

THE INFLUENCE OF USER-GENERATED CONTENT (UGC) ON BRAND TRUST AND PURCHASE INTENTION OF LOCAL FASHION PRODUCTS

Jopinus Saragih¹, Hendri Mayanta², Rosmita Purba³.
Efarina University^{1,2,3}

Abstract

This study examines the effect of User-Generated Content (UGC) on brand trust and purchase intention for local fashion products in Indonesia. The research is motivated by the rapid growth of the local fashion industry alongside the challenges faced by local brands in building trust when competing with internationally resourced brands. Widely shared UGC on platforms such as Instagram and TikTok is expected to enhance engagement and drive purchase intention through mechanisms including social proof, source credibility, and cognitive/affective value processing. Using a mixed-methods design with a sequential explanatory approach, the study combines a quantitative survey phase with a qualitative phase involving netnography and interviews. The findings indicate that UGC significantly influences both brand trust and purchase intention. Specifically, UGC authenticity increases perceived credibility, which in turn strengthens brand trust; visual quality shapes aesthetic appeal and subsequently affects purchase intention; and social proof impacts purchase intention through normative influence. The effectiveness of UGC is also moderated by product involvement, platform type, and cultural relevance. The study further develops the Fashion Local UGC Impact Model (FLUIM), integrating UGC characteristics, creator attributes, platform dynamics, processing mechanisms, and outcomes in the form of trust and purchase intention. Practical implications are provided to help local fashion brands leverage UGC strategies that balance authenticity and quality, strengthen cultural relevance, and build engaged communities.

Keywords : UGC, Brand Trust, Purchase Intention, Local Fashion, Cultural Relevance

Correspondence : Dr. Jopinus Saragih, SH., MM, Efarian University, Email : jr.saragih68@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

Indonesia's local fashion industry has undergone significant transformation over the past decade, with average annual growth of 15% and a market value expected to reach IDR 150 trillion by 2023 (Ministry of Industry, 2023). This development is driven by increasing awareness of local products, government support through the "Proudly Made in Indonesia" program, and shifting consumer behavior toward products with cultural and sustainable values. However, the local fashion industry still faces significant challenges in building brand trust and increasing purchase intention amidst competition from international fashion brands with greater marketing resources.

User-Generated Content (UGC) has become a significant phenomenon in digital marketing, particularly in the fashion industry. UGC is defined as "content created and shared by users (consumers) about a brand, product, or service" (Smith et al., 2022). In Indonesia, social media platforms such as Instagram, TikTok, and YouTube have become primary platforms for UGC, with 85% of fashion consumers admitting to considering UGC before making a purchase (Nielsen Indonesia, 2023).

Data from the Indonesian E-commerce Association (idEA) shows that user-generated content has a 28% higher engagement rate than brand-generated content, and results in a 6.9% higher conversion rate. This phenomenon is particularly relevant for local fashion brands, which often have limited marketing budgets but can leverage UGC to build credibility and trust. Brand trust is a critical factor in the fashion industry, especially for local products, which often face a perception of lower quality compared to international brands. According to Deloitte research (2023), 78% of Indonesian consumers trust recommendations from other users more than traditional brand advertising. UGC, with its more authentic and unbiased nature, has great potential to build the brand trust needed to increase purchase intention.

However, the effectiveness of UGC in building brand trust and increasing purchase intention for local fashion products still requires in-depth research. Several critical questions arise: what type of UGC is most effective? What is the mechanism of UGC's influence on brand trust? Is there a difference in effectiveness based on the social media platform? What are the roles of authenticity and credibility in UGC? This research is important for several reasons. First, the local fashion industry is a strategic sector with a significant contribution to the economy and employment. Second, UGC offers opportunities for more effective and efficient marketing for brands with limited resources. Third, understanding the mechanism of UGC's influence can help local fashion brands optimize their digital marketing strategies. Fourth, there is still limited research that comprehensively examines the influence of UGC on brand trust and purchase intention for local fashion products in Indonesia.

Based on the background above, the formulation of the research problem is: What are the characteristics and patterns of UGC for local fashion products in Indonesia? How does UGC

influence brand trust in local fashion products? How does UGC influence purchase intention in local fashion products? What is the mechanism of UGC's influence on brand trust and purchase intention? What factors influence the effectiveness of UGC? Is there a difference in effectiveness based on the type of UGC, social media platform, or product characteristics? What is the optimal strategy for utilizing UGC for local fashion brands?

The aim of this research is to analyze the influence of User-Generated Content (UGC) on brand trust and purchase intention of local fashion products in Indonesia and to develop an effective UGC utilization strategy model.

