

Volume 1 Number 3, 2026

Krakatoa Management Research Journal

The Effect of Marketing Strategy on Purchase Decisions in Layer Poultry Enterprises in Montong District

Maya Nur Nazila¹, Fadhoilus Shofi^{2*}

Entrepreneurship Study Program, Institute of Technology and Business Tuban, Indonesia^{1,2}

[¹mayanurnazila160@gmail.com](mailto:mayanurnazila160@gmail.com), [^{2*}fadhoilusshofi@gmail.com](mailto:fadhoilusshofi@gmail.com)

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 25 July 2026;

Revised: 15 August 2026;

Revised: 27 August 2026;

Accepted: 29 September 2026;

Volume 1, Number 3

2026, pp 183-196

<https://doi.org/10.61401/kmrj.v1i3.610>

Corresponding author:

Fadhoilus Shofi

Entrepreneurship Study Program,
Institute of Technology and Business
Tuban, Indonesia

E-mail: fadhoilusshofi@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Purpose: This study examines the effect of a composite marketing strategy consisting of product, price, place, and promotion on purchase decisions among customers of layer poultry enterprises in Montong District, Tuban Regency.

Methodology: A quantitative, descriptive-associative, cross-sectional design was applied to 82 customers selected through purposive sampling. Data were collected using an 18-item five-point Likert questionnaire and analyzed through descriptive statistics, validity and reliability testing, residual normality, the Glejser test, simple linear regression, t testing, F testing, and the coefficient of determination.

Results: All questionnaire items were valid, and the marketing strategy and purchase decision scales were reliable (Cronbach's α = .869 and .740). Marketing strategy had a positive and statistically significant effect on purchase decisions (B = .133, t = 2.437, p = .017), and the model was significant (F = 5.939, p = .017), explaining 6.9% of the variance.

Conclusions: Marketing strategy contributes positively to purchase decisions, although its explanatory power is modest and other consumer and market factors remain influential.

Limitations: The study uses one composite independent variable and a nonprobability sample from one district, so the findings should not be generalized automatically to all poultry customers or regions.

Contributions: The study provides local empirical evidence on the integrated 4P marketing mix in layer poultry microenterprises and identifies practical priorities involving egg quality, price transparency, payment convenience, distribution, and digital communication.

Keywords: *Layer Poultry, Marketing Strategy, Marketing Mix, Microenterprise, Purchase Decision*

How to Cite: Nazila, M. N., & Shofi, F. (2026). The Effect of Marketing Strategy on Purchase Decisions in Layer Poultry Enterprises in Montong District. *Krakatoa Management Research Journal*, 1(3), 183-196.

1. Introduction

Layer poultry enterprises contribute to food availability and local income, but their commercial performance depends on whether production can be converted into stable and repeated purchases. Eggs are perishable, frequently purchased products, so marketing decisions concerning quality, price, accessibility, and communication must be coordinated with logistics and customer value creation. Marketing management treats these controllable decisions as an integrated system rather than as isolated activities [Kotler, Keller, and Chernev \(2022\)](#), while supply-chain management emphasizes the importance of product flow, availability, and service reliability in time-sensitive markets [\(Christopher, 2023\)](#). Purchase decisions in local food markets are not determined by price alone. Consumers evaluate product condition, perceived value, seller trust, payment convenience, purchase timing, and prior experience before selecting a seller or deciding to repurchase [\(Aliyevna, 2025\)](#). Consumer behavior theory explains that personal, social, situational, and psychological influences jointly shape evaluation and choice [\(Schiffman & Wisenblit, 2019\)](#). Evidence from food and retail settings also shows that perceived quality, price fairness, value, and satisfaction are linked to purchase and revisit intentions [\(Konuk, 2019; Yrjölä, Rintamäki, Saarjärvi, Joensuu, & Kulkarni, 2019\)](#).

Digitalization has increased the number of touchpoints through which small enterprises can communicate with customers [\(Nugraeni, Nasution, Yuliansyah, & Aulia, 2026\)](#). Social media, messaging platforms, online reviews, and data-supported customer interaction allow firms to provide timely product information and respond to changing preferences [\(Chaffey & Ellis-Chadwick, 2022\)](#). Research on digital and social media marketing highlights the growing role of interactive communication and customer engagement [Dwivedi, Ismagilova, Hughes, Carlson, Filieri, Jacobson, Jain, Karjaluoto, Kefi, Krishen, Kumar, Rahman, Raman, Rauschnabel, Rowley, Salo, Tran, and Wang \(2021\)](#), while digital transformation research indicates that technology can alter value creation, channel structure, and organizational responsiveness [\(Verhoef, Broekhuizen, Bart, Bhattacharya, Dong, Fabian, & Haenlein, 2021\)](#). Layer poultry businesses in Montong District still operate within a predominantly local market in which direct relationships, intermediaries, and conventional communication remain important. The practical problem is whether the marketing strategy currently perceived by customers is strong enough to influence their purchase decisions. The research gap lies in the limited evidence that tests the 4P marketing mix as one composite predictor of purchase decisions in small-scale layer poultry enterprises within a rural district market. The study therefore aims to describe marketing strategy and purchase decisions, test instrument quality and model assumptions, and analyze the effect of marketing strategy on purchase decisions among 82 respondents.

