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Purpose: This study is aimed at explaining the factors that influence a person to decide to use TikTok in the Jabodetabek (Jakarta-Bogor-Depok-Tangerang-Bekasi) area. This study also uses the variables of self-efficacy, utilitarian value, hedonic value, information sharing, trust, and decision-making.

Design/Method/Approach: Quantitative approaches and explanatory research are used in this study. Respondents were consumers who used the TikTok application in the Jabodetabek area to determine the number of samples. The present study uses non-probability sampling and convenience sampling techniques with 252 respondents. Data collection methods used questionnaires, and data were analyzed using Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) and the Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) method with the help of AMOS 24.

Findings: The findings of this study indicate that self-efficacy and hedonic value positively affect trust, and trust positively affects information sharing and decision-making. Nevertheless, the results of this study also explain that self-efficacy does not affect information sharing. The utilitarian value does not significantly affect trust, and information sharing does not affect decision-making.

Theoretical Implications: The study contributes to the existence literature on Social Media Use and Social Media Marketing especially about variables used in this study, wherein concludes that trust play an important role to use and activities of sharing information in social media.

Practical Implications: Social media service providers should focus on the influence of information sharing and decision-making in the TikTok application, namely trust. One example is making efforts to improve consumer trust by protecting the personal information which consumers provide on social networking sites and developing the TikTok application as advertising for business. This study can be used as a reference for advertisers when choosing advertising media in the TikTok application because hedonic values influence trust in the TikTok application. Advertisers are advised to promote products by providing hedonic value, such as TikTok dance.

Originality/Value: The use of the TikTok application is a trend that is currently popular. We tried to perform this research by using a dependent variable of decision-making that is not easy to find and is used in marketing studies.

Research Limitations/Future Research: For further research, it is recommended to modify the model using factors other than those used in this study, use similar research objects other than the TikTok application, with a broader scope of the study location.
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Мета роботи: Це дослідження спрямоване на пояснення факторів, які впливають на прийняття рішення про використання TikTok в регіоні Джабодетабек (Джакарта-Богор-Депок-Тангеранг-Бекас). У цьому дослідженні також використовуються змінні самоефективності, утилітарної цінності, гедоністичної цінності, обміну інформацією, довіри та прийняття рішень.

Дизайн / Метод / Підхід дослідження: Це дослідження спрямоване на пояснення факторів, які впливають на прийняття рішення про використання TikTok в регіоні Джабодетабек. У цьому дослідженні також використовуються змінні самоефективності, утилітарної цінності, гедоністичної цінності, обміну інформацією, довіри та прийняття рішень.

Результати дослідження: Результати цього дослідження вказують на те, що самоефективність та гедоністичні цінності позитивно впливають на довіру, а довіра позитивно впливає на обмін інформацією та прийняття рішень. Разом з тим, результати дослідження також пояснюють, що самоефективність не впливає на обмін інформацією. Утилітарна цінність суттєво не впливає на довіру, а обмін інформацією не впливає на прийняття рішень.

Теоретична цінність дослідження: Дослідження робить внесок в існуючу літературу щодо використання соціальних мереж та маркетингу соціальних мереж, особливо щодо змінних, використаних у цьому дослідженні, і робить висновок, що довіра відіграє важливу роль у використанні та діяльності обмін інформацією в соціальних мережах.

Практична цінність дослідження: Постачальникам послуг соціальних мереж слід зосередити увагу на впливі на обмін інформацією та прийняття рішень у додатку TikTok, а саме на довірі. Одним із прикладів є докладання зусиль для підвищення довіри споживачів шляхом захисту особистої інформації, яку споживачі надають у соціальних мережах, а також розвиток додатку TikTok як реклами для бізнесу. Дане дослідження може бути використано як орієнтир для рекламодавців при виборі рекламних носіїв у додатку TikTok, оскільки гедоністичні цінності впливають на довіру до додатку TikTok. Рекламодавцям рекомендується просувати товари, надаючи гедоністичну цінність, наприклад, танець TikTok.

