

Diagnostic Evidence for Marketing Decisions: Brand Perceptions, Product Quality, and Promotion in Honda Beat User Satisfaction

Dwi Wininggar*, Liberty

Universitas Islam Negeri Jurai Siwo Lampung, Indonesia

ARTICLE HISTORY

Submitted: Apr 11, 2026

Revised: May 23, 2026

Accepted: Jun 27, 2026

KEYWORD

Decision sciences;
Marketing decision
support; Consumer
satisfaction; Product
quality; Brand perceptions;
Promotion; Regression
analysis.

ABSTRACT

Background: Managerial use of consumer surveys requires a distinction between observed associations and evidence supporting an intervention.

Aim: This study reassesses the reported conditional relationships between brand perceptions, product quality, promotion, and satisfaction among Honda Beat users, and identifies what those relationships can contribute to marketing decision diagnosis.

Method: The article reinterprets published results from a 2019 cross-sectional questionnaire study of 36 purposively selected Honda Beat users from an identified group of 56 students. Original multiple-regression estimates were retained without respondent-level reanalysis.

Results: Product quality was positively associated with satisfaction ($B = 0.375$, $\beta = 0.503$, $p = .003$). Brand perceptions ($B = 0.209$, $p = .193$) and promotion ($B = 0.206$, $p = .243$) had positive but statistically non-significant partial estimates. The joint model was significant, $F(3, 32) = 18.967$, $p < .001$, with $R^2 = .640$ and adjusted $R^2 = .606$.

Conclusion: In this historical, purposively selected sample, perceived product quality offers the clearest diagnostic association, not evidence that spending on quality would produce the largest causal or financial return. Decision prescription would require information on feasible actions, costs, objectives, and intervention effects.

INTRODUCTION

Marketing managers routinely receive customer satisfaction scores alongside indicators of brand reputation, experienced product quality, and promotional activity. The apparent usefulness of these indicators creates a methodological tension: an association observed among existing customers can help diagnose a problem, but it cannot by itself establish which investment would improve outcomes. Recent customer-satisfaction scholarship distinguishes post-consumption appraisal from related constructs such as service quality, customer experience, and loyalty (Mittal et al., 2026; Schiebler et al., 2026). Research on customer insights similarly separates generating and interpreting information from implementing and evaluating an organisational response (Arkadan et al., 2024; Stremersch et al., 2025). This distinction is particularly important for small, observational surveys whose coefficients may be mistaken for estimates of managerial effectiveness.

The empirical setting is a historical survey of Honda Beat motorcycle users from the 2015 Islamic Economics student cohort at IAIN Metro, Indonesia. In the original study, 145 students were identified as motorcycle users, 56 of whom used Honda Beat, and 36 Honda Beat users were purposively included in the questionnaire analysis (Wininggar, 2019). The sample concerns satisfaction among people who already owned or used the brand, rather than the decision to purchase a motorcycle. Brand-related judgments, perceived product performance, and exposure to promotional communication therefore enter the model as self-reported experiences and evaluations. Their relevance to the Indonesian motorcycle market is concrete, but the setting cannot support claims about all users, competing brands, or current market conditions.

These three marketing attributes pose different decision questions. Brand perceptions combine impressions of reputation, competence, consistency, and trust; product quality encompasses ownership-related assessments of performance and features; promotion concerns

* Corresponding author:

Dwi Wininggar, Universitas Islam Negeri Jurai Siwo Lampung, Indonesia
dwiwininggar12@gmail.com ✉

advertising, discounts, and sales communication (Malau, 2017; Sari, 2017; Tjiptono, 2015). Research on consumer trust shows that its antecedents and consequences vary substantially across settings, while studies of brand experience likewise place evaluations within broader relationships between customers and brands (Khamitov et al., 2024; Ndhlovu & Maree, 2024; Park et al., 2023). Evidence from other product and service categories further links perceived quality to customer evaluations without implying that the same effect size should occur in motorcycles (Bae & Jeon, 2022; Kosasih et al., 2024). For a manager, distinguishing the constructs is necessary before translating statistical summaries into operational questions.

The decision problem becomes more difficult when all indicators are entered into one regression model. A significant overall F test describes collective explanatory evidence under a specified model, whereas each partial coefficient describes a conditional association given the other measured variables. Neither result directly quantifies the incremental benefit of changing a product attribute or a promotional programme. Prescriptive-analytics studies explicitly require a decision objective and feasible actions rather than only an explanatory or predictive model (Bertsimas & Kallus, 2020; Elmachtoub & Grigas, 2022; Sadana et al., 2025). Work on observational versus experimental decisions also explains why confounding can separate reported relationships from intervention effects (Fernández-Loría & Provost, 2025). The current paper accordingly treats the regression as an input to disciplined diagnosis, not as an optimisation rule.

