The International Review of Multidisciplinary Research
Volume 1, Issue 3, March 2026, pp. 670-680
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19382658

Comparative Study of Online and Offline Purchasing Intentions among ABM Senior High Students

Katherine Joy G. Macapañas[1], Marco Arturo C. Acosta[2], Ma. Lucille W. Daiz[3], Leoniel Ree M. Olegario[4], Gracie Laika L. Dolor[5], Janine M. Sajorda[6], Christine Irish E. Ranido[7], Althea Nicole E. Sevilla[8], Rotsen C. Yodico[9]
Eastern Samar State University – Guiuan Campus
[1]katherinegayla0@gmail.com, [2]marcocorderoacosta@gmail.com, [3]lucilledaiz27@gmail.com, [4]mhoiolegario@gmail.com, [5]dolorgracielaika@gmail.com, [6]janinesajorda925@gmail.com, [7]escalanteranidochristineirish@gmail.com, [8]sevillateyang@gmail.com, [9]rotsen.yodico@essu.edu.ph

Article Details:

Received: 15 March 2026
Revised: 23 March 2026
Accepted: 28 March 2026
Published: 31 March 2026
Corresponding Email:
marcocorderoacosta@gmail.com

Recommended Citation:

Macapañas, K. J. G., Acosta, M. A. C., Daiz, M. L. W., Olegario, L. R. M., Dolor, G. L. L., Sajorda, J. M., Ranido, C. I. E., Sevilla, A. N. E., Yodico, R. C. (2026). Comparative study of online and offline purchasing intentions among ABM senior high students. The International Review of Multidisciplinary Research. 1 (3), 670-680. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19382658

Index Terms:
online shopping, offline shopping, purchase intention, consumer behavior, ABM students, generation z.

Abstract. This study focused on the inclination of ABM Senior High School students at Guiuan National High School toward online and offline shopping environments. The researchers used a descriptive-comparative research design to survey 104 respondents who were chosen through stratified sampling in order to ascertain how their shopping intentions are influenced by time, money, and personal preference. A validated questionnaire modified from Abong et al. (2023) was used to collect the data. Descriptive statistics and inferential tests were used for analysis. Analysis showed that both online (M=3.73) and offline (M=3.68) shopping were preferred by students. It appears that online shopping was popular due to its cost-effective options and time-saving advantages, such as discounts and convenience. Offline shopping was still relevant to students who appreciated physically examining products before purchasing them and immediately receiving the items they purchased. There were no statistically significant differences regarding purchase intentions of the sample based on any of the following: age category, gender category, or income category (p>.05). Additionally, comparison using paired samples t-test revealed that online and offline purchasing intentions did not differ significantly; thus, students seem to perceive both forms of purchasing as equal in importance. Results further validate the Theory of Planned Behavior in regard to how a consumer's purchase decision is more influenced by situational variables and perceived convenience than by their demographic characteristics. Finally, results demonstrate that ABM students practice flexible and adaptive consumer behavior, as they determine what platform to use based on their immediate context. Additional future research should explore other psychological and behavioral factors that can affect purchasing decisions.

Introduction

The rise of e-commerce has completely changed how consumers make purchasing decisions and have altered their behavior in terms of obtaining essential information, making product comparisons, and finalizing purchase transactions. The blended marketplace is a result of the growth of E-Commerce platforms forcing consumers to understand how to combine traditional offline retailing with the convenience of shopping using their digital device. This has made the competition between the online and traditional retailing sectors significantly more intense. According to Chaffey (2019), digital environments influence consumers' purchasing behavior by allowing them to access user-generated content, compare prices across different suppliers, and have access to immediate product information. Generation Z or the "Digital (Ben)Native" experiences high levels of comfort when consuming products through technology.

ORCID: [1]https://orcid.org/0009-0002-9225-478X, [2]https://orcid.org/0009-0000-5374-9945, [3]https://orcid.org/0009-0008-6264-342X, [4]https://orcid.org/0009-0003-6407-8923, [5]https://orcid.org/0009-0001-2625-782X , [6]https://orcid.org/0009-0006-5040-1760, [7]https://orcid.org/0009-0005-3085-1636, [8]https://orcid.org/0009-0007-6945-0535, [9]https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2149-9790