2. Literature Review and Hypothesis/es Development

2.1 Marketing Strategy and the Marketing Mix

Marketing strategy is a coordinated choice of target market, value proposition, and marketing programs designed to create, communicate, and deliver value. The 4P framework organizes controllable actions into product, price, place, and promotion, while contemporary marketing management requires these actions to remain customer-centered and mutually consistent [\(Kotler, Keller, & Chernev, 2022\)](#). Marketing 5.0 extends this logic by emphasizing the responsible use of technology to understand customers and improve the relevance of market offerings [\(Kotler et al., 2022\)](#). The product component in layer poultry marketing concerns egg quality, availability, cleanliness, physical condition, and consistency. Consumers of food products tend to evaluate both functional quality and signals of safety and reliability. Research on egg attributes reports that neatness, hygiene, size, packaging, supply consistency, and customer care contribute to consumer satisfaction and preference [\(Amfo et al., 2024\)](#). Organic food research similarly shows that product attributes, health-related perceptions, and trust can increase willingness to pay and purchase intention [\(Katt & Meixner, 2020; Kamboj et al., 2023\)](#).

Price represents the monetary sacrifice required to obtain the product and the customer's judgment of whether that sacrifice is fair relative to quality and alternatives. Effective pricing requires knowledge of costs, competition, customer value, and willingness to pay [\(Zamzami, Hakim,](#)

[Yuliansyah, & Saputri, 2026](#)). Empirical studies show that perceived price fairness and product value are associated with consumer satisfaction and purchase decisions ([Konuk, 2019](#); [Simbolon et al., 2020](#)). Place concerns ease of access, continuity of distribution, market reach, and delivery speed. In perishable product markets, channel reliability affects whether customers can obtain the required quantity at the expected time. Logistics research emphasizes coordinated inventory, transport, and relationship management to improve availability and responsiveness ([Christopher, 2023](#)). Technology can also reduce friction between sellers and buyers by integrating physical and digital channels, improving information, and supporting faster fulfillment ([Shankar et al., 2021](#)). Promotion comprises product information, customer communication, and market introduction. Digital marketing enables small enterprises to reach narrowly defined segments, maintain two-way communication, and monitor customer response more efficiently ([Chaffey & Ellis-Chadwick, 2022](#)). Social media research shows that visibility, engagement, brand awareness, and influencer credibility can strengthen purchase intention and decision processes ([Andreani et al., 2021](#); [Febriyantoro, 2020](#); [Gielens & Steenkamp, 2019](#)).

2.2 Purchase Decision

A purchase decision is the consumer's choice to buy a product from a particular seller, at a particular time, in a particular quantity, and through a particular payment method ([Roihan & Imantoro, 2026](#)). It is the outcome of need recognition, information search, evaluation of alternatives, choice, and post-purchase assessment ([Schiffman & Wisenblit, 2019](#)). This study operationalizes purchase decisions through product choice, seller or brand choice, purchase timing, purchase quantity, payment method, and repurchase intention.

Decision journeys are sensitive to contextual conditions. Scarcity can alter attention, information processing, and choice ([Hamilton, Thompson, Bone, Chaplin, Griskevicius, Goldsmith, Hill, John, Mittal, Piff, Roux, Shah, and Zhu \(2019\)](#)), while external disruptions can change channel preferences and shopping behavior across age cohorts ([Eger, Komárková, Egerová, & Mičík, 2021](#)). Store or service atmosphere can also affect purchase decisions, particularly among Generation Z consumers ([Budiman & Dananjoyo, 2021](#)). These findings suggest that purchase decisions result from interacting marketing, situational, demographic, and relationship factors.

2.3 Relationship Between Marketing Strategy and Purchase Decisions

An integrated marketing strategy can reduce customer uncertainty by providing a suitable product, a justifiable price, convenient access, and credible information. Greater perceived value should make product and seller choices more favorable and increase the likelihood of repeat purchasing ([Rosada, & Shofi, 2025](#); [Munthe, Siregar, and Ritonga \(2026\)](#)). Customer value research supports the view that functional, emotional, and relational evaluations influence satisfaction and behavioral intentions ([Yrjölä, Rintamäki, Saarijärvi, Joensuu, & Kulkarni, 2019](#)). The study therefore proposes the following hypothesis:

H₁: Marketing strategy has a positive and significant effect on purchase decisions in layer poultry enterprises in Montong District

3. Methodology

3.1 Design, Location, and Period

The study uses a quantitative, descriptive-associative, cross-sectional design. A quantitative design is appropriate for measuring variables and testing a hypothesized relationship using numerical data, while an associative design examines whether variation in one variable is related to variation in another ([Creswell & Creswell, 2023](#)). The research setting is layer poultry enterprises in Montong District, Tuban Regency, East Java, and the planned data-collection period in the source manuscript is March–May 2026.