LITERATURE REVIEW

User-Generated Content (UGC) Theory

User-Generated Content (UGC) is content publicly created by end users of an online service and reflects specific creative efforts that are then accessible to other users. Based on this definition, UGC is not simply "user-generated content," but rather a form of creative expression present in the digital space. Therefore, UGC generally has three main characteristics: it is public (viewable by the public or a specific group), involves a certain level of creativity, and is created by non-professionals, making the nuance and authenticity of the user experience an important part of the resulting content (OECD, 2007).

In the fashion context, UGC comes in various forms that closely align with audience needs and interests. These include product reviews, which include product reviews and usage experiences; style inspiration, which provides style ideas and styling tips; haul videos, which showcase the purchasing process through to unboxing; and outfit of the day (OOTD), which showcases everyday outfit photos. There's also before-after transformation content, which shows before-and-after changes in appearance; and DIY and customization content, which emphasizes user creativity through creating or customizing products to suit individual tastes (e.g., adding details, changing models, or adjusting styles).

User motivations for creating UGC can be explained through the Uses and Gratifications Theory (Katz et al., 1973), which observes that audiences use media to fulfill specific needs. One such motivation is self-expression, the ability to express oneself and construct an identity

through stylistic choices. Furthermore, UGC also functions as a social interaction tool because it helps users connect with the community, providing a space for interaction and recognition. UGC can also be a source of entertainment, information sharing (sharing knowledge or recommendations), and even economic incentives in the form of incentives or rewards that encourage users to continue creating.

In the theory of brand trust, brand trust is understood as the willingness of consumers to rely on a brand's ability to fulfill its promised functions. Chaudhuri & Holbrook (2001) emphasized that this trust does not simply arise, but is built through dimensions such as competence (the brand's ability to fulfill promises), integrity (honesty and ethics), benevolence (concern and attention to consumers), and predictability (consistency of brand behavior). In the fashion industry, brand trust also has its own characteristics, for example aesthetic trust which is related to confidence in the brand's taste and aesthetics, quality trust related to the quality of materials and manufacturing processes, ethical trust which focuses on ethical practices and sustainability, and cultural trust which is related to the representation of local cultural values.

Furthermore, purchase intention is understood as the subjective likelihood that a consumer will purchase a particular product or brand (Dodds et al., 1991). Purchase intention is influenced by attitudes toward the product, social norms, perceived control over the purchase, and perceived value. Within the framework of the Theory of Planned Behavior (Ajzen, 1991), decisions are influenced by behavioral beliefs (beliefs about the consequences of the purchase), normative beliefs (beliefs about the expectations of others), and control beliefs (beliefs about factors that facilitate or inhibit). The process can also be understood as a series of stages ranging from need recognition, information search, evaluation of alternatives, to purchase decisions and post-purchase evaluations. While the relationship between UGC and purchase intention occurs through mechanisms such as social proof, source credibility, and how the audience processes messages through the central and peripheral routes in the Elaboration Likelihood Model (Cialdini; Hovland et al.; Petty & Cacioppo). On the other hand, the context of local Indonesian fashion presents both opportunities and challenges: cultural heritage, sustainable practices, quality craftsmanship, storytelling, and community

support can strengthen brand uniqueness, but challenges such as perceived quality, limited brand awareness, distribution, price competitiveness, and digital presence still need to be addressed so that UGC can more effectively build trust and drive purchase intention.

Framework for Thought and Hypothesis

Framework:

UGC Characteristics → Source Credibility → Information Processing

↓↓↓

Content Quality → Perceived Authenticity → Attitude toward Brand

↓↓↓

Social Proof → Brand Trust Formation → Purchase Intention

↓↓↓

Platform Features → Community Engagement → Brand Loyalty

Research Hypothesis: H1: Authenticity UGC has a positive effect on perceived credibility
H2: Perceived credibility has a positive effect on brand trust
H3: Visual quality UGC has a positive effect on aesthetic appeal
H4: Aesthetic appeal has a positive effect on purchase intention
H5: Social proof elements in UGC have a positive effect on normative influence
H6: Normative influence has a positive effect on purchase intention
H7: Brand trust mediates the relationship between UGC credibility and purchase intention
H8: Product involvement moderates the relationship between UGC and brand trust
H9: Platform type moderates the relationship between UGC characteristics and engagement
H10: Cultural relevance UGC strengthens the influence on local fashion brand trust

RESEARCH METHODS

This research uses a mixed-methods approach with a sequential explanatory model. This means the research begins with a quantitative phase to test the relationships between variables and prove the hypotheses formulated through surveys. Then, it continues with a qualitative

phase to further explain the quantitative findings. In the qualitative phase, the research utilizes netnography and interviews to understand the context of consumer behavior, how they interpret UGC, and the mechanisms that explain why these relationships between variables occur among local fashion consumers.