Despite the rise of online shopping, there are still benefits to shopping offline at brick-and-mortars. Retailers continue to have an obligation to provide customers with first-hand examinations of products before buying them, as well as an opportunity for consumers to make immediate purchases and create an experience through product interactions. Therefore, emerging retailer questions arise from a growing two-channel retail landscape regarding how young consumers evaluate and navigate both types of retail environments. Since the introduction of online purchasing, the retail environment has changed significantly, resulting in a dynamic interaction between traditional brick-and-mortar stores and online marketplaces. Customers who appreciate being able to physically inspect things and receive personalized attention continue to be drawn to offline shopping due to its tactile experience and instant pleasure. However, due to its unmatched ease, wide selection, and affordable prices, internet shopping has completely changed how consumers behave. This is especially true for time- and tech-conscious consumers. New developments in the retail sector show that these two shopping experiences are becoming more and more similar. For example, augmented reality (AR) allows customers to view products in real time while physical stores are incorporating digital technologies to improve the in-store experience (Patel, N. et.al. 2024).

Previous studies were conducted to analyze purchasing behaviors based on urban versus rural populations, adults or across different generations. In the study conducted by Ray and Bandyopadhyay (2025), entitled "Exploring Consumer Preferences: An In-Depth Comparative Study on Online and Offline Shopping Habits," emphasizes that consumer buying behavior has evolved significantly in the digital age, with both online and offline channels providing unique experiences and benefits. The study investigates the factors influencing consumer preferences for online and offline shopping and analyzes consumer behavior patterns in both settings. In the study, the finding reveals that online and offline shopping behaviors are shaped by various factors, including demographics, convenience, product type, and sensory experiences. While online shopping is preferred for convenience and variety, offline shopping remains popular for high-involvement purchases where tactile experience and immediate ownership are valued. The author further discussed that to effectively meet consumer expectations, retailers should adopt an omnichannel approach that incorporates the strengths of both online and offline shopping. By understanding consumer motivations and preferences, businesses can create integrated retail strategies that maximize customer satisfaction and retention.

There are very few empirical studies that focused solely on rural Senior High School Students in the Philippines, due to the fact that constraints to purchasing decisions can greatly differ in regions with limited infrastructure, variability in income, and/or limited access to markets. Few studies conduct a direct comparison of intentions for making purchases online versus making purchases in-store and also evaluate the impact of demographic characteristics like age, gender, and socio-economic status at the same time. This is particularly significant for students who are enrolled in Accountancy, Business and Management (ABM) programs, since their exposure to business and consumer principles may influence how they perceive cost, time, and personal preference when making a purchasing decision. The absence of localized, strand-focused comparative research limits a comprehensive understanding of youth consumer behavior in rural educational settings.

Due to this gap, this research study seeks to analyze in a comparative manner the respective online and offline shopping intention of students from the ABM Senior High School at Guiuan National High School. This study shall address the following three (3) objectives: (1) To ascertain the extent to which respondents prefer shopping online or in-store through examining their own personal preferences, cost effectiveness, and time effectiveness when compared with their own individual circumstances; (2) To determine whether there are any significant differences for respondents based on their respective ages, genders and/or economic statuses; and (3) To identify an overall difference between those who intend to shop online versus those who intend to shop in-store. By conducting this research within the context of a rural public school in the Philippines, the results of this research may serve as empirical evidence added to the growing body of literature discussing Generation Z consumer buying behavior, providing useful information to those involved in decision making regarding education, retailing and government policy.

Statement of the Problem

This study explored and compared the buying preferences of ABM Senior High School students at Guiuan National High School between offline and online markets. In addition, the study gained a better understanding of how these students make purchasing decisions and whether there were significant differences in their preferences for online versus offline shopping.

Specifically, the following questions were answered:

1. What are the profiles of the students in terms of:
1.1 Age;
1.2 Gender; and

1.3 Economic Status?

2. What is the level of preference of ABM Senior High students towards online purchase intention in terms of:
2.1 Personal Preferences;
2.2 Cost Efficient; and
2.3 Time Efficient?

3. What is the level of preference of ABM Senior High students towards offline purchase intention in terms of:
3.1 Personal Preferences;
3.2 Cost Efficient; and
3.3 Time Efficient?

4. What is the preferred purchase of ABM Senior High Students in terms of Online and Offline shopping Environment?

5. Is there significant difference between the level of preference between online purchase intention in terms of personal preferences, cost efficient, and time efficient classified according to age, sex, economic status?

6. Is there significant difference between the level of preference between offline purchase intention in terms of personal preferences, cost efficient, and time efficient classified according to age, sex, economic status?

