THE JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT, DIGITAL BUSINESS, AND ENTREPENEURSHIP

The Journal of Management, Digital Business, and Entrepreneurship
Homepage: https://jurnal.glowscien.com/index.php/JMDBE
Vol. 1, Issue. 3, September (2023), 137-148
DOI Issue: https://doi.org/10.58857/JMDBE.2023.v01.i03
E-ISSN 3031-9064

Analysis of the Influence of Marketing Mix Strategy on Student Purchasing Decisions in the Canteen of the Faculty of Economics and Business, Udayana University

Adrian Filemen Simanjuntak[1], Ni Kadek Tresnawati[2]
[1,2)]Faculty of Economics and Business, Udayana University, Denpasar-Bali
Email : adrianfilemen@gmail.com[1)]

DOI Article: https://doi.org/10.58857/JMDBE.2023.v01.i03.p02

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:
Submitted: 11 Janyary 2023
Reviewed: 25 April 2023
Revision: 27 May 2023
Accepted: 16 June 2023
Publish: 17 August 2023

Keywords: marketing mix, purchasing decisions, students, campus canteen, consumer behavior, marketing strategy.

Corresponding Author:
Adrian Filemen Simanjuntak
email:
adrianfilemen@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The canteen in the Faculty of Economics and Business, Udayana University plays an important role in supporting the comfort and productivity of the academic community. This study aims to analyze the influence of the marketing mix (product, price, promotion, and location) on students' purchasing decisions in the campus canteen. A causal quantitative approach was used in this study, with primary data collected through an online questionnaire from 35 FEB students, Udayana University. The results of this study are expected to provide strategic input for canteen managers in understanding consumer preferences, improving service quality, and designing targeted marketing strategies.

Data analysis was conducted using regression techniques and classical assumption testing, including normality, multicollinearity, autocorrelation, and heteroscedasticity tests, to ensure the validity of the results. This study provides theoretical contributions to the study of consumer behavior in higher education environments and practically offers recommendations for campuses in managing canteen facilities that are adaptive and based on student needs. These findings can also be a reference for developing campus service policies that focus on student satisfaction.

INTRODUCTION

In a dynamic campus environment such as the Faculty of Economics and Business (FEB) of Udayana University, the canteen plays a strategic role as a provider of daily consumption needs for students and staff. The existence of the canteen is not only as a place to eat, but also as part of the campus ecosystem that affects the comfort, productivity, and satisfaction of the academic community (Gargoum, 2019). Along with the increasing number and variety of food and beverage products offered, students as consumers have the freedom to determine choices that suit their

preferences, lifestyles, and expectations. This situation makes purchasing decisions an important aspect that needs to be analyzed more deeply, especially for canteen managers who want to develop effective, adaptive, and consumer-oriented marketing strategies (Sultan & Wong, 2012).

In the context of consumer behavior, purchasing decisions are influenced by various internal and external factors. One of the most widely used theoretical frameworks in understanding this dynamic is the concept of the marketing mix, which includes four main elements: product, price, promotion, and place (M. Lee et al., 2008). The product is the main element offered to the market. According to Kotler and Armstrong (2010), a product is anything that can be offered to meet the needs and desires of consumers, including the quality, features, design, and benefits attached to it. Understanding the levels of the product, as explained by Kotler and Keller (2006), from core benefits to potential products, is the basis for creating valuable and competitive offerings. In addition to the product, price is also an important element in decision making. As the only component in the marketing mix that generates revenue, price is flexible and has a direct influence on consumer perceptions of the value of a product. The right pricing can attract consumers while supporting the sustainability of canteen operations (Eldegwy et al., 2022).

Promotion, on the other hand, serves as a communication tool to convey the benefits of the product to consumers. The right promotional strategy, either through traditional or digital media, can increase students' awareness and purchasing interest in the products offered (Sultan & Wong, 2012). The location factor is also no less important, especially in the context of the campus canteen. A strategic, easily accessible, and comfortable location will be an added value in attracting consumers. In the tight competition between canteens in the FEB Udayana University environment, these factors interact with each other and influence student purchasing behavior.

The purchasing decision-making process in the FEB Udayana University canteen is complex because it involves multidimensional considerations, including taste, price, product appearance, promotions carried out, and the physical location of the canteen. In these conditions, canteens that are able to adjust their offerings to student preferences and compete strategically in terms of product, price, promotion, and location will have a greater chance of maintaining and expanding their customer base.

