

# The Influence of Brand Image, Product Quality, and Price Perception on The Purchase Decision of So Nice Sausage in Surabaya

Rizky Nanda Satya <sup>1\*</sup>, Hery Pudjoprastyono <sup>2</sup>

<sup>1\*,2</sup> Management Study Program, Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Pembangunan Nasional “Veteran” Jawa Timur, Surabaya City, East Java Province, Indonesia

Email: 22012010319@student.upnjatim.ac.id <sup>1\*</sup>, heryp.ma@upnjatim.ac.id <sup>2</sup>

Article history:

Received August 17, 2026

Revised August 31, 2026

Accepted September 1, 2026

## Abstract

This research evaluates how brand reputation, product caliber, and pricing perceptions affect consumer purchasing choices regarding So Nice Sausages in Surabaya. Utilizing a quantitative framework, the dependent variable (buying decision) was tested against three independent variables. The investigation involved 112 local consumers selected via a purposive, non-probability sampling strategy involving questionnaire distribution. Analytical processing was conducted using Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) via SmartPLS software. Findings reveal that: 1) Brand image has a positive and significant effect on the purchase decision for So Nice Sausage in Surabaya ( $\beta = 0.266$ ,  $p = 0.001$ ); 2) Product quality has a positive and significant effect on the purchase decision for So Nice Sausage in Surabaya ( $\beta = 0.254$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ); 3) Price perception has a positive and significant effect on the purchase decision for So Nice Sausage in Surabaya ( $\beta = 0.462$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ). The tested variables collectively explain 60.1% of the variance in the purchase decision.

## Keywords:

Brand Image; Product Quality; Price Perception; Purchase Decision; PLS-SEM.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The accelerated expansion of the instant food sector has transformed consumer habits, emphasizing convenience in fulfilling daily dietary requirements. This behavioral shift urges manufacturers to innovate and compete vigorously to capture buyer interest and maintain market dominance (Mardiyatno & Astuti, 2021).

Point of sales data classifying the sausage category within the delicatessen segment, as distinct from the frozen food segment, recorded the highest sales growth among instant food categories in 2025, indicating that consumer preference is shifting toward ready-to-eat processed meat products (PT Global Loyalty Indonesia Tbk, 2025). This trend is particularly pronounced in East Java, where Surabaya recorded the highest per capita weekly consumption of processed meat among cities and regencies in the province, reflecting a strong tendency among the urban population toward practical and ready-to-eat food consumption in line with the demands of a fast-paced modern lifestyle (Badan Pusat Statistik, 2025). Furthermore, as a major metropolitan and educational hub, Surabaya is characterized by a dense population of university students and urban workers. This demographic heavily prioritizes time-saving dietary solutions, making the city a highly competitive and representative barometer for the ready-to-eat food industry's success.

Amid this favorable market condition, PT So Good Food, through its So Nice sausage brand which is historically recognized as a pioneer of ready-to-eat sausage in Indonesia, has instead experienced a worrying decline in competitiveness. Top Brand Index data for the sausage category from 2021 to 2025 show that So Nice held a dominant position with an index of 20.10 percent in 2021, which steadily eroded to only 11.30 percent by 2025 (Top Brand Award, 2025), a decline that signals weakening brand competitiveness and fading consumer trust amid intensifying market competition.

This downward trajectory is exacerbated by the aggressive expansion of rival brands—such as Kenzler and other immediate competitors—who continuously innovate their product variants and promotional

strategies. With such an abundance of substitute products available at the retail level, consumers face very low switching costs, meaning any perceived flaw in a brand's offering can lead to immediate consumer defection.

This decline in brand strength is mirrored at the retail level, where local sales data from a retail outlet in Surabaya recorded a sharp contraction, from a relatively stable range of around 340 to 387 units per month in the first quarter to a low point of only 198 units in the following quarter, before stagnating around 199 to 296 units for the remainder of the year. This pattern of declining retail turnover reinforces the indication that the negative sentiment and reputational crisis circulating in the market have directly affected consumer willingness to purchase So Nice sausage in Surabaya.

