

Waitstaff Service Quality and Guest Satisfaction at Mentawai Restaurant, Pangeran Beach Hotel Padang

Rizki Rahmat Wahyudi¹, Lise Asnur^{2*}

^{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:

Waitstaff Service Quality,
Guest Satisfaction,
Restaurant Service,
Responsiveness, Simple
Linear Regression

ABSTRACT

This study examines the relationship between waitstaff service quality and guest satisfaction at Mentawai Restaurant, Pangeran Beach Hotel Padang. A quantitative cross-sectional survey was conducted with 370 guests selected through purposive sampling from a population record of 29,337 guest visits during September 2022 to March 2023. Eligible respondents were guests who had experienced dining service at Mentawai Restaurant and were able to evaluate direct interaction with the waitstaff. Data were collected using a five-point Likert-scale questionnaire and analyzed in SPSS 26 using descriptive statistics, assumption testing, and simple linear regression. Waitstaff service quality achieved 65.75% of the ideal score and guest satisfaction reached 62.72%, both classified as sufficient under the study's scoring convention. Responsiveness was the lowest service-quality dimension (64.28%), while revisit intention was the lowest satisfaction indicator (62.27%). The residuals met the reported normality criterion ($p = 0.200$), the archived homogeneity test was non-significant ($p = 0.211$), and deviation from linearity was non-significant ($p = 0.641$). Service quality was positively associated with guest satisfaction ($B = 0.453$, $\beta = 0.827$, $t = 28.256$, $p < 0.001$), and the model explained 68.4% of the observed variance. The results indicate that management should prioritize response speed, order accuracy, menu knowledge, complaint handling, and individualized attention while maintaining professional appearance.

Corresponding Author:

Lise Asnur

Universitas Negeri Padang

Email: lise.asnur@fpp.unp.ac.id

1. INTRODUCTION

Restaurant service is produced and consumed through direct interaction, making frontline employees central to how guests evaluate the dining experience [1]. Professional restaurant operations require waitstaff to combine technical service procedures with communication, product knowledge, accuracy, and interpersonal attention [2]. Training is therefore important because waiter competence is visible to guests at the moment the service is delivered [3]. Although food quality and ambience are important parts of dining, waitstaff are the focus of this study because they directly receive orders, communicate delays, respond to requests, explain menu items, and handle service problems in real time.

Service quality is commonly defined as the customer's evaluation of how well service performance corresponds with expectations. The SERVQUAL framework identifies tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy as core dimensions [4]. Subsequent service-quality research distinguishes perceived performance from expectation-based measurement while retaining the importance of reliable and responsive delivery [5]. Guest satisfaction can be understood through expectancy-disconfirmation, in which customers compare prior expectations with perceived performance after consumption [6]. A broader behavioral perspective also treats satisfaction as an evaluative response that can shape subsequent intentions [7]. In restaurant settings, DINESERV adapted service-quality measurement to the dining context [8], while LODGSERV demonstrated the relevance of hospitality-specific service-quality scales [9].

Research has repeatedly linked restaurant service quality with customer satisfaction and behavioral intentions. Reviews of SERVQUAL research emphasize that service-quality dimensions should be interpreted within the operating context [10]. In fast-food restaurants, service quality has been associated with satisfaction and behavioral intentions [11]. Food quality also contributes to satisfaction and future behavior, showing that service should be examined alongside other dining attributes [12]. Physical environment and price perception influence restaurant loyalty through satisfaction [13], while integrated models show that service, food, and physical-environment quality jointly contribute to restaurant image, perceived value, and satisfaction [14]. Relationship quality and loyalty in chain restaurants are also shaped by the broader guest experience [15]. Hospitality satisfaction research similarly supports links between service evaluations and post-consumption responses [16].

