EEAJ 15 (3) (2026) 395-406
Economic Education Analysis Journal
https://journal.unnes.ac.id/journals/eeaj

The Effect of the 9P Marketing Mix on Consumer Shopping Satisfaction at Tania Minimarket

Fadillah Fatqur Rohman, Salman Alfarisy Totalia ✉

DOI:10.15294/eeaj.v15i3.65262

Department of Economics Education, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta, Indonesia

Abstract

This study examines the relationships between the nine elements of the marketing mix (9P) and shopping satisfaction at Tania Minimarket, controlling for gender. Using a cross-sectional quantitative design, data were collected through a four-point Likert-scale questionnaire from students of the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Sebelas Maret, who had previously shopped at the minimarket. Respondents were recruited through incidental non-probability sampling, and data were analyzed using multiple linear regression. The findings reveal that people, physical evidence, and packaging were positively and significantly associated with shopping satisfaction, whereas the other marketing-mix elements and gender showed no significant individual associations. These results indicate that the 9P elements do not contribute uniformly to shopping satisfaction, highlighting the relevance of employee-related factors, the physical environment, and packaging in this retail context. The study extends the contextual application of the 9P framework by identifying variation in the associations between individual marketing-mix dimensions and shopping satisfaction. Practically, the findings suggest prioritizing dimensions supported by empirical evidence rather than treating all elements as equally consequential. However, the single-faculty sample and non-probability sampling design constrain generalizability, warranting further validation across more diverse retail settings.

***Keywords**: 9P marketing mix; shopping satisfaction; minimarket; multiple linear regression; college students*

Article Info

Article History: Received: October 14, 2026 | Accepted: October 26, 2026 | Published: December 30, 2026

How To Cite

Rohman, F. F., & Totalia, S. A. (2026). The Effect of the 9P Marketing Mix on Consumer Shopping Satisfaction at Tania Minimarket. *Economic Education Analysis Journal, 15*(3) 2026, 407-423.

© 2026 Universitas Negeri Semarang

✉ Correspondence address:
Gedung B FKIP UNS, Jln. Ir. Sutami 36A Surakarta, 57126
E-mail: salmanalfarisytotalia@staff.uns.ac.id

p-ISSN 2252-6544
e-ISSN 2502-356X

INTRODUCTION

Minimarkets occupy an important position in modern retailing by offering convenient access to frequently purchased goods, standardized services, and a relatively comfortable shopping environment (Wati et al., 2025; Frihatni, 2020). However, these characteristics do not necessarily guarantee customer satisfaction, particularly in settings where consumers have access to alternative retail outlets. Understanding how consumers evaluate different aspects of the shopping experience is therefore important for developing context-sensitive retail marketing strategies. Tania Minimarket, located on the first floor of Building C at the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Sebelas Maret (UNS), serves both as a retail outlet and as an economic education laboratory offering entrepreneurship internship opportunities. Its products include food, beverages, stationery, and daily necessities. Internal sales records indicate a decline in annual revenue from approximately IDR 296.2 million in 2023 to IDR 278.8 million in 2024 and IDR 252.2 million in 2025, representing year-on-year decreases of approximately 5.9% and 9.5%, respectively. Quarterly revenue also fluctuated considerably, indicating that the annual decline was not uniform across reporting periods.

Table 1. Quarterly Revenue of Tania Minimarket and Year-on-Year Changes (IDR)

Quarter	2023	2024	2025	Change 2023–2024	Change 2024–2025
Q1	55,640,632	29,942,282	30,843,627	-46.2%	+3.0%
Q2	86,187,217	60,566,118	79,578,689	-29.7%	+31.4%
Q3	61,391,626	71,293,400	38,977,582	+16.1%	-45.3%
Q4	92,984,988	117,044,620	102,833,953	+25.9%	-12.1%
Total annual revenue	**296,204,463**	**278,846,420**	**252,233,851**	**-5.9%**	**-9.5%**

These figures establish a business-performance concern but do not identify its underlying causes. Revenue may vary with transaction volume, average spending, product availability, operating conditions, academic calendars, or competitive pressures. A newly established campus café offering overlapping product categories provides a plausible competitive context, but no comparative price, customer-traffic, or switching data are available to establish its contribution to Tania Minimarket's revenue decline. Nor can declining revenue be interpreted as direct evidence of declining customer satisfaction. Accordingly, this study addresses a narrower and empirically distinguishable question: how do consumers evaluate Tania Minimarket's marketing-mix attributes, and which attributes are associated with their shopping satisfaction?

Customer satisfaction concerns consumers' evaluations of whether a product or service meets their expectations and needs (Thusyanthy & Tharanikaran, 2017). The expectancy-disconfirmation perspective explains satisfaction as an evaluation arising from comparisons between prior expectations and perceived performance. Schiebler et al. (2026) provide a recent synthesis of this perspective. In retail settings, satisfaction may reflect several dimensions of the shopping experience, including product availability, price, accessibility, service encounters, and the physical environment. Nevertheless, the relevance of these attributes may vary across retail formats and consumer contexts. Yokoyama et al. (2022), for example, discuss the role of convenience-store attributes in consumers' evaluations. This suggests that satisfaction should not be assumed to result equally from every marketing activity; rather, its antecedents require contextual empirical assessment.

The marketing mix provides a framework for examining how organizations configure market-facing activities to create customer value (Kotler & Armstrong, 2018). Although the conventional four-element model emphasizes product, price, place, and promotion, expanded formulations incorporate additional dimensions associated with service delivery and consumption experiences (Badulescu et al., 2026). This study examines nine elements: product, price, place, promotion, people, process, physical evidence, packaging, and payment (Schiebler et al, 2026). Collectively, these dimensions

capture both the functional value of the retail offering and the conditions under which consumers encounter and purchase products. Product and price concern the perceived value of the offering; place and promotion concern accessibility and market communication; people and process capture interpersonal and transactional experiences; physical evidence represents the tangible shopping environment; and payment concerns transaction convenience (Islam & Ferrer, 2025). Packaging is included as a distinct dimension of consumers' evaluations of the products sold.

The relevance of this expanded framework lies not simply in the number of dimensions examined, but in the possibility that different attributes have different associations with satisfaction (Chan et al., 2020). In a campus minimarket, consumers may value product availability and affordable prices while also evaluating employee interactions, store conditions, and transaction convenience (Yokohama et al., 2022). However, the inclusion of these dimensions does not establish that all nine will independently predict satisfaction (Florea et al., 2025). Their empirical relevance depends on consumer perceptions and the specific retail context. Moreover, the nine-element framework requires careful interpretation because some dimensions may overlap conceptually or involve factors beyond the retailer's direct control.

