3. Methodology

3.1 Sample and Procedures

After conducting a preliminary pilot test, a comprehensive formal survey was executed. The study specifically targeted Indonesian citizens holding valid driving licenses and possessing a history of owning or currently owning a Hyundai vehicle of any model. To gather data, a multifaceted approach encompassing both online and offline methodologies was adopted, employing a Google Form questionnaire as the primary tool for data collection. The online facet involved digital platforms, such as a wide range of social media. Simultaneously, the offline component strategically utilized traditional methods, including the distribution of the questionnaire in physical formats. This concerted effort in employing hybrid data collection methodologies aimed to encompass a broad spectrum of experiences and perspectives related to Hyundai car ownership among Indonesian citizens, thus enriching the comprehensiveness of the gathered data for subsequent analysis.

The survey distribution occurred through social media platforms and through scannable QR codes strategically positioned across various parking lots within Surabaya. This survey spanned from October 1, 2023, to October 23, 2023, specifically focusing on individuals who possessed direct involvement in purchasing, owning, and driving a Hyundai car. A purposive sampling method was used in this research, in which participants were intentionally chosen based on specific characteristics aligning with the research criteria mentioned above.

The determination of the minimum sample size was based on the 10-time rule proposed by Hair et al. (2021). This guideline advises that the sample size should ideally be at least 10 times the largest number of structural paths directed at a particular construct in the structural model. Given that the largest structural path in the model is purchase intention with 4 structural paths, the minimum required sample size is thus established at 40 for this study.

146 responses were accumulated through a comprehensive outreach strategy spanning social media platforms and strategically positioned scannable QR codes across diverse parking lots in Surabaya. This inclusive approach aimed to cast a wide net, engaging individuals from various backgrounds and demographics associated with Hyundai car ownership. Subsequent to this data collection phase, a stringent vetting process was employed to ensure the integrity and accuracy of the dataset. Through meticulous scrutiny, 29 responses were identified as invalid. This meticulous curation process resulted in a refined pool of 117 validated questionnaires. This selection of validated responses underpins the study's

commitment to precision and comprehensive analysis, ensuring that the subsequent data analysis provides a reliable foundation for drawing insightful conclusions regarding the behaviors and perceptions of Indonesian Hyundai car owners.

Demographically, the respondents consisted of 57 males (39%) and 89 females (61%). Most respondents fell within the age of 17 - 23 years old (48.6%). Preceding to place of residence, majority of the respondents come from Jabodetabek (60.3%) and Surabaya (23.3%).

3.2 Measures

The validity and reliability of the measurement model was assessed by performing the PLS-SEM analysis using the SmartPLS 4 software. The reliability and validity of five constructs, including Product Characteristics, Perceived Value, Brand Trust, and Purchase Intention, were evaluated using factor loadings, Cronbach's alpha (Cronbach's α), composite reliability (CR), and average variance extracted (AVE), following the guiding principles of Hair et al. (2010). Accordingly, one measurement item with low Cronbach's alpha was eliminated to ensure the constructs' validity and reliability. The measurement model analysis results are presented in Table 3.2.1. All factors loading are greater than 0.7, ranging from 0.751 to 0.936. One item namely BT1 were retained because their removals significantly increase the Cronbach's alpha. Cronbach's alpha, CR and AVE values of five constructs Product Characteristics, Perceived Value, Brand Trust, and Purchase Intention were above the suggested threshold levels of 0.7, 0.7 and 0.5, respectively (Hair et al., 2010). The discriminant validity was assessed by the Fornell-Larcker criterion, and one cross loadings issue was found, the details can be seen in Table 3.2.2.

Table 3.1

The Analysis Results of Factor Loading, Cronbach Alpha, Composite Reliability & AVE

Variables	**Factors**	**Items**	**Factor Loadings**	**Cronbach's alpha**	**Composite reliability (rho_a)**	**Average variance extracted (AVE)**
Brand Trust		BT2	0.936	0.849	0.851	0.869
		BT3	0.928			
Product Characteristics	Uniqueness	PC1	0.844	0.91	0.911	0.691
		PC2	0.826			
		PC3	0.855			

		PC4	0.821			
		PC5	0.862			
		PC6	0.778			
	Investment	PC7	0.847	0.893	0.893	0.756
		PC8	0.885			
		PC9	0.868			
		PC10	0.878			
	Self-Expression	PC11	0.92	0.83	0.832	0.854
		PC13	0.929			
Purchase Intention		PI1	0.846	0.898	0.902	0.766
		PI2	0.881			
		PI3	0.877			
		PI4	0.896			
Perceived Value	Emotional Value	PV1	0.751	0.799	0.825	0.715
		PV3	0.879			
		PV4	0.899			
	Social Value	PV5	0.884	0.865	0.866	0.788
		PV6	0.879			
		PV8	0.899			
	Economical Value	PV9	0.927	0.83	0.831	0.855
		PV10	0.922			

Table 3.2

Analysis of Discriminant Validity (Fornell–Larcker Criterion)

	Brand Trust	Economical Value	Emotional Value	Investment	Purchase Intention	Self-Expression	Social Value	Uniqueness
Brand Trust	**0.932**							
Economical Value	0.729	**0.925**						
Emotional Value	0.78	0.797	**0.845**					
Investment	0.727	0.788	0.828	**0.87**				
Purchase Intention	0.841	0.724	0.77	0.813	**0.875**			
Self-Expression	0.764	0.782	0.818	0.834	0.772	**0.924**		
Social Value	0.75	0.778	0.835	0.856	0.782	0.832	**0.887**	
Uniqueness	0.779	0.808	0.817	0.81	0.755	0.833	0.803	**0.831**

3.2.1 Purchase Intention Operationalization

The assessment of purchase intention encompasses four specific components labeled as PI1, PI2, PI3, and PI4 were measured using 4-point Likert scale, ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Each component's reliability and validity underwent scrutiny via factor loadings, Cronbach's alpha (Cronbach's α), composite reliability (CR), and average variance extracted (AVE), adhering to thresholds of 0.7 for factor loadings, Cronbach's alpha, and composite reliability, and 0.5 for average variance extracted. The result from Table 3.2.1 revealed that each item satisfies the reliability and validity testing. Discriminant validity was evaluated using the Fornell-Larcker criterion, which revealed no instances of cross-loading issues. This test demonstrated that every item met the stringent criteria set for reliability and validity testing. This affirmation further increases the confidence in the consistency and accuracy of the measurements within each component.

