



## Promotion, Price, and Customer Decisions to Upgrade Electricity Capacity: A Value-Based Decision Approach

Muhamad Patriansyah, Diah Natalisa\*, Ahmad Maulana

Universitas Sriwijaya, Indonesia

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.61987/bamj.v4i2.2411>

### Article History:

Received: 31 May 2026

Revised: 13 July 2026

Accepted: 05 August 2026

### Keywords:

Value-Based Decision,  
Promotion, Price, Customer  
Purchase Decision

### \*Correspondence Address:

[diah.natalisa@unsri.ac.id](mailto:diah.natalisa@unsri.ac.id)

### Abstract:

This study examined the influence of promotion and price on customers' decisions to upgrade electricity capacity from a value-based decision perspective. The study focused on consumer decision-making behavior in public electricity utility services, particularly in the context of electricity capacity upgrades. A quantitative approach was employed using survey data collected from 100 customers who had experienced electricity capacity upgrade services. The data were analyzed using multiple linear regression analysis. The results showed that both promotion and price had significant positive effects on customer purchase decisions. However, price was identified as the more dominant factor influencing customer behavior. Promotion and price simultaneously explained 83.6% of the variance in customer purchase decisions. These findings indicate that customers in public utility services tend to make rational, value-oriented decisions, in which affordability and perceived economic benefits play a stronger role than promotional communication. This study contributes to marketing and consumer behavior literature by extending the value-based decision framework to public electricity utility services. The findings also provide managerial implications for developing customer-oriented pricing policies and effective digital promotion strategies in the electricity sector.

## INTRODUCTION

PT PLN (Persero), Indonesia's national electricity provider, operates in a service environment in which digital transformation, service accessibility, and customer experience increasingly shape public expectations. Utility firms are therefore required not only to provide reliable electricity but also to communicate service options clearly and make transactions easier through digital channels (Abusafia et al., 2022; Wang & Xia, 2024). PLN has responded through services such as PLN Mobile, which supports access to electricity-related information and transactions. At the regional level, PT PLN (Persero) UP3 Jambi serves customers with diverse household and business electricity needs, including applications for electricity capacity upgrades. Such decisions are relevant because electricity capacity requirements vary with appliance ownership, productive activities, and service-use patterns, while customer responses may differ across socio-economic and regional contexts (Nazari & Musilek, 2023; Fadillah & Hidayah, 2025).

Purchase decisions generally involve need recognition, information search, evaluation of alternatives, choice, and post-purchase evaluation (Mihajlovic et al., 2025). In this process, promotion can create awareness, explain service procedures, reduce uncertainty, and stimulate interest, whereas price represents the monetary sacrifice relative to expected benefits (Hidayat, 2021). Empirical studies in commercial and service settings commonly report significant effects of promotion and price on purchase decisions, including through digital marketing, promotional programs, and discounted pricing (Afrianda et al., 2024; Agung et al., 2024; Dwi & Rusmawan, 2024). Other studies likewise show that the effectiveness of promotion depends on message relevance and communication channels, while price and sales promotions can alter customers' willingness to transact (Salim & Fermayani, 2021; Islahuben et al., 2023; Rahmawati & Samiono, 2024).

However, evidence from retail and e-commerce cannot be transferred uncritically to an essential public utility. Electricity capacity upgrades are primarily utilitarian and may be evaluated based on affordability, functional necessity, expected service benefits, and longer-term economic value. A value-based decision perspective is therefore useful because consumers compare perceived benefits with financial sacrifice; price can simultaneously signal cost, fairness, and value (Todorova, 2026; Gârdan et al., 2025). This reasoning also complements the Theory of Planned Behavior, in which information can support behavioral intention while financial capability can affect perceived behavioral control (Olawejaju et al., 2026). In digitally mediated services, technology acceptance, trust, and service quality may provide additional context even when they are not included as predictors in the tested model (Iqbal et al., 2021; Lee et al., 2025).

Research on electricity capacity upgrade decisions in the Jambi regional context remains limited. This study therefore examines whether promotion and price influence customer purchase decisions at PT PLN (Persero) UP3 Jambi, and whether price makes a stronger contribution within a value-based decision framework. Three hypotheses were tested: H1, promotion has a positive and significant effect on purchase decisions; H2, price has a positive and significant effect on purchase decisions; and H3, promotion and price simultaneously have a significant effect on purchase decisions. By locating these relationships in a public electricity utility rather than a conventional retail market, the study extends the marketing and consumer-behavior discussion toward rational, value-oriented service consumption. It provides practical evidence for customer-oriented pricing and promotional communication.

