MJIFM | MAJAPAHIT JOURNAL OF ISLAMIC FINANCE AND MANAGEMENT

Vol. 6 No. 2, 2026, 6319–6331 e-ISSN 2798-0170

THE INFLUENCE OF LOCATION, PRICE, AND PRODUCT PROMOTION ON CONSUMER LOYALTY THROUGH CONSUMER SATISFACTION IN HOUSING: A STUDY OF PT EXPERT JAYA GROUP, BOGOR REGENCY

A. Mudrika[1]
Universitas Pamulang, Banten, Indonesia
Ahmadmudrika08@gmail.com

Kasmad[2]
Universitas Pamulang, Banten, Indonesia
dosen00559@unpam.ac.id

Nurmin Arianto[3]
Universitas Pamulang, Banten, Indonesia
dosen01118@unpam.ac.id

Abstract

This study examines the influence of location, price, and product promotion on consumer loyalty, both directly and indirectly through consumer satisfaction as an intervening variable, among housing consumers of PT Expert Jaya Group in Bogor Regency, Indonesia. Using a quantitative associative design, data were collected from 268 respondents through a five-point Likert-scale questionnaire and analyzed with Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) via SmartPLS 3.0. The results show that location, price, and promotion each have a positive and significant effect on consumer satisfaction. Location, price, and satisfaction also have a positive and significant direct effect on consumer loyalty, whereas promotion does not significantly affect loyalty directly. All three exogenous variables influence loyalty positively and significantly through consumer satisfaction, confirming satisfaction as a partial mediator. These findings extend the Theory of Planned Behavior and Expectation-Confirmation Theory into the residential property context and offer practical guidance for property developers seeking to strengthen long-term customer relationships.

Keywords: Location, Price, Promotion, Consumer Satisfaction, Consumer Loyalty, Housing, PLS-SEM

Vol. 6 No. 2, 2026, 6319–6331 e-ISSN 2798-0170

INTRODUCTION

Indonesia's residential property sector has expanded steadily alongside population growth, rising housing demand, and the development of satellite areas around Jakarta, such as Bogor Regency. This expansion has intensified competition among developers, who must differentiate themselves through strategic site selection, competitive pricing, and effective promotion to sustain market share (Tjiptono, 2021). Easier access to information has also made consumers more selective and rational in evaluating housing options. In this setting, consumer satisfaction is a central determinant of business success. It arises when a housing product meets or exceeds a buyer's expectations, shaped by the perceived quality of the location, the fairness of the price, and the clarity of promotional communication (Zeithaml et al., 2018). Satisfaction is in turn regarded as one of the strongest predictors of long-term consumer loyalty (Oliver, 1980).

PT Expert Jaya Group is a property developer that has operated since 2010, headquartered in South Tangerang, with housing projects in Bogor Regency, including Kierana Indah Residence 2, Kierana Indah Residence 3, Sentul Indah Residence 2, and Aurora View. Despite offering strategic locations, competitive prices, and active promotional campaigns, the company's internal data for 2022–2024 show fluctuating and, in 2024, sharply declining sales, with actual sales reaching only about 40% of the target. Customer numbers over the same period also repeatedly fell short of targets. This suggests that the company's marketing mix has not yet translated consistently into stable loyalty outcomes.

This gap between marketing effort and loyalty outcomes raises an empirical question that prior studies have not fully resolved: whether location, price, and promotion affect loyalty only indirectly, by first building satisfaction, or also exert meaningful direct effects. Existing evidence is mixed. In hospitality settings, Habibarrahman et al. (2022) found that promotion influenced satisfaction but did not significantly affect loyalty, while Wasiman et al. (2022) reported a positive effect of location on loyalty. In residential settings, Tarigan et al. (2023) showed that location and price affect satisfaction. However, few studies jointly test location, price, and promotion as antecedents of both satisfaction and loyalty within a single structural model in the housing sector, and fewer still separate their direct effects from their satisfaction-mediated effects.