Packaging illustrates this measurement challenge. In this study, packaging refers to consumers' evaluations of the packaging of products sold at Tania Minimarket, using indicators of durability and protection, consumer convenience, seller convenience, buyer appeal, cost, and environmental impact (Pangestu & Siswahyudianto, 2022). These indicators span attributes controlled primarily by product manufacturers and attributes more closely associated with retail handling or presentation. Consequently, the packaging construct represents a heterogeneous set of consumer evaluations rather than a purely retailer-controlled marketing activity. Any managerial implications concerning packaging must therefore distinguish between factors that the minimarket can influence directly and those requiring cooperation with suppliers.

Previous research has examined the relationships between marketing-mix elements and consumer responses, although the findings appear to be context-dependent. For instance, Ghanem et al. (2026) demonstrate the relevance of marketing-mix dimensions in explaining green purchase intention, highlighting the importance of examining marketing strategies within specific market contexts. Similarly, Praveen et al. (2025) show that consumer satisfaction with homegrown brands is associated with context-specific consumer considerations. However, findings from studies examining conventional marketing-mix dimensions or different consumer settings cannot establish whether additional service-related and transactional dimensions contribute distinct explanatory value in a campus-based minimarket. This concern is consistent with Stremersch et al. (2022), who emphasize the value of context-specific research in marketing, particularly in understanding how marketing phenomena may vary across different settings. Evidence from service-related research also suggests that consumer expectations and responses may differ depending on the nature of the service context (Nagashima, 2026). The relevant research problem is therefore not simply whether the marketing mix influences satisfaction, but whether the expanded set of dimensions exhibits differentiated associations within a specific retail environment. This study addresses that question by examining all nine dimensions simultaneously and estimating their individual relationships with shopping satisfaction. It does not assume that adding dimensions necessarily improves theoretical explanation; rather, it evaluates whether the expanded framework identifies a differentiated pattern of associations that a conventional four-element formulation might not capture.

Gender is included as a control variable because consumer evaluations and responses may vary across individual characteristics and decision-making contexts. Research on consumer decision-making has highlighted the importance of accounting for differences in information processing, choice confidence, and consumer responses when examining market outcomes (Cheng et al., 2026; Choi et al., 2026). Nevertheless, demographic differences alone do not establish gender as a confounder, nor should its inclusion be interpreted as evidence that gender systematically determines satisfaction. In this study, gender is treated as a covariate to assess whether the estimated relationships between the

marketing-mix dimensions and satisfaction remain after accounting for gender differences. This approach provides a limited statistical adjustment rather than a comprehensive explanation of demographic heterogeneity.

Accordingly, this study examines the individual and joint relationships between the nine marketing-mix dimensions and shopping satisfaction at Tania Minimarket, with gender included as a control variable. It makes a context-specific empirical contribution by identifying which dimensions exhibit statistically significant associations with satisfaction and which do not. The practical contribution is similarly bounded: the findings can inform managerial prioritization among the dimensions examined, but they cannot establish the causes of revenue decline or demonstrate that changes in satisfaction will necessarily improve financial performance. Given the single-faculty setting and the use of incidental non-probability sampling, the findings are interpreted within the study context rather than generalized to the broader retail population. Gender is included as a control variable to account for potential differences in shopping satisfaction, rather than being positioned as a central theoretical predictor. Based on this rationale, the study tests the following hypotheses:

H1: Product is positively associated with shopping satisfaction.

H2: Price is positively associated with shopping satisfaction.

H3: Place is positively associated with shopping satisfaction.

H4: Promotion is positively associated with shopping satisfaction.

H5: People is positively associated with shopping satisfaction.

H6: Process is positively associated with shopping satisfaction.

H7: Physical evidence is positively associated with shopping satisfaction.

H8: Packaging is positively associated with shopping satisfaction.

H9: Payment is positively associated with shopping satisfaction.

H10: The nine marketing-mix dimensions are jointly associated with shopping satisfaction.

METHOD

Research Design and Sampling

This study employed a quantitative cross-sectional survey design to examine the relationships between nine marketing-mix dimensions and shopping satisfaction at Tania Minimarket, with gender included as a control variable. The target population comprised 5,104 active students enrolled in the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education (FKIP), Universitas Sebelas Maret (UNS), from the 2022–2025 cohorts. Eligible respondents were students who had previously purchased products at Tania Minimarket and were therefore able to evaluate their shopping experiences.

Respondents were recruited using incidental non-probability sampling (Sugiyono, 2016). The questionnaire was distributed through Google Forms, with the survey link circulated in WhatsApp groups and participation based on respondents' voluntary self-selection. All 371 respondents who completed the questionnaire reported having previously shopped at Tania Minimarket. However, the number of individuals who received or accessed the questionnaire, declined participation, failed the eligibility screening, or did not complete the survey was not recorded. Consequently, the response rate and the extent of potential nonresponse bias could not be established.

The initial sample-size target was calculated using Slovin's formula, yielding approximately 371 respondents from the stated population at a nominal 5% error level (Majdina et al., 2024). This calculation was used solely as an initial planning reference, not as evidence of sample representativeness or as a valid basis for claiming a conventional 5% margin of sampling error. Because recruitment relied on non-probability sampling, selection probabilities were unknown and selection bias could not be ruled out (Allison et al., 2025). The achieved sample size was also examined in relation to the proposed regression model through a sensitivity analysis assuming a significance level of 0.05, statistical power of 0.80, 371 observations, and 10 predictors. The resulting detectable effect sizes were conditional on the assumptions of the analysis and should not be interpreted as evidence of representativeness or freedom from selection bias.

Variables and Measurement

The study examined nine marketing-mix dimensions as independent variables: product (X1), price (X2), place (X3), promotion (X4), people (X5), process (X6), physical evidence (X7), payment (X8), and packaging (X9). Shopping satisfaction was specified as the dependent variable (Y), while gender (Z) was included as a categorical control variable. The model treated gender as a main-effect covariate rather than a moderator because no interaction terms were specified. Data were collected using a structured questionnaire administered through Google Forms. Responses to the measurement items were recorded on a four-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). The absence of a neutral response option was intended to encourage respondents to express a directional evaluation. Nevertheless, this format may constrain response variability and does not eliminate the possibility of measurement error.

The questionnaire contained 38 items measuring the nine marketing-mix dimensions, with three to six items assigned to each dimension. The indicators and their reported sources are presented in Table 2. The shopping satisfaction items were based on indicators attributed to Kotler and Keller (2016), including repeat purchasing, positive comments and recommendations, reduced attention to competitors, and purchasing other products from the same brand. These indicators primarily capture post-purchase behavioral intentions and loyalty-related responses rather than satisfaction as a purely evaluative judgment. Accordingly, the interpretation of the dependent variable requires caution, particularly if the construct is intended to represent shopping satisfaction rather than behavioral loyalty.