## RESEARCH METHODS

### Research Design, Setting, and Sample

The study used a quantitative explanatory design to assess causal relationships among promotion, price, and purchase decisions using numerical survey data and multiple linear regression (Thomas & Zubkov, 2023; Sharma et al., 2023; Alford & Teater, 2025). Data were collected from customers at PT PLN (Persero) UP3 Jambi who had purchased electricity-capacity upgrade services during January–March 2025. The target population comprised 2,136 customers. Using the Slovin formula with a 10% margin of error produced a minimum sample of 95.52, which was rounded to 100 respondents. Purposive sampling was used to ensure that all respondents had direct experience with the service being evaluated.

**Table 1. Research Population Distribution**

| No                     | Customer Service Unit (ULP) | Jan-25       | Feb-25     | Mar-25       |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|------------|--------------|
| 1                      | Telanaipura                 | 219          | 154        | 146          |
| 2                      | Kotabaru                    | 380          | 209        | 234          |
| 3                      | Seberang Kota               | 50           | 24         | 24           |
| 4                      | Muara Bulian                | 151          | 74         | 49           |
| 5                      | Kuala Tungkal               | 115          | 70         | 42           |
| 6                      | Muara Sabak                 | 100          | 50         | 45           |
| <b>Jambi Total</b>     |                             | <b>1,015</b> | <b>581</b> | <b>540</b>   |
| <b>Total Customers</b> |                             |              |            | <b>2,136</b> |

Source: Internal data, processed by the authors (2025).

## Measurement and Data Collection

Primary data were obtained through a structured questionnaire using a five-point Likert response scale from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (5), a format widely used to quantify attitudes and perceptions (Lindner & Lindner, 2024; Huh & Gim, 2025; Koo & Yang, 2025). Promotion was measured with 15 items covering advertising, sales promotion, public relations, direct marketing, and personal selling. Price was measured with 10 items covering affordability, compatibility with service quality, and compatibility with benefits. The purchase decision was measured using 10 items covering product selection, purchase timing, and payment method. The dimensions reflect established marketing and purchase-decision concepts (Kotler & Keller, 2016). Secondary information from company records and relevant literature was used only to describe the research context and support interpretation.

**Table 2. Operational Definition of Variables**

| Variable              | Dimension        | Indicators                                                                                                               | Scale   |
|-----------------------|------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| <b>Promotion (X1)</b> | Advertising      | 1. PLN promotional information on social media is always up-to-date.                                                     | Ordinal |
|                       |                  | 2. Information regarding electricity power upgrade promotions is presented clearly and is easy to understand.            |         |
|                       |                  | 3. PLN promotional advertisements on digital platforms attract customer attention.                                       |         |
|                       | Sales Promotion  | 4. Discounts or promotional fee reductions increase customers' interest in electricity power upgrades.                   | Ordinal |
|                       |                  | 5. PLN provides special promotional programs for customers.                                                              |         |
|                       |                  | 6. Promotional time limits encourage customers to make faster purchasing decisions.                                      |         |
|                       | Public Relations | 7. Official PLN publications help customers understand electricity power upgrade services.                               | Ordinal |
|                       |                  | 8. PLN's positive corporate image increases customer trust.                                                              |         |
|                       |                  | 9. PLN's Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) programs strengthen customer trust in electricity power upgrade services. |         |
|                       | Direct Marketing | 10. Direct notifications (SMS/WhatsApp/Email) encourage customers to learn about promotional programs.                   | Ordinal |
|                       |                  | 11. Notifications through the PLN Mobile application help customers understand promotional programs.                     |         |