This study draws on two complementary theories that together link the marketing mix to loyalty. Expectation-Confirmation Theory explains the evaluative stage: location, price, and promotion shape what buyers expect and

Vol. 6 No. 2, 2026, 6319–6331 e-ISSN 2798-0170

what they actually experience, and the confirmation of those expectations produces satisfaction (Oliver, 1980). The Theory of Planned Behavior then explains how this evaluation is converted into behavior: a favorable post-purchase judgment strengthens attitudes toward the developer, which raises the intention to repurchase, recommend, and resist competing offers (Ajzen, 1991). The marketing mix is therefore positioned as the antecedent of satisfaction (marketing mix → satisfaction → loyalty), with satisfaction acting as the attitudinal mechanism through which the first theory feeds into the second. The model also allows each marketing-mix element to affect loyalty directly, because a strategic location or a fair price can independently signal long-term value and reduce the perceived risk of a high-involvement purchase.

Accordingly, this article aims to: (1) analyze the direct effects of location, price, and promotion on consumer satisfaction; (2) analyze the direct effects of location, price, promotion, and satisfaction on consumer loyalty; and (3) analyze the indirect effects of location, price, and promotion on loyalty through satisfaction as an intervening variable, using survey data from 268 housing consumers of PT Expert Jaya Group in Bogor Regency.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Marketing Management and the Marketing Mix

Marketing management is commonly defined as the analysis, planning, implementation, and control of programs designed to create, build, and maintain profitable exchanges with target buyers in order to achieve organizational goals (Kotler & Armstrong, 2019). Within this framework, the marketing mix—commonly summarized as product, price, place (location), and promotion—remains the core set of controllable variables through which a firm shapes consumer perception and behavior (Kotler & Keller, 2023).

Location. In the property industry, location functions as a surrogate for accessibility, convenience, and long-term livability. Tjiptono and Diana (2020) argue that location is a critical purchase-decision factor because it directly affects accessibility, comfort, and the time and cost consumers must expend to use a product or service. For housing specifically, location indicators typically include ease of access, visibility, parking availability, competitive positioning relative to nearby developments, and surrounding environmental quality.

Price. Price represents the monetary value a consumer must exchange to obtain a product's benefits, and it functions simultaneously as a transaction mechanism and a quality signal (Zeithaml et al., 2018). When perceived price is

Vol. 6 No. 2, 2026, 6319–6331 e-ISSN 2798-0170

congruent with perceived quality and benefit, satisfaction and trust are more likely to develop.

Promotion. Promotion refers to the communication activities firms use to inform, persuade, and remind consumers about a product's value proposition (Kotler & Keller, 2023). Effective promotion clarifies product benefits and builds an emotional connection between the brand and consumer, thereby shaping expectations that later interact with actual product performance to produce satisfaction.

Consumer Satisfaction and Consumer Loyalty

Consumer satisfaction is the post-purchase evaluative state that results when perceived performance meets or exceeds prior expectations (Oliver, 1980). Lupiyoadi and Hamdani (2019) similarly describe satisfaction as a key antecedent of loyalty: satisfied consumers develop favorable attitudes that translate into repeat purchase intentions and positive word-of-mouth.

Consumer loyalty, in turn, is defined by Griffin (2020) as a deep commitment to repurchase or continue using a preferred product or service consistently in the future, despite situational influences and competitors' marketing efforts. In high-involvement, high-value purchases such as housing, loyalty is particularly significant because it reflects a long-term economic and relational commitment between the buyer and the developer.