Оригінальність / Цінність дослідження: Використання додатку TikTok - це тенденція, яка є популярною. Ми спробували провести це дослідження, використовуючи залежну змінну прийняття рішень, яку неможливо знайти і яка використовується в маркетингових дослідженнях.

Обмеження дослідження / Майбутні дослідження: Для подальших досліджень рекомендується модифікувати модель з використанням факторів, відмінних від тих, що були використані в даному досліджені, використовуючи аналогічні об’єкти дослідження, відмінні від додатку TikTok, з більш широким охопленням локації дослідження.

Тип статті: Емпіричний

Ключові слова: прийняття рішень, гедоністична цінність, обмін інформацією, самоефективність, довіра, соціальні мережі, утилітарна цінність.
1. Introduction

The development of the world of technology and information is rising rapidly from year to year, making the internet a communication tool in great demand by the public. Therefore, there has been a shift in conventional communication to modern and all-digital. According to research results from the HootSuite site and marketing agency named We Are Social entitled “Digital 2021: Global Overview Reports” in January 2021, users who are active on social media in Indonesia will reach 170 million people (Kemp, 2021).

One of the most popular social media worldwide is TikTok. On September 27, 2021, through its official page, TikTok announced that TikTok had reached a billion monthly active users globally (TikTok, 2021). A survey by Sensor Tower (2021) showed that TikTok is the most downloaded non-gaming application globally in June 2021, with over 65 million installations. The country with the largest number of TikTok installations is China at 13%, followed by Indonesia at 12%.

The rapid growth of the number of TikTok users attracted our attention as a focal point for this study and examples of users of social networking sites in general. These findings are expected to provide beneficial insights into understanding users’ motives for making decisions to use social media. Understanding decision-making to use social media is essential in both academia and industry.

The TikTok application is not only used for fun or entertainment but can also be used to promote, sell, and advertise products or services. In marketing, online social platforms are becoming a tool used to advertise and promote products and services simply, cheaply, and continuously (Breitsohl et al., 2015). According to the analysis by The Content Factory, the average organization spends between $200 and $350 daily on social media marketing. This works to between $6,000 and $10,500 per month or between $72,000 and $126,000 per year (Yormark, 2021). Previous studies have found some interesting points, i.e., information or content shared through social media could influence consumer opinions and behaviour (Stephen, 2016). Fifty-two per cent of social media marketers believe social media positively influences their company’s revenue and sales (Reno, 2021).

Variable information sharing is a predictor that affects decision-making. According to Wasko and Faraj (2000), an essential element in social media is receiving and disseminating information, where social media has characteristics that support information-sharing activities. So that the increasing use of social media makes it a strong source of information, and information-sharing activities on social media are things that social media users pay attention to in determining the chosen social media platform. Moreover, trust is a predictor in determining information sharing and decision-making. Ulusu et al. (2011) postulated that trust is one of the main factors that affects the intensity of activities on social media and the intensity of information-sharing activities (Dwyer et al., 2007). When a consumer uses a product, the high level of trust the consumers have in the product or service is a valuable thing that must be considered.

When users trust a social media platform, they tend to share information and develop new relationships. This is because trust helps users reduce their perception of risk when dealing with other social media platforms (Van der Heijden et al., 2003). Such trust in a social media platform could make them more comfortable sharing their personal information. In general, the higher users’ trust in a social media platform, the more their willingness to share information on that social media to meet their needs.

The determinant predictor of trust and information sharing is self-efficacy. According to Chen and Cheng (2019), users’ psychological features, namely self-efficacy, can improve trust in the Facebook social media platform. Also, Kim et al. (2015) proved that there is a personal factor, namely self-efficacy, that can affect information sharing on social media. In information technology, self-efficacy is considered a determinant of individual behaviour and performance. Following the statements put forward by Compeau and Higgins (1995), self-efficacy is shown to understand an individual’s behaviour towards newly received information technology. Meanwhile, self-efficacy is shown to understand individual behaviour towards newly received information technology. Self-efficacy is related to the belief that we can take the expected action. Social media users who can influence situations and can use their skills well will improve trust and make users want to share information on social media.

