THE INFLUENCE OF PRICE AND PRODUCT QUALITY ON PURCHASE DECISION THROUGH E-COMMERCE SHOPEE (CASE STUDY ON STUDENTS OF THE FACULTY OF ECONOMICS AND BUSINESS

Wisnu Tri Sardi[1], Rosmaniar[2], Muh. Asbar[3]

[1] Master of Management, Faculty of Economics and Business, Hasanuddin University;
  wisnutrisardi82@gmail.com
[2] Hasanuddin University Faculty of Economics and Business;email@email.com
[3] Hasanuddin University Faculty of Economics and Business;email@email.com

Abstract
Wisnu Tri Sardi, Rosmaniar, Muh. Ashbar, 2023.Effects of cost and product quality on internet buying decisions (a case study for economics students, Angkaa) A case study involving economics students was used to investigate how product quality and cost influence customer purchasing decisions when shopping online. The research method chosen was a quantitative one. 2020 Economics Faculty students made up the study's population. The sample was created using the Slovin formula, with 87 respondents serving as the number of samples collected using proportionate random sampling. A questionnaire with 8 statements for the pricing variable, 12 for the product quality variable, and 8 for the purchase decision variable was used as the data collection method. and it was determined that every claim was true and reliable. Both primary and secondary data were used. Tools for data analysis include quantitative descriptive analysis, validity testing, reliability testing, multiple regression analysis testing, classical assumption testing (normality, multicollinearity, and heteroscedasticity tests), and hypothesis testing (partial, simultaneous, and coefficient determination tests). employing spss 22. The results of the hypothesis test (t-test) in this study demonstrate that the cost influences business students' online shopping purchasing choices in part. However, simultaneous testing (F-test) demonstrates that price and product quality simultaneously affect purchase decisions made through electronic shopping. Product quality characteristics do not partially influence the online shopping decisions of economics students. Ftable (3.10) > Fcount (26.004) 0.05 and 0.000 respectively, yes.
Keywords: *Price, product quality, purchasing decisions, online stores*

A. INTRODUCTION

Shopee is currently the first shopping app to have more than 100,000,000 users. there is a high probability that people will buy and sell goods there (Nabila, 2021). Shopee provides various conveniences that attract customers for this e-commerce buying and selling transaction. Customers love to shop online at Shopee as it saves them time and money on travel expenses. Consumers primarily consider Shopee's price, promotions and quality of service before making a purchase. Users or consumers are more likely to continue shopping online because it is easier and more convenient.

E-commerce refers to business operations involving the use of the internet or what can be referred to as online companies. The sales process using this method is not just the act of buying and selling goods through digital media, this is very helpful for businesses and consumers. E-commerce is supported by extensive partnerships and covers the full process, from development to marketing, sales, shipping, and consumer payments.

Due to the prevalence of smartphones, internet access is now very convenient and affordable, accounting for 30% of all internet users in Indonesia, or 82 million people. According to a study cited in We Are Social, Hootsuite (2020), there were e-commerce transactions worth 460 trillion rupees in 2019. While Indonesia's total e-commerce value only reached 391 trillion in 2018, this is an increase of around 69 trillion. Sales in a number of industries or categories, including food

and personal care (up 60%), furniture and appliances (57%), fashion and beauty (54%), gadgets and electronics (48%), and some others, also increased with this increase.

In terms of marketing strategy, Shopee is a marketplace for promotions. Promotion is a stimulus to attract the attention of consumers to make more purchases. The incentives of the company are product, price, location and promotion. Promotion in this case is important so that consumers can make repeat purchases because of the price and quality of the product. The marketing strategy carried out by shopee is the first form of media which is television and billboards. Price and product quality, in addition to the active use of shopee advertising tactics, also significantly influence whether customers choose to buy from them. Price is the inflated value for a particular product. In fact, various psychological factors are taken into account in addition to physical ones when determining the amount of value or price. Price is a manageable variable and influences whether consumers will find an item that has multiple uses. Therefore, a price that makes a type of good valuable to consumers and commensurate with its quality is an appropriate pricing strategy.