Prior Empirical Research

A growing body of empirical work has examined the relationships among location, price, promotion, satisfaction, and loyalty, primarily in the hospitality and retail sectors, with an emerging stream in residential property. Tarigan et al. (2023) found that location, price, and facilities positively influence consumer satisfaction in a residential setting in Medan. Manik and Simatupang (2023) reported that price positively affects consumer satisfaction in a manufacturing-retail context. Muktar (2025), studying a housing complex in Depok, found that price, location, facilities, and promotion jointly affect consumer satisfaction. Wasiman et al. (2022) found that location positively affects customer loyalty in the hospitality sector, while Mustakim et al. (2026) confirmed that price positively affects consumer loyalty in a Shariah hotel context. In contrast, Habibarrahman et al. (2022) found that promotion, despite influencing satisfaction, did not significantly affect loyalty directly—a finding that anticipates one of the present study's results. Studies examining satisfaction as a mediator, such as Sulistiy et al. (2024) and Yudianto et al. (2023), consistently report that satisfaction strengthens the indirect effect of marketing-mix variables on loyalty, while

Vol. 6 No. 2, 2026, 6319–6331 e-ISSN 2798-0170

Susnita (2023) confirmed a strong direct effect of satisfaction on loyalty in a hotel setting.

Collectively, these studies suggest that location, price, and promotion are generally significant predictors of satisfaction, but their direct effects on loyalty are less consistent—particularly for promotion—implying that satisfaction may function as a genuine mediating mechanism rather than a redundant pathway.

Conceptual Framework and Hypotheses

Building on the theoretical foundations and prior findings above, this study proposes location (X1), price (X2), and promotion (X3) as exogenous variables; consumer satisfaction (Y) as an intervening variable; and consumer loyalty (Z) as the endogenous outcome variable. Ten hypotheses were formulated:

- H1: Location has a positive and significant effect on consumer satisfaction.
- H2: Price has a positive and significant effect on consumer satisfaction.
- H3: Promotion has a positive and significant effect on consumer satisfaction.
- H4: Location has a positive and significant effect on consumer loyalty.
- H5: Price has a positive and significant effect on consumer loyalty.
- H6: Promotion has a positive and significant effect on consumer loyalty.
- H7: Consumer satisfaction has a positive and significant effect on consumer loyalty.
- H8: Location has a positive and significant effect on consumer loyalty through consumer satisfaction.
- H9: Price has a positive and significant effect on consumer loyalty through consumer satisfaction.
- H10: Promotion has a positive and significant effect on consumer loyalty through consumer satisfaction.

RESEARCH METHOD

Research Design

This study employed an associative quantitative design intended to test the causal relationships among multiple variables (Sugiyono, 2022). Data were gathered through a structured survey and analyzed statistically to test the ten hypotheses described above.

Population, Sample, and Sampling Technique

The population comprised 808 consumers who purchased housing units from PT Expert Jaya Group's four projects in Bogor Regency during 2024. The

Vol. 6 No. 2, 2026, 6319–6331 e-ISSN 2798-0170

sample size was determined using the Slovin formula at a 5% margin of error, yielding a minimum required sample of 268 respondents. Probability sampling with a simple random sampling technique was used, giving every population member an equal chance of selection.

Research Location and Period

Data collection took place across the company's four housing developments in Parung, Babakan Madang, and Sukaraja sub-districts, Bogor Regency. The overall research process, from proposal preparation through thesis finalization, spanned March 2025 to January 2026.

Data Collection and Measurement

Primary data were collected through a closed-ended questionnaire using a five-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree), covering indicators of location (access, visibility, parking, competition, environment), price (affordability, price-quality congruence, price competitiveness, price-benefit conformity), promotion (advertising, sales promotion, personal selling, publicity), consumer satisfaction (conformity of expectations, interest in repurchase, willingness to recommend), and consumer loyalty (repeat purchase, resistance to competitor offers, recommendation behavior). Mean item scores were interpreted using a five-category scale ranging from "very good" (4.20–5.00) to "very poor" (1.00–1.79).