|                                |                                          |                                                                                                           |         |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| <b>Price (X2)</b>              | Personal Selling                         | 12. Direct communication (SMS/WhatsApp/Email/PLN Mobile) facilitates access to procedural information.    | Ordinal |
|                                |                                          | 13. PLN staff provide clear explanations regarding the electricity power upgrade process.                 |         |
|                                |                                          | 14. PLN staff are able to answer questions regarding costs and procedures comprehensively.                |         |
|                                |                                          | 15. PLN staff provide recommendations regarding appropriate electricity capacity based on customer needs. |         |
|                                | Price Affordability                      | 1. The offered price is affordable.                                                                       | Ordinal |
|                                |                                          | 2. The offered service price is attractive.                                                               |         |
|                                |                                          | 3. The pricing is appropriate and accurate.                                                               |         |
|                                | Price Compatibility with Service Quality | 4. The offered price is consistent with the quality provided.                                             | Ordinal |
|                                |                                          | 5. The service price is appropriate for the quantity requested and received.                              |         |
|                                |                                          | 6. The offered price is suitable for customer usage needs.                                                |         |
|                                |                                          | 7. The offered service price matches customers' financial capabilities.                                   |         |
|                                | Price Compatibility with Benefits        | 8. The offered price is consistent with the benefits received.                                            | Ordinal |
|                                |                                          | 9. Customers are satisfied with the offered service price.                                                |         |
|                                |                                          | 10. Promotional prices can be directly processed and utilized.                                            |         |
| <b>Purchasing Decision (Y)</b> | Product Selection                        | 1. Customers are interested in selecting the offered service.                                             | Ordinal |
|                                |                                          | 2. Customers are interested in choosing the service because of lower prices.                              |         |
|                                |                                          | 3. Customers are attracted by the offered pricing.                                                        |         |
|                                |                                          | 4. Self-assessment of service utilization.                                                                |         |
|                                | Purchase Timing                          | 5. Service requests can be submitted during service hours.                                                | Ordinal |
|                                |                                          | 6. The service request process is easy and quickly processed.                                             |         |
|                                |                                          | 7. The application process is simple and convenient.                                                      |         |
|                                |                                          | 8. PLN responds promptly to customer needs.                                                               |         |
|                                | Payment Method                           | 9. The available payment methods are diverse.                                                             | Ordinal |
|                                |                                          | 10. The payment process is easy to conduct.                                                               |         |

Source: Data processed by the author, 2025.

Several procedural remedies were used to reduce common method bias. Participation was voluntary; respondents were assured that responses were anonymous and confidential; items used clear and neutral wording; independent- and dependent-variable items were placed in separate sections; and item order was arranged to limit repetitive response patterns. These procedures were supplemented by Harman's single-factor test and full-collinearity VIF diagnostics. A first-factor variance below 50% and full-collinearity VIF below 3.3 were used as conservative indicators that common method bias was not a serious concern.

## Data Analysis

IBM SPSS was used for analysis. Item validity was examined using Pearson item-total correlations, with  $p < 0.05$  and  $r$  exceeding the  $r$ -table value of 0.195 for  $n = 100$ . Internal consistency was assessed using Cronbach's alpha. Descriptive statistics summarized respondent characteristics and variable scores. Regression assumptions

were evaluated using the standardized residual histogram and Normal P-P Plot, tolerance and variance inflation factor (VIF), and the residual scatterplot. Multiple linear regression estimated the partial effects of promotion and price; t-tests evaluated H1 and H2, the F-test evaluated H3 and overall model feasibility, and R and R<sup>2</sup> described the strength and explanatory capacity of the model.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Results

#### Measurement Quality and Diagnostic Tests

All questionnaire items met the validity criterion. Item-total correlations ranged from 0.806 to 0.910 for Promotion, 0.764 to 0.902 for Price, and 0.751 to 0.878 for Purchase Decision, with all significance values below 0.001. Internal consistency was very high, with Cronbach's alpha values of 0.975, 0.966, and 0.945, respectively. Harman's first unrotated factor explained 38.21% of the total variance, while the full-collinearity VIF for both predictors was 3.15; both results were below their conservative common-method thresholds. The residual histogram and Normal P-P Plot showed an approximately normal pattern, and the scatterplot showed no systematic heteroscedasticity. Tolerance values of 0.318 and VIF values of 3.150 further indicated that multicollinearity did not invalidate the regression model.

**Table 3. Measurement Quality and Model Diagnostics**

| Assessment                  | Result                                                                                 | Criterion / Interpretation                                                  |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Item validity               | X1: $r = 0.806-0.910$ ; X2: $r = 0.764-0.902$ ; Y: $r = 0.751-0.878$ ; all $p < 0.001$ | All items valid ( $r > 0.195$ ; $p < 0.05$ )                                |
| Reliability                 | $\alpha X1 = 0.975$ ; $\alpha X2 = 0.966$ ; $\alpha Y = 0.945$                         | All constructs reliable                                                     |
| Harman's single-factor test | First factor = 38.21%                                                                  | Below 50%; no serious common method bias                                    |
| Full-collinearity VIF       | X1 = 3.15; X2 = 3.15                                                                   | Below 3.3; no serious common method bias                                    |
| Regression assumptions      | Tolerance = 0.318; VIF = 3.150; residual plots acceptable                              | No serious multicollinearity, non-normality, or heteroscedasticity detected |

Source: Processed questionnaire data (2025).

