



DOI: <https://doi.org/10.38035/jimt.v8i1>  
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

## Advertising Promotion, Price Sensitivity, and Brand Image as Determinants of Purchase Decisions at Bersamastore: A Fashion MSME on Tokopedia Bandung

Khidhir Akbar Ghofar<sup>1</sup>, Ghani Saepuloh<sup>2</sup>, Entis Sutisna<sup>3</sup>, Melsa Ulfie Wahyudianty<sup>4</sup>, Kannisa Adjani<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Universitas Teknologi Bandung, Bandung, Indonesia, [khidhirakbarghofar@utb-univ.ac.id](mailto:khidhirakbarghofar@utb-univ.ac.id)

<sup>2</sup>Universitas Teknologi Bandung, Bandung, Indonesia, [ganiuloh13@gmail.com](mailto:ganiuloh13@gmail.com)

<sup>3</sup>Akademi Digital Bandung, Bandung, Indonesia, [entis.sutisna@digitalbdg.ac.id](mailto:entis.sutisna@digitalbdg.ac.id)

<sup>4</sup>Universitas Teknologi Bandung, Bandung, Indonesia, [melsaulfie@utb-univ.ac.id](mailto:melsaulfie@utb-univ.ac.id)

<sup>5</sup>Universitas Teknologi Bandung, Bandung, Indonesia, [kannisa@utb-univ.ac.id](mailto:kannisa@utb-univ.ac.id)

Corresponding Author: [khidhirakbarghofar@utb-univ.ac.id](mailto:khidhirakbarghofar@utb-univ.ac.id)<sup>1</sup>

**Abstrak:** Pertumbuhan UMKM fashion berbasis e-commerce di Bandung menciptakan persaingan yang semakin ketat, sehingga pelaku usaha perlu memahami faktor-faktor yang memengaruhi keputusan pembelian konsumen. Studi terdahulu cenderung menguji promosi iklan, sensitivitas harga, dan citra merek secara terpisah atau dalam konteks platform B2C multi-kategori yang besar; bukti empiris yang mengintegrasikan ketiga prediktor tersebut dalam setting UMKM berbasis platform tunggal di Indonesia masih terbatas. Penelitian ini mengisi kesenjangan tersebut dengan menganalisis pengaruh simultan dan parsial promosi iklan, sensitivitas harga, dan citra merek terhadap keputusan pembelian di Bersamastore, sebuah UMKM fashion yang beroperasi secara eksklusif di Tokopedia Bandung. Pendekatan kuantitatif dengan regresi linier berganda digunakan. Data dikumpulkan melalui kuesioner skala Likert terstruktur dari 101 responden purposive yang telah melakukan repeat order lebih dari dua kali dalam satu tahun. Profil responden: 58,4% perempuan, 40,6% berusia 22–26 tahun, 41,6% pegawai swasta. Hasil: promosi iklan ( $\beta = 0,467$ ;  $t = 5,216$ ;  $p < 0,001$ ), sensitivitas harga ( $\beta = 0,284$ ;  $t = 3,723$ ;  $p < 0,001$ ), citra merek ( $\beta = 0,225$ ;  $t = 3,262$ ;  $p = 0,002$ ) masing-masing berpengaruh positif dan signifikan. Ketiga variabel menjelaskan 80,2% varians keputusan pembelian ( $\text{Adjusted } R^2 = 0,802$ ;  $F = 135,958$ ;  $p < 0,001$ ). Uji Glejser mengkonfirmasi tidak adanya heteroskedastisitas. Harman single factor test mengindikasikan 55,54% variance faktor pertama (dicatat sebagai keterbatasan). Promosi iklan merupakan prediktor dominan.