The deterioration of the brand's image is corroborated by substantial negative feedback on platforms like Instagram and TikTok. Consumers have raised viral food safety alarms, criticized the firm's defensive reactions to quality complaints, and even campaigned for a product renaming or boycott. As noted by (Herlina et al., 2025), modern consumers' heightened food safety awareness requires transparent corporate communication; failing to do so destroys trust and harms the corporate image. Consequently, this reputational damage directly affects initial buying decisions, as buyers evaluate brands based on accumulated pre-purchase information (Riani et al., 2023).

Beyond reputation, physical product quality remains paramount, as superior items generate positive pre- and post-consumption evaluations (Charviandi et al., 2023). Complaints documented on social media point to inconsistent product quality across retail outlets, including reports of an overly soft texture, a flour-dominated taste, and cases of physical spoilage occurring before the printed expiration date, which collectively indicate that a failure to protect physical product quality has become a primary trigger of perceived risk among consumers.

Lastly, pricing perception—how buyers weigh costs against perceived value (Kotler et al., 2022). Consumer discussion on social media has questioned why So Nice prices its beef and chicken variants identically despite the known cost gap between the two raw materials in the market, a discrepancy that has fueled public suspicion that the product relies on lower grade raw materials and artificial flavoring to sustain its low price point, ultimately eroding consumer confidence in the product's overall value proposition.

Crucially, this research strictly isolates its focus on the initial purchase decision rather than repeat purchasing behavior. In the context of a brand experiencing a reputational and quality crisis, the consumer's evaluation process is essentially "reset." Buyers no longer rely on past consumption habits; instead, they conduct a highly critical, fresh assessment of the brand's current image, tangible quality, and price fairness before deciding to execute a purchase.

Prior literature confirms that brand reputation, item quality, and pricing perception significantly steer buying choices across various sectors, such as instant noodles Islamiyah & Soebiantoro (2022); Fikri & Pudjoprastoyo (2023), frozen seafood Anisa et al., (2024), noodle restaurants Valerio et al., (2025), and instant noodle brands Latifa et al., (2023), generally confirming positive and significant relationships, although the strength of price perception in particular has varied across contexts. However, research focusing specifically on Surabaya's ready-to-eat sausage market amid a reputational crisis remains scarce. Therefore, this paper investigates how these three elements impact the decision to purchase So Nice sausages in Surabaya, aiming to enrich academic consumer behavior literature and offer strategic marketing insights.

Brand image embodies the credibility and trust consumers attribute to a firm, with robust reputations reducing purchase hesitation Khairullah & Vildayanti (2024); Nisa (2022). Product caliber denotes an item's reliable fulfillment of buyer expectations, effectively boosting purchase confidence (Utami et al., 2024); Winalda & Sudarwanto (2021). Perceived price evaluates whether a cost is justifiable relative to the acquired benefits; favorable evaluations encourage buying actions Sandra & Prawoto (2024); (Latifa et al., 2023). Thus, this research postulates:

H1: Brand reputation positively drives the buying decision for So Nice sausages in Surabaya.

H2: Product excellence positively drives the buying decision for So Nice sausages in Surabaya.

H3: Pricing perception positively drives the buying decision for So Nice sausages in Surabaya.

## 2. RESEARCH METHOD

This empirical study utilized a quantitative survey design to examine the causal relationships connecting brand reputation, product caliber, and pricing perceptions (exogenous factors) with buying choices (the endogenous factor). This research adopts an explanatory quantitative approach, which aims to test pre-established hypotheses and explain the causal relationships between the defined variables through statistical analysis. By utilizing this design, the study can objectively measure how independent variables influence the dependent variable, providing measurable and generalizable conclusions.

Brand image was measured through three indicators adapted from Putri et al., (2025), user, product, and corporate image. Product quality was measured through five indicators adapted from Adonis & Silintowe, (2021), namely workmanship, ease of use, durability, product superiority, and product attributes. Price perception was measured through four indicators adapted from Sandra & Prawoto (2024), namely price affordability, price competitiveness, price to quality conformity, and price to benefit conformity. Purchase

decision was measured through four indicators adapted from Mardiana & Sijabat (2022), namely product stability, purchase habit, willingness to recommend, and repurchase intention. Responses were collected on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). The structured questionnaire was designed using a closed-ended format to ensure standard responses. This scaling method was chosen for its proven reliability in capturing the nuances of consumer attitudes and perceptions, allowing qualitative feelings to be transformed accurately into quantifiable data for structural modeling.

