Impact Factor:					
	ISRA (India) = 6.317	SIS (USA) = 0.912	ICV (Poland) = 6.630
	ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582	РИНЦ (Russia) = 3.939	PIF (India) = 1.940
	GIF (Australia) = 0.564	ESJI (KZ) = 8.771	IBI (India) = 4.260
	JIF = 1.500	SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184	OAJI (USA) = 0.350

SOI: 1.1/TAS DOI: 10.15863/TAS
International Scientific Journal
Theoretical & Applied Science
p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) **e-ISSN:** 2409-0085 (online)
Year: 2023 **Issue:** 06 **Volume:** 122
Published: 27.06.2023 **http://T-Science.org**

Issue Article

Norberto M. Secretaria
Cebu Technological University
Ph.D., MBA, LPT
College of Management and Entrepreneurship

EFFECT OF PRICING METHODS ON CONSUMER BEHAVIOR IN KEY DEMOGRAPHIC: A STUDY ON GENERATION Zs

Abstract: *This research article examines the effect of pricing methods on consumer behavior within the key demographic (Gen Z). The study aims to gain insights into how different pricing strategies impact consumer behavior among Gen Zs, including purchase behavior, brand loyalty, brand switching, willingness to pay, and price sensitivity. Linear Regression analysis and ANOVA were conducted to analyze the data collected from a sample of Gen Z respondents. The results show that there are many different ways in which pricing strategies affect Gen Z consumers' behavior. The results indicate that pricing strategies significantly influence brand loyalty, with Skimming Pricing, Value-Based Pricing showing a likely impact. However, the effect on purchase behavior and willingness to pay was less pronounced, suggesting a more neutral response from Gen Zs. Furthermore, the study identifies that pricing strategies, particularly Penetration Pricing and Discount Pricing, are likely to influence brand-switching behavior among Gen Z consumers. However, the relationship between pricing strategies and price sensitivity was less consistent, with mixed results regarding the specific effects of different pricing indicators. These findings emphasize the importance of understanding Gen Z consumers' unique characteristics and preferences when developing pricing strategies. Businesses targeting this demographic should consider a holistic approach beyond pricing, considering factors such as brand loyalty and switching, as well as other elements that influence consumer behavior.*

Key words: *Pricing methods, Consumer behavior, Gen Z, Brand loyalty, Brand switching.*
Language: *English*
Citation: Secretaria, N. M. (2023). Effect of Pricing Methods on Consumer Behavior in Key Demographic: A Study on Generation Zs. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science, 06 (122),* 351-361.
Soi: http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-06-122-59 ***Doi***: crossref https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2023.06.122.59
Scopus ASCC: *2000.*

Introduction

Understanding customer behavior has become crucial for organizations looking to prosper and gain a competitive edge in today's market environment, which is continually changing. Generation Z (Gen Z) stands out among the many consumer sectors as a significant demographic, exerting enormous economic impact and influencing the direction of markets(Thangavel et al., 2019). Being digital natives, members of Gen Z display unique traits, tastes, and spending habits that distinguish them from earlier generations. Consequently, it becomes an important and exciting research subject to examine how price strategies affect Gen Z customer behavior(Ali & Anwar, 2021).

Due to their direct effect on perceptions of value, affordability, and product desirability, pricing strategies can affect customer decision-making. Customers in the Gen Z generation, who have grown up in a highly connected and digitally advanced environment, may not be interested in traditional pricing strategies like cost-plus or competition-based pricing. As a result, companies must modify and reinvent their pricing strategies to successfully appeal to and get the attention of this robust population.

This study intends to examine how pricing practices affect Gen Z consumer behavior, offering light on the variables that affect their decisions to buy and the strategies that successfully sway them(Thangavel et al., 2019). Businesses can improve their marketing efforts, boost their competitiveness, and better customize their services to fit the requirements and preferences of Gen Z by recognizing

the connection between pricing methods and this generation's behavior.

For companies looking to optimize pricing strategies and successfully market to the Gen Z customer demographic, the findings of this study have significant consequences. Companies can successfully modify their marketing messaging, product positioning, and price strategies to appeal to Gen Z by identifying the variables impacting this group's purchase decisions(Liu et al., 2019). This research will also advance our understanding of customer behavior, pricing tactics, and the distinctive traits of the Gen Z generation.

Methodology

This study investigates how Gen Zers will likely base their purchasing choices on price tactics. The respondents for this study come from various universities with diverse geographic origins to guarantee that the sample is representative of the population. Participants in the survey will be asked about their likelihood of purchasing in response to various pricing strategies. The descriptive approach was adopted in this investigation. The study gathered consumer behavior and price tactics information by creating a systematic questionnaire. To ensure that the sample sufficiently represents the target audience, the researcher distributed the survey to a random sample of customers who had recently purchased goods or services from various businesses. The questionnaire, composed of 20 Likert scale items, was divided into four categories by the researchers: value-based pricing, penetration pricing, discount pricing, and skimming pricing. Additionally, we divided the 20 Likert scale questions into six groups based on consumer behavior: willingness to pay, purchasing behavior, brand loyalty, brand switching, price sensitivity, and perceived value.

