The Contrarian: Finance, Accounting, and Business Research
Volume 5, Issue 2, 2026
pp. 472-483

Social media, brand image, and price perception as predictors of purchase decisions: Evidence from kopi kenangan consumers in Manado, Indonesia

Koinonia Tires
Corresponding author:
koinoniatires2@gmail.com
Sam Ratulangi University
Indonesia

Agus Supandi Soegoto
Sam Ratulangi University
Indonesia

Jane Grace Poluan
Sam Ratulangi University
Indonesia

Received 15 September 2026
Revised 17 November 2026
Accepted 18 November 2026
Published online 19 November 2026

DOI: 10.58784/cfabr.518

ABSTRACT

This study examines whether social media, brand image, and price perception are associated with the purchase decisions of Kopi Kenangan consumers in Manado, Indonesia, a regional market in which prior findings for this brand are mixed. A cross-sectional questionnaire survey of 100 customers, recruited through purposive sampling offline and online, was analyzed with multiple linear regression. Social media and brand image were positively and significantly associated with purchase decisions, with effects of comparable and moderate size. Price perception showed no significant association, and its confidence interval included zero, so no direction of effect can be inferred. Together, the three predictors explained about one quarter of the variance in purchase decisions. The study provides jointly estimated effects, confidence intervals, and effect sizes for three commonly studied predictors in an Eastern Indonesian city. Informative social media content and a consistent brand image are associated with purchase decisions, whereas the study offers no evidence for or against a price-perception association. Non-probability sampling, a single time point, self-reported data, and modestly reliable price and purchase-decision scales limit generalization.

Keywords: social media; brand image; price perception; purchase decision; Kopi Kenangan;
JEL Classification: M31; M37

©2026 Koinonia Tires, Agus Supandi Soegoto, Jane Grace Poluan

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

1. Introduction

Coffee has become a routine consumer product in Indonesia, and consumers increasingly buy not only a physical product but also information, convenience, and an experience offered by a brand (Kotler et al., 2022). Domestic coffee consumption rose from about 4.42 million 60-kg bags in 2014/15 to 4.80 million in 2018/19 (Annur, 2020) and was about 4.8 million bags in both 2023/24 and 2024/25 (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Foreign Agricultural Service [USDA FAS], 2024). In a market whose volume has been broadly stable, modern grab-and-go coffee

chains compete on service speed, digital ordering, and brand appeal.

Kopi Kenangan, founded in 2017, describes itself as the first new-retail food and beverage unicorn to emerge from Southeast Asia (Niessner, 2022). In the Top Brand Index for the "kedai kopi" (coffee shop) subcategory, it ranked second in 2024 (TBI = 39.0%) and 2025 (TBI = 39.3%), behind Janji Jiwa (44.8% and 42.1%, respectively), and first in 2026 (TBI = 45.9%, against 35.0% for Janji Jiwa) (GoodStats, 2026; Top Brand Award, 2025). The brand operates an outlet in the Megamas area of Manado, where menu variation and café atmosphere have been examined as correlates of purchase decisions (Lantu et al., 2024).

A purchase decision can be understood as a process in which consumers evaluate alternatives in response to marketing stimuli before a transaction (Schiffman & Wisenblit, 2019). Three stimuli are widely studied in the Kopi Kenangan literature: social media, brand image, and price. Their reported associations with purchase decisions, however, are not uniform. Table 1 summarizes the closest prior studies.

Table 1. Closest prior studies on Kopi Kenangan (and a comparable chain) and purchase decisions

Study	Setting and sample	Predictors	Method	Main finding for purchase decision
Songgigilan et al. (2023)	Mega Mall area, Manado; n = 100	Brand image, price	Multiple regression	Brand image (β = 0.331) and price (β = 0.537) positive and significant
Aviliani (2024)	Cimahi; n = 92	Price, promotion, brand image	Quantitative survey	All three significant individually and jointly (54.4% of variance)
Ar-Rasyid et al. (2023)	Kopi Kenangan consumers; n = 195	Social media marketing activities, price perception	SEM	Both significant
Putri et al. (2024)	DP Mall, Semarang; n = 104	Social media marketing, brand awareness, brand image	SEM-PLS	Social media marketing significant; brand image negative, not significant
Zakiy & Praswati (2025)	Solo; n = 123	Social media marketing, brand image, brand awareness, trust	SEM-PLS	Social media marketing and brand image positive but not significant; brand awareness significant
Anto & Siratan (2026)	Instagram users who bought Kopi Kenangan; n = 262	Social media marketing, brand image, emotional attachment	SEM-PLS	Brand image significant (β = 0.174); social media marketing not significant (β = 0.063)
Nisa (2022)	Janji Jiwa, Jakarta	Price perception, brand image, word of mouth	Quantitative survey	Price perception positive but not significant; others significant
This study	Kopi Kenangan, Manado; n = 100	Social media, brand image, price perception	Multiple regression	See Results