Data Analysis Technique

Data were analyzed using Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) with SmartPLS 3.0, a variance-based approach well suited to complex models with mediating relationships and modest sample sizes (Hair et al., 2017). The analysis proceeded through two stages. First, the measurement model (outer model) was evaluated for convergent validity (outer loading > 0.7 and Average Variance Extracted [AVE] > 0.5), discriminant validity (cross-loading), and reliability (Cronbach's alpha and Composite Reliability > 0.7) (Ghozali & Latan, 2019). Second, the structural model (inner model) was evaluated using the coefficient of determination (R^2), predictive relevance (Q^2), and hypothesis testing via bootstrapping, applying the criteria that a path is significant when the t-statistic exceeds 1.96 and the p-value is below 0.05.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Respondent Profile

Of the 268 respondents, 142 (53.0%) were female and 126 (47.0%) were male, indicating a slightly female-dominant buyer profile—consistent with the view that women often play a central role as household decision-makers

Vol. 6 No. 2, 2026, 6319–6331 e-ISSN 2798-0170

regarding comfort, safety, and long-term family needs (Griffin, 2020). By age, 119 respondents (44.4%) were 20–30 years old, 86 (32.1%) were 31–40, and 63 (23.5%) were 41–50, showing that young adults in the early family-formation stage of the consumer life cycle dominate the sample—consistent with the view that this cohort places high priority on securing housing as both a residence and a long-term financial asset.

Table 1
Respondent Profile (N = 268)

Characteristic	Category	n	%
Gender	Male	126	47.0
	Female	142	53.0
Age	20–30 years	119	44.4
	31–40 years	86	32.1
	41–50 years	63	23.5

Descriptive Analysis of Research Variables

Table 2 summarizes the overall mean scores and interpretive categories for each of the five constructs, based on aggregated responses across all indicator items.

Table 2
Descriptive Summary of Research Variables

Variable	Mean Score	Category
Location (X1)	4.18	Good
Price (X2)	4.12	Good
Promotion (X3)	4.24	Very Good
Consumer Satisfaction (Y)	4.17	Good
Consumer Loyalty (Z)	4.17	Good

Respondents rated the company's location strategy and pricing as "good," reflecting general satisfaction with accessibility and price-value congruence, while promotion received the highest rating ("very good"), suggesting that the company's advertising and informational campaigns are perceived as effective in shaping consumer awareness. Both satisfaction and loyalty were rated "good," indicating a generally favorable but not yet outstanding relationship between the company and its consumers—consistent with the fluctuating sales performance reported in the company's internal data.

Vol. 6 No. 2, 2026, 6319–6331 e-ISSN 2798-0170

Measurement Model (Outer Model) Evaluation

Convergent validity was assessed through AVE values, all of which exceeded the 0.5 threshold recommended by Hair et al. (2017), confirming that each latent construct's indicators explain more than half of the average indicator variance. Reliability was assessed through Cronbach's alpha and Composite Reliability (CR), both of which substantially exceeded the 0.7 benchmark, indicating strong internal consistency across all constructs.

Table 3
Convergent Validity and Reliability of Research Constructs

Latent Variable	AVE	Cronbach's Alpha	Composite Reliability
Location (X1)	0.625	0.957	0.961
Price (X2)	0.749	0.969	0.973
Promotion (X3)	0.620	0.956	0.961
Consumer Satisfaction (Y)	0.637	0.959	0.963
Consumer Loyalty (Z)	0.617	0.973	0.975

Discriminant validity, assessed via cross-loading comparisons, confirmed that each indicator loaded most strongly on its intended construct rather than on other latent variables, satisfying Hair et al.'s (2017) criterion for discriminant validity.

Structural Model (Inner Model) Evaluation

The coefficient of determination (R^2) for consumer satisfaction was 0.955, indicating that location, price, and promotion jointly explain 95.5% of the variance in satisfaction, with the remaining 4.5% attributable to factors outside the model. The R^2 for consumer loyalty was 0.972, meaning the exogenous and intervening variables together explain 97.2% of loyalty variance. The overall predictive relevance, $Q^2 = 1 - [(1 - 0.955)(1 - 0.972)] = 0.998$, indicates very strong predictive relevance for the structural model as a whole (Ghozali & Latan, 2019).