Contemporary consumer research provides several reasons not to expect uniform findings across branding, quality, and communication measures. A review of brand image and satisfaction identifies relevant connections but demonstrates that much of the evidence concerns settings other than motorcycle ownership (Tahir et al., 2024). Evidence on service quality and perceived value likewise comes from varied sectors and measurement designs (Tedja et al., 2024; Ūsas et al., 2023). Experience-focused studies distinguish the roles of product experience, interpersonal encounters, and trust, while communication research separates different audiences and channel objectives (Siqueira et al., 2023; Valenti et al., 2024). These differences matter because a pre-purchase choice, a post-purchase satisfaction judgment, and an organisation's allocation decision are not interchangeable dependent variables.

Motorcycle studies have examined brand image, quality, and promotion in relation to purchase decisions in Indonesian markets, but those outcomes do not reproduce the satisfaction outcome recorded in the historical Honda Beat sample (Askal et al., 2024; Syntia & Realize, 2024). Other studies of customer journeys suggest that information and experiences can have different functions before, during, and after a transaction (Beverland et al., 2024; Homburg & Tischer, 2023). Marketing research also cautions against drawing within-person or intervention-level conclusions from purely between-person associations (Childs et al., 2024). A narrow gap remains in how a fixed, small-sample marketing regression can be described in decision-relevant terms without inventing resource priorities or causal responsiveness. Addressing this gap requires analytical restraint as well as a precise account of the data originally collected.

This article therefore examines the reported conditional associations of brand perceptions (H1), product quality (H2), and promotion (H3) with Honda Beat user satisfaction, together with their joint explanatory relationship (H4). It also asks which results offer provisional signals for follow-up marketing investigation and which evidence would be required before a manager acted on them. Its empirical basis remains the 2019 survey and regression tables; no additional participants, estimates, managerial choices, or intervention outcomes are claimed. Its contribution is a bounded translation from explanatory regression findings to diagnostic questions, positioned within research distinguishing descriptive information from action-oriented analytics (Giesecke et al., 2022; Diamant, 2024). Rather than presenting a new decision system, the article identifies what this existing evidence supports and where its usefulness ends.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Consumer satisfaction is a retrospective evaluation of consumption, while purchase choice and brand loyalty reflect related but conceptually distinct processes (Schmitt, 2024; Mittal et al., 2026). A recent meta-analysis of expectancy-disconfirmation research places perceived performance and expectations at the centre of this judgment (Schiebler et al., 2026). Customer research in e-commerce and services links quality, experienced value, and satisfaction, although these relationships depend on the attributes and outcomes under study (Do et al., 2023; Hidayat & Idrus, 2023; Wenninger et al., 2022). Such findings provide theoretical reasons to inspect quality perceptions in a user sample, but they do not make observed product-quality coefficients estimates of product-improvement effects.

Brand perceptions should also be distinguished from specific trust, reputation, engagement, and attachment mechanisms. Evidence from cross-country reputation research indicates that the importance of reputation dimensions can vary with context (Damberg et al., 2024); research into consumer trust similarly identifies substantial heterogeneity (Khamitov et al., 2024). Studies of sensory brand experience, green perceived quality, and negative brand-related experience show how evaluation can develop through different routes (Chen, 2023; de Cosmo et al., 2023; Zha et al., 2025). Other investigations focus on brand commitment and branded digital applications, offering insights into behavioural continuation and brand relationships rather than direct tests of motorcycle-user satisfaction (Amoroso & Ackaradejruangsri, 2026; Tran et al., 2026). These distinctions argue against treating a single composite brand variable as a universal measure of brand-management value.

Promotional indicators often operate through customer acquisition, information provision, expectations, or subsequent engagement, and the chosen outcome affects their interpretation. Field-tested multichannel marketing demonstrates that different channels and customer groups require different performance questions (Valenti et al., 2024). Marketing communication and word of mouth can also operate differently across market conditions (Bahadir & Pauwels, 2024). Research on customer experience orientation emphasises that collecting feedback and acting on it are separate organisational capabilities (Arkadan et al., 2024). Consequently, a non-significant partial association between a broad promotion scale and post-purchase satisfaction does not establish that promotional initiatives have no commercial or behavioural value.