The target demographic consisted of an infinite population of individuals in Surabaya who had previously eaten So Nice sausages. A purposive, non-probability sampling strategy was deployed based on specific criteria: residents of Surabaya, aged 17 or older, with prior consumption experience of the product. The age criterion of 17 years or older was established because individuals in this demographic are legally considered adults in Indonesia and are presumed to possess independent purchasing power and the cognitive maturity to evaluate their buying choices rationally. Furthermore, the requirement of prior consumption ensures that the respondents' evaluations are grounded in actual product experience rather than mere speculation or brand hearsay. Adhering to Hair et al., (2022) recommendation of 5 to 10 respondents per indicator, the 16 total indicators necessitated a minimum sample of 112 participants, which was successfully met. Primary data collection occurred digitally from July 1 to July 15, 2026, supplemented by secondary data from books, reports, and academic journals.

Primary data were collected through an online questionnaire distributed to respondents between July 1 and July 15, 2026, while secondary data supporting the theoretical framework were obtained from relevant journal articles, books, and institutional reports.

Analytical procedures were executed via PLS-SEM using SmartPLS software, an approach suited for prediction-focused models featuring reflective parameters (Ghozali & Kusumadewi, 2023). PLS-SEM was specifically chosen over covariance-based SEM (CB-SEM) due to its robustness in handling relatively smaller sample sizes and its lack of strict assumptions regarding multivariate normal data distribution. Furthermore, PLS-SEM is highly optimal for predictive research models aiming to maximize the explained variance of endogenous latent constructs. The measurement (outer) model underwent rigorous validation to confirm reliability and validity. Convergent validity was established via Average Variance Extracted (AVE) and outer loadings surpassing 0.50, whereas discriminant validity was verified using AVE square roots and cross-loading values. Internal consistency was proven with Composite Reliability scores exceeding the 0.70 benchmark. An AVE value above the 0.50 threshold indicates that, on average, the construct explains more than half of the variance of its associated indicators, confirming that the questionnaire items correctly and consistently represent the variables they are meant to measure. Following measurement confirmation, the structural (inner) model was assessed via R-Square values. Bootstrapping techniques tested the hypotheses, defining significance at a p-value below 0.05 or t-statistic above 1.96. For the inner model, the evaluation not only focuses on the R-Square value to determine the model's explanatory power, but also crucially relies on the bootstrapping procedure (typically involving 5,000 subsamples) to rigorously estimate standard errors and calculate the t-statistics for hypothesis testing.

### 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

#### 3.1. Respondent Profile

Among the 112 participants, the largest age group was 21–25 years (89.3%), followed by 17–20 years (7.1%), 26–30 years (2.7%), and those over 30 (0.9%). Females constituted the majority at 55.4% (62 individuals), while males made up 44.6% (50 individuals), demonstrating a dominance of female young adult buyers in the sample.

#### 3.2. Measurement Model (Outer Model) Evaluation

Outer model testing revealed that all indicators possessed loading values between 0.759 and 0.915, easily exceeding the minimum 0.50 cutoff. Corresponding t-statistics ranged from 13.872 to 58.541, demonstrating that every parameter reliably represented its specific latent construct (Table 1).

Table 1. Outer Loading and T-Statistics

| Indicator | Construct        | Loading | T-Statistics |
|-----------|------------------|---------|--------------|
| X1.1      | Brand Image      | 0.915   | 58.541       |
| X1.2      | Brand Image      | 0.898   | 41.394       |
| X1.3      | Brand Image      | 0.817   | 15.940       |
| X2.1      | Product Quality  | 0.838   | 23.599       |
| X2.2      | Product Quality  | 0.877   | 30.309       |
| X2.3      | Product Quality  | 0.803   | 17.132       |
| X2.4      | Product Quality  | 0.770   | 13.872       |
| X2.5      | Product Quality  | 0.759   | 15.594       |
| X3.1      | Price Perception | 0.881   | 37.491       |

|      |                   |       |        |
|------|-------------------|-------|--------|
| X3.2 | Price Perception  | 0.859 | 35.743 |
| X3.3 | Price Perception  | 0.884 | 35.213 |
| X3.4 | Price Perception  | 0.838 | 23.217 |
| Y.1  | Purchase Decision | 0.827 | 18.821 |
| Y.2  | Purchase Decision | 0.876 | 33.591 |
| Y.3  | Purchase Decision | 0.850 | 26.184 |
| Y.4  | Purchase Decision | 0.878 | 32.907 |

