



The Role of Quality Product, Quality Service, Price, Promotion and Image Brand on Purchase Decisions (Case Study at Apotik Anisa Ajung, Jember)

Harry Sulaksono^{1*}, Destiana ²

^{1,2} Faculty Economic and Business, Institut Teknologi and Science Mandala, Indonesia

Corresponding Author: hary@itsm.ac.id

Received: 10-08-2025 Accepted: 13-08-2025 Published: 30-09-2025

Abstract

This study aims to analyze the influence of product quality, service quality, price, promotion, and brand image on purchasing decisions. The study was conducted at apotik Anisa in Jember Regency. The research type was quantitative. The sample used was 60 consumers. Data collection was carried out through observation, interviews, literature studies, and questionnaires. The sampling method in this study use purposive sampling. The data analysis method uses Multiple Linear Regression. Analysis Which used starting from test instrument data, test classical assumptions, coefficient of determination and hypothesis testing with t-test for partial influence and F-test for simultaneous influence. The conclusion of this study is the quality of product in a way partial No influential to Purchasing decisions, service quality, price, promotion, and brand image partially influence purchasing decisions. Simultaneously, all independent variables of product quality, service quality, price, promotion, and brand image significantly influence purchasing decisions.

Keywords: Product Quality, Service Quality, Price, Promotion, Brand Image, Purchasing Decision.

1. Introduction

Pharmacies are one of the health retail business that have an important role in meeting community's need for health product. The pharmaceutical industry in Indonesia has experienced significant growth along with increasing public awareness of importance health as well as access to drugs. Based on data Badan Pusat Statistik, (2020) the pharmaceutical sector grew by 7.2% in 2020. This data reveals the high demand for healthcare products in Indonesia. Demand for healthcare products, including medicines, is increasing, but competition in the pharmaceutical industry is also intensifying. Data from the Indonesian Pharmacy Association (2021) shows the number of pharmacies in Indonesia increased to more than 30,000 operating in 2021. Meanwhile, data from 2021 shows that the number of pharmacies in Jember was 93, according to the Badan Pusat Statistik (2023). With the increasing number of pharmacies in Jember, competition in trade in this industry is increasing strict,

In facing increasingly tight competition which is marked by the increasing number of pharmacies, pharmacies are not only required to provide quality products, but also provide good service and maintain brand image to remain competitive. Based on the results of observations that have been carried out, Apotik Anisa, as one of the pharmacies operating in Jember Regency, is faced with the challenge of maintaining its competitiveness. And expand share the market. Management Pharmacists or pharmacy owners need to understand several variables that can influence decision purchase consumer so that the pharmacy remains competitive.

Quality product is element important Which influence decision purchase Consumers. High-quality products provide consumers with assurance that the goods they purchase are safe and effective for use (Kotler & Keller, 2016). This is particularly important in the pharmaceutical industry, where the safety and quality of medicines are a top priority for consumers. Quality product in pharmacy between drug generic and drug the patents are relatively similar, as are their uses, and the prices of the drugs are different (Munisih & Soliha, 2019).

Product quality influences purchasing decisions. This conclusion is in accordance with research by Mauliyani et al., (2021), Trisnawati et al., (2022) who stated that product quality has a positive influence on purchasing decisions.

In addition to product quality, quality service Also very important For interesting customer. Kotler & Keller, (2016) stated that service quality is measured from two main dimensions, namely technical quality is what is provided and functional quality is how the service is provided. from something pharmacy Also is matter Which crucial in motivating customer pharmacy To be able to decide to buy from a particular pharmacy, this can provide quality service such as providing 5S: Smile, Greet, Say Hello, Be Polite and Courteous in serving consumers. This attitude has a positive impact on increasing the desire and decision to buy from a particular pharmacy. Munisih & Soliha, (2019). Statement the supported by study previous. The research among them Khaerudin et et al., (2023) state quality service influential in a way partially on purchasing decisions and according to research by Nggagho et al., (2024) stated that service quality has a significant influence on purchasing decisions.