In Decision Sciences, predictive or explanatory fit is not itself an objective function. Prescriptive approaches formulate the feasible action space, constraints, response uncertainty, and costs of error before claiming that a policy is preferable (Bertsimas & Skali Lami, 2023; Chen et al., 2026; Sim et al., 2025; Wang et al., 2026). Contextual optimisation surveys and decision-focused learning work show how strongly these requirements differ from an ordinary observational regression (Sadana et al., 2025; Wen et al., 2025). Applied prescriptive studies demonstrate that even seemingly concrete interventions require explicit objectives, trade-offs, and evaluation designs (Brandt et al., 2022). The present evidence-to-decision map uses these works to identify missing inputs, not to claim that such models were estimated in the source survey.

METHOD

Research design and setting

This article is a secondary presentation and retrospective interpretation of a quantitative, observational, cross-sectional study described in the source thesis as correlational field research (Wininggar, 2019). The original questionnaire data were processed in SPSS version 20 in January 2019. The present revision does not involve new recruitment, new questionnaires, access to respondent-level data, or any additional statistical estimation. The decision-oriented analysis comprises an interpretive comparison of the reported coefficients and a bounded evidence-to-

decision map. Contemporary publications are introduced solely to frame the retrospective interpretation; they were not part of the original 2019 analysis.

Study Setting, Participants, and Sampling

The original setting was the 2015 cohort in the Islamic Economics Department at IAIN Metro, Indonesia. Of 145 identified motorcycle users, 56 used Honda Beat; the study selected 36 Honda Beat users through non-probability purposive sampling. Inclusion referred to the specified student cohort and Honda Beat fuel-injection motorcycles manufactured during 2012–2017. The thesis used the Slovin expression $n = N / (1 + Ne^2)$, substituting $N = 56$ and $e = .10$ to obtain 35.89, rounded to 36. Because selection was purposive rather than probabilistic, the .10 input should not be read as an achieved design-based margin of sampling error.

Questionnaire and Original Data Collection

The source describes a closed-ended questionnaire with five ordered response categories ranging from strong disagreement to strong agreement. The appendix lists 22 items: six for brand perceptions, six for product quality, five for promotion, and five for satisfaction. Brand items address reputation, perceived competence, consistency, and trust; product-quality items address engine durability, fuel economy, spare-part availability, stability, design, and environmental characteristics. Promotion items cover communication clarity, advertising appeal, staff persuasion, discounting, and segmentation; satisfaction items include perceived value, complaint management, engine experience, purchase access, and brand preference. The thesis also mentions semi-structured interviews, but the regression results discussed here derive from the questionnaire, and no separate qualitative findings are attributed to interviews.

Instrument Checks and Measurement Boundaries

The thesis compared item correlations with $r = .329$ and reported that 21 of the 22 listed items exceeded that criterion. All six brand items, all six quality items, and all five satisfaction items passed; one promotion item ($r = .301$) did not. A pooled Cronbach's alpha of .891 is shown for 21 items. The source does not clearly establish the sequence of item deletion and regression-scale construction, and it does not report construct-specific reliability estimates. Accordingly, this manuscript reports the checks as originally presented and avoids claiming that each scale was independently validated. It also recognises conceptual proximity between the engine-related quality and satisfaction items as a possible measurement limitation.

Statistical Analysis and Decision-Evidence Interpretation

The source estimated $\text{Satisfaction} = \beta_0 + \beta_1(\text{Brand}) + \beta_2(\text{Quality}) + \beta_3(\text{Promotion}) + \varepsilon$ by multiple linear regression, with .05 as the reported statistical significance criterion. Available output includes B, standard errors, standardised β , t tests, an omnibus F test, R^2 , adjusted R^2 , and limited assumption diagnostics. The reported values are transcribed rather than re-estimated, and confidence intervals or predictive-validation statistics are not constructed in this article. Hypotheses H1–H3 concern positive conditional associations; H4 concerns the joint model. A separate qualitative interpretation asks whether each statistical result is informative for problem diagnosis and what additional action-effect, objective, and cost data would be necessary for prescriptive decision-making (Bertsimas & Kallus, 2020; Elmachtoub & Grigas, 2022).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

The 2019 study reported 36 usable questionnaires. Item screening indicated that 21 of 22 listed items exceeded the original comparison value, while the first promotion item did not. The pooled reliability result was $\alpha = .891$ for 21 items, without a source-reported alpha for each separate construct (Table 1). These values document how the original instrument was reported; they do not establish comprehensive measurement validity for the four scales.

