



## Research Article

# Analysis of Consumer Attitudes towards MSME-produced and Factory-produced Coffee Powder in East Java

Febriyanti Amirotul Nabila <sup>a,1,\*</sup>, Mardiyah Hayati <sup>b,2</sup>

Program of Agribisnis Studies, Faculty of Agriculture, Trunojoyo University of Madura

<sup>1</sup> [febbynabila@gmail.com](mailto:febbynabila@gmail.com) <sup>2</sup> [mardiyah@trunojoyo.ac.id](mailto:mardiyah@trunojoyo.ac.id)

\* corresponding author: [mardiyah@trunojoyo.ac.id](mailto:mardiyah@trunojoyo.ac.id)

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article history

Received July 28, 2021

Revised March 01, 2022

Accepted March 21, 2022

Published March 31, 2022

#### Keywords

Coffee

MSMEs

Consumer Purchase Decisions

Attributes

Fishbein

### ABSTRACT

The increasing trend of coffee consumption creates opportunities for business actors and coffee producers of various regions to produce MSME-made coffee powder as a competitor to the factory-made one. As the market competition becomes tougher, coffee powder producers need to equip themselves with the information on attributes useful to attract and maintain customers' choice. The purpose of this study is to understand the characteristics of coffee powder consumers produced by both MSMEs and factories as well as to determine and analyze the level of importance, trust, and consumer attitudes. The sampling method used is accidental sampling with 100 respondents. As for the research methods, this research used descriptive and multi-attribute Fishbein analysis methods. The included attributes are taste, aroma, price, halal logo, packaging, coffee powder dregs, marketing place, and promotion. The results of the study informed that the characteristics of consumers are mostly aged 17-25 years old, male, working as students, residing in East Java, and having monthly income less than IDR 500,000. Consumer attitudes (Ao) towards MSMEs produced powder coffee is considered good by consumers.

Copyright © 2022, Nabila et al

This is an open access article under the [CC-BY-SACC-BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license



## INTRODUCTION

Indonesia is the second largest ASEAN coffee producer and exporter after Vietnam (As'ad & Aji, 2020). As one of the largest coffee bean exporters in the world, plantations in Indonesia put coffee as a prime commodity, sixth in the position after palm oil, rubber, sugar, tea, and cocoa (Sudarto, 2017). In addition to export commodity, Indonesia has the potential of increasing domestic coffee production. In the last five years from 2016 to 2020, domestic coffee production increased every year.

**Table 1. Coffee Production Data in Indonesia from 2016 to 2020**

Year	Coffee Production in Indonesia (ton)
2016	663,871
2017	717,962
2018	756,051
2019	760,963
2020	773,409

Source: Pertanian.go.id, 2020

Based on Table 1, coffee production in Indonesia can be estimated to reach 758.28 thousand tons of coffee in 2021 (Ministry of Agriculture, 2017). The centers of coffee production in Indonesia are on the islands of Sumatra and Java. In the last five years, 2016 to 2020, the top five regions contributing to the country's coffee production were South Sumatra, Lampung, Aceh, North Sumatra, and East Java (Pertanian.go.id, 2020). One of the many provinces in Indonesia that are centers of coffee production is East Java. This province ranks fifth for having numerous coffee-producer areas including regencies of Malang, Pasuruan, Banyuwangi, Jember, and others (As'ad & Aji, 2020). In addition to the level of coffee production, the chairman of the ICO board in 2019 said the level of coffee consumption over the last 10 years experienced a growth of 44% from October 2008 to September 2019 of 1.13 tons/year. In September 2019, Indonesia became the country with the highest coffee consumption rate in Asia at 13.5%. Based on data showing the increase in annual coffee consumption, Indonesian people show to have a high interest in coffee and make it a part of their lifestyle (Dinda & Fitriani, 2020).

The high public demands for coffee consumption serve an opportunity for business actors to bring up every type of coffee on the market in the form of ground coffee packaging produced by Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises (MSMEs) as well as ground coffee produced by factories. Ground coffee refers to one processed and produced by roasting and fine grinding (Mizfar & Sinaga, 2015). According to Tambunan et al. (2018), powdered coffee produced by MSMEs has an advantage in the distinctive coffee aroma that makes the taste more concentrated. However, MSME-produced coffee is not as fine as factory-made one. The factory-made is easy to get, but the downside is that its aroma is not as strong as one produced by MSMEs (Mizfar & Sinaga, 2015). Noviansah et al. (2019) stated that having a coffee processing business provides a promising business opportunity for a producer, judging from the penchant of a consumer in enjoying coffee that has a distinctive taste, aroma, and benefit. There are various types of ground coffee circulating in various regions having different flavors and characteristics depending on the brand.

The high coffee consumption and the numerous types of ground coffee products by both MSMEs and factories sold under different brands trigger the interest of this current study as the coffee product competition is growing rapidly. Producers of processed ground coffee certainly need to know some attributes that can attract and maintain consumer purchasing power. Based on this explanation, this study aims at (1) determining the characteristics of consumers of ground coffee produced by MSMEs and factories in East Java, (2) analyzing the level of importance and the level of consumer confidence in the attributes of ground coffee produced by MSMEs and factories in East Java, and (3) analyzing consumer attitudes towards MSMEs powder coffee and factory-produced ground coffee in East Java.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

According to Engel et al. (1995), consumer behavior is a consumer activity in obtaining, consuming, assessing, and spending a product that is preceded by a decision process (Bilson Simamora, 2002). The purchase decision according to Peter & Olson (2009) in Indriasari (2017) is an integration process by a consumer on their behavior to determine a product that will be chosen. According to Schiffman & Kanuk (2010), a consumer's purchase decision in choosing alternatively a product or service has different perspectives in making purchasing decisions (Gumelar et al., 2016). Kotler & Armstrong (2008) say that a consumer makes a purchase decision based on the goods they like, in addition, there are two factors causing consumers to make a purchase (Irawati, 2016).