7. Is there a significant difference between the level of preference for online and offline purchase intention?

Methodology

Research Design

The researchers utilized a descriptive-comparative research design in this case which accommodates explaining measuring and comparing how students intend to purchase goods in both online and offline stores. In this context narrative explanation is quite essential because it allows probing of phenomena where the aim is to investigate the differences in a targeted population, here the ABM students, as well as the impact of other demographic factors like age, gender or economic class on their shopping behavior.

Research Locale

The study was conducted at the Guiuan National High School (GNHS), which was located in Barangay Cogon in the Municipality of Guiuan, Province of Eastern Samar. Guiuan is located at the southernmost part of Samar Island and is a first-class municipality in the province of Eastern Samar. Additionally, serving a diverse student body from different barangays in Guiuan and surrounding communities, GNHS is a public secondary school run by the Department of Education. The school gives students options that are in line with their educational objectives and career interests by offering Senior High School programs under both the Academic and Technical-Vocational-Livelihood (TVL) tracks.

Respondents of the Study

The respondents of this study were the ABM Senior High School Students in Guiuan National High School who were enrolled in the school year 2025-2026. From a total of 123 ABM Senior High School Students from the Academic Track, 104 respondents were selected using the Stratified Sampling. The study focuses only on ABM (Accountancy, Business and Management) students because their academic track directly relates to consumer behavior, marketing principles, and business decision making. These students are more likely to have foundational knowledge and interest in the concept of buying preferences, product evaluation, and market trends, which align with the study's objective.

Instrumentation

In their study, Abong et al. (2023) used a structured survey questionnaire called "Exploring the Purchasing Behavior of Customers in Pangantucan Bukidnon in both Online Shopping and Physical Store," as adapted for the context of the ABM Senior High School students who attended Guiuan National High School. The survey was broken up into three sections: (1) demographic profile (age, sex, and economic status), (2) intention to purchase online, and (3) offline purchase intention.

Usage intention, both online and offline, was measured on three separate dimensions: (1) personal preference, (2) cost efficiency, and (3) time efficiency; using a five-point Likert scale of 1 = Highly Not Preferred to 5 = Highly Preferred. The questionnaire was submitted to research advisors for clarity and relevance then went through a pilot test prior to finalizing the questionnaire to determine reliability.

Data Gathering Procedure

Before data gathering commenced, official consent was obtained from academic institutions and the administration of Guiuan National High School to gather data from participating students. School officials and class advisors had coordinated with the researchers to make necessary arrangements to administer questionnaires in such a way as to not disturb the students' regular schooling. Participants were made aware of what was going to occur in regard to research, and consent was obtained in order for researchers to collect data from the participants. Researchers enforced research ethics throughout the data collection process including confidentiality, anonymity (there was no identifying information collected), and obtaining participant consent. The researchers administered the questionnaires directly in order to provide clear directions on how to complete the questionnaires and answer any questions that may arise. After data collection, the researchers reviewed the returned questionnaires to make sure that they were completed prior to encoding them. All data collected from the participants was only used for research purposes and academia.

Data Analysis

All gathered data were organized, cleaned, then analyzed using both descriptive statistics and inferential statistics techniques. To describe the demographic profile of respondents, frequency and percentage will be used. To calculate a level of preference regarding purchasing either online or offline via personal preference, cost efficiency, and time efficiency will have mean and standard deviation calculated. The mean score will be interpreted using pre-defined ranges correlating to that of the descriptive equivalent of Highly Not Preferred through Highly preferred. Independent samples t-test will compare male vs. female for gender purposes; one-way anova will compare economic status groups; kruskal wallis test will compare the age ranges. A paired sample t-test determined overall difference between online and offline purchases in general.

Results and Discussion

Variable	Category	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
Age	16-17 years old	101	97.1
	18-19 years old	2	1.9
	20 years old and above	1	1.0
Gender	Male	20	19.2
	Female	84	80.8
Economic Status	Below 8,000 php	67	64.4
	8,000- 14,999 php	22	21.2
	15,000- 24,999 php	8	7.7
	25,000 php and above	7	6.7

Table 1. The Demographic Profile of the Respondents

Demographic Profile of the Respondents

Age Profile

A total of 104 ABM Senior High School Students from Guiuan National High School participated in the research. According to this distribution, the ages of the majority of students from ABM Senior High School correspond to the stage of adolescence commonly found in students in the Philippines. It can be assumed that the small percentage of students 18 years old or older are due to delayed entry into school, or other interruptions or personal issues that caused them to return. Because the majority of the respondents are younger, this study represents a typical example of the consumption behavior and spending habits of younger generation Z students. Most of the participants were 16-17 years old (97.1%) and at least 18 years old (1.9%) and 20+ (1.0%) were found thus the sample is representative of mostly mid-adolescent learners.