Results and Discussion

The verbal description of the first pricing indicator, Price Skimming, which obtained a mean score of 2.855 and was classified as "Neutral," implies that Gen Z respondents are unsure or unconcerned about how price skimming may affect their purchasing decisions. This suggests that this price strategy might not significantly impact their decision to buy.

Table 1. Pricing Indicators

Pricing Indicators	Mean	Category	Verbal Description
Price Skimming	2.855	Neutral	I am neutral on whether the pricing strategies in the study will impact my consumer behavior.
Penetration Pricing	3.8915	Likely	The pricing strategies in the study will likely impact my consumer behavior.
Discount Pricing	3.474	Likely	The pricing strategies in the study will likely impact my consumer behavior.
Value-Based Pricing	3.6955	Likely	The pricing strategies in the study likely impact my consumer behavior.
General Pricing Questions	3.73925	Likely	The pricing strategies in the study likely impact my consumer behavior.

The following pricing indicators, however, obtained mean scores above 3, indicating that Gen Z respondents believe they will impact their purchasing decisions: penetration pricing, discount pricing, value-based pricing, and general pricing questions. The language descriptions support this idea and imply that these pricing techniques should noticeably affect Gen Z customers.

Penetration Pricing received a favorable reaction, with a mean score of 3.8915, showing that Gen Z individuals consider it a determining factor in their purchasing decisions. Setting low beginning prices will help you capture market share and draw in customers rapidly(Yuan et al., 2022). The positive opinion of penetration pricing shows that Gen Z consumers think it is a successful method of swaying purchasing decisions.

Similar to how Discount Pricing earned a favorable reaction, with a mean score of 3.474, indicating its likely influence on Gen Z consumer behavior. This pricing strategy provides discounts or other incentives to encourage purchasing(Sharma et al., 2019). Discount pricing is seen by Gen Z consumers as having a substantial impact on their purchasing decisions, underscoring the value of this tactic in drawing in this group of consumers.

Value-Based Pricing likewise garnered favorable feedback from Gen Z respondents, with a mean score of 3.6955. This pricing strategy involves determining prices depending on how much the consumer thinks a good or service is worth

(Simanjuntak et al., 2020). Given that Gen Z consumers are more likely to be motivated by the perceived value of a good or service, it is clear from the positive perception of value-based pricing that Gen Z people believe it to be important in influencing their purchasing decisions.

Last but not least, the General Pricing Questions category had a mean score of 3.73925, indicating that respondents from Generation Z believe pricing methods, in general, will affect their purchasing decisions. This broad category offers a more comprehensive view of pricing tactics and how they affect Gen Z customers.

Table 2. Behavioral Indicators

Behavior Indicators	Mean	Category	Verbal Description
Purchase Behavior	3.3392	Neutral	I am neutral on whether the pricing strategies in the study will impact my consumer behavior.
Brand Loyalty	3.4	Likely	The pricing strategies in the study likely impact my consumer behavior.
Brand Switching	3.7248	Likely	The pricing strategies in the study likely impact my consumer behavior.
Willingness to pay	3.3334	Neutral	I am neutral on whether the pricing strategies in the study will impact my consumer behavior.
Price Sensitivity	3.484	Likely	The pricing strategies in the study will likely have an impact on my consumer behavior.

The table provided offers valuable insights into the perceptions of Gen Z individuals regarding various behavior indicators and their anticipated impact on consumer behavior. The mean values, category labels, and verbal descriptions provide comprehensive information on how Gen Z respondents perceive each behavior indicator.

The first behavior indicator, Purchase Behavior, received a mean score of 3.3392, categorizing it as "Neutral." The verbal description suggests that Gen Z respondents feel undecided or indifferent regarding the impact of pricing strategies on their purchase behavior. This implies that pricing methods may not strongly influence their overall purchasing decisions.

In contrast, the following behavior indicators, Brand Loyalty, Brand Switching, Willingness to Pay, and Price Sensitivity, all received mean scores above 3, indicating that Gen Z respondents perceive them as likely to impact their consumer behavior. The verbal descriptions further support this perception, suggesting that pricing strategies are expected to significantly influence Gen Z consumers.

Brand Loyalty, with a mean score of 3.4, received a positive response from Gen Z respondents, indicating that they perceive pricing strategies as likely to influence their loyalty to a particular brand (Sharma et al., 2019). This finding suggests that pricing methods build brand loyalty among Gen Z consumers and can significantly impact their repeat purchases.

Similarly, Brand Switching received a mean score of 3.7248, indicating that pricing strategies will likely impact Gen Z consumers' switching between brands. Gen Z individuals are considered more brand-agnostic than previous generations, making them more likely to switch brands if they perceive better value or pricing from a competitor. This finding underscores the importance of pricing strategies in capturing and retaining Gen Z customers.

The behavior indicator of Willingness to Pay received a mean score of 3.3334, categorizing it as "Neutral." Gen Z respondents disagree on pricing strategies impacting their willingness to pay for products or services (F. Li et al., 2019). This suggests that factors beyond pricing, such as perceived value, brand reputation, or personal, play a more significant role in shaping their willingness to pay.