Source: SmartPLS data processing results (2026)

Convergent validity was further cemented by AVE scores surpassing the 0.50 threshold across all variables, while Composite Reliability metrics consistently beat the 0.70 benchmark (Table 2). This confirms robust internal consistency and adequate validity. Discriminant validity was also achieved, as indicators loaded highest on their designated constructs rather than alternative variables within the model.

Table 2. Average Variance Extracted and Composite Reliability

| Construct             | AVE   | Composite Reliability |
|-----------------------|-------|-----------------------|
| Brand Image (X1)      | 0.771 | 0.909                 |
| Product Quality (X2)  | 0.657 | 0.905                 |
| Price Perception (X3) | 0.750 | 0.923                 |
| Purchase Decision (Y) | 0.736 | 0.918                 |

Source: SmartPLS data processing results (2026)

### 3.3. Structural Model (Inner Model) and Hypothesis Testing

Inner model analysis yielded an R-Square of 0.601, meaning the three independent variables collectively account for 60.1% of the variance in buying decisions, leaving 39.9% to unmeasured external factors. Table 3 details the bootstrapping outcomes for the hypotheses.

Table 3. Path Coefficients and Hypothesis Testing Results

| Hypothesis / Path                        | Coefficient | T-Statistics | P-Values | Result    |
|------------------------------------------|-------------|--------------|----------|-----------|
| H1: Brand Image → Purchase Decision      | 0.266       | 3.401        | 0.001    | Supported |
| H2: Product Quality → Purchase Decision  | 0.254       | 5.369        | 0.000    | Supported |
| H3: Price Perception → Purchase Decision | 0.462       | 8.103        | 0.000    | Supported |

Source: SmartPLS data processing results (2026)

Bootstrapping confirmed that brand image positively and significantly drives purchasing ( $\beta = 0.266$ ,  $t = 3.401$ ,  $p = 0.001$ ), validating H1. Product excellence similarly exhibited a significant positive impact ( $\beta = 0.254$ ,  $t = 5.369$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ). Finally, perceived pricing emerged as the dominant predictor with the strongest effect ( $\beta = 0.462$ ,  $t = 8.103$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ), substantiating H3.

### 3.4. Discussion

The positive link between brand image and purchasing aligns with consumer tendencies to favor strong, trusted brands during pre-purchase alternative evaluations (Nasri et al., 2023). The "company image" indicator scored highest, meaning local buyers prioritize corporate responsibility and complaint resolution over mere product aesthetics (Putri et al., 2025). This mirrors Anisa et al., (2024), conclusions that corporate trust underpins the foundational evaluation of the product itself. This finding is particularly critical given that this study strictly examines the initial purchase decision rather than repeat purchasing behavior or habituation. For consumers deciding whether to execute an initial transaction for a product—especially one recently subjected to negative social media exposure—a responsible corporate image serves as the primary risk-mitigation tool. If the brand fails to project a trustworthy image during this evaluative stage, the initial purchase intention is typically abandoned before the physical product attributes are even considered.

The significance of product caliber emphasizes that reliable quality fulfills buyer expectations (Utami et al., 2024). Ease of use produced the highest loading among the product quality indicators, indicating that practicality and hygiene, which allow consumers to consume the product directly without additional preparation, weighed more heavily in the purchase decision than durability or taste superiority (Adonis & Silintowe, 2021). This finding corresponds with Valerio et al., (2025), who reported that product quality significantly influenced purchase decision for Mie Gacoan products in South Tangerang, reinforcing that practicality and consumption safety remain central considerations for ready-to-eat food products. In the context of first-time or spontaneous buying decisions, visual cues of product quality—such as secure, hygienic, and informative packaging—function as silent sales drivers. Because prospective buyers cannot evaluate the taste or internal texture prior to their initial trial, they rely heavily on these external, tangible quality attributes to justify taking the risk on their first purchase.