Consumer attitude according to Rasmikayati et al. (2017) is a consumer's point of view that describes a belief and benefits for a product. According to Sumarwan (2011) and Tambunan et al. (2018), consumer attitudes are an important idea used by producers to identify consumers. There are three indicators on consumers, namely 1) cognitive is consumer perception of the product directly or from various sources, 2) affective is a comprehensive assessment of the product by looking at consumer considerations on a product whether it is good or bad, liked or disliked, and 3) conative refers to the belief and behavior of consumers in making certain actions against a product. According to Ichwan (2013) and Utami (2020), product attributes are characteristics considered by consumers to make purchasing decisions on the products offered (price, quality, packaging, design, features, services).

Azevedo et al. (2015) suggest that attributes will always be attached to a product, both tangible and intangible products such as goods and services (Paiva et al., 2017). According to Arifiana et al. (2013), the Fishbein attribute attitude model is one of the attribute models that has been widely heard and used by researchers (Ramdhani et al., 2012). The attribute attitude model describes an object in a product or brand assessed based on consumer attitudes with evaluated attributes (Sumarwan et al., 2013).

Research on consumer behavior conducted by Priyambodo et al. (2019) entitled *Consumer Behavior towards Mandarin Orange at Surabaya Keputran Market* used a multi-attribute analysis of Fishbein. The results of the study reveal that consumers really like Mandarins with a sweet taste, small size, and a fresh skin color. Another previous research, conducted by Yulihartika (2017) on consumer behavior towards corn seeds, also uses Fishbein's attitude analysis. The results of this study indicate that the behavior of farmers towards two different types of corn seeds is positive, and it is possible that the farmers will make repeated purchases. Harsita & Amam (2019), Tarigan et al. (2014), and Ngadiyo et al. (2017) in their research using Fishbein multi-attribute analysis show results revealing that attitudes towards consumers are positive and will make repeat purchases.

Research on ground coffee conducted by Manunomo (2016) and Tambunan et al. (2018) were based on the attributes that consumers choose: price, taste, aroma, brand, variant, and packaging. Meanwhile, research by Satyajaya et al. (2014) and Rukhbaniyah et al. (2013) state that the most important attributes of ground coffee products according to consumers are taste, aroma, color, and packaging. However, price and brand are less important. Qomariyah et al. (2014) in their research on *Sido Luhur Malang* ground coffee reveal that the main priority is the price and product availability.

## RESEARCH METHODS

This research was conducted on people residing in East Java Province. The data collection in this study was carried out online through social media such as Whatsapp, Instagram, and Twitter. The type of data used in this study consisted of primary data. Primary data was obtained by conducting online observations with consumers. Data of the respondents was collected online through a questionnaire presented in a Google form. The sampling method used in this study is accidental sampling where the determination of the sample is taken by accident or by chance, meaning that anyone can take a participation by filling out the questionnaire as long as they are eligible or meeting the criteria. The respondent's criteria in this study are that consumers have consumed ground coffee produced by MSMEs or by factories. The sample used in this study was 100 respondents as the number was said to have met the criteria for the number of respondents if the total population is not known. According to Suyigono (2012), the appropriate sample size used in such a study is between 30–500 respondents.

The analytical method used in this study is a qualitative descriptive analysis to determine the characteristics of consumers of ground coffee produced by both MSMEs and factories. Fishbein's multi-attribute analysis was used to determine the most dominant attribute in consuming MSME-produced ground coffee and factory-produced ground coffee as well as to determine the level of trust, importance value, and consumer attitudes towards MSME- and factory-produced ground coffee. The multi-attribute attitude model describes an object in a product or brand that is assessed based on consumer attitudes with evaluated attributes (Ramdhani et al., 2012). Fishbein's attribute attitude model towards a product is determined by two components, namely the bi component (trust in the attributes of ground coffee products produced by

MSMEs/factories) and the ei component (evaluating the importance of attributes of MSME/factory-made ground coffee products) (Lubis, 2018). According to Umar (2000), Fishbein's mathematical analysis can be seen as follows:

$$A_o = \sum_{i=1}^n b_i \times e_i$$

Description:

- Ao = Overall consumer attitudes towards MSME-produced ground coffee
- Bi = The level of consumer confidence in the attributes of (i) ground coffee produced by MSMEs
- Ei = Evaluation of the level of consumer interest in attributes (i) on ground coffee produced by MSMEs and ground coffee produced by factories
- n = The number of attributes (Taste, Aroma, Price, Halal Logo, Packaging, Color, Dregs, Place of Sale and Promotion) owned by the object

The trust component (bi) explains how important it is for consumers to believe that the attributes of ground coffee produced by MSMEs and ground coffee produced by factories have the appropriate attribute values. Consumer evaluation (ei) of the attributes of MSME-produced and factory-produced ground coffee was measured thoroughly using the five categories presented in Table 2 (Ramdhani et al., 2012, and Sumarwan, 2011).