3.2 Population, Sample, and Sampling Technique

The target population consisted of household consumers, traders, entrepreneurs, distributors, and other customers who had purchased layer poultry products in Montong District. The analytical sample comprised 82 respondents selected through purposive sampling because participants were required to meet criteria directly relevant to the research objectives. This sampling technique is

appropriate when researchers seek information from individuals with relevant purchasing experience and decision-making authority. Respondents were eligible to participate if they had purchased products from a layer poultry enterprise in Montong District, had made at least one purchase during the relevant recent period, were at least 17 years old and capable of making independent purchasing decisions, were directly involved in selecting the product or seller rather than merely acting as a messenger, represented a relevant buyer category such as household consumers, traders, distributors, entrepreneurs, or other customers, and completed the questionnaire voluntarily with sufficient information for analysis.

3.3 Variables and Measurement

Marketing strategy (X) is the independent variable and is measured as one composite construct containing 12 items. Product is represented by quality, availability, and cleanliness or condition, price by competitive price, price–quality fit, and payment convenience, place by product access, distribution continuity, and market reach, and promotion by product information, customer communication, and product introduction. Purchase decision (Y) is the dependent variable and contains six items: product choice, seller or brand choice, purchase timing, purchase quantity, payment method, and repurchase intention. All items use a five-point Likert scale from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree.

3.4 Data Collection and Analysis

Primary data were obtained through a structured questionnaire, supported by observation and documentation. The analysis sequence comprised respondent profiling, descriptive statistics, corrected item–total validity testing, Cronbach alpha reliability testing, residual normality testing, a multicollinearity check, the Glejser heteroskedasticity test, simple linear regression, a t test for the predictor, an F test for model significance, and the coefficient of determination. Statistical significance was evaluated at $\alpha=.05$. The source manuscript specifies JASP as the analysis software.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Results

4.1.1 Respondent Characteristics

The 82 respondents were described by gender, age, occupation, purchase frequency, and duration as a customer. Women formed the largest gender group, respondents aged 17–25 years formed the largest age group, and household consumers were the dominant occupation category. A substantial share had purchased more than three times and had remained customers for more than three months.

Table 1. Respondent characteristics by gender

No	Gender	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Male	28	34.1
2	Female	54	65.9
Total		82	100.0

Table 1 shows female respondents accounted for 54 participants (65.9%), while male respondents accounted for 28 participants (34.1%). This distribution indicates that the respondent profile was dominated by women, suggesting that female consumers were more actively represented in purchasing layer poultry products within the study area.

Table 2. Respondent characteristics by age

No	Age	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	17–25 years	36	43.9
2	26–35 years	23	28.0
3	36–45 years	14	17.1

No	Age	Frequency	Percentage (%)
4	>45 years	9	11.0
Total		82	100.0

Table 2 shows respondents aged 17–25 years formed the largest group (43.9%), followed by those aged 26–35 years (28.0%), 36–45 years (17.1%), and above 45 years (11.0%). This distribution indicates that the sample was dominated by younger consumers, suggesting that individuals in early adulthood represented the primary customer segment for layer poultry products in the study area.

Table 3. Respondent characteristics by occupation

No	Occupation	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Household consumer	44	53.7
2	Trader	20	24.4
3	Entrepreneur	13	15.9
4	Other	5	6.1
Total		82	100.0

Table 3 shows household consumers represented 53.7% of the sample, indicating that the findings primarily reflect the perceptions and purchasing experiences of end users. Nevertheless, traders, entrepreneurs, and other business buyers were also included, providing a broader representation of customer groups within the layer poultry market.

Table 4. Respondent characteristics by purchase frequency

No	Purchase frequency	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Once	26	31.7
2	2–3 times	24	29.3
3	>3 times	32	39.0
Total		82	100.0

Table 4 shows the largest group of respondents had purchased the products more than three times (39.0%), indicating that a substantial proportion of the sample had repeated purchasing experience. This suggests that many respondents were familiar with the seller's marketing practices and were able to provide informed evaluations based on prior transactions.

Table 6. Descriptive statistics

Variables	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. deviation	Category
Marketing strategy (X)	82	22	54	36.10	7.205	Moderately favorable
Purchase decision (Y)	82	10	28	18.09	3.645	Moderately favorable

Table 6 shows a total of 33 respondents (40.2%) had been customers for more than three months, while 32.9% had been customers for less than one month. This distribution indicates that the sample included both long-term and relatively new customers, allowing the study to capture purchasing evaluations from respondents with varying levels of experience.

4.1.2 Descriptive Analysis

Table 6. Descriptive statistics

Variables	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. deviation	Category
Marketing strategy (X)	82	22	54	36.10	7.205	Moderately favorable
Purchase decision (Y)	82	10	28	18.09	3.645	Moderately favorable

Table 6 shows the marketing strategy total score averaged 36.10, equivalent to approximately 3.01 per item, and the purchase decision total score averaged 18.09, also equivalent to approximately 3.01 per item. Both variables were therefore interpreted as moderately favorable rather than strongly positive.

