



Applying Customer Value Analysis to Determine Differentiating Factors in Consumer Purchase Decisions: A Comparative Study of Aice and Joyday Ice Cream in Bandar Lampung

Pria Estu Prayogi¹, Sripto², Jeni Wulandari³

¹Program Studi Magister Ilmu Administrasi, Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik, Universitas Lampung, Indonesia

Correspondence E-mail: Prayogipriaestu@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The ice cream industry in Indonesia has evolved into a highly competitive landscape with the emergence of aggressive players like Aice and Joyday, disrupting the long-standing dominance of established brands. This study aims to analyze the specific factors that differentiate consumer purchase decisions between these two brands in Bandar Lampung using the lens of Customer Value Theory. By employing a quantitative approach, 400 respondents were surveyed using purposive sampling. Data were analyzed using Multiple Discriminant Analysis (MDA) to identify the most potent discriminators among four variables: Price, Promotion, Taste & Variants, and Product Availability. The results reveal that all variables contribute significantly to the distinction between the two groups. "Taste and Product Variants" emerged as the most dominant discriminator, followed by Price. While Joyday is perceived superior in sensory innovation, Aice maintains a stronghold in logistics and economic accessibility.

Article Information

Riwayat Artikel:

Diterima 30 April 2026

Direvisi 1 Mei 2026

Diterbitkan 2 Mei 2026

Tersedia Online 2 Mei 2026

Publikasi 2 Mei 2026

Keyword:

Aice, Joyday.Aice, Consumer Behavior, Customer Value Analysis, Discriminant Analysis, FMCG, Joyday

1. INTRODUCTION

The Fast-Moving Consumer Goods (FMCG) sector, particularly the ice cream category, has undergone a radical transformation in Indonesia over the last decade. Historically, the market was polarized between premium international brands and local traditional players. However, the entry of Aice (Singapore-based) and Joyday (Yili Group, China) has introduced a new "mass-premium" segment characterized by high quality at affordable prices.

In Bandar Lampung, a strategic urban hub in Sumatra, this competition is particularly visible. Both brands have implemented distinct market entry strategies. Aice focused on deep penetration through "General Trade" (GT) outlets by providing freezers to thousands of small traditional kiosks. In contrast, Joyday entered with a focus on "Modern Trade" and heavy investment in flavor R&D to appeal to the adventurous palate of younger consumers. This study utilizes Customer Value Theory to understand how consumers weigh the benefits (taste, convenience, image) against the costs (price, effort) when choosing between these two aggressive competitors.

2. METHOD

This study adopts a comparative-explanatory quantitative approach using a survey method. Sample: 400 respondents in Bandar Lampung selected through purposive sampling (minimum age 17, consumed both brands in the last 3 months). Instrument: A questionnaire utilizing a 5-point Likert Scale. Data Analysis: Multiple Discriminant Analysis (MDA) was employed to determine which variables most effectively differentiate consumer preferences between the two brands.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

3.1. Characteristics of Respondents

a. The Dominance of Sensory Value (Taste & Variants)

The analysis shows that Taste and Product Variants (X3) has the highest standardized canonical discriminant coefficient (0.842). This indicates that the primary reason consumers choose Joyday over Aice, or vice-versa, is the perceived uniqueness of the flavor profile. Joyday is heavily associated with "novelty" and "texture" (e.g., their crunchy malt series), whereas Aice is perceived as the "standard" for refreshing, fruit-based, and affordable ice cream.

This finding is consistent with the concept of perceived value, where functional and emotional benefits—such as taste and sensory experience—play a dominant role in consumer decision-making (Sweeney & Soutar, 2001). Additionally, sensory attributes are widely recognized as key determinants of food preference and purchase behavior (Ryu et al., 2008). The emphasis on novelty also aligns with Holbrook's (1999) view that experiential value significantly influences consumer choices in hedonic products such as ice cream.

b. Price as a Secondary Discriminant

Price (X1) remains a significant factor (coefficient 0.615). Aice's strategy of keeping most products below the IDR 5,000 threshold has created a perception of "unbeatable value." However, the study finds that as consumer income increases, the discriminatory power of price weakens, and the focus shifts back to product innovation.

This result supports prior research indicating that price functions not only as a monetary sacrifice but also as a signal of value (Zeithaml, 1988). Furthermore, Dodds et al. (1991) argue that while price influences perceived quality and purchase intention, its importance tends to decline when consumers perceive higher intrinsic product value, such as superior taste or innovation.

c. The Logistics War (Availability)

Product Product Availability (X4) shows a coefficient of 0.489. Aice's "Freezer Placement Strategy" has made it ubiquitous. Consumers in Bandar Lampung perceive Aice as more "reliable" in terms of stock availability in residential areas, while Joyday is seen as more "exclusive" to minimarkets like Indomaret or Alfamart.

