Locus Journal of Academic Literature Review
Powered by locus media publishing
Vol. 5 No. 9, September 2026
P-ISSN: 2829-4262, E-ISSN: 2829-3827

Brand Awareness, Brand Image, and Honda BeAT Purchase Decisions in South Tangerang

[*1.] Fandi Fansuri
[2.] Agus Firmansyah

[1.2.] Esa Unggul University, Jakarta.
*Corresponding author: fandii27fansurii@gmail.com

Received 7 Agustus 2026 Initial submission → **Revised** 16 September 2026 Author revision → **Accepted** 24 September 2026 Editorial decision → **Published** 30 September 2026 Online publication

DOI: https://doi.org/10.56128/ljoalr.v5i9.1189

Abstract

Brand awareness and brand image are widely examined in consumer research, including studies of Honda BeAT, but the interpretation of purchase-decision questionnaires within small residential communities requires closer attention. This cross-sectional study analyzes associations among brand awareness, brand image, and self-reported purchase-decision readiness among 94 eligible residents of Setneg Residential Complex, RW 06, South Tangerang. Participants were recruited through purposive and convenience sampling and completed a four-point Likert questionnaire comprising 39 items. Reported multiple-regression estimates were positive for brand awareness ($B = 0.533$; $t = 4.586$; $p < .001$) and brand image ($B = 0.589$; $t = 4.094$; $p < .001$). The overall model was significant ($F = 19.260$; $p < .001$), with adjusted $R^2 = .282$. Descriptive scores were 63.28%, 65.25%, and 55.70% of the respective scale maxima. The study offers a bounded account of brand-related perceptions in a neighborhood sample while distinguishing purchasing readiness from verified transactions. Measurement overlap, nonprobability recruitment, incomplete model-output documentation, and missing ethics declarations limit stronger inferences and require author verification before publication.

Keywords

brand awareness, brand image, Honda BeAT, marketing communication, purchase decisions.

1. Introduction

Motorcycles remain an important means of everyday mobility in Indonesian urban and peri-urban settings, where short-distance commuting, flexible routes, and household transport requirements are frequently addressed through privately owned two-wheelers. Automatic scooters have become particularly visible in this market. Competition among models therefore concerns not only price, operating costs, and physical specifications but also the ways in which buyers recognize a model, evaluate its reputation, and form expectations about ownership. Honda BeAT offers a useful case because the model is commonly discussed in relation to accessible daily transport, fuel economy, and maintenance considerations. Industry reporting and consumer-oriented media provide background on the motorcycle category (Kompas, 2025), although such market descriptions are not substitutes for locally collected evidence about consumer perceptions.

Marketing communication research distinguishes the availability of a brand in memory from the associations linked to that brand. In Keller's (1993) customer-based brand equity framework,

brand awareness concerns recognition and recall, whereas brand image denotes the strength, favorability, and uniqueness of brand associations. These constructs are related but should not be merged with intention, product evaluation, or an actual transaction. A resident may readily recognize Honda BeAT yet defer purchase because of financing or household needs; conversely, an existing owner may retrospectively report favorable product associations. Consequently, this study treats the questionnaire scores as operational composites requiring construct-validation evidence rather than assuming that every item directly measures its nominal label (Kotler & Armstrong, 2021).

In integrated marketing communication (IMC), brands attempt to coordinate information and promotional messages across channels and consumer touchpoints. Consistency may support brand familiarity and reinforce associations, but the effectiveness of communication cannot be inferred from the presence of a recognizable name alone. Butkouskaya et al. (2024) discuss IMC as an organizational and market-facing capability, whereas research on consumer decisions has considered the distinct roles of brand awareness and brand image (Pratamasari & Sulaeman, 2022). This distinction is useful in a neighborhood setting, where interpersonal recommendations, dealer encounters, and digital sources may intersect in consumers' judgments.

Earlier Indonesian studies link brand awareness and brand image to consumer choices in clothing retail, smartphone markets, cafés, and food services (Manik & Siregar, 2022; Tondang & Silalahi, 2022). Importantly, this topic has also been examined for Honda BeAT itself. Alfandy et al. (2024) analyzed product quality, price, brand awareness, brand image, and purchasing decisions among 100 Honda BeAT purchasers in Purwokerto. Pamelia and Sudarwanto (2022) explored product quality and brand image among residents of a housing complex in Sidoarjo. These precedents rule out a claim that brand-related correlates of Honda BeAT purchase decisions are previously unstudied. They do, however, provide comparators with different predictor sets, eligibility rules, and geographic settings. A localized study in RW 06 can add contextual evidence only if it specifies what was actually measured and resists claiming effects that its design cannot establish.

