e-ISSN: 3025-8189 ; p-ISSN: 3025-8197

LANCAH JURNAL INOVASI DAN TREN

doi.org/10.35870/ljit.v4i2.8997

Vol. 4, No. 2, 2026

PP. 2188-2200

Homepage http://www.journal.lembagakita.com/ljit

Understanding Customer Satisfaction in the Coffee Shop Industry through Service Quality and Product Quality

Fiqri Firmansyah[1], Herdian Farisi[2*]

Program in Retail Management, Faculty of Social Sciences and Technology, Universitas Medika Suherman, Indonesia [1,2]

*Corresponding Author's Email: hedianfarisi@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Submitted *10 15, 2026*
Accepted *11 06, 2026*
Published *11 29, 2026*

ABSTRACT

Customer satisfaction is a key determinant of competitiveness in the coffee shop industry, where both service encounters and product performance shape consumers' evaluations. This study examines the individual and joint effects of service quality and product quality on customer satisfaction among Kopi Kenangan customers in Bekasi City. A quantitative, cross-sectional survey was conducted with 210 repeat customers selected through purposive sampling. Data were collected using a five-point Likert-scale questionnaire and analyzed through multiple linear regression in SPSS. The findings reveal that service quality ($B = 0.615$; $\beta = 0.788$; $p < 0.001$) and product quality ($B = 0.124$; $\beta = 0.193$; $p < 0.001$) are positively and significantly associated with customer satisfaction. Their combined effect is also significant ($F = 1{,}839.395$; $p < 0.001$), with an adjusted R^2 of 0.946. Service quality demonstrates a stronger standardized coefficient than product quality, highlighting the importance of service responsiveness, order accuracy, and staff interactions in the grab-and-go coffee shop context. These findings suggest that managers should prioritize service improvement while maintaining consistent product standards.

Keywords: *Customer Satisfaction;Product Quality; Service Quality*

How to Cite:

Farisi, H., & Firmansyah, F. (2026). Understanding Customer Satisfaction in the Coffee Shop Industry through Service Quality and Product Quality. LANCAH: Jurnal Inovasi Dan Tren, 4(2), 2188-2200. https://journal.lembagakita.com/ljit/article/view/8997

Copyright @ 2026. Published by Lembaga Komunitas Informasi Teknologi Aceh (KITA), Indonesia. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0). Based on a work at http://journal.lembagakita.com/ljit

Abstract & Indexing CC BY-NC 4.0 OPEN ACCESS

INTRODUCTION

Coffee drinking and visiting coffee shops in Indonesia are closely linked to changes in urban lifestyle and consumer spending patterns. Pratiwi (2022) shows that coffee shops have become a common part of the lifestyle for young people in Surabaya. In addition, Rasmikayati et al. (2024) investigated how lifestyle and social surroundings influence coffee drinking habits in Indonesia. The coffee shop market has grown, leading to intensified competition among local coffee brands offering similar prices and a wide range of menu choices. Kopi Kenangan is a coffee brand that has expanded its business across Indonesia. In August 2024, the company reported having over 900 stores in Indonesia and shared a plan to establish 2,000 Kenangan Brands locations in the country by 2027 (Kopi Kenangan, 2024). Kopi Kenangan also uses a grab-and-go business model, which focuses on making purchases easy and fast for customers. However, the precise number of Kopi Kenangan outlets in Bekasi City and how each outlet arranges its seating must be verified through local sources.

Research on coffee shops shows that the overall customer experience comprises many interacting factors. Altun et al. (2025) analyzed 20,499 online reviews from customers of a coffee shop chain and identified six main themes that people discussed when sharing their experiences. These themes were product quality, atmosphere, customer service helpfulness, menu variety, shop location, and price relative to value received. Opoku et al. (2022) discussed how baristas and ambient scents in coffee shops affect customer revisit intentions at urban specialty coffee establishments. Vu et al. (2025) found that in Vietnam, consumers and coffee shop managers place different levels of importance on factors such as the physical environment, product quality and variety, service staff performance, and shop location. All three studies show that both product quality and service quality affect customer evaluations, but the importance of each varies across studies.

Customer satisfaction is commonly understood through expectancy-disconfirmation theory, introduced by Oliver (1980). This theory posits that satisfaction arises from the extent to which actual experience matches or differs from prior expectations. A meta-analysis of 150 research papers involving 58,597 participants found that disconfirmation is strongly associated with customer satisfaction (Schiebler et al., 2026). On the service side, Parasuraman et al. (1988) explain that service quality reflects a customer's perception of the gap between expected and experienced service. On this basis, service quality and product quality are two dimensions that consumers compare against their expectations.