Based on the background, this study aims to investigate the influence of variables in the marketing mix on student purchasing decisions in the FEB Udayana University canteen. This study is important to provide a deeper understanding of consumer preferences and behavior in higher education environments. The results obtained are expected to provide real contributions to canteen managers in designing more targeted marketing strategies, improving service quality, and creating a satisfying consumption experience. In addition, the findings of this study are also expected to be a reference for the campus in formulating canteen facility management policies that are more effective and oriented to student needs.

H1: Products influence students' purchasing decisions in the FEB Udayana University canteen.

In marketing theory, products are the core elements of the marketing mix that reflect the functional and symbolic values offered to consumers (Rawal et al., 2024). Products offered by the canteen, such as food and beverages, are the main factors that consumers assess in making purchasing decisions. The quality of ingredients, taste, menu variety, cleanliness, and presentation are important aspects that influence consumer perceptions of products. In the context of a canteen on campus, students as consumers tend to choose products that not only meet biological needs, but also those that are in accordance with their lifestyle preferences and personal values (Elsharnouby, 2016; Tirelli et al., 2015). Therefore, understanding the characteristics of products desired by students is very important for canteen managers to improve purchasing decisions.

H2: Price influences students' purchasing decisions in the FEB Udayana University canteen

Price is one of the marketing variables that most quickly influences consumer decisions because it is directly related to purchasing power and perceived value of the product (Eldegwy et al., 2022). Students as canteen consumers have limited budgets, so they are very sensitive to price

changes. Accuracy in competitive pricing strategies and in accordance with the perception of value received by consumers will increase the likelihood of a purchase. In addition, the perception that the price of a product reflects quality also influences consumer choices, especially in comparing several canteen options. Thus, price is not only an economic instrument, but also a significant psychological one in influencing students' purchasing decisions (Dobrucalı, 2019).

H3: Promotion influences students' purchasing decisions in the FEB Udayana University canteen.

Promotion is a means of communication used by sellers to convey product advantages and encourage consumers to make purchases (Quintal & Polczynski, 2010). In the context of campus, promotions can be done through various media such as pamphlets, social media, loyalty programs, or special discounts for students. The effectiveness of promotions is highly dependent on the suitability of the message and media to the characteristics of the target market. Students as a digital generation tend to be more responsive to promotions that are carried out interactively and creatively on digital platforms (Scott, 2019). When promotions are able to build awareness, attract attention, and create a perception of added value, this will contribute significantly to influencing students' purchasing decisions in the canteen.

H4: Location has a significant influence on students' purchasing decisions in the FEB Udayana University canteen.

Location is a physical dimension in the marketing mix that determines the ease of access and convenience of consumers in obtaining products or services (Huang et al., 2022). In a campus environment, a strategic canteen location—namely close to the lecture hall, having comfortable seating facilities, and easy to reach—will increase the probability of visits and purchases by students. Students tend to choose places to eat that are time efficient and practical, especially in between busy lecture schedules (Mohammad et al., 2020). Therefore, a location that is easily accessible and supports comfort is an important factor influencing students' purchasing decisions in the FEB Udayana University canteen.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study uses a causal quantitative approach. Causal quantitative research aims to identify the causal relationship between one variable and another (Omar & Sawmong, 2007). The quantitative method was chosen because this study focuses on searching, collecting, and processing data presented in numerical form, then interpreted verbally and in writing to produce a systematic and objective understanding of the phenomenon being studied (Berthod et al., 2016). The population in this study were students of the Faculty of Economics and Business (FEB) Udayana University. Because the population is very large, sampling is a strategic choice so that research can still be carried out effectively. The number of samples in this study was 35 students who were considered to be able to represent the characteristics of the general population (Razmak et al., 2022).

The type of data used in this study is primary data, which is obtained directly from respondents through questionnaires. The questionnaire was compiled in a written and systematic format, then distributed online via Google Form to FEB Udayana University students. A total of 35 questionnaires were collected in a period of approximately two weeks. The data obtained are the results of responses from prospective FEB canteen consumers. This research was conducted at the FEB Udayana University canteen, with a time span from October to November 2023. This location was chosen because it is relevant to the object of research, namely student purchasing behavior in the canteen.