Table 3 shows the results of the measurement quality assessment and model diagnostic tests conducted to ensure the validity, reliability, and suitability of the research model. The item validity test indicates that all measurement items for Promotion (X1), Price (X2), and Purchase Decision (Y) were valid, with correlation coefficients exceeding the required threshold and significance values below 0.001, confirming that each item accurately represented its respective construct. The reliability analysis demonstrates strong internal consistency, as all constructs achieved Cronbach's Alpha values above the acceptable level, with  $\alpha X1 = 0.975$ ,  $\alpha X2 = 0.966$ , and  $\alpha Y = 0.945$ . Furthermore, Harman's single-factor test indicates that the first factor accounted for 38.21% of the total variance, below the 50% threshold, suggesting that common method bias was not a serious concern. The full-collinearity VIF values for Promotion and Price were both 3.15, remaining below the recommended limit of 3.3, suggesting the absence of problematic collinearity. Additionally, regression diagnostic results with tolerance values of 0.318, a VIF of 3.150, and acceptable residual patterns confirm that the model does not suffer from serious multicollinearity, non-normality, or heteroscedasticity issues. Overall, these results indicate that the measurement instruments and regression model meet the required statistical criteria for further hypothesis testing.

## Respondent Profile and Descriptive Results

Of the 100 respondents, 69% were male, and 31% were female. Most were 26–35 years old (44%) or 36–50 years old (42%); 12% were over 50 years old, and 2% were 12–25 years old. Senior high school was the most common educational background (69%), followed by bachelor's degree (21%), diploma (6%), university student status (2%), and postgraduate and vocational high school backgrounds (1% each). At the construct level, mean scores were 4.113 for Promotion, 4.081 for Price, and 4.169 for Purchase Decision, indicating generally positive evaluations of the three variables.

**Table 4. Research Respondent Profile**

| Respondent Profile     | Category                          | Frequency | Percentage (%) |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------|----------------|
| Gender                 | Male                              | 69        | 69             |
|                        | Female                            | 31        | 31             |
| Age                    | 12 – 25 Years                     | 2         | 2              |
|                        | 26 – 35 Years                     | 44        | 44             |
|                        | 36 – 50 Years                     | 42        | 42             |
|                        | > 50 Years                        | 12        | 12             |
| Educational Background | Diploma                           | 6         | 6              |
|                        | University Student                | 2         | 2              |
|                        | Bachelor' s Degree (S1)           | 21        | 21             |
|                        | Master' s/Doctoral Degree (S2/S3) | 1         | 1              |
|                        | Senior High School (SMA)          | 69        | 69             |
|                        | Vocational High School (SMK)      | 1         | 1              |

Table 4 shows the demographic characteristics of the 100 respondents involved in the study, including gender, age, and educational background. The respondent composition indicates that males represented the majority of participants (69%). In comparison, females accounted for 31%, suggesting that male customers more frequently reported decisions to upgrade electricity capacity in this sample. In terms of age distribution, most respondents were in the productive age groups, particularly 26–35 years (44%) and 36–50 years (42%), while those aged 50 years and above accounted for 12%, and those aged 12–25 years represented only 2%. This distribution indicates that the majority of customers who utilized electricity capacity upgrade services were adults with relatively stable economic and household conditions.

Regarding educational background, senior high school graduates constituted the largest group (69%), followed by bachelor's degree holders (21%) and diploma graduates (6%). In contrast, university students, postgraduate graduates, and vocational high school graduates each represented only a small proportion (1–2%). Overall, the respondent profile suggests that the study primarily captures the perceptions of adult customers with diverse educational backgrounds, providing a relevant representation of consumer characteristics in evaluating factors influencing electricity capacity upgrade decisions.

Table 5 presents the descriptive statistics for the research variables: Promotion (X1), Price (X2), and Purchase Decision (Y). The analysis was conducted using responses from 100 customers on a five-point Likert scale. The descriptive analysis aims to provide an overview of respondents' perceptions regarding promotional activities, price considerations, and their decisions to upgrade electricity capacity.