**Kata Kunci:** promosi iklan, sensitivitas harga, citra merek, keputusan pembelian, UMKM

**Abstract:** This study examines the effects of advertising promotion, price sensitivity, and brand image on consumer purchase decisions at Bersamastore, a fashion micro, small, and medium enterprise (MSME) operating on the Tokopedia e-commerce platform in Bandung, Indonesia. Prior research has tended to examine these variables separately or within broader multi-category B2C contexts; studies focusing on all three within a single-platform MSME setting remain

relatively scarce. A quantitative approach was used, with data collected via structured Likert-scale questionnaires from 101 purposively sampled respondents who had made repeat purchases at Bersamastore more than twice in the preceding year. Multiple linear regression was applied for analysis. The majority of respondents were female (58.4%), aged 22–26 years (40.6%), and employed in the private sector (41.6%). Results indicate that advertising promotion ( $\beta = 0.467$ ,  $t = 5.216$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), price sensitivity ( $\beta = 0.284$ ,  $t = 3.723$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), and brand image ( $\beta = 0.225$ ,  $t = 3.262$ ,  $p = 0.002$ ) each show a significant positive effect on purchase decisions. Together, the three variables account for 80.2% of the variance in purchase decisions (Adjusted  $R^2 = 0.802$ ,  $F = 135.958$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). The Glejser test confirmed no heteroscedasticity across predictors. A Harman single factor test yielded a first-factor variance of 55.54%, which exceeds the conventional 50% threshold and is acknowledged as a study limitation. Advertising promotion emerged as the strongest predictor. The findings carry practical implications for single-platform fashion MSMEs, particularly in allocating promotional resources and building brand recognition within competitive marketplace environments.

**Keyword:** advertising promotion, price sensitivity, brand image, purchase decision, MSME

## INTRODUCTION

The growth of e-commerce platforms in Indonesia has opened up market access for micro, small, and medium enterprises (MSMEs) that previously faced geographic and logistical constraints. MSMEs contribute over 60% of national GDP and account for a large share of employment (Government of Indonesia, 2022). In Bandung, which has long been a center for the creative and fashion industries, a growing number of fashion MSMEs now operate through platforms such as Tokopedia, Shopee, and Lazada. As the number of sellers on these platforms has expanded, so has competition, making it more important for individual sellers to understand what drives consumers to choose one store over another. Purchase decisions in this context are shaped by a range of controllable marketing stimuli, including promotional activity, pricing, and brand perception (Kotler & Keller, 2016). (L\u00e1\u00e1\u00e1\u00e1 et al., 2020) found that consumer trust and perceived risk on online platforms play a moderating role in purchase decision processes, which points to the relevance of platform-level context in shaping how these factors operate.

Adeola et al. (Adeola et al., 2024) similarly found that consumer values shape online fashion purchase behavior in an emerging market context, though their findings from Nigeria also underscore that results from one developing market do not transfer straightforwardly to another a point that reinforces the need for country- and platform-specific studies. Several studies have investigated advertising promotion, price sensitivity, and brand image in relation to purchase decisions, but usually in different settings. (Helmi et al., 2022) examined advertising and sales promotion mediated by brand image in the cosmetics sector, not fashion MSMEs. (Anugrah et al., 2021) tested brand image and promotion on Shopee using a general cross-category consumer sample, which does not capture the dynamics of a fashion-specific single-seller store. (Ghoni & Soliha, 2022) conducted a similar study on Shopee but included online customer reviews as an additional variable, making direct comparison with the present study difficult. (Rahmani & Kordrostami, 2023) studied price sensitivity in online shopping channels but did so in a Western market context. (Savitri et al., 2021) confirmed the role of brand image on digital platforms, though their focus was smartphone purchases rather than fashion. (Fernandes et al., 2021) and (Singh, 2023), in broader reviews of online consumer behavior, noted that studies integrating all three of these predictors within a single-platform MSME setting in Indonesia remain limited. More specifically, no published study appears to have examined this combination among repeat-buyers of a specific fashion MSME store on

Tokopedia in Bandung, where price competition and promotional dynamics differ from those on large multi-seller platforms. This gap motivates the present study.

The study aims to: (1) examine the effect of advertising promotion on purchase decisions at Bersamastore; (2) examine the effect of price sensitivity; (3) examine the effect of brand image; and (4) assess the simultaneous effect of all three variables on purchase decisions.