Determining consumer trust in hedonic products and utilitarian value is a factor. Lee et al. (2015) mentioned that hedonic and utilitarian values are factors in fostering users’ trust on social media platforms. Blythe and Martin (2019) stated that Hedonic value is related to the fulfillment of pleasure or aesthetic aspects of a product where social media is a fun-oriented information system and the causes that influence a person’s use are related to the pleasure he/she feels. Meanwhile, utilitarian value is when consumers’ consumption is related to the function possessed by the product or service (Voss et al., 2003). The TikTok application provides several functional services, such as the ability to upload videos that offer various video editing features that can hone users’ creativity. Consumers could evaluate the functional dimensions they obtained.

Several researchers have studied decision-making. Most marketing, however, uses a purchase decision approach, such as the research conducted by Prasad et al. (2017) in India, Farmia (2017) in Indonesia, and also with a buying decision approach by Zolati et al. (2018) in Bahrain and Kithandheachauorn (2016) in Thailand. By far, the study on decision-making to use social media is still arduous to find, unlike previous studies. We used TikTok as the object of the current research. The present research was performed in Indonesia, using a dependent variable of decision-making to use Tiktok to operate.

2. Theoretical Background

2.1. Decision-Making

Decision-making is the study based on the value of a person’s preference in identifying and choosing alternatives to make decisions (Davidavičienė et al., 2020). Colquitt et al. (2011) declared that decision-making refers to the process of generating and choosing from a set of alternatives to solve a problem. It means that something cannot be categorized as decision-making without alternative options. Wang and Ruhe (2007) stated that decision-making is selecting which option is preferred or an action from a set of alternatives based on the benchmark or strategy given. According to Sadovykh et al. (2015), there are five decision-making styles, i.e., rational, intuitive, dependent, avoidant, and spontaneous.

2.2. Information Sharing

Onsda-Raacke and Raacke (2010) defined information sharing as the extent to which a person has access to data from each other that is considered a common interest and benefit. Wu et al. (2015) explained that knowledge-sharing activities on social media in general also apply to information-sharing activities, such as when someone searches for information by sending messages on social media and then answering and sharing on social media.

Previous researchers have examined the effect of information sharing on decision-making (He et al., 2008; Xiao et al., 2016; Durmuş, 2019; Yoo et al., 2019; Davidavičienė et al., 2020). For example, David (2020) studied the factors that influence decision-making. With their research in the United Arab Emirates that involved virtual teams, they found that information sharing affects...
decision-making. The following final hypothesis has been formulated based on previous studies.

**H7:** Information sharing positively affects decision-making when using TikTok.

### 2.3. Trust

Organ and Hunt (1994) defined trust as a party with confidence that the exchange partner has reliability and integrity. In virtual communities, trust is essential for exchanging information between fellow members and tends to rely on shared values and effective communication (Cyr et al., 2007). Gefen and Straub (2000) explained that trust on a website proves it can encourage the use of the website. The initial trust on the online site leads to the belief that the site can be useful.

Previous researchers have studied the effect of trust on decision-making. (Gao et al., 2005; Fadilla & Farmania, 2019; Prasad et al., 2015; Vongurai et al., 2018; Davidaviciene et al., 2020). For example, Prasad et al. (2017) researched the factors influencing purchase decisions made in India involving online shopping consumers, and one of their research results is that trust affects purchase decisions. Based on those studies, the following hypothesis has been formulated:

**H6:** Trust positively affects decision-making when using TikTok.

Numerous researchers have studied the effect of trust on information sharing (Saleh et al., 2013; Chinje & Chinomona, 2015, 2018; Gupta & Dhami, 2015). Chinje and Chinomona (2015) found that trust affects information sharing. They researched the factors that affect firm performance conducted in Gauteng, South Africa, involving consumers who use social media. Thus, based on those studies, the following hypothesis has been formulated:

**H5:** Trust positively affects information sharing when using TikTok.

### 2.4. Hedonic Value

According to Overby and Lee (2006), hedonic value is defined as a consumer’s overall evaluation of benefits and costs of experience. In addition to that, Helander and Khalid (2005) stated that hedonic value could be obtained through individuals’ emotional responses to users’ behaviours and experiences with certain behaviours. Next, Alcu et al. (2019) stated that there are three emotional responses that represent hedonic value, i.e., happiness, pleasure, and enjoyment. Sledgianowski and Kuivivat (2009) showed that social networking sites are pleasure-oriented information systems that are used to acquire joy and satisfaction for their users.

Previous researchers have investigated the effect of hedonic value on trust (Hanzsae & Andervanz, 2012; Lee et al., 2015; Mosunmola et al., 2018, 2019; Olivier & Terblanche, 2016; Wongkitrungrueng & Assarut, 2020). For example, Wongkitrungrueng and Assarut (2020) researched the factors influencing customer engagement in Thailand by involving consumers who watched a live Facebook video selling fashion products, and they proved that hedonic value affects trust. Based on those studies, the following hypothesis has been formulated:

**H4:** Hedonic value positively affects trust when using TikTok.

### 2.5. Utilitarian Value

Utilitarian value is defined as a consumer’s overall evaluation of functional benefits and costs (Overby & Lee, 2006). Ryu et al. (2010) stated that utilitarian products are described as when consumers consume being goal-oriented, which is driven by a desire to meet basic needs or to complete functional tasks. Practical value is based on functions, indicating that the user can complete specific tasks, for example, with the help of mobile internet services (Kim et al., 2007).

Previous researchers have studied the effect of utilitarian value on trust (Dastan & Gecti, 2014; Lee et al., 2015; Mosunmola et al., 2018; Olivier & Terblanche, 2016; Wongkitrungrueng & Assarut, 2020). For example, Lee et al. (2015) studied the factors influencing continuing intention in South Korea by involving Facebook consumers. One of their findings is that utilitarian values affect trust. Based on those studies, the third hypothesis has been formulated as follows:

**H3:** Utilitarian value positively affects trust when using TikTok.

### 2.6. Self-efficacy

Andura (1997) argued that self-efficacy is an individual’s belief in a person’s ability to organize and perform actions to achieve something he/she wants. According to Lippke (2009), self-efficacy is a significant connecting factor that dramatically impacts the hope that changes in a person’s behaviour will be. Next, Pavlov and Pygenson (2006) explained that self-efficacy is the belief that a person can use technology.

Previous researchers have examined the effect of self-efficacy on information sharing (Kim et al., 2015; Shang et al., 2017; Yahaya et al., 2018). For example, Cheng and Chen (2020) investigated the factors affecting the intensity of Facebook use by involving Facebook users in the United States. The study’s result showed that self-efficacy positively affects trust. Guided by these prior studies, the following hypothesis has been formulated:

**H2:** Self-efficacy positively affects trust when using TikTok.

Previous researchers have studied the effect of self-efficacy on information sharing (Kim et al., 2015; Shang et al., 2017; Yahaya et al., 2018). For example, Kim et al. (2015) researched the factors influencing information-sharing behaviour by involving consumers using Facebook, Twitter, Google+, Instagram, and LinkedIn in the United States. One of their findings is that information self-efficacy affects information sharing. Guided by these previous studies, the following hypothesis has been formulated:

**H1:** Self-efficacy positively affects information sharing when using TikTok.

### 3. Research and Methodology

#### 3.1. Conceptual Framework of the Research

Based on the background and formulation of the problem, a theoretical framework has been established in this study (Fig. 1).

This study used quantitative methods with explanatory research types and quantitative approaches by using survey and technical SEM data analysis (Structural Equation Modelling).