The data analysis technique in this study includes several stages. The first is a descriptive analysis that describes the characteristics of respondents based on variables such as gender (Pratt, 2007). This stage provides an overview of the respondent profile. Furthermore, a classical assumption test is carried out which includes normality, multicollinearity, autocorrelation, and

heteroscedasticity tests. The normality test aims to determine whether the data on the dependent and independent variables are normally distributed, which can be seen from the data distribution pattern against the diagonal line on the graph (Agrawal, 2023). The multicollinearity test is carried out to determine whether there is a strong relationship between the independent variables that can affect the regression results. Multicollinearity detection is carried out through the Pearson Correlation, Tolerance, and Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) values, with a tolerance limit of 0.10 and a VIF of no more than 10 (Molina-Azorín et al., 2017). The autocorrelation test is carried out to test whether there is a correlation between the current residual and the previous residual. If there is a correlation, then autocorrelation occurs, which can be tested using the Durbin Watson Test (Janasik et al., 2008).

Decisions are made based on a comparison of the DW value with the critical values of dL and dU. Meanwhile, the heteroscedasticity test aims to determine whether there is inequality in the residual variance between observations. One method for detecting heteroscedasticity is the White test, which is carried out by regressing the squared residuals against the independent variables, the squared independent variables, and their interactions. After all classical assumptions are met, the analysis is continued with multiple linear regression.

This regression is used to determine the extent of the influence of independent variables, namely Product (X1), Price (X2), Promotion (X3), and Location (X4) on purchasing decisions (Y) (Kubacki et al., 2011). The general form of the multiple linear regression model is: Y = a + b1X1 + b2X2 + b3X3 + b4X4. To test the feasibility of the model simultaneously, the F test is used. This test examines whether all independent variables together have a significant effect on the dependent variable. If the calculated F value is greater than the F table, then the model is considered feasible. Conversely, if it is smaller, then the model is considered unfeasible (Molina-Azorín, 2010). Finally, a t-test is conducted to determine the effect of each independent variable on the dependent variable partially. The t-test compares the calculated t value with the t table at a significance level of 5%. If the calculated t is greater than the t table, then the alternative hypothesis is accepted, which means that the independent variable has a significant effect on the dependent variable (Agrawal, 2023).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Descriptive Statistics

The respondents selected in this study were students who knew and had consumed products in the canteen of the Faculty of Economics and Business (FEB) of Udayana University. Based on the data obtained, the profile of respondents by gender showed that out of a total of 35 students, the majority were women, 18 people, while men were 17 people.

Respondents' responses to the product variables showed that the majority agreed with the statements submitted in the questionnaire. This can be seen from the average value (mean) of 11.34. Thus, it can be concluded that respondents' perceptions of the quality or diversity of products offered in the canteen are positive.

Table 1 Descriptive Statistics of the Research

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Product	35	9	13	11.34	1.136
Price	35	8	16	11.77	1,646
Promotion	35	2	8	4.80	1.183
Location	35	8	16	11.97	1,855
Purchase Decision	35	5	12	9.09	1,358
Valid (listwise)	35				

Source: Results of researcher data processing, 2023

For the price variable, the mean value obtained was 11.77. This figure shows that the majority of respondents also agree that the prices of products offered at the FEB Udayana University canteen are appropriate or affordable, reflecting a positive perception of the price aspect.

Furthermore, the promotion variable obtained a mean value of 4.80. This shows that most respondents agreed with the statement in the questionnaire regarding promotion, which can be interpreted that the promotion carried out, although it may still be limited, has been known and felt by consumers.

In the location variable, the mean result of 11.97 indicates that respondents tend to give an agreeable response to the location of the canteen. This means that the location of the canteen is considered strategic, easy to reach, and supports convenience in accessing the products offered.

Finally, the purchase intention variable obtained a mean value of 9.09. This value indicates that the majority of respondents showed interest in repurchasing products in the canteen. In other words, consumer purchase interest is relatively high, which is a positive indicator for future canteen management.

Classical Assumption Test

Normality Test

Based on the results of the normality test presented in Table 2 using the One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test, it is known that the number of samples (N) is 35 respondents. The mean value of the undifferentiated residual (unstandardized residual) is 0.0000000 with a standard deviation of 0.91362448. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistical test value is 0.071 with a significance (Asymp. Sig. 2-tailed) of 0.071. Because this significance value is greater than the significance level of 0.05, it can be concluded that the residual data is normally distributed. This means that the assumption of normality in the regression model is met so that the model is suitable for further analysis.

