

Accommodation Infrastructure and Employee Behavior Influence Guest Satisfaction at Kyriad Hotel Bumiminang Padang

Sasgia Febby Yolla^{1*}, Youmil Abrian²

^{1,2}Universitas Negeri Padang

Copyright©2026 by authors, all rights reserved. Authors agree that this article remains permanently open access under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Licence 4.0 International License.

Article Info

Article history:

Received July 27, 2026

Revised August 7, 2026

Accepted August 8, 2026

Keywords:

Accommodation

Infrastructure, Employee

Behavior, Guest Satisfaction,

Hotel Guests, Multiple Linear

Regression

ABSTRACT

Preliminary researcher observations at Kyriad Hotel Bumiminang Padang indicated concerns involving facility condition and frontline service interactions, making it important to assess how both operational dimensions relate to guest satisfaction. This study examines the effects of accommodation infrastructure and employee behavior on guest satisfaction. A quantitative causal-associative survey design was applied to a reported population of 1,673 hotel guests, with 323 respondents selected through non-probability purposive sampling. Data were collected using a five-point Likert-scale questionnaire and analyzed with descriptive statistics and multiple linear regression in SPSS 26. Accommodation infrastructure (mean = 40.99), employee behavior (mean = 27.83), and guest satisfaction (mean = 31.16) were all classified as good. Accommodation infrastructure had a positive and significant effect on guest satisfaction ($B = 0.422$, $t = 11.224$, $p < 0.001$), and employee behavior also had a positive and significant effect ($B = 0.362$, $t = 6.941$, $p < 0.001$). Together, both predictors were significant ($F = 314.988$, $p < 0.001$) and explained 66.1% of the variance in guest satisfaction (adjusted $R^2 = 0.661$). Accommodation infrastructure was the stronger predictor, indicating that facility maintenance should be prioritized while employee-service development is strengthened in parallel.

Corresponding Author:

Sasgia Febby Yolla

Universitas Negeri Padang

Email: sasgiafebbyolla11@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

Hotel service performance depends on the coordination of physical resources and employee interactions throughout the guest stay [1]. Guest satisfaction reflects an evaluation of whether service performance meets or exceeds expectations [2]. In hospitality, satisfaction is strategically important because it is linked to perceived value, repeat patronage, and favorable behavioral intentions [3]. Evidence from accommodation research further shows that satisfaction is shaped by several service-quality dimensions and that their importance can vary across hotel categories [4]. Service quality also influences guests' subsequent behavioral intentions rather than operating as a single isolated attribute [5].

Accommodation infrastructure refers to the physical and functional resources that enable guests to use hotel services comfortably, safely, and efficiently. The servicescape perspective positions the physical environment as an important cue affecting customer responses and employee performance [6]. Hotel atmosphere, including distinctiveness, hospitability, relaxation, and refinement, contributes to guests' evaluations of the stay experience [7]. More recent hotel research also shows that ambience and other expanded servicescape cues can strengthen satisfaction [8], while lighting, layout, style, and furnishings shape first impressions in hotel public areas [9]. In hotel service-quality research, physical products and facilities are consistently treated as core antecedents of perceived quality [10], and lodging-specific measurement work similarly recognizes tangible quality as part of customers' evaluations [11]. Indonesian evidence also links hotel facilities and service quality with guest satisfaction [12], while another hotel study shows that facilities operate together with service quality and location in explaining satisfaction [13].

Employee behavior represents the interpersonal dimension of the service encounter. Organizational behavior literature emphasizes that employee conduct is expressed through attitudes, communication, responsiveness, and actions performed in work roles [14], while performance management highlights the importance of consistent behavior in delivering organizational standards [15]. In hotels, employee behavior directly influences guests' service-quality perceptions and overall satisfaction [16]. Performance cues from front desk, housekeeping, parking, and room-service employees also shape perceived quality and value [17]. Research examining physical and human service clues further indicates that the behavior and appearance of service employees can be especially influential in customers' evaluations [18]. From a management perspective, customer-contact employees require clear role expectations, support, and service-quality commitment to produce consistent guest experiences [19], while service climate and employee involvement can translate into stronger service performance and customer outcomes [20].

