

Price and Promotion Effects on Shopee Purchase Decisions Among Denpasar University Students: STIMI Handayani Case Study

Tettie Setiyarti¹, Alfra Jemira², Ida Bagus Swaputra³, Ida Ayu Trisna Wijayanthi⁴

^{1,2,3,4} Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Manajemen Indonesia Handayani

Corresponding author email: Tettie.setiyarti84@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

E-commerce has changed the way people shop, and among the many factors shaping a buyer's final decision, price and promotion are usually considered the two that matter most. This study examines how price and promotion, both individually and jointly, influence the purchase decisions of university students who use the Shopee application in Denpasar City, with students of STIMI Handayani as the research subject. A quantitative associative approach was used, and data were gathered through a Likert-scale questionnaire completed by 151 respondents, then analyzed with multiple linear regression in SPSS 25. The results show that price has a positive and significant partial effect on purchase decisions ($B = 0.477$, $p = 0.000$), and so does promotion ($B = 0.510$, $p = 0.000$). Considered together, the two variables also show a positive and significant effect on purchase decisions ($F = 132.187$, $p = 0.000$), with promotion coming out slightly ahead of price in relative influence. The coefficient of determination ($R^2 = 0.641$) shows that price and promotion together account for 64.1% of the variance in purchase decisions, leaving 35.9% to factors not captured in this model.

Keywords: Price, Promotion, Purchase Decision, E-Commerce, Shopee

Received:	Revised:	Accepted:	Available online:
01.02.2026	01.04.2026	01.05.2026	15.07.2026

INTRODUCTON

Advances in internet technology have reshaped how business gets done, moving commercial activity away from face-to-face exchange and toward transactions that happen almost entirely online (Barkatullah, 2006). This shift is what we now call *electronic commerce*, or e-commerce, and it has grown to the point where it rivals, and in many cases outpaces, conventional retail (Barkatullah, 2006). Where sellers and buyers once had to meet in person, digital marketplaces now let transactions happen at a distance, with no direct encounter between the two sides at all. That change is not a small one. It strips away the cues consumers used to rely on: the chance to physically inspect a product, a salesperson's persuasion, even the quiet social pressure of walking into a store. In their place, a platform designs its own cues, and two of them, price presentation and promotional signaling, end up carrying much more of the persuasive weight that used to be spread across an entire in-person retail experience. That is precisely why these two factors deserve close empirical attention in a shopping environment that is digital from the ground up.

Within this environment, a purchase decision can be understood as the final choice a consumer makes after weighing the alternatives available to satisfy a need (Kotler & Keller, 2012). Consumers typically pass through a sequence of stages before reaching that final choice: recognizing a problem, searching for information, and evaluating alternatives, all before the purchase itself. Yet even though this is meant to be the endpoint of a longer psychological process, purchase decisions made through e-commerce are shaped heavily by whatever features, offers, and perceived value a platform puts in front of the buyer, which is exactly what makes online marketplaces such effective magnets for shoppers. It is also worth noting that this staged process does not always unfold in a straight line for digital consumers. Mobile commerce tends to compress the search and evaluation stages, since price comparisons and promotional offers sit on the very same screen, often within the very same scroll, that first triggers problem recognition. This compression helps explain why price and promotion, rather than more deliberative factors such as brand loyalty built up through repeated offline visits, tend to dominate purchase decisions in app-based shopping.

Shopee itself was launched in Singapore in 2015 and now operates across Southeast Asia and Taiwan as part of the Sea Group. It has become one of the region's most downloaded shopping applications, setting itself

apart through the breadth of its categories (electronics, fashion, health, household goods) and its hashtag-based product discovery, which makes it easier for buyers to find specific items. Among university students, including those in Denpasar, Shopee has become a go-to channel for everyday purchases like clothing, bags, and skincare, based on informal surveys conducted before this study began. University students, it turns out, are worth studying as their own group rather than folding them into the general e-commerce population. Compared with salaried or older consumers, students tend to work with tighter and less predictable budgets, lean more heavily on peers and social media when making shopping decisions, and have grown up entirely within an app-mediated retail world rather than transitioning into one.

These traits plausibly make them more sensitive to both price, since discretionary income is limited, and promotion, since students are frequent, highly engaged users of the very platforms through which promotional content is delivered. Prior studies on price and promotion in Indonesian e-commerce have more often drawn their samples from employees or general consumers instead. Erpurini et al. (2023), for instance, studied factory employees, while Dwijantoro et al. (2021) and Rozi and Khuzaini (2021) sampled general Shopee users. Even the more recent studies that do sample students, such as Pinasty and Habib (2024) in East Java and Rusliani et al. (2024) in Jambi, do not isolate the relative weight of price against promotion within a clean two-predictor design, and none are set in Denpasar. That leaves open the question of whether the same relationships hold, and hold with the same relative strength, among students specifically in this city, which is the gap this study sets out to address.

