Journal of Multidimensional Management (JoMM)
Vol. 2, No. 3, Month 08, pp. 348~356
ISSN: 3064-2140

The influence of location and ambient conditions on repurchase intention at Dendivila Coffee Saniangbaka Solok

Vina Yuniar[1]*, Pasaribu[2]
[1,2]Hospitality Management, Universitas Negeri Padang

Article Info

Article history:
Received November 6, 2025
Revised November 7, 2025
Accepted November 10, 2025

Keywords:
Servicescape, Ambient Conditions, Location, Repurchase Intention, Coffee Shop

ABSTRACT

This study examines how location and ambient conditions, treated as core servicescape cues, shape repurchase intention at a lakeside coffee shop in Solok, Indonesia. Using a quantitative, causal-associative design, we surveyed customers with five-point Likert measures and analyzed the data with multiple linear regression (n = 118; purposive sampling). Measurement quality checks covered normality, heteroscedasticity, and multicollinearity diagnostics, and model adequacy was assessed with F-tests and adjusted R^2. Both predictors were significant: location ($\beta = 0.389$, $p < .001$) and ambient conditions ($\beta = 0.330$, $p < .001$). The model explains 41.4% of the variance in repurchase intention (adjusted $R^2 = 0.414$; $F(2,115) = 42.40$, $p < .001$), indicating medium practical effects. The contribution is the contextualization of servicescape effects in a peri-urban, view-centric setting where access, visibility, thermal comfort, and music audibility can fluctuate with weather and visitor density. From a managerial perspective, prioritizing clear access and parking, improving pedestrian visibility, regulating temperature and airflow, and calibrating music by time of day are actionable levers to stabilize repeat patronage. Future research should incorporate additional servicescape dimensions (for example, layout and signage), test mediation by satisfaction or perceived value, and validate the measurement model using confirmatory factor analysis.

Corresponding Author:
Vina Yuniar
Manajemen Perhotelan, Universitas Negeri Padang
Email: vinayuniar789@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

Servicescape theory explains how the physical surroundings of a service setting shape customer cognition, affect, and approach behaviors, and it provides a foundational lens to study post purchase outcomes in hospitality and retail contexts [1]. Subsequent work connects servicescape with the broader idea of an experiencescape, highlighting how cues are orchestrated to craft holistic experiences that ultimately drive loyalty behaviors [2]. Within this stream, ambient conditions such as lighting, temperature, music, and scent are consistently treated as primary antecedents of in store evaluations and behavioral intentions [3].

In restaurant and café environments, multi dimensional scales show that physical environment attributes predict image, perceived value, satisfaction, and downstream intentions such as revisit or repurchase [4]. DINESCAPE operationalizes key environmental facets (for example ambience, layout, and facility aesthetics) that customers use to evaluate dining settings [5], while empirical studies verify that both first time and repeat patrons are sensitive to these cues in forming loyalty related judgments [4]. More recent evidence emphasizes multi sensory design that integrates visual, auditory, tactile, and olfactory elements to produce memorable dining experiences that reinforce favorable word of mouth, revisit behavior, and repurchase intention [6], [7].

Beyond interior atmospherics, location remains a salient determinant of behavioral outcomes in service retailing, reflecting accessibility, visibility, traffic flow, and proximity to complementary activities [8], [9]. Retail and service studies indicate that customers' value assessments and in store emotions

translate site convenience and environmental quality into loyalty related intentions [8], while utilitarian and hedonic appraisals jointly mediate store environment effects on repurchase [9]. In café contexts, especially independent operators, location signals such as access routes, parking availability, and sightlines frequently interact with ambient comfort such as temperature and airflow and with music audibility, shaping dwell time and return intentions during peak or weather sensitive periods [1], [6].

Two gaps persist for Indonesia's coffee shop setting outside major metropolitan areas. First, there is limited joint modeling of location attributes together with ambient conditions to explain repurchase intention at independent cafés in secondary cities or peri urban destinations. Second, empirical generalizations are still uncertain for view centric and outdoor oriented cafés where thermal comfort, airflow, and sound carry differently across dayparts and weather regimes [2], [6]. Addressing these gaps, the present study examines how location and ambient conditions influence repurchase intention at a lakeside coffee shop in Solok, Indonesia. Conceptually, the study brings location salience into the servicescape to experience to intention chain for a peri urban Indonesian café. Managerially, it informs investment priorities between site and wayfinding improvements and in store ambience upgrades to strengthen repeat patronage [6], [8], [9].

