



The Influence of Promotion and Price on Purchase Decisions of Chicken Cuts Sellers

Muh. Fiqri Mustari¹, Edy Jumady¹, Muh. Rusni¹

¹Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi Makassar Bongaya Stiem Bongaya Makassar

*Corresponding Author: Muh. Fiqri Mustari



Article Info

Article history:

Received 13 December 2024

Received in revised form 15 January 2025

Accepted 3 February 2025

Keywords:

Promotion

Price

Purchasing Decision

Abstract

The influence of promotion and price on purchasing decisions at CV. Cahaya Huspi chicken sellers in Makassar, MUH. FIQRI MUSARI 2024. The purpose of this study was to determine the influence of promotion and price on purchasing decisions. The method used in this study was a survey method with a quantitative approach, namely by emphasizing hypothesis testing. The sample in this study were consumers who made purchases at Cahaya Huspi Makassar with a total of 97 participants from 161 questionnaires distributed. The sampling technique used the Accidental Sampling method by setting a time limit for distributing the questionnaire for two weeks. Data collection methods through questionnaires and direct observation. The data analysis used was descriptive quantitative using the SPSS program with a simple Linear Regression analysis method.

Introduction

A decision is the selection of an action from two or more alternative choices. A consumer who wants to make a choice must have alternative choices, this is because consumers are currently faced with many choices of products for them to consume (Kotler & Keller, 2016; Rajasa et al., 2023; Giacalone et al., 2022).

Decision making in making a purchase is interpreted as a consumer's decision on what to buy, where to do it, when to do it and how the purchase will be made (Islamiyah et al., 2020; Ridwan, 2022; Kasmad, 2022). There are several factors that influence, namely promotion and price (Warningrum, 2023). Findings from several researchers explain that the most important factors influencing purchasing decisions are promotion and price factors (Marlius & Nadilla, 2023).

This evidence is supported by the theory that decision making in making a purchase is influenced by the suitability between expectations and the reality obtained by consumers (Ridwan, 2022; Mishra et al., 2021). The statement refers to the expectation confirmation theory which explains that consumers will make purchases if their expectations are met (confirmation), conversely consumers will disconfirm if their expectations do not match the reality of the product or service they will consume (Ardiansyah et al., 2021; Wang et al., 2021; Mehrabioun, 2024).

This theory is relevant to the results of previous studies, that the better the promotion carried out by the company, the better the consumer decision-making in making purchasing decisions. (Marlius & Nadilla, 2023; Warningrum, 2023).

The results of Pranindyastuti et al. (2023) research provide evidence that promotions measured by advertising, personal selling, sales promotions, and public relations provide significant positive results on purchasing decisions. These results differ from the findings of other researchers, that promotions measured by advertising, personal selling, sales promotions, and

public relations do not have a significant positive effect on purchasing decisions (Saktiendi et al., 2022) ub.

Another factor that influences purchasing decisions is the price factor which is explained as determining the value of a product (Asti et al., 2022; Arif & Siregar, 2021). The more economical the price offered, coupled with satisfactory product quality, the more interested and satisfied consumers will be so that consumers want to revisit the place (Marlius & Jovanka, 2023; Suttikun & Meeprom, 2021; Alegre & Juaneda, 2006; Homburg et al., 2005).

The findings of Kotler & Armstrong's research, (2018) which analyzed prices and were measured by indicators of price affordability, price determination, price growth, and price determination. These four indicators show significant positive results on purchasing decisions. These results differ from the findings of other researchers, saying that prices measured by price affordability, price perception and benefits, and price competition show that prices do not have a significant effect on purchasing decisions (Marlius & Noveliza, 2022; Dwiarta & Ardiansyah, 2021; Anwar & Andrian, 2021; Bangun, 2023; Rivaldo et al., 2022).

Based on sales level data of CV. Cahaya Huspi in 2023, it shows that the observation period starting in April showed a sales value of IDR 657,111,000 due to online promotions and cheap chicken prices of IDR 28,000 per kilo. This value when compared to the final observation period based on data in October, the company's sales value decreased from IDR 657,111,000 to IDR 381,962,000 because from May to October the price of chicken rose to IDR 30,000-33,000 per kilo and there was a lack of promotion. Based on field conditions as evidenced by the documentation of the sales report of CV. Cahaya Huspi Makassar, which shows that there was a decrease in the company's sales based on the owner's identification due to the suboptimal purchases made by consumers due to the lack of online and offline promotions carried out by the Company and the price of chicken which is increasing day by day due to lack of supply so that according to consumers the price offered is too expensive and not appropriate so that consumers do not make a purchase decision. And sales calculations are done per kilo or per head.