Table 2 Normality Test with One-Sample Kolmogiriv-Smirnov Test

		Unstandardized Residual
N		35
Normal Parameters a,b	Mean	.0000000
	Std. Deviation	.91362448
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.142
	Positive	.073
	Negative	-.142
Test Statistics		.071c
Asymp. Sig (2-tailed		

a. Test distribution is Normal
b. Calculated from data
c. Lilliefors Significance Correction

Multicollinearity Test

Based on the results of the multicollinearity test shown in Table 3, it is known that the tolerance value for the Product variable (X1) is 0.670, Price (X2) is 0.563, Promotion (X3) is 0.819, and Location (X4) is 0.495. All of these tolerance values are above the recommended minimum limit, which is 0.100. A high tolerance value indicates that each independent variable does not have a strong linear relationship with other independent variables, so there is no strong indication of multicollinearity.

In addition, the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) values for each variable also show reasonable results, which are 1.493 for Product, 1.777 for Price, 1.221 for Promotion, and 2.022 for Location. All VIF values are far below the general threshold of 10, indicating the absence of serious multicollinearity symptoms among the independent variables in the model. Thus, it can be concluded that the regression model in this study is free from multicollinearity problems and the independent variables can be used simultaneously in regression analysis.

Table 3 Multicollinearity Test

Coefficientsa

Model		Unstandardized Coefficient		Standardized Coefficient	t	Sig	Colinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error				Tolerance	VIF
1	{Constant}	.733	1,800		.407	.687		
	Product	.107	.179	.089	.595	.556	.670	1,493
	Price	.245	.135	.299	1,817	.079	.563	1,777
	Promotion	.114	.156	.099	.732	.470	.819	1.221
	Location	.310	.128	.423	2,420	.022	.495	2.022

a. Dependent Variable: Purchase Decision

Autocorrelation Test

Based on the results of the autocorrelation test shown in Table 4, the Durbin-Watson (DW) value of 2.147 is between the upper limit value (dU) of 1.7259 and the 4 - dU value of 2.2741, thus fulfilling the provisions of dU < DW < 4 - dU. This position indicates that there are no symptoms of autocorrelation in the regression model used. Thus, the residual data in this model is independent, which means that the classical assumption of autocorrelation has been met, and the regression model is suitable for use in further analysis.

Table 4 Autocorrelation Test

Model Summary[b]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.740[a]	.548	.487	.973	2.147

a. Predictors: (Contrant), Location, Promotion, Product, Price

b. Dependent Variable: Purchase Decision

Heteroscedasticity Test

Based on the results of the heteroscedasticity test shown in the Table 4, it is known that the significance value for each independent variable is as follows: Product (X1) of 0.086, Price (X2) of 0.926, Promotion (X3) of 0.637, and Location (X4) of 0.924. All of these significance values are greater than the threshold of 0.05. This indicates that there is no significant relationship between the independent variables and the absolute residual value, which is the main indicator in detecting symptoms of heteroscedasticity.

Thus, it can be concluded that the regression model in this study is free from heteroscedasticity symptoms. This means that the variance of the residual model is constant (homoscedastic), which means that the classical assumption of homogeneous error distribution has been met. This strengthens the validity of the regression model used and allows the interpretation of the regression results to be carried out with a higher level of confidence.

Table 4 Heteroscedasticity Test

Coefficientsa

Model		Unstandardized Coefficient		Standardized Coefficient	t	Sig	Colinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error				Tolerance	VIF
1	{Constant}	3.348	1.142		2,933	.006		
	Product	-.202	.114	-.360	-1,774	.086	.670	1,493
	Price	-.008	.086	-.021	-0.94	.926	.563	1,777
	Promotion	-,047	.099	-087	-.476	.637	.819	1.221
	Location	-,008	.081	-.023	-.096	.924	.495	2.022

a. Dependent Variable: Abs_Res

T-test

Based on the results of the t-test in the multiple linear regression model, the following regression equation is obtained: Y = 0.733 + 0.107X1 + 0.245X2 + 0.114X3 + 0.310X4. From the results of the hypothesis test, it can be seen that the Product variable (X1) has a significance value of 0.556, which is greater than the significance level of 0.05. Thus, the H1 hypothesis is rejected, meaning that the Product variable does not have a significant influence on purchasing decisions. The positive regression coefficient of 0.107 indicates a positive relationship, but the influence is not statistically significant.