There is evidence from various contexts demonstrating how service quality can exert an effect. Wattoo et al. (2025) discovered that different aspects of service quality enhance young customers' satisfaction with e-commerce in Pakistan. Chau et al. (2025) state that service quality serves as a pathway connecting corporate culture with customer satisfaction in food and beverage franchises in Vietnam. In Indonesia, Afrianingsih et al. (2024) examined how the quality of GrabFood drivers affects customer satisfaction in Banyumas Regency. Regarding product quality, Kosasih et al. (2024) found that good product quality enhances corporate customer satisfaction in the petrochemical industry, and Rashid and Rasheed (2024) observed the same positive effect in online shopping. Other factors such as price value and trade promotions have also been investigated in studies on retail and food delivery (Rakhmawati & Farisi, 2024; Sucipto et al., 2026). Thus, even if service and product quality are good, they do not fully determine overall customer satisfaction.

Studies on Kopi Kenangan customers in Indonesia often examine how product quality, marketing efforts, pricing, and service level affect customer satisfaction or loyalty in local contexts (Dalilah, 2023;

Utama et al., 2024). A study on Generation Z customers at Fore Coffee Surabaya showed that good service enhances customer satisfaction (Nesta, 2025). Conversely, research on local coffee shops found that service quality did not significantly affect customer satisfaction. Instead, factors such as coffee taste, store ambiance, and staff friendliness were the main drivers of customer satisfaction (Saputra et al., 2024). These mixed results indicate a research gap regarding the relative strength of service quality and product quality in grab-and-go coffee shops.

Operational issues can also be identified in the field through their symptoms. An initial review of Google reviews for the Kopi Kenangan store in Summarecon Mall Bekasi mentioned that one customer was dissatisfied because it took more than 30 minutes to prepare their drink. A single review does not reflect all outlets, but the complaint provides a sound rationale to investigate whether service speed and accuracy, as well as product consistency, are related to customer satisfaction. This study examines how service quality and product quality, both individually and jointly, are associated with the satisfaction of Kopi Kenangan customers in Bekasi City. Three hypotheses are proposed: first, service quality is positively associated with customer satisfaction (H1); second, product quality is positively associated with customer satisfaction (H2); and third, service quality and product quality together are positively associated with customer satisfaction (H3).

Previous Kopi Kenangan studies (Dalilah & Prawoto, 2023; Utama et al., 2024) have already examined product quality and service quality alongside other variables such as promotion, price perception, and loyalty, and studies in other coffee shop settings report mixed results on the role of service quality (Nesta, 2025; Saputra et al., 2024). What remains unanswered is how strongly service quality and product quality are each associated with satisfaction when both are placed in a single model for repeat customers of a grab-and-go brand, and how reliable such a comparison is when the two predictors are strongly correlated. This study addresses this question by estimating both predictors jointly and reporting standardized coefficients together with collinearity diagnostics. The contributions are therefore (a) theoretical, in providing evidence on the relative association of service quality and product quality with satisfaction in a grab-and-go context where findings elsewhere are inconsistent; (b) methodological, in transparently showing the limits of such a comparison under high multicollinearity; and (c) practical, in giving outlet managers information on the aspects (speed, accuracy, staff interaction) associated with satisfaction. Bekasi City is the research setting and is not claimed as the novelty of this study.

Expectancy-disconfirmation theory is used in this article only as an interpretive lens. Because expectations and disconfirmation were not measured, this study does not test the theory, and its role is limited to offering a possible explanation of the results. The article also reports instrument checks and classical assumption tests, including a VIF close to 10, so that readers can judge the extent to which conclusions about the relative importance of the two predictors are supported.

METHODS OF RESEARCH

This study uses a quantitative method with an associative-causal design and a cross-sectional measurement approach, meaning all variables were measured at the same time. Service quality (X1) and product quality (X2) are the independent variables, and consumer satisfaction (Y) is the dependent variable. Data were collected between April and September 2026 in the Bekasi City area. Kosasih et al. (2024) likewise used a structured questionnaire and a five-point Likert scale to assess corporate clients, although

they applied PLS-SEM rather than multiple regression, so the designs are comparable only in terms of data collection format.

