CHAPTER V

RESEARCH RESULTS AND DISCUSS

A. Validity Test and Reliability Test

1. Validity Test

A validity test is done to find out whether valid or not a questionnaire will be given to respondents. By using SPSS version 21.0, the validity of data which counts able rtable can be said to be valid. From table 4.7 it can be seen that the r table is 0.1388 greater than r count so the conclusion is all the variables are said to be valid.

Table 5. 1 **Validity Test**

Variable	Item	rcount	Information
Trust	X1.1	0,752	Valid
	X2.1	0,866	Valid
	X3.1	0,842	Valid
	X4.1	0,724	Valid
Price	X2.1	0,772	Valid
	X2.2	0,793	Valid
	X2.3	0,798	Valid
	X2.4	0,787	Valid
Promotion	X3.1	0,697	Valid
	X3.2	0,760	Valid
	X3.4	0,814	Valid
	X3.4	0,800	Valid
Time	X4.1	0,822	Valid
	X4.2	0,848	Valid
	X4.3	0,787	Valid
	X4.4	0,619	Valid
Risk	X5.1	0,793	Valid
	X5.2	0,798	Valid
	X5.3	0,674	Valid
	X5.4	0,600	Valid
Ease of Use	X6.1	0,877	Valid
	X6.2	0,911	Valid
	X6.3	0,883	Valid
	X6.4	0,817	Valid
Quality of Information	X7.1	0,804	Valid
	X7.2	0,793	Valid

Variable	Item	rcount	Information
	X7.3	0,815	Valid
	X7.4	0,769	Valid
Purchase Intention	Y1	0,748	Valid
	Y2	0,791	Valid
	Y3	0,842	Valid
	Y4	0,804	Valid

Source: Primary data processed, 2019

2. Reliability Test

Reliability test to measure the value of the questionnaire variables so that it can produce data that is consistent using the statistical test tool SPSS version 21.0, can be said to be reliable if Cronbach's alpha is greater than 0.06. The following are the results of the reliability test.

Table 5. 2 **Reliable Test**

Variable	Nilai Alpha	Information
Trust	0,806	Reliable
Price	0,795	Reliable
Promotion	0,769	Reliable
Time	0,770	Reliable
Risk	0,685	Reliable
Ease of Use	0,893	Reliable
Quality of Information	0,806	Reliable
Purchase Intention	0,808	Reliable

Source: Primary data processed, 2019

Based on Table 5.2 the reliability test results show all the variables in this study have a Cronbach Alpha coefficient value> 0.6, it can be concluded that all the variables in this study are declared reliable.

B. Classic Assumption Test

The classic assumption test is performed to determine the condition of the data used in this study. This was done to obtain the right analysis model to be used in this study. The classic assumption tests include statistical normality test, heteroscedasticity test and multicollinearity test.

1. Normality Test

Normality test is carried out to look at the regression model of a confounding or residual variable having a normal distribution. Can be known by researchers' statistical test analysis. Based on the results of normality testing in this study can be seen in table 5.3.

Table 5. 3 **Normality Test**

	Unstandardized Residual
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z	1.223
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	0.101

Source: Primary data processed, 2019

The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test results in table 5.3 show the Kolmogorov-Smirnov value of 1,223 with a significant probability value (Asymp. Sig) of 0.101. because of the Asymp value. Sig> 0.05, it can be concluded that the residual data are normally distributed. In other words, the regression model of this study is normally distributed.

2. Heteroscedasticity Test

Heteroscedasticity test to test whether in the regression model there is an inequality of variance from residuals or observations to other observations. If the residuals from one observation to another are fixed, then it is called homokedacity, if the variance is different, it is called heteroscedasticity. This heteroscedasticity test is conducted to see or to find out whether or not there is a deviation in the classical assumptions in the regression model.

Table 5. 4 **Heteroscedasticity Test**

Variable	**Sig.**	**Information**
Trust	0.480	No Heteroscedasticity
Price	0.325	No Heteroscedasticity
Promotion	0.468	No Heteroscedasticity
Time	0.992	No Heteroscedasticity
Risk	0.214	No Heteroscedasticity
Ease of Use	0.052	No Heteroscedasticity
Quality of Information	0.515	No Heteroscedasticity

Source: Primary data processed, 2019

As shown in Table 5.4, it can be seen that the independent variables namely trust, price, promotion, time, risk, ease of use, and quality of information the absence of heteroscedasticity in the regression model by looking at the significant value in table 5.4 which is> 0.05.

3. Multicollinearity Test

Multicollinearity test was conducted to look at the regression model found a correlation between the independent variables in the regression model, the results of the analysis can be seen in table 5.5.

