Understanding the mediating role of perceived risk in the relationship between price, product quality, and copra repurchase intention in North Maluku province
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Abstract
This study aims to examine the relationship between perceived risk, price, and product quality as it pertains to the intention to repurchase copra in North Maluku Province. Coconut meat, commonly known as copra, is the raw material for making crude coconut oil. Apart from being a superior commodity and contributing greatly to the Gross Regional Domestic Product (GRDP) of North Maluku Province from the agricultural sector, this product has experienced a decline in purchases since 2022 until now. We used a quantitative method based on SEM analysis, with a sample size of 120 respondents. The primary data collection technique used was a questionnaire. While this study did find a significant relationship between product quality and perceived risk and between perceived risk and repurchase intention, it did not find a significant relationship between price and repurchase intention or product quality and repurchase intention directly. Concurrently, there is full mediation in the indirect influence of product quality on repurchase intention; that is, perceived risk is a key component of the relationship between product quality and repurchase intention. If buyers feel that there is a low risk associated with product quality, they will be more likely to consider repeat purchases. Perceived risk can include financial, operational, and reputational risks associated with poor-quality products.

1. Introduction
The agricultural sector, as a potential sector and the backbone of the North Maluku economy, has an important role in the GRDP structure of North Maluku Province (DJPb Provinsi Maluku Utara, 2022). This is because copra, as a superior agricultural commodity, is routinely exported from North Maluku to several countries until 2022 (Bank Indonesia, 2022). Copra, or dried coconut fruit meat, is the raw material for making crude coconut oil (CCO) and is one of the mainstay commodities in Indonesia. Since a long time ago, CCO from Indonesia has been known as the best in the world (Sarimas Permai, 2020).
In 2021, Indonesia produced 17.13 million tons of copra, as shown in Figure 1. Indonesia has the world's greatest copra production, according to the World Atlas study. Despite being a leading commodity in Indonesia and considered a commodity that plays an important role as the backbone of the economy of North Maluku Province, on the other hand, copra purchases have actually decreased since 2022 (Disdagperin, 2023). Additional data suggests that the price of copra has dropped significantly, from 6,600 IDR/kg to 5,700 IDR/kg, indicating a dramatic decrease. The decline in the price of copra is thought to have had an impact on farmers' decisions to sell copra to intermediary traders. In addition, one of the factors influencing the sustainability of the copra industry in North Maluku Province is the level of customer retention or repurchase intention of copra producers. In an increasingly competitive business environment, understanding the factors that influence customers' intentions to repurchase copra products is crucial for producers and industry stakeholders. These elements include the degree of copra quality and the cost of copra, both of which are believed to have a direct bearing on farmers' intentions to repurchase their own copra. In other words, it is believed that a number of factors, such as price factors, product quality (copra) and farmers' decisions to sell copra as a processed agricultural commodity, are to blame for the phenomenon in this case, namely the decline in the purchase or purchase intention of copra.

Evidence from prior studies showing that pricing influences purchase intention provides credence to this theory (Madrid Devéscovi & Sempertiga Hernández, 2019; Weerasiri & Cooray, 2016), and agricultural product buying intention is influenced by product quality (Sun, Huang, Fang, & Yan, 2022; Thuy, Phuong Dio, Hoan, Ninh, & Thuy Nga, 2021). Although some studies show different results, namely that price and product have no significant effect on purchase intention (Amanda, Kusniawati, & Surjaatmadja, 2021; Mirabi, Akbariyeh, & Tahmasebijfard, 2015). This shows that there is a gap between several previous studies that need to be re-examined by adding perceived risk as a mediator, because perceived risk is also a factor that can influence repurchase intention. Perceived risk can appear in various forms, such as financial risk, product quality risk, or social risk. How consumers assess and manage these risks can influence whether or not they decide to repurchase copra products.

