LEX LOCALIS-JOURNAL OF LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT
ISSN:1581-5374 E-ISSN:1855-363X
VOL. 23, NO. 10(2025)

STRATEGIC PRICING AND CONSUMER BEHAVIOR IN INDONESIAN MODERN RETAIL

[1]Angga Kurniawan, [2]Nelson Lajuni, [3]Ravindra Zeno Kurniawan, [4]Dwi In Diana Laely

[1,4]Faculty Business and law, Universitas PGRI Yogyakarta, Indonesia,
[2]Faculty of Business, Economics and Accountancy, Universiti Malaysia Sabah, Malaysia

*anggakurniawan@upy.ac.id[1]

Abstract

Price is a key factor in determining the selling value of a product because it directly influences consumer purchase intention. In Indonesia's modern retail sector, pricing strategies are crucial for attracting and retaining customers. This study aims to analyze the effect of pricing on consumer purchase intention, focusing on Indomie products sold at Alfamart outlets. A descriptive quantitative method was applied, with data collected through random sampling of 90 respondents using questionnaires, supported by interviews and observations. Statistical analysis was performed using SPSS 25, including descriptive statistics, correlation, regression, and hypothesis testing. The results of the t-test showed that pricing has a significant effect on purchase intention, with a significance value of 0.00 < 0.05. Similarly, the F-test confirmed a significant relationship, with Fcount (5.091) greater than Ftable (3.95). These findings indicate that fair and consistent pricing positively influences consumer purchase intention.

Keywords: Pricing ; purchase intention ; consumer behavior ; retail

1 Introduction

The rapid growth of the retail industry has reshaped consumer purchasing patterns in emerging markets, particularly in Indonesia. Modern retail outlets such as supermarkets, hypermarkets, and minimarkets have expanded aggressively, offering consumers not only essential household products but also enhanced shopping experiences compared to traditional markets (Nugroho & Irawan, 2018). This structural shift in the retail landscape has intensified market competition, compelling retailers to adopt effective strategies to sustain customer loyalty and purchasing interest (Kotler & Keller, 2016).

Among the key strategies, pricing plays a critical role in influencing consumer purchase decisions. Pricing is not only a reflection of production and operational costs but also a strategic tool that signals product value, competitiveness, and brand positioning (Monroe, 2003). In highly competitive retail markets, price adjustments—whether through discounts, promotions, or psychological pricing—can significantly impact consumer perceptions and intentions to buy (Zeithaml, 1988; Hinterhuber & Liozu, 2014). Prior studies highlight that consumers are highly sensitive to price fairness, transparency, and consistency, especially in essential goods (Rudianto, 2013; Surjadi, 2013).

In Indonesia, Alfamart has emerged as one of the dominant players in the minimarket segment, leveraging its franchise system and widespread store network to reach consumers in both urban and rural areas. As of 2023, Alfamart operated more than 18,000 outlets across 27 provinces, serving an average of four million daily customers (USDA, 2024; CNBC Indonesia, 2019). One of its most demanded products is Indomie, a leading instant noodle brand with a strong top-of-mind presence in the Indonesian market (Top Brand Index, 2022). Despite its dominant market share, Indomie's purchase intention remains influenced by price dynamics, retail competition, and promotional strategies (Durianto, 2013).

Although pricing has long been recognized as a determinant of consumer behavior, limited empirical studies have focused on how strategic pricing in modern retail outlets affects consumer purchase intention for staple products in emerging economies. Moreover, while Alfamart and Indomie are well-known brands in Indonesia, few studies systematically examine the interaction between pricing strategies, consumer perceptions, and purchase intention within the modern retail context.

This study addresses a gap in the literature by focusing on the intersection of strategic pricing and consumer behavior in Indonesian modern retail, using Indomie sales at Alfamart as a case study. Unlike previous research that emphasizes general consumer price sensitivity, this study contributes by contextualizing the analysis within the fast-moving consumer goods (FMCG) sector and linking it to a specific product category that dominates the Indonesian market.