Methods

The study utilizes quantitative methods for testing hypotheses about promotion and pricing effects on consumer purchasing behavior by focusing on numerical data and statistical inference analysis. The research design belongs to the explanatory (causal) category which focuses on pattern description alongside variable relationship analysis to determine causal effects. The research design requires explanatory methods to verify that changes in promotional strategies and pricing models lead to alterations in consumer purchasing activities.

The study took place at a poultry purveyor operating from Makassar in South Sulawesi Indonesia. Every person who bought broiler chicken products at the retail store formed the research target group. The research used Accidental Sampling as its sampling technique because it serves as a non-probability method which allows researchers to seek out participants based on their presence at the study period. A data collection period of two weeks resulted in distributing 161 questionnaires which generated 97 valid responses. Accidental sampling was set as the initial classification but the final selection became purposive by screening respondents to verify purchase behavior at the company before including them in the study.

The research data collection method combined direct observation with structured questionnaires. The research combined standardized questionnaire methods with point-of-sale observational techniques to generate results suitable for statistical evaluation and ensure behavioral assessment accuracy. The questionnaire included closed-ended items that measured

perceptions about promotion and price and purchasing decisions for respondents through Likert scale responses.

The research results received statistical enhancement through tests administered within SPSS software. A process of validity and reliability assessment was conducted by measuring how different items correlated with one another and running Cronbach's Alpha tests. The validity of every measurement item surpassed the essential threshold during statistical analysis. The reliability of the instrument was supported by high internal consistency values found in Cronbach's Alpha tests which reached 0.907 for promotion items and 0.892 for price and 0.850 for purchasing decisions.

The data needed to fulfill linear regression analysis requirements so hypothesis testing began after performing several classical tests for assumptions. The analysis involving the Runs Test as well as Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test proved that the data followed a normal distribution pattern. The analysis using Durbin-Watson statistic confirmed the residuals showed no signs of autocorrelation. Multicollinearity did not exist in the data set because Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) measurements together with tolerance calculations remained within appropriate boundaries. Analysis of both residuals through the Glejser method confirmed homoscedasticity and linear statistical models validated variable relationships.

The multiple linear regression analysis evaluated each independent variable including promotion and price as factors that influenced purchasing decisions after establishing that assumptions were valid. The application of regression analysis delivered two main functions including forecasting relationship fundamental aspects and detecting leading variables as well as hypothesis testing.

Result and Discussion

Data Validity and Reliability Test Results

Validity testing is carried out based on item analysis, namely correlating the score of each item with the variable score. For the number of respondents as many as 97 people and with a significance level of 5%, a critical number of 0.05 is obtained.

Table 1. Validity and Reliability Test

| Variables | Correlation r = > 0.30 | Cronbach's Alpha |
|-----------|------------------------|------------------|
| | Person | |
| Promotion | .700 ** | .907 |
| | .719 ** | |
| | .674 ** | |
| | .773 ** | |
| | .796 ** | |
| | .665 ** | |
| | .780 ** | |
| | .696 ** | |
| | .684 ** | |
| | .620 ** | |
| | .675 ** | |
| | .681 ** | |
| Price | .788 ** | .892 |
| | .775 ** | |
| | .837 ** | |

| | | |
|-----------------|---------|------|
| | .796 ** | |
| | .817 ** | |
| | .714 ** | |
| | .599 ** | |
| | .608 ** | |
| | .525 ** | |
| | .694 ** | |
| | .600 ** | |
| | .394 ** | |
| Buying decision | .621 ** | .850 |
| | .760 ** | |
| | .629 ** | |
| | .601 ** | |
| | .727 ** | |
| | .711 ** | |
| | .571 ** | |
| | .718 ** | |
| | .754 ** | |

The initial requirement in using regression for perception data is that if the calculated r value is greater than the r table, then all research instrument items are declared valid. The data in the table above shows that the calculated r value for each item is greater than the r table (0.2978), thus the items are declared valid.

Furthermore, if the calculated r value is greater than the r table for each research variable, the variable is declared reliable. The results of data processing show that the calculated r value for promotion is 0.907, the calculated value for the price variable is 0.892, and the calculated r value for the Purchase Decision variable is 0.50, which is greater than the r table value (0.2978). Thus, the research variables are declared reliable.