Shopee e-commerce has changed consumer buying patterns. One of the Indonesians who is interested in Shopee is a student at Muhammadiyah Makassar University, namely at the Faculty of Economics. Shopee is ideal for millennial business economics students who live in the digital era where smartphones are the only devices that can access anything. Due to the convenience, speed and safety of purchasing everyday goods at Shopee via smartphone, the buying and selling process saves time.

Another advantage as consumers is that we get more information about the products we want to buy, so we get the things we want. However, if Shopee e-commerce is the ideal medium for purchasing decisions and what effect does it have on purchasing decisions. According to Heriyanto, 2020, to make a decision, you must have two or more options available to you. Heriyanto defines a purchase decision as a choice among a number of options or preferences when making a purchase.

A call option is a decision between two or more possible actions. Consequently, in this scenario, factors such as price, product quality, and advertising are required to influence the consumer's purchase choice. Students' capacity to make purchases also depends on how much pocket money they have. Students are usually the most cost-conscious buyers because, from their point of view, they are more likely to choose goods of the same quality at a lower price. When they see price differences for the same quality of goods, students will be enticed to make an online purchase immediately. As can be seen from the statement above, research is needed on shopee e-commerce to ascertain the extent to which price and product quality affect consumer decisions to buy.

B.   RESEARCH METHODS

Location and Research Design
The author of this section studies students of the Faculty of Economics and Business, University of Muhammadiyah Makassar on Jl. Sultan Alauddin No. 259

Population and Sample
The 658 students from Muhammadiyah Makassar University who are enrolled in the Faculty of Economics and Business consist of the people or sample in this study, and the sample in this study contains a number of these students.

Method of collecting data
The questionnaire is a collection of statements with suggested responses. Respondents were asked to choose one of the options written to them and shown to them. All indicators for each variable are measured using a Likert scale.

Variable Operational Definitions

Table 1. Price Variable Indicators

Variable	Indicator	Measurement
Price (X1)	1. Affordability 2. Prices according to product quality 3. Price suitability with perceived benefits 4. Prices according to ability or price competitiveness	Likert scale
Product Quality (X2)	1. performance 2. Additional Characteristics 3. Reputation 4. Compliance with specifications 5. endure 6. aesthetic	Likert scale
Purchase decision (Y)	1. Want to use the product 2. Want to buy a product 3. Offer advice to others 4. For repeat purchases	Likert scale

Data analysis method

Actions included in the analysis include grouping data according to variables and categories of respondents, presenting data for each variable analyzed, performing calculations to solve problems, and testing hypotheses that have been proposed. (Sugiyono, 2018: 147). Quantitative Descriptive Analysis was used as the data analysis technique in this investigation.

Price Variable Answers from Respondents (X1)

Table 2. Price Variables

Items		STS	TS	KS	S	SS	Total
				Alternative Answers			
X1.1	F	0	0	23	55	9	87
	%	0	0	26,4	63,2	10,3	100
X1.2	F	0	0	24	47	16	87
	%	0	0	27,6	54.0	18,4	100
X1.3	F	0	0	22	46	19	87
	%	0	0	25,3	52,9	21,8	100
X1.4	F	0	0	27	41	19	87
	%	0	0	31.0	47,1	21,8	100
X1.5	F	0	0	23	51	13	87
	%	0	0	26,4	58,6	14,9	100
X1.6	F	0	1	37	38	11	87
	%	0	1,1	42.5	43,7	12,6	100
X1.7	F	0	0	16	54	17	87
	%	0	0	18,4	62,1	19.5	100
X1.8	F	0	0	0	39	48	87
	%	0	0	0	44.8	55,2	100

Based on table 2, the results of the respondents' responses can be seen as follows:

1. Of the 87 respondents, 23 people (26.4%) disagreed with statement X1.1, 55 people (63.2%) and 9 people (10.3%) disagreed. From this information, it was concluded that many respondents chose point X1.1