Table 3.3
Purchase Intention Operationalization

Variable	Measurement Items
Purchase Intention	I need a Hyundai car
	I will look for more information about Hyundai cars
	I will buy a Hyundai car
	I would choose to buy a Hyundai car over another car brand

Source: Chae *et al.* (2020)

3.2.2 Product Characteristics Operationalization

The evaluation of Product Characteristics involved examining fourteen distinct components labeled PC1 to PC12, assessed through a 4-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Each component underwent assessment for reliability and validity using factor loadings, Cronbach's alpha (Cronbach's α), composite reliability (CR), and average variance extracted (AVE). The thresholds set for these assessments were 0.7 for factor loadings, Cronbach's alpha, and composite reliability, and 0.5 for average variance extracted. The findings in Table 3.2.1 indicated that all items met the criteria for reliability and validity. However, when employing the Fornell-Larcker criterion for discriminant validity, some cross-loading issues surfaced, leading to the exclusion of PC12 and PC14. This test demonstrated that every item met the stringent criteria set for reliability and validity testing. This affirmation further bolsters the confidence in the consistency and accuracy of the measurements within each component.

Table 3.4
Product Characteristics Operationalization

Variable	Measurement Items
Product Characteristics	**Uniqueness**
	Hyundai has its own distinctive car design
	Hyundai cars have unique features that cannot be found in other car brands

	Hyundai has a unique product design
	Hyundai cars have characteristics that make them different from other car brands
	Hyundai cars are easy to recognize
	Owning a Hyundai car gives an impression of exclusivity
	Investment
	When buying a car, a Hyundai car is my first choice
	In my opinion, buying a Hyundai car is an investment
	Hyundai cars are a promising investment in the long term (for example due to fuel savings and regular service costs)
	My main goal in buying a Hyundai car is the economic benefits obtained
	Self-Expression
	I feel proud when I own a Hyundai car
	I feel that Hyundai cars can reflect my individuality
	I feel that owning a Hyundai car can improve my self-image
	I feel that Hyundai cars are a means to express my identity

Source: Chae *et al.* (2020)

3.2.3 Perceived Value Operationalization

The assessment of Perceived Value involved an in-depth analysis of twelve individual components, denoted as PV1 to PV12. These components were evaluated using a 4-point Likert scale, spanning from strongly disagree to strongly agree, capturing nuanced perceptions. Rigorous scrutiny encompassed multiple facets of reliability and validity checks, employing established measures such as factor loadings, Cronbach's alpha (Cronbach's α), composite reliability (CR), and average variance extracted (AVE). Stringent thresholds were set at 0.7 for factor loadings, Cronbach's alpha, and composite reliability, and

at 0.5 for average variance extracted. The meticulous analysis, as presented in Table 3.2.1, showcased that all evaluated items surpassed the stringent criteria for reliability and validity assessments, underscoring their consistency and accuracy. Despite meeting these criteria, the evaluation process highlighted certain cross-loading concerns, notably with items PV11 and PV12, necessitating their exclusion to maintain the integrity of the discriminant validity assessment based on the Fornell-Larcker criterion. This meticulous scrutiny, albeit leading to the exclusion of specific components, reaffirms the confidence in the robustness and precision of the measurements within each discerned component, further fortifying the reliability of the evaluation process.

Table 3.5

Perceived Value Operationalization

Variable	Measurement Items
Perceived Value	**Emotional Value**
	I feel different when using a Hyundai car
	Hyundai cars are my favorite cars
	I feel happy when I own a Hyundai car
	I have a desire to own a Hyundai car
	Social Value
	Hyundai cars make me look different.
	When driving a Hyundai car, I feel socially recognized
	Hyundai cars are the choice of people in my social circle.
	Owning a Hyundai car makes a good impression on me
	Economical Value
	Hyundai cars have reasonable prices

	The benefits provided by Hyundai cars exceed the price offered

Source: Chae *et al.* (2020)

3.2.4 Brand Trust Operationalization

The evaluation of Brand Trust involved examining three components labeled BT1, BT2, and BT3, assessed through a 4-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Each component underwent assessment for reliability and validity using factor loadings, Cronbach's alpha (Cronbach's α), composite reliability (CR), and average variance extracted (AVE). The thresholds set for these assessments were 0.7 for factor loadings, Cronbach's alpha, and composite reliability, and 0.5 for average variance extracted. The assessment revealed a Cronbach's alpha that falls below the minimum threshold, resulting in exclusion of BT1. Discriminant validity was evaluated using the Fornell-Larcker criterion, which revealed no instances of cross-loading issues. This test demonstrated that every item met the stringent criteria set for reliability and validity testing. This affirmation further bolsters the confidence in the consistency and accuracy of the measurements within each component.

Table 3.6

Brand Trust Operationalization

Variable	Measurement Items
Brand Trust	When a major problem occurs with the Hyundai car I own, I will not buy a Hyundai product again (for example, it breaks down repeatedly)
	I feel Hyundai is competent in making cars
	I had a good experience when using a Hyundai car

Source: Chae *et al.* (2020)