Mentawai Restaurant operates within Pangeran Beach Hotel Padang and serves both hotel guests and other visitors. Preliminary researcher observations conducted during the 2023 data-collection period, together with guest comments reviewed at that time, indicated recurring concerns involving slow response to requests, inaccurate order handling, inconsistent menu explanations, and limited attentiveness during service. These issues are operationally important because restaurant-service research shows that perceived value and satisfaction depend on the quality of the service encounter [17], and hotel-service evidence indicates that service-quality effects can vary by context [18]. Indonesian hotel research also links service quality with guest satisfaction [19]. Similar evidence from a hotel dining venue shows that service quality contributes to guest satisfaction [20], while another Padang hotel study identifies service quality as an important satisfaction determinant together with facilities and location [21]. Employee helpfulness has also been associated with positive customer responses in hotel settings [22], and training and work experience have been linked to waiter quality in Padang [23]. The gap addressed here is therefore not whether service quality matters in general, but how strongly guest evaluations of waitstaff service are associated with satisfaction in a hotel-restaurant context where responsiveness problems were specifically observed. The study also identifies which dimensions should receive immediate supervisory attention.

2. METHOD

This study used a quantitative cross-sectional survey with simple linear regression to examine the relationship between waitstaff service quality and guest satisfaction. Waitstaff service quality was operationalized through tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy based on SERVQUAL [4] and restaurant-service measurement [8]. Guest satisfaction was represented by conformity with expectations, revisit intention, and willingness to recommend, consistent with satisfaction and behavioral-intention theory [6], [24], [25]. The source manuscript reports a population of 29,337 guest visits recorded from September 2022 to March 2023 and a final sample of 370 respondents selected through purposive sampling. At minimum, respondents had experienced dining service at Mentawai Restaurant and were able to evaluate direct waitstaff interaction. The purposive-sampling criteria required respondents to be at least 18 years old, to have completed a dining experience at Mentawai Restaurant, Pangeran Beach Hotel Padang, and to have received direct service from the waitstaff before completing the questionnaire.

Data were collected using a five-point Likert-scale questionnaire. The waitstaff service-quality scale consisted of 22 items, comprising four tangibles items, five reliability items, four responsiveness items, four assurance items, and five empathy items. Guest satisfaction was measured with nine items, with three items each for conformity with expectations, revisit intention, and willingness to recommend. All items exceeded the corrected item-total correlation criterion of 0.30; validity coefficients ranged from 0.386 to 0.812 for service quality and from 0.421 to 0.798 for guest satisfaction. Cronbach's alpha was estimated at 0.928 for service quality and 0.905 for guest satisfaction, indicating strong internal consistency. The percentage of the ideal score was calculated as the observed score divided by the maximum possible score and multiplied by 100. The percentage categories were interpreted using equal intervals on the five-point scale: 20.00-35.99% = Very Poor, 36.00-51.99% = Poor, 52.00-67.99% = Sufficient, 68.00-83.99% = Good, and 84.00-100.00% = Very Good. Data analysis was performed using SPSS version 26. Descriptive analysis summarized each variable, service-quality dimension, and satisfaction indicator. Before hypothesis testing, the archived analysis reported a Kolmogorov-Smirnov residual-normality test, a Levene homogeneity test, and a deviation-from-linearity test. For the regression interpretation, residual normality and linearity are directly relevant; the Levene test is retained because it formed part of the original analytical record, although a residual-based homoscedasticity diagnostic would be preferable in future reporting. The hypothesis was tested using simple linear regression at $p < 0.05$, and results were reported

using B, beta, t, F, R, and R-squared. Standard regression interpretation followed established methodological guidance [26], [27], [28].

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Descriptive Results

The descriptive results show that waitstaff service quality achieved 65.75% of the ideal score and guest satisfaction reached 62.72%. Both values were classified as sufficient using the scoring convention applied in the source study. This indicates that basic service expectations were being met, but performance had not reached a consistently strong level. The result also shows why the category thresholds should be reported explicitly in the Method section rather than leaving the interpretation dependent on a label alone.

Table 1. Overall descriptive results

Variable	Achievement (%)	Category
Waitstaff service quality	65.75	Sufficient
Guest satisfaction	62.72	Sufficient

Source: SPSS-processed research data (2023).