**Table 2. Description of Evaluation Value and Attribute Trust Value**

Number	Consumer Attribute Evaluation Value (ei)	Scale	Consumer Attribute Trust Value (bi)	Scale
1	Very Important	5	Very Good	5
2	Important	4	Good	4
3	Quite Important	3	Quite Good	3
4	Not Too Important	2	Bad	2
5	Not Important	1	Very Bad	1

Source: Sumarwan, 2011

The attitude of consumers of powdered coffee produced by MSMEs and factories, the Ao component, is obtained from the result of multiplying bi\*ei at each point of the attribute assessment. The data processing in this Fishbein analysis research uses the 2016 Microsoft Excel computer application. Fishbein's multi-attribute attitude, consisting of trust and interest in ground coffee produced by MSMEs and factories, has all (ei) and (bi) attributes. The attribute selection and determination in this study was carried out by an initial survey using Google forms, and the attribute results consisted of 1) Taste, 2) Aroma, 3) Price, 4) Halal Logo, 5) Packaging, 6) Color, 7) Dregs, 8) Point of Sale, and 9) Promotion.

The results of the attitude values obtained through Fishbein's multi-attribute attitude model are interpreted to see how the attitudes of consumer respondents for ground coffee produced by MSMEs and factories are. Engel et al. (1994) stated that these attitudes must have value in each of their attributes. The interpretation of these values is obtained using an interval scale range with the following formula:

$$\text{Interval Scale Range} = \frac{m-n}{b} = \frac{5-1}{5} = 0,8$$

Description:

- m = the highest possible score
- n = the lowest possible score
- b = the number of rating scales that you want to form

Based on this calculation, the assessment scores are obtained as follows:

**Table 3. Category of Trust Level and Evaluation Level**

Number	Trust Level	Score	Evaluation Level	Score
1	Very Good	$4.2 < b_i \leq 5.0$	Very Important	$4.2 < e_i \leq 5.0$
2	Good	$4.2 < b_i \leq 3.4$	Important	$4.2 < e_i \leq 3.4$
3	Quite Good	$3.4 < b_i \leq 2.6$	Quite Important	$3.4 < e_i \leq 2.6$
4	Bad	$2.6 < b_i \leq 1.8$	Not Important	$2.6 < e_i \leq 1.8$
5	Very Bad	$1.8 \leq b_i \leq 1.0$	Very Unimportant	$1.8 \leq e_i \leq 1.0$

Source: Sumarwan, 2011

The assessment of respondents' attitudes towards the attributes of MSME- and factory-produced ground coffee ( $b_i \cdot e_i$ ) will be interpreted into five categories (very positive, positive, neutral, negative, and very negative). The magnitude of the range for the attitude category is:

$$\frac{(m.m) - (n.n)}{b} = \frac{(5.5) - (1.1)}{5} = 4,8$$

The assessment of respondents' attitudes towards the two types of processed coffee with a combination of ( $b_i \cdot e_i$ ) is categorized into the following interval scale ranges:

**Table 4. Categories of Attitude Values towards Overall Attributes**

Number	Overall Value of Consumer Attitude (ao)	Scale
1	Very Positive	$25.0 < a_o \leq 2.2$
2	Positive	$20.2 < a_o \leq 15.4$
3	Neutral	$15.4 < a_o \leq 10.6$
4	Negative	$10.6 < a_o \leq 5.8$
5	Very Negative	$5.8 \leq a_o \leq 1.0$

Source: Processed Primary Data, 2021

## RESULT AND DISCUSSION

### Respondents Characteristics of MSME- and Factory-produced Ground Coffee in East Java

The characteristics of the two coffees are taken from one consumer by comparing the two types of coffee, while the respondent characteristics include gender, age, occupation, status, domicile, and income.

Gender characteristics greatly influence consumers in making purchasing decisions. Differences in the nature and characteristics of male and female respondents differently affect the purchasing decisions (Wahyuni & Zuhriyah, 2020). Respondents of ground coffee produced by MSMEs consisted of 51 male and 49 female participants, indicating that men have higher coffee consumption (51%) than the female respondents do. These results are in line with the research of Qomariyah et al. (2014), Kurniawan & Ridlo (2010), and Lase et al., (2019) revealing that men tend to consume more coffee as it is juxtaposed with their smoking and staying up late habit.

According to Kalsum et al. (2013), age can influence a person in making purchasing decisions. Teenagers tend to be emotional and considerate in every purchase decision, while adults of productive age take definite and important decisions with their choices (Isen et al., 2016). The number of respondents who consume ground coffee produced by MSMEs and factories are mostly aged 17-25 years old (69%), followed by the age group of 26-30 years old (19%) and age group of 31-50 years old and above, having a percentage value around 10%. From these percentages, the dominant coffee consumers are teenagers who are characterized with the habit of gathering and enjoying a cup of coffee with their peers (Pramelani, 2020, and Kurniawan & Ridlo, 2010).

As for the occupations of the respondents, the majority of respondents are dominated by students (49%), followed by private employees (30%), entrepreneurs (9%), civil servants and housewives, 4% each. However, as many as 6% of respondents work outside the category such as online motorcycle drivers, lab

assistants, and midwives. This is in line with As'ad & Aji's research (2020) revealing that students are the most frequent respondents who visit and consume coffee.

The respondent characteristic based on status is dominated by respondents who are not married, accounting for 77% or 77 respondents compared to those who are married by 23%. This is because most of the respondents are still aged 17-25 years old and work as students. Status is very influential on consumer characteristics because someone who is not married tends to spend more time outside such as visiting café.

Based on domicile, coffee-consumer respondents are spread in several cities and regencies in East Java namely Surabaya, Sidoarjo, Gresik, Bangkalan, Jombang, Malang, Probolinggo, Pasuruan, Mojokerto, Tuban, Banyuwangi, Lamongan, Bojonegoro, Jember, Ponorogo, and Nganjuk. The majority of respondents were from the city of Surabaya (53%). This is because the questionnaires were widely distributed and filled out by respondents in the area. This position was followed by Sidoarjo (9%), Gresik (8%), Bangkalan (6%), Jombang (5%), Probolinggo and Lamongan (3% each). Meanwhile, Malang, Mojokerto, Tuban and Bojonegoro have 2% each. The remaining 1% is from Pasuruan, Banyuwangi, Jember, Ponorogo and Nganjuk areas.

