

## **The Influence of Product Quality, Price, and Promotion on iPhone 15 Purchasing Decisions (A Study of Central Java College Students)**

**Fika Wulandari<sup>1\*</sup>, Rizcho Louistama Setyana Putra<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup> Fortuna Consultant, Jalan Kompol R Soekanto Block B3-B5, Sambiroto, Tembalang District, Semarang City, Central Java 50276.

<sup>2</sup> Muhammadiyah University of Surakarta, Jalan A. Yani Tromol Pos 1 Pabelan, Kartasura, Surakarta, Central Java, Indonesia 57169.

Correspondence: [farma.fika16@gmail.com](mailto:farma.fika16@gmail.com)

---

### **Article Info**

#### **Article history:**

Received Oktober 22, 2025

Revised November 11, 2025

Accepted Desember15, 2025

---

#### **Keyword:**

Product Quality; Price; Promotion;  
Purchasing Decisions.

---

### **ABSTRACT**

The rapid growth of smartphone usage, the high market potential of students, and the influence of price and promotion on premium product purchases. This study employed a quantitative approach through a field survey, involving 300 students selected using accidental sampling. Data were collected using Likert-scale questionnaires and analyzed with multiple linear regression. The study found that among the three variables examined, promotion had the strongest influence on iPhone 15 purchase decisions among college students in Central Java, followed by price, which was also significant, while product quality was not significant. Collectively, product quality, price, and promotion explained 72.9% of the variation in purchase decisions, indicating that a balanced marketing mix strategy is crucial for influencing consumer decisions.



© 2025 The Authors. Published by Media Scholar Indonesia. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

---

## **INTRODUCTION**

The development of global communication technology has shown a significant upward trend over the past two decades, particularly marked by the increasing use of smartphones (Agata & Ali, 2025). According to a report from the International Data Corporation in research Husna & Mairita (2024), global smartphone shipments in the fourth quarter of 2024 reached 331.7 million units, with an annual growth rate of 6.4%. This indicates a recovery in demand after a period of global economic slowdown and inflation that had pressured consumer purchasing power (Zhou et al., 2024). Apple, as one of the key players, has maintained its strong position in the premium segment and even topped global sales in several quarters of 2023–2024, driven by high demand for its latest iPhone series (Krisnawati, 2024). Nevertheless, competition with Android vendors such as Samsung, Xiaomi, Oppo, and Vivo remains fierce, making the global market highly dynamic and influenced by product release cycles as well as promotional strategies adopted by each manufacturer (Syuhada et al., 2023).

**Table 1. World Iphone Users**

No	Country	Population	iOS	Estimated iPhone Users
1	China	1,408,975,000	22.49%	316,878,477
2	India	1,450,935,000	4.96%	71,966,376
3	United States	341,200,000	57.24%	195,302,880
4	Indonesia	283,487,931	10.32%	29,255,954
5	Pakistan	241,000,000	4.35%	10,483,500
6	Nigeria	219,000,000	10.57%	23,148,300
7	Brazil	216,422,446	14.44%	31,251,401
8	Bangladesh	171,000,000	4.96%	8,481,600
9	Russia	144,000,000	31.97%	46,036,800
10	Mexico	129,000,000	10.96%	14,138,400

Source: Halyana & Bangsawan (2025)

Table 1 illustrates the distribution of iPhone users in the ten most populous countries in the world in 2024. The United States holds the highest position with an iOS share of 57.24% or around 195.3 million users, followed by China, which records the largest absolute number of iPhone users—over 316 million despite its relatively lower iOS share of 22.49%. India, as the most populous country, shows a relatively low iOS share of 4.96%, equal to about 72 million users. Indonesia has approximately 29.2 million iPhone users with a 10.32% share, placing it fourth after China, the United States, and Brazil. Meanwhile, developing countries such as Pakistan, Nigeria, and Bangladesh report relatively small iOS adoption, yet still significant considering their large populations.