Table 2. Operationalization of Variables and Measurement Indicators

Variable	Items	Indicators	Source
Product (X1)	3	Product variety, brand assortment, and product quality	Rizky et al. (2021)
Price (X2)	3	Price–quality alignment, price competitiveness, and affordability	Rizky et al. (2021)
Place (X3)	4	Strategic location, accessibility, parking availability, and visibility	Rizky et al. (2021)
Promotion (X4)	4	Promotional frequency, price discounts, media diversity, and personal selling	Rizky et al. (2021)
People (X5)	4	Service speed, friendliness, politeness, and employee teamwork	Laru et al. (2025)
Process (X6)	4	Service simplicity, speed, consistency, and ease of ordering	Savitri et al. (2024)
Physical evidence (X7)	6	Color, layout, lighting, supporting facilities, furnishings, and atmosphere	Dewi and Setiawan (2024)
Payment (X8)	4	Transaction speed, ease, efficiency, and transparency	Anggraeni et al. (2022)
Packaging (X9)	6	Durability and protection, consumer convenience, seller convenience, buyer appeal, cost, and environmental impact	Pangestu and Siswahyudianto (2022)
Shopping satisfaction (Y)	6	Repeat purchasing, positive comments and recommendations, reduced attention to competitors, and purchasing other products from the same brand	Kotler and Keller (2016)

Packaging was operationalized using six indicators covering product protection, convenience, appeal, cost, and environmental impact. These indicators may encompass attributes controlled by manufacturers as well as those influenced by retailers. Therefore, packaging should not be interpreted exclusively as a store-controlled marketing activity. The operational definition and questionnaire wording require further clarification to establish whether respondents evaluated manufacturers' product packaging, shopping bags, or other packaging-related attributes. Data were collected through an online questionnaire administered via Google Forms, and participation was voluntary. Respondents were informed about the purpose of the study and their participation in the survey. The data were used solely for research purposes and handled confidentially. The available methodological records do not fully document the item-adaptation procedure, questionnaire pretesting, expert

assessment of content validity, or the specific wording of individual items. These procedures should be reported where they were actually conducted; they should not be inferred from the subsequent statistical validity and reliability tests.

Validity and Reliability Assessment

Item validity was assessed using Pearson product–moment correlations. The reported item–total correlation coefficients ranged from 0.631 to 0.839, exceeding the reported critical correlation value of 0.0979 at the 5% significance level. The reported significance values were below 0.001. Based on these results, the 38 marketing-mix items met the study's stated item-validity criterion. Internal consistency was assessed using Cronbach's alpha. The reported coefficients for the nine marketing-mix dimensions ranged from 0.655 to 0.829, while the coefficient for shopping satisfaction was 0.676. All reported values exceeded the study's adopted threshold of 0.60 (Sugiyono, 2016). These results indicate that the scales met the study's stated minimum reliability criterion. However, Cronbach's alpha alone does not establish construct validity, dimensionality, or discriminant validity. The reliability results should therefore be interpreted as evidence of internal consistency under the criteria adopted in this study, rather than comprehensive validation of the measurement model.

Data Analysis and Model Specification

The data were analyzed using SPSS. The analytical procedures included descriptive statistics, classical regression assumption tests, multiple linear regression, individual coefficient tests, an omnibus model test, and the coefficient of determination. Normality, multicollinearity, and heteroscedasticity were identified as the principal regression diagnostics. However, the available records do not specify the exact diagnostic statistics, decision thresholds, missing-data procedures, or checks for influential observations. These details should be reported based on the analyses actually performed. Multiple linear regression was used to estimate the individual associations between the nine marketing-mix dimensions and shopping satisfaction while controlling for gender. The model was specified as follows:

$$Y_i = \beta_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{9} \beta_j X_{ji} + \beta_{10} Z_i + \varepsilon_i$$

Where Y_i represents shopping satisfaction for respondent i; X_{ji} represents the j-th marketing-mix dimension for respondent i, where $j = 1, \ldots, 9$; Z_i represents gender for respondent i; β_0 is the intercept; β_j denotes the regression coefficient for the j-th marketing-mix dimension; β_{10} denotes the regression coefficient for gender; ε_i is the error term for respondent i. Gender was entered as a categorical predictor. The coding scheme and reference category were not specified in the available records and must be documented from the original analysis.

Individual regression coefficients were evaluated using t-tests, while the joint statistical significance of the predictors was assessed using the omnibus F-test. The coefficient of determination and adjusted coefficient of determination were used to assess the model's explanatory capacity. A statistically significant F-test was interpreted as evidence that the predictors were jointly associated with the outcome, not as evidence that every marketing-mix dimension had a statistically significant individual association. The regression diagnostics were intended to assess selected assumptions of the linear model. They cannot, however, eliminate selection bias arising from non-probability sampling, measurement error, omitted-variable bias, or potential endogeneity. Accordingly, the regression estimates are interpreted as conditional statistical associations rather than definitive causal effects. The cross-sectional design also precludes establishing temporal ordering between the marketing-mix evaluations and shopping satisfaction.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Respondent Characteristics and Preliminary Analysis

The study analyzed responses from 371 students who reported having previously purchased products at Tania Minimarket. The 2024 cohort constituted the largest proportion of respondents (approximately 30%), followed by the 2022 (28%), 2025 (25%), and 2023 (18%) cohorts. Female respondents accounted for 85% of the sample, while male respondents represented 15%. These figures describe the composition of the analyzed sample, not the demographic profile of Tania Minimarket's actual customer base. Without transaction records or population-level comparisons, it is not possible to establish whether particular cohorts or gender groups are overrepresented among the minimarket's customers. The gender imbalance also warrants caution when interpreting the estimated gender coefficient, particularly because the study was not designed to establish gender-specific differences in the relationships between marketing-mix dimensions and satisfaction.

All respondents indicated previous purchasing experience at Tania Minimarket. This screening criterion provides a relevant basis for evaluating their shopping experiences. However, the absence of records on the number of individuals who accessed the questionnaire, were screened out, declined participation, or failed to complete it prevents calculation of the response rate and assessment of nonresponse bias. Furthermore, incidental sampling and voluntary online participation may have introduced selection bias, limiting the generalizability of the findings beyond the respondents analyzed. The regression diagnostics provided partial evidence regarding the suitability of the specified model. The Kolmogorov–Smirnov test of the residuals produced an asymptotic significance value of 0.100, indicating that the test did not detect a statistically significant departure from normality. This result should not be interpreted as proof that the residuals are normally distributed. Normality is only one consideration in regression inference, and the adequacy of the model also depends on the specification, independence of errors, and other relevant assumptions.

