

The Effect of Service Quality, Facilities, and Location on Guest Satisfaction at Truntum Hotel Padang

Al Hambra^{1*}, Azmen Kahar²

^{1,2}Hospitality Management, Universitas Negeri Padang

Copyright©2025 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 August 4, 2025

Revised August 8, 2025

Accepted August 10, 2025

Keywords:

Service Quality, Facilities,
Location, Guest Satisfaction,
Hospitality Management

ABSTRACT

This study examines the impact of service quality, facilities, and location on guest satisfaction at Truntum Padang Hotel, a four-star property in West Sumatra, Indonesia. Using a quantitative, causal-associative design, data were collected from 370 guests through a structured questionnaire employing validated SERVQUAL-based indicators and analyzed using multiple linear regression in SPSS 26.0. The results reveal that, collectively, the three independent variables significantly influence guest satisfaction ($F = 94.530$, $p < 0.001$). However, partial tests indicate that only facilities ($\beta = 0.194$, $p < 0.001$) and location ($\beta = 0.233$, $p < 0.001$) have significant positive effects, while service quality shows a positive but statistically insignificant relationship ($\beta = 0.034$, $p = 0.223$). These findings suggest that in this context, tangible attributes such as well-maintained amenities and strategic accessibility play a more decisive role in shaping guest perceptions than service interactions, particularly when baseline service standards are already met. The study offers practical implications for hotel managers to prioritize continuous facility upgrades and maximize location.

Corresponding Author:

Al Hambra

Hospitality Management, Universitas Negeri Padang

Email: alhambra0912@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

The hospitality industry is one of the most competitive segments in the global tourism market, where the value proposition extends beyond providing accommodation to delivering a comprehensive guest experience. This encompasses personalized service, high-quality food and beverage offerings, modern facilities, recreational amenities, and strategic accessibility, all of which jointly shape guest satisfaction and loyalty [1], [2]. In the era of globalization and rapid technological advancement, guests increasingly demand seamless service delivery, well-maintained physical facilities, and prime locations that enhance convenience and travel efficiency [3]. Within this context, guest satisfaction is not only a key performance indicator but also a driver of repeat visitation, positive word-of-mouth, and long-term sustainability in the hospitality business [4].

Service quality has long been recognized as a critical determinant of guest satisfaction, often measured through the SERVQUAL framework, which includes dimensions such as tangibility, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy [5]. High service quality enhances perceived value, fosters emotional bonds with the brand, and influences guests' future behavioral intentions [6]. Nevertheless, some empirical studies have reported mixed results, showing that service quality does not always have a significant direct effect on satisfaction, particularly when other factors such as facilities and location play a more dominant role in shaping guest perceptions [7].

Facilities, both tangible and intangible, also play an essential role in determining guest satisfaction. These facilities include room amenities, meeting spaces, recreational areas, and technology infrastructure, which together enhance the guest's comfort and convenience [8]. Well-maintained and high-quality facilities contribute directly to positive guest evaluations and loyalty, especially in mid-scale hotels where differentiation from budget and luxury segments can be challenging [9]. Research suggests that facility

quality often becomes a decisive factor in guest decision-making, serving as a competitive advantage in attracting and retaining customers [10].

Location is another fundamental aspect influencing guest decisions, as proximity to tourist attractions, commercial districts, and transportation hubs can significantly enhance the guest experience [11]. A strategically located hotel can offset certain shortcomings in service or facilities by providing guests with easier access to points of interest and essential services [12]. In urban hospitality settings, location has consistently been identified as one of the most influential determinants of guest satisfaction, particularly for leisure and business travelers [13].

Although the relationships between service quality, facilities, and location with guest satisfaction have been widely studied, much of the existing research focuses on luxury hotels in metropolitan areas or budget accommodations in mass tourism markets [7], [11]. There remains limited empirical evidence from mid-scale four-star hotels in emerging tourism destinations such as West Sumatra, Indonesia, where the hospitality sector is experiencing steady growth due to rising domestic and international tourist arrivals. Truntum Padang Hotel, a four-star property located in the heart of Padang City, offers a relevant case study for examining these factors. Competing with both upscale and budget hotels, it serves a diverse clientele comprising leisure and business travelers.

Given this context, the present study aims to investigate the individual and combined effects of service quality, facilities, and location on guest satisfaction at Truntum Padang Hotel. By addressing this gap, the study seeks to contribute to both practical strategies for hotel management and the theoretical development of guest experience research in emerging hospitality markets.