Table 4
Structural Model Fit Indices

Endogenous Variable	R^2	Interpretation
Consumer Satisfaction (Y)	0.955	Substantial
Consumer Loyalty (Z)	0.972	Substantial
Q^2 (predictive relevance)	0.998	Strong predictive relevance

Vol. 6 No. 2, 2026, 6319–6331 e-ISSN 2798-0170

Hypothesis Testing: Direct Effects

Bootstrapping results (Table 5) show that location, price, and promotion each exert a positive and statistically significant direct effect on consumer satisfaction (all t-statistics > 1.96; all p-values < 0.05). Location and price also exert positive and significant direct effects on consumer loyalty, as does satisfaction itself—which shows the strongest path coefficient in the model (1.113). Promotion, however, does not have a statistically significant direct effect on loyalty (t = 1.147, p = 0.252), even though its coefficient is positive.

Table 5
Summary of Direct-Effect Hypothesis Testing

Path	Path Coefficient	t-statistic	p-value	Conclusion
Location (X1) → Satisfaction (Y)	0.565	4.314	0.000	Significant
Price (X2) → Satisfaction (Y)	0.286	3.853	0.000	Significant
Promotion (X3) → Satisfaction (Y)	0.169	2.430	0.015	Significant
Location (X1) → Loyalty (Z)	0.503	4.115	0.000	Significant
Price (X2) → Loyalty (Z)	0.414	5.723	0.000	Significant
Promotion (X3) → Loyalty (Z)	0.080	1.147	0.252	Not significant
Satisfaction (Y) → Loyalty (Z)	1.113	9.177	0.000	Significant

These findings support H1, H2, H3, H4, H5, and H7, while H6 is not supported. The strong effect of location on satisfaction (0.565) is consistent with Tarigan et al. (2023) and with Tjiptono and Diana's (2020) view that accessibility and environmental convenience are central to purchase satisfaction in housing. The significant price–satisfaction relationship (0.286) aligns with Manik and Simatupang (2023) and with Zeithaml et al.'s (2018) argument that price functions as both a transaction cost and a quality signal. The significant, though comparatively smaller, promotion–satisfaction path (0.169) corroborates Muktar (2025) and Kotler and Keller's (2023) view that promotion builds informational clarity and trust that translate into short-term satisfaction gains.

The non-significant promotion–loyalty path is the most theoretically important direct-effect finding. It suggests that while promotional activities can attract initial interest and shape early perceptions, they are not, by themselves, sufficient to sustain long-term repurchase commitment once the initial purchase decision has been made—an interpretation consistent with Habibarrahman et al. (2022) and with Tjiptono's (2019) observation that promotion is primarily an attention- and interest-generating tool rather than a loyalty-building mechanism.

Vol. 6 No. 2, 2026, 6319–6331 e-ISSN 2798-0170

Loyalty, by contrast, appears to depend far more heavily on the consumer's actual satisfaction with location and price performance after the purchase.

Hypothesis Testing: Indirect Effects (Mediation)

Table 6 presents the specific indirect effects of location, price, and promotion on loyalty through satisfaction. All three indirect paths are positive and statistically significant, confirming that satisfaction functions as a significant mediating mechanism linking each marketing-mix variable to loyalty.

Table 6
Summary of Indirect-Effect (Mediation) Hypothesis Testing

Path	Indirect Effect	t-statistic	p-value	Conclusion
Location (X1) → Satisfaction (Y) → Loyalty (Z)	0.628	2.885	0.004	Significant
Price (X2) → Satisfaction (Y) → Loyalty (Z)	0.318	4.378	0.000	Significant
Promotion (X3) → Satisfaction (Y) → Loyalty (Z)	0.188	2.632	0.009	Significant