## METHOD

This study used a quantitative descriptive-causal design. The population was consumers who had purchased fashion products from Bersamastore through Tokopedia in Bandung. Purposive sampling was applied, with two eligibility criteria: having made at least one purchase from Bersamastore through the platform, and having made repeat purchases on more than two occasions within the preceding year. A total of 101 respondents met these criteria, satisfying the commonly cited rule of at least 5–10 observations per predictor in regression analysis (Hair et al., 2019).

Data were collected using a structured Likert-scale questionnaire (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). The measurement instruments were adapted from validated scales in the existing literature. Advertising Promotion (X1) was measured with four indicators informativeness, shipping incentives, visual appeal, and cashback availability adapted from (Kotler & Armstrong, 2018) and operationalized following (Bilal et al., 2021) approach to digital promotional stimuli. Price Sensitivity (X2) used four indicators affordability, price competitiveness, price–quality fit, and perceived value drawn from (Nagle & Müller, 2018) and (Ghali-Zinoubi & Toukabri, 2019). Brand Image (X3) was measured with three indicators brand recognition ease, product uniqueness, and visual attractiveness adapted from (Aaker, 1991), (Keller, 2021), and (Savitri et al., 2021). Purchase Decision (Y) used four indicators perceived product quality, likelihood of recommendation, perceived advantage over competitors, and ease of product access adapted from (Kotler & Keller, 2016) and (Fernandes et al., 2021).

Validity was assessed using Pearson correlation; all items were significant at  $p < 0.001$ . Reliability was measured with Cronbach's Alpha, with a threshold of 0.70 (Hair et al., 2019). Classical assumption tests included normality (Kolmogorov–Smirnov), multicollinearity (VIF), heteroscedasticity (Glejser test), and common method bias (Harman single factor test via PCA). Analysis was conducted in SPSS at a significance level of  $\alpha = 0.05$ .

$$Y = 0.801 + 0.476X1 + 0.294X2 + 0.273X3 + \varepsilon$$

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Respondent Profile

A total of 101 respondents met the sampling criteria. Their characteristics are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. Respondent Profile

| Characteristic | Category                | n  | %    |
|----------------|-------------------------|----|------|
| Gender         | Female                  | 59 | 58.4 |
|                | Male                    | 42 | 41.6 |
| Age            | 18–22 years             | 19 | 18.8 |
|                | 22–26 years             | 41 | 40.6 |
|                | 26–30 years             | 17 | 16.8 |
|                | 30–34 years             | 15 | 14.9 |
|                | 34–38 years             | 9  | 8.9  |
|                | 38–42 years             | 11 | 10.9 |
| Occupation     | Private sector employee | 42 | 41.6 |
|                | Self-employed           | 35 | 34.7 |
|                | Student                 | 7  | 6.9  |
|                | Contract worker         | 5  | 5.0  |
|                | Civil servant           | 3  | 3.0  |

|                                       |                         |            |            |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|------------|------------|
|                                       | Other                   | 9          | 8.9        |
| <b>Monthly income</b>                 | IDR 2,500,000–3,000,000 | 49         | 48.5       |
|                                       | IDR 4,500,000–5,000,000 | 18         | 17.8       |
|                                       | IDR 4,000,000–4,500,000 | 13         | 12.9       |
|                                       | IDR 3,000,000–3,500,000 | 12         | 11.9       |
|                                       | IDR 3,500,000–4,000,000 | 9          | 8.9        |
| <b>Shopping frequency (Tokopedia)</b> | Once per month          | 39         | 38.6       |
|                                       | More than 5x per year   | 26         | 25.7       |
|                                       | Twice per month         | 21         | 20.8       |
|                                       | Once per 6 months       | 15         | 14.9       |
| <b>Total</b>                          |                         | <b>101</b> | <b>100</b> |

Source: Primary data processed (2025)

Most respondents were female (58.4%), aged 22–26 (40.6%), and employed in the private sector (41.6%). The largest income group earned IDR 2,500,000–3,000,000 per month (48.5%), and the most common shopping frequency was once per month (38.6%). The dominance of young adult female consumers is broadly consistent with patterns observed by Rahmani and Kordrostami (2023), who noted that this demographic tends to be active in online fashion purchasing.