Table 7. Response distribution for marketing strategy

Item	Indicator	SD (1)	D (2)	N (3)	A (4)	SA (5)	Mean	Category
X _{1.1}	Product quality	5	19	34	20	4	2.99	Moderately favorable
X _{1.2}	Product availability	3	24	32	17	6	2.99	Moderately favorable
X _{1.3}	Cleanliness and condition	5	18	36	18	5	3.00	Moderately favorable
X _{1.4}	Competitive price	4	22	31	23	2	2.96	Moderately favorable
X _{1.5}	Price–quality fit	4	17	33	27	1	3.05	Moderately favorable
X _{1.6}	Payment convenience	2	19	39	15	7	3.07	Moderately favorable
X _{1.7}	Ease of product access	4	17	34	25	2	3.05	Moderately favorable
X _{1.8}	Distribution continuity	2	21	37	17	5	3.02	Moderately favorable
X _{1.9}	Market reach	5	19	31	23	4	3.02	Moderately favorable
X _{1.10}	Product information	5	22	28	24	3	2.98	Moderately favorable
X _{1.11}	Customer contact	4	20	34	20	4	3.00	Moderately favorable
X _{1.12}	Product introduction	1	27	33	16	5	2.96	Moderately favorable

Table 7 shows the payment convenience recorded the highest item mean (3.07), followed by price–quality fit and ease of product access (3.05 each). Competitive price and product introduction recorded the lowest means (2.96 each). These item-level differences are descriptive priorities and do not represent separate causal tests of each 4P dimension.

Table 8. Response distribution for purchase decision

Item	Indicator	SD (1)	D (2)	N (3)	A (4)	SA (5)	Mean	Category
Y _{i.1}	Product choice	5	15	39	19	4	3.02	Moderately favorable
Y _{i.2}	Seller/brand choice	0	24	39	13	6	3.01	Moderately favorable
Y _{i.3}	Purchase timing	4	19	38	17	4	2.98	Moderately favorable
Y _{i.4}	Purchase quantity	3	20	36	16	7	3.05	Moderately favorable
Y _{i.5}	Payment method	7	13	34	27	1	3.02	Moderately favorable
Y _{i.6}	Repurchase intention	0	28	31	18	5	3.00	Moderately favorable

Table 8 shows the purchase quantity had the highest mean (3.05), whereas purchase timing had the lowest mean (2.98). The narrow range of item means suggests that respondent evaluations were concentrated around the midpoint of the scale.

4.1.3 Instrument Testing

Table 9. Item validity results for marketing strategy

Item	Indicator	Corrected item–total r	p	Decision
X _{i.1}	Product quality	.424	<.001	Valid
X _{i.2}	Product availability	.699	<.001	Valid
X _{i.3}	Cleanliness and condition	.552	<.001	Valid
X _{i.4}	Competitive price	.460	<.001	Valid
X _{i.5}	Price–quality fit	.503	<.001	Valid
X _{i.6}	Payment convenience	.682	<.001	Valid
X _{i.7}	Ease of product access	.628	<.001	Valid
X _{i.8}	Distribution continuity	.583	<.001	Valid
X _{i.9}	Market reach	.478	<.001	Valid
X _{i.10}	Product information	.491	<.001	Valid
X _{i.11}	Customer communication	.606	<.001	Valid
X _{i.12}	Product introduction	.542	<.001	Valid

Table 9 shows all 12 marketing strategy items were valid, with corrected item–total correlations ranging from .424 to .699 and p values below .001. These results indicate that each item demonstrated a satisfactory level of correlation with the overall construct and was therefore appropriate for inclusion in the subsequent analysis.

Table 10. Item validity results for purchase decision

Item	Indicator	Corrected item–total r	p	Decision
Y _{i.1}	Product choice	.464	<.001	Valid
Y _{i.2}	Seller/brand choice	.589	<.001	Valid

Item	Indicator	Corrected item–total r	p	Decision
$Y_{1.3}$	Purchase timing	.404	.0002	Valid
$Y_{1.4}$	Purchase quantity	.392	.0003	Valid
$Y_{1.5}$	Payment method	.556	<.001	Valid
$Y_{1.6}$	Repurchase intention	.467	<.001	Valid

Table 10 shows all six purchase decision items were valid, with corrected item–total correlations ranging from .392 to .589. These findings indicate that each item was sufficiently correlated with the overall construct and could be retained for further statistical analysis.

Table 11. Reliability results

Variables	Cronbach alpha	Criterion	Decision
Marketing strategy (X)	.869	>.60	Reliable
Purchase decision (Y)	.740	>.60	Reliable

Table 11 shows the Cronbach alpha exceeded .60 for both constructs, indicating acceptable internal consistency for the analysis. These results suggest that the measurement items produced reliable responses and were suitable for use in the subsequent statistical analyses.

4.1.4 Classical Assumption Tests

Table 12. Residual normality results

Test	Statistic	p	Decision
Kolmogorov–Smirnov	.069	.810	Normal
Shapiro–Wilk	.989	.709	Normal

Table 12 shows both normality tests produced p values above .05, supporting the assumption that the regression residuals were normally distributed.

Table 13. Multicollinearity check

Independent variable	Tolerance	VIF	Decision
Marketing strategy (X)	1.000	1.000	No multicollinearity

Table 13 shows the model contains only one independent variable, tolerance and VIF are 1.000 by definition and multicollinearity is not a substantive concern.