Gender

Most of the respondents were female (80.8%) and male (19.2%). The distribution of gender reflects a predominance of females on the ABM strand. It can be seen from this sample that female students represented a larger percentage of the survey participants than male students. This is in line with national statistics, which also show that more females sign up for commerce-related vocational programs than males. A higher percentage of female respondents to the survey may mean that females were quicker to respond or were more inclined to participate in this survey than their male counterparts. Bagla (2019) states that women are more engaged in online purchases and other digital shopping activities than men. Therefore, when considering the findings of the study, it should be noted that due to the demographics of the respondent population, the behavior patterns found may reflect how females traditionally purchase goods.

Economic Status

Of the respondent's economic status, respondent's monthly household income was below ₱8,000 reported by 64.4% of respondents, followed by 21.2% in the ₱8,000-₱14,999 category. Very few (only 1%) were found in the higher income category thus representing the lack of resources available to the majority of participants came from low-income households. According to research, most ABM students come from low-income households, a common trend in rural schools. As a result, ABM students are typically more cautious when making purchases and tend to evaluate prices before deciding whether they can afford to make the purchase. Therefore, students' purchasing habits are influenced by their family's financial limits and as such, ABM students' purchasing decisions are largely made based on what is reasonable or financially a good deal rather than on what would otherwise be preferred

Statements	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Personal Preference			
I like to try to purchase different things online	3.51	0.92	High Preference
I like a great deal of variety online	3.34	0.76	Moderate Preference
I prefer the availability of high-quality products and services provided by the web retailer	3.56	0.95	High Preference
I search various online websites just to find out more about the latest sales	3.44	1.00	High Preference
Mean	**3.46**	**0.91**	**High Preference**
Cost Efficient			
I decide that I may be able to find better sales at another online stores	3.74	0.87	High Preference
I find a website that offers discounts or free shipping	4.25	0.81	Very High Preference
I find a website that has a low price	4.00	0.99	High Preference
I find a website that has lower prices than offline stores	3.89	1.07	High Preference
Mean	**3.97**	**0.93**	**High Preference**
Time Efficient			
I prefer to purchase from an online store because I can take my time compare products	3.60	0.95	High Preference
I prefer online shopping because its time saving	3.63	0.99	High Preference
I prefer online shopping because it reduces the effort of travelling, walking, and carrying.	3.96	0.96	High Preference
I prefer online shopping it takes less time to evaluate and select products	3.82	0.89	High Preference
Mean	**3.75**	**0.95**	**High Preference**
Overall Mean	**3.73**	**0.93**	**High Preference**

Table 2. Level of Preference towards Online Purchase Intention

Level of Preference towards Online Purchasing Intention

The statistics indicated that students strongly preferred making purchases online (M=3.73, SD=0.93). In terms of Personal Preference, the highest mean score is 3.56 "I prefer the availability of high-quality products and services provided by the web retailer", with a SD of 0.95 interpreted as "High Preference". The lowest was the statement " I like a great deal of variety online" with a mean score of 3.34, a SD of 0.76 and interpreted as "Moderate Preference ". In terms of Cost Efficiency, the statement "I find a website that offers discounts or free shipping " garnered a mean score of 4.25, with a SD of 0.81 interpreted as Very High Preference. Additionally, the statement " I decide that I may be able to find better sales at another online stores" gained a mean score of 3.74, with a SD of 0.87 and interpreted as High Preference. Lastly, In the Time Efficiency, the statement " I prefer to purchase from an online store because I can take my time compare products" garnered as lowest mean score of 3.60, with a SD of 0.95 interpreted as High Preference. On the other hand, the highest score was on the statement" I prefer online shopping because it reduces the effort of travelling, walking, and carrying" with a mean score of 3.96, a SD of 0.96 and interpreted as High Preference. Of the three criteria, cost efficiency (M=3.97) was the highest, indicating that students value the free shipping, affordable prices, and discounts offered by online platforms. With a mean score of 3.75, Time Efficiency ranked second, suggesting that students value the convenience of shopping without having to travel. Additionally, Personal Preference displayed a high mean of 3.46, suggesting that many students find web browsing to be convenient and comfortable. While most students agreed on the benefits of online purchasing, there was some heterogeneity due to individual experiences with internet availability and product quality, as indicated by the standard deviation values (SD≈ 0.9).