2. For statement X1.2, out of 87 respondents, 24 people (27.6%) disagreed, 47 people (54.0%) agreed, and 16 people (18.4%) strongly agreed. From this information, respondents prefer point X1.2
3. Out of a total of 87 people who responded to statement X1.3, there were 22 people (25.3%) who decided to disagree, 46 people (52.9%) chose to agree, 19 people (21.8%) fully agreed. . From this information, it can be concluded that more respondents chose point X1.3
4. Of the total number of 87 people who responded to statement X1.4, 27 people (31.0%) decided to disagree, 41 people (47.1%) chose to agree, 19 people (21.8%) chose I strongly agree. From this information, it can be concluded that more respondents chose point X1.4
5. Of the total number of 87 people who responded to statement X1.5, 23 people (26.4%) decided to disagree, 51 people (58.6%) chose to agree, 13 people (14.9%) chose I strongly agree. From this information, it can be concluded that more respondents chose to support clause X1.5
6. Of the total respondents to statement X1.6, 1 (1.1) did not agree with 87 people, 37 (42.5) did not agree, 54 people (62.1) voted in favor, 17 people (19), 5%) voted completely. favor From this information, it can be concluded that more respondents chose point X1.6
7. Out of a total of 87 people who responded to statement X1.7, there were 16 people (18.4%) who decided to disagree, 54 (62.1%) chose to agree, and 17 (19.5%) chose to support more. From this information, more people choose point X1.7
8. Of the total number of respondents to statement X1.8, there were 87 people, 39 people (44.8%) voted in favor, 48 people (55.2%) fully agreed. From these results, the statement X1.8 is preferred.

Product Quality Variable Results

Table 3. Product Quality Variables

Alternative Answers							
Items		STS	TS	N	S	SS	Total
X2.1	F	0	0	15	38	34	87
	%	0	0	17,2	43,7	39,1	100
X2.2	F	0	0	7	46	34	87
	%	0	0	8.0	52,9	39,1	100
X2.3	F	0	0	15	36	36	87
	%	0	0	17,2	41,4	41,4	100
X2.4	F	0	0	8	48	31	87
	%	0	0	9,2	55,2	35,6	100
X2.5	F	0	0	3	52	32	87
	%	0	0	3,4	59,8	36,8	100
X2.6	F	0	0	21	33	33	87
	%	0	0	24,1	37,9	37,9	100
X2.7	F	0	1	8	49	29	87
	%	0	1,1	9,2	56,3	33,3	100
X2.8	F	0	0	3	53	31	87
	%	0	0	3,4	60,9	35,6	100
X2.9	F	0	0	14	40	33	87
	%	0	0	16,1	46.0	37,9	100
X2.10	F	0	0	8	40	39	87
	%	0	0	9,2	46.0	44.8	100

