



The Effect Of Product Quality And Price On Purchase Decisions For Packaged Coffee In Surakarta City

Aditya Dwi Rizka Ismaila

Management Study Program, Faculty of Law and Business, Universitas Duta Bangsa Surakarta,
Indonesia

Corresponding Author e-mail: adityadra10@gmail.com

Article History:

Received : 28-08-2026

Revised : 18-10-2026

Accepted : 19-10-2026

Keywords: *Product Quality;
Price; Purchase Decision;
Packaged Coffee; Surakarta*

Abstract: *Purpose: This study examines the relationships of product quality and price with purchase decisions for packaged coffee in Surakarta City. Design/methodology/approach: A quantitative cross-sectional survey was conducted with 100 respondents selected through purposive sampling. Eligible respondents were Surakarta residents aged at least 17 years who had purchased packaged coffee at least twice in the previous three months. Data were collected using a five-point Likert-scale questionnaire and analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics 25, including validity and reliability tests, classical assumption tests, multiple linear regression, t-tests, an F-test, and coefficient of determination analysis. Findings: Product quality was positively and significantly associated with purchase decisions ($B = 0.187$, $t = 2.166$, $p = 0.033$). Price also showed a positive and significant association ($B = 0.604$, $t = 6.293$, $p < 0.001$) and was the stronger predictor based on its standardized coefficient. This positive relationship reflects favorable perceptions of affordability, price competitiveness, and price-value suitability, rather than an increase in nominal price. The regression model was statistically significant ($F = 60.044$, $p < 0.001$), with $R^2 = 0.553$ and adjusted $R^2 = 0.544$. Practical implications: Producers should maintain consistent product quality while strengthening affordability, price competitiveness, and perceived value for money. Originality/value: By examining packaged coffee across brands rather than focusing on a single brand, this study provides category-level evidence on the relative associations of product quality and price with purchase decisions in Surakarta. Because the study uses cross-sectional survey data, the findings indicate statistical associations rather than definitive causal relationships.*

How to Cite: Ismaila, A. D. R. (2026). The effect of product quality and price on purchase decisions for packaged coffee in Surakarta City. 4(4), pp.468-478. <https://doi.org/10.61536/escalate.v4i4.794>



<https://doi.org/10.61536/escalate.v4i4.794>

This is an open-access article under the [CC-BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/)
License.



Introduction

Competition in the food and beverage category encourages producers to understand why consumers choose one product among many alternatives that serve similar functions. Packaged coffee is one category that illustrates this condition because it is available as ground coffee, sachets, and ready-to-drink products, with wide variations in flavor, size, packaging, and price level. For urban consumers, convenience is an important attribute, yet purchase decisions are not determined by ease of use alone. Consumers continue to evaluate the quality they perceive and the financial sacrifice required to obtain the product. Studies across different contexts show that product quality and price repeatedly emerge as determinants of purchase decisions, although the strength of their effects is not always identical across products and consumer groups (Arianto et al., 2022; Putri & Handayani, 2025).

Purchase decisions are strategically important because they represent the stage at which consumer preferences are translated into the actual act of selecting and buying a product. In the coffee category, such decisions may be formed through evaluations of taste, aroma, durability, packaging design, affordability, and the extent to which the benefits received are commensurate with the price paid. Anggraeni and Soliha (2020), in a study of coffee consumers in Semarang, showed that product quality and perceived price are important parts of consumers' evaluations before purchase. More recent findings on Point Coffee likewise indicate that product quality and price can operate together in encouraging purchase decisions (Chaerunnisa & Safria, 2024). Thus, buying coffee is not merely a functional action but also reflects consumers' assessment of the value obtained from the product.

Product quality in this study is understood through characteristics that can be directly experienced by consumers. Its operationalization includes the availability of product variants, durability or shelf life, the conformity of taste and aroma quality with expectations, the aesthetics and practicality of packaging, and an overall assessment of quality relative to other brands. In packaged coffee, consistency across these attributes is important because consumers generally expect a relatively similar experience in each purchase. If the taste changes, the packaging is less practical, or quality is perceived to be inferior to competitors, confidence in purchasing may weaken. Conversely, stable quality can reduce perceived risk and strengthen the certainty of choice. Empirical evidence from Lingkar Coffee shows that product quality has a positive and significant effect on purchase decisions (Amalia et al., 2025), consistent with findings on Faste Coffee that place quality among the main factors influencing purchases (Jenita & Septiani, 2026).

