THE EFFECT OF MARKETING MIX ON PURCHASING DECISIONS IN FASTFOOD RESTAURANTS (CASE STUDY IN *POPEYE CHICKEN EXPRESS*, SURAKARTA)

Sutrisno Hadi Purnomo[1], Ayu Intan Sari[2], Nita Prasetia[3]
Animal Husbandry Study Program, Faculty of Agriculture, Sebelas Maret University
Email: sutrisnohadi@staff.uns.ac.id
Corresponding Author

Abstract

This research was purposed to describe the implementation of the marketing mix and itsinfluence on consumer purchasing decisions in fast food restaurants. The research was conducted at Popeye's Chicken Express outlet in Surakarta. The location and sampling determination are purposive with the number of respondents as many as 80 people. The method used was a survey, which consist of presurvey and surveys. Variables analyzed include independent variables, namely the marketing mix consisting of the product (X_1), price (X_2), promotion (X_3), place (X_4), people (X_5), process (X_6), and the physical evidence (X_7) also dependent variable, namely the purchase decision (Y).

Data analysis was conducted in this research, which uses a questionnaire test (validity and reliability) and normality and multiple linear regression analysis followed by a test of determination (R^2), F test, t-test, and classical assumption. The questionnaire test showed valid and reliable results. The normality test conducted by Kolmogorov-Smirnov showed normal distribution of data. Multiple linear regression equation $Y= 3,006 + 0,164 X_1 + 0,214 X_2 + 0,119 X_3 + 0,495 X_4 + (-0,167) X_5 + 0,569 X_6 + 0,151 X_7$. The coefficient of determination (R^2) of 0,655, meaning that the dependent purchase decisions variable is influenced by the marketing mix variable amounted to 65,5%. Analysis showed that the variable of marketing mixes simultaneously affects the purchase decision. A marketing mix consisting of variable place and process has a significant effect on consumer purchasing decisions, while variable product, price, promotion, people, and physical evidence do not have a significant effect partially.

Keywords: Marketing Mix; Purchasing Decisions; Fast Food Restaurants

INTRODUCTION

The development of restaurant and restaurant businesses, especially fast-food restaurants,is widely found in the city of Surakarta. Starting from local to international brands, it causes every business to compete for consumers for profit. Some fast-food restaurants on an international scale such as KFC, A & W, and Mc. Donald's, as well as local ones such as olive *fried chicken*, *Rocket Chicken*, and *Jupe Fried Chicken*. Many local fast-food restaurants do not make *Popeye Chicken Express* less competitive but still try to improve the quality of products and services to consumers so that consumers choose to buy at *Popeye Chicken Express* and feel satisfied.

Customer satisfaction is one of the indicators of a business success. This will have a different impact on a business. Therefore, the importance of an effort to find out the behavior of consumers and the selection of the right marketing strategy can make the business survive from its competitors. One of these strategies is the *marketing mix*. A marketing mix strategy ispart of a business strategy that gives direction to all functions and goals of an organization (Cravens, 2000)

People's habits such as eating outside the home, result in changes in lifestyle and

workinghours. It needs the right strategy in running the business so that it gets a lot of consumers. Oneof the marketing tools used is a *marketing* mix. According to Kotler and Keller (2009) the marketing mix is a set of marketing tools that companies use to continuously achieve their company's goals in the target market which includes 7P, namely product, *price*, promotion, distribution channel or *place*, people, process (*process*), physical environment (*physical evidence*).

The emergence of local businesses like Popeye Chicken Express caused fierce competition in Surakarta City. Improper implementation of strategies in marketing can cause Popeye Chicken Express to be unable to survive and lose the competition. One of the marketing strategies that is often used is the marketing mix. The use of the 7P marketing mix on Popeye Chicken Express aims to influence consumers' decisions in buying and using the company's products. The marketing mix can have an impact on consumer satisfaction itself so that consumers who are satisfiedwith the products and services of Popeye Chicken Express can bring profit while helping to market. Therefore, this study aims to determine the influence of the 7P marketing mix (*product, price, place, promotion, people, physical evidence, and process*) on purchasing decisions.