Classical Assumption Test Results

Normality Test Results

In this study, the normality test was carried out with two types of tests, namely the Run Test and the One Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test statistical test. The basis for decision making in both tests is that if the significant value is greater than 0.05, the data is normally distributed. Meanwhile, if the test results show a significant value below 0.05, the data is not normally distributed. The results of the normality test can be seen in the table below:

Table 2. Data Normality

| Types of testing | Z-score | p-value | Decision |
|------------------------------------|---------|---------|----------------------|
| <i>Runs Test</i> | 1,532 | 0.125 | Normally distributed |
| One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test | 0.079 | 0.159 | Normally distributed |

The normality test shows that in the two types of testing, the Run Test value is $0.125 > 0.05$ and the Kolmogorov-Smirnov value = $0.159 > 0.05$ so that it can be stated that the data used is well distributed.

Autocorrelation Test Results

The Autocorrelation Test aims to detect the presence or absence of autocorrelation in the regression model, in this model the Durbin-Watson test (DW-Test) is used. A good regression

model is a model that is free from autocorrelation. The results of the autocorrelation test can be seen in the table below:

Table 3. Autocorrelation

| Parameter | Results |
|-----------------|--------------------|
| DW | 1,953 |
| DU | 1,631 |
| DL | 1,714 |
| Null Hypothesis | No autocorrelation |
| Decision | Not rejected |

Based on table 5.13 above, the criteria for whether or not there is a disruption in the data relationship are explained through the autocorrelation test if $1.631 (DU) < 1.953 (DW) < 2.369$, so the results indicate that there is no data disruption.

Multicollinearity Test

Multicollinearity Test aims to test whether the regression model finds a correlation between independent variables. A good regression model should not have a correlation between independent variables (no multicollinearity). The results of the multicollinearity test can be seen in the table below:

Table 4. Multicolonierity

| Causality | Tolerance < 1 | Value influence factor < 10 | Decision |
|----------------|---------------|-----------------------------|-----------|
| KP Promotion → | 0.799 | 1,252 | Non Multi |
| KP Price → | 0.799 | 1,252 | Non Multi |

Based on table 4 above, it shows that the multicollinearity results show that both promotion and purchasing decision constructs show results of $0.799 (TOL) < 1$ and $1.252 (VIF) < 10$ so that both constructs are free from multicollinearity.

Heteroscedasticity Test

The Heteroscedasticity Test aims to test whether in the regression model there is inequality of variance from the residual of one observation to another. If the variance of the residual of one observation to another remains, then it is called Homoscedasticity while the different one is called Heteroscedasticity.

A good regression model should not have heteroscedasticity. The basis for decision making in the Heteroscedasticity test is if the significant value is greater than 0.05 then it can be said that there is no heteroscedasticity. The results of the multicollinearity test can be seen in the table below:

Table 5. Heteroscedasticity

| Causality (Glejser) | P-value | Symbol | P-level | Decision |
|---------------------|---------|--------|---------|-------------|
| Promotion → KP | 0.072 | > | 0.05 | Homogeneity |
| Price → KP | 0.356 | > | 0.05 | Homogeneity |

Table 5 is a table of testing whether or not heteroscedasticity occurs, this test uses the Glejser test. The test results show that the influence of Promotion on Purchasing Decisions produces a p-value of $0.072 > 0.05$, then in the second test the influence of price on Purchasing Decisions produces a p-value of $0.356 > 0.05$. From both tests it can be explained if the data used in this study is homogenous (has uniform data).

Linearity Test

Linearity test is used to determine whether two variables have a linear relationship or not significantly. The criteria in the linearity test are two variables are said to have a linear relationship if the significance (linearity) < 0.05 . The results of the linearity test can be seen in the table below:

Table 6. Data Linearity

| Causality | Linearity (Sig.) | Deviation from Linearity (Sig.) | Decision |
|------------------|-------------------------|--|-----------------|
| KP Promotion → | 0.474 | 0.683 | Linear |
| KP Price → | 0.535 | 0.846 | Linear |

Based on table 6 above, it shows that the linearity value and the linearity deviation value of the influence of promotion on purchasing decisions, as well as price on purchasing decisions, both show results > 0.05 , so that by referring to the standard used ($p\text{-value} = > 0.05$), then the data from each observation variable of the promotion → of purchasing decisions and the price → of purchasing decisions are stated to have a unidirectional relationship (linear), that if there is an increase in promotion and price, then purchasing decisions will also increase.