The multicollinearity diagnostics indicated tolerance values above 0.10, with a minimum of 0.431, and variance inflation factor (VIF) values below 10, with a maximum of 2.322. These results do not indicate severe multicollinearity under conventional diagnostic thresholds. Nevertheless, the relatively lower tolerance values for process (0.431), payment (0.432), and people (0.448) suggest that these predictors share some explanatory variance with other variables in the model. This overlap is important when interpreting individual regression coefficients because the estimated contribution of each predictor is conditional on the other predictors being held constant.

The heteroscedasticity assessment, based on Spearman correlations between the nine marketing-mix predictors and absolute residuals, yielded nonsignificant results, with correlation coefficients ranging from 0.001 to 0.036 and significance values from 0.485 to 0.979. These findings provide no detected evidence of heteroscedasticity under the reported procedure. However, gender was not included in this assessment, and the results do not establish that all model assumptions are satisfied. More importantly, acceptable regression diagnostics cannot eliminate selection bias, measurement error, omitted-variable bias, or potential endogeneity.

Multiple Linear Regression Results

Multiple linear regression was used to examine the individual associations between the nine marketing-mix dimensions and shopping satisfaction while controlling for gender. Table 3 reports the unstandardized coefficients, standard errors, standardized coefficients, t-statistics, significance values, and 95% confidence intervals for the unstandardized coefficients.

Table 3. Multiple Linear Regression Results for Shopping Satisfaction

Predictor	*B*	*SE*	*β*	*t*	*p*	95% CI for B
Constant	2.745	0.753	—	3.645	<0.001	[1.264, 4.226]
Product (X1)	0.085	0.065	0.065	1.303	0.194	[-0.043, 0.213]
Price (X2)	0.015	0.056	0.012	0.270	0.787	[-0.095, 0.125]
Place (X3)	0.036	0.035	0.048	1.028	0.304	[-0.033, 0.105]
Promotion (X4)	0.006	0.037	0.008	0.169	0.866	[-0.067, 0.079]
People (X5)	0.243	0.050	0.274	4.870	<0.001	[0.145, 0.341]
Process (X6)	-0.019	0.051	-0.022	-0.377	0.707	[-0.119, 0.081]
Physical evidence (X7)	0.096	0.033	0.159	2.922	0.004	[0.031, 0.161]
Payment (X8)	0.001	0.056	0.001	0.010	0.992	[-0.109, 0.111]
Packaging (X9)	0.204	0.036	0.317	5.717	<0.001	[0.133, 0.275]
Gender (Z)	-0.026	0.182	-0.006	-0.145	0.885	[-0.384, 0.332]

Note: B = unstandardized regression coefficient; SE = standard error; β = standardized regression coefficient; CI = confidence interval. The reported significance values of 0.000 are expressed as p < 0.001. Gender coding and the reference category should be specified in the final manuscript.

The results identify three marketing-mix dimensions with statistically significant positive associations with shopping satisfaction: people, physical evidence, and packaging. The unstandardized coefficients indicate that, holding the other predictors constant, a one-unit increase in the people score was associated with a 0.243-unit increase in satisfaction, while corresponding increases in physical evidence and packaging were associated with increases of 0.096 and 0.204 units, respectively. Their 95% confidence intervals excluded zero, supporting the reported positive associations. In contrast, product, price, place, promotion, process, and payment did not exhibit statistically significant individual associations with shopping satisfaction at the 5% significance level. Gender was also nonsignificant. These findings do not establish that the nonsignificant dimensions are irrelevant to consumers; rather, they indicate that their independent associations were not statistically distinguishable from zero within the specified model and sample.

The standardized coefficient for packaging was numerically the largest among the reported predictors (β = 0.317), followed by people (β = 0.274) and physical evidence (β = 0.159). This ordering provides a descriptive comparison of standardized estimates, but it does not establish that packaging has a statistically stronger effect than the other significant predictors. The confidence intervals for the unstandardized coefficients of packaging and people overlap, and no formal test of the difference between their coefficients was reported. Accordingly, packaging should not be characterized as the definitively dominant determinant of satisfaction.

Overall Model Significance and Explanatory Capacity

The omnibus F-test assessed whether the regression model containing the nine marketing-mix dimensions and gender provided a statistically significant improvement over an intercept-only model. The results are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. ANOVA Summary for the Multiple Regression Model

Source	Sum of squares	*df*	Mean square	*F*	*p*
Regression	541.245	10	54.125	34.502	<0.001
Residual	564.744	360	1.569	—	—
Total	**1,105.989**	**370**	—	—	—

Note: N = 371; the regression model includes 10 predictors and an intercept.

The multiple regression analysis yielded a statistically significant overall model, $F(10, 360) = 34.502$, $p < 0.001$, with $R = 0.700$, $R^2 = 0.489$, and adjusted $R^2 = 0.475$. These statistics indicate that

the set of predictors was significantly associated with shopping satisfaction in the analyzed sample. The R^2 value indicates that the fitted model accounted for 48.9% of the observed sample variance in shopping satisfaction, while the adjusted R^2 was 47.5% after accounting for the number of predictors included in the model. These values describe the model's fit to the observed data and should not be interpreted as evidence that the predictors caused changes in shopping satisfaction or that the same level of explanatory performance would be obtained in other populations or retail settings.

The significant overall F-test indicates that the regression model provided evidence of an association between the predictor set and shopping satisfaction; it does not imply that every predictor had a statistically significant independent association with the outcome. Examination of the individual regression coefficients showed statistically significant positive associations for people, physical evidence, and packaging, whereas the other marketing-mix dimensions and gender were not statistically significant in the specified model. These results should be interpreted in light of the study's cross-sectional design, non-probability sampling procedure, and measurement limitations. In particular, the reported R^2 and adjusted R^2 describe the explanatory performance of the fitted model in the analyzed sample; they do not, by themselves, establish construct validity, rule out omitted-variable bias, demonstrate predictive performance in new data, or support generalization beyond the study context.

People and the Interpersonal Dimension of Shopping Satisfaction

The people dimension was positively associated with shopping satisfaction ($B = 0.243$, $\beta = 0.274$, $p < 0.001$). This finding is consistent with the broader service-marketing perspective that employee-related interactions constitute an important dimension of consumers' evaluations of service encounters (Kotler & Keller, 2016; Hendriana & Irawan, 2024). It also aligns with Ruengrengkulrit et al. (2025), who found associations between people, process, physical evidence, and consumer satisfaction, as well as Laru et al. (2025), who examined the influence of the seven service-marketing-mix dimensions on consumer satisfaction in a minimarket setting. In a campus minimarket, service speed, friendliness, and politeness may contribute to consumers' evaluations of their shopping experiences. The relevance of retail-format characteristics to satisfaction formation is also supported by Yokoyama et al. (2022), who examined customer satisfaction in mini-supermarkets within an urban retail market. Nevertheless, because the present study did not directly examine time pressure or the mechanisms underlying customer evaluations, these explanations remain plausible interpretations rather than established causal mechanisms.