Income earned by respondents can affect their interest and purchasing power in a product (Isen et al., 2016). Most of the respondents have an income of less than IDR 500,000 as most of the respondents are college students who tend to not have a job or have a financial dependency on their parents' income. While respondents who work and have income above IDR 3,000,000 rank in second at 34%, followed by respondents earning IDR 1,000,000-3,000,000 by 12% and those with income of IDR 500,000–1,000,000 in last place at 10%.

The consumer's decision in choosing the right time to consume the two types of coffee is at night by 41%, higher when being compared to consuming coffee in the morning or evening. The dominant answer regarding daily coffee consumption is due to habit. These results are in line with Manunomo's research (2016) stating that a consumer consumes coffee due to a habit that cannot be separated from the necessities of life. The allocation of costs incurred by respondents for ground coffee produced by MSMEs and factories less than IDR 100,000 every month. This is related to the number of respondents with less incomes and work as students. From the data obtained, respondents consume coffee in general due to being heavily influenced by peers with a percentage of 38%; humans tend to live socially that they participate in buying coffee products (Satyajaya et al., 2014).

### **The Level of Interest and the Level of Consumer Confidence in the Attributes of Coffee Powder Production of MSMEs and Factories in East Java**

Attributes refer to characteristics of a product useful for assessing the criteria in purchasing decisions (Ismanto et al., 2018). Attributes will always be attached to an item or product. A consumer can distinguish and evaluate a product from one another by looking at the attributes it has.

Powdered coffee products by MSMEs and factories have 9 attributes consisting of taste, aroma, price, halal logo, packaging, color, dregs, marketing place, and promotion. Taste is an attribute serving as the main attraction for consumers when making purchasing decisions. The good taste of a product will be a consideration for consumers to make repeat purchases (Harsita et al., 2019). Aroma is another attribute considered by consumers because it has a specific character that can be caught by the sense of smell due to its aromatic and distinctive smell. The aroma of coffee will have a reaction effect on consumers even though they have not tasted it (Qomariyah et al., 2014). Consumers will assess the aroma attribute as a purchase decision of the two processed coffees. Price is the amount of money that consumers spend to get the goods they want (Tampubolon et al., 2019).

The halal logo is an attribute indicating that the two processed coffee products have an official certificate from the Indonesian Ulema Council (MUI), guaranteeing consumers to not hesitate to consume the coffee product. Packaging is a container or wrapper used as a protection for the ground coffee products. In addition to protecting the product, packaging provides an attraction for consumers (Hayati, 2009). Colors in coffee tend to have similarities. Therefore, the color attribute is rarely used as a consumption consideration. People have the tendency to like dark brown coffee (Retnowati & Abdurahman, 2018). Dregs are small solid

pieces of black coffee that sink to the bottom of a coffee cup. Generally, ground coffee produced by MSMEs tends to have more dregs compared to one produced by factories. Marketing place is where the coffee products can be easily reached by consumers (Wahdah et al., 2020). Promotion is a technique in which a mfactory offers its products to consumers. Promotion has an influence on the purchase decision of a consumer; the more attractive the promotion made by the producer, the more consumers are interested in (Alang, 2018).

**Table 5. Fishbein's Analysis Results of Powder Coffee Products by MSME and Factories**

Attribute	Importance (ei)	MSME Product			Factory Product		
		(bi)	Ao	Category	(bi)	Ao	Category
Taste	4.4	3.86	16.98	Positive	3,47	15,27	Neutral
Aroma	4.24	3.86	16.37	Positive	3,34	14,16	Neutral
Price	4.01	3.92	15.72	Positive	3,59	14,40	Neutral
Halal Logo	4.13	4.26	17.59	Positive	4,27	17,64	Positive
Packaging	3.87	3.84	14.86	Neutral	4,05	15,67	Positive
Color	3.54	3.82	13.52	Neutral	3,42	12,11	Neutral
Dregs	3.86	3.48	13.43	Neutral	3,61	13,93	Neutral
Marketing Place	4.27	3.71	15.84	Positive	4,36	18,62	Positive
Promotion	3.84	4.41	16.93	Positive	4,14	15,90	Positive
			<b>141.26</b>			<b>137,69</b>	

Source: Processed Primary Data, 2021

Fishbein's multi-attribute analysis explains the attitude assessment (Ao) of the attributes that have been assessed by consumers of ground coffee produced by MSMEs. The components of Fishbein's multi-attribute analysis include the level of consumer confidence (bi) and evaluation of the importance (ei) of the attributes of MSME-produced ground coffee. Consumer assessments of MSME products will be compared with factory-produced ground coffee. The comparison will provide an assessment of their respective attributes.

The level of trust (bi) is the consumer's belief and knowledge of the attributes of ground coffee produced by MSMEs and factories (Rasmikayati et al., 2017). Based on Table 5, the value of consumer confidence level (bi) in powdered coffee products by MSMEs is as follow: promotion attribute (4.41), halal logo attribute (4.26), price attribute (3.92), taste and aroma attribute (3.86), packaging attribute (3.84), color attribute (3.82), marketing place attribute (3.71), and dreg attribute (3.48).

