INKUBIS: Jurnal Ekonomi dan Bisnis
Volume 8, Issue 4, 3591-3602
e_ISSN: 2775-3913
https://inkubis.polteksci.ac.id/index.php/ink/index
DOI: doi.org/10.59261/inkubis.v8i4.579

The Role of Consumer Value in Building Platform Trust, Seller Trust, and Customer Engagement in Indonesian E-Commerce

Isana Sri Christina Meranga*
Universitas Pelita Harapan, Indonesia

Hendra Achmadi
Universitas Pelita Harapan, Indonesia

Juniarty Siahaan
Universitas Pelita Harapan, Indonesia

***Corresponding author:**
Isana Sri Christina Meranga,
Universitas Pelita Harapan, Indonesia.
✉isana.meranga@uph.edu

Article Info:

Article history:
Received: October 08, 2026
Revised: October 30, 2026
Accepted: November 03, 2026
Available Online: November 20, 2026

Keywords:
Consumer Value;
Customer Engagement;
E-commerce;
S-O-R;
Trust in Platform;
Trust in Sellers

This is an open access article under the CC BY-SA license.

Copyright © 2026 by Author. Published by Politeknik Siber Cerdika International

Abstract

Background: Online consumers assess financial benefits alongside shopping experiences and social considerations as they develop confidence in platforms and sellers.
Objective: The study investigates associations between three value dimensions (Economic, Experiential, and Social Value) and trust in platforms and sellers, as well as the links of these two trust constructs with Customer Engagement in Indonesian online commerce.
Methods: Drawing on the Stimulus–Organism–Response framework, the explanatory quantitative investigation collected online survey responses from 300 purposively recruited consumers. Eligibility required prior use of an online marketplace and an online purchase during the previous six months. Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) was applied to the survey data.
Results: Each consumer-value dimension showed a positive, statistically significant relationship with both trust constructs. Platform trust was positively related to seller trust ($\beta = 0.315$, $p < 0.001$). Trust in Platform ($\beta = 0.257$, $p < 0.001$) and Trust in Sellers ($\beta = 0.393$, $p < 0.001$) each had a positive relationship with Customer Engagement; seller trust had the larger direct coefficient. The explained-variance shares were 29.4% for Trust in Platform, 39.1% for Trust in Sellers, and 32.6% for Customer Engagement.
Conclusion: The results bring multidimensional consumer value and separate platform- and seller-level trust measures together within the S-O-R framework. Cross-sectional data and purposive recruitment preclude conclusions about causal trust transfer or generalization to the broader population.

To cite this article: Meranga, I. S. C., Achmadi, H., & Siahaan, J. (2026). The role of consumer value in building platform trust, seller trust, and customer engagement in Indonesian e-commerce. *INKUBIS: Jurnal Ekonomi dan Bisnis, 8*(4), 3591-3602. https://doi.org/10.59261/inkubis.v8i4.579

INTRODUCTION

E-commerce has fundamentally transformed consumer behavior by changing how individuals search for information, evaluate products, make purchasing decisions, and interact with digital marketplaces. As e-commerce becomes more widely used, consumer assessments encompass product attributes and prices as well as the quality of the shopping experience (Zerbini et al., 2022). Across the digital customer journey, shopping incorporates functional, cognitive, emotional, and social dimensions, which may influence consumer evaluations and subsequent behavioral responses (Koronaki et al., 2023). The growth of online commerce in Indonesia makes these relationships especially pertinent to investigate. According to the e-Conomy SEA 2025 report, Indonesia's digital economy was projected to approach US$100 billion in gross merchandise value (GMV), of which e-commerce would account for approximately US$71 billion

(Google et al., 2025). Indonesia (2025) likewise reported on the growth of online businesses through its E-Commerce Statistics 2024 publication. Taken together, these developments underscore the need to investigate consumer perceptions of value, the formation of trust, and engagement with marketplace operators and sellers.

