

THE IMPACT OF MARKETING MIX TO BUYING BEHAVIOR IN MOTOLITE CENTER SURABAYA

Gerald Johnson¹, Tina Melinda²

Universitas Ciputra Surabaya
INDONESIA

E-mails: ¹gjohnson01@magister.ciputra.ac.id,
²tina.melinda@ciputra.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This study aims to determine the impact of marketing mix towards buying behavior in Motolite Center Surabaya. The variables studied in this research are product (X1), price (X2), place (X3), promotion (X4), people (X5), process (X6), and physical evidence (X7). This study uses a multiple regression linear analysis. The population in this study is buyer at Motolite Center Surabaya with a sample consist of 110 respondents who were determined by purposive sampling. The results of this study indicates that only place (X3) have a significant effect on the buying behavior in Motolite Center Surabaya partially with a significance value of 0,007 (less than 0,05). This study also indicates that other variables such as product (X1), price (X2), promotion (X4), people (X5), process (X6), and physical evidence (X7) have no significant effect with significance values more than 0,05. Based on the result of this study, company needs to maintain the variables that have been valued well by the customer and needs to improve several things that customers considered lacking. For the future study, researchers may add other variables that may have impact on buying behavior or use the same variables on different types of companies.

Keywords: product, price, place, promotion, people, process, and physical evidence.

INTRODUCTION

Car battery or what we usually called accu is a vital component functioned to provide energy for the starter dynamo and starting the car. This component also has the role to store the power of all vehicle's electricity needs. Data from Central Bureau of Statistics stated that

in 2017 there are more than 138 million vehicles in Indonesia which consisted of passenger vehicles, buses, trucks, and motorcycles. The data also stated that the need for car batteries in Indonesia is almost 10% from the population.

The author used PT. Sukses Tri Mandiri Jaya as the object for this study. The company itself has been established since 2013 and is a sole distributor in Indonesia for MOTOLITE brand batteries which is supplied and imported from Philippine. This study aims to examine the impact of marketing mix in distributor company which can help the company in many aspects including raising the sales volume by determining the right marketing strategic with the right aspects of marketing mix.

The study conducted by Jeanette (2017) stated that price, place, promotion, people, and process as marketing mix variables had a significant effect on customer's buying behavior. Marcelina (2017) also added that the physical evidence had a significant effect,

which was then complemented by Riyono (2016) who stated that the product also had a significant effect on customer's buying behavior. Thus, this study suggests the hypotheses below:

- H.1 Product significantly affect buying behavior
- H.2 Price significantly affect buying behavior
- H.3 Place significantly affect buying behavior
- H.4 Promotion significantly affect buying behavior
- H.5 People significantly affect buying behavior
- H.6 Process significantly affect buying behavior
- H.7 Physical evidence significantly affect buying behavior

Research Methods

To test hypotheses above, this study used quantitative method. According to Sugiyono in Purnamasari (2015), quantitative method study is a method whereby numbers were used to measure the variables in this study. The population in this study was 110 Motolite Center outlets' customers in Surabaya. The sample used purposive sampling with the criterion of customers who changed old battery's brand to Motolite brand, 110 samples were obtained.

According to Sugiyono in Adhaghassani (2016) research instrument is a tool that is used to make research process systematic. In this study, Likert scale was used to measure the statements in the questionnaire. Variables used in the study were product (X1), price (X2), place (X3), promotion (X4), people (X5), process (X6), physical evidence (X7), and buying behavior (Y). There were 2 steps conducted in this study. First was validity and reliability test, as well as hypothesis testing on each indicator and variable used. Validity test was conducted using Pearson Correlation and reliability test was conducted using Cronbach Alpha. After two test were conducted, hypothesis testing was conducted using multiple linear regression. If the significance value is less than 5% than it can be concluded that the independent variables in this study have significant influence on the dependent variable.

After the first step was conducted, the examination proceeded to the second step which was classical assumption test. The study used 5 classical assumption tests which consisted of normality test, multicollinearity test, heteroschedasticity test, linearity test, and autocorrelation test.

Results

Table 1. Respondent Data Description

Age	Number of Respondent	Percentage
21-30	4	37,27%
31-40	5	51,82%
>4	1	10,91%

Based on the questionnaire distributed, it could be inferred that majority of the respondents have an age range of 31 to 40 years with percentage of 51,82%. In addition,

37,27% of the respondents are people who are at the age range of 21 to 30 years, and the remaining 10,91% respondents are people who are over 40 years old.