With that context in mind, this study investigates how price and promotion, two of the most frequently cited drivers of purchase behavior in the marketing literature, influence the purchase decisions of Shopee's student users in Denpasar, using STIMI Handayani as a case study. Specifically, it takes on three research questions: does price affect purchase decisions, does promotion affect purchase decisions, and do price and promotion jointly affect purchase decisions. The corresponding objectives are to work out the partial effect of price, the partial effect of promotion, and the simultaneous effect of both variables on purchase decisions. Theoretically, this study aims to contribute to the marketing literature on consumer behavior in digital marketplaces, and more

specifically to the smaller body of work that treats students as their own analytical segment rather than a subset of the general consumer population. Practically, it gives Shopee's management empirical evidence to sharpen its pricing and promotional strategy for the student segment, and it may also serve as a reference point for future research into what drives purchase decisions in e-commerce settings.

Marketing can be understood as a process of building integrated communication aimed at informing customers about products or services, so that their needs and wants are satisfied, while also maximizing value for stakeholders through strong customer relationships (Sudaryono, 2022; Kotler et al., 2022). Marketing management, more specifically, is what Kotler et al. (2022) describe as the art and science of choosing target markets and building, keeping, and growing a base of customers by creating and communicating superior value. It is, relatedly, an ongoing process of analyzing, planning, and implementing programs designed to build, maintain, and grow a customer base (Assauri, 2022). Its core functions include the exchange function, which links buying and selling activity and can itself be split into a purchasing function and a selling function that together determine how buyers and sellers come together; the physical function, which manages the time, place, and form utility of a product as it moves toward the consumer, since a mishandled or poorly timed delivery process can chip away at the value a customer perceives even when the underlying product is perfectly sound; and the supply function, which makes sure the operational resources behind marketing activity run smoothly (Satriadi et al., 2021, as cited in Hendrayani & Siwiyanti, 2021).

These functions matter for this study because they place price and promotion within a broader set of coordinated marketing levers rather than treating them as isolated tactics. In a digital marketplace like Shopee, the exchange function is compressed into the platform's checkout flow, the physical function is largely handed off to third-party logistics, and the supply function shows up through the app's own features, such as flash sales, vouchers, and seller tools. Unlike traditional retail, where price and promotion are experienced separately from logistics and service quality, an app-based marketplace bundles all four functions into a single interface. That bundling is one reason price and promotion cues can have such an outsized, immediate effect on purchase decisions compared with an offline setting.

In its narrowest sense, price is, in Kotler and Armstrong's (2018) own words, the amount of money charged for a product or a service. It has long been one of the primary factors shaping buyer choice, and it remains a critical strategic variable because it signals perceived quality while also directly affecting a firm's sales volume and profit. For consumers, price plays two key roles. There is an *allocative* role, which helps them decide how to spread their purchasing power across alternatives, and an *informative* role, since price often works as a shortcut for judging quality when a product cannot be easily evaluated firsthand (Kotler & Armstrong, 2018). Firms, for their part, set prices to maximize profit, expand market share, skim the market, or give a product a temporary boost through reduced pricing.

These two roles interact in a distinctive way inside an app-based marketplace populated largely by unbranded or lesser-known sellers, which describes much of Shopee's third-party seller base. When a buyer cannot lean on brand reputation to judge quality, price becomes almost the only signal available, and this matters even more for student buyers, who, having limited purchase history with any single seller, have fewer alternative quality cues, such as past personal experience with a specific brand, to fall back on. This helps explain a pattern that shows up in the descriptive results of this study: discount-linked pricing items score higher than general affordability items. Discounting does double duty for student buyers. It lowers the allocative cost while also reinforcing, rather than undermining, the informative signal, because a discount framed as time-limited or seller-initiated tends to be read as a promotional gift rather than a sign the product is somehow lower quality.

Following Kotler and Armstrong (2018), this study measures price using four indicators: price affordability, price competitiveness, conformity between price and product quality, and conformity between price and benefit received. Together, these four indicators capture both of price's theoretical roles. Affordability and competitiveness map onto the allocative role, while quality and benefit conformity map onto the informative role, which is part of why this instrument was judged suitable for isolating the price construct empirically in this study.

Promotion covers the set of activities used to inform, persuade, and remind consumers of a product's benefits in order to encourage a purchase. At its core, it is a communication process between buyer and seller intended to change attitudes and behavior, turning an unfamiliar

prospect into a repeat buyer (Laksana, 2019; Kotler & Armstrong, 2018; Tjiptono, 2015, as cited in Astuti & Wahyu, 2023). Kotler and Armstrong (2018) define the promotion mix as the specific blend of promotional tools a company uses to communicate customer value, and they identify five main tools within it: advertising, sales promotion, personal selling, public relations, and direct marketing, each aimed respectively at informing, persuading, or reminding the target market, whether through mass media, incentive-based offers, direct salesmanship, reputation management, or interactive engagement with buyers. The goals of promotion include encouraging short-term purchases while still strengthening long-term customer relationships, motivating resellers to stock new products, and supporting the sales force as it works to bring in new customers (Schoell, 2016, as cited in Prasetyo et al., 2021; Kotler & Armstrong, 2018).