Lastly, Price Sensitivity received a mean score of 3.484, categorizing it as "Likely." Gen Z individuals perceive pricing strategies as likely influencing their price sensitivity. This finding highlights the importance of pricing methods that resonate with Gen Z consumers' affordability concerns and value-oriented preferences.

Overall, the table provides insights into the perceptions of Gen Z individuals regarding various behavior indicators and their anticipated impact on consumer behavior. While purchase behavior and willingness to pay received neutral responses, the positive reactions towards brand loyalty, brand switching, and price sensitivity suggest that pricing strategies notably influence Gen Z consumers' behavior. Understanding these perceptions and preferences is crucial for businesses seeking to effectively target and engage the Gen Z demographic, enabling them to develop pricing strategies that align with their values and capture their attention.

Pricing Strategies and Purchasing Behavior

The regression analysis reveals that the model, incorporating predictors such as General Pricing Questions, Skimming Pricing, Penetration Pricing,

Value-Based Pricing, and Discount Pricing, effectively explains a substantial portion of the variance observed in the dependent variable, "Purchasing Behavior." The obtained F-value of 6.267 ($p < .001$) signifies a statistically significant relationship between the pricing methods and the purchasing behavior of the targeted population.

The regression component of the ANOVA table demonstrates that the selected predictors collectively account for 7.661 units of variation in Purchasing Behavior. This indicates that the pricing methods under investigation notably impact the studied population's purchasing behavior. The mean square value of 1.532 further suggests that, on average, each individual predictor explains approximately 1.532 units of variance in the dependent variable. Consequently, specific pricing methods may influence consumer behavior, thereby prompting businesses to carefully consider their pricing strategies to optimize consumer engagement and satisfaction.

On the other hand, the residual section of the ANOVA table reveals the unexplained variance in Purchasing Behavior, representing factors beyond the selected predictors that contribute to consumer behavior. The substantial residual variation of 15.403 units highlights the existence of additional influential elements that are not captured by the considered pricing methods. Consequently, businesses should recognize that factors such as brand reputation, product quality, or subjective consumer preferences may also significantly influence purchasing behavior, warranting a holistic understanding of consumer decision-making processes.

The statistically significant results obtained from the ANOVA analysis hold important implications for businesses. The findings underscore the importance of strategically selecting and implementing pricing methods that align with consumer preferences and effectively shape their purchasing behavior. By considering the specific pricing indicators identified in this study, namely General Pricing Questions, Skimming Pricing, Penetration Pricing, Value-Based Pricing, and Discount Pricing, businesses can tailor their pricing strategies to maximize their impact on consumer behavior within the targeted demographic. However, it is crucial to acknowledge that pricing methods alone may not fully explain the complexity of consumer behavior, necessitating a comprehensive approach that accounts for other influential factors.

Table 3. Pricing Strategies vs. Purchasing Behavior

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.294	.562		2.302	.025
	Skimming Pricing	.218	.086	.277	2.547	.013
	Penetration Pricing	-.140	.105	-.158	-1.331	.188
	Discount Pricing	.172	.109	.204	1.579	.119
	Value-Based Pricing	.267	.104	.325	2.566	.013
	General Pricing Questions	.102	.129	.096	.791	.432

a. Dependent Variable: Purchasing Behavior

The attached table presents the results of a regression analysis to examine the effects of different pricing methods on purchasing behavior within the targeted Gen Z demographic. The unstandardized coefficients indicate the magnitude and direction of the relationships between each predictor (pricing method) and the dependent variable (purchasing behavior). In contrast, the standardized coefficients (Beta) demonstrate the relative importance of each predictor in explaining the variance in purchasing behavior(Lim et al., 2016). Let's discuss the table comprehensively, including its meaning and implications.

The constant term, represented by the "Constant" row, indicates the expected value of the dependent variable when all predictors are set to zero. In this case, the constant term is 1.294, with a standard error of .562. The associated t-value of 2.302 ($p = .025$) suggests that the regular term is statistically significant, implying that factors other than the pricing methods examined in this study also contribute to purchasing behavior among Gen Z consumers.

Among the specific pricing methods, Skimming Pricing exhibits a positive unstandardized coefficient of .218 ($p = .013$) and a standardized coefficient (Beta) of .277. This indicates that an increase in Skimming Pricing is associated with a corresponding increase in purchasing behavior among Gen Z consumers. The significant t-value of 2.547 means that this relationship is statistically significant. Thus, businesses targeting Gen Z consumers may benefit from implementing skimming pricing strategies to stimulate their purchasing behavior.

On the other hand, Penetration Pricing shows a negative unstandardized coefficient of -.140, suggesting that higher levels of Penetration Pricing are

associated with decreased purchasing behavior among Gen Z consumers. However, the non-significant t-value of -1.331 (p = .188) suggests that this relationship is not statistically significant, and the effect of Penetration Pricing on purchasing behavior may be less pronounced in this demographic.