Among the service-quality dimensions, tangibles recorded the highest achievement at 69.59% and were classified as good. Responsiveness was the lowest dimension at 64.28%, followed by assurance at 64.97%, reliability at 65.20%, and empathy at 65.28%. The pattern indicates that visible appearance and presentation were relatively stronger than the interaction process itself. For immediate operational control, supervisors should set a clear acknowledgement standard for newly seated guests, require periodic table monitoring, establish escalation rules for delayed orders, and assign responsibility for complaint follow-up.

Table 2. Waitstaff service-quality dimensions

Dimension	Achievement (%)	Category
Tangibles	69.59	Good
Reliability	65.20	Sufficient
Responsiveness	64.28	Sufficient
Assurance	64.97	Sufficient
Empathy	65.28	Sufficient

Source: SPSS-processed research data (2023).

Guest satisfaction was also relatively uniform. Willingness to recommend recorded the highest value at 63.35%, conformity with expectations reached 62.74%, and revisit intention was lowest at 62.27%. The lower revisit score is important because recommendation does not necessarily mean that guests are strongly committed to returning. This suggests that operational improvements should be evaluated not only through immediate satisfaction but also through whether the dining experience becomes sufficiently reliable and responsive to encourage repeat patronage.

Table 3. Guest-satisfaction indicators

Indicator	Achievement (%)	Category
Conformity with expectations	62.74	Sufficient
Revisit intention	62.27	Sufficient
Willingness to recommend	63.35	Sufficient

Source: SPSS-processed research data (2023).

3.2. Assumption Tests

The reported diagnostics were acceptable under the criteria applied in the source analysis. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov residual test produced $p = 0.200$, exceeding 0.05 and therefore providing no evidence of non-normal residuals. The archived Levene test produced $p = 0.211$, and the deviation-from-linearity test produced $F = 0.511$ with $p = 0.641$; the non-significant deviation indicates that a linear functional

form was reasonable. For future replication, homoscedasticity should preferably be evaluated directly from regression residuals, for example through a residual plot or a formal residual-variance test, because the Levene test is not the standard primary diagnostic for simple linear regression.

Table 4. Regression assumption tests

Test	Statistic	p value	Interpretation
Normality of residuals	K-S = 0.041	0.200	Normality requirement met
Homogeneity	Levene = 1.203	0.211	Homogeneity requirement met
Deviation from linearity	F = 0.511	0.641	Linear relationship supported

Source: SPSS-processed research data (2023).

3.3. Hypothesis Testing

The overall regression model was statistically significant, $F(1, 368) = 798.381$, $p < 0.001$. The proposed hypothesis was therefore supported. Because the study used a cross-sectional questionnaire, this significance should be interpreted as a strong statistical association within the observed sample rather than definitive evidence of temporal causality.

Table 5. Analysis of variance for the regression model

Source	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	p value
Regression	8719.929	1	8719.929	798.381	<0.001
Residual	4019.304	368	10.922	-	-
Total	12739.232	369	-	-	-

Source: SPSS-processed research data (2023).

The service-quality coefficient was positive and significant ($B = 0.453$, $SE = 0.016$, $\beta = 0.827$, $t = 28.256$, $p < 0.001$). The estimated regression equation was $Y = -0.230 + 0.453X$. Holding the equation structure constant, a one-unit increase in the service-quality score was associated with a 0.453-unit increase in the guest-satisfaction score. The coefficient is a change in score, not a percentage. The intercept was not significant ($p = 0.801$) and has little substantive meaning because a zero service-quality score lies outside the practical range of the instrument.

Table 6. Simple linear regression coefficients

Predictor	B	Std. error	Beta	t	p value	Decision
Constant	-0.230	0.912	-	-0.252	0.801	-
Service quality	0.453	0.016	0.827	28.256	<0.001	Significant

Source: SPSS-processed research data (2023).

