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Abstract
The objective of this research aimed to analyze the influence of intention factors including attitudes towards social media advertising, celebrity endorsements, the reputation of tutoring, and E-WOM on students' intentions to take tutoring in Palembang City. The method used in this study was quantitative research with a total of 100 respondents. Data was obtained by the online questionnaire method and the analytical technique used was SEM analysis with the Lisrel 8.80 program. The results of this study indicated that attitudes towards social media advertising and E-WOM had a positive effect on students' intentions. Further results also concluded that endorsing celebrities and the reputation of courses had no effect on students’ intentions. It was expected for the future, businessmen of courses could use social media advertising and EWOM on TikTok to increase students’ intention to join courses.
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1. Introduction
Technological Advances created a new phenomenon in the buying and selling process in Indonesia (Octaviani and Arief, 2016). As a result of technological advances, many businessepeople including businessmen of courses made various innovations so that the products or services offered can be competed with other competitors and can be adapted to technological changes.

Technological changes were used by businessmen of courses to promote their courses on social media. It was because the Indonesian population who was active in social media was 59% or 160 million people and spent an average of 3 hours every day. According to Riyanto (2020), Facebook users in Indonesia in 2020 were 130 million people and Instagram users were 63 million people. Based on Haryanto (2019) The highest internet users were at the age of 15-19, namely at the age of junior high and high school. The use of social media in promoting tutoring requires the right strategy so that it can be put to good use.

In previous research analyzed by Mekawie & Hany (2019) that four factors influenced purchase intentions, namely attitudes towards social media advertising, celebrity endorsements, company reputation, and Electronic Word of Mouth (E-WOM).

Based on the references above, it showed that the use of social media in the promotion courses was very appropriate. This can be seen from user data and user age in Indonesia, the highest was school age, but there were still many business people who did not know the factors of effective intention that needed to be considered in marketing their courses using social media advertisements.
1.1 Objectives
From the description above, this research aimed to analyze the effect of attitudes towards social media advertising, company reputation, celebrity endorsements, and E-WOM on students' intentions to take tutoring in Palembang City and analyzed the most effective factors in increasing students' intentions to take courses in Palembang City.

2. Literature Review
Marketing Mix. Marketing mix according to Kotler (2007) was a set of marketing tools used by the company to continuously achieve the goals of the company. In the marketing mix, there were good marketing tools known as the 4Ps, including product, price, place, and promotions.

Social Media Advertising. Social media advertising was the marketing communication of a product by utilizing social media so that advertisements had a wider scope. Sellers can interact directly with potential customers in a virtual form. Popular social media ads were Instagram ads, TikTok ads, Twitter ads, and Facebook ads (Adam & Gunarto, 2021; Gunarto et al., 2021; Wahid & Gunarto, 2022).

Theory of Intentions. Martin Fishbein and Icek Ajzen (1980) quoted by Mekawie & Hany (2019) created the reasoned action theory (TRA theory) regarding intentions that were formed into two factors, including attitudes and subjective norms. (Figure 1)

![Figure 1. The Reasoned Action Theory (TRA Theory)](source: Mekawie & Hany (2019))

In 1986, Fred Davis proposed the technology acceptance model. This theory explained the TRA theory with a technological approach. This theory defined two variables that affected a certain acceptance. The first variable was the ease-of-use perception, and the second variable was the perception of its usefulness (Mekawie and Hany, 2019).

![Figure 2. TAM Behavior Model (Technology Acceptance Model)](source: Kristiadi (2018))

Purchase Intention. Purchase intention was the tendency of customers to take immediate action before actual action. Purchase intention can also be interpreted as a happy attitude of an object that made someone have a desire to obtain
the object by paying for it using sacrifice or money (Kanuk, 2007). The indicators of purchase intention were described in several components, including wanting to find information about the product, considering buying the product, having an interest in trying it, having a desire to know, and owning the product. According to (Mekawie & Hany, 2019) the factors that influenced purchase intention using social media include social media advertising attitudes, celebrity endorsements, company reputation, and E-WOM.

