



# Marketing Mix Analysis on the Purchase Decision of Processed Beef Products for MSMEs in Malang, Indonesia

Rizki Prafitri<sup>1,\*</sup>, Priyo Sugeng Winarto<sup>1</sup>, Puji Akhiroh<sup>1</sup>, Rizkia Kurnia Pratami<sup>1</sup>, Mochammad Syahrul Ramadhani<sup>1</sup>, Ary Nurdiansah<sup>1</sup>, and Jihan Maghfiro Alrina<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Faculty of Animal Science, Universitas Brawijaya, Malang 65145, Indonesia  
\*rizkiprafitri@ub.ac.id

**Abstract.** This study aims to analyze the consumer characteristics and identify marketing mix factors that affect consumer purchase decisions for processed beef products in Malang, Indonesia. This research was carried out from July to August 2024, involving 300 consumer respondents from 10 micro, small, and medium enterprises (MSMEs) spread across Malang City and Malang Regency. The method used in this study was descriptive quantitative using surveys with purposive and simple random sampling technique. Data analysis was carried out using the Validity Test, Reliability Test, and Multiple Linear Regression Test, which included four variables, namely product, price, place, and promotion. The results of the study showed that consumer characteristics based on gender are dominated by women, with the majority working as self-employed, having the last high school education, aged between 19-30 years, and having an average income between Rp1,000,000 to Rp3,000,000. The results of the validity and reliability test on four variables were valid and reliable. The results of the t-test showed that product variables and promotional variables had a significant influence on purchase decisions, while price variables and place variables did not show a significant influence on purchasing decisions of processed beef products from MSMEs in Malang City and Malang Regency.

**Keywords:** Purchase Decision, Consumer, Processed Beef Products, MSMEs.

## 1 Introduction

Beef consumption in Indonesia has increased because public awareness of fulfilling animal protein is rising [1]. The increase in beef consumption in Indonesia is also due to the rise in the number of people; the level of beef consumption in Indonesia will also continue to increase, while if the number of people in Indonesia decreases, the number of beef consumption in Indonesia will also decrease [2]. Beef consumption in Indonesia has increased significantly due to the rising awareness of animal protein benefits and population growth. According to the Central Statistics Agency (BPS), beef consumption in Indonesia reached approximately 695,390 tons in 2022, with a population of 274 million. This figure increased to an estimated 816,790 tons in 2023 as the population

© The Author(s) 2025

I. Novianti et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Environmentally Sustainable Animal Industry (ICESAI 2024)*, Advances in Biological Sciences Research 45,

[https://doi.org/10.2991/978-94-6463-670-3\\_57](https://doi.org/10.2991/978-94-6463-670-3_57)

grew to 278.84 million [3]. This upward trend creates substantial opportunities for micro, small, and medium enterprises (M.S.M.E.s) in the food processing industry, particularly those producing processed beef products. These products cater to the increasing demand for convenient, protein-rich food options, supporting the growth of MSMEs as a vital component of the national economy.

Processed meat has been altered through salting, preservation, fermentation, heat treatment (smoking and cooking), or other processes to improve sensory characteristics and preservation [4]. Beef is a livestock commodity that is one of the sources of animal protein [5]. Beef, a source of animal protein, can be made into various food products. Food products from beef include meatballs, nuggets, shredded sausages, rendang, jerky, and so on [6]. Beef provides a source of high-quality protein (essential amino acids), fats, B complex vitamins, and minerals such as iron and water, all of which are essential for the growth and development of the body [7]. The protein content in beef has a vital role in meeting the daily nutritional needs of humans in order to support various organ functions and increase the stamina humans need to carry out daily activities. Beef is often used in various processed foods, from traditional to modern cuisines, and is an integral part of many diets in different cultures [8]. With product innovation, MSMEs can add value to beef raw materials.

M.S.M.E.s are business activities run by individuals, households, or small-scale business entities. Usually, M.S.M.E. businesses are classified through annual revenue, number of employees, and assets owned [9]. M.S.M.E.s are one of the business sectors in national economic growth that must be empowered and developed. M.S.M.E.s have several potential strengths that can become the center of business development in the future, namely: a. Job providers in the small industrial business sector that can absorb up to 50% of the available workforce; b. Small and medium enterprises have been proven to create new entrepreneurs that can generate the growth and development of new entrepreneurs; c. Have its own unique market business, using simple and flexible management of possible market changes; d. Able to empower the natural resources around them, small industries can mainly utilize waste or products from large industries or other industries. It has the potential to develop [10].

Malang City is a city in the province of East Java, Indonesia. The city is located in the southern part of East Java and is known as an educational city with its humid climate and beautiful scenery. Malang is a popular tourist destination and attracts visitors with its historical sites, beautiful parks and gardens, and active volcanoes. Malang is known for its rich culinary culture, with various traditional and street foods reflecting the city's diverse cultural heritage [11]. Culinary tourism in Malang City offers a variety of choices, flavors, and qualities, which makes culinary visitors even more interested in exploring their culinary experiences. One of the famous culinary specialties in Malang City is Malang Meatballs. Therefore, the development of culinary tourism is the right step. Offering culinary tourism as the main attraction can take advantage of tourist visits, which is one of the added values and attractions of Malang City [12]. Beef is the main ingredient in various Malang dishes that are popular with the public, such as Malang meatballs, rawon, meat soup, and other processed meats. This creates opportunities for M.S.M.E.s in the processed beef sector to develop and meet high market demand. With excellent market potential, support from various parties, and the enthusiasm of

M.S.M.E. actors, the processed beef industry in Malang is believed to continue to advance and become one of the culinary icons of this city.

The success of M.S.M.E.s in this field will boost the local economy and inspire M.S.M.E.s in other regions to continue to innovate and develop. In addition, the beef processing M.S.M.E. industry in Malang Regency also plays an important role in providing a source of protein for the community. Malang Regency, one of the regions in East Java Province, has the potential to be developed. Regional development efforts must begin with an analysis of the condition and potential of the region, which is then used as a basis for developing a regional development strategy. This strategy needs to consider the relationship between the community's socio-economic development, the potential of natural resources, and the availability of facilities and infrastructure that support economic activities in the region [13].

Efforts to maintain the number of customers are carried out through marketing mix analysis aimed at increasing sales and competing with other micro-businesses. Some companies and business actors make the marketing mix strategy a key element in their marketing system. This strategy involves managing product, price, promotion, and distribution variables to influence buyer and consumer decisions. Implementing an effective marketing mix strategy is critical to maintaining business continuity and expanding consumer reach [14]. The marketing mix is a series of tactical tools that companies can use to trigger the desired response from consumers in the targeted market. This mix plays a role in influencing consumer purchasing decisions. [15]. Therefore, it is necessary to study the characteristics of consumers and the most dominant marketing mix factors that influence the decision to purchase processed beef products from M.S.M.E.s in Malang.

## **2 Materials and Methods**

### **2.1 Location and Time of Data Collection**

The research was conducted in Malang Regency and City from July to August 2024. There were 300 consumer respondents from 10 micro, small, and medium enterprises (M.S.M.E.s) spread across Malang City and Malang Regency.