The correlation coefficient was 0.827 and R-squared was 0.684, indicating that service-quality scores accounted for 68.4% of the observed variance in guest-satisfaction scores. The remaining 31.6% was not explained by the model and may involve food quality, price fairness, ambience, waiting time, perceived value, and previous experience. The relatively high R-squared should be interpreted cautiously because both constructs were measured from the same respondents in one questionnaire and are conceptually related. The value therefore indicates strong explanatory overlap in this dataset, not that service quality is the only determinant of satisfaction.

Table 7. Model summary

R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	Std. error of estimate	Explained variance
0.827	0.684	0.684	3.305	68.4%

Source: SPSS-processed research data (2023).

3.4. Discussion

The positive relationship supports the theoretical view that service quality and satisfaction are closely connected but conceptually distinct. Expectancy-disconfirmation theory explains satisfaction as a response to the comparison between expectations and experienced performance [6]. SERVQUAL identifies reliability, responsiveness, assurance, empathy, and tangibles as mechanisms through which customers evaluate service delivery [4]. The present result is also consistent with restaurant research showing that customer satisfaction is influenced by frontline responsiveness and transaction-specific service performance [29]. Restaurant operations research in China similarly found significant links between service quality and customer satisfaction [30].

The strongest managerial signal is not the overall coefficient alone, but the descriptive weakness in responsiveness. Research on restaurant-service attributes shows that different service elements can have unequal effects on satisfaction [31]. Recent fast-food evidence also shows that service quality works together with perceived value and other dimensions in shaping satisfaction and behavioral intentions [32]. Because responsiveness was the lowest dimension in Mentawai Restaurant, management should focus on observable response behaviors: acknowledging guests promptly, checking tables before guests need to call staff, communicating expected waiting times, confirming special requests, and escalating unresolved issues to a supervisor. These actions are directly controllable and can be monitored through service audits.

Restaurant employees are particularly important because both the functional and personal aspects of their behavior can influence satisfaction [33]. Complaint handling is another critical moment in which responsiveness and empathy become visible to guests [34]. For Mentawai Restaurant, training should therefore move beyond general hospitality reminders. A short recurring program should combine menu-knowledge tests, order-confirmation practice, role-play for delayed orders, complaint-handling scenarios, and coaching on personalized communication. The aim is to reduce service variability while preserving the interpersonal qualities that distinguish restaurant hospitality.

The lower revisit-intention score provides a second practical warning. Restaurant atmosphere can influence satisfaction and behavioral intentions, including return behavior [35], while hotel-restaurant research shows that service, food, and physical-environment quality jointly shape satisfaction and revisit intention [36]. A recent emerging-economy study likewise confirms that restaurant atmospherics can contribute to satisfaction and behavioral responses [37]. In Mentawai Restaurant, responsiveness problems may therefore matter not only for immediate satisfaction but also for whether guests choose to return. Management should track repeat dining, complaints by service stage, order-error frequency, and average response time alongside satisfaction scores. Future research should include food quality, price fairness, ambience, perceived value, and waiting time and should compare breakfast, lunch, dinner, banquet, and room-service settings.

4. CONCLUSION

Waitstaff service quality was positively and significantly associated with guest satisfaction at Mentawai Restaurant, Pangeran Beach Hotel Padang. Service quality achieved 65.75% of the ideal score and guest satisfaction reached 62.72%, both classified as sufficient under the study's scoring convention. The regression coefficient was $B = 0.453$, $\beta = 0.827$, $t = 28.256$, and $p < 0.001$, while R -squared was 0.684. Responsiveness was the weakest service-quality dimension and revisit intention was the weakest satisfaction indicator. Management should therefore institute periodic menu-knowledge training, mandatory order confirmation for special requests, response-time standards, structured table monitoring, and routine complaint-handling simulations. Supervisors should review recurring complaints and service delays during weekly operational briefings. The findings should be interpreted with caution because the study is cross-sectional, limited to one hotel restaurant, and based on self-reported data from a single questionnaire source. Future research should include additional dining-quality variables and multi-restaurant samples.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors thank the management, employees, and participating guests of Mentawai Restaurant, Pangeran Beach Hotel Padang, as well as the Department of Tourism and Hospitality, Universitas Negeri Padang, for supporting the research process.