**Attitudes towards Social Media Advertising.** Attitude towards advertising was the tendency of consumers to respond favorably or unfavorably to a particular advertisement (Assael, 2002). Attitude Social media advertising can be influenced purchase intention. A positive attitude towards product advertising on social media was expected to make consumers have the desire to buy the products or services offered. Indicators on the attitude of social media advertising included trust, entertaining, informative, and useful.

**Celebrity endorsement.** According to Mekawie & Hany (2019), celebrity endorsements can be affected consumers' purchase intentions. Things that needed to be considered in choosing celebrities used in advertisements were attractiveness, expertise, credibility, and celebrity image in line with the advertised brand image. A study conducted by Lanongbuka (2018) showed that advertising stars were classy because of their good reputation as advertising stars. Celebrities who had acting skills as professional commercials. Then, a handsome or beautiful face had an attraction to product purchase intentions. In addition, celebrities must be reliable by conveying advertising information sincerely and honestly and celebrities must be experienced and had good knowledge of the product.

The results of research conducted by Gupta, R., Kishore, N., and Verma (2015) showed different results, this was due to differences in subjects and objects advertised, thus affecting the influence of celebrity endorsements on product purchase intentions.

**The Reputation of Courses.** The reputation of a company affected purchase intention. Reputation was a sign of the company's success to fulfill customer needs, and had an impact on customer satisfaction, giving rise to customer loyalty and word of mouth that encouraged new consumers. The indicators on a company's reputation were good name, reputation compared to competitors, widely known, and easy to remember. In research conducted by Adhilendra, Brian Gregory (2018), factors that influenced reputation on purchase intentions were good service, and if something happened that was not by the wishes of students, the company would provide assistance to overcome the problems that occurred.

**E-WOM.** According to Mekawie & Hany (2019), E-WOM consisted of shares, comments, likes, and Friend's likes that affected the intention to buy products or services through social media. In E-WOM, consumers can be shared, liked, and commented on the products or services offered so that it would influence the purchase intentions of other social media users. E-WOM was by The Reasoned Action Theory (TRA Theory) where the opinion of other references would influence the customer's purchase intention towards the offered product.

**Conceptual Framework.** Based on the results of previous studies and the theory described above, the variables of this research were shown in Figure 3.
Based on Figure 3, the hypotheses in this study are:
H₁ = There was a positive influence of attitudes towards social media advertising (X₁) on students' intentions (Y)
H₂ = There was a positive influence on celebrity endorsements (X₂) students' intentions (Y)
H₃ = There was a positive influence on the reputation of courses (X₃) students’ intentions (Y)
H₄ = There was a positive influence on E-WOM (X₄) students' intentions (Y).

3. Methods
This study used a quantitative method, there were two variables, among others: Independent Variables (X) in this study were attitudes towards social media advertising (X₁), celebrity endorsement (X₂), the reputation of courses (X₃), and E-WOM (X₄) and then the dependent variable (Y) in this study was the intention of students to join courses in Palembang City.

4. Data Collection
This study used a purposive sampling. The respondents selected were junior and senior high school students in the city of Palembang. The population of this research is junior and senior high school students in Palembang City. The number of samples in this study referred to the statement by Hair et al (2014) that the number of samples was 5 to 10 times the number of indicators so that 20 × 5 = 100 respondents. The data collection technique was carried out using a closed questionnaire using a google form. Questionnaires were sent to respondents via FB, Instagram, and WhatsApp. The data collected was processed by validation test, reliability test, goodness of fit (GOF), and hypothesis testing using the Lisrel 8.80 program (Gunarto, 2018).

