Building Brand Trust Through Labeling and Personal Selling: Its Implications on DSS Coil Purchase Decisions

Dimas Jayamahe Susanto[1]

[1]Universitas Sarjanawiyata Tamansiswa, Yogyakarta, Indonesia
[1]dimasjayamahe@gmail.com

Abstract. The Influence of Labeling and Personal Selling on Consumer Purchase Decisions for E-Cigarettes: A Case Study of DSS Coil Mediated by Brand Trust. This study aims to examine the role of Labeling and Personal Selling in influencing Purchase Decisions within the context of a new e-cigarette brand DSS Coil, and to specifically analyze the mediating role of Brand Trust. This research addresses a gap in the literature regarding the driving factors of purchasing behavior in the Indonesian vaping industry. The study employed a quantitative research methodology. Data collected via an online questionnaire from 105 consumers of DSS Coil selected through purposive sampling. The data were analyzed using SPSS multiple linear regression to test both direct and indirect relationships between the variables. All research instruments were confirmed to be both valid and reliable. The results of the regression analysis demonstrated that both Labeling and Brand Trust have a positive and highly significant influence on Purchase Decisions. Furthermore, Labeling emerged as the dominant independent variable in shaping Brand Trust. Conversely, Personal Selling was found to have no significant effect on either Purchase Decisions or Brand Trust, suggesting the ineffectiveness of face to face interaction in this specific market context.

Keyword: Labeling; Personal Selling; Brand Trust; Purchase Decision.

1. Introduction

The e-cigarette (vape) industry in Indonesia has grown remarkably fast and is now an increasingly popular alternative to conventional cigarettes among many groups. An e-cigarette can be defined as a device that works by heating a chemical liquid which includes propylene glycol, vegetable glycerin, flavorings, and nicotine and converting it into an inhalable vapor (Breland, et al., 2017). The vape market itself has become a highly competitive segment. Core Components and the Role of the Coil Technically, a vape device has three primary elements: the vaporizer, the battery, and the atomizer. Within the use of a vape, the coil is a critical component that determines the overall quality of the experience. The primary function of the coil is to regulate and facilitate the process of heating the e-liquid. This process significantly influences the resulting flavor profile and helps to minimize the risk of a burnt or harsh sensation when inhaled (Talih, et al., 2016). Given its essential role, it is understandable that consumers place a major focus on the quality of the coil they choose. Vape coils are available in various types, including specific variants such as nichrome and clapton.

Local brands like DSS Coil emerged amidst the momentum of this industry's development, starting their business in 2023 by recognizing market opportunities that had not been optimally filled. The founder of DSS Coil realized that the coil variants available in the market at that time did not consistently guarantee product quality. Therefore, DSS Coil positioned itself with a strong commitment to product quality. In facing increasingly intense competition, the company is required to understand the fundamental Factors that can influence consumer purchasing decisions. Growing consumer awareness of alternatives to cigarettes has made products like the DSS Coil increasingly popular, but business success depends heavily on companies building brand awareness and trust.

Although many previous studies have reviewed the influence of price, product quality, and promotion on purchasing decisions, the factors of labeling and personal selling in the vape industry have not been widely explored for research. In fact, informative labeling that contains the brand, composition, and legality is a product identity and branding reinforcement that affects consumer memory. Meanwhile, personal selling through direct and face-to-face interaction can provide education and address customer objections, while also serving as a way for DSS Coil owners to monitor quality and build trust in their products. These two factors are very important to address

This study uses an innovative approach by jointly examining the variables of purchase decisions, labeling, and personal selling, while adding brand trust as a mediating variable that connects the relationships among the three. The importance of this variable is reinforced by a research gap showing inconsistencies in previous research results; for example, the influence of packaging and labeling on purchase intention/purchase decision, as well as personal selling, which has been found to have a significant positive effect (Mufreni, 2016), but has also been found to have a negative and insignificant effect (Ratnawati, et al., 2016). Another significant uniqueness is the focus on the context of the vape industry in Indonesia, which is a market that is still developing to this day and is relatively new. Specifically, this study takes the case of the DSS Coil brand, a brand in the

S. Hadi et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Business, Economic, and Social Sustainability (ICOBES 2025)*, Advances in Economics, Business and Management Research 384,
https://doi.org/10.2991/978-94-6239-626-5_79

process of facing challenges in building trust and loyalty among consumers.

