

PURCHASE DECISION MAKING STYLES, MARKETING MIX, AND SOCIO DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS INFLUENCING CONSUMER BUYING BEHAVIOR

CARLOS, JENNY DANE B¹, MENES, MA. CARMEN C²

¹ DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, CAVITE STATE UNIVERSITY – CCAT CAMPUS, ROSARIO, CAVITE, PHILIPPINES

² GRADUATE SCHOOL FACULTY, SAN SEBASTIAN RECOLETOS DE CAVITE, PHILIPPINES

EMAIL: ¹jdrbasaysay@cvsu.edu.ph, ²ccmenes@gmail.com

ORCID: ¹0009-0007-7513-1207, ²0000-0001-8540-7595

ABSTRACT:

AMarketers strive to understand various steps in the whole process of consumer decision making for final purchase of the products of their choices. The purpose of this study was to identify the extent of use and influence of purchase decision-making styles, marketing mix, and socio-demographic factors on consumer buying behavior, among 334 participants in General Trias City, Cavite through a descriptive comparative research design. A valid and reliable adapted-modified survey questionnaire was used to collect the data which were analyzed using the mean, standard deviation, ANOVA and Kruskal Wallis. In terms of purchase decision-making styles, the respondents are price-value conscious. Among the 7P's in the marketing mix influencing consumers' buying behavior, process and physical evidence have the highest influence. Personal and psychological factors influence more the buying behavior of the consumers than socio-cultural factors. The consumers' purchase decision making significantly vary in the aspects of confused by over choice and novelty/fashion consciousness when they are grouped according to sex. The 7Ps of marketing mix, the influence of people on the consumers' buying behavior significantly vary when they are grouped according to sex. Awareness of consumer purchasing behavior will help us understand different market segments. The consumers or stakeholders are encouraged to provide unbiased customer feedback and recommendations in order to help improve the products and services.

KEYWORDS: Purchase decision-making styles, marketing mix, socio-demographic factors, consumers, descriptive comparative research design

1) INTRODUCTION:

Marketers strive to comprehend various steps in the overall process of consumer decision-making for the final purchase of their preferred products (Panwar et al., 2019). The need for certainty in a person may be a good predictor of his decision-making style (Mendes et al., 2021; Jepsen & Prediger, 1981; Super, 1980; Harren, 1979; Wilson, 1971). One of the factors influencing consumer purchase behavior that is critical for understanding consumer behavior and developing successful marketing strategies is the decision-making styles (Virdi et al., 2020; Saleh et al., 2017; Madahi et al., 2012). Perfectionism, brand consciousness, novelty and fashion consciousness, recreational, price value consciousness, impulsiveness, confusion by over choice, and brand loyal and habitual are the eight mental characteristics of consumer decision (Sarkar et al., 2020; Kumar et al., 2017; Bandara, 2014). Decision-making styles are important in marketing because they influence consumer behavior; they are relatively stable over time; and thus, can be used to segment markets (Makgosa & Sangodoyin, 2018; Walsh et al., 2001). In case wherein consumer decision-making styles differ across countries, advertising and other elements of the marketing mix must be adjusted to account for these differences (Abubakar et al., 2019; Lysonski et al., 1996). The marketing mix is a model for creating and implementing strategies (Thabit & Raewf, 2018; Supaartagorn, 2017). The rapid development of marketing methods in recent years has resulted in the emergence of numerous new methods aimed at increasing customer satisfaction (Thabit & Aissa, 2019). Marketing mix' is also referred and known as the four Ps (i.e. product, price, place of distribution, and promotion) (Malelak et al., 2021; Ahmed & Rahman, 2015; Khan, 2014; Bennett, 1997). Marketers attempt to shape customer perceptions of their firm in order to influence purchasing decisions by implementing various controllable elements of the marketing mix known as the 7Ps product, price, place, promotion, people, process, and physical evidence (Genovate & Madrigal, 2022; Amofah et al., 2016; Mahmood & Khan, 2014). Industry competition cannot be avoided; only those who managed to reap the wisdom of a global trend will be able to survive. This condition clearly demonstrates the tight of competition in the industry in seizing consumers to buy their products (Jaminyasa et al., 2017).

The primary goal of a business is to determine the purchase decision-making styles, marketing mix and socio-demographic factors influencing consumer buying behavior in the City of General Trias, Cavite.

The research was carried out in the four (4) populated barangays of General Trias, Cavite, namely: Vibora, Bagumbayan, San Gabriel, and Sampalucan. The consumers were grouped according to their sex, level of education, and marital status. The influence of marketing mix and socio-demographic factors on purchase decision-making styles were looked into.

