MJIFM | MAJAPAHIT JOURNAL OF ISLAMIC FINANCE AND MANAGEMENT

Vol. 6 No. 2, 2026, 6405–6421 e-ISSN 2798-0170

The Influence of Brand Image and Price Perception on Online Purchase Decisions on the Shopee Application in the North Cikarang Area

Nur Fadillah Aprilliani[1]
Universitas Medika Suherman, Bekasi, Indonesia
dillahaprilliani@gmail.com

Herdian Farisi[2*]
Universitas Medika Suherman, Bekasi, Indonesia
herdian@medikasuherman.ac.id

Abstract

This study examines the influence of brand image and price perception on online purchase decisions among Shopee users in North Cikarang, Bekasi Regency. A quantitative cross-sectional survey design was used, employing multiple linear regression to estimate the direction and magnitude of the relationships. Using purposive non-probability sampling based on the Cochran formula, 100 respondents who had transacted on Shopee within the past six months and resided in North Cikarang were recruited via an online Likert-scale questionnaire. All instrument items for brand image, price perception, and purchase decision were valid and reliable, with Cronbach's Alpha values above 0.70. Classical assumption tests indicated that the regression residuals were normally distributed, free from multicollinearity, and free from heteroscedasticity. The regression results showed that brand image ($B = 0.348$; $\beta = 0.321$; $t = 4.104$; $p < 0.001$) and price perception ($B = 0.601$; $\beta = 0.605$; $t = 7.740$; $p < 0.001$) each had a significant positive effect on purchase decision. Simultaneously, both variables significantly predicted purchase decision, $F(2, 97) = 168.531$; $p < 0.001$, explaining 77.7% of the variance ($R^2 = 0.777$; adjusted $R^2 = 0.772$). Price perception showed a relatively stronger association than brand image based on standardized coefficients. These findings suggest that Shopee's platform reputation and consumers' evaluation of price fairness jointly play an important role in shaping purchase decisions, although the cross-sectional design and purposive sampling limit causal and probabilistic generalization.

Keywords: Brand Image, Price Perception, Purchase Decision, Shopee, E-Commerce

Vol. 6 No. 2, 2026, 6405–6421 e-ISSN 2798-0170

INTRODUCTION

The expansion of internet access has strengthened the use of e-commerce platforms in the process of searching for information, comparing offers, and purchasing products. The 2025 survey by the Indonesian Internet Service Providers Association (APJII) reported an internet penetration rate in Indonesia of 80.66%, or approximately 229.43 million users out of a total population of 284.44 million. This figure continues a stable growth trend since 2018 (64.8%), 2020 (73.7%), 2022 (77.01%), 2023 (78.19%), through to 2024 (79.5%). However, the scale of digital access alone does not explain why consumers choose one particular platform. Handoyo's (2024) meta-analysis shows that consumer decisions in e-commerce are related to a number of considerations, including trust, risk, security, and electronic word of mouth. Therefore, the decision to purchase through Shopee needs to be understood not merely as a consequence of ease of access, but also as a result of consumer evaluation of the platform's image and economic offerings.

In the digital environment, brand image functions as a set of associations that help consumers assess the credibility, reliability, and attractiveness of a platform before making a transaction. Recent evidence shows that brand image is positively related to purchase intention and repurchase intention in retail and digital service contexts (Farisi & Lutfiani, 2025; Chang, 2025; Nguyen et al., 2025; Yürüyen et al., 2026). At the same time, e-commerce consumers can compare prices across sellers at low search cost, making perceptions of price fairness, perceived value, relative price position, and cost transparency important parts of the purchase evaluation (Kim et al., 2024; Senali et al., 2024; Rakhmawati & Farisi, 2024; Farisi & Rahmawati, 2025). Shopee, as a platform that actively runs promotions, campaigns, and discount programs, seeks to build a strong brand image as a safe, user-friendly, and beneficial online shopping application for its users. Prices perceived as fair, commensurate with quality, and supported by offers such as free shipping, cashback, or discounts create a favorable price perception; conversely, prices perceived as inappropriate risk driving customers to switch to platforms considered more advantageous (Patricia et al., 2024).

North Cikarang is a region with high industrial activity, commerce, and population mobility, making time efficiency and ease of digital access relevant to the shopping behavior of its residents. According to data from the Central Statistics Agency (BPS), the population of North Cikarang District reaches 288,239 people, consisting of 156,181 men and 132,058 women, with Simpangan Village being the most populous area (45,420 people). This population density is also

Vol. 6 No. 2, 2026, 6405–6421 e-ISSN 2798-0170

influenced by the development of industrial estates, residential areas, and economic activity in the region. Nevertheless, population data alone cannot be used as direct evidence of Shopee user behavior, so this study requires primary data from users who genuinely reside in North Cikarang and have transaction experience on Shopee.