Table 5. 5 Multicollinearity Test

Variable	Tolerance	VIF	Information
Trust	0.495	2.021	No Multicollinearity
Price	0.427	2.344	No Multicollinearity
Promotion	0.567	1.764	No Multicollinearity
Time	0.376	2.660	No Multicollinearity
Risk	0.806	1.241	No Multicollinearity
Ease of Use	0.389	2.568	No Multicollinearity
Quality of Information	0.607	1.647	No Multicollinearity

Source: Primary data processed, 2019

As shown in Table 5.5 it appears that shows all the VIF values of all independent variables in this study have a Tolerance value> 0.1 and a VIF value ≤ 10. Then it can be said to mean the data is free from multicollinearity.

C. Hypothesis Testing and Data Analysis

1. Descriptive Statistics

Based on the primary data that has been processed, the variables used in this study will be explained. As shown in Table 5.6, it can be explained that the lowest value for the trust variable is 7 and the highest value for the trust variable is 20. The average value for the trust variable is 14.82. Furthermore, the standard deviation of the trust variable is 2.580 which is smaller than the average size of the trust variable, so it can be said that it is indicated as good.

Table 5. 6 Descriptive Variable Statistic

Variable	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Deviation
Trust	7	20	14.82	2.580
Price	6	20	15.25	2.685
Promotion	6	20	14.82	2.602
Time	6	20	15.71	2.700
Risk	7	20	14.92	2.449
Ease of Use	7	20	16.36	2.620
Quality of Information	6	20	14.73	2.391
Selection of E-Commerce Sites	7	20	14.93	2.587

Source: Primary data processed, 2019

As shown in Table 5.6, the lowest value for the price variable is 6 and the highest value for the price variable is 20. The average value for the price variable is 15.25. Furthermore, the standard deviation of the price variable is 2.685 which is smaller than the average price variable, so it can be said that it is indicated as good.

As shown in Table 5.6, the lowest value for the promotion variable is 6 and the highest value for the promotion variable is 20. The average value for the promotion variable is 14.82. Furthermore, the standard deviation of the promotion variable is 2.602 which is smaller than the average size of the promotion variable so it can be said that it is indicated as good.

As shown in Table 5.6, the lowest value for the time variable is 6 and the highest value for the time variable is 20. The average value for the time variable is 15.71. Furthermore, the standard deviation of the time variable is 2,700 which is smaller than the average time variable so it can be said that it is indicated as good.

As shown in Table 5.6, the lowest value for the risk variable is 7 and the highest value for the risk variable is 20. The average value for the risk variable is 14.92. Furthermore, the standard deviation of the risk variable is 2.449 which is smaller than the average risk variable, so it can be said that it is indicated as good.

As shown in Table 5.6, the lowest value for the ease of use variable is 7 and the highest value for the ease of use variable is 20. The average value for the ease of use variable is 16.36.

Furthermore, the standard deviation of the ease of use variable is 2,620 which is smaller than the average ease of use variable so it can be said that it is indicated as good.

As shown in Table 5.6, the lowest value for the variable quality of information is 6 and the highest value for the variable quality of information is 20. The average value for the variable quality of information is 14.73. Furthermore, the standard deviation of the variable quality of information is 2,391 which is smaller than the average size of the quality of information variable, so it can be said that it is indicated as good.

As shown in Table 5.6, the lowest value for the selection of e-commerce sites variable is 7 and the highest value for the selection of e-commerce sites variable is 20. The average value for the selection of e-commerce sites variable is 14.93. Furthermore, the standard deviation of the selection of e-commerce sites variable is 2.587, which is smaller than the average selection of e-commerce sites variable, so it can be said that it is indicated as good.

2. Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

This multiple linear regression analysis to see the effect of the independent variable with the dependent variable, proves the existence of a positive or negative relationship on the variables of trust, price, promotion, time, risk, ease of use, and partial and simultaneous quality of information on the selection of e-commerce sites by millennial generation, the following is the result of statistical analysis using SPSS version 21.0.

Table 5. 7 SPSS Data Analysis

Model	Standardized Coefficients	T hitung	Significant
	B		
Constant		0.765	0.445
Trust	0.189	2.903	0.004
Price	0.164	2.334	0.021
Promotion	0.197	3.231	0.001
Time	0.163	2.117	0.031
Risk	-0.054	-1.056	0.292
Ease of Use	0.197	2.677	0.008
Quality of Information	0.080	1.359	0.176

Source: Primary data processed, 2019

Thus, that regression equation can be obtained as follows:

Y = 0,189 X1 + 0,164 X2 + 0,197 X3 + 0,163 X4 - 0.054 X5 + 0,197 X6 + 0,080 X7

From the regression equation, it can be seen the results of the regression coefficient, which can be concluded that:

a. β1 = 0,189

   0,189 coefficient for independent variable trust. It shows coefficient regression for trust is positive. It means that when trust level increase then the selection of e-commerce sites will increase.

b. β2 = 0.164

   0,164 coefficient for independent variable price. It shows coefficient regression for price is positive. It means that when price level increase then the selection of e-commerce sites will increase.

c. β3 = 0.197

   0,197 coefficient for independent variable promotion. It shows coefficient regression for promotion is positive. It means that when promotion level increase then the selection of e-commerce sites will increase.

d. β4 = 0.163

   0,163 coefficient for independent variable time. It shows coefficient regression for time is positive. It means that when time level increase then the selection of e-commerce sites will increase.

e. β5= -0,054

   -0,054 coefficient for independent variable risk. It shows coefficient regression for risk is negative. It means that when risk level increase then the selection of e-commerce sites will decrease.

f. β6 = 0.197

0,197 coefficient for independent variable ease of use. It shows coefficient regression for ease of use is positive. It means that when ease of use level increase then the selection of e-commerce sites will increase.

g. $\beta 7 = 0.080$

0,080 coefficient for independent variable quality of information. It shows coefficient regression for quality of information is positive. It means that when quality of information level increase then the selection of e-commerce sites will increase.

a. Partial Test (T-Test)

Table 5. 8 **T Test**

Model	Standardized Coefficients	T hitung	Significant	Information
	B			
Constant		0.765	0.445	
Trust	0.189	2.903	0.004	Significant
Price	0.164	2.334	0.021	Significant
Promotion	0.197	3.231	0.001	Significant
Time	0.163	2.117	0.031	Significant
Risk	-0.054	-1.056	0.292	Not Significant
Ease of Use	0.197	2.677	0.008	Significant
Quality of Information	0.080	1.359	0.176	Not Significant

Source: Primary data processed, 2019

A T-test is used to determine the effect of independent variables on the dependent variable. H0 is rejected if the significance value <0.05 which means that there is enough evidence that the independent variable influences the dependent variable. Ha is accepted if the significance

value> 0.05 which means that there is enough evidence that the independent variable has no effect on the dependent variable. Following the results obtained in table 5.8, it can be explained that:

1) T-test of the Trust variable

In this hypothesis it is assumed that the trust variable has an influence on the selection of e-commerce sites by the millennial generation. Where the null hypothesis (H0) and the alternative hypothesis (Ha1) can be explained as follows:

Ho : Trust has negative and no significant influence on the selection of e-commerce sites by millennial generation.

Ha1: Trust has a positive and significant influence on the selection of e-commerce sites by millennial generation

As shown in Table 5.8, it can be seen that the t-count value of the trust variable is 2.903, greater than the table whose value (200-2) 1.388 and the probability value on the trust variable has a significant value of 0.004 less than 0.05, so, H0 is rejected and Ha1 can accept, it means that trust variable significantly affects the selection of e-commerce sites by millennial generation.

2) T-Test for Price Variable

In this hypothesis it is suspected that the price variable has a positive influence on the selection of e-commerce sites by the millennial generation. Where the null hypothesis (H0) and the alternative hypothesis (Ha2) can be explained as follows:

Ho : Price has negative and no significant influence on the selection of e-commerce sites by millennial generation.

Ha2 : Price has a positive and significant influence on the selection of e-commerce sites by millennial generation.

As shown in Table 5.8, it can be seen the result of the t-count on the price variable of 2.333 is greater than the table whose value (200-2) 1.388 and the probability value on the price variable has a significant value of 0.021 less than 0.05, so, H0 is rejected and Ha2 can accept, it means that the price variable significantly influences millennial generation's selection of e-commerce sites.

3) T-Test for Promotion

In this hypothesis it is assumed that the promotion variable has a positive influence on the selection of e-commerce sites by the millennial generation. Where the null hypothesis (H0) and the alternative hypothesis (Ha3) can be explained as follows:

Ho : The promotion has negative and no significant influence on the selection of e-commerce sites by millennial generation.

Ha3 : The promotion has a positive and significant influence on the selection of e-commerce sites by millennial generation.

As shown in Table 5.8, it can be seen that the t-count value on the promotion variable is 3.231 greater than the table whose value (200-2) is 1.388 and the probability value on the trust variable has a significant value of 0.001 less than 0.05, so, H0 is rejected and Ha can accept, it means that the promotion variable significantly affects the selection of e-commerce sites by millennial generation.