Given the rising intensity of retail competition and evolving consumer preferences, understanding how consumers respond to pricing strategies is crucial. Misalignment between price policies and consumer expectations may reduce purchase intention and erode brand loyalty. Conversely, effective pricing strategies can strengthen consumer trust, increase purchase frequency, and enhance overall retail competitiveness

The aim of this research is to analyze the effect of strategic pricing on consumer behavior in Indonesian modern retail. The specific objectives are:

1. To identify the role of pricing strategies in influencing consumer purchase intention at Alfamart.
2. To evaluate consumer perceptions of price fairness and consistency regarding Indomie products.
3. To provide managerial implications for modern retailers in optimizing pricing strategies to sustain competitiveness.

This study employs a quantitative research design using a structured survey distributed to Alfamart customers in selected urban areas of Indonesia. Respondents are asked about their perceptions of price, purchase intentions, and overall shopping experience. Data analysis is conducted using regression modeling to test the relationship between strategic pricing variables and consumer purchase behavior. This methodological approach ensures empirical validation of theoretical assumptions and provides practical insights for retail strategy formulation.

2 Literature overview

Strategic Pricing

Pricing is no longer perceived merely as a result of cost calculations and profit margins but as a strategic instrument that shapes consumer value perceptions, brand competitiveness, and business sustainability. According to Hinterhuber and Liozu (2019), strategic pricing integrates customer insights, market dynamics, and differentiation strategies to produce prices that reflect the firm's value proposition.

Recent studies emphasize value-based pricing, where prices are set according to perceived customer value rather than production costs (Ingenbleek, 2020). In the modern retail context, digitalization and dynamic pricing have become critical, allowing retailers to adjust prices depending on location, time, or consumer behavior (Grewal et al., 2020).

The main indicators of strategic pricing relevant to this study include:

1. Affordability – the extent to which consumers perceive prices as financially accessible.
2. Price–quality congruence – the alignment between price and product quality.

3. Price competitiveness – price comparison relative to competitors.
4. Perceived value – the extent to which consumers believe the price matches product benefits.

Consumer Behavior and Purchase Intention

Purchase intention refers to the consumer's inclination to buy a product based on perceived value, shopping experience, and external influences such as promotion and price (Ajzen, 2020).
Recent research highlights that purchase intention is strongly influenced by perceived price fairness, brand trust, and customer experience (Liu, Lamberton, & Norton, 2021). Within the modern retail environment, consumer behavior manifests through:

1. Transactional intention: the tendency to purchase a product.
2. Referential intention: the tendency to recommend a product to others.
3. Preferential intention: the tendency to favor a particular brand over alternatives.
4. Exploratory intention: the tendency to seek further product-related information.

Due to digitalization, consumers now compare prices across multiple retailers instantly, which makes transparent and consistent pricing essential for retaining customer loyalty (Grewal et al., 2020).

Relationship between Strategic Pricing and Purchase Intention

Recent studies confirm that effective pricing strategies have a significant impact on consumer purchase intention (Liozu, 2020; Viglia, Mariani, & Zenker, 2019). Fair and consistent pricing fosters consumer trust, while price–value misalignment may decrease purchase intention and brand loyalty.
In Indonesia, retail products such as Indomie sold at Alfamart illustrate that discount pricing and bundling strategies effectively enhance purchase intention, particularly among middle-income consumers (USDA, 2024). Hence, this study underlines strategic pricing as a key determinant of purchase intention in modern retail settings.

3 Research

This study employed a quantitative descriptive design to examine the relationship between strategic pricing and consumer purchase intention in Indonesian modern retail. A survey method was selected as it allows systematic collection of primary data from consumers and is widely applied in consumer behavior research (Creswell, 2018).

Research Location and Period
The research was conducted at Alfamart outlets in Bekasi, Indonesia, over a three-month period from October 2019 to January 2020.