5. Results and Discussion
5.1 Analysis of Usage Time and Total Use of social media
This study was followed by 100 respondents from the age of 11-18 years with 63% women and 37% men. From this study it was found that the length of time middle and high school used social media in a day was as follows:

![Figure 4. Social Media Usage Time](source)

Next Page
Data above Figure 5 can be analyzed that the most frequently used social media by adolescent respondents is TikTok with 28%, then Instagram and youtube 23%, then other social media 14% and the lowest is Facebook and Twitter with 7% and 5% respectively.

5.2 Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA)
CFA was used to test the dimensionality of the construct. Before testing, the researcher must be analyzed the initial measurement model for validation and reliability testing of all latent construct indicators using CFA. (Gunarto, 2018) The testing of the CFA model in this study was carried out in first-order.

CFA models on X1. The first variable tested with the CFA model was attitudes towards social media advertising (X1). The results of the analysis were obtained with the Lisrel 8.80 program.

Table 1 Result of CFA X1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Λ</th>
<th>λ²</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>Explanations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X1.1</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X1.2</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X1.3</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X1.4</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVE</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 1. The CFA model of social media advertising variables with 4 indicators was valid because the loading factors (λ) were more than 0.5. In addition, the reliability test showed that the attitudes toward social media advertising were reliable. This was because the CR value > 0.7 (CR=0.85) and the AVE value > 0.5 (AVE=0.60). It meant that the indicators formulated in the CFA model of social media advertising attitude variable were valid and reliable.

CFA model on X2. The second variable tested with the CFA model was the celebrity endorsement variable (X2). The results of the CFA model were obtained with the Lisrel 8.80 program.

Table 2. Results of CFA X2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Λ</th>
<th>λ²</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>Explanations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X2.1</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2.2</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2.3</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2.4</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVE</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 2 4 indicators were valid. These were because all indicators in the celebrity endorsement variable had λ > 0.5. Then in the reliability test, variable X2 had been reliable because CR > 0.7 (0.91) and AVE > 0.5 (0.72). It meant that the variable X2 was valid and reliable.

CFA model on X3. The third variable tested with the CFA model was the reputation of courses (X3). The results of the CFA model were obtained using the Lisrel 8.80 program.

Table 3. Result of CFA X3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Λ</th>
<th>λ²</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>Explanations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X3.1</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3.2</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From Table 3 above, the CFA model of the reputation courses variable (X3) which had 4 indicators were valid. These were because all indicators in this variable had > 0.5. In addition, in the reliability test the variable reputation of tutoring has CR > 0.5 (0.88) and AVE > 0.5 (0.65). This means that the variable X3 was valid and reliable.

**CFA models on X4**. The fourth variable tested with the CFA model is the E-WOM variable (X4). Below were the results of the CFA model obtained using the Lisrel 8.80 program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>λ</th>
<th>λ²</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>Explanations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X4.1</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X4.2</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X4.3</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X4.4</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVE</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 4 the CFA model of the E-WOM variable (X4) which had 4 indicators were valid. This is because all indicators on X4 had > 0.5. Then, the results of the reliability test of the CFA model obtained the value of CR > 0.7 (CR = 0.85) and AVE > 0.5 (AVE = 0.58) so that it can be stated that the X4 variable was valid and reliable.

**CFA model on Y**. The fifth variable tested with the CFA model was the student Intention variable (Y). The results of the CFA model were obtained using the Lisrel 8.80 program below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>λ</th>
<th>λ²</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>Explanations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y1.1</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y1.2</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y1.3</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y1.4</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVE</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 5 the CFA model of the student intention variable (Y) which has 4 indicators has > 0.5 so that all indicators on this variable are declared valid. Then, the CR value obtained is more than 0.7 (CR = 0.89) and the AVE is more than 0.5 (AVE = 0.66). Therefore, it can be stated that the Y variable is valid and reliable.