### **2.2 Research Methods**

This study uses a descriptive quantitative method with a survey approach. Quantitative descriptive is a statistical analysis used to describe, summarize, and analyze quantitative data obtained through surveys [16]. Meanwhile, Bungin [17] explained that the descriptive survey method is a research method that studies the characteristics of the sample and allows the results to be generalized to a wider Population.

### 2.3 Sample Determination Method

**Determination of Respondents.** The determination of respondents in this study uses a simple random sampling method, carried out randomly regardless of the level or Population group [18]. The criteria for respondents to be selected to fill out the questionnaire are respondents who are at least 17 years old or older, have bought processed meat products.

**Determination of MSMEs.** The determination of M.S.M.E.s is determined by purposive sampling. Purposive sampling is the selection of samples by determining several criteria first so that samples not included in the criteria are not used [19]. The criteria used by the first researcher is to determine M.S.M.E.s in Malang City and Regency and have a business turnover of at least 100 million/month that sells processed beef products that are willing to support the running of the research.

**Research Variables.** The observation variables used in this study are:

1. Products (x1)
  - a. Product Flavor (X1.1)
  - b. Product Variations (X1.2)
  - c. Product Packaging (X1.3)
2. Price (x2)
  - a. Price Compatibility (X2.1)
  - b. Discount (x2.2)
  - c. Price Affordability (x2.3)
3. Place (x3)
  - a. Location Access (x3.1)
  - b. Cleanliness of the Place (X3.2)
  - c. Parking (x3.3)
4. Promotion (x4)
  - a. Ad Marketing (X4.1)
  - b. Brochure Deployment (x4.2)
  - c. Print Media Marketing (x4.3)

#### Data Collection Methods

*Primary Data.* Primary data is data obtained directly from data sources by researchers. Data is obtained from respondents directly by researchers by providing structured questions such as questionnaires, interviews, and observations [20].

*Secondary Data.* Secondary data is data that was first written and reported by previous researchers. This data is taken from internet sources or journals that discuss research on marketing mix analysis [20].

## Data Analysis Techniques

*Validity Test.* Validity is a measure that indicates the level of validity or authenticity of an instrument. A valid or valid instrument has high validity. On the other hand, an instrument that is less valid means that it has a crack validity. The validity test uses Pearson correlation analysis to determine whether the instrument item is valid or not [21].

*Reliability Test.* Reliability is a research instrument or a test used to determine whether the questionnaire used in taking research data has been said to be reliable. In the reliability test, the research was carried out using Alpha Cronbach with a reference value of  $>0.6$ . If the Alpha Cronbach value variable is  $>0.6$ , it can be concluded that the variable tested is said to be reliable or consistent in measuring [22].

*Multiple Linear Regression Test.* This study uses multiple linear regression analysis. Multiple linear regression analysis is a linear relationship between two or more independent variables with one dependent variable used to predict or forecast the value of a dependent variable based on an independent variable [23]. In addition, linear regression tests are also helpful in measuring the strength of the relationship between two or more variables and showing the direction of the relationship between the dependent variable and the independent variable.

## 3 Results and Discussion

### 3.1 Characteristics of Research Respondents

This study divides the characteristics of respondents to consumers of processed beef products in M.S.M.E.s into five categories: age, gender, last education, occupation, and monthly income. The characteristics of these respondents can be seen as follows:

**Characteristics of Respondents of Beef Processed Products in Malang MSMEs Based on Age.** Age is one of the critical factors in consumer perception when buying processed beef products because age affects consumer needs, preferences, and priorities in choosing food, mainly processed beef products. Below are the characteristics of consumer respondents of processed beef products in Malang M.S.M.E.s based on age, as follows.

**Table 1.** Characteristics of Respondents of Beef Processed Products in Malang MSMEs Based on Age.

| Age Group | Number of Respondents (People) | Percentage (%) |
|-----------|--------------------------------|----------------|
| 19-29     | 142                            | 48             |
| 30-39     | 109                            | 36             |
| >40       | 49                             | 16             |
| Total     | 300                            | 100            |

Based on Table 1. Most respondents are 19-29 years old, 48% or 142 people out of 300 respondents. At this age, many people choose a practical lifestyle because many young consumers are often busy with activities such as college, work, or participating in social activities, so they tend to choose food products that are easy and quick to prepare, such as processed beef (sausages, nuggets, meatballs, and corned beef). Processed beef products often require minimal preparation and can be eaten directly or only take a short time to heat up.

According to [24], the age range of 20-25 years is a productive age with various food needs. This age also tends to consume processed food products, which reduces the product's nutritional content. Baraja [25], as individuals age, individuals tend to become more selective in purchasing decisions, adjusting product choices to their consumption patterns.

**Characteristics of Respondents of Consumers of Processed Beef Products in Malang MSMEs by Gender.** The characteristics of respondents to consumers of processed beef products in MSMEs in Malang by gender are as follows:

**Table 2.** Characteristics of Respondents of Consumers of Processed Beef Products in MSMEs by Gender.

| Gender | Number of Respondents (People) | Percentage (%) |
|--------|--------------------------------|----------------|
| Man    | 113                            | 38             |
| Woman  | 187                            | 62             |
| Total  | 300                            | 100            |

Based on Table 2. The above shows that the gender of the respondents who consume the most processed beef products is female, with a percentage of 62%. This is because women generally play the role of housewives tasked with shopping. Female respondents also usually tend to buy processed beef products such as sausages, meatballs, or nuggets, offering practical and fast solutions for preparing food. Due to busyness or household responsibilities, women often look for products that can be processed quickly and still be liked by family members, especially children. In line with the research of [26], Most respondents who purchase UD Mitra Abadi frozen food products are women, with a percentage of 70%. This is because female consumers are more selective in choosing and consuming practical products that can be served quickly. In addition, frozen food products are also easy to obtain and available around the place of residence so that consumers can make frozen food products as a side dish, snack, or for resale also Sudirman et al. [27] stated that the gender of respondents who buy the most processed beef products is women (56.7%). This condition is because mostly women in Indonesia, as housewives, shop food products for their families.

**Characteristics of Respondents of Consumers of Processed Beef Products in Malang MSMEs Based on Education Level.** Consumers' level of education can affect their perception of buying processed beef products. Consumers with higher levels of education tend to be more critical in evaluating the quality, safety, and nutritional value

of the products they buy. They may be more concerned about processed beef products' labels, production processes, and health or environmental impacts. In addition, they may also be more concerned with certifications, such as organic or chemical-free labels, when choosing processed beef products. Below are the characteristics of respondents who consume processed beef products in Malang M.S.M.E.s based on their education, as follows.

**Table 3.** Characteristics of Respondents of Consumers of Processed Beef Products in Malang MSMEs Based on Education Level.

| Education | Number of Respondents (People) | Percentage (%) |
|-----------|--------------------------------|----------------|
| SD        | 4                              | 1              |
| SMP       | 37                             | 12             |
| SMA       | 191                            | 64             |
| College   | 68                             | 23             |
| Total     | 300                            | 100            |

Based on Table 3. Most respondents for processed beef products have the highest high school education status, with a percentage of 64%. The number of respondents who met at the end of high school education level was because they did not have enough money to continue to the university level; consumers with a high school education background generally have a pretty good understanding of fundamental aspects such as product quality, price, and safety. They tend to consider nutrition, hygiene, and product certification information more. However, they may not delve into more complex factors, such as the origin of the product or its production process. With high school education, consumers are also more sensitive to marketing and promotional campaigns related to these products. This is comparable to Putri and Tamami [28], stating that most respondents who buy frozen food products have a high school education percentage of 64%. This is because the level of education is very influential in buying products and pays great attention to the product to be consumed.