4) T-Test for Time Variables

In this hypothesis it is assumed that the time variable has a positive influence on the selection of e-commerce sites by the millennial generation. Where the null hypothesis (H0) and the alternative hypothesis (Ha4) can be explained as follows:

Ho: Time has negative and no significant influence on the selection of e-commerce sites by millennial generation.

Ha4: Time has a positive and significant influence on the selection of e-commerce sites by millennial generation.

As shown in Table 5.8, it can be seen the results of the t-count on the time variable of 2.117 is greater than the table whose value (200-2) 1.388 and the probability value on the time variable has a significant value of 0.031 less than 0.05, so, H0 is rejected and Ha4 can accept, it means that the time variable significantly affects the selection of e-commerce sites by millennial generation.

5) T-Test for Risk Variable

In this hypothesis it is assumed that the risk variable has a positive influence on the selection of e-commerce sites by the millennial generation. Where the null hypothesis (H0) and the alternative hypothesis (Ha5) can be explained as follows:

Ho: Risk has negative and no significant influence on the selection of e-commerce sites by millennial generation.

Ha5: Risk has a positive and significant influence on the selection of e-commerce sites by millennial generation.

As shown in Table 5.8, it can be seen the results of the t-count on the risk variable of -1.056 smaller than the table whose value (200-2) 1.388 and the probability value on the risk variable does not have a significant value of 0.292 over 0.05, so, H0 is accepted and Ha5 is rejected, meaning that the risk variable has no significant effect on the selection of e-commerce sites by millennial generation.

6) T-Test for ease of use

In this hypothesis it is assumed that the ease of use variable has a positive influence on the selection of e-commerce sites by the millennial generation. Where the null hypothesis (H0) and the alternative hypothesis (Ha6) can be explained as follows:

Ho: Ease of use has negative and no significant influence on the selection of e-commerce sites by millennial generation.

Ha6: Ease of use has a positive and significant influence on the selection of e-commerce sites by millennial generation.

As shown in Table 5.8, it can be seen the results of the t-count on the ease of use variable of 2.677 is greater than the table whose value (200-2) 1.388 and the probability value on the time variable has a significant value of 0.008 less than 0.05, so, H0 is rejected and Ha6 is acceptable, meaning that the time variable significantly influences the choice of e-commerce sites by millennial generation.

7) T-Test for quality of information

In this hypothesis it is suspected that the variable quality of information has a positive influence on the selection of e-commerce sites by the millennial generation. Where the null hypothesis (H0) and the alternative hypothesis (Ha7) can be explained as follows:

Ho: Quality of information has negative and no significant influence on the selection of e-commerce sites by millennial generation.

Ha7: Quality of information has a positive and significant influence on the selection of e-commerce sites by millennial generation.

As shown in Table 5.8, it can be seen that the t-count value of the variable quality of information is 1.359 smaller than the table whose value (200-2) is 1.388 and the probability value of the ease of use variable has no significant value of 0.176 over 0.05, so, H0 is accepted and Ha7 is rejected, meaning the ease of use variable has no significant effect on the selection of e-commerce sites by millennial generation.

b. Simultaneous Influence test (F Test)

This F test is carried out to see how much influence the independent variable that is trust, price, promotion, time, risk, ease of use, quality of information affects the dependent variable ie purchase intention which is carried out together or simultaneously.

Table 5. 9 F Test

Model	F	Sig.
Regression Residual Total	40.515	.000[b]

Source: Primary data processed, 2019

As shown in Table 5.9, obtained a probability value of 0,000 <(0.05) which means there is a significant influence of independent variables trust, price, promotion, time, risk, ease of use, quality of information simultaneously affect the selection of e-commerce sites by millennial generation.

c. Determination Coefficient Test (R^2)

R^2 is the ratio between the dependent explained by the independent variable, the magnitude of R^2 does not have a definite size and can be said to be right on the regression model.

Table 5. 10 R2 Test

Adjusted R Square	0.582

Source: Primary data processed, 2019

The coefficient of determination is used to see how far the model explains the dependent variable. A small value of R2 means that the ability to vary independent variables explains the dependent variable is limited and vice versa. From table 5.10 the R2 value of 0.582 shows the variables of trust, price, promotion, time, risk, ease of use, quality of information can explain the dependent variable by 58.2%. While the remaining 41.8% is explained by other variables not included in this research model.