In this context, this study aims to examine the relationship between copra consumers' repurchase intention and product quality as it relates to price in North Maluku Province. Perceived risk's mediating function in this connection is also an area of interest for the research. The anticipated outcomes of this research are poised to offer valuable insights to producers, traders, and other stakeholders in the copra industry. This, in turn, will empower them to implement more suitable measures aimed at enhancing customer retention and sustaining the copra business in the region. To achieve the aforementioned research objectives, the study addresses several research questions:

1. **RQ1:** Does price significantly influence repurchase intention?
2. **RQ2:** Does product quality significantly impact the perceived risk?
3. **RQ3:** Does perceived risk mediate the relationship between product quality and repurchase intention?
4. **RQ4:** Does perceived risk significantly influence repurchase intention?
5. **RQ5:** Does product quality have a significant impact on repurchase intention?

---

1 IDR stands for Indonesian Rupiah. It is the official currency of Indonesia. The code IDR is used in international transactions and on foreign exchange markets to identify the Indonesian Rupiah.
2. Literature Review and Research Framework

2.1. Price Relationship with Repurchase Intention

An important consideration for consumers is the correlation between price and the likelihood that they will make a repeat purchase. Pricing has a significant impact on how much customers think a product or service is worth. In this regard, Bruce, Daly, and Towers (2004) draw attention to the significance of cost in a cutthroat market where consumers sometimes buy on impulse and items frequently have a limited lifespan. From a consumer perspective, they tend to be more attracted to products with lower prices (Fleischmann, Hall, & Pyke, 2004; Yee, Yeung, & Tavares, 2008), so they are immediately drawn to a range of affordable options, meaning that when the price is perceived as appropriate or lower than the consumer's perceived value, purchase intentions are likely to increase. On the flip side, consumers may lose interest or even abandon a purchase altogether if they believe the price is excessively high in relation to the value they will receive.

In order to create successful marketing campaigns, businesses must have a thorough grasp of how price affects consumers' intentions to buy. By matching product prices to consumers' perceived value and quality, companies can increase purchase intentions, create consumer loyalty, and increase their market share. In addition, companies can also optimize profitability by determining prices that match the value that products provide to consumers. Several studies have found that product price significantly affects purchase intention (Arslan & Zaman, 2015; Dwivedi, Nayem, & Murshed, 2018; Farid et al., 2023; Kluge & Fassnacht, 2015; Shah et al., 2012; Wenyi, 2020). Therefore, product price is a major concern for consumers when they decide to make a purchase. Consumers examine the product's price in relation to the value it will provide before making a purchasing decision (Kim & Park, 2013). Here, customers think about the price while making a decision to buy because it represents the product's value and practicality. Singh (2019) research also proves the relationship between product prices and cognitive and affective experiences, which means that one propensity to buy may be affected by this. This study proposes the following hypothesis based on previous research that has described how pricing influences consumers' intentions to buy:

\[ H_1: \text{Price has a significant effect on repurchase intention.} \]

2.2. The Correlation between Perceived Risk and Product Quality

In agricultural product marketing, the relationship between perceived risk and product quality can be intricate and multifaceted. Several studies have explored this relationship in the context of specific agricultural products, such as strawberries (Ağır & Adanacoglu, 2014; Saner, 2014), fresh agricultural products (Yang et al., 2021), and organic foods (Yue, Liu, & Wei, 2017). These studies have identified a range of factors that can influence farmers' and consumers' perceptions of risk and quality, including production capacity, soil fertility, use of new agricultural technologies, alternative marketing methods, and online product presentation. In general, higher quality perceptions can lead to lower risk perceptions and higher purchase intentions, while lower quality perceptions can have the opposite effect.

Meanwhile, Bauer (1960) argues that risk is the implicit uncertainty of outcomes that consumers assume when making purchase decisions; consumer behavior generates perceived risk; and consumers are unable to define the anticipated consequences. In this regard, Gao (2003) stated that the simplest example is the mobile phone market. By systematically examining the influence of perceived risk and risk reduction measures on consumer purchase intention, one can derive insights from this example. According to Gao (2003), there exists a negative correlation between perceived risk and purchase intention. Specifically, as perceived risk increases, purchase intention decreases. Additionally, the research results of Yang et al. (2021) show that perceived risk mediates the relationship between consumer purchase intention and agricultural product quality. Based on the findings of prior investigations, the subsequent hypotheses are developed:

\[ H_2: \text{Product quality has a significant effect on perceived risk.} \]
\[ H_3: \text{Perceived risk mediates the relationship between product quality and repurchase intention.} \]
\[ H_4: \text{Perceived risk have a significant effect on repurchase intention.} \]