2) METHODS AND METHODOLOGY:

The descriptive comparative design was adopted in this study. The researcher was able to identify the purchase decision-making styles, marketing mix, and socio-demographic factors influencing consumer buying behavior. Descriptive comparative design is needed for stating empirically testable universal claims (Haspelmath, 2010). The respondent of the study consists of 334 consumers with the age of 22 years old and above from the four (4) barangays from City of General Trias, Cavite with their total population namely; Vibora (523), Bagumbayan (563), San Gabriel (934), and Sampalucan (493). A random sample was taken from each strata. The advantages include the assurance of representation of all groups in the populations needed. Given the population size of 2,513 consumers, with 5 percent margin error, 50 percent response distribution and 95 percent confidence level, the recommended sample size is 334. The modified adapted questionnaires used in this study was subjected to content validity ratio by Lawshe through 15 validators who rated the items as either “essential”, “useful but not essential” or “not essential” (Ayre & Scally, 2014). The CVI is equal to 0.851 which is the average of all retained items. After validating the instrument, the researcher pilot tested the instrument for internal consistency of the data using Cronbach’s Alpha reliability test to 30 participants who were not be included in the actual participants. The result of Cronbach’s alpha reliability test for 30 participants is 0.961 which reflects high internal consistency. The distribution of questionnaire was done face to face. The distribution and retrieval were personally done by the researcher with assistance by a local guide from each barangay. Data were analyzed using the mean, standard deviation, ANOVA and Kruskal Wallis.

3) RESULTS

Table 1. The Extent of Use of Purchase Decision-making Styles Taken as a Whole

Purchase Decision-making Styles	Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
Brand Consciousness	3.00	0.808	To a Great Extent
Perfectionist, High-Quality Consciousness	3.15	0.738	To a Great Extent
Recreational, Hedonistic	2.74	0.843	To a Great Extent
Impulsiveness	2.91	0.712	To a Great Extent
Price-Value Consciousness	3.24	0.767	To a Great Extent
Confused By Over Choice	2.95	0.747	To a Great Extent
Novelty, Fashion	2.71	0.841	To a Great Extent

Table 1 reveals that all the seven purchase decision-making styles are being used to a great extent by the participants with price-value consciousness has the highest mean.

Table 2. The Extent of Use of Purchase Decision-making Styles According to Sex

Purchase Decision-making Styles	Male			Female		
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Interpretation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
Brand Consciousness	2.91	0.816	To a Great Extent	3.07	0.797	To a Great Extent
Perfectionist, High-Quality Consciousness	3.09	0.714	To a Great Extent	3.20	0.753	To a Great Extent
Recreational, Hedonistic	2.69	0.765	To a Great Extent	2.78	0.898	To a Great Extent
Impulsiveness	2.82	0.655	To a Great Extent	2.98	0.745	To a Great Extent
Price-Value Consciousness	3.21	0.762	To a Great Extent	3.27	0.771	Very Great Extent

Confused By Over Choice	2.83	0.694	To a Great Extent	3.03	0.774	To a Great Extent
Novelty, Fashion	2.57	0.793	To a Great Extent	2.81	0.865	To a Great Extent
Total	2.88	0.573	To a Great Extent	3.02	0.650	To a Great Extent

The price-value consciousness has the highest mean for both male and female. For male, the novelty, fashion consciousness has the lowest mean, and brand consciousness has the more dispersed responses. For female, the recreational, hedonistic has the lowest mean and has the most dispersed responses.

Table 3. The Extent of Use of Purchase Decision-making Styles According to Level of Education

Purchase Decision-making Styles	Basic Education			Higher Education		
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Interpretation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
Brand Consciousness	2.86	0.760	To a Great Extent	3.25	0.833	Very Great Extent
Perfectionist, High-Quality Consciousness	3.04	0.730	To a Great Extent	3.35	0.712	Very Great Extent
Recreational, Hedonistic	2.66	0.814	To a Great Extent	2.88	0.878	To a Great Extent
Impulsiveness	2.85	0.698	To a Great Extent	3.03	0.724	To a Great Extent
Price-Value Consciousness	3.16	0.773	To a Great Extent	3.39	0.736	Very Great Extent
Confused By Over Choice	2.87	0.762	To a Great Extent	3.08	0.704	To a Great Extent
Novelty, Fashion Consciousness	2.62	0.821	To a Great Extent	2.86	0.858	To a Great Extent
Total	2.87	0.589	To a Great Extent	3.12	0.647	To a Great Extent

Table 3 reveals that according to level of education under higher education, the price-value consciousness has the highest mean, while under the basic education, novelty fashion consciousness has the lowest mean. The recreational hedonistic of higher education has the most dispersed responses.

Table 4. The Extent of use of Purchase Decision-making Styles According to Marital Status

Purchase Decision-making Styles	Single			Married		
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Interpretation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
Brand Consciousness	2.96	0.811	To a Great Extent	3.07	0.801	To a Great Extent
Perfectionist, High-Quality Consciousness	3.14	0.720	To a Great Extent	3.19	0.768	To a Great Extent
Recreational, Hedonistic	2.79	0.860	To a Great Extent	2.67	0.814	To a Great Extent
Impulsiveness	2.90	0.737	To a Great Extent	2.94	0.671	To a Great Extent
Price-Value Consciousness	3.22	0.786	To a Great Extent	3.29	0.735	Very Great Extent
Confused By Over Choice	2.97	0.767	To a Great Extent	2.92	0.713	To a Great Extent
Novelty, Fashion Consciousness	2.77	0.841	To a Great Extent	2.60	0.835	To a Great Extent
Total	2.96	0.642	To a Great Extent	2.95	0.590	To a Great Extent

Table 4 shows that the price-value consciousness has a higher mean of married participants, while the novelty, fashion consciousness has a lower mean of married participants, and the recreational, hedonistic has the most dispersed responses of single participants.