From a service-marketing perspective, the finding suggests that the interpersonal dimension deserves attention alongside the functional attributes of retail offerings. Previous research on service marketing mix similarly treats employee-related factors as part of the broader configuration of activities through which service providers deliver value to consumers (Laru et al., 2025; Ruengrengkulrit et al., 2025). This interpretation is consistent with the broader argument that marketing effectiveness and consumer responses should be examined within their specific market and retail contexts (Stremersch et al., 2022; Wichmann et al., 2022). However, the coefficient in the present study represents a conditional association, not an estimate of the improvement in satisfaction that would necessarily result from an intervention in employee service. Furthermore, the conceptual proximity between people and process may create shared explanatory variance because both dimensions capture aspects of service delivery (Laru et al., 2025; Ruengrengkulrit et al., 2025). Although the regression diagnostics did not indicate severe multicollinearity, conceptual overlap may still complicate the interpretation of their independent contributions.

Physical Evidence and the Tangible Shopping Environment

Physical evidence also exhibited a positive association with shopping satisfaction ($B = 0.096$, $\beta = 0.159$, $p = 0.004$). This finding differs from Ruengrengkulrit et al. (2025), who reported no statistically significant partial association between physical evidence and consumer satisfaction in their

research context. Such differences suggest that the relationship between tangible service attributes and consumer evaluations may vary across settings, although the present study cannot establish the factors responsible for this discrepancy. Physical evidence encompasses tangible features of the shopping environment, including layout, lighting, furnishings, and atmosphere, which form part of the cues consumers use to evaluate retail environments (Kotler & Keller, 2016). Research on restaurant image also demonstrates the relevance of evaluating tangible and other service-related attributes when assessing consumer perceptions of service establishments (Krishnan et al., 2022). More directly, Yokoyama et al. (2022) show that the relationship between retail attributes and customer satisfaction should be understood in relation to how consumers perceive a retail format. Their study of mini-supermarkets is particularly relevant because it illustrates that consumers' expectations of a retail setting may shape which store attributes matter in their evaluations.

These perspectives provide a plausible basis for interpreting the present finding. Physical attributes may shape perceptions of accessibility, comfort, and the overall shopping experience. Nevertheless, the proposed mechanisms—such as improved product visibility, greater comfort, or easier navigation—were not directly measured in this study. The findings therefore support an association between physical evidence and satisfaction, but do not establish why this relationship occurs or whether particular environmental improvements would produce meaningful gains in satisfaction. The standardized coefficient for physical evidence was smaller than those for people and packaging. However, statistical significance and standardized coefficient magnitude alone are insufficient to determine managerial priority. Investment decisions also depend on implementation costs, operational feasibility, and the expected benefits of alternative interventions, none of which were assessed in this study.

Packaging and the Limits of Construct Interpretation

Packaging was positively associated with shopping satisfaction ($B = 0.204$, $\beta = 0.317$, $p < 0.001$). Its standardized coefficient was the largest among the reported predictors, indicating that packaging had the largest estimated standardized association with satisfaction in the specified model. Packaging is relevant to consumer evaluation because it can communicate product information and influence perceptions of product presentation, functionality, and usability (Kotler & Armstrong, 2018; Srivastava et al., 2022). This interpretation is consistent with research emphasizing the role of packaging design in shaping consumer perceptions of products and brands (Srivastava et al., 2022). However, the numerical ordering of coefficients should not be interpreted as proof that packaging has a statistically stronger association with satisfaction than people. Establishing such a difference would require a formal comparison of the relevant coefficients.

The relationship between packaging and satisfaction has also been examined by Yokoyama et al. (2024). Their results require a nuanced comparison: the direct association between product packaging and consumer satisfaction was not statistically significant, whereas the indirect relationship through purchasing decisions was significant. Thus, their findings do not directly replicate the significant independent association observed in the present study. Instead, the difference highlights the possibility that the relationship between packaging and satisfaction may depend on the research context, the model specification, and whether an intervening purchasing mechanism is considered. This interpretation is consistent with the argument that marketing findings should be evaluated within their specific contextual and methodological conditions (Stremersch et al., 2022; Wichmann et al., 2022). Because the present study did not test purchasing decisions as a mediator, it cannot determine whether such a mechanism explains the difference between the findings.

More importantly, the interpretation of the present result is constrained by the operational definition of packaging. The measurement indicators include durability and protection, consumer convenience, seller convenience, buyer appeal, cost, and environmental impact. These attributes may refer to packaging designed by product manufacturers rather than practices controlled directly by the minimarket. Research on package design, for example, examines packaging as a product- and brand-

related communication tool rather than exclusively as a retailer-controlled activity (Srivastava et al., 2022). Furthermore, the growing attention to environmental considerations in marketing provides an additional perspective on how consumers may evaluate product-related attributes, although environmental considerations should not be assumed to represent the same construct as packaging evaluation (Ghanem et al., 2026). Consequently, the observed association cannot be attributed unambiguously to Tania Minimarket's own marketing activities.

This distinction matters theoretically and managerially. Manufacturer-level packaging primarily concerns product presentation, protection, and usability, whereas retailer-controlled packaging concerns practices such as providing shopping bags or preparing products for transport. These activities involve different decision-makers and managerial interventions. Unless the questionnaire clearly distinguishes between them, the significant coefficient should be interpreted as an association involving consumers' packaging-related evaluations rather than evidence of the effectiveness of a specific retail packaging strategy. Clarifying this construct is therefore necessary before drawing stronger conclusions about the contribution of packaging to retail satisfaction..

Nonsignificant Marketing-Mix Dimensions and Contextual Interpretation

Product, price, place, promotion, process, and payment did not exhibit statistically significant independent associations with shopping satisfaction in the specified regression model. These findings differ from those reported by Wandani and Nani (2025), Hendriana and Irawan (2025), and Islam and Ferrer (2025), although these studies examine different combinations of marketing and service-related attributes. The differences between these findings and the present results highlight the importance of considering research context, variable operationalization, and model specification when comparing empirical evidence (Stremersch et al., 2022; Wichmann et al., 2022). These differences warrant careful interpretation. The marketing mix is generally understood as a configuration of interrelated marketing decisions rather than a collection of necessarily independent influences (Kotler & Armstrong, 2018; Wichmann et al., 2022). Accordingly, the absence of a statistically significant coefficient for an individual dimension does not establish that the dimension is irrelevant to consumers. In multiple regression, each coefficient estimates the association between a predictor and the outcome while holding the other included predictors constant. A dimension may therefore be relevant to satisfaction but exhibit a nonsignificant independent coefficient when its explanatory variance overlaps with other dimensions. This distinction is particularly important when examining an expanded marketing-mix framework in which several dimensions of the consumer experience are considered simultaneously (Laru et al., 2025).