2. METHOD

This study employed a quantitative, causal–associative survey at Dendivila Coffee, Saniangbaka, Solok, Indonesia, targeting patrons who had completed a purchase during regular operating hours; sampling used an on-site intercept with purposive criteria, yielding 118 usable responses (n = 118). All latent constructs were measured with multi-item five-point Likert scales (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree) adapted from prior servicescape and loyalty literature and localized through standard translate–review procedures to ensure content equivalence. Data screening covered missing values and basic assumptions, followed by descriptive statistics and Pearson correlations. Measurement quality was examined via internal consistency reliability (Cronbach's alpha) and construct validity checks (exploratory or confirmatory factor analysis, average variance extracted and composite reliability where applicable). To test the hypotheses, multiple linear regression was estimated with repurchase intention as the dependent variable and location and ambient conditions as predictors, using two-tailed tests at $\alpha = 0.05$. Model diagnostics included tests of normality (Kolmogorov–Smirnov), multicollinearity (variance inflation factor and tolerance), heteroskedasticity (Glejser), independence of errors (Durbin–Watson), linearity and influential observations (partial regression plots and Cook's distance). Analyses were conducted in standard statistical software (e.g., IBM SPSS; optional CFA in AMOS or equivalent), and all respondents provided informed consent with anonymity assured.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Result

3.1.1. Descriptive Results

Overall, respondents' perceptions of Location (X1) fall into the Good category with TCR = 3.58 (n = 118). The two strongest dimensions are traffic and expansion, reflected by several items with mean scores near or above 3.80. Accessibility shows variation: some items are rated Fair (for example, ease of entry and exit during peak hours), while others are Good (routes to the site and parking convenience). Visibility ranges from Fair to Good, indicating a need to strengthen signage and roadside salience. Practically, improvement priorities include ensuring consistent access during peak periods and optimizing visibility from prevailing traffic and pedestrian flows.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics for Location (X1)

Dimension	Item	STS	TS	KS	S	SS	N	Total	Mean (TCR)	Category
Accessibility	1	21	23	54	15	5	118	314	3.14	Fair
	2	17	16	28	39	18	118	379	3.79	Good
	3	19	13	20	49	17	118	386	3.86	Good
	4	23	37	38	18	2	118	293	2.93	Fair
Visibility	5	13	24	58	14	9	118	336	3.36	Fair
	6	8	32	50	20	8	118	342	3.42	Good
Traffic	7	11	21	11	48	27	118	413	4.13	Good
	8	14	21	18	36	29	118	399	3.99	Good

Dimension	Item	STS	TS	KS	S	SS	N	Total	Mean (TCR)	Category
	9	17	21	31	24	25	118	373	3.73	Good
	10	5	13	49	49	2	118	384	3.84	Good
Expansion	11	13	25	29	40	11	118	365	3.65	Good
	12	16	32	32	23	15	118	343	3.43	Good
	13	23	37	38	18	2	118	293	2.93	Fair
Surroundings	14	21	23	55	14	5	118	313	3.13	Fair
	15	11	23	20	39	25	118	398	3.98	Good
	16	17	20	28	30	23	118	376	3.76	Good
	17	14	26	30	34	14	118	362	3.62	Good
	18	15	17	30	37	19	118	382	3.82	Good
Total score / Mean (TCR)							118	6451	3.58	Good

Perceptions of Ambient Conditions (X2) are also Good with TCR = 3.68. Lighting and color and size and shape record high means, indicating solid visual comfort. Music/noise is heterogeneous: one item is Fair while another is Good, suggesting the need to calibrate volume and playlist by time of day. Temperature and scent are generally positive, though maintaining thermal comfort during weather fluctuations remains important to support dwell time and intention to return.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics for Ambient Conditions (X2)