Price Also play an important role in consumer decision making. Price is often a direct indicator for consumers about a product or service. Determination price from each pharmacy different depending on policy owner, as well as Fix cost And Variables Cost Which Yazid needed & Hidayat, (2020). Consumers typically compare product price with the quality offered before making a purchasing decision. This statement is supported by previous research. Among these studies, Misnawati & Sumarni (2020) stated that price influences purchasing decisions. Conversely, Suyanto et al. (2021) stated that price has no significant effect on purchasing decisions.

Promotion is a crucial factor in influencing consumer decisions to purchase a particular product or service. According to Kotler & Armstrong (2016), effective promotion can create positive product perceptions, introduce new features, and increase consumer interest. This statement is supported by previous research, including that of Trisnawati. et al., (2022) who stated promotion influential positive to decision purchasing and Suyanto et al., (2021) who stated that the promotional mix has a significant influence on purchasing decisions.

Brand image is the consumer's perception of something brand. Consumer perception formed based on experience And interaction them with the products or services offered. Keller, (2013) stated that a positive brand image can increase trust consumer And push loyalty they to product or service. Statement the supported by research by Mauliyani et al., (2021) stated that brand image has a significant influence on purchasing decisions, research by Ibrahim & Ignatius, (2023) stated that brand image has a significant influence on purchasing decisions.

Based on description on researchers interested For do study This with title "The Influence of Product Quality, Service Quality, Price, Promotion and Brand Image on Purchasing Decisions in Anisa pharmacy in Ajung Jember", results study This expected can give contribution This is beneficial for pharmacy management or owners. It can be used as a reference and consideration in formulating policies and strategies related to efforts to increase consumer purchasing decisions, and pharmacies are said to have a competitive advantage.

2. Methods

Study This done in Subdistrict Ajung Which focused on apotik Anisa. This study used a quantitative approach, with primary and secondary data sources. The sampling method used was purposive sampling, with sampling based on specific criteria. used to take samples based on certain criteria. The specified criteria are (1) customers who have made a purchase in pharmacy Anisa Ajung Jember. (2) age minimum 17 year or More. The number of samples taken was 60 people. The data analysis method used was Multiple Linear Regression with the t-test for partial effects and the F-test for simultaneous effects. The steps used by the researcher were first to test the data instrument (reliability test and validity test), then to test the classical assumptions (normality test, multicollinearity test, and heteroscedasticity test), Multiple Linear Regression, Coefficient of Determination test, and hypothesis test (t-test and F-test).

3. Results and Discussion

Test Instrument Data (Validity and Reliability)

test validity in research used for measure legitimate or valid whether or not something questionnaire.

| No | Indicator | R count | R Table | Sig | Alpha | Information |
|----|-----------|---------|---------|-------|-------|-------------|
| 1 | X1.1 | 0.742 | 0.2542 | 0,000 | 0.05 | Valid |
| 2 | X1.2 | 0.711 | 0.2542 | 0,000 | 0.05 | Valid |
| 3 | X1.3 | 0.543 | 0.2542 | 0,000 | 0.05 | Valid |
| 4 | X1.4 | 0.515 | 0.2542 | 0,000 | 0.05 | Valid |
| 5 | X1.5 | 0.765 | 0.2542 | 0,000 | 0.05 | Valid |
| 6 | X2.1 | 0.727 | 0.2542 | 0,000 | 0.05 | Valid |
| 7 | X2.2 | 0.732 | 0.2542 | 0,000 | 0.05 | Valid |
| 8 | X2.3 | 0.667 | 0.2542 | 0,000 | 0.05 | Valid |
| 9 | X2.4 | 0.801 | 0.2542 | 0,000 | 0.05 | Valid |
| 10 | X2.5 | 0.799 | 0.2542 | 0,000 | 0.05 | Valid |
| 11 | X3.1 | 0.617 | 0.2542 | 0,000 | 0.05 | Valid |
| 12 | X3.2 | 0.659 | 0.2542 | 0,000 | 0.05 | Valid |
| 13 | X3.3 | 0.713 | 0.2542 | 0,000 | 0.05 | Valid |
| 14 | X3.4 | 0.669 | 0.2542 | 0,000 | 0.05 | Valid |
| 15 | X3.5 | 0.715 | 0.2542 | 0,000 | 0.05 | Valid |
| 16 | X4.1 | 0.709 | 0.2542 | 0,000 | 0.05 | Valid |
| 17 | X4.2 | 0.742 | 0.2542 | 0,000 | 0.05 | Valid |
| 18 | X4.3 | 0.703 | 0.2542 | 0,000 | 0.05 | Valid |
| 19 | X4.4 | 0.611 | 0.2542 | 0,000 | 0.05 | Valid |
| 20 | X4.5 | 0.590 | 0.2542 | 0,000 | 0.05 | Valid |
| 21 | X5.1 | 0.737 | 0.2542 | 0,000 | 0.05 | Valid |
| 22 | X5.2 | 0.627 | 0.2542 | 0,000 | 0.05 | Valid |
| 23 | X5.3 | 0.673 | 0.2542 | 0,000 | 0.05 | Valid |
| 24 | X5.4 | 0.470 | 0.2542 | 0,000 | 0.05 | Valid |
| 25 | X5.5 | 0.774 | 0.2542 | 0,000 | 0.05 | Valid |
| 26 | Y.1 | 0.706 | 0.2542 | 0,000 | 0.05 | Valid |
| 27 | Y.2 | 0.618 | 0.2542 | 0,000 | 0.05 | Valid |
| 28 | Y.3 | 0.751 | 0.2542 | 0,000 | 0.05 | Valid |
| 29 | Y.4 | 0.748 | 0.2542 | 0,000 | 0.05 | Valid |
| 30 | Y.5 | 0.487 | 0.2542 | 0,000 | 0.05 | Valid |