The 2025 APJII survey also shows that Shopee is the most frequently accessed e-commerce platform among respondents, at 53.22%, followed by TikTok Shop (27.37%) and Tokopedia (9.57%). The growth in TikTok Shop usage indicates that customers have an increasingly diverse range of platform choices, encouraging Shopee to sustain purchase decisions through a resilient platform image and competitively perceived pricing. Recent research shows that brand image, trust, price fairness, and price transparency are related to purchase intention or post-purchase behavior across various digital contexts (Handoyo, 2024; Senali et al., 2024; Chang, 2025; Vijay et al., 2026). However, these results cannot be directly generalized to represent Shopee users in North Cikarang due to differences in platform, respondent characteristics, region, and the behaviors measured. This study focuses on the purchase-decision evaluation reported by Shopee users, so its contribution is contextual — testing whether platform brand image and price perception still influence purchase decisions among Shopee users in the North Cikarang region.

The specific problem motivating this study is not a decline in platform use, but the growing uncertainty about what sustains purchase decisions as alternatives multiply. Although Shopee remained the most frequently accessed platform in the 2025 APJII survey (53.22%), TikTok Shop was already reported by more than a quarter of respondents (27.37%), and consumers can compare offers across platforms at very low search cost. Under these conditions, choosing Shopee becomes less habitual and more dependent on how users evaluate the platform and its offers at the moment of decision. Platform-level indicators that would show this shift directly, such as transaction volume, customer retention, purchase frequency, or complaint data, are not published for North Cikarang, so they cannot be used here. For this reason, the study relies on primary data in which local users report how they evaluate Shopee's image and prices, and it treats these evaluations as candidate explanations for purchase decisions rather than as evidence that purchases have declined.

Based on the foregoing, brand image and price perception were selected as predictors because they represent symbolic-reputational and economic considerations of consumers, respectively. This study aims to determine and

Vol. 6 No. 2, 2026, 6405–6421 e-ISSN 2798-0170

analyze the effect of brand image and price perception, both partially and simultaneously, on online purchase decisions through the Shopee application among users in North Cikarang. The research problems formulated are: (1) does brand image significantly influence online purchase decisions on Shopee among users in North Cikarang; (2) does price perception significantly influence online purchase decisions on Shopee among users in North Cikarang; and (3) do brand image and price perception simultaneously and significantly influence online purchase decisions on Shopee among users in North Cikarang.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Brand Image

Brand image refers to the associations and beliefs consumers hold about a particular brand, shaped by experience, information, reputation, and evaluation (Meylinda Anggraeni et al., 2026; Firmansyah, 2022; Wardhana, 2022). In digital platforms, this image is reflected in perceived credibility, security, reliability, and consistency of experience. Prior studies show brand image plays a significant role in shaping purchase intention (Chang, 2025; Nguyen et al., 2025) and repurchase intention (Yürüyen et al., 2026). Common indicators include brand association, perceived superiority, uniqueness, and reputation/credibility (Rahul, 2021), which for Shopee manifest as app usability, transaction ease, payment security, seller reputation, and promo consistency. In this study, brand image is treated as respondents' overall evaluation of Shopee as a platform, not of individual products or sellers.

Because brand image is multidimensional, its theoretical boundary needs to be stated explicitly. Several indicators discussed above, including app usability, payment security, and promotional consistency, overlap conceptually with perceived security, service quality, and promotion. In this study, these elements are not treated as separate constructs. They are included only insofar as they shape the consumer's overall associations with Shopee as a reputable and credible platform, in line with the indicators of brand association, perceived superiority, uniqueness, and reputation (Rahul, 2021). Items that primarily measure transaction mechanics or promotional intensity belong to other constructs and are not intended to be captured by the brand image score. This overlap cannot be fully removed, and it may partly explain why brand image and price perception are strongly correlated in this sample (r = 0.790). The coefficient for brand image should therefore be read as the contribution of the platform's overall image, not of any single underlying component.