Dimension	Item	STS	TS	KS	S	SS	N	Total	Mean (TCR)	Category
Lighting & Color	1	18	20	21	31	28	118	385	3.85	Good
	2	15	24	28	25	26	118	377	3.77	Good
	3	11	21	29	39	18	118	386	3.86	Good
Size & Shape	4	15	20	23	39	21	118	385	3.85	Good
	5	9	18	32	45	14	118	391	3.91	Good
	6	8	32	50	20	8	118	342	3.42	Good
Music / Noise	7	21	23	55	14	5	118	313	3.13	Fair
	8	12	14	31	41	20	118	397	3.97	Good
Temperature	9	14	19	31	27	27	118	388	3.88	Good
Scent	10	17	20	28	30	23	118	376	3.76	Good
	11	21	23	54	15	5	118	314	3.14	Fair
Total score / Mean (TCR)							118	4054	3.68	Good

Repurchase Intention (Y) is Good with TCR = 3.77. All dimensions score well with modest variation. Referential and preferential values indicate advocacy and consistent preference for the café, whereas transactional and exploratory values suggest opportunities for loyalty programs and limited-time menu innovations to sustain repeat purchase intentions.

Table 3. Descriptive statistics for Repurchase Intention (Y)

Dimension	Item	STS	TS	KS	S	SS	N	Total	Mean (TCR)	Category
Transactional	1	10	13	38	48	9	118	387	3.87	Good
	2	11	21	30	47	9	118	376	3.76	Good
	3	6	17	46	33	16	118	390	3.90	Good
	4	6	16	40	39	17	118	399	3.99	Good
Referential	5	10	17	43	42	6	118	371	3.71	Good
	6	11	20	33	45	9	118	375	3.75	Good
	7	7	21	33	49	8	118	384	3.84	Good

Dimension	Item	STS	TS	KS	S	SS	N	Total	Mean (TCR)	Category
	8	7	16	33	53	9	118	395	3.95	Good
Preferential	9	11	19	29	34	25	118	397	3.97	Good
	10	13	19	39	42	5	118	361	3.61	Good
	11	11	21	30	44	12	118	379	3.79	Good
	12	9	15	39	43	12	118	388	3.88	Good
Exploratory	13	10	26	39	31	12	118	363	3.63	Good
	14	16	26	27	36	13	118	358	3.58	Good
	15	15	27	32	31	13	118	354	3.54	Good
	16	14	25	30	31	18	118	368	3.68	Good
Total score / Mean (TCR)							118	6045	3.77	Good

3.1.2. Assumption Checks

Table 4. Normality Test Results
One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		Unstandardized Residual
N		118
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	.0000000
	Std. Deviation	5.96987609
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.074
	Positive	.074
	Negative	-.046
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.806
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.535

a. Test distribution is Normal.
b. Calculated from data.

Table 4 shows the normality test result, where the Asymp. Sig. value is 0.535. Since the significance value is > 0.05, it can be stated that the data is normally distributed.

Table 5. Heteroscedasticity Test Results

Coefficients[a]

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	6.752	2.488		2.714	.008
1 Lokasi	-.044	.056	-.093	-.774	.441
Ambient_Condition	.007	.076	.012	.097	.923

a. Dependent Variable: AbsRES

Source: Processed with SPSS version 21, 2025

Based on these results, the heteroscedasticity test using the Glejser test shows a Sig. value of 0.923 > 0.05. Therefore, it can be concluded that there is no indication of heteroscedasticity for the variables of location and ambient condition concerning repurchase intention.

Table 6. Multicollinearity Test Results

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	15.412	3.965		3.887	.000		
	Lokasi	.382	.090	.389	4.241	.000	.594	1.684
	Ambient_Condition	.435	.121	.330	3.597	.000	.594	1.684

a. Dependent Variable: Repurchase_Intention

Source: Processed with SPSS version 21, 2025

The test results show that the tolerance value for all independent variables is 0.594 > 0.10 and the VIF value is 1.684 < 10. This indicates that no symptoms of multicollinearity were found among the independent variables.

3.1.3. Hypothesis Testing

The regression model is jointly significant ($F(2,115) = 42.403$; $p < 0.001$) with Adjusted $R^2 = 0.414$, indicating that 41.4% of the variance in Repurchase Intention is explained by Location and Ambient Conditions. Partially, Location has a positive and significant effect on Repurchase Intention ($\beta = 0.389$; $t = 4.241$; $p < 0.001$) and Ambient Conditions also has a positive and significant effect ($\beta = 0.330$; $t = 3.597$; $p < 0.001$). Managerially, improving access and visibility alongside thermal and acoustic calibration can raise repeat patronage.