These interpersonal mechanisms are particularly relevant in operational hotel work, where employees must combine procedural consistency with situational judgment. Service climate can connect organizational resources and employee engagement with customer loyalty through employee performance [21]. At the operational level, consistent standard operating procedures help structure guest handling activities [22], while job training and work experience support the quality of frontline service delivery [23]. Consequently, accommodation infrastructure and employee behavior should be examined as complementary operational levers rather than as separate explanations of the guest experience.

At Kyriad Hotel Bumiminang Padang, preliminary researcher observations suggested concerns involving aspects of building maintenance, room equipment, lighting, bathroom drainage, air-conditioning, linen condition, reservation consistency, employee responsiveness, communication, and service etiquette. These observations are treated as contextual signals rather than estimates of complaint prevalence. Indonesian hotel research has shown that physical environment and contact personnel can jointly contribute to service quality and loyalty [24], while front-office management of guest voice is relevant to guest satisfaction [25]. Large-scale hotel review evidence also identifies tangibles, surroundings, reliability, responsiveness, and service processes as distinct dimensions of hotel service quality [26]. Physical-environment quality and service quality have likewise been linked to satisfaction in hotel-related settings [27]. The novelty of the present study lies in estimating the individual and simultaneous contribution of accommodation infrastructure and employee behavior within one operational model at Kyriad Hotel Bumiminang Padang. Accordingly, the study tests their partial and joint effects on guest satisfaction.

2. METHOD

This study used a quantitative causal-associative survey design to examine the effects of accommodation infrastructure (X_1) and employee behavior (X_2) on guest satisfaction (Y) [28]. The source study reports an average population of 1,673 staying guests during January to March 2026, based on the hotel guest records used as the sampling frame. The original sample target was calculated using the Slovin formula, producing 323 respondents, after which respondents were recruited through non-probability purposive sampling. At minimum, eligible participants were staying guests who had direct experience with the hotel's facilities and employee service; respondents were at least 18 years old, had completed at least one overnight stay, and guests who had not yet experienced the hotel facilities and frontline services were excluded. Questionnaires were administered directly to eligible guests at check-out, primarily through a QR-code link to an online questionnaire after they had completed their stay experience.

Data were collected using a five-point Likert-scale questionnaire. Accommodation infrastructure was measured with 12 statements, employee behavior with eight statements, and guest satisfaction with nine statements. The construct domains are conceptually consistent with established service-quality and performance measurement approaches [29], [30]; however, conceptual consistency is not a substitute for instrument provenance. Therefore, the accommodation-infrastructure items were adapted from Bitner [6], Wilkins et al. [10], and Getty and Getty [11]; the employee-behavior items were adapted from Kattara et al. [16], Hartline and Jones [17], and Hartline and Ferrell [19]; and the guest-satisfaction items were adapted from Oh [3], Nunkoo et al. [4], and Clemes et al. [33]. Instrument quality was evaluated before the main analysis; all questionnaire items exceeded the corrected item-total correlation criterion of 0.30, with coefficients ranging from 0.421 to 0.823. Cronbach's alpha was 0.903 for accommodation infrastructure, 0.887 for employee behavior, and 0.895 for guest satisfaction, indicating satisfactory internal consistency.

Data were processed using SPSS version 26. Descriptive statistics summarized each construct. To make the original category labels transparent, total means were converted to mean-per-item scores and

respondent achievement percentages (TCR), calculated as mean-per-item divided by the maximum scale value and multiplied by 100. Equal-width interpretation on the five-point scale was used: 1.00-1.80 = very poor, 1.81-2.60 = poor, 2.61-3.40 = fair, 3.41-4.20 = good, and 4.21-5.00 = very good. Multiple linear regression, t tests, F tests, and the adjusted coefficient of determination were used to evaluate the model [31]. Statistical significance was assessed at $p < 0.05$ [32].