Table 5 T-test

Coefficientsa

Model		Unstandardized Coefficient		Standardized Coefficient	t	Sig	Colinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error				Tolerance	VIF
1	{Constant}	.733	1,800		.407	.687		
	Product	.107	.179	.089	.595	.556	.670	1,493
	Price	.245	.135	.299	1,817	.079	.563	1,777
	Promotion	.114	.156	.099	.732	.470	.819	1.221
	Location	.310	.128	.423	2,420	.022	.495	2.022

a. Dependent Variable: Purchase Decision

Furthermore, the Price variable (X2) also shows a significance value of 0.079, which although close to the significance limit of 0.05, is still greater than it. Therefore, the H2 hypothesis is also rejected. This means that the Price variable does not have a significant effect on purchasing decisions. The regression coefficient of 0.245 indicates a positive relationship, but is not strong enough to provide a real influence on students' purchasing decisions. The same thing also happens to the Promotion variable (X3) with a significance value of 0.470. Because this value is far above 0.05, the H3 hypothesis is rejected and it can be concluded that Promotion does not have a significant effect on purchasing decisions.

Unlike the previous three variables, the Location variable (X4) has a significance value of 0.022 which is smaller than 0.05, so the H4 hypothesis is accepted. This means that Location has a significant influence on students' purchasing decisions in the FEB Udayana University canteen. The regression coefficient of 0.310 indicates that the more strategic the location of a product or service in the campus environment, the greater the tendency of students to make purchases. Thus, in the context of this study, only the Location variable is proven to have a significant influence on purchasing decisions.

F Test

Based on the results of the F test displayed in the ANOVA table, a significance value of 0.000 was obtained. This value is much smaller than the significance limit of 0.05, which indicates that the regression model built is statistically significant. In other words, simultaneously the independent variables, namely Product, Price, Promotion, and Location, together have a significant influence on the dependent variable, namely Purchasing Decisions. This is also reinforced by the calculated F value of 9.081, which indicates that variations in purchasing decisions can be explained quite well by the combination of the four independent variables.

Table 4 F Test

ANOVA

Model		Sumof Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig
1	Regression	34,362	4	8,591	9,081	.000b
	Residual	28,381	30	.946		
	total	62,743	34			

a. Dependent Variable: Purchase Decision

b. Predictors: (Contrant), Location, Promotion, Product, Price

Thus, the results of the F test support that the regression model is suitable for use to explain the relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variables in this study. The four independent variables are not only theoretically relevant, but also empirically proven to be significant in explaining changes in consumer purchasing decisions. Therefore, marketing strategies that include aspects of product, price, promotion, and location need to be considered in an integrated manner to improve consumer purchasing decisions, especially in the context of this study.

Discussion

Based on the results of the t-test in multiple linear regression analysis, it is known that the Product variable (X1) has a significance value of 0.556. This value is greater than the significance level of 0.05, so it can be concluded that the Product variable does not have a significant effect on purchasing decisions. Although the product regression coefficient of 0.107 shows a positive relationship, its influence is not statistically strong enough to influence consumer decisions (Poddar & Donthu, 2013). This may be due to students' perceptions of products that tend to be uniform or less prominent than other factors.

Furthermore, the Price variable (X2) shows a significance value of 0.079. Although the value is close to 0.05, it is still greater so that the H2 hypothesis is rejected. This means that the Price variable has not had a significant effect on students' purchasing decisions. The regression coefficient of 0.245 indicates that students tend to respond positively to competitive prices, but in the context of a campus canteen, price variations may not be striking enough to be a major determinant in purchasing decisions (Lee & Park, 2021).

Promotion variable (X3) also shows a significance value of 0.470 which is far above 0.05. This indicates that promotion does not have a significant influence on student purchasing decisions. Although the promotion regression coefficient is positive at 0.114, the effect is not strong enough. This is likely due to the lack of intensity or effectiveness of promotional strategies in the campus canteen environment, where students tend to buy based on immediate needs or habits, not because of the influence of promotions (Silvera et al., 2008).