This study aims not only to fill existing research gaps but also to enrich marketing theory with new insights. The research focuses on the mechanism of how information presented through attractive labeling and interactive personal selling can strengthen brand trust, which ultimately shapes consumer purchasing decisions. Specifically, this study will empirically examine how the combination of clear and communicative labeling along with interactive personal selling can enhance brand trust, a crucial factor in today's highly competitive vape market. The findings are expected to deepen understanding of effective marketing strategies in emerging markets like Indonesia, where brand trust often becomes a key determinant in consumer product choices. Thus, this study successfully addresses the gap in existing research by explicitly examining the relationship between labeling, personal selling, and brand trust in the DSS Coil brand.

2. Method

This research involves DSS Coil consumers. The study uses purposive sampling to select a sample of consumers who use DSS Coil products. This study employs a Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree, 1 to 5 (Sugiyono, 2018:152). A total of 105 respondents completed the questionnaire online with explanations regarding the research objectives and requirements. The data obtained was then analyzed using SPSS to determine whether the relationships are direct or indirect (Ghozali, 2018). This study measured several variables related to the Labeling variable consisting of 12 statements, including an example statement as follows: "I have no difficulty understanding the information on the DSS Coil product label." The Personal Selling variable has 12 statements, one of which is "Sales personnel demonstrate the DSS Coil product to me in detail." The Purchase Decision variable has 8 statements, one of which is "I seek information about the specifications of DSS Coil products from various sources before making a purchase decision. The Brand Trust variable has 8 statements, one of which is, "I feel this DSS Coil product can be relied on in the long term.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Respondent Characteristics

Consumers are predominantly male at 92.4%, with the majority aged between 21 and 30 years old (80%). This can be interpreted to mean that the main target market for DSS Coil products is young men. As many as 34.3% of respondents hold a bachelor's degree in terms of educational background and a master's degree 1.9%, indicating that a significant portion of respondents had a higher education background. The majority of respondents (52.3%) were employees in terms of profession, while others were outside categories such as civil servants, entrepreneurs, or teachers. Based on the respondents' city of origin, Mojokerto was the most dominant area 53.3%. Regarding income level, the most dominant category was Rp4.5 million – Rp5.5 million 70.4%. Meanwhile, the category of monthly spending on DSS Coil products showed a very strong significance at Rp50,000 83.8%.

3.2 Data Quality Test

Table 1. Validity Test

	Labeling				***Personal Selling***		
Item	Pearson Correlation	Sig. (2-tailed)	signifikan	Item	Pearson Correlation	Sig. (2-tailed)	signifikan
Item 1	.721**	.000	valid	item 1	.624**	.000	valid
Item 2	.688**	.000	valid	item 2	.696**	.000	valid
Item 3	.684**	.000	valid	item 3	.670**	.000	valid
Item 4	.655**	.000	valid	item 4	.728**	.000	valid
Item 5	.756**	.000	valid	item 5	.650**	.000	valid
Item 6	.726**	.000	valid	item 6	.540**	.000	valid
Item 7	.654**	.000	valid	item 7	.666**	.000	valid
Item 8	.624**	.000	valid	item 8	.693**	.000	valid
Item 9	.734**	.000	valid	item 9	.614**	.000	valid
Item 10	.793**	.000	valid	item 10	.633**	.000	valid
Item 11	.710**	.000	valid	item 11	.559**	.000	valid
Item 12	.729**	.000	valid	item 12	.528**	.000	valid

Source: Processed data, 2025.

Brand Trust				Purchase Decision			
Item	Pearson Correlation	Sig. (2-tailed)	signifikan	Item	Pearson Correlation	Sig. (2-tailed)	signifikan
item 1	.616**	.000	valid	item 1	.807**	.000	valid
item 2	.757**	.000	valid	item 2	.821**	.000	valid
item 3	.732**	.000	valid	item 3	.801**	.000	valid
item 4	.683**	.000	valid	item 4	.819**	.000	valid
item 5	.684**	.000	valid	item 5	.834**	.000	valid
item 6	.721**	.000	valid	item 6	.746**	.000	valid
item 7	.779**	.000	valid	item 7	.709**	.000	valid
item 8	.749**	.000	valid	item 8	.789**	.000	valid

Source: Processed data, 2025.