Price is another dimension closely related to consumer evaluation because it directly determines the magnitude of economic sacrifice. In this study, price is assessed not only in nominal terms but also through affordability, competitiveness relative to other products, conformity with quality, and conformity with the benefits received. These considerations are especially important in the packaged-coffee category, where consumers face many alternatives across different price ranges. Consumers may accept a higher price when quality and benefits are considered commensurate, whereas price differences that are not accompanied by additional value may shift preference toward another brand. Mardiyanti and Andriana (2022) showed that price is a strong variable in purchase decisions for consumer products, while Ashara et al. (2025) found that perceived price positively affects purchase decisions for Kopi Kenangan. These findings reinforce the importance of approaching price as a perception of value rather than merely as a nominal figure.

Although many studies report positive effects of quality and price, the literature also presents



findings that are not entirely consistent. Purnama (2023) found that product quality significantly affected purchase decisions among coffee-shop consumers, whereas price did not show a significant effect. In contrast, Ashara et al. (2025) reported that product quality was not significant, while perceived price had a positive and significant effect. In the context of Noira Coffee, product quality had a positive effect, while perceived price instead showed a negative and significant direction (Ramadhan et al., 2026). These variations confirm that purchase decisions are contextual and are shaped by product characteristics, the intensity of competition, respondent profiles, and the manner in which consumers evaluate benefits. Therefore, testing the relationships in the packaged-coffee category in Surakarta remains relevant even though the variables have been widely examined.

This study examines packaged coffee as a general product category and does not restrict the analysis to a single brand. This choice provides a perspective that differs from many earlier studies focused on one coffee shop or one brand. Respondents could refer to the packaged coffee they purchased, whether ground coffee, sachets, or ready-to-drink products, so the results more broadly capture consumer considerations at the category level. Surakarta was selected as the research location, and the sample was dominated by consumers aged 21-25 years. This age profile makes affordability and utility particularly relevant because young consumers face many products that can be compared easily. Evidence on Good Day in an e-commerce channel also shows that quality and price are related to purchase interest and purchase decisions, indicating that both factors remain important when consumers have broad access to product alternatives (Wisnuwardhani et al., 2026).

The practical novelty of the study lies in measuring the relative strength of product quality and price within a single model among packaged-coffee consumers in Surakarta. This information can help producers set priorities. If quality exerts the greater influence, investment in product development may become the primary focus; if price is more dominant, firms need to ensure that price structure, package size, and the value proposition remain aligned with consumers' purchasing power. The systematic review by Putri and Handayani (2025) concludes that price and quality are two important aspects of consumer decisions in coffee- and cafe-based businesses, but category-level studies are still needed so that strategy is not guided only by findings from a single brand. On this basis, the present study tests empirical relationships using data from packaged-coffee consumers in Surakarta City.

The study aims to analyze: (1) the partial effect of product quality on purchase decisions; (2) the partial effect of price on purchase decisions; and (3) the simultaneous effect of product quality and price on purchase decisions for packaged coffee in Surakarta City. Three hypotheses are proposed: H1, product quality significantly affects purchase decisions; H2, price significantly affects purchase decisions; and H3, product quality and price simultaneously have a significant effect on purchase decisions. The hypotheses are tested using multiple linear regression so that the direction, magnitude, and significance of each variable's effect can be compared directly.

Research Methods

This study employed a quantitative approach with a cross-sectional survey design. The research object was consumers' purchase decisions regarding packaged-coffee products available in Surakarta City. The population comprised all packaged-coffee consumers in Surakarta, whose exact number was unknown. Given this population characteristic, the sample size was determined using the Lemeshow formula, resulting in 100 respondents. Sampling used a non-probability approach with purposive sampling. Respondents were required to meet three criteria: residing in Surakarta City, being at least 17 years old, and having purchased packaged coffee at least twice during the previous three months. The



repeated-purchase criterion was applied so that respondents had sufficient experience to evaluate product quality, price, and purchase decisions.

Primary data were collected through a questionnaire using a five-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Product quality (X1) was measured using five statements representing product variety, durability, the conformity of taste and aroma quality with expectations, packaging appearance or practicality, and overall quality relative to other brands. Price (X2) was measured using four statements concerning affordability, price competitiveness, price-quality conformity, and price-benefit conformity. Purchase decision (Y) was measured using four statements related to certainty in choosing a product, purchasing habits, willingness to recommend, and repeat purchase. This operationalization retained the thesis instrument as the primary data source, so the article does not alter the constructs or indicators that had already been tested.