Source: Compiled by the authors from the cited studies. Study characteristics are as reported in the published abstracts or articles.

Three observations follow from Table 1. First, the effect of social media marketing is significant in some studies (Ar-Rasyid et al., 2023; Putri et al., 2024)

and not significant in others (Anto & Siratan, 2026; Zakiy & Praswati, 2025). Second, brand image is significant in Manado (Songgigilan et al., 2023) and several other cities (Aviliani, 2024; Juliyanti et al., 2024; Warganegara & Safitri, 2023) but not in two SEM-PLS studies that modeled mediators (Putri et al., 2024; Zakiy & Praswati, 2025). Third, price or price perception is usually significant (Aviliani, 2024; Ar-Rasyid et al., 2023; Farrel & Sofia, 2026; Songgigilan et al., 2023), with at least one exception (Nisa, 2022). These studies differ in setting, sampling, constructs, and estimator, so the pattern is suggestive rather than conclusive.

The unresolved question is therefore under what measurement and sampling conditions each predictor retains a direct association with purchase decisions when all three are estimated together. The existing Manado evidence for Kopi Kenangan covers brand image and price (Songgigilan et al., 2023) or menu and atmosphere (Lantu et al., 2024); to our knowledge among the studies reviewed here, none includes social media, brand image, and price perception in one model for this city. This study is a context-specific extension rather than a replication, and it asks four research questions: (RQ1) Is social media associated with purchase decisions? (RQ2) Is brand image associated with purchase decisions? (RQ3) Is price perception associated with purchase decisions? (RQ4) Do the three predictors jointly explain a significant share of the variance in purchase decisions?

This study contributes, to our knowledge among the studies reviewed here, the first joint estimate of the associations of social media, brand image, and price perception with Kopi Kenangan purchase decisions in Manado, reported with confidence intervals and effect sizes. The remainder of the paper presents the theoretical foundation and hypotheses (Section 2), the method (Section 3), the results (Section 4), the discussion (Section 5), and the conclusions, implications, and limitations (Section 6).

2. Literature review

2.1 Theoretical foundation

The study draws on the Stimulus–Organism–Response (S–O–R) framework, in which stimuli shape internal evaluations that lead to behavioral responses (Jacoby, 2002; Mehrabian & Russell, 1974). Information on social media, brand cues, and price information are the stimuli; consumers' perceptions of them are the evaluations; and the purchase decision is the response. Customer-based brand equity theory adds that brand associations produce differential consumer response to marketing (Keller, 1993), and the means–end model of price, quality, and value holds that consumers weigh perceived price against perceived quality and benefits (Zeithaml, 1988). H1–H3 are directional and H4 is an omnibus test.

2.2 Constructs

Social media (X_1) is an internet-based medium for creating and exchanging content (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010) that firms use for marketing communication and consumer interaction (Chaffey & Ellis-Chadwick, 2022; Kotler & Keller, 2016). It is measured through perceived ease of use, trust, and information quality of the brand's accounts (six items); these indicators do not cover the entertainment, interaction, and word-of-mouth dimensions of fuller scales (Godey et al., 2016). Brand image (X_2) is the set of perceptions and associations held in consumer memory (Keller, 1993), measured with eight items on price image, product image, brand reputation, and product superiority. Price perception (X_3) is the judgment of monetary sacrifice relative to the quality and benefits received (Zeithaml, 1988); six items capture affordability, price–quality and price–

benefit fit, competitiveness, ability to pay, and price flexibility, so the construct is labeled price perception. Purchase decision (Y) is the choice to buy after need recognition, information search, and evaluation of alternatives (Kotler & Armstrong, 2018; Kotler & Keller, 2016; Schiffman & Wisenblit, 2019), measured with seven items (product choice, brand choice, channel, timing, amount, confidence, recommendation).