Table 5. The Extent of Influence of Marketing Mix Taken as a Whole

Marketing Mix	Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
Product	3.21	0.713	To a Great Extent
Price	3.09	0.739	To a Great Extent
Place	3.26	0.756	Very Great Extent
Promotions	3.21	0.665	To a Great Extent
People	3.25	0.677	Very Great Extent
Process	3.29	0.705	Very Great Extent
Physical Evidence	3.29	0.649	Very Great Extent
Total	3.23	0.610	To a Great Extent

Table 5 reveals that participants are influenced to a very great extent by place, people, process, and physical evidence, while to a great extent by product, price, and promotions. However, it can be deduced that the process, and physical evidence has the highest mean, while the price has the lowest mean, and place has the most dispersed responses.

Table 6. The Extent of Influence of Marketing Mix According to Sex

	Male			Female		
Marketing Mix	Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Interpretation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
Product	3.15	0.693	To a Great Extent	3.26	0.726	Very Great Extent
Price	3.04	0.684	To a Great Extent	3.14	0.776	To a Great Extent
Place	3.18	0.754	To a Great Extent	3.31	0.755	Very Great Extent
Promotions	3.18	0.646	To a Great Extent	3.23	0.679	To a Great Extent
People	3.16	0.676	To a Great Extent	3.32	0.670	Very Great Extent
Process	3.25	0.674	Very Great Extent	3.31	0.729	Very Great Extent
Physical Evidence	3.24	0.599	To a Great Extent	3.33	0.682	Very Great Extent
Total	3.17	0.581	To a Great Extent	3.27	0.628	Very Great Extent

Table 6 shows that the process has the highest mean for male and physical evidence for female. For male, price has the lowest mean and place has the most dispersed responses. For female, the price has the lowest mean and has the most dispersed responses.

Table 7. The Extent of Influence of Marketing Mix According to Level of Education

	Basic Education			Higher Education		
Marketing Mix	Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Interpretation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
Product	3.08	0.706	To a Great Extent	3.44	0.669	Very Great Extent
Price	2.99	0.709	To a Great Extent	3.28	0.754	Very Great Extent
Place	3.14	0.748	To a Great Extent	3.46	0.730	Very Great Extent
Promotions	3.09	0.635	To a Great Extent	3.42	0.667	Very Great Extent
People	3.16	0.645	To a Great Extent	3.42	0.700	Very Great Extent

Process	3.16	0.699	To a Great Extent	3.50	0.666	Very Great Extent
Physical Evidence	3.17	0.654	To a Great Extent	3.50	0.587	Very Great Extent
Total	3.11	0.578	To a Great Extent	3.43	0.614	Very Great Extent

Table 7 reveals that according to the level of education, process and physical evidence has the highest mean among higher education participants while price has the lowest mean among basic education participants. The price has the most dispersed responses among higher education participants.

Table 8. *The Extent of Influence of Marketing Mix According to Marital Status*

	Single			Married		
Marketing Mix	Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Interpretation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
Product	3.21	0.711	To a Great Extent	3.21	0.720	To a Great Extent
Price	3.11	0.727	To a Great Extent	3.07	0.760	To a Great Extent
Place	3.23	0.733	To a Great Extent	3.29	0.793	Very Great Extent
Promotions	3.23	0.672	To a Great Extent	3.18	0.654	To a Great Extent
People	3.28	0.657	Very Great Extent	3.22	0.708	To a Great Extent
Process	3.32	0.684	Very Great Extent	3.24	0.738	To a Great Extent
Physical Evidence	3.29	0.649	Very Great Extent	3.29	0.651	Very Great Extent
Total	3.24	0.595	To a Great Extent	3.21	0.636	To a Great Extent

Table 8 reveals that among the marketing mix, the process has the highest mean with the marital status of single, while the price has the lowest mean with the marital status of married, and the price has the most dispersed responses of married consumers.

Table 9. *The Extent of Influence of Socio-Cultural, Personal, and Psychological Factors on the consumer buying behavior Taken as a Whole*

Socio-demographic Factors	Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
Socio-Cultural Factors	3.19	0.771	To a Great Extent
Personal Factors	3.30	0.697	Very Great Extent
Psychological Factors	3.26	0.677	Very Great Extent
Total	3.25	0.643	Very Great Extent

Table 9 reveals that among the three socio-demographic factors, participants strongly agree on the influence of personal factors and psychological factors, while they only agree on socio-cultural factors. However, it can be deduced that personal factors have the highest mean, while the socio-cultural factors have the lowest mean and has the most dispersed responses.

Table 10. *The Extent of Influence of Socio-Cultural, Personal, and Psychological Factors on the consumer buying behavior According to Sex*

	Male			Female		
Socio-demographic Factors	Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Interpretation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
Socio-Cultural Factors	3.16	0.727	Agree	3.21	0.803	To a Great Extent
Personal Factors	3.27	0.658	Strongly Agree	3.32	0.725	Very Great Extent
Psychological Factors	3.22	0.628	Agree	3.29	0.712	Very Great Extent
Total	3.22	0.589	Agree	3.27	0.681	Very Great Extent

Table 10 shows that the personal factors have the highest mean for both male and female. The socio-cultural factors have also the lowest mean for both male, as well as the most dispersed responses, and female.

