Volume 4 Number 2 (2026)
July-December 2026
Page: 951-970

Journal of Creative Power and Ambition (JCPA)
https://edujavare.com/index.php/jcpa
E-ISSN: 3031-4054
DOI: 10.70610/jcpa.1734

The Influence of Service Quality, Business Location, Products and Trust on Customer Satisfaction of Micro Businesses in the Culinary Sector in Bima City

Nurlaila[1], muhammad rizkan[2], syafruddin[3], khas sukma mulya[4]

Universitas Muhammadiyah Bima; Indonesia
* Correspondence e-mail; nurlailaruslan5@gmail.com, riji.umbima@gmail.com, syafruddinmuhtartahir@gmail.com, khassukma.se@gmail.com

Article history Submitted: 2026/04/01; Revised: 2026/05/11; Accepted: 2026/07/23

Abstract

This study aims to analyze the influence of service quality, business location, product, and trust on customer satisfaction for micro-enterprises in the culinary sector in Bima City. The study employs a quantitative approach using a survey method involving 96 respondents selected through purposive sampling. Data were collected via questionnaires using a Likert scale and analyzed using multiple linear regression with the aid of SPSS. As the residual normality test results did not meet the assumption of normality, parameter significance testing was conducted using the bootstrapping method. The results indicate that, individually, service quality and trust do not have a significant effect on customer satisfaction, whereas business location and product have a positive and significant effect. Simultaneously, service quality, business location, product, and trust significantly influence customer satisfaction ($F = 53.788$; $Sig. < 0.001$). The Adjusted R-squared (R^2) value of 0.690 indicates that 69% of the variation in customer satisfaction can be explained by the four research variables, while the remaining 31% is influenced by factors outside the research model. These findings suggest that business location and product quality are the dominant factors in enhancing customer satisfaction for culinary micro-enterprises in Bima City.

Keywords Service Quality, Business Location, Product, Trust, Customer Satisfaction, Culinary Micro-Business Sector

INTRODUCTION

Bima City's culinary micro-enterprises are one of the rapidly growing MSME sectors and play an important role in improving the economic welfare of the community. Culinary micro-enterprises are small-scale businesses engaged in the processing, sales, and service of food and beverages with limited capital and labor. These types of businesses include food stalls, coffee shops, traditional snacks, fast

food, catering, and various home-cooked food and beverage businesses. Micro-enterprises are one of the most important pillars of the national economy, which have a strategic role in creating jobs and improving the welfare of the community. The definition of Micro-enterprises is indirectly included in the definition of small businesses based on Law No. 9 of 1995, but is specifically defined as follows: Micro-enterprises are small-scale, traditional and informal economic activities of the people in the sense that they are not registered, not recorded, and not yet legally incorporated. The annual sales proceeds of the business are a maximum of IDR 100,000,000.00 (one hundred million rupiah), and are owned by Indonesian citizens. According to Law No. 20 of 2008 Article 1 paragraph (1), Micro Enterprises are productive businesses owned by individuals or individual business entities that meet the following criteria:

Having a maximum net worth of Rp50,000,000.00 (fifty million rupiah) excluding land and buildings for business premises and having annual sales of Rp300,000,000.00 (three hundred million rupiah). According to the Central Statistics Agency (BPS), the definition of micro-enterprises is based on the quantity of labor.

Table 1. Number of Micro-Businesses in the Culinary Sector in Bima City

No	Unit	Year	Number of Culinary Micro Enterprises
1.	Unit	2019	534
2.	Unit	2020	1907
3.	Unit	2021	1907
4.	Unit	2022	2290

Source: Bima City Government Portal Data 2022

The culinary micro-enterprise sector has become one of the most dynamic contributors to regional economic development in Indonesia, particularly in Bima City. According to data published by the Bima City Cooperatives, Industry, and Trade Office (Dinas Koperasi, Perindustrian, dan Perdagangan Kota Bima) through the Bima City Government Data Portal, the number of culinary micro-enterprises increased substantially between 2019 and 2022. In 2019, there were approximately 534 culinary micro-enterprises, which increased dramatically to 1,907 enterprises in 2020, representing a growth of approximately 257.2%. The number remained stable in 2021 before increasing again to 2,290 enterprises in 2022, reflecting an additional

growth of 20.8%. This remarkable increase demonstrates that the culinary industry has become one of the fastest-growing sectors in Bima City, contributing significantly to employment creation, local income generation, and regional economic development. However, the rapid growth of the industry has also intensified market competition, requiring business owners to continuously improve their competitiveness by enhancing customer satisfaction.