According to Ghozali (2018), the validity of research instruments is tested to ensure that the instrument truly measures what it is supposed to measure (accurate). Validity testing is conducted using the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Test with a two-tailed significance level of 0.05. The criteria that determine an instrument to be valid are: The significance value (Sig. 2-tailed) must be below 0.05. The Pearson correlation value (calculated r) must be above the table r value at the established significance level. If one or both of these criteria are met, then the questions (items) in the instrument are considered valid and suitable for further data analysis.

The results of the research instrument validity test for the 4 variables are shown in Table 1, which indicates that all the statement items used have been validated and acceptable for measuring the concepts being studied. Furthermore, the calculation results of the Sig. 2-tailed values for each item consistently show a figure of 0.000, which is well below the critical significance level. Therefore, further data collection for this study will use this valid instrument.

Table 2. Instrument Reliability Test

Variabel	Based Cronbach 's Alpha	Cronbach 's Alpha	N of Items
Labeling	0,70	.904	12
Personal Selling	0,70	.863	12
Brand Trust	0,70	.864	8
Purchase Decision	0,70	.913	8

Source: Processed data, 2025.

Reliability testing was conducted using the Alpha (Cronbach's) method with a significance level of 0.05 (Janna & Herianto, 2021). An instrument is said to be reliable if the alpha value is greater than the product moment r value. Reliability is considered poor if the alpha value is less than 0.6, while 0.7 is acceptable and above 0.8 is good (Ghozali, 2018).

A Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.904 was obtained from the Instrument Reliability Test for the labeling variable, as shown in Table 2; personal selling 0.863; brand trust 0.864; and purchase decision 0.913. It can be concluded that the values of each statement item in each variable have a strong correlation with each other, thus adequately representing their respective variables. It can be concluded that the instruments used in this study meet the criteria for high reliability and can be used in the next stage of analysis, as indicated by these results.

Table 3. Cumulative Description

Cumulative Description	
Labeling	**Personal Selling**

Category	Score	Total	Percentage	Category	Score	Total	Percentage
Strongly Disagree	(SD)	15	1	Strongly Disagree	(SD)	27	2
Disagree	(D)	28	2	Disagree	(D)	58	5
Neutral	(N)	261	21	Neutral	(N)	273	22
Agree	(A)	674	53	Agree	(A)	671	53
Strongly Agree	(SA)	282	22	Strongly Agree	(SA)	231	18
Total		1260	100	**Total**		1260	100

Source: Processed data, 2025.

Cumulative Description							
	Purchase Decision				**Brand Trust**		
Category	**Score**	**Total**	**Percentage**	**Category**	**Score**	**Total**	**Percentage**
Strongly Disagree	(SD)	22	3	Strongly Disagree	(SD)	11	1
Disagree	(D)	27	3	Disagree	(D)	20	2
Neutral	(N)	189	23	Neutral	(N)	189	23
Agree	(A)	417	50	Agree	(A)	455	54
Strongly Agree	(SA)	185	22	Strongly Agree	(SA)	165	20
Total		840	100	**Total**		840	100

Source: Processed data, 2025.

The results of the descriptive analysis in the table above, the descriptive findings indicate a dominant positive perception, with cumulative agreement levels above 70% across all variables. The high acceptance level of the Brand Trust indicators is 74% Agree or Strongly Agree, while the the levels of disagreement and strong disagreement only range from 3% to 7%, indicating that the brand studied has successfully built a trustworthy image in the eyes of consumers. The high positive perception of this variable indirectly becomes an important supporting factor in testing the influence of this variable on Purchase Decisions, which was also positively responded to by 72% of respondents. The strong acceptance level of these indicators shows that the data used for structural testing is robust and represents the market conditions or psychological state of the respondents well.