Table 11. The Extent of Influence of Socio-Cultural, Personal, and Psychological Factors on the consumer buying behavior According to Level of Education

Socio-demographic Factors	Basic Education			Higher Education		
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Interpretation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
Socio-Cultural Factors	3.09	0.776	To a Great Extent	3.38	0.727	Very Great Extent
Personal Factors	3.19	0.704	To a Great Extent	3.49	0.644	Very Great Extent
Psychological Factors	3.16	0.674	To a Great Extent	3.44	0.647	Very Great Extent
Total	3.15	0.640	To a Great Extent	3.44	0.607	Very Great Extent

Table 11 reveals that, the personal factors have the highest mean among higher education participants, while socio-cultural factors among basic education participants have the lowest mean and has the most dispersed responses.

Table 12. The Extent of Influence of Socio-Cultural, Personal, and Psychological Factors on the consumer buying behavior According to Marital Status

Socio-demographic Factors	Single			Married		
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Interpretation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Verbal Interpretation
Socio-Cultural Factors	3.25	0.739	Very Great Extent	3.09	0.813	To a Great Extent
Personal Factors	3.32	0.707	Very Great Extent	3.27	0.681	Very Great Extent
Psychological Factors	3.31	0.668	Very Great Extent	3.18	0.687	To a Great Extent
Total	3.29	0.629	Very Great Extent	3.18	0.663	To a Great Extent

Table 12 reveals that personal factors have the highest mean with the marital status of single, while the socio-cultural factors have the lowest mean with the marital status of married and has the most dispersed responses.

4) DISCUSSION

The results imply that the consumers consider all the purchase decision-making styles, but price is the most important factor when making a purchase decision because consumers are more likely to watch how much they spend for a particular product. The above results affirm that when deciding to purchase a product, consumers consider price, and they seek the lowest possible price for the product. Their purchasing decisions are influenced by the price of an item, and they avoid purchasing expensive items (Castillo Jr, 2018; Sual et al., 2012; Anic et al., 2010; Franken & Muris, 2005).

Both male and female consider the price and usefulness of the product as a significant factor when making purchases. Moreover, male consumers are not fashion-conscious, and being fashionable is not important to them, while female consumers do not enjoy the repeated enjoyment of a particular product. According to Dealca et al. (2022), the above results certify that the male and female consumers consider price-value consciousness when they purchase a product with females who score highly on this factor being price conscious and frequently choosing lower-priced products (Mokhlis & Salleh, 2009; Bakewell & Mitchell, 2006). Males, on the other hand, score significantly lower on the novelty-fashion consciousness trait (Mitchell & Walsh, 2004).

Higher education participants are price conscious and seek low-cost products, but they are also concerned with getting the best value for their money. Basic education participants, on the other hand, are uninterested in new products because they do not seek out on fashion trends. The findings supported by the studies of Ipia (2021), Tanksale et al. (2014), Sungwon Bae and Miller (2009), and Yousef (1998), implying that the education influences the consumer particularly among higher education consumers. They are concerned with getting the best value for their money but in a low cost.

Single and married participants are price and value conscious when making a purchase because they place a higher value on the price of the product and carefully weigh the potential benefits of the purchase against the cost of the good. Married consumers are not who keep up-to-date with styles because they prioritized what is needed to

organize their budget. Studies conducted by Mohsenin et al. (2018), Rehman and Khan (2016), Nayeem (2012), and Hanzae and Lotfizadeh (2011), affirms the above findings were married consumers are constantly looking for sales, bargains, and lower-priced products. These customers are concerned with price and value for money. Participants consider all aspects of the marketing mix but prioritize process and physical evidence as the important factors when making a purchase decision. This results is supported by the studies of Guinto and Alcantara (2022), Kartawinata et al. (2020), Paguntalan (2020), and Recamadas (2018) that marketing mix is an important approach in making a purchase decision. Males value products that consistently provide the same level of service while females consider physical environment, interior design, packaging, and branding important factor when purchasing product regardless of price, which influences consumer purchasing behavior. The results are supported by the studies of Jain and Jain (2022), Khorsheed et al. (2020), Barusman (2019), and Mallik and Farhan (2018) wherein marketing mix is a tactical and controllable tool for marketing that consists of 7Ps, and process and physical evidence has a positive influence on male and female participants.

Higher education participants consider the store's convenient time, how quickly goods are delivered, how employees dressed (appearance) using uniform, how comfortable the physical environment is, and how spacious the store is, whereas basic education participants look for cheaper prices of products compared to other brands and stores that offer discounts. The results are supported by the studies of Guinto & Alcantara (2022), Mahajan & Golahit (2020), Gilaninia et al. (2013), and Enache (2011) illustrating that, processes are very crucial in keeping the momentum forward to achieve the goals of a product but it will definitely influences the consumer buying behavior. Furthermore, personnel are critical to providing excellent service to clients Khan (2014). Customer-oriented personnel, according to Kushwaha & Agrawal (2015), try to demonstrate personal attention, interpersonal care, civility, and quick behavior. Ultimately, providing the best for customers, such as an appealing environment and ambiance, demonstrates a company's commitment (Menes et al., 2015).