Research Data Analysis

Descriptive Statistical Analysis

Descriptive analysis is an analysis that is the collection, processing, and presentation and interpretation of data quantitatively or in percentages that can be presented in the form of tables or graphs. Descriptive statistical analysis provides an overview or description of data by comparing the mean value with the standard deviation value. Descriptive statistics describe data into clearer and easier-to-understand information. The results of the descriptive statistical analysis test can be seen in the table below:

Table 7. Data Description

| Variables | Average | Symbol | Std. Deviation |
|------------------|----------------|---------------|-----------------------|
| Buying decision | 386,134 | > | 46,960 |
| Promotion | 418,391 | > | 52,314 |
| Price | 377,845 | > | 53,519 |

Source: Research questionnaire (processed data, 2024)

Based on table 7 shows that the results of statistical analysis found if the average value (mean) for the decision-making variable in making a purchase is $386,134 > 46,960$ (Std. Deviation), for the promotion variable the average value (mean) is $418,391 > 52,314$ (Std. Deviation) while for the price variable the average value (mean) is $377,845 > 53,519$ (Std. Deviation). The results of the data description show that observations of purchasing decisions and promotions and PRK have a mean value $>$ deviation so that it can be stated that the three constructs tend to have well-distributed data.

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

Multiple linear regression analysis is a linear relationship between two or more independent variables (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n) with a dependent variable (Y). This analysis is to determine the direction of the relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable whether each independent variable is positively or negatively related and to predict the value of the dependent variable if the value of the independent variable increases or decreases.

In this study, the dependent variable is decision making in making purchases (Y), while the independent variables are *online promotion* (X1) and consumer behavior (X2). The results of the multiple linear regression analysis test can be seen in the table below:

Table 8. Multiple Linear Regression Test Results

| Causality | | | Beta Coefficient | T-count | Symbol | T-table | P-value |
|------------|---|----|------------------|---------|--------|---------|---------|
| (Constant) | | | 189,515 | | | | |
| Std. Error | | | 37,306 | | | | |
| Promotion | → | KP | 0.492 | 4.947 | > | 1,984 | 0.000 |
| Price | → | KP | 0.036 | 0.365 | < | 1,984 | 0.716 |

Source: Research questionnaire (processed data, 2024)

From the results of the table above, when written in *unstandardized form*, the regression equation is as follows:

$$Y = a + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + e$$

Y (Purchase Decision) = 189.515 (a / constant) + 0.492 (β_1 X₁ / Promotion) + 0.036 (β_2 X₂ / Price) + 37.306 (e / Error term)

From the regression equation model, it can be explained as follows: a) The positive constant number of 189.515 indicates that every 19% increase will be followed by an increase in the other variables of the same magnitude; b) The positive promotion coefficient of 0.492 indicates that every 1% increase in promotion will increase purchasing decisions by 49.20% while other variables remain constant; c) The positive price coefficient of 0.036 indicates that every 1% increase in price will reduce purchasing decisions by 3.6%.

Model Suitability Test (Fisher test)

The use of the F-test is carried out with the aim of assessing whether the analyzed model has met the requirements for model feasibility (goodness of fit model) as a basis for decision making whether or not the proposed hypothesis is proven, namely if the F-count value > F-table and at a significance level <0.05, then the model is declared feasible for further analysis. The results of the model feasibility test can be seen in the table below:

Table 9. Model Feasibility Test

| Causality | | | F-count | Symbol | F-table | p-value |
|-----------|---|----|---------|--------|---------|---------|
| Promotion | → | KP | 16,418 | > | 3,093 | 0,000 |
| Price | → | KP | | > | | |

Source: Research questionnaire (processed data, 2024)

Based on table 9, it shows that the results of the Fisher test show a calculated F value = 16.418 > 3.093 (F-table). These results indicate that the calculated F value > F-table, so it can be stated that the regression model built in this study is feasible, fulfilling the model feasibility test (goodness *fit of test*).

Student Test (t-test)

The t-statistic test basically shows how much influence one explanatory variable (independent) contributes to the dependent variable. The t-statistic value test uses a significance value of $\alpha = 5\%$. The criteria for testing the hypothesis using the t-statistic test are if the significance value of t (p-value) <0.05, then the alternative hypothesis is accepted, which states that an

independent variable individually and significantly affects the independent variable (Ghozali 2016).

t-count > t-table: then H0 is rejected and Ha is accepted

t-count < t-table: then H0 is accepted and Ha is rejected

Table 10. Student Test

| Causality | | | Beta Coefficient | T-count | Symbol | T-table | P-value |
|------------|---|----|------------------|---------|--------|---------|---------|
| (Constant) | | | 189,515 | | | | |
| Std. Error | | | 37,306 | | | | |
| Promotion | → | KP | 0.492 | 4.947 | > | 1,984 | 0.000 |
| Price | → | KP | 0.036 | 0.365 | < | 1,984 | 0.716 |

Source: Research questionnaire (processed data, 2024)

Table 10 shows that the fixed variable number is positive at 189,515, indicating that every 1% increase will be followed by an increase in other variables with the same magnitude. The positive promotion coefficient value = 0.492 indicates that every 1% increase in promotion will increase the Purchase Decision = 49.20% when other variables remain constant. The positive price coefficient = 0.036 explains that a 1% increase in price results in an increase in the Purchase Decision in making a purchase of 3.6%.