Of these five tools, sales promotion, meaning flash sales, vouchers, cashback, and bundling, is by far the most visible one inside Shopee's own interface, and it is this tool, rather than advertising or public relations, that the promotion indicators in this study are designed to capture. This scope decision is worth spelling out. Personal selling and direct marketing, as Kotler and Armstrong (2018) describe them, presuppose some kind of interpersonal or one-to-one contact between seller and buyer, and that kind of contact is largely absent from a marketplace app, where most transactions are mediated entirely through the interface rather than a human being. The promotion construct in this study is therefore best understood as a measure of perceived *platform-level* promotional intensity, meaning the reach, quality, quantity, and timing of the offers a student runs into while browsing, rather than promotion in its full five-tool sense. This scoping matters when it comes to interpreting the results, because it means the effect of "promotion" observed here is really an effect of algorithmically delivered sales-promotion exposure, a somewhat narrower and arguably more behaviorally immediate construct than promotion in the broadest sense.

This study measures promotion using four indicators adapted from Kotler et al. (2022): promotional reach, promotional quality, promotional quantity, and promotional timing. A purchase decision sits within the broader field of consumer behavior, which studies how individuals, groups, and organizations select, buy, use, and dispose of goods, services, ideas, or experiences in order to satisfy their needs and wants (Kotler &

Armstrong, 2018). It is shaped by a wide range of factors, including economic conditions, technology, politics, culture, product attributes, price, location, promotion, and other elements of the broader service marketing mix (Alma, 2013). The purchase decision process typically unfolds across five stages: problem recognition, information search, evaluation of alternatives, the purchase decision itself, and post-purchase behavior (Kotler & Armstrong, 2018).

For a student population specifically, some of Alma's (2013) broader antecedents, especially economic conditions and technology, are not just background context but active, everyday constraints. Most students in this study's sample reported modest and often irregular monthly income (see the Respondent Profile subsection under Result and Discussion), which means price sensitivity here is not merely a preference but frequently a binding constraint. At the same time, this same population is highly fluent with, and constantly exposed to, the app's promotional interface, since smartphone and app use is close to universal within this demographic. In this sense, the purchase decision in this study functions as the point where a binding economic constraint (price) meets a saturating communicative stimulus (promotion), which offers a useful lens for understanding why both variables carry significant, and jointly high-explanatory, weight in the regression results reported below.

Following Kotler and Armstrong (2018), purchase decision is measured using five indicators: product choice, brand choice, dealer or retailer choice, purchase timing, and purchase quantity. A number of studies support a positive relationship between price, promotion, and purchase decisions in e-commerce settings, though the strength of the two effects, and which one comes out ahead, varies from one context to the next. That variation turns out to be instructive when placing the present study's findings in context. Dwijantoro et al. (2021) found that price, product quality, and promotion each significantly influenced purchase decisions on the Shopee marketplace, using a general consumer sample rather than a segmented one. Their work establishes that the price, promotion, and purchase decision relationship holds at the platform level, without saying much about whether it holds uniformly across different consumer segments. Erpurini et al. (2023), who studied employees shopping on Shopee, found that price and promotion had significant effects both individually and together, and since their population has more stable income than students, comparing their partial

coefficients with this study's own offers a useful way to test whether price sensitivity really is higher among students, as the theoretical discussion above would predict.

Marlius and Jovanka (2023) reported similar partial effects of price and promotion on purchase decisions for a cosmetics brand sold through a physical retail outlet, though in their case price showed the stronger influence ($t = 2.229$ for price, against a lower relative effect for promotion). That is notably the reverse of the ordering found in this study, and it is plausibly explained by the offline retail setting, where price can be directly compared across neighboring physical stores in a way that is less true in an app environment saturated with rotating promotional offers. Astuti et al. (2023) found that promotion had a markedly stronger effect on purchase decisions than price ($\beta = 0.614$ for promotion, against a non-significant $\beta = 0.131$ for price) when both were tested alongside product reviews and photos in an e-commerce setting. That result aligns directionally with this study's finding that promotion narrowly edges out price, though the gap in Astuti et al.'s (2023) study is considerably larger, and price does not reach significance at all in their model, a discrepancy this study's discussion returns to later. Along similar lines, Handayani et al. (2024) found that online promotion, trust, and price perception jointly and partially influenced repurchase intention on Tokopedia, extending the price and promotion relationship to a repeat-purchase outcome rather than a first-time purchase decision, and to a competing marketplace platform, which suggests the underlying relationship is not something unique to Shopee.

Later Shopee-focused research broadly confirms this pattern while adding useful texture. Rozi and Khuzaini (2021) found that price, product diversity, service quality, and promotion jointly and partially predicted purchase decisions among Shopee users generally, again without segmenting by student status. Outside Shopee, Karlina et al. (2023) found comparable effects of perceived price, promotion, product quality, and service quality on purchase intention among Lazada users in Depok, and Hutagalung and Waluyo (2020) found a similar pattern for price alongside product and service quality in an offline food-and-beverage setting, reinforcing the point that price's relative weight shifts somewhat between online and offline retail. More recent work has moved toward the kind of student-specific sample used in this study: Pinasty and Habib (2024) found that price, promotion, and product reviews jointly predicted

Shopee purchase decisions among students in a business management program, Rusliani et al. (2024) reported a similar three-variable pattern among students in Jambi, and Kurniawan and Alriani (2026) found that price, product quality, and promotion jointly predicted purchase decisions for fashion products on Shopee among students in Semarang. None of these three studies isolates the relative weight of price against promotion the way the present two-predictor model does, and none are set in Denpasar.