Vol. 6 No. 2, 2026, 6405–6421 e-ISSN 2798-0170

Price Perception

Price perception is a psychological, subjective evaluation of monetary sacrifice relative to quality, benefits, and available alternatives — meaning a lower price is not automatically perceived as better (Kasman & Dewi, 2024). Price image influences buying intention through value, fairness, emotion, and quality inference (Zielke et al., 2023); perceived price fairness strengthens the trust–purchase intention link in social commerce (Senali et al., 2024), and price transparency shapes how consumers evaluate offers in digital retail (Kim et al., 2024). Key indicators are price affordability, price–quality fit (good value pricing), price competitiveness, and price fairness (Kotler & Armstrong, in Agustina & Acyasmoro, 2020). Here, price perception is defined as respondents' evaluation of Shopee's affordability, fairness, competitiveness, and total transaction cost relative to benefit received.

Purchase Decision

Purchase decision is the process by which consumers select a product or service after considering needs, references, and available information (Balaji et al., 2025), influenced in e-commerce by product information, trust, security, risk, reviews, and price (Handoyo, 2024; Vijay et al., 2025). It is distinct from satisfaction, loyalty, or repurchase, which are post-purchase outcomes. Dimensions include product choice, brand choice, seller/vendor choice, purchase timing and quantity, and payment method (Kotler & Keller, 2022). In this study, purchase decision refers to respondents' resolve to choose and complete a purchase on Shopee based on evaluation of available alternatives.

Conceptual Framework and Hypotheses

Brand image and price perception are positioned as independent variables influencing purchase decision as the dependent variable. A positive Shopee brand image is expected to strengthen consumer trust and confidence in shopping through the app (Laily & Ekowati, 2023), while a positive price perception — fair pricing, attractive offers, cost clarity — is expected to create a sense of good value that drives purchase (Permatasari, 2024). Supporting prior research includes Aprillia and Sri Yanthy (2020), who found brand image and price perception jointly influence Shopee purchase decisions in East Jakarta; Yanuar (2023), who found promotion, price, and brand image jointly influence purchase decisions for Somethinc products on Shopee; and Nguyen et al. (2025), who confirmed brand image as a full mediator between e-WOM and purchase intention.

Based on this, three hypotheses are proposed:

Vol. 6 No. 2, 2026, 6405–6421 e-ISSN 2798-0170

H1: Brand image has a significant effect on online purchase decisions on Shopee among users in North Cikarang.

H2: Price perception has a significant effect on online purchase decisions on Shopee among users in North Cikarang.

H3: Brand image and price perception simultaneously have a significant effect on online purchase decisions on Shopee among users in North Cikarang.

RESEARCH METHOD

Type of Research

This study uses a quantitative approach with a cross-sectional explanatory survey design. Data from each respondent were collected in a single period to test the statistical influence of brand image and price perception as predictors on online purchase decisions as the dependent variable. Multiple linear regression was used to estimate the direction and magnitude of each predictor's partial relationship as well as the overall model's fit. Because there was no variable manipulation, randomization, or longitudinal observation, the results are not interpreted as evidence of causality. This study uses two independent variables, namely brand image (X_1) and price perception (X_2), and one dependent variable, namely online purchase decisions through the Shopee application (Y).

Population and Sample

The target population of the study is Shopee users residing in North Cikarang District who had transacted on the Shopee application within the past six months, with an unknown exact population size. Therefore, the sample size was determined using the Cochran formula:

n0=Z2pqe2n_0 = \frac{Z^2 pq}{e^2}n0=e2Z2pq

with Z = 1.96 (95% confidence level), p = 0.5, q = 0.5, and e = 0.10 (10% margin of error), yielding n_0 = 96.04, rounded up to 100 respondents. The sampling technique used was non-probability sampling with a purposive sampling approach, with inclusion criteria: aged 17 years or older, residing in North Cikarang District, having a Shopee account, having transacted at least once in the past six months, and willing to participate in the study. Exclusion criteria included respondents who did not meet the inclusion criteria and respondents who were active employees or business partners of Shopee. Because the e = 10% parameter serves as a sample-size planning reference rather than a probabilistic margin of error, the generalization of results is limited to the characteristics of the study sample (Qing, 2025).

Vol. 6 No. 2, 2026, 6405–6421 e-ISSN 2798-0170

Data Collection and Processing Procedures

Data were collected through a five-point Likert-scale survey questionnaire (score 1 = strongly disagree to score 5 = strongly agree) distributed online via Google Form. The data collection procedure included determining the objective of data collection, developing the instrument, determining respondents, distributing the questionnaire, collecting and checking data, coding data, and processing data using univariate analysis and multiple linear regression. Data processing was carried out in four stages: editing, coding, processing (using Microsoft Excel and IBM SPSS Statistics version 27), and cleaning.