The present study focuses on Setneg Residential Complex, RW 06, in Pondok Kacang Barat, Pondok Aren District, South Tangerang City. The original research report cites administrative information indicating a population of 1,504 residents across eight neighborhood units (RTs) as of September 30, 2025. It also describes Honda BeAT as visible in the residential environment. These local observations motivated the survey, but they do not independently establish the motorcycle ownership rate or explain why a resident selected a particular model. A community-level survey allows examination of responses under a shared local setting rather than treating the general Indonesian motorcycle market as uniform.

The research gap is therefore narrower and more defensible than an assertion of an unexplored motorcycle brand. In particular, the literature provides limited documentation of the joint association of these two reported questionnaire composites with purchase-decision readiness among both previous purchasers and prospective consumers within this specific South Tangerang neighborhood. The paper contributes a transparent, localized description of their associations, the reported magnitude of model fit, and the measurement ambiguity introduced by combining purchase-related attitudes with actual-purchase language. It does not offer an original causal theory, a representative estimate for South Tangerang, or direct evidence that an integrated marketing communication campaign changed purchasing behavior. Comparison with automotive studies is used to clarify the limits of transferring estimates across populations and measurement frameworks (Alfandy et al., 2024).

The original instrument was organized using three marketing frameworks. The attention–interest–desire–action (AIDA) sequence grouped 12 items labeled brand awareness (X1); stimulus–organism–response (S–O–R) grouped nine items labeled brand image (X2); and the hierarchy-of-effects sequence grouped 18 items labeled purchase decisions (Y) (Dewi & Auliya, 2025). These

frameworks identify possible stages or processes but are not equivalent to established discriminant measurement of the three constructs. For example, 'desire' or an intended dealer visit may indicate purchase readiness rather than recall; the 'awareness' component of Y may overlap with X1; and advertising exposure within X2 is not itself a brand association. The manuscript therefore retains the reported instrument names for continuity while explicitly treating the resulting scores as composites whose construct validity remains to be demonstrated from the original item wording and data.

Three research questions guide the analysis: (1) Is the reported brand-awareness score positively associated with the Honda BeAT purchase-decision composite among sampled residents? (2) Is the reported brand-image score positively associated with that composite? (3) Do the two predictors explain statistically significant variation when entered jointly? The corresponding directional hypotheses are H1: $\beta 1 > 0$; H2: $\beta 2 > 0$; and H3: the joint regression differs from an intercept-only model. The first two hypotheses concern conditional regression associations, while the third is an overall model test rather than a claim of causation. The intended contribution is a cautious comparison of local survey associations with previous marketing and automotive research, highlighting what the measures can and cannot establish.

2. Research Methods

Design and research setting

The research used a quantitative, descriptive-correlational design with explanatory aims. A structured survey gathered standardized responses at a single point in the research period, and regression analysis assessed associations between two predictor scores and a purchase-decision score. The research setting was Setneg Residential Complex, RW 06, Pondok Kacang Barat, Pondok Aren, South Tangerang City. The reported residential population comprised 1,504 persons distributed across eight neighborhood units. This population figure describes the area; it is not itself a sampling frame of verified Honda BeAT purchasers. Because the study relied on nonprobability recruitment, the sample should not be interpreted as a statistically representative draw from all residents.

Respondents and recruitment

The study included 94 residents aged 18–59 who lived in the designated residential complex and reported either having purchased Honda BeAT or considering its purchase. The sampling approach combined eligibility-based purposive sampling with convenience or accidental contact during a two-day data-collection period; completion was voluntary according to the source's eligibility description, but documented informed-consent wording was not provided. Inclusion criteria concerned residence, age, purchase/consideration status, and willingness to complete the form. Because neither recruitment contacts nor selection probabilities were enumerated, the sample cannot be treated as representative of the 1,504 residents. The actual collection dates, recruitment channel and location, number of people approached, responses excluded, response rate, and numbers of existing versus prospective purchasers were not supplied; these require verification from field records. The mixed purchase-status eligibility is a substantive measurement limitation, not simply a sampling footnote.