The target population includes individuals aged 17 years or older who have purchased and consumed Kopi Kenangan products at stores in Bekasi City and have made at least two purchases in the past one to two months. Because the exact population size was unknown, a non-probability purposive sampling method was employed. This method helped the researchers select respondents who met the predetermined criteria. Because no sampling frame was available, the results cannot be generalized to all Kopi Kenangan customers. Based on Hair et al. (2019), the minimum sample size was determined using a ratio of five to ten observations per indicator item. This rule of thumb is more common for factor analysis and SEM than for multiple regression, and no a priori power analysis was conducted. The study used an instrument with 30 questions and applied a multiplier of seven, resulting in a minimum requirement of 210 participants (30 × 7). This requirement was exactly met, as exactly 210 completed responses passed the screening questions and proceeded to the final analysis. This sample size is very similar to the 200 valid responses collected by Kosasih et al. (2024) and the 197 respondents surveyed by Rashid and Rasheed (2024), although the analytic approaches differed (PLS-SEM in Kosasih et al., 2024).

Measurement Instrument and Operationalization

Primary data were gathered via Google Forms using a five-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). Service quality (X_1) was operationalized through 12 items adapting the classic SERVQUAL dimensions, namely tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy (Parasuraman et al., 1988). Product quality (X_2) was measured using 10 items capturing physical and qualitative product attributes, with product quality dimensions drawn from Tjiptono and Chandra (2016) as cited in Marie and Budi (2020). Consumer satisfaction (Y) was evaluated through eight items addressing post-purchase satisfaction with the product, the service, payment methods, value relative to cost, and the overall experience, with the conceptual basis taken from Kotler as cited in Marie and Budi (2020). The structural framework of variables, items, and indicators is detailed in Table 1.

Table 1. Operationalization of Research Variables and Indicators

Variabel	Item	Indicator
Quality of service (X_1)	12	Speed of serving and serving orders, problem resolution, response to complaints, knowledge of products, friendliness and courtesy, concern for consumers, neat and professional appearance, neatness and cleanliness of the outlet
Product quality (X_2)	10	Taste, aroma, toppings or complements, variety of menus, guaranteed and hygienic raw materials, packaging design
Consumer satisfaction (Y)	8	Product satisfaction, excellent service, payment methods, ease of ordering, customer experience

(Source: Processed from research instruments, 2026)

Data Processing and Statistical Diagnostics

Before the formal evaluation, screening questions were asked to verify whether respondents met the repeat-purchase criteria. Those who did not meet the criteria were excluded from the evaluation. The final dataset was carefully checked to ensure completeness, proper numerical coding, and consistency. All statistical calculations were performed using IBM SPSS Statistics version 25. To assess construct validity, Pearson's product-moment correlation was used; thus, validity was assessed only through item-total

correlation. With 210 data points and a significance level of 0.05, the critical r-value from the table is 0.135. The calculated values needed to be higher than this to show a significant relationship. Internal consistency reliability was checked using Cronbach's alpha, and a criterion of α greater than 0.60 was applied in the analysis; all coefficients also exceed the stricter benchmark of 0.70 (Hair et al., 2019).

A comprehensive set of tests was conducted to verify the basic assumptions of the ordinary least squares regression model. This diagnostic step involved the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test to check whether residuals were normally distributed (criterion: Asymp. Sig ≥ 0.05). The Glejser test was performed to detect heteroskedasticity, using a significance level greater than 0.05 as the criterion. Multicollinearity was assessed using a tolerance level higher than 0.10 and a Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) lower than 10. While a VIF limit of 10 is common in consumer research (Kosasih et al., 2024), methodological reviews suggest that this threshold is merely a general guideline (O'Brien, 2007). They also note that having VIF values under 10 does not always mean there is no multicollinearity, especially if the model is not perfectly specified (Kalnins & Praitis Hill, 2025). Therefore, multicollinearity tests were carefully reviewed alongside the size of the correlation values between predictor variables.

At last, the structural hypotheses were checked using a multiple linear regression model.

$$\mathbf{Y = \alpha + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \varepsilon} \quad \textbf{(1)}$$

In this equation, Y represents customer satisfaction. α is a constant, while β_1 and β_2 are coefficients indicating how much service quality (X_1) and product quality (X_2) are associated with customer satisfaction. ε is a random error term that accounts for other factors that might influence satisfaction but are not included in the model. To test the partial associations (H1 and H2), partial t-tests were used. An F-test was conducted to examine the combined association (H3), and the R-squared value was used to assess overall predictive ability, all at a 5% significance level.

RESULTS

1) Respondent Characteristics and Perception of Variables

Data were collected from 210 respondents who met the research criteria. Table 2 summarizes their profiles by gender, age, and occupation.

