

Perceived Price Analysis on Selected Processed Livestock Meat Product Brands

Agung Triatmojo¹, Mujtahidah Anggriani Ummul Muzayyanah¹, Nguyen Hoang Qui²

Department of Livestock Socioeconomic, Faculty of Animal Science, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Yogyakarta, Indonesia¹

Department of Animal Science and Veterinary Medicine, School of Agriculture and Aquaculture, Tra Vinh University, Tra Vinh, Vietnam²



ABSTRACT— Consumers have several considerations before choosing a particular product brand. Earlier studies showed that consumers no longer consider price when selecting a brand of processed meat products. However, factors influencing product brand selection decisions are price and differences in consumer characteristics. The study utilized a cross-sectional design with a survey method to analyse the effects of consumers' sociodemographic characteristics on perceived price in choosing a brand of processed meat products. Primary data were collected using a convenience sampling technique and a self-administered questionnaire. A total of 456 respondents were consumers of processed meat products, including sausages, nuggets, corned meat, meatballs, and meat floss. The results showed that farmers 18-42 years old accounted for 68.64% with single status (56.80%). A total of 60% of respondents were non-tertiary (69.74%), and 64.91% of farmers had fewer than 4 members in their houses and mostly stayed in urban areas (65.13%). The differences in income, location, gender, and recent education significantly influence perceived price in product brand selection decisions ($P < 0.001$). This study concluded that sociodemographic characteristics impact consumers' perceived prices, yet income is the dominant factor in determining selected processed livestock meat product brands.

KEYWORDS: Meat product, brand, perceived price, sociodemographic.

1. INTRODUCTION

Consumers have several considerations before choosing a particular product brand [1]. Price and consumer characteristics influence the final decision [2- 4]. Prices drive the purchasing decisions for fresh meat products [5]. [6] found that consumers evaluate prices when purchasing fresh meat products. In contrast, when purchasing processed meat products, consumers no longer considered price as their purchasing decision [7].

Consumers recognize that processed meat products have more benefits than fresh meat because they can be stored longer [8- 11]. Therefore, some people have started to substitute processed foods such as sausages, nuggets, corned meat, meatballs, and meat floss for fresh foods [12]. It is demonstrated by the growth of the meat processing market, which expanded by 28.87% from 2016 to 2019 [13]. Due to this expansion, numerous processed meat brands have emerged [9], [14]. The top three processed meat brands have achieved a market share of more than 16.8% [15]. Consumer perception is the initial impression of a product formed by information processing. Perception will lead consumers to select or buy a good [16], [17]. Perceived price is a decisive factor in how consumers evaluate a product's value [18], [19]. In addition, different types of information that impact the choice of a product influence purchase and consumption decisions. The sociocultural background of a consumer affects their behavior and preferences for goods and services, including modes of consumption and frequency of consumption [20- 23] According to, [24], consumers will

perceive the price differently since they have different characteristics. Perceived price is one of actors that has a positive and significant effect on the purchase decision of customers [25]. One of the instruments a marketer may use to engage the market is price, whether they are using it to directly recruit customers, influence their purchasing decisions, and keep them loyal or to compete with competitors [26].

Perceived price variables might be influenced by consumer characteristics. Hence, whether a product is costly or affordable relies on how people perceive its pricing. There has not been much study on how consumers perceive the prices of processed livestock products, particularly brands with higher market shares in Indonesia. This study aims to analyse the effects of consumers' sociodemographic characteristics on perceived price in choosing a brand of processed meat products.

2. Material and Methods

2.1 Location

The study was conducted on Java Island and included 6 provinces, namely Banten, Jakarta, West Java, Central Java, Yogyakarta, and East Java. These provinces have a significant beef consumption and higher population density than other provinces in Indonesia.

2.2 Data collection

The study design used a survey method, which included 456 meat consumers selected by convenience sampling. The respondents are chosen by the following criteria: consumers who can access the questionnaire, have at least 18 years old, consume beef as their routine and know at least one brand each meat processed product. The scoop location is chosen due to the most populous region in Indonesia. The data were collected using self-administered questionnaires. The respondents were asked to complete a questionnaire based on their personal experiences and preferences regarding the priority of their preferred brand of processed meat products.