In the final sample, 57 respondents were women (60.6%) and 37 were men (39.4%). The largest reported age bracket was 39–45 years (19 respondents; 20.2%), followed by 32–38 years (18; 19.1%) and 46–52 years (17; 18.1%). Forty respondents (42.6%) were described as students, while civil servants and government employees working under the PPPK scheme together accounted for 35 (37.2%). Reported neighborhood-unit shares ranged from 11.7% to 13.8% across the eight RTs. These details

describe the respondents who participated and should not be presented as the population distribution, particularly because the unreported categories are not reconstructed.

Measures and data collection

Primary data came from a structured Google Forms questionnaire using four options: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, and 4 = strongly agree. The original study reported 39 items divided into brand awareness (X1: 12 items grouped as attention, interest, desire, action), brand image (X2: nine items grouped as stimulus, organism, response), and purchase decisions (Y: 18 items grouped as awareness, knowledge, liking, preference, conviction, purchase). Table 1 preserves the reported allocation. Each score appears to have been analyzed as a summed Likert-item composite; this is consistent with the stated maximum possible totals, but the original report does not supply all 39 item texts, scoring syntax, reverse-keying rules, missing-response treatment, or item-to-dimension mapping. The authors must provide the actual questionnaire and scoring documentation as a supplementary file or in the confidential editorial record. Without them, content coverage and separation of the constructs cannot be independently assessed.

The outcome must be interpreted carefully. Eligibility included both residents who had already purchased Honda BeAT and residents merely considering it, while the Y composite covers early awareness, liking, preference, conviction, and a purchase-related stage. It is therefore a self-reported decision-readiness composite, not a validated measure of completed sales. Items referring to future action or intentions must not be described as observed purchasing behavior. Secondary information about neighborhood population came from local administrative records; no dealership transaction records, purchase receipts, third-party verification, or longitudinal follow-up were supplied. Brand awareness should also be distinguished from advertising exposure and information search, whereas brand image should be distinguished from stimulus exposure and behavioral response (Keller, 1993).

Operational documentation for resubmission should include the verbatim 39-item instrument, an item-to-construct map, coding and reverse-scoring instructions, treatment of missing responses, and a description of whether purchase-intention items are separated from actual-purchase responses. The existing study report does not provide these records, so their completion is an author responsibility rather than an editorial reconstruction.

Table 1. Measurement framework and original instrument specifications

Composite	Reported dimensions	Items	Response scale
Brand awareness (X1)	Attention; interest; desire; action	12	1–4
Brand image (X2)	Stimulus; organism; response	9	1–4
Purchase decisions (Y)	Awareness; knowledge; liking; preference; conviction; purchase	18	1–4

Note. The dimensions reflect the original study's instrument design. They should not be interpreted as independently validated factor structures.

Reported instrument evaluation

A preliminary item-validity exercise was reported for 19 respondents, using Pearson item–total correlations against r = .456 at a nominal 5% threshold. Stated correlation ranges were .669–.918 for X1, .700–.918 for X2, and .714–.911 for Y. Reported Cronbach's alphas were .947, .932, and .969, respectively. These values document the author-reported calculations; they were not independently reproduced here. High internal consistency does not by itself demonstrate that AIDA measures awareness, S–O–R measures image, or the purchase-decision items form one unidimensional construct. The source does not specify whether the 19 pilot respondents were among the 94 analyzed cases, whether correlations were corrected item–total coefficients, or whether any items were removed. Raw item outputs and the instrument should be checked before making stronger validity claims.

The 18-item outcome alpha of .969 warrants particular scrutiny because several stages of the hierarchy of effects may be conceptually distinct and may share wording with the brand-awareness predictor. The analysis did not report exploratory or confirmatory factor analysis, discriminant validity, cross-construct correlations, or criterion validation against completed transactions. Such analyses should not be claimed unless performed on the underlying data. The revision instead identifies a possible shared-method and construct-overlap problem: the same respondent rated all predictors and outcomes on the same Likert scale, and some item domains overlap. The authors should document item-level content and, if the retained data permit, assess dimensionality or provide an explicit rationale for using the reported composites.

Statistical analysis

Data processing was described as questionnaire editing, coding, tabulation, and analysis in IBM SPSS Statistics 27. Descriptive totals were divided by reported theoretical maxima. The inferential model was $Y = a + b1X1 + b2X2 + e$, assessed through unstandardized regression coefficients, t statistics, an overall F statistic, and adjusted R^2. The nominal α level was .05. The original document reported a one-sample Kolmogorov–Smirnov p value of .200, tolerance and VIF values of 1.000 for both predictors, and a visually examined ZPRED–SRESID scatter plot. However, the full SPSS coefficients, model summary, ANOVA table, residual diagnostics, scale-coding procedures, and respondent-level data were not provided with this manuscript. The study's numerical estimates are therefore reproduced as author-reported and remain subject to source-output verification; no missing coefficient precision or significance tests have been invented.