**Characteristics of Respondents of Beef Processed Products in Malang MSMEs Based on Type of Work.** Based on the results of this research, it can be proven that respondents in 10 M.S.M.E.s spread across Malang City and Regency have different jobs. Below are the characteristics of respondents who consume processed beef products in Malang M.S.M.E.s based on the Type of Job, as can be seen in Table 4.

Based on Table 4, The most common type of work of respondents is as an entrepreneur, with a percentage of 34%. The number of respondents who work as self-employed is due to busy entrepreneurs; processed beef products can be a practical option to save time in preparing food. These products are often ready-to-eat or require a shorter cooking time. Some self-employed people open businesses such as selling burgers, sausages, and meatballs, and they also buy processed beef products to be resold in several M.S.M.E.s spread across Malang Regency and City. This is also in line with the opinion

Fausayana and Marzuki [29] that the type of work owned by a person affects the pattern of purchasing goods and services, including purchasing livestock products.

**Table 4.** Characteristics of Respondents of Consumers of Processed Beef Products in Malang MSMEs Based on Type of Work.

| Work                     | Number of Respondents (People) | Percentage (%) |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|
| Student                  | 83                             | 28             |
| Self employed            | 104                            | 34             |
| Entrepreneur             | 44                             | 15             |
| Civil Servants/TNI/Polri | 12                             | 4              |
| Other                    | 57                             | 19             |
| Total                    | 300                            | 100            |

**Characteristics of Respondents of Consumers of Processed Beef Products in Malang MSMEs Based on Monthly Income.**

As shown in Table 5, the respondents for processed beef products based on monthly income, the most monthly income of Rp. 1,000,000 – Rp. 3,000,000 with a percentage of 56%. This happens because most consumers of processed beef products in Malang are respondents who have jobs as entrepreneurs and choose processed beef products for personal consumption or to be sold again. This is comparable to according to Nurjaman et al. [30] the factor that affects the goods a person purchases is income; a person with a high income tends to make high purchases and choose good quality.

**Table 5.** Characteristics of Respondents of Consumers of Processed Beef Products in Malang MSMEs Based on Monthly Income.

| Income per Month         | Number of Respondents (People) | Percentage (%) |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|
| < Rp. 1000.000           | 52                             | 17             |
| Rp. 1.000.000- 3.000.000 | 168                            | 56             |
| >Rp. 3.000.000           | 80                             | 27             |
| Total                    | 300                            | 100            |

### 3.2 Validity Test

A validity test is a test to ascertain whether a data collection instrument or questionnaire measures what it is supposed to measure. In S.P.S.S., validity tests are usually conducted by looking at the correlation between each question item and the total score. An instrument is valid if the Pearson Product Moment correlation value (r calculated) is greater than the r of the table at a certain level of significance (usually 0.05). If  $r_{\text{counts}} > r_{\text{table}}$ , then the item is considered valid. The R table in this study is 0.113.

#### Product Variable (X1)

**Table 6.** Validity Test Product Variable (X1).

|      |                     | Correlations |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |       |       |       |       |            |
|------|---------------------|--------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------------|
|      |                     | X1.1         | X1.2 | X1.3 | X1.4 | X1.5 | X1.6 | X1.7 | X1.8 | X1.9 | X1.10 | X1.11 | X1.12 | X1.13 | Produ<br>k |
| X1.1 | Pearson Correlation | 1            | .703 | .885 | .796 | .716 | .917 | .811 | .808 | .764 | .806  | 1.000 | .786  | .991  | .913       |
|      | Sig. (2-tailed)     |              | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000  | .000  | .000  | .000  | .000       |
|      | N                   | 300          | 300  | 300  | 300  | 300  | 300  | 300  | 300  | 300  | 300   | 300   | 300   | 300   | 300        |
| X1.2 | Pearson Correlation | .703         | 1    | .839 | .847 | .924 | .832 | .769 | .840 | .912 | .830  | .703  | .850  | .717  | .903       |
|      | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000         |      | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000  | .000  | .000  | .000  | .000       |
|      | N                   | 300          | 300  | 300  | 300  | 300  | 300  | 300  | 300  | 300  | 300   | 300   | 300   | 300   | 300        |
| X1.3 | Pearson Correlation | .885         | .839 | 1    | .814 | .814 | .923 | .831 | .794 | .772 | .800  | .885  | .803  | .879  | .928       |
|      | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000         | .000 |      | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000  | .000  | .000  | .000  | .000       |
|      | N                   | 300          | 300  | 300  | 300  | 300  | 300  | 300  | 300  | 300  | 300   | 300   | 300   | 300   | 300        |
| X1.4 | Pearson Correlation | .796         | .847 | .814 | 1    | .893 | .827 | .758 | .963 | .891 | .962  | .796  | .988  | .817  | .935       |
|      | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000         | .000 | .000 |      | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000  | .000  | .000  | .000  | .000       |
|      | N                   | 300          | 300  | 300  | 300  | 300  | 300  | 300  | 300  | 300  | 300   | 300   | 300   | 300   | 300        |
| X1.5 | Pearson Correlation | .716         | .924 | .814 | .893 | 1    | .884 | .821 | .897 | .876 | .881  | .716  | .905  | .729  | .926       |
|      | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000         | .000 | .000 | .000 |      | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000  | .000  | .000  | .000  | .000       |
|      | N                   | 300          | 300  | 300  | 300  | 300  | 300  | 300  | 300  | 300  | 300   | 300   | 300   | 300   | 300        |
| X1.6 | Pearson Correlation | .917         | .832 | .923 | .827 | .884 | 1    | .908 | .847 | .784 | .845  | .917  | .824  | .911  | .960       |
|      | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000         | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 |      | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000  | .000  | .000  | .000  | .000       |
|      | N                   | 300          | 300  | 300  | 300  | 300  | 300  | 300  | 300  | 300  | 300   | 300   | 300   | 300   | 300        |
| X1.7 | Pearson Correlation | .811         | .769 | .831 | .758 | .821 | .908 | 1    | .778 | .717 | .783  | .811  | .756  | .811  | .892       |
|      | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000         | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 |      | .000 | .000 | .000  | .000  | .000  | .000  | .000       |
|      | N                   | 300          | 300  | 300  | 300  | 300  | 300  | 300  | 300  | 300  | 300   | 300   | 300   | 300   | 300        |
| X1.8 | Pearson Correlation | .808         | .840 | .794 | .963 | .897 | .847 | .778 | 1    | .867 | .974  | .808  | .975  | .830  | .938       |
|      | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000         | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 |      | .000 | .000  | .000  | .000  | .000  | .000       |
|      | N                   | 300          | 300  | 300  | 300  | 300  | 300  | 300  | 300  | 300  | 300   | 300   | 300   | 300   | 300        |

The entire r-count on variable item X1 is more than the r-table which is 0.113. Therefore, the variable X1 is declared valid.