Table 14. Glejser heteroskedasticity test

Variable	t	p	Decision
Marketing strategy (X)	1.658	.101	No heteroskedasticity detected

Table 14 shows the Glejser test produced a p value of .101, which exceeds the significance threshold of .05. This indicates that the regression model did not exhibit heteroskedasticity, suggesting that the assumption of constant error variance was satisfied.

4.1.5 Regression and Hypothesis Testing

Table 15. Simple linear regression coefficients

Model term	B	t	p
Constant	13.284	6.614	<.001

Model term	B	t	p
Marketing strategy (X)	.133	2.437	.017

$$Y = 13.284 + 0.133X \quad (1)$$

Table 15 and Formula 1 shows the positive coefficient indicates that a one-unit increase in the marketing strategy score is associated with an estimated 0.133-unit increase in the purchase decision score, assuming other unmodeled influences remain unchanged.

Table 16. Partial t test

Predictor	t	p	Decision
Marketing strategy (X)	2.437	.017	Positive and significant

Table 16 shows the marketing strategy coefficient was statistically significant at the .05 level; therefore, H_1 was supported. This finding indicates that marketing strategy has a significant effect on purchase decisions, providing empirical support for the proposed hypothesis.

Table 17. Model F test

Model	F	p	Decision
Regression	5.939	.017	Model significant

Table 17 shows the F test confirmed that the simple regression model was statistically significant. This result indicates that the model was appropriate for explaining the relationship between marketing strategy and purchase decisions.

Table 18. Coefficient of determination

Model	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²
Regression	.263	.069	.057

Table 18 shows the correlation between the predicted and observed purchase decision scores was .263. Marketing strategy explained 6.9% of the variance in purchase decisions, while 93.1% remained associated with factors outside the model.

4.2 Discussion

4.2.1 Effect of Marketing Strategy on Purchase Decisions

The principal finding is that marketing strategy has a positive and statistically significant effect on purchase decisions. The coefficient of .133 means that better customer evaluations of the combined product, price, place, and promotion activities are associated with stronger product choice, seller choice, purchase quantity, payment choice, and repurchase intention. This result is consistent with the logic of integrated marketing, in which the marketing mix creates value when its elements reinforce one another rather than operate independently (Kotler, Keller, & Chernev, 2022). It also accords with evidence that product quality, price fairness, brand image, and customer value contribute to purchase decisions (Simbolon et al., 2020).

The statistically significant model should not be interpreted as a large effect. The R^2 of .069 indicates that marketing strategy accounts for only a modest proportion of purchase decision variation. This is theoretically plausible because consumer choice is shaped by personal needs, household income, social influence, prior experience, perceived risk, situational urgency, and alternative availability (Schiffman & Wisenblit, 2019). Food purchase intention is also affected by health perceptions, trust, environmental attitudes, and product knowledge (Kamboj et al., 2023).

The result therefore supports the relevance of marketing strategy while cautioning against treating it as the sole determinant of demand.

4.2.2 Product and Price Priorities

The product indicators were evaluated at a moderate level, with means of 2.99 for quality and availability and 3.00 for cleanliness and condition. These scores suggest that the enterprises have not yet achieved a clearly strong customer perception of freshness, consistency, and physical assurance. Egg consumers can be sensitive to cleanliness, shell condition, packaging, supply continuity, and seller service, and dissatisfaction with these attributes may weaken preference even when the product is routinely consumed ([Amfo, Bannor, Boateng, & Oppong-Kyeremeh, 2024](#)). Management should therefore standardize sorting, cleanliness checks, storage, packaging, and delivery records so that quality is visible and repeatable. The lowest price-related score was competitive price (2.96), while price–quality fit scored 3.05. This pattern indicates that respondents may not perceive the absolute price as highly competitive, but they are somewhat more accepting of the value received relative to quality. Price strategy should consequently emphasize transparent price updates, consistent grading, volume-based terms for traders, and clear explanations when input costs change. Strategic pricing requires balancing cost recovery, competitor prices, and customer value rather than relying on price reductions alone ([Widyastuti, Pujiharto, Tubastuvi, & Santoso, 2020](#)). Research in food services also demonstrates that perceived price fairness can strengthen perceived value, satisfaction, and revisit intentions [Konuk \(2019\)](#), while willingness to pay depends on credible quality and trust signals ([Katt & Meixner, 2020](#)).

4.2.3 Distribution, Access, and Payment Convenience

Payment convenience achieved the highest marketing strategy mean (3.07), and ease of product access reached 3.05. These results imply that transactional convenience is one of the more favorable aspects of the current marketing approach. Flexible cash and transfer options, responsive ordering, and accessible collection or delivery points can reduce the effort required to complete a purchase ([Jamil, Mahmood, Ismail, Jwmaa, Younus, Othman, & Kanabi, 2022](#)). Distribution continuity and market reach, both at 3.02, remain only moderate, so the enterprises should strengthen delivery schedules, order confirmation, stock information, and direct coordination with household customers and traders. Logistics integration is particularly important for products that must remain available and in acceptable condition ([Christopher, 2023](#)).