Similarly, Discount Pricing exhibits a positive unstandardized coefficient of .172, indicating a positive relationship with purchasing behavior. However, the non-significant t-value of 1.579 (p = .119) suggests that this relationship is not statistically significant, and the impact of Discount Pricing on purchasing behavior may be more nuanced.

Value-Based Pricing, represented by a positive unstandardized coefficient of .267 (p = .013), demonstrates a significant positive association with purchasing behavior among Gen Z consumers. The standardized coefficient (Beta) of .325 suggests that Value-Based Pricing substantially impacts purchasing behavior more than the other pricing methods examined in this study. Businesses can leverage this pricing strategy to attract and engage Gen Z consumers.

Lastly, General Pricing Questions exhibit a positive unstandardized coefficient of .102. Still, the non-significant t-value of .791 (p = .432) indicates that the relationship between General Pricing Questions and purchasing behavior is not statistically significant in the Gen Z demographic.

The analysis provides insights into the effects of different pricing methods on purchasing behavior among Gen Z consumers. Skimming Pricing and Value-Based Pricing emerge as significant predictors with positive associations, suggesting that these strategies will likely influence Gen Z consumers' purchasing behavior. However, the non-significant results for Penetration Pricing, Discount Pricing, and General Pricing Questions suggest their impact may be less pronounced or more complex in this particular demographic. Businesses targeting Gen Z consumers can utilize these findings to design pricing strategies that align with their preferences and optimize purchasing behavior. Further research is warranted to explore additional factors that may influence purchasing behavior in the Gen Z demographic and to enhance the understanding of their consumer decision-making processes.

Pricing Strategies and Brand Loyalty

The data reveals that the regression model significantly explains the variability in Brand Loyalty. The Regression row indicates that the predictors collectively account for 11.385 units of variation in Brand Loyalty, as represented by the sum of squares. The associated F-value of 4.590 (p = .001) indicates a statistically significant relationship between the predictors and brand loyalty.

The Mean Square value of 2.277 suggests that, on average, each predictor explains approximately 2.277 units of variance in Brand Loyalty. This signifies the individual contribution of each predictor to the overall explanation of brand loyalty.

In contrast, the Residual row captures the unexplained variance in Brand Loyalty, which amounts to 31.255 units of variation. The Residual term represents the portion of the dependent variable that is not accounted for by the chosen predictors. This indicates that factors beyond the considered pricing methods may influence brand loyalty among the studied population.

The comprehensive examination of the ANOVA table further reveals that the obtained results are statistically significant (p = .001). This implies that the observed relationship between the predictors and brand loyalty is highly unlikely to have occurred by chance alone. The significant F-value indicates that the chosen predictors collectively contribute to explaining brand loyalty in the studied population.

The implications of these findings are substantial for businesses aiming to enhance brand loyalty. The statistically significant relationship between pricing methods and brand loyalty suggests that the selected predictors, including General Pricing Questions, Skimming Pricing, Penetration Pricing, Value-Based Pricing, and Discount Pricing, play a role in influencing consumers' attachment and loyalty to a brand. Businesses can strengthen brand loyalty among their target demographic by strategically implementing these pricing methods.

However, it is essential to note that while the regression model explains a significant portion of the variance in brand loyalty, there is still a substantial amount of unexplained variance. This indicates the presence of other influential factors beyond the chosen predictors. Businesses should recognize the need for a comprehensive approach considering additional elements such as product quality, customer service, and marketing strategies to foster brand loyalty(Sharma et al., 2019).

Table 4. Pricing Strategies vs. Brand Loyalty

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.522	.801		.651	.517

Skimming Pricing	.265	.122	.247	2.168	.034
Penetration Pricing	-.180	.150	-.149	-1.197	.236
Discount Pricing	.260	.155	.226	1.675	.099
Value-Based Pricing	.187	.148	.167	1.262	.212
General Pricing Questions	.328	.184	.226	1.784	.079

a. Dependent Variable: Brand Loyalty

Table 4 presents the regression analysis results investigating the relationship between pricing strategies and brand loyalty. The table provides information about the unstandardized coefficients, standardized coefficients (Beta), t-values, and significance levels for each predictor in the model.

The constant term, represented by the "Constant" row, indicates the expected value of the dependent variable (brand loyalty) when all predictors are set to zero. In this case, the constant term is .522, with a standard error of .801. The associated t-value of .651 (p = .517) suggests that the regular term is not statistically significant, indicating that other factors beyond the pricing strategies included in the study might be more influential in determining brand loyalty(Sharma et al., 2019).

Analyzing the individual pricing strategies, Skimming Pricing exhibits a positive unstandardized coefficient of .265 (p = .034) and a standardized coefficient (Beta) of .247. This indicates that an increase in Skimming Pricing is associated with a corresponding increase in brand loyalty. The significant t-value of 2.168 suggests that this relationship is statistically significant, implying that businesses can potentially enhance brand loyalty by implementing skimming pricing strategies.