Table 2. Characteristics of Respondents (N = 210)

Features	Groups	Quantity	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	79	**37.6**
	Female	131	**62.4**
Age	17–23 years old	71	33.8
	24–30 years	69	32.9
	31–37 years old	43	20.5
	≥ 38 years old	27	12.9
Jobs	Private employees	81	38.6
	University students	52	24.8
	Self-employed	44	21.0

Features	Groups	Quantity	Percentage (%)
	School students	23	11.0
	Teachers	4	1.9
	Others (freelancers, civil servants, housewives, affiliates)	6	2.9
Total		**210**	**100**

(Source: Primary data processed, 2026)

Female respondents totaled 131 people (62.4%) and male respondents 79 people (37.6%). The age group of 17–23 years (33.8%) and 24–30 years (32.9%) together reached 66.7%, so the sample was dominated by young consumers under 31 years old. Private employees were the largest occupational group (38.6%), followed by university students (24.8%) and self-employed (21.0%). This profile is natural for brands targeting urban workers and students, but the research findings are more representative of young people than all consumers of Kopi Kenangan.

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics, Validity, and Reliability of Instruments

Variabel	Item	Min–max score	Total average	Average for Item	Range r calculation	α Cronbach
Quality of service (X_1)	12	16–60	49.78	4.15	0.846–0.903	0.972
Product quality (X_2)	10	13–50	41.78	4.18	0.860–0.886	0.966
Consumer satisfaction (Y)	8	12–40	33.68	4.21	0.828–0.893	0.955

(Source: Primary data processed, 2026; r table = 0.135)

The average score per item for all three variables was in the range of 4.15 to 4.21 on a maximum scale of 5, so respondents tended to agree and even almost strongly agree with the questionnaire's statements. The wide range of minimum and maximum scores indicates that the experience between consumers remains variable. All 30 items met the item-total correlation criterion (r count 0.828–0.903, well above the table r 0.135) and all three are reliable scales (α 0.955–0.972, beyond the 0.60 criterion and the stricter 0.70 benchmark). Such a high alpha value indicates strong consistency, as shown in Table 1.

2) Classic Assumption Test

Table 4. Classical Assumption Test Results

Test	Variabel	Results
Normality (Kolmogorov-Smirnov)	Residual	Statistics uji 0.057; Asymp. Sig. 0.200
Multikolinearitas	X_1 and X_2	Tolerance 0.103; VIF 9.682
Heteroscedasticity (Glejser)	X_1	t = −0,234; Sig. 0,815
	X_2	t = 0,201; Sig. 0,841

(Source: Primary data processed, 2026)

The residual model was normally distributed (K-S = 0.057; Asymp. Sig. = 0.200), and the Glejser test found no symptoms of heteroscedasticity (Sig. 0.815 for X_1 and 0.841 for X_2). *A tolerance* of 0.103 and a VIF of 9.682 were formally qualified, but the values were very close to the limit. Since the model contained only two predictors, the two variables had identical *tolerance* and VA; the VIF value was

equivalent to a correlation of about 0.95 between quality of service and product quality (calculated from 1 − 1/VIF). Consequently, the coefficients of each variable need to be interpreted carefully, as outlined in the discussion.

3) Regression Results and Hypothesis Testing

Table 5. Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

Variabel	B	Std. error	b	t	Say.	Verdict
(Constant)	1.805	0.536	–	–	0.001	–
Quality of service (X_1)	0.615	0.039	0.788	15.795	< 0.001	H1 accepted
Product quality (X_2)	0.124	0.032	0.193	3.863	< 0.001	H2 accepted

(Source: Primary data processed, 2026; bound variable: consumer satisfaction; t table, df = 207: 1.9716)

Table 6. F Test Results and Coefficient of Determination

Statistics	Value	Remarks
Calculated F hitung ($df_1 = 2$; $df_2 = 207$)	1,839.395	Beyond F table (± 3.04); Sig. < 0.001; H3 accepted
R	0.973	Strong relationships
R^2	0.947	
Adjusted R^2	0.946	Both variables explain 94.6% of satisfaction variations
Std. error of the estimate	1.524	

(Sumber: Data primer diolah, 2026)

The regression equation obtained was $Y = 1.805 + 0.615X_1 + 0.124X_2 + \varepsilon$. An increase of one unit in the quality of service score was associated with an increase in the satisfaction score of 0.615 units with product quality considered fixed, while an increase in one unit of product quality score was associated with an increase in satisfaction of 0.124 units with service quality considered fixed. Both coefficients were positive and significant (t = 15.795 and t = 3.863; both $p < 0.001$ and exceeded t table 1.9716), so H1 and H2 were accepted. The F test yielded a value of 1,839.395 ($p < 0.001$), so H3 was also accepted. An adjusted R^2 of 0.946 means that both variables explain 94.6% of the satisfaction variation, and the remaining 5.4% comes from factors outside the model.