Additionally, price exhibit similar demographic characteristics in age (Rihn et al., 2018). Participants who are single prefer simple and convenient over-the-counter transactions while married participants prefer payment plans or credit policies, as well as discounts. Rynca and Ziaieian (2021), Mahajan and Golahit (2020), Kushwaha and Agrawal (2015), and Kartawinata and Wardhana (2013) affirm that the simpler and more convenient your processes are, the more satisfied your customers will be.

According to the findings, participants consider the size of their family, their age, and occupation before purchasing a product, as well as their social standing, culture, and beliefs as a major factor when making a purchase decision. According to Qazzafi (2020), Bahl and Chandra (2018), Ramya and Ali (2016), and Abdullahi Farah et al. (2011), socio-demographic factors is important to these factors include household income, household size, number of children, family choice and gender. Both male and females have been influenced by the following: age, life-cycle stage, occupation, economic circumstances, and lifestyle, with male having a stronger influence because they represent a stable set of values, preferences, and behaviors that the consumer has acquired over time. Rehman and Khan (2016), Gajjar (2013), Jisana (2014), and Lawan and Zanna (2013) showing that personal factors can also affect the consumer behavior. Some of the important personal factors that influence the buying behavior are: liestyle, economic situation, occupation, age, personality and self-concept.

Participants who obtained higher education have been influenced by their personality and self-conception when buying products, whereas basic education participants influenced by their friends and different social groups. These findings are supported by the studies of Ramya and Ali (2016), Jisana (2014), Gajjar (2013), and Lawan and Zanna (2013). Personal values in turn shape our beliefs, attitudes and ultimately our buying behaviors, which usually bear some basic similarity to those around us and reflect the collective cultural and other social influences on which we are exposed. Some of these personal or internalized variables that uniquely influence our clothes buying behavior include; education, lifestyle, intuition, ostentations and the like.

Therefore, the market needs to determine which stages typically has the greater influence in the purchase of a particular products or services (Tyagi, 2018) to identify the consumer's primary motivation for purchase (Grant et al., 2007). Participants who are single in terms of marital status are influenced by their individual choice of goods while married participants are influenced by the needs of their family. One of the important factor of demographic factors is in the marital status because it is likely to increase product purchasing (Abdullahi Farah et al., 2011).

Some consumers search for products, which have images compatible to their perceptions of self. This will reinforce the consumer's self-concept. Consumers buy products not for what they can do, but also for what they mean (Muniady et al., 2014). These studies are important because for satisfying the consumers the firm should know about the behavior of the consumers (Tyagi, 2018).

5) CONCLUSION

Based on the findings, all seven purchase decision-making styles were used to a great extent by the participants, and majority of the participants are female and college graduates. The consumers are price conscious and highly consider the value and quality of a product. The study revealed that considering all the seven areas in the marketing mix, participants strongly agree on the influence of place, people, process, and physical evidence, while they only agree on product, price, and promotions. The participants are also dominated by female which revealed that they

consider a product that repeatedly delivers the same standard of service. It is important to have a unique and easy process for consumers to attract.

The study revealed that all the three socio-demographic factors, participants strongly agree on the influence of personal factors and psychological factors, while they only agree on socio-cultural factors. The majority of the participants are female, which influenced by their lifestyle, economic situation, occupation, age, personality and self-concept. Obviously, what millennials buy is different from what an elderly person buys, and the higher the income, the more purchasing power they hold and vice versa. The market prioritizes the consumer. Understanding consumer purchasing behavior will help us understand different market segments and develop market penetration strategies. Both male and female consumers play an important role in this study, but females, particularly millennials, have shown to be price conscious who highly consider the value and quality of a product and they are influenced by their lifestyle, economic situation, occupation, age, personality, and self-concept. Marketers or the business owners should be carefully designed and be tailored to the specific needs of identified consumer.

6) ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We would like to thank all the respondents of this research. I am also grateful to my co-author, Dr. Ma. Carmen C. Menes, for her contributions to this work. Special thanks to Cavite State University - CCAT Campus, including our University President, Dr. Ma. Agnes P. Nuestro; Campus Administrator, Dr. Lauro B. Pascua; and Research and Extension Director, Dr. Aries M. Gelera.

7) FUNDING STATEMENT

This research was my thesis during masteral and the research presentation and publication is funded and supported by Cavite State University – CCAT Campus.

8) DATA AVAILABILITY

No new data were created or analyzed in this study. Data sharing is not applicable to this article. Data is personally tabulated by the researchers.

9) Conflict of interest

The authors declare that there is **no conflict of interest**.