The highest level of trust for ground coffee produced by MSMEs is the promotional attribute (4.41), indicating that the promotion is trusted and rated very well by a consumer to introduce the product. With the promotion, consumers will be interested, seek information, and buy the coffee product. According to Hermawan (2012), promotion is a form of direct persuasion with various incentives that can be arranged to encourage immediate purchase of a product or increase the number of products purchased by customers. Thejaya's research (2019) shows that promotion and Brand Awareness have a significant influence on the desire to buy *Manna Coffee*. However, this is opposite to the research of Rasmikayati et al. (2017) reporting that promotion is considered less effective, meaning that the purchase of coffee products at Amoor Garden is not too influenced by promotion.

The color attribute of coffee powder produced by MSMEs has the lowest level of confidence (3.82), meaning that the color attribute is considered the least important when compared to other attributes. According to consumers, the color of ground coffee produced by MSMEs tends to be the same, dark. This is in line with the research of Tambunan et al. (2018) which found that the color strength attribute was less important than other attributes. However, consumers believe that the color of local coffee is stronger than that of instant coffee.

The highest value of consumer confidence level (bi) in the factory-produced ground coffee product is on the sale attribute (4.36), followed by the halal logo attribute (4.27), promotion attribute (4.14), packaging

attribute (4.05), dreg attribute (3.61), price attribute (3.59), taste attribute (3.47), color attribute (3.42), and aroma attribute (3.34). This shows that the attribute of the factory-produced ground coffee shop has a very good level of trust from its consumers due to the ease of obtaining at various marketing places (conventional and online stores) easily. Based on Table 5, the level of confidence in the aroma attribute has the lowest value when compared to other attributes. According to consumers, the aroma of ground coffee produced by factories is not as sharp as the aroma of ground coffee produced by MSMEs. This is also in line with the research results of Tambunan et al. (2018) reporting that the aroma of sachet coffee is not as sharp as local ground coffee. This means that consumers trust and like the aroma of local ground coffee better. However, this is different from the research of Qomariyah et al. (2014), stating that consumer attitudes towards the aroma attribute of ground coffee are positive with a very good level of trust and become a very important attribute to consider in buying ground coffee.

Evaluation of importance (ei) is a consumer's assessment of how important the attributes of ground coffee produced by MSMEs and factories are (Sugawara & Nikaido, 2014). The value of the evaluation level of importance (ei) shows that the taste attribute value is 4.40, marketing place attribute is 4.27, and the aroma attribute is 4.24. Consumers consider the attributes of taste, marketing place, and aroma to be the most important attributes in choosing MSME- and factory-produced ground coffee compared to other attributes. These results are in line with research by Qomariyah et al. (2014) stating that taste and aroma attributes are considered very important by consumers of *Sidoluhur* ground coffee.

Based on Table 5, respondents for powdered coffee produced by MSMEs assessed the taste attribute at the level of confidence (bi) of 3.86, powdered coffee produced by manufacturers of 3.47, and the value of importance (ei) of 4.4. This shows that the taste of the two coffees is considered very important by consumers and is considered to have met consumer expectations in a good category even though they have different values from the evaluation of interests.

The aroma of ground coffee produced by MSMEs has a confidence value (bi) of 3.86 which is categorized as good, while the aroma of ground coffee produced by factories has a confidence value (bi) of 3.34 which is categorized as quite good, and the results of the evaluation of importance (ei) in both coffees is 4.24. This shows that consumers consider the aroma attributes of the two processed coffees to be very important. However, the trust value (bi) of consumers of ground coffee produced by SMEs is considered good in meeting their expectations when compared to powdered coffee produced by factories.

The price attribute for ground coffee produced by MSMEs has a confidence value of 3.92 and one produced by factories has a confidence value of 3.59; while the value of importance on the price attribute is 4.01. This shows that consumers of the two processed coffees consider the importance value of the price attribute to be important even though the value of the confidence level is lower. However, it is still considered good in meeting their expectations.

The halal logo on the two processed coffees has very good trust, at 4.26 and 4.27; meanwhile, the importance value of the two processed coffees is 4.13. This shows that consumers value the halal logo even though it is higher than the trust value, meaning that consumers perceive the two processed coffees to meet their expectations.

The packaging for ground coffee produced by MSMEs obtained a lower confidence value (3.84) than the powder coffee produced by the manufacturer (4.05), and the evaluation value of the importance of the two processed coffees was 3.87. This shows that the value of the evaluation of importance in the two processed coffees is said to be important and gains good trust in accordance with consumer expectations although the trust value in MSME ground coffee is lower than factory-produced ground coffee.

The color of ground coffee produced by MSMEs has a higher confidence value (3.82) than ground coffee produced by factories (3.42), and the importance value for the two processed coffees is 3.54. This shows that the color attribute in the two processed coffees is considered important and trusted by consumers even though the trust value in ground coffee produced by MSMEs has the highest value from the trust value for ground coffee produced by factories and the value of importance, meaning that the color in ground coffee produced by MSMEs is darker compared to factory-produced one.

The dregs of ground coffee produced by MSMEs (3.48) and produced by factories (3.61) earn good trust from consumers. The importance value of the two processed coffees is 3.86. This shows that consumers

consider the two processed coffees to be important and able to meet the expectations of consumers in the good category even though the evaluation value of the difference is higher. From the two values of trust in the dreg attribute, ground coffee produced by MSMEs is more likely to have a lot of dregs when compared to ground coffee produced by factories.

The marketing place for ground coffee produced by MSMEs obtains a lower confidence value (3.71) than the trust value for ground coffee produced by the factories (4.36), and the importance value of the two processed coffees is 4.27, categorized as very important. This shows that the marketing place of processed coffee is very important for consumers and is considered to meet consumer expectations even though the trust value for ground coffee produced by the factories is higher, meaning that factory-produced ground coffee sales are easy to reach compared to MSMEs.