Customer satisfaction has become a key indicator of business success because satisfied customers are more likely to make repeat purchases, recommend products to others, and develop long-term loyalty. Previous studies have consistently identified several determinants of customer satisfaction, including service quality, business location, product quality, and customer trust. According to Rozi and Khuzaini (2021), service quality reflects the ability of businesses to meet or exceed customer expectations through reliable, responsive, and professional services, thereby increasing customer satisfaction. High-quality service not only fulfills customer needs but also strengthens positive perceptions of a business and encourages long-term relationships.

In addition to service quality, business location plays a crucial role in influencing consumer purchasing decisions and satisfaction. Widodo Ismanto et al. (2021) reported that strategic business locations significantly improve customer satisfaction because they provide easier accessibility and greater convenience for consumers. Likewise, Wibowo et al. (2025) found that businesses located in easily accessible areas with good visibility, adequate parking facilities, and comfortable surroundings tend to receive more positive customer evaluations and higher visitation rates. These findings indicate that location is an essential competitive factor, particularly for culinary businesses operating in highly competitive environments.

Product quality is another important determinant of customer satisfaction. Consumers increasingly demand products that provide superior quality, safety, and value for money. According to Oscar and Megantara (2020), product quality is a major consideration influencing consumer purchasing decisions, while Kotler and Armstrong (2017) define a product as a solution designed to satisfy customer needs and solve consumer problems. Consequently, culinary businesses must consistently maintain product quality, ensure food safety, and continuously innovate their menus to remain competitive. Food safety has become increasingly important because consumers are becoming more aware of the health implications of food consumption.

Widiyaningsih (2018) emphasized that food safety is a fundamental requirement for protecting consumer health and increasing confidence in food products.

Another important factor affecting customer satisfaction is customer trust. According to Saputri (2025), customer trust is built through positive purchasing experiences, consistent product quality, honesty, and transparency in business transactions. Strong customer trust contributes to customer loyalty, repeat purchases, and sustainable business relationships. Furthermore, Khoiriyah and Habib (2024) argued that culinary business owners must continuously fulfill customer expectations to maintain satisfaction amid increasingly intense market competition.

Although numerous studies have examined customer satisfaction, most have focused on large companies or businesses located in metropolitan areas. Research simultaneously investigating the effects of service quality, business location, product quality, and trust on customer satisfaction within culinary micro-enterprises in Bima City remains limited. This gap highlights the need for empirical research in the local context. Therefore, this study aims to analyze the influence of these four variables on customer satisfaction among customers of culinary micro-enterprises in Bima City. The findings are expected to contribute to the existing body of marketing literature while providing practical recommendations for culinary micro-business owners and policymakers in developing strategies that enhance customer satisfaction and strengthen the competitiveness of the local culinary industry.

METHODS

This study adopted a quantitative approach using a non-experimental explanatory research design to investigate the influence of service quality, business location, product quality, and trust on customer satisfaction among customers of culinary micro-enterprises in Bima City, Indonesia. A quantitative approach was selected because it enables researchers to objectively measure relationships among variables using statistical techniques and hypothesis testing. The explanatory design was considered suitable since the primary objective of the study was to determine the causal relationships between multiple independent variables and a dependent variable rather than merely describing existing conditions. As a non-experimental study, the research did not manipulate any variables but instead examined naturally occurring phenomena through a structured survey. Data were collected using questionnaires distributed to respondents who had previously purchased products from culinary micro-enterprises. The findings are expected to provide empirical evidence regarding the determinants of customer satisfaction while offering practical

implications for improving the competitiveness and sustainability of culinary micro-businesses.