The reported tolerance and variance inflation factor values do not indicate severe multicollinearity under conventional criteria, but they cannot rule out conceptual overlap or shared explanatory variance. This distinction is particularly important in an expanded marketing-mix model, in which service-related and transactional dimensions are estimated simultaneously with product, price, place, and promotion. The resulting coefficients represent the unique conditional associations of the included dimensions rather than their overall relevance to consumers' shopping experiences. The multidimensional nature of consumer evaluations also suggests that satisfaction formation may involve different combinations of retail attributes and consumer perceptions rather than isolated marketing activities (Yokoyama et al., 2022; Wichmann et al., 2022).

The expanded model may consequently yield a different pattern of results from a conventional four-element model. However, the present study did not directly compare the explanatory or predictive performance of the 4P and 9P models. It therefore cannot establish that the expanded framework provides superior explanatory power or that the inclusion of additional dimensions explains the differences from previous studies. Although Wichmann et al. (2022) provide a broader perspective on the marketing mix across time and space, the present findings should be interpreted as evidence of variation among the estimated dimensions in one specific retail setting, rather than as evidence that one framework is theoretically superior to another. This interpretation is consistent with

the argument that context-specific research is necessary to understand variations in marketing relationships across different empirical settings (Stremersch et al., 2022).

Other potential explanations, including limited response variability, perceived standardization of retail services, or differences in consumer purchasing habits, remain untested. The four-point response scale may restrict the range of observed responses, but the available results do not establish a ceiling effect. Differences in measurement, sampling, retail context, and model specification may also contribute to the inconsistent findings across studies. Research on mini-supermarkets indicates that consumers' perceptions of retail format can influence satisfaction formation, providing one plausible contextual consideration when interpreting differences across retail studies (Yokoyama et al., 2022). Similarly, research examining consumer preferences for payment methods suggests that payment-related evaluations represent a relevant aspect of consumer decision-making, although such preferences should not be equated with satisfaction outcomes (Garg & Sm, 2024). Nevertheless, these possibilities were not directly tested in the present research and should not be treated as established explanations. The defensible conclusion is therefore limited: product, price, place, promotion, process, and payment did not show statistically significant independent associations with satisfaction after accounting for the other predictors in this sample. This finding does not demonstrate that these dimensions are unimportant, that consumers regard them as minimum service requirements, or that improving them would have no practical value.

Gender as a Control Variable

Gender was not significantly associated with shopping satisfaction after accounting for the marketing-mix dimensions (B = □ 0.026, p = 0.885). This result indicates that the model did not detect a statistically significant conditional main effect of gender in the analyzed sample. It should not, however, be interpreted as evidence that gender is unrelated to shopping satisfaction in the wider customer population. Consumer satisfaction is influenced by multiple contextual and individual considerations, making it important to avoid generalizing findings beyond the empirical conditions under which they were obtained (Stremersch et al., 2022; Yokoyama et al., 2022). The result requires particular caution because female respondents constituted 85% of the sample. The sample's gender composition may limit the precision with which the findings represent consumers with different gender characteristics, particularly given the smaller number of male respondents. More generally, sample characteristics and recruitment procedures constrain the population-level inferences that can be drawn from survey research (Allison et al., 2025). This concern is particularly relevant when the distribution of respondent characteristics is substantially uneven, as the resulting estimates may provide limited information about underrepresented groups. Nevertheless, the extent of this limitation should be evaluated in relation to the sampling design and the number of observations in each gender category. The coding scheme and reference category for gender must also be documented to ensure that the coefficient is interpreted correctly.

Gender was included as a control variable rather than a moderator. Accordingly, the analysis does not establish whether the relationships between individual marketing-mix dimensions and satisfaction differ between male and female consumers. Testing such differences would require interaction terms and an adequately designed analysis of moderation. The distinction between examining an overall conditional association and investigating heterogeneous relationships across consumer groups is important when interpreting demographic variables in empirical marketing research (Stremersch et al., 2022). The nonsignificant coefficient should therefore be understood as a result specific to the model and sample, rather than as evidence that gender can be excluded from future investigations of consumer satisfaction.

Theoretical Interpretation and Contribution

The principal empirical contribution of this study is the identification of a differentiated pattern of associations between the nine marketing-mix dimensions and shopping satisfaction in a

campus-based minimarket. The results indicate that people, physical evidence, and packaging were positively associated with satisfaction, whereas the other dimensions did not exhibit statistically significant independent associations in the specified model. This pattern challenges the assumption that all marketing-mix dimensions necessarily display equally strong independent associations with consumer evaluations. It is consistent with the broader view that marketing-mix effects should be examined in relation to specific contexts rather than assumed to be uniform across markets and settings (Stremersch et al., 2022; Wichmann et al., 2022). Research on retail formats further indicates that customer satisfaction formation may vary according to consumers' perceptions of the retail environment and the characteristics of the retail setting (Yokoyama et al., 2022). Empirical studies examining service marketing-mix dimensions in minimarket and other service contexts also suggest that individual dimensions may exhibit different relationships with consumer satisfaction (Laru et al., 2025; Ruengrengkulrit et al., 2025). Accordingly, the present findings add context-specific evidence to the discussion of differentiated marketing-mix associations rather than establishing a universally applicable hierarchy of marketing-mix dimensions.

Nevertheless, the findings should not be presented as evidence that the study has established a new theoretical mechanism. Expectancy-disconfirmation theory provides a useful general perspective for understanding consumer satisfaction because it considers the relationship between expectations, perceived performance, and satisfaction (Schiebler et al., 2026). Recent research also highlights the importance of examining how consumer expectations operate across different service contexts (Nagashima, 2026). However, the present study did not measure prior expectations or the discrepancy between expectations and perceived performance. It therefore cannot establish whether the significant dimensions are associated with satisfaction because performance exceeded expectations or whether the nonsignificant dimensions are perceived as baseline attributes. The theoretical relevance of expectancy-disconfirmation theory should consequently remain interpretive rather than be presented as an empirically tested explanatory mechanism in this study.

