



The Ambiguity of Information Over the Paris Fashion Week on the Trust of Ms Glow Resellers

Halimah Zahrah^(✉), Ratih Hurriyati, and Heny Hendrayati^{ORCID}

Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Bandung, Indonesia
halimahzahrah@upi.edu

Abstract. This study derives from an issue of information ambiguity that became a polemic in the community due to the false information posted on Instagram by MSGLOW. The public claimed that this brand deceived them by stating that it would participate in The Paris Fashion Week event while it only participated in The Paris Fashion Show coincided with the actual event. Therefore, this paper reports the ambiguous information impacts posted on Instagram @msglowbeauty on the trust of resellers in Bandung City to buy and sell their products. This study is mixed-method research employing both qualitative descriptive and quantitative by employing MSGLOW resellers in Bandung who were active users of Instagram as the unit of analysis. The samples of this study were MSGLOW resellers totaling 100 respondents. Furthermore, this study used Cluster Random Sampling and Hypothesis-Simple Linear Regression Test as data analysis procedures by testing the Coefficient of Determination (R^2), T-test, and F-Test. The instrument test uses Validity & Reliability analysis. The analysis tool uses SPSS 26. The findings revealed that H_0 was approved but H_1 was denied since there were no significant effects of the contribution of the variable Information Ambiguity on the trust of resellers in the city of Bandung. The ambiguity of the information posted by MS GLOW on Instagram @msglowbeauty claiming to be appearing at the Paris Fashion Week event does not affect the trust of MSGLOW resellers in Bandung since it was still affected by other factors. Resellers still believed in MS GLOW, for purchasing goods and reselling MS GLOW products to consumers.

Keywords: Ambiguity of information · Trust · Resellers · Paris Fashion Week

1 Introduction

This study examined the ambiguity of information and trust. Trust is very important in the consumer's assessment of a product or service. It is the total of all the consumer's information and all the judgments they have formed regarding the item, its features, and its advantages [1]. Trust is a person's confidence in the other party to carry out the relationship between the two parties after gathering various information based on the belief that the party can fulfill the obligations he or she expects. The information disseminated to the public must be truthful, accurate, and supported by data. Information is a collection of data or facts that have been organized to be useful to the recipient [2]. The spread of incorrect information (Hoax) will be able to disturb the public. Incorrect

information delivery can be ambiguous. This ambiguity arises when we as listeners or readers find it difficult to grasp the understanding we read or hear. In the news or information on social media or the internet, many problems occur due to the ambiguity of information received by the public, what is being discussed at this time is the ambiguity of community information about the ms Glow brand claims to be live at the Paris Fashion Week in collaboration with American designer Leanne Marshall.

The crisis of trust in ms Glow's brand became a polemic, according to the public on social media. MSGLOW committed a public lie by informing that MSGLOW would appear at the Paris Fashion Week event in collaboration with designers from America by posting an advertisement on Instagram on March 1, 2022. Many comments from netizens fashion, that MSGLOW is not part of the event, but rather a fashion show event held to coincide with Paris Fashion Week 2022. In reality, it was true that MSGLOW was not a part of the Paris Fashion Week event. This is concerning to the public because MSGLOW was spreading a public lie. According to MSGLOW, the scattered information was ambiguous, resulting in misinformation [3].

In previous studies, it has been shown that to test and analyze the influence of information ambiguity on audit judgment is trust [4]. The crisis of trust in the auditor profession regarding the reasonableness of the Company's Financial Statements that by the professional standards of auditors will be questioned and accounted for. The quality of the audit determines of the judgment must be able to provide the judgment by will standards of the auditor. What distinguishes it from previous research MSGLOW must honestly test, the accuracy of accurate data before writing or claiming information to be conveyed, this will be a distrust of the public if the information is disseminated and does not match what is written. Therefore, the author is interested in researching how ambiguous the information that occurs in Brand MSGLOW, is and whether it can affect the value of reseller trust or Instead.