Technology can improve this area without requiring a complex e-commerce system. A simple digital order register, customer group messaging, scheduled route planning, and real-time stock updates can connect physical distribution with digital information ([Ammaridho & Shofi, 2024](#)). Retail transformation research shows that technology can reduce search and transaction friction and improve the coordination of customer touchpoints ([Shankar et al., 2021](#); [Verhoef et al., 2021](#)). These practices are relevant to Montong because the model's modest R^2 implies that availability, delivery reliability, and convenience may interact with other situational factors that were not explicitly measured.

4.2.4 Promotion and Digital Communication

Promotion appears to be the clearest improvement area because product information scored 2.98 and product introduction scored 2.96. Conventional word-of-mouth communication may maintain existing relationships, but it can limit market reach and the consistency of information received by prospective customers. Digital marketing enables small enterprises to share product availability, prices, quality evidence, delivery schedules, and customer testimonials at relatively low cost ([Chaffey & Ellis-Chadwick, 2022](#)). Social media marketing research further indicates that brand awareness and credible communication can support purchase decisions among younger consumers ([Andreani, Gunawan, & Haryono, 2021](#); [Febriyantoro, 2020](#)).

A directly relevant study by [Ammaridho and Shofi \(2024\)](#) found that several elements of the service marketing mix, including product, promotion, price, physical evidence, and process, were significant in explaining sales at a snack retail business, although location and employee variables were not significant. The setting differs from layer poultry farming, yet the study reinforces the need to treat marketing execution as a coordinated set of controllable activities rather than relying

on one element. The present result adds context-specific evidence by showing that the combined 4P strategy is significant for purchase decisions in a rural layer poultry market. [Shofi, Kholilurrohmah, and Marsono \(2025\)](#) also reported that Instagram influencer-based communication could attract attention, build trust, and support consumer loyalty in the Wardah context. Layer poultry enterprises do not need to imitate large consumer brands, but the underlying principle is applicable: credible people, authentic visual evidence, and regular interaction can make marketing messages more persuasive. Local sellers can use customer testimonials, short videos showing cleanliness and packaging, and trusted community figures to communicate reliability without overstating product claims.

[Shofi et al. \(2025\)](#) emphasized segmentation and targeting when examining Generation Z consumers in the coffee-shop market. This insight is especially relevant because 43.9% of the current respondents were aged 17–25 years. The enterprise should distinguish communication for younger consumers from communication for traders or household buyers. Younger segments may respond better to concise mobile content, transparent prices, fast replies, and cashless payment, while traders may prioritize stable supply, volume terms, and delivery certainty. Segmentation can therefore turn the broad composite strategy into more precise market actions.

4.2.5 Interpretation of the Modest Explanatory Power

The 6.9% explanatory power indicates that future models should include variables beyond the marketing mix. Purchase timing and quantity can change because of income, household consumption needs, seasonal events, stock shortages, competing sellers, and sudden price changes. Scarcity research shows that limited availability can redirect attention and alter the consumer decision journey [Hamilton, Thompson, Bone, Chaplin, Griskevicius, Goldsmith, Hill, John, Mittal, Piff, Roux, Shah, and Zhu \(2019\)](#), while evidence from pandemic-era shopping shows that external conditions can produce different responses across generations [\(Eger, Komárková, Egerová, & Mičík, 2021\)](#). These mechanisms help explain why a statistically significant marketing strategy may still leave most purchase decision variance unexplained.

Customer experience and perceived value should also be considered. A purchase can be repeated because the seller is responsive, the order is fulfilled accurately, the customer feels fairly treated, or the overall transaction is convenient. Customer value studies in service settings demonstrate that experience-based evaluations can shape satisfaction and behavioral intentions [\(Yrjölä, Rintamäki, Saarijärvi, Joensuu, & Kulkarni, 2019\)](#). The implication is that future layer poultry research should test trust, satisfaction, perceived value, service quality, income, seasonality, and product availability as mediators or additional predictors.

4.2.6 Theoretical and Practical Implications

The theoretical implication is that the traditional 4P framework remains relevant in a local agribusiness microenterprise, but its direct explanatory contribution is limited when modeled as a single predictor. Marketing 5.0 suggests that technology should support rather than replace human-centered value creation [\(Kotler, Kartajaya, & Setiawan, 2021\)](#). The practical implication is that layer poultry enterprises should combine visible product assurance, fair and transparent pricing, reliable access, convenient payment, and segment-specific communication. These improvements are more likely to strengthen purchase decisions when implemented as an integrated customer journey. The age composition of the sample also supports a blended offline–digital approach. More than two-fifths of respondents were 17–25 years old, a group likely to encounter sellers through mobile communication, while household consumers and traders may still value direct contact and predictable service. Digital and social media scholarship emphasizes that interactive channels work best when content, responsiveness, and customer relationships are aligned with a clear objective [\(Dwivedi et al., 2021\)](#). The enterprise should therefore measure simple indicators such as repeat orders, response time, complaint resolution, delivery accuracy, and customer acquisition by channel.