Before final publication, the statistical record should allow readers to determine the analyzed N, regression residual degrees of freedom, unstandardized B, standard error, standardized β (if used), t, p, confidence intervals, overall F, model R^2 and adjusted R^2, and diagnostics for residual normality, heteroskedasticity, and collinearity. The original report does not allow all of these fields to be completed accurately. The Kolmogorov–Smirnov result cannot by itself prove normally distributed residuals, and a VIF printed as 1.000 requires comparison with predictor correlations and unrounded output. Cross-sectional associations must not be worded as causal effects. Any percentage of outcome variance not accounted for by the model is unexplained variance, not a measured percentage attributable to specific factors such as credit availability or price.

Research ethics and data transparency

The source document does not describe the participant information sheet, informed-consent wording, withdrawal arrangements, privacy notice, applicable ethics approval or exemption decision, personally identifying fields on the Google Form, retention and access safeguards, or a feasible de-identified data-sharing arrangement. No assertion of ethics committee approval or consent has been added without evidence. Before resubmission, the authors must accurately complete JALR's confidential OJS declarations concerning research ethics, consent, personal-data handling, data availability, author contributions, funding, competing interests, and AI use, where applicable. If the original process did not include a given safeguard or approval, it must not be fabricated retrospectively; the editor should determine an appropriate response. Because the manuscript is anonymized for double-anonymous review, declarations capable of identifying the researchers should be submitted separately.

To protect participant privacy, any released spreadsheet should remove direct identifiers and potentially identifying combinations of residence, demographic characteristics, and purchase history. If sharing respondent-level data is restricted, the authors should explain the restriction and consider providing de-identified summary tables and analysis syntax instead. No specific sharing authorization can be assumed from the supplied study.

3. Results and Discussion

Respondent profile and descriptive responses

The respondent group represented a localized set of adults who reported a connection to Honda BeAT purchasing or purchase consideration. Women comprised 60.6% of the 94 survey participants and men 39.4%. The reported concentration in the 32–52 age categories and substantial student participation demonstrate variety in the observed group, but the full age and occupational distributions were not available for reconstruction. Likewise, the relatively balanced reported RT shares indicate that respondents came from several parts of the complex, not that random sampling occurred or that every eligible household had an equal probability of participation.

The brand-awareness score was 2,855 out of a reported scale maximum of 4,512, or 63.28%. The source categorized this score as 'fairly good.' Among the reported AIDA-related items, searching for information on price or motorcycle variants and intending to visit a dealer or website each had a mean of 2.60. Recognition of the Honda BeAT name had the lowest stated item mean, 2.47. In the reported instrument, these values suggest modest differences among items and relatively active information-search intentions. They do not establish that actual dealer visits occurred or that spontaneous, unaided brand recall was objectively measured.

Brand image achieved 2,208 out of 3,384 possible points (65.25%), also classified as 'fairly good' by the source. The item presenting Honda BeAT as economical and durable had a mean of 2.68; preference for Honda BeAT because of its image had a mean of 2.65. The item about frequently seeing Honda BeAT advertisements or promotions yielded the lowest stated mean, 2.55. These descriptive differences suggest that practical product associations may be salient for the surveyed respondents, while the visibility of promotions is less strongly endorsed. However, the questionnaire did not objectively test fuel consumption, engine lifespan, or exposure logs. The results characterize perceptions rather than independent product-performance findings.

The reported purchase-decision score was 3,770 out of 6,768 (55.70%), again described by the authors as 'fairly good.' Suitability for daily activities received a stated mean of 2.32, while confidence that Honda BeAT was the correct choice had the lowest stated mean of 2.09. Within the questionnaire's hierarchy-of-effects arrangement, this lower conviction is consistent with respondents evaluating alternatives despite finding the motorcycle practically suitable. Because some respondents were prospective buyers, this pattern is best interpreted as decision readiness and reported preference, not a direct measure of completed purchases.

Table 2. Reported descriptive statistics for the three questionnaire composites

Variable	Actual / maximum	Percentage	Source category
Brand awareness (X1)	2,855 / 4,512	63.28%	Fairly good
Brand image (X2)	2,208 / 3,384	65.25%	Fairly good
Purchase decisions (Y)	3,770 / 6,768	55.70%	Fairly good

Note. Totals, percentages, and categories reproduce the values reported by the original study. The questionnaire's cutoffs for the descriptive categories were not documented.