**Table 2. Indonesian iPhone users**

No	City	Population	Estimated iPhone users
1	Jakarta	11,038,216	1,139,143
2	Surabaya	3,020,000	311,664
3	Bandung	2,506,603	258,681
4	Bekasi	2,564,940	264,701
5	Medan	2,435,252	251,318
6	Depok	2,056,400	212,220
7	Tangerang	1,857,000	191,642
8	Semarang	1,657,000	171,002
9	Makassar	1,508,000	155,625
10	Palembang	1,455,000	150,156

Source: Amelia et al. (2024)

Table 2 presents the estimated number of iPhone users in the ten largest cities in Indonesia. Jakarta ranks the highest with more than 1.1 million users out of a population of around 11 million. Surabaya follows with 311 thousand users, while Bandung and Bekasi each record over 250 thousand users. Other major cities such as Medan, Depok, and Tangerang also show significant figures, with more than 190 thousand users each. Meanwhile, Semarang has around 171 thousand iPhone users, making it a potential market hub in Central Java. Makassar and Palembang complete the list with more than 150 thousand users each. This data highlights that iPhone penetration is fairly distributed across major Indonesian cities, although Jakarta remains the primary hub of users.

At the national level, Indonesia has emerged as one of the largest potential markets in Southeast Asia. With a population exceeding 278 million most of whom are of productive age and internet penetration reaching 212 million users as of January 2025 (Handayani et al., 2025), Indonesia is a strategic target for global smartphone manufacturers. The premium smartphone segment, particularly those priced above USD 600, has shown rapid growth. iPhone dominates approximately 40% of this segment (Louisa & Simbolon, 2025). However, in the overall market, Apple's share remains relatively small compared to Android. Mahfouz et al. (2025) reported that iOS accounted for only around 10%, while Android controlled over 80%. This phenomenon highlights that despite iPhone's strength in the premium segment, Android continues to dominate the mass market. Moreover, pricing poses a critical challenge (Pasianus & Kana, 2021). iPhones in Indonesia are relatively more expensive than in other countries due to import taxes, the Domestic Component Level (TKDN) regulation, and distribution costs (Pratama & Handoyo, 2024). Several reports even noted that regulatory changes and import costs pushed Apple's market share down to around 8% in certain quarters of 2024 (Wikantari, 2023). These conditions underline that price and promotional strategies are decisive factors in shaping consumer purchasing decisions in Indonesia, particularly among young consumers with limited purchasing power (Dionigi et al., 2023).

In the context of Central Java, data from the Central Statistics Agency Halyana & Bangsawan (2025) recorded approximately 678,569 university students enrolled across higher education institutions, with the largest concentration located in Semarang City. This demographic represents a highly potential market segment in terms of both consumption trends and long-term brand loyalty. However, limited purchasing power is the primary concern (Yulasmri et al., 2025). Most students depend financially on their parents, scholarships, or part-time jobs, which makes the decision to purchase a premium product like the iPhone 15 highly influenced by price considerations and promotional schemes. Pian et al. (2023), competition in the local smartphone market is intensifying. Android vendors

such as Samsung, Oppo, Vivo, and Xiaomi consistently offer products with advanced specifications (camera quality, processors, display technology, and battery durability) at more affordable prices. Many students in Central Java face a dilemma between choosing an iPhone for its prestige but higher cost, or opting for Android smartphones that are more economical (Munir & Ahmadi, 2025). Preliminary observations also reveal that iPhone promotions in Central Java are still limited to specific events at shopping centers or through official partners, whereas Android vendors pursue more aggressive promotions via online marketplaces, social media platforms, and influencers, effectively reaching student segments (Sitta & Perdana, 2021).

Based on this overview, there are both knowledge gaps and urgent reasons for conducting this research. First, there is still a lack of empirical studies specifically examining the influence of product quality, price, and promotion on the purchasing decisions of iPhone 15 among university students in Central Java. Yet, students represent a highly strategic segment for shaping long-term brand loyalty. Second, the rapid changes in the smartphone market in terms of product innovation, pricing strategies, and regulatory policies make up-to-date analysis crucial for understanding young consumers' responses. Third, this research is expected to provide practical contributions to companies, distributors, and retailers in designing more relevant marketing strategies, while also enriching the academic literature in consumer behavior studies.