Validity and Reliability Test

All statements in product, price, place, promotion, people, process, physical evidence, and buying behavior show significance value less than 0,05, therefore all the statements in all the variables in this study can be deemed valid.

Each statements also show Cronbach Alpha value of more than 0,6. Therefore all statements in product, price, place, promotion, people, process, physical evidence, and buying behavior are deemed reliable.

Multiple Linear Regression Test

Table 2. Multiple Linear Regression Test

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta	
(Constant)	2,136	0,680		0,002
<i>Product (X₁)</i>	0,121	0,062	0,187	0,052
<i>Price (X₂)</i>	-0,073	0,072	-0,095	0,308
<i>Place (X₃)</i>	0,185	0,067	0,255	0,007
<i>Promotion (X₄)</i>	0,158	0,083	0,189	0,061
<i>People (X₅)</i>	0,035	0,063	0,053	0,577
<i>Process (X₆)</i>	0,061	0,073	0,077	0,405
<i>Physical Evidence (X₇)</i>	0,027	0,077	0,032	0,731

Based on table 2 it could be known that the coefficient value from the regression model to form a multiple linear regression equation could be illustrated by the following mathematical equation: $Y = 2,136 + 0,121X_1 - 0,073X_2 + 0,185X_3 + 0,158X_4 + 0,035X_5 + 0,061X_6 + 0,027X_7$. The regression equation model above has positive value, which means the value of buying behavior is affected by other variables not studied in this study by 2,136.

The positive values on independent variables indicated that for the increase in values of each statements would increase the dependent variable which is buying behavior by that number while assuming that the independent variable stayed constant. On the contrary, the negative value on independent variables indicated that for the increase in values of each statements would decrease the dependent variable by that number while assuming that the independent variable stayed constant.

t-Test

Table 3. t-Test

Model	Unstandardized		Standardized	Sig.	Collinearity	
	Coefficients		Coefficients		Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta		Tolerance	VIF
(Constant)	2,136	0,680		0,002		
<i>Product (X₁)</i>	0,121	0,062	0,187	0,052	0,913	1,096
<i>Price (X₂)</i>	-0,073	0,072	-0,095	0,308	0,960	1,042
<i>Place (X₃)</i>	0,185	0,067	0,255	0,007	0,969	1,032
<i>Promotion (X₄)</i>	0,158	0,083	0,189	0,061	0,830	1,205
<i>People (X₅)</i>	0,035	0,063	0,053	0,577	0,922	1,085
<i>Process (X₆)</i>	0,061	0,073	0,077	0,405	0,985	1,015
<i>Physical Evidence (X₇)</i>	0,027	0,077	0,032	0,731	0,958	1,044

According to table 3, the significance value of product is $0,052 > \alpha(0,05)$. From this statement it can be concluded that product (X1) doesn't have a significant effect on buying

behavior (Y) in Motolite Center Surabaya partially.

The significance value of price is $0,308 > \alpha(0,05)$. From this statement it can be concluded that price (X2) doesn't have a significant effect on buying behavior (Y) in Motolite Center Surabaya partially.

Meanwhile according to table 3, the significance value of place is $0,007 < \alpha(0,05)$. From this statement it can be concluded that place (X3) have a significant effect on buying behavior (Y) in Motolite Center Surabaya partially.

Next, the significance value of promotion is $0,061 > \alpha(0,05)$. From this statement it can be concluded that promotion (X4) doesn't have a significant effect on buying behavior (Y) in Motolite Center Surabaya partially.

The significance value of people is $0,577 > \alpha(0,05)$. From this statement it can be concluded that people (X5) doesn't have a significant effect on buying behavior (Y) in Motolite Center Surabaya partially.

concluded that process (X6) doesn't have a significant effect on buying behavior (Y) in Motolite Center Surabaya partially.

And the significance value of physical evidence is $0,731 > \alpha(0,05)$. From this statement it can be concluded that physical evidence (X7) also doesn't have a significant effect on buying behavior (Y) in Motolite Center Surabaya partially.

F-Test

Table 4. F-Test

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
<i>Regression</i>	4,079	7	0,583	2,270	0,013
<i>Residual</i>	21,850	102	0,214		
<i>Total</i>	25,930	109			

The result of the F-test show a significance value of $0,013 < 0,05$, which from that

statement it can be concluded that all independent variables (product, price, place, promotion, people, process, and physical evidence) together have a significant effect to buying behavior.