This study could provide information that producers can apply to set up marketing plans based on segmented consumers. In addition to supporting marketers in raising sales by affecting consumer response, understanding consumer behavior also helps businesses identify underexploited opportunities through descriptive statistics. Moreover, binary logistic regression (BLR) analysis was used to determine the effects of consumers' perceived price of sociodemographic characteristics in choosing a brand of processed meat products. Logical regression models describe the relationship between dependent variables on a category scale and one or more independent variables. Therefore, binary logistic regression is the development of logistic regression in which dependent variables have a binary scale. The binary logistic regression model gives responses for the dependent factors that are either 0 (if an event does not happen) or 1 (if an event does happen) [27].

This survey is concerned with the effect sociodemographic characteristics on perceived price of selected meat processed product. We distinguished older adults (>42 years old) as being more likely to have stable income and health problems than younger adults (18-41 years old), which may have increased their focus on the repercussions of food choices rather than price [28], [29]. A married person's multiple roles influence their own and their family members' purchasing behavior. Shoppers seek similar value and savings for household matters [29], [30]. Men are relatively price insensitive, whereas female shoppers ranked price, value for money, and cleanliness as important [29], [31]. Food preferences are influenced by family structure, including the presence of children and family size. Children and other family members, for example, may influence the food decisions of the person procuring and preparing food, to the detriment of the overall cost of what is purchased [32]. Furthermore, research conducted by [29] found that non-tertiary educated were more

concerned with regular promotional and pricing. The educated and paid-full time consumer who live in metropolitan region is more likely to work in a professional role, have a middle-higher income (IDR >6 mio [33]), therefore be too busy to be concerned with other things, which influences their evaluation of a purchase decision.

The consumers were asked to choose three preferred processed meat product brands from a list that included sausage, corned meat, meatballs, nuggets, and meat floss, as well as the primary reason for their choice. The brand chosen for this study is based on a pre-survey and is strengthened by the results of a survey conducted by Top Brand Indonesia, one of the independent research institutions [34]. Subsequently, the consumers were asked to select whether the price was the primary reason for their priority. The variables are defined in Tables 1 and 2 below:

Table 1. Definition of operational variables.

Variables		Sign	Scale	Operational Definition
Independent variable				
X ₁	Age (year)	+	Ordinal	1: 18-41 0: >42
X ₂	Marital status	+	Nominal	1: Married 0: Single
X ₃	Sex	-	Nominal	1: Male 0: Female
X ₄	Education	-	Ordinal	1: Tertiary 0: Nontertiary
X ₅	Employment	-	Nominal	1: Paid-full time 0: Part-time
X ₆	Household size (person)	+	Ratio	1: >4 0: ≤4
X ₇	Income (IDR)	-	Ordinal	1: Upper middle (upper IDR 6.000.000) 0: Lower middle (under IDR 6.000.000)
X ₈	Location	-	Nominal	1: Urban 0: Rural
Dependent variable				
Y	Price (the main reason for choosing product)		Nominal	1: Yes 0: No

Table 2. Brand diversities and brand codes

Code	Brand	Code	Brand
A	So Nice	H	Pronas
B	Kanzler	I	So good
C	Belfoods	J	Cap ratu
D	Fiesta	K	Gloria
E	Champ	L	Indomaret
F	Bernardi	M	Alfamart
G	Cip		

2.3 Data analysis

This study used five processed livestock products due to their high consumption product and to assess the consistency of the model. To analyse the effect of social profile on the perceived price in selecting various brands the logistic regression model used for this research was as follows:

$$Y_{hi} = \text{Log} \left(\frac{p}{p-1} \right)$$

$$= \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{Age} + \beta_2 \text{Marital status} + \beta_3 \text{Gender} + \beta_4 \text{Education} + \beta_5 \text{Employment}$$

$$+ \beta_6 \text{Household size} + \beta_7 \text{Income} + \beta_8 \text{Location}$$

where:

- Y_{hi} = dependent variable (price as the main reason for choosing a product brand)
 Y: 1, Yes
 Y: 0, No
 h: processed meat products (sausage, nugget, cornet meat, meatball, and meat floss)
 i: respondent i (1,2,3.... N)
- Log = logistic equation
 p = likelihood of respondents choosing price as the driving factor in their purchases
 $p-1$ = otherwise
 β_0 = constant
 β_{1-8} = coefficient regression
 X_{1-8} = independent variables

3. Results

3.1 Characteristic Respondents

Most survey participants were young adults and adolescents compared to older respondents. More than half of the respondents to the study were unmarried, and approximately 60% of the respondents were female, with a total of fewer than four household members. Most respondents are nontertiary graduates based on the latest education. Employment and income levels are relatively comparable in each group. Table 3 summarizes the personnel characteristics of the respondent.

Table 3. Characteristic respondents.

Characteristics	Amount	%
Age range (years)		
>42	143	31.36
18-41	313	68.64
Marital status		
Single	259	56.80
Married	197	43.20
Sex		
Male	178	39.04
Female	278	60.96
Education		
Nontertiary	318	69.74
Tertiary	138	30.26
Employment		
Part-time	231	50.66
Paid-full time	225	49.34
Household size		
≤4	296	64.91
>4	160	35.09
Income		
Lower middle	221	48.46
Upper middle	235	51.54
Location		
Urban	297	65.13

Rural	159	34.87
-------	-----	-------

3.2 Selected brand-processed livestock meat products

Table 4 shows the top three brands of processed livestock products that consumers prefer. Generally, brand D is chosen in different categories and priority orders of processed meat products. Brand D is believed to be a product of a prominent Indonesian corporation. Respondents prefer the D brand among processed meat goods such as sausages, nuggets, and meatballs.

Table 4. Top three consumer-preferred brands of processed meat products.

Product	First Choice			Second Choice			Third Choice		
	Brand	Freq	%	Brand	Freq	%	Brand	Freq	%
Sausage	A	118	25.88	D	110	24.12	E	99	21.71
	D	99	21.71	E	90	19.74	A	73	16.01
	B	73	16.01	A	74	16.23	D	60	13.16
Nugget	D	284	62.28	E	120	26.32	E	110	24.12
	I	62	13.60	I	111	24.34	C	98	21.49
	E	53	11.62	C	89	19.52	I	95	20.83
Corned meat	H	268	58.77	C	113	24.78	C	111	24.34
	F	81	17.76	G	104	22.81	F	87	19.08
	C	39	8.55	H	90	19.74	G	66	14.47
Meatball	I	181	39.69	D	193	42.32	E	166	36.40
	D	133	29.17	I	93	20.39	I	88	19.30
	E	57	12.50	E	86	18.86	C	83	18.20
Meat floss	H	224	49.12	L	104	22.81	M	94	20.61
	J	86	18.86	H	86	18.86	H	66	14.47
	K	41	8.99	K	81	17.76	L	62	13.60

Aside from brand D, respondents preferred brand E as an alternative product brand. It should be noted that brand E is a product manufactured by the same company as brand D. The company differentiates its products to increase market share. The company differentiates its products to expand its market share. It derives from differences in the composition of the materials used to produce the product. Even though it lowers product quality, the approach enhances consumer choice in the product. Third, brand C is an alternative last choice in various product categories and consumer preference orders. Brand C is another product brand of Indonesia's globally integrated livestock industry. Brand C competes with brand E in terms of price. In comparison, brand C is a superior alternative for corned meat products, although it does not compete with brand E. Among sausage, nugget, corned meat, and meatball products, consumer-desired meat floss product brands are not dominated by large market share companies. Extensive livestock companies have not yet reached the meat floss market. Thus, it is considered that the H brand is the preferred option for consumers in various priority orders. However, the H brand does not emerge from medium enterprises but from middle-class businesses. Multinational businesses could rapidly become market leaders since they thrive in capital, manufacturing capacity, and price.