A separate strand of research examines specific promotional formats rather than treating promotion as a single construct. Nastiti (2020) and Anggarwati et al. (2023) both found that flash sales and price discounts on Shopee significantly increased impulsive buying, in Anggarwati et al.'s (2023) case via hedonic shopping motivation as a mediating mechanism, and Kusumasari (2022) reported a comparable effect of flash sales, discounts, and free-shipping subsidies on impulsive buying among active business-administration students. Halik and Nugroho (2022) similarly found that price discounts and content marketing shaped online shopping decisions and loyalty among Generation Z consumers, with consumer delight moderating the relationship, and Astuti and Susila (2022) found that online customer ratings, free-shipping promotion, and discount promotion together shaped e-commerce purchasing decisions. Kusuma (2023) focused specifically on university-student Shopee users in Bandung, finding that online customer reviews meaningfully shaped purchase decisions alongside price and promotion. Writing in an internationally indexed retailing journal, Mohiuddin et al. (2023) found that young consumers' post-pandemic online buying decisions were shaped by a combination of impulsive tendencies and financial awareness, a pairing that maps closely onto the price sensitivity and promotion responsiveness this study documents among students.

Taken together, these studies support the expectation that both price and promotion positively predict purchase decisions, even though their relative strength shifts depending on the retail setting (online versus offline), the platform (Shopee versus Lazada versus Tokopedia), the sample composition (students versus employees versus general consumers versus Generation Z broadly), the specific promotional format examined (general promotion versus flash sales, cashback, or free shipping), and whatever competing predictors, such as reviews, photos,

or trust, happen to be in the model. This study contributes to that body of work in two specific ways: by isolating the direct partial contribution of price and promotion within a two-predictor model uncomplicated by additional variables, and by locating that contribution in Denpasar specifically, a city not previously represented in the Shopee-and-students literature reviewed here.

Building on the theoretical foundation above, price (X1) and promotion (X2) are positioned as independent variables predicting purchase decision (Y) as the dependent variable, both individually and jointly. The conceptual logic runs roughly like this: price affordability and competitiveness reduce the perceived cost side of the purchase equation, while price-quality and price-benefit conformity reduce the perceived risk of making a bad purchase. Promotional reach, quality, quantity, and timing then increase how salient and attractive specific offers feel at the moment a student is browsing. Purchase decision, operationalized through product, brand, dealer, timing, and quantity choice, captures the behavioral resolution of that combined cost, risk, and salience calculation. This yields three hypotheses:

H1: Price has a significant effect on purchase decisions.

H2: Promotion has a significant effect on purchase decisions.

H3: Price and promotion jointly have a significant effect on purchase decisions.

METHOD

This study uses a quantitative, associative research design, defined by Sugiyono (2022) as a design intended to determine the relationship between two or more variables, here two independent variables (price and promotion) and one dependent variable (purchase decision). An associative design was chosen over a purely descriptive one because the research questions call for testing directional relationships, essentially asking whether X affects Y, rather than simply describing each variable's state in isolation. A cross-sectional survey was judged sufficient given that the aim was to establish the existence and relative strength of an association at a single point in time, rather than to trace how that relationship might change over the course of a purchase cycle or across repeated purchases.

The population, defined following Sugiyono (2022) as the entire set of subjects or objects with characteristics relevant to the study, consists of STIMI Handayani students who use the Shopee application. Sampling followed an accidental-purposive approach, a combination of two non-probability techniques described by Sugiyono (2022): accidental sampling, which selects whichever members of the population the researcher happens to encounter, and purposive sampling, which restricts selection to those who meet a specific criterion, here being an active Shopee user. This method was chosen mainly for practical reasons: no complete sampling frame of Shopee-using students existed beforehand, since app usage is not something the institution tracks, so a probability sampling method such as stratified random sampling was not really feasible without first running a separate screening census. The purposive element, restricting the sample to Shopee users, was necessary to make sure respondents could meaningfully answer the questionnaire, since every item presupposes direct experience with the app. In the end, a total of 151 valid responses were collected and used in the final analysis.