Table 1. Validity Test Results

Sources: Data processed

From the table above, the calculated r value for all indicators is > r table and the significance value is < 0.05. So it can be concluded that all statement items are valid.

Reliability Test Results

| No | Variables | Cronbach Alpha | Alpha Standard | Information |
|----|--------------------|----------------|----------------|-------------|
| 1 | Product Quality | 0.762 | 0.600 | Reliable |
| 2 | Quality of Service | 0.791 | 0.600 | Reliable |
| 3 | Price | 0.767 | 0.600 | Reliable |
| 4 | Promotion | 0.767 | 0.600 | Reliable |
| 5 | Brand Image | 0.760 | 0.600 | Reliable |
| 6 | Buying decision | 0.765 | 0.600 | Reliable |

Table 2. Reliability Test Results

Source: Data Processed

From the results of the Reliability test, it can be seen that the Cronbach Alpha values are all above 0.600 so they are said to be Reliable.

Test Assumptions Classic (Test Normality, Test Multicollinearity, Test Heteroscedasticity)

| One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| N | Unstandardized Residual 60 |

| | | |
|----------------------------------------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| Normal Parameters ^{a, b} | Mean | .0000000 |
| | Std. Deviation | 1.33446068 |
| | Absolute | .081 |
| Most Extreme Differences | Positive | .058 |
| | Negative | -.081 |
| Test Statistics | | .081 |
| Asymp. Sig. (2- tailed) | | .200 ^{c, d} |
| a. Test distribution is Normal. | | |
| b. Calculated from data. | | |
| c. Lilliefors Significance Correction. | | |
| d. This is a lower bound of the true significance. | | |

Table 3. Test Normality

Source: Data Processed

Based on the results of the normality test with the One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test, it can be concluded that the regression model in this study is normally distributed.

| Coefficients ^a | | | |
|---------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|-------|
| Model | | Collinearity Statistics | |
| | | Tolerance | VIF |
| 1 | Product Quality | .435 | 2,299 |
| | Quality of Service | .552 | 1,813 |
| | Price | .451 | 2,215 |
| | Promotion | .880 | 1,137 |
| | Brand Image | .448 | 2,230 |

a. Dependent Variable: Purchasing Decision

Table 4. Test Multicollinearity

Source: Data Processed

Results test multicollinearity show that mark VIF all variables independent in this research more small from 10 whereas mark tolerance all variables independent more from 10% or 0.1, This means that there is no correlation between variables in this study. It can be concluded that there are no symptoms of multicollinearity between the independent variables in the regression model.

| Coefficients ^a | | | |
|---------------------------|--------------------|--------|------|
| Model | | t | Sig. |
| 1 | (Constant) | 1,097 | .278 |
| | Product Quality | .160 | .874 |
| | Quality of Service | .954 | .344 |
| | Price | -2,184 | .033 |
| | Promotion | .217 | .829 |
| | Brand Image | .312 | .756 |

a. Dependent Variable: ABRESID.2

Table 5. Results Test Heteroscedasticity Use Glacier

Source: Data Processed

Based on the results of the heteroscedasticity test using Glejser, it can be seen that the significant values of the independent variables of product quality, service quality, promotion and brand image show significant values. more big from 0.05 Which It means No happen problem heteroscedasticity whereas For the price variable, it shows a significant value of less than 0.05, which means that heteroscedasticity occurs in the price variable.