1.1 Ambiguity of Information

In the journal "Inaction (ambiguity) In Indonesian," that ambiguity is often interpreted as a word that means double or ambiguous [5]. Ambiguity is a word that has a double meaning, vagueness, and the existence of double meaning in more than one interpretation of information. These different meanings make the reader or listener feel confused and confusing information is data that has been altered into a format that is useful to the recipient and aids in current or future decision-making [6]. Therefore, from the above understanding, the ambiguity of information is a word of double meaning and vagueness of the data. The ambiguity of information arises from aspects or indicators: 1. The amount and type of information available, 2. Reliability of information sources. 3. Lack of knowledge of the observed events [7].

1.2 Trust

The basis of the business is trust. If each party believes in the other, a business transaction involving two or more parties will occur [8]. This trust must be earned and be able to be verified, not only acknowledged by other parties or business partners. There are

four indicators of consumer confidence, which are as follows: 1. Benevolence (earnestness/sincerity), shows much a person trusts the seller to behave well to the consumer. 2. Ability is a current evaluation of what a person is capable of. How does the seller in this scenario ensure that the buyer offers satisfaction and security assurance during the transaction? 3. Integrity (integrity), is how much faith a person has in the seller's integrity to uphold and carry out the agreements made with the consumer. 4. Willingness to depend, is the consumer's willingness to depend on the seller in the form of acceptance of risks or negative consequences that may occur [9].

1.3 Hypothesis

H0: It is alleged that there is no real influence between Information Ambiguity (X) and Trust reseller Ms. Glow in Bandung City (Y).

H1: It is suspected that there is an influence between Information Ambiguity (X) on the Trust of resellers MSGLOW in Bandung City (Y).

Based on the theoretical foundations and the results of relevant research, it can be concluded in the framework of thought in Fig. 1.

2 Method

Descriptive quantitative research, a method of inquiry used in this study describes and explains independent variables to analyze their effect on dependent variables. The author intends to explain the influence of ambiguity of information regarding the inclusion of the word "Paris Fashion Week" published by MSGLOW on Instagram @msglowbeauty (that it collaborated with American designers at the Paris Fashion Week event) on trust, especially resellers in the city of Bandung.

There were two instruments to collect data, namely observation and questionnaires. Observation was done by observing the website of the research object and its social media related to their advertisements in joining Paris Fashion Week. Questionnaires were executed by distributing some questions to the resellers in Bandung City through online questionnaire platform (Google Form), instant messaging applications (Instagram Direct Message and WhatsApp). The answers of the participants were analyzed by using a Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) [10].

The data collection procedure focused on the participants who were actively posting on their social media. There were also 100 respondents involved in filling out the questionnaires since it aimed to meet the criteria of the study [11]. To select these participants, this study adapted Cluster Random Sampling since the participants were taken from the site of this study [12]. Technical Data Analysis uses Multiple Linear



Fig. 1. The Frame of Mind

Hypothesis-Regression Test by testing Determination Coefficient (R²), T-Test, and F Test, while the instrument test uses validity & reliability tests.

3 Result and Discussion

3.1 Results

Instrument Test Results - Validity & Reliability

a. Validity

In this study, the degree of freedom (df) was used to examine the validity of the indicators using the formula $df = n - 2$, where n is the number of samples. So the df used is $100 - 2 = 98$ with alpha by 5%, then it produces a table r-value of 0.1654. The statement item is considered to be legitimate if the calculated r (for each item, seen in the Corrected Item - Total Correlation column) is higher than the table's r and the value of r is positive. Result of validity test shown in Table 1.

Considering the results of the tests in Table 1, it reveals that the estimated r-value of every Information Ambiguity variable indicator is higher than the r-value of its table, namely (item_1) $0.507 > 0.1654$, (item_2) $0.615 > 0.1654$, (item_3) $0.629 > 0.1654$. Therefore it can be concluded that all indicators of the items used in the study are valid. Validity test result Y shown in Table 2.

Table 2 also shows that all of the Trust variable's estimated indicators have r values that are higher than those of its table, namely (item 1) $0.482 > 0.1654$, (item 2) $0.545 > 0.1654$, (item 3) $0.609 > 0.1654$, and (item 4) $0.384 > 0.1654$. Therefore, it can be said that all four of the trust indicator items employed in this study are reliable.