REFERENCES

- [1] F. Tjiptono, *Pemasaran Jasa: Prinsip, Penerapan, dan Penelitian*. Yogyakarta, Indonesia: Andi, 2019.

- [2] E. D. Durachim, "Restoran bisnis berbasis standar kompetensi," *Jurnal Pariwisata*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 10-21, 2017.
- [3] K. R. Mentari, D. O. S., and A. F. Rahman, "Pengaruh pelatihan terhadap keterampilan pramusaji food and beverage service di Hotel Swiss-Belinn Malang," *Jurnal Manajemen Perhotelan*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 46-52, 2020, doi: 10.9744/jmhot.6.1.46-52.
- [4] 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.
- [5] 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.
- [6] R. L. Oliver, "A cognitive model of the antecedents and consequences of satisfaction decisions," *Journal of Marketing Research*, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 460-469, 1980, doi: 10.1177/002224378001700405.
- [7] R. L. Oliver, *Satisfaction: A Behavioral Perspective on the Consumer*, 2nd ed. New York, NY, USA: Routledge, 2010.
- [8] P. Stevens, B. Knutson, and M. Patton, "DINESERV: A tool for measuring service quality in restaurants," *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, vol. 36, no. 2, pp. 56-60, 1995, doi: 10.1016/0010-8804(95)93844-K.
- [9] B. Knutson, P. Stevens, C. Wullaert, M. Patton, and F. Yokoyama, "LODGSERV: A service quality index for the lodging industry," *Hospitality Research Journal*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 277-284, 1990, doi: 10.1177/109634809001400230.
- [10] R. Ladhari, "A review of twenty years of SERVQUAL research," *International Journal of Quality and Service Sciences*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 172-198, 2009, doi: 10.1108/17566690910971445.
- [11] H. Qin and V. R. Prybutok, "Service quality, customer satisfaction, and behavioral intentions in fast-food restaurants," *International Journal of Quality and Service Sciences*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 78-95, 2009, doi: 10.1108/17566690910945886.
- [12] Y. Namkung and S. Jang, "Does food quality really matter in restaurants? Its impact on customer satisfaction and behavioral intentions," *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, vol. 31, no. 3, pp. 387-409, 2007, doi: 10.1177/1096348007299924.
- [13] H. Han and K. Ryu, "The roles of the physical environment, price perception, and customer satisfaction in determining customer loyalty in the restaurant industry," *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 487-510, 2009, doi: 10.1177/1096348009344212.
- [14] K. Ryu, H. R. Lee, and W. G. Kim, "The influence of the quality of the physical environment, food, and service on restaurant image, customer perceived value, customer satisfaction, and behavioral intentions," *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 200-223, 2012, doi: 10.1108/09596111211206141.
- [15] S. S. Hyun, "Predictors of relationship quality and loyalty in the chain restaurant industry," *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, vol. 51, no. 2, pp. 251-267, 2010, doi: 10.1177/1938965510363264.
- [16] Y. Ekinici, P. L. Dawes, and G. R. Massey, "An extended model of the antecedents and consequences of consumer satisfaction for hospitality services," *European Journal of Marketing*, vol. 42, no. 1/2, pp. 35-68, 2008, doi: 10.1108/03090560810840907.
- [17] J. Ha and S. Jang, "Perceived values, satisfaction, and behavioral intentions: The role of familiarity in Korean restaurants," *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, vol. 29, no. 1, pp. 2-13, 2010, doi: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2009.03.009.
- [18] 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.
- [19] 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.