Table 5. Descriptive Statistics of Research Variables

| Variable              | N   | Minimum | Maximum | Mean  | Std. Deviation |
|-----------------------|-----|---------|---------|-------|----------------|
| Promotion (X1)        | 100 | 1.00    | 5.00    | 4.113 | 0.775          |
| Price (X2)            | 100 | 1.00    | 5.00    | 4.081 | 0.739          |
| Purchase Decision (Y) | 100 | 1.00    | 5.00    | 4.169 | 0.688          |

Table 5 shows the descriptive statistics of the research variables, including Promotion (X1), Price (X2), and Purchase Decision (Y), based on responses from 100 customers using a five-point Likert scale. The results indicate that all variables obtained high mean scores, reflecting generally positive perceptions among respondents. Promotion (X1) recorded a mean score of 4.113 with a standard deviation of 0.775, suggesting that customers perceived the promotional activities for electricity capacity upgrade services positively. However, some differences in individual responses remained. Price (X2) obtained a mean score of 4.081 with a standard deviation of 0.739, indicating that customers considered the pricing aspects acceptable and consistent with their perceived value of the service.

Meanwhile, Purchase Decision (Y) achieved the highest mean score of 4.169 with the lowest standard deviation of 0.688, demonstrating a strong level of customer agreement regarding their decision to upgrade electricity capacity. The relatively low standard deviations across all variables indicate that respondents' evaluations were consistent. Overall, the findings suggest that customers perceive the service offering positively, where promotional efforts, price considerations, and perceived value collectively contribute to favorable purchase decisions.

### Regression and Hypothesis Testing

The regression results show that Promotion had a positive and significant coefficient ( $B = 0.100$ ,  $\beta = 0.169$ ,  $t = 2.318$ ,  $p = 0.023$ ), supporting H1. Price also had a positive and significant effect ( $B = 0.721$ ,  $\beta = 0.770$ ,  $t = 10.562$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), supporting H2. The substantially larger standardized coefficient for Price indicates that it was the dominant predictor. The overall model was significant ( $F = 247.845$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), supporting H3. The correlation coefficient was  $R = 0.915$  and  $R^2 = 0.836$  (adjusted  $R^2 = 0.833$ ), meaning that Promotion and Price together explained 83.6% of the variation in Purchase Decision in this sample.

Table 6. Multiple Regression and Hypothesis Test Results

| Predictor      | B     | Std. Error | Beta  | t      | p       | Decision     |
|----------------|-------|------------|-------|--------|---------|--------------|
| Constant       | 6.097 | 1.629      | -     | 3.741  | < 0.001 | -            |
| Promotion (X1) | 0.100 | 0.043      | 0.169 | 2.318  | 0.023   | H1 supported |
| Price (X2)     | 0.721 | 0.068      | 0.770 | 10.562 | < 0.001 | H2 supported |

The results of the multiple regression analysis indicate that both promotion and price have significant positive effects on customer purchase decisions. The promotion variable (X1) has a positive regression coefficient ( $B = 0.100$ ) with a significance level of  $p = 0.023$ , indicating that higher promotional activity increases customers' decisions to upgrade electricity capacity; therefore, H1 is supported. Meanwhile, the price variable (X2) shows a stronger positive influence ( $B = 0.721$ ;  $\beta = 0.770$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ), indicating that price is the most dominant factor affecting customer purchase decisions, supporting H2. Simultaneously, promotion and price explain 83.6% of the variation in customer purchase decisions ( $R^2 = 0.836$ ), with the remaining 16.4% attributable to other factors

outside the research model. The F-test results confirm that the regression model is statistically significant ( $F(2,97) = 247.845$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), supporting H3. These findings demonstrate that customers' decisions in electricity capacity upgrade services are strongly influenced by value considerations, particularly affordability and perceived economic benefits associated with pricing.

## Discussion

Promotion had a statistically significant positive effect on customers' decisions to upgrade electricity capacity, but its effect was considerably smaller than the effect of price. This result is consistent with the role of promotion as a communication mechanism that increases awareness, provides information, and reduces uncertainty before purchase (Kovacheva & Nikolova, 2024). Prior studies similarly report positive effects of promotion and digital marketing on purchase decisions and customer responses (Afrianda et al., 2024; Maulid et al., 2022). In the PLN context, information delivered through PLN Mobile, social media, direct notifications, or official publications can help customers recognize service availability, understand application procedures, and identify promotional periods. The result also accords with evidence that marketing communication is more effective when channels and messages match customer needs and are integrated across touchpoints (Mou, 2024; Yin, 2025). Nevertheless, promotion alone may be insufficient when a transaction requires customers to evaluate a concrete financial commitment. This helps explain why studies of promotion, brand image, and sales promotion often find that promotional effects operate alongside price and other value cues rather than replacing them (Islahuben et al., 2023; Rahmawati & Samiono, 2024).