#### 3.2. Participants, Data, and Methods

The sample in this study was Tiktok application consumers living in the Jabodetabek area who have prior experience in spreading information through the TikTok application (at least once). Non-probability with convenience sampling as a technique to select models was employed in this current study. The number of samples taken in this population was estimated at 252 samples by considering the number of samples in the previous studies by Prasad (2017). The data collection techniques used questionnaires distributed through Microsoft 365. At first, there were a total of 311 respondents, but only 252 were eligible to participate. The spread of the questionnaire to the respondents was accomplished for about two weeks in January 2022.

#### 3.3. Data Analysis

In this study, the Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) technique was utilized to find out the validity level of each indicator, while reliability tests using Cronbach’s alpha values were executed with the help of SPSS 25 software. The data analysis method in the analysis used SEM (Structural Equation Modelling) techniques with the help of AMOS 24 application software.
3.4. Measurements

The indicators for measuring the six variables in the study were adopted from several previous studies. The variable indicator of self-efficacy was adapted from Choi and Park (2020) and Hu et al. (2018), and it consisted of six needles. The variable utilitarian value adapted from Ashraf et al. (2019) consisted of six hands. The variable hedonic value was measured through six indicators from Ashraf et al. (2019) and Kim and Hyun (2019). Variable information sharing was measured through five indicators from Chinchie and Chinomona (2015). Variable trust was measured through six indicators from Lee et al. (2015) and Chen and Cheng (2019). Meanwhile, the decision-making indicator was adapted from Sadovykh et al. (2019), and it consisted of six hands. The present study used a Likert scale of 6 points to avoid the existence of a middle value or zero points in the research scale. According to Kulas and Stachowski (2009), respondents tend to choose the middle level of the scale when they are in doubt, do not understand the statement, their answers are conditional, or they have a neutral attitude.

4. Results

All the 252 respondents who participated in this study, 94 of them (37.3%) are men, and the other 153 people (62.7%) are women. This indicates that the respondents who are users of the TikTok application are dominated by women. Based on age at the time of the study, most of the respondents in the present study were at the age of 21-24, which are 134 people (53.2%). The rest of the respondents were at the age of 17-20, 25-29, 30-34, 35-39, and 40-44 with the number of 55 people (21.8%), 34 people (13.5%), 15 people (6%), 8 people (3.2%), and 5 people (2.4%), respectively.

According to the latest level of education at the time of the study, most of the respondents got a senior high school education, i.e., 135 people (55.6%). The remains of the respondents had an undergraduate degree, diploma, under a senior high school education, and a master’s/doctoral degree with the number of 64 people (25.4%), 29 people (11.5%), 22 people (8.7%), and 2 people (0.8%), respectively.

Based on employment status at the time of the study, most of the respondents were not working yet, i.e., 139 people (51.2%). The rest of the respondents were working, had their own business, and were unemployed, with the number of 86 people (34.1%), 22 people (8.7%), and 15 people (6%), respectively. Meanwhile, according to marital status at the time of the study, most of the respondents were unmarried, i.e., 207 people (82.1%). The remaining respondents who were married, divorced/separated, and so did respondents with spouses who were died are 39 people (15%), 3 people (1.2%), and 3 people (1.2%).

In this study, a validity test was carried out using factor analysis (Exploratory Factor Analysis) to look at a group of items based on their similarity where the things had a high correlation. A sample of 200 conditions specified by an indicator can be valid, with the minimum loading factor number in the EFA being .40 (Hair et al., 2018). To ensure the accuracy and consistency of an instrument’s measurements over time, a reliability test was conducted with the standard Cronbach Alpha value > .60 (Sekaran & Bougie, 2016). The results can be seen in the following table (Tab. 1).

Items with low factor loading values (DM4) and indicators that cannot be grouped or cross-loading (IS2) were dropped during the analysis. Furthermore, according to the study’s results, two components make up utilitarian value, but the utilitarian value dimension 2 is unreliable. It does not meet the requirements because it is below .60 (namely UV1 and UV2, and they were also dropped during the analysis).

After a validity test through Exploratory Factor Analysis and reliability was carried out, the subsequent step was to test the validity through Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) using AMOS 24 (Fig. 2).