Test Regression multiple

| Coefficients ^a | | | | | |
|---------------------------|------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|-------|
| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t |
| | | B | Std. Error | Beta | |
| 1 | (Constant) | 7,326 | 2,660 | | 2,754 |
| | | | | | .008 |

| | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------|------|-------|--------|------|
| Product Quality | .118 | .137 | .108 | .859 | .394 |
| Quality of Service | .442 | .126 | .379 | 3,501 | .001 |
| Price | .703 | .122 | .644 | 5,783 | .000 |
| Promotion | -.217 | .082 | -.237 | -2,652 | .010 |
| Brand Image | -.385 | .105 | -.435 | -3,674 | .001 |

a. Dependent Variable: Purchasing Decision

Table 6. Results Test Regression Multiple

Source: Data Processed

Based on results analysis regression multiple can known equality regression Which the form is:

$$Y = a + b_1 X_1 + b_2 X_2 + b_3 X_3 + b_4 X_4 + b_5 X_5 + e$$

$$Y = 7,326 + 0,118X_1 + 0.442 X_2 + 0.703X_3 - 0.217X_4 - 0.385X_5$$

Information:

Y: decision Purchase

X₁ : Product Quality

X₂ : Quality Service X₃ : Price

X₄ : Promotion

X₅ : Brand Image

From the equation above it can be interpreted that:

The constant has a positive value of 7.326, meaning that if the variables of product quality, service quality, price, promotion, and brand image are assumed to be 0, then the purchasing decision is positive. The product quality coefficient is positive, meaning that if product quality is improved, assuming other variables remain constant, it will increase the purchasing decision. The service quality coefficient is positive, meaning that if service quality is improved, assuming other variables remain constant, the purchasing decision will increase. The price variable coefficient is positive, meaning that if the price increases, the purchasing decision will increase. In theory, if the price increases, the purchase will decrease, meaning there is a decrease in the purchasing decision. In pharmacies, this occurs when the price increases, the purchasing decision will increase. This can occur because most respondents are women, although generally sensitive to price, but for medicinal products, from interviews with some respondents stated that if the price is higher, the medicine will be better quality and efficacious. The Promotion coefficient is negative, meaning that if the promotion is increased, the purchasing decision will decrease. Likewise, for brand image, the coefficient is negative, meaning that the better the brand image, the lower the purchasing decision.

Coefficient of Determination

| Model Summary ^b | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
| 1 | .805 ^a | .649 | .616 | 1.13755 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Brand Image, Quality_of_Service, Promotion, Price, Product Quality

b. Dependent Variable: Purchasing Decision

Table 7. Results Test Coefficient Determination

Source: Data Processed

The results of the determination coefficient test show that *The adjusted R Square* obtained was 0.616. Matter This means 61.6% variation variables decision purchase can explained by quality product, service quality, price, promotion and brand image, while the remaining 0.384 or 38.4% is explained by other variables not proposed in this study.

Test Hypothesis

| Coefficients ^a | | | |
|---------------------------|--------------------|--------|------|
| Model | | t | Sig. |
| 1 | (Constant) | 2,754 | .008 |
| | Product Quality | .859 | .394 |
| | Quality of Service | 3,501 | .001 |
| | Price | 5,783 | .000 |
| | Promotion | -2,652 | .010 |
| | Brand Image | -3,674 | .001 |

Table 8. Results Test t

Source: Data Processed

From the Partial Test Results (T-Test), the Results Obtained Were The Influence of Product Quality on Purchasing Decisions

Based on the results of the data analysis, the calculated t value $< t$ table is $0.859 < 2.005$ and the sig value is $0.394 > 0.05$, it is concluded that product quality partially does not influence purchasing decisions. Most consumers assume that the drugs purchased are in accordance with the benefits they will obtain, for example, hypertension drugs are meant to reduce hypertension, simvastatin is to lower cholesterol, so they assume the quality is appropriate to the benefits and uses. In addition, the drugs sold by apotik Anisa are still not expired. The results of this study differ from research by Mauliyani et al. (2021) and Tisnawati et al. (2022) which stated that product quality influences purchasing decisions.