2.3. The Relationship between Product Quality and Repurchase Intention

In the business world, the correlation between product quality and purchase intent is an indispensable factor that must not be disregarded. Certain products tend to drive consumer purchase intentions thanks to their appealing characteristics, such as healthiness and freshness, and provide an anticipated pleasurable experience that can trigger the urge to make a purchase. Previous research has shown a relationship between product attributes and propensity to purchase, especially when they provide significant value to consumers (Hausmann & Poellmann, 2016; Shah et al., 2012; Yeung & Yee, 2010). In this instance, product quality is a significant determinant in shaping the purchase intentions of consumers. Consumers are more likely to experience satisfaction during the usage of a product that possesses superior quality. This favorable experience significantly contributes to the augmentation of consumer confidence. Better product quality additionally influences consumers' perception of value in a positive way.

The perception of superior quality in products will lead to their being regarded as valuable investments, thereby augmenting the probability of consumer engagement in the form of a purchase. Customer loyalty is often increased as a result of their satisfaction with the performance and benefits offered by high-quality
products. Customers who are content and devoted are inclined to engage in additional purchases and may even advocate for the product to others. As such, this increased repeat purchase intention from loyal customers will contribute significantly to the long-term success of a business. Conversely, low product quality or not meeting consumer expectations can lead to a decrease in purchase intentions. Therefore, companies must always be committed to improving the quality of their products in order to maintain and increase consumer purchase intentions and build strong long-term relationships with customers. This demonstrates the proximity and interdependence of the correlation between consumer purchase intentions and product performance. According to the findings of a study by Shah et al. (2012) purchase intention is a process of decision-making that demonstrates the factors influencing consumers' selection of different products for purchase. This purchase intention signifies the probability that consumers will repurchase goods or services in the future (Arslan & Zaman, 2015). In addition, the more businesses that produce high-quality products, the more likely consumers are to buy them (Arslan & Zaman, 2015; Chakraborty, 2019). Based on the findings of prior investigations, the subsequent hypotheses are developed:

\[ H_5: \text{Product quality has a significant effect on repurchase intention.} \]

2.4. Research Framework

Following a comprehensive review of the relevant literature and the development of hypotheses, a conceptual framework is constructed. This conceptual framework shows how the theories used were put together to build a study around the things that were found to be problems in this research problem: price, product quality, perceived risk, and intention to buy again. Thus, this conceptual structure aids in specifying the relationships among these concepts to dissect and comprehend the complexity of this research issue.

A conceptual framework illustrating the interrelationships among the research variables is presented in Figure 2. The framework designates price and product quality as exogenous factors influencing repurchase intention and perceived risk as endogenous and mediating variables, respectively. This model diverges significantly from previous research models, which incorporated awareness and brand trust as antecedents of purchase intention, alongside product quality and price. Awareness and brand trust were left out of this study because it was thought that they would not be good predictors of repurchase intention for copra products in the agricultural sector when use in a business-to-business (B2B) setting. Specifically, purchasing decisions in the B2B agricultural sector tend to prioritize technical and functional aspects of the product over brand or emotional considerations.

3. Methods

The research employs a quantitative method with the purpose of elucidating the impact of one variable on changes in other variables (Cooper & Schindler, 2014; Sangadji, 2023). The primary data collection method involves utilizing a research questionnaire comprising closed-ended questions, allowing respondents to promptly select the most fitting answer. The incorporation of closed questions serves to expedite respondents' responses and facilitates researchers in analysis of all collected data. The distribution of questionnaires was executed by directly providing them to research participants.

Traders who have bought copra were chosen because they fit the research goals, which were to find a theory and test it empirically about the relationship between price, product quality, and intention to buy again, with perceived risk acting as a mediating factor. According to the guidelines provided by Ghozali (2011), a sample size of 100 samples or more is recommended by Hair, Anderson, Babin, and Black (2010) for Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) using the Maximum Likelihood (ML) estimate approach. By and large, it is recommended that the sample size exceed the number of manifest variables by a factor of five to ten. By applying the rule of thumb calculation and taking into account ten times the twelve manifest factors, the study was able to obtain a sample size of 120 respondents.