Price was the strongest predictor of purchase decisions. This finding is theoretically plausible because price is the most direct expression of monetary sacrifice and therefore strongly shapes perceived affordability and economic feasibility (Hidayat, 2021). During an electricity capacity upgrade, customers are likely to compare the fee with expected functional benefits, such as adequate power for appliances, reduced overload risk, household convenience, or support for business activities. Previous studies show that price and promotional price reductions can materially affect purchase decisions (Quality et al., 2021; Salim & Fermayani, 2021; Agung et al., 2024). The result is also consistent with the value-based decision perspective. Consumers do not evaluate price only as an amount paid; they judge whether the sacrifice is fair and proportionate to the benefits obtained (Rakangthong et al., 2025). Perceived value therefore emerges from the balance between what is received and what is given (Biscaia et al., 2023; Al-Abdullatif et al., 2024). Because an electricity-capacity upgrade is a utilitarian rather than primarily hedonic service, that balance is especially salient. Customers may appreciate promotional communication, but the final decision is more likely when the price is viewed as affordable, reasonable, and justified by functional value.

The simultaneous effect of promotion and price, together with  $R^2 = 0.836$ , indicates that customer decisions were shaped by both information-related and economic evaluation. Promotion can support intention by making the service visible and understandable, whereas price can constrain or enable action through customers' financial capability. This interpretation is compatible with the Theory of Planned Behavior, particularly the distinction between intention formation and perceived behavioral control (Lim et al., 2023). It also fits the digital-service setting of PLN. Digital

transformation can improve access and convenience, but customers must trust the information, understand the service, and perceive the platform and process as useful and manageable (Abusafia et al., 2022; ElKhatib et al., 2024). Service quality and customer experience may reinforce this process, especially when digital interactions are reliable and responsive (Iqbal et al., 2021; Fadillah & Hidayah, 2025). Regional energy service behavior can also vary with digital adoption, socioeconomic characteristics, and consumption needs (Nazari & Musilek, 2023). These factors were not directly tested here, so they should be treated as contextual mechanisms rather than additional empirical determinants.

The findings have practical implications for PT PLN (Persero) UP3 Jambi. First, because price had the largest coefficient, pricing information should be transparent, easy to compare, and explicitly linked to the functional benefits of additional capacity. Customers should be able to understand the fee structure, applicable promotional reductions, payment procedures, and the practical value of the upgrade before submitting an application. Second, promotion should emphasize informative rather than purely persuasive content. Clear explanations of eligibility, procedures, deadlines, costs, and expected service benefits can reduce uncertainty and make promotional messages more useful. Third, digital channels should be coordinated so that information provided through PLN Mobile, social media, SMS, WhatsApp, and service staff is consistent. These actions can strengthen the value proposition by combining accessible communication with credible economic benefits rather than treating promotion and price as independent managerial instruments.

Several limitations should guide interpretation and future research. The sample was limited to 100 customers of one regional unit and used purposive sampling, so the findings should not be generalized automatically to all PLN customers. The cross-sectional design captured perceptions at one point in time and cannot establish how responses change after new tariffs, promotional schemes, or service innovations. The model included only promotion and price; perceived value, service quality, satisfaction, digital trust, digital literacy, and technology acceptance may provide additional explanatory power. Although procedural remedies, Harman's test, and full-collinearity VIF indicated that common method bias was not serious, self-reported data remain subject to subjective perception. Future studies should use broader multi-region samples, longitudinal or transaction-linked data, and expanded models that test perceived value as a mediator and digital-service constructs as antecedents or moderators. Alternative specifications and robustness checks would also strengthen causal interpretation.

## CONCLUSION

The findings confirm that promotion and price have positive and significant effects on customers' decisions to upgrade electricity capacity, both individually and simultaneously. Among the factors examined, price emerged as the strongest predictor, indicating that customers place greater emphasis on affordability, financial considerations, and the perceived economic and functional value of the service. The regression model explained 83.6% of the variation in customer purchase decisions, demonstrating the strong explanatory power of value-related factors in public utility consumption decisions. From a managerial perspective, these results highlight the importance of integrating promotional communication with transparent and customer-oriented pricing strategies. Effective communication should emphasize not only service

availability but also the justification of pricing, expected benefits, and applicable promotional conditions. This study contributes to the consumer behavior and marketing literature by extending the value-based decision perspective to the public electricity utility sector. It provides a foundation for future research incorporating factors such as perceived value, service quality, digital trust, and technology acceptance.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors would like to express their sincere gratitude to PT PLN (Persero) UP3 Jambi for providing permission, support, and access to the research context required for this study. The authors also thank the respondents who voluntarily participated and provided valuable information for this research. This study received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