Table 1. Reported instrument screening and pooled reliability

Scale	Items listed	Items above $r = .329$	Reported r range
Brand perceptions	6	6	0.598–0.703
Product quality	6	6	0.403–0.542
Promotion	5	4	0.301–0.575
User satisfaction	5	5	0.350–0.599
Overall reliability	21 items in alpha output	Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.891$	Not reported by scale

The thesis reported tolerance statistics of .445, .466, and .630 for brand perceptions, product quality, and promotion, respectively; corresponding VIF values were 2.246, 2.147, and 1.588. Its normal-probability plot and residual scatterplot were described as broadly consistent with normality and without a clear heteroskedasticity pattern. Because individual-level observations were not available, those visual assessments are not presented as independently reproducible diagnostics. They also do not establish out-of-sample prediction, measurement invariance, or the quality of a managerial intervention.

The original fitted equation was $\text{Satisfaction} = 1.485 + 0.209(\text{Brand}) + 0.375(\text{Quality}) + 0.206(\text{Promotion})$. Product quality was positively and significantly associated with satisfaction after adjustment for the other variables ($B = 0.375$, $\beta = 0.503$, $t = 3.246$, $p = .003$). Brand perceptions ($B = 0.209$, $\beta = 0.221$, $p = .193$) and promotion ($B = 0.206$, $\beta = 0.172$, $p = .243$) yielded positive point estimates that were not statistically significant at the preselected .05 level (Table 2). These results support H2 in the specified model, but do not provide statistical support for H1 or H3. Differences among the coefficients were not themselves tested.

Table 2. Multiple linear regression coefficients for user satisfaction

Predictor	B	SE	Standardised β	t	p
Constant	1.485	2.769	—	0.536	.596
Brand perceptions	0.209	0.157	0.221	1.329	.193
Product quality	0.375	0.116	0.503	3.246	.003
Promotion	0.206	0.174	0.172	1.188	.243

The joint regression was statistically significant, $F(3, 32) = 18.967$, $p < .001$. The reported multiple R was .800, R^2 was .640, and adjusted R^2 was .606 (Table 3). Thus, 64.0% of the variation in satisfaction within these 36 observations was accounted for under the reported three-predictor model. This is a within-sample description, not a validated prediction rate or a decomposition of explained variance attributable to each predictor. H4 is supported as a joint-model statement, subject to the study's design and measurement limitations.

Table 3. Reported model summary and analysis of variance

Model statistic	Value	ANOVA component	SS	df	MS
R	0.800	Regression	96.487	3	32.162
R^2	0.640	Residual	54.263	32	1.696
Adjusted R^2	0.606	Total	150.750	35	—
Std. error of estimate	1.30220	F (model)	18.967	3, 32	$p < .001$

Discussion

The strongest reported partial relationship concerns perceived product quality, not the effect of changing product quality through a managerial intervention. Quality has the largest standardised coefficient in this regression ($\beta = .503$, $p = .003$), consistent with the possibility that repeated product use supplies relatively immediate information about satisfaction. Research on consumption-based appraisal places experienced performance close to post-purchase judgments (Schiebler et al., 2026; Mittal et al., 2026). Studies in other industries also associate perceived quality or service attributes with satisfaction, although their constructs and study settings differ from this Honda Beat sample (Kosasih et al., 2024; Do et al., 2023; Wenninger et al., 2022). The

practical interpretation is to investigate specific ownership experiences, not to declare product-quality expenditure the highest-return investment.

Engine dependability, fuel efficiency, spare-parts availability, vehicle stability, design, and environmental characteristics are relevant elements of the original quality instrument. These are concrete aspects of a respondent's ownership experience, making a relationship with satisfaction substantively plausible. Yet an engine-related satisfaction item also resembles an engine-related quality item, creating potential overlap between predictor and outcome content. Consumer-experience and perceived-quality studies demonstrate that such constructs need to be distinguished at the measurement level before theoretical interpretations are enlarged (Bae & Jeon, 2022; Chen, 2023; Zha et al., 2025). The pooled reliability coefficient cannot resolve that overlap because it was not reported separately by scale. Any intervention-level inference therefore remains unsupported by the observed coefficient alone.

The positive brand-perception coefficient did not meet the stated significance criterion ($\beta = .221$, $p = .193$), but this does not establish that brand management lacks value. All participants were Honda Beat users, so the study did not contrast customers choosing different motorcycle brands. Its brand scale combined trust, competence, and reputation, constructs whose antecedents and outcomes are differentiated in recent research (Khamitov et al., 2024; Siqueira et al., 2023; Ndhlovu & Maree, 2024). Cross-cultural reputation evidence and systematic synthesis of brand image additionally indicate that broad branding conclusions can vary by context and outcome (Damberg et al., 2024; Tahir et al., 2024). More differentiated measures and broader comparative data would be necessary to determine whether a particular brand initiative merits managerial action.