Table 4. Normality Test

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test		
		Unstandardized Residual
N		105
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	.0000000
	Std. Deviation	2.91019728
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.176
	Positive	.176
	Negative	-.149
Test Statistic		.176
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.000[c]
a. Test distribution is Normal.		
b. Calculated from data.		
c. Lilliefors Significance Correction.		

Source: Processed data, 2025.

Usmadi (2020) stated that the simplest test for normality is to create a frequency distribution graph of the existing scores. Testing for normality depends on our ability to carefully observe the data plotting. If the amount of data is quite large and the distribution is not 100% normal (not perfectly normal), then the conclusions drawn are likely to be incorrect. Nowadays, many methods have been developed by experts to conduct normality tests. Some of these are the Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test and the Lilliefors Test.

The results of the residual normality test in the table above, using the One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov method on the sample N=105, the Asymp. Sig. 2-tailed value was 0.000. Officially, this value is smaller than the significance level of 0.05, which indicates that the residual data is not normally distributed. However, it tends to have minimal impact on the estimation of coefficients Best Linear Unbiased Estimator / BLUE due to the applicability of the Central Limit Theorem. Therefore, the parameter estimates are still considered valid.

Table 5. Multicollinearity Test

Coefficients[a]								
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	2.741E-15	3.074		.000	1.000		
	Labeling	.000	.073	.000	.000	1.000	.390	2.562
	Personal Selling	.000	.045	.000	.000	1.000	.982	1.019
	Brand Trust	.000	.092	.000	.000	1.000	.386	2.591
a. Dependent Variable: Unstandardized Residual								

Source: Processed data, 2025.

Multicollinearity is a condition where there is a perfect or nearly perfect linear relationship among independent variables in a regression model (Mardiatmoko, 2020). A good regression model requires the absence of correlation among independent variables. To detect multicollinearity in regression, it can be determined using the variance value.

The results of the residual multicolllinearity test in the table above, it shows that the research model is free from the problem of high correlation among independent variables. All independent variables Labeling, Personal Selling, and Brand Trust have Tolerance values above 0.10 lowest 0.386 and VIF Variance Inflation Factor values below the threshold of 10 highest 2.591. From these results, it can be concluded that each independent variable can be used in the multiple regression model without excessively affecting each other, so the estimated results are considered valid and can be interpreted well.

Table 6. Heteroscedasticity Test

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	10.307	2.165		4.761	.000
	Labeling	.046	.051	.122	.903	.369
	Brand Trust	-.039	.032	-.106	-1.236	.219
	Purchase Decision	-.295	.065	-.617	-4.526	.000

a. Dependent Variable: abs_RES

Source: Processed data, 2025.

Based on the results of the heteroscedasticity test using the Glejser method, it shows that most of the independent variables do not have a problem with unequal residual variance. The Labeling variable p=0.369 and Personal Selling p=0.219 have p-values greater than 0.05, indicating no heteroscedasticity. However, the Brand Trust variable shows a p-value of 0.000 ($p < 0.05$), which means there are signs of heteroscedasticity in that variable.

Table 7. Multiple Linear Regression Test of the Influence on Purchase Decisions

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.155	3.074		1.026	.307
	Labeling	.400	.073	.514	5.492	.000
	Personal Selling	-.026	.045	-.034	-.579	.564
	Brand Trust	.332	.092	.338	3.591	.001

a. Dependent Variable: Purchase Decision

Source: Processed data, 2025.

Table 8. Multiple Linear Regression Test on the Effect on Brand Trust

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	4,623	3,261		1,418	0,159
	Labeling	0,614	0,049	0,776	12,600	0,000
	Personal Selling	-0,062	0,048	-0,080	-1,295	0,198

a. Dependent Variable: Brand Trust

Source: Processed data, 2025.

Multiple regression analysis will be conducted if the number of independent variables is at least two (Lian, 2023). Based on Table 7, the results of the multiple linear regression test on the influence on Purchase

Decisions, the regression results Table of Coefficients Model 1 testing the effect of Labeling X1, Personal Selling X2, and Brand Trust X3 on Purchase Decisions Y show two significant findings:

Labeling and Brand Trust have a positive and very significant influence on Purchase Decisions.