**Price Variable (X2)**

**Table 7.** Validity Test Price Variable (X2).

|       |                     | Correlations       |                    |                    |                    |                    |                    |                    |
|-------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
|       |                     | X2.1               | X2.2               | X2.3               | X2.4               | X2.5               | X2.6               | Harga              |
| X2.1  | Pearson Correlation | 1                  | .863 <sup>**</sup> | .807 <sup>**</sup> | .863 <sup>**</sup> | .941 <sup>**</sup> | .861 <sup>**</sup> | .953 <sup>**</sup> |
|       | Sig. (2-tailed)     |                    | .000               | .000               | .000               | .000               | .000               | .000               |
|       | N                   | 300                | 300                | 300                | 300                | 300                | 300                | 300                |
| X2.2  | Pearson Correlation | .863 <sup>**</sup> | 1                  | .811 <sup>**</sup> | .854 <sup>**</sup> | .839 <sup>**</sup> | .724 <sup>**</sup> | .910 <sup>**</sup> |
|       | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000               |                    | .000               | .000               | .000               | .000               | .000               |
|       | N                   | 300                | 300                | 300                | 300                | 300                | 300                | 300                |
| X2.3  | Pearson Correlation | .807 <sup>**</sup> | .811 <sup>**</sup> | 1                  | .869 <sup>**</sup> | .838 <sup>**</sup> | .758 <sup>**</sup> | .909 <sup>**</sup> |
|       | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000               | .000               |                    | .000               | .000               | .000               | .000               |
|       | N                   | 300                | 300                | 300                | 300                | 300                | 300                | 300                |
| X2.4  | Pearson Correlation | .863 <sup>**</sup> | .854 <sup>**</sup> | .869 <sup>**</sup> | 1                  | .926 <sup>**</sup> | .813 <sup>**</sup> | .952 <sup>**</sup> |
|       | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000               | .000               | .000               |                    | .000               | .000               | .000               |
|       | N                   | 300                | 300                | 300                | 300                | 300                | 300                | 300                |
| X2.5  | Pearson Correlation | .941 <sup>**</sup> | .839 <sup>**</sup> | .838 <sup>**</sup> | .926 <sup>**</sup> | 1                  | .892 <sup>**</sup> | .971 <sup>**</sup> |
|       | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000               | .000               | .000               | .000               |                    | .000               | .000               |
|       | N                   | 300                | 300                | 300                | 300                | 300                | 300                | 300                |
| X2.6  | Pearson Correlation | .861 <sup>**</sup> | .724 <sup>**</sup> | .758 <sup>**</sup> | .813 <sup>**</sup> | .892 <sup>**</sup> | 1                  | .902 <sup>**</sup> |
|       | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000               | .000               | .000               | .000               | .000               |                    | .000               |
|       | N                   | 300                | 300                | 300                | 300                | 300                | 300                | 300                |
| Harga | Pearson Correlation | .953 <sup>**</sup> | .910 <sup>**</sup> | .909 <sup>**</sup> | .952 <sup>**</sup> | .971 <sup>**</sup> | .902 <sup>**</sup> | 1                  |
|       | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000               | .000               | .000               | .000               | .000               | .000               |                    |
|       | N                   | 300                | 300                | 300                | 300                | 300                | 300                | 300                |

The entire r-count on variable item X2 is more than the r-table which is 0.113. Therefore, the X2 variable is declared valid.

**Place Variable (X3)**

**Table 8.** Validity Test Place Variable (X3).

|        |                     | Correlations       |                    |                     |                    |                    |                    |                     |                    |                    |
|--------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
|        |                     | X3.1               | X3.2               | X3.3                | X3.4               | X3.5               | X3.6               | X3.7                | X3.8               | Tempat             |
| X3.1   | Pearson Correlation | 1                  | .754 <sup>**</sup> | .827 <sup>**</sup>  | .735 <sup>**</sup> | .992 <sup>**</sup> | .861 <sup>**</sup> | .827 <sup>**</sup>  | .796 <sup>**</sup> | .917 <sup>**</sup> |
|        | Sig. (2-tailed)     |                    | .000               | .000                | .000               | .000               | .000               | .000                | .000               | .000               |
|        | N                   | 300                | 300                | 300                 | 300                | 300                | 300                | 300                 | 300                | 300                |
| X3.2   | Pearson Correlation | .754 <sup>**</sup> | 1                  | .760 <sup>**</sup>  | .934 <sup>**</sup> | .762 <sup>**</sup> | .816 <sup>**</sup> | .760 <sup>**</sup>  | .738 <sup>**</sup> | .884 <sup>**</sup> |
|        | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000               |                    | .000                | .000               | .000               | .000               | .000                | .000               | .000               |
|        | N                   | 300                | 300                | 300                 | 300                | 300                | 300                | 300                 | 300                | 300                |
| X3.3   | Pearson Correlation | .827 <sup>**</sup> | .760 <sup>**</sup> | 1                   | .762 <sup>**</sup> | .837 <sup>**</sup> | .918 <sup>**</sup> | 1.000 <sup>**</sup> | .963 <sup>**</sup> | .955 <sup>**</sup> |
|        | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000               | .000               |                     | .000               | .000               | .000               | .000                | .000               | .000               |
|        | N                   | 300                | 300                | 300                 | 300                | 300                | 300                | 300                 | 300                | 300                |
| X3.4   | Pearson Correlation | .735 <sup>**</sup> | .934 <sup>**</sup> | .762 <sup>**</sup>  | 1                  | .744 <sup>**</sup> | .822 <sup>**</sup> | .762 <sup>**</sup>  | .725 <sup>**</sup> | .878 <sup>**</sup> |
|        | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000               | .000               | .000                |                    | .000               | .000               | .000                | .000               | .000               |
|        | N                   | 300                | 300                | 300                 | 300                | 300                | 300                | 300                 | 300                | 300                |
| X3.5   | Pearson Correlation | .992 <sup>**</sup> | .762 <sup>**</sup> | .837 <sup>**</sup>  | .744 <sup>**</sup> | 1                  | .870 <sup>**</sup> | .837 <sup>**</sup>  | .805 <sup>**</sup> | .924 <sup>**</sup> |
|        | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000               | .000               | .000                | .000               |                    | .000               | .000                | .000               | .000               |
|        | N                   | 300                | 300                | 300                 | 300                | 300                | 300                | 300                 | 300                | 300                |
| X3.6   | Pearson Correlation | .861 <sup>**</sup> | .816 <sup>**</sup> | .918 <sup>**</sup>  | .822 <sup>**</sup> | .870 <sup>**</sup> | 1                  | .918 <sup>**</sup>  | .884 <sup>**</sup> | .958 <sup>**</sup> |
|        | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000               | .000               | .000                | .000               | .000               |                    | .000                | .000               | .000               |
|        | N                   | 300                | 300                | 300                 | 300                | 300                | 300                | 300                 | 300                | 300                |
| X3.7   | Pearson Correlation | .827 <sup>**</sup> | .760 <sup>**</sup> | 1.000 <sup>**</sup> | .762 <sup>**</sup> | .837 <sup>**</sup> | .918 <sup>**</sup> | 1                   | .963 <sup>**</sup> | .955 <sup>**</sup> |
|        | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000               | .000               | .000                | .000               | .000               | .000               |                     | .000               | .000               |
|        | N                   | 300                | 300                | 300                 | 300                | 300                | 300                | 300                 | 300                | 300                |
| X3.8   | Pearson Correlation | .796 <sup>**</sup> | .738 <sup>**</sup> | .963 <sup>**</sup>  | .725 <sup>**</sup> | .805 <sup>**</sup> | .884 <sup>**</sup> | .963 <sup>**</sup>  | 1                  | .929 <sup>**</sup> |
|        | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000               | .000               | .000                | .000               | .000               | .000               | .000                |                    | .000               |
|        | N                   | 300                | 300                | 300                 | 300                | 300                | 300                | 300                 | 300                | 300                |
| Tempat | Pearson Correlation | .917 <sup>**</sup> | .884 <sup>**</sup> | .955 <sup>**</sup>  | .878 <sup>**</sup> | .924 <sup>**</sup> | .958 <sup>**</sup> | .955 <sup>**</sup>  | .929 <sup>**</sup> | 1                  |
|        | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000               | .000               | .000                | .000               | .000               | .000               | .000                | .000               |                    |
|        | N                   | 300                | 300                | 300                 | 300                | 300                | 300                | 300                 | 300                | 300                |