Some findings match what (Sisca, 2022) - how price views and site exposure affect online buys. The spread of answers shows whether most students thought alike or had different opinions. While many like the ease and cheaper deals of digital shopping, confidence and happiness differ because results were mixed in the middle.

Shopping Mode	Mean	Rank	Interpretation
Online Purchase Intention	3.72	1	High Preference
Offline Purchase Intention	3.69	2	High Preference

Table 3. Preferred Purchase of ABM Senior High School Students in term of Online and Offline Purchasing Intentions

The results show ABM Senior High students prefer buying stuff online or at actual shops. Even though internet shopping scored 3.72 (SD = 0.55), real-store visits reached nearly the same at 3.69 (SD = 0.53). Browsing online edged out slightly, thanks to a mere gap of 0.03 - offline habits hardly changed at all. With narrow SDs across responses, it's clear most pupils shared close views when rating either method. These findings suggest that students choose where to shop based on what feels most practical at the moment. They appreciate the convenience, affordability, and accessibility that online shopping offers, yet they still place importance on being able to physically inspect products and obtain them immediately when shopping in stores.

This equal division matches what Ajzen Theory of Planned Behavior suggested back in 1991 - what people do isn't only shaped by beliefs, yet depends on their sense of control too. Since students enjoy online buying just as much as physical shops, alongside feeling comfortable with both, their purchase intentions remain flexible rather than fixed.

Variable	X^2	df.	p	Interpretation
Online Purchasing Intention	0.043	2	0.979	Not Significant

Table 4. Kruskal-Wallis Test for Age vs Online Purchase Intention

The test results, X2(2) = 0.043, p = .979, show interest in online shopping stayed about the same across age groups - most participants were 16 to 17 years old, so there wasn't a wide range to look at; still, standard deviations were alike in each group, meaning views on online shopping didn't really shift with age.

Gender	Mean	SD	t	df	p	Interpretation
Male	3.60	0.49				
Female	3.75	0.52	-1.77	102	0.80	Not Significant

Table 5. Independent- Samples t-test for Gender vs Online Purchase Intention

Although female students (M= 3.75, SD = 0.52) reported slightly higher online- shopping preference than male students (M= 3.60, SF= 0.49), the difference was not statistically significant (p= .080). The close mean values and small SDs demonstrate that both groups of share comparable views toward online purchasing. Standard deviation was useful here to illustrate that responses within each gender were homogeneous, meaning that individual opinions did not deviate widely from the group mean.

Variable	df Between	df Within	F	Sig. (p)	Interpretation
Online Purchasing Intention	3	100	0.202	0.670	Not Significant

Table 6 Economic Status vs. Online Purchase Intention

One-way ANOVA showed no significant differences across economic status groups (F (3, 100) = 0.202, p= .670). This indicates that students across all levels of economic standing- whether low, average, or relatively higher- reported comparable preferences for online shopping. The relatively small SDs across categories show uniform responses, indicating that economic status had minimal effect on students' online - shopping preferences. Access to affordable internet and mobile apps may explain this uniformly.

Statements	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Personal Preference			
I like new and different styles of products in the physical stores	3.72	0.88	High Preference
I prefer to see things I buy before buying them	4.13	0.95	High Preference
I find better-quality products and services in the physical store	4.00	0.85	High Preference
It was easy to find the product I wanted in the physical store	3.49	0.96	High Preference
Mean	**3.84**	**0.91**	**High Preference**
Cost Efficient			
I decide that I may be able to find better sales at a land-based store.	3.62	0.83	High Preference
I buy items on sales in physical stores	3.49	0.85	High Preference
I notice price difference in physical stores	3.84	0.93	High Preference
I consider buying in physical stores to check products, even at a high price	3.35	1.00	Moderate Preference
Mean	**3.58**	**0.90**	**High Preference**
Time Efficient			
I prefer to purchase from physical stores because it is more convenient	3.62	0.79	High Preference
I consider the day when I make a purchase in physical stores	3.52	0.88	High Preference
I choose to purchase in physical stores, particularly in such a hurry	3.70	0.94	High Preference
I find myself pressed for time when I do my shopping in physical stores	3.67	0.81	High Preference
Mean	**3.63**	**0.86**	**High Preference**
Overall Mean	**3.68**	**0.89**	**High Preference**