Instrument, Validity, and Reliability

Instrument evaluation was conducted prior to hypothesis testing. The correspondence between item content and construct definitions was examined through expert judgement and a questionnaire trial, while internal consistency was examined using Cronbach's Alpha and corrected item-total correlation. Validity testing was conducted by comparing the calculated r-value against the table r-value (an item was declared valid if the calculated r-value > table r-value and was positive), while reliability testing used the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient (an instrument was declared reliable if Cronbach's Alpha > 0.70). The use of a single questionnaire, a single respondent source, and a single measurement time point was noted as a potential source of common method bias (Cheung et al., 2024; Lim et al., 2026).

Data Analysis Technique

Data analysis was carried out through several stages: checking data completeness and compliance with the inclusion criteria; descriptive statistics of respondent characteristics and each construct; validity and reliability evaluation of the instrument; testing of linearity, multicollinearity, residual normality, and homoscedasticity; multiple linear regression estimation; and reporting of coefficient B, standard error, standardized beta, t-values, p-values, 95% confidence intervals, F-values, degrees of freedom, R^2, and adjusted R^2. Normality testing used the One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test, multicollinearity testing used Tolerance and VIF values, and heteroscedasticity testing used the Glejser Test. The t-test was used to test each predictor's partial effect, the F-test was used to test the simultaneous effect, and the coefficient of determination (R^2) was used to measure the magnitude of the predictors' contribution to the dependent variable.

Vol. 6 No. 2, 2026, 6405–6421 e-ISSN 2798-0170

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Respondent Characteristics

Of the total 100 respondents, the majority were female (86%) and in the 17–25 age range (81%), with occupational backgrounds dominated by students (49%) and private-sector employees (31%).

Table 1.
Respondent Characteristics

Characteristic	Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	14	14%
	Female	86	86%
Age	17–25 years	81	81%
	26–35 years	14	14%
	36–45 years	5	5%
	> 45 years	0	0%
Occupation	Student	49	49%
	Private employee	31	31%
	Fresh graduate	7	7%
	Civil servant	6	6%
	Other professional	5	5%
	Entrepreneur	2	2%
Total respondents		**100**	**100%**

Source: Processed primary data, 2026

The dominance of female respondents (86%) and the 17–25 age group (81%) indicates that these findings primarily reflect the experiences of young and female users within the sample, so this composition should be taken into account when interpreting the representativeness of the results.

Descriptive Statistics and Inter-Variable Correlation

Descriptive analysis of the 100 respondents shows that all three research variables exhibited a high tendency in ratings, with mean scores of 42.98 for brand image, 42.40 for price perception, and 42.53 for purchase decision (score range 30–50).

Vol. 6 No. 2, 2026, 6405–6421 e-ISSN 2798-0170

Table 2.
Descriptive Statistics and Correlation Among Constructs

Variable	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Correlation with Purchase Decision
Brand Image	100	42.98	4.49237	0.799**
Price Perception	100	42.40	4.90310	0.859**
Purchase Decision	100	42.53	4.87097	1

Note: ***Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed); Brand Image–Price Perception correlation = 0.790****. Source: Data processed with SPSS 27 (2026)*

The correlation between brand image and purchase decision ($r = 0.799$, $p < 0.001$) indicates a very strong, positive relationship: the better consumers' perceived brand image, the higher their tendency to make an online purchase decision. The correlation between price perception and purchase decision ($r = 0.859$, $p < 0.001$) is the highest among the three variables, showing that a more positive price perception is associated with a higher tendency to purchase. The correlation between brand image and price perception ($r = 0.790$, $p < 0.001$) indicates that consumers with a favorable perception of brand image also tend to perceive product prices favorably.

To interpret the descriptive scores, each construct consists of 10 items on a five-point scale, giving a theoretical range of 10 to 50. Dividing this range into three equal intervals yields low (10.0 to 23.3), moderate (23.4 to 36.6), and high (36.7 to 50.0) categories. The mean scores for brand image (42.98), price perception (42.40), and purchase decision (42.53) all fall in the high category, corresponding to item averages of approximately 4.2 to 4.3, which indicates that respondents generally agreed with the statements. The observed minimum was 30, so no respondent fell in the low category. These high means also suggest a possible ceiling effect. The mean of each variable lies only about 1.5 standard deviations below the maximum score of 50, meaning that a large share of responses was concentrated near the top of the scale. This compresses variance and may attenuate correlations, and it limits the ability of the instrument to distinguish among respondents with already favorable views. Because the sample consists of recent Shopee users, favorable ratings are also not surprising, and the scores should not be interpreted as the evaluations of non-users or lapsed users.