2.3 Hypothesis development

Social media and purchase decisions.

Under the S–O–R logic, informative and trustworthy social media content lowers the effort of information search and can make a brand easier to choose (Kotler et al., 2022). Supportive evidence comes from Kopi Kenangan consumers (Ar-Rasyid et al., 2023; Putri et al., 2024), and from Manado students buying local products (Poluan et al., 2024). Contrary evidence reports a positive but non-significant direct association (Zakiy & Praswati, 2025; Anto & Siratan, 2026), and Anto and Siratan suggested that largely informational exposure does not automatically lead to purchase. Plausible reasons for the divergence are measurement (marketing activity versus perceived platform quality), mediated model structures, sampling from online users versus in-store customers, and estimator (SEM-PLS versus OLS). Because this study measures perceived information quality and trust and samples both offline and online customers, a positive direct association is expected.

H_1: Social media is positively associated with purchase decisions of Kopi Kenangan products in Manado.

Brand image and purchase decisions.

Strong, favorable brand associations are expected to produce a more favorable response to the brand (Keller, 1993). Brand image was significant for Kopi Kenangan in Manado (Songgigilan et al., 2023) and elsewhere (Anto & Siratan, 2026; Aviliani, 2024; Juliyanti et al., 2024; Warganegara & Safitri, 2023). It was not significant in two models in which trust, awareness, or attachment were included as additional pathways (Putri et al., 2024; Zakiy & Praswati, 2025), which suggests that part of the brand-image effect may run through other constructs. Because the present model has no mediators, a positive total association is expected.

H_2: Brand image is positively associated with purchase decisions of Kopi Kenangan products in Manado.

Price perception and purchase decisions.

When consumers judge price as affordable and consistent with quality and benefits, perceived value increases and purchase become more likely (Zeithaml, 1988). Significant positive associations were reported for Kopi Kenangan (Ar-Rasyid et al., 2023; Aviliani, 2024; Farrel & Sofia, 2026; Songgigilan et al., 2023) and for a nearby retail setting in Megamas, Manado (Karundeng et al., 2021). Contrary evidence is thinner: one study of a competing chain reported a positive but non-significant effect (Nisa, 2022). Plausible reasons for such divergence are measurement (price level versus perceived affordability and value), the weight of promotions in the price offer, differences in respondent mix, and low variance when most customers rate prices similarly. Because this study measures perceived affordability and fit with quality and benefits, and because most of the evidence for this brand is supportive, a positive association is expected.

H_3: Price perception is positively associated with purchase decisions of Kopi Kenangan products in Manado.

Joint effect.

An omnibus test is non-directional and is satisfied when at least one predictor

contributes, so it is stated as a model-fit hypothesis and placed last.

H_4: Social media, brand image, and price perception jointly explain a significant proportion of the variance in purchase decisions.

3. Research method

3.1 Design

The study is a cross-sectional, quantitative survey with an associative design (Sugiyono, 2023). It tests whether social media (X_1), brand image (X_2), and price perception (X_3) are associated with purchase decision (Y). Because the data are single-wave, self-reported, and observational, the results are interpreted as associations and not as causal effects.

3.2 Population, sampling, and sample size

The target population was consumers who had bought Kopi Kenangan products in Manado through a physical outlet or an ordering application. No sampling frame was available, so the population was treated as unknown in size. Seven days of direct observation in March 2026 at one Kopi Kenangan outlet in Manado recorded 133 customers. This count is only a rough indication of customer flow at that outlet; it is not the population size and was not used in the sample-size calculation.

The sample size was computed with the Lemeshow formula for an unknown population (Lemeshow et al., 1990), $n = Z^2p(1 - p)/d^2$, where $Z = 1.96$ (95% confidence), $p = .5$, and $d = .10$, giving $n = (1.96)^2(.5)(.5)/(.10)^2 = 96.04$, rounded up to 100 respondents.