**5.3 Overall Analysis of the Structural Model**

In the CFA measurement, all variables had been valid and reliable. This meant that all latent variables were measured well. The next step was to establish a structural model to find out how the latent variables were related. (Figure 6)
Validation and Reliability on the Initial Full Model. Validation testing in this study was carried out with 20 indicators. A validation test was carried out to see whether the indicators were valid or not in a study. The following were the results of the validation test on the full structural model using the Lisrel 8.80 program.

Table 6. Validation Test Results on The Initial Full Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>λ</th>
<th>λ²</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>Explanations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X₁</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₁.₁</td>
<td>0,7</td>
<td>0,49</td>
<td>0,51</td>
<td>0,85</td>
<td>0,6</td>
<td>Valid and Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₁.₂</td>
<td>0,88</td>
<td>0,77</td>
<td>0,22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Valid and Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₁.₃</td>
<td>0,76</td>
<td>0,58</td>
<td>0,42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Valid and Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₁.₄</td>
<td>0,73</td>
<td>0,53</td>
<td>0,46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Valid and Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₂.₁</td>
<td>0,83</td>
<td>0,69</td>
<td>0,31</td>
<td>0,91</td>
<td>0,72</td>
<td>Valid and Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₂.₂</td>
<td>0,86</td>
<td>0,74</td>
<td>0,26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Valid and Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₂.₃</td>
<td>0,88</td>
<td>0,77</td>
<td>0,23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Valid and Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₂.₄</td>
<td>0,82</td>
<td>0,67</td>
<td>0,32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Valid and Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₃</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₃.₁</td>
<td>0,76</td>
<td>0,58</td>
<td>0,42</td>
<td>0,88</td>
<td>0,65</td>
<td>Valid and Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₃.₂</td>
<td>0,75</td>
<td>0,56</td>
<td>0,43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Valid and Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₃.₃</td>
<td>0,82</td>
<td>0,67</td>
<td>0,33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Valid and Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₃.₄</td>
<td>0,89</td>
<td>0,79</td>
<td>0,21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Valid and Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₄</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₄.₁</td>
<td>0,69</td>
<td>0,48</td>
<td>0,53</td>
<td>0,85</td>
<td>0,58</td>
<td>Valid and Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₄.₂</td>
<td>0,81</td>
<td>0,66</td>
<td>0,34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Valid and Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₄.₃</td>
<td>0,78</td>
<td>0,61</td>
<td>0,39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Valid and Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X₄.₄</td>
<td>0,77</td>
<td>0,59</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Valid and Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y₁.₁</td>
<td>0,85</td>
<td>0,72</td>
<td>0,27</td>
<td>0,89</td>
<td>0,66</td>
<td>Valid and Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y₁.₂</td>
<td>0,8</td>
<td>0,64</td>
<td>0,35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Valid and Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y₁.₃</td>
<td>0,84</td>
<td>0,71</td>
<td>0,29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Valid and Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y₁.₄</td>
<td>0,75</td>
<td>0,56</td>
<td>0,44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Valid and Reliable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Lisrel Output of Researcher (2022)
Based on Table 6 on the initial full model, the 20 indicators were valid. These were because all indicators had a loading factor (λ) of more than 0.5 and it can be seen that all variables in the entire structural model were reliable because they had Construct-Reliability (CR) > 0.70 and Average Variance Extracted (AVE) value > 0.5.