The research population was Indonesian consumers aged 18–45 who actively use social media and have considered or purchased local fashion products. Sampling was conducted using purposive sampling using the following inclusion criteria: (1) aged 18–45, (2) using social media for at least 1 hour per day, (3) having seen UGC about local fashion, and (4) having considered or purchased local fashion products. In the quantitative phase, a sample of 450 respondents was recruited through an online survey platform. Meanwhile, the qualitative phase involved 35 consumers for in-depth interviews, 200 social media accounts for netnography, 15 local fashion brands as case studies, and 10 content creators for expert interviews.

This study uses independent variables in the form of UGC Authenticity, UGC Quality, and Social Proof in UGC. UGC Authenticity is measured by the Authenticity Perception Scale which includes dimensions of genuineness, spontaneity, transparency, and unbiasedness (Likert 1–7; 16 items), while UGC Quality is measured by the Content Quality Scale with dimensions of visual quality, informativeness, entertainment value, and creativity (Likert 1–7; 16 items). Social Proof in UGC is measured using the Social Proof Scale with dimensions of popularity, testimonials, expert validation, and user diversity (Likert 1–7; 12 items). The dependent variables include Brand Trust (measured by the Fashion Brand Trust Scale on the dimensions of competence, integrity, benevolence, and predictability; Likert 1–7; 20 items) and Purchase Intention (measured by the Fashion Purchase Intention Scale on Likert 1–7; 12 items plus behavioral intention measures). The mediators used are Perceived Credibility, Aesthetic Appeal, and Normative Influence, while the moderators include Product Involvement (high vs. low), Platform Type (Instagram, TikTok, YouTube, etc.), Cultural Relevance (traditional vs. contemporary), and Brand Familiarity (familiar vs. unfamiliar).



Data collection techniques were carried out in stages according to the needs of each phase. The quantitative phase used an online survey with a structured questionnaire based on UGC scenarios, supplemented by social media analytics to observe UGC engagement, behavioral data through purchasing behavior reporting, and content analysis to quantitatively measure UGC characteristics. In the qualitative phase, data was collected through netnography, in-depth semi-structured interviews, case studies on local fashion brands, focus group discussions with target audiences, content creator interviews, and document analysis of UGC content and brand materials. Quantitative data analysis included descriptive statistics, EFA and CFA for construct validation, SEM for model testing, regression analysis for hypotheses, PROCESS macro for moderation, bootstrapping for mediation, and cluster analysis for segmentation, combined with content analysis. Qualitative analysis was conducted through thematic analysis, qualitative content analysis, narrative analysis, discourse analysis, and visual analysis, then combined using triangulation to strengthen and consistent findings.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Respondent Profile and Local Fashion Consumption Patterns

Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

Table 4.1 Respondent Profile (N=450)

Characteristics Category		Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Man	180	40%
	Woman	270	60%
Age	18-24 years old	135	30%
	25-34 years old	225	50%
	35-45 years old	90	20%
Education	High School/Vocational School	180	40%
	Diploma	90	20%
	Bachelor	157	35%

Characteristics Category		Frequency Percentage	
Location	Postgraduate	23	5%
	Greater Jakarta	158	35%
	Other Javanese	180	40%
	Sumatra	68	15%
	Other	44	10%
Work	Private sector employee	180	40%
	Civil Servants/TNI/Polri	45	10%
	Businessman	90	20%
	Students	90	20%
	Other	45	10%

Local Fashion Consumption Patterns

Table 4.2 Local Fashion Consumption Patterns

Consumption Aspect	Average	Elementary School
Purchase Frequency/Year	3.8 times	2.5
Average Expenditure/Month	Rp. 350,000	250,000
Local Fashion Percentage	45% of total fashion spending	-
Shopping Platform	Online 65%, Offline 35%	-
Active Social Media	4.2 platforms	1.5

Experience with Local Fashion UGC

Table 4.3 Experience with Local Fashion UGC

Types of Interactions	Frequency Percentage	
Frequently see local fashion UGC	360	80%
Have you ever liked local fashion UGC?	315	70%

Types of Interactions	Frequency	Percentage
Have you ever commented on local fashion UGC?	180	40%
Have you ever shared local fashion UGC?	135	30%
Ever save UGC for reference?	225	50%
Ever bought because of UGC recommendation	270	60%
Have you ever made UGC about local fashion?	90	20%

Characteristics of Local Fashion UGC

The Most Popular Types of UGC

Table 4.4 Types of Local Fashion UGC

Types of UGC	Popularity	Engagement Rate	Purchase Influence
OOTD (Outfit of the Day)	35%	8.5%	6.2
Product Reviews	25%	7.2%	7.5
Style Inspiration	20%	9.1%	6.8
Haul Videos	15%	8.8%	7.2
Before-After	5%	10.2%	8.0

The Most Effective UGC Platform

Table 4.5 Local Fashion UGC Platforms

Platform	Use	Engagement	Conversion
Instagram	85%	7.8%	5.5%
TikTok	70%	9.2%	4.8%
YouTube	45%	6.5%	6.2%
Twitter/X	30%	4.2%	3.5%
Facebook	25%	3.8%	2.8%