- Labeling (beta = 0.400; t = 5.492; p = 0.000) is a strong predictor.
- Brand Trust (beta = 0.332; t = 3.591; p = 0.001) also has a significant effect.
- Personal Selling (beta = -0.026; t = -0.579; p = 0.564) has no significant effect on Purchase Decisions. The coefficient being close to zero and not significant indicates that face-to-face sales interactions are not effective in influencing the consumer's final decision.

These findings explain that non-personal aspects and credibility, such as good product information and the trust that is built, are important factors in encouraging consumers to make purchases.

Based on Table 8, the results of the multiple linear regression test on the effect on Brand Trust. The regression results in the Coefficient Table of Model 2, which tests the effect of Labeling X1 and Personal Selling X2 on Brand Trust Z, show different results

• Labeling beta = 0.614; t = 12.600; p = 0.000 has a very significant and dominant positive effect on Brand Trust. The high Beta coefficient indicates that Labeling is an important factor in building Brand Trust. This explains that the quality and honesty of the product information presented are important in brand trust.

• Personal Selling beta = -0.062; t = -1.295; p = 0.198 does not have a significant effect on Brand Trust. This reinforces that Personal Selling is not an effective strategy, either for influencing Purchase Decisions or for building Brand Trust.

Table 9. Coefficient of Determination Test (R^2)

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.809[a]	.655	.645	2.953

a. Predictors: (Constant), Brand Trust, Personal Selling, Labeling

Source: Processed data, 2025.

Table 10. Regression Model of the Influence of Personal Selling and Labeling on Brand Trust

Model Summary[b]

Model	Change Statistics				
	R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.614[a]	81,155	2	102	0,000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Personal Selling, Labeling

b. Dependent Variable: Brand Trust

Source: Processed data, 2025.

According to Ghozali (2018), "The coefficient of determination (R^2) essentially measures the extent to which a model's ability can explain the variation of the dependent variable." The value of the coefficient of determination ranges from 0 to 1. A small R^2 value means that the ability of the independent variables to explain the variation of the dependent variable provides all the information needed to predict the variation of the dependent variable. The coefficient of determination is calculated by squaring the results.

Based on the results of the determination coefficient test, it is known that the R value of 0.809 indicates a strong relationship between the independent and dependent variables. The R Square value of 0.655 signifies that 65.5% of the variation in the dependent variable can be explained by the independent variables, namely personal selling, labeling, and brand trust, while the remaining 34.5% is explained by factors outside this research model. The adjusted R Square value of 0.645 indicates that after adjusting for the number of variables in the model, the

predictive ability remains high, and the significance value of 0.000 shows that the regression model used has a statistically significant effect on the dependent variable.

Table 11. Simultaneous Test (F)

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1670.589	3	556.863	63.854	.000[b]
	Residual	880.802	101	8.721		
	Total	2551.390	104			

a. Dependent Variable: Purchase Decision

b. Predictors: (Constant), Brand Trust, Personal Selling, Labeling

Source: Processed data, 2025.

Table 12. Table of Simultaneous Test F Results for the Brand Trust Variable.

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1624,615	2	812,307	81,155	.000[b]
	Residual	1020,947	102	10,009		
	Total	2645,562	104			

a. Dependent Variable: Brand Trust

b. Predictors: (Constant), Personal Selling, Labeling

Source: Processed data, 2025.

The F-test is a test of the regression coefficients simultaneously. This test is conducted to determine the effect of all independent variables included in the model together (simultaneously) on the dependent variable (Ghozali 2018).

Based on the F-test results presented for both regression models, it can be concluded that all regression models used in this study are proven to be significant. This indicates that the independent variables tested overall contribute significantly to the formation of each dependent variable.

Based on Table 11. First Regression Model Dependent Variable: Purchase Decision.

•Key Results: The F-value is 63.854 with a significance level of 0.000.

•Conclusion: Sig. value 0.000 < 0.05, the simultaneous hypothesis is accepted.

Implications: Overall, Brand Trust, Personal Selling, and Labeling have a significant effect on consumer Purchase Decisions. This confirms that marketing strategies and brand components should be well combined to drive purchasing decisions.

Based on Table 12, the Second Regression Model (Dependent Variable: Brand Trust)

•Key Result: The F-value is 81.155 with a significance level of 0.000.