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Descriptive Results

All three variables fell within the good category when total scores were standardized to the five-point response scale. Accommodation infrastructure recorded a total mean of 40.99, equivalent to a mean per item of 3.42 and a TCR of 68.32%. Employee behavior recorded a total mean of 27.83, equivalent to 3.48 per item and a TCR of 69.58%. Guest satisfaction recorded a total mean of 31.16, equivalent to 3.46 per item and a TCR of 69.24%. These standardized values clarify the basis for the descriptive category reported in Table 1.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics and standardized interpretation of the research variables

Variable	Items	Total Mean	Mean/Item	TCR (%)	SD	Min.	Max.	Category
Accommodation infrastructure	12	40.99	3.42	68.32	6.955	24	60	Good
Employee behavior	8	27.83	3.48	69.58	5.016	17	40	Good
Guest satisfaction	9	31.16	3.46	69.24	5.455	18	45	Good

3.2. Coefficient of Determination

The multiple correlation coefficient was 0.814, indicating a strong combined relationship between the two predictors and guest satisfaction. The adjusted R^2 value was 0.661, meaning that accommodation infrastructure and employee behavior jointly accounted for 66.1% of the variance in guest satisfaction in this sample. The remaining 33.9% represents unexplained variance outside the present model. Factors such as price, location, food and beverage quality, brand image, security, and previous guest experience are plausible candidates for future investigation, but they were not directly tested in this study.

Table 2. Model summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of Estimate
1	0.814	0.663	0.661	3.176

3.3. Simultaneous Effect

The ANOVA test produced $F = 314.988$ with $p < 0.001$, showing that accommodation infrastructure and employee behavior were jointly significant predictors of guest satisfaction. This result is consistent with hospitality evidence that guest satisfaction is formed through multiple service-quality dimensions [33]. Hotel research also shows that satisfaction and repeat patronage reflect combined evaluations of service attributes rather than a single operational factor [34]. Managerially, the finding means that guest satisfaction should be managed through coordinated improvement of facilities and employee service behavior rather than through isolated interventions.

Table 3. Analysis of variance

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p-value
Regression	6353.172	2	3176.586	314.988	<0.001
Residual	3227.131	320	10.085		
Total	9580.303	322			

3.4. Regression Assumption Checks

Before interpreting the regression coefficients, the classical assumptions for multiple linear regression should be documented. Residual normality was acceptable based on the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test ($p = 0.087 > 0.05$). Multicollinearity was not indicated because both predictors had a tolerance value of 0.684 (> 0.10) and a VIF of 1.462 (< 10). The Glejser test also indicated no heteroscedasticity, with significance values of 0.318 for accommodation infrastructure and 0.427 for employee behavior, both exceeding 0.05. The regression findings should be presented as fully supported only after these diagnostics confirm that the model assumptions are acceptable.

3.5. Partial Effects and Regression Model

Both predictors had positive and statistically significant partial effects. Accommodation infrastructure produced $B = 0.422$, $t = 11.224$, and $p < 0.001$, whereas employee behavior produced $B = 0.362$, $t = 6.941$, and $p < 0.001$. The standardized coefficient was larger for accommodation infrastructure ($\beta = 0.538$) than for employee behavior ($\beta = 0.333$). Thus, within this model, accommodation infrastructure was the stronger predictor and should receive particular attention when management prioritizes resources for improving guest satisfaction.

Table 4. Multiple linear regression coefficients

Predictor	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	p-value
Constant	3.808	1.104		3.449	0.001
Accommodation infrastructure	0.422	0.038	0.538	11.224	<0.001
Employee behavior	0.362	0.052	0.333	6.941	<0.001

$$Y = 3.808 + 0.422X_1 + 0.362X_2$$

The equation indicates that, while the other predictor is held constant, a one-unit increase in the accommodation-infrastructure score is associated with a 0.422-unit increase in the guest-satisfaction score. Likewise, a one-unit increase in the employee-behavior score is associated with a 0.362-unit increase in guest satisfaction. These coefficients represent changes in the dependent-variable score and must not be interpreted as percentages.