### Validity and Reliability

All items showed significant Pearson correlations with their respective scale totals ( $p < 0.001$ ). Item-total correlations ranged from 0.767 to 0.831 for X1, 0.734 to 0.867 for X2, 0.792 to 0.873 for X3, and 0.762 to 0.843 for Y. Reliability results are presented in Table 2.

**Table 2. Reliability Test Results**

| Variable                          | Cronbach's Alpha | Items | Result   |
|-----------------------------------|------------------|-------|----------|
| <b>Advertising Promotion (X1)</b> | 0.805            | 4     | Reliable |
| <b>Price Sensitivity (X2)</b>     | 0.818            | 4     | Reliable |
| <b>Brand Image (X3)</b>           | 0.790            | 3     | Reliable |
| <b>Purchase Decision (Y)</b>      | 0.826            | 4     | Reliable |

Source: Processed data (2025)

All Cronbach's Alpha values exceeded the 0.70 threshold recommended by Hair et al. (2019), indicating acceptable internal consistency across instruments.

### Classical Assumption Tests

The Kolmogorov–Smirnov test produced a statistic of 0.077 ( $p = 0.147$ ), indicating that the residuals were approximately normally distributed. Multicollinearity diagnostics showed Tolerance values of 0.247 (X1), 0.340 (X2), and 0.418 (X3), with corresponding VIF values of 4.054, 2.945, and 2.392. All VIF values fall below the threshold of 5 recommended by Hair et al. (2019). That said, the VIF for X1 (4.054) is relatively high and suggests a moderate degree of correlation between advertising promotion and the other independent variables. This may inflate the standard error for X1's coefficient, making its partial estimate somewhat less precise. The overall model validity is not compromised, but this should be kept in mind when interpreting X1's contribution in isolation.

Heteroscedasticity was tested formally using the Glejser test (Table 3), which involves regressing the absolute values of the residuals on the independent variables.

**Table 3. Glejser Test Results**

| Variable                   | t      | Sig.  | Result          |
|----------------------------|--------|-------|-----------------|
| Advertising Promotion (X1) | -0.290 | 0.772 | Not significant |
| Price Sensitivity (X2)     | -0.621 | 0.536 | Not significant |
| Brand Image (X3)           | -0.187 | 0.852 | Not significant |

Source: Processed data, SPSS (2025)

Significance values for X1 (0.772), X2 (0.536), and X3 (0.852) all exceed 0.05, indicating no heteroscedasticity in the model. Common method bias was assessed using a Harman single factor test; the first extracted factor accounted for 55.54% of total variance. This exceeds the conventional 50% threshold and suggests that common method bias may be present to some degree, a point returned to in the limitations section.

## Multiple Linear Regression

**Table 4. Regression Coefficients and t-test Results**

| Variable                   | B     | Std. Error | Beta ( $\beta$ ) | t     | Sig.   |
|----------------------------|-------|------------|------------------|-------|--------|
| Constant                   | 0.801 | 0.760      | –                | 1.054 | 0.294  |
| Advertising Promotion (X1) | 0.476 | 0.091      | 0.467            | 5.216 | <0.001 |
| Price Sensitivity (X2)     | 0.294 | 0.079      | 0.284            | 3.723 | <0.001 |
| Brand Image (X3)           | 0.273 | 0.084      | 0.225            | 3.262 | 0.002  |

Source: Processed data, SPSS (2025)

The regression equation is:  $Y = 0.801 + 0.476X1 + 0.294X2 + 0.273X3$ . The constant (0.801) represents the baseline purchase decision score when all predictors are zero, though this value has limited interpretive meaning on its own.

**Table 5. Coefficient of Determination and F-test Results**

| R            | R Square | Adjusted R <sup>2</sup> | Std. Error | F       | Sig. F |
|--------------|----------|-------------------------|------------|---------|--------|
| <b>0.899</b> | 0.808    | 0.802                   | 1.263      | 135.958 | <0.001 |

Source: Processed data, SPSS (2025)

The Adjusted R<sup>2</sup> of 0.802 indicates that the three variables together explain 80.2% of the variance in purchase decisions. The F-statistic of 135.958 ( $p < 0.001$ ) confirms that the model as a whole is statistically significant.