Table 1. Operational Definition of Variables

Variable	Definition	Indicators	Measurement
Price (X1)	The amount of money charged to obtain a product or service; historically the primary factor shaping buyer choice (Kotler & Armstrong, 2018)	Price affordability; price competitiveness; price-quality conformity; price-benefit conformity	5-point Likert scale
Promotion (X2)	Actions that inform consumers of a product's usefulness and influence them	Promotional reach; promotional quality; promotional quantity;	5-point Likert scale

Variable	Definition	Indicators	Measurement
	toward purchase (Kotler & Armstrong, 2018)	promotional timing	
Purchase Decision (Y)	Part of consumer behavior describing how individuals select, buy, use, and dispose of goods or services to satisfy needs and wants (Kotler & Armstrong, 2018)	Product brand dealer purchase purchase quantity	choice; choice; choice; timing;
			5-point Likert scale

Data source: Processed by the author, 2026

Data were gathered through semi-structured interviews with respondents, documentation of relevant institutional records, and a structured questionnaire using a 5-point Likert scale (Sugiyono, 2022), running from 1 for strongly disagree to 5 for strongly agree. Rather than sending out an open online link, the questionnaire was distributed directly to respondents in person. That approach let the researcher confirm on the spot that each respondent really was an active Shopee user before they filled out the instrument, which cut down the risk of unqualified responses slipping into the sample. Data were processed in SPSS 25 following the procedures set out in Ghazali (2018). First came validity testing, using Pearson correlation against the r -table value for $n = 151$ (r -table = 0.361). Next was reliability testing, using Cronbach's Alpha with a minimum acceptable threshold of 0.60. This was followed by classical assumption testing, covering normality (via the Normal P-P Plot), multicollinearity (via tolerance and VIF), and heteroscedasticity (via a scatterplot of ZPRED against SRESID). Multiple linear regression

came next, of the form $Y = a + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + e$, and finally hypothesis testing was carried out through a partial t-test, a simultaneous F-test, and the coefficient of determination (R^2).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Respondent Profile

Of the 151 respondents, 66% were female and 34% male. The majority, 76%, were aged 20 to 25, and just over half, 53%, were in their 8th semester. Respondents came predominantly from NTT (52%) and Bali (41%). Most were unmarried (90%) and already employed (66%), with 40% earning more than IDR 2,000,000 per month. It is worth pausing on this profile before moving into the main results, because it has a direct bearing on how the price and promotion effects should be read. Two features stand out. First, although the sample is drawn from a student population, a majority, 66%, reported being employed, and 40% reported monthly earnings above IDR 2,000,000. These figures place a meaningful share of this “student” sample closer to the income profile of the working respondents Erpurini et al. (2023) studied than to a purely dependent, allowance-funded student population. This is a relevant qualification: the price sensitivity documented here should be read as characteristic of working students with modest but self-generated income, not students who rely entirely on money from their parents. Second, the heavy concentration of respondents in the 8th semester, at 53%, means the sample skews toward students nearing graduation, who may bring both more purchasing experience on the platform and more disposable income than earlier-semester students would. That could be one source of the relatively high overall Likert means reported below, since all constructs average out in the “high” to “very high” category, and more experienced, higher-income users may simply tend to be more satisfied Shopee users on average than a first- or second-semester student would be.

Descriptive Results

Respondents rated price at an overall mean of 3.84, which falls in the high category, with the item “Shopee provides discounts and promos that make prices more attractive” scoring highest at 4.03. Promotion

scored even higher overall, at a mean of 3.91, placing it in the very high category, driven mainly by strong agreement that “the reach of Shopee’s promotions is very broad” (4.11). Purchase decision averaged 3.88, also high, with brand choice, captured by the item “brand options on Shopee are quite varied,” as the dominant item at 4.13.

Two patterns in these descriptive results foreshadow the regression findings discussed later. First, within the price construct, the highest-scoring item is not a pure affordability item but a discount-linked one, which fits the theoretical point made earlier: for this population, a “good price” is functionally inseparable from promotional discounting rather than being its own distinct, low-price standard. Second, within the purchase decision construct, brand choice scores highest even though brand loyalty in the conventional sense is arguably weak in a marketplace populated by many small, interchangeable sellers. A more plausible reading is that respondents are interpreting “brand” broadly, as product-line variety, meaning the breadth of options available under a given product category, rather than as loyalty to a specific manufacturer. This is a nuance the instrument, adapted directly from Kotler and Armstrong (2018), does not distinguish, and it is one that future instrument refinement in marketplace-specific research should probably address.

Validity and Reliability

Following the thresholds set out in Ghazali (2018), all items across the three variables produced Pearson correlation coefficients above the 0.361 threshold, which confirms that all indicators were valid. Cronbach’s Alpha came out to 0.901 for price, 0.911 for promotion, and 0.931 for purchase decision, all comfortably above the 0.60 minimum and pointing to high reliability across all three constructs. These alpha values are notably high, all above 0.90, and while that indicates strong internal consistency, it can also be a symptom of item redundancy, meaning items within a construct that measure nearly the same underlying content rather than distinct facets of it. This is not a flaw unique to this study. It is a common trade-off in short, closely worded Likert batteries adapted from a single source (Kotler & Armstrong, 2018) rather than triangulated across several independently developed instruments, and it is noted here as something to keep in mind when interpreting the strength, though not the direction, of the reported effects.