The formula assumes simple random sampling, whereas respondents were selected by non-probability purposive sampling with three criteria: having purchased Kopi Kenangan products in Manado at least once, being at least 17 years old, and being willing to complete the questionnaire. A sensitivity analysis ($\alpha = .05$, power = .80, $df_2 = 96$) indicates that single-predictor effects of $f^2 \geq 0.08$ and an overall effect of $f^2 \geq 0.11$ could be reliably detected (authors' calculation); smaller effects could not. Purposive sampling limits generalization beyond the respondents.

3.3 Instrument and measurement

Primary data were collected with a closed questionnaire on a five-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree), distributed offline at the outlet and online through a digital form, after a pre-test of item comprehension. The 27 statements (six for social media, eight for brand image, six for price perception, seven for purchase decision) were specified by the authors from the cited definitions. Scale scores are item sums. The purchase-decision composite analyzed in SPSS sums items Y1–Y6; item Y7 (willingness to recommend) was collected but is not part of it. Two brand-image items (X2.1, X2.2) refer to price image and overlap with the price construct, and some price indicators overlap conceptually.

Validity was assessed with Pearson item–total correlations (valid if $r > .195$, $df = 98$, $\alpha = .05$), a lenient criterion; no construct-level validity evidence such as factor analysis is available. Reliability was assessed with Cronbach's alpha (Cronbach, 1951) against the conventional .70 benchmark (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994); values of .60–.70 are treated as marginal and values below .60 as low. Likert composites were treated as interval-level variables, a common but debated practice.

3.4 Data analysis

Classical assumptions were checked in line with common practice (Hair et al., 2019): normality of residuals (Kolmogorov–Smirnov), multicollinearity (tolerance and VIF), and heteroscedasticity (residual scatterplot). The model was estimated in SPSS 26:

$$Y = a + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + b_3X_3 + e \quad (1)$$

where Y is purchase decision, a the constant, b_1–b_3 the regression coefficients, X_1 social media, X_2 brand image, X_3 price perception, and e the error term. SPSS reports two-tailed p-values; directional hypotheses (H1–H3) were judged by the sign of the coefficient together with $p < .05$, which is conservative for one-sided predictions. The F-test addressed H4. Confidence intervals, effect sizes ($f^2 = t^2/df$ for predictors and $R^2/(1 - R^2)$ for the model; Cohen, 1992), and the model without price were computed from the reported coefficients, standard errors, and t-values. Descriptive statistics, correlations, item analysis, and robustness checks (Breusch–Pagan and Glejser tests, HC3 standard errors, 5,000 bootstrap resamples, Cook's distance, Shapiro–Wilk test, and Harman's single-factor test) were computed from the respondent-level data (Python, statsmodels).

4. Results and discussion

4.1 Respondent profile

Of the 100 respondents, 41% were male and 59% female. By age, 11% were 17–25 years, 55% were 26–40 years, and 34% were 41–60 years (bands as recorded; the band tabulated as "40–60" is read as 41–60). By monthly purchase frequency, 17% bought 0–3 times, 41% 4–6 times, 12% 7–10 times, and 30% more than 10 times. Thus 89% were older than 25 and 83% bought at least four times per month, so the sample consists mainly of adult, frequent customers and not of the Generation Z segment often emphasized in the literature.

4.2 Descriptive statistics

Table 2 reports descriptive statistics and reliability. Respondents rated all constructs high: mean item scores were 4.05–4.27 on the five-point scale, and 80–93% of item responses were 4 or 5. Variability was small (standard deviations of item-mean scores 0.31–0.41), indicating a restricted range and probable ceiling effects, especially for price perception and purchase decision. Skewness and kurtosis were within ±1 for all composites. Social media and brand image correlated positively with purchase decision ($r = .44$ and .38, $p < .001$), whereas price perception correlated slightly negatively and not significantly ($r = -.10$); the predictors were weakly related to each other ($|r| = .06$–$.20$).