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The entire r-count on the X3 variable item is more than the r-table which is 0.113. Therefore, the X3 variable is declared valid.

**Promotion Variable (X4)****Table 9.** Validity Test Promotion Variable (X4).

|         |                     | <b>Correlations</b> |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |         |
|---------|---------------------|---------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|
|         |                     | X4.1                | X4.2   | X4.3   | X4.4   | X4.5   | X4.6   | X4.7   | X4.8   | Promosi |
| X4.1    | Pearson Correlation | 1                   | .867** | .974** | .808** | .975** | .830** | .994** | .901** | .970**  |
|         | Sig. (2-tailed)     |                     | .000   | .000   | .000   | .000   | .000   | .000   | .000   | .000    |
|         | N                   | 300                 | 300    | 300    | 300    | 300    | 300    | 300    | 300    | 300     |
| X4.2    | Pearson Correlation | .867**              | 1      | .854** | .764** | .891** | .784** | .862** | .938** | .921**  |
|         | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000                |        | .000   | .000   | .000   | .000   | .000   | .000   | .000    |
|         | N                   | 300                 | 300    | 300    | 300    | 300    | 300    | 300    | 300    | 300     |
| X4.3    | Pearson Correlation | .974**              | .854** | 1      | .806** | .949** | .828** | .968** | .888** | .960**  |
|         | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000                | .000   |        | .000   | .000   | .000   | .000   | .000   | .000    |
|         | N                   | 300                 | 300    | 300    | 300    | 300    | 300    | 300    | 300    | 300     |
| X4.4    | Pearson Correlation | .808**              | .764** | .806** | 1      | .786** | .991** | .802** | .797** | .901**  |
|         | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000                | .000   | .000   |        | .000   | .000   | .000   | .000   | .000    |
|         | N                   | 300                 | 300    | 300    | 300    | 300    | 300    | 300    | 300    | 300     |
| X4.5    | Pearson Correlation | .975**              | .891** | .949** | .786** | 1      | .807** | .969** | .927** | .964**  |
|         | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000                | .000   | .000   | .000   |        | .000   | .000   | .000   | .000    |
|         | N                   | 300                 | 300    | 300    | 300    | 300    | 300    | 300    | 300    | 300     |
| X4.6    | Pearson Correlation | .830**              | .784** | .828** | .991** | .807** | 1      | .825** | .818** | .918**  |
|         | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000                | .000   | .000   | .000   | .000   |        | .000   | .000   | .000    |
|         | N                   | 300                 | 300    | 300    | 300    | 300    | 300    | 300    | 300    | 300     |
| X4.7    | Pearson Correlation | .994**              | .862** | .968** | .802** | .969** | .825** | 1      | .908** | .967**  |
|         | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000                | .000   | .000   | .000   | .000   | .000   |        | .000   | .000    |
|         | N                   | 300                 | 300    | 300    | 300    | 300    | 300    | 300    | 300    | 300     |
| X4.8    | Pearson Correlation | .901**              | .938** | .888** | .797** | .927** | .818** | .908** | 1      | .949**  |
|         | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000                | .000   | .000   | .000   | .000   | .000   | .000   |        | .000    |
|         | N                   | 300                 | 300    | 300    | 300    | 300    | 300    | 300    | 300    | 300     |
| Promosi | Pearson Correlation | .970**              | .921** | .960** | .901** | .964** | .918** | .967** | .949** | 1       |
|         | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000                | .000   | .000   | .000   | .000   | .000   | .000   | .000   |         |
|         | N                   | 300                 | 300    | 300    | 300    | 300    | 300    | 300    | 300    | 300     |

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The entire r-count on the variable item X4 is more than the r-table which is 0.113. Therefore, the X4 variable is declared valid.

**Decision Variable (Y)**

The entire r-count on the variable item Y is greater than the r-table which is 0.113. Therefore, the Y variable is declared valid.

**Table 10.** Validity Test Decision Variable (Y).

|                     |                     | Correlations |        |        |        |                     |
|---------------------|---------------------|--------------|--------|--------|--------|---------------------|
|                     |                     | Y.1          | Y.2    | Y.3    | Y.4    | Keputusan Pembelian |
| Y.1                 | Pearson Correlation | 1            | .893** | .827** | .758** | .905**              |
|                     | Sig. (2-tailed)     |              | .000   | .000   | .000   | .000                |
|                     | N                   | 300          | 300    | 300    | 300    | 300                 |
| Y.2                 | Pearson Correlation | .893**       | 1      | .884** | .821** | .952**              |
|                     | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000         |        | .000   | .000   | .000                |
|                     | N                   | 300          | 300    | 300    | 300    | 300                 |
| Y.3                 | Pearson Correlation | .827**       | .884** | 1      | .908** | .967**              |
|                     | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000         | .000   |        | .000   | .000                |
|                     | N                   | 300          | 300    | 300    | 300    | 300                 |
| Y.4                 | Pearson Correlation | .758**       | .821** | .908** | 1      | .938**              |
|                     | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000         | .000   | .000   |        | .000                |
|                     | N                   | 300          | 300    | 300    | 300    | 300                 |
| Keputusan Pembelian | Pearson Correlation | .905**       | .952** | .967** | .938** | 1                   |
|                     | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000         | .000   | .000   | .000   |                     |
|                     | N                   | 300          | 300    | 300    | 300    | 300                 |

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

**3.3 Reliability Test**

A reliability test determines the consistency of an instrument's measurement results when used repeatedly under the same conditions. In SPSS, reliability tests are usually performed using Cronbach's Alpha. The instrument is re-liaible if the value of Cronbach's Alpha is more than 0.6. If this value is achieved, then the instrument is considered to have good internal con-sistency and reliability.