The research was conducted in Bima City, a region experiencing significant growth in the culinary micro-business sector, resulting in increasingly intense business competition. This competitive environment makes customer satisfaction a crucial factor in maintaining business sustainability and attracting repeat customers. Therefore, Bima City was considered an appropriate research setting for examining customer perceptions of service quality, business location, product quality, and trust. The study was conducted from February to May 2026, covering several stages, including proposal preparation, literature review, questionnaire development, instrument testing, data collection, data processing, statistical analysis, interpretation of findings, and report writing. This four-month research period ensured sufficient time for collecting representative data and minimized the potential influence of seasonal purchasing behavior.

The study population consisted of customers who had purchased products from culinary micro-enterprises operating in Bima City. Based on official statistics, there were approximately 2,290 culinary micro-enterprises in the city. Considering the limitations of time, cost, and accessibility, it was not feasible to survey the entire population. Therefore, the sample size was determined using the Slovin formula with a margin of error of 10%, resulting in a minimum sample of 96 respondents. This sample size was considered adequate for conducting multiple linear regression analysis involving four independent variables. Respondents were selected using purposive sampling, a non-probability sampling technique in which participants are chosen based on specific criteria. Eligible respondents were required to have purchased products from a culinary micro-enterprise at least once, be at least 17 years old, possess sufficient experience to evaluate the research variables, and voluntarily agree to participate in the survey. This sampling method ensured that respondents had relevant experience and could provide reliable information regarding customer satisfaction.

The research examined four independent variables—service quality, business location, product quality, and trust—with customer satisfaction serving as the dependent variable. Service quality was measured using the five SERVQUAL dimensions proposed by Parasuraman: reliability, responsiveness, assurance, empathy, and tangibles. Business location was evaluated based on accessibility, visibility, traffic conditions, parking facilities, and the surrounding environment. Product quality was measured through indicators including product quality, product

features, product design, product safety, and the suitability of product benefits. Trust was assessed using indicators such as reliability, honesty, corporate concern, credibility, and customer confidence. Customer satisfaction was measured through conformity with expectations, overall satisfaction, repurchase intention, recommendation intention, and customers' feelings after consuming the products or services. These variables were operationalized into measurable indicators to facilitate quantitative assessment through questionnaire items.

Both primary and secondary data were utilized in this study. Primary data were collected directly from respondents through structured questionnaires developed according to the operational indicators of each research variable. Respondents evaluated each statement using a five-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree), allowing researchers to quantify customer perceptions and attitudes. Secondary data were obtained from textbooks, scientific journals, government publications, statistical reports, and previous empirical studies related to customer satisfaction, service quality, business location, product quality, and trust. In addition to questionnaire surveys, a comprehensive literature review was conducted to strengthen the theoretical foundation and support the development of the conceptual framework and research hypotheses.

Data analysis was performed using IBM SPSS through several systematic procedures. Instrument quality was first evaluated using validity and reliability tests. Item validity was assessed using the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation, while reliability was measured using Cronbach's Alpha, with values greater than or equal to 0.70 indicating acceptable reliability. Prior to hypothesis testing, classical assumption tests were conducted, including tests of normality, multicollinearity, and heteroscedasticity, to ensure that the regression model satisfied the required statistical assumptions. Subsequently, multiple linear regression analysis was employed to examine the effects of service quality, business location, product quality, and trust on customer satisfaction using the regression equation $Y = a + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + b_3X_3 + b_4X_4 + e$. Hypotheses were tested using the t-test to evaluate the partial effects of each independent variable and the F-test to examine their simultaneous influence. Furthermore, the coefficient of determination (R^2) was calculated to determine the proportion of customer satisfaction explained by the independent variables. All statistical analyses were conducted at a 5% significance level ($\alpha = 0.05$) to ensure the validity, reliability, and scientific rigor of the research findings. Through these comprehensive analytical procedures, the study aimed to identify the key determinants of customer satisfaction among customers of culinary micro-enterprises

in Bima City and provide evidence-based recommendations for business development.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Distribution of Respondents' Answers