Although online commerce continues to grow, the determinants of consumer trust and engagement still warrant systematic investigation. Before completing online purchases, consumers frequently cannot inspect goods in person and instead depend on information and services supplied by platforms and vendors. Trust is therefore central to how consumers assess transactions conducted online. Importantly, confidence in the marketplace itself differs conceptually from confidence in the sellers who use it. Platform trust concerns consumers' confidence in marketplace reliability, responsiveness, and transaction support, whereas seller trust reflects confidence in sellers' commitments and transaction fulfillment. Consumers may also assess online shopping across several dimensions of value, including Economic Value, Experiential Value, and Social Value. Economic Value captures perceived financial advantages; Experiential Value addresses the quality and enjoyment of shopping; and Social Value encompasses recognition, self-image, and perceived social standing. Accordingly, the study asks how the three value dimensions are related to trust in platforms and sellers and how each trust construct is linked to Customer Engagement.

Previous studies have established important relationships among consumer value, trust, and behavioral responses in digital commerce. Moriuchi & Takahashi (2022) investigated perceived value, trust, and engagement within consumer-to-consumer online markets, while Arisman & Imam (2022) studied engagement among consumers participating in Shopee live-stream commerce. Qin et al. (2022) explored trust in consumer-to-consumer e-commerce platforms, and Taheri et al. (2024) analyzed engagement using a Stimulus–Organism–Response approach focused on website attributes. Subsequent studies have further differentiated trust directed toward platforms from trust directed toward sellers. Santoso et al. (2026) assessed the links of seller-level and platform-level trust with consumer engagement in Indonesian live-streaming commerce, while Suleman et al. (2026) considered the transfer of trust between marketplaces and their sellers in Indonesian social commerce. Furthermore, Sembiring et al. (2025) examined utilitarian, hedonic, and social values in relation to consumer trust and behavioral outcomes. Together, this literature informs an understanding of different value perceptions and the formation of marketplace trust. Even so, the joint relationships among Economic Value, Experiential Value, Social Value, Trust in Platform, Trust in Sellers, and Customer Engagement remain suitable for investigation in a single explanatory framework.

As digital marketplaces become more complex, platforms and vendors need a clearer account of how consumers assess value and place confidence in different market participants. Financial benefits may be insufficient on their own to explain participation in online commerce, as experiential and social considerations may also inform assessments of trust. Trust directed toward platforms and toward individual sellers may also have differing relationships with Customer Engagement. These distinctions matter in the Indonesian market, where consumers interact with multiple e-commerce platforms and sellers. The question is theoretically significant because examining consumer-centered value dimensions alongside two distinct forms of trust may clarify the psychological processes associated with engagement. For managers, identifying these associations may guide relationship strategies grounded in value delivery and consumer confidence.

This study contributes an integrated analysis of three dimensions of consumer value alongside two separate forms of marketplace trust in explaining Customer Engagement using the Stimulus–Organism–Response (S-O-R) framework. Specifically, Economic Value, Experiential Value, and Social Value are conceptualized as consumer-centered stimuli, while Trust in Platform and Trust in Sellers are treated as related organism-level assessments associated with Customer Engagement as the response. Unlike approaches focusing primarily on individual value dimensions, website characteristics, or trust relationships within specific digital commerce formats, this model assesses, in parallel, the direct associations of all three value dimensions with both forms of trust, the relationship between platform trust and seller trust, and the associations

of both trust constructs with engagement. The resulting perspective brings consumer value and marketplace trust into a unified analysis without assuming that the distinction between platform trust and seller trust is itself a newly established concept.

To address the research problem, this study examines the relationships of Economic Value, Experiential Value, and Social Value with Trust in Platform and Trust in Sellers, the relationship between Trust in Platform and Trust in Sellers, and the relationships of both trust constructs with Customer Engagement among Indonesian e-commerce consumers. At the theoretical level, the analysis seeks to elaborate the S-O-R framework by integrating multidimensional consumer value with distinct but interconnected forms of marketplace trust. The empirical contribution is an assessment of the comparative magnitudes of the proposed associations among surveyed consumers. In practice, the evidence may help marketplace operators and vendors in understanding the value dimensions and trust-related factors associated with consumer engagement.