Fig. 2 demonstrates that the error estimate value indicates symptoms of a Heywood case in one of the standardized regression weight values that should be < 1. According to Haryono and Wardoyo (2015), a way to overcome a Heywood case is by creating a model construct for those containing the term error value. Therefore, we agree on the relationship between trust and information sharing and self-efficacy and information sharing.

Based on Fig. 3 above, all standardized regression estimation values have shown the estimated value of < 1, meaning that the model is final and no longer contains a Heywood case. This also indicates that the Structural Equation Model that has been modified fits seven criteria or meets the goodness of fit requirements so that the model is declared feasible and can be analysed further. The results of the model can be seen in the following table (Tab. 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goodness (GOF) Index</th>
<th>Off-Fit</th>
<th>Cut of Value</th>
<th>Analysis Result</th>
<th>Evaluation Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X²-Chi-squarey</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>89.210</td>
<td>Fit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig Probability</td>
<td>≥ .05</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>Fit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>≤ .08</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>Fit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFI</td>
<td>≥ .90</td>
<td>.952</td>
<td>Fit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGFI</td>
<td>≥ .90</td>
<td>.927</td>
<td>Fit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMIN/DF</td>
<td>≤ 2.00</td>
<td>≤ 1.293</td>
<td>Fit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLI</td>
<td>≥ .95</td>
<td>.376</td>
<td>Fit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>≥ .95</td>
<td>.982</td>
<td>Fit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research results, 2022
To test the hypothesis, we used AMOS 24. The decision-making hypothesis test compared the critical ratio (C.R) of 1.96 and probability with the level of significance with a value of .05. The results of the hypothesis test (a total of seven) were tested. The results showed four accepted hypotheses, namely H1, H4, H5, and H7, while other ideas were rejected. The results can be seen in the following table (Tab. 3).

### 5. Methodology

#### 5.1. The Influence of Self-Efficacy on Information Sharing

1: **Self-efficacy has a positive effect on information sharing when using TikTok.** It is indicated by a probability value (sig) below .05, which is .000, and a critical ratio (C.R) value above 1.96 which is 8.544. This study’s results align with the earlier studies by Kim et al. (2015) and Shang et al. (2017), which revealed the influence of self-efficacy on information sharing. Thus, the H1 hypothesis was proven in this analysis.

#### 5.2. The Influence of Self-Efficacy on Trust

2: **Self-efficacy does not positively affect users’ trust when using TikTok.** It is indicated by a probability value (sig) above .05, which is .83, and a critical ratio (C.R) value below 1.96 is 1.331. This study’s results do not match the results of the previous study by Kim et al. (2009) and Cheng and Chen (2020). Nevertheless, this study’s results are in alignment with the earlier study by Shanj and Raza (2017), who found that there is no effect of self-efficacy on users’ trust. Thus, the H2 hypothesis was not proven in this analysis. This may be associated with users’ confidence in the TikTok application and could also be influenced by outside (social) things that can affect users’ trust in the TikTok application, such as news about the TikTok application. It does not come from the confidence that exists in TikTok users.

### 5.3. The Influence of Utilitarian Value on Trust

3: **Utilitarian value does not positively affect users’ trust when using TikTok.** It is indicated by a probability value (sig) above .05, which is .454, and a critical ratio (C.R) below 1.96 is .749. It is not in alignment with Lee et al. (2015) and Mosunmola et al. (2019), who stated the influence of utilitarian value on trust. However, the study’s results are in line with the previous research by Achmad et al. (2020), which displayed the absence of a practical value in trust. Thus, the H3 hypothesis was not proven in this analysis. This may be associated with the majority of the respondents aged 21-24, whereas 55% of them prioritize enjoyment and pleasure when using TikTok as the application offers a lot of entertaining content. So, the benefits are not the main thing that TikTok users desire to trust the application.
5.4. The Influence of Hedonic Value on Trust