Coefficient of Determination Test (R2)

The determination coefficient (R2) aims to determine the best level of accuracy in regression analysis, which is indicated by the magnitude of the determination coefficient (R2) between 0 (zero) and 1 (one). The determination coefficient (R2) of zero means that the independent variable has no effect on the dependent variable at all. If the determination coefficient approaches one, then it can be said that the independent variable has an effect on the dependent variable. The results of the determination coefficient test can be seen in the table below:

Table 11. Modeling Contribution

| Causality | Pearson Correlation | X | Beta Coefficient | Contribution | R | R Square |
|----------------|---------------------|---|------------------|--------------|-------|----------|
| KP Promotion → | 0.508 | X | 0.492 | 0.250 | 0.509 | 0.259 |
| KP Price → | 0.257 | X | 0.036 | 0.090 | | |

Source: Research questionnaire (processed data, 2024)

Promotion has a correlation coefficient = 0.508 while Price has a correlation coefficient = 0.257 which means that the contribution given is categorized as strong. the contribution of the influence of promotion on purchasing decisions is 0.250 (25%) while the influence of price on purchasing decisions is 0.090 (9%). So, if rounded up, the amount of contribution (determination coefficient) is 0.259 = 26% (R Square). Based on these results, it can be explained that the dominant contribution of the variables that influence Purchasing decisions is promotion with a total contribution of 25%.

Interpretation of Research Results

H1: Promotion has a positive and significant effect on purchasing decisions

The effect of promotion on purchasing decisions can be proven by the t-count value = 4.947 > 1.984 t-table with a beta coefficient value = 0.492 (p-value = 0.000), these results prove that high-intensity promotions are proven to increase purchasing decisions. Promotion is also one

of the important factors that influence consumers in making purchases at Cahaya Huspi chicken sellers. Consumers will make purchases if the chicken is halal and still fresh, this creates customer trust that makes consumers feel safe in buying the chicken.

The frequency test in this study showed that of the 97 respondents who answered the questionnaire, 54 women or 56% were dominated by women and 43 men or 44% of respondents. And most of those who make purchases are housewives to meet their daily needs. Promotion contributes to purchasing decisions if promotional activities are carried out intensively, it tends to increase consumer decisions in making purchases will be even higher. The results of this study provide evidence that promotion provides a significant positive contribution to decision making in making purchases.

Promotion is one of the activities carried out by the company in offering brochure products that are introduced or advertised through social media or offline promotions by distributing brochures and putting up banners (George, 2021; Czinkota et al., 2021; Maina & Afande, 2015; Meirmanov, 2021). Promotional activities through social media are carried out with the consideration that the information presented in the form of advertisements, sales, relations with consumers and direct marketing is more easily accessed anywhere and by anyone. Consumer responses on online media are a form of message that is an activity to promote broiler chickens that is oriented for a short duration of time so that it influences consumers to use and/or buy broiler chickens (Dewi et al., 2024; Akter et al., 2023; Widmar et al., 2020; De Krom, 2009). Other promotional activities are carried out by building relationships with consumers so that a reciprocal relationship is created, in addition, the cause of the real impact of promotion is direct sales activities which on several occasions are carried out by utilizing social media.

Through online promotion, the costs required are much lower so that budget efficiency occurs which then with advertising displays that are designed in such a way that they can be used as an orientation for prospective buyers to be enthusiastic in deciding to purchase because with unlimited social media reach, anyone can access information on the products offered in addition to the advertisements offered are flexible, can be designed in such a way that they are in accordance with the target market so that purchases can be obtained at any time which in turn can increase the number of customers and sales of broiler chickens using whats app, facebook and instagram media) (Hikmah, 2021; Lestari, 2021).

Currently, there has been a change in consumers who always want to get up-to-date information. This has a positive impact on the company because it can be done easily and can be adjusted to consumer desires, so that it can increase the market's desire to consume broiler chickens. The better the presentation of the promotion carried out, the more it will increase the level of market participation in making purchases (Tibebe & Ayenew, 2018; Mustari et al., 2025).