Promotion of ground coffee produced by MSMEs received very good trust (4.41) compared to ground coffee produced by factories (4.14), and the importance value of the two processed coffees is 3.84. This shows that promotion is considered important and powdered coffee produced by factories can exceed customer expectations compared to ground coffee produced by MSMEs.

### **Consumer Attitudes towards Powdered Coffee Produced by MSMEs and Factories in East Java**

Attitude is one of the most important elements of buying behavior. According to Kotler (2008), attitude is a person's appreciation of an object or idea, feelings, and long-term favorable or unfavorable behavioral tendencies. Consumer attitudes towards ground coffee produced by MSMEs and factories are consumers' feelings towards coffee. Hence, consumers tend to like or dislike both types of coffee. Consumer attitude (ao) is the product of the level of confidence (bi) and the evaluation of the level of importance (ei).

The results of Fishbein's multi-attribute analysis in Table 5 show that consumer attitudes towards all attributes of MSME and factory product ground coffee are in the neutral and positive categories. With the total attitude value of consumers of MSME-produced ground coffee (141.26) compared to factory-produced ground coffee (137.69), this indicates that consumers tend to prefer MSME-produced coffee to factory-produced one. In line with Sudyarto's research; Gyska Indah Harya; Resti Prastika Destiarni, (2020), the attitude value of ground coffee is higher than instant coffee. This is the reason consumers prefer ground coffee to instant coffee. In contrast to the research of Tambunan (2021), the attitudes of consumers of local ground coffee and instant coffee are overall positive, but the total value of consumer attitudes of instant coffee is higher than that of local coffee. This means that consumers tend to choose to consume instant coffee over local coffee.

The positive values of consumer attitudes towards the attributes considered for choosing MSME product coffee from the highest to the lowest are the halal logo, taste, promotion, aroma, marketing place, and price; while the positive values of consumer attitudes on factory-made coffee are marketing place, halal logo, promotion, and packaging. The halal logo attribute is the attribute having the first highest value for MSME-produced coffee and the second highest for factory-produced coffee. This shows that consumers will consider choosing coffee that has a halal logo because based on the level of consumer confidence in both types of coffee is very good, and the evaluation of the importance of the halal logo attribute is very important. For this reason, producers need to maintain the halal guarantee of coffee products.

The coffee taste attribute of MSME products is the second attribute that is considered by consumers in choosing coffee, because according to Sudyarto; Gyska Indah Harya; Resti Prastika Destiarni (2020), taste is the main essence of coffee. Meanwhile, consumer attitudes towards the taste of factory-produced coffee are neutral, meaning that consumers pay no consideration on the taste of factory-made coffee. The taste attribute in consumer attitudes towards *Sido Luhur* ground coffee has the highest positive value (Qomariyah et al., 2014).

The attitude value of the promotion attribute of MSME and factory products are both considered when purchasing. With promotions, consumers become aware of and interested in buying coffee. Promotion will also increase brand awareness of the coffee products so that it will significantly increase the purchase interest (Thejaya, 2019).

Taste is the fourth attribute that is considered by consumers in buying ground coffee produced by MSMEs, while for factory-produced coffee, consumers are neutral. According to research by Tambunan

(2021) and Sudiyarto; Gyska Indah Harya; Resti Prastika Destiarni (2020), taste is an attribute that is considered in purchasing local coffee because taste is the main essence of coffee.

## CONCLUSION

The coffee customer characteristics are mostly aged 17–25 years, male, working as students in East Java Province, and having an income of less than IDR 500,000. The consumer's decision in choosing the right time to consume is at night, and the purpose of consuming coffee is due to habit. The allocation of costs that are often incurred to consume coffee is less than IDR 100,000, and the information about the coffee is from peer's recommendation. Evaluation of the importance of the attributes of coffee powder produced by MSMEs that are considered the most important by consumers are the attributes of taste, marketing place, and aroma. The level of consumer confidence in the attributes of ground coffee produced by MSMEs is the promotional attribute and the halal logo, while the factory-produced ground coffee's is the attribute of the marketing place and the halal logo. The results from Fishbein's multi-attribute analysis show that the total value of consumer attitudes (Ao) of MSMEs powdered coffee is higher than that of factory-produced ground coffee. Overall, the attributes of ground coffee produced by MSMEs are considered good compared to ground coffee produced by factories.

The advice given to producers of ground coffee produced by MSMEs is to be bolder and improve the quality of their products in terms of promotion, halal logo, price, and aroma as well as to pay attention to the dregs in coffee. Consumers are more aware of the existence of ground coffee produced by factories than the existence of ground coffee produced by MSMEs. Therefore, MSME coffee producers are expected to promote more of their coffee products to be able to compete in the market. Recommendations for further research are to ensure that the areas to be taken as respondents cover other potential non-dominant areas.