**Variable X1**

**Table 11.** Reliability Test Variable X1.

| Reliability Statistics |            |
|------------------------|------------|
| Cronbach's Alpha       | N of Items |
| .980                   | 13         |

**Variable X2**

**Table 12.** Reliability Test Variable X2.

| Reliability Statistics |            |
|------------------------|------------|
| Cronbach's Alpha       | N of Items |
| .976                   | 8          |

**Variable X3****Table 13.** Reliability Test Variable X3.

| <b>Reliability Statistics</b> |            |
|-------------------------------|------------|
| Cronbach's                    |            |
| Alpha                         | N of Items |
| .981                          | 8          |

**Variable X4****Table 14.** Reliability Test Variable X4.

| <b>Reliability Statistics</b> |            |
|-------------------------------|------------|
| Cronbach's                    |            |
| Alpha                         | N of Items |
| .946                          | 4          |

**Variable Y****Table 15.** Reliability Test Variable Y.

| <b>Reliability Statistics</b> |            |
|-------------------------------|------------|
| Cronbach's                    |            |
| Alpha                         | N of Items |
| .970                          | 6          |

**3.4 Multiple Linear Regression Test**

**Test t.** The t-test is a statistical method used to determine whether there is a significant difference between the averages of two groups or to test whether an individual independent variable significantly affects the dependent variable in the regression model. The calculated t value is compared to the t table or seen as a significance value (p-value). The t-table for data of 300 respondents and four independent variables is 1,967. If the p-value < 0.05 (at a significant level of 5%), then the independent variable is considered to have a significant effect on the dependent variable. If the p-value  $\geq$  0.05, then the variable is considered in-significant.

**Table 16.** t Test Results.  
**Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

| Model |            | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients | t     | Sig. |
|-------|------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|-------|------|
|       |            | B                           | Std. Error | Beta                      |       |      |
| 1     | (Constant) | .785                        | .287       |                           | 2.733 | .007 |
|       | Produk     | .566                        | .016       | 1.533                     | 5.105 | .000 |
|       | Harga      | .028                        | .017       | .035                      | 1.599 | .111 |
|       | Tempat     | -.009                       | .014       | -.014                     | -.638 | .524 |
|       | Promosi    | .403                        | .032       | .558                      | 2.744 | .000 |

a. Dependent Variable: Keputusan Pembelian

The results of the above t-test can be interpreted as follows:

1. The constant value (0.785) with t count = 2.733 and p-value (Sig.) = 0.007 indicates that if all independent variables (Product, Price, Place, Promo-tion) are zero, then the purchase decision will go up by 0.785. Since the p-value < 0.05, this constant is statistically significant.
2. The value of the Product coefficient (X1) = 0.566, with t count = 5.105 and p-value = 0.000, indicates that the product has a significant effect on the purchase decision. Each increment of one unit in the product variable will increase the purchase decision by 0.566, and this is significant because the p-value < 0.05.
3. The value of the Price coefficient (X2) = 0.028, with t count = 1.599 and p-value = 0.111, indicates that price has no significant effect on the purchase decision because the p-value > 0.05.
4. The value of the Place coefficient (X3) = -0.009, with t count = -0.638 and p-value = 0.524, indicates that the place also has no significant effect on the purchase decision, as the p-value > 0.05.
5. The value of the Promotion coefficient (X4) = 0.403, with t count = 2.744 and p-value = 0.000, indicates that promotion has a significant effect on purchase decisions. Each increment of one unit in the promotion variable will increase the purchase decision by 0.403, and this is significant because the p-value < 0.05.

**Test F.** The F test is a statistical method used to test the significance of the regression model as a whole, by assessing whether the independent variables together have a significant effect on the dependent variables.

**Table 17.** F Test Results.

|       |            | ANOVA <sup>a</sup> |     |             |          |                   |
|-------|------------|--------------------|-----|-------------|----------|-------------------|
| Model |            | Sum of Squares     | df  | Mean Square | F        | Sig.              |
| 1     | Regression | 2516.563           | 4   | 629.141     | 3288.731 | .000 <sup>b</sup> |
|       | Residual   | 56.434             | 295 | .191        |          |                   |
|       | Total      | 2572.997           | 299 |             |          |                   |

a. Dependent Variable: Keputusan Pembelian

b. Predictors: (Constant), Promosi, Harga, Tempat, Produk

Based on the results above, it is known that the significance value is 0.000 or less than 0.05. This means that all independent variables in this study simultaneously have a significant effect.

**Coefficient of Determination Test.** The determination coefficient test, or commonly called R-squared ( $R^2$ ), is a measure that shows how well an independent variable in a regression model explains the variation of the dependent variable. The  $R^2$  value ranges between 0 and 1.

**Table 18.** Coefficient of determination test result.

| Model Summary <sup>b</sup> |                   |          |                   |                            |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| Model                      | R                 | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
| 1                          | .889 <sup>a</sup> | .878     | .858              | .43738                     |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Promosi, Harga, Tempat, Produk

b. Dependent Variable: Keputusan Pembelian

It is known that the Adjusted R-Squared value is 0.858. This means that all independent variables in this study can have an effect of 85.8% on the dependent variable.

### 3.5 Impact of Products to the Purchasing Decisions

Products have an essential role to play in purchasing decisions. The results of the partial test of the product variable had a t-count value of 5.105 > t-table value of 1.967 with a p-value of 0.000 < 0.05, which means that the product has a significant effect on the decision to purchase processed beef products from M.S.M.E.s in Malang City and Malang Regency. Each increment of one unit in the product variable will increase the purchase decision by 0.566. People feel satisfaction, product availability, quality, taste, halal certification, and information related to products are essential in purchasing decisions. Products that meet or exceed consumer expectations can increase consumer satisfaction and loyalty because consumers compare product quality with prices and competitors [31].

The results of this study are in line with the research of Khoiriyah and Wicaksana [32], which shows that product quality has a positive and significant influence on the purchase decision of Golden Farm brand Frozen Food products with a t-count value of 3.671 > t table 1.659 and a sig value of 0.000 < 0.05.

The results of another study by Anisa et al. [33] show that product quality has a significant influence on the purchase of frozen food seafood "Ahaa!" I.C.S. Food. This is evidenced by a p-value of  $<0.001$ , where the value meets the criteria accepted by the hypothesis, namely a p-value of 0.05. The coefficient value obtained in the study of Anisa et al. [33] is 0.414, which indicates an increase of 0.414 if there is an increase in quality and a decrease of 0.414 when there is a decrease in the quality of frozen seafood products "Ahaa!" I.C.S. Food.

### 3.6 Impact of Prices to the Purchasing Decisions

The analysis revealed that the price variable had no significant effect on purchasing decisions, as indicated by a t-value of 1.599 and a p-value of 0.111 ( $p > 0.05$ ). This suggests that consumers in Malang prioritize the quality of processed beef products over cost considerations. Loyal customers appear willing to pay a premium for products that meet their expectations in terms of taste, quality, and safety. This aligns with findings by Wasi and Mahjudin [34], who reported that price perception often becomes secondary when strong brand loyalty is present. The absence of a significant price effect may also reflect the limited price variability within the MSMEs studied, rendering this factor less impactful.

While previous studies, such as Ciu et al. [35], highlighted the importance of price in frozen food purchasing decisions, our findings suggest a market-specific behavior. The shift toward prioritizing quality over price could be influenced by cultural factors, regional preferences, or a growing emphasis on nutritional value. This warrants further investigation to identify whether these trends are consistent across different demographics and regions.

The findings underscore the need for MSMEs to focus on maintaining and enhancing product quality, as this is a primary driver of consumer decisions. Investing in premium packaging, halal certification, and consistent quality control will likely yield better returns than competing on price alone. Additionally, integrating price into promotional strategies (e.g., discounts, bundles) may still appeal to price-conscious consumers without undermining the perceived value of the product.