Classical Assumption Tests

Following the classical assumption procedures in Ghazali (2018), the Normal P-P Plot showed residuals clustering closely along the diagonal, which supports the assumption of normally distributed residuals. Multicollinearity was not a problem: both price and promotion returned a VIF of 4.304, well below the threshold of 10, and a tolerance of 0.232, above the 0.10 minimum. The heteroscedasticity scatterplot showed no systematic pattern between predicted values and residuals, which points to homoscedasticity. A Durbin-Watson statistic of 2.010 was also obtained, falling within the conventional no-autocorrelation range of roughly 1.55 to 2.46, offering additional support that the regression residuals are independent and that the model is well specified for cross-sectional survey data of this kind.

It is worth noting that a VIF of 4.304, while comfortably under the conventional threshold of 10, is not trivially low. It points to a moderate degree of shared variance between price and promotion, which fits the qualitative observation above that respondents seem to associate “good price” partly with promotional discounting. This shared variance does not undermine the regression results, but it does mean the partial coefficients for price and promotion are best read as the effect of each variable net of the other, rather than as fully independent, non-overlapping constructs, a caveat that lines up with the conceptual overlap flagged earlier between the price and promotion indicator sets.

Table 2. Multiple Linear Regression Results

Model	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
(Constant)	8.250	1.920	—	4.297	.000
Price (X1)	0.477	0.122	0.399	3.905	.000
Promotion (X2)	0.510	0.122	0.428	4.187	.000

Dependent variable: Purchase Decision

This produces the regression equation: $Y = 8.250 + 0.477X_1 + 0.510X_2 + e$. The constant of 8.250 indicates where purchase decision would sit as a baseline if both price and promotion were rated at zero. That figure works more as a mathematical anchor for the regression line than as a scenario that would actually happen, since it is unlikely in practice that a

respondent would rate both constructs at the questionnaire's theoretical minimum. Each one-unit increase in price is associated with a 0.477 increase in purchase decision, holding promotion constant, and each one-unit increase in promotion is associated with a 0.510 increase in purchase decision, holding price constant, which indicates promotion has a marginally stronger effect. The standardized beta coefficients, 0.399 for price versus 0.428 for promotion, tell the same story on a comparable scale, confirming that the promotion effect is not simply an artifact of the two constructs having different item variances.

Hypothesis Testing

Partial effects (t-test). Price shows a significant positive effect on purchase decision ($B = 0.477$, $t = 3.905$, $p = 0.000 < 0.05$), which supports H1. Promotion also shows a significant positive effect ($B = 0.510$, $t = 4.187$, $p = 0.000 < 0.05$), supporting H2. Simultaneous effect (F-test). The ANOVA results ($F = 132.187$, $p = 0.000 < 0.05$) confirm that price and promotion jointly and significantly predict purchase decision, which supports H3. Coefficient of determination. The multiple correlation coefficient ($R = 0.801$) points to a strong relationship between the two predictors and purchase decision. $R^2 = 0.641$ shows that price and promotion together explain 64.1% of the variance in purchase decisions, with the remaining 35.9% attributable to factors outside this model.

DISCUSSION

Effect of price on purchase decision. In line with Dwijantoro et al. (2021), Erpurini et al. (2023), Marlius and Jovanka (2023), Astuti et al. (2023), Rozi and Khuzaini (2021), and Hutagalung and Waluyo (2020), this study finds a significant positive effect of price on purchase decision. This suggests that, for student users, a “good price” is not necessarily the same thing as a low price. It reflects, instead, a sense of fairness relative to affordability, competitiveness, quality, and benefit. Positive peer reviews around pricing appear to reinforce this effect, which underscores how important it is to maintain competitive pricing in order to sustain purchase decisions on Shopee.

It is worth placing this result against the one genuine point of disagreement in the comparative literature. Astuti et al. (2023) found that price failed to reach significance ($p = 0.365$) once product reviews and

photos were added to the same model, whereas this study finds price to be strongly significant ($p = 0.000$) in a model that includes only price and promotion. Two explanations seem plausible, and they are not mutually exclusive. One is omitted-variable bias: without reviews or photos in the present model, some of the explanatory power a fuller model would attribute to those variables might instead be absorbed into the price coefficient here, if reviews and price happen to be correlated (positively reviewed sellers, for example, may also be perceived as more fairly priced). The other, and perhaps more substantive, explanation is that the two samples differ in exactly the income dimension discussed in the Respondent Profile subsection. Astuti et al.'s (2023) e-commerce sample was not restricted to students with the specific income and platform-usage profile documented here, so it is plausible that price genuinely carries more weight for a semi-independent, moderate-income student population than it does for the broader e-commerce consumer base in their study. Sorting out which of these explanations is closer to the truth would call for a follow-up model that includes reviews and photos alongside price and promotion within a student sample specifically, which is a natural next step flagged in the Conclusion.