3.3 Effects of sociodemographics on perceived price

Five models with different product categories were compared to determine whether the results supported the hypothesis. Researchers speculated that perceived price-related outcomes should be consistent across the model. Furthermore, the Hosmer and Lemeshow tests revealed no significant difference between the models and their observation values ($P > 0.05$) for the four models obtained. The results indicate that the developed model can be utilized for logistic regression analysis. Nevertheless, sausage models with a likelihood ratio (LR) more significant than ($P > 0.10$) are not interpreted. The LR value indicates that at least one independent

variable, or an independent variable, simultaneously impacts the dependent variable.

Table 5. Effects of consumers' sociodemographics on perceived price for processed livestock meat product brands.

Variables	Sausage		Nugget		Corned meat		Meatball		Meat floss	
	X ²	Sig.	X ²	Sig.	X ²	Sig.	X ²	Sig.	X ²	Sig.
Constant	-1.63	0.10	0.09	0.92	-0.39	0.69	-0.15	0.88	-0.39	0.69
Age (X1)	-1.04	0.03	-0.01	0.99	1.15	0.25	-0.93	0.35	1.15	0.25
Marital status (X2)	-0.79	0.42	0.04	0.96	0.67	0.50	-0.59	0.55	0.67	0.50
Sex (X3)	-0.79	0.82	-1.75	*0.08	-2.16	**0.03	0.58	0.56	-2.16	**0.03
Education (X4)	-0.34	0.73	-1.23	0.22	-1.06	0.29	-2.25	**0.02	-1.06	0.29
Employment (X5)	0.71	0.47	0.79	0.42	1.53	0.12	0.34	0.73	1.53	0.12
Household size (X6)	0.46	0.64	0.28	0.78	-0.75	0.45	-1.38	0.16	-0.75	0.45
Income (X7)	-1.42	0.15	-2.18	**0.02	-1.96	**0.04	-1.68	*0.09	-1.96	**0.04
Location (X8)	1.10	0.26	-1.97	**0.04	-1.28	0.20	0.31	0.75	-1.28	0.20
Goodness-of-Fit										
X ²	213.45		204.45		215.33		221.72		215.33	
Sig.	0.38		0.55		0.34		0.24		0.35	
Model Fitting										
Pseudo R ²	0.01		0.03		0.03		0.03		0.03	
LR Wald X ²	5.05		13.60		15.64		13.88		15.64	
Sig.	0.75		*0.09		**0.04		*0.08		**0.04	

Note: *significant at (P<0.10), **significant at (P<0.05)

Partially, there is a likelihood that gender, education, income, and location have a significant effect on perceived price discrepancies (Table 5). Nonetheless, consumer income has the most significant impact on the construction of price perception. A significantly high regression coefficient value evidence it compared to other variables. The value of the logistic regression coefficient is directly proportional to the Z value. The Z value describes the magnitude of an independent variable's effect on the dependent variable. Coefficients cannot be evaluated directly in logistic regression analysis (Table 5). However, the coefficient can be used to calculate the likelihood value (odd ratio). The odds ratio is the probability value of the independent variable toward the dependent variable. The odds ratio value in Table 5 represents the possibility of price as a consumer consideration.

Table 6. Binary logistic regression analysis results.

Variable	Sausage	Nugget	Corned meat	Meatball	Meat floss
Constant	0.39	1.05	0.79	0.91	0.80
Age (18-41 years old vs. above 42 years old)	0.70	0.99	1.45	0.70	1.50
Marital status (Married vs. single)	0.77	1.01	1.23	0.81	1.23
Sex (Female vs. male)	1.05	-0.68	-0.63	1.14	-0.63
Education (Tertiary vs. nontertiary)	0.91	0.72	0.76	-0.54	0.76
Employment (Paid-full time vs. part-time)	1.20	1.22	1.50	1.09	1.48
Household size (less than 4-person vs. above 4-person)	1.03	1.02	0.95	0.91	0.96
Income (above IDR 6 Mio vs. less than IDR 6 Mio)	0.71	-0.58	-0.62	-0.67	-0.62
Location (Urban vs. rural)	1.27	-0.62	0.75	1.07	0.75

Note: the bolded numbers in the table indicate significant effects.