Classical Assumption Test

The result of the normality test showed asymptotic significance level of $0,959 > 0,05$. This suggested that the residual was normally distributed. For the multicollinearity test all independent variables

showed VIF values below 10, which indicate that there are no multicollinearity in the regression model. For the heteroscedasticity test, all independent variables showed significance values of more than 0,05. This can be concluded that the regression model has no heteroscedasticity symptoms. For the autocorrelation test, $DL=1,5565$, $DU=1,8262$, and $(4-DU)=2,1738$. Based on Durbin-Watson which showed 1,914 as the value, it can be concluded that there is no autocorrelation. For the linearity test, the significance value of product, price, promotion, people, process, and physical evidence are above 0,05, so this can be concluded those variables have a non-linear relationship with buying buying behavior (Y). Meanwhile variable place shows significance value of $0,009 < 0,05$. This can be concluded that place (X3) has a linear relationship with buying behavior (Y).

Discussions

Based on table 3, it could be concluded that only place (X3) significantly affect buying behavior with significance value of $0,007 < 0,05$ partially while product (X1), price (X2), promotion (X4), people (X5), promotion (X6), and physical evidence (X7) had no significant effect toward buying behavior in Motolite Center Surabaya partially with significance values more than 0,05. This suggested that only hypotheses 3 could be accepted while hypotheses 1, hypotheses 2, hypotheses 4, hypotheses 5, hypotheses 6, and hypotheses 7 couldn't be accepted. Author did further study using informal interviews on several respondents in Motolite Center Surabaya. Most of respondents stated that variables like product, price, promotion, people, process, and physical evidence mostly are not the main factors for determining their buying decisions. Respondents said that no matter how good the value of the products or how cheap the prices are, it will become less useful if customers can't reach the stores or the outlets. Respondents also explained their reasons with a situation where their car suddenly broke down and urgently needs new battery. In a situation like this, product, price, and other variables are no longer a determining factor for respondents' buying behavior. During emergency situations, respondents usually will try to find the closest store or outlet that provide the needed product, so the problems can be handled with more efficiency.

PT. Sukses Tri Mandiri Jaya has 3 Motolite Center outlets located in South Surabaya, West Surabaya, and Central Surabaya as its main and biggest outlet in Surabaya. With these outlets, company expects they can help customers to find and reach the outlets easily. In addition, the process of buying outside the outlets will be faster and more efficient. Author advised for the company to open more outlets, specially in area which hasn't been covered in

Surabaya to increase the level of sales with considerations from this study.

This study was undertaken to understand the impact of marketing mix toward buying behavior in distributor company. The combined effect analysis using multiple regression showed that only place (X3) significantly affect buying behavior while product (X1), price (X2), promotion (X4), people (X5), promotion (X6), and physical evidence (X7) are not significantly related to buying behavior in Motolite Center Surabaya partially.

Limitations for Further Studies

- This study involved 110 respondents, thus the result of this study can't be generalized in studies with much larger population and sample.
- The result of this study can't be generalized in non-similar business.

REFERENCES

- Adhaghassani, F. S. (2016). *Strategi Bauran Pemasaran (Marketing Mix) 7P (Product, Price, Place, Promotion, People, Process, Physical Evidence) di Cherryka Bakery. Jurnal Pendidikan Teknik Boga.*
- Jeanette, O. P. (2017). *Pengaruh Marketing Mix Terhadap Keputusan Pembelian Konsumen di*

- Libreria Eatery*. 444-458.
- Kotler, P., & Keller, K. L. (2016). *Marketing Management*.
- Marcelina, J., & Tantra, B. (2017). *Pengaruh Marketing Mix (7P) Terhadap Keputusan Pembelian pada Guest House di Surabaya*.
- Purnamasari, Y. (2015). *Pengaruh Kualitas Produk dan Harga Terhadap Kepuasan Konsumen Produk M2 Fashion Online di Singaraja Tahun 2015*. *Jurnal Jurusan Pendidikan Ekonomi*, 5(1).
- Riyono, & Budiharja, G. E. (2016). *Pengaruh Kualitas Produk, Harga, Promosi dan Brand Image Terhadap Keputusan Pembelian Produk Aqua di Kota Pati*. *Jurnal STIE Semarang*, 8(2), 92-121.