Promotion also produced a positive but statistically non-significant conditional estimate ($\beta = .172$, $p = .243$). Its survey items covered heterogeneous phenomena, including advertising messages, sales persuasion, and discounts, whereas the dependent variable concerned satisfaction after use. Channel-focused research shows that promotional communication can serve acquisition, retention, or other objectives depending on the target group and delivery channel (Valenti et al., 2024; Bahadir & Pauwels, 2024). Research on brand relationships and post-purchase engagement reinforces the need to distinguish immediate choice from subsequent evaluation (Amoroso & Ackaradejruangsri, 2026; Tran et al., 2026). The original model did not observe actual campaign exposure, campaign costs, or shifts in purchases, so its promotion coefficient cannot evaluate those objectives. A sensible next question concerns what a specific promotional intervention is intended to achieve.

The significant model-level F statistic and $R^2 = .640$ can coexist with two individually non-significant coefficients without contradiction. The omnibus test concerns the predictor set as a whole; the partial tests concern the evidence attached to individual coefficients after adjustment for the remaining terms. This distinction is particularly consequential in a 36-person purposive sample with correlated self-reported measures and limited precision. Guidance on statistical interpretation cautions against reducing scientific conclusions to whether an estimate crosses an arbitrary p-value threshold (Boscardin et al., 2024; Homa-Bonell, 2023). It is therefore inappropriate either to equate non-significance with a zero managerial effect or to treat a large in-sample R^2 as proof of reliable decision performance. Confidence intervals, prospective data, and independent validation would be useful in new work, but they are not claimed as results here.

The study's most defensible Decision Sciences contribution lies in distinguishing information that motivates investigation from evidence capable of selecting an action. Decision-focused optimisation requires explicit feasible alternatives, objective values, costs, and distributions or credible estimates of response uncertainty (Bertsimas & Skali Lami, 2023; Sadana et al., 2025; Wang et al., 2026). Robust and actionable prescriptive methods further illustrate the importance of assessing how decisions behave under uncertainty and constraints (Chen et al.,

2026; Sim et al., 2025). An empirical regression from a single cross-sectional user group contains none of the necessary treatment-response or cost evidence. It consequently informs the first diagnostic stage of an evidence-based process rather than implementing an optimisation system or a new decision policy. This limited but explicit translation is preferable to labelling an explanatory coefficient as an investment priority.

Retrospective interpretation also demands attention to what a later theoretical frame can and cannot change. The data were analysed in 2019; newer decision-analytics literature does not retroactively give that survey an experimental design, novel software, or managerial performance outcomes. Research contrasting observational and experimental decision evidence identifies confounding as a central difficulty when moving from recorded outcomes to policy choice (Fernández-Loría & Provost, 2025). Marketing methodology similarly cautions that between-person patterns cannot automatically justify assumptions about how an individual's behaviour changes after an intervention (Childs et al., 2024). Work on contextual optimisation and decision-focused learning addresses fundamentally different data and design requirements (Sadana et al., 2025; Wen et al., 2025). The article therefore treats contemporary sources as an interpretive benchmark rather than as evidence that the historical survey used those methods.

Finally, the participants' Islamic Economics programme defines the institutional sampling context, not a tested religious or ethical mechanism. The questionnaire did not measure Islamic purchasing rules, religious beliefs, Sharia compliance, or comparisons between Islamic and non-Islamic consumers. Thus, its substantive outcome remains ordinary post-purchase satisfaction. Research on consumer journeys and customer insights shows why the organisational use of feedback depends on clearly specified audiences and future actions (Beverland et al., 2024; Stremersch et al., 2025; Arkadan et al., 2024). By keeping context and explanation separate, the present case can speak to evidence use across organisational settings without importing unsupported cultural assumptions. The concluding implication is methodological: good decision support begins with accurate labels for what the available evidence can establish.

Implications

The results justify asking more focused questions about observed product and ownership experiences while continuing to investigate brand and promotion indicators. They do not warrant an immediate budget transfer, discontinuation of promotion, or a ranking of expected intervention returns. Table 4 maps the reported statistical signals to diagnostic questions and the additional information needed before action. Prospective managerial decisions would require defined objectives, feasibility constraints, marginal costs, customer feedback linked to specific attributes, and evidence of outcomes after interventions. This sequence accords with the distinction between generating marketing insights and evaluating their application (Stremersch et al., 2025; Giesecke et al., 2022).