•Conclusion: Since the Sig. value (0.000) < 0.05, the simultaneous hypothesis is accepted.

Implication: Overall, Personal Selling and Labeling have a significant influence on Brand Trust. This emphasizes that the combination of Personal Selling interactions and reliable product information on Labeling is important in building consumer trust in the brand.

The F Test Simultaneous Test results for both models still show that all independent variables in each model are proven to be feasible and significant overall. The strength of this proven significant model provides strong empirical evidence to proceed to the t-test Partial Test stage and to explain the coefficient of determination R^2, because the model used has met the statistical model adequacy model fit standards.

Table 13. Partial t-test (t)

Coefficients[a]						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.155	3.074		1.026	.307
	Labeling	.400	.073	.514	5.492	.000
	Personal Selling	-.026	.045	-.034	-.579	.564
	Brand Trust	.332	.092	.338	3.591	.001
a. Dependent Variable: Purchase Decision						

Source: Processed data, 2025.

The t-test is a test used to determine the truth or falsity of the null hypothesis (Saputra et al., 2021). Based on the results of the t-test partial test in the table above, it can be explained that Labeling: The Labeling variable has a significant and positive effect on Purchase Decisions Sig. 0.000 < 0.05. The regression coefficient B = 0.400 indicates that an improvement in the quality of Labeling directly increases consumer Purchase Decisions.

Brand Trust: The Brand Trust variable also has a significant and positive effect on Purchase Decisions Sig. 0.001 < 0.05. The regression coefficient B = 0.332 shows that the higher the consumer's Brand Trust, the more likely they are to make Purchase Decisions.

Personal Selling: The Personal Selling variable is proven to have no significant effect on Purchase Decisions Sig. 0.564 > 0.05. This indicates that the Personal Selling strategy used in the context of this study is not a major factor in driving consumer Purchase Decisions partially.

Table 14. Direct Sobel Test

Coefficients[a]						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.155	3.074		1.026	.307
	Labeling	.400	.073	.514	5.492	.000
	Personal Selling	-.026	.045	-.034	-.579	.564
	Purchase Decision	.332	.092	.338	3.591	.001
a. Dependent Variable: Purchase Decision						

Source: Processed data, 2025.

Table 15. Indirect Sobel Test

Coefficients[a]						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	4.623	3.261		1.418	.159
	Labeling	.614	.049	.776	12.600	.000
	Personal Selling	-.062	.048	-.080	-1.295	.198

a. Dependent Variable: Brand Trust

Source: Processed data, 2025.

Table 16. Indirect Test (Labeling → Brand Trust)

Variabel	B	Std. Error	Sig
Labeling → Brand Trust	0.614	0.049	0.000
Personal Selling → Brand Trust	-0.062	0.048	0.198

Source: Processed data, 2025.

Table 17. Direct Test (*Labeling*, *Personal Selling*, Brand Trust → Purchase Decision)

Variabel	B	Std. Error	Sig
Labeling → Purchase Decision	0.400	0.073	0.000
Personal Selling → Purchase Decision	-0.026	0.045	0.564
Kepercayaan Merek → Purchase Decision	0.332	0.092	0.001

Source: Processed data, 2025.

The Sobel test is conducted to determine whether the effect of a mediating variable is significant or not. A variable is referred to as an intervening variable if it affects the relationship between the independent and dependent variables (Surajiyo et al., 2020).

The results of the Sobel test above indicate that the mediator variable plays an important role as a link between the independent and dependent variables. The statistical table for the findings is as follows: the Sobel value is 3.4678, with a two-tailed p-value of only 0.0005248. Since this p-value is far below the 0.05 threshold, the mediation effect is considered valid. This means that the mediator variable successfully bridges and explains why the independent variable affects the dependent variable. Part of the impact of the independent variable on the dependent variable is explained through the mediator variable, making the role of the mediator crucial in the interaction of these variables.

Conceptually, these results reinforce the initial assumption that the mediator is a strong connecting factor. The significance of the mediation also indicates that if we only look at the direct relationship without a mediator, we will not see the complete picture of the actual relationship because there is an indirect pathway.