Linearity testing showed a *Deviation from Linearity* significance of 0.149 for brand image and 0.052 for price perception, both above 0.05, while the *Linearity* row was significant at $p < 0.001$ for both. The linearity assumption for both

Vol. 6 No. 2, 2026, 6405–6421 e-ISSN 2798-0170

predictor–outcome relationships was therefore met, and the data were suitable for multiple linear regression.

Instrument Validity and Reliability

All brand image items (X1) had corrected item-total (calculated r) values ranging from 0.584–0.750, price perception items (X2) ranged from 0.647–0.788, and purchase decision items (Y) ranged from 0.607–0.793 — all exceeding the table r-value of 0.197 (n = 100, 5% significance level), with significance at 0.001. All 30 items were therefore declared valid.

Table 3.
Summary of Instrument Reliability

Variable	Number of Items	Cronbach's Alpha	Description
Brand Image (X1)	10	0.876	Reliable
Price Perception (X2)	10	0.890	Reliable
Purchase Decision (Y)	10	0.883	Reliable

Source: Data processed with SPSS 27 (2026)

All Cronbach's Alpha values exceeded the minimum threshold of 0.70, confirming that all three instruments produced consistent and reliable measurements.

Classical Assumption Tests

The One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test on the regression residuals showed no significant deviation from normality (D = 0.085; p = 0.069), corroborated by a Monte Carlo estimate (p = 0.070) and a Normal P-P Plot in which residual points clustered along the diagonal line. Multicollinearity testing showed a Tolerance of 0.377 (> 0.10) and VIF of 2.656 (< 10) for both predictors, indicating no multicollinearity despite the relatively high inter-predictor correlation. The Glejser heteroscedasticity test showed non-significant results for brand image (p = 0.792) and price perception (p = 0.475), both above 0.05, indicating homoscedasticity. Outlier diagnostics showed Standardized Residuals ranging from −2.706 to 3.467, with one case (Case 67) slightly exceeding +3; however, Cook's Distance (0.001–0.320) and Centered Leverage Values (0.001–0.104) indicated this case had no meaningful influence on overall model stability.

MJIFM | MAJAPAHIT JOURNAL OF ISLAMIC FINANCE AND MANAGEMENT
Vol. 6 No. 2, 2026, 6405–6421 e-ISSN 2798-0170

Multiple Regression, t-Test, F-Test, and Coefficient of Determination

Table 4.
Multiple Linear Regression Results

Model	B	Std. Error	Beta (β)	t	Sig.
(Constant)	2.067	2.287	–	0.904	0.368
Brand Image (X1)	0.348	0.085	0.321	4.104	0.000
Price Perception (X2)	0.601	0.078	0.605	7.740	0.000

Dependent variable: Purchase Decision. Source: Data processed with SPSS 27 (2026)

The resulting regression equation is:

$$\mathbf{Y = 2.067 + 0.348X_1 + 0.601X_2}$$

The model was significant, $F(2, 97) = 168.531$, $p < 0.001$, with $R = 0.881$, $R^2 = 0.777$, and adjusted $R^2 = 0.772$. Brand image and price perception jointly explained 77.7% of the variance in purchase decision scores in this sample, with the remaining 22.3% attributable to unmeasured factors rather than to any specific variable outside the model. The small gap between R^2 and adjusted R^2 indicates good model fit.

Table 5.
Summary of Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis	Test	Statistic	Sig.	Result
H1: Brand Image → Purchase Decision	t-test	t = 4.104	0.000	Supported
H2: Price Perception → Purchase Decision	t-test	t = 7.740	0.000	Supported
H3: Brand Image & Price Perception (simultaneous) → Purchase Decision	F-test	F = 168.531	0.000	Supported

Partially, brand image had a significant effect on purchase decision ($B = 0.348$; $SE = 0.085$; $\beta = 0.321$; $t(97) = 4.104$; $p < 0.001$), with a 95% confidence interval for B of 0.180 to 0.516 (entirely above zero). Price perception also had a significant effect ($B = 0.601$; $SE = 0.078$; $\beta = 0.605$; $t(97) = 7.740$; $p < 0.001$), with a 95% confidence interval of 0.447 to 0.756. Based on standardized coefficients, price perception showed a relatively stronger association than brand image in this model and sample. The F-test confirmed that brand image and price perception jointly had a significant effect on purchase decision, supporting the overall adequacy of the regression model.