Data were analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics version 25. The initial stage included validity testing through item-total correlations and reliability testing using Cronbach's alpha. Items were considered acceptable when their correlation coefficients exceeded the critical r value, while constructs were considered reliable when alpha values were above the 0.60 threshold applied in the original study. Prior to regression, the residuals were examined for normality, multicollinearity, and heteroscedasticity. Multicollinearity was evaluated using tolerance values and the variance inflation factor (VIF); the model was considered free from multicollinearity when tolerance exceeded 0.10 and VIF was below 10. Heteroscedasticity was assessed using the Glejser test with a significance criterion above 0.05.

The empirical model was specified as $Y = a + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + e$, where Y represents purchase decision, X_1 product quality, X_2 price, a the constant, and e the error term. Partial effects were tested using t -tests at a 5% significance level, while the joint effect was tested with the F -test. Model strength was evaluated through R -squared (R^2) and adjusted R -squared. Adjusted R -squared was prioritized when explaining the proportion of variation in purchase decisions because it corrects for the number of predictors included in the model. Respondent data were analyzed in aggregate; therefore, the article interprets group-level patterns and does not identify individual responses.

Result and Discussion

A total of 100 questionnaires that met the eligibility criteria were included in the analysis. By gender, respondents consisted of 63% men and 37% women. The age distribution was highly concentrated in the 21-25-year group, which represented 90% of the sample; respondents aged 17-20 years accounted for 6%, those aged 25-30 years for 3%, and those aged 31-35 years for 1%. In terms of domicile, respondents came from all five districts of Surakarta City, with the largest proportion in Laweyan (40%), followed by Banjarsari (19%), Pasar Kliwon (18%), Jebres (13%), and Serengan (10%). This composition indicates that the findings primarily represent the assessments of young adult consumers while still covering every district included in the study.

Table 1. Respondent Characteristics

Characteristic	Category	n	%
Gender	Male	63	63
Gender	Female	37	37
Age	17–20	6	6
Age	21–25	90	90
Age	25–30	3	3
Age	31–35	1	1
Domicile	Banjarsari	19	19
Domicile	Jebres	13	13
Domicile	Laweyan	40	40
Domicile	Pasar Kliwon	18	18
Domicile	Serengan	10	10

Source: Primary data processed with IBM SPSS Statistics 25 (2026).

Instrument testing showed that all items met the validity criterion. Item-correlation coefficients ranged from 0.780 to 0.868 for product quality, 0.816 to 0.869 for price, and 0.812 to 0.875 for purchase decision, all of which were higher than the critical r value of 0.194. Reliability was also adequate, with Cronbach's alpha values of 0.881 for product quality, 0.869 for price, and 0.871 for purchase decision. These results indicate good internal consistency and provide an adequate basis for proceeding to the regression analysis.

The classical-assumption tests indicated that the model was suitable for analysis. The normality test produced a Monte Carlo significance value above 0.05, indicating that the residuals were normally distributed. Product quality and price each had a tolerance value of 0.525 and a VIF of 1.904, well within the limits used to identify multicollinearity. In the Glejser test, the significance value was 0.712 for product quality and 0.590 for price, both above 0.05. Accordingly, no meaningful indication of heteroscedasticity was found. These diagnostic results are important because they indicate that the regression coefficients can be interpreted without major disturbance from high correlations among the independent variables or unequal residual variances.

Table 2. Instrument Reliability and Regression Diagnostics

Test	Product Quality (X1)	Price (X2)	Purchase Decision (Y)	Interpretation
Validity r -range	0.780–0.868	0.816–0.869	0.812–0.875	All items valid
Cronbach's alpha	0.881	0.869	0.871	Reliable
Tolerance	0.525	0.525	—	> 0.10
VIF	1.904	1.904	—	< 10
Glejser Sig.	0.712	0.590	—	No heteroscedasticity

Source: Primary data processed with IBM SPSS Statistics 25 (2026).