Population and Sample
The population consisted of 505 Alfamart customers. Using a random sampling technique, 90 respondents were selected as the study sample. This number meets the minimum sample size requirement for regression analysis, ensuring adequate representativeness (Hair et al., 2019).

Data Collection

Primary data were obtained through a structured questionnaire, while secondary data were gathered from company documents, reports, and relevant literature. The questionnaire included two main constructs:

- Strategic Pricing (indicators: affordability, price–quality congruence, price competitiveness, perceived value).
- Purchase Intention (indicators: transactional, referential, preferential, exploratory intention).

Responses were measured using a 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree).

Instrument Validity and Reliability

Instrument validity was tested using the Pearson Product-Moment correlation, with items considered valid if r-calculated > r-table. Reliability was tested using Cronbach's Alpha, with values above 0.70 indicating acceptable reliability.

Data Analysis

Data analysis was conducted using SPSS 25, applying the following procedures:

1. Descriptive statistics to summarize respondent characteristics and variable distributions.
2. Correlation analysis to assess the strength and direction of relationships.
3. Simple linear regression to evaluate the effect of strategic pricing on consumer purchase intention.
4. Coefficient of determination (R^2) to measure the explanatory power of the independent variable.
5. t-test and F-test for hypothesis testing.

Ethical Considerations

All respondents were informed about the research purpose, ensured anonymity, and participated voluntarily. Data were collected and analyzed in accordance with ethical research standards.

4 Discussion

Descriptive Statistical Analysis

The descriptive statistical analysis test is used to provide an overview of the variables under study through the mean, maximum value, minimum value, standard deviation, range, and variance

Statistics

PH

N	Valid	90
	Missing	0
Mean		27,2778
Median		28,0000
Mode		28,00
Std. Deviation		3,28780
Variance		10,810
Range		22,00
Minimum		18,00
Maximum		40,00

Table 1.1 Statistics

Based on the table above, it can be seen that the total number of respondents who completed the questionnaire was 90 people. From these 90 respondents, the results of the pricing variable (X) show a mean value of 27.2778, a median of 28.0000, a mode of 28.00, a standard deviation of 3.28780, a variance of 10.810, a range of 22.00, a minimum value of 18.00, and a maximum value of 40.00.

Descriptive Test of the Purchase Intention Variable

Statistics

MB

N	Valid	90
	Missing	0
Mean		31,2111
Median		31,0000
Mode		32,00
Std. Deviation		4,45324
Variance		19,831
Range		25,00
Minimum		15,00
Maximum		40,00

Table. 1.2 Descriptive Test of the Purchase Intention Variable (Y)

Based on the table above, it can be seen that the total number of respondents who completed the questionnaire was 90 people. From these 90 respondents, the results for the purchase intention variable show a mean value of 31.2111, a median of 31.0000, a mode of 32.00, a standard deviation of 4.45324, a variance of 19.831, a range of 25.00, a minimum value of 15.00, and a maximum value of 40.00.

Instrument Test Analysis
Validity Test

Correlations

		PH1	PH2	PH3	PH4	PH5	PH6	PH7	PH8	TOTAL
PH1	Pearson Correlation	1	-,119	,297**	-,114	,308**	-,007	,770**	-,147	,433**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,264	,004	,285	,003	,946	,000	,167	,000
	N	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
PH2	Pearson Correlation	-,119	1	-,159	,535**	-,221*	,488**	-,118	,464**	,566**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,264		,135	,000	,036	,000	,266	,000	,000
	N	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
PH3	Pearson Correlation	,297**	-,159	1	-,102	,363**	,003	,451**	-,204	,335**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,004	,135		,338	,000	,975	,000	,053	,001
	N	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
PH4	Pearson Correlation	-,114	,535**	-,102	1	-,217*	,452**	-,139	,534**	,608**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,285	,000	,338		,039	,000	,192	,000	,000
	N	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
PH5	Pearson Correlation	,308**	-,221*	,363**	-,217*	1	-,265*	,303**	-,173	,181
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,003	,036	,000	,039		,012	,004	,104	,088
	N	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
PH6	Pearson Correlation	-,007	,488**	,003	,452**	-,265*	1	,041	,493**	,654**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,946	,000	,975	,000	,012		,699	,000	,000
	N	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
PH7	Pearson Correlation	,770**	-,118	,451**	-,139	,303**	,041	1	-,225*	,454**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,266	,000	,192	,004	,699		,033	,000
	N	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
PH8	Pearson Correlation	-,147	,464**	-,204	,534**	-,173	,493**	-,225*	1	,541**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,167	,000	,053	,000	,104	,000	,033		,000
	N	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
TOTAL	Pearson Correlation	,433**	,566**	,335**	,608**	,181	,654**	,454**	,541**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,001	,000	,088	,000	,000	,000	
	N	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 1.3 Validity Test