Table 2. Descriptive statistics and reliability of the composite scores

Variable	k	M	SD	Min–Max	Skew	Kurt	M per item (SD)	α
Social media (X_1)	6	25.31	2.47	20–29	−0.18	−0.65	4.22 (0.41)	0.790
Brand image (X_2)	8	32.38	3.06	26–39	0.00	−0.06	4.05 (0.38)	0.748
Price perception (X_3)	6	25.61	2.09	18–30	−0.15	0.74	4.27 (0.35)	0.664
Purchase decision (Y)	6[a]	25.18	1.84	21–29	0.12	−0.37	4.20 (0.31)	0.597

Source: Authors' calculation from the respondent-level data (n = 100); k = number of items.
[a] Composite of items Y1–Y6 as used in the regression; α for all seven items =0 .632.

4.3 Validity and reliability

All items had item–total correlations between .34 and .79, above the r-table threshold of .195, and were retained; corrected item–total correlations were positive and above .195 except item X2.4 (.15). Social media (α = .790) and brand image (α = .748) exceed .70; price perception (α = .664) is marginal; and the purchase-decision composite (Y1–Y6) has α = .597 (α = .632 with all seven items), below .60, so coefficients involving these two scales may be attenuated.

4.4 Classical assumption tests

The Kolmogorov–Smirnov test on the residuals (Z = 0.907, p = .383) does not reject normality. Tolerance values (.955–.993) exceeded .10 and VIF values (1.007–1.048) were below 10, indicating no problematic multicollinearity. The residual scatterplot showed no funnel-shaped pattern, and formal tests agreed: Breusch–Pagan $\chi^2(3) = 1.12$, p = .771; Glejser regressions, p = .24–.83; Shapiro–Wilk test on the residuals, p = .178. The largest Cook's distance was 0.14 and the largest leverage 0.17, and five observations exceeded the 4/n rule of thumb. Linearity was not examined formally.

4.5 Multiple regression

Table 3 presents the regression results. Social media was positively associated with purchase decisions (B = 0.277, 95% CI [0.146, 0.408], t(96) = 4.21, p < .001, f^2 = 0.18), as was brand image (B = 0.177, 95% CI [0.072, 0.282], t(96) = 3.32, p = .001, f^2 = 0.12). Price perception was not (B = −0.048, 95% CI [−0.201, 0.105], t(96) = −0.62, p = .537, f^2 = 0.004). Because the interval for price perception contains zero, the negative sign carries no interpretation; the data are compatible with small effects of either direction. The standardized coefficient of social media (β = .373) is numerically larger than that of brand image (β = .295), but the difference was not tested and is unlikely to be reliable at n = 100, so the two predictors are described as comparable in size and are not ranked.

Table 3. Multiple linear regression results (dependent variable: Purchase decision)

Predictor	B	SE	95% CI for B	β	t(96)	p	f^2
Constant	13.648	3.031	[7.632, 19.664]	—	4.50	< 0.001	—
Social media (X_1)	0.277	0.066	[0.146, 0.408]	0.373	4.21	< 0.001	0.18
Brand image (X_2)	0.177	0.053	[0.072, 0.282]	0.295	3.32	0.001	0.12
Price perception (X_3)	−0.048	0.077	[−0.201, 0.105]	−0.054	−0.62	0.537	0.004

Source: Authors' calculation based on SPSS output (2026). Confidence intervals and f^2 were computed by the authors from the reported B, SE, t, and df = 96.

4.6 Robustness checks

Conclusions were unchanged under HC3 robust standard errors and bootstrapped confidence intervals (5,000 resamples). Social media (HC3 SE = 0.083; bootstrap 95% CI [0.124, 0.433]) and brand image (SE = 0.058; [0.065, 0.284]) remained significant (HC3 p = .001 and p = .003), whereas price perception did not (SE = 0.076, p = .535; [−0.180, 0.106]). Harman's single-factor test gave a first unrotated factor explaining 18.1% of the variance in the 27 items, below the 50% criterion, which suggests that a single common factor does not dominate the data, although the test is a weak safeguard against common-method bias (Podsakoff et al., 2003).

4.7 Overall model fit

The model was significant, F(3, 96) = 12.35, p < .001. R = .528, R^2 = .279, and adjusted R^2 = .256, so the model explains about one quarter of the variance in purchase decisions and leaves about 74% unexplained; the overall effect size is f^2 = 0.39, above Cohen's (1992) benchmark of 0.35 for a large effect. A model without price perception gave R^2 = .276 and adjusted R^2 = .261, a change of ΔR^2 =0.003 that is not significant, F(1, 96) = 0.38, p = .537, so price perception adds essentially nothing to the explained variance in this sample. H1, H2, and H4 are supported; H3 is not supported.