The Goodness of Fit on The Initial Full Model. The results of the goodness of fit (GOF) in the initial full model were shown in Table 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>GOF index</th>
<th>Cut off value</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Explanations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Absolute/predictive fit indicators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>X² chi-square, p-Value</td>
<td>Small, p 0.05</td>
<td>270.48 and p = 0.00</td>
<td>Unfit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>RMR</td>
<td>≤ 0.10</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>Fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SRMR</td>
<td>≤ 0.08</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>Fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>≤ 0.08</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>Unfit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>GFI</td>
<td>&gt; 0.90</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>Unfit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>GOF index</td>
<td>Cut off value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Explanations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>AGFI</td>
<td>&gt; 0.90</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>Unfit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparative fit indices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>NFI</td>
<td>&gt; 0.90</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>Fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>GOF index</td>
<td>Cut off value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Explanations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>IFI</td>
<td>&gt; 0.90</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>Fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>&gt; 0.90</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>Fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parsimonious fit indices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>PNFI</td>
<td>&gt; 0.90</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>Unfit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>PGFI</td>
<td>&gt; 0.90</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>Unfit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>AIC</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>370.48</td>
<td>Fit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 7 it is known that 6 of the 12 criteria met the requirements of the measurement model that did not fit, especially RSMEA. Based on the consensus, the RSMEA criteria were mostly used to determine the suitability of a model (Hoyle, 2012) so it was necessary to make new modifications to the entire structural model of this research.

5.4 Final Full Model After Modification
The results of the modifications in this study can be seen in Figure 7
Validation and Reliability Test on the Final Full Model. The results were shown in Table 8.

Table 8. Validation Test Results on Final Full Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>( \lambda )</th>
<th>( \lambda^2 )</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>Explanations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( X_1 )</td>
<td>( X_{1.1} )</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>Valid and Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( X_1 )</td>
<td>( X_{1.2} )</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( X_1 )</td>
<td>( X_{1.3} )</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( X_1 )</td>
<td>( X_{1.4} )</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( X_2 )</td>
<td>( X_{2.1} )</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>Valid and Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( X_2 )</td>
<td>( X_{2.2} )</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( X_2 )</td>
<td>( X_{2.3} )</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( X_2 )</td>
<td>( X_{2.4} )</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Lisrel Output of Researcher (2022)

From Table 8 all indicators in the final full model had > 0.5 so 20 indicators in the final model had valid and the 5 variables in the final model had values of CR > 0.7 and AVE > 0.5. This meant that all indicators and variables in this study were valid and reliable.
GOF Analysis the Final Full Model. GOF results in the final model were shown in Table 9.

Table 9. GOF Results on The Final Full Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>GOF index</th>
<th>Cut off value</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Explanations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absolute/predictive fit indicators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$X^2$ chi-square, P-Value</td>
<td>Small, $p &lt; 0.05$ and $p = 0.009$</td>
<td>197.42</td>
<td>Unfit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>RMR</td>
<td>$\leq 0.10$</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>Fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SRMR</td>
<td>$\leq 0.08$</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>Fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>$\leq 0.08$</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>Fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>GFI</td>
<td>$&gt; 0.90$</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>Unfit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>AGFI</td>
<td>$&gt; 0.90$</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>Unfit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative fit indices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>NFI</td>
<td>$&gt; 0.90$</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>Fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>IFI</td>
<td>$&gt; 0.90$</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>Fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>$&gt; 0.90$</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>Fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsimonious fit indices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>PNFI</td>
<td>$&gt; 0.90$</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>Unfit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>PGFI</td>
<td>$&gt; 0.90$</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>Unfit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>AIC</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>311.42</td>
<td>Fit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Lisrel Output of Researcher (2022)

Table 9 showed that the final model that had been formed had fulfilled several GOF statistical criteria. 7 criteria out of 12 criteria had met the goodness of fit criteria especially RMSEA had met the statistical criteria < 0.08 (RMSEA: 0.054).

5.4 Hypothesis Analysis

The full model test results were shown in Figure 8. All parameters were tested by a statistical t-test. Variable declared significant if the t-value > 1.96 and if the t-value < 1.96, it meant the variable was not significant statistically. (Figures 8 – 9)

Figure 8. T-Values Final Full Model

Source: Lisrel Output of Researcher (2022)
The test results for each variable are shown in Table 10. Based on Table 10, of the 4 hypotheses, there are 2 significant hypotheses and 2 other hypotheses that are not significant.