Based on the statement above and the table, the work motivation variable (X) consisting of 8 items is valid. This can be seen from the correlation (r-count) value for each item, which is greater than the r-table value of 0.207 (with a significance level of 5% and n = 90). Thus, the 8 items in the instrument meet the validity requirements, and statistically, the data can be used for subsequent research measurements.

Validity Test Results of Purchase Intention (Y)

Correlations

		MB1	MB2	MB3	MB4	MB5	MB6	MB7	MB8	SUM
MB1	Pearson Correlation	1	,613**	,317**	,454**	,575**	,380**	,413**	,271**	,695**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,000	,002	,000	,000	,000	,000	,010	,000
	N	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
MB2	Pearson Correlation	,613**	1	,359**	,429**	,559**	,554**	,346**	,451**	,756**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000		,001	,000	,000	,000	,001	,000	,000
	N	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
MB3	Pearson Correlation	,317**	,359**	1	,472**	,408**	,510**	,372**	,415**	,690**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,002	,001		,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
	N	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
MB4	Pearson Correlation	,454**	,429**	,472**	1	,491**	,437**	,578**	,411**	,743**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000		,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
	N	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
MB5	Pearson Correlation	,575**	,559**	,408**	,491**	1	,510**	,523**	,297**	,758**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	,000		,000	,000	,004	,000
	N	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
MB6	Pearson Correlation	,380**	,554**	,510**	,437**	,510**	1	,315**	,434**	,735**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000		,002	,000	,000
	N	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
MB7	Pearson Correlation	,413**	,346**	,372**	,578**	,523**	,315**	1	,419**	,686**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,001	,000	,000	,000	,002		,000	,000
	N	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
MB8	Pearson Correlation	,271**	,451**	,415**	,411**	,297**	,434**	,419**	1	,648**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,010	,000	,000	,000	,004	,000	,000		,000
	N	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
SUM	Pearson Correlation	,695**	,756**	,690**	,743**	,758**	,735**	,686**	,648**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	
	N	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90

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

Table 1.4 Validity Test Results of Purchase Intention (Y)

Based on the statement above and the table, the purchase intention variable (Y) consisting of 8 items is valid. This can be seen from the correlation (r-count) value for each item, which is greater than the r-table value of 0.207 (with a significance level of 5% and n = 90). Thus, the 8 items in the instrument meet the validity requirements, and statistically, the data can be used for subsequent research measurements.

Reliability Test

Reliability Statistics

	Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
PH	,694	,687	9
MB	,774	,900	9

Table 1.5 Reliability Test

Based on the table above, the SPSS results show that the pricing variable has a value of 0.694 and the purchase intention variable has a value of 0.774. This indicates that the instruments for each research variable are reliable or consistent, since a Cronbach's Alpha value greater than 0.6 is considered reliable or consistent.

