regarding products produced by organizations, individuals or homes ladder. these results are in line with research by Kesuma et al., (2021).

The Effect of Testimonials on the Decision to Return *Bear Milk Products Brands*

The results showed that the testimony variable obtained the calculated t value of -0.225 with a significance value of 0.823 greater than 0.05 ($0.823 > 0.05$) and coefficient regression have score as big -0.024 so this study proves the fourth hypothesis stated "Testimony no significant effect on buying decisions *Bear Brand* dairy products in Supermarket Adabaru." This means that the testimonial factor has no effect to consumer for To do purchase milk *Bear Brands* in Adabaru supermarket Salatiga. Myths about issues circulating in society about the benefits of *Bear Brand* milk can cure covid-19 yet proven the truth.

Public wrong assume opinion about *Bear Brand* dairy products, so rumors about all of that were not true. Some people even think that *Bear Brand* dairy products there was no difference with other dairy products. It makes part of society not too influential on the purchase product milk *Bear Brands* in a manner significant, even sales tend to be still stable there was no increase that was too high. Interest to buy society towards *Bear Brand* dairy products was still not very good many. According to Abraham *et al.* (2014), testimony was method which used for marketers for build trust customer. Information which served somebody testimony must take sides to person many and no for interest personal.

CONCLUSION

From discussion study about Analysis factors which influencing buying decisions in the era of the co-19 pandemic (Case study on *Bear Brand* milk drink products) that have been made can be withdrawn conclusion as following:

1. Quality product has no effect positive and significant to buying decisions *Bear Brands* drinking milk with significant value $0.211 > 0.05$ and the calculated t value $1.262 < t$ table 2,000.
2. Price has no positive and significant effect on decisions purchase *Bear Brand* drinking milk with significant value as big $0.913 > 0.05$ and score t count $-0.110 < t$ table 2,000.
3. Promotion has a positive and significant effect on buying decisions for *Bear Brand* drinking milk with significant value as big $0.043 < 0.05$ and score t count $2,061 > t$ table 2,000.
4. Testimonials have no positive and significant effect on buying decisions for *Bear Brand* drinking milk with a significant value as big $0.478 > 0.05$ and score t count $0.714 < t$ table 2,000.

From discussion study about Analysis of Factors That Influence Buying Decisions in The Covid-19 Pandemi Era (Case Study in *Bear Brand* Drinking Milk Beverage Products) that have been carried out can be obtained suggestion as following:

1. For Company

Study this give description in a manner general about product *Bear Brands* which already confirmed, as well as quality product and connection with customer satisfaction. Further increase the promotion factor to make consumers feel interested in *Bear Brand* products offered. always innovating new products launched by the company in order to remain competitive in market.

2. For Researcher next

This research was still very limited where the number of samples taken from respondents only numbered 66 and have not received represent the customer population *Bear Brand* milk. So for further researchers it was recommended to use sample which more many again so that results earned more accurate.

REFERENCES

- Abraham, S., Rivero, H.G., Erlikh, R.V., Griffith, L.F., & Kondamudi, V.K. 2014. Surgical and nonsurgical management of gallstone. *American Family Physician*. 89(10): 795-802.
- Armstrong, K. 2015. *Marketing an Introducing*. New York: Pretiece Hall.
- Bahar, A & Sjaharudin, H. 2015. Pengaruh Kualitas Produk dan Kualitas Pelayanan Terhadap Kepuasan Konsumen dan Minat Beli Ulang. *Jurnal Organisasi dan Manajemen*. 3: 14-34.
- Dianah, N & Welsa, H. 2017. Pengaruh Kualitas Produk dan Citra Merek Terhadap Keputusan Pembelian Smartphone Xiaomi Serta Dampaknya Pada Kepuasan Konsumen. *Jurnal Manajemen*. 7(1): 16-26.
- Diyatma, A.J. 2017. Pengaruh Promosi Melalui Media Sosial Instagram Terhadap Keputusan Pembelian Produk Saka Bistro. *e-Proceeding of Management*. 4(1): 175-179.
- Kesuma, M., Fitria, D., & Albab Al Umar, A. U. (2021). Pengaruh Harga, Kualitas Produk, dan Promosi Terhadap Keputusan Pembelian Produk Pattaya Corner Kota Salatiga. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Ubhara*, 3(1), 13-21.
- Kotler, P & Kellerr, A. 2009. *Manajemen Pemasaran*. Jakarta: PT. Prenhallindo.
- Kotler, P. 1996. *Manajemen Pemasaran*. Jakarta: PT. Prenhallindo.
- Kotler, P. 2004. *Prinsip-Prinsip Pemasaran*. Jakarta: Erlangga.
- Kotler, P. 2009. *Manajemen Pemasaran*. Jakarta: PT. Prenhallindo.
- Kotler, P. 2012. *Perilaku Konsumen*. Jakarta: PT. Prenhallindo.
- Mc Carthy, E.J. 1990. *Basic Marketing: A Managerial Approach*. New York: Irwin.
- Pastikarani, D.A & Astuti, S.R.T. 2016. Analisis Pengaruh Faktor-Faktor Minat Beli Ulang dengan Kepuasan Pelanggan Sebagai Variabel Intervening (Studi Kasus Pada Pelanggan Hest'in Modiste di Jakarta). *Diponegoro Journal of Management*. 5(2): 1-9.
- Rahayu, M.P & Utami S.S. 2012. Pengaruh Kualitas, Fitur dan Model Handphone Sony Ericsson Terhadap Kepuasan Konsumen. *Jurnal Ekonomi dan Kewirausahaan*. 12(1): 67-75.
- Schiffman, L.G & Kanuk, L.L. 2014. *Consumer Behavior*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Simamora, H. 2018. *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Jakarta: Bina Aksara.
- Sugiyono. 2016. *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Sumara, R & Salim, L. 2020. Service Quality, Customer Satisfaction, Brand Trust and Repurchase Intention. *Fokus Ekonomi: Jurnal Ilmu Ekonomi*. 15(2): 493-514.
- Tjiptono, F. 2015. *Manajemen Pemasaran Berbasis Kopetensi*. Yogyakarta: Andi Offset.
- Swashta, B & Irawan, 2005. *Manajemen Pemasaran Modern*. Yogyakarta: Liberti.
- Yamit, Z. 2013. *Manajemen Kualitas Produk dan Jasa*. Yogyakarta: Ekonisia.