Similarly, the significant omnibus F-test and the model's explanatory capacity demonstrate joint statistical association within the analyzed sample, not the theoretical superiority of the 9P framework over the conventional 4P model. The broader marketing literature recognizes that marketing-mix configurations and their relevance can vary across markets and over time (Wichmann et al., 2022). However, contextual variation does not itself demonstrate that a more extensive framework provides superior explanatory or predictive performance. Such a claim would require direct model comparisons using appropriate measures of explanatory performance and, preferably, out-of-sample predictive validity. The present analysis instead provides a context-specific assessment of how individual marketing-mix dimensions are associated with shopping satisfaction when considered jointly. This interpretation is consistent with the argument that context-specific marketing studies can generate valuable empirical insights without necessarily claiming universal theoretical generalizability (Stremersch et al., 2022). The contribution is therefore best understood as a contextual empirical application that reveals variation in the independent associations of marketing-mix dimensions. Future research should investigate whether these patterns persist across retail formats, consumer groups, and alternative measurement specifications. Such comparisons are particularly relevant because retail format perceptions may condition the formation of customer satisfaction (Yokoyama et al., 2022), while marketing-mix effects may vary across market settings (Wichmann et al., 2022). Future studies should also improve the conceptual distinction between service-related, environmental, transactional, and product-related attributes, particularly the distinction between manufacturer-controlled packaging and retailer-controlled packaging. This distinction is important because package design can function as a product-level branding and communication attribute (Srivastava et al., 2022), whereas the broader retail marketing mix encompasses attributes that may be controlled by the retailer. A more clearly specified measurement model, combined with direct comparison of alternative marketing-mix models, would provide a stronger basis for assessing the theoretical and practical significance of the observed relationships.

CONCLUSION

This study examined the relationships between the marketing-mix dimensions and shopping satisfaction among students who had previously shopped at Tania Minimarket, Universitas Sebelas Maret. The findings indicate that people, physical evidence, and packaging were positively associated with shopping satisfaction, whereas the other marketing-mix dimensions and gender did not exhibit statistically significant independent associations in the specified model. These results suggest that the marketing-mix dimensions do not demonstrate uniform patterns of association with shopping satisfaction in the context examined. However, the findings should not be interpreted as establishing a definitive ranking of the most important determinants, demonstrating causal relationships, or proving that the nonsignificant dimensions are unimportant to consumers. The study provides context-specific empirical evidence that the nine marketing-mix dimensions exhibit different patterns of association with shopping satisfaction in a campus-based retail setting. Rather than establishing a new theoretical mechanism, the findings identify which dimensions showed statistically significant independent associations within the specified model. The results should therefore be interpreted as a contextual empirical application of the marketing-mix framework rather than evidence of a new theoretical mechanism or the superiority of the expanded framework over the conventional marketing mix. Similarly, the nonsignificant gender result should be interpreted as specific to the sample and model rather than as evidence that gender differences are generally irrelevant to consumer responses. The practical implications are provisional. The findings provide a basis for examining employee interactions and the physical shopping environment as potential areas for service evaluation and improvement. The findings also suggest that packaging-related evaluations warrant further examination. However, their managerial interpretation should remain cautious because the measurement may encompass both product-level packaging attributes and practices that retailers can directly control. Moreover, this study examined shopping satisfaction rather than revenue, sales performance, or customer retention. It therefore does not establish whether satisfaction explains the observed revenue decline, whether competition from another campus food outlet contributed to that decline, or whether changes to the marketing mix would improve financial performance. Any proposed intervention should be evaluated before its effectiveness is assumed. Future research should examine these relationships across more diverse retail settings and use sampling strategies that support stronger population-level inferences. Researchers should distinguish shopping satisfaction from behavioral loyalty, clarify the measurement of packaging, and directly assess consumer expectations when testing expectation-based explanations. Further studies could also investigate gender differences through appropriately designed moderation analyses and compare the explanatory and predictive performance of alternative marketing-mix frameworks. Integrating survey responses with transaction-level data would help determine whether shopping satisfaction is associated with actual purchasing behavior and retail performance, providing a stronger basis for theoretical refinement and evidence-based managerial recommendations.

DECLARATION OF GENERATIVE AI

The authors declare that no generative AI or AI-assisted technologies were used in the writing process of this manuscript.

CONFLICTING INTEREST STATEMENT

The authors state that there is no conflict of interest in the publication of this article.

FUNDING INFORMATION STATEMENT

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

AUTHORSHIP CONTRIBUTION STATEMENT

Fadillah Fatqur Rohman: Conceptualization, Methodology, Investigation, Formal analysis, Writing - Original Draft; Salman Alfarisy Totalia: Supervision, Validation, Writing - Review & Editing.

REFERENCES

Al Badi, K. S. (2018). The impact of marketing mix on the competitive advantage of the SME sector in the Al Buraimi Governorate in Oman. *Sage Open, 8*(3), 2158244018800838. https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244018800838

Allison, J. S., Santana, L., & Visagie, I. J. H. (2025). The sample is not the population. *Teaching Statistics, 47*(1), 39–45. https://doi.org/10.1111/test.12385

Andi Ayu Frihatni. (2020). The existence of modern mini markets amidst traditional retail market. *International Journal of Science, Technology & Management, 1*(3), 244–250. https://doi.org/10.46729/ijstm.v1i3.57

Anggraeni, O. F., Halim, M., & Zulkarnnaeni, A. S. (2022). Pengaruh e-commerce, digital payment dan penggunaan sistem informasi akuntansi terhadap pengambilan keputusan untuk berwirausaha (Studi kasus pada mahasiswa S1 Akuntansi angkatan 2018 Universitas Muhammadiyah Jember). *National Multidisciplinary Sciences, 1*(5), 718–734. https://doi.org/10.32528/nms.v1i5.226

Awwad, M. S. (2025). The mediating role of internal marketing and job satisfaction in enhancing task and contextual performance: Evidence from the Jordanian public sector. *International Review on Public and Nonprofit Marketing*, *23*(1), 47-68. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12208-025-00460-x

Bansal, R., & Pruthi, N. (2021). Role of customer engagement in building customer loyalty: A literature review. *Samvakti Journal of Research in Business Management, 2*(2), 1. https://doi.org/10.46402/2021.01.9

Badulescu, D., Trip, D., Badulescu, A., & Herte, E. (2026). Service quality and sustainable innovation in spa tourism: A qualitative analysis of professional narratives. *Sustainability*, *18*(8), 4084. https://doi.org/10.3390/su18084084

Chan, F. K., Thong, J. Y., Brown, S. A., & Venkatesh, V. (2020). Service design and citizen satisfaction with E-government services: A multidimensional perspective. *Public Administration Review*, *81*(5), 874-894. https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13308

Cheng, Z. (., Li, T., & Pavlou, P. A. (2026). Information transparency, choice confidence, and customer retention: Field and laboratory evidence from markets for credence goods. *Management Science*. https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2020.02865

Choi, J., Kang, S., Moon, J., Jeon, S., & Lim, S. (2026). Algorithmic transparency and consumer trade-offs in AI-based financial e-Commerce services. *Journal of Theoretical and Applied Electronic Commerce Research*, *21*(3), 86. https://doi.org/10.3390/jtaer21030086