Correlations

		PH	MB
PH	Pearson Correlation	1	,234*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,027
	N	90	90
MB	Pearson Correlation	,234*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,027	
	N	90	90

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 1.6 Correlation Test

Based on the table above, the correlation coefficient is 0.234**. This means that the correlation or relationship between the pricing variable and purchase intention is 0.234, which is considered strong as it approaches the value of 1. The double asterisk (**) indicates that the correlation is significant at the 0.001 level. Furthermore, the relationship between the pricing variable and purchase intention is significant because the significance value of 0.000 < 0.01. The direction of the correlation can be seen from the coefficient value, whether positive or negative. According to the analysis results, the correlation coefficient is positive at 0.234, which means the relationship between the two variables is in the same direction.

Uji F

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	96,518	1	96,518	5,091	,000[b]
	Residual	1668,471	88	18,960		
	Total	1764,989	89			

a. Dependent Variable: MB

b. Predictors: (Constant), PH

Table 1.7 F-Test

From the table above, it can be seen that the calculated F-value (Fcount) obtained using SPSS is 5.091. Meanwhile, the F-table value from the Distribution F Table is 3.95, with a significance value below 0.05. Thus, it can be stated that Fcount = 5.091 > Ftable = 3.95 and the significance value < 0.05. This means that the pricing variable has a significant effect on purchase intention at Alfamart, Bekasi.

5 Conclusions

Based on the analysis results described above, the pricing variable (X) has a significant effect on the purchase intention variable (Y). Through descriptive data analysis, correlation tests, determination tests, regression tests, and hypothesis testing, the findings indicate a highly significant relationship between the two variables. The results show that the significance value between the pricing variable (X) and purchase

intention (Y) is smaller than 0.05, namely (0.00 < 0.05). Therefore, the relationship is declared linear and significant.

Both partially and simultaneously, the tests produced significant results. This is evidenced by the t-test, which obtained a significance value of 0.00, smaller than 0.05, indicating that the partial hypothesis is strongly supported. Likewise, the F-test shows that the calculated F-value (Fcount = 5.091) is greater than the F-table value (3.95). Thus, it can be concluded that pricing significantly influences purchase intention, where pricing becomes an important factor in consumers' intention to purchase a product.

Acknowledgment

The authors would like to express their deepest gratitude to Universitas PGRI Yogyakarta, particularly the Master of Management Program, for the support and guidance provided throughout the completion of this research. Sincere appreciation is also extended to the management and staff of Alfamart, Bekasi, for granting access and assistance during data collection.

Special thanks are due to all respondents who willingly participated in this study and provided valuable insights that made this research possible. Finally, the authors would also like to thank their families, colleagues, and everyone who contributed directly or indirectly to the successful completion of this work.

References

Ajzen, I. (2020). The theory of planned behavior: Frequently asked questions. Human Behavior and Emerging Technologies, 2(4), 314–324. https://doi.org/10.1002/hbe2.19

CNBC Indonesia. (2019). Alfamart jadi pemimpin ritel modern. Retrieved from https://www.cnbcindonesia.com

Creswell, J. W. (2018). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (5th ed.). Sage Publications.

Durianto, D. (2013). Strategi menaklukkan pasar melalui riset ekuitas dan perilaku merek. Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Grewal, D., Roggeveen, A. L., & Sisodia, R. S. (2020). Retailing in a pandemic: The future of retail pricing. Journal of Retailing, 96(4), 521–529. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretai.2020.10.005

Guerreiro, R. A., & Ventura, J. (2018). Cost-based price and value-based price: Are they conflicting approaches? The Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing, 33(3), 390–404. https://doi.org/10.1108/JBIM-04-2016-0085

Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2019). Multivariate data analysis (8th ed.). Cengage Learning.

Hinterhuber, A., & Liozu, S. M. (2019). Innovation in pricing: Contemporary theories and best practices. Routledge.