X2.11	F	0	0	2	50	35	87
	%	0	0	2,3	57.5	40,2	100
X2.12	F	0	0	4	48	35	87
	%	0	0	4,6	55,2	40,2	100

Based on table 3 it can be seen as follows
1. For statement X2.1, out of a total of 87 respondents, there were 15 people (17.2%) who disagreed, 38 people (43.7%) agreed, 34 people (39.1%) strongly agreed. From these results, it can be concluded that most of them support item X2.1
2. For statement X2.2, out of a total of 87 respondents, there were 7 people (8.0%) who disagreed, 46 people (52.9%) agreed, 34 people (39.1%) who strongly agreed. From this data, more choose the statement item X2.2
3. For statement X2.3, out of a total of 87 respondents, 15 people (17.2%) chose to disagree, 36 people (41.4%) chose to agree, 36 people (41.4%) chose to strongly agree. From these data it can be concluded that more respondents chose to agree to the statement item X2.3
4. For statement X2.4, out of a total of 87 respondents, there were 8 people (9.2%) who disagreed, 48 people (55.2%) agreed, 31 people (35.6%) who strongly agreed. From these data it can be concluded that more respondents chose to agree to the statement item X2.4
5. For statement X2.5, out of a total of 87 respondents, there were 3 people (3.4%) who disagreed, 52 people (59.8%) agreed, 32 people (36.8%) who strongly agreed. From these data it can be concluded that more respondents chose to agree to the statement item X2.5
6. For statement X2.6, out of a total of 87 respondents there were 21 people (24.1%) who chose not to agree, 33 people (37.9%) chose to agree, 33 people (37.9%) chose to strongly agree. From these data it can be concluded that more respondents chose to agree and strongly agree for the statement item X2.6
7. For statement X2.7, out of a total of 87 respondents, there was 1 person (1.1%) who disagreed, 8 people (9.2%) who disagreed, 49 people (56.3%) agreed, 29 people (33.3%) who strongly agreed. From these data it can be concluded that more respondents chose to agree to the statement item X2.7.
8. For statement X2.8, out of a total of 87 respondents, there were 3 people (3.4%) who disagreed, 53 people (60.9%) agreed, 31 people (35.6%) who strongly agreed. From these data it can be concluded that more respondents chose to agree to the statement item X2.8
9. For statement X2.9, out of a total of 87 respondents, 14 people (16.1%) chose to disagree, 40 people (46.0%) chose to agree, 33 people (37.9%) chose to strongly agree. From these data it can be concluded that more respondents chose to agree to the statement item X2.9
10. For statement X2.1, out of a total of 87 respondents, there were 8 people (9.2%) who disagreed, 40 people (46.0%) agreed, 39 people (44.8%) who strongly agreed. From these data it can be concluded that more respondents chose to agree to the statement item X2.10
11. For statement X2.11, out of a total of 87 respondents, there were 2 people (2.3%) who disagreed, 50 people (57.5%) agreed, 35 people (40.2%) who strongly agreed. From these data it can be concluded that more respondents chose to agree to the statement item X2.11
12. For statement X2.12, out of a total of 87 respondents, there were 4 people (4.6%) who disagreed, 48 people (55.2%) chose to agree, 35 people (40.2%) chose to strongly agree. From these data it can be concluded that more respondents chose to agree to the statement item X2.12

Respondents' Responses to Purchasing Decision Variables

Table 4. Purchasing Decision Variables

Alternative Answers						
Items		STS	TS	N	S	SS	Total
Y1	F	0	0	25	45	17	87
	%	0	0	28,7	51,7	19.5	100
Y2	F	0	0	20	46	21	87
	%	0	0	23.0	52,9	24,1	100
Y3	F	0	0	23	44	20	87
	%	0	0	26,4	50,6	23.0	100
Y4	F	0	0	33	39	15	87
	%	0	0	37,9	44.8	17,2	100
Y5	F	0	0	27	36	24	87
	%	0	0	26,4	58,6	14,9	100
Y6	F	0	0	18	29	40	87
	%	0	0	20,7	33,3	46.0	100
Y7	F	0	0	20	36	31	87
	%	0	0	23.0	41,4	35,6	100
Y8	F	0	0	25	36	25	87
	%	0	0	28,7	41,4	29,9	100

Based on table 4 the results of the responses of respondents include:

1. Of the total respondents to Y1's statement, 87 people disagreed, 25 people (28.7%), 45 people (51.7%) agreed, and 17 people (19.5%) completely agreed. Based on this information, it can be concluded that more respondents choose to support clause Y1.
2. Of the total number of respondents to statement Y2, 87 people (23.0%) disagreed with 20 people, 46 people (52.9%) agreed with them, and 21 people (24.1%) fully agreed. . Based on this information, it can be concluded that more respondents choose to support clause Y2.
3. Regarding statement Y3, out of 87 respondents, 23 people (26.4%) disagreed, 44 people (50.6%) agreed and 20 people (23.0%) strongly agreed. . From this information, more respondents chose to support clause Y3.
4. Of a total of 87 people who responded to Y4's statement, 33 people (37.9%) decided to disagree, 39 people (44.8%) voted in favor, 15 people (17.2%) completely agreed. . Based on this information, it can be concluded that more respondents choose to support clause Y4.
5. Of the total 87 people who responded to Y5's statement, 27 people (31.0%) disagreed, 36 people (41.4%) voted for it, and 24 people (27.6%) strongly agreed. . From this information, more supports clause Y5.
6. Of the total 87 people who responded to statement Y6, 18 people (20.7%) decided to disagree, yes 29 people (33.3%), 40 people (46.0%) completely agreed. . Based on this information, it can be concluded that more respondents voted in favor of clause Y6.
7. Statement Y7 From 87 respondents, 20 people (23.0%) decided to disagree, 36 people (41.4%) supported, 31 people (35.6%) completely agreed. Based on this information, it can be concluded that more respondents voted in favor of clause Y7.
8. Out of a total of 87 people who responded to Y8's statement, 25 people (28.7%) decided to disagree, 36 people (41.4%) voted in favor, 26 people (29.9%) completely agreed. From this information, more supports the Y8 claim point