Effect of promotion on purchase decision. The significant positive effect of promotion here lines up with the same body of prior work, and specifically with studies that isolate individual promotional formats: Nastiti (2020), Anggarwati et al. (2023), Kusumasari (2022), and Halik and Nugroho (2022) all find that flash sales, discounts, and free-shipping subsidies move purchase and shopping-decision behavior among Shopee users and Generation Z consumers more broadly. If Shopee's promotional reach keeps expanding among Indonesian students, purchase decisions are likely to rise along with it. As part of the broader marketing mix, promotion works as the communicative bridge between seller and buyer, shaping both initial interest and repeat purchase behavior. The fact that the highest-scoring promotion item concerns reach specifically, rather than, say, promotional quality or timing, fits with the platform-level, algorithmically distributed nature of the promotion construct discussed earlier. Students appear to respond more to how pervasively promotional content surrounds their browsing experience than to the creative quality of any single offer, which carries a direct managerial implication returned to in the final section.

Joint effect of price and promotion. The simultaneous significance of both variables, consistent with Erpurini et al. (2023) and Astuti et al. (2023), suggests that price and promotion should not be treated as isolated levers. Improvements in pricing strategy combined with more creative promotional packaging are likely to compound each other rather than simply add up. At the same time, an R^2 of 0.641, while comparatively strong for a two-predictor social-science model, still leaves more than a third of the variance in purchase decisions unaccounted for. Candidate variables suggested both by the broader consumer behavior literature (Alma, 2013) and by the comparative studies reviewed earlier include product reviews and product photos (Astuti et al., 2023), platform trust (Handayani et al., 2024), product quality (Dwijantoro et al., 2021), and factors more specific to a student population, such as peer or social-media influence and delivery speed relative to a fixed academic schedule. None of these were captured in the present two-predictor model, and each represents a concrete, testable extension for future research on this population.

CONCLUSION

This study set out to determine whether price and promotion, individually and jointly, affect purchase decisions among student users of Shopee in Denpasar, and whether the relative weight between the two matches what prior research has found among employees and general consumers. Price has a positive and significant partial effect on purchase decisions among this student sample ($B = 0.477$, $t = 3.905$, $p = 0.000$), which supports H1. Promotion also has a positive and significant partial effect, and is marginally the stronger of the two predictors ($B = 0.510$, $t = 4.187$, $p = 0.000$; standardized $\beta = 0.428$ versus 0.399 for price), which supports H2. Price and promotion jointly and significantly predict purchase decisions ($F = 132.187$, $p = 0.000$), together accounting for 64.1% of the variance in purchase decisions ($R^2 = 0.641$), with the remaining 35.9% attributable to variables outside this two-predictor model, which supports H3. Taken together, these results indicate that the price–promotion–purchase decision relationship documented in prior studies of employees and general Shopee consumers (Dwijantoro et al., 2021; Erpurini et al., 2023; Rozi & Khuzaini, 2021) also holds among Denpasar's student users, and that within this specific segment, promotion carries a

marginally greater relative weight than price. The study contributes an empirically grounded answer, from a student population and a city not previously represented in the Shopee literature reviewed above, to the wider question of what drives purchase decisions on app-based marketplaces: both price and promotion matter to student consumers, they matter jointly more than either would alone, and price is not automatically the dominant lever it is sometimes assumed to be in a discount-saturated app environment.

REFERENCES

- Alma, B. (2013). *Manajemen pemasaran dan pemasaran jasa*. Alfabeta.
- Anggarwati, D., Hermawan, A., & Rahayu, W. P. (2023). The effect of price discount and promotion on impulse buying through hedonic shopping motivation as an intervening variable on Shopee consumers. *Literacy: International Scientific Journals of Social, Education, Humanities*, 2(1), 34–49. <https://doi.org/10.56910/Literacy.v2i1.411>
- Assauri, S. (2022). *Manajemen pemasaran*. PT RajaGrafindo Persada.
- Astuti, A. Y., & Wahyu, A. (2023). *Strategi promosi pada Manna Kampus Godean* [Undergraduate thesis, STIM YKPN Yogyakarta].
- Astuti, N. P., & Susila, I. (2022). Influence analysis of customer ratings reviews online, free shipping promotion and discount promotion on purchasing decisions in e-commerce. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Economics and Business Studies (ICOEBS 2022)*, 655, 38–46.
- Astuti, W. S., Reny, A., Tandiono, D., & Calvin. (2023). Harga, promosi, ulasan, dan foto produk terhadap keputusan pembelian e-commerce. *Journal of Management and Business (JOMB)*. <https://journal.ipm2kpe.or.id/index.php/JOMB/article/download/5246/3446>
- Barkatullah, A. H. (2006). *Bisnis e-commerce: Studi sistem keamanan dan hukum di Indonesia*. Pustaka Pelajar.
- Dwijantoro, R., Dwi, B., & Syarief, N. (2021). Pengaruh harga, kualitas produk, dan promosi terhadap keputusan pembelian marketplace