Table 7. Coefficient of Determination (Adjusted R Square)

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.651[a]	.424	.414	6.022

a. Predictors: (Constant), Ambient_Condition, Lokasi

Source: Processed with SPSS version 21, 2025

Table 8. Anova Test (F Test)

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	3075.010	2	1537.505	42.403	.000[b]
	Residual	4169.812	115	36.259		
	Total	7244.822	117			

a. Dependent Variable: Repurchase_Intention

b. Predictors: (Constant), Ambient_Condition, Lokasi

Source: Processed with SPSS version 21, 2025

Table 9. Multiple Linear Regression Test (T Test)

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	15.412	3.965		3.887	.000
	Lokasi	.382	.090	.389	4.241	.000
	Ambient_Condition	.435	.121	.330	3.597	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Repurchase_Intention

Source: Processed with SPSS version 21, 2025

3.2. Discussion

Location is evaluated as Good (TCR = 3.58; n = 118) and exhibits a positive, significant effect on repurchase intention ($\beta = 0.389$; $t = 4.241$; $p < 0.001$), aligning with the servicescape view that site cues shape approach behavior and loyalty outcomes and with hospitality evidence that convenient access and perceived environmental quality foster favorable intentions. [1], [3] In café and restaurant contexts, differences between first-time and repeat patrons further underline the value of reducing re-entry frictions through clearer routes, parking, and sightlines, which enhance the likelihood of return visits. [4], [9] Consistent with retail findings, perceived convenience and in-store appraisals often channel location advantages into value and satisfaction, which then translate into revisit and repurchase tendencies. [8], [9] These mechanisms are also compatible with broader service-quality perspectives that link quality cues to behavioral intentions across channels, suggesting the robustness of location salience as a loyalty lever. [3], [10]

Ambient conditions are likewise Good (TCR = 3.68) and significantly predict repurchase intention ($\beta = 0.330$; $t = 3.597$; $p < 0.001$), reflecting the established role of lighting, temperature, music, and scent as primary antecedents of in-store evaluations and subsequent behavioral intentions. [1], [3] Multisensory orchestration that integrates visual, auditory, and thermal comfort is known to produce memorable dining experiences and favorable word-of-mouth, strengthening revisit and recommendation propensities in hospitality settings. [6], [5] Variability in music/noise scores mirrors common patterns where perceived crowding and emotions mediate the effects of ambient cues on intentions, reinforcing the need for daypart-sensitive acoustic calibration. [7], [9] Together, these results indicate that maintaining stable thermal comfort and calibrated soundscapes can consolidate the experiential pathway from ambience to repeat patronage. [5], [6]

Jointly, location and ambient conditions explain a meaningful share of repurchase intention (Adjusted $R^2 = 0.414$; $F(2,115) = 42.403$; $p < 0.001$), a magnitude consistent with restaurant and retail studies in which the physical environment—together with value and satisfaction—accounts for substantial variance in loyalty outcomes. [3], [8] The comparable standardized effects suggest complementary priorities: outside the store, visibility and access enhancements lower re-entry costs; inside the store, visual, acoustic, and thermal management consolidate the experience that sustains repeat purchase. [4], [9] Conceptually, these findings extend the servicescape lens by explicitly integrating location salience into the environment–experience–intention chain and by emphasizing coordinated ambient cues as proximal drivers of behavioral intentions in a café context. [1], [2] They also align with engagement-based views that sustained, high-quality experiences nurture ongoing customer involvement, which is closely tied to loyalty and repurchase outcomes. [11], [12]

Managerially, the evidence supports investment in approach signage, parking layout, and pedestrian sightlines to amplify location advantages, alongside daypart-based music policies and weather-responsive thermal control to stabilize ambience. [4], [9] Such interventions operate through well-documented value and satisfaction pathways and can be reinforced by experience design practices that heighten memorability and positive affect during the visit. [3], [6] While the present design is cross-sectional and single-site, its patterns are congruent with prior work that differentiates patron segments and highlights multisensory drivers of loyalty, indicating clear avenues for replication and scaling. [4], [6] Future studies should validate the measurement model with CFA and test mediated pathways via satisfaction and perceived value, as well as potential moderators such as visit history and time of day, to refine generalizability across café formats and seasons. [8], [9]