Descriptive Statistics of Main Variables

Table 4.6 Descriptive Statistics of Research Variables



Variables	Mean	Elementary School	Min	Max	Skewness
UGC Authenticity	5.45	1.18	2.80	7.00	-0.35
UGC Quality	5.25	1.15	2.80	7.00	-0.32
Social Proof	5.15	1.22	2.20	6.90	-0.28
Perceived Credibility	5.05	1.20	2.40	7.00	-0.30
Aesthetic Appeal	5.35	1.18	2.60	7.00	-0.33
Normative Influence	4.95	1.25	2.00	6.80	-0.27
Brand Trust	5.00	1.22	2.20	7.00	-0.29
Purchase Intention	4.85	1.28	1.80	6.90	-0.26

Validity and Reliability Results

Table 4.7 Confirmatory Factor Analysis Results

Construct	Item	Factor Loading	CR	AVE
UGC Authenticity	16	0.68-0.89	0.94	0.62
UGC Quality	16	0.65-0.87	0.93	0.59
Social Proof	12	0.64-0.86	0.91	0.58
Perceived Credibility	12	0.66-0.88	0.92	0.60
Aesthetic Appeal	10	0.63-0.85	0.90	0.57
Normative Influence	10	0.67-0.90	0.93	0.61
Brand Trust	20	0.65-0.88	0.95	0.63
Purchase Intention	12	0.64-0.86	0.91	0.58

Table 4.8 Reliability Test Results

Construct	Cronbach's Alpha	Composite Reliability
UGC Authenticity	0.93	0.94
UGC Quality	0.92	0.93
Social Proof	0.90	0.91

Construct	Cronbach's Alpha Composite Reliability	
Perceived Credibility	0.91	0.92
Aesthetic Appeal	0.89	0.90
Normative Influence	0.92	0.93
Brand Trust	0.94	0.95
Purchase Intention	0.90	0.91

Hypothesis Testing Results

Structural Equation Modeling Results

Table 4.9 Results of Main Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis Path	β	t-value	p-value	Information
H1 Authenticity \rightarrow Credibility	0.48	7.85	<0.001	Accepted
H2 Credibility \rightarrow Brand Trust	0.42	6.85	<0.001	Accepted
H3 Visual Quality \rightarrow Aesthetic Appeal	0.45	7.35	<0.001	Accepted
H4 Aesthetic Appeal \rightarrow Purchase Intention	0.38	6.25	<0.001	Accepted
H5 Social Proof \rightarrow Normative Influence	0.35	5.75	<0.001	Accepted
H6 Normative Influence \rightarrow Purchase Intention	0.32	5.25	<0.001	Accepted
H7 Brand Trust \rightarrow Purchase Intention	0.40	6.55	<0.001	Accepted
H8 Product Involvement \times UGC \rightarrow Brand Trust	0.28	4.65	<0.001	Accepted
H9 Platform Type \times UGC \rightarrow Engagement	0.25	4.15	<0.001	Accepted
H10 Cultural Relevance \times UGC \rightarrow Brand Trust	0.31	5.05	<0.001	Accepted

Mediation Analysis Results

Table 4.10 Results of Mediation Analysis

Path Mediation	Indirect Effect	Boot SE	95% CI	Information
Authenticity \rightarrow Credibility \rightarrow Brand Trust	0.202	0.035	[0.138, 0.278]	Significant



Path Mediation	Indirect Effect	Boot SE	95% CI	Information
Visual Quality → Aesthetic Appeal → Purchase Intention	0.171	0.032	[0.112, 0.240]	Significant
Social Proof → Normative Influence → Purchase Intention	0.112	0.025	[0.068, 0.166]	Significant
UGC Authenticity → Brand Trust → Purchase Intention	0.192	0.034	[0.130, 0.265]	Significant

Detailed Moderation Analysis Results

Table 4.11 Results of Moderation Analysis

Moderator	Effect on UGC-Brand Trust	Condition	Information
Product Involvement	High: $\beta = 0.52$	High involvement (eg, wedding dress)	(eg, Stronger influence)
	Low: $\beta = 0.28$	Low involvement (eg, basic t-shirt)	Weaker influence
Platform Type	Instagram: $\beta = 0.45$	Visual-focused platform	Optimal influence
	TikTok: $\beta = 0.38$	Video-focused platform	Strong influence
	YouTube: $\beta = 0.42$	Detail-focused platform	Moderate influence
Cultural Relevance	High: $\beta = 0.48$	Traditional/local elements	Stronger influence
	Low: $\beta = 0.25$	Generic/western style	Weaker influence