3.6. Discussion

The positive effect of accommodation infrastructure indicates that guests evaluate the hotel through the condition, reliability, and usability of its physical environment. The preliminary observations in this study pointed to facility-related concerns involving lighting, air-conditioning, bathroom drainage, linen, room equipment, and maintenance; these examples should be read as observed contextual concerns, not as estimates of how frequently all guests encountered each problem. Big-data evidence from hotel reviews similarly shows that room and physical attributes are prominent sources of satisfaction and dissatisfaction [35]. Configurational research also confirms that hotel satisfaction can depend on different combinations of service-quality conditions [36]. Because accommodation infrastructure had the larger standardized coefficient in the present model, management should treat high-contact facility reliability as the first operational priority. In the short term, the hotel should close urgent defects through room-by-room checks of air-conditioning, lighting, bathroom drainage, linen, and in-room equipment. In the medium term, these actions should be institutionalized through preventive-maintenance schedules, condition logs, replacement cycles, and periodic room-quality audits.

Employee behavior also had a positive and significant effect on guest satisfaction. This finding reinforces the role of human interaction in hospitality even as hotels adopt more technology-supported service delivery [37]. Comparative evidence likewise shows that human-interaction service remains a distinct dimension of hotel service quality [38]. Operationally, employee development should focus on observable service behaviors: consistent greeting and welcoming, clear communication during check-in, accurate reservation confirmation, prompt responses to guest requests, respectful handling of privacy, and structured complaint recovery. Supervisors can reinforce these behaviors through pre-shift briefings, role-

play for difficult service situations, spot coaching, and review of recurring complaints. These actions translate the statistical relationship into service standards that guests can directly experience.

The simultaneous effect and adjusted R^2 of 0.661 show that physical infrastructure and employee conduct jointly account for a substantial portion of the guest experience. Service quality has behavioral consequences when guests translate their evaluations into future intentions [39], and hotel loyalty research similarly places satisfaction within an integrated service-and-image process [40]. Research using hotel guest ratings also shows that physical-product performance and people/process performance can vary in importance across guest and hotel segments [41]. For Kyriad Hotel Bumiminang Padang, the short-term priority should therefore be to remove high-impact facility failures while standardizing frontline behaviors and complaint response. The medium-term priority should combine preventive maintenance, planned asset replacement, periodic room inspections, reservation-control improvements, recurring service training, complaint-trend analysis, and supervisor-based service audits. This two-horizon approach preserves the stronger infrastructure effect without treating employee behavior as secondary or optional.

4. CONCLUSION

Accommodation infrastructure and employee behavior were both positive and significant predictors of guest satisfaction at Kyriad Hotel Bumiminang Padang. Accommodation infrastructure was the stronger predictor ($B = 0.422$; $\beta = 0.538$; $p < 0.001$), while employee behavior also made a meaningful contribution ($B = 0.362$; $\beta = 0.333$; $p < 0.001$). Jointly, the predictors produced $F = 314.988$ ($p < 0.001$) and explained 66.1% of the variance in guest satisfaction. The practical implication is clear: facility reliability should receive immediate priority, but sustained improvement requires parallel development of employee service behavior. This study is limited to one hotel and relies on guest-perception data collected at one point in time; therefore, the regression estimates should not be interpreted as definitive evidence of temporal causality or generalized automatically to other hotels. Future research should use multi-hotel samples, document sampling and instrument procedures in greater detail, and examine additional factors such as price fairness, food and beverage quality, security, brand image, service recovery, and behavioral intentions.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors thank the management and guests of Kyriad Hotel Bumiminang Padang for their participation and support during the data collection process.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Sulastiyono, *Manajemen Penyelenggaraan Hotel*. Bandung, Indonesia: Alfabeta, 2011.
- [2] F. Tjiptono, *Pemasaran Jasa*. Yogyakarta, Indonesia: Andi, 2015.
- [3] H. Oh, "Service quality, customer satisfaction, and customer value: A holistic perspective," *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 67-82, 1999, doi: 10.1016/S0278-4319(98)00047-4.
- [4] R. Nunkoo, V. Teeroovengadum, C. M. Ringle, and V. Sunnassee, "Service quality and customer satisfaction: The moderating effects of hotel star rating," *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, vol. 91, Art. no. 102414, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2019.102414.
- [5] S. S. Kang, F. Okamoto, and J. F. Donovan, "Service quality and its effect on customer satisfaction and customer behavioral intentions: Hotel and ryokan guests in Japan," *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 189-202, 2004, doi: 10.1080/1094166042000233649.
- [6] M. J. Bitner, "Servicescapes: The impact of physical surroundings on customers and employees," *Journal of Marketing*, vol. 56, no. 2, pp. 57-71, 1992, doi: 10.1177/002224299205600205.
- [7] M. Heide and K. Grønhaug, "Key factors in guests' perception of hotel atmosphere," *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, vol. 50, no. 1, pp. 29-43, 2009, doi: 10.1177/1938965508328420.
- [8] S. Lee and N.-K. Chuang, "Applying expanded servicescape to the hotel industry," *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, vol. 46, no. 4, pp. 771-796, 2022, doi: 10.1177/10963480211011535.
- [9] C. C. Countryman and S. Jang, "The effects of atmospheric elements on customer impression: The case of hotel lobbies," *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, vol. 18, no. 7, pp. 534-545, 2006, doi: 10.1108/09596110610702968.