Table 7 Level of Preference towards Offline Purchase Intention

In terms of Personal Preference, the highest mean score was 4.13 “I prefer to see things I buy before buying them", with a SD of 0.95 interpreted as "High Preference". The lowest was the statement "It was easy to find the product I wanted in the physical store" with a mean score of 3.49, a SD of 0.96 and interpreted as "High Preference ". In terms of Cost Efficiency, the statement "I notice price difference in physical stores" garnered a mean score of 3.84, with a SD of 0.93 interpreted as High Preference. Additionally, the statement "I consider buying in physical stores to check products, even at a high price" gained

a mean score of 3.35 with a SD of 1.00 and interpreted as Moderate Preference. Lastly, In the Time Efficiency, the statement "I choose to purchase in physical stores, particularly in such a hurry" garnered a highest mean score of 3.70, with a SD of 0.94 interpreted as High Preference. On the other hand, the lowest mean score was on the statement" I consider the day when I make a purchase in physical stores" with a mean score of 3.52, a SD of 0.88 and interpreted as High Preference.
The findings reveal students favored buying things in person, scoring it 3.68 on average (SD = 0.89). Of the three factors, liking it personally stood out with a 3.84 - this hints that plenty prefer checking items up close then walking out with them right away after store visits. Since the spread of answers was narrow, their views lined up closely, showing most felt just about equally relaxed and sure about shopping offline.

This decision highlights why seeing items yourself matters - many students rely on things they've personally examined or touched. This thought matches findings from (Muhammad and Raiker 2019), when touching products boosted buyer confidence during purchases.

Variable	X^2	df.	p	Interpretation
Offline Purchasing Intention	0.290	2	0.865	Not Significant

Table 8. Kruskal-Wallis Test for Age vs Offline Purchase Intention

In spite of varying ages, learners preferred real-world store perks - $X^2(2) = 0.290$, p = .865 revealed no major gaps in offline buying habits. Opinions stayed consistent throughout cohorts - the spread of responses backed that up. Physical shops' instant rewards mattered just as much to younger crowds as older ones did.

Gender	Mean	SD	t	df	p	Interpretation
Male	3.60	0.49				
Female	3.75	0.52	-1.77	102	0.80	Not Significant

Table 9. Independent- Samples t-test for Gender vs Offline Purchase Intention

Female students showed slightly stronger offline shopping habits (M = 3.72, SD = 0.54) compared to male peers (M = 3.63, SD = 0.50), yet this gap didn't reach statistical significance (p = .136).The average difference is small- yet shows both genders think pretty alike. Most answers stayed near the middle since spreads were tight. That closeness means views don't swing much when buying face-to-face.

Variable	df Between	df Within	F	Sig. (p)	Interpretation
Online Purchasing Intention	3	100	0.225	0.855	Not Significant

Table 10. Economic Status vs. Online Purchase Intention

The ANOVA result (F(3, 100) = 0.225, p = .866) revealed no real gap in offline buying interest among different income brackets. Each group landed close together on average, with tight standard deviations - pointing to shared views about in-person shopping. So instead of money shaping behavior, it looks like access and checking items firsthand pull equal weight for students from any economic level.

Online Mean (SD)	Offline Mean (SD)	Mean Difference	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
3. 719 (0.547)	3.689 (0.529)	0.030	0.603	103	0.548

Table 11. Significant Difference between Online and Offline Purchase Intention

The paired-sample t-test revealed nearly identical results for web-based buying interest (M=3.72, SD=0.55) versus in-store options (M=3.69, SD=0.53), with t(103)=0.603 and a p-value of .548 - meaning no real gap existed. A tiny average shift of just 0.03 suggests learners rated both methods about the same. Since standard deviations stayed small, answers didn't swing widely; this points to steady views across individuals when weighing digital against physical stores. This discovery backs up the idea that Gen Z shoppers think across channels, moving easily between online and offline shops based on what's easier or what they're buying. Looking at Ajzen's (1991) Theory of Planned Behavior, this mix shows students tend to have alike favorable attitudes and perceived control over both modes of shopping.