D. Discussion

The purpose of this study is to look at the dependent effect of trust, price, promotion, time, risk, ease of use, quality of information on the dependent variable. The variables can be explained as follows:

1. Trust

From the results of the hypothesis test, the trust variable probability value is 0.004. The probability value of the trust variable is smaller than 0.05 so it can be concluded that the trust variable has a positive and significant effect on the selection of e-commerce sites by the millennial generation. According to Nurrahmanto (in Khotimah and Febriansyah 2018) defines trust as a consumer's belief that other people have integrity and can be trusted, and people who are trusted will fulfil all their obligations in conducting transactions as expected. Trust is an important factor in online transactions. Important for e-commerce to be able to form consumer trust through benevolence, ability and integrity. E-Commerce can guaranteed that sellers can form millennials confidence, they don’t just look for profit, they make sure that the millennial generation identity is safe. Sellers can explain well and correctly about things that millennial generation want to know. So trust can assist in millennial generation in overcome the perception of uncertainty about the risk where consumers can not see the seller directly, examine the goods

to be purchased or get the goods directly after making payment. Millennials who have high trust with e-commerce sites will select the e-commerce sites and vice versa.

Table 5.11
Response To Trust

Indicator	SS	S	N	TS	STS	Score
I believe e-commerce sites keep my identity a secret	20	93	62	22	3	705
Transaction security on e-commerce sites	26	96	57	21	0	727
believe the e-commerce site will fulfil its responsibilities	34	109	49	6	2	767
I am satisfied to transact on e-commerce sites	30	115	44	11	0	764

Source: Primary data processed, 2019

Respondents' responses regarding trust can be seen from the statement indicators: I believe e-commerce sites keep my identity a secret, which answers strongly agree as many as 20 people (10%), agree 93 people (46.5%), neutral 62 people (31%), disagreeing 22 people (11%) and strongly disagreeing 3 people (1.5%). The average count obtained is 3.53, this shows the average score of respondents' assessment of trust can be categorized high. Transaction security on e-commerce sites, which answered strongly agreed as many as 26 people (13%), agreed 96 people (48%), neutral 57 people (28.5%) and disagreed 21 people (10.5%). The average count obtained is 3.64, this shows the average score of respondents' assessment of trust can be categorized high. I believe the e-commerce site will fulfil its responsibilities, which answered strongly agree as many as 34 people (17%), agree 109 people (54.5%), neutral 49 people (24.5%), disagree 6 people (3%) and strongly disagree 2 people (1%). The average count obtained was 3.82, this shows the average score of respondents' assessment of trust can be

categorized high. I am satisfied to transact on e-commerce sites, which answered strongly agree as many as 30 people (15%), agree 115 people (57.5%), neutral 44 people (22%) and disagree 11 people (5.5%). The average count obtained is 3.84, this shows the average score of respondents' assessment of trust can be categorized high.

The results of this study are consistent with research conducted by Wijaya and Farida (2014), Asri and Susanti (2018), Wijaya and Teguh (2012), Solihat et, al (2019), Khotimah and Febriansyah (2018), Ling et, al ((2010), Anwar and Afifah (2016), and Chiu, et al (2018) which shows that trust significantly influences purchase intention.

2. Price

From the results of the hypothesis test, the value of the probability variable price is 0.021. The probability value of the price variable is less than 0.05 so it can be concluded that the price variable has a positive and significant effect on the selection of e-commerce sites by the millennial generation. Price is a measure of the size of the value of one's satisfaction with the product purchased (Gitosudarmo, 2014). Prices according to each consumer vary depending on the product purchased by the consumer. Prices for goods offered online different from those offered in the store directly. Millennial generation will dare to pay for a product at a high price if they assesses the expected satisfaction with the product to be bought is high. Conversely, if millennial generation evaluates that the satisfaction with a product is low, they will not be willing to pay or buy the product at a high price. Price in every e-commerce sites is different, the price of goods in e-commerce is lower and there are certain price discounts. If e-commerce provides prices in accordance with millennial generation the selection of e-commerce sites by millennial generation will occur.

Table 5.12
Response To Price

Indicator	SS	S	N	TS	STS	Score
Catalog of product prices on e-	55	10	34	8	1	802

commerce sites displayed clearly and easily understood		2				
Product prices on e-commerce sites are cheaper than offline stores	47	86	50	16	1	762
The price of a reasonable product is proportional to the quality	29	90	65	13	3	729
I easily do price comparisons on e-commerce sites	34	10 4	48	12	2	756