The estimated regression equation was $Y = 1.782 + 0.187X_1 + 0.604X_2 + e$. The product-quality coefficient of 0.187 indicates that a one-unit increase in perceived product quality, while holding price constant, is associated with a 0.187-unit increase in purchase decision. The price coefficient of 0.604 means that a one-unit increase in favorable evaluations of affordability and price appropriateness, while holding product quality constant, is associated with a 0.604-unit increase in purchase decision. Both coefficients are positive, although the price coefficient is substantially larger. The standardized beta coefficients show the same pattern, at 0.203 for product quality and 0.589 for price, indicating that price is the relatively stronger predictor in the model.

Table 3. Multiple Linear Regression and Hypothesis Testing

Predictor	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Decision
Constant	1.782	1.313	—	1.357	0.178	—
Product Quality (X1)	0.187	0.086	0.203	2.166	0.033	H1 accepted
Price (X2)	0.604	0.096	0.589	6.293	<0.001	H2 accepted

Source: Primary data processed with IBM SPSS Statistics 25 (2026).

Model summary: $R = 0.744$; $R^2 = 0.553$; *Adjusted $R^2 = 0.544$* ; *Std. Error of the Estimate = 2.266*; $F(2,97) = 60.044$; $p < 0.001$. H3 is accepted.

The partial test supports H1. Product quality produced a t-value of 2.166, exceeding the critical t-value of 1.984, with $p = 0.033$. At the 5% significance level, product quality therefore has a positive and significant effect on purchase decisions for packaged coffee in Surakarta City. This result indicates that variety, durability, conformity of taste and aroma, packaging appearance, and perceived overall quality remain considerations capable of strengthening consumers' choices. The finding is consistent with Arianto et al. (2022), Anggraeni and Soliha (2020), and Amalia et al. (2025), all of whom show that product quality can strengthen purchase decisions in different contexts. In markets containing many brands, quality functions as a differentiator that gives consumers a reason to maintain their choice.

From a consumer-behavior perspective, the effect of product quality can be explained through reduced uncertainty. Packaged coffee is frequently purchased for routine consumption, so consumers develop expectations regarding taste, aroma, ease of preparation, and packaging safety. Consistency in these attributes allows previous experience to be used in anticipating the next experience. When the product meets expectations, the purchase decision becomes easier because consumers do not need to evaluate all alternatives again from the beginning. Jenita and Septiani (2026) likewise show that quality is an important factor among young consumers of Faste Coffee, while Ramadhan et al. (2026) report a positive effect of quality on Noira Coffee consumers' decisions. The similarity in direction across these studies indicates that quality remains relevant across different forms of coffee businesses.

However, the magnitude of the product-quality effect in this study is smaller than the effect of price. This does not mean that quality is unimportant; rather, it suggests that after a minimum quality standard is satisfied, consumers may become more sensitive to differences in economic value among products. The result also helps explain differences from Ashara et al. (2025), who found no significant effect of product quality on purchases of Kopi Kenangan. Differences in the object of study can produce different degrees of quality homogeneity. For a particular brand, consumers may already treat quality as a basic attribute, leaving limited variation in their assessments; across multiple packaged-coffee brands, quality still varies and continues to explain purchase decisions. Product quality should therefore be



viewed as a competitive requirement that must remain consistent even when it is not the most dominant factor.

The practical implication of H1 is that producers should not rely solely on price promotions. The five quality indicators in the instrument provide concrete directions: maintain relevant product variety, preserve durability and product standards, ensure that taste and aroma match consumer expectations, improve packaging design and practicality, and maintain a favorable quality position relative to competitors. Adding new variants creates value only when consistency of taste is not sacrificed. Likewise, packaging design should support storage and ease of preparation rather than serving an aesthetic function alone. This strategy is consistent with Amalia et al. (2025), who recommend improving quality while maintaining competitive pricing in the coffee market.

H2 is also supported. Price produced a t-value of 6.293, far above the critical t-value of 1.984, with $p < 0.001$. The regression coefficient of 0.604 and standardized beta of 0.589 indicate that price is the most dominant variable in explaining purchase decisions within the model. The positive direction requires careful interpretation: a higher price score represents increasingly favorable perceptions of affordability, competitiveness, conformity with quality, and conformity with benefits, rather than an increase in the nominal price itself. Purchase decisions therefore become stronger when consumers perceive the price as more reasonable and valuable. This result is consistent with Mardiyanti and Andriana (2022), who also identify price as a strong variable, and with Chaerunnisa and Safria (2024), who demonstrate the role of price in Point Coffee purchase decisions.