Table 4. Decision-evidence map (interpretive, not an evaluated decision model)

Reported signal	Defensible interpretation	Diagnostic managerial question	Further evidence for action
Quality: $\beta = .503$; $p = .003$	Positive conditional association in this sample; intervention effect unknown	Which product or service experiences require closer investigation?	Feature-level complaints; feasible changes; costs; intervention outcomes
Brand: $\beta = .221$; $p = .193$	Positive point estimate; statistical evidence insufficient at .05	Which trust or reputation dimensions should be distinguished?	Construct-specific measures; broader users; comparative benefits
Promotion: $\beta = .172$; $p = .243$	Positive point estimate, not statistically confirmed for satisfaction	Is the intended outcome acquisition, expectations, or retention?	Campaign exposure; outcome-specific performance; costs; causal response
Joint model: $R^2 = .640$; $p < .001$	Substantial within-sample fit, not external decision validation	What information should guide a subsequent decision study?	New data; uncertainty bounds; objectives; constraints; intervention evaluation

Limitations

The purposive sample of 36 students from one cohort restricts both power and generalisability. A cross-sectional questionnaire cannot establish causal pathways and may contain common-method covariance or reverse associations. The quality and satisfaction scales include conceptually adjacent items, while construct-level internal consistency and the promotion-item retention sequence were not fully documented. Individual-level observations, coefficient confidence intervals, and independently reproducible diagnostic tests were unavailable for this secondary presentation. No budget, choice set, decision objective, intervention, or subsequent customer outcome was observed, and the market context is historical rather than contemporary. These limitations restrict the study to transparent diagnosis of the reported model, not policy evaluation or prescriptive prioritisation.

Suggestions for Future Research

A new prospective study could recruit a larger and more heterogeneous set of motorcycle owners, distinguish quality and satisfaction items more carefully, and report each scale's reliability and construct-validity evidence. It could also track actual promotional exposure, repair or service experiences, and post-intervention satisfaction over time. If the aim is to compare managerial actions, researchers should define feasible interventions and costs, specify an objective, and evaluate action effects using credible experimental or quasi-experimental methods before considering multi-criteria or cost-sensitive optimisation. Such work would examine the decision performance that this historical cross-sectional dataset cannot address (Fernández-Loría & Provost, 2025; Brandt et al., 2022; Homburg & Tischer, 2023).

CONCLUSION

Among 36 purposively selected Honda Beat users in the 2019 source survey, product quality showed the clearest positive conditional association with satisfaction ($B = 0.375$, $\beta = 0.503$, $p = .003$). Brand perceptions ($p = .193$) and promotion ($p = .243$) had positive but non-significant partial estimates, while the joint model was significant, $F(3, 32) = 18.967$, $p < .001$, explaining 64.0% of observed within-sample variance (adjusted $R^2 = .606$). These results describe a historical association structure, not a comparison of the consequences of marketing interventions. Reinterpreted as a Decision Sciences case, they demonstrate how a regression finding can guide diagnostic inquiry while leaving resource-allocation prescriptions unresolved. Stronger measurement, broader sampling, identified action effects, and explicit objectives and constraints would be required to justify prescriptive recommendations.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS STATEMENT

PPAN and DKW conceived the study and led the writing of the manuscript. PSU, RPYA, and RRLC designed the rubric and supervised data collection in the five districts. AMI developed the production observation sheet. WUAA and PA ran the descriptive and fsQCA analyses. DEP advised on the configurational design, organised the expert panel, and revised the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

REFERENCES

- Amoroso, D. L., & Ackaradejruangsri, P. (2026). Brand commitment as predecessor to the factors of continuance intention. *Journal of Marketing Analytics*, 14, 158–172. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41270-024-00333-y>
- Arkadan, F., Macdonald, E. K., & Wilson, H. N. (2024). Customer experience orientation: Conceptual model, propositions, and research directions. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 52, 1560–1584. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-024-01031-y>