The distribution of respondents' answers to each variable in this study can be seen in the tables below:

Table 2 Description of Respondents' Answers Regarding the Service Quality Variable (X1)

Item	SS		S		N		TS		STS		AMOUNT		Average
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	
X1.1	29	30.2	51	53.1	15	15.6	1	1.0	0	0	96	100	4.13
X1.2	23	24.0	58	60.4	10	10.4	4	4.2	1	1.0	96	100	4.02
X1.3	35	36.5	53	55.2	7	7.3	1	1.0	0	0	96	100	4.27
X1.4	29	30.2	56	58.3	7	7.3	4	4.2	0	0	96	100	4.15
X1.5	25	26.0	56	58.3	14	14.6	1	1.0	0	0	96	100	4.09
AVERAGE													**4.13**

Source: Processed primary data, 2026

Based on table 3 X1.1 with the indicator of physical evidence (Tangibles). The results show that 29 or 30.2% of respondents answered strongly agree, 51 or 53.1% of respondents answered agree, 15 or 15.6% of respondents answered neutral, and 1 or 1.0% of respondents answered disagree with an average value of 3. In the second statement item with the Reliability indicator, the results showed that 23 or 24.0% of respondents answered strongly agree, 58 or 60.4% of respondents answered agree, 10 or 10.4% of respondents answered neutral, 4 or 4.2% of respondents answered disagree, and 1 or 1.0% of respondents answered strongly disagree with an average value of 4.02. In the third statement item with the responsiveness indicator, the results showed that 35 or 36.5% of respondents answered strongly agree, 53 or 55.2% of respondents answered agree, 7 or 7.3% of respondents answered neutral, and 1 or 1.0% of respondents answered disagree with an average value.

In the fourth statement item with the indicator (Guarantee), the results show that as many as 29 or 30.2% of respondents answered strongly agree, 56 or 58.3% of respondents answered agree, 7 or 7.3% of respondents answered neutral, and 4 or 4.2% of respondents answered disagree with an average value of 4.15. In the fifth statement item with the empathy indicator, the results showed that 25 or 26.0% of

respondents answered strongly agree, 56 or 58.3% of respondents answered agree, 14 or 14.6% of respondents answered neutral, and 1 or 1.0 respondents answered disagree with an average value.

Table 3 Description of respondents' answers regarding the business location variable (X2)

Item	SS		S		N		TS		STS		AMOUNT		Average
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	
X1.1	28	29.2	53	55.2	13	13.5	2	2.1	0	0	96	100	4.11
X1.2	32	33.3	54	56.3	7	7.3	1	1.0	2	2.1	96	100	4.18
X1.3	38	39.6	37	38.5	20	20.8	0	0	1	1.0	96	100	4.16
X1.4	29	30.2	38	39.6	25	26.0	4	4.2	0	0	96	100	3.96
X1.5	32	33.3	44	45.8	17	17.7	3	3.1	0	0	96	100	4.09
AVERAGE													**4.1**

Source: Processed Primary Data, 2026

Based on table 4 item X2.1 with accessibility indicators, the results show that 28 or 29.2% of respondents answered strongly agree, 53 or 55.2% of respondents answered agree, 13 or 13.5% of respondents answered neutral, and 2 or 2.1% of respondents answered disagree with an average of 4.11. In the second statement item with a visibility indicator, the results showed that 32 or 33.3% of respondents answered strongly agree, 54 or 56.3% of respondents answered agree, 7 or 7.3% of respondents answered neutral, 1 or 1.0% of respondents answered disagree, and 2 or 2.1% of respondents answered strongly disagree with an average.