## REFERENCES

- Alang, S. (2018). Analisis Faktor Mempengaruhi Keputusan Pembelian Kopi Luwak Pada Mahkota Luwak Liwa-Lampung Barat. *Jurnal Administrasi Dan Manajemen*, 9(2), 147–149.
- Arifiana, W. E., Kumadji, S., & Fanani, D. (2013). Pengaruh Atribut Produk Terhadap Keputusan Pembelian Deterjen Rinso. *Jurnal Administrasi Bisnis*, 1(2), 1–12.
- As'ad, M. H., & Aji, J. M. (2020). Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Konusmen Kedai Kopi Modern Di Bondowoso. *Jurnal Agribisnis Dan Sosial Ekonomi Pertanian*, 13(2), 182–199.
- Dinda, S., & Fitriani, E. (2020). *Konsumsi Kopi di Indonesia Naik 44%*. Investor Daily.
- Gumelar, K. T., Waluyo, H. D., & Suryoko, S. (2016). Pengaruh Kualitas Pelayanan, Variasi Menu, Dan Harga Terhadap Keputusan Pembelian. *Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi Bisnis*, 5(1), 164–173.
- Harsita, Ayu, P., & Amam. (2019). Analisis Sikap Konsumen Terhadap Produk Olahan Singkong. *Jurnal Sosial Ekonomi Dan Kebijakan Pertanian*, 3(1), 19–27.
- Hayati, M. (2009). Manajemen Pemasaran Emping Singkong (Keripik Tette) di Kabupaten Pamekasan. *Embryo*, 6(2), 161–168.
- Ichwan, C. (2013). Pengaruh Atribut Produk Terhadap Keputusan Pembelian Air Mata Kucing Di Royal Plaza Surabaya. *Jurnal Pendidikan Tata Nlaga*, 1(1), 1–19.
- Indriasari, D. P. (2017). Pengaruh Harga, Promosi Dan Produk Terhadap Keputusan Pembelian Konsumen Pada Restoran Cepat Saji. *Jurnal Ekonomi*, 19(3), 1689–1699.
- Irawati, S. Z. R. (2016). Pengaruh Produk Dan Harga Terhadap Keputusan Pembelian Konsumen Di Morning Bakery Batam. *Jurnal Inovasi Dan Bisnis*, 4(2), 129–136.
- Iсен, Lamusa, A., & Effendy. (2016). Analisis Preferensi Konsumen Buah Jeruk Lokal dan Buah Jeruk (Sunkis) Impor Kota Palu. *J. Agrotekbis*, 4(4), 479–484.
- Ismanto, A., Julianda, T., & Mursidah. (2018). ANALISIS SIKAP DAN KEPUASAN KONSUMEN TERHADAP ATRIBUT PRODUK KARKAS AYAM PEDAGING SEGAR DI PASAR TRADISIONAL KOTA SAMARINDA. *Jurnal Ilmu Peternakan Dan Veteriner Tropis*, 8(2), 71–82.
- Kalsum, U., Fauziyah, E., & Nugroho, T. R. A. (2013). PREFERENSI KONSUMEN DALAM MEMBELI

- RENGGINANG LORJUK DI KECAMATAN KAMAL BANGKALAN. *Agriekonomika*, 2(2), 153–162.
- Kementerian Pertanian. (2017). *Outlook Komoditas Kopi*. Pusat Data dan Sistem Informasi Pertanian Sekretariat Jenderal - Kementerian Pertanian.
- Kotler, P., & Armstrong, G. (2008). *Prinsip - Prinsip Pemasaran* (Jilid 1). Erlangga.
- Kurniawan, A., & Ridlo, M. R. (2010). Perilaku Konsumtif Remaja Penikmat Warung Kopi. *Jurnal Sosiologi DILEMA*, 32(1), 9–21.
- Lase, A., Setiadi, A., & Budiraharjo, K. (2019). Analysis of the Factors Affecting the Consumer Purchasing Decisions on Coffee At Resto Banaran 9, Gemawang Village, Semarang. *AGROLAND: The Agricultural Sciences Journal*, 6(1), 1.
- Lubis, D. D. J. (2018). *Analisis Keputusan Pembelian Konsumen Terhadap Buah Anggur Impor Kota Medan ( Kasus : Berastagi Supermarket*. Universitas Sumatra Utara.
- Manunomo, N. S. & A. ambarsari & D. (2016). Analisis Pengaruh Atribut Produk Terhadap Pengambil Keputusan Konsumen Produk Kopi Instan Di Kabupaten Sleman, DIY. *Masepi*, 1(1).
- Mizfar, F., & Sinaga, A. (2015). Analisis Faktor-Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Perilaku Konsumen Dalam Pengambilan Keputusan Pembelian Kopi Instan. *SEPA: Jurnal Sosial Ekonomi Pertanian Dan Agribisnis*, 11(2), 175–180.
- Ngadiyo, N., Taridala, S. A. A., & Yusnaini, Y. (2017). Kajian Preferensi Konsumen Ikan Lele. *Jurnal Sosio Agribisnis*, 2(1), 21–31.
- Noviansah, M. R., Fauzi1, T., & Arida, A. (2019). Analisis Pendapatan Usaha Pengolahan Kopi Bubuk Di Kota Banda Aceh (Studi Kasus Pada Usaha Kopi Bubuk Solong Kopi). *Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa Pertanian Unsyiah*, 4(4), 71–80.
- Paiva, R. V. C. de, Sa, F. B. de, Moura, L. R. C., & Souki, G. Q. (2017). Attributes considered by coffee consumers during their buying decision process: a study using factorial analysis. *Organizações Rurais & Agroindustriais*, 19(2), 84–95.
- Pramelani. (2020). Faktor Ketertarikan Minuman Kopi Kekinian Terhadap Minat Beli Konsumen Kalangan Muda. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen*, 15(1), 121–129.
- Priyambodo, C. S., Sastryawanto, H., & Diah Tri Hermawati. (2019). Analisis Preferensi Konsumen Buah Jeruk Di Pasar Keputran Utara, Surabaya. *Jurnal Sosio Agribisnis*, 19(1), 1–19.
- Qomariyah, N., Santoso, I., & Effendi, M. (2014). Analisis Sikap Konsumen dan Kinerja Atribut Kopi Bubuk Sido Luhur (Studi Kasus di UKM Kopi Bubuk Sido Luhur, Kota Malang). *Jurnal Industria*, 3(1), 53–61. <http://industria.ub.ac.id/index.php/industri/article/view/155>
- Ramdhani, A., Alamanda, D., & Sudrajat, H. (2012). Analysis of Consumer Attitude Using Fishbein Multi-Attributes Approach. *International Journal of Basic and Applied Science*, 1(1), 33–39.
- Rasmikayati, E., Pardian, P., Hapsari, H., Ikhsan, R. M., & Saefudin, B. R. (2017). Kajian Sikap Dan Perilaku Konsumen Dalam Pembelian Kopi serta Pendapatnya Terhadap Varian Produk Dan Potensi Kedainya. *Jurnal Pemikiran Masyarakat Ilmiah Berwawasan Agribisnis*, 3(2), 117–133.
- Retnowati, N., & Abdurahman, A. (2018). Analisis Sikap Konsumen Pada Produk Kopi (Studi Kasus Pada Perusahaan Pdp Kahyangan Kabupaten Jember ). *Jurnal Ilmiah Inovasi*, 17(2), 54–61.
- Rukhbaniyah, L. Y., Utami, D. P., & Wicaksono, I. A. (2013). Perilaku Konsumen Terhadap Kopi Tubruk dan Kopi Instan di Kecamatan Pejagoan Kabupaten Kebumen. *Surya Agritama : Jurnal Ilmu Pertanian Dan Peternakan*, 2(1), 31–40.
- Satyajaya, W., Rangga, A., Nurainy, F., & Rasyid, H. Al. (2014). PROSES PENGAMBILAN KEPUTUSAN KONSUMEN DAN ATRIBUT PRODUK KOPI INSTAN DALAM SACHET. *Jurnal Teknologi Industri Dan Hasil Pertanian*, 19(2).
- Simamora, B. (2002). *Panduan Riset Perilaku Konsumen*. Gramedia.
- Sudarto. (2017). *Peluang Usaha Kopi IKM*. Kementrian Perindustrian Republik Indonesia.
- Sudiyarto., Gyska I. H., Resti P. D. (2020). PERILAKU KONSUMEN KOPI TUBRUK. *Buku Referensi*. [http://repository.upnjatim.ac.id/124/1/Buku Referensi perilaku konsumen kopi tubruk.pdf](http://repository.upnjatim.ac.id/124/1/Buku%20Referensi%20perilaku%20konsumen%20kopi%20tubruk.pdf)
- Sugawara, E., & Nikaido, H. (2014). Properties of AdeABC and AdeIJK efflux systems of *Acinetobacter baumannii* compared with those of the AcrAB-TolC system of *Escherichia coli*. *Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy*, 58(12), 7250–7257. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AAC.03728-14>
- Sumarwan, U. (2011). *Perilaku Konsumen: Teori dan Penerapannya Dalam Pemasaran* (kedua). PT Ghalia