This finding aligns with the concept of convenience value, where ease of access reduces consumer effort and increases purchase likelihood (Woodruff, 1997). Availability also contributes to customer trust and loyalty, as consistent product presence strengthens reliability perceptions (Sirdeshmukh et al., 2002).

d. Discriminant Function and Hit Ratio

The resulting discriminant function achieved a high Hit Ratio (classification accuracy) of over 85%, meaning the model can accurately predict whether a consumer in Bandar Lampung will choose Aice or Joyday based on how they rate these four marketing variables.

This high level of predictive accuracy indicates that the selected variables effectively capture the underlying dimensions of customer value, supporting the robustness of discriminant analysis in consumer behavior studies (Hair et al., 2010).

Table 1 Tests of Equality of Group Means

Variable	Wilks' Lambda	F	Sig.	Rank of Importance
Price (X1)	0.842	75.12	0.000	2
Promotion (X2)	0.915	37.24	0.000	4
Taste & Variants (X3)	0.785	109.55	0.000	1
Product Availability (X4)	0.887	51.10	0.000	3

4. CONCLUSION

The study concludes that while Aice excels in price leadership and accessibility, Joyday has successfully carved a market share through strong sensory differentiation. Successful competition in the Indonesian ice cream market requires a balance between low-cost operational efficiency and constant product innovation to maintain "Customer Value."

5. REFERENCES

- Chen, C. F., & Chen, F. S. (2010). Experience quality, perceived value, satisfaction, and behavioral intentions for heritage tourists. *Tourism Management*, 31(1), 29–35.
- Cronin, J. J., Brady, M. K., & Hult, G. T. M. (2000). Assessing the effects of quality, value, and customer satisfaction on consumer behavioral intentions. *Journal of Retailing*, 76(2), 193–218.
- Dodds, W. B., Monroe, K. B., & Grewal, D. (1991). Effects of price, brand, and store information on buyers' product evaluations. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 28(3), 307–319.
- Grewal, D., Monroe, K. B., & Krishnan, R. (1998). The effects of price-comparison advertising on buyers' perceptions of acquisition value and transaction value. *Journal of Marketing*, 62(2), 46–59.
- Hair, J. F., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2011). PLS-SEM: Indeed a silver bullet. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 19(2), 139–152.
- Holbrook, M. B. (1999). Introduction to consumer value. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 26(2), 102–120.
- Jin, N., Lee, S., & Huffman, L. (2012). Impact of restaurant experience on brand image and customer loyalty: Moderating role of dining motivation. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 29(6), 532–551.
- Kumar, V., & Reinartz, W. (2016). Creating enduring customer value. *Journal of Marketing*, 80(6), 36–68.
- Monroe, K. B. (1973). Buyers' subjective perceptions of price. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 10(1), 70–80.
- Petrick, J. F. (2002). Development of a multi-dimensional scale for measuring the perceived value of a service. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 34(2), 119–134.
- Ryu, K., Han, H., & Kim, T. H. (2008). The relationships among overall quick-casual restaurant image, perceived value, customer satisfaction, and behavioral intentions. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 27(3), 459–469.
- Sánchez, J., Callarisa, L., Rodríguez, R. M., & Moliner, M. A. (2006). Perceived value of the purchase of a tourism product. *Tourism Management*, 27(3), 394–409.
- Sirdeshmukh, D., Singh, J., & Sabol, B. (2002). Consumer trust, value, and loyalty in relational exchanges. *Journal of Marketing*, 66(1), 15–37.
- Sweeney, J. C., & Soutar, G. N. (2001). Consumer perceived value: The development of a multiple item scale. *Journal of Retailing*, 77(2), 203–220.
- Voss, G. B., Parasuraman, A., & Grewal, D. (1998). The roles of price, performance, and expectations in determining satisfaction. *Journal of Marketing*, 62(4), 46–61.
- Wang, Y., Lo, H. P., & Yang, Y. (2004). An integrated framework for service quality, customer value, satisfaction. *Information Systems Frontiers*, 6(4), 325–340.

- Applying Customer Value Analysis to Determine Differentiating Factors in Consumer Purchase Decisions: A Comparative Study of Aice and Joyday Ice Cream in Bandar Lampung | 2882**
- Woodruff, R. B. (1997). Customer value: The next source for competitive advantage. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 25(2), 139–153.
- Yang, Z., & Peterson, R. T. (2004). Customer perceived value, satisfaction, and loyalty. *Psychology & Marketing*, 21(10), 799–822.
- Zeithaml, V. A. (1988). Consumer perceptions of price, quality, and value. *Journal of Marketing*, 52(3), 2–22.
- Kim, H. B., Kim, W. G., & An, J. A. (2003). The effect of consumer-based brand equity on firms' financial performance. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 20(4), 335–351.
- Ha, J., & Jang, S. (2010). Perceived values, satisfaction, and behavioral intentions. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 34(4), 520–542.