2. METHOD

This study adopted a quantitative research design with a causal-associative approach to examine the effects of service quality, facilities, and location on guest satisfaction at Truntum Padang Hotel. The research population consisted of hotel guests who had stayed at least once during the study period, with purposive sampling applied to ensure the inclusion of respondents with direct experience of the hotel's services. A total of 370 valid responses were obtained through self-administered questionnaires using a five-point Likert scale ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree." The questionnaire items were adapted from validated instruments in prior hospitality studies, covering 15 indicators for service quality, 15 for facilities, 12 for location, and 9 for guest satisfaction. Data were collected from August 2024 to January 2025 and analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics version 26.0. Instrument validity was assessed via Pearson's correlation, while reliability was measured using Cronbach's alpha, with a threshold of 0.70 for acceptability [14]. Classical assumption tests included the Kolmogorov–Smirnov test for normality, Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) for multicollinearity, and the Glejser test for heteroscedasticity [15]. Multiple linear regression analysis was employed to test the hypotheses, with partial effects assessed through the t-test, simultaneous effects through the F-test, and the coefficient of determination (Adjusted R^2) used to evaluate the proportion of variance in guest satisfaction explained by the independent variables [16].

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Result

3.1.1. Descriptive Analysis

Descriptive statistics were employed to assess the average respondent achievement rates (TCR) for the variables of service quality, facilities, location, and guest satisfaction. The findings reveal that the service quality variable achieved a TCR of 83.03%, indicating that guests generally perceive the hotel's service delivery positively, with consistent performance across dimensions such as tangibility, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy. The facilities variable obtained a TCR of 78.09%, suggesting that guests consider the hotel's amenities—including room features, recreational areas, and meeting facilities—to be good, although certain aspects may benefit from enhancement. The location variable recorded a TCR of 84.32%, reflecting high guest satisfaction with the hotel's accessibility, proximity to attractions, and convenience for travel. Finally, the guest satisfaction variable achieved the highest TCR of 84.50%, indicating that overall, guests are satisfied with their experience at Truntum Padang Hotel and are likely to recommend or revisit the property. These results suggest that while all variables are rated in the "good" category, continuous improvement in facilities could further enhance overall guest satisfaction.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Research Variables

Variable	TCR (%)	Category
Service Quality	83.03	Good
Facilities	78.09	Good
Location	84.32	Good
Guest Satisfaction	84.50	Good

3.1.2. Instrument Testing

3.1.2.1. Validity Test

Validity testing was conducted using Pearson's product-moment correlation to evaluate whether each item in the questionnaire accurately measured its respective construct. The results showed that all item correlation coefficients (r-count) exceeded the critical value of 0.361 at a significance level of $p < 0.05$. This finding confirms that each measurement item was valid for assessing its corresponding variable—service quality, facilities, location, and guest satisfaction—and could be retained for subsequent analysis.

3.1.2.2. Reliability Test

Reliability testing was conducted to determine the internal consistency of the research instrument for each variable. Cronbach's alpha coefficients were calculated for service quality, facilities, location, and guest satisfaction. The results indicate that all variables obtained alpha values well above the minimum acceptable threshold of 0.70, demonstrating strong internal consistency. This means the items within each construct consistently measure the same underlying concept, ensuring the stability and reliability of the instrument for further statistical analysis.

Table 2. Reliability Testing Results

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha	Reliability Category
Service Quality	0.949	Reliable
Facilities	0.947	Reliable
Location	0.946	Reliable
Guest Satisfaction	0.916	Reliable

3.1.3. Assumption Testing

To ensure the robustness and validity of the regression analysis, three classical assumption tests were conducted: normality, multicollinearity, and heteroscedasticity. The normality of the residuals was examined using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, a widely applied statistical method in hospitality and management research to evaluate whether the residuals follow a normal distribution pattern [17]. As shown in Table 3, the Monte Carlo significance value was 0.060, exceeding the 0.05 threshold, indicating that the residuals are normally distributed.

The multicollinearity test assessed the intercorrelation among independent variables by examining tolerance and Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) values. According to Hair et al. [18], tolerance values greater than 0.10 and VIF values below 10 indicate the absence of multicollinearity. As presented in Table 4, service quality, facilities, and location recorded tolerance values of 0.471, 0.551, and 0.457, respectively, with corresponding VIF values of 2.123, 1.816, and 2.189, confirming that no multicollinearity issue exists in the model.