Taken together, these descriptive findings depict a community sample in which favorable brand associations and information-seeking responses exceed the reported purchase-decision score. The pattern does not, by itself, demonstrate a sequence from awareness to image to buying. The three composites use different item counts and may capture overlapping stages of the decision process. Comparing percentages of their respective maxima is therefore a descriptive convenience, not evidence that one latent construct is intrinsically stronger or more effective than another.

Reported model diagnostics

The original analysis states that a one-sample Kolmogorov–Smirnov test returned an asymptotic two-sided p value of .200, that the two predictors each had tolerance = 1.000 and VIF = 1.000, and that the residual-versus-predicted scatter plot lacked an obvious systematic pattern. These are author-reported diagnostics, not independently checked results. The report does not identify whether the normality procedure used regression residuals rather than item or composite scores, provide a residual normal Q–Q plot, or furnish the original scatter plot. A residual-based diagnostic assessment and the complete SPSS table exports are necessary for an auditable test of model assumptions.

The absence of a significant Kolmogorov–Smirnov result is not proof that residuals are normally distributed, and visual scatter inspection cannot establish homoskedasticity with certainty. More importantly, tolerance and VIF rounded to 1.000 for both regressors imply negligible linear association between X1 and X2; although mathematically possible, this merits inspection of unrounded VIF values and the predictor-correlation matrix given their conceptual relationship. Durbin–Watson and influential-case diagnostics would also help assess model adequacy if available, but their results must not be introduced as though already calculated. These unresolved checks limit certainty about the suitability of the fitted model, even while the original reported values are preserved.

Individual predictor associations and multiple regression

The reported fitted equation was $Y = 10.088 + 0.533X1 + 0.589X2 + e$, where Y is the questionnaire's purchase-decision composite, X1 is brand awareness, and X2 is brand image. Both unstandardized coefficients were positive. In the fitted score units, a one-point increase in X1 corresponds to an estimated .533-point higher Y score when X2 is held constant; the corresponding conditional difference for a one-point increase in X2 is .589 points when X1 is held constant. These are properties of the estimated model and should not be interpreted as effects of experimentally changing awareness or image. Because the scales contain different numbers and types of items, their unstandardized coefficients do not establish which construct has greater substantive influence.

The original report gives $t = 4.586$ for X1 and $t = 4.094$ for X2, both with $p < .001$. These are reported as statistically significant positive conditional associations, subject to confirmation in the original coefficient table. The source additionally lists adjusted $R^2 = .159$ and .126 as separate contributions associated with X1 and X2. It does not supply the fitted models or formulas underlying those values; therefore, they must not be interpreted as partial R^2, unique variance components, or additive parts of the joint model. The authors should identify whether they arise from separate single-predictor regressions and provide their model summaries. Standard errors, confidence intervals, standardized coefficients, and residual degrees of freedom remain absent and cannot be inferred reliably from the manuscript alone.

In substantive terms, the positive awareness coefficient is consistent with the proposition that easier brand recognition and related information-seeking responses coexist with greater purchase consideration in this sample. The positive image coefficient likewise suggests that favorable associations with economy, durability, or reputation tend to occur alongside stronger purchase-decision responses. These findings are compatible with research that identifies brand-related perceptions as correlates of consumer behavior (Arianty & Andira, 2021; Manik & Siregar, 2022; Pratamasari & Sulaeman, 2022). They do not identify the direction of influence: a person who has already selected a motorcycle may subsequently report higher familiarity and a more favorable image.

Simultaneous model and explained variance

The overall regression was reported as $F = 19.260$ ($p < .001$) with adjusted $R^2 = .282$ for the two-predictor model. This supports a reported statistical association between the composites, not a causal model of sales. As a limited arithmetic check, if all 94 cases were included and an intercept and two predictors were fitted, the implied residual degrees of freedom would be 91, and $F = 19.260$ would correspond to unadjusted R^2 of approximately .297 and adjusted R^2 of approximately .282. This derived consistency is reassuring but does not verify the original respondent data or the separate coefficient tests. The complete ANOVA and model-summary tables are still required to confirm case exclusions, degrees of freedom, and estimates.