The possibility for upper-middle-income consumers to select a brand based on price is 0.62 times smaller than for middle-to-low incomes on purchasing processed meat products. Moreover, the tendency of consumers

living in urban areas or women or tertiary graduates to recognize price as a reason for selecting a brand of processed livestock products is 0.63 times smaller than that of consumers living in rural areas, men, and primary and secondary (nontertiary) school graduates. The data presented in Table 6 demonstrate that price-related considerations differ in selecting a processed food brand.

4. Discussion

Through the data of the social profile, the market segmentation was partly identified. The segments derived from the responses to meat purchase criteria are mainly delineated demographically by their age, gender, education, and living location following the results. This was in line with the study of [35], who found that meat consumers in Makassar were older, married, employed by the government, and had tertiary education. On the other hand, the company always acquires a competitive advantage in production, pricing, and marketing [36]. The results of selected brand-processed livestock meat products were corroborated with a survey conducted by [15], which found that brand D has one of the top three market shares in processed meat brands. Price and quality remain dominant in selecting fresh livestock products [37- 39]. However, once a good has been processed, taste becomes the most important determinant in product selection [40]. When the price is no longer the primary determinant in product selection, it needs to be investigated whether sociodemographic differences cause distinctions in the perceived price. Consequently, this study will demonstrate which consumer characteristics tend to consider prices when purchasing brands of processed livestock products.

The findings suggest that sociodemographic factors influence consumers' perceived price. Although some studies have shown that price is no longer the primary concern in choosing a processed food product brand, consumers continue to consider product prices. According to [41] also stated that good value for money and low price were globally crucial for meat consumers, and the study also showed that good value for money appeared to have a greater effect than just straight price. Notably, consumers who still emphasize price as a purchasing factor are men with a lower level of education, those with a lower middle income, and those in rural areas. Men preferred a broad product selection with high-quality fresh food, meat, and transparent pricing. There is a perception that pricing is the most important buying factor. Studies show that men typically purchase the same size, brand, and flavour as they always have. Price may be the most important thing for men to consider when shopping for food, but it is not considered significant enough to change the decision-making process [42], [43]. In contrast, women are typically less price-conscious while making purchases. The value view of women is multifaceted and more focused on quality. Regarding the pricing feature, women are opposed to either being overpriced or underpriced; instead, they prefer products that are appropriately priced within an affordable range. Women have a more complex and comprehensive purchasing decision-making process. Furthermore, women tend to conclude a series of cycles, frequently looping back to an earlier phase of the decision-making process as they review past choice variables and incorporate new information in search of the optimal solution. Women were more concerned with weekly specials, regular discounts, and promotional prices than men.

Consumers with less education tend to be more concerned about prices when they purchase processed meat products. [43] discovered that noncollege-educated consumers were more concerned with price and promotions. Similar to all learning, tertiary and nontertiary education enriches the significance of more extensive and complex issues by relating them to lifestyles. Moreover, the more educated a consumer is, the more likely they are to have a professional career, receive a comparably higher salary, and be too busy to bother about other matters, altering how they judge a purchase. In practice, such perspectives align with a "grab-and-go" group that prioritizes shopping efficiency over other considerations. However, groups with greater levels of education were more likely to report high-income levels than groups with less education.

Therefore, the interaction between high education and lower costs may indicate that more highly educated groups are more price-conscious than less educated groups [43], [44].

Consumers with low to middle incomes typically think about product prices more than consumers with high incomes. Generally, groups with more education were likelier to report high-income levels than those with less education. Low-income groups are more worried about the cost of food. Middle-lower income consumers considered consistent pricing, whereas middle-upper income consumers were unaffected by price considerations [44], [43]. In contrast, higher-income groups were more critical of taste than lower-income groups. Socioeconomically affluent groups are noted for their admiration of refined and upscale cuisine or what they consider sensory-appealing culinary options [45]. Rural customers have a higher opportunity to evaluate prices when purchasing processed meat products than their urban counterparts. People who live in more urban areas have higher incomes and more activity around them [46]. Consequently, consumers in urban areas prioritize the functionality and flavor of processed beef products [45], resulting in more elastic price sensitivity. Compared to consumers in rural areas, processed meat products are merely condiments. Therefore, prices are more concerned with regulating the budget for fresh foods, and variances in how consumers perceive their location can influence pricing.