Pricing perception's leading influence confirms that buyers evaluate costs based on perceived fairness and value, not merely low prices (Kotler et al., 2022). Price to quality conformity produced the highest loading

among the price perception indicators, suggesting that Surabaya consumers evaluate price primarily in terms of whether it corresponds fairly to the benefit and safety of the product received, rather than simply favoring the lowest price (Sandra & Prawoto, 2024). This result supports Latifa et al., (2023), who found that price perception significantly influenced purchase decision for Mie Sedaap products, and further indicates that for a brand whose pricing strategy has come under public scrutiny, restoring perceived price fairness may be the most consequential lever for recovering purchase decisions. When consumers are on the verge of executing an initial purchase, cognitive dissonance often arises. A pricing strategy that clearly communicates value conformity effectively resolves this dissonance, acting as the final psychological catalyst that converts initial interest into an actual purchase. Therefore, strategies that explicitly align the price with functional benefits are crucial to stimulate initial product trials among skeptical consumers.

### 3.5. Supplementary Descriptive Statistics of Research Variables

To complement the measurement and structural model results above, respondent answers for each indicator were also examined descriptively, capturing how consumers rated brand image, product quality, price perception, and purchase decision in practice. Each item was measured on a five-point Likert scale, where 1 denotes strongly disagree and 5 denotes strongly agree, and the mean score for every indicator was computed from the full sample of 112 respondents.

Table 4. Respondent Response Frequency for Brand Image (X1)

| No | Statement                                                                                                       | SD<br>(1) | D<br>(2) | N<br>(3) | A<br>(4) | SA<br>(5) | Total | Mean |
|----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|-------|------|
| 1  | Company image — So Nice's producer is seen as a responsible, trustworthy processor that handles complaints well | 1         | 11       | 25       | 46       | 29        | 112   | 3.81 |
| 2  | Product image — So Nice is regarded as a distinctive, practical ready-to-eat snack made from safe ingredients   | 1         | 6        | 30       | 44       | 31        | 112   | 3.88 |
| 3  | User image — consuming So Nice does not carry a negative image and remains socially acceptable                  | 2         | 10       | 26       | 46       | 28        | 112   | 3.79 |

Source: Primary data processed, 2026

The mean scores for Brand Image (X1) indicators ranged from 3.79 to 3.88, with an overall construct mean of 3.82, placing consumer perception in the moderately favorable range on the five-point scale and indicating room for improvement rather than a fully positive assessment.

Table 5. Respondent Response Frequency for Product Quality (X2)

| No | Statement                                                                                             | SD<br>(1) | D<br>(2) | N<br>(3) | A<br>(4) | SA<br>(5) | Total | Mean |
|----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|-------|------|
| 1  | Workmanship — the product arrives physically intact and fit for consumption                           | 2         | 10       | 19       | 46       | 35        | 112   | 3.91 |
| 2  | Ease of use — the packaging is practical and hygienic enough to consume without further preparation   | 1         | 12       | 22       | 49       | 28        | 112   | 3.81 |
| 3  | Durability — the product resists spoilage and mold and keeps a consistent taste without refrigeration | 1         | 10       | 27       | 43       | 31        | 112   | 3.83 |
| 4  | Product superiority — the texture is firm and the meat flavor is dominant                             | 1         | 18       | 19       | 53       | 21        | 112   | 3.67 |
| 5  | Product attributes — packaging is neatly designed with legible BPOM, halal, and expiry information    | 0         | 10       | 18       | 48       | 36        | 112   | 3.98 |

Source: Primary data processed, 2026

The mean scores for Product Quality (X2) indicators ranged from 3.67 to 3.98, with an overall construct mean of 3.84, placing consumer perception in the moderately favorable range on the five-point scale and indicating room for improvement rather than a fully positive assessment.