RESEARCH METHODS

Research Location and Time

This research was conducted from January 5 to February 26, 2016, at one of *the Popeye Chicken Express outlets* located at Jalan Hasanudin No.94 A, Punggawan, Banjarsari, Surakarta. The criteria for respondents chosen are consumers who are at least 13 years old and have visited *Popeye Chicken Express* 2 times. The sample used as respondents, which was taken by the *purposive sampling* method, was 80 people.

Data Type and Sources

The study was conducted by a survey method consisting of the pre-survey stage (to find out the location of data collection, the number of consumers, and the determination of samples) and the survey stage (to take primary and secondary data). The data used in this study are primary and secondary data. Primary data were obtained from the results of interviews with managers and the results of filling out questionnaires for respondents in the study. Data collection is carried out in several ways, including observations, interviews with questionnaires, and literature research.

Data Analysis

Qualitative descriptive analysis, which is to find out the characteristics of respondents and the implementation of the marketing mix. Instrument Testing uses validity and reliability tests. The normality test is used to test whether normally distributed data. Multicollinearity, heteroskedasticity, and autocorrelation tests were performed to determine the presence of impaction in the regression model. Data testingwas carried out with the SPSS version 17 program.

Multiple Linear Regression Test

The formula used in the study, namely:

$$Y = a + b_1x_1 + b_2x_2 + b_3x_3 + \ldots + b_7x_7$$

Information:
Y: purchase decision
a: Constant
b: Regression coefficient
x_1: Product variable
x_2: Variable price (*price*)

x3: Place variable
x4: Promotion variable
x5: Variable people
x6: Process variables
x7 : Physical evidence variables

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Overview and Implementation of the Marketing Mix

Popeye Chicken Express is one of the local fast-food restaurants in the city of Surakarta. This restaurant uses a franchise system (*Franchise*) in running its business and the character of figures and consumers who are the target market segmentation currently comes from all age groups. The promotions carried out today are in the formof discounted package menu prices given at certain events, for example when the *outlet*is first opened. Promotions are carried out through *personal selling* from *staff* or *crew*at the cashier, while prices are not carried out because of the pricing itself from the center. *Popeye Chicken Express outlet* Jl. Hasanudin has two floors and is located onthe side of the road, so it is easy to reach but the parking facilities are not so spacious. The first floor is used to serve purchases, kitchens, warehouses, and dining establishments. The second floor is used for dining, toilets, and warehouses. Yellow and red colors in the building are the characteristics of each *outlet*.

Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

The results of the study based on the demographic characteristics of respondents showed that most of the respondents who made the most purchases, namely the age group of 13-23 years as many as 59 people with a percentage of 73.75%, this age group was adolescence and according to the Ministry of Health of the Republic of Indonesia (2009). That means that age can influence a person in making purchasing decisions and teenagers are the most consumers who consume fast food. Based on gender, therewere more women, namely 42 people with a percentage of 52.5%.
The respondents who made the purchase were mostly students or students as manyas 49 people with a percentage of 61.25%. This is due to the tendency of adolescentdiets that cannot be separated from changes in lifestyle, economic growth and the number of restaurants appearing. In accordance with the opinion of Virgianto and Purwaningsih (2006) that lifestyle changes in adolescents have an influence on the choice of the food they will eat, they also often dabble in new foods, one of which is*fried chicken* food.
The income or pocket money that most respondents have, is $\leq$ Rp. 500,000 with atotal of 38 people and a percentage of 47.5%. According to Nisa (2009), a highprice setting will be considered reasonable if it is directly proportional to the quality of the product, it is concluded that the level of income affects what is purchased andalso the lifestyle of a person. Most respondents who became customers, namely for $\leq$ 1 year as many as 36 people with a percentage of 45%. The presentation of food thatdoes not take a long time and a price that suits the pocket makes this food popular among teenagers. Fast food restaurants are becoming the preferred place to eat for teenagers today.