10) REFERENCES

1. Abdullahi Farah, A., Zainalabidin, M., & Ismail, A. L. (2011). The influence of socio-demographic factors and product attributes on attitudes toward purchasing special rice among Malaysian consumers. *International Food Research Journal*, 18(3), 1135–1142.
2. Abubakar, A. M., Elrehail, H., Alatailat, M. A., & Elçi, A. (2019). Knowledge management, decision-making style and organizational performance. *Journal of Innovation and Knowledge*, 4(2), 104–114. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jik.2017.07.003>
3. Ahmed, S., & Rahman, M. H. (2015). THE Effects of Marketing Mix on Consumer Satisfaction: A Literature Review from Islamic Perspective. *Turkish Journal of Islamic Economics*, 2(1), 17–30. <https://doi.org/10.3139/104.100724>
4. Amofah, O., Gyamfi, I., & Tutu, C. O. (2016). The Influence of Service Marketing Mix on Customer Choice of Repeat Purchase of Restaurant in Kumasi, Ghana. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 8(11), 102–112. www.iiste.org
5. Anic, I. D., Ciunova-Suleska, A., & Rajh, E. (2010). Decision-Making Styles of Young-Adult Consumers in the Republic of Macedonia. *Economic Research-Ekonomska Istraživanja*, 23(4), 102–113. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1331677X.2010.11517436>
6. Ayre, C., & Scally, A. J. (2014). Critical values for Lawshe's content validity ratio: Revisiting the original methods of calculation. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, 47(1), 79–86. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0748175613513808>
7. Bahl, S., & Chandra, T. (2018). Impact of Marketing Mix on Consumer Attitude and Purchase intention towards "Green" Products. *A Journal of Research Articles in Management Science and Allied Areas*, 11(1), 1–11.
8. Bakewell, C., & Mitchell, V. W. (2006). Male versus female consumer decision making styles. *Journal of Business Research*, 59(12), 1297–1300. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2006.09.008>
9. Bandara, W. W. M. C. (2014). Consumer Decision-Making Styles and Local Brand Biasness: Exploration in the Czech Republic. *Journal of Competitiveness*, 6(1), 3–17. <https://doi.org/10.7441/joc.2014.01.01>
10. Barusman, A. R. P. (2019). The Impact of 7p's (Marketing Mix) on Student Parents' Decision at School for Disable Students with Special Needs. *Journal of Business and Management*, 21(5), 22–28. <https://doi.org/10.9790/487X-2105022228>
11. Bennett, A. R. (1997). The five Vs - a buyer's perspective of the marketing mix. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 15(3), 151–156. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02634509710165957>

12. Castillo Jr, F. G. (2018). Consumer Buying Behavior: The Multicultural Influence in the Philippines. *The International Journal of Business Management and Technology*, 2(2), 71–75.
<https://www.theijbmt.com/archive/0920/844974745.pdf>
13. Dealca, S. M. Q., Estrera, J. R. D., Tibalao, C. L. L., & De Jesus, F. L. B. (2022). Factors Influencing Customer Satisfaction towards Luxury Clothing: Quiet Luxury and Logomania among Filipino Millennials. *Journal of Business and Management Studies*, 4(2), 313–333. <https://doi.org/10.32996/jbms.2022.4.2.25>
14. Enache, I.-C. (2011). Marketing Higher Education Using the 7 Ps Framework. *Bulletin of the Transilvania University of Brasov. Series V: Economic Sciences*, 4(1), 23–30.
<http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bth&AN=66180380&lang=fr&site=ehost-live>
15. Franken, I. H. A., & Muris, P. (2005). Individual differences in decision-making. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 39(5), 991–998. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2005.04.004>
16. Gajjar, N. B. (2013). Factors Affecting Consumer Behavior. *Humanities and Social Sciences*, 1(2), 10–15
17. Genovate, M. C. J., & Madrigal, D. V. (2022). Assessing Stakeholders' Satisfaction of a Catholic University Graduate School in the Philippines. *Philippine Social Science Journal*, 4(3), 85–95.
18. Gilaninia, S., Taleghani, M., & Azizi, N. (2013). Marketing Mix And Consumer Behavior. *Kuwait Chapter of Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review*, 2(12), 53–58. <https://doi.org/10.12816/0001270>
19. Guinto, A. L., & Alcantara, A. N. (2022). The Kentucky Fried Chicken Integrated Marketing Communications Mix Strategy and Its Sales Revenue, Profitability, and Market Share. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 3(4), 710–716. <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.03.04.20>
20. Hanzae, K. H., & Lotfizadeh, F. (2011). Influence of Family Structure on Consumer Decision-making Style in Iran. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 6(11), 297–304.
<https://doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v6n11p297>
21. Harren, V. A. (1979). A model of career decision making for college students. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14(2), 119–133. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791\(79\)90065-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791(79)90065-4)
22. Haspelmath, M. (2010). Discussion notes: Comparative concepts and descriptive categories in crosslinguistic studies. *Language*, 86(3), 663–687. <https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2010.0021>
23. Ipia, G. I. (2021). Covid-19 Pandemic in Nigeria-Challenges and Opportunities. *International Journal of Public Administration and Management Research*, 6(1), 98–106. <https://doi.org/10.36758/ijpamr/v6n1.2021/09>
24. Jain, R., & Jain, S. (2022). Analyzing and Exploring the Effectiveness of Each Element of 7Ps of Marketing Mix Impact of Single Use Plastic and Its Subsequent Substitutes View project Analyzing and Exploring the Effectiveness of Each Element of 7Ps of Marketing Mix View project Analy. *International Journal of All Research Education and Scientific Methods (IJARESM)*, 10(1), 2455–6211.
25. Jaminyasa, I. M., Pulawan, I. M., Martadiani, A. A. M., & Amerta, I. M. S. (2017). The marketing mix affect on the consumer buying decision (case study of sausage products at PT. Aroma Denpasar). *International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 1(2), 65–74. <https://doi.org/10.29332/ijssh.v1n2.44>
26. Jepsen, D. A., & Prediger, D. J. (1981). Dimensions of adolescent career development: A multi-instrument analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 19(3), 350–368. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791\(81\)90070-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791(81)90070-1)
27. Jisana, T. K. (2014). Consumer Behaviour Models: An Overview. *Sai Om Journal of Commerce & Management*, 1(5), 34–43.
28. Kartawinata, B. R., & Wardhana, A. (2013). Marketing Strategies and Their Impact on Marketing Performance of Indonesian Ship Classification Society. *International Journal of Science and Research*, 4(2), 69–74.
www.ijsr.net
29. Khan, M. T. (2014). The concept of 'marketing mix' and its elements (a conceptual review paper). *International Journal of Information, Business and Management*, 6(2), 95.
30. Khorsheed, R. K., Abdulla, D. F., Othman, B. A., Mohammed, H. O., & Sadq, Z. M. (2020). The Role of Services Marketing Mix 7P's on Achieving Competitive Advantages (The Case of Paitaxt Technical Institute in Kurdistan Region of Iraq). *Test Engineering and Management*, 83(May-June), 15947–16971.
<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/341882956>
31. Kumar, A., Vohra, A., & Dangi, H. K. (2017). Consumer decision-making styles and post purchase behaviour of poor for Fast Moving Consumer Goods. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 41(2), 121–137.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/ijcs.12320>
32. Kushwaha, G. S., & Agrawal, S. R. (2015). An Indian customer surrounding 7P's of service marketing. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 22, 85–95. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2014.10.006>
33. Lawan, L. A., & Zanna, R. (2013). Evaluation of Socio-Cultural Factors Influencing Consumer Buying Behaviour of Clothes in Borno State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Basic and Applied Science*, 1(3), 519–529. <https://doi.org/10.17142/ijbas-2012.1.3.7>
34. Lysonski, S., Durvasula, S., & Zotos, Y. (1996). Consumer decision-making styles: a multi-country investigation. *European Journal of Marketing*, 30(12), 10–21. <https://doi.org/10.1108/03090569610153273>
35. Madahi, A., Sukati, I., Mazhari, M. Y., & Rashid, W. N. (2012). Consumer Decision Making Styles Amongst Young Generation in Malaysia. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 30(2), 263–275.
36. Mahajan, P., & Golahit, S. (2020). Service marketing mix as input and output of higher and technical education: A measurement model based on students' perceived experience. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher*