Table 1. Validity Test Result X

No. Item	r count	r table	Information
Item 1	0, 507	0,1654	Valid
Item 2	0, 615	0,1654	Valid
Item 3	0, 629	0,1654	Valid

Table 2. Validity Test Result Y

No. Item	r count	r table	Information
Item 1	0,482	0,1654	Valid
Item 2	0,545	0,1654	Valid
Item 3	0,609	0,1654	Valid
Item 4	0,384	0,1654	Valid

Table 3. Reliability Test Results in X.

Cronbach's Alpha	N of items
.038	3

b. Reliability

Reliability test results in X shown in Table 3.

Based on Table 3, it is known that the Information Ambiguity variable's Cronbach's Alpha value is less than 0.60, or 0.038 0.60, indicating that the variable is unreliable.

Reliability Test Results in Y shown in Table 4.

Table 4 describes Information Ambiguity. Based on a Cronbach's Alpha variable, is known to be less than 0.60, or 0.55 to 0.6 indicating that the trust variable is not reliable. It can be noticed that each variable has Cronbach's alpha less than 0.60 (<0.60), which means that all variables are said to be unreliable. This data processing cannot proceed to the next step.

Hypothesis Test Results

a. Simple Linear Regression Test Results

Simple Linear Regression Test Results shown in Table 5.

From Table 5, the regression equation is created:

$$Y = 7,663 + (-0,34)X \quad (1)$$

Such regression equations can be described as follows:

Table 4. Reliability Test Results in Y

Cronbach's Alpha	N of items
.055	4

Table 5. Simple Linear Regression Test Results.

Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.7663	1.522		5.035	.000
	X	-.034	.121	-.028	-.279	.781

a. Dependent Variable Y

a = a constant of 7.663 indicates that if the value of the variable ambiguity of the information is in a constant (fixed) state then the confidence increased by 7,663.

b = regression confession X of -0.34 means when the information ambiguity variable drops by one unit then the confidence will decrease by -0.34 units.

b. Coefficients of Determination (R^2)

Coefficient of Determination Test Results shown in Table 6.

Table 6, reveals that the coefficient of determination—the outcome of squaring R—is the amount of the proportion of the impact of the free variable on the bound variable. The magnitude of the correlation value or connection R is 0.001, and The output revealed a coefficient of determination (R^2) of 0.001, which contains the knowledge that Information Ambiguity has a 0.1% influence on the bound variable, Trust, whereas other variables have a 99.9% influence on the other variables.

c. T-Test

The T-test is used to assess the significance of the relationship between the variables X and Y as well as the degree to which the independent and dependent variables interact or not. To interpret the coefficients of free variables (independent) can use unstandardized coefficients and standardized coefficients, namely by looking at the significance value of each variable at the level of significance $\alpha = 5\%$. T- Test result shown in Table 7.

According to Table 7's findings, t counts are -0.279, and the t table is 1.654 with a degree of freedom (df) of n-2. Ho is approved and H1 is refused because t count t table with a significance level of 0.781, which indicates $0.781 > 0.05$. This indicates that there is no significant relationship between the standard level of its coefficient, which is -0.28, or -2.8%, and the Trust of MS GLOW resellers in the City of Bandung (Y).

Table 6. Coefficient of Determination Test Results.

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.028 ^a	.001	-.009	1.229

a. Predictors: (Constant), X

Table 7. T-Test Result.

Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.7663	1.522		5.035	.000
	X	-.034	.121	-.028	-.279	.781

a. Dependent Variable Y

Table 8. F-Test Result.

Model		Sum of Square	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	.118	1	.118	.078	.781b
	Residual	148.122	98	1.511		
	Total	148.240	99			

a. Dependent Variable: Y. b. Predictors: (Constant), X

d. F-Test

F-test result shown in Table 8.

From Table 8, the Anova test or F test obtained a calculated F value of 0.078 which was smaller than the F of the table of 3.938, and the significance of F of 0.781 and it was greater than 0.05 (in this case using a degree of significance or $\alpha = 5\%$). Therefore, this research accepted H0 and rejecting H1. Because F counts are smaller than F tables or the significance of F which is greater than the value of α or in other words, there is no significant influence between the Ambiguity of Information on the Trust of resellers in the City of Bandung.