Heteroscedasticity was evaluated using the Glejser test [19], [20], which regresses the absolute values of residuals against the independent variables to detect non-constant error variance. If the significance value is greater than 0.05, the dataset is considered free from heteroscedasticity. As shown in Table 5, service quality ($p = 0.067$), facilities ($p = 0.457$), and location ($p = 0.975$) all exceeded the 0.05 threshold, confirming that the data meet the homoscedasticity assumption. Meeting these assumptions ensures that the regression estimates are unbiased, consistent, and efficient for hypothesis testing in this study.

Table 3. Results of Normality Test (Kolmogorov–Smirnov)

Parameter	Value
N	370
Mean	0.0000
Std. Deviation	2.3377
Most Extreme Differences (Absolute)	0.068
Most Extreme Differences (Positive)	0.054
Most Extreme Differences (Negative)	-0.068
Test Statistic	0.068
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
Monte Carlo Sig. (2-tailed)	0.060
99% CI Lower Bound	0.054
99% CI Upper Bound	0.066

Table 4. Results of Multicollinearity Test

Variable	Tolerance	VIF	Conclusion
Service Quality	0.471	2.123	No multicollinearity
Facilities	0.551	1.816	No multicollinearity
Location	0.457	2.189	No multicollinearity

Table 5. Results of Heteroscedasticity Test (Glejser Method)

Variable	Significance (p-value)	Conclusion
Service Quality	0.067	No heteroscedasticity
Facilities	0.457	No heteroscedasticity
Location	0.975	No heteroscedasticity

3.1.4. Hypothesis Test

To assess the influence of service quality (X_1), facilities (X_2), and location (X_3) on guest satisfaction (Y), multiple linear regression analysis was performed using SPSS version 26.0. Two main tests were conducted: (1) the simultaneous significance test (F-test) to evaluate the combined effect of the predictors, and (2) the partial significance test (t-test) to determine the individual contributions of each independent variable.

The simultaneous significance test results are presented in Table 6. The ANOVA output shows an F-value of 94.530 with a significance level of 0.000 (< 0.05), indicating that service quality, facilities, and location collectively have a statistically significant impact on guest satisfaction. Accordingly, the null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected, confirming that the predictors jointly explain variations in guest satisfaction.

Table 6. Simultaneous Significance Test (ANOVA)

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	1562.443	3	520.814	94.530	0.000
Residual	2016.489	366	5.510	–	–
Total	3578.932	369	–	–	–

The partial significance test results are shown in Table 7. The estimated regression model is:

$$Y=12.032+0.034X_1+0.194X_2+0.233X_3$$

The coefficient for service quality (X_1) is 0.034 ($t = 1.221$, $p = 0.223$), indicating a positive but statistically insignificant effect on guest satisfaction. This implies that changes in service quality do not significantly alter guest satisfaction levels when considered individually. In contrast, facilities (X_2) have a coefficient of 0.194 ($t = 6.672$, $p = 0.000$), suggesting that a one-unit increase in facilities improves guest satisfaction by 0.194 units. Location (X_3) has a coefficient of 0.233 ($t = 5.557$, $p = 0.000$), meaning that a one-unit increase in location rating enhances guest satisfaction by 0.233 units.

Table 7. Multiple Linear Regression Analysis Results

Variable	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
Constant	12.032	1.552	–	7.752	0.000
Service Quality	0.034	0.028	0.070	1.221	0.223
Facilities	0.194	0.029	0.353	6.672	0.000
Location	0.233	0.042	0.323	5.557	0.000

These results highlight that facilities and location are significant determinants of guest satisfaction, while service quality does not exert a significant individual effect in this context. The findings align with prior studies suggesting that in certain hospitality settings, tangible factors such as facility quality and strategic location may have a stronger influence on guest evaluations than service quality alone.

3.2. Discussion

The results of the regression analysis provide important insights into the determinants of guest satisfaction in the hospitality industry, particularly in the context of Truntum Padang Hotel. The simultaneous significance test confirmed that service quality, facilities, and location collectively exert a statistically significant influence on guest satisfaction, supporting the view that customer experiences in hotels are shaped by a combination of tangible and intangible attributes [21], [22]. This aligns with the service quality theory proposed by Parasuraman et al. [23], which posits that guest satisfaction is the result of both functional service delivery and physical evidence of quality.