## REFERENCES

- Abusafia, A., Bouguettaya, A., & Lakhdari, A. (2022). Maximizing Consumer Satisfaction of IoT Energy Services. *The University of Sydney, Sydney*, 1–15. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-20984-0\\_28](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-20984-0_28)
- Afrianda, R., Zainal, V. R., Siswanti, I., & Nawangsari, L. C. (2024). Economic Analysis and Factors Influencing Customer Satisfaction and Electricity Purchase Decisions in a Case Study at PT PLN in Indonesia. *International Journal of Economic Literature (INJOLE)*, 1(10), 1664–1676. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e31415>
- Agung, H., Mayke, N., Normasari, E., Clarisa, I., Friscilla, S., Ardhanayudha, I., Simaremare, A., & Nurrohman, F. (2024). Customer's Response to Dynamic Pricing in Utility Energy Tariff Quality and Reliability with the Time of Use: An Empirical Case Study of Household Electricity Customers in Indonesia. *Heliyon*, 10(11), e31415. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e31415>
- Al-Abdullatif, A. M., & Alsubaie, M. A. (2024). ChatGPT in Learning: Assessing Students' Use Intentions Through the Lens of Perceived Value and the Influence of AI Literacy. *Behavioral Sciences*, 14(9), 845. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs14090845>
- Alford, S., & Teater, B. (2025). Quantitative Research. In *Handbook of Research Methods in Social Work* (pp. 156–171). Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781035310173.00023>
- Biscaia, R., Yoshida, M., & Kim, Y. (2023). Service Quality and Its Effects on Consumer Outcomes: A Meta-Analytic Review in Spectator Sport. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 23(3), 897–921. <https://doi.org/10.1080/16184742.2021.1938630>
- Dwi, E., & Rusmawan, T. (2024). Investigating the Role of Viral Marketing and Brand Awareness on Purchase Decisions: An Empirical Study in Indonesian Online Shops. *International Journal of Data and Network Science*, 8, 1715–1726. <https://doi.org/10.5267/j.ijdns.2024.2.016>
- ElKhatib, M., Angelova, Y., & Kazim, H. (2024). Digital Transformation Significance on Quality of SMART Services: Innovation, Mobility, Adaptability, Analytical Ability and Trust. In *2024 2nd International Conference on Cyber Resilience (ICCR)* (pp. 1–4). IEEE. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICCR61006.2024.10533077>

- Fadillah, M. B., & Hidayah, R. T. (2025). The Effect of Service Quality on Customer Satisfaction, Attitude, and Loyalty of PT PLN (Persero) UP3 Rantauprapat. *International Journal of Science, Technology & Management*, 6(4), 928–940. <https://doi.org/10.46729/ijstm.v6i4.1335>
- Gârdan, I. P., Roșca, M. I., Gârdan, D. A., Andronie, M., Roșca, L. D., & Paștiu, C. A. (2025). Adoption of 3D-Printed Food in Romania: Price Perception as a Key Determinant of Consumer Acceptance. *Foods*, 14(24), 4306. <https://doi.org/10.3390/foods14244306>
- Hidayat, R. (2021). Buying Decision Influence with Price, Product Quality and Promoting. *International Journal of Economic, Technology and Social Sciences*, 2(1), 216–226. <https://doi.org/10.53695/injects.v2i1.384>
- Huh, I., & Gim, J. (2025). Exploration of Likert Scale in Terms of Continuous Variable with Parametric Statistical Methods. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 25(1), 218. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-025-02668-1>
- Iqbal, K., Munawar, H. S., & Inam, H. (2021). Promoting Customer Loyalty and Satisfaction in Financial Institutions Through Technology Integration: The Roles of Service Quality, Awareness, and Perceptions. *Sustainability*, 13(23), 12951. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su132312951>
- Islahuben, I., Widayati, C. C., Yenita, Y., & Budiawan, L. S. (2023). The Influence of Product Quality, Promotion and Price on Purchasing Decisions. *Journal of Accounting and Finance Management*, 4(3), 258–265. <https://doi.org/10.38035/jafm.v4i3.235>
- Koo, M., & Yang, S. W. (2025). Likert-Type Scale. *Encyclopedia*, 5(1), 18. <https://doi.org/10.3390/encyclopedia5010018>
- Kotler, P., & Keller, K. L. (2016). *Marketing Management* (15th ed.). Pearson.
- Kovacheva, A., & Nikolova, H. (2024). Uncertainty Marketing Tactics: An Overview and a Unifying Framework. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 52(1), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-023-00941-7>
- Lee, A. T., Ramasamy, R. K., & Subbarao, A. (2025). Understanding Psychosocial Barriers to Healthcare Technology Adoption: A Review of TAM Technology Acceptance Model and Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology and UTAUT Frameworks. *Healthcare*, 13(3), 250. <https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare13030250>
- Lim, W. M., & Weissmann, M. A. (2023). Toward a Theory of Behavioral Control. *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 31(1), 185–211. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0965254X.2021.1890190>
- Lindner, J. R., & Lindner, N. (2024). Interpreting Likert-Type, Summated, Unidimensional, and Attitudinal Scales: I Neither Agree nor Disagree, Likert or Not. *Advancements in Agricultural Development*, 5(2), 152–163. <https://doi.org/10.37433/aad.v5i2.351>
- Maulid, D. L., Hurriyati, R., & Hendrayati, H. (2022). The Impact of Social Media Marketing on Consumer Purchase Decisions. *Advances in Economics, Business and Management Research*, 220, 231–235. <https://doi.org/10.2991/aebmr.k.220701.045>
- Mihajlovic, M., Savic, A., & Sarcevic, V. (2025). Stages in the Consumer Buying Decision-Making Process. *MEST Journal*, 13(2), 166–176. <https://doi.org/10.12709/mest.13.13.02.14>