These results support H8, H9, and H10. Notably, the indirect effect of location on loyalty through satisfaction (0.628) exceeds its direct effect (0.503), and the same pattern holds for price (0.318 indirect vs. 0.414 direct, combining to a larger total effect) and, most strikingly, for promotion, whose only significant pathway to loyalty runs through satisfaction (0.188), since its direct effect on loyalty was non-significant. This pattern indicates that consumer satisfaction operates as a genuine intervening mechanism rather than a redundant statistical artifact: for promotion specifically, satisfaction is the sole channel through which marketing communication translates into loyalty. These findings are consistent with Sulistiy et al. (2024) and Yudianto et al. (2023), who likewise found that satisfaction substantially strengthens the marketing-mix–to–loyalty relationship, and with Susnita (2023), who confirmed satisfaction as the strongest proximate predictor of loyalty in a comparable service context.

Theoretical and Practical Implications

Theoretically, these findings extend the Expectation-Confirmation Theory (Oliver, 1980) into the residential property context by demonstrating that the confirmation or disconfirmation of expectations regarding location and price—more so than promotion—is the dominant satisfaction driver, which subsequently shapes loyalty in line with the behavioral logic of the Theory of Planned Behavior (Ajzen, 1991). Practically, the results suggest that PT Expert Jaya Group should prioritize sustained investment in strategic site development

Vol. 6 No. 2, 2026, 6319–6331 e-ISSN 2798-0170

and transparent, value-congruent pricing as the primary levers for building both satisfaction and loyalty, while treating promotional activity as a tool for generating initial interest and awareness rather than a stand-alone loyalty strategy. Given that satisfaction is the strongest single predictor of loyalty in the model (path coefficient 1.113), post-purchase service quality, complaint handling, and consistent fulfilment of promised product attributes should be treated as strategic priorities.

CONCLUSION

This study examined the direct and satisfaction-mediated effects of location, price, and promotion on consumer loyalty among 268 housing consumers of PT Expert Jaya Group in Bogor Regency, using PLS-SEM. The findings show that location, price, and promotion each have a positive and significant effect on consumer satisfaction, and that location, price, and satisfaction each have a positive and significant direct effect on consumer loyalty. Promotion, however, does not significantly affect loyalty directly; its influence on loyalty operates entirely through consumer satisfaction. All three exogenous variables also exert positive and significant indirect effects on loyalty through satisfaction, confirming satisfaction's role as a partial (for location and price) to full (for promotion) mediating variable within the model. The structural model demonstrated strong explanatory power ($R^2 = 0.955$ for satisfaction; $R^2 = 0.972$ for loyalty) and strong predictive relevance ($Q^2 = 0.998$).

These results underscore those that satisfaction is the pivotal construct linking a developer's marketing-mix decisions to long-term customer retention in the housing sector. For PT Expert Jaya Group and comparable developers, the practical implication is clear: strategic location selection and fair, competitive pricing should be treated as the foundational levers of both satisfaction and loyalty, while promotional investment should be calibrated to support—rather than substitute for—consistent product and service performance. Future research could extend this model by incorporating additional mediators such as trust or perceived value, testing it across multiple developers or regions, and employing longitudinal designs to capture how satisfaction–loyalty relationships evolve over the multi-year housing ownership cycle.

Vol. 6 No. 2, 2026, 6319–6331 e-ISSN 2798-0170

REFERENCES

Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *50*(2), 179–211. https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T

Ghozali, I., & Latan, H. (2019). *Partial least squares: Konsep, teknik dan aplikasi menggunakan program SmartPLS 3.0* (Edisi ke-3). Universitas Diponegoro.

Griffin, J. (2020). *Customer loyalty: How to earn it, how to keep it*. Erlangga.

Habibarrahman, M. F., Kusnadi, E., & Fandiyanto, R. (2022). Pengaruh promosi dan fasilitas terhadap loyalitas melalui variabel intervening kepuasan pengunjung pada Hotel Rengganis Pasir Putih Kabupaten Situbondo. *Jurnal Mahasiswa Enterpreneurship (JME)*, *1*(5). https://doi.org/10.36841/jme.v1i5.2144

Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2017). *A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM)* (Edisi ke-2). Sage Publications.