DISCUSSION

1) The Association between Service Quality and Consumer Satisfaction

The standardized coefficient for service quality (β = 0.788) is much higher than that for product quality (β = 0.193). For Kopi Kenangan customers in Bekasi, service speed, staff friendliness and alertness, order accuracy, complaint handling, and shop cleanliness appear to be more strongly associated with satisfaction than the quality of the drink itself. This comparison must be interpreted cautiously due to the severe multicollinearity between the two predictors (VIF = 9.682). The grab-and-go concept keeps staff interactions brief and straightforward, making any mistake or delay in the order highly noticeable.

This pattern can be tentatively interpreted using EDT, as proposed by Oliver (1980). EDT is used here only as an interpretive lens; expectations and disconfirmation were not measured in this study, so this interpretation was not empirically tested. Drinks prepared using standard methods yield similar taste experiences for customers, which means the likelihood of customers feeling either highly satisfied or highly dissatisfied with product quality is relatively low. Service depends on the staff on duty and the number of

customers waiting in line at that moment, making outcomes more variable and more likely to exceed or fall below expectations. The strong association between disconfirmation and satisfaction found in the meta-analysis by Schiebler et al. (2026) makes this explanation plausible, even though that study did not directly measure expectations or disconfirmation.

There are also usage-related reasons. In-store and mobile app orders typically take time to prepare, and this waiting period is part of the service, not the product itself. When the order arrives after the promised time, customers perceive a worse experience, even though the drink tastes the same as before. Complaints about drinks taking more than 30 minutes to prepare, identified in the initial review, are consistent with this situation, but a single review is insufficient to draw definitive conclusions.

These results align with several recent studies. Wattoo et al. (2025) state that service quality enhances young customers' satisfaction, and that satisfaction helps build loyalty. Chau et al. (2025) found that in food and beverage franchise businesses in Vietnam, service quality serves as a pathway through which corporate culture affects customer satisfaction. In coffee shops, Opoku et al. (2022) stated that baristas play a key role in creating specialty coffee experiences, and Vu et al. (2025) included service staff performance and interaction as part of the coffee shop experience model. Altun et al. (2025) also mentioned that customer service is one of six main themes in the experience of chain coffee shops. In Indonesia, similar findings on service quality were reported by Generation Z customers of Fore Coffee (Nesta, 2025) and by Kopi Kenangan customers (Dalilah & Prawoto, 2023).

The results from other studies were not entirely consistent. Saputra et al. (2024) found that in local coffee shops, service quality did not significantly affect customer satisfaction; instead, atmosphere, staff friendliness, and coffee quality made a noticeable difference. This discrepancy might be because the model treats employee mood and behavior as separate constructs, or because of the type of shop that provides seating. In grab-and-go establishments like Kopi Kenangan, there is less opportunity to create a distinctive atmosphere, making quick service the primary factor. These explanations regarding the grab-and-go format are speculative, as they were not empirically tested in this study.

For management, these results mean training for frontline staff that emphasizes quick service, correct order preparation, and managing customer complaints, using clear but flexible service steps. Waiting time complaints at Summarecon Mall Bekasi can serve as a real starting point.

2) The Association between Product Quality and Consumer Satisfaction

Product quality was positively and significantly associated with satisfaction ($B = 0.124$; $\beta = 0.193$; $p < 0.001$), but the strength of the association was much lower than that of service quality. Improvements in taste, aroma, menu variety, ingredient hygiene, and packaging were still associated with higher satisfaction, but not as strongly as service quality.

Many consumers today regard good taste as a baseline expectation rather than a differentiating factor. This aligns with the findings of Altun et al. (2025), where product quality is one of the six main aspects of the experience. However, dissatisfaction often stems from price, perceived value, atmosphere, and menu variety. When product quality is a baseline requirement, its impact on differences in customer satisfaction becomes less noticeable. This interpretation should be considered alongside the limitations mentioned in the Limitations section, because when two predictors are highly correlated, the unique effect of one may appear less important than its overall effect.

Kosasih et al. (2024) also found that good product quality has a positive effect on customer satisfaction, specifically among corporate customers in the petrochemical industry. Similarly, Rashid &

Rasheed (2024) studied product satisfaction in e-commerce in Pakistan and reported the same positive impact of product quality on customer satisfaction. In coffee shops, Vu et al. (2025) pointed out that the quality and range of products are one of the factors that both customers and managers look at. Opoku et al. (2022) also said that the smell of the coffee plays a big role in the overall experience of drinking specialty coffee, which connects to the aroma factors discussed in this study. In Indonesia, Utama et al. (2024) connected product quality with customer loyalty for Kopi Kenangan, and Saputra et al. (2024) discovered that coffee quality greatly influences customer satisfaction at local coffee shops.