## RESEARCH METHODS

This research employs a quantitative approach through a field survey conducted among college students in Central Java (Afif et al., 2023). Data were collected using questionnaires distributed to 300 respondents, namely active university students living in Central Java who had purchased or expressed an interest in purchasing the iPhone 15 within the last six months. The questionnaire was designed using a Likert scale with response options ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree, aiming to measure respondents' perceptions regarding product quality, price, promotion, and purchase decisions. The sampling technique applied was accidental sampling, based on the availability and willingness of students encountered during the survey. This approach enabled the sample to be considered representative of Central Java college students during the research period. Data analysis was carried out using SPSS version 25. The stages of analysis began with a validity test to ensure that each indicator accurately measured the intended variable.

A reliability test using Cronbach's Alpha was then conducted to evaluate the internal consistency of the questionnaire items (Hardani et al., 2020). Classical assumption tests including normality, multicollinearity, and heteroscedasticity were also performed to confirm that the data met the requirements for multiple linear regression analysis. The influence of the independent variables (product quality, price, and promotion) on the dependent variable (iPhone 15 purchase decisions) was analyzed using multiple linear regression. A partial test (t-test) was conducted to examine the effect of each independent variable individually, while a simultaneous test (F-test) was used to assess the combined effect of all independent variables (Ali et al., 2022). Finally, the coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ) was employed to measure the extent to which the independent variables collectively explained the variance in students' purchasing decisions for the iPhone 15.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Results

**Table 3. Characteristics of Respondents**

No	Characteristic	Category	Frequency	Percentage
1	Gender	Male	140	46.7%
		Female	160	53.3%
2	Age Group	17–19 years	60	20.0%
		20–22 years	160	53.3%
		23–25 years	60	20.0%
		>25 years	20	6.7%
3	Study	Humanities / Arts	90	30.0%
		Social Sciences	70	23.3%
		Engineering / IT	60	20.0%

No	Characteristic	Category	Frequency	Percentage
4	Year of Study	Economics / Business	50	16.7%
		Science / Health	30	10.0%
		1 (Freshman)	50	16.7%
		2 (Sophomore)	80	26.7%
5	Income	3 (Junior)	90	30.0%
		4 (Senior)	80	26.6%
		Parents / Family	200	66.7%
		Scholarship	40	13.3%
6	Status	Part-time work	60	20.0%
		Unemployed	200	66.7%
		Part-time employed	90	30.0%
		Full-time employed	10	3.3%
7	Average Monthly	< Rp 1,000,000	90	30.0%
		Rp 1,000,000–2,000,000	120	40.0%
		Rp 2,000,001–3,000,000	50	16.7%
		> Rp 3,000,000	40	13.3%
8	City	Surakarta (Solo)	60	20.0%
		Demak	30	10.0%
		Other cities	60	20.0%
		Unemployed	200	66.7%
9	University	Unemployed	200	66.7%
		Part-time work	60	20.0%
		Full-time employed	10	3.3%
		Total	300	100.0%

Table 3 presents the characteristics of 300 respondents in this study. In terms of gender, the majority were female, with 160 respondents (53.3%), while 140 respondents (46.7%) were male. Regarding age, most respondents were between 20–22 years old (160 respondents or 53.3%), followed by those aged 17–19 years and 23–25 years (each 60 respondents or 20.0%), and those above 25 years old (20 respondents or 6.7%). Based on field of study, the largest group came from Humanities/Arts with 90 respondents (30.0%), followed by Social Sciences with 70 respondents (23.3%), Engineering/IT with 60 respondents (20.0%), Economics/Business with 50 respondents (16.7%), and Science/Health with 30 respondents (10.0%). By year of study, most respondents were in their third year (Junior) with 90 respondents (30.0%), followed by second year (Sophomore) with 80 respondents (26.7%), fourth year (Senior) with 80 respondents (26.6%), and first year (Freshman) with 50 respondents (16.7%). In terms of income sources, the majority were financially supported by parents/family (200 respondents or 66.7%), while others received scholarships (40 respondents or 13.3%) or worked part-time (60 respondents or 20.0%). Employment status indicated that most respondents were unemployed (200 respondents or 66.7%), whereas 90 respondents (30.0%) had part-time jobs, and 10 respondents (3.3%) were employed full-time. For average monthly allowance, the largest group fell within Rp 1,000,000–2,000,000 (120 respondents or 40.0%), followed by < Rp 1,000,000 (90 respondents or 30.0%), Rp 2,000,001–3,000,000 (50 respondents or 16.7%), and > Rp 3,000,000 (40 respondents or 13.3%). Looking at city of origin, most respondents came from Semarang (80 respondents or 26.7%), followed by Surakarta (Solo) (60 respondents or 20.0%), Pekalongan (40 respondents or 13.3%), Cilacap (30 respondents or 10.0%), Demak (30 respondents or 10.0%), and other cities in Central Java (60 respondents or 20.0%). Meanwhile, university distribution showed that the largest proportion of respondents came from Diponegoro University (70 respondents or 23.3%), Sebelas Maret University