4.8 Discussion

Social media

Social media was positively associated with purchase decisions with a medium-to-large effect ($f^2 = 0.18$). In S–O–R terms, perceptions of usable, trustworthy, and informative content are consistent with consumers having the information needed to choose the brand. The result agrees with Ar-Rasyid et al. (2023), Putri et al. (2024), and Poluan et al. (2024) but differs from Zakiy and Praswati (2025) and Anto and Siratan (2026). Our indicators capture perceived information quality and trust, which are closer to the purchase decision than exposure or content activity, and our respondents were mostly adult, frequent customers; neither explanation was tested, and tightly clustered ratings (Table 2) limit how well the scales discriminate between respondents.

Brand image

Brand image was also positively associated with purchase decisions ($f^2 = 0.12$). This agrees with Songgigilan et al. (2023), who studied the same brand in Manado, and with Aviliani (2024), Juliyanti et al. (2024), and Warganegara and Safitri (2023), and it is consistent with the view that favorable associations produce a more positive response to the brand (Keller, 1993). The non-significant direct effects in Putri et al. (2024) and Zakiy and Praswati (2025) arose in models with additional pathways; because the present model has no mediators, its coefficient may combine direct and indirect paths. This reading is a conjecture to be tested with mediation models.

Price perception

The study found no evidence of an association: the 95% CI [−0.201, 0.105] includes zero, the effect is negligible ($f^2 = 0.004$), and the result held under robust standard errors and bootstrapping. This contrasts with significant price effects in Songgigilan et al. (2023), Aviliani (2024), Ar-Rasyid et al. (2023), and Farrel and Sofia (2026), and is in line with Nisa (2022). Absence of significance is not evidence of absence, and measurement-related alternatives exist. First, the price scale ($\alpha = .664$) and the purchase-decision composite ($\alpha = 0.597$) have modest reliability, which attenuates coefficients. Second, respondents rated all price items high ($M = 4.27$ per item, $SD = 0.35$), leaving little variance to relate to purchase decisions. Third, the zero-order correlation was already slightly negative ($r = -.10$), and the discount item (X3.6) correlated negatively with purchase decision ($r = -.26$, $p = .009$), which may reflect a construct different from affordability and fit and warrants checking. Fourth, adults and frequent buyers may buy habitually; this is conjecture. Effects below $f^2 \approx 0.08$ could not be reliably detected, and price sensitivity itself was not measured, so the study cannot show whether customers are price-insensitive.

Joint effect

The significant F-test is not contradicted by the non-significant price coefficient, because the omnibus test is satisfied when at least one predictor contributes. The two-predictor model fits as well as the full model (adjusted $R^2 = .261$ versus $.256$), so retaining price perception rests on theoretical grounds. About three quarters of the variance remains unexplained, so determinants such as product quality, service quality, electronic word of mouth, or brand trust are likely missing.

5. Conclusions

Among 100 Kopi Kenangan customers in Manado, social media and brand image were positively associated with purchase decisions, with comparable effect sizes, while price perception showed no significant association and its confidence interval included zero. Together, the three predictors explained about one quarter of

the variance in purchase decisions. The results are consistent with the S–O–R framework and brand equity theory for social media and brand image, and they add a Manado data point to a literature in which the significance of each predictor varies. For price perception, the value-based mechanism of price, quality, and value was not detectable in this sample, but given the modest scale reliability and limited power this does not refute it. Practically, efforts to provide accurate, trustworthy social media information and to maintain a consistent brand image are supported by this evidence, whereas pricing decisions such as discounts, cashback, or bundling should rest on other evidence, such as transaction data or field experiments.

Because the design is cross-sectional and non-probabilistic, these findings are associations in this sample and not causal effects. The sample was drawn from a limited period and outlet(s) and was dominated by frequent adult customers, the data were single-wave and self-reported, and the price and purchase-decision scales had modest reliability, with ratings clustered near the top of the scale. Future studies should use multi-outlet probability sampling, longitudinal or experimental designs with demographic and purchase-frequency controls, and refined scales tested with confirmatory factor analysis or PLS-SEM. They should also compare perceived information quality and trust directly with activity-based social media scales, and include other determinants and mediators such as product quality, service quality, brand trust, and electronic word of mouth.