4. Conclusion

The limitations of this study include constraints related to time, location, the variables used, the sample taken, and the research objects employed in this study. Based on extensive data analysis of 105 DSS Coil consumer respondents, this study can conclude regarding the role of Labeling, Personal Selling, and Brand Trust in influencing Purchase Decisions in the e-cigarette industry.

It was found that Branding and Brand Trust are key factors that have a significant and positive influence on Purchase Decisions. Meanwhile, it was not found that Personal Selling has a significant influence on Purchase

Decisions or Brand Trust individually. Most important thing for the DSS Coil brand is that the main focus should be shifted from Personal Selling to strengthening Labeling regarding information, composition, and legality because Labeling is the strongest predictor that not only influences direct purchases but also is a key to building Brand Trust. The role of Brand Trust has been proven to be an important mediator that bridges the influence of Labeling on Purchase Decisions, confirming that vape consumers heavily rely on brand trust before making a purchase decision.

This research makes a significant contribution by filling the research gap, The inconsistencies found in previous research are addressed through strong evidence regarding the significance of Labeling and Brand Trust. At the same time, Personal Selling is confirmed to be ineffective in the context of marketing e-cigarette products. This study uses an Implicit Mediation Model, providing strong empirical evidence that Labeling serves a dual function, both as a builder of Brand Trust and as a driver of Purchase Decisions although formal mediation tests are not reported, this relationship is statistically proven.

Suggestion

Providing input for future research (for example, Changing or Adding Mediating Variables: Future research is recommended to examine mediating variables other than Brand Trust. This is important because Brand Trust is assumed to have been formed by Labeling and Personal Selling; testing other variables can provide a different perspective on the implications of these two independent variables on Purchase Decisions. Quantitative methods, or expanding the sample scope, may also be considered).

References

[1]. Breland, A., Soule, E., Lopez, A., Ramôa, C., El-Hellani, A., & Eissenberg, T. (2017). Electronic cigarettes: What are they and what do they do? *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, *1394*(1), 5–30. https://doi.org/10.1111/nyas.12977

[2]. Ghozali, I. (2018). Aplikasi analisis multivariate dengan program IBM SPSS 25. Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.

[3]. Janna, N. M., & Herianto, H. (2021). Konsep uji validitas dan reliabilitas dengan menggunakan SPSS. Sekolah Tinggi Agama Islam Darud Da'wah wal Irsyad (STAI DDI) Pinrang.

[4]. Lian, L. H. (2023). Metodologi penelitian: Dasar-dasar dan praktik. Erlangga.

[5]. Mardiatmoko, G. (2020). Pentingnya uji asumsi klasik pada analisis regresi linier bergambar (studi kasus penyusunan persamaan regresi linier bergambar). Barekeng: Jurnal Ilmu Matematika dan Terapan, 14(3), 333–342. https://doi.org/10.30598/barekengvol14iss3pp333-342

[6]. Mufreni, A. N. (2016). Pengaruh desain kemasan dan harga terhadap keputusan pembelian konsumen. *Jurnal Ekonomi Manajemen*, *2*(2), 82–92.

[7]. Ratnawati, A., & Putranti, H. R. D. (2016). Pengaruh kemasan dan harga terhadap minat beli melalui citra merek. *Jurnal Bisnis dan Ekonomi*, *23*(1), 1–12.

[8]. Saputra, G. W., dkk. (2021). *Statistik penelitian: Teori dan aplikasi*. Widina Bhakti Persada.

[9]. Sugiyono. (2018). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D*. Alfabeta.

[10]. Surajiyo, S., Nasruddin, N., & Herman, H. (2020). *Penelitian sumber daya manusia, manajemen pemasaran dan keorganisasian: Teori dan aplikasi*. Deepublish.

[11]. Talih, S., Balhas, Z., Salman, R., Karaoghlanian, N., & Shihadeh, A. (2016). "Direct dripping": A high-temperature electronic cigarette use pattern associated with high levels of toxic aldehydes. *Chemical Research in Toxicology*, *29*(3), 413–419. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.chemrestox.5b00429

[12]. Usmadi, U. (2020). Pengujian persyaratan analisis statistik (uji normalitas dan uji homogenitas). *Jurnal Inovasi Pendidikan*, *7*(1), 50–62.

.