Kotler, P., & Armstrong, G. (2019). *Principles of marketing* (Edisi ke-17). Pearson.

Kotler, P., & Keller, K. L. (2023). *Marketing management* (Edisi ke-16). Pearson.

Lupiyoadi, R. (2021). *Manajemen pemasaran jasa*. Salemba Empat.

Lupiyoadi, R., & Hamdani, A. (2019). *Manajemen pemasaran jasa* (Edisi ke-2). Salemba Empat.

Manik, C. D., & Simatupang, Y. A. (2023). Pengaruh harga dan kualitas produk terhadap kepuasan konsumen pada PT Pava Mandiri Makmur Tangerang Selatan. *Jurnal Pemasaran, Keuangan dan Sumber Daya Manusia*, *3*(4). https://doi.org/10.32493/j.perkusi.v3i4.34650

Muktar, R. (2025). Pengaruh harga, lokasi fasilitas dan promosi terhadap kepuasan konsumen pada perumahan Villa Pertiwi. *Jurnal Manajemen Akuntansi*, *1*(3). https://doi.org/10.36987/jumsi.v1i3.3116

Mustakim, I., Pribadi, T., Amelia, W. R., Tarigan, E. D. S., & Alfifto. (2026). Pengaruh brand image dan harga terhadap loyalitas konsumen (Studi kasus pada Hotel Syariah Grand Jamee Medan). *Journal of Artificial Intelligence and Digital Business (RIGGS)*, *4*(4).

Oliver, R. L. (1980). A cognitive model of the antecedents and consequences of satisfaction decisions. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *17*(4), 460–469. https://doi.org/10.2307/3150499

Sugiyono. (2022). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif dan R&D*. Alfabeta.

Sulistiy, T. D., Nurbaeti, Mariati, S., Mumin, A. T., Doni, & Muhardiansyah. (2024). Pengaruh lokasi strategis dan kualitas pelayanan terhadap loyalitas pelanggan melalui kepuasan pelanggan pada Reddoorz near CBD Ciledug,

Vol. 6 No. 2, 2026, 6319–6331 e-ISSN 2798-0170

Kota Tangerang, Provinsi Banten. *Jurnal Bisnis Hospitaliti*, *13*(1).

Susnita, T. A. (2023). Pengaruh kualitas pelayanan dan kepuasan pelanggan terhadap loyalitas pelanggan pada Hotel Libra Kadipaten Kabupaten Majalengka. *Jurnal Institusi Politeknik Ganesha Medan*, *3*(1). https://doi.org/10.33395/juripol.v3i1.10485

Tarigan, S. P., Situmorang, M. K., & Munthe, R. G. (2023). Pengaruh harga, lokasi, dan fasilitas terhadap kepuasan konsumen pada perumahan Medan River Valley Residence. *Jurnal PERKUSI: Pemasaran, Keuangan dan Sumber Daya Manusia*, *2*(1).

Tjiptono, F. (2019). *Strategi pemasaran* (Edisi ke-4). Andi.

Tjiptono, F. (2021). *Strategi pemasaran*. Andi.

Tjiptono, F., & Diana, A. (2020). *Pemasaran*. Andi.

Wasiman, Silitonga, F., & Wibowo, A. E. (2022). Pengaruh kualitas pelayanan dan lokasi terhadap loyalitas pelanggan Hotel Bintang Dua di Kota Batam. *Jurnal Cafetaria*, *1*(2).

Yudianto, Martaleni, & Astuti, R. (2023). Pengaruh harga dan kualitas pelayanan terhadap loyalitas pelanggan dengan kepuasan pelanggan sebagai variabel intervening pada Savana Hotel & Convention Malang. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Bisnis*, *6*(2). https://doi.org/10.37479/jimb.v6i2.21958

Zeithaml, V. A., Bitner, M. J., & Gremler, D. D. (2018). *Services marketing: Integrating customer focus across the firm* (Edisi ke-7). McGraw-Hill Education.