(60 respondents or 20.0%), and Semarang State University (50 respondents or 16.7%), followed by other universities such as Walisongo State Islamic University, UPN Veteran Yogyakarta, Dian Nuswantoro University, Muhammadiyah University of Surakarta, and Sultan Agung Islamic University.

**Table 4 Validity Test Results – Product Quality (X1)**

Item	r-count	r-table	Remark
1	0.823	0.196	Valid
2	0.816	0.196	Valid
3	0.826	0.196	Valid
4	0.740	0.196	Valid
5	0.765	0.196	Valid

Source: Primary Data Analysis, 2025

Based on Table 4, all items of the Product Quality variable have r-count values greater than r-table (0.196), so all items are valid. This indicates that the instrument can accurately measure the construct of Product Quality.

**Table 5. Validity Test Results – Price (X2)**

Item	r-count	r-table	Remark
1	0.851	0.196	Valid
2	0.834	0.196	Valid
3	0.903	0.196	Valid
4	0.843	0.196	Valid

Source: Primary Data Analysis, 2025

Table 5 shows that all Price items have r-count > r-table (0.196), so they are valid. This proves that the questionnaire can accurately measure students' perceptions of iPhone 15 pricing.

**Table 6. Validity Test Results – Promotion (X3)**

Item	r-count	r-table	Remark
1	0.787	0.196	Valid
2	0.861	0.196	Valid
3	0.822	0.196	Valid
4	0.832	0.196	Valid
5	0.817	0.196	Valid

Source: Primary Data Analysis, 2025

The results in Table 6 show that all Promotion items have r-count > r-table (0.196), indicating validity. This means the instrument can measure the influence of promotion on purchase decisions effectively.

**Table 7. Validity Test Results – Purchase Decision (Y)**

Item	r-count	r-table	Remark
1	0.763	0.196	Valid
2	0.812	0.196	Valid
3	0.743	0.196	Valid
4	0.847	0.196	Valid
5	0.844	0.196	Valid
6	0.869	0.196	Valid

Source: Primary Data Analysis, 2025

From Table 7, all items of Purchase Decision have r-count > r-table, indicating validity. The questionnaire can measure iPhone 15 purchase decisions accurately.

**Table 8. Reliability Test Results**

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha	Remark
Product Quality (X1)	0.853	Reliable
Price (X2)	0.878	Reliable
Promotion (X3)	0.879	Reliable
Purchase Decision (Y)	0.897	Reliable

Source: Primary Data Analysis, 2025

Table 8 shows Cronbach's Alpha values for all variables above 0.6: Product Quality (0.853), Price (0.878), Promotion (0.879), and Purchase Decision (0.897). This indicates all instruments are reliable and consistent.

**Table 9. Normality Test (Kolmogorov-Smirnov)**

K-S Test Value	Sig. (2-tailed)	Result
0.152	> 0.05	Normal

Source: Primary Data Analysis, 2025

The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test value is  $0.152 > 0.05$ , indicating that the data is normally distributed, allowing the use of multiple linear regression.

**Table 10. Multicollinearity Test Results**

Variable	Tolerance	VIF	Remark
Product Quality	0.414	2.416	No multicollinearity
Price	0.362	2.766	No multicollinearity
Promotion	0.271	3.693	No multicollinearity

Source: Primary Data Analysis, 2025

Table 10 shows all VIF values below 10 and Tolerance above 0.1, indicating no multicollinearity among independent variables. Each variable can be analyzed individually.