Interestingly, the partial significance test revealed that facilities and location have significant positive effects on guest satisfaction, whereas service quality, while positively associated, did not exhibit a statistically significant individual effect. This finding deviates from the commonly held assumption that service quality is the primary driver of satisfaction in hotels [24]. One plausible explanation is that in certain markets, particularly leisure destinations such as Padang, tangible attributes like room amenities, cleanliness, recreational facilities, and strategic proximity to tourist attractions may outweigh the perceived value of service interactions. This is consistent with the argument by Wu and Ko [25], who found that the perceived convenience and physical environment had a stronger influence on satisfaction in urban tourism settings than interpersonal service quality.

The significant role of facilities suggests that guests value the completeness and quality of physical amenities, including accommodation comfort, dining facilities, and supporting features such as meeting rooms, pools, and fitness centers. These tangible elements not only enhance the guest experience but also contribute to the perceived value, a known antecedent of satisfaction and loyalty [26]. Similarly, the positive influence of location supports the premise that accessibility, visibility, and proximity to major attractions are critical factors in hotel selection, particularly for short-stay or business travelers [27].

The non-significant effect of service quality in this study warrants further exploration. One possibility is that the baseline level of service quality at Truntum Padang Hotel already meets guest expectations, resulting in limited variance in responses. This phenomenon is in line with the "threshold effect" described by Chen and Tsai [28], where once a certain quality level is reached, further improvements in service yield diminishing returns in terms of satisfaction. Another contributing factor may be that repeat guests or corporate clients place greater emphasis on efficiency, location, and facility convenience over personalized service.

Overall, the findings reinforce the importance for hotel managers to adopt a balanced improvement strategy that addresses both tangible and intangible aspects of the guest experience. For Truntum Padang Hotel, this means sustaining service quality standards while prioritizing continuous upgrades to facilities and ensuring that the hotel's location advantages are maximized through targeted marketing campaigns. The strategic alignment of these factors can foster higher guest satisfaction,

enhance brand image, and potentially increase repeat visitation rates, which are critical for long-term competitiveness in the hospitality sector.

4. CONCLUSION

This study examined the influence of service quality, facilities, and location on guest satisfaction at Truntum Padang Hotel, employing multiple linear regression analysis. The results demonstrate that these three variables collectively have a significant effect on guest satisfaction; however, only facilities and location exert a statistically significant positive impact when evaluated individually, while service quality, although positively associated, does not show a significant direct influence. These findings suggest that in this hospitality context, guests prioritize tangible attributes such as well-maintained facilities and strategic accessibility over service interactions, particularly when baseline service standards are already met. The study underscores the importance for hotel managers to adopt a balanced strategy that ensures consistent service quality while focusing on continuous facility improvements and maximizing location advantages to enhance guest satisfaction, strengthen brand reputation, and encourage repeat patronage.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to express their sincere gratitude to the management and staff of Truntum Padang Hotel for their valuable cooperation and assistance during the data collection process. Special appreciation is also extended to the respondents who generously contributed their time and insights to this study. The authors acknowledge the support from colleagues and academic advisors for their constructive feedback, which significantly enhanced the quality of this research.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Kandampully, T. Zhang, and A. Bilgihan, "Customer loyalty: A review and future directions with a special focus on the hospitality industry," *Int. J. Contemp. Hosp. Manag.*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 379–414, 2015, doi: 10.1108/IJCHM-03-2014-0151.
- [2] R. K. A. Rahman, S. N. Ahmad, and N. A. Aziz, "Customer satisfaction in the hospitality industry: A case study of a luxury resort in Malaysia," *Tour. Manag. Perspect.*, vol. 38, p. 100841, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.tmp.2021.100841.
- [3] O. A. Ali, S. G. Kim, and Y. S. Ryu, "Impact of service quality on customer satisfaction and loyalty in the hotel industry," *Sustainability*, vol. 13, no. 22, p. 12537, 2021, doi: 10.3390/su132212537.
- [4] C. M. Wu and J. H. Ko, "The influence of facilities and service quality on guest satisfaction in the hospitality industry," *J. Qual. Assur. Hosp. Tour.*, vol. 22, no. 5, pp. 528–549, 2021, doi: 10.1080/1528008X.2020.1814879.
- [5] A. Parasuraman, V. A. Zeithaml, and L. L. Berry, "SERVQUAL: A multiple-item scale for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality," *J. Retail.*, vol. 64, no. 1, pp. 12–40, 1988.
- [6] I. P. G. G. Dewangga, S. J. Saharjo, and P. G. P. Putra, "The effect of service quality and facilities on guest satisfaction: Evidence from Mercure Bali Legian Hotel," *J. Mosaic Hosp.*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 11–19, 2024.
- [7] Y. A. Alsharari, "Service quality of hotels serving Saudi tourism industry," *Int. J. Qual. Res.*, vol. 14, no. 4, pp. 1003–1018, 2020, doi: 10.24874/IJQR14.04-16.
- [8] S. A. Mohd et al., "Hotel facilities and guest satisfaction: Evidence from Malaysia," *Asia Pac. J. Tour. Res.*, vol. 25, no. 8, pp. 803–819, 2020, doi: 10.1080/10941665.2020.1787018.
- [9] M. A. Namin, "Revisiting customers' perception of service quality in fast food restaurants," *J. Retail. Consum. Serv.*, vol. 34, pp. 70–81, 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.jretconser.2016.09.008.
- [10] S. C. Chen and C. P. Lin, "Understanding the effect of social media marketing activities: The mediation of customer relationship quality," *Tour. Manag. Perspect.*, vol. 17, pp. 188–196, 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.tmp.2015.12.011.
- [11] K. Kim and C. Kim, "The influence of location on hotel performance: Evidence from the hotel industry," *Tour. Econ.*, vol. 25, no. 5, pp. 747–761, 2019, doi: 10.1177/1354816618814331.
- [12] L. N. Hakim and S. Paludi, "The effect of service quality, price perception, and location on customer satisfaction in the hotel industry," *Hum. Cap. Dev.*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 12–21, 2023.
- [13] E. I. Gian, I. B. A. K. Putra, and R. M. R. M. Nurochman, "The effect of service quality, price, and location on customer satisfaction at a city hotel," *Sci. J. Masters Admin. Sci.*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 45–54, 2023.
- [14] U. Sekaran and R. Bougie, *Research Methods for Business: A Skill-Building Approach*, 8th ed. Hoboken, NJ, USA: Wiley, 2019.