The proposed framework has implications for consumer behavior research and e-commerce management. By treating Trust in Platform separately from Trust in Sellers, the study allows consumer confidence and engagement to be considered in relation to different marketplace participants. The relationship between platform trust and seller trust also informs the hypothesized mechanism of trust transfer, although a cross-sectional design cannot demonstrate the direction or timing of any causal transfer. For e-commerce platforms, the results may guide attention to dependable transactions, transparency, and favorable shopping experiences. For sellers, understanding the relationship between seller trust and Customer Engagement may encourage a stronger emphasis on honoring commitments, delivering reliable service, and earning consumer confidence. In this way, the research aims to clarify theory and inform practice regarding how multidimensional consumer value and marketplace trust are related to engagement in Indonesian e-commerce.

The research objectives and conceptual model lead to the following hypotheses:

H1a: Economic Value has a positive effect on Trust in Platform.
H1b: Economic Value has a positive effect on Trust in Sellers.
H2a: Experiential Value has a positive effect on Trust in Platform.
H2b: Experiential Value has a positive effect on Trust in Sellers.
H3a: Social Value has a positive effect on Trust in Platform.
H3b: Social Value has a positive effect on Trust in Sellers.
H4: Trust in Platform has a positive effect on Trust in Sellers.
H5: Trust in Platform has a positive effect on Customer Engagement.
H6: Trust in Sellers has a positive effect on Customer Engagement

METHOD

A quantitative explanatory design was adopted to investigate associations among Economic Value, Experiential Value, Social Value, Trust in Platform, Trust in Sellers, and Customer Engagement among users of e-commerce services in Indonesia. Participants were consumers with experience browsing and purchasing on online marketplaces. Purposive selection yielded 300 respondents who satisfied two eligibility conditions: they had used an online marketplace and completed an e-commerce purchase during the preceding six months. Responses were obtained through a web-based questionnaire. The analytical tables did not record the respondents' distribution by island or province; thus, geographic representativeness could not be assessed, and the sample cannot be regarded as geographically representative of the Indonesian population.

Hollebeek et al. (2014)Measurement items originated from previously established scales and were contextualized for Indonesian online commerce. Economic Value, Trust in Platform, and Trust in Sellers were adapted from Moriuchi & Takahashi (2022), Experiential Value and Social Value were adapted from Varshneya & Das (2017), and Customer Engagement was adapted from and Dong et al. (2024). Each construct was assessed on a five-category Likert scale anchored at 1 (strongly disagree) and 5 (strongly agree).

The data were analyzed using Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) with SmartPLS 4. Model evaluation proceeded in two phases. The first phase assessed the

measurement model through indicator loadings, Cronbach's alpha, composite reliability, Average Variance Extracted (AVE), and the Heterotrait–Monotrait ratio (HTMT) as evidence of construct reliability and convergent and discriminant validity. The second phase examined the structural model through the coefficient of determination (R^2), effect sizes (f^2), path coefficients, t-statistics, p-values, and 95% confidence intervals to evaluate the proposed paths. Reporting was guided by the PLS-SEM recommendations described by Hair et al. (2019).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

The survey included 300 participants. Each participant had used an e-commerce marketplace and purchased online during the preceding six months. Respondent demographics and online-shopping characteristics are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1
Respondent Profile

Characteristic	Category	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	128	42.7
	Female	172	57.3
Age	18–24 years	82	27.3
	25–34 years	108	36.0
	35–44 years	64	21.3
	45–54 years	31	10.3
	≥55 years	15	5.0
Education	Senior high school/ equivalent	74	24.7
	Diploma	38	12.7
	Bachelor's degree	151	50.3
	Master's degree	32	10.7
	Doctoral degree	5	1.7
E-commerce purchase frequency	1–2 times/month	83	27.7
	3–4 times/month	101	33.7
	5–6 times/month	63	21.0
	More than 6 times/month	53	17.7
Most frequently used platform	Shopee	124	41.3
	Tokopedia	71	23.7
	TikTok Shop	47	15.7
	Lazada	31	10.3
	Other platforms	27	9.0
Total		300	100.0

The survey participants exhibited variation in demographic background and online-shopping behavior. Women comprised 57.3% of respondents, compared with 42.7% men. The largest age category was 25–34 years (36.0%); the next largest was 18–24 years (27.3%). Bachelor's degree holders constituted approximately half of the surveyed group (50.3%).
For monthly shopping frequency, three to four purchases was the most common response (33.7%), followed by one or two purchases (27.7%). Shopee accounted for the largest share of preferred platforms (41.3%), ahead of Tokopedia (23.7%) and TikTok Shop (15.7%). Overall, the sample varied by demographics, purchase frequency, and marketplace preference. These characteristics provide descriptive context for interpreting the relationships among consumer value, trust, and customer engagement within the surveyed sample. However, because purposive sampling was employed, the sample should not be interpreted as statistically representative of all e-commerce consumers in Indonesia.