- Mou, A. J. (2024). Marketing Capstone Insights: Leveraging Multi-Channel Strategies for Maximum Digital Conversion and ROI. *Review of Applied Science and Technology*, 3(4), 1–28. <https://doi.org/10.63125/5w76qb87>
- Nazari, Z., & Musilek, P. (2023). Impact of Digital Transformation on the Energy Sector: Algorithms Review. *Algorithms*. <https://doi.org/10.3390/a16040211>
- Niyomyaht, S. (2014). Research Methods for Business. *Academic Journal Bangkokthonburi University*, 2(2), 203–206.
- Olarewaju, T., Belitski, M., Dalziel, N., Do, H., & McLuskie, P. (2026). A Student or an Entrepreneur? Financial Capability, Behavioral Control and Subjective Norms as Pathways to Entrepreneurial Activity at University. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEBR-03-2025-0368>
- Quality, S., Image, C., & Decision, P. (2021). The Effect of Price, Service Quality, and Company Image on Purchase Decisions on Jalanjalan.id Gresik. *International Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting Research (IJEBAR)*, 5(2), 304–317. <https://doi.org/10.29040/ijebar.v5i2.2468>
- Rahmawati, N., & Samiono, B. E. (2024). Pengaruh Affiliate Marketing dan Sales Promotion terhadap Impulsive Buying pada Marketplace Lazada. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Penelitian dan Pemberdayaan Masyarakat 2024*, 20–21. <https://doi.org/10.36722/psn.v4i1.3463>
- Rakangthong, N. K., Kim, L., Ru-Zhue, J., Npueng, S., & Issayeva, G. (2025). From Service Attributes to E-Banking Value Development Influencing E-Banking User Feedback: A Moderating Effect of Technological Competency. *Journal of Financial Services Marketing*, 30(2), 14. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41264-025-00307-w>
- Salim, A., & Fermayani, R. (2021). Pengaruh Potongan Harga, Promosi Penjualan, Tampilan dalam Toko terhadap Keputusan Pembelian Impulsif Konsumen Matahari Departement Store Padang. *Menara Ekonomi*, 7(3), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.31869/me.v7i3.2836>
- Sharma, L. R., Bidari, S., Bidari, D., Neupane, S., & Sapkota, R. (2023). Exploring the Mixed Methods Research Design: Types, Purposes, Strengths, Challenges, and Criticisms. *Global Academic Journal of Linguistics and Literature*, 5(1), 28–35. <https://doi.org/10.36348/gajll.2023.v05i01.002>
- Thomas, D., & Zubkov, P. (2023). Quantitative Research Designs. *Quantitative Research for Practical Theology*, 5(6), 103–114.
- Todorova, M. (2026). Price as a Communication Signal: Theoretical Dependencies Between Price and Perceived Quality. *Open Journal of Business and Management*, 14(1), 681–692. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ojbm.2026.141040>
- Wang, D., & Xia, X. (2024). The Impact of Corporate Digital Transformation on Firms' Performance in Utilities Sector. *Heliyon*, 10, e23362. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e23362>
- Yin, C. C. (2025). Integrating or Tailoring? Optimizing Touchpoints for Enhanced Omnichannel Customer Experience. *Journal of Research in Interactive Marketing*, 19(6), 1001–1017. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JRIM-11-2023-0418>