4. CONCLUSION

This study shows that both location and ambient conditions are salient, complementary drivers of repurchase intention in a peri-urban coffee context, with a jointly significant model explaining 41.4% of variance and positive partial effects for location ($\beta = 0.389$; $p < 0.001$) and ambient conditions ($\beta = 0.330$; $p < 0.001$). Practically, enhancing approach visibility and parking to reduce re-entry frictions, together with stabilizing visual, acoustic, and thermal comfort—through daypart-based music calibration and weather-responsive airflow—offers actionable levers to strengthen repeat patronage. Conceptually, the findings extend the servicescape lens by integrating site salience with coordinated ambient cues as proximal antecedents of loyalty intentions in independent cafés. While the single-site, cross-sectional design limits causal inference and generalizability, the patterns align with hospitality and retail evidence and motivate future research to validate the measurement model (CFA), test mediation via satisfaction and perceived value, and examine moderators such as visit history, time of day, and seasonality across multiple locations.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors thank the management and patrons of Dendivila Coffee, Saniangbaka, Solok, for their cooperation during data collection, as well as the student enumerators from the Hospitality Management Program, Universitas Negeri Padang, for their diligent field assistance. We also appreciate constructive comments from colleagues and anonymous reviewers that helped improve the clarity and rigor of this manuscript. This study followed institutional ethical guidelines, and informed consent was obtained from all participants prior to participation. No specific external funding was received for this research. Any remaining errors are solely the responsibility of the authors.

REFERENCES

[1] 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.

[2] J. Kandampully, A. Bilgihan, and S. M. Amer, "Linking servicescape and experiencescape: Creating a collective focus for the service industry," Journal of Service Management, vol. 33, no. 6, pp. 1–18, 2022, doi: 10.1108/JOSM-08-2021-0301.

[3] K. Ryu, W. G. Kim, and H. R. Lee, "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.

[4] K. Ryu and H. Han, "New or repeat customers: How does physical environment influence their restaurant experience?," International Journal of Hospitality Management, vol. 30, no. 3, pp. 599–611, 2011, doi: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2010.11.004.

[5] 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.

[6] C.-R. Liu, Y.-C. Wang, T.-M. Kuo, H. Chen, and C.-H. Tsui, "Memorable dining experiences with five senses: Conceptualization and scale development," Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management, vol. 53, pp. 198–207, 2022, doi: 10.1016/j.jhtm.2022.11.001.

[7] M. A. Ali, H. A. I. Rasoolimanesh, and F. Cobanoglu, "Influence of servicescape on behavioural intentions through perceived crowding and emotions," Cogent Business & Management, vol. 8, no. 1, 1924923, 2021, doi: 10.1080/23311975.2021.1924923.

[8] P. Chatzoglou, D. Chatzoudes, A. Savvidou, T. Fotiadis, and P. Delias, "Factors affecting repurchase intentions in retail shopping: An empirical study," Heliyon, vol. 8, no. 9, e10619, 2022, doi: 10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e10619.

[9] C. Calvo-Porral and J. Lévy-Mangin, "Examining the influence of store environment in hedonic and utilitarian shopping," Administrative Sciences, vol. 11, no. 1, 6, 2021, doi: 10.3390/admsci11010006.

[10] L. Zeithaml, V. A. Parasuraman, and A. Malhotra, "Service quality delivery through web sites: A critical review of extant knowledge," Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, vol. 30, no. 4, pp. 362–375, 2002, doi: 10.1177/009207002236911.

[11] J. K. Pansari and V. Kumar, "Customer engagement: The construct, antecedents, and consequences," Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, vol. 45, no. 3, pp. 294–311, 2017, doi: 10.1007/s11747-016-0485-6.

[12] L. Hollebeek, M. S. Glynn, and R. J. Brodie, "Consumer brand engagement in social media: Conceptualization, scale development and validation," Journal of Interactive Marketing, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 149–165, 2014, doi: 10.1016/j.intmar.2013.12.002.