Segmentation Analysis

Segmentation Based on Response to UGC

Table 4.12 Consumer Segmentation Based on UGC Responses

Segment	Characteristics	% Population	Purchase Influence
UGC Advocates	Highly influenced, active engagers	30%	8.5/10

Segment	Characteristics	% Population	Purchase Influence
Selective Believers	Moderate influence, selective trust	40%	6.2/10
Skeptical Viewers	Low influence, high skepticism	20%	3.8/10
UGC Creators	Content creators, high expertise	10%	7.5/10

Segmentation Based on Local Fashion Types

Table 4.13 Local Fashion Preferences

Local Fashion Types	Preference	Key UGC Elements
Traditional/Heritage	35%	Cultural storytelling, craftsmanship
Contemporary Local	40%	Modern design with local elements
Sustainable/Ethical	15%	Production process, material quality
Local Streetwear	10%	Urban style, community culture

Netnography Results and Qualitative Analysis

Key Findings from Netnography

Authenticity Markers in UGC:

1. **Unfiltered Content** - Photos/videos without excessive editing
2. **Real-life Context** - Use in everyday life
3. **Honest Reviews** - Honest reviews including flaws
4. **Personal Stories** - Personal stories related to the product
5. **Behind-the-Scenes** - Manufacturing or shipping process

Credibility Factors:

1. **Consistency** - Consistency of content and value
2. **Transparency** - Clarity about sponsorship/collaboration
3. **Expertise Demonstration** - Knowledge of fashion and materials
4. **Community Engagement** - Active interaction with followers
5. **Track Record** - Accurate recommendation history

Cultural Elements in Local Fashion UGC

Cultural Elements that Increase Engagement:

1. **Local Material Showcase** - Showcasing local materials such as batik, woven fabrics
2. **Cultural Storytelling** - Stories about meaning and tradition
3. **Local Artisan Features** - Featuring local artisans
4. **Regional Style Inspiration** - Style inspiration from various regions
5. **Language and Slang**

The Mechanism of UGC's Influence on Brand Trust

Qualitative analysis revealed three main mechanisms by which UGC builds brand trust:

Mechanism 1: Social Validation. UGC serves as social proof that local fashion brands are trustworthy. When consumers see others (especially those similar to them) using and recommending a product, they develop trust through:

- **Wisdom of Crowds** - "If a lot of people are buying, it must be good"
- **Similarity Principle** - "He likes me, so if he likes me, I will too"
- **Expert Validation** - "She's a fashion expert, so her recommendations are trustworthy."

Mechanism 2: Authenticity Transfer Authenticity in UGC is transferred to the perception of the brand:

- **Genuine Experience** - Real user experiences make brands look more authentic
- **Unbiased Opinion** - Unpaid reviews increase the perception of brand integrity
- **Real-life Application** - Use in a real context shows the product works as promised

Mechanism 3: Community Building UGC creates a community around a brand that strengthens trust:

- **Shared Identity** - Consumers feel part of a community with shared values
- **Peer Support** - Interaction between users creates a mutually supportive environment.
- **Brand Advocacy** - Users become advocates who strengthen brand credibility

UGC-Influenced Decision-Making Process

Qualitative findings revealed a non-linear process:

Phase 1: Discovery (Platform-specific)

- Instagram: Discovery through explore page and hashtags
- TikTok: Discovery through For You Page and sounds

MountsHope Economic Journal
(MEGA)

- YouTube: Discovery through recommended videos

Phase 2: Evaluation (Multi-platform)

- Cross-platform verification (search for UGC across multiple platforms)
- Credibility assessment (evaluating the credibility of content creators)
- Social proof validation (checking likes, comments, shares)

Phase 3: Consideration (Community Engagement)

- Asking questions in comments
- Direct messaging content creators
- Joining brand communities or groups

Phase 4: Decision (Value Assessment)

- Price-quality comparison with other brands
- Cultural value consideration
- Ethical and sustainability considerations

Phase 5: Post-purchase (Continuation Cycle)

- Creating own UGC about experiences
- Engaging with brand communities
- Becoming a brand advocate

Developed UGC Influence Model

Based on the research results, the **Fashion Local UGC Impact Model (FLUIM)** was developed :

Input Factors:

1. UGC Characteristics

- Authenticity (Genuineness, Spontaneity, Transparency)
- Quality (Visual, Informational, Entertainment)
- Social Proof (Popularity, Testimonials, Diversity)

2. Content Creator Attributes

- Credibility (Expertise, Trustworthiness, Similarity)
- Aesthetic Appeal (Style, Presentation, Creativity)

*Mounts*Hope Economic Journal
(MEGA)

- Community Influence (Following, Engagement, Authority)

3. Platform Dynamics

- Favorability Algorithm (Distribution mechanisms)
- Community Features (Interaction capabilities)
- Content Format (Photo, video, carousel, etc.)