Data Validity Test

a. Validity test

Table 5. Validity Test Results

No	Variable	Items Statement	validity		Information
			rcount	rtable	
1	Price (X1)	X1.1	0.643	0.208	Valid
		X1.2	0.891	0.208	Valid
		X1.3	0.901	0.208	Valid
		X1.4	0.826	0.208	Valid
		X1.5	0.880	0.208	Valid
		X1.6	0.731	0.208	Valid
		X1.7	0.647	0.208	Valid
		X1.8	0.233	0.208	Valid
2	Product Quality(X2)	X2.1	0.766	0.208	Valid
		X2.2	0.658	0.208	Valid
		X2.3	0.695	0.208	Valid
		X2.4	0.547	0.208	Valid
		X2.5	0.673	0.208	Valid
		X2.6	0.722	0.208	Valid
		X2.7	0.661	0.208	Valid
		X2.8	0.679	0.208	Valid
		X2.9	0.648	0.208	Valid
		X2.10	0.594	0.208	Valid
		X2.11	0.734	0.208	Valid
		X2.12	0.614	0.208	Valid
3	Decision purchase(Y)	Y1	0.710	0.208	Valid
		Y2	0.743	0.208	Valid
		Y3	0.577	0.208	Valid
		Y4	0.666	0.208	Valid
		Y5	0.756	0.208	Valid
		Y6	0.233	0.208	Valid
		Y7	0.291	0.208	Valid
		Y8	0.269	0.208	Valid

Based on information 5. Students of the Faculty of Economics and Business obtain results for the overall value of the calculation > r table, with a total of 0.208. In the validity test with all questionnaire indicators. As a result, it was determined that each item on the research questionnaire was considered valid.

b. Reliability Test

Table 6. Reliability Test Results

Variable	Cronbach Alpha	Reliability Standards	information
X1	0874	0.60	Reliable
X2	0.884	0.60	Reliable
Y	0.621	0.60	Reliable

Table 6. The findings of the reliability test show that further testing can be carried out on each variable, or that all variables show a higher reliability value than the reliability criterion of 0.60.

1. Classic assumption test
a. Normality test

Table 7. Normality test results
One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		Unstandardized Residuals
N		87
Normal Parameters, b	Means	.0000000
	std. Deviation	2.42209212
Most Extreme Differences	absolute	087
	Positive	087
	Negative	-.049
Test Statistics		087
asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.099c

Table 7 normality test, the regression model used is normally distributed if the significance value is 0.099 > 0.05.

b. Multicollinearity test

In determining the regression model to identify the correlation between the independent variables, a multicollinearity test is used. By examining the magnitude of the tolerance value and the variance inflation factor (VIF), multicollinearity can be identified. When VIF values > 10 and VIF 10 reveal variables that lead to multicollinearity, the model is said to be free from multicollinearity.