- Askal, S., Naqiya, A. Z., & Siswanto, A. (2024). The influence of brand image, product quality, promotion, and purchasing system on purchasing decisions (Honda automatic motorcycle purchase decision in Yogyakarta City). *Equity: Jurnal Ekonomi*, 12(2), 43–52. <https://doi.org/10.33019/equity.v12i2.345>
- Bae, J.-H., & Jeon, H.-M. (2022). Exploring the relationships among brand experience, perceived product quality, hedonic value, utilitarian value, and brand loyalty in unmanned coffee shops during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Sustainability*, 14(18), Article 11713. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su141811713>
- Bahadir, S. C., & Pauwels, K. (2024). When does word of mouth versus marketing drive brand performance most? *Journal of Marketing Analytics*, 12, 473–491. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41270-023-00267-x>
- Bertsimas, D., & Kallus, N. (2020). From predictive to prescriptive analytics. *Management Science*, 66(3), 1025–1044. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2018.3253>
- Bertsimas, D., & Skali Lami, O. (2023). Holistic prescriptive analytics for continuous and constrained optimization problems. *INFORMS Journal on Optimization*, 5(2), 155–171. <https://doi.org/10.1287/ijoo.2022.0080>
- Beverland, M. B., Cankurtaran, P., Micheli, P., & Wilner, S. J. S. (2024). Co-creating educational consumer journeys: A sensemaking perspective. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 52, 284–305. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-023-00951-5>
- Boscardin, C. K., Sewell, J. L., Tolsgaard, M. G., & Pusic, M. V. (2024). How to use and report on p-values. *Perspectives on Medical Education*, 13(1), 250–254. <https://doi.org/10.5334/pme.1324>
- Brandt, T., Dlugosch, O., Abdelwahed, A., van den Berg, P. L., & Neumann, D. (2022). Prescriptive analytics in urban policing operations. *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management*, 24(5), 2463–2480. <https://doi.org/10.1287/msom.2021.1022>
- Chen, J.-L. (2023). Effect of perceived quality of green brands on road race participants' green word of mouth and mediating roles of satisfaction with and trust in green brands. *Sustainability*, 15(17), Article 13121. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su151713121>
- Chen, L., Sim, M., Zhang, X., Zhao, L., & Zhou, M. (2026). Robust actionable prescriptive analytics. *Operations Research*, 74(1), 550–571. <https://doi.org/10.1287/opre.2023.0300>
- Childs, D., Lee, N., Cadogan, J. W., & Dewsnap, B. (2024). How within-person research can extend marketing knowledge. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 52, 695–714. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-023-00978-8>
- Damberg, S., Liu, Y., & Ringle, C. M. (2024). Does culture matter? Corporate reputation and sustainable satisfaction in the Chinese and German banking sector. *Journal of Marketing Analytics*, 12, 6–24. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41270-023-00259-x>
- de Cosmo, L. M., Piper, L., Mileti, A., & Guido, G. (2023). The influence of negative travel-related experience on tourist's brand loyalty. *Italian Journal of Marketing*, 2023, 351–368. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43039-023-00075-2>
- Diamant, A. (2024). Introducing prescriptive and predictive analytics to MBA students with Microsoft Excel. *INFORMS Transactions on Education*, 24(2), 152–174. <https://doi.org/10.1287/ited.2023.0286>
- Do, A. D., Ta, V. L., Bui, P. T., Do, N. T., Dong, Q. T., & Lam, H. T. (2023). The impact of the quality of logistics services in e-commerce on the satisfaction and loyalty of Generation Z customers. *Sustainability*, 15(21), Article 15294. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su152115294>
- Elmachtoub, A. N., & Grigas, P. (2022). Smart “predict, then optimize”. *Management Science*, 68(1), 9–26. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2020.3922>
- Fernández-Loría, C., & Provost, F. (2025). Observational vs. experimental data when making automated decisions using machine learning. *INFORMS Journal on Data Science*, 4(3), 197–229. <https://doi.org/10.1287/ijds.2023.0012>