Table 3. Reported multiple-regression findings

Statistic or term	Reported value	Interpretation boundary
Intercept	10.088	Predicted score at X1 = X2 = 0; outside observed four-point composite range
Brand awareness (X1), B	+0.533	Positive conditional association; $t = 4.586$, $p < .001$
Brand image (X2), B	+0.589	Positive conditional association; $t = 4.094$, $p < .001$
Overall F	19.260	Two-predictor model; $p < .001$
Adjusted R^2	.282	Reported variance explained after adjustment
Coefficient SE / 95% CI / residual df	Not supplied	Must be verified from original SPSS output; not estimated.

Note. B, t, F, and adjusted R^2 are transcribed from the author-supplied report. An approximate unadjusted R^2 can be derived from F only if N = 94 and the model includes exactly two predictors and an intercept; this does not replace the original SPSS output. Standard errors, confidence intervals, standardized coefficients, degrees of freedom, original unadjusted R^2, and residual diagnostics await author documentation.

The remaining 71.8% cannot be specifically assigned to price sensitivity, household income, financing plans, after-sales services, promotional discounts, or peer influence because those variables were not estimated in this model. They are plausible candidate predictors for future models, not documented explanations for a known proportion of respondent variation. In particular, access to credit and purchase price may be important for a durable consumer product, but the present evidence does not quantify their associations. A future study could add these variables and assess whether the awareness and image coefficients remain stable after adjustment.

The magnitude of explained variance should also be interpreted in light of the dependent measure. The score combines awareness, knowledge, liking, preference, conviction, and purchase-related items, so it can reflect attitudes and readiness rather than a discrete buying event. Associations may partly arise because the questionnaire's predictors and outcome use related perceptual wording and the same response method. Respondent-level data, item wording, and evidence on common-method variance are needed to examine this possibility. Accordingly, the fitted regression serves the study's correlational aims but is not evidence of a verified sales effect.

A note on statistical interpretation is particularly important: the reported intercept of 10.088 is an algebraic model parameter evaluated at X1 = X2 = 0, a combination outside the range of positive summed Likert-item scores. It is not evidence of a meaningful baseline purchase-decision level. Likewise, the larger unstandardized B for brand image than for brand awareness does not establish a stronger substantive predictor because the operational composites differ in composition and length. Such comparisons require valid standardized measures and adequate model documentation.

3.5. Implications for integrated marketing communication

The first implication concerns how communication is evaluated. The comparatively favorable responses to searching prices or variants suggest that informational access may matter to the sampled

residents, while relatively lower endorsement of encountering promotional content raises questions about local visibility. Rather than inferring that additional advertising would cause purchases, marketers could use these findings to formulate testable interventions, such as clearer online comparison tools, locally accessible dealer information, and mobile service demonstrations. Subsequent evaluation would require measured exposure, an appropriate comparison strategy, and behaviorally relevant outcomes.

A second implication concerns the content of brand associations. Respondents' relatively favorable item scores for fuel economy and durability describe beliefs that can influence product comparisons. Promotional claims based on these qualities should be substantiated by product data, servicing information, and transparent communication about operating costs. Brand image can be reinforced by credible experience as well as communication. This interpretation is consistent with the literature on consumer perceptions and purchasing decisions, including findings from other Indonesian service and product contexts (Rumaidlany et al., 2022; (Tondang & Silalahi, 2022). while acknowledging that those contexts do not establish effects in the Honda BeAT market.

A third implication is the need to consider the movement between stages of awareness, evaluation, and choice. The original survey's use of AIDA and the hierarchy of effects creates a practical vocabulary for distinguishing attention from conviction, even though these frameworks are not equivalent to independent measurement models for awareness and purchase behavior. The descriptive results suggest stronger information-seeking and functional associations than final conviction within the reported item set. This gap is a reasonable basis for further investigation into comparisons with competing scooters, purchase financing, and the timing of household decisions. It should not be labeled a proven failure of brand messaging without studying these additional mechanisms.

The findings should be interpreted against studies that actually concern Honda BeAT as well as cross-category studies. Alfandy et al. (2024) examined purchasers in Purwokerto using awareness, image, product quality, and price, whereas Pamelia and Sudarwanto (2022) studied residents of another housing community in Sidoarjo in relation to product quality and brand image. Those settings provide relevant comparators but use different predictor sets and cannot supply an expected coefficient for RW 06. The present questionnaire mixes previous purchasers and those considering purchase and measures reported decision stages rather than verified transactions. Thus, even consistent coefficient signs would amount to contextual replication, not a new universal mechanism. Studies on clothing retail, cafés, and smartphones likewise provide supporting but non-equivalent comparisons (Tondang & Silalahi, 2022). The contribution is greater transparency about this local association and its measurement limits, not superiority over or novelty relative to these established models.