Table 8. Multicollinearity Test Results
Coefficientsa

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			Collinearity Statistics	
		B	std. Error	Betas	t	Sig.	tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	17,434	3,312		5,263	.000		
	x1	.536	.074	.626	7,210	.000	.975	1,026
	x2	-.052	052	-.086	-.985	.327	.975	1,026

As can be observed from the test results in table 8 above, all the variables used have a VIF value of 1.026 for the Price variable (X1) and 1.026 for the Product Quality variable (X2). The tolerance value is greater than 0.10 and the two variable VIF values are 10 times smaller. Therefore, this indicates that the independent variables used in this study do not indicate any multicollinearity problem in this particular example.

c. Heteroscedasticity test

Table 9. Heteroscedasticity Test Results
Coefficientsa

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
		B	std. Error	Betas	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	-.001	003		-.434	.665
	transformx1	1.739E-6	.000	.292	1,324	.189
	transformx2	032	.026	.270	1,226	.224

From table 9, it is known that the significant number of price variables (X1) is 0.189 and product quality (X2) is 0.224 obtained by the heteroscedasticity test using the motodelejser. This significant value is higher than 0.05, indicating that there is no heteroscedasticity problem with the data.

1.2 Multiple linear regression

Table 10. Multiple Linear Regression test results

<div align="center">Coefficientsa</div>

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	std. Error	Betas	t	Sig.
1 (Constant)	17,434	3,312		5,263	.000
x1	.536	.074	.626	7,210	.000
x2	-.052	052	-.086	-.985	.327

a. Dependent Variables: y

$$Y= \alpha + b1X1 + b2X2$$
$$Y = 17.434 + 0.536(X1) – 0.502(X2)$$

From the linear similarity in 10 it is described to ensure the effect of the independent variables on the dependent variable seen from the significant value of each variable:

1. The positive value of constant value () is 17.434. The positive result means that there is a one-way relationship between the independent and dependent variables. This shows that the purchase decision value is 17,434 if all independent variables, including price (X1) and product quality (X2), remain stable or constant at zero.

2. Price variable regression coefficient (X1) stands. 0.536. Value indicates a favorable (unidirectional) relationship between price factors and purchase choices. This implies that the purchase choice variable will increase by 53.6% if the price variable increases by 1%. This shows that, if other variables are held constant, price can explain 46.4% of the impact on the purchasing decision variable. The positive result means that there is a one-way relationship between the independent and dependent variables.

3. The regression coefficient for the variable X2 which represents product quality is negative and equal to -0.052. Values indicate adverse (opposite) effects. This shows that if the quality of the product increases, the decision to buy will change.

Hypothesis testing
Partial hypothesis test (t test)

<div align="center">Table 11. Partial test results</div>
<div align="center">Coefficientsa</div>

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	std. Error	Betas	t	Sig.
1 (Constant)	17,434	3,312		5,263	.000
x1	.536	.074	.626	7,210	.000
x2	-.052	052	-.086	-.985	.327

Based on the top-level T-test results in Table 11. So, it can be understood that

1. The estimated price value for the price variable (X1) is 7.210 > ttable, or 0.208 with a sig value of 0.000 at a significant level (0.05). This finding indicates that H0 is rejected and Ha is accepted. With the conclusion from the findings mentioned above, the findings of this study indicate that price has a limited impact on purchasing decisions.

2. It is known that the product quality variable (X2) has a computational value of -0.985, a table value of 0.208, and a sig value of 0.372 > significant level (0.05). From these findings, it is clear that Ha

a.   Determination Test (R2)

Table 12. R2 test results
Summary model b

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	std. Error of the Estimate
1	.618a	.382	.368	2,451

According to table 12 above, 36.8% of the variation in the dependent variable on purchasing decisions can be explained by the independent variables Price and Product Quality, while the remaining 63.2% is explained by other variables outside the research variables, resulting in an adjusted R square of 0.368.

b. Simultaneous Test (Test F)

Table 13. F test results
ANOVAa

Model	Sum of Squares	Df	MeanSquare	F	Sig.
1 Regression	312,375	2	156,187	26,004	.000b
residual	504,522	84	6006		
Total	816,897	86			

The results of the Fcalculate values for the price (X1) and product quality (X2) variables on the purchase decision (Y) are 26.004 with a sig value of 0.000, as can be seen from table 13 above. According to the results of this study Fcalculate (26.004) > Ftable (3.10) test and a sig value of 0.000 0.05, the hypothesis is accepted, price (X1) and product quality (X2) simultaneously affect the purchase decision (Y).