On the other hand, Penetration Pricing shows a negative unstandardized coefficient of -.180, suggesting a negative relationship with brand loyalty. However, the non-significant t-value of -1.197 (p = .236) indicates this relationship is not statistically significant. This suggests that the impact of Penetration Pricing on brand loyalty may be limited or influenced by other factors not considered in the analysis.

Similarly, Discount Pricing exhibits a positive unstandardized coefficient of .260, indicating a positive relationship with brand loyalty. However, the non-significant t-value of 1.675 (p = .099) suggests this relationship is not statistically significant. This implies that the effect of Discount Pricing on brand loyalty may be less pronounced or subject to other contextual factors.

Value-Based Pricing demonstrates a positive unstandardized coefficient of .187 (p = .212) and a standardized coefficient of .167. While the unstandardized coefficient suggests a positive relationship, the non-significant t-value of 1.262 indicates that this relationship is not statistically significant. This means that Value-Based Pricing may have a limited impact on brand loyalty within the context of this study.

General Pricing Questions exhibit a positive unstandardized coefficient of .328. Still, the non-significant t-value of 1.784 (p = .079) indicates that the relationship between General Pricing Questions and brand loyalty is not statistically significant. This implies that the effect of asking general pricing questions may not significantly influence brand loyalty in the studied population.

Overall, the regression analysis results indicate that Skimming Pricing has a statistically significant positive impact on brand loyalty, suggesting that businesses can leverage this pricing strategy to enhance brand loyalty. However, the non-significant results for other pricing strategies indicate that their impact on brand loyalty may be less pronounced or influenced by additional factors.

Pricing Strategies and Brand Switching

The data reveals that the regression model significantly explains the variability in Brand Switching behavior. The Regression row shows that the predictors collectively account for 11.112 units of variation in Brand Switching, as represented by the sum of squares. The associated F-value of 9.658 (p = .000) indicates a statistically significant relationship between the predictors and brand-switching behavior.

The Mean Square value of 2.222 suggests that, on average, each predictor explains approximately 2.222 units of variance in Brand Switching. This signifies the individual contribution of each predictor to the overall explanation of brand-switching behavior.

In contrast, the Residual row captures the unexplained variance in Brand Switching, which amounts to 14.496 variation units. The Residual term represents the portion of the dependent variable not accounted for by the chosen predictors. This indicates that factors beyond the considered pricing methods may influence brand-switching behavior among the studied population.

The comprehensive examination of the ANOVA table further reveals that the obtained results are statistically significant (p = .000). This implies that the observed relationship between the predictors and brand-switching behavior is highly unlikely to have occurred by chance alone. The significant F-value indicates that the chosen predictors collectively explain brand changing behavior in the studied population.

The implications of these findings are significant for businesses aiming to reduce brand-switching behavior. The statistically significant relationship between pricing strategies and brand-switching behavior suggests that the selected predictors, including General Pricing Questions, Skimming Pricing, Penetration Pricing, Value-Based Pricing, and Discount Pricing, play a role in influencing consumers' tendency to switch brands. Businesses can reduce brand-switching behavior and improve customer retention by strategically implementing these pricing methods(Tran, 2020).

Table 5. Pricing Strategies vs. Brand Switching

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.755	.545		1.385	.171
	Skimming Pricing	.047	.083	.057	.571	.570
	Penetration Pricing	.389	.102	.417	3.806	.000
	Discount Pricing	.262	.106	.294	2.478	.016
	Value-Based Pricing	.032	.101	.037	.314	.755
	General Pricing Questions	.078	.125	.069	.623	.535

a. Dependent Variable: Brand Switching

Table 5 presents a regression analysis examining the relationship between pricing strategies and brand-switching behavior. The table provides information on the unstandardized coefficients, standardized coefficients (Beta), t-values, and significance levels for each predictor in the model. Let's discuss the table comprehensively, including its meanings and implications.

The constant term, represented by the "Constant" row, indicates the expected value of the dependent variable (brand switching) when all predictors are set to zero. In this case, the constant term is .755, with a standard error of .545. The associated t-value of 1.385 (p = .171) suggests that the regular term is not statistically significant, indicating that other factors beyond the pricing strategies included in the study might play a more influential role in determining brand-switching behavior(Hanifawati et al., 2019).

Analyzing the individual pricing strategies, Penetration Pricing demonstrates a positive unstandardized coefficient of .389 (p = .000) and a standardized coefficient (Beta) of .417. This indicates that an increase in Penetration Pricing is associated with a corresponding rise in brand-switching behavior. The significant t-value of 3.806 suggests that this relationship is statistically significant, implying that businesses should consider the impact of penetration pricing on brand-switching behavior when formulating pricing strategies.

Discount Pricing exhibits a positive unstandardized coefficient of .262 (p = .016) and a standardized coefficient of .294. This indicates that an increase in Discount Pricing is associated with a higher likelihood of brand switching. The significant t-value of 2.478 suggests that this relationship is statistically significant. Thus, businesses should be cautious when employing discount pricing strategies, as they may inadvertently encourage customers to switch brands.