Conclusion and Recommendations

According to the data collected before the research process, students in the ABM Senior High School exhibit similar purchase intention for both online (M. 3.73, SD. 0.93) and offline (M. 3.68, SD. 0.89) shopping methods. No significant difference was found between these two methods of purchasing (t.= 0.603, p 0.548). Students rated online shopping as having greater appeal to them than offline shopping because of its greater cost efficiency (M = 3.97) and time efficiency (M = 3.75) demonstrating their preference for a digitized method of shopping because they value affordability and discounts in addition to convenience when performing purchase transactions digitally. The aforementioned findings are consistent with previous research wherein online shopping was preferred over offline shopping largely as a result of price competition, accessibility and ease of use. Despite this, shopping offline was still rated a preference (M=3.84) like shopping online, indicating that college students continue to value the ability to see products before purchasing them and to receive them immediately. Additionally, there is a low standard deviation across dimensions for each of the two shopping experiences reflecting a commonality of perception between students on the advantages of each.

Moreover, the results of the inferential statistical analysis did not reveal any significant differences in purchase intentions when students were categorized by demographic factors such as age, gender, and economic status ($p > .05$), indicating that demographic factors do not significantly influence students' preferences. These findings can be explained by the Theory of Planned Behavior developed by Icek Ajzen (1991), in which behavioral intentions are influenced by attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control. The findings indicate that students have positive attitudes toward both online and offline shopping and perceive themselves as capable of performing both behaviors, irrespective of demographic factors. The study, therefore, reveals that Generation Z students display adaptive and flexible consumer behavior, whereby they can select between online and offline alternatives depending on situational factors, whereas demographic factors do not significantly influence students' preferences for online or offline shopping.

Acknowledgement

The researchers would like to express their heartfelt gratitude to the people who assisted the researchers to make this study possible.

Mrs. June O. Dagsa, their research advisor, the researchers would like to thank you for everything: from your time, thoughts, wisdom, and guidance. Thank you is undoubtedly not enough for your contagious positivity, which drove us on at all times.

Dr. Rotsen C. Yodico, research advisor, for generously sharing his time, wisdom, advice, and expertise, which enable us to continue on this path. Without your assistance in this field, we would not have made it this far. You have our outmost respect and admiration.

Ms. Rechel P. Samarro, their statistician, for sparing her time, knowledge, and wisdom. The researchers would like to extend their appreciation for the support, encouragement, and inspiration.

Dr. Teresita Villa G. Lacaba, **Dr. Alvin B. Lacaba**, **Dr. Jordan M. Cabaguing**, **Dr. Cecelia G. Lagramada**, **Dr. Jeffrey A. Guimbaolibot**, and **Dr. Rotsen C. Yodico**, members of the review committee for their guidance and expertise delivered to the researchers with full of encouragement is highly appreciated. This study means nothing without their presence.

To the Respondents, who in one way or another helped in the completion of this study, our greatest appreciation for their cooperation and patience.

To the family, the Parents and Siblings, words are not enough to express the love and appreciation we have for you in our hearts. Your love has never been failed us and your unceasing prayers have fueled us to make this far. Because of these priceless things, we're able to go through life's frictions and polishing that have made us who and what we are today.

To our classmates and friends, thank you for the small and great favor they have unselfishly shared to us. Thise made us realize that we are not alone on our way up there. The researchers would like to thank you for being always there to respond the request.

To our Alma Mater, Eastern Samar State University – Guiuan Campus, through the faculty and staff, for their unwavering support and teaching.

To the Almighty Father, for being our source of strength and wisdom throughout this endeavor. We offer You our deepest gratitude for all the blessings You have bestowed upon us. With gratitude and humility, we offer this acknowledgment to You, our Almighty Father.

To the rest of the people who parades themselves to helped in this endeavor, thank you so much and God Bless.

Funding

This research received no external funding from any public, commercial, or not-for-profit funding agency, and no organization provided financial support for the conduct of the study, authorship, or publication of this article.

Competing Interests Statement

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this article.

Data Availability Statement

Data sharing is not applicable to this article as no new data were created or analyzed in this study; all data used were obtained from previously published sources as cited in the reference list.

References

Abong, et al. (2023). Exploring the Purchasing Behavior of Customer in Pangantucan Bukidnon in both Online Shopping and in Physical Store. https://www.scribd.com/document/813201772/EXPLORING-THE-CONSUMERS-PURCHASING-BEHAVIOR-ON-ONLINE-SHOPPING-AND-ON-PHYSICAL-STORE-IN-PANGANTUCAN-MUNICIPALITY

Ajzen, I. (1991). The Theory of Planned Behavior. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 50(2), 179-211. https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-t

Babu, S. (2020). Factors Influencing Customers Buying Decisions Towards Shopping Online and Offline with Reference to Coimbatore City. Research Article: 2020 Vol: 24 Issue: 1. Shopping. International Journal of Creative Research and Innovation (IJCRI). https://www.abacademies.org/articles/factors-influencing-customers-buying-decision-towards-shopping-online-and-offline-with-reference-to-coimbatore-city-8973.html