In the third statement item with environmental indicators, the results showed that 38 or 39.6% of respondents answered strongly agree, 37 or 38.5% of respondents answered agree, 20 or 20.8% of respondents answered neutral, and 1 or 1.0% of respondents answered strongly disagree with an average of 4.16. In the fourth statement item with the parking space indicator, the results showed that 29 or 30.2% of respondents answered strongly agree, 38 or 39.6% of respondents answered agree, 25 or 26.0% of respondents answered neutral, and 4 or 4.2% of respondents answered disagree with an average of 3.96. In the fifth statement item with traffic indicators, the results showed that 32 or 33.3% of respondents answered strongly agree, 44 or 45.8% of respondents answered agree, 17 or 17.7% of respondents answered neutral, and 3 or 3.1% of respondents answered disagree with an average.

Table 5. Description of Respondents' Answers Regarding the Product Variable (X3)

Ite	SS	S	N	TS	STS	AMOUN	Aver

m											T		age
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	
X3.1	40	41.7	39	40.6	16	16.7	1	1.0	0	0	96	100	4.23
X3.2	33	34.4	38	39.6	20	20.8	5	5.2	0	0	96	100	4.03
X3.3	30	31.3	52	54.2	13	13.5	1	1.0	0	0	96	100	4.16
X3.4	46	47.9	45	46.9	3	3.1	2	2.1	0	0	96	100	4.41
X3.5	32	33.3	43	44.8	21	21.9	0	0	0	0	96	100	4.11
AVERAGE													**4.19**

Source: Processed Primary Data, 2026

Based on table 5 item X3.1 with product quality indicators, the results show that 40 or 41.7% of respondents answered strongly agree, 39 or 40.6% of respondents answered agree, 16 or 16.7% of respondents answered neutral, and 1 or 1.0% of respondents answered disagree with an average. In the second question item with product variation indicators, the results showed that as many as 33 or 34.4% of respondents answered strongly agree, 38 or 39.6% of respondents answered agree, 20 or 20.8% of respondents answered neutral, and 5 or 5.2% of respondents answered disagree with an average.

In the third statement itemwith the product display indicator, the results show that as many as 30 or 31.3% of respondents answered strongly agree, 52 or 54.2% of respondents answered agree, 13 or 13.5% of respondents answered neutral, and 1 or 1.0% of respondents answered disagree with an average. In the fourth statement item with product safety indicators, the results showed that 46 or 47.9% of respondents answered strongly agree, 45 or 46.9% of respondents answered agree, 3 or 3.1% of respondents answered neutral, and 2 or 2.1% of respondents answered disagree with an average. In the fifth statement item with product benefit indicators, the results showed that 32 or 33.3% of respondents answered strongly agree, 43 or 44.8% of respondents answered agree, and 21 or 21.9% of respondents answered neutral with an average.

Table 6. Description of Respondents' Answers Regarding the Trust Variable (X4)

Item	SS		S		N		TS		STS		AMOUNT		Average
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	
X4.1	44	45.8	41	42.7	10	10.4	1	1.0	0	0	96	100	4.32
X4.2	40	41.7	41	42.7	13	13.5	1	1.0	1	1.0	96	100	4.23
X4.3	46	47.9	35	36.5	14	14.6	1	1.0	0	0	96	100	4.31

X4.4	33	34.4	54	56.3	8	8.3	0	0	1	1.0	96	100	4.23
X4.5	30	31.3	51	53.1	14	14.6	1	1.0	0	0	96	100	4.15
AVERAGE													**4.25**

Source: Processed primary data, 2026

Based on table 6 item X4.1 with security indicators, the results show that 44 or 45.8% of respondents answered strongly agree, 41 or 42.7% of respondents answered agree, 10 or 10.4% of respondents answered neutral, and 1 or 1.0% of respondents answered strongly disagree with an average value. In the second statement item with honesty indicator, the results showed that 40 or 41.7% of respondents answered strongly agree, 41 or 42.7% of respondents answered agree, 13 or 13.5% of respondents answered neutral, 1 or 1.0% of respondents answered disagree, and 1 or 1.0% of respondents answered strongly disagree with an average. In the third statement item with the concern indicator, the results showed that 46 or 47.9% of respondents answered strongly agree, 35 or 36.5% of respondents answered agree, 14 or 14.6% of respondents answered neutral, and 1 or 1.0% of respondents answered disagree with an average value.