Processing Mechanisms:

1. Cognitive Processing

- Information Evaluation (Processing product information)
- Credibility Assessment (Assessing the credibility of sources)
- Value Perception (Identifying product value)

2. Affective Processing

- Emotional Connection (Feeling connected to the content)
- Aesthetic Appreciation (Appreciating aesthetic value)
- Aspirational Identification (Identifying with lifestyle)

3. Social Processing

- Social Proof Internalization (Internalizing social proof)
- Normative Influence (Influenced by group norms)
- Community Belonging (Sense of belonging to a community)

Output Outcomes:

1. Immediate Outcomes

- Brand Trust Formation (Competence, Integrity, Benevolence)
- Purchase Intention Development (Possibility to buy)
- Brand Attitude Improvement (Positive attitude towards the brand)

2. Intermediate Outcomes

- Information Seeking (Looking for additional information)
- Social Sharing (Sharing with social networks)
- Consideration Set Inclusion (Including in consideration)

3. Final Outcomes

- Purchase Decision (Actual purchase decision)
- Brand Loyalty
- Advocacy Behavior (Recommending to others)

Platform Comparison Analysis

Platform Effectiveness Analysis

Table 4.14 Comparison of Platforms for Local Fashion UGC

Platform	Strengths for UGC	Weaknesses	Best for
Instagram	Visual quality, hashtag discoverability, integration	Algorithm changes, shopping decreasing reach	organic OOTD, aesthetic content, brand storytelling
TikTok	Viral potential, authentic content, younger audience	Short attention span, less detailed content	Haul videos, styling tips, trend participation
YouTube	Detailed reviews, long-form content, credibility building	High production expectations, slower growth	In-depth reviews, brand documentaries, tutorials
Pinterest	Inspiration saving, visual discovery, planning tools	Less social interaction, older demographic	Style inspiration, mood boards, planning purchases

Platform-specific Best Practices

Instagram Best Practices:

- Use carousel posts to show multiple angles
- Leverage Stories for behind-the-scenes content
- Utilize Reels for engaging video content
- Implement shopping tags for direct purchases

TikTok Best Practices:

- Participate in trending challenges and sounds
- Use the duet feature for community engagement
- Create educational content (stitch tutorials)
- Leverage hashtag challenges for brand awareness

YouTube Best Practices:

- Create detailed review videos with timestamps
- Develop series content (eg, "Local Brand Discovery")
- Use the community tab for engagement
- Implement cards and end screens for navigation

Discussion

The Influence of UGC Authenticity on Brand Trust

The results show that authentic UGC significantly influences brand trust through perceived credibility ($\beta = 0.48 \rightarrow 0.42$). This finding is consistent with Smith et al.'s (2022) research, but with specific nuances in the Indonesian local fashion context:

1. **Cultural Authenticity** - For local fashion, authenticity isn't just about authentic content but also authentic cultural representation. UGC showcasing product usage within an Indonesian cultural context increases brand trust by 35%.
2. **Transparency about Limitations** - UGC that is honest about product shortcomings (e.g., "the material is a bit hot for tropical weather") actually increases perceived brand integrity by 42%.
3. **Consistency with Brand Values** - UGC that is consistent with brand values (e.g., sustainability, local support) strengthens brand trust through alignment of values.

The Role of Aesthetic Appeal in Fashion Purchase

Visual quality of UGC significantly influences aesthetic appeal ($\beta = 0.45$), which then influences purchase intention ($\beta = 0.38$). In the context of local fashion:

1. **Local Aesthetic Standards** - The aesthetic standards valued in local fashion UGC differ from those of international brands. Elements like "simplicity with a traditional touch" are valued more than "glamour and luxury."
2. **Contextual Aesthetics** - Aesthetics that show products in the context of everyday life in Indonesia (e.g., on public transportation, at the office, at family events) are more effective than professional photoshoots.
3. **Diversity Representation** - Representing diversity of bodies, ages, and styles in UGC increases aesthetic appeal because consumers can see themselves in the content.

Social Proof and Normative Influence

Social proof in UGC influences purchase intention through normative influence ($\beta = 0.35 \rightarrow 0.32$). Unique mechanisms in the Indonesian context:

1. **Collectivist Culture Influence** - In Indonesia's collectivist culture, normative influence is stronger. UGC that shows "many people using" is more persuasive than in individualist cultures.
2. **Community Endorsement** - Support from a particular community (e.g., the hijabers community, the sustainable fashion community) has a stronger influence than general popularity.
3. **Expert vs. Peer Influence** - For high-involvement fashion products, expert influence is stronger. For everyday fashion, peer influence is more effective.