Table 6. Respondent Response Frequency for Price Perception (X3)

| No | Statement                                                                                        | SD<br>(1) | D<br>(2) | N<br>(3) | A<br>(4) | SA<br>(5) | Total | Mean |
|----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|-------|------|
| 1  | Price affordability — the price feels fair despite being relatively low                          | 1         | 19       | 26       | 34       | 32        | 112   | 3.69 |
| 2  | Price competitiveness — So Nice remains preferred despite similar pricing to competitors         | 2         | 23       | 25       | 42       | 20        | 112   | 3.49 |
| 3  | Price-to-quality conformity — the price matches the composition and taste delivered              | 1         | 16       | 23       | 36       | 36        | 112   | 3.80 |
| 4  | Price-to-benefit conformity — the price paid remains worth the practicality and satiety obtained | 0         | 14       | 26       | 42       | 30        | 112   | 3.79 |

Source: Primary data processed, 2026

The mean scores for Price Perception (X3) indicators ranged from 3.49 to 3.80, with an overall construct mean of 3.69, placing consumer perception in the moderately favorable range on the five-point scale and indicating room for improvement rather than a fully positive assessment.

Table 7. Respondent Response Frequency for Purchase Decision (Y)

| No | Statement                                                                              | SD<br>(1) | D<br>(2) | N<br>(3) | A<br>(4) | SA<br>(5) | Total | Mean |
|----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|-------|------|
| 1  | Product steadiness — respondents feel no hesitation choosing So Nice over other brands | 2         | 9        | 34       | 51       | 16        | 112   | 3.62 |
| 2  | Purchase habit — So Nice is a routine, go-to choice for ready-to-eat snacking          | 5         | 9        | 39       | 42       | 17        | 112   | 3.51 |
| 3  | Willingness to recommend — respondents are willing to recommend So Nice to others      | 2         | 8        | 42       | 43       | 17        | 112   | 3.58 |
| 4  | Repurchase intention — respondents intend to keep buying So Nice in the future         | 3         | 9        | 33       | 43       | 24        | 112   | 3.68 |

Source: Primary data processed, 2026

The mean scores for Purchase Decision (Y) indicators ranged from 3.51 to 3.68, with an overall construct mean of 3.60, placing consumer perception in the moderately favorable range on the five-point scale and indicating room for improvement rather than a fully positive assessment.

#### 4. CONCLUSION

Ultimately, this investigation verifies that perceived price, product caliber, and brand reputation act as significant positive drivers of buying choices for So Nice sausages in Surabaya, collectively accounting for 60.1% of decision variance. These findings suggest that the brand's recent decline in market performance is closely tied to how consumers perceive the company's credibility, the consistency of the product's physical quality, and the fairness of its pricing relative to the benefits received. From a theoretical standpoint, this research contributes to the literature on crisis marketing by demonstrating that during periods of negative brand sentiment, the hierarchy of consumer decision-making shifts. Rational evaluations—specifically the alignment between price and functional benefits—become the primary catalyst for initial purchase decisions, overshadowing traditional emotional brand appeals.

These findings carry direct implications for marketing strategy. Because price perception exerts the strongest influence on purchase decision, pricing and value-communication strategies should take priority over cosmetic branding efforts in the short term, with the company reframing price relative to product benefits rather than competing on the lowest price alone. Concurrently, repositioning must center on rebuilding consumer trust to restore the brand's favorable status, while strict product quality assurance is necessary to legitimize pricing and marketing claims.

Based on these findings, the company is advised to respond to customer complaints openly and promptly rather than defensively, in order to rebuild the trust eroded by recent reputational incidents. Stricter quality control during distribution and retail storage is also recommended to minimize the recurrence of physical defects reported by consumers. In addition, greater transparency regarding raw material composition on product packaging may help address public suspicion surrounding the brand's pricing strategy. To operationalize this, the company is encouraged to launch an educational digital marketing campaign detailing the sourcing and manufacturing processes of their meat products, directly tackling consumer skepticism. Furthermore,

introducing limited-time promotional pricing or trial-sized packaging could effectively lower the barrier to entry, encouraging hesitant consumers to make that crucial first transaction without perceiving a high financial risk.

Theoretically, this research contributes to the broader literature on marketing by demonstrating that while brand image suffers during negative virality, robust price-to-quality conformity can act as a crucial buffer to sustain market share. This study is limited to the initial purchase decision of So Nice consumers in Surabaya and does not capture other potentially relevant factors such as word of mouth, consumer trust, or food safety assurance. The cross-sectional nature of this data captures consumer sentiment only at a specific point in time. Future researchers should incorporate these elements and expand their geographical focus to build a more comprehensive understanding of ready-to-eat meat consumption behavior. Specifically, future studies are strongly encouraged to integrate mediating variables such as perceived risk, brand trust, or electronic word-of-mouth (eWOM) to map the psychological pathways leading to a purchase. Moreover, applying a longitudinal research design would allow academics and practitioners to accurately monitor how effectively a brand recovers its initial purchase appeal over time following a reputational crisis.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors extend their gratitude to the Faculty of Economics and Business at the "Veteran" National Development University of East Java for its academic support, and to all respondents who participated in the survey. We also thank advisor Mr. Hery Pudjoprastyono for his guidance.