Skimming Pricing, Value-Based Pricing, and General Pricing Questions show non-significant relationships with brand-switching behavior, as indicated by their non-significant t-values and p-values. This suggests that these pricing strategies may not significantly influence brand-switching behavior within the context of this study.

The regression analysis results indicate that Penetration Pricing and Discount Pricing have statistically significant impacts on brand-switching behavior. This implies that businesses should consider the potential consequences of employing these pricing strategies, as they may increase customers' likelihood of switching brands.

Pricing Strategies and Willingness to Pay

The ANOVA table reveals that the regression model accounts for some of the variability in Willingness to Pay, but the results are not statistically significant at the conventional level (p = .059). The Regression row shows that the predictors collectively explain 2.417 units of variation in Willingness to Pay, as represented by the sum of squares. The associated F-value of 2.259 suggests a marginal significance level (p = .059), indicating a possible relationship between the predictors and consumers' willingness to pay.

The Mean Square value of .483 indicates that, on average, each predictor explains approximately .483 units of variance in Willingness to Pay. This signifies the individual contribution of each predictor to the overall explanation of consumers' willingness to pay.

The Residual row captures the unexplained variance in Willingness to Pay, which amounts to 13.477 variation units. The Residual term represents

the portion of the dependent variable not accounted for by the chosen predictors. This indicates that factors beyond the considered pricing methods may influence consumers' willingness to pay.

While the overall model does not reach conventional levels of statistical significance, it is worth noting that individual predictors may still hold significance. However, further analysis and examination are needed to determine the specific impact of each predictor on consumers' willingness to pay.

The implications of these findings suggest that the chosen pricing strategies, including General Pricing Questions, Skimming Pricing, Penetration Pricing, Value-Based Pricing, and Discount Pricing, may have a limited direct impact on consumers' willingness to pay. Other factors, such as brand perception, product quality, and personal financial considerations, may be more significant in determining consumers' willingness to pay.

Table 6. Pricing Strategies vs. Willingness to Pay

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.843	.526		3.505	.001
	Skimming Pricing	.157	.080	.240	1.962	.054
	Penetration Pricing	.006	.099	.008	.056	.955
	Discount Pricing	-.059	.102	-.084	-.577	.566
	Value-Based Pricing	.140	.097	.205	1.434	.156
	General Pricing Questions	.189	.121	.214	1.570	.121

a. Dependent Variable: Willingness to Pay

Table 6 presents a regression analysis examining the relationship between pricing strategies (Skimming Pricing, Penetration Pricing, Discount Pricing, Value-Based Pricing, and General Pricing Questions) and consumers' willingness to pay. The table provides information on the unstandardized coefficients, standardized coefficients (Beta), t-values, and significance levels for each predictor in the model. Let's discuss the table comprehensively, including its meanings and implications.

The constant term, represented by the "Constant" row, indicates the expected value of the dependent variable (Willingness to Pay) when all predictors are set to zero. In this case, the constant term is 1.843, with a standard error of 0.526. The associated t-value of 3.505 (p = .001) indicates that the regular term is statistically significant, suggesting that there are factors beyond the pricing strategies included in the study that influence consumers' willingness to pay.

Examining the individual pricing strategies, Skimming Pricing shows a positive unstandardized coefficient of 0.157 (p = .054) and a standardized coefficient (Beta) of 0.240. Although the p-value is marginally above the conventional significance level, the positive coefficient suggests that Skimming Pricing may positively impact consumers' willingness to pay. However, further research is needed to establish the statistical significance of this relationship(Ali & Anwar, 2021; Yuan et al., 2022).

Penetration Pricing exhibits a negligible unstandardized coefficient of 0.006 (p = .955) and a standardized coefficient of 0.008. The non-significant p-value and small coefficient indicate that Penetration Pricing does not substantially impact consumers' willingness to pay within the context of this study.

Discount Pricing demonstrates a negative unstandardized coefficient of -0.059 (p = .566) and a standardized coefficient of -0.084. The non-significant p-value suggests that Discount Pricing does not significantly affect consumers' willingness to pay. This implies that offering discounts may not be a significant driver of consumer behavior regarding their willingness to pay.

Value-Based Pricing shows a positive unstandardized coefficient of 0.140 (p = .156) and a standardized coefficient of 0.205. Although the p-value is not statistically significant, the positive coefficient suggests a potential positive relationship between Value-Based Pricing and consumers' willingness to pay. However, further research is necessary to establish the significance of this relationship.

General Pricing Questions exhibit a positive unstandardized coefficient of 0.189 (p = .121) and a standardized coefficient of 0.214. Although the p-value is not statistically significant, the positive coefficient suggests that general pricing considerations may influence consumers' willingness to pay. Nonetheless, additional research is needed to confirm the significance of this relationship.

Pricing Strategies and Price Sensitivity

The regression model's sum of squares is 4.358, with 5 degrees of freedom, resulting in a mean square value of 0.872. The F-value of 3.576 indicates the overall significance of the regression model. The associated significance level (p-value) of .007 suggests that the regression model is statistically significant.

The residual sum of squares is 15.355, with 63 degrees of freedom, resulting in a mean square value of 0.244. The residual sum of squares represents the variation in the dependent variable that the regression model does not explain.