This study is relevant to confirmation theory Ardiansyah et al. (2021), that if the promotional activities carried out are in accordance with consumer desires, consumers will give high trust to the products being marketed. In other parts, this study is relevant to the findings of Yuli & Hasan & Sohail (2021) Hanaysha (2022) if promotional activities through social media have a real impact on consumer decisions. The results of this study reject some of the findings of Islamiyah et al. (2020) that even though the intensity of promotion is carried out at a high level, in practice it cannot act as a purchasing stimulus.

H2: Price has a positive and insignificant effect on purchasing decisions

The t-value = 0.365 <1.984 (t-table) with a beta coefficient value = 0.036 (p-value = 0.716), that a good price can increase consumer desire in making purchasing decisions. The statement

explains that there are various factors that result in purchasing decisions, such as price affordability factors, price determination, price growth, and price determination.

The results of direct observation show that the company has known the price of a product well, but on several occasions there are reasons for consumers if the broiler chicken offered is relatively more expensive than the product offered and there are also other reasons, such as market demands that on several occasions consumers want the product offered to be accompanied by a discount or other personal reasons, so that it causes an unreal direction between consumer behavior and purchasing decisions.

Other conditions are shown in the description of the age of respondents who are mostly old (46-54 years), with this age the consumer's diet becomes very limited to consuming foods that are high in cholesterol so that their concerns about health become a limitation for making repeat purchases.

The high level of business competition in the broiler chicken business is also one of the reasons, this shows that if consumers have many purchasing alternatives, the company based on a direct survey has limitations in service. This is evidenced by employees at Cahaya Huspi who are generally educated only up to the general high school level so that they have limitations in providing maximum service to consumers.

H3: Promotion is a dominant variable influencing purchasing decisions

The influence of promotion on purchasing decisions can be proven by the t-count value = 4.947 > 1.984 t-table with a beta coefficient value = 0.492 (p-value = 0.000), while the influence of price on purchasing decisions can be proven by the t-count value = 0.365 < 1.984 (t-table) with a beta coefficient value = 0.036 (p-value = 0.716). These results prove that large promotions are proven to increase decision making in making purchases (significantly positive).

Conclusion

This company analyzes the influence of independent variables, namely promotion and price, on the dependent variable, namely purchasing decisions for chicken sellers CV. Cahaya Huspi in Makassar. This study shows that not all variables observed have a positive or negative and significant or insignificant influence on the dependent variable. Based on the results of the study, the researcher draws the following conclusions: Promotion has a positive and significant effect on purchasing decisions for chicken sellers CV. Cahaya Huspi in Makassar. This is due to the high frequency (intensity) of Cahaya Huspi in conducting promotions online and offline, resulting in consumers being interested in making decisions in making purchases. Price has a positive and insignificant effect on purchasing decisions for chicken sellers CV. Cahaya Huspi in Makassar. The results of direct observation show that the company has known the price of broiler chicken products well, but on several occasions there are consumer reasons if the broiler chicken offered is relatively more expensive compared to the products offered and there are also other reasons, such as market demands that on several occasions consumers want the products offered to be accompanied by discounts or other personal reasons, so that it causes an unreal direction between price and purchasing decisions. 3. Promotion is a more dominant variable that influences purchasing decisions because the company has a high ability to always market its products through social media and offline so that with the frequency of promotions carried out continuously and with the support of the media used in its implementation, it has been proven to increase consumer desire in determining purchasing decisions, in addition to the desire of consumers to obtain the latest information from the company and the company's ability to provide attractive designs on the media used are the causes of high purchasing

decisions. This is because the company can stimulate consumers through the promotions it does.