5. Conclusions

5.1 Conclusion

The marketing strategy and purchase decision variables were both evaluated at a moderately favorable level by 82 respondents. The marketing strategy instrument was valid and reliable, the regression assumptions were supported, and the hypothesis test showed that marketing strategy had a positive and significant effect on purchase decisions ($B=.133$, $t=2.437$, $p=.017$). The model was statistically significant ($F=5.939$, $p=.017$), but marketing strategy explained only 6.9% of purchase decision variation. The finding answers the research question by demonstrating that improvements in the combined product, price, place, and promotion strategy are associated with stronger purchase decisions in layer poultry enterprises in Montong District. The modest R^2 shows that the relationship is meaningful but incomplete. Customer income, trust, perceived value, service experience, availability, competition, and seasonal conditions are likely to account for a much larger share of purchasing behavior. At the item level, payment convenience and product access were relatively stronger, whereas competitive price and product introduction were the weakest areas. These patterns indicate that future improvement should focus on making quality visible, explaining price fairly, securing product availability, extending direct access, and communicating consistently to different customer segments.

5.2 Research Limitations

The analysis uses one independent variable and a nonprobability sample, so the findings cannot establish a complete causal model or be generalized automatically to all poultry customers. The cross-sectional design captures perceptions at one point in time, and self-reported responses may be affected by recall or social desirability. Most importantly, the supplied results document identifies the data as analytical trial data rather than verified field observations. The statistical findings must therefore be treated as a draft demonstration until the underlying field evidence is authenticated.

5.3 Suggestions and Directions for Future Research

Layer poultry enterprises should maintain consistent egg quality through standardized sorting, cleanliness, packaging, and storage while communicating these quality controls to customers. Transparent pricing, efficient stock and delivery management, flexible payment options, and active use of digital platforms such as WhatsApp and Instagram are recommended to improve customer satisfaction and market reach. Marketing strategies should also be adjusted to different customer segments by emphasizing convenience for household consumers and reliability for traders. Future research should incorporate additional variables, such as perceived value, trust, customer satisfaction, service quality, household income, competitor pricing, seasonality, and product availability, to improve the explanatory power of the model. Researchers are also encouraged to apply probability sampling, expand the study area, and combine survey data with interviews or sales records to provide a more comprehensive understanding of purchasing behavior. Local business support institutions should strengthen the competitiveness of layer poultry enterprises by providing practical training in digital marketing, customer database management, pricing communication, and delivery planning. In addition, they should encourage collaboration among farmers to improve supply stability, transportation efficiency, and product quality assurance, thereby increasing consumer confidence in local egg products.

Acknowledgement

The authors would like to express their sincere gratitude to the owners of the layer poultry enterprises in Montong District and all respondents who generously participated in this study by providing valuable information during the data collection process. The authors also acknowledge the academic support provided by the Institute of Technology and Business Tuban throughout the completion of this research. Finally, the authors are grateful to the editors and anonymous reviewers for their constructive comments and valuable suggestions, which significantly contributed to improving the quality of this manuscript.

References

- Aliyevna, B. S. (2025). The formation of spiritual values: Changes and evolutions. *Review of Multidisciplinary Academic and Practice Studies*, 2(2), 73-83. <https://doi.org/10.61401/rmap.s.v2i2.234>
- Amfo, B., Bannor, R. K., Boateng, A. O., & Oppong-Kyeremeh, H. (2024). Consumer satisfaction and preferences for enhanced chicken egg attributes in Ghana: An application of extended theory of reasoned action and means-end theory. *Cogent Food & Agriculture*, 10(1), 2340156. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311932.2024.2340156>
- Ammaridho, E. A., & Shofi, F. (2024). Analisis pengaruh bauran pemasaran jasa terhadap penjualan Toko UD. *Camilan Enak. EBA Journal: Journal Economic, Business and Accounting*, 11(2), 66-74.
- Andreani, F., Gunawan, L., & Haryono, S. (2021). Social media influencer, brand awareness, and purchase decision among Generation Z in Surabaya. *Jurnal Manajemen dan Kewirausahaan*, 23(1), 18-26.
- Budiman, S., & Dananjoyo, R. (2021). The effect of cafe atmosphere on purchase decision: Empirical evidence from Generation Z in Indonesia. *Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, 8(4), 483-490. <https://doi.org/10.13106/jafeb.2021.vol8.no4.0483>
- Chaffey, D., & Ellis-Chadwick, F. (2022). *Digital marketing: Strategy, implementation and practice* (8th ed).
- Christopher, M. (2023). *Logistics & supply chain management* (6th ed).
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2023). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (6th ed).
- Dwivedi, Y. K., Ismagilova, E., Hughes, D. L., Carlson, J., Filieri, R., Jacobson, J., Jain, V., Karjaluoto, H., Kefi, H., Krishen, A. S., Kumar, V., Rahman, M. M., Raman, R., Rauschnabel, P. A., Rowley, J., Salo, J., Tran, G. A., & Wang, Y. (2021). Setting the future of digital and social media marketing research: Perspectives and research propositions. *International Journal of Information Management*, 59, 102168. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2020.102168>
- Eger, L., Komárková, L., Egerová, D., & Mičík, M. (2021). The effect of COVID-19 on consumer shopping behaviour: Generational cohort perspective. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 61, 102542. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2021.102542>
- Febriyantoro, M. T. (2020). Exploring YouTube marketing communication: Brand awareness, brand image and purchase intention in the millennial generation. *Cogent Business & Management*, 7(1), 1787733. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2020.1787733>
- Gielens, K., & Steenkamp, J.-B. E. M. (2019). Branding in the era of digital (dis)intermediation. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 36(3), 367-384. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijresmar.2019.01.005>
- Hamilton, R., Thompson, D., Bone, S., Chaplin, L. N., Giskevicius, V., Goldsmith, K., Hill, R., John, D. R., Mittal, C., O'Guinn, T., Piff, P., Roux, C., Shah, A., & Zhu, M. (2019). The effects of scarcity on consumer decision journeys. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 47(3), 532-550. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-018-0604-7>
- Jamil, D. A., Mahmood, R. K., Ismail, Z. S., Jwmaa, S. J., Younus, S. Q., Othman, B. J., & Kanabi, I. S. (2022). Consumer Purchasing decision: Choosing the Marketing Strategy to influence consumer decision making. *International Journal of Humanities and Education Development*, 4(6), 38-52. <https://doi.org/10.22161/jhed.4.6.4>