The influence of service quality on purchasing decisions

Based on the results of the data analysis, the calculated t value $> t$ table, namely $3.501 > 2.005$ and a sig value of $0.001 < 0.05$, it is concluded that service quality partially influences purchasing decisions. The better the service provided, the better the purchasing decision. The services provided by Anisa Pharmacy, for example, the pharmacy provides information about the drugs purchased by consumers, the pharmacy provides fast service, the pharmacy responds quickly to consumer complaints. Consumers feel satisfied and happy to buy at apotik Anisa.

This conclusion is in accordance with research from Puspitadewi and Rachman (2020), Suyanto et al. (2021), Ibrahim and Ignatius (2023), Khaerudin et al. (2023), Rochmah and Lestari (2024).

The influence of price on purchasing decisions

Based on the results of the data analysis, the calculated t value $> t$ table, namely $5.783 > 2.005$ and a sig value of $0.000 < 0.05$, it is concluded that price partially influences purchasing decisions. Price is usually a consideration for consumers before making a purchase. From the existing respondents, it shows that most are women, married, and in the age range of 17-30 years. In this condition, price is a consideration before deciding to buy goods or services. Consumers who buy medicine at apotik Anisa consider that the price is in accordance with the benefits that can be obtained, the price is affordable. This conclusion is in line with research by Misnawati and Sumarni (2020) Khaerudin et al. (2023), which states that price influences purchasing decisions.

The influence of promotions on purchasing decisions

Based on the results of the data analysis, the calculated t value $> t$ table, namely $2.652 > 2.005$ and a sig value of $0.010 < 0.05$, it is concluded that promotions partially influence purchasing decisions. Promotions carried out by apotik Anisa, such as banners or pamphlets, certain discounts, and clear information, are considerations for consumers to purchase at apotik Anisa. The results of this study are consistent with research by Suyanto et al. (2021) and Trisnawati et al. (2022), which stated that promotions influence purchasing decisions.

The influence of brand image on purchasing decisions

Based on the results of data analysis, the calculated t value $> t$ table, namely $3.674 > 2.005$ and a sig value of $0.001 < 0.05$, it is concluded that brand image partially influences purchasing decisions. Consumers buy at Anisa pharmacies because the service is good, they have a positive image in the eyes of consumers, consumers feel appreciated, so consumers choose to buy at apotik Anisa. This study is in line with research from Mauliyani (2021), Trisnawati et al (2022), Ibrahim and Ignatius (2023) which states that brand image influences purchasing decisions.

The influence of product quality, service quality, price, promotion and brand image simultaneously on purchasing decisions

Based on the results of data analysis, the calculated F value $> F$ table is $19.496 > 2.386$ and the sig value is $0.000 < 0.05$, so it is concluded that product quality, service quality, price, promotion and brand image simultaneously influence purchasing decisions. Together, the quality of the drug products sold, the quality of the services provided, the prices set, the promotions carried out and the brand image owned by apotik Anisa are able to influence purchasing decisions.

4. Conclusion

Based on analysis data And discussion Which has described, so can withdrawn conclusion: 1) Product quality partially does not have a significant influence on purchasing decisions, 2) Service quality partially has a significant influence on purchasing decisions, 3) Price partially has a significant influence on purchasing decisions, 4) Promotion partially has a significant influence on purchasing decisions, 5) Brand image has a partial and significant influence on purchasing decisions, 6) Product quality, service quality, price, promotion and brand image simultaneously have a significant influence on purchasing decisions.