- [10] H. Wilkins, B. Merrilees, and C. Herington, "Towards an understanding of total service quality in hotels," *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, vol. 26, no. 4, pp. 840-853, 2007, doi: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2006.07.006.
- [11] J. M. Getty and R. L. Getty, "Lodging quality index (LQI): Assessing customers' perceptions of quality delivery," *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 94-104, 2003, doi: 10.1108/09596110310462940.
- [12] M. Aurellia and Hermansyah, "The influence of hotel facilities and service quality on guest satisfaction at Fave Hotel Olo Padang," *Journal of Multidimensional Management*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 73-77, 2025, doi: 10.63076/jomm.v2i1.20.
- [13] Al Hambra and A. Kahar, "The effect of service quality, facilities, and location on guest satisfaction at Truntum Hotel Padang," *Journal of Multidimensional Management*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 133-139, 2025, doi: 10.63076/jomm.v2i2.36.
- [14] J. M. Ivancevich, R. Konopaske, and M. T. Matteson, *Perilaku dan Manajemen Organisasi*. Jakarta, Indonesia: Erlangga, 2007.
- [15] Wibowo, *Manajemen Kinerja*. Jakarta, Indonesia: Rajawali Pers, 2013.
- [16] H. S. Kattara, D. Weheba, and O. A. El-Said, "The impact of employee behaviour on customers' service quality perceptions and overall satisfaction," *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, vol. 8, no. 4, pp. 309-323, 2008, doi: 10.1057/thr.2008.35.
- [17] M. D. Hartline and K. C. Jones, "Employee performance cues in a hotel service environment: Influence on perceived service quality, value, and word-of-mouth intentions," *Journal of Business Research*, vol. 35, no. 3, pp. 207-215, 1996, doi: 10.1016/0148-2963(95)00126-3.
- [18] E. A. Wall and L. L. Berry, "The combined effects of the physical environment and employee behavior on customer perception of restaurant service quality," *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, vol. 48, no. 1, pp. 59-69, 2007, doi: 10.1177/0010880406297246.
- [19] M. D. Hartline and O. C. Ferrell, "The management of customer-contact service employees: An empirical investigation," *Journal of Marketing*, vol. 60, no. 4, pp. 52-70, 1996, doi: 10.1177/002224299606000406.
- [20] H. Liao and A. Chuang, "A multilevel investigation of factors influencing employee service performance and customer outcomes," *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 47, no. 1, pp. 41-58, 2004, doi: 10.5465/20159559.
- [21] M. Salanova, S. Agut, and J. M. Peiró, "Linking organizational resources and work engagement to employee performance and customer loyalty: The mediation of service climate," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 90, no. 6, pp. 1217-1227, 2005, doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.90.6.1217.
- [22] S. J. N. Hidayah and V. M. Pratama, "Implementation of standard operating procedures for bellboys handling guest luggage during check-in at Pangeran Beach Hotel," *Journal of Multidimensional Management*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 88-94, 2025, doi: 10.63076/jomm.v2i1.24.
- [23] W. R. Rizal and L. Asnur, "The influence of job training and work experience on the quality of waiters in Padang City," *Journal of Multidimensional Management*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 240-245, 2025, doi: 10.63076/jomm.v2i2.50.
- [24] D. Lemy, E. Goh, and J. Ferry, "Moving out of the silo: How service quality innovations can develop customer loyalty in Indonesia's hotels," *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, vol. 25, no. 4, pp. 462-479, 2019, doi: 10.1177/1356766718819658.
- [25] A. F. Putra and R. Fadilah, "Analysis of front office's role in managing guest voice to increase guest satisfaction at Natra Bintan, a Tribute Portfolio Resort," *Journal of Multidimensional Management*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 147-153, 2025, doi: 10.63076/jomm.v2i2.32.
- [26] K. Kalnaovakul and P. Promsivapallop, "Hotel service quality dimensions and attributes: An analysis of online hotel customer reviews," *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 420-440, 2023, doi: 10.1177/14673584221145819.