## REFERENCES

- Adonis, M. R., & Silintowe, Y. B. R. (2021). Desain Produk, Kualitas Produk, Citra Merek dan Harga Produk Terhadap Keputusan Pembelian Generasi Y. *JURNAL CAPITAL: Kebijakan Ekonomi, Manajemen Dan Akuntansi*, 3(1), 118–138. <https://doi.org/10.33747/capital.v3i1.80>
- Anisa, T. N., Winarno, S. T., & Atasa, D. (2024). Pengaruh Persepsi Harga, Kualitas Produk, dan Citra Merek Terhadap Keputusan Pembelian Konsumen Produk Frozen Seafood "AHAA!" ICS Food di Sidoarjo. *Jurnal Ilmiah Respati*, 15(1), 59–71. <https://doi.org/10.52643/jir.v15i1.3717>
- Badan Pusat Statistik. (2025). Rata-rata Konsumsi Perkapita Seminggu Menurut Kelompok Daging Per Kabupaten/Kota-Komoditas 2025. Badan Pusat Statistik. <https://www.bps.go.id/id/statistics-table/2/MjU1MiMy/rata-rata-konsumsi-perkapita-seminggu-menurut-kelompok-daging-per-kabupaten-kota-komoditas-2025.html>
- Charviandi, A., Noviany, H., Suhartini, Y., Wijaya, A., & Abdullah, M. A. F. (2023). *Manajemen Pemasaran (Perspektif Digital Marketing)*. CV. Eureka Media Aksara.
- Fikri, A., & Pudjoprastyono, H. (2023). The Influence of Price Perception and Product Quality Perception on Indomie Purchasing Decisions in Surabaya. *International Journal of Economics (IJE)*, 2(2), 549–562. <https://doi.org/10.55299/ijec.v2i2.595>
- Ghozali, I., & Kusumadewi, K. A. (2023). *Partial Least Squares Konsep Teknik dan Aplikasi Menggunakan Program SmartPLS 4.0 Untuk Penelitian Empiris (1st ed.)*. Penerbit Yoga Pratama.
- Hair, J. F., J., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2022). *A Primer on Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) (3rd ed.)*. SAGE Publications.
- Herlina, R., Arifah, H., Susana, E., Nurlimah, N., Aryanti, I., & Lubis, R. (2025). Komunikasi Strategis Sebagai Upaya Meningkatkan Citra Perusahaan: Studi Kasus PT Agavi di Industri Pangan Strategic Communication as an Effort to Improve Corporate Image: A Case Study of PT Agavi in The Food Industry. *Jurnal Studi Komunikasi dan Media*, 29(2), 125–144. <https://doi.org/doi.org/10.56873/jskm.2025.6036>
- Islamiyah, K., & Soebiantoro, U. (2022). Pengaruh Citra Merek dan Kualitas Produk terhadap Keputusan Pembelian pada Produk Mi Instan Sarimi (Studi pada Mahasiswa yang Sedang Kuliah di Surabaya). *Jurnal Ilmiah Universitas Batanghari Jambi*, 22(3), 1567. <https://doi.org/10.33087/jiubj.v22i3.2579>