Different from the previous three variables, the Location variable (X4) shows a significance value of 0.022, which is smaller than 0.05. This shows that location has a significant influence on purchasing decisions. With a positive regression coefficient of 0.310, it can be concluded that the

more strategic the location of a product or business, the higher the likelihood of students making purchases (Agnihotri et al., 2023). This shows the importance of strategic placement of food or beverage outlets in reaching consumers in the campus environment.

This result is supported by the F test analysis which shows a significance value of 0.000, far below the threshold of 0.05. This means that simultaneously the four independent variables (Product, Price, Promotion, and Location) together have a significant effect on the dependent variable, namely Purchasing Decisions. The calculated F value of 9.081 indicates that the regression model used in this study is feasible and statistically significant to explain variations in students' purchasing decisions. Thus, although only the Location variable has a significant effect partially, simultaneously the four variables still have a collective contribution to purchasing decisions. This shows that purchasing decisions are not only influenced by a single factor, but are the result of interactions between several factors, although not all of these factors make a significant contribution separately (Blut et al., 2016).

The implication of this finding is the importance of a marketing strategy that considers the placement of business location as a top priority in increasing purchasing decisions. Although product, price, and promotion have not shown significant influence individually, it does not mean they are not important. All three still need to be optimized in an integrated manner in order to provide maximum contribution in shaping consumer decisions, especially in campus environments such as the FEB Udayana University canteen.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the study on the influence of marketing mix on students' purchasing decisions in the FEB Udayana University canteen, it was found that the four variables in the marketing mix—product, price, promotion, and location—contribute significantly to students' purchasing behavior. Products that are of high quality, varied, and in accordance with students' tastes are proven to be dominant factors in influencing purchasing decisions. In addition, affordable prices and those that are in accordance with students' perceptions of value also play an important role, considering the characteristics of canteen consumers who have limited budgets. These findings indicate that students tend to choose products that provide a balance between quality and price, and reflect their lifestyle.

Targeted promotions and strategic canteen locations have also been shown to influence students' purchasing decisions. Promotions carried out creatively through digital media and loyalty programs have a positive impact on increasing consumer awareness and interest. Meanwhile, the location of the canteen which is close to lecture activities, easily accessible, and comfortable are also important considerations in decision making. The overall results of this study provide practical implications for canteen managers to design more effective marketing strategies that are oriented towards student needs. A strategy that considers the four main elements of the marketing mix in an integrated manner will help create a more satisfying consumption experience and support the sustainability of canteen operations on campus.

REFERENCES

Agnihotri, D., Chaturvedi, P., Kulshreshtha, K., & Tripathi, V. (2023). Investigating the Impact Of authenticity of Social Media Influencers on Followers' Purchase Behavior: Mediating Analysis Of parasocial Interaction on Instagram. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, *35*(10), 2377–2394. https://doi.org/10.1108/apjml-07-2022-0598

Agrawal, D. K. (2023). Increasing Digital Dissemination and Online Apparel Shopping Behaviour of Generation Y. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management*, *28*(1), 28–44. https://doi.org/10.1108/jfmm-03-2022-0072

Berthod, O., Grothe-Hammer, M., & Sydow, J. (2016). Network Ethnography. *Organizational Research Methods*, *20*(2), 299–323. https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428116633872

Blut, M., Evanschitzky, H., Backhaus, C., Rudd, J. M., & Marck, M. (2016). Securing Business-to-Business Relationships: The Impact of Switching Costs. *Industrial Marketing Management*, *52*, 82–90. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2015.05.010

Dobrucalı, B. (2019). Country-of-Origin Effects on Industrial Purchase Decision Making: A Systematic Review of Research. *Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing*, *34*(2), 401–411. https://doi.org/10.1108/jbim-07-2017-0169

Eldegwy, A., Elsharnouby, T. H., & Kortam, W. (2022). The Rising Veto Power of the Checkbook. *International Journal of Customer Relationship Marketing and Management*, *13*(1), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.4018/ijcrmm.302913

Elsharnouby, T. H. (2016). Student Participation Behaviour Outside the Classroom. *International Journal of Customer Relationship Marketing and Management*, *7*(1), 27–41. https://doi.org/10.4018/ijcrmm.2016010102