Source: Primary data processed, 2019

Respondents regarding the price can be seen from the statement indicators: Catalog of product prices on e-commerce sites displayed clearly and easily understood, who answered strongly agree as many as 55 people (27.5%), agree 102 people (51%), neutral 34 people (17%), disagree 8 people (4%) and strongly disagree 1 person (0.5%). The average count obtained by 4.01, this shows the average score of respondents' assessment of price can be categorized high. Product prices on e-commerce sites are cheaper than offline stores, which answered strongly agree as many as 47 people (23.5%), agree 86 people (43%), neutral 50 people (25%), disagree 16 people (8%) and strongly disagree 1 person (0.5%). The average count obtained was 3.81, this shows the average score of respondents' assessment of price can be categorized high. The price of a reasonable product is proportional to the quality, which answers strongly agree as many as 29 people (14.5%), agree 90 people (45%), neutral 65 people (32.5%), disagree 13 people (6.5%) and strongly disagree 3 people (1.5%). The average count obtained is 3.65, this shows the average score of respondents' assessment of price can be categorized high. I easily do price comparisons on e-commerce sites, who answer strongly agree as many as 34 people (17%), agree 104 people (52%), neutral 48 people (24%), disagree 12 people (6%) and strongly disagree agree 2 people (1%). The average count obtained was 3.78, this shows the average score of respondents' assessment of price can be categorized high.

This research is in accordance with research conducted by Wijaya and Teguh (2012) that price influences purchase intention.

3. Promotion

From the results of the hypothesis test, the probability variable value of the promotion is 0.001. The probability value of the promotion variable is smaller than 0.05 so it can be concluded that the promotion variable has a positive and significant effect on the selection of e-commerce sites by the millennial generation. Promotion is one of the variables that attract consumers to buy goods in an online shop. Philip Kotler (1997) defines promotion as an activity carried out by a company to communicate the benefits of its products and to convince consumers to buy. Usually, a high and attractive promotion makes millennial generation tempted to get the goods offered. Promotion is carried out by e-commerce on social media such as, Instagram, Facebook, etc, so that it targets to millennial generation. Promotions carried out by several e-commerce sites usually provide free shipping with a minimum spend, a certain discounted date, etc. This promotion condition indicates that promotion is increasingly attractive and the choice is in accordance with what is felt by millennial generation and in accordance with what is expressed in the promotion, then positive behaviour in selection the e-commerce will occur, and vice versa.

Table 5.13
Response To Promotion

Indicator	SS	S	N	TS	STS	Score
I always get promotion/advertisement info	35	96	60	9	0	757
I am interested in promotion programs on e-commerce sites	25	83	73	16	3	711
Promotion / advertising influenced me in choosing e-commerce	27	84	65	21	3	711

E-commerce sites often hold promotions/discounts	49	99	40	12	0	785

Source: Primary data processed, 2019

Respondents' responses regarding promotion can be seen from the statement indicators: I always get promotion/advertisement info, who answered strongly agree as many as 35 people (17.5%), agreed 96 people (48%), neutral 60 people (30%) and disagree 9 people (4.5%). The average count obtained was 3.79, this shows the average score of respondents' assessment of price can be categorized high. I am interested in promotion programs on e-commerce sites, which answer strongly agree as many as 25 people (12.5%), agree 83 people (41.5%), neutral 73 people (36.5%), disagree 16 people (8%) and strongly disagree 3 (1.5%). The average count obtained was 3.56, this shows the average score of respondents' assessment of price can be categorized high. Promotion / advertising influenced me in choosing e-commerce, which answered strongly agree as many as 27 people (13.5%), agree 84 people (42%), neutral 65 people (32.5%), disagree 21 people (10, 5%) and strongly disagree 3 people (1.5%). The average count obtained was 3.56, this shows the average score of respondents' assessment of price can be categorized high. E-commerce sites often hold promotions/discounts, who answer strongly agree as many as 49 people (24.5%), agree 99 people (49.5%), neutral 40 people (20%) and disagree 12 people (6%). The average count obtained is 3.93, this shows the average score of respondents' assessment of price can be categorized high.

The results of this study are in accordance with Wijaya and Christina (2012) that promotion has an influence on purchase intention.

4. **Time**

From the results of the hypothesis test, the probability variable time value is 0.031. The probability value of the time variable is less than 0.05 so it can be concluded that the time variable has a positive and significant effect on the selection of e-commerce sites by the millennial generation. Browsing the online catalog during online shopping saves time and

reduces stress compared to traditional shopping. According to Rohm and Swaminathan (2004), one of the possible explanations for why buying online saves time is eliminating the travel required to go to the store. According to customer perception, the advantage of online commerce is related to purchase simplicity and the reduction of time spent on shopping. Millennial generation can save time, they can check the state of goods without a certain time limit after that can make transactions anytime and anywhere and just waiting for the goods to be sent. The transaction stage in e-commerce requires a short time. If transaction in e-commerce takes more a short time, the selection of e-commerce sites by millennial generation will also increase. These time variables provide great benefits for the millennial generation.