Effect of Brand Image on Purchase Decision

The regression results show that brand image significantly affects online purchase decisions on Shopee. Controlling for price perception, a one-unit increase in brand image score was associated with an average 0.348-unit increase

Vol. 6 No. 2, 2026, 6405–6421 e-ISSN 2798-0170

in purchase decision score. This suggests that reputation, credibility, security, and positive associations with Shopee help consumers reduce uncertainty when selecting a platform, given that they cannot always inspect products and sellers directly in digital transactions. This finding is consistent with Chang (2025), who showed the role of brand image in shaping purchase intention; Nguyen et al. (2025), who found brand image to be an important mechanism linking e-WOM and purchase intention; and Yürüyen et al. (2026), who demonstrated the role of website brand image in repurchase intention. However, these results are not identical to the present study given differences in dependent variables, countries, and research objects. The findings support H1, though they do not prove that changes in brand image will causally always produce changes in purchase decisions.

Effect of Price Perception on Purchase Decision

Price perception significantly affects purchase decision; controlling for brand image, a one-unit increase in price perception score was associated with an average 0.601-unit increase in purchase decision score. Its standardized beta coefficient exceeded that of brand image, making price evaluation the relatively strongest predictor in this model. For marketplace users, price evaluation extends beyond nominal product cost to include competitiveness across sellers, shipping costs, cost transparency, discounts, and perceived value for money. This result is consistent with Zielke et al. (2023), who showed that price image influences buying intention through value, fairness, emotion, and quality inference, and with Senali et al. (2024), who found perceived price fairness strengthens purchase intention formation in social commerce. Berends and Gerpott (2025) similarly found that users of price-comparison channels have lower price tolerance and pay close attention to relative price position. The dominance of respondents aged 17–25 and students in this sample offers a plausible, though inferential, explanation for heightened price sensitivity, since age and occupation were not tested as moderators. The findings support H2 without implying an untested moderating mechanism.

Simultaneous Effect of Brand Image and Price Perception on Purchase Decision

The combined model, incorporating both brand image and price perception, was significant in explaining purchase decision, with $R^2 = 0.777$ indicating that both predictors jointly explained 77.7% of the variance in purchase decision scores. This supports H3 as an omnibus test of model fit; however, the F-test does not demonstrate that brand image and price perception reinforce each other or produce a synergistic effect — such interaction claims would require an explicit X1×X2 interaction term. Substantively, the two predictors provide distinct

Vol. 6 No. 2, 2026, 6405–6421 e-ISSN 2798-0170

information to consumers: brand image represents a reputational evaluation of the platform, while price perception represents an economic evaluation of the offer. Recent e-commerce literature shows that purchase decisions and post-purchase behavior are shaped by a combination of platform characteristics, trust, security, information, and price evaluation (Handoyo, 2023; Vijay et al., 2025). Accordingly, Shopee's strategy cannot rely solely on brand communication or low pricing; strengthening reputation, security, information clarity, total-cost transparency, and consistency in promotional benefits must be managed in an integrated manner. Because the research design is cross-sectional, these implications are association-based recommendations that warrant further testing through longitudinal or experimental designs.

Limitations

This study has several limitations. First, data were collected cross-sectionally, so the temporal order among variables cannot be established and findings cannot be used as evidence of causality. Second, purposive sampling with 100 respondents limits statistical generalization to the entire population of Shopee users in North Cikarang, and the sample composition is dominated by women, the 17–25 age group, and students. Third, all variables were measured using the same questionnaire, from the same source, at the same time, raising the potential for common method bias (Podsakoff et al., 2024). Fourth, several instrument items may overlap conceptually with related constructs such as brand awareness, promotion, satisfaction, and repurchase, which limits the precision of construct interpretation. Fifth, the model includes only brand image and price perception, whereas e-commerce purchase decisions may also relate to trust, risk, security, service quality, and reviews (Handoyo, 2024).

CONCLUSION

This study shows that brand image and price perception both have a positive effect on online purchase decisions through the Shopee application among the sampled users in North Cikarang. Brand image remained a significant predictor of purchase decision after controlling for price perception, underscoring the importance of reputation, credibility, security, and positive platform associations. Price perception was also a significant predictor and showed a larger standardized beta coefficient, indicating that consumer evaluation of affordability, fairness, competitiveness, and value for money is a relatively stronger predictor in this model. Together, the two variables explained 77.7% of the variance in purchase decision scores. These findings address the research

Vol. 6 No. 2, 2026, 6405–6421 e-ISSN 2798-0170

objectives but are constrained by the cross-sectional design, purposive sampling, respondent composition, and single-source questionnaire, and therefore cannot be interpreted as evidence of causality or generalized probabilistically to the entire population of Shopee users in North Cikarang.