- [27] H. Han and S. S. Hyun, "Impact of hotel-restaurant image and quality of physical-environment, service, and food on satisfaction and intention," *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, vol. 63, pp. 82-92, 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2017.03.006.
- [28] Sugiyono, *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung, Indonesia: Alfabeta, 2019.
- [29] A. Parasuraman, V. A. Zeithaml, and L. L. Berry, "SERVQUAL: A multiple-item scale for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality," *Journal of Retailing*, vol. 64, no. 1, pp. 12-40, 1988.
- [30] J. J. Cronin Jr. and S. A. Taylor, "Measuring service quality: A reexamination and extension," *Journal of Marketing*, vol. 56, no. 3, pp. 55-68, 1992, doi: 10.1177/002224299205600304.
- [31] J. F. Hair Jr., W. C. Black, B. J. Babin, and R. E. Anderson, *Multivariate Data Analysis*, 8th ed. Andover, U.K.: Cengage, 2019.
- [32] J. Pallant, *SPSS Survival Manual*, 7th ed. London, U.K.: McGraw-Hill Education, 2020.
- [33] M. D. Clemes, C. Gan, and M. Ren, "Synthesizing the effects of service quality, value, and customer satisfaction on behavioral intentions in the motel industry," *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, vol. 35, no. 4, pp. 530-568, 2011, doi: 10.1177/1096348010382239.
- [34] T. Y. Choi and R. Chu, "Determinants of hotel guests' satisfaction and repeat patronage in the Hong Kong hotel industry," *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 277-297, 2001, doi: 10.1016/S0278-4319(01)00006-8.
- [35] P. Padma and J. Ahn, "Guest satisfaction and dissatisfaction in luxury hotels: An application of big data," *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, vol. 84, Art. no. 102318, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2019.102318.
- [36] V. Perdomo-Verdecia, A. Garrido-Vega, and M. Sacristán-Díaz, "An fsQCA analysis of service quality for hotel customer satisfaction," *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, vol. 119, Art. no. 103714, 2024.
- [37] C. Prentice, S. Dominique Lopes, and X. Wang, "The impact of artificial intelligence and employee service quality on customer satisfaction and loyalty," *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, vol. 29, no. 7, pp. 739-756, 2020, doi: 10.1080/19368623.2020.1722304.
- [38] S. Park, "Service quality dimensions in hotel service delivery options: Comparison between human interaction service and self-service technology," *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality & Tourism*, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 931-959, 2022, doi: 10.1080/1528008X.2021.1935392.
- [39] V. A. Zeithaml, L. L. Berry, and A. Parasuraman, "The behavioral consequences of service quality," *Journal of Marketing*, vol. 60, no. 2, pp. 31-46, 1996, doi: 10.1177/002224299606000203.
- [40] J. Kandampully and D. Suhartanto, "Customer loyalty in the hotel industry: The role of customer satisfaction and image," *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, vol. 12, no. 6, pp. 346-351, 2000, doi: 10.1108/09596110010342559.
- [41] R. Ramanathan, "An exploratory study of marketing, physical and people related performance criteria in hotels," *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 44-61, 2012, doi: 10.1108/09596111211197791.