**Table 11. Heteroscedasticity Test Results**

Variable	Sig.	Remark
Product Quality	0.678	Homoscedasticity
Price	0.568	Homoscedasticity
Promotion	0.348	Homoscedasticity

Source: Primary Data Analysis, 2025

Results in Table 11 indicate all independent variables have  $\text{sig} > 0.05$ , confirming no heteroscedasticity. Residual variance is relatively constant.

**Table 12. Multiple Linear Regression Results**

Variable	B
Constant ( $\alpha$ )	1.097
Product Quality	0.167
Price	0.381
Promotion	0.720
Regression Equation:	
<b>Purchase Decision = 1.097 + 0.167X1 + 0.381X2 + 0.720X3 + e</b>	

Source: Primary Data Analysis, 2025

Based on Table 12, the regression equation is:  $\text{Purchase Decision} = 1.097 + 0.167X1 + 0.381X2 + 0.720X3 + e$ . This means that increases in Product Quality, Price, and Promotion lead to higher iPhone 15 purchase decisions. Promotion has the highest coefficient (0.720), indicating the strongest influence.

**Table 13. t-Test Results**

Variable	t-count	t-table	Sig.	Remark
Product Quality	1.470	1.983	0.145	Not Significant
Price	2.889	1.983	0.005	Significant
Promotion	5.287	1.983	0.000	Significant

Source: Primary Data Analysis, 2025

Table 13 shows that Product Quality does not significantly affect purchase decisions (t-count  $1.470 < t\text{-table } 1.983$ ; sig  $0.145 > 0.05$ ), while Price (t-count  $2.889 > 1.983$ ; sig  $0.005 < 0.05$ ) and Promotion (t-count  $5.287 > 1.983$ ; sig  $0.000 < 0.05$ ) significantly influence student purchase decisions for iPhone 15.

**Table 14. F-Test Results (Simultaneous Test)**

F-count	F-table	Sig.	Remark
86.273	2.70	0.000	Significant Simultaneous

Source: Primary Data Analysis, 2025

The F-test (Table 14) shows F-count  $86.273 > F\text{-table } 2.70$  with sig  $0.000 < 0.05$ , indicating that Product Quality, Price, and Promotion simultaneously have a significant effect on iPhone 15 purchase decisions.

**Table 15. Coefficient of Determination ( $R^2$ )**

Variable	$R^2$	Remark
Purchase Decision	0.729	Independent variables explain 72.9% of variation in purchase decision

Source: Primary Data Analysis, 2025

Table 15 shows  $R^2 = 0.729$ , meaning 72.9% of the variation in iPhone 15 purchase decisions can be explained by Product Quality, Price, and Promotion, while 27.1% is influenced by other factors outside this study.

## Discussion

This study aimed to analyze the influence of product quality, price, and promotion on the purchasing decisions of iPhone 15 among college students in Central Java. Based on respondent characteristics, most students were aged 20–22 years (53.3%) and the majority were female (53.3%). Most respondents came from the Humanities/Arts field (30.0%), and the largest proportion were third-year (Junior) students (30.0%). Regarding income sources, the majority of students relied on parental/family support (66.7%), with most respondents being unemployed (66.7%), and the largest group having a monthly allowance of Rp 1,000,000–2,000,000 (40.0%). Respondents came from various cities such as Semarang, Surakarta, Pekalongan, Cilacap, Demak, and other cities in Central Java, and were enrolled in universities such as Diponegoro University, Sebelas Maret University, and Semarang State University.

### The Influence of Product Quality (X1)

The regression results indicated that product quality had a coefficient of 0.167 but was not statistically significant in influencing iPhone 15 purchasing decisions ( $t\text{-count} = 1.470$ ;  $p = 0.145$ ). This shows that students' perceptions of iPhone 15 quality were not a primary factor in their purchasing decisions. This finding aligns with the study by Pristiyono et al. (2025), which stated that product quality did not significantly affect consumers' purchasing decisions for certain products. However, it differs from Wikantari (2023), who found that product quality significantly influenced the purchase decisions of packaged tea. This indicates that although product quality is important, other factors such as price and promotion may be more dominant in the context of students in Central Java.