The total sum of squares, which combines the regression and residual sum of squares, is 19.712, with 68 degrees of freedom. The ANOVA results imply that the regression model, which includes the pricing strategies as predictors, explains a significant amount of variation in Price Sensitivity(Zhang et al., 2019). The F-value of 3.576 suggests that the variation explained by the model is greater than what would be expected by chance alone. The associated p-value of .007 indicates that the relationship between the predictors and Price Sensitivity is statistically significant.

These findings suggest that the pricing strategies included in the model collectively have a significant impact on consumers' Price Sensitivity. The pricing strategies, such as General Pricing Questions, Skimming Pricing, Penetration Pricing, Value-Based Pricing, and Discount Pricing, play a role in influencing consumers' sensitivity to prices. This implies that different pricing strategies may evoke varying levels of price sensitivity among consumers.

Table 7. Pricing Strategies and Price Sensitivity

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.664	.561		2.965	.004
	Skimming Pricing	-.015	.086	-.021	-.181	.857
	Penetration Pricing	.112	.105	.137	1.065	.291
	Discount Pricing	.216	.109	.276	1.982	.052
	Value-Based Pricing	-.015	.104	-.019	-.142	.888
	General Pricing Questions	.196	.129	.199	1.522	.133

a. Dependent Variable: Price Sensitivity

The table provides information on the unstandardized coefficients, standard error, standardized coefficients (Beta), t-values, and significance (Sig.) for each predictor in the regression model. The unstandardized coefficients represent the change in the dependent variable for a one-unit change in the predictor, while the standardized coefficients (Beta) show the standardized effect size of each predictor.

The regression analysis includes a constant term, indicating the baseline level of Price Sensitivity when all predictors are zero. The constant time has an unstandardized coefficient of 1.664, a standard error of 0.561, a t-value of 2.965, and a significance level of .004.

Among the pricing strategies, Skimming Pricing has an unstandardized coefficient of -0.015, indicating a small negative effect on Price Sensitivity. However, this coefficient is not statistically significant (p = .857), suggesting that Skimming Pricing does not significantly impact Price Sensitivity(Abrate et al., 2019; Krishnan et al., 2013; Tandon & Kiran, 2018).

Penetration Pricing has an unstandardized coefficient of 0.112, indicating a positive effect on Price Sensitivity. However, this coefficient is not statistically significant (p = .291), implying that Penetration Pricing does not significantly impact Price Sensitivity.

Discount Pricing has an unstandardized coefficient of 0.216, indicating a positive effect on Price Sensitivity. Although this coefficient approaches statistical significance (p = .052), it does not reach the conventional threshold of .05, suggesting that Discount Pricing may have a limited impact on Price Sensitivity.

Value-Based Pricing has an unstandardized coefficient of -0.015, indicating a small negative effect on Price Sensitivity. This coefficient is not statistically significant (p = .888), implying that Value-Based Pricing does not significantly impact Price Sensitivity.

General Pricing Questions has an unstandardized coefficient of 0.196, indicating a positive effect on Price Sensitivity. However, this coefficient is not statistically significant (p = .133), suggesting that General Pricing Questions may not significantly impact Price Sensitivity.

In summary, the regression analysis in Table 7 suggests that only Discount Pricing shows a potentially significant effect on Price Sensitivity among the pricing strategies examined. However, caution should be exercised in interpreting this result,

as the p-value for Discount Pricing (p = .052) is marginally above the conventional significance level. The other pricing strategies, including Skimming Pricing, Penetration Pricing, Value-Based Pricing, and General Pricing Questions, do not appear to significantly impact Price Sensitivity.

These findings imply that businesses should consider pricing strategies to effectively manage and address consumers' price sensitivity. While Discount Pricing may have a stronger influence, other pricing strategies may have limited or negligible effects on Price Sensitivity. Therefore, businesses should explore additional factors and marketing strategies to effectively address and manage consumers' price sensitivity, such as value-added services, product differentiation, and targeted promotions(P. Li et al., 2021; Wang & Tzeng, 2012).

Conclusion

According to the data in the preceding tables, pricing strategies have a complicated and nuanced effect on customer behavior among Gen Z. Regression studies were conducted to examine the links between various pricing methods and a variety of consumer behavior characteristics, such as purchasing behavior, brand loyalty, brand switching, willingness to pay, and price sensitivity. The connections were both substantial and not significant. Regarding Purchase Behavior, the results were inconclusive, as the mean scores for pricing indicators fell in the neutral category, indicating a lack of substantial impact on consumer behavior. However, when considering Brand Loyalty, the findings suggested that pricing strategies, particularly Skimming Pricing, Value-Based Pricing, and General Pricing Questions, will likely impact Gen Zs' brand loyalty. In terms of Brand Switching, the pricing strategies in the study were found to likely influence Gen Zs' behavior, with Penetration Pricing and Discount Pricing showing significant effects. On the other hand, the analysis on Willingness to Pay revealed neutral responses, suggesting that pricing strategies might not significantly impact Gen Zs' willingness to pay for products or services. Regarding Price Sensitivity, the regression analysis yielded mixed results. While the overall ANOVA indicated a significant relationship between pricing strategies and Price Sensitivity, the specific coefficients for the individual pricing strategies did not consistently demonstrate significant effects. Overall, these findings suggest that pricing strategies have varying degrees of influence on Gen Zs' consumer behavior. The results highlight the importance of understanding the unique characteristics and preferences of Gen Zs when developing pricing strategies. Businesses targeting this demographic should consider a holistic approach, considering factors beyond pricing, such as brand loyalty, switching, and other elements that may influence consumer behavior.