5. Conclusion

Consumers' perceptions of a price will vary depending on their sociodemographic characteristics. Extensive and integrated industries dominate brands of processed animal products in Indonesia. It provides producers the chance to implement price strategies. Brands with a significant market share should diversify to alter pricing and quality to reach consumers, particularly those with modest incomes or who live in rural areas. This study concludes that consumer demographics such as gender, education, income, and residence location significantly affect a difference in consumer perceived prices. Nevertheless, income is the dominant factor in determining selected processed livestock meat product brands. Since specific consumers considered prices differently, the company could conduct strategy segmentation promotion based on sociodemography.

6. Acknowledgement

We acknowledge the Directorate of Research at Universitas Gadjah Mada for funding this study under Contract 2559/UN1.P.III/Dit-Lit/PT.01.03/2022 through Strengthening Lecturers Capability Grants in 2022.

7. References

- [1] Jang, S., Prasad, A., and Ratchford, B.T. (2012): How consumers use product reviews in the purchase decision process. *Marketing Letters*. Vol. 23 (3). pp: 825–838.
- [2] Punj, G. (2011): Effect of Consumer Beliefs on Online Purchase Behavior: The Influence of Demographic Characteristics and Consumption Values. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*. Vol. 25 (3). pp: 134–144.
- [3] Magalhaes, D.R., Maza, M.T., Prado, I.N. do, Fiorentini, G., Kirinus, J.K., and Campo, M. del M. (2022): An Exploratory Study of the Purchase and Consumption of Beef: Geographical and Cultural Differences between Spain and Brazil. *Foods*. Vol. 11 (1). pp: 129.
- [4] Sasaki, K. (2022): Diversity of Japanese consumers' requirements, sensory perceptions, and eating preferences for meat. *Animal Science Journal*. Vol. 93 (1).
- [5] Setyowati, K., Murti, A.T., and Astuti, F.K. (2021): Faktor Pengambilan Keputusan Pembelian

Masyarakat Terhadap Produk Daging Sapi Segar Dan Produk Olahan Di Kota Wisata Batu. *Jurnal Ilmiah Fillia Cendekia*. Vol. 6 (2). pp: 118–129.

[6] Firdaus, A.M., Firman, A., and Fitriani, A. (2022): Terhadap Keputusan Pembelian Produk Daging Sapi dan Turunannya. *Jurnal Pemikiran Masyarakat Ilmiah Berwawasan Agribisnis*. Vol. 8 (1). pp: 376–386.

[7] Muzayyanah, M.A.U., Triatmojo, A., and Guntoro, B. The consumer preferences for processed meat products based on choice brand priorities The consumer preferences for processed meat products based on choice brand priorities, in: *IOP Conf Ser Earth Environ Sci*, 2022: pp. 1–5.

[8] Roobab, U., Chacha, J.S., Abida, A., Rashid, S., Muhammad Madni, G., Lorenzo, J.M., Zeng, X., and Aadil, R.M. (2022): Emerging Trends for Nonthermal Decontamination of Raw and Processed Meat: Ozonation, High-Hydrostatic Pressure and Cold Plasma. *Foods*. Vol. 11 (15). pp: 2173.

[9] Dias, K.T., and Braga Junior, S.S. (2016): The use of reverse logistics for waste management in a Brazilian grocery retailer. *Waste Management & Research: The Journal for a Sustainable Circular Economy*. Vol. 34 (1). pp: 22–29.

[10] Gelbíčová, T., Brodíková, K., and Karpíšková, R. (2022): Livestock-associated methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* in Czech retailed ready-to-eat meat products. *International Journal of Food Microbiology*. Vol. 374 pp: 109727.

[11] Danh, L.N., Thi, N., and Truc, T. Analysis of factors affecting the consumption intention of processed sea crabs in big cities in Vietnam, 2022.