### **The Influence of Price (X2)**

The analysis showed that price significantly affected iPhone 15 purchasing decisions (t-count = 2.889; p = 0.005) with a coefficient of 0.381. This indicates that students consider price an important factor in their purchasing decisions. This finding is consistent with research by Kolibu et al. (2024) and Putra (2020), which found that product price significantly affects consumers' purchasing decisions. Competitive pricing and perceived value make it easier for students to make purchase decisions, especially for high-priced products like the iPhone 15.

### **The Influence of Promotion (X3)**

Promotion had the strongest influence on purchasing decisions, with a coefficient of 0.720 and statistically significant (t-count = 5.287; p = 0.000). This result is consistent with Wondal & Widodo (2023), who found that promotion significantly influences consumers' purchase intentions. Effective promotions, whether through discounts, advertising, or social media campaigns, have been proven to increase students' interest in purchasing the iPhone 15. This demonstrates that promotion is a key strategy in driving purchasing decisions, even more dominant than product quality.

### **The Combined Influence of Product Quality, Price, and Promotion**

The simultaneous F-test showed that the three independent variables together significantly influenced purchasing decisions (F-count = 86.273; p = 0.000), with a coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ) of 0.729. This means that 72.9% of the variation in iPhone 15 purchasing decisions can be explained by product quality, price, and promotion, while 27.1% is influenced by other factors not examined in this study. This finding aligns with the research by Zed et al. (2024), which found that the simultaneous effect of product quality, price, and promotion significantly influenced consumer purchase decisions.

Research on consumer behavior consistently highlights the roles of product quality, price, and promotion in shaping purchasing decisions. Several studies have shown that product quality positively influences purchase decisions, as consumers prefer products with better features, durability, and performance (Saridewi & Nugroho, 2022). However, in some contexts, product quality may not have a significant impact when price and promotional factors dominate consumer considerations (Widitya et al., 2024). Price remains a critical determinant, as consumers evaluate the trade-off between value and cost before making purchases, and higher price sensitivity leads consumers to focus more on affordability and perceived value (Wahab et al., 2024). Promotion, through activities such as advertising, discounts, and special offers, has been identified as a particularly strong influencer of purchase intention, directly enhancing consumer interest and awareness (Silviah, 2025).

The combined effect of product quality, price, and promotion has been shown to explain a substantial portion of consumer behavior variance, indicating that these factors work synergistically to influence purchase decisions (Saragih et al., 2024). Consumers' perception of value, which considers quality relative to price, further illustrates the interaction between these factors in decision-making (Halyana & Bangsawan, 2025). Advertising plays a critical role by creating positive attitudes and emphasizing product benefits, thereby supporting other elements of the marketing mix in influencing purchase intentions (Amelia et al., 2024). Overall, these findings suggest that a balanced marketing mix strategy, incorporating high-quality products, competitive pricing, and effective promotional efforts, is essential for maximizing consumer satisfaction and purchase likelihood (Prasetya & Marina, 2022).

## **CONCLUSION**

Based on the results of this study, it can be concluded that product quality, price, and promotion collectively play a significant role in influencing iPhone 15 purchasing decisions among college students. While product quality alone was not statistically significant, price and promotion were found to have a substantial impact, with promotion being the strongest determinant. The combined effect of these three factors explains 72.9% of the variation in purchase decisions, indicating that students' decisions are highly influenced by a balanced consideration of price, promotional strategies, and product attributes.

It is recommended that marketers focus on enhancing promotional strategies to attract and retain student consumers, while maintaining competitive pricing and ensuring product quality meets consumer expectations. Implementing integrated marketing campaigns that leverage social media, discounts, and targeted advertising can further strengthen purchase intentions among this demographic.

## REFERENCES

Afif, Z., Azhari, D. S., Kustati, M., & Sepriyanti, N. (2023). Penelitian Ilmiah (Kuantitatif) Beserta Paradigma, Pendekatan, Asumsi Dasar, Karakteristik, Metode Analisis Data Dan Outputnya. *Innovative: Journal Of Social Science Research*, 3(3), 682–693.

Agata, V. T. L., & Ali, H. (2025). Pengaruh Strategi Pemasaran, Kualitas Pelayanan dan Kualitas Produk terhadap Keputusan Pembelian. *Dinasti Information and Technology*, 2(4), 195–204.

Ali, M. M., Hariyati, T., Pratiwi, M. Y., & Afifah, S. (2022). Metodologi Penelitian Kuantitatif Dan Penerapan Nya Dalam Penelitian. *Education Journal*, 2(2), 1–10.