C. DISCUSSION

1. The cost of goods and services that consumers have to buy from vendors is known as price. When making a purchase or visiting, potential customers will compare the prices of goods with those offered by competing businesses. If they determine that the product offered there fits their budget requirements and desired product specifications, they will make a purchase.

   The price value determined from the t-test table is 7.210; the table is 0.208; sig value is 0.000; and the significant level is (0.05). Ho is rejected (Ha is approved), which indicates that price influences the decision to buy through the online marketplace Shopee, based on decision-making criteria.

   This research is in line with previous research by Chica Fahriana (201:89) which was conducted at the University of Muhammadiyah Malangwho asserts that because price is a component of marketing strategy, it is easy to adjust in terms of product characteristics, distribution routes, and even communication, price influences purchasing decisions.

   Consumers take into account prices when making purchases on the Shopee marketplace to avoid business competition. When making a purchase on Shopee, customers will decide whether they believe the benefits of the product outweigh or at least equal the cost of the item. Also, customers can purchase products from Shopee without breaking the bank, and they trust that if the price difference between the two options is significant, they will choose the more expensive option because, in general, people tend to associate higher prices with higher quality items. 72 (Dwiyantoro 2021).

2. The ability of a product to perform its functions, including robustness, dependability, accuracy, cost, usability, and repairability, among other important characteristics, is referred to as product quality. A product may be considered high quality if it satisfies the previous needs and demands of a potential buyer. Purchasing decisions will be influenced whether the cause of the product is in accordance with consumer expectations.

   The calculated product quality value is -0.985; t-test table is 0.208; The table has a sig value of 0.372; and the table is significant at the 0.05 level.H0 was passed (Ha rejected) based on decision-making criteria, indicating that product quality has nothing to do with purchases made by students using the Shopee application. According to Nasution's research (2020; 51). According to a survey conducted among undergraduate students at the Faculty of Economics, Labuhan Batu University, majoring in management, and published in The

Influence of Product Quality, Brand Image, Trust, Convenience, and Price on Purchasing Decisions on Shopee E-Commerce, "The product quality variable does not partially influence decisions at Shopee e-commerce. So why? It may also be the result of poor product quality provided by the online retailer, such as the availability of items that have been used before or were delivered with damage. Customers may feel disappointed by the quality of e-commerce products as a result (Agustiani, 2021; 73).

      This is also supported by the research conducted by Sukawati (2018: 84) which states that there are difficulties in ensuring product quality when shopping online, there is no guarantee that the quality of the product that comes later will be the same as what is expected, not to mention if there is a problem in shipping which results in the product being defective, damaged, and so on. Research is also supported by discussions about product quality that does not have much effect on consumer purchasing decisions, (Ababil, Muttaqien & Nawangsih, 2019) and (Rawung, Oroh & Sumarauw, 2015). This finding defines that consumers, as target producers, may lack awareness of the quality of the goods they will consume. But in general, the quality of a product is what determines how long it stays in the market.This shows that product quality is not always a factor in consumer purchasing decisions. For their products to compete successfully in the market, manufacturers must be able to offer both high quality products at a reasonable price.

3. The research findings, which describe how Product Price and Quality affect purchasing decisions in e-commerce Shopee, include Fcalculate (26.004) > Ftable (3.10) and sig value 0.000 0.05. This research is in line with Andrean's research from 2021 which found that price, promotion, and product quality all had an impact on the decision of Cendana Medan Polytechnic students to use the online shopping service Shopee.
4. This is in line with research (Santoso, Waluyo, & Listyorni, 2013) which shows how factors such as product quality, price, and promotion positively influence purchasing decisions and have a strong degree of close relationship. This shows that if product quality, price, and promotion are improved, it will result in higher purchasing decisions.