This research makes use of clever PLS-based Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) as its data analysis approach. The adoption of SEM analysis is justified by several reasons, including: (1) SEM's capability to
estimate relationships among variables with multiple connections, as manifested in a structural model linking
exogenous and endogenous latent constructs; (2) SEM’s proficiency in depicting the relationship patterns
between latent constructs and manifest variables (indicators); and (3) SEM’s effectiveness in measuring the
direct, indirect, and total effects of latent constructs.

According to Kuncoro and Ridwan (2008) Structural Equation Modeling aims to determine the direct or
indirect impacts of a set of exogenous variables on an endogenous dependent variable.

4. Results and Discussion

The Smart PLS-based Structural Equation Modeling method involves two stages for assessing the Fit
Model of a research model, as outlined by Ghozali (2006). The respective stages are as follows:

4.1. Assessing the Outer Model or Measurement Model

Validity and reliability tests are two important parts of SEM–PLS's evaluation of the measurement model
(outer model).

Two main considerations—convergent validity and discriminant validity—are focused on throughout the
validity test stage. When the indicator loading value is greater than 0.70, convergent validity is considered
to be satisfied.

Two things must be taken into account instead to make sure discriminant validity: first, the square root of
the average variance extracted (AVE) must be higher than the correlation between constructs; and second,
indicators must have a higher loading onto the measured construct than onto other constructs. At the same
time, when it comes time for the reliability test, a measurement is considered reliable if both the Cronbach
alpha and the composite reliability values are higher than 0.70.

A total of 120 copra purchasers provided the data used in this study, and the accompanying table shows
the outcomes of applying Smart-PLS to get the outer loading value for each variable indicator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Outer loading.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PQ1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PQ2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PQ3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the information presented in Table 1, it can be inferred that every indicator contributing to each
variable satisfies the criteria for convergent validity. This is evident as the loading factor values surpass the
specified threshold of > 0.70.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. Average variances extracted.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repurchase intention</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the average variance extracted from the test results obtained in Table 2. Since the square root of
the average variance extracted (AVE) is > 0.50, it is known that all indicators that make up each variable have
met the discriminant validity requirements.
The study's indicators have all fulfilled discriminant validity, as shown in Table 3. The cross-loading value indicates that the correlation value between a construct and its indicator is higher than the correlation value with other constructs.

Looking at the composite reliability value and Cronbach’s alpha of each construct or variable is another way to do the reliability test:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
<th>Composite reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived risk</td>
<td>0.758</td>
<td>0.861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>0.907</td>
<td>0.942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product quality</td>
<td>0.762</td>
<td>0.864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repurchase intention</td>
<td>0.905</td>
<td>0.940</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With a composite reliability value > 0.70 and a Cronbach’s alpha value > 0.70, all variables are deemed reliable, as shown in data Table 4.

4.2. Structural Model (Inner Model)

The purpose of doing an internal model evaluation is to test hypotheses and examine the effect of the link between latent variables. The R-squared value reveals the interdependence of the latent variables. A higher R-squared value indicates that the structural route parameter coefficients are statistically significant and that exogenous latent factors have a larger impact on endogenous latent variables.

The structural model Figure 3 illustrates the path coefficient value between the price variable and repurchase intention at 0.111. A path coefficient of 0.804 is reached between perceived risk and product quality at the same time. Also, the perceived risk-product quality relationship has a path coefficient of 0.427, and the repurchase intention-product quality relationship has a path coefficient of 0.142. These numbers reflect the level of interrelationship between these variables. Paying close intention to the R-Square value allows for further evaluation of the outcomes of this internal model.
Based on Table 5, it is known that the R square value obtained is 0.647 for the perceived risk construct and 0.378 for the repurchase intention construct. These results indicate that the product quality variable can explain about 64.7% of the perceived risk variance, while the price, product quality, and perceived risk variables can only explain about 37.7% of the repurchase intention variance as a result of factors not included in this investigation.