Bhatt, V., & Nagvandia, J. (2021). Factors influencing consumers' online buying behavior: An empirical study. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/355396679_-FACTORS_INFLUENCING_CONSUMER'S_ONLINE_BUYING_BEHAVIOR_AN_EMPIRICAL_STUDY_Doctor_of_Philosophy_in_Management

Chaffey, D. (2019). Digital marketing: Strategy, implementation, and practice. Pearson Education. https://www.scirp.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=3413574

Delelis, M. 2019. The online shopping preferences of the Bachelor of Science in Accounting Technology Students of the College of Business, Entrepreneurship and Accountancy. International Journal of Advanced Research. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/400232999_THE_ONLINE_SHOPPING_PREFERENCES_OF_THE_BACHELOR_OF_SCIENCE_IN_ACCOUNTING_TECHNOLOGY_STUDENTS_OF_THE_COLLEGE_OF_BUSINESS_ENTREPRENEURSHIP_AND_ACCOUNTANCY

Espinoza, M. et al. (2021). Consumer Behavior Analysis on Online and Offline Shopping During Pandemic Situation. https://doi.org/10.32535/ijafap.v4i3.1208

Gunawan, C., Rahmania, L., & Hendrika, I. (2023). The influence of social influence and peer influence on intention to purchase in e-commerce. Review of Management and Entrepreneurship, 7(1), 61-84. https://doi.org/10.37715.v7i.3683

Kiran, B. and Vishnuvandana, V. (2019). Comparative Study on Online and Offline Shopping. https://doi.org/10.22214/ijraset.2019.10029

Kumar, D. & Khurana, K. (2023). A Comparative Study of Online and Offline Shopping in Haryana. https://www.academia.edu/45566850/A_Comparative_Study_of_Online_and_Offline_Shopping_in_Haryana

Mubtaqheem, M. and Raiker, S. (2019). A study on consumer behavior towards online and offline shopping. Iconic Research and Engineering Journals. https://www.irejournals.com/paper-details/1701666

Patel, N. et al. (2024). Consumer preference towards online shopping and offline shopping of apparels. A Global Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies. https://www.gapinterdisciplinarities.org/res/articles/(145-

154)%20CONSUMER%20PREFERENCE%20TOWARDS%20ONLINE%20SHOPPING%20AND%20OFFLINE%20SHOPPING%20OF%20APPARELS.pdf

Ray, N, and Bandyopadhyay, A. (2025). Exploring consumer preferences: An in-depth comparative study on online and offline shopping habits. Business Strategies Emerging Issues and Prospects: Indian Context. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14568108

Sanchez, R. 2023. The preferences of senior high school students of Sienna College of Quezon City in traditional and online shopping: A mixed method study. International Journal of Academic and Practical Research. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/371655539_The_Preferences_of_Senior_High_School_Students_of_Siena_College_of_Quezon_City_in_Traditional_and_Online_Shopping_A_Mixed_Method_Study

Sisca, S. et al. (2022). What do Consumers really want? Online Vs. Offline Shopping for Fashion Products. International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Sustainability Studies (IJEASS). https://doi.org/10.31098/ijeass.v2i2.714

Suthamathi, D. and Jeeva, S. (2020) Online shopping vs offline shopping customer preference in Salem District. International Journal of Scientific & Technology Research. https://www.ijstr.org/final-print/feb2020/Online-Shopping-Vs-Offline-Shopping-Customer-Preference-In-Salem-District.pdf

Syamsudin, A., Sabirin, S., & Elliyana, E. (2025). Generational Differences in Online Shopping: Millennials VS. Generation Z. Journal of Production, Operations Management and Economics, 51, 51–62. https://doi.org/10.55529/jpome.51.51.62

Verbiska, L., et al. (2023). The development of e-commerce in the context of the digitalization of the economy. Review of Economics and Finance, 21, 577-583. https://refpress.org/ref-vol21-a59/

Williams, K., & Page, R. (2018). Marketing to the generations. Journal of Behavioral Studies in Business, 3, 37-52. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/242760064_Marketing_to_the_Generations

Zamfirache, A., Neacşu, N.A., Madar, A. et al. (2024). Behavioural differences and purchasing experiences through online commerce or offline within mall-based retail structures. Electron Commer Res. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10660-024-09879-6

Appendices

No appendices are attached to this study.