Assessment of the measurement model addressed indicator reliability, internal consistency, and both convergent and discriminant validity. The assessment considered indicator loadings, Cronbach's alpha, composite reliability, and Average Variance Extracted (AVE), while

discriminant validity was assessed using the Heterotrait–Monotrait ratio (HTMT). Tables 2 and 3 show that the stated measurement criteria were met, supporting the reliability and validity of the constructs included in the model.

Table 2
Measurement model results

Variable/ Construct	Indicator	Indicator Statement	Outer Loading	Cronbach's Alpha	Composite Reliability (ρc)	AVE
Economic Value	EV1	The product I purchase through e-commerce has a reasonable price.	0.856	0.871	0.912	0.722
	EV2	The product I purchase through e-commerce provides value that is commensurate with the money I spend.	0.883			
	EV3	The product I purchase through e-commerce is a good choice considering its price.	0.805			
	EV4	Shopping through e-commerce helps me obtain economic benefits.	0.852			
Experie-ntial Value	EXV1	The e-commerce service provides me with a high-quality shopping experience.	0.872	0.897	0.929	0.765
	EXV2	Shopping through e-commerce makes me enjoy the shopping process.	0.889			
	EXV3	I feel happy and enjoy browsing through e-commerce.	0.865			
	EXV4	Shopping through e-commerce allows me to temporarily escape from my routine.	0.872			
Social Value	SV1	Shopping through e-commerce helps me create a favorable impression on others.	0.876	0.886	0.921	0.745
	SV2	Shopping through e-commerce	0.853			

Variable/ Construct	Indicator	Indicator Statement	Outer Loading	Cronbach's Alpha	Composite Reliability (ρc)	AVE
		provides me with social recognition.				
	SV3	The shopping experience through e-commerce enhances my self-confidence and self-esteem.	0.892			
	SV4	The shopping experience through e-commerce is related to my social image and status.	0.832			
Trust in Platform	TP1	I trust the e-commerce platform to provide adequate information to support transactions.	0.862	0.898	0.929	0.765
	TP2	I trust the e-commerce platform to be open and responsive to consumers' needs.	0.837			
	TP3	I trust the e-commerce platform to make efforts to resolve consumers' problems effectively.	0.910			
	TP4	I trust the e-commerce platform to be reliable in conducting transactions.	0.887			
Trust in Sellers	TS1	I trust sellers on e-commerce platforms to fulfill their promises.	0.898	0.896	0.935	0.827
	TS2	I trust sellers on e-commerce platforms to consider consumers' interests in transactions.	0.900			
	TS3	I trust sellers on e-commerce platforms to remain committed to fulfilling transaction agreements.	0.930			

Variable/ Construct	Indicator	Indicator Statement	Outer Loading	Cronbach's Alpha	Composite Reliability (ρc)	AVE
Customer Engage-ment	CE1	I spend time using or browsing e-commerce platforms.	0.803	0.912	0.932	0.695
	CE2	I am highly interested in the activities available on e-commerce platforms.	0.849			
	CE3	I have a strong interest in shopping activities through e-commerce.	0.830			
	CE4	Browsing e-commerce platforms is a meaningful part of my activities.	0.859			
	CE5	I enjoy shopping activities through e-commerce with other people.	0.805			
	CE6	I enjoy shopping through e-commerce more when I can do it together with other people.	0.854			

Indicator loadings span 0.803–0.930, with every value above the recommended 0.70 cutoff. Internal consistency is supported by Cronbach's alpha of 0.871–0.912 and composite reliability of 0.912–0.935. Across constructs, AVE falls between 0.695 and 0.827, above the 0.50 criterion and consistent with acceptable convergent validity.