In the fourth statement item with credibility indicators, the results showed that as many as 33 or 34.4% of respondents answered strongly agree, 54 or 56.3% of respondents answered agree, 8 or 8.3% of respondents answered neutral, and 1 or 1.0% of respondents answered strongly disagree with an average value. In the fifth statement item with customer confidence indicator, the results showed that as many as 30 or 31.3% of respondents answered strongly agree, 51 or 53.1% of respondents answered agree, 14 or 14.6% of respondents answered neutral, and 1 or 1.0% of respondents answered disagree with an average value.

Table 7. Description of respondents' answers regarding the customer satisfaction variable (Y)

Item	**SS**		**S**		**N**		**TS**		**STS**		**AMOUNT**		**Average**
	F	**%**	**F**	**%**	**F**	**%**	**F**	**%**	**F**	**%**	**F**	**%**	
X5.1	26	27.1	48	50.0	20	20.8	2	2.1	0	0	96	100	4.02
X5.2	23	24.0	58	60.4	15	15.6	0	0	0	0	96	100	4.08
X5.3	33	34.4	50	52.1	12	12.5	1	1.0	0	0	96	100	4.20
X5.4	24	25.0	56	58.3	16	16.7	0	0	0	0	96	100	4.08
X5.5	28	29.2	56	58.3	12	12.5	0	0	0	0	96	100	4.17
AVERAGE													**4.11**

Source: Processed primary data, 2026

Based on table 7 item X5.1 with the expectation conformity indicator, the results show that 26 or 27.1% of respondents answered strongly agree, 48 or 50.0% of respondents answered agree, 20 or 20.8% of respondents answered neutral, and 2 or 2.1% of respondents answered disagree with an average value. In the second statement item with an overall satisfaction indicator, the results showed that as many as 23 or 24.0% of respondents answered strongly agree, 58 or 60.4% of respondents answered agree, and 15 or 15.6% of respondents answered neutral with an average value. In the third statement item with the indicator of repurchase intention, the results showed that as many as 33 or 34.4% of respondents answered strongly agree, 50 or 52.1% of respondents answered agree, 12 or 12.5% of respondents answered neutral, and 1 or 1.0% of respondents answered disagree with an average value.

In the fourth statement item with recommendation indicators, the results showed that as many as 24 or 25.0% of respondents answered strongly agree, 56 or 58.3% of respondents answered agree, and 16 or 16.7% of respondents answered neutral with an average. In the fifth statement itemwith the indicator of feeling happy, the results showed that 28 or 29.2% of respondents answered strongly agree, 56 or 58.3% of respondents answered agree, and 12 or 12.5% of respondents answered neutral with an average.

Discussion of Research Results

Instrument Test

Validity Test Results

Validity testing is used to determine how effectively a research instrument measures what it is supposed to measure. According to Sugiyono (2022), validity reflects the degree of agreement between the actual data on the object and the data generated by the researcher. In this study, validity testing was conducted using the Pearson Product Moment correlation with the help of SPSS. A questionnaire item is considered valid if the calculated r value exceeds the table r value at a significance level of 0.05.

Table 8. Results of Pearson Correlation Validity Test

	Quality of service	Business location	Product	Trust	Customer satisfaction
Quality of service	1 <0.001 96	601 <0.001 96	709 <0.001 96	688 <0.001 96	566 <0.001 96
Business location	601 <0.001 96	1 <0.001 96	716 <0.001 96	759 <0.001 96	783 <0.001 96
Product	709 <0.001 96	716 <0.001 96	1 <0.001 96	796 <0.001 96	761 <0.001 96

Trust	688 <0.001 96	759 <0.001 96	796 <0.001 96	1 <0.001 96	735 <0.001 96
Customer satisfaction	566 <0.001 96	783 <0.001 96	761 <0.001 96	735 <0.001 96	1 <0.001 96

Source: Processed primary data, 2026

Based on Table 8, the results of the Pearson correlation test can be seen between the variables of service quality, business location, product, trust, and customer satisfaction. The Service Quality variable has a calculated r value of 0.566 > 0.2006 with a significance of <0.001. Because the significance value is <0.05, the correlation value is positive. This indicates a positive and significant relationship between service quality and customer satisfaction. The business location variable has a calculated r value of 0.783 > 0.2006 with a significance of <0.001.