### 3.7 Impact of Places on the Purchasing Decisions

Similarly, the place variable did not significantly influence purchasing decisions, with a t-value of -0.638 and a p-value of 0.524 ( $p > 0.05$ ). This finding contradicts research by Nugroho and Simamora [36], which emphasized the importance of accessible and convenient locations in consumer purchasing behavior. The shift observed in this study may be attributed to the widespread adoption of delivery services and online platforms, which reduce the reliance on physical store location or parking facilities. Consumers now prioritize product variety and promotional efforts over traditional place-based factors.

This finding underscores the growing relevance of digital transformation in retail and M.S.M.E.s operations. While the physical location remains important in some contexts, the role of online channels in shaping consumer decisions is becoming

increasingly evident. Future research should explore how M.S.M.E.s can better integrate online sales strategies to complement their physical presence.

The findings highlight the need for M.S.M.E.s to adapt to the growing digital transformation in retail by prioritizing online visibility through e-commerce platforms, social media, and targeted advertising while optimizing delivery services to ensure timely and efficient customer experiences. Creating hybrid models, such as combining physical stores with click-and-collect options, can cater to diverse consumer preferences and bridge the gap between traditional and digital retail. Investments in product variety, quality, and effective promotional strategies are likely to yield higher returns than focusing solely on physical location improvements. Future research should explore how M.S.M.E.s in Malang leverage digital platforms, analyze differences in consumer behavior across online and offline channels to understand varying priorities, and examine whether these findings hold in regions with different levels of urbanization and infrastructure development.

### **3.8 The Impact of Promotions to the Purchasing Decisions**

The partial test of the promotion variable had a t-count value of 2.744 > a t-table value of 1.967 with a p-value of 0.000 < 0.05, which showed that promotion had a significant effect on the decision to purchase processed beef products from M.S.M.E.s in Malang City and Malang Regency. Each increment of one unit on the promotion variable will increase the purchase decision by 0.403, which is significant because the p-value < 0.05. Promotions carried out by M.S.M.E.s have a significant influence on purchasing decisions. Promotion can also be defined as a mechanism in marketing communication, the exchange of information between buyers and sellers [37]. Through promotional communication, sellers can persuade, inform, and influence potential buyers' opinions [38]. Improving quality perception, choosing effective communication, and targeting the right consumers in promotions can improve consumer purchasing decisions.

The results of this study align with the results of the research of Anggelina et al. [39] that promotion has a significant effect on consumer perception with a p-value of < 0.05. In this modern era, social media has become the leading platform for disseminating information. Consumers get information faster through social media because it can be accessed anytime and anywhere.

### **3.9 Impact of Products, Prices, Venues, and Promotions to the Purchasing Decisions**

The results of the partial test of product variables have a t-count value of 2.733 > a t-table value of 1.967 with a p-value of 0.007 < 0.05, which shows that these four have a significant effect on the decision to purchase processed beef products from M.S.M.E.s in Malang City and Malang Regency. The constant value of 0.785 means that if all independent variables (Product, Price, Place, and Promotion) have zero values, then the purchase decision will increase by (78.5%). The marketing mix can influence product demand and can be grouped into 4P: Product, Price, Place, and Promotion [40].

Effective marketing is carried out by integrating all elements of the marketing mix into integrated marketing so that it can provide value to consumers [41].

Research on the relationship between the four variables (product, price, place, and promotion) was conducted to see the decision to buy Aice ice cream in Balikpapan. The study's results stated that the influence of product, price, place, and promotion variables had a significant effect, with a t-count value of  $2.670 > 1.966$  and a p-value of  $0.011 < 0.05$ . These four variables have an influence of 48.9% on the decision to buy Aice ice cream in Balikpapan, while the remaining 51.1% are influenced by other variables or factors outside the study [42].

## 4 Conclusion

Based on the results of the study, it concludes that:

1. Consumer characteristics of processed beef products in M.S.M.E.s in Malang, Indonesia based on gender are 62% female, with an average job as a self-employed, have the last high school education, average age 29-39 years and an average income of Rp.1000,000-3000,000.
2. Product and promotion variables significantly influenced purchasing decisions, while price and place variables did not. The insignificant impact of price reflects consumers' emphasis on quality and loyalty to trusted products, suggesting a diminished role for price sensitivity. Similarly, the negligible effect of place indicates a shift towards digital purchasing behaviors, where convenience and accessibility through online channels outweigh physical location considerations. These findings highlight the evolving priorities of consumers and underscore the need for M.S.M.E.s to adapt by emphasizing quality, effective promotions, and robust online sales strategies.

**Disclosure of Interests.** The authors have no competing interests to declare that are relevant to the content of this article.

## References

1. Ummah, R., Vikko, H.P., Nesya, Z., Heikelindra, K and Silva, S. 2024. Analysis of Factors Affecting Meat Consumption on the Island of Java. *Postgraduate Scientific Journal*. 4 (2) : 174-182.
2. Hartati, L. (2022). Analysis of Factors Affecting Beef Consumption in Indonesia for the Period 2000-2020. S1 THESIS, UNIVERSITY OF JAMBI
3. Central Statistics Agency. 2023. *Livestock in 2023 Figures*: BPS
4. Smet, S.D dan Thomas, V.H. 2024. *Meat Products in Human Nutrition and Health-About Hazards and Risks*. Elsevier : 1-12.
5. Nguju, Apliana Leki, Pieter Rihi Kale, and Bastari Saturday. "The Effect of Different Cooking Methods on Protein, Fat, Cholesterol and Taste of Balinese Beef." *Journal of Animal Husbandry Nucleus* 5, no. 1 (2018): 17–23.