References

- Akter, M. S., Uddin, M. T., & Dhar, A. R. (2023). Advancing safe broiler farming in Bangladesh: An investigation of management practices, financial profitability, and consumer perceptions. *Commodities*, 2(3), 312-328. <https://doi.org/10.3390/commodities2030018>
- Alegre, J., & Juaneda, C. (2006). Destination loyalty: Consumers' economic behavior. *Annals of tourism research*, 33(3), 684-706. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2006.03.014>
- Anwar, M., & Andrean, D. (2021, January). The effect of perceived quality, brand image, and price perception on purchase decision. In *4th International Conference on Sustainable Innovation 2020-Accounting and Management (ICoSIAMS 2020)* (pp. 78-82). Atlantis Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2991/aer.k.210121.012>
- Ardiansyah, R., Sjahrudin, H., Themba, O. S., & Tenriola, A. (2021). Kontribusi tingkat religiusitas dan promosi terhadap minat masyarakat menjadi nasabah. *Niagawan*, 10(1), 21-29. <http://dx.doi.org/10.24114/niaga.v10i1.21115>
- Arif, M., & Siregar, I. K. (2021). Purchase decision affects, price, product quality and word of mouth. *International Journal of Economic, Technology and Social Sciences (Injects)*, 2(1), 260-273. <https://doi.org/10.53695/injects.v2i1.389>
- Asti, D. W., Hasbiah, S., & Haeruddin, M. I. W. (2022). The Influence of price and product quality on product purchasing decisions at PT Intan Pariwara. *Journal of Scientific Research, Education, and Technology (JSRET)*, 1(2), 238-258. <http://dx.doi.org/10.58526/jsret.v1i2.32>
- Bangun, R. (2023). Brand image, product quality, and price perception on drinking water purchase decision. *Enrichment: Journal of Management*, 12(6), 4834-4840. <https://doi.org/10.35335/enrichment.v12i6.1059>
- Czinkota, M. R., Kotabe, M., Vrontis, D., Shams, S. R., Czinkota, M. R., Kotabe, M., ... & Shams, S. R. (2021). Direct marketing, sales promotion, and public relations. *Marketing Management: Past, Present and Future*, 607-647. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-66916-4_13
- De Krom, M. P. (2009). Understanding consumer rationalities: consumer involvement in European food safety governance of avian influenza. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 49(1), 1-19. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9523.2008.00474.x>
- Dewi, G., Smith, C., Martin, W., Venkitanarayanan, K., & Kollanoor Johny, A. (2024). Focus groups exploring American consumer perspectives on contemporary poultry production reveal critical insights to educate sustainable practices for producers. *Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems*, 8, 1416167. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fsufs.2024.1416167>
- Dwiarta, I. M. B., & Ardiansyah, R. W. (2021). The Effect Of Price Perception, Quality Perception, And Location On Purchase Decisio. *International Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting Research (IJEBAR)*, 5(2). <https://doi.org/10.29040/ijebar.v5i2.2120>

- George, R. (2021). Designing the Tourism and Hospitality Promotions Mix. In *Marketing Tourism and Hospitality: Concepts and Cases* (pp. 343-368). Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-64111-5_11
- Ghozali, I. (2019). *Aplikasi analisis multivariete*. Semarang: Universitas Diponegoro.
- Giacalone, D., Clausen, M. P., & Jaeger, S. R. (2022). Understanding barriers to consumption of plant-based foods and beverages: Insights from sensory and consumer science. *Current Opinion in Food Science*, 48, 100919. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cofs.2022.100919>
- Hanaysha, J. R. (2022). Impact of social media marketing features on consumer's purchase decision in the fast-food industry: Brand trust as a mediator. *International Journal of Information Management Data Insights*, 2(2), 100102. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jjime.2022.100102>
- Hasan, M., & Sohail, M. S. (2021). The influence of social media marketing on consumers' purchase decision: investigating the effects of local and nonlocal brands. *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 33(3), 350-367. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08961530.2020.1795043>
- Hikmah, N. (2021). Strategi Bauran Pemasaran Dalam Meningkatkan Volume Penjualan Pada Usaha Ayam Potong Putra Sawung Galih Di Kecamatan Karanganyar, Purbalingga. *Skripsi. Purwokerto. IAIN Purwokerto*.
- Homburg, C., Koschate, N., & Hoyer, W. D. (2005). Do satisfied customers really pay more? A study of the relationship between customer satisfaction and willingness to pay. *Journal of marketing*, 69(2), 84-96. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.69.2.84.60760>
- Islamiyah, D., Kurniati, R. R., & Kridianto, D. (2020). Analisis pengaruh celebrity endorser dan promosi online terhadap keputusan pembelian pada online. *Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi Niaga atau Bisnis (JIAGABI)*, 9(1), 94–102.
- Kasmad, K. (2022). Analysis of Purchase Decision Estimates Based on Store Atmosphere and Affordable Prices. *AKADEMIK: Jurnal Mahasiswa Ekonomi & Bisnis*, 2(1), 27-34. <https://doi.org/10.37481/jmeh.v2i1.246>
- Kotler, P., & Armstrong. (2018). *Prinsip-prinsip marketing* (Edisi ke-7). Jakarta: Salemba Empat.
- Kotler, P., & Keller, K. L. (2016). *Manajemen pemasaran* (Jilid I). Jakarta: Erlangga.
- Lestari, A. A. (2021). *Analisis Efisiensi Biaya Pemasaran dalam Usaha Meningkatkan Profitabilitas bagi Perusahaan (Studi Kasus Pada PT. So Good Food cabang Medan)* (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Islam Negeri Sumatera Utara Medan).
- Maina, P., & Afande, F. (2015). Effect of promotional mix elements on sales volume of financial institutions in Kenya: Case study of Kenya post office savings bank. *Journal of Marketing and Consumer Research*, 11(1), 64-91.
- Marlius, D., & Jovanka, N. (2023). Pengaruh harga dan promosi terhadap keputusan pembelian konsumen YOU pada Hasanah Mart Air Haji. *Jurnal Economina*, 2(2), 476–490. <http://dx.doi.org/10.55681/economina.v2i2.326>
- Marlius, D., & Noveliza, K. (2022). Pengaruh harga, kualitas produk dan promosi terhadap keputusan pembelian produk sepatu Converse pada Toko Babe. Shopp Padang.