Behavioral Characteristics of Respondents

The results of the study based on the behavioral characteristics of respondents showed that the frequency of purchases at *Popeye Chicken Express* was the highest, which was 2 times per month by 19 people with a percentage of 23.75%. This happens repeatedly because consumers are satisfied with the product or service provided so that they make a repurchase. The opinion of Durianto and Liana (2004) is that the interest in repurchasing is part of the behavioral component in the attitude to consuming a product. Most respondents knew about the

existence of *Popeye* Chicken Express, namely from family/friends as many as 37 people with a percentage of 46.25%. Solomon (2004) states that information to consumers is an important factor in the consumer's buying decision-making process.

The reason for buying the biggest respondents at *Popeye* Chicken Express is because of the affordable price of 21 people with a percentage of 26.25%. According to Schiffman and Kanuk (2007) that the price is said to be expensive, cheap, or mediocre from the individual does not have to be the same, because it depends on the perception of the individual which is motivated by the living environment and conditions of the individual. The type of chicken cut that consumer like the most is the chest part with several 25 people or 31.25%. This is because this type of cut has thicker flesh when compared to other parts such as thighs and wings.In addition, the size of the pieces is an attraction for consumers (Kahn, 1998).

Testing of Research Instruments (Validity and Reliability Test)

The validity test shows a valid result with a calculated rvalue > rtable (0.217) per item of validstatement. Reliability tests *showed the Cronbach* value α > 0.60 on each variable, so it is said to be reliable.

Normality Test

The test results showed that the data was normally distributed with *a value of Asym.sig* >0.05, which is 0.706. According to Priyatno (2014) that a good regression model is one that has a normally distributed residual value.

Multiple Linear Regression Test

Table 3. Multiple Linear Analysis Test Results

Variable	Coefficient Regression	T Count	α = 0,05
X1 (Product)	0,164	0,842	0,403
X2 (Price)	0,119	0,571	0,570
X3 (Promotion)	0,214	1,563	0,122
X4 (Venue)	0,495	2,470	0,016
X5 (Person)	-0,167	-1,181	0,241
X6 (Process)	0,569	3,050	0,003
X7 (Physical Evidence)	0,151	0,715	0,477
Constant	3,006		
Fcount	19,512	Ftable (0.05)	2,130
Adjusted R Square (R^2)	0,621	Fsig	0,000
Dependent variables	Y (Purchase Decision)		

Source : Data Process

Based on Table 3, the multiple linear regression equation is obtained as follows:
Y= 3.006+ 0.164X1+ 0.119X2+ 0.214X3+ 0.495X4- 0.167X5 + 0.569X6 + 0.151X7
It is known that the value of the constant (a) is 3,006, meaning that all free variables (product, price, promotion, place, person, process, and physical evidence) have a value of 0, then the bound variable (purchase decision) is worth 3,006. The value of the regression coefficient X1 (product) is 0.164, meaning that each addition of the value of the product variable is one unit, it will increase the value of the boundvariable (purchase decision) by 0.164. The value of the variable regression coefficientX2 (price) is 0.119, meaning that each addition of the value of the unit price variable,it will increase the bound variable (purchase decision) by 0.119. The value of the variable regression coefficient X3 (promotion) is 0.214, meaning that each addition of the value

of the promotion variable by one unit, it will increase the bound variable (purchase decision) by 0.214. The value of the regression coefficient of the variable X4 (place) is 0.495, meaning that each addition of the value of the variable place one unit, it will increase the bound variable (purchase decision) by 0.495. The value of the variable regression coefficient X5 (person) is -0.167, meaning that each addition of the variable value of one person in unit, will decrease the value of the bound variable (purchase decision) by -0.167. The value of the variable regression coefficient X6 (process) is 0.569, meaning that each addition of the value of the process variable by one unit, will increase the bound variable (purchase decision) by 0.569. The value of the regression coefficient of the variable X7 (physical evidence) is 0.151, meaning that each addition of the value of the physical proof variable of one unit, will increase the bound variable (purchase decision) by 0.151.

T test

In result the t test shows that:

Effect of product variable (X1) on purchasing decision variable (Y)

The calculated t value in the product variable, which is 0.842 < t table (1.669) with its probability value of 0.403 > the significance level (0.05), so H0 is accepted and H1 is rejected. The product variables in this study did not affect the purchasing decision. This is because the product has indicators that can affect the product itself. According to Kotler (2009), products can be measured, among others, through product variations, product quality and product appearance. The variety and quality and appearance of products in competitors are almost the same so that they do not affect purchasing decisions.