4.3. Hypothesis Test

Paying close attention to t-statistics, p-values, and inter-construct significance values might help us decide whether to accept or reject hypotheses. Here, actual data is used instead of statistical assumptions to calculate measurement estimates and standard errors. If the p-values are less than 0.05, the hypothesis is accepted in the context of this study's bootstrapping procedure.

| Hypothesis testing | Original sample (O) | T statistics \(|O/STDEV|\) | P values |
|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------|---------|
| Perceived risk -> Repurchase intention | 0.427 | 2.832 | 0.005 |
| Price -> Repurchase intention | 0.111 | 0.892 | 0.373 |
| Product quality -> Perceived risk | 0.804 | 21.217 | 0.000 |
| Product quality -> Repurchase intention | 0.142 | 0.780 | 0.436 |

This product quality construct significantly affects the perceived risk construct, according to the Path Coefficient t test. The same holds true for the impact of perceived risk on the likelihood of a repeat purchase. The statistically significant p-values (0.000 and 0.005, respectively, which are less than 0.05) corroborate this discovery. This means that both the second and fourth hypotheses can be accepted: that product quality \((X2)\) and perceived risk \((Z)\) are influenced by one another, and that perceived risk influences the intention to repurchase.

The p-values for the first and fifth hypotheses are 0.373 and 0.436, respectively, which are higher than the significance level of 0.05; hence, they must be rejected. These findings are considered rational because, in a business-to-business \((B2B)\) context, purchasing decisions are often influenced by factors that are more complex than direct consumer purchasing decisions. One factor that can influence B2B purchasing decisions is the long-term relationship between supplier and buyer. In the case of agricultural products, sustainability and consistency of supply can be a more crucial factors than price or quality of the product itself. If the supplier has built a strong relationship with the buyer, trust and dependability may become more dominant factors in influencing repurchase intentions.

Also, in a B2B environment, purchasing decisions often involve a complex negotiation process involving multiple stakeholders. In these cases, factors such as customer service, flexibility in offerings, and the supplier's ability to customize products or services to the buyer’s business needs can also be more influential than price or product quality. Likewise, agricultural products are often considered commodities or common goods. In this context, the differences between products from one supplier to another may not be as pronounced, and this can make attention to price and quality less significant. Factors such as continuity of supply, reliability, and timeliness in delivery may become more important in maintaining long-term business relationships.

Thus, in a B2B context, other elements such as solid business relationships, flexibility, and supplier reliability may be more dominant in influencing repurchase intentions than price or product quality considerations in isolation.

In addition, the mediation effect is at the heart of the third hypothesis of this study. One useful method for evaluating the strength of the association between the mediator variable and other variables is the indirect impact calculation, which can be done with SmartPLS 3.

When one variable modifies the relationship with another, we say that there is mediation. When one changes the independent variable, it causes the mediator variable to alter as well, which in turn affects the dependent variable.

This study employs a straightforward mediation model with a single mediator variable. To dissect this mediation model, we adopt the framework developed by Zhao, Lynch Jr, and Chen (2010) as follows:

\[
\text{Repurchase Intention} = \beta_1 \times \text{Price} + \beta_2 \times \text{Product Quality} + \beta_3 \times \text{Perceived Risk} + \epsilon
\]
The picture, Figure 4, shows an example of a simple mediator model that Zhao et al. (2010) suggested could be used to look at the mediating effects in a single measurement. In this context, Zhao et al. (2010) put forth a framework that identifies five distinct categories based on the presence and significance of direct and indirect effects, namely: first, Full Mediation, where the independent variable (X) only influences the dependent variable (Y) indirectly through the mediator (Z), with a non-significant or zero direct effect. Second, Partial Mediation, wherein the independent variable (X) has both a direct and indirect effect on the dependent variable (Y), and both effects are statistically significant. Third, No Mediation, indicating that the independent variable (X) has a direct impact on the dependent variable (Y), while the mediator (Z) plays no significant role, with a non-significant or zero indirect effect. Fourth, Suppression, where the independent variable (X) exerts a direct influence on the dependent variable (Y) in the opposite direction to the indirect effect. However, when the mediator (Z) is introduced into the model, the direct effect becomes non-significant, thereby masking the true relationship between the independent variable (X) and the dependent variable (Y). Fifth, Amplification, wherein the indirect effect through the mediator (Z) strengthens the direct impact of the independent variable (X) on the dependent variable (Y). Both direct and indirect effects are statistically significant, and their combined influence surpasses the individual effects.