- Giesecke, K., Liberali, G., Nazerzadeh, H., Shanthikumar, J. G., & Teo, C. P. (2022). Introduction to the special section on data-driven prescriptive analytics. *Management Science*, 68(3), 1591–1594. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2021.4296>
- Hidayat, K., & Idrus, M. I. (2023). The effect of relationship marketing towards switching barrier, customer satisfaction, and customer trust on bank customers. *Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, 12, Article 29. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13731-023-00270-7>
- Homa-Bonell, J. K. (2023). Interpreting P values in 2023. *Journal of Patient-Centered Research and Reviews*, 10(3), 102–103. <https://doi.org/10.17294/2330-0698.2064>
- Homburg, C., & Tischer, M. (2023). Customer journey management capability in business-to-business markets: Its bright and dark sides and overall impact on firm performance. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 51, 1046–1074. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-023-00923-9>
- Khamitov, M., Rajavi, K., Huang, D.-W., & Hong, Y. (2024). Consumer trust: Meta-analysis of 50 years of empirical research. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 51(1), 7–18. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucad065>
- Kosasih, O., Hidayat, K., Hutahayan, B., & Sunarti. (2024). Achieving sustainable customer loyalty in the petrochemical industry: The effect of service innovation, product quality, and corporate image with customer satisfaction as a mediator. *Sustainability*, 16(16), Article 7111. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16167111>
- Malau, H. (2017). *Manajemen pemasaran: Teori dan aplikasi pemasaran era tradisional sampai era modernisasi global*. Alfabeta.
- Mittal, V., Singh, S., & Malshe, A. (2026). Customer satisfaction: A multi-level framework. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-026-01175-z>
- Ndhlovu, T., & Maree, T. (2024). The central role of consumer–brand engagement in product and service brand contexts. *Journal of Marketing Analytics*, 12, 944–961. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41270-023-00241-7>
- Park, J., Hong, E., & Park, Y.-N. (2023). Toward a new business model of retail industry: The role of brand experience and brand authenticity. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 74, Article 103426. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2023.103426>
- Sadana, U., Chenreddy, A., Delage, E., Forel, A., Frejinger, E., & Vidal, T. (2025). A survey of contextual optimization methods for decision-making under uncertainty. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 320(2), 271–289. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2024.03.020>
- Sari, C. A. S. (2017). *Teknik mengelola produk dan merek*. Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Schiebler, T., Lee, N., & Brodbeck, F. C. (2026). Expectancy-disconfirmation and consumer satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 54, 91–112. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-024-01078-x>
- Schmitt, B. (2024). Consumer information processing and decision-making: Origins, findings, applications, and future directions. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 51(1), 2–6. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucae008>
- Sim, M., Tang, Q., Zhou, M., & Zhu, T. (2025). The analytics of robust satisficing: Predict, optimize, satisfice, then fortify. *Operations Research*, 73(5), 2708–2728. <https://doi.org/10.1287/opre.2023.0199>
- Siqueira, J. R., Bendixen, M., Reinoso-Carvalho, F., & Campo, R. (2023). Key drivers of brand trust in a Latin American airline: The impact of Colombia's Avianca customer experience. *Journal of Marketing Analytics*, 11, 186–201. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41270-023-00208-8>
- Stremersch, S., Cabooter, E., Guitart, I. A., & Camacho, N. (2025). Customer insights for innovation: A framework and research agenda for marketing. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 53, 29–51. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-024-01051-8>
- Syntia, K., & Realize, R. (2024). The influence of brand image, promotion and product quality on the decision to purchase a Honda Capella Batam motorcycle. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen dan Bisnis*, 10(2), 157–170. <https://doi.org/10.22441/jimb.v10i2.25846>

- Tahir, A. H., Adnan, M., & Saeed, Z. (2024). The impact of brand image on customer satisfaction and brand loyalty: A systematic literature review. *Heliyon*, 10(16), Article e36254. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e36254>
- Tedja, B., Al Musadieq, M., Kusumawati, A., & Yulianto, E. (2024). Systematic literature review using PRISMA: Exploring the influence of service quality and perceived value on satisfaction and intention to continue relationship. *Future Business Journal*, 10, Article 39. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s43093-024-00326-4>
- Tjiptono, F. (2015). *Strategi pemasaran (4th ed.)*. Andi.
- Tran, T. P., Zemanek, J. E., & Sakib, M. N. (2026). Improving brand love through branded apps: Is that possible? *Journal of Marketing Analytics*, 14, 274–294. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41270-024-00356-5>
- Ūsas, A., Jasinskas, E., & Streimikiene, D. (2023). The impact of quality of C2C online store on consumer satisfaction: An empirical study in Lithuania. *Management & Marketing*, 18, 113–126. <https://doi.org/10.2478/mmcks-2023-0007>
- Valenti, A., Srinivasan, S., Yildirim, G., & Pauwels, K. (2024). Direct mail to prospects and email to current customers? Modeling and field-testing multichannel marketing. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 52, 815–834. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-023-00962-2>
- Wang, Y., Srivastava, P. R., Hanasusanto, G. A., & Ho, C. P. (2026). On data-driven prescriptive analytics with side information: A regularized Nadaraya–Watson approach. *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management*, 28(3), 841–859. <https://doi.org/10.1287/msom.2024.0997>
- Wen, J., Abeel, T., & de Weerd, M. (2025). Performance and interaction assessment of neural network architectures and bivariate smart predict-then-optimize. *Machine Learning*, 114, Article 252. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10994-025-06910-1>
- Wenninger, A., Rau, D., & Röglinger, M. (2022). Improving customer satisfaction in proactive service design: A Kano model approach. *Electronic Markets*, 32, 1399–1418. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12525-022-00565-9>
- Wininggar, D. (2019). Pengaruh merek, kualitas produk dan promosi terhadap kepuasan pengguna Honda Beat pada mahasiswa Jurusan Ekonomi Syariah IAIN Metro Angkatan 2015 [Undergraduate thesis, Institut Agama Islam Negeri Metro].
- Zha, D., Foroudi, P., Melewar, T. C., & Jin, Z. (2025). Examining the impact of sensory brand experience on brand loyalty. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 28, 14–42. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41299-023-00175-x>