IMC remains a useful practical perspective for coordinating dealership contact, digital information, and neighborhood communication (Kotler & Armstrong, 2021). Yet this dataset did not directly measure exposure to an IMC campaign, message consistency across channels, objective advertising reach, or later purchase transactions. Its results therefore should not be framed as evidence that IMC caused a sales increase. A more rigorous follow-up would separate completed purchasers from considerers, establish a baseline, collect independent exposure indicators, and observe subsequent transactions. The present results can motivate a testable proposition about information access and brand associations, but an intervention evaluation would be needed to claim effectiveness.

Study limitations and directions for further research

The survey combined 94 purposively eligible and conveniently recruited residents in one location during two days, limiting external validity. The exact recruitment pathway, response rate,

and distinction between previous buyers and considerers have not been documented. The source used one self-report instrument for predictor and outcome scores, leaving possible shared-method effects and construct overlap. In particular, X1 includes desire and action, X2 includes stimulus and response, and Y includes awareness and several pre-purchase steps. Consequently, the outcome should not be presented as verified purchasing. The high alphas do not replace evidence that the composites measure distinct constructs, and no population-wide inference is warranted.

The full SPSS model summaries, coefficient standard errors, confidence intervals, degrees of freedom, item-level data, and diagnostic plots were unavailable for independent checking. The two rounded VIFs of 1.000 warrant particular confirmation. The stated pilot results also require clarification of participant overlap and item–total correlation procedures. These gaps prevent the article from satisfying the reviewer's request for complete reproducible statistical reporting without new documentation from the researchers. The appropriate next step is author verification or an analysis rerun on the actual dataset, not the insertion of estimated or invented output fields. A transparent data-availability statement should specify what anonymized data and analysis syntax can ethically be shared.

Future research should include multiple neighborhoods and a defined probability-sampling strategy where feasible, distinguish completed purchases from consideration and purchase intention, and examine price perception, financing accessibility, after-sales service, social influence, and word of mouth. Using verified transaction outcomes or a longitudinal design would make the timing of awareness, image, and buying decisions clearer. Qualitative interviews could also investigate why some respondents endorse practical product benefits without expressing strong conviction that one model is the best choice. These extensions would test rather than assume the processes suggested by this survey.

4. Conclusion

This study examined the association between brand awareness, brand image, and a self-reported Honda BeAT purchase-decision measure among 94 eligible survey respondents in Setneg Residential Complex, RW 06, South Tangerang. The descriptive scores reported for brand awareness, brand image, and purchase decisions were 63.28%, 65.25%, and 55.70% of their respective maximum scores. In the fitted two-predictor regression, both brand awareness ($B = 0.533$; $t = 4.586$; $p < .001$) and brand image ($B = 0.589$; $t = 4.094$; $p < .001$) showed positive conditional associations. The overall model was statistically significant ($F = 19.260$; $p < .001$), with a reported adjusted R^2 of .282. These estimates answer the study's three correlational questions within the analyzed sample; they do not demonstrate that changing brand perceptions would cause purchases.

The study contributes a bounded neighborhood-level illustration of how recognition-related and image-related survey composites correlate with decision readiness in a motorcycle market already examined in previous Indonesian research. Its contribution is contextual, not the first demonstration of these associations for Honda BeAT (Alfandy et al., 2024; Pamelia & Sudarwanto, 2022). The comparatively lower reported conviction score suggests a question for future research about decision barriers, but does not demonstrate that existing promotion failed. Marketers may consider testing clearer cost comparisons, verified durability information, and accessible dealer communications; none of these interventions was experimentally evaluated here.

Interpretation remains limited by nonprobability recruitment, the inclusion of both purchasers and prospective purchasers, overlapping operational composites, absent verified transaction records, and incomplete statistical and ethics documentation. The remaining model variance cannot be assigned to financing, price, servicing, or household influence without measuring those factors. Before acceptance, the underlying questionnaire, sampling record, regression outputs, and applicable consent and ethics declarations must be reconciled with the manuscript. Larger cross-neighborhood samples,

documented construct validation, separate outcome definitions, longitudinal tracking, and appropriate mixed-methods designs would provide stronger evidence on how brand perceptions relate to purchase processes.