Based on these findings, Shopee is advised to display total transaction costs upfront (product price, shipping, service fees, and voucher terms), maintain consistency between brand messaging and actual experience through transaction security and responsive complaint resolution, and monitor strategy effectiveness through indicators such as payment-page cancellation rates and voucher usage. Consumers are advised to remain diligent by comparing prices across sellers, reading product descriptions carefully, checking reviews, and understanding promotional terms. Future researchers are encouraged to use probability sampling or broaden recruitment across demographic groups, apply longitudinal or experimental designs, and incorporate trust as a mediator, price sensitivity as a moderator, and e-service quality or online reviews as additional predictors.

REFERENCES

Ainulyaqin, M. H., Sr, A., Ia, L., Mamun, S., & Jaelani, A. (2022). Perspektif Ekonomi Islam: Dampak Keberadaan Kawasan Industri Cikarang Pada Peningkatan Kesejahteraan Masyarakat. *Jurnal Ekonomi Islam*, 11(04), 175–191.

Asosiasi Penyelenggara Jasa Internet Indonesia (APJII). (2025). *Profil Internet Indonesia 2025*. Survei APJII. https://survei.apjii.or.id/home

Badan Pusat Statistik (BPS). https://bekasikab.bps.go.id/id

Barella, Y., Fergina, A., Mustami, M. K., Rahman, U., & Alajaili, H. M. A. (2024). Quantitative Methods in Scientific Research. *Jurnal Pendidikan Sosiologi Dan Humaniora*, 15(1), 281.

Begashaw, G. B., & Yohannes, Y. B. (2020). Review of Outlier Detection and Identifying Using Robust Regression Model. *International Journal of Statistical Distributions and Applications*, 5(1), 4. https://doi.org/10.11648/J.IJSSAM.20200501.12

Berends, J., & Gerpott, T. J. (2025). Exploring price tolerance in online retail: A comparative analysis of price comparison website use and repeat purchases. *Electronic Commerce Research*, 25, 3165–3185. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10660-023-09791-5

Berggren, M. (2024). Coefficients of determination measured on the same scale as the outcome. *Psychological Methods*. https://doi.org/10.1037/met0000681

Chang, J. (2025). The mediating role of brand image in the relationship between

Vol. 6 No. 2, 2026, 6405–6421 e-ISSN 2798-0170

storytelling marketing and purchase intention: Case study of PX Mart. *Future Business Journal*, 11, Article 23. https://doi.org/10.1186/s43093-025-00447-4

Cheung, G. W., Cooper-Thomas, H. D., Lau, R. S., & Wang, L. C. (2024). Reporting reliability, convergent and discriminant validity with structural equation modeling. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 41(2), 745–783. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10490-023-09871-y

Djalic, I., & Terzić, S. (2021). Violation of the assumption of homoscedasticity and detection of heteroscedasticity. 4(1), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.31181/DMAME2104001D

Euis Paramita. (2025). Pengaruh brand awareness, brand image, dan kualitas produk terhadap keputusan pembeli sandal havaianas di jakarta pusat. 5(2), 1–13.

Farisi, H., & Rahmawati, D. (2025). Pengaruh media sosial dan persepsi harga terhadap impulsive buying dengan positive emotion sebagai variabel mediasi. *Jurnal Manajemen dan Bisnis Madani*, *7*(1), 93–111.

Farisi, H., & Lutfiani, I. (2025). Brand love sebagai katalis strategis: Mediasi antara citra merek dan brand awareness dalam ekosistem ritel impor KKV Tiongkok. *KENDALI: Economics and Social Humanities*, *3*(3), 194–200.

Forester, B. J., Idris, A., Khater, A., Afgani, M. W., Isnaini, M., & Islam, U. (2024). Penelitian Kuantitatif: Uji Reliabilitas. 4(3), 1812–1820.

Hafizah, N., P, T. C. P., & Sari, M. (2025). Identifikasi Variabel Penelitian, Jenis Sumber Data Dalam Penelitian Pendidikan. 586–596.