Amelia, R. R., Maimunah, Akbar, N. R., Qomariah, N., & Thamrin, M. (2024). The Influence of Marketing Mix Strategy on Supermarket Customer Satisfaction in Banyuwangi. *International Journal of Management Science and Information Technology (IJMSIT)*, 4(1), 64–69.

Dionigi, A., Duradoni, M., & Vagnoli, L. (2023). Understanding the Association Between Humor and Emotional Distress: The Role of Light and Dark Humor in Predicting Depression, Anxiety, and Stress. *Eurupe's Journal Of Psychology*, 1(10), 358–370.

Halyana, P. S., & Bangsawan, S. (2025). The Influence of Price and Product Quality on Purchase Decisions with Purchase Intention as Intervening Variable (Study on Mixue Lampung). *Ijori Journal*, 1(1), 7–14.

Handayani, A., Apriliani, L., & Astuti, D. (2025). Analisis Kelayakan Bisnis Makanan Dan Minuman Kekinian Untuk Generasi Z. *Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Bisnis Digital*, 12(1), 1489–1495.

Hardani, Auliya, N. H., Andriani, H., Fardani, R. A., Ustiawaty, J., Utami, E. F., Sukmana, D. J., & Istiqomah, R. R. (2020). *Buku Metode Penelitian Kualitatif & Kuantitatif* (1st ed., Issue March). CV. Pustaka Ilmu Editor: Husna, A. H., & Mairita, D. (2024). Gen Z dan Perilaku Konsumsi Konten Influencer pada TikTok. *Jurnal Riset Komunikasi*, 7(1), 86–100.

Kolibu, M. F. I., Nainggolan, N., & Langi, Y. A. R. (2024). Analisis Faktor-faktor yang Mempengaruhi Harga Cabai Merah di Kota Manado Provinsi Sulawesi Utara Menggunakan Analisis Regresi Linear Berganda. *Jurnal MIPA*, 13(1), 32–36.

Krisnawati, A. A. A. M. (2024). Tren Penggunaan Teknologi Komunikasi Smartphone Terhadap Hubungan Pasangan Jarak Jauh. *Jurnal Sistem Dan Teknologi Informasi (JSTI)*, 06(3), 71–88.

Louisa, L., & Simbolon, F. P. (2025). Determinants of Customer Loyalty: An Empirical Study from Online Food Delivery Services. *Binus Business Review*, 14(14), 247–258.

Mahfouz, M. R., Fayez, M., & ElSamadicy, A. M. (2025). Investigation of Factors That Affecting on Customer Loyalty in Banking Sector in Egypt. *Open Access Library Journal*, 12(1), 1–21.

Munir, A. F., & Ahmadi, M. A. (2025). Pengaruh Harga, Kualitas Produk, dan Promosi terhadap Loyalitas Pelanggan pada Brand Evolene. *Jurnal Manuhara: Pusat Penelitian Ilmu Manajemen Dan Bisnis*, 3(1), 303–322.

Pasianus, O., & Kana, A. A. (2021). Pengaruh Kualitas Layanan Terhadap Loyalitas Pelanggan Melalui Kepuasan Sebagai Variabel Intervening Pada Swalayan Pamella Enam Yogyakarta. *Cakrawangsa Bisnis*, 2(2), 197–216.

Pian, W., Zhou, Y., & Xiao, T. (2023). A review of the feasibility of aluminum alloys, carbon fiber composites and glass fiber composites for vehicle weight reduction in the automotive industry. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 2608(1).

Prasetya, D., & Marina, R. (2022). Studi Analisis Media Baru: Manfaat dan Permasalahan dari Media Sosial dan Game Online. *Telangke:Jurnal Telangke Ilmu Komunikasi*, 4(2), 01–10.

Pratama, F., & Handoyo, S. E. (2024). Pengaruh Perceived Price Dan Perceived Quality Terhadap Purchase Intention Melalui Perceived Value. *Jurnal Manajemen Bisnis Dan Kewirausahaan*, 8(4), 895–906.