References

Alfandy, R., Alfalisyado, Endratno, H., & Aryoko, Y. P. (2024). Pengaruh kualitas produk, harga, kesadaran merek dan citra merek terhadap keputusan pembelian (Studi pada pembeli Honda Beat di Purwokerto). *J-MAS (Jurnal Manajemen Dan Sains)*, *9*(2), 1420–1432. https://doi.org/10.33087/jmas.v9i2.1986

Arianty, N., & Andira, A. (2021). Pengaruh brand image dan brand awareness terhadap keputusan pembelian. *Jurnal Ilmiah Magister Manajemen*, *4*(1), 39–50.

Butkouskaya, V., Llonch-Andreu, J., & Alarcón-del-Amo, M.-C. (2024). Market orientation, integrated marketing communications, and small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) performance: A comparison between developed and developing economies. *European Research on Management and Business Economics*, *30*(3). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iedeen.2024.100260

Dewi, W. E., & Auliya, Z. F. (2025). Model stimulus-organism-response (S-O-R): Peran trust sebagai mediasi dalam keputusan pembelian produk N'Pure di TikTok Shop. *Jurnal Ilmu Ekonomi*, *8*(3), 775–790.

Keller, K. L. (1993). Conceptualizing, measuring, and managing customer-based brand equity. *Journal of Marketing*, *57*(1), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224299305700101

Kompas. (2025). Penjualan motor tembus 590.000 unit pada Oktober 2025. *Kompas.Com*. https://otomotif.kompas.com/read/2025/11/10/070200915/penjualan-motor-tembus-590.000-unit-pada-oktober-2025

Kotler, P., & Armstrong, G. (2021). *Principles of marketing* (18th ed.). Pearson.

Manik, C. M., & Siregar, O. M. (2022). Pengaruh brand image dan brand awareness terhadap keputusan pembelian pada konsumen Starbucks di Kota Medan. *Journal of Social Research*, *1*(7), 694–707. https://doi.org/10.55324/josr.v1i7.134

Pamelia, A., & Sudarwanto, T. (2022). Pengaruh kualitas produk dan brand image terhadap keputusan pembelian motor matic Honda BeAT (Studi pada warga Perumahan Pesona Permata Ungu Krian Sidoarjo). *Jurnal Pendidikan Tata Niaga (JPTN)*, *10*(1), 1554–1563. https://doi.org/10.26740/jptn.v10n1.p1554-1563

Pratamasari, V. F., & Sulaeman, E. (2022). Pengaruh brand awareness dan brand image terhadap keputusan pembelian. *Forum Ekonomi*, *24*(2), 422–432. https://doi.org/10.30872/jfor.v24i2.10837

Rumaidlany, D., Mariam, S., & Ramli, A. H. (2022). Pengaruh brand image dan brand awareness terhadap keputusan pembelian pada McDonald's di Palmerah Jakarta Barat. *Jurnal Lentera Bisnis*, *11*(2), 102. https://doi.org/10.34127/jrlab.v11i2.567

Tondang, G. A., & Silalahi, P. R. (2022). Pengaruh brand awareness dan brand image terhadap keputusan pembelian smartphone android. *Jurnal Pendidikan Sosial Dan Humaniora*, *1*(2), 92–99. https://doi.org/10.56799/peshum.v1i2.55

Publication Declarations

Author Contributions	:	Fandi Fansuri: Conceptualization, Investigation, Data Curation, Formal Analysis, Writing – Original Draft. Agus Firmansyah: Methodology, Supervision, Validation, Writing – Review & Editing. Both authors reviewed and approved the final manuscript.
Funding	:	This research received no external funding.
Competing Interests	:	The authors declare no competing interests.
Ethics and Consent	:	This quantitative study involved 94 adult respondents participating in a questionnaire-based survey. Participation was reported as voluntary. The authors are responsible for ensuring participant confidentiality, appropriate handling of personal information, and accurate disclosure of informed consent procedures and the applicable institutional ethics review status.
Data Availability	:	The findings are based on questionnaire responses and statistical analyses conducted using IBM SPSS Statistics. The research instrument, anonymized summary data, and relevant statistical outputs may be made available by the corresponding author upon reasonable request, subject to participant confidentiality, applicable ethical requirements, and data availability.
AI Use Declaration	:	Generative artificial intelligence tools were used to assist with academic language refinement, sentence structure, and the presentation of scholarly arguments. The authors critically reviewed, revised, and validated AI-assisted content and retain full responsibility for the accuracy, originality, and integrity of the final manuscript.

Copyright and License

Copyright © 2026 Fandi Fansuri and Agus Firmansyah. The authors retain copyright and grant *Locus Journal of Academic Literature Review (JALR)* the non-exclusive right of first publication. This article is distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License (CC BY-SA 4.0): https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/