6. Susanti, Siti, Ahmad N. Al-Baari, Heni Rizqiati, and Puput Afwa Aimmati. "Technology for Processing Rabbit Meat in a Safe, Healthy, Intact and Halal (ASUH)". Undip Press. (2021).
7. Astatuti, F.K., Karunia, S.S., and Erik.P.S. 2019. Analysis of Marketing Mix on Beef Consumer Behavior and Implications of Marketing Strategy at Hypermart Malang City. Buana Science. 19 (1) : 25-36.
8. Al-Jabbar, Habib Muhammad, Hurriyatul Fitriyah, and Rizal Maulana. 2021. "Beef Freshness Classification System Based on Imagery Using Raspberry Pi-Based Naïve Bayes Method." Journal of Information Technology and Computer Science Development 5(4):1646–53.
9. Sudartono, T., Hari, N., Irwanto., I Gusti, A.A.A., Herlin, G.Y., Lu'lu, U.M., Hanik, A., Ferdinandus, L. W., Nuryanti., Acai, S. 2022. Entrepreneurship of MSMEs in the Digital Era. Bandung : Widina Bhakti Persada Bandung.
10. Farisi, S., Muhammad, I.F and Suharto. 2022. The Role of MSMEs (Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises) in Improving Community Welfare. Journal of Sharia Economic Dynamics. 9 (1) : 73-84.
11. Setioko, M. D. (2019). Analysis of Urban Tourism Development Strategy in Malang City. Journal of Tourism Pesona, 4(1), 81–88.
12. Sasongko, I., Setiawan, A., & Purnama, Y. S. (2019). Strategy for the Development of Culinary Tourism Areas Along the Corridor of Jalan Soekarno Hatta, Malang City. Urban and Regional Planning, 3, 34–67.
13. Cipta, S.W., Santun, R.P., Sitorus., and Djuara, P.L. 2017. Development of Leading Commodities in the Tumpang Development Area, Malang Regency7 (2): 115-206.
14. Sudrartono, T. 2020. The Influence of Marketing Mix Strategy on the Development of SMEs in the Bandung Regency Small and Medium Business Cooperative Office. Eco-Iqtishodi: Scientific Journal of Sharia Economics and Finance, 2(1): 59-74
15. Kotler and Gary Armstrong. 2008. Marketing Principles. Jakarta: Erlangga.
16. Sudirman., Marilyn, L.K., Ayunda, S., I Made, E.C., Ni Luh, S.A., Jan, S., Willy, Y.T., Sitti, R., Diah, O.N., Farah, I., Nurul L.F., Nurul, A., Nia, K., Aditya, W., Tita, H. 2023. Research Methodology 1. Bandung : Media Sains Indonesia and Penulis
17. Bungin, B. 2013. Social & Economic Research Methods: quantitative and qualitative formats for the study of sociology, policy, public, communication, management and marketing first edition. Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Media Group.
18. Hariyanto, E., Akhmad, D dan Bima, C.P., 2019. Research Method Sampling Method Survey Research. Depok: PT Rajagrafindo Persada
19. Ruroh, I. N., & S. W., Latifah. 2018. The Effect of Profitability, Leverage, Company Size and Risk Minimization on Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Disclosure. Journal of the Academy of Accounting, 1(1).

20. Situmorang, S. H. I., Muda, M., Doli, & F. S., Fadli. 2010. Data analysis for management and business research. USUpres.
21. Arikunto. (2010). Validity and Reliability Test : Rineka Cipta.
22. Rosita, E. W., Hidayat, & W., Yuliani. 2021. Test of validity and reliability of prosocial behavior questionnaire. FOCUS (Guidance & Counseling Studies in Education), 4(4): 279- 284.
23. Gulla, R., Oroh, S. G., & Roring, F. 2015. Analysis of Price, Promotion, and Service Quality on Consumer Satisfaction at the Manado Grace Inn hotel. Journal of EMBA: Journal of Research in Economics, Management, Business and Accounting, 3(1):1313-1322.
24. Prastiwi, W. D., Santoso, S. I., & Marzuki, S. (2017). Preferences and Perceptions of Nugget Product Consumption as an Alternative to Chicken Meat Consumption in the Community in Secang District, Magelang Regency. AGROMEDIA: Scientific Periodical of Agricultural Sciences, 35(1), 65–72.
25. Baraja RR. 2018. Analysis of Consumer Perception and Preferences for Frozen Beef at Maradeka Beef Bogor. [Thesis]. Bogor: Bogor Agricultural University.
26. Sulastri, A.P., Novi, D.B.T. 2021. Factors Influencing Consumer Behavior in Purchasing Frozen Food at UD Mitra Abadi, Maduran District, Lamongan Regency. Agriscience. 2(1) :239.254.
27. Sudirman, S., Yani, A., Amrullah, A., Budiman, C., Sukarne, S., & Alfatin, M. F. 2024. Consumer Perception of Beef Quality in the Main Market of Sumbawa Regency (Case Study in Seketeng Market). Agroteksos, 34(1) : 207-218.
28. Putri, S. A., & Tamami, N. D. B. 2021. Factors Influencing Consumer Behavior in Purchasing Frozen Food at UD Mitra Abadi, Maduran District, Lamongan Regency. Agriscience, 2(1) : 239-254.
29. Fausayana, I., & Marzuki, M. A. (2017). Analysis of factors influencing the demand for purebred chicken eggs in Kendari City and its relationship with the empowerment of farmers. Journal of Socio-Agribusiness, 1(1), 32-46.
30. Nurjaman, T., Soetoro, S., & Yusuf, M. N. (2018). Analysis of Cost, Revenue, Revenue, and R/c of Peanut Farmers (*Arachis hypogaea* L) (a case in Cintakarya Village, Parigi District, Pangandaran Regency). AGROINFO GALUH Student Scientific Journal, 4(1), 585-590.
31. Lisdiyawati, C. and H. Aribowo, H. 2024. The Influence of Product Quality, Brand Image, and Price on the Purchase Decision of Kanzler Brand Frozen Food Crispy Chicken Nugget Products in the City of Surabaya. Jupiter: Balance Sheet of Management, Accounting, and Economics. 7(10): 91-100.
32. Khoiriyah, A., & P. S. I. Wicaksana. 2023. The Effect of Product Quality, Brand Image and Price on Purchase Decisions of Golden Farm Brand Frozen Food Products in the Bekasi City Community. Journal of Business Economics Informatics. 5(4): 1141-1144.
33. Anisa, T.N., S.T. Winarno, & D. Atasa. 2024. The Influence of Price Perception, Product Quality, and Brand Image on Consumer Purchase Decisions of Frozen

- Seafood Products "AHAA!" ICS Food in Sidoarjo. *Scientific Journal of Respati*. 15(1): 59-71.
34. Wasi, Z. and Mahjudin. 2022. Predicting the Mediation Impact of Brand Image on the Correlational Relationship between Price Perception, Product Quality, Promotion and Purchasing Decision. *International Journal of Economics, Business and Management Research*. 06(12): 144–157.
  35. Ciu, Y., M. Ginting, and P.S. Tarigan. 2024. Analysis of Frozen Food Consumer Purchase Decisions Based on Brand Image Contribution, Price and Promotion (Case Study on Frozen Food So Good Products). *Journal of Microskill Economics Heroes*. 14(1): 101-114.
  36. Nugroho, E.J. and L. Simamora. 2021. Factors Influencing Beef Purchase Decisions at Salatiga I Supermarket. *Ziraa'ah Agricultural Scientific Magazine*. 46(2): 134-143.
  37. Setyaningrum, A. (2015). *Marketing Principles*. Yogyakarta: Andi.
  38. Lamb, C.W., J.F. Hair Jr, and C.D. McDaniel. 2010. *Essentials of marketing* Mason. OH: South-Western Cengage Learning.
  39. Anggelina, O.M., N.A. Arnold, K. Maria, L. Matheos. F., L. Ulrikus R. 2024. Socio-Economic, Personal and Marketing Factors In Determining Purchasing Decisions For Fresh Pork In Kupang City, Indonesia. *Russian Journal of Agricultural and Socio-Economic Sciences*. 145(1): 27–35.
  40. Van Waterschoot, W. and Van den Bulte, C. 1992. The 4P Classification of the Marketing Mix Revisited. *Journal of Marketing*. 56(4): 83-93.
  41. Holm, O., 2006. Integrated marketing communication: from tactics to strategy. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*. 11(1):23-33.
  42. Erlimisnawati, E., C. Prihandoyo, and A. Hermawansyah. 2024. The Influence of Marketing Mix on Aice Ice Cream Purchase Decision in Balikpapan: Marketing mix. *Jurnal Ekonomi*, 13(01): 883-897.

**Open Access** This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