The difference in size shows up when these results are looked at compared to other studies where product quality is considered the most important factor. Kosasih et al. (2024) discovered that product quality was the only factor directly linked to customer satisfaction among the three factors they examined, in an industry that depends on safe and reliable products. Perdomo-Verdecia et al. (2024), studied a five-star hotel in Cuba using fsQCA and discovered that the quality of food in a special restaurant played a key role in customer satisfaction across three different situations. In both cases, the product is central to the experience or its failure could be very risky, but in ready-to-eat coffee drinks that follow standard methods and involve less consumer attention, the product is seen as just a basic need. This explanation is based on guesswork because it wasn't actually tested in this study.

In real situations, taste standards must still be kept the same by following usual methods, because a drop in quality can lead to unwanted negative reactions. This statement about taste standards is also speculative and was not empirically tested. Menu innovation should be seen as something that supports and adds value to the service strategy, rather than replacing it.

3) Joint Association, Theoretical Implications, and Factors Outside the Model

The F-test ($F = 1{,}839.395$; $p < 0.001$) indicated that the two variables together were significantly associated with satisfaction, with an adjusted R^2 of 0.946. By comparison, the PLS-SEM model developed by Kosasih et al. (2024) accounted for only 4.4% of the variation in corporate customer satisfaction, although it used a different analytic approach and population. An adjusted R^2 of up to 94.6% must be interpreted cautiously. There are four possible reasons: first, all three variables were collected from the same group of respondents in a single survey; second, the two predictors were very similar in meaning and had a correlation of approximately 0.95; third, the sample was relatively homogeneous, consisting mainly of young people from one city; and fourth, the satisfaction items for product and service satisfaction overlap conceptually with product quality and service quality, making the relationship close to tautological. Kalnins and Praitis Hill (2025) warn that a VIF below the usual threshold does not always mean there is no multicollinearity issue. Instead, the difference in β weights between the two variables is better interpreted as a clue rather than a definitive answer. With a VIF of 9.682, the B and β estimates of each predictor may be unstable; therefore, the conclusion that service quality is more dominant cannot be substantiated by this model alone, and the magnitude of the coefficients should not be framed as definitive evidence of a causal relationship. Supporting analyses such as simple regressions for each variable, hierarchical regression, or dominance/relative importance analysis were not conducted in this study and are recommended for future research.

From a theory point of view, these findings are compatible with the thought that after using something, people think about it in a full way: they compare what they thought would happen with what actually happened in the same experience (Oliver, 1980; Schiebler et al., 2026). However, because expectations and disconfirmation were not measured, the findings do not test EDT. Other research also

shows that satisfaction comes from multiple factors at the same time. For example, Chau et al. (2025) looked at satisfaction in food and beverage franchise services, Wattoo et al. (2025) studied it in online shopping services, and Kosasih et al. (2024) focused on the petrochemical industry. The main point of this study is to compare the associations of the two predictors with satisfaction in a network of quick coffee shops in Indonesia.

Table 7. Comparison with Referenced Recent Studies

Study	Context	Relevant findings
Wattoo et al. (2025)	Online shopping, young Pakistani customers	The quality dimension of service increases satisfaction, which leads to loyalty
Chau et al. (2025)	Food and beverage franchise, Vietnam	Service quality is the path from company culture to satisfaction
Kosasih et al. (2024)	Petrochemical Corporate Customer, Indonesia	Product quality has a significant effect on satisfaction and loyalty
Rashid & Rasheed (2024)	Electronic commerce, Pakistan	Product quality and information quality have a positive effect on product satisfaction
Altun et al. (2025)	Online reviews of coffee shop networks	Products and services include six themes; dissatisfaction stems a lot from price, atmosphere, and variety of menus
Saputra et al. (2024)	Local coffee shops, Indonesia	The quality of coffee, atmosphere, and attitude of employees is significant; service quality is not significant
This research	Kopi Kenangan, Bekasi City	Service ($\beta = 0.788$) and product ($\beta = 0.193$) are equally significant; greater service

(Source: Summary of referenced studies and primary data processed, 2026)

Table 7 shows where these results stand in comparison to the studies that were referenced. The positive influence stayed the same in most situations, but how much each service and product mattered changed based on the industry type, how much customers cared about the purchase, and other factors in the model. The most clear thing is that the importance of the two factors can't just be moved from one situation to another.