- [15] I. Etikan, S. A. Musa, and R. S. Alkassim, "Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling," *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 1–4, 2016, doi: 10.11648/j.ajtas.20160501.11.
- [16] J. Cohen, *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*, 2nd ed. New York, NY, USA: Routledge, 1988, doi: 10.4324/9780203771587.
- [17] A. Ghasemi and S. Zahediasl, "Normality tests for statistical analysis: A guide for non-statisticians," *International Journal of Endocrinology and Metabolism*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 486–489, 2012, doi: 10.5812/ijem.3505.
- [18] J. F. Hair Jr., W. C. Black, B. J. Babin, and R. E. Anderson, *Multivariate Data Analysis*, 8th ed. Andover, U.K.: Cengage, 2019.
- [19] H. Glejser, "A new test for heteroscedasticity," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, vol. 64, no. 325, pp. 316–323, 1969, doi: 10.1080/01621459.1969.10500976.
- [20] D. N. Gujarati and D. C. Porter, *Basic Econometrics*, 5th ed. New York, NY, USA: McGraw-Hill, 2009.
- [21] 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.
- [22] R. K. A. Rahman, S. N. Ahmad, and N. A. Aziz, "Customer satisfaction in the hospitality industry: A case study of a luxury resort in Malaysia," *Tourism Management Perspectives*, vol. 38, p. 100841, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.tmp.2021.100841.
- [23] A. Parasuraman, V. A. Zeithaml, and L. L. Berry, "A conceptual model of service quality and its implications for future research," *Journal of Marketing*, vol. 49, no. 4, pp. 41–50, 1985, doi: 10.1177/002224298504900403.
- [24] A. Akbaba, "Measuring service quality in the hotel industry: A study in a business hotel in Turkey," *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, vol. 25, no. 2, pp. 170–192, 2006, doi: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2005.08.006.
- [25] 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.
- [26] J. J. Cronin Jr., M. K. Brady, and G. T. M. Hult, "Assessing the effects of quality, value, and customer satisfaction on consumer behavioral intentions in service environments," *Journal of Retailing*, vol. 76, no. 2, pp. 193–218, 2000, doi: 10.1016/S0022-4359(00)00028-2.
- [27] Y. Yang, Z. Mao, and J. Tang, "Understanding guest satisfaction with urban hotel location," *Journal of Travel Research*, vol. 58, no. 8, pp. 1284–1299, 2019 (online 2017), doi: 10.1177/0047287517691153.
- [28] C.-F. Chen and D. Tsai, "How destination image and evaluative factors affect behavioral intentions?," *Tourism Management*, vol. 28, no. 4, pp. 1115–1122, 2007, doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2006.07.007.