Effect of price variable (X2) on purchase decision variable (Y)

The price variable (X2) has a t value (0.571) < t table (1.669) with a sig probability. (0.570) > a significance level (0.05), then H0 is accepted and H1 is rejected. So, it can be concluded that the price has no effect on the purchase decision and has a unidirectional relationship. Consumers consider that price is a variable that is considered important but not in question because of the high purchasing power. According to Fitri (2009), a high price setting will be considered reasonable if it is directly proportional to the quality of the product so that consumers will feel satisfied. Consumers judge that the price of the food menu set by *Popeye Chicken Express* is reasonable and not much different from other similar fast-food restaurants.

The effect of the promotion variable (X3) on the purchase decision variable (Y)

The promotion variable (X3) has a t calculated value (1.563) < t table (1.669) with a probability of sig. (0.122) > a significance level (0.05), then H0 is accepted and H1 is rejected. Based on this, promotion has no effect on purchasing decisions. The promotion carried out by *Popeye Chicken Express*, namely when at the beginning of the opening of the *outlet*, the rest was not promoted through other media. According to Lupiyoadi (2013) that the nature of individual sales can be said to be more flexible because salespeople can also directly adjust sales offers to the needs and behaviors of each potential buyer.

Effect of place variable (X4) on purchasing decision variable (Y)

The place variable (X4) has a t calculated value (2,470) > table t (1,669) with a sig probability. (0.016) < the significance level (0.05), then H0 is rejected and H1 is accepted. Place variables affect purchasing decisions. Lupiyoadi (2013) states that location is the place where the company must be headquartered to carry out its operations or

activities. The location of this restaurant is located not far from schools and government offices and is around businesses in the food sector, thus influencing consumers' decision to buy.

The influence of the person variable (X5) on the purchase decision variable(Y)

The person variable (X5) has a t calculated value (-1.181) < t of the table (1.669) with a probability of sig. (0.241) > the significance level (0.05), then H0 is accepted and H1 is rejected. So, it can be concluded that people have no influence on purchasing decisions and have a unidirectional relationship. The definition of people in this study is employees who serve consumers and is an important element, especially in the delivery of services because according to Harriyanto (2013) the success of marketing a service depends largely on the selection, training, motivation, and management of human resources.

Effect of process variables (X6) on purchasing decision variables (Y)

The process variable (X6) has a t calculated value (3,050) > t of the table (1,669) with a probability of sig. (0.003) < a significance level (0.05), then H0 is rejected and H1 is accepted. Process variables affect purchasing decisions. Park (2004) mentions that the speed of service is a basic attribute of fast- f o o d restaurants. *Popeye Chicken Express* serves consumers quickly and the provision of food that does not take a short time so as not to make consumers wait long.

Effect of physical evidence variable (X7) on purchasing decision variable (Y)

The physical evidence variable (X7) has a t calculated value (0.715) < t table (1.669) with a sig probability. (0.477) > the significance level (0.05), then H0 is accepted and H1 is rejected. The physical evidence variable has no effect on the purchase decision made. This can be due to the unattractive design and inadequate service facilities at *Popeye Chicken Express*. According to Assael (2001), the characteristics of physical evidence or physical environment are the most visible aspects in relation to situations, decorations, rooms, sounds, aromas, light, weather, laying and layouts that appear or the environment is important as an object of stimuli.

Test F

The F calculated value obtained is 19.512 while the F Sig is 0.000. The F value of the table obtained is 2.130 with a significance level at a=5%. The calculated F value (19.512) > the table F (2.130) and the FSig value (0.000) > probability value (0.05), then H0 is rejected and H1 is accepted. It can be concluded that the variables of the marketing mix simultaneously affect purchasing decisions.

Coefficient of Determination Test

The results of the Multiple Regression Analysis Test, the value of R *Square* (R^2) shows several 0.655. This value means that the percentage of contributions influenced by independent variables (product, price, promotion, place, people, process, and physical evidence) has an influence of 65.5% on purchasing decisions, while the other 34.5% is influenced by variables that are not studied. In accordance with the opinion of Zulfikar (2011) who states that if the coefficient of determination is getting closer to one, it can be said that the independent variable affects the dependent variable.