Table 10. Results of Hypothesis Testing for the Final Full Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Variable Effect</th>
<th>Estimates</th>
<th>T-Value</th>
<th>Explanations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H₁</td>
<td>Y ← X₁</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂</td>
<td>Y ← X₂</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₃</td>
<td>Y ← X₃</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₄</td>
<td>Y ← X₄</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on Table 10, it can be concluded that each hypothesis was as follows:

1) There was a positive influence between students' intentions and attitude towards social media advertising with a t-value of 3.50 so it can be stated that the relationship was significant because of the t-value > 1.96.

2) There was no positive effect between students’ intentions and celebrity endorsements because the t-value obtained was 0.86, which meant t-value < 1.96.

3) There was no positive effect between students’ intentions and the reputation of courses because it only got t-value of -0.53 which meant t-value < 1.96.

4) There was a positive influence between students’ intentions and E-WOM. it can be stated that the relationship was significant because of the t-value > 1.96.

5.5. Discussion

Based on the test results above, the effect of the dependent variable on the independent variable would be described below:

**The effect of Attitudes towards Social Media Advertising (X₁) on Student Intentions (Y).** Based on the test results above, attitudes towards social media advertising (X₁) had a positive effect on student intentions (Y) with a t-value of 3.50. This meant that the better the social media advertising so that the better the students' intention to take courses. This positive effect was because students' trust in the information conveyed through social media advertising, provided clear information, and raised students' attention with entertaining and interesting content.
The Effect of Celebrity Endorsement (X2) on Student Intentions (Y). The results of the above test, celebrity endorsement (X2) had a negative effect on student intentions (Y) with a t-value = 0.86. This meant that celebrity endorsements had no significant effect on students' intention to join courses. Celebrity endorsements did not have a positive effect because the factors that influence celebrity endorsements on intentions were not only attractiveness, expertise, credibility, and celebrity image in line with the advertised brand image, things that would affect celebrity endorsement on student intentions were the experience of advertising stars advertising products, and good knowledge of advertised products as well as sincerity and honesty in delivering product information. In addition, differences in objects and subjects studied can be also significantly influenced celebrity endorsement or not on students' intentions to enroll in courses.

The Effect of Course Reputation (X3) on Students’ Intentions (Y). From the above test, it was known that the Reputation of courses (X3) did not have a positive effect on students' intentions (Y). this meant that the reputation of courses had no direct influence on students’ intentions to take courses. The negative influence of reputation on students’ intentions was because apart from a good name, reputation compared to competitors, widely known, and easy to remember was not only factors that affected students' intention. Other reputation factors that would affect students' intention were good service, and if something happened so that was not by the wishes of students, the company would provide assistance to overcome the problems that occurred.

Effect of E-WOM (X4) on Students’ Intentions (Y). Based on the test results using the Lisrel 8.80 program above, it showed that E-WOM (X4) had a positive influence on students’ intentions (Y). This meant that the better the E-WOM, so that would be the better the students' intention to take courses. This positive influence was by the reasoned action theory (TRA Theory) where opinions from other references would affect students' intentions to take courses.

6. Conclusion
Based on the research resulted obtained the conclusions obtained from this study are as follows: From 100 respondents were 11-18 years old, 37% of respondents used social media for 1-3 hours/day, and the most widely used social media was Tiktok with 28% of users. Furthermore, all variables were valid and reliable, and the analysis model of this study met the statistical criteria for the goodness of fit (GOF), then the results of hypothesis testing showed that social media advertising and E-WOM had a positive effect on students’ intentions. also, Social media advertisements and E-WOM on TikTok were the right tools to increase students’ intention joining courses.

The celebrity endorsement variable in the study had a negative effect, so it was necessary to do research by adding an indicator of celebrity experience and delivering sincere and honest celebrity information. Moreover, the reputation of courses variable in the study had a negative effect so it must be added other indicators for the next research liked the best services and tutoring assistance on student problems. Also, this research only focused on courses in Palembang City, so it required further research for a wider scope and other research objects.
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