- Education, 12(2), 151–193. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JARHE-01-2019-0022>
37. Mahmood, R., & Khan, S. M. (2014). Impact of Service Marketing Mixes on Customer Perception: A Study on Eastern Bank Limited, Bangladesh. *European Journal of Business and ManagementOnline*, 6(34), 2222–2839.
38. Makgosa, R., & Sangodoyin, O. (2018). Retail market segmentation: the use of consumer decision-making styles, overall satisfaction and demographics. *International Review of Retail, Distribution and Consumer Research*, 28(1), 64–91. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09593969.2017.1334690>
39. Malelak, S. L., Setiawan, B., & Maulidah, S. (2021). Analysis of Marketing Mix on Consumer Loyalty: Empirical Study of Customer Satisfaction of Local Product. *International Journal of Business, Technology and Organizational Behavior (IJTOB)*, 1(3), 160–168. <https://doi.org/10.52218/ijbtob.v1i3.88>
40. Mallik, D. M. A., & Farhan, S. N. (2018). Customer Centric Approach Using 7ps of Marketing Mix D.M. Paper Knowledge . Toward a Media History of Documents, 6(11), 107–115. <https://doi.org/11.25835/IJIK-323> www.doie.org
41. Mendes, F., Mendes, E., Salleh, N., & Oivo, M. (2021). Insights on the relationship between decision-making style and personality in software engineering. *Information and Software Technology*, 136(April), 106586. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infsof.2021.106586>
42. Menes, C. C., Haguisan, I. A., & Castellano, S. R. (2015). Customer Satisfaction on Products and Services of Fine Dining Restaurants in Bacolod City, Philippines. *Development Education Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 4(1), 1–28.
43. Mitchell, V.-W., & Walsh, G. (2004). Gender differences in German consumer decision-making styles. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour: An International Research Review*, 3(4), 331–346. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cb.146>
44. Mohsenin, S., Sharifsamet, S., Esfidani, M. R., & Skoufa, L. A. (2018). Customer decision-making styles as a tool for segmenting digital products market in Iran. *Journal of Islamic Marketing*, 9(3), 560–577. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JIMA-04-2017-0041>
45. Mokhlis, S., & Salleh, H. S. (2009). Consumer decision-making styles in Malaysia: An exploratory study of gender differences. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 10(4), 574–584.
46. Muniady, R., Al-Mamun, A., Permarupan, P. Y., & Binti Zainol, N. R. (2014). Factors influencing consumer behavior: A study among university students in Malaysia. *Asian Social Science*, 10(9), 18. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v10n9p18>
47. Nayeem, T. (2012). Decision-making Styles of Individualist and Collectivist Automobile Consumers in Australia. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 7(16), 44–55. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v7n16p44>
48. Paguntalan, L. C. (2020). The Effectiveness of Promotional Mix of Pharmaceutical Companies in the Philippines: The Sales Force Perspective. *Asian Journal of Research in Business and Management*, 2(1), 1–10.
49. Panwar, D., Anand, S., Ali, F., & Singal, K. (2019). Consumer Decision Making Process Models and Their Applications to Market Strategy. *International Management Review*, 15(1), 36–44.
50. Qazzafi, S. (2020). Factor Affecting Consumer Buying Behavior: A Conceptual Study. *IJSRD-International Journal for Scientific Research & Development*, 8(May), 2321–0613. www.ijssrd.com
51. Ramya, N., & Ali, M. (2016). Factors Affecting Consumer Buying Behavior. *International Journal of Applied Research*, 2(10), 76–80.
52. Recamadas, H. K. (2018). A path analysis of customer loyalty of homegrown coffee shops in Davao region. *Journal of Administrative and Business Studies*, 4(4), 185–195. <https://doi.org/10.20474/jabs-4.4.1>
53. Rehman, R. R., & Khan, A. W. (2016). Work-family conflict and decision making styles: Study of higher education sector of Pakistan. *VFAST Transactions on Education and Social Sciences*, 4(1), 81–93. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-47241-5_132
54. Rihn, A., Khachatryan, H., & Wei, X. (2018). Assessing Purchase Patterns of Price Conscious Consumers. *Horticulturae*, 4(3), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.3390/horticulturae4030013>
55. Rynca, R., & Ziaecian, Y. (2021). Applying the Goal Programming in the Management of the 7P Marketing Mix Model at Universities-Case Study. *PloS One*, 16(11), 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0260067>
56. Saleh, M., Alhosseini, S. E., & Slambolchi, A. (2017). A Review of Consumer Decision-Making Styles : Existing Styles and Proposed Additional Styles. *International Journal of Research in IT, Management and Engineering*, 7(1), 33–44.
57. Sarkar, S., Khare, A., & Sadachar, A. (2020). Influence of consumer decision-making styles on use of mobile shopping applications. *Benchmarking*, 27(1), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BIJ-07-2018-0208>
58. Sual, R. J., Ang, F. M. S., Jumao-as, M. A. A., Macapasir, A. H., & Ragandang Jr, A. (2012). Marketing Strategies as Predictor of Competencies of Selected Established Food Chains in Cagayan de Oro City. *Advancing Social Science Research*, 1(1), 87–101. <https://doi.org/10.7828/assr.v1i1.184>
59. Sungwon Bae, B., & Miller, J. (2009). Consumer Decision-Making Styles for Sport Apparel: Gender Comparisons between College Consumers. *Journal of Research*, 4(1), 40–45.
60. Supaartagorn, C. (2017). Marketing Mix Factors Toward Decision Making in the Purchasing Goods and Services Via Facebook: in the Case of Muang District, Ubonrajchathani Province, Thailand. *International Journal of Management and Applied Science*, 3(2), 50–54.