It is crucial for marketers and businesses to continuously evaluate and adapt their pricing strategies to effectively resonate with Gen Zs and align with their expectations and preferences. This may involve a combination of pricing methods, value-based pricing approaches, and understanding the specific needs and values of Gen Zs as a key demographic. Further research and investigation into the underlying factors driving Gen Zs' consumer behavior and their response to pricing strategies would contribute to a deeper understanding of this key market segment.

References:

1. Abrate, G., Nicolau, J. L., & Viglia, G. (2019). The impact of dynamic price variability on revenue maximization. *Tourism Management*, *74*, 224–233. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.TOURMAN.2019.03.013
2. Ali, B. J., & Anwar, G. (2021). Marketing Strategy: Pricing strategies and its influence on consumer purchasing decision. *International Journal of Rural Development, Environment and Health Research*, *5*(2), 26–39. https://doi.org/10.22161/IJREH.5.2.4
3. Hanifawati, T., Dewanti, V. W., & Saputri, G. D. (2019). THe role of social media influencer on brand switching of millennial and gen Z: a study of food-beverage products. *Jurnal Aplikasi Manajemen*, *17*(4), 625–638. https://doi.org/10.21776/UB.JAM.2019.017.04.07
4. Krishnan, B. C., Dutta, S., & Jha, S. (2013). Effectiveness of Exaggerated Advertised Reference Prices: The Role of Decision Time Pressure. *Journal of Retailing*, *89*(1), 105–113. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretai.2012.11.001
5. Li, F., Du, T. C. ting, & Wei, Y. (2019). Offensive pricing strategies for online platforms. *International Journal of Production Economics*, *216*, 287–304. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.IJPE.2019.06.009
6. Li, P., Rao, C., Goh, M., & Yang, Z. (2021). Pricing strategies and profit coordination under a double echelon green supply chain. *Journal of*

Cleaner Production, *278*, 123694. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JCLEPRO.2020.123694

7. Lim, Y. J., Osman, A., Salahuddin, S. N., Romle, A. R., & Abdullah, S. (2016). Factors Influencing Online Shopping Behavior: The Mediating Role of Purchase Intention. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, *35*, 401–410. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671(16)00050-2
8. Liu, J., Zhai, X., & Chen, L. (2019). Optimal pricing strategy under trade-in program in the presence of strategic consumers. *Omega*, *84*, 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.OMEGA.2018.03.005
9. Sharma, G., Bajpai, N., Kulshreshtha, K., Tripathi, V., & Dubey, P. (2019). Foresight for online shopping behavior: a study of attribution for "what next syndrome." *Foresight*, *21*(2), 285–317. https://doi.org/10.1108/FS-11-2017-0069
10. Simanjuntak, M., Putri, N. E., Yuliati, L. N., & Sabri, M. F. (2020). Enhancing customer retention using customer relationship management approach in car loan bussiness. *Http://Www.Editorialmanager.Com/Cogentbusiness*, *7*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2020.1738200
11. Tandon, U., & Kiran, R. (2018). Study on drivers of online shopping and significance of cash-on-delivery mode of payment on behavioural intention. *International Journal of Electronic Business*, *14*(3), 212–237. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJEB.2018.095959
12. Thangavel, P., Pathak, P., & Chandra, B. (2019). Consumer Decision-making Style of Gen Z: A Generational Cohort Analysis. *Https://Doi.Org/10.1177/0972150919880128*, *23*(3), 710–728. https://doi.org/10.1177/0972150919880128
13. Tran, L. T. T. (2020). Online reviews and purchase intention: A cosmopolitanism perspective. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, *35*, 100722. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.TMP.2020.100722
14. Wang, Y.-L., & Tzeng, G.-H. (2012). Brand marketing for creating brand value based on a MCDM model combining DEMATEL with ANP and VIKOR methods. *Expert Systems with Applications*, *39*(5), 5600–5615. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ESWA.2011.11.057
15. Yuan, N., Feng, H., Li, M., Feng, N., & Feng, N. (2022). Penetration or Skimming? Pricing Strategies for Software Platforms Considering Asymmetric Cross-Side Network Effects. *Journal of the Association for Information Systems*, *23*(4), 966–998. https://doi.org/10.17705/1jais.00748
16. Zhang, J., Zhang, J., & Zhang, M. (2019). From free to paid: Customer expertise and customer satisfaction on knowledge payment platforms. *Decision Support Systems*, *127*, 113140. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.DSS.2019.113140