## Discussion

Advertising promotion was the strongest predictor ( $\beta = 0.467$ ,  $t = 5.216$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). This is broadly consistent with (Kotler & Armstrong, 2018) argument that promotional content which is informative, visually engaging, and accompanied by incentives tends to shorten the consumer decision process. At Bersamastore, promotional elements such as free shipping and cashback appear to function as decisive purchase triggers. (Bilal et al., 2021) found that digital promotional signals influence purchase intention through eWOM mechanisms, which aligns with the observed dominance of this variable in a platform context where promotional visibility is a key differentiator between sellers.

Price sensitivity showed a significant positive effect ( $\beta = 0.284$ ,  $t = 3.723$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). Respondents who are repeat buyers still appear to weigh price-related considerations affordability, competitive pricing, price quality fit, and perceived value when making decisions. Nagle and Müller (2018) argue that in price-transparent markets such as e-commerce, consumers are generally more attuned to price differences than in offline settings. Rahmani and (Rahmani & Kordrostami, 2023) add that this sensitivity varies by product category and consumer context. Risqo et al. (Risqo et al., 2022) found that price discount moderated the relationship between eWOM, brand image, and online purchase decisions on Indonesian marketplaces, suggesting that promotional incentives and price-related cues tend to reinforce

each other rather than operate independently. The present study does not include a moderation design, but the significant effects of both advertising promotion and price sensitivity in this model are consistent with that pattern. It is worth noting that (Anugrah et al., 2021) found price to be more influential than brand image in a general Shopee sample, whereas in this study both are significant but promotion dominates. The difference may partly reflect the repeat-buyer characteristic of the sample here consumers who return to a specific store may already have formed some degree of brand familiarity, reducing the relative weight of price over multiple transactions.

Brand image had the smallest but still significant effect ( $\beta = 0.225$ ,  $t = 3.262$ ,  $p = 0.002$ ). In an online purchase setting where physical inspection is not possible, brand image functions partly as a quality signal that lowers perceived risk (Aaker, 1991; Keller, 2021). Savitri et al. (2021) reported a similar positive relationship between brand image and purchase intention on digital platforms. (Helmi et al., 2022) further showed that brand image mediates the relationship between promotion and purchase decisions, which suggests that the promotional activity at Bersamastore may also indirectly strengthen brand perception over time. (Lăzăroiu et al., 2020) noted that consumer trust partly shaped by brand cues moderates the effect of perceived risk on online purchase intentions, which may explain why brand image retains a significant role even among repeat buyers who are presumably already somewhat familiar with the store.

The Adjusted  $R^2$  of 0.802 is relatively high for a survey-based consumer behavior study, and should be interpreted with caution given the Harman test result. (Fernandes et al., 2021) note that single-source survey designs are susceptible to common method variance, which can artificially inflate observed associations. The practical implications are fairly straightforward: fashion MSMEs like Bersamastore that operate on a single platform are likely to benefit most from investing in clear, incentive-driven promotional content. Pricing should be approached in terms of perceived value rather than pure price competition, and brand identity even at a small-store scale appears to matter to returning customers.

## CONCLUSION

Advertising promotion, price sensitivity, and brand image each showed a significant positive effect on purchase decisions among repeat buyers at Bersamastore on Tokopedia. Advertising promotion was the dominant predictor ( $\beta = 0.467$ ), followed by price sensitivity ( $\beta = 0.284$ ) and brand image ( $\beta = 0.225$ ). The three variables jointly explained 80.2% of the variance in purchase decisions (Adjusted  $R^2 = 0.802$ ,  $F = 135.958$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ).

Several limitations should be noted. The Harman single factor test result (55.54%) suggests that common method bias cannot be ruled out, and future studies would benefit from multi-source data collection or time-lagged survey designs. The study is also limited to one MSME on one platform, which restricts generalizability. Extending this line of research to multiple fashion MSMEs across different platforms would allow for more robust conclusions. The model could also be enriched by including mediating variables such as consumer trust (Lăzăroiu et al., 2020) or customer satisfaction (Savitri et al., 2021), which may help clarify the mechanisms linking marketing stimuli to purchase behavior.