- Shopee. *Jurnal Riset Manajemen dan Bisnis*.
<https://doi.org/10.21460/jrmb.2021.162.392>
- Erpurini, W., Farmasih, S., Sutreusna, D., & Safitri, T. A. (2023). Pengaruh harga dan promosi terhadap keputusan pembelian pada marketplace Shopee (Studi kasus karyawan produksi di PT Otto Pharmaceutical Industries). <http://journal.lembagakita.org/>
- Ghozali, I. (2018). *Aplikasi analisis multivariate dengan program IBM SPSS 25* (9th ed.). Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.
- Halik, A., & Nugroho, M. (2022). The role of consumer delight moderating the effect of content marketing and price discount on online shopping decision and loyalty of Generation Z. *Media Ekonomi dan Manajemen*, 37, 35–54.
<https://doi.org/10.24856/mem.v37i1.2259>
- Handayani, M. M., Meryawan, W., Putri, C. I. A. V. N., & Dewi, K. T. (2024). Pengaruh promosi online WIB, kepercayaan dan persepsi harga terhadap minat beli ulang konsumen Tokopedia di Kecamatan Gianyar.
<http://ejournal.universitasmahendradatta.ac.id/index.php/satyagraha>
- Hendrayani, E., & Siwiyanti, L. (2021). *Manajemen pemasaran*. Samudra Biru.
- Hutagalung, Y. M., & Waluyo, H. D. (2020). Effect of product quality, service quality and price on purchasing decisions (Case study on Kopi Benteng 2 Banyumanik). *Journal of Business Administration*, 9(3), 209–215.
- Karlina, E., Elyana, I., Nelfianti, F., Nuryati, S., & Arief, Z. (2023). The effect of perceived price, promotion, product quality and service quality on consumer purchase intentions Lazada marketplace in Depok. *Jurnal Ekonomi*, 12(3), 977–980.
<http://ejournal.seaninstitute.or.id/index.php/Ekonomi>
- Kotler, P., & Armstrong, G. (2018). *Principles of marketing* (17th ed., Global ed.). Pearson.
- Kotler, P., & Keller, K. L. (2012). *Manajemen pemasaran* (13th ed., Vol. 1). Erlangga.

- Kotler, P., Keller, K. L., & Chernev, A. (2022). *Marketing management* (16th ed., Global ed.). Pearson.
- Kurniawan, I. A., & Alriani, I. M. (2026). Pengaruh harga, kualitas produk, dan promosi terhadap keputusan pembelian produk fasion di marketplace Shopee: Studi kasus mahasiswa di STIE Dharma Putra Semarang. *Jurnal Transformasi Bisnis Digital (JUTRABIDI)*, 3(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.61132/jutrabidi.v3i1.1205>
- Kusuma, I. S. (2023). The influence of online customer reviews on purchasing decisions on the Shopee marketplace among university students in Bandung City, Indonesia. *International Journal Administration Business and Organization*, 4(2), 31–39.
- Kusumasari, I. R. (2022). Pengaruh flash sale, diskon, dan subsidi gratis ongkir terhadap perilaku impulse buying pengguna marketplace Shopee (Studi pada mahasiswa aktif Administrasi Bisnis UPN Veteran Jawa Timur). *Jurnal Bisnis Indonesia*, 13(2).
- Laksana, F. (2019). *Praktis memahami manajemen pemasaran*. Graha Ilmu.
- Marlius, D., & Jovanka, N. (2023). Pengaruh harga dan promosi terhadap keputusan pembelian konsumen Y.O.U pada Hasanah Mart Air Haji. <https://ejournal.45mataram.ac.id/index.php/economina>
- Mohiuddin, M., Su, Z., & Rashid, M. (2023). Understanding post-pandemic changes in young consumers' online buying decisions: A focus on impulsive behavior and financial awareness. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 72, 103184. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2023.103184>
- Nastiti, R. (2020). The effect of flash sale and discount towards impulsive buying (Study on Shopee users). *Jurnal Akuntansi, Manajemen dan Ekonomi*, 22(4), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.32424/1.jame.2020.22.4.3092>
- Pinasty, W. A., & Habib, M. A. F. (2024). Pengaruh harga, promosi, dan ulasan produk terhadap keputusan pembelian melalui marketplace Shopee pada mahasiswa jurusan Manajemen Bisnis Syariah angkatan 2019–2022. *TRILOGI: Jurnal Ilmu Teknologi, Kesehatan, dan Humaniora*. <https://ejournal.unuja.ac.id/index.php/trilogi/article/view/7299>

- Prasetyo, C. A., Cholifah, C., & Sutopo, S. (2021). Pengaruh produk, promosi dan suku bunga terhadap keputusan nasabah dalam pengambilan kredit di PT. Bank Mandiri (Persero) Tbk. *UBHARA Management Journal*, 1(1), 33–39.
- Rozi, I. A., & Khuzaini, K. (2021). The influence of price, product diversity, service quality and promotion on purchasing decisions in the Shopee marketplace. *Journal of Management Science and Research*, 10(5), 1–20.
- Rusliani, H., Syamsuddin, S., & Ferdila, M. (2024). Pengaruh harga, kualitas produk dan promosi terhadap keputusan pembelian di e-commerce Shopee: Studi kasus pada mahasiswa di Kota Jambi. *Lokawati: Jurnal Penelitian Manajemen dan Inovasi Riset*, 2(3), 140–156. <https://doi.org/10.61132/lokawati.v2i3.868>
- Sudaryono, S. P. (2022). *Komunikasi bisnis*. Prenada Media.
- Sugiyono. (2022). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D*. Alfabeta.