- http://www.ijar.in/jurnal/journal_file/journal_pdf/14-348-149268766250-54.pdf
61. Super, D. E. (1980). A life-span, life-space approach to career development. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 16, 282–298.
 62. Tanksale, D., Neelam, N., & Venkatachalam, R. (2014). Consumer Decision Making Styles of Young Adult Consumers in India. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 133, 211–218. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.04.186>
 63. Thabit, H., & Raewf, M. (2018). The Evaluation of Marketing Mix Elements: A Case Study. *International Journal of Social Sciences & Educational Studies*, 4(4). <https://doi.org/10.23918/ijsses.v4i4p100>
 64. Thabit, T. H., & Aissa, S. A. H. (2019). Modelling the Relevance between the Relationship Marketing and WOM Marketing through the Customer Satisfaction Case Study in Algeria Telecommunications Corporation. *Tikrit Journal of Administrative and Economic Sciences*, 15(45 Part 1), 1–21.
 65. Tyagi, A. (2018). A Study on Factors Affecting Consumer Buying Behaviour. *International Journal of Business and Research*, 11(November).
 66. Viridi, P., Kalro, A. D., & Sharma, D. (2020). Online Decision Aids: The Role of Decision-Making Styles and Decision-Making Stages. *International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management*, 48(6), 555–574. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJRDM-02-2019-0068>
 67. Walsh, G., Hennig-Thurau, T., Wayne-Mitchell, V., & Wiedmann, K.-P. (2001). Consumers' decision-making style as a basis for market segmentation. *Journal of Targeting, Measurement and Analysis for Marketing*, 10(2), 117–131. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jt.5740039>
 68. Wilson, D. T. (1971). Industrial Buyers' Decision-Making Styles. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 8(4), 433. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3150232>
 69. Yousef, D. A. (1998). Predictors of decision-making styles in a non-western country. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 19(7), 366–373. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01437739810242522>