References

Annur, C. M. (2020, November 24). Domestic coffee consumption in Indonesia continues to increase over the past five years. *Databoks*. https://databoks.katadata.co.id/en/agroindustry/statistics/3ffb3ccce57b802/domestic-coffee-consumption-in-indonesia-continues-to-increase-over-the-past-five-years

Anto, J., & Siratan, E. D. (2026). SMM dan brand image pada pembelian Kopi Kenangan: Mediasi emotional attachment. *Business Management Journal, 22*(1), 58–73. https://doi.org/10.30813/bmj.v22i1.9668

Ar-Rasyid, M. H., Satiawan, A. A., Alfiansyah, & Hamid, R. S. (2023). Analisis dampak aktivitas pemasaran pada media sosial dan persepsi harga terhadap keputusan pembelian dan kepuasan konsumen. *Jesya (Jurnal Ekonomi & Ekonomi Syariah), 6*(2), 1873–1887. https://doi.org/10.36778/jesya.v6i2.1189

Aviliani. (2024). The influence of price, promotion and brand image on buying decisions on the contemporary drink product, Kopi Kenangan. *Jurnal Info Sains: Informatika dan Sains, 14*(3), 546–559. https://ejournal.seaninstitute.or.id/index.php/InfoSains/article/view/5480

Chaffey, D., & Ellis-Chadwick, F. (2022). *Digital marketing: Strategy, implementation and practice* (8th ed.). Pearson.

Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin, 112*(1), 155–159. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.112.1.155

Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika, 16*(3), 297–334. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02310555

Farrel, & Sofia, E. (2026). Kualitas produk, persepsi harga, dan promosi sebagai penentu keputusan pembelian [Product quality, price

perception, and promotion as determinants of purchasing decisions]. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen dan Bisnis, 27*(1), 68–81. https://doi.org/10.30596/jimb.v27i1.26430

Godey, B., Manthiou, A., Pederzoli, D., Rokka, J., Aiello, G., Donvito, R., & Singh, R. (2016). Social media marketing efforts of luxury brands: Influence on brand equity and consumer behavior. *Journal of Business Research, 69*(12), 5833–5841. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.04.181

GoodStats. (2026). *Top 3 kedai kopi terpopuler di Indonesia 2026, ada langgananmu?* https://data.goodstats.id/statistic/top-3-kedai-kopi-terpopuler-di-indonesia-2026-ada-langgananmu-zuFeL

Hair, J. F., Jr., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2019). *Multivariate data analysis* (8th ed.). Cengage Learning.

Jacoby, J. (2002). Stimulus-organism-response reconsidered: An evolutionary step in modeling (consumer) behavior. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 12*(1), 51–57. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327663JCP1201_05

Juliyanti, W., Sidanti, H., & Purwanto, H. (2024). Brand image, purchase intention & purchase decision: Studi perilaku konsumen "Kopi Kenangan hanya untukmu" [Brand image, purchase intention, and purchase decision: A consumer behavior study of "Kopi Kenangan hanya untukmu"]. *AMAL: Jurnal Ekonomi Syariah, 6*(1), 53–68. https://doi.org/10.33477/eksy.v6i1.7070

Kaplan, A. M., & Haenlein, M. (2010). Users of the world, unite! The challenges and opportunities of social media. *Business Horizons, 53*(1), 59–68. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2009.09.003

Karundeng, V. A., Soegoto, A. S., & Arie, F. V. (2021). Pengaruh kualitas pelayanan, harga, dan lokasi terhadap keputusan pembelian konsumen di Indomaret Point Kawasan Megamas saat pandemi Covid-19 [The influence of service quality, price, and location on consumer purchase decisions at Indomaret Point, Megamas area, during the Covid-19 pandemic]. *Jurnal EMBA: Jurnal Riset Ekonomi, Manajemen, Bisnis dan Akuntansi, 9*(4), 702–711. https://doi.org/10.35794/emba.v9i4.36506

Keller, K. L. (1993). Conceptualizing, measuring, and managing customer-based brand equity. *Journal of Marketing, 57*(1), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224299305700101

Kotler, P., & Armstrong, G. (2018). *Principles of marketing* (17th ed.). Pearson.