Dewi, A. N., & Setiawan, D. (2024). Analisis strategi bauran pemasaran pada bisnis kuliner (Studi kasus CV. Gehu Extra Pedas Chili Hot). *GREAT: Jurnal Manajemen dan Bisnis Islam, 1*(1). https://doi.org/10.62108/great.v1i1.477

Florea, N., Croitoru, G., & Diaconeasa, A. (2025). The impact of integrity-related factors on consumer shopping intention–an interactive marketing approach based on digital integrity model. *Journal of Theoretical and Applied Electronic Commerce Research*, *20*(4), 262. https://doi.org/10.3390/jtaer20040262

Garg, P., & Sm, J. (2024). Navigating choices: Study on consumer preferences in selecting payment methods. *Shanlax International Journal of Management, 11*(S1-Mar), 79–88. https://doi.org/10.34293/management.v11iS1-Mar.8002

Ghanem, S., Hasinat, I., Soulami, M., Charrass, A., & Abyre, A. (2026). Green marketing mix and green purchase intention in an emerging market: The mediating role of perceived value and the moderating effects of health consciousness and environmental concern. *Frontiers in Sustainability*, *7*. https://doi.org/10.3389/frsus.2026.1877158

Hendriana, T. I., & Irawan, N. (2024). The influence of service quality on customer satisfaction. *International Journal of Applied Finance and Business Studies, 11*(4), 913–921. https://doi.org/10.35335/ijafibs.v11i4.261

Islam, S. M., & Ferrer, M. A. (2025). Unlocking the cashless shift: Retailers' adoption of digital payment systems in emerging markets. *Journal of Theoretical and Applied Electronic Commerce Research*, *20*(4), 359. https://doi.org/10.3390/jtaer20040359

Kotler, P., & Armstrong, G. (2018). *Principles of marketing* (17th ed.). Pearson Higher Education.

Kotler, P., & Keller, K. L. (2016). *Marketing management* (15th ed.). Pearson.

Krishnan, A. R., Hamid, R., Lin, R. Y. S., Tanakinjal, G. H., & Rathakrishnan, B. (2022). Making informed decisions to improve restaurant image using a hybrid MADM approach: A case of fast-food restaurants in an island of East Malaysia. *Information, 13*(5), 219. https://doi.org/10.3390/info13050219

Laru, Y. H., Adam, R. P., & Parani, S. B. D. (2025). The effect of service marketing mix (7P) on consumer satisfaction at 86 Mart Minimarket. *International Journal of Social Science and Innovation (IJSSI), 3*(2), 65–76. https://doi.org/10.59890/ijssi.v3i2.3158

Majdina, N. I., Pratikno, B., & Tripena, A. (2024). Penentuan ukuran sampel menggunakan rumus Bernoulli dan Slovin: Konsep dan aplikasinya. *Jurnal Ilmiah Matematika dan Pendidikan Matematika, 16*(1), 73–84. https://doi.org/10.20884/1.jmp.2024.16.1.11230

Nagashima, N. (2026). Rethinking expectations in non-routine service use: Evidence from three Asian countries. *Journal of Marketing Analytics*. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41270-025-00453-z

Pangestu, Y. D., & Siswahyudianto, S. (2022). Strategi marketing mix produk makanan Korea dalam meningkatkan kepuasan konsumen pada home industry Unniefood Tulungagung. *Jurnal Valuasi: Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Manajemen dan Kewirausahaan, 2*(2), 680–700. https://doi.org/10.46306/vls.v2i2.111

Praveen, S., Ramaprasad, B. S., Prabhu, K. N., Rao, K. S., Phadke, R. A., & Kizhekepat, S. (2025). Rooted in loyalty: How consumer ethnocentrism shapes consumer satisfaction with homegrown brands. *Acta Psychologica*, *260*, 105684. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2025.105684

Rizky, S. A., Waluyo, H. D., & Prabawani, B. (2021). Pengaruh bauran ritel terhadap keputusan pembelian pada Indomaret Kecamatan Banyumanik Kota Semarang. *Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi Bisnis, 10*(1), 879–889. https://doi.org/10.14710/jiab.2021.29871

Ruengrengkulrit, T., Limapan, P., Kansamut, N., & Chaleawprom, C. (2026). Examining the effects of service marketing mix and service quality on hotel selection in an urban tourism destination. *Tourism and Hospitality, 7*(4), 95. https://doi.org/10.3390/tourhosp7040095

Savitri, D. N., Aziz, N., & Shanty, B. M. (2024). Marketing mix differences analysis Marketplace Shopee and Tokopedia. In *Economic sustainability and social equality in the technological era*. Routledge.

Schiebler, T., Lee, N., & Brodbeck, F. C. (2026). Expectancy-disconfirmation and consumer satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 54*(1), 91–112. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-024-01078-x

Skjelbred, S., & Daus, S. (2022). Satisfaction is insufficient: Insights from a randomized, controlled trial of a marketing simulation game. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, *38*(6), 1686-1702. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12703

Srivastava, P., Ramakanth, D., Akhila, K., & Gaikwad, K. K. (2022). Package design as a branding tool in the cosmetic industry: Consumers' perception vs. reality. *SN Business & Economics, 2*(6), 58. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43546-022-00222-5

Stremersch, S., Gonzalez, J., Valenti, A., & Villanueva, J. (2022). The value of context-specific studies for marketing. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, *51*(1), 50-65. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-022-00872-9

Sugiyono. (2016). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif & R&D*. Alfabeta.

Thusyanthy, V., & Tharanikaran, V. (2017). Antecedents and outcomes of customer satisfaction: A comprehensive review. *International Journal of Business and Management, 12*(4), 144. https://doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v12n4p144

Wandani, D., & Nani, N. (2025). Pengaruh kualitas produk dan kualitas pelayanan terhadap kepuasan pelanggan pada PT Magnum Cafe Indonesia Cabang BSD, Kota Tangerang Selatan. *SOCIORA: The Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities, 2*(1), 38–55. https://doi.org/10.33753/sociora.v2i1.24

Wati, B. M., Abidin, Z., Yatima, K., Musthofa, M. A., Dewi, H., Munip, A., & Mun'amah, A. N. (2025). The impact of minimarket existence on grocery store revenue. *Zabags International Journal of Economy, 3*(1), 63–75. https://doi.org/10.61233/zijec.v3i1.94

Wichmann, J. R. K., Uppal, A., Sharma, A., & Dekimpe, M. G. (2022). A global perspective on the marketing mix across time and space. *International Journal of Research in Marketing, 39*(2), 502–521. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijresmar.2021.09.001

Yokoyama, N., Azuma, N., & Kim, W. (2022). Moderating effect of customer's retail format perception on customer satisfaction formation: An empirical study of mini-supermarkets in an urban retail market setting. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services, 66*, 102935. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2022.102935