References

- Asosiasi Apotek Indonesia. (2021). *Laporan Tahunan AAI 2021*.
- Badan Pusat Statistik. (2020). *Statistik Kesehatan Indonesia 2020*.
- Badan Pusat Statistik. (2023). *Jumlah yang Memiliki Sarana Apotek Provinsi Jawa Timur*.
- Ibrahim, S., & Ignatius, J. (2023). Pengaruh Kualitas Pelayanan dan Citra Merek Terhadap Keputusan Pembelian pada Apotek K-24 Surabaya. *Bisnis-Net Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Bisnis*, 6(2), 510–518. <https://doi.org/10.46576/bn.v6i2.3666>
- Keller, K. L. (2013). *Strategic Brand Management: Building, Measuring, and Managing Brand Equity* (4th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Khaerudin, H., Waruwu, H., & Ibrahim, M. H. (2023). Pengaruh Kualitas Pelayanan dan Harga terhadap Kepuasan Pelanggan pada Apotek K24 Bintaro. *Jurnal Manajemen & Pendidikan*, 1(2), 142–152. <https://doi.org/10.58174/jmp.volume:1.no:2.2023.14.hal:142-152>
- Kotler, P., & Armstrong, G. (2016). *Principles Of Marketing* (15th, ilustr ed.). Person Education.
- Kotler, P., & Keller, K. L. (2016). *Marketing Management* (15th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Mauliyani, E., Zahra, S., & Tabrani, M. B. (2021). Pengaruh Citra Merek Dan Kualitas Produk Terhadap Keputusan Pembelian Bedak Marcks Di Apotek Kimia Farma Ayip Usman Kota Serang. *Jurnal Bina Bangsa Ekonomika*, 14(1), 166–171. <https://doi.org/10.46306/jbbe.v14i1.68>
- Misnawati, & Sumarni, I. (2020). Pengaruh Harga Terhadap Keputusan Pembelian Obat-obatan di Apotek Zafira Ruhama. *Japb*, 3(2), 1322–1331.
- Munisih, S., & Soliha, E. (2019). Pengaruh Kualitas Produk Terhadap Nilai Pelanggan dan Kepuasan Pelanggan dan Dampaknya Pada Loyalitas Pelanggan Apotek Dela Semarang. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional & Call for Paper. Fakultas Ekonomika Dan Bisnis Universitas STIKUBANK Semarang*, 2(1), 1–16.
- Nggagho, N., Kurniawan, A. P., & Tonce, Y. (2024). Pengaruh Kualitas Pelayanan dan Kelengkapan Produk terhadap Keputusan Pembelian di Apotek Winola Medika Maumere. *Jurnal Kewirausahaan Dan Manajemen Bisnis*, 2(3), 168–178.
- Puspitadewi, I. C., & Rachman, M. M. (2020). Pengaruh Kualitas Layanan, Lokasi dan Kelengkapan Produk Terhadap Keputusan Pembelian Apotek Kencana Mas Sidoarjo. *Journal of Sustainability Bussiness Research (JSBR)*, 1(1), 384–390. <https://doi.org/10.36456/jsbr.v1i1.3032>
- Rochmah, M. A., & Lestari, U. P. (2024). Pengaruh Keragaman Produk, Kualitas Pelayanan dan Pengalaman Pengguna Terhadap Keputusan Pembelian: Studi pada Apotek K-24 Senopati, Sedati. *Center of Economic Students Journal*, 7(3), 149–159.
- Suyanto, M. A., Akmar, M., & Karundeng, D. R. (2021). Pengaruh Bauran Promosi, Harga, Display Produk dan Kualitas Layanan terhadap Keputusan Pembelian pada Apotek Anugerah Farma di Kota Gorontalo. *Jurnal Manajemen Bisnis Syariah*, 3(1), 75–91. <https://doi.org/10.24090/mabsya.v3i1.4746>
- Trisnawati, ida ayu mely, Suardhika, I. N., & Hendrawan, I. G. Y. (2022). Pengaruh Citra Merek, Kualitas Produk dan Promosi Terhadap Keputusan Pembelian Bedak Marcks dan Venus di Apotek Kimia Farma Denpasar. *Jurnal Emas*, 3(3), 136–147. www.kimiafarma.co.id.
- Yazid, I., & Hidayat, W. (2020). *Pengaruh Kualitas Pelayanan dan Harga terhadap Keputusan Pembelian (Apotek K-24 Jl. Gajah Mada Yogyakarta)*. 40.