Handoyo, S. (2024). Purchasing in the digital age: A meta-analytical perspective on trust, risk, security, and e-WOM in e-commerce. *Heliyon*, 10(8), e29714. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e29714

Herlina, R. T. (2022). Pengaruh e-commerce shopee terhadap perilaku konsumtif pada mahasiswa fakultas ekonomi dan bisnis islam. *AD DIWAN*, 2(1), 35–42. https://doi.org/10.51192/ad.v2i1.393

Kim, K., Ryoo, Y., Zdravkovic, S., & Yoon, S. (2024). Price transparency in international retailing on digital platforms. *International Marketing Review*, 41(5), 1133–1160. https://doi.org/10.1108/IMR-12-2023-0352

Nguyen, C., Pham, S., & Nguyen, L. (2025). The mediating effect of brand image on the relationship between E-WOM and purchase intention. *Cogent Business & Management*, 12(1), 2471532. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2025.2471532

Nursetiadi, M. L., & Agustina, R. (2022). Bus Karyawan Pekerja Pabrik Kecamatan

Vol. 6 No. 2, 2026, 6405–6421 e-ISSN 2798-0170

Cikarang Utara Menuju Tempat Kerja. 455–465.

Patricia, A. P., Anggraini, D., & Sutarno. (2024). Pengaruh Brand Image, Price, Trust Terhadap Purchase Intention Konsumen Shopee. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Dan Kewirausahaan*, 3(2), 447–459. https://doi.org/10.33998/jumanage.2024.3.2.1707

Podsakoff, P. M., Podsakoff, N. P., Williams, L. J., Huang, C., & Yang, J. (2024). Common method bias: It's bad, it's complex, it's widespread, and it's not easy to fix. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 11, 17–61. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-110721-040030

Putri, F. N. R., Zed, E. Z., Sagita, M., & Nayla, U. N. (2024). Pemanfaatan Market Place GrabFood dan GoFood dalam Peningkatan Penjualan UMKM di Kecamatan Cikarang Barat. *Kegiatan Positif*, 2(4), 105–114. https://doi.org/10.61132/kegiatanpositif.v2i4.1422

Rakhmawati, N., & Farisi, H. (2024). The influence of price value on consumer purchase intention on the food delivery application with the attitude variable as mediation. *Jurnal Akuntansi, Manajemen dan Ekonomi*, *26*(4), 27–34.

Qing, S. (2025). Extending Cochran's Sample Size Rule to Stratified Simple Random Sampling with Applications to Audit Sampling. https://doi.org/10.1177/0282423X241277054

Sally, J. L., & Ciputra, U. (2020). Pengaruh Brand Image Dan Persepsi Harga Terhadap Keputusan Pembelian Produk T'Nuners. X.

Senali, M. G., Iranmanesh, M., Ghobakhloo, M., Foroughi, B., Asadi, S., & Rejeb, A. (2024). Determinants of trust and purchase intention in social commerce. *Electronic Commerce Research and Applications*, 64, 101370. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.elerap.2024.101370

Sharma, P. K., & Yadav, M. (2023). Confidence Interval: Advantages, Disadvantages and the Dilemma of Interpretation. *Reviews on Recent Clinical Trials*. https://doi.org/10.2174/0115748871266250231120043345

Sin, C. Y., & Lee, C.-F. (2021). Using heteroscedasticity-non-consistent or heteroscedasticity-consistent variances in linear regression. *Econometrics and Statistics*, 18, 117–142. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ECOSTA.2020.10.002

Tabar, F. A., & Farisi, H. (2023). Pengaruh Kualitas Produk, Celebrity Endorser, Dan Brand Image Terhadap Keputusan Pembelian Produk Kosmetik. *Jurnal Manajemen & Bisnis Digital*, 2(1), 1–19.

Waruwu, M., Natijatul, S., Utami, P. R., & Yanti, E. (2025). Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif: Konsep, Jenis, Tahapan dan Kelebihan. 10, 917–932.

Vol. 6 No. 2, 2026, 6405–6421 e-ISSN 2798-0170

Yürüyen, A. A., Sever, S., Çatı, K., & Şeyhanoğulları, T. (2026). Logistics service quality and repurchase intention: Investigating the mediating role of website brand image. *Future Business Journal*, 12, Article 248. https://doi.org/10.1186/s43093-026-00952-0

Zielke, S., De Toni, D., & Mazzon, J. A. (2023). Cognitive, emotional and inferential paths from price perception to buying intention in an integrated brand price image model. *SN Business & Economics*, 3, Article 24. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43546-022-00395-z