Table 5.14
Response To Time

Indicator	SS	S	N	TS	STS	Score
Shopping on e-commerce sites saves time	66	85	37	11	1	804
The transaction phase can be completed in a short time	66	86	38	9	1	807
Whenever I can shop on an e-commerce site	73	81	35	10	1	815
Delivery of goods in accordance with the specified time	32	70	82	14	2	716

Source: Primary data processed, 2019

Respondents regarding time can be seen from the indicator statement: Shopping on e-commerce sites saves time, who answered strongly agree as many as 66 people (33%), agree 85 people (42.5%), neutral 37 people (18.5%), disagree 11 people (5.5%) and strongly disagree 1 person (0.5%). The average count obtained by 4.02, this shows the average score of respondents' assessment of time can be categorized high. The transaction phase can be

completed in a short time, those who answered strongly agree with 66 people (33%), agree 86 people (43%), neutral 38 people (19%), disagree 9 people (4.5%) and strongly disagree 1 person (0.5%). The average count obtained by 4.04, this shows the average score of respondents' assessment of time can be categorized high. Whenever I can shop on an e-commerce site, those who answer strongly agree as many as 73 people (36.5%), agree 81 people (40.5%), neutral 35 people (17.5%), disagree 10 people (5%) and strongly disagree 1 person (0.5%). The average count obtained by 4.08, this shows the average score of respondents' assessment of time can be categorized high. Delivery of goods in accordance with the specified time, who answered strongly agree as many as 32 people (16%), agree 70 people (35%), neutral 82 people (41%), disagree 14 people (7%) and strongly disagree 2 people (1%). The average count obtained is 3.58, this shows the average score of respondents' assessment of time can be categorized high.

The results of this study are inversely related to research conducted by Zhao, et al (2019) showed that time had a significant effect on purchase intention. Ariffin, et al. (2018) also conducted a study that showed that time had a significant effect on purchase intention.

5. Risk

From the results of the hypothesis test, the probability variable value of risk is 0.292. The probability value of the risk variable is greater than 0.05 so it can be concluded that the risk variable has negative and no significant effect on the selection of e-commerce sites by the millennial generation. Risk also has an important role in choosing e-commerce sites. If the risk is too high then the selection of e-commerce sites by millennial generation will be lower and vice versa. In this case, because the level of millennial generation awareness when making online purchases will always face risk which is loss of their products during the delivery process to consumers and there is also the risk of product damage in the shipping process. so this is not a matter that is too much considered by the millennial generation because some e-

commerce sites usually provide a warranty. This shows that the millennial generation prioritizes other factors such as trust, price, promotion, time, and ease of use.

Table 1.15
Response To Risk

Indicator	SS	S	N	TS	STS	Score
I am worried the product is not in accordance with the information	42	80	63	14	1	748
I am worried that the product will suffer damage when shipping	34	86	66	14	0	740
I am afraid that personal identity is abused	50	91	44	14	1	775
With the guarantee / insurance I am not afraid of making transactions in e-commerce	23	91	70	15	1	750

Source: Primary data processed, 2019

Respondents regarding risk can be seen from the statement indicators: I am worried the product is not in accordance with the information, which answered strongly agree as many as 42 people (21%), agree 80 people (40%), neutral 63 people (31.5%), disagree 14 people (7%) and strongly disagree 1 person (0.5%). The average count obtained was 3.74, this shows the average score of respondents' assessment of risk can be categorized high. I am worried that the product will suffer damage when shipping, who answered strongly agree as many as 34 people (17%), agree with 86 people (43%), neutral 66 people (33%) and disagree 14 people (7%). The average count obtained is 3.70, this shows the average score of respondents' assessment of risk can be categorized high. I am afraid that personal identity is abused, those who answered strongly agree as many as 50 people (25%), agree 91 people (45.5%), neutral 44 people (22%), disagree 14 people (7%) and strongly disagree 1 person (0.5%). The average count obtained was 3.88, this shows the average score of respondents' assessment of risk can be categorized high. With

the guarantee / insurance I am not afraid of making transactions in e-commerce, who answered strongly agree as many as 23 people (11.5%), agree 91 people (45.5%), neutral 70 people (35%), disagree 15 people (7.5%) and strongly disagree 1 person (0.5%). The average count obtained is 3.60, this shows the average score of respondents' assessment of risk can be categorized high.

The results of this study are consistent with Asri and Febsri (2018) that risk does not significantly influence purchase intention.

6. **Ease of Use**

From the results of the hypothesis test, the ease of use variable probability value is 0.008. The probability value of the ease of use variable is smaller than 0.05 so it can be concluded that the ease of use variable has a positive and significant effect on the selection of e-commerce sites by the millennial generation. The usefulness felt by consumers is how effective online purchases are in helping consumers complete their needs and perceived ease of use is how easily the internet is used as a shopping media (Monsuwe, Dellaert, and Ruyter, 2004). Millennials find the e-commerce site easy to understand, simple and easy to operate, so it's easy to run and doesn't require much effort. Conversely, if the millennials feel that e-commerce sites are not easy to learn, are not simple, are too complicated and difficult to operate, then there is no interest in using them. Millennials assume the use of e-commerce sites does not require a lot of effort and when using they feel that the desired work will be easier, then e-commerce sites will often be used. If the level of ease of using e-commerce is increasing, the selection of e-commerce sites by this millennial generation will also increase.