Multicollinearity Test

Based on the Multicollinearities Test, there are no free variables that have a VIF value of < 10 and *a tolerance* value of > 0.10, so it can be concluded that there are no symptoms of multicollinearity in free variables in the regression model.

Heteroskedasticity Test

Based on *the scatterplot*, the dots spread randomly and do not form a specific clear pattern. Then it can be concluded that there is no problem of heteroskedasticity. In accordance with the opinion of Ghozali (2006), who states that a good regression model is one that is homoscedastic or that does not occur heteroskedasticity.

Autocorrelation Test

The Autocorrelation test performed, showed a DW (*Durbin-watson*) result of 1,867. The value is greater than the value of DU (1.831) and smaller than 4-DU (2.133), so it can be concluded that there was no occurrence of autocorrelation in this study.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

The conclusion that can be taken from this study is that simultaneously the marketing mix variables affect the purchase decision (Y). Partially, it is the variables of place (X4) and process (X6) that have a significant effect, while the variables of product (X1), price (X2), promotion (X3), people (X5), and physical evidence (X7) do not exert a significant influence on purchasing decisions.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alma, B. 2013. Marketing Management and Service Marketing. Alphabet. Bandung.Assael, H. 2001. Consumer Behavior. 6th Ed. Thompson-Learning. New York. Ministry of Health of the Republic of Indonesia. 2009. National Health System. Jakarta. Durianto and C.

Liana. 2004. Analysis of the Effectiveness of Soft Softener Television Advertising in Jakarta and Its Surroundings using the Consumed Decision Model. Journalof Corporate Economics. Vol.11(1).

Fitri, E. 2009. Analysis of Marketing Mix and Consumer Behavior towards Purchasing Decisions of MPA Members in the Department Store Unit of the Semen Padang Big Family Cooperative. www.journal.unitas-pdg.ac.id. May 30, 2016.

Ghozali, I. 2006. Multivariate Analysis Applications with SPSS Programs. Fourth Printing.Publishing Agency of Diponegoro University, Semarang.

Kahn, B. E. 1998. Dynamic Relationship with Customer: High-Variety Strategis. Journal of the academy of Markeing Science 26(1): 45-53.

Kotler, P and K. L Keller. 2009. Marketing Management. Volume 1. Thirteenth Edition. Erlangga. Jakarta.

Kotler, P. 2009. Marketing Management. Thirteenth edition. Volume I. Language Transfer: B.Sabran. Erlangga. Jakarta.

Lupiyoadi R. 2013. Service Marketing Management. Third Edition. Salemba Four. Jakarta. Nisa, F. Z. 2009. The Effect of Quality of Pond's COSMETIC PRODUCTS PT. Unilever

Against Customer Purchasing Decisions at PT. Sanrio Swalayan Mojokerto. Thesis of the Department of Social Science Education, Economic Education Study Program, Faculty of Tarbiyah, Maulana Malik Ibrahim State Islamic University Malang. Hapless.

Park, C. 2004. Efficient Or Enjoyable? Consumer Values Of Eating-Out and Fast Food Restaurant Consumption In Korea. Hospitality Management 23:87-94.

Priyatno, D. 2014. SPSS 22: Practical Data Processing. First Edition. First Printing. Andi. Yogyakarta.

Schiffman, L. G and L. L. Kanuk. 2007. Consumer Behavior. Seventh Edition. Translated By Zoelkifli Kasip. Index. Jakarta.

Solomon, R. 2004. Consumer Behaviour. Pearson Education, Inc. New Jersey.

Virgianto, G and Purwaningsih. 2006. Consumption of Fast Food as a Risk of Obesity inAdolescents. http://www. M3undip.Org. 14 September 2016.

Zulfikar, M. W. 2011. Analysis of the Effect of Marketing Mix on Purchasing Decisions (Study on Purchasing Pekalongan Batik Oasis). Thesis. Diponegoro University. Semarang.