[12] Santoso, I., Mustaniroh, S.A., and Pranowo, D. (2018): Keakraban produk dan minat beli frozen food: peran pengetahuan produk, kemasan, dan lingkungan sosial. *Jurnal Ilmu Keluarga Dan Konsumen*. Vol. 11 (2). pp: 133–144.

[13] Kementerian Perindustrian. (2020): Industri Pengolahan Daging Terus Bertumbuh, Hasil Produksi Diserap 200 Ribu Peritel Makanan. <https://agro.kemenperin.go.id/berita/6407-dirjen-agro-abdul-rochim-industri-pengolahan-daging-terus-bertumbuh-hasil-produksi-diserap-200-ribu-peritel-makanan> (accessed August 10, 2022).

[14] Saleh, I.M., M, R., and Nella. (2011): Hubungan antara pengetahuan merek sozzis dengan volume pembelian produk sosis merek Sozzis Pada PT. Carrefour Cabang MTC Karebosi, Makassar. *Jurnal Agribisnis*. Vol. 10 (3). pp: 59–69.

[15] Top Brand Index. (2022): Top Brand Index Beserta Kategori Lengkap. Top Brand Index. <https://www.topbrand-award.com/top-brand-index/> (accessed August 10, 2022).

[16] Sumarwan, U. *Perilaku Konsumen: Teori dan Penerapannya dalam Pemasaran*, 2nd ed., Ghalia Indonesia, Bogor, 2014.

[17] Liu, J., Ellies-Oury, M.-P., Stoyanchev, T., and Hocquette, J.-F. (2022): Consumer Perception of Beef Quality and How to Control, Improve and Predict It? Focus on Eating Quality. *Foods*. Vol. 11 (12). pp: 1732.

- [18] Zeithaml, V.A., and Bitner, M.J. *Service Marketing*, McGraw Hill Inc, New York, 2003.
- [19] Setiadi, R., Setyowati, R., Iskandar, K., Syaifulloh, M., Abadiyah, A., Yulianto, A., and Ikhwan, S. (2022): The Effect of Perceived Price and Service Quality on Consumer Satisfaction of Healthy Baby Food Counters. *Food Science and Technology (United States)*. Vol. 10 (2). pp: 17–22.
- [20] Sans, P., and Combris, P. (2015): World meat consumption patterns: An overview of the last fifty years (1961–2011). *Meat Science*. Vol. 109 pp: 106–111.
- [21] Kang, J., Jun, J., and Arendt, S.W. (2015): Understanding customers' healthy food choices at casual dining restaurants: Using the Value–Attitude–Behavior model. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*. Vol. 48 pp: 12–21.
- [22] Henchion, M., McCarthy, M., Resconi, V.C., and Troy, D. (2014): Meat consumption: Trends and quality matters. *Meat Science*. Vol. 98 (3). pp: 561–568.
- [23] de Boer, J., Schösler, H., and Aiking, H. (2014): “Meatless days” or “less but better”? Exploring strategies to adapt Western meat consumption to health and sustainability challenges. *Appetite*. Vol. 76 pp: 120–128.
- [24] Buiga, A., Stegorean, R., Chiş, A., and Lazăr, D. (2017): Pricing of the tourism product: A tool for entrepreneurs to adapt to a flexible market. *Ekonomie a Management*. Vol. 20 (1). pp: 172–186.
- [25] Suhaily, L., and Darmoyo, S. *Effect of Product Quality, Perceived Price and Brand Image on Purchase Decision Mediated by Customer Trust (Study on Japanese Brand Electronic Product)*, 2017.
- [26] Boonlertvanich, K. *Consumer Buying and Decision-Making Behavior of a Digital Camera in Thailand*, 2009.
- [27] Mendenhall, W., and Sincich, T. *A Second Course in Statistics: Regression Analysis*, 7th Editio, Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, 2011.
- [28] Kamphuis, C.B.M., de Bekker-Grob, E.W., and van Lenthe, F.J. (2015): Factors affecting food choices of older adults from high and low socioeconomic groups: a discrete choice experiment. *The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*. Vol. 101 (4). pp: 768–774.
- [29] Mortimer, G., and Clarke, P. (2011): Supermarket consumers and gender differences relating to their perceived importance levels of store characteristics. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*. Vol. 18 (6). pp: 575–585.
- [30] Guha, S. (2013): The changing perception and buying behaviour of women consumer in Urban India. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*. Vol. 11 (6). pp: 34–39. www.iosrjournals.org (accessed August 10, 2022).
- [31] Subramanian, K.S., and Tarafdar, J.C. (2011): Prospects of nanotechnology in Indian farming. *Indian Journal of Agricultural Sciences*. Vol. 81 (20). pp: 3–9. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/262178208> (accessed August 10, 2022).