D. CONCLUSION

      The following can be concluded regarding students at the Faculty of Economics and Business based on research findings and talkers who have conducted addressing the impact of price and product quality on purchasing decisions through e-commerce shopee:

1. Prices influence purchases through Shopee e-commerce in profitable and significant ways. Those enrolled in the Faculty of Economics and Business. The hypothesis test of the estimated price value of 7.210 > ttable, i.e. 0.208 with a sig value of 0.000 at a significant level (0.05), serves as evidence of this.
2. In terms of product quality, selecting goods through the online shop Shopee is destructive and irrelevant. those who are students at the Faculty of Economics and Business. The hypothesis test shows that, as shown above, based on the findings of the study and discussions conducted regarding how Shopee e-commerce customers decide what to buy in terms of price and product quality, the following can be concluded as students of the Faculty of Economics and Business:
3. Both price and product quality have an impact on purchases made through the Shopee online shopping system. student at the Faculty of Economics and Business. This is shown by the F test (simultaneous) with a Fcalculate value (26.004), > Ftable (3.10), and a sig value of 0.000, 0.05.

REFERENCES

Ababil, R., Muttaqien, F., & Nawangsih. (2019). Analysis of Product Quality, Word Of Mouth, and Location on Purchase Decision of the Senduro Coffee Brand. Journal Progress Conference, 2(7), 572–581.

Agustiani, V., & Jaya, UA (2021). The Influence of Product Quality and Promotion on Purchase Decisions at Shopee. co. id. Winter Journal: IMWI Student Research Journal, 2(1), 73-86.

Andrean, A., Nugroho, N., Hutabarat, FAM, Anggraini, D., & Supriyanto, S. (2021, October). The Relationship of Price, Promotion, and Product Quality to Student Purchase Decisions in the Shopee E-Commence Application. In National Seminar on Science and Information Technology (SENSASI) (Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 240-244).

Dwijantoro, R., Dwi, B., & Syarief, N. (2022). The Effect of Price, Product Quality, and Promotion on Purchase Decisions in the Shopee Marketplace. Journal of Management and Business Research, 16(2), 63-76.

Fahriana, C. (2022). The Influence of Price, Product Quality, and Service Quality on Purchasing Decisions on Shopee E-Commerce (Study on Students of the Faculty of Economics and Business, Islamic University of Malang).

Harapan, DA (2015). Analysis of Factors Influencing Consumer Purchase Decisions at USU Tax (Pajus) Medan. Journal of Finance and Business, 7(3), 227–242.

Heriyanto, H., Rachma, N., & Asiyah, S. (2020). The Influence of Product Quality, Price and Promotion on Consumer Purchasing Decisions at Online Shop Bukalapak (Case Study of Students of Feb Class of 2016 Islamic University of Malang). Scientific Journal of Management Research, 9(25).

Nabila, I. 2021. The Influence of Price, Promotion, Trust and Product Quality on Purchasing Decisions of Shopee E-Commerce Users Case Studies in Students of the Faculty of Economics and Business, University of Kusuma, Surabaya Thesis. Kusuma University. Surabaya.

Nasution, SLA, Limbong, CH, & Ramadhan, DA (2020). The influence of product quality, brand image, trust, convenience, and price on purchasing decisions in e-commerce shopee (Survey of Undergraduate Students of the Faculty of Economics, Management Department, Labuhan Batu University). Ecobisma (Journal of Economics, Business and Management), 7(1), 43-53

Rawung, DR, Oroh, SG, & Sumarauw, JS (2015). Analysis of product quality, brand and price on purchasing decisions for Suzuki motorcycles at PT. Sinar Galesong Pratama Manado. EMBA Journal: Research Journal of Economics, Management, Business and Accounting, 3(3).

Santoso, KW, Waluyo, HD, & Listyorini, S. (2013). The Influence of Product Quality, Price and Promotion on Purchasing Decisions of Tolak Angin Candy in Semarang. Diponogoro Journal Of Social and Politics, 3(1), 1–11

Sugiyono. 2016, "Quantitative Research Methods. Bandung: Alphabet.

Sukawati, S. (2018). The Influence of Trust, Price, and Product Quality on Purchasing Decisions Through the Internet in Makassar City. Phinisi Integration Review, 1(2), 190–200.