The rest of the 5.4% difference is probably because there are other factors that haven't been included in the model yet. Altun et al. (2025) mentioned that high prices, poor atmosphere, and limited menu choices were reasons for customer dissatisfaction. The studies in retail and food delivery look at how price values and what customers think about prices (Gredenggo et al., 2024; Rakhmawati & Farisi, 2024) as well as how promotions and price differences affect things (Sucipto et al., 2026). These variables should be considered for future studies.

For outlet management, the implications are integrated. Product standards are kept the same through usual steps when making drinks, but it may be worthwhile to direct extra resources to improve the skills of the people who serve customers because the service quality coefficient was larger, bearing in mind the caution above. Concrete steps involve setting a specific serving time goal for each location, verifying that orders are correct before giving them to customers, and having clear ways to handle complaints, whether from people shopping in the store or those using the app. To make sure these steps work, we should check their success regularly by doing satisfaction surveys, not just relying on occasional online reviews.

CONCLUSION

Service quality and product quality were both positively and significantly associated with customer satisfaction with Kopi Kenangan in Bekasi City. Together, they accounted for 94.6% of the variation in customer satisfaction. The service quality coefficient (B = 0.615; β = 0.788) was larger than that of product quality (B = 0.124; β = 0.193), suggesting that speed, accuracy, and friendly service deserve attention while maintaining consistent product standards. Because the design is cross-sectional and survey-based, these findings indicate statistical associations rather than causal relationships, and they are limited by purposive sampling in a single city. Future research should investigate other factors that might influence customer satisfaction, such as overall experience, perceived value, brand image, and customer loyalty, to gain a more comprehensive understanding of customer satisfaction in the coffee shop industry.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

The first author contributed to conceptualization, methodology, data collection, formal analysis, and writing the original draft. The second author contributed to supervision, validation, critical review, and editing of the manuscript. Both authors reviewed and approved the final version of the manuscript and agreed to be accountable for all aspects of the work.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest related to this study. The research was independently funded by the authors using personal funds, with no financial support from external organizations that could have influenced the research process, results, or interpretation.

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE (AI) USE STATEMENT

In preparing this article, the authors used artificial intelligence (AI) tools to assist in adapting the original thesis into a journal article, editing the language, and improving the manuscript's structure. AI was not used to generate or manipulate research data or to conduct data analysis. The authors reviewed and verified the manuscript's content and references and take full responsibility for the accuracy of the information presented, the interpretation of the research findings, and the scientific integrity of the manuscript.

REFERENCES

Afrianingsih, F., Farisi, H., & Safitri, A. (2024). Pengaruh kualitas pelayanan jasa driver GrabFood terhadap kepuasan pelanggan (Studi di Kabupaten Banyumas). *Jurnal Dinamika Ekonomi & Bisnis, 21*(2), 195–208. https://doi.org/10.34001/jdeb.v21i2.7128

Altun, Ö., Saydam, M. B., & Günay, T. (2025). Unraveling customer experiences in chain coffee shops through online reviews. *British Food Journal, 127*(6), 1895–1909. https://doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-11-2024-1160

Chau, D. T. L., Nguyen, L. T., & Huynh, L. G. (2025). Relationship between corporate culture, service quality, and customer satisfaction of food and beverage franchise enterprises. *F1000Research, 14*, Artikel 267. https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.154431.1

Dalilah, N., & Prawoto, P. (2023). Pengaruh kualitas produk, promosi dan kualitas pelayanan terhadap kepuasan pelanggan di Kopi Kenangan. *MAMEN: Jurnal Manajemen, 2*(2), 186–197. https://doi.org/10.55123/mamen.v2i2.1774

Gredenggo, A. F., Farisi, H., & Safitri, A. (2024). Pengaruh mediasi sikap terhadap niat beli halal: Studi tentang halal kesadaran, pengetahuan, dan religiusitas. *Jurnal Riset Ilmu Ekonomi dan Bisnis*, *4*(2), 159–166. https://doi.org/10.29313/jrieb.v4i2.5450

Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2019). *Multivariate data analysis* (Edisi ke-8). Cengage. https://books.google.co.id/books?id=0R9ZswEACAAJ

Kalnins, A., & Praitis Hill, K. (2025). Additional caution regarding rules of thumb for variance inflation factors: Extending O'Brien to the context of specification error. *Quality & Quantity*, *59*(1), 291–314. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-024-01980-0

Kopi Kenangan. (2024, 27 Agustus). *Genap berusia 7 tahun, Kopi Kenangan umumkan pencapaian dan rencana ekspansi internasional selanjutnya*. https://kopikenangan.com/news/genap-berusia-7-tahun-kopi-kenangan-umumkan-pencapaian-dan-rencana-ekspansi-internasional-selanjutnya