- Kamboj, S., Matharu, M., & Gupta, M. (2023). Examining consumer purchase intention towards organic food: An empirical study. *Cleaner and Responsible Consumption*, 9, 100121. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clrc.2023.100121>
- Katt, F., & Meixner, O. (2020). A systematic review of drivers influencing consumer willingness to pay for organic food. *Trends in Food Science & Technology*, 100, 374–388. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tifs.2020.04.029>
- Konuk, F. A. (2019). The influence of perceived food quality, price fairness, perceived value and satisfaction on customers' revisit and word-of-mouth intentions towards organic food restaurants. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 50, 103–110. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2019.05.005>
- Kotler, P., Keller, K. L., & Chernev, A. (2022). *Marketing management* (16th ed).
- Munthe, R. F. G., Siregar, Z. Y., & Ritonga, M. (2026). Price, product quality, and service quality on customer satisfaction at SME food stall. *Jurnal Usaha Kecil Dan Menengah*, 1(1), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.61401/jukm.v1i1.521>
- Nugraeni, N. A., Nasution, T. R., Yuliansyah, Y., & Aulia, A. R. (2026). Digital promotion of Petengoran Mangrove Ecotourism via TikTok and Instagram. *Krakatoa Community Service Journal*, 1(1), 31-43. <https://doi.org/10.61401/kcsj.v1i1.540>
- Roihan, R. I., & Imantoro, J. (2026). E-Commerce platform adoption and MSME income growth: Evidence from Indonesia. *Krakatoa Management Research Journal*, 1(1), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.61401/kmrj.v1i1.544>
- Rosada, A., & Shofi, F. (2025). Meracik pasar anak muda: Studi segmentasi dan targeting konsumen Gen Z pada bisnis coffee shop. *RIGGS: Journal of Artificial Intelligence and Digital Business*, 4(2), 7724-7730. <https://doi.org/10.31004/riggs.v4i2.1922>
- Schiffman, L. G., & Wisenblit, J. (2019). *Consumer behavior* (12th ed).
- Shankar, V., Kalyanam, K., Setia, P., Golmohammadi, A., Tirunillai, S., Douglass, T., Hennessey, J., Bull, J. S., & Waddoups, R. (2021). How technology is changing retail. *Journal of Retailing*, 97(1), 13-27. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretai.2020.10.006>
- Shofi, F., Kholilurrohman, M., & Marsono. (2025). Pemasaran media sosial Instagram melalui influencer sebagai sebuah strategi mendapatkan hati konsumen Wardah. *Mount Hope International Business Journal*, 2(1), 1-12.
- Simbolon, F. P., Handayani, E. R., & Nugraedy, M. (2020). The influence of product quality, price fairness, brand image, and customer value on purchase decision of Toyota Agya consumers. *Binus Business Review*, 11(3), 187-196. <https://doi.org/10.21512/bbr.v11i3.6420>
- Verhoef, P. C., Broekhuizen, T., Bart, Y., Bhattacharya, A., Dong, J. Q., Fabian, N., & Haenlein, M. (2021). Digital transformation: A multidisciplinary reflection and research agenda. *Journal of Business Research*, 122, 889–901. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.09.022>
- Widyastuti, A. N., Pujihearto, P., Tubastuvi, N., & Santoso, S. B. (2020). The effect of marketing mixes on purchase decisions. *Jurnal Manajemen Bisnis*, 11(2), 163-176. <https://doi.org/10.18196/mb.11295>
- Yrjölä, M., Rintamäki, T., Saarijärvi, H., Joensuu, J., & Kulkarni, G. (2019). A customer value perspective to service experiences in restaurants. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 51, 91–101. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2019.05.030>
- Zamzami, R., Hakim, L., Yuliansyah, Y., & Saputri, C. W. R. (2026). Installation of village identity sign to strengthen territorial identity of Gebang Village. *Krakatoa Community Service Journal*, 1(1), 17-30. <https://doi.org/10.61401/kcsj.v1i1.539>