## REFERENCES

- Aaker, D. A. (1991). *Managing Brand Equity: Capitalizing on the Value of a Brand Name*. Free Press.
- Adeola, O., Moradeyo, A. A., Muogboh, O., & Adisa, I. (2024). Consumer values, online purchase behaviour and the fashion industry: an emerging market context. *PSU Research Review*, 8(1), 68–83. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PRR-04-2021-0019>
- Anugrah, I. B., Nurfarida, I. N., & Sarwoko, E. (2021). Determinants of purchasing decisions on {Shopee}: Online customer review, brand image dan promosi. *MBR (Management and Business Review)*, 5(2), 239–250. <https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.mbr.2021.005.02.8>

- Bilal, M., Zeng, J., Dukhaykh, S., Fan, M., & Trunk, A. (2021). Understanding the effects of {eWOM} antecedents on online purchase intention in {China}. *Information*, 12(5), 192. <https://doi.org/10.3390/info12050192>
- Fernandes, S., Venkatesh, V. G., Panda, R., & Shi, Y. (2021). Measurement of factors influencing online shopper buying decisions: {A} scale development and validation. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 59, 102394. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2020.102394>
- Ghali-Zinoubi, Z., & Toukabri, M. (2019). The antecedents of the consumer purchase intention: Sensitivity to price and involvement in organic product: Moderating role of product regional identity. *Trends in Food Science & Technology*, 90, 175–179. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tifs.2019.02.028>
- Ghoni, M. A., & Soliha, E. (2022). The influence of brand image, online customer reviews and promotion on purchasing decisions on the {Shopee} marketplace. *Jurnal Mirai Management*, 7(1), 14–22. <https://doi.org/10.37531/mirai.v7i1.1504>
- Government of Indonesia. (2022). *{Indonesia}'s updated nationally determined contribution ({NDC})*. [https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/NDC/2022-09/23.09.2022\\_Enhanced NDC Indonesia.pdf](https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/NDC/2022-09/23.09.2022_Enhanced%20NDC%20Indonesia.pdf)
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2019). *Multivariate Data Analysis* (8th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- Helmi, S., Ariana, S., & Supardin, L. (2022). The role of brand image as a mediation of the effect of advertising and sales promotion on customer purchase decision. *Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development*, 13(8), 90–99. <https://doi.org/10.7176/JESD/13-8-09>
- Keller, K. L. (2021). *Strategic Brand Management: Building, Measuring, and Managing Brand Equity* (4th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Kotler, P., & Armstrong, G. (2018). *Principles of Marketing* (17th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Kotler, P., & Keller, K. L. (2016). *Marketing Management* (15th ed.). Pearson Education.
- L\u00e1\u00e1\u00e1\u00e1\u00e1, G., Neguri\u00e1\u00e1, O., Grecu, I., Grecu, G., & Mitran, P. C. (2020). Consumers' decision-making process on social commerce platforms: {Online} trust, perceived risk, and purchase intentions. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 890. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00890>
- Nagle, T. T., & Müller, G. (2018). *The Strategy and Tactics of Pricing: {A} Guide to Growing More Profitably* (6th ed.). Routledge.
- Rahmani, V., & Kordrostami, E. (2023). Price sensitivity and online shopping behavior during the {COVID-19} pandemic. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 40(4), 481–492. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JCM-07-2021-4777>
- Risqo, M., Suharyono, & Supriono. (2022). The impact of electronic word of mouth and brand image on online purchase decisions moderated by price discount. *European Journal of Business and Management Research*, 7(2), 139–148. <https://doi.org/10.24018/ejbmr.2022.7.2.1340>
- Savitri, C., Hurriyati, R., Wibowo, L. A., & Hendrayati, H. (2021). The role of social media marketing and brand image on smartphone purchase intention. *International Journal of Data and Network Science*, 6(1), 185–192. <https://doi.org/10.5267/j.ijdns.2021.9.006>
- Singh, R. (2023). Online consumer shopping behaviour: {A} review and research agenda. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 47(3), 1152–1182. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijcs.12899>