Ingenbleek, P. (2020). Value-based pricing in competitive markets. Industrial Marketing Management, 87, 163–175. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2020.02.003

Johansson, M., Hallberg, N., Hinterhuber, A., Zbaracki, M., & Liozu, S. (2012). Pricing strategies and pricing capabilities. Journal of Revenue and Pricing Management, 11(1), 4–11. https://doi.org/10.1057/rpm.2011.42

Johansson, M., Keränen, J., Hinterhuber, A., Liozu, S., & Andersson, L. (2015). Value assessment and pricing capabilities – how to profit from value. Journal of Revenue and Pricing Management, 14(3), 178–197. https://doi.org/10.1057/rpm.2015.8

Johnston, W., & Cortez, R. M. (2018). Unit pricing and its implications for B2B marketing research. Industrial Marketing Management, 69, 32–39. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2018.01.026
Kienzler, M. (2018). Value-based pricing and cognitive biases: An overview for business markets. Industrial Marketing Management, 68, 86–94. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2017.09.028
Kienzler, M., & Kowalkowski, C. (2017). Pricing strategy: A review of 22 years of marketing research. Journal of Business Research, 78, 101–110. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2017.05.005
Kotler, P., & Keller, K. L. (2016). Marketing management (15th ed.). Pearson.
Kurniawan, A. (2023). Digital Marketing.
Kurniawan, A., Hidayatun, U. S., Jayanti, A., Septyarini, E., & Sudibyo, T. D. (2025). Enhancing Customer Loyalty: The Role Of Service Quality In Customer Satisfaction. *Journal of Lifestyle and SDGs Review*, *5*(2), e04412-e04412.
Liozu, S. M. (2020). Pricing and human capital: A behavioral perspective. Journal of Revenue and Pricing Management, 19(1), 3–10. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41272-019-00224-0
Liu, Q., Lamberton, C., & Norton, D. A. (2021). The psychology of pricing: Consumer responses to price strategies. Journal of Consumer Research, 48(5), 1001–1023. https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucab031
Monroe, K. B. (2003). Pricing: Making profitable decisions (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
Nugroho, Y., & Irawan, B. (2018). Retail business transformation in Indonesia: Challenges and opportunities. Journal of Business and Retail Management Research, 12(3), 120–129. https://doi.org/10.24052/JBRMR/V12IS03/ART-11
Rudianto. (2013). Akuntansi manajemen: Informasi untuk pengambilan keputusan manajemen. Erlangga.
Surjadi. (2013). Pengantar manajemen. Mitra Wacana Media.
THE POWER OF INVISIBLE INTERACTIONS: A MICROECONOMIC ANALYSIS OF SILENT USERS IN DIGITAL MARKETING. (2025). *Lex Localis - Journal of Local Self-Government*, *23*(10), 400-413. https://doi.org/10.52152/
Theory of Planned Behavior (Wikipedia). (2025, August). Theory of planned behavior. In Wikipedia. Retrieved from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Theory_of_planned_behavior
Top Brand Index. (2022). Top Brand Award survey results. Frontier Consulting Group.
Töytäri, P. R. (2015). Value-based selling: An organizational capability perspective. Industrial Marketing Management, 45(1), 101–112. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2015.02.009
Töytäri, P., Parvinen, P., Ollila, I., & Rosendahl, N. (2011). Bridging the theory to application gap in value-based selling. The Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing, 26(7), 493–502. https://doi.org/10.1108/08858621111162299
Töytäri, P., Rajala, R., & Alejandro, C. (2015). Organizational and institutional barriers to value-based pricing in industrial relationships. Industrial Marketing Management, 47, 53–64. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2015.02.005
United States Department of Agriculture (USDA). (2024). Indonesia: Retail foods report. GAIN Report.
VBP structured review (Christen, 2024). (2024). A structured review on the mechanisms of value-based pricing. Unpublished review.

Viglia, G., Mariani, M., & Zenker, S. (2019). Pricing strategies in the sharing economy: New perspectives for marketing research. Journal of Marketing, 83(6), 90–108. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022242919867957

Zeithaml, V. A. (1988). Consumer perceptions of price, quality, and value: A means–end model and synthesis of evidence. Journal of Marketing, 52(3), 2–22. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224298805200302