The dominance of price can be associated with the packaged-coffee market, which offers extensive substitution possibilities. When consumers face many products with similar basic functions, comparing prices becomes simple and immediate. At the point of purchase, consumers can compare package sizes, serving quantities, variants, and prices across products. Consequently, a price difference perceived as inconsistent with the benefits offered can quickly shift preference. Wisnuwardhani et al. (2026) show that price together with quality affects purchase interest in Good Day coffee on Shopee, while Putri and Handayani (2025) identify price as an important factor in consumer decisions within coffee businesses. The present findings strengthen this evidence in a cross-brand packaged-product context in Surakarta.

Nevertheless, a pricing strategy should not be interpreted as a race to reduce prices. The indicators in this study emphasize appropriateness rather than simply low prices. A price that is too low may create doubts about quality, while a high price without additional benefits may reduce perceived value. Laksmana et al. (2026) emphasize the role of perceived value in connecting evaluations of quality and price with purchase decisions at Pandang Kopi. This value perspective is consistent with the pattern found here: consumers respond positively when a price is perceived as affordable while also being commensurate with quality and benefits. Management can therefore use package sizes, multipacks, bundling, or periodic promotions to strengthen perceived value without undermining the product's quality position.

Comparison with other studies also shows that the influence of price depends on context. Purnama (2023) found that price was not significant at the Gula Kopi coffee shop, while Ramadhan et al. (2026) found a negative and significant direction for perceived price at Noira Coffee. Such differences may arise because coffee-shop consumers also pay for service experience, atmosphere, location, and social interaction, whereas packaged coffee is more readily compared through product attributes and economic value. In the present study, price measured directly through affordability and appropriateness showed a strong effect. This indicates that packaged-coffee producers need to monitor perceived price relative to competitors rather than relying only on internal margin calculations.



H3 is supported by the simultaneous test. The calculated F-value of 60.044 exceeds the critical F-value of 3.090, with $p < 0.001$, indicating that product quality and price jointly have a significant effect on purchase decisions. The R value of 0.744 indicates a strong combined relationship between the predictors and purchase decision. The model summary reports $R^2 = 0.553$ and adjusted $R^2 = 0.544$. Thus, after adjustment for the number of predictors, approximately 54.4% of the variation in purchase decisions can be explained by product quality and price, while the remaining 45.6% is associated with factors outside the model. Reporting both the raw R^2 and adjusted R^2 provides a more precise interpretation of the coefficient of determination.

The magnitude of adjusted R^2 shows that two relatively straightforward variables can explain more than half of the variation in respondents' purchase decisions. This result is consistent with Arianto et al. (2022), Mardiyanti and Andriana (2022), Amalia et al. (2025), and Jenita and Septiani (2026), who support the simultaneous relationship of quality and price with purchase decisions. The remaining unexplained variation nevertheless remains important. Brand image, digital promotion, service quality in sales channels, product availability, word of mouth, consumption habits, and taste preferences may also contribute to purchasing decisions. Ashara et al. (2025) demonstrate the importance of brand image alongside perceived price, while Ramadhan et al. (2026) include word of mouth in explaining coffee-consumer behavior. These findings provide room for expanding the model in future research.

From a managerial perspective, the simultaneous findings indicate the need to balance quality and pricing strategies. Reducing prices without maintaining taste, safety, and packaging standards may offer short-term gains but weaken trust. Conversely, increasing quality to the point that prices rise far beyond market purchasing power may reduce attractiveness. A more appropriate combination is to establish consistent quality standards, develop innovations that consumers can genuinely perceive, and then determine price levels according to the value of the benefits communicated. Firms can also differentiate variants by size or features to serve segments with different purchasing power without lowering the product's core quality standards.

The respondent profile should be considered when applying these implications. Ninety percent of the sample was aged 21-25 years, so the conclusions mainly reflect the behavior of young adult consumers in Surakarta. This group has many product alternatives and can readily obtain price information from physical stores and digital channels. Price transparency, consistency of package size, and promotions that are easy to understand may therefore be important. However, the study did not measure occupation, income, or consumption intensity in detail, so price sensitivity should not be generalized directly as an effect of income level. The findings only show that, in a sample dominated by young consumers, price evaluation has the largest effect coefficient.