- [32] Evans, A.E., Jennings, R., Smiley, A.W., Medina, J.L., Sharma, S. v., Rutledge, R., Stigler, M.H., and Hoelscher, D.M. (2012): Introduction of farm stands in low-income communities increases fruit and vegetable among community residents. *Health & Place*. Vol. 18 (5). pp: 1137–1143.
- [33] World Bank. (n.d.): Country classification based on GDP per capita. <https://data.worldbank.org/country/indonesia> (accessed September 22, 2022).
- [34] Top Brand Index. (2022): Top Brand Index Beserta Kategori Lengkap. Top Brand Index. <https://www.topbrand-award.com/top-brand-index/> (accessed August 10, 2022).
- [35] Nasrullah, Nurhayu, A., Natsir, A., Asja, M.A., Murray-Prior, R., and Murray, P. The 5 th International Seminar on Tropical Animal Production Community Empowerment and Tropical Animal Industry, n.d.
- [36] Novita, D., and Husna, N. (2020): Competitive Advantage in the Company. *Jurnal TECHNOBIZ*. Vol. 3 (1). pp: 14–18.
- [37] Conte, F., Passantino, A., Longo, S., and Voslářová, E. (2014): Consumers' attitude towards fish meat. *Italian Journal of Food Safety*. Vol. 3 (3). pp: 178–181.
- [38] Claret, A., Guerrero, L., Aguirre, E., Rincón, L., Hernández, M.D., Martínez, I., Benito Peleteiro, J., Grau, A., and Rodríguez-Rodríguez, C. (2012): Consumer preferences for sea fish using conjoint analysis: Exploratory study of the importance of country of origin, obtaining method, storage conditions and purchasing price. *Food Quality and Preference*. Vol. 26 (2). pp: 259–266.
- [39] Pieniak, Z., Verbeke, W., and Scholderer, J. (2010): Health-related beliefs and consumer knowledge as determinants of fish consumption. *Journal of Human Nutrition and Dietetics*. Vol. 23 (5). pp: 480–488.
- [40] Muzayyanah, M.A.U., Triatmojo, A., and Guntoro, B. (2022): The consumer preferences for processed meat products based on choice brand priorities. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*. Vol. 1001 (1).
- [41] Banks, J. (2008): The consumer's perspective, OECD. www.oecd.org/dataoecd/52/38/42691624.pdf (accessed September 21, 2022).
- [42] Subramanian, K.S., and Tarafdar, J.C. (2011): Prospects of nanotechnology in Indian farming. *Indian Journal of Agricultural Sciences*. Vol. 81 (20). pp: 3–9.
- [43] Mortimer, G., and Clarke, P. (2011): Supermarket consumers and gender differences relating to their perceived importance levels of store characteristics. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*. Vol. 18 (6). pp: 575–585.
- [44] Kamphuis, C.B.M., De Bekker-Grob, E.W., and Van Lenthe, F.J. (2015): Factors affecting food choices of older adults from high and low socioeconomic groups: a discrete choice experiment. *The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*. Vol. 101 (4). pp: 768–774.
- [45] Pierre Bourdieu. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, in: Taylor & Francis,

Oxford, 2010: p. 610.

[46] Shutters, S.T., Applegate, J.M., Wentz, E., and Batty, M. (2022): Urbanization favors high wage earners. *Npj Urban Sustainability*. Vol. 2 (1).



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