Table 7. Indirect effects on repurchase intention.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis testing</th>
<th>Original sample</th>
<th>Sample mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>T statistics</th>
<th>P values</th>
<th>Status of the mediation effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Product quality -&gt; Perceived risk</td>
<td>0.344</td>
<td>0.354</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>2.626</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>Full mediation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived risk -&gt; Repurchase intention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the specific indirect effects analysis using Smart PLS, Table 7 shows a mean value of 0.344, which shows that perceived risk acts as a mediator between product quality and the intention to buy again. The standard deviation (STDEV) of 0.131 denotes a relatively low variability in respondents' responses to this particular influence. The T-statistic of 2.626 underscores the statistical significance of the effect, supported by P-values of 0.009, which are below the conventional significance level. Consequently, within the scope of this study, it can be inferred that product quality significantly shapes repurchase intention through the intermediary role of perceived risk. In addition, when viewed from the results shown in Table 6 and referring to the explanation of Zhao et al. (2010) the mediation effect resulting from this study is full mediation, that is, there’s a large relationship between product quality and perceived risk and between perceived risk and repurchase intention, but no such relationship between product quality and repurchase intention. The results of this study are in line with previous findings that have been revealed by several previous studies such as Ağır and Adanacığlı (2014); Saner (2014); Yang et al. (2021) and Yue et al. (2017), which demonstrate a positive and statistically significant association between perceived risk and product quality. Also consistent with Bauer (1960) descriptions is the correlation between perceived risk and repurchase intent. According to him, risk in the context of consumer purchasing decisions is the uncertainty of the implied outcome. This risk arises from consumer behavior, although consumers themselves may find it difficult to define the expected consequences. Thus, this study confirms that the presence of quality and risk in the marketing of agricultural products contributes to the understanding of consumer intention to repurchase.
5. Conclusions

While the findings of this study indicate that product quality does not exert a direct influence on repurchase intentions within the business-to-business (B2B) context, an indirect effect emerges when perceived risk is introduced as a mediator between these two variables. This is due to several reasons, namely: first, in B2B transactions, sustainability and product quality are very important to meet the buyer's business needs consistently. High-quality agricultural products can provide assurance to buyers regarding the consistency of supply, hygiene, and quality standards required in their production processes. This reliability can reduce the risk of uncertainty in the buyer's business operations, which in turn can increase repurchase intention. Second, perceived risk plays an important role in linking product quality with repurchase intention. If buyers feel that there is low risk associated with product quality, they will be more likely to consider repurchasing. Perceived risk can include financial, operational, and reputational risks associated with poor-quality products. High quality can help reduce the level of uncertainty and worry associated with these risks, thereby encouraging repeat purchase decisions. Third, business trust between suppliers and buyers in a B2B environment can play a key role. Consistent product quality can build trust between both parties. Perceived risk may be reduced due to the trust that has been established, which in turn increases the intention to repurchase. Good product quality can be a decisive factor in building and maintaining long-term business relationships. Thus, agricultural product quality in a B2B context can have a significant impact on repurchase intention, especially when perceived risk serves as a mediator that reduces risk and increases buyer trust in the supplier. These factors are interrelated and can create a favorable environment for sustaining long-term business relationships.

6. Limitations and Recommendations for Future Research

It is possible that the results cannot be applied to other agricultural industries due to the study's narrow emphasis on the copra industry in a B2B setting. In addition, other variables that may affect repurchase intention, such as environmental factors or social factors, have not been explored in depth. Since this study found that product quality and price did not significantly affect repurchase intention, future research can broaden its scope to include additional external variables that may impact the relationship between these three factors and perceived risk. Therefore, suggestions for future research include looking into how industry dynamics and contextual factors may affect the relationship between these variables. More research should also be done to understand the role of psychological and social factors in the B2B decision-making process for agricultural products. In addition, research could consider the influence of technology and innovation in managing risk and building trust in B2B agricultural supply chains.
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