The dominance of price can also be interpreted as a characteristic of competition at the category level. Unlike a purchase decision involving one specific brand, respondents in this study evaluated packaged coffee across multiple brands and formats. In such circumstances, consumers have greater opportunity to substitute when one product offering does not meet expectations. Price is an easily observed comparison cue, whereas some quality attributes can only be evaluated after consumption. Affordability and price competitiveness may therefore function as an initial screening mechanism before consumers assess taste, aroma, or usage experience. This pattern does not reduce the importance of quality; instead, quality determines whether a purchase encouraged by favorable price perceptions can be sustained as a habit and repeat purchase. Wisnuwardhani et al. (2026), in examining the relationships among quality, price, purchase interest, and decisions for Good Day coffee, support the view that the

two variables should be managed as a complementary value proposition.

Across the studies reviewed, at least three empirical patterns can be identified. First, both quality and price are significant, as reported by Arianto et al. (2022), Chaerunnisa and Safria (2024), and Amalia et al. (2025). Second, quality is more prominent than price, as found by Purnama (2023) and Jenita and Septiani (2026). Third, perceived price is stronger or remains significant when quality is not significant, as shown by Ashara et al. (2025). The Surakarta study belongs to the first pattern, but with a much stronger price effect than quality. Differences across studies show that marketing strategies cannot simply replicate priorities from other coffee businesses. Firms need to monitor their own consumer data and examine whether changes in price, quality, packaging, or variants produce the same response in the intended segment. Regression results therefore provide a basis for prioritization rather than a reason to disregard other factors outside the model.

At the operational level, the four price indicators carry different implications. Affordability concerns consumers' ability to include the product within their routine budget. Competitiveness requires firms to understand their relative position against comparable products of similar size and function. Price-quality conformity requires the promised product attributes to be clearly visible or experienced, while price-benefit conformity emphasizes consumption efficiency, ease of preparation, and the satisfaction obtained. Because the standardized beta for price reaches 0.589, management of these four dimensions deserves primary attention. Pricing policies should nevertheless be assessed together with quality indicators so that discounts, size changes, or reformulation do not create a perception of declining quality. The perceived-value approach discussed by Laksmana et al. (2026) is relevant for integrating both sides into a single consumer evaluation.

The findings can also be translated into marketing communication. Promotional messages that only emphasize a low price may be insufficient if consumers do not understand the benefits they receive. Conversely, abstract quality claims are unlikely to change decisions when they are not supported by evidence that consumers can readily recognize. Producers can communicate variants, taste characteristics, packaging practicality, number of servings, and price advantages in an integrated manner so that consumers can compare product value quickly. Such a strategy is consistent with the model, which shows that quality and price operate significantly at the same time. For retailers, clear information about price and package size can also help consumers evaluate alternatives without increasing search effort. For producers, consistency between packaging, promotional materials, and prices across channels is important so that value perceptions do not become fragmented. These implications are recommendations and should be tested further through experimental research or sales data.

Another limitation lies in the purposive-sampling technique and the coverage of a single city, meaning that the findings are not intended as estimates of the national population of packaged-coffee consumers. The study also relies on perceptual data collected at one point in time and therefore does not capture preference changes caused by seasonality, promotions, or new product launches. In addition, a cross-brand category object increases general relevance but does not allow detailed comparisons among individual brands. Future studies may use probability sampling when a sampling frame is available, expand the geographic scope, add variables such as brand image and digital promotion, or apply multigroup designs to compare brands, product formats, and age groups. These approaches can test whether the dominance of price observed in Surakarta remains consistent across different market segments.



Conclusion and Recommendation

The study concludes that product quality has a positive and significant effect on purchase decisions for packaged coffee in Surakarta City, with a coefficient of 0.187, $t = 2.166$, and $p = 0.033$. Price also has a positive and significant effect, with a coefficient of 0.604, $t = 6.293$, and $p < 0.001$, and is the relatively stronger predictor based on its standardized coefficient. Simultaneously, product quality and price produce $F = 60.044$ with $p < 0.001$. The model has $R^2 = 0.553$ and adjusted $R^2 = 0.544$, indicating that the two variables explain a substantial proportion of the variation in purchase decisions. The findings reinforce that consumers not only require consistent quality but also evaluate affordability and the correspondence between price and the benefits they receive.

Packaged-coffee producers are advised to maintain consistency in taste, aroma, durability, and packaging quality while continuing to develop relevant variants. On the pricing side, priority should be given to affordability, competitiveness, and a clear value-for-money proposition through appropriate package sizes, periodic promotions, or bundling without lowering quality standards. Future research may incorporate brand image, digital marketing, service quality, word of mouth, or perceived value and may expand the geographic coverage and sample size. A more diverse sample is also needed to test whether the dominance of price continues to appear across groups with different ages, income levels, and coffee preferences.