Hedonic value positively affects users' trust when using TikTok. It is indicated by a probability value (sig) below 5%, which is .034, and a critical ratio (C.R) value above 1.96 of 2.120. The study's results are in line with the results of the previous research by Lee et al. (2015) and Hanzaee and Andervazh (2012), which showed that hedonic value has a positive effect on users' trust. Thus, the H4 hypothesis is evident in this analysis.
The Influence of Trust on Information Sharing

5. Trust positively affects information sharing when using TikTok. It is shown by a probability value (sig) below 5%, which is 0.083, and a critical ratio (C.R) value above 1.96 of 2.705. The results of this study do not match the results of the previous research by Davidaviciene et al. (2020) and Gao et al. (2005), which stated the absence of influence from information sharing on decision-making. Moreover, the study's results align with the earlier research by Fadhilla & Triachyono (2020) that showed the absence of influence from information sharing on decision-making. Hence, it can be said that the H6 hypothesis was not proven in this analysis. This is because the information shared in the TikTok application does not always match what the user wants. TikTok recommends a video according to its algorithm on the main page of TikTok or “For Your Page”, which is not necessarily desired by its users.

The Influence of Information Sharing on Decision-Making

6. Information sharing does not have a positive effect on decision-making when using TikTok. It is indicated by a probability value (sig) below 5%, which is 0.007, and a critical ratio (C.R) value above 1.96 of 2.705. This study is in alignment with the prior research by Davidaviciene et al. (2020) and Gao et al. (2005), which stated the influence of trust on decision-making. Therefore, the H7 hypothesis was proven in this analysis.

The Influence of Trust on Decision-Making

7. Trust has a positive effect on decision-making when using TikTok. It is indicated by a probability value (sig) below 5%, which is 0.007, and a critical ratio (C.R) value above 1.96 of 2.705. This study is in alignment with the prior research by Davidaviciene et al. (2020) and Gao et al. (2005), which stated the influence of trust on decision-making. Therefore, the H7 hypothesis was proven in this analysis.

The Influence of Trust on Information Sharing

The third hypothesis is that utilitarian value does not affect users' trust when using TikTok. The benefits offered by TikTok are not the main thing that TikTok users want, and the benefits cannot affect users' trust in the application. The fourth hypothesis is that hedonic value positively affects users' trust when using TikTok. Hedonic value aspects, such as happiness, pleasure, and enjoyment through users' experience when playing TikTok, could improve users' trust in the TikTok application.

The fifth hypothesis is that trust positively affects information sharing using TikTok. The higher the level of trust that users of the TikTok application have, the higher their willingness to share information in the TikTok application, especially in business. The sixth hypothesis is that information sharing does not affect decision-making when using TikTok. Information sharing that someone does in the TikTok application does not result in users deciding to use TikTok. Meanwhile, the seventh hypothesis is that trust positively affects decision-making when using TikTok. The higher the level of trust that a TikTok application user has, the higher the tendency of that user to decide to use the TikTok application.

Based on the research results, social media service providers should focus on the influence of information sharing and decision-making in the TikTok application, namely trust. One example is making efforts to improve consumer confidence by protecting the personal information that consumers provide. Also, the research result indicated that the information sharing indicator “the use of TikTok for business is a wise step” obtained the highest average score. This implies that TikTok could improve and develop its application so that it is not only used for entertainment but could also be used as an advertising medium for business. The indicator “I double-check the sources of information I get to make sure that the information I have is correct, before making a decision to play TikTok” obtained the highest average score. This shows that respondents in this study are dominated by a "rational" decision-making style.

The research results of the present study are expected to be used as a reference for advertisers when choosing advertising media in the TikTok application, as hedonic values influence trust in the TikTok application. Advertisers are advised to promote products by providing hedonic value, such as TikTok dance.

For further research, it is recommended to:

a. Modify the model using factors other than those used in this study, such as similarity, perceived ease of use, and others.

b. Use similar research objects but other than the TikTok application, such as Instagram, Twitter, Facebook, and others.

c. Include a broader scope of the study location. For instance, the study’s location is not only in the Jabodetabek area but can be expanded to other areas, such as other major cities on the island of Java.
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