Indonesia.

- Sumarwan, U., Noviandi, A., & Kirbrandoko. (2013). Analisis Proses Keputusan Pembelian, Persepsi dan Sikap Konsumen Terhadap Beras Organik di Jabotabek. *Pangan*, 22(2), 333–344.
- Tambunan, L. P. R. S. S. (2021). ANALISIS SIKAP KONSUMEN TERHADAP KOPI BUBUK LOKAL DAN KOPI INSTAN DI KOTA PEMATANGSIANTAR. <https://docplayer.info/88027155-Analisis-sikap-konsumen-terhadap-kopi-bubuk-lokal-dan-kopi-instan-di-kota-pematangsiantar-leo-prima-r-tambunan-thomson-sebayang-salmiah.html>
- TAMPUBOLON, M., ANTARA, M., & WIDHIANTHINI, W. (2019). Faktor-Faktor yang Mempengaruhi Keputusan Pembelian Kopi Bubuk Banyuwatis di Kota Denpasar. *Jurnal Agribisnis Dan Agrowisata (Journal of Agribusiness and Agritourism)*, 8(1), 20. <https://doi.org/10.24843/jaa.2019.v08.i01.p03>
- Tarigan, A. R., Hadi, S., & Eri Sayamar. (2014). Analisis Perilaku Konsumen Dalam Pembelian Buah Lokal Di Pasar Tradisional Arengka Kota Pekan baru. *Jurnal Online Mahasiswa Pertanian*, 1(1), 1–27.
- Thejaya, I. (2019). PENGARUH PROMOSI PENJUALAN DAN BRAND AWARENESS TERHADAP MINAT BELI PADA MANNA KOPI. *PERFORMA: Jurnal Manajemen Dan Start-Up Bisnis*, 4(3), 468–478. <https://journal.uc.ac.id/index.php/performa/article/download/1660/1326/>
- Umar, H. (2000). *Riset Pemasaran dan Perilaku Konsumen* (PT Gramedi).
- Utami, N. agustina. (2020). Preferensi Konsumen Terhadap Pembelian Batik Tulis. *Agriscience*, 1(1), 260–271.
- Wahdah, R., Isdiantoni, I., & Wahyuni, P. R. (2020). Analisis Preferensi Konsumen Terhadap Kecap Cap Ikan Terbang Pt. Surya Mandala Di Pasar Anom Kecamatan Kota Sumenep. *Journal of Food Technology and Agroindustry*, 2(1), 20–26.
- Wahyuni, T., & Zuhriyah, A. (2020). Perilaku Konsumen Analisis Perilaku Konsumen terhadap Keputusan Pembelian Puduk Di Toko Sari Kelapa. *Agriscience*, 1(1), 232–243.
- Yulihartika, R. D. (2017). Analisis Sikap Dan Perilaku Petani Terhadap Dua Benih Jagung Hibrida (Jaya Dan Bisi 2) Di Desa Sukasari Kecamatan Air Periukan Kabupaten Seluma. *AGRITEPA: Jurnal Ilmu Dan Teknologi Pertanian*, 3(1), 117–132.