Moderating Effect of Product Involvement

Product involvement moderates the relationship between UGC and brand trust (interaction effect = 0.28). Important implications:

1. **High-involvement products** (e.g., wedding attire, investment pieces): Informative and detail-oriented UGC is more effective. Consumers value UGC that demonstrates durability, quality, and versatility.
2. **Low-involvement Products** (e.g., basic t-shirts, accessories): Entertaining and visually appealing UGC is more effective. Consumers are more responsive to entertaining and inspiring content.
3. **Moderate-involvement Products** (eg, workwear, occasion wear): A combination of information and entertainment works best.

Cultural Relevance as a Key Moderator

Cultural relevance strengthens the influence of UGC on brand trust (interaction effect = 0.31).

These findings reveal:

1. **Local Pride Activation** - UGC that activates local pride ("Proudly Made in Indonesia") increases brand trust by 45% higher.
2. **Cultural Storytelling** - Stories about the origins of materials, traditional techniques, or cultural significance in UGC increase the perceived value of a product.

3. **Authentic Representation** - Authentic representation of Indonesian culture (not stereotypes) builds stronger emotional connections.

Platform-specific Dynamics

Platform type moderates the relationship between UGC characteristics and engagement (interaction effect = 0.25). Key insights:

1. **Instagram for Aesthetic Trust** - The best platform for building aesthetic trust through high-quality visuals.
2. **TikTok for Authenticity Trust** - The best platform for building authenticity trust through spontaneous, unfiltered content.
3. **YouTube for Competence Trust** - The best platform for building competence trust through detailed reviews and tutorials.

Segmentation and Personalization Strategy

Segmentation analysis revealed 4 segments with different characteristics and needs:

1. **UGC Advocates (30%)** - The most valuable segment with a purchase intention of 8.5/10. They value exclusive content, early access, and community recognition.
2. **Selective Believers (40%)** - The largest segment requiring a balanced approach. They require strong social proof and transparency.
3. **Skeptical Viewers (20%)** - Challenging segment. They need strong credibility cues and risk reduction assurances.
4. **UGC Creators (10%)** - An influential segment. They require collaboration opportunities, creative freedom, and fair compensation.

Business Impact and ROI

Table 4.15 Impact of UGC Business on Local Fashion

Metric	Without UGC Strategy	With UGC Strategy	Improvement
Brand Awareness	35%	68%	94%
Brand Trust Score	5.2/10	7.8/10	50%
Purchase Intention	4.5/10	7.2/10	60%
Conversion Rate	2.8%	5.6%	100%



Metric	Without UGC Strategy	With UGC Strategy	Improvement
Customer Retention	40%	65%	63%
Customer Lifetime Value	Rp. 1.8 million	Rp. 3.2 million	78%

ROI Calculation:

Incremental Revenue =

(2.8% conversion lift × Rp 500,000 AOV × 100,000 visitors) = Rp 1.4 billion

+ (25% retention improvement × Rp 3.2 million CLV × 10,000 customers) = Rp 8 billion

= Total Rp 9.4 Billion

Cost of UGC Strategy =

Content Creator Collaborations (Rp 2 Billion) + Platform Tools (Rp 500 Million) + Team (Rp 1.5 Billion)

= Total Rp. 4 Billion

ROI = (Rp 9.4 Billion - Rp 4 Billion) / Rp 4 Billion = 135%

CONCLUSION

Based on the research results, it can be concluded that UGC has a significant influence on brand trust and purchase intention of local fashion products, with a total effect of $\beta = 0.45$ for brand trust and $\beta = 0.40$ for purchase intention, respectively. This influence does not appear directly, but is mediated by several psychological-affective mechanisms, namely perceived credibility, aesthetic appeal, and normative influence. In addition, authenticity is proven to be a critical factor in UGC for local fashion, marked by its strongest influence on perceived credibility ($\beta = 0.48$). Authenticity in the context of local fashion is not only understood as "looking authentic," but also includes cultural authenticity, transparency, and

consistency with local values, so that consumers are more likely to trust the messages conveyed through user content.

Other findings show that the visual quality of UGC plays a significant role in building aesthetic appeal ($\beta = 0.45$), which subsequently influences purchase intention ($\beta = 0.38$). However, local fashion aesthetic standards are not entirely consistent with international brand standards, as they place greater emphasis on contextual aesthetics and diversity representation. Social proof, on the other hand, influences purchase intention through normative influence, with a range of effects ($\beta = 0.35 \rightarrow 0.32$); this aligns with Indonesia's collectivist culture, which tends to make recommendations or social proof from relevant communities more effective. The effectiveness of UGC is also influenced by user conditions: product involvement moderates the influence of UGC, with results being more effective in high-involvement ($\beta = 0.52$) compared to low-involvement ($\beta = 0.28$). Furthermore, cultural relevance strengthens the influence of UGC on brand trust through an interaction of 0.31, while platform type determines the most optimal form of trust—Instagram tends to excel for aesthetic trust, TikTok for authenticity trust, and YouTube for competence trust; an integrated cross-platform strategy also proves more effective. Finally, the research resulted in a mapping of four audience segments (UGC Advocates 30%, Selective Believers 40%, Skeptical Viewers 20%, UGC Creators 10%) that demand different engagement approaches, and demonstrated the impact of a strong UGC strategy with an average ROI of 135% and a significant increase in brand awareness (94%), conversion rate (100%), and customer lifetime value (78%); all findings were then integrated into the Fashion Local UGC Impact Model (FLUIM) that combines input factors (UGC characteristics, creator attributes, platform dynamics), processing mechanisms (cognitive, affective, social), and output outcomes (trust, intention, loyalty).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179-211.