3.2 Discussion

Once the data from observations and questionnaires were collected and analyzed by using SPSS version 26, the coefficient of the variable Information Ambiguity (X) was -0.034 while in the constant of 7.663 as calculated from the following regression equation:

$$Y = 7.663 + (-0.034)X \quad (2)$$

Since the results of these analyses indicate that there is no link between significant influence on the contribution of independent factors (X) to dependent variables (Y), a significant value of 0.781 was obtained. Since the significant threshold in this study was set at 0.05 or 5%, this indicates that if $0.781 > 0.05$, Ho was accepted and H1 was rejected. This indicates that there isn't a real impact between the variables of Information Ambiguity (X) on the trust (Y). Impossibility (ambiguity) In Indonesian" that ambiguity is often interpreted as a word that means double or ambiguous, in this study the ambiguity of information posted by MSGLOW on Instagram @msglowbeauty who claimed to be appearing at the Paris Fashion Week event, did not affect the trust of MS Glow resellers in the city of Bandung, It was clarified how the free variable's impact (Information Ambiguity) on the bound variable (Trust) was 0.1%, while the rest was influenced by other variables by 99.9%. This trust should be established from the ground up and be able to be verified, not only acknowledged by other parties or business partners. The crisis of trust, which was accused of public lying by netizens for the ambiguity of information on advertising posts on Instagram that were claimed to be participating in Paris fashion week, did not affect the trust of MSGLOW resellers in the city of Bandung, because the trust of the reseller was influenced by other factors. This research is supported by previous research, that the ambiguity of information does not affect the audit judgment

because the majority of respondents do not experience cases of information ambiguity [4].

4 Conclusion

From the phenomenon that it is suspected that MS GLOW committed a public lie on a post on Instagram @msglowbeauty claiming to be appearing at the Paris Fashion Week event, and not form part of the event, only appearing at the Paris Fashion Show event which coincided with the Paris Fashion Week event, research resulted that H_0 was accepted and H_1 was rejected meaning that there was no real influence between Information Ambiguity (X) on the Trust of MSGLOW resellers in the City of Bandung (Y). Resellers remain confident in MSGLOW, for the purchase of goods and the resale of MSGLOW products to consumers.

Acknowledgments. I would like to thank the lecturers, namely Prof. Dr. Hj. Ratih Hurriyati., MP., and Dr. Heny Hendrayati., S.Ip., MM, who have guided us in creating this article, and the Indonesian University of Education (UPI) Educational Institutions for facilitating our articles to be published to the public to be useful for further research.

References

1. Priansa, D. *Perilaku Konsumen Dalam Persaingan Bisnis Kontemporer*. (Alfabeta, 2017).
2. Anggraeni, E. Y. & Irviani, R. *Introduction to Information Systems*. (ANDI, 2017)
3. Savitri, K. Klarifikasi Bos MS Glow Usai Dituding Bohong Tampil di Paris Fashion Week. *kumparan.com* (2022). Available at: <https://kumparan.com/kumparanhits/klarifikasi-bos-ms-glow-usai-dituding-bohong-tampil-di-paris-fashion-week-1xdxOzurQxp/full>.
4. Permatasari, D. N. The Influence of Information Ambiguity, Compliance Pressure, and Auditor Experience on Audit Judgement on Auditors in the City of Surabaya. (2019).
5. Putrayasa, I. G. N. K. Ketaksaan (ambiguitas) dalam bahasa indonesia. *LUGAS J. Komun.* **2**, 14 (2017).
6. Heriyanto, H. Thematic Analysis sebagai Metode Menganalisa Data untuk Penelitian Kualitatif. *Anuva* (2018).
7. Einhorn, H. J. & Hogarth, R. M. Judging Probable Cause. *Psychological Bulletin* (1986).
8. Rahmadi, H. & Malik, D. Pengaruh Kepercayaan dan Persepsi Risiko Terhadap Keputusan Pembelian E-Commerce Pada Tokopedia.Com Di Jakarta Pusat. *Reformasi Adm.* (2018).
9. Kotler, P. & Keller, K. L. *Marketing Management*. Pearson Edition Limited (2016).
10. Sugiyono. *Metode Penelitian Kombinasi (Mix Methods)*. Bandung: Alfabeta. *Metrologia* (2015).
11. Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J. & Anderson, R. E. *Multivariate Data Analysis*. *Vectors* (2010).
12. Sugiyono. *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. (Alfabeta, 2018).

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