Table 3
Discriminant validity – HTMT

	Customer Engagement	Experience Value	Social Value	Trust in Platform	Trust in Sellers	Economic Value
Customer Engagement						
Experience Value	0.414					
Social Value	0.308	0.451				
Trust in Platform	0.512	0.444	0.452			
Trust in Sellers	0.584	0.500	0.509	0.586		
Economic Value	0.352	0.458	0.450	0.510	0.465	

The Heterotrait–Monotrait (HTMT) ratios ranged from 0.308 to 0.586, with the maximum corresponding to Trust in Sellers versus Trust in Platform (HTMT = 0.586). Every HTMT estimate falls beneath the recommended 0.90 limit, which is consistent with satisfactory discriminant validity among constructs. Accordingly, the constructs can be distinguished empirically from one another.

Structural-model assessment considered explanatory capacity and the magnitude of

effects between constructs. The principal indices were the determination coefficient (R^2) and effect sizes (f^2). Table 4 summarizes these estimates. Reported R^2 estimates amount to 0.294 for Trust in Platform, 0.391 for Trust in Sellers, and 0.326 for Customer Engagement. Because neither original model output nor respondent-level observations were available, PLSpredict and Q^2_predict could not be assessed; predictive relevance is therefore not claimed.

Table 4
Structural Model Assessment

Endogenous Construct	R^2	Predictor	f^2
Trust in Platform	0.294	Economic Value	0.091
		Experiential Value	0.042
		Social Value	0.048
Trust in Sellers	0.391	Economic Value	0.014
		Experiential Value	0.047
		Social Value	0.050
		Trust in Platform	0.115
Customer Engagement	0.326	Trust in Platform	0.071
		Trust in Sellers	0.166

Table 5 reports the hypothesis-testing outcomes. Each of the nine proposed paths has a positive, statistically significant coefficient, with p-values ranging from 0.024 to <0.001. On this basis, the data support all hypotheses from H1a through H6.

Table 5
Hypothesis testing results

Hypothesis	Relationship	β	t-value	p-value	95% CI	Decision
H1a	Economic Value → Trust in Platform	0.288	5.731	<0.001	[0.189, 0.386]	Supported
H1b	Economic Value → Trust in Sellers	0.108	2.257	0.024	[0.013, 0.202]	Supported
H2a	Experiential Value → Trust in Platform	0.197	3.484	<0.001	[0.087, 0.308]	Supported
H2b	Experiential Value → Trust in Sellers	0.197	3.851	<0.001	[0.098, 0.297]	Supported
H3a	Social Value → Trust in Platform	0.210	3.960	<0.001	[0.102, 0.311]	Supported
H3b	Social Value → Trust in Sellers	0.204	3.683	<0.001	[0.094, 0.313]	Supported
H4	Trust in Platform → Trust in Sellers	0.315	6.142	<0.001	[0.210, 0.410]	Supported
H5	Trust in Platform → Customer Engagement	0.257	4.574	<0.001	[0.148, 0.366]	Supported
H6	Trust in Sellers → Customer Engagement	0.393	6.726	<0.001	[0.277, 0.504]	Supported

Hypothesis tests indicate positive and statistically significant estimates for all nine proposed paths. A positive coefficient links Economic Value with Trust in Platform ($\beta = 0.288$, $t = 5.731$, $p < 0.001$) and Trust in Sellers ($\beta = 0.108$, $t = 2.257$, $p = 0.024$). Neither 95% confidence interval includes zero, consistent with the significance of both estimates.

Experiential Value is positively related to Trust in Platform ($\beta = 0.197$, $t = 3.484$, $p < 0.001$) and Trust in Sellers ($\beta = 0.197$, $t = 3.851$, $p < 0.001$). Social Value likewise has a significant positive association with Trust in Platform ($\beta = 0.210$, $t = 3.960$, $p < 0.001$) and Trust in Sellers ($\beta = 0.204$, $t = 3.683$, $p < 0.001$). For these four paths, the confidence intervals exclude zero, further supporting H2a, H2b, H3a, and H3b.