- [20] D. D. Fadhilla and T. Putra, "The influence of price and quality of service on guest satisfaction at Sky Lounge The Premiere Hotel Padang," *Journal of Multidimensional Management*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 32-38, 2025, doi: 10.63076/jomm.v1i2.14.
- [21] 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.
- [22] S. Firdaus and Y. Abrian, "A quantitative study on the influence of authenticity and employee helpfulness on customer delight at The Balcone Hotel & Resort," *Journal of Multidimensional Management*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 114-119, 2025, doi: 10.63076/jomm.v2i1.26.
- [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] C. Fornell, M. D. Johnson, E. W. Anderson, J. Cha, and B. E. Bryant, "The American Customer Satisfaction Index: Nature, purpose, and findings," *Journal of Marketing*, vol. 60, no. 4, pp. 7-18, 1996, doi: 10.1177/002224299606000403.
- [25] 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.
- [26] Sugiyono, *Metode Penelitian dan Pengembangan: Pendekatan Kualitatif, Kuantitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung, Indonesia: Alfabeta, 2015.
- [27] U. Sekaran and R. Bougie, *Research Methods for Business: A Skill-Building Approach*, 7th ed. Chichester, U.K.: Wiley, 2016.
- [28] A. Field, *Discovering Statistics Using IBM SPSS Statistics*, 5th ed. London, U.K.: Sage, 2018.
- [29] S. S. Andaleeb and C. Conway, "Customer satisfaction in the restaurant industry: An examination of the transaction-specific model," *Journal of Services Marketing*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 3-11, 2006, doi: 10.1108/08876040610646536.
- [30] I. H. S. Chow, V. P. Lau, T. W. C. Lo, Z. Sha, and H. Yun, "Service quality in restaurant operations in China: Decision- and experiential-oriented perspectives," *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 698-710, 2007, doi: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2006.07.001.
- [31] F. Y. Pai, T. M. Yeh, and C. Y. Tang, "Classifying restaurant service quality attributes by using Kano model and IPA approach," *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, vol. 29, no. 3-4, pp. 301-328, 2018, doi: 10.1080/14783363.2016.1184082.
- [32] N. J. Slack, G. Singh, J. Ali, R. Lata, K. Mudaliar, and Y. Swamy, "Influence of fast-food restaurant service quality and its dimensions on customer perceived value, satisfaction and behavioural intentions," *British Food Journal*, vol. 123, no. 4, pp. 1324-1344, 2021, doi: 10.1108/BFJ-09-2020-0771.
- [33] J. A. Alhelalat, M. Habiballah, and N. M. Twaissi, "The impact of personal and functional aspects of restaurant employee service behaviour on customer satisfaction," *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, vol. 66, pp. 46-53, 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2017.07.001.
- [34] P. T. Loo, C. Khoo, and H. C. Boo, "How should I respond to a complaining customer? A model of Cognitive-Emotive-Behavioral from the perspective of restaurant service employees," *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, vol. 95, Art. no. 102882, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2021.102882.
- [35] V. C. S. Heung and T. Gu, "Influence of restaurant atmospherics on patron satisfaction and behavioral intentions," *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, vol. 31, no. 4, pp. 1167-1177, 2012, doi: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2012.02.004.
- [36] 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.
- [37] M. S. H. Rathnasiri, P. Kumar, B. Aggarwal, K. Nair, and N. J. Dewasiri, "Influences of atmospherics on customer satisfaction and behavioural intentions in the restaurant industry:

- Evidence from an emerging economy," PLOS ONE, vol. 20, no. 4, Art. no. e0319948, 2025, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0319948.
- [38] K. Ryu and S. Jang, "DINESCAPE: A scale for customers' perception of dining environments," *Journal of Foodservice Business Research*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 2-22, 2008, doi: 10.1080/15378020801926551.
- [39] H. C. Wu and Y. J. Ko, "Assessment of service quality in the hotel industry," *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality & Tourism*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 218-244, 2013, doi: 10.1080/1528008X.2013.802557.
- [40] J. Kandampully, T. Zhang, and A. Bilgihan, "Customer loyalty: A review and future directions with a special focus on the hospitality industry," *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 379-414, 2015, doi: 10.1108/IJCHM-03-2014-0151.
- [41] N. Srijani and A. S. Hidayat, "Pengaruh fasilitas terhadap kepuasan tamu di Aston Madiun Hotel & Conference Center," *Wiga Jurnal Penelitian Ilmu Ekonomi*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 31-38, 2018, doi: 10.30741/wiga.v7i1.336.