Table 5.16
Response To Ease of Use

Indicator	SS	S	N	TS	STS	Score
E-commerce sites are easily accessible	65	108	20	7	0	831

The operating system in an e-commerce site is easy	61	108	25	6	0	824
The stages of transactions on e-commerce sites are easy to learn	53	111	30	5	1	810
Uncomplicated payment system	54	109	26	11	0	806

Source: Primary data processed, 2019

Respondents regarding ease of use can be seen from the statement indicators: E-commerce sites are easily accessible, who answered strongly agree as many as 65 people (32.5%), agree 108 people (54%), neutral 20 people (10%) and not agree 7 people (3.5%). The average count obtained is 4.16, this shows the average score of respondents' assessment of ease of use can be categorized high. The operating system in an e-commerce site is easy, which answers very much as 61 people (30.5%), agree with 108 people (54%), neutral 25 people (12.5%) and disagree with 6 people (3%). The average count obtained is 4.12, this shows the average score of respondents' assessment of ease of use can be categorized high. The stages of transactions on e-commerce sites are easy to learn, who answered strongly agree as many as 53 people (26.5%), agree 111 people (55.5%), neutral 30 people (15%), disagree 5 people (5%) and strongly disagree 1 person (0.5%). The average count obtained was 4.05, this shows the average score of respondents' assessment of ease of use can be categorized high. Uncomplicated payment system, which answered strongly agree as many as 54 people (27%), agree 109 people (54.5%), neutral 26 people (13%) and disagree 11 people (5.5%). The average count obtained was 4.03, this shows the average score of respondents' assessment of ease of use can be categorized high.

The results of this study are in accordance with Widhiani and Idris (2018), Yonaldi, et al. (2019), Faradila and Harry (2016), Chiu, et al. (2018) which shows that ease of use influences purchase intention.

7. Quality of Information

From the results of hypothesis testing, the result of the probability value of the variable quality of information is 0.176. Probability value on the variable quality of information is greater than 0.05 so it can be concluded that the variable quality of information has positive and no significantly influence the selection of e-commerce sites by the millennial generation. This shows that the quality of the information provided by e-commerce has no effect on the selection of e-commerce sites by the millennial generation. Millennial generation assume that the information on e-commerce sites sometimes not accurate, not detail, and not up to date. So millennials often doubt the information provided by e-commerce and prefer to look for information personally such as asking the closest person who has bought an e-commerce site or reading reviews of consumers who have bought e-commerce sites as a reference.

Table 5.17
Response To Quality of Information

Indicator	SS	S	N	TS	STS	Score
-commerce sites provide information that is easily understood	35	116	40	8	1	776
E-commerce sites provide the latest information	29	111	54	5	1	762
The information provided by the e-commerce site is accurate	19	78	90	12	1	702
The information provided was as I expected	18	84	84	14	0	706

Source: Primary data processed, 2019

Respondents regarding the quality of information can be seen from the statement indicators: E-commerce sites provide information that is easily understood, who answered strongly agree as many as 35 people (17.5%), agree 116 people (58%), neutral 40 people (20%), disagree 8 people (4%) and strongly disagree 1 (0.5%). The average count obtained was

3.88, this shows the average score of respondents' assessment of the quality of information can be categorized high. E-commerce sites provide the latest information, which answers strongly agree as many as 29 people (14.5%), agree 111 people (55.5%), neutral 54 people (27%), disagree 5 people (2.5%) and strongly disagree 1 (0.5%). The average count obtained was 3.81, this shows the average score of respondents' assessment of the quality of information can be categorized high. The information provided by the e-commerce site is accurate, who answered strongly agree as many as 19 people (9.5%), agree 78 people (39%), neutral 90 people (45%), disagree 12 people (6%) and strongly disagree agree 1 (0.5%). The average count obtained was 3.51, this shows the average score of respondents' assessment of the quality of information can be categorized high. The information provided was as I expected, who answered strongly agree as many as 18 people (9%), agree 84 people (42%), neutral 84 people (42%) and disagree 14 people (7%). The average count obtained is 3.53, this shows the average score of respondents' assessment of the quality of information can be categorized high.

The results of research conducted by Widhiani and Indris (2018) which show that the quality of information influences purchase intention.