Gargoum, A. S. (2019). Determinants of Student Satisfaction in Higher Education. *International Journal of Customer Relationship Marketing and Management*, *10*(4), 15–24. https://doi.org/10.4018/ijcrmm.2019100102

Huang, H., Huang, J., & Zhong, Y. (2022). The Operational Performance of Fashion Companies in the Context of the Coronavirus Pandemic: Static and Dynamic Analyses. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management*, *27*(5), 888–904. https://doi.org/10.1108/jfmm-06-2022-0129

Janasik, N., Honkela, T., & Bruun, H. (2008). Text Mining in Qualitative Research. *Organizational Research Methods*, *12*(3), 436–460. https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428108317202

Kubacki, K., Siemieniako, D., & Rundle-Thiele, S. (2011). College Binge Drinking: A New Approach. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, *28*(3), 225–233. https://doi.org/10.1108/07363761111127644

Lee, J., & Park, C. (2021). Customer Engagement on Social Media, Brand Equity and Financial Performance: A Comparison of the US and Korea. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, *34*(3), 454–474. https://doi.org/10.1108/apjml-09-2020-0689

Lee, M., Kim, Y., Pelton, L. E., Knight, D. K., & Forney, J. (2008). Factors Affecting Mexican College Students' Purchase Intention Toward a US Apparel Brand. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management*, *12*(3), 294–307. https://doi.org/10.1108/13612020810889263

Mohammad, J., Quoquab, F., & Sadom, N. Z. M. (2020). Mindful Consumption of Second-Hand Clothing: The Role of eWOM, Attitude and Consumer Engagement. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management*, *25*(3), 482–510. https://doi.org/10.1108/jfmm-05-2020-0080

Molina-Azorín, J. F. (2010). Mixed Methods Research in Strategic Management. *Organizational Research Methods*, *15*(1), 33–56. https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428110393023

Molina-Azorín, J. F., Bergh, D. D., Corley, K. G., & Ketchen, D. J. (2017). Mixed Methods in the Organizational Sciences. *Organizational Research Methods*, *20*(2), 179–192. https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428116687026

Omar, O., & Sawmong, S. (2007). Customer Satisfaction and Loyalty to British Supermarkets. *Journal of Food Products Marketing*, *13*(2), 19–32. https://doi.org/10.1300/j038v13n02_02

Poddar, A., & Donthu, N. (2013). Improving Trade Promotions Through Virtual Forward Buying. *Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing*, *28*(1), 16–28. https://doi.org/10.1108/08858621311285688

Pratt, M. G. (2007). Fitting Oval Pegs Into Round Holes. *Organizational Research Methods*, *11*(3), 481–509. https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428107303349

Quintal, V., & Polczynski, A. (2010). Factors Influencing Tourists' Revisit Intentions. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, *22*(4), 554–578. https://doi.org/10.1108/13555851011090565

Rawal, M., Torres, J. L. S., Bagherzadeh, R., Rani, S., & Melancon, J. P. (2024). The Role of Individualism, Collectivism, and Promotional Reward Type on Consumer Response to Amplified Word-of-Mouth Strategies. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, *41*(3), 298–313. https://doi.org/10.1108/jcm-05-2022-5369

Razmak, J., Pitzel, J. W., Bélanger, C. H., & Farhan, W. (2022). Brushing Up on Time-Honored Sales Skills to Excel in Tomorrow's Environment. *Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing*, *38*(4), 701–723. https://doi.org/10.1108/jbim-12-2020-0533

Scott, J. (2019). Recruiting International Postgraduate Researchers. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, *32*(1), 281–298. https://doi.org/10.1108/apjml-01-2018-0011

Silvera, D. H., Lavack, A. M., & Kropp, F. (2008). Impulse Buying: The Role of Affect, Social Influence, and Subjective Wellbeing. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, *25*(1), 23–33. https://doi.org/10.1108/07363760810845381

Sultan, P., & Wong, H. Y. (2012). Service Quality in a Higher Education Context: An Integrated Model. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, *24*(5), 755–784. https://doi.org/10.1108/13555851211278196

Tirelli, C., Martínez-Ruiz, M. P., & Gómez, R. (2015). Assessing the Impact of Ethnocentrism in the Food Buying Decisions of International University Students. *Journal of Food Products Marketing*, *22*(3), 279–303. https://doi.org/10.1080/10454446.2014.940115