EKOMA: Jurnal Ekonomi, Manajemen, Akuntansi, 2(1), 255–268.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.56799/ekoma.v2i1.1251>

- Mehrabioun, M. (2024). A multi-theoretical view on social media continuance intention: Combining theory of planned behavior, expectation-confirmation model and consumption values. *Digital Business*, 4(1), 100070.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.digbus.2023.100070>
- Meirmanov, D. (2021). *Creating effective digital promotion and sales channels in B2C, case of Beeline Kazakhstan* (Master's thesis, M. Narikbayev KAZGUU University (Kazakhstan)).
- Mishra, R., Singh, R. K., & Koles, B. (2021). Consumer decision-making in Omnichannel retailing: Literature review and future research agenda. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 45(2), 147-174. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijcs.12617>
- Mustari, M. F., Jumady, E., & Rusni, M. (2025). The Influence of Promotion and Price on Purchase Decisions of Chicken Cuts Sellers. *Journal La Bisecoman*, 6(1), 56-67.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.37899/journallabisecoman.v6i1.1848>
- Pranindyastuti, T., & Ni'Mah, F. S. (2023). Pengaruh harga dan promosi terhadap keputusan pembelian aksesoris HP (Studi kasus: Gajah Mungkur Cell Pangkalan Bun). *Magenta*, 11(2), 103–117.
- Rajasa, E. Z., Manap, A., Ardana, P. D. H., Yusuf, M., & Harizahayu, H. (2023). Literature Review: Analysis Of Factors Influencing Purchasing Decisions, Product Quality And Competitive Pricing. *Jurnal Ekonomi*, 12(01), 451-455.
- Ridwan, M. (2022). Purchasing Decision Analysis in Modern Retail. *AKADEMIK: Jurnal Mahasiswa Ekonomi & Bisnis*, 2(1), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.37481/jmeh.v2i1.243>
- Rivaldo, Y., Kamanda, S. V., & Yusman, E. (2022). The Effect Of Products, Promotions And Prices On Mizon's Purchasing Decision At Alfamart Sungai Harapan. *Jurnal Mantik*, 6(2), 2393-2399. <https://doi.org/10.35335/mantik.v6i2.2811>
- Saktiendi, E., Herawati, S., Yenny, L. A., & Agusti, A. W. (2022). Pengaruh viral marketing, promosi, dan kualitas pelayanan terhadap keputusan pembelian MS Glow di Bumi Indah Kabupaten Tangerang. *Jurnal Penelitian Multidisiplin Formosa*, 1(2), 197–210.
<https://doi.org/10.55927/fjmr.v1i2.524>
- Suttikun, C., & Meeprom, S. (2021). Examining the effect of perceived quality of authentic souvenir product, perceived value, and satisfaction on customer loyalty. *Cogent Business & Management*, 8(1), 1976468.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2021.1976468>
- Tibebe, G., & Ayenew, T. (2018). The effectiveness of integrated marketing communication for high involvement product purchase decision: In case of University of Gondar employees. *Pacific Business Review International*, 11(4).
- Wang, C., Liu, J., & Zhang, T. (2021). ‘What if my experience was not what I expected?’: Examining expectation-experience (dis) confirmation effects in China’s rural destinations. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 27(4), 365-384.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/13567667211006763>

- Warningrum, S. L. (2023). Pengaruh promosi produk dan harga terhadap keputusan pembelian skincare Skintific pada mahasiswa Universitas 17 Agustus 1945 Surabaya. *Jurnal Riset Manajemen*, 1(3), 13–21. <https://doi.org/10.54066/jurma.v1i3.585>
- Widmar, N., Bir, C., Wolf, C., Lai, J., & Liu, Y. (2020). #Eggs: social and online media-derived perceptions of egg-laying hen housing. *Poultry Science*, 99(11), 5697-5706. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psj.2020.07.011>