Pristiyono, Ardiani, W., Ritonga, A. Y., Nasution, M. P., & Nahrisah, E. (2025). Msmes Marketing Strategies On Competitive Advantage Case Study Of Msmes In South Labuhanbatu District. *Journal of Industrial Engineering & Management Research*, 6(1), 21–33.

Putra, W. Y. (2020). Pengaruh Kredibilitas Influencer Media Sosial Instagram Terhadap Minat Beli Konsumen Doubletree By Hilton Surabaya. *Jurnal Manajemen*.

Saragih, J. R. S., Siregar, M. S., Batubara, K. A., & Hidayat, N. (2024). Pengaruh Penggunaan Social-Commerce (Tiktok Shop) Terhadap Gaya Hidup Konsumtif Generasi-Z. *MESIR: Journal of Management Education Social Sciences Information and Religion*, 1(2), 330–343.

Saridewi, D. O., & Nugroho, R. H. (2022). Pengaruh Citra Merek, Harga, Dan Kualitas Produk Terhadap Loyalitas Melalui Kepuasan Konsumen Sebagai Variabel Intervening: Studi pada Pelanggan Susu Bear Brand di Surabaya. *Al-Kharaj: Jurnal Ekonomi, Keuangan & Bisnis Syariah*, 4(6), 1722–1738.

Silviah, R. (2025). Strategi Manajemen Pemasaran: Peran Produk, Harga, dan Promosi dalam Meningkatkan Daya Saing. *JIMT: Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen Terapan*, 6(4), 261–267.

Sitta, Y., & Perdana, A. (2021). The Influence Of Consumer Perceptions About Price, Product Quality And Service Quality Towards Purchasing Decisions (at Janji Jiwa Bengkalis). *Inovbiz: Jurnal Inovasi Bisnis*,

*I*(1), 14–17.

Syuhada, R., Isyanto, P., & Yani, D. (2023). Analisis Strategi Pemasaran Dalam Meningkatkan Penjualan Pada Café & Restoran Kokok Petok Di Cimalaya Wetan. *Jurnal Ekonomi Manajemen Dan Bisnis*, 24(1), 54–65.

Wahab, A., Razak, M., & Hidayat, M. (2024). Pengaruh Modal Usaha, Promosi Dan Manajemen Usaha Terhadap Keberhasilan Usaha Pada UMKM Di Kabupaten Mamuju. *Jurnal Ilmiah Bisnis & Kewirausahaan: JBK*, 13(2), 198–211.

Widitya, A. A., Susanti, N. I., Suyoko, Y., & Sumaryanto. (2024). Pengaruh Kualitas Pelayanan, Kualitas Produk, Dan Persepsi Harga Terhadap Minat Beli melalui Kepuasan Konsumen Sebagai Variabel Intervening (Studi Kasus Pada Toko Elektronik Sinar Mas Karanganyar). *Jurnal STIE Semarang*, 16(2), 95–103.

Wikantari, M. A. (2023). Analysis of Digital Marketing Determinants on Customer Loyalty with Customer Satisfaction, Online Promotion and Customer Experience as Mediation Variables. *International Journal of Economics Development Research*, 4(5), 2502–2519.

Wondal, P. J. M., & Widodo, A. (2023). Pengaruh Celebrity Influencer dan Non Celebrity Influencer Terhadap Keputusan Pembelian Produk Skincare Somethinc. *Al Qalam: Jurnal Ilmiah Keagamaan Dan Kemasyarakatan*, 17(3).

Yulasmi, Lasman, F., & Yuliarman. (2025). Determinants of Customer Satisfaction and Its Implications on Loyalty at Government-owned Commercial Banks in West Sumatera. *Integrative Business & Economics*, 8(2), 222–232.

Zed, E. Z., Febriansah, A. E., Primayanti, M., Aryani, F., & Dewi, V. (2024). Pengaruh Packaging Produk Terhadap Keputusan Pembelian Konsumen Di Industri Makanan (Literatur Review Manajemen Pemasaran). *Nnovative: Journal Of Social Science Research*, 5(5), 2209–2229.

Zhou, L., Godsey, J. A., Kallmeyer, R., Hayes, T., & Cai, E. L. (2024). Public perceptions of the brand image of nursing: Cross-cultural differences between the United States and China. *Nursing Outlook*, 72(5), 102220.