- Khairullah, R., & Vildayanti, R. A. (2024). Pengaruh Citra Merek, Persepsi Harga dan Kualitas Produk Terhadap Keputusan Pembelian. *EKOMA: Jurnal Ekonomi, Manajemen, Akuntansi*, 3(6), 1125–1136. <https://doi.org/10.56799/ekoma.v3i6.5082>
- Kotler, P., Keller, K. L., Chernev, A., Sheth, J. N., & Shainesh, G. (2022). *Marketing Management*. Pearson Education (Global Edition).
- Latifa, M. N., Huzaimah, S., & Gunaningrat, R. (2023). Pengaruh Kualitas Produk Dan Persepsi Harga Dalam Pengambilan Keputusan Pembelian Produk Mie Sedaap. *Jurnal Publikasi Ilmu Manajemen*, 3(1), 49–61. <https://doi.org/10.55606/jupiman.v3i1.3254>
- Mardiana, D., & Sijabat, R. (2022). Widya Cipta: Jurnal Sekretari dan Manajemen Analisis Faktor-Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Keputusan Pembelian. *Widya Cipta: Jurnal Sekretari Dan Manajemen*, 6, 9–13. <http://ejournal.bsi.ac.id/ejurnal/index.php/widyacipta>
- Mardiyatno, L., & Astuti, M. (2021). The Effect of Products, Prices, and Advertising on the Purchase Decision of So Nice Sausage Products PT So Good Food (Japfa) in Sidoarjo. *Academia Open*, 5. <https://doi.org/10.21070/acopen.5.2021.1718>
- Nasri, S., Karnit, L., Shamandour, M., & Khnouf, V. (2023). The Effect of Brand Image on Customer Purchase Decision. *Journal of Service, Innovation and Sustainable Development*, 4(1), 59–71. <https://doi.org/10.33168/SISD.2023.0106>
- Nisa, K. (2022). Pengaruh Persepsi Harga, Citra Merek, dan Word of Mouth terhadap Keputusan Pembelian (Studi Produk Kopi Janji Jiwa Tanjung Duren Jakarta). *Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen Terapan*, 4(1), 44–47. <https://doi.org/10.31933/jimt.v4i1>
- PT Global Loyalty Indonesia Tbk. (2025, December 1). Memantau Permintaan Makanan Instan pada 2025: Apakah Makanan Instan Masih Menarik di Kalangan Konsumen? GLI Insight Hub. <https://gli.id/memantau-permintaan-makanan-instan-pada-2025-apakah-makanan-instan-masih-menarik-di-kalangan-konsumen>
- Putri, E. N., Kurniawan, D., & Husadha, C. (2025). Pengaruh Brand Image, Promosi, dan Kualitas Produk Terhadap Keputusan Pembelian Air Minum Dalam Kemasan Merek Le Minerale (Studi Kasus Pada Mahasiswa Prodi Manajemen Universitas Bhayangkara Jakarta Raya Angkatan 2021). *Jurnal Ilmiah Ekonomi Dan Manajemen*, 3, 349–360. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.61722/jiem.v3i8.6140>
- Riani, O., Wijayanto, G., & Riau, U. (2023). Pengaruh Brand Image Dan Celebrity Endorser Terhadap Brand Loyalty Dan Repurchase Intention Pada Konsumen Produk Maybeline Di Kota Pekanbaru. In *Management Studies and Entrepreneurship Journal* (Vol. 4, Number 1). <http://journal.yrpiiku.com/index.php/msej>
- Sandra, T. J., & Prawoto, P. (2024). Pengaruh Kualitas Produk, Persepsi Harga, Dan Kualitas Pelayanan Terhadap Keputusan Pembelian Pada Kedai Kopi Konnichiwa. *Jurnal Maneksi*, 13(2), 370–377. <https://doi.org/10.31959/jm.v13i2.2176>
- Utami, R. N., Muslikh, & Oktavia, D. (2024). The Effect of Product Quality, Price Perception on Purchasing Decisions with Purchase Intention as Mediating. *Marketing and Business Strategy*, 1(2), 80–92. <https://doi.org/10.58777/mbs.v1i2.228>
- Valerio, J., Azizi, H. Z., & Siboro, S. M. (2025). Pengaruh Kualitas Produk terhadap Keputusan Pembelian Dimediasi Citra Merek (Studi Kasus Mie Gacoan di Tangerang Selatan). *Sanskara Manajemen Dan Bisnis*, 4(01), 248–255.
- Winalda, I. T., & Sudarwanto, T. (2021). Pengaruh Word Of Mouth dan Kualitas Produk Terhadap Keputusan Pembelian di Rumah Makan Bebek Sinjay Bangkalan. *Jurnal Pendidikan Tata Niaga (JPTN)*, 10(1), 1573–1582. <https://doi.org/10.26740/jptn.v10n1.p1573-1582>