Trust in Platform is positively associated with Trust in Sellers (β = 0.315, t = 6.142, p < 0.001), supporting H4. Additionally, Trust in Platform (β = 0.257, t = 4.574, p < 0.001) and Trust in Sellers (β = 0.393, t = 6.726, p < 0.001) are positively associated with Customer Engagement. Among the modeled direct paths, the largest coefficient connects Trust in Sellers to Customer Engagement (β = 0.393, t = 6.726, p < 0.001). Multiplication of the reported standardized coefficients yields positive candidate indirect paths: Economic Value → Trust in Platform → Trust in Sellers (0.288 × 0.315 = 0.091), Experiential Value → Trust in Platform → Trust in Sellers (0.197 × 0.315 = 0.062), Social Value → Trust in Platform → Trust in Sellers (0.210 × 0.315 = 0.066), and Trust in Platform → Trust in Sellers → Customer Engagement (0.315 × 0.393 = 0.124). These values are calculated products of path coefficients and do not constitute separately tested mediation effects. Without bootstrap confidence intervals or significance tests for indirect effects, mediation cannot be confirmed.

Discussion

The results identify consumer value as a relevant correlate of trust in online marketplaces. All three value dimensions—Economic Value, Experiential Value, and Social Value—are positively related to Trust in Platform and Trust in Sellers, in line with the S-O-R view that evaluations of consumption stimuli are associated with internal psychological assessments and subsequent responses. Economic Value significantly influences both Trust in Platform and Trust in Sellers, suggesting that perceived financial advantages are associated with greater marketplace trust. This pattern accords with earlier work linking utilitarian and perceived value to trust in online shopping (Cuong, 2025; Zeqiri et al., 2023). The result suggests that economic benefits remain an important basis for trust formation, but their influence extends beyond the immediate evaluation of transactional benefits to consumers' confidence in both the platform and sellers operating within the e-commerce ecosystem. Of particular note, the effect size for Economic Value is smaller in the Trust in Sellers equation (f^2 = 0.014) than for Trust in Platform (f^2 = 0.091). One possible explanation is that consumers ascribe price fairness and transactional savings chiefly to features of the platform, whereas confidence in individual sellers depends on seller-specific fulfillment and communication. This explanation remains tentative because those mechanisms were not directly examined.

Experiential Value positively influences both Trust in Platform (β = 0.197, p < 0.001) and Trust in Sellers (β = 0.197, p < 0.001), suggesting that positive shopping experiences coincide with stronger confidence in platforms and vendors. This pattern aligns with research on experiential and hedonic value in online shopping (Tan et al., 2024; van Rooyen & Amoah, 2021). Social Value also positively influences Trust in Platform (β = 0.210, p < 0.001) and Trust in Sellers (β = 0.204, p < 0.001). These estimates suggest a link between trust assessments and the recognition, self-image, and social standing that consumers associate with online purchasing. This interpretation is consistent with the Social Value indicators employed in the present study and with previous research examining social value in digital commerce (Sembiring et al., 2025; Zhang et al., 2024). Taken together, the findings indicate that trust in e-commerce is associated not only with perceived economic benefits but also with experiential and social dimensions of consumer value.

The statistically significant positive association of Trust in Platform with Trust in Sellers (β = 0.315, p < 0.001) is compatible with the proposed marketplace trust-transfer account. Respondents with stronger platform confidence generally also express stronger confidence in sellers using that marketplace. The pattern distinguishes the two targets of trust conceptually while demonstrating an association between their measured levels. From an S-O-R perspective, these results suggest that the two forms of trust may operate as interconnected psychological evaluations. However, because the study employed a cross-sectional research design, the findings should not be interpreted as establishing a causal or temporal transfer of trust from platforms to sellers.

Both platform-directed and seller-directed trust show positive relationships with Customer Engagement, suggesting that trust relates not only to perceived transaction security but also to consumers' continued involvement. The larger coefficient for Trust in Sellers underscores the association between seller-specific confidence and engagement. This finding is consistent with

Chen et al. (2022) and Taheri et al. (2024), who associate customer trust with engagement and continued participation in digital commerce. This difference may arise because shoppers engage with sellers more directly during purchasing. Platform trust may offer general transactional reassurance, whereas seller trust appears more closely related to ongoing interaction and participation.