Kotler, P., & Keller, K. L. (2016). *Marketing management* (15th ed.). Pearson.

Kotler, P., Keller, K. L., & Chernev, A. (2022). *Marketing management* (16th ed.). Pearson.

Lantu, G. N., Tampi, J. R. E., & Tumbel, T. M. (2024). Pengaruh variasi menu dan cafe atmosphere terhadap keputusan pembelian konsumen di Kopi Kenangan kawasan Megamas Manado [The influence of menu variation and cafe atmosphere on consumer purchase decisions at Kopi Kenangan, Megamas area, Manado]. *Productivity, 5*(4), 1074–

1078. https://doi.org/10.35797/ejp.v5i4.55613

Lemeshow, S., Hosmer, D. W., Jr., Klar, J., & Lwanga, S. K. (1990). *Adequacy of sample size in health studies*. John Wiley & Sons.

Mehrabian, A., & Russell, J. A. (1974). *An approach to environmental psychology*. MIT Press.

Niessner, J. (2022, January 3). Indonesia coffee shop start-up achieves unicorn status. *AVCJ*. https://www.avcj.com/avcj/news/3025826/indonesia-coffee-shop-start-up-achieves-unicorn-status

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), 44–57. https://doi.org/10.31933/jimt.v4i1.1158

Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J.-Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(5), 879–903. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879

Poluan, J. G., Rondonuwu, C. N., & Karuntu, M. M. (2024). Pengaruh gaya hidup dan pemasaran media sosial terhadap keputusan membeli produk lokal (Studi pada mahasiswa FEB UNSRAT Manado). *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Bisnis dan Inovasi Universitas Sam Ratulangi (JMBI UNSRAT), 11*(3), 1796–1808. https://doi.org/10.35794/jmbi.v11i3.59250

Putri, D. A., Nurhayati, N., & Firdaus, F. (2024). The influence of social media marketing and brand awareness on purchasing decisions with brand image as a mediating variable in Kopi Kenangan. *Economics and Business International Conference Proceeding, 1*(2), 92–101. https://jurnalnew.unimus.ac.id/index.php/EBiC/article/view/427

Schiffman, L. G., & Wisenblit, J. (2019). *Consumer behavior* (12th ed.). Pearson.

Songgigilan, C., Tampi, J. R. E., & Walangitan, O. F. C. (2023). Pengaruh brand image dan harga terhadap keputusan pembelian produk Kopi Kenangan di kawasan Mega Mall [The influence of brand image and price on purchase decisions of Kopi Kenangan products in the Mega Mall area]. *Productivity, 4*(1), 100–111. https://ejournal.unsrat.ac.id/v3/index.php/productivity/article/view/46985

Sugiyono. (2023). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D* [Quantitative, qualitative, and R&D research methods]. Alfabeta.

Top Brand Award. (2025). *Komparasi brand index: Kedai kopi, 2023–2025* [Data set]. https://topbrand-award.com/komparasi_brand/bandingkan?id_award=1&id_kategori=2&id_subkategori=730

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Foreign Agricultural Service. (2024). *Indonesia: Coffee annual* (GAIN Report No. ID2024-0016). https://fas.usda.gov/data/indonesia-coffee-annual-8

Warganegara, T. L. P., & Safitri, D. (2023). Pengaruh promosi online dan brand image terhadap keputusan pembelian pada produk UMKM Kopi Kenangan Ruko Ahmad Yani di Bandar Lampung.

Jurnal EMT KITA, 7(2), 521–529. https://doi.org/10.35870/emt.v7i2.1159

Zakiy, F. F., & Praswati, A. N. (2025). Pengaruh social media marketing, citra merek, dan brand awareness terhadap keputusan pembelian dengan kepercayaan pelanggan sebagai mediasi pada konsumen Kopi Kenangan di Solo. *Indonesian Journal of Digital Business, 5*(4), 1900–1916. https://doi.org/10.17509/ijdb.v5i4.97476

Zeithaml, V. A. (1988). Consumer perceptions of price, quality, and value: A means-end model and synthesis of evidence. *Journal of Marketing, 52*(3), 2–22. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224298805200302