Acknowledge

The author expresses sincere appreciation to all packaged-coffee consumers in Surakarta City who participated in the data collection and to the Management Study Program, Faculty of Law and Business, Universitas Duta Bangsa Surakarta, for the academic support provided during the completion of this study.

References

- Amalia, F., Prabawani, B., & Purbawati, D. (2025). The influence of quality product and price on purchase decision on Lingkar Coffee. *Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi Bisnis*, 14(4), 1382–1390. <https://doi.org/10.14710/jiab.2025.47392>
- Anggraeni, A. R., & Soliha, E. (2020). Kualitas produk, citra merek dan persepsi harga terhadap keputusan pembelian (Studi pada konsumen Kopi Lain Hati Lamper Kota Semarang). *Al Tijarah*, 6(3), 96–107. <https://doi.org/10.21111/tijarah.v6i3.5612>
- Arianto, N., Asmalah, L., & Rahmat, F. (2022). Pengaruh kualitas produk dan harga terhadap keputusan pembelian studi pada pengguna Mas Cleaner. *Jurnal Pemasaran Kompetitif*, 5(2), 194–203. <https://doi.org/10.32493/jpkpk.v5i2.18521>
- Ashara, L. F., Rachmawati, E., Tubastuvi, N., & Septin, T. (2025). The influence of product quality, brand image and price perception on purchase decisions of Kopi Kenangan. *International Journal of Business and Applied Economics*, 4(5), 2951–2964. <https://doi.org/10.55927/ijbae.v4i5.268>
- Chaerunnisa, K. A., & Safria, D. (2024). Pengaruh kualitas produk dan harga terhadap keputusan pembelian pada Point Coffee di Kebon Besar Tangerang. *Jurnal Ekonomi, Manajemen dan Perbankan*, 10(3), 249–264. <https://doi.org/10.35384/jemp.v10i3.650>



- Jenita, R. J., & Septiani, M. (2026). The influence of product quality, price, and brand image on product purchase decisions at Faste Coffee. *EKOMBIS REVIEW: Jurnal Ilmiah Ekonomi dan Bisnis*, 14(2), 2219–2230. <https://doi.org/10.37676/ekombis.v14i2.9830>
- Laksmiana, I. N. H., Widhiari, L. K. P., Rinaldi, E., & Fauziah, L. (2026). Perceived value mediates product quality and price effects on purchases at Pandang Kopi, Gianyar, Bali. *Jurnal Manajemen Bisnis dan Kewirausahaan*, 6(1), 98–108. <https://doi.org/10.22219/jamanika.v6i1.43299>
- Mardiayanti, M., & Andriana, A. N. (2022). Pengaruh harga dan kualitas produk serta review produk terhadap keputusan pembelian produk Scarlett Whitening. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Kewirausahaan*, 10(3), 1091–1109. <https://doi.org/10.47668/pkwu.v10i3.560>
- Purnama, O. (2023). Pengaruh kualitas produk, kualitas layanan, dan harga terhadap keputusan pembelian konsumen coffee shop “Gula Kopi”. *Jurnal Performa: Jurnal Manajemen dan Start-up Bisnis*, 8(3), 281–293. <https://doi.org/10.37715/jp.v8i3.3964>
- Putri, N. A., & Handayani, S. (2025). Systematic literature review (SLR): The influence of price and product quality on consumer purchase decisions at cafes in Indonesia. *American Journal of Economic and Management Business*, 4(6), 692–697. <https://doi.org/10.58631/ajemb.v4i6.253>
- Ramadhan, R., Madjid, R., & Razak, A. (2026). Pengaruh word of mouth, persepsi harga dan kualitas produk terhadap keputusan pembelian konsumen pada Noira Coffee Kendari. *HORIZON: Indonesian Journal of Multidisciplinary*, 4(2), 120–133. <https://doi.org/10.54373/hijm.v4i2.5328>
- Wisnuwardhani, P., Huda, F. A., & Suparno, S. (2026). Pengaruh kualitas produk dan harga melalui minat beli terhadap keputusan pembelian Kopi Good Day di Shopee. *Suluh Pembangunan: Journal of Extension and Development*, 8(2), 66–72. <https://doi.org/10.23960/jsp.Vol8.No02.2026.454>