In consumer behavior scholarship, these results apply the Stimulus–Organism–Response (S-O-R) perspective to online commerce. The model treats Economic Value, Experiential Value, and Social Value as stimuli perceived by consumers, while distinguishing Trust in Platform and Trust in Sellers as interconnected psychological mechanisms preceding Customer Engagement. The framework differentiates the associations connecting perceived value with engagement by showing that trust operates at both the platform and seller levels. In particular, the significant platform–seller trust association is compatible with, but does not establish, a potential trust-transfer process, while the stronger effect of Trust in Sellers on Customer Engagement highlights the importance of seller-level trust in converting psychological confidence into behavioral engagement.

For practitioners, the associations suggest considering financial, experiential, and social value in marketplace relationship strategies. The observed relationships point to the potential relevance of fair economic benefits, satisfying shopping experiences, and perceived social value for both trust targets. Platforms may also consider strengthening transparency, transaction reliability, and seller accountability, while sellers may prioritize fulfilling transaction commitments and maintaining consumer confidence. These suggestions follow from observed associations; the study did not experimentally evaluate the proposed managerial actions. Further research is needed to determine whether specific managerial initiatives produce measurable improvements in trust and customer engagement.

CONCLUSION

The investigation assessed associations among Economic Value, Experiential Value, Social Value, Trust in Platform, Trust in Sellers, and Customer Engagement in a survey of 300 Indonesian online shoppers. All three consumer-value dimensions show positive, statistically significant associations with both platform trust and seller trust. A positive relationship is also observed between Trust in Platform and Trust in Sellers ($\beta = 0.315$, $p < 0.001$). Additionally, Trust in Platform ($\beta = 0.257$, $p < 0.001$) and Trust in Sellers ($\beta = 0.393$, $p < 0.001$) positively influence Customer Engagement, with seller trust demonstrating the strongest direct relationship with engagement. Explained variance reaches 29.4% for Trust in Platform, 39.1% for Trust in Sellers, and 32.6% for Customer Engagement. The results inform the Stimulus–Organism–Response framework through the joint consideration of consumer value, two related trust constructs, and engagement.

The evidence suggests that marketplace operators and vendors may attend to financial advantages, shopping quality, and social value when seeking to build consumer confidence. Several limitations nevertheless qualify these findings. The one-time survey cannot support causal inference, and purposive recruitment limits generalization to the wider Indonesian online-shopping population. Although the estimated paths are compatible with hypothesized trust transfer, neither causal transfer nor the individual indirect effects were independently verified. Further studies might use longitudinal observations, probability sampling when practical, and direct tests of mediation to investigate the development of consumer value, trust, and engagement over time. Comparisons among different marketplaces could provide further insights into whether these relationships differ across marketplace environments, provided that measurement invariance and adequate sample sizes are established.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors would like to express their sincere appreciation to Universitas Pelita Harapan for providing an academic environment that supported the development of this research. The authors also gratefully acknowledge all respondents who participated in the study and provided valuable information for this research.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTION STATEMENT

Isana Sri Christina Meranga contributed to the conceptualization, methodology, data analysis, interpretation, and manuscript preparation. Hendra Achmadi contributed to supervision and conceptual input. Juniarty Siahaan contributed to conceptual input and manuscript revision. All authors approved the final manuscript.

REFERENCES

Arisman, A., & Imam, S. (2022). Does Live Stream Selling Affect Customer Engagement and Purchase Intention? The Shopee Live Platform Case Study. *ASEAN Marketing Journal*, *14*(2). https://doi.org/10.21002/amj.v14i2.1201

Chen, Y., Prentice, C., Weaven, S., & Hisao, A. (2022). The influence of customer trust and artificial intelligence on customer engagement and loyalty – The case of the home-sharing industry. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *13*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.912339

Cuong, D. T. (2025). The influence of utilitarian value, hedonic value, and online review on consumers' satisfaction, trust, and repurchasing intention in e-commerce platforms. *Innovative Marketing*, *21*(2), 105–118. https://doi.org/10.21511/im.21(2).2025.09

Dong, X., Veloutsou, C., & Morgan-Thomas, A. (2024). Negative online brand engagement: conceptualisation, scale development and validation. *Journal of Research in Interactive Marketing*, *18*(5), 787–814.