Kosasih, O., Hidayat, K., Hutahayan, B., & Sunarti. (2024). Achieving sustainable customer loyalty in the petrochemical industry: The effect of service innovation, product quality, and corporate image with customer satisfaction as a mediator. *Sustainability*, *16*(16), Artikel 7111. https://doi.org/10.3390/su16167111

Marie, A. L., & Budi, A. (2020). Analisis pengaruh kualitas produk terhadap kepuasan pelanggan Kopi Kenangan The Breeze, Bumi Serpong Damai. *Jurnal Ilmiah Pariwisata*, *25*(2), 99–107. https://doi.org/10.30647/jip.v25i2.1341

Nesta, G. (2025). Service quality and consumer satisfaction at Fore Coffee: A Generation Z study in Surabaya. *Journal of Law and Economics*, *4*(2), 73–81. https://doi.org/10.56347/jle.v4i2.280

O'Brien, R. M. (2007). A caution regarding rules of thumb for variance inflation factors. *Quality & Quantity*, *41*(5), 673–690. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-006-9018-6

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/10.1177/002224378001700405

Opoku, E. K., Tham, A., Morrison, A. M., & Wang, M. S. (2022). An exploratory study of the experiencescape dimensions and customer revisit intentions for specialty urban coffee shops. *British Food Journal*, *125*(5), 1613–1630. https://doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-04-2022-0361

Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1988). SERVQUAL: A multiple-item scale for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality. *Journal of Retailing, 64*(1), 12–40. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14579729

Perdomo-Verdecia, V., Garrido-Vega, P., & Sacristán-Díaz, M. (2024). An fsQCA analysis of service quality for hotel customer satisfaction. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *122*, Artikel 103793. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2024.103793

Pratiwi, R. W. (2022). Persepsi anak muda di Surabaya mengenai coffee shop sebagai gaya hidup masyarakat perkotaan. *Commercium, 5*(2), 238–248. https://doi.org/10.26740/tc.v5i2.47850

Rakhmawati, N., & Farisi, H. (2024). The influence of price value on consumer purchase intention on the food delivery application with the attitude variable as mediation. *Jurnal Akuntansi, Manajemen Dan Ekonomi*, *26*(4), 27–34. https://doi.org/10.32424/1.jame.2024.26.4.13568

Rashid, D. A., & Rasheed, D. R. (2024). Logistics service quality and product satisfaction in e-commerce. *SAGE Open*, *14*(1), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440231224250

Rasmikayati, E., Ernah, Hapsari, H., Hanipradja, R. A. S. A., & Saefudin, B. R. (2024). Pengaruh gaya hidup dan peran lingkungan sosial pada perilaku konsumsi kopi. *Jurnal Pertanian Agros*, *26*(1), 4526–4537. https://doi.org/10.37159/jpa.v26i1.3801

Saputra, R. H., Mariam, S., & Ramli, A. H. (2024). The effect of service quality and customer satisfaction on customer loyalty in coffee shop. *JIMKES (Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Kesatuan)*, *12*(5), 1697–1714. https://doi.org/10.37641/jimkes.v12i5.2824

Schiebler, T., Lee, N., & Brodbeck, F. C. (2026). Expectancy-disconfirmation and consumer satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, *54*(1), 91–112. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-024-01078-x

Sucipto, A., Rosadi, R., Muyasar, R., & Farisi, H. (2026). How trade promotion and price margins drive retailers procurement decisions in the digital distribution era. *Journal of Principles Management and Business*, *5*(1), 67–82. https://doi.org/10.55657/jpmb.v5i01.320

Tjiptono, F., & Chandra, G. (2016). Service, quality & satisfaction (4th ed.). Andi.

Utama, W. P., Andhika, B. R. D., Fahrian, A. R., & Luthfiyah, S. (2024). Pengaruh kualitas produk, layanan dan persepsi harga terhadap loyalitas pelanggan Kopi Kenangan. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen dan Bisnis*, *3*(2), 130–138. https://doi.org/10.24034/jimbis.v3i2.6291

Vu, O. T. K., Alonso, A. D., Tran, T. D., Martens, W., Do, L., Nguyen, T. T., Atay, E., & Akbari, M. (2025). Coffee culture unravelled: Exploring the coffee shop experience model in the Vietnamese context. *Tourism Recreation Research*, *50*(3), 459–477. https://doi.org/10.1080/02508281.2023.2295621

Wattoo, M. U., Du, J., Shahzad, F., & Kousar, S. (2025). Shaping e-commerce experiences: Unraveling the impact of service quality on youth customer behavior in a developing nation. *SAGE Open*, *15*(1), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440241311786