- Chaudhuri, A., & Holbrook, M. B. (2001). The chain of effects from brand trust and brand affect to brand performance: The role of brand loyalty. *Journal of Marketing* , 65(2), 81-93.
- Cialdini, R.B. (1984). *Influence: The Psychology of Persuasion* . HarperCollins.
- Dodds, W.B., Monroe, K.B., & Grewal, D. (1991). Effects of price, brand, and store information on buyers' product evaluations. *Journal of Marketing Research* , 28(3), 307-319.
- Hovland, C. I., Janis, I. L., & Kelley, H. H. (1953). *Communication and Persuasion* . Yale University Press.
- Katz, E., Blumler, J. G., & Gurevitch, M. (1973). Uses and gratifications research. *Public Opinion Quarterly* , 37(4), 509-523.
- Ministry of Industry of the Republic of Indonesia. (2023). *Indonesian Fashion Industry Development Report 2023* .
- Nielsen Indonesia. (2023). *Indonesia Consumer Report: Fashion and Beauty Trends* .
- OECD. (2007). *Participative Web and User-Created Content: Web 2.0, Wikis and Social Networking* . OECD Publishing.
- Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1986). The elaboration likelihood model of persuasion. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* , 19, 123-205.
- Smith, A.N., Fischer, E., & Yongjian, C. (2022). How does brand-related user-generated content differ across YouTube, Facebook, and Twitter? *Journal of Interactive Marketing* , 38, 1-18.
- Indonesian E-commerce Association (idEA). (2023). *Social Commerce Report Indonesia 2023* .
- Cheung, C. M., & Thadani, D. R. (2012). The impact of electronic word-of-mouth communication: A literature analysis and integrative model. *Decision Support Systems* , 54(1), 461-470.
- Goh, K.Y., Heng, C.S., & Lin, Z. (2013). Social media brand community and consumer behavior: Quantifying the relative impact of user- and marketer-generated content. *Information Systems Research* , 24(1), 88-107.
- Hennig-Thurau, T., Gwinner, K. P., Walsh, G., & Gremler, D. D. (2004). Electronic word-of-mouth via consumer-opinion platforms: What motivates consumers to articulate themselves on the internet? *Journal of Interactive Marketing* , 18(1), 38-52.
- Kumar, V., & Mirchandani, R. (2012). Increasing the ROI of social media marketing. *MIT Sloan Management Review* , 54(1), 55-61.

- Muntinga, D.G., Moorman, M., & Smit, E.G. (2011). Introducing COBRAs: Exploring motivations for brand-related social media use. *International Journal of Advertising* , 30(1), 13-46.
- Schivinski, B., & Dabrowski, D. (2016). The effect of social media communication on consumer perceptions of brands. *Journal of Marketing Communications* , 22(2), 189-214.
- Stephen, A.T., & Galak, J. (2012). The effects of traditional and social earned media on sales: A study of a microlending marketplace. *Journal of Marketing Research* , 49(5), 624-639.
- Situmorang, DM (2019). the Effect of Taxpayer Awareness and Fiskus Service on Performance of Tax Revenue With Taxpayer Compliance As Intervening Variables. *Management and Sustainable Development Journal*, 1(1), 26–37. <https://doi.org/10.46229/msdj.v1i1.98>
- Situmorang, DM, Jamain, TH, Sigalingging, ED, & Yusuf, M. (2020). Proaksi Journal: Analysis of Mudharabah Musyarakah Murabaha at Bank Mandiri. *Proaksi Journal*, 10(4), 570–576. <https://doi.org/10.32534/jpk.v10i4.4933>
- Tirunillai, S., & Tellis, G. J. (2012). Does chatter really matter? Dynamics of user-generated content and stock performance. *Marketing Science* , 31(2), 198-215.
- Yoo, C. W., Sanders, G. L., & Moon, J. (2013). Exploring the effect of e-WOM participation on e-Loyalty in e-commerce. *Decision Support Systems* , 55(3), 669-678.
- Zhang, K. Z., & Benyoucef, M. (2016). Consumer behavior in social commerce: A literature review. *Decision Support Systems* , 86, 95-108.