Google, Temasek, & Company, B. &. (2025). *e-Conomy SEA 2025: From digital decade to AI reality: Accelerating the future in ASEAN*.

Hair, J. F., Risher, J. J., Sarstedt, M., & Ringle, C. M. (2019). When to use and how to report the results of PLS-SEM. *European Business Review*, *31*(1), 2–24. https://doi.org/10.1108/EBR-11-2018-0203

Indonesia, B.-S. (2025). *E-Commerce Statistics 2024*. BPS-Statistics Indonesia.

Koronaki, E., Vlachvei, A., & Panopoulos, A. (2023). Managing the online customer experience and subsequent consumer responses across the customer journey: A review and future research agenda. *Electronic Commerce Research and Applications*, *58*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.elerap.2023.101242

Moriuchi, E., & Takahashi, I. (2022). The role of perceived value, trust and engagement in the C2C online secondary marketplace. *Journal of Business Research*, *148*, 76–88. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2022.04.029

Qin, L., Qu, Q., Zhang, L., & Wu, H. (2022). Platform trust in C2C e-commerce platform: the sellers' cultural perspective. *Information Technology and Management*, *23*(4), 233–243. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10799-021-00349-1

Santoso, A., Prasetio, A., Martini, E., Manalu, V. G., & Sulaiman, E. (2026). Assessing the impact of seller and platform trust on consumer engagement matter in live streaming: evidence from Indonesia. *Innovative Marketing*, *22*(1), 96–106. https://doi.org/10.21511/im.22(1).2026.08

Sembiring, B. K. F., Rini, E. S., Absah, Y., & Rossanty, Y. (2025). The Effect of Utilitarian, Hedonic, and Social Values on Behavioral Outcomes through Consumer Trust. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Kesatuan*, *13*(6), 5141–5154. https://doi.org/10.37641/jimkes.v13i6.4072

Suleman, D., Wianti, W., Sofyanty, D., Haryati, R. A., Joesah, N., & Hakim, L. (2026). Trust Transfer in Social Commerce: The Role of Platform Trust and Seller Trust in Shaping Consumer Behavior in Indonesia. *Dinasti International Journal of Economics, Finance & Accounting*, *7*(4). https://doi.org/10.38035/dijemss.v7i4

Taheri, B., Yousaf, A., Gannon, M., & Mishra, A. (2024). e-commerce website customer engagement: Delineating the role of UTAUT, vividness, and compulsion. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, *79*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2024.103835

Tan, T. Le, Nguyen Chau Ngoc, K., Thanh, H. L. T., Thu, H. N. T., & Hoang, U. V. T. (2024). Enhancing Repurchase Intention on Digital Platforms Based on Shopping Well-Being Through Shopping Value, Trust and Impulsive Buying. *SAGE Open*, *14*(3). https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440241278454

van Rooyen, K., & Amoah, F. (2021). *Online shopping experiences: A quantitative investigation into*

hedonic value, trust, and risk in the South African retail industry.

Varshneya, G., & Das, G. (2017). Experiential value: Multi-item scale development and validation. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, *34*, 48–57. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2016.09.010

Zeqiri, J., Ramadani, V., & Aloulou, W. J. (2023). The effect of perceived convenience and perceived value on intention to repurchase in online shopping: the mediating effect of e-WOM and trust. *Economic Research-Ekonomska Istrazivanja*, *36*(3). https://doi.org/10.1080/1331677X.2022.2153721

Zerbini, C., Bijmolt, T. H. A., Maestripieri, S., & Luceri, B. (2022). Drivers of consumer adoption of e-Commerce: A meta-analysis. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, *39*(4), 1186–1208. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijresmar.2022.04.003

Zhang, H., Zheng, S., & Zhu, P. (2024). Why are Indonesian consumers buying on live streaming platforms? Research on consumer perceived value theory. *Heliyon*, *10*(13). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e33518