This shows that there is a positive and significant relationship between the business location variable and customer satisfaction. The Product variable has a calculated r value of 0.761 > 0.2006 with a significance of <0.001. This indicates that there is a positive and significant relationship between the product variable and customer satisfaction. The trust variable has a calculated r value of 0.735 > 0.2006 with a significance of <0.001. This indicates that there is a positive and significant relationship between the trust variable and customer satisfaction. Therefore, all variables are declared valid because the calculated r value is > r table with a significance level of <0.05.

Reliability test

In this study, reliability testing was conducted using the Cronbach's Alpha method using SPSS. A variable is considered reliable if it has a Cronbach's Alpha value ≥ 0.70 (Ghozali, 2021).

Table 9. Reliability Test Results

No.	Variables	*Cronbach Alpha*	Information
1.	Quality of Service	0.710	Reliable
2.	Business Location	0.807	Reliable
3.	Product	0.850	Reliable
4.	Trust	0.851	Reliable
5.	Customer satisfaction	0.807	Reliable

Source: Processed primary data, 2026

Based on table 9 above, it can be seen that the service quality variable has a Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.710 > 0.70. The business location variable has a Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.807 > 0.70. The product variable has a Cronbach's Alpha

value of 0.850 > 0.70. The trust variable has a Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.851 > 0.70. The customer satisfaction variable has a Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.807 > 0.70. Therefore, all variables in this study have a Cronbach's Alpha value above 0.70, so it can be said that the research instrument is reliable.

Classical Assumption Test

Normality Test

According to Ghozali (2021), the purpose of normality testing is to determine whether the residuals or confounding variables in a regression model have a normal distribution. A good regression model is one with a normal or near-normal residual distribution.

Table 10. Normality Test Results

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		Unstandardized Residual
N		96
Normal Parameters(a,b)	Mean	,0000000
	Standard Deviation	1.46904118
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	,117
	Positive	,076
	Negative	-,117
Monte Carlo		,002
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		,002

Source: Processed primary data, 2026

Based on Table 4.10 above, it is known that the results of the normality test using the One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test show an Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) value of 0.002. Because the significance value of 0.002 <0.05, it can be concluded that the residual data is not normally distributed. However, if the data is not normally distributed, the bootstrapping method is used to test the hypothesis. This is done because bootstrapping is a method that is robust to violations of the normality assumption and is most recommended for regression, the main purpose of regression is to test the effect. Bootstrapping can still test the T and F tests without having to be normal. Thus, the violated normality assumption can be overcome and the analysis remains valid.The bootstrap method was introduced by Efron in 1979. To obtain the best estimate based on minimal data with the help of a computer program. The results of this study are in line with research conducted by(Prihatmono et al., 2020), which explains that bootstrapping can be used in linear regression when the assumption of normality of residuals is not met.

Multicollinearity Test

According to Imam Ghozali (2021), the purpose of the multicollinearity test is to determine whether there is a significant correlation between the independent variables in a regression model. A good regression model should ensure that there is no correlation between the independent variables. If the tolerance value is >0.1 and VIF <10 then multicollinearity does not occur. If the tolerance value is < 0.1 and VIF > 10, then it is explained as a multicollinearity problem.

Table 11. Multicollinearity Test Results

Coefficients[a]

Model		Collinearity Statistics	
		Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)		
	Quality of Service	,454	2,203
	Business Location	,388	2,577
	Product	,299	3,350
	Trust	,277	3,611

Source: Processed primary data, 2026

Based on table 11 above, it can be seen that the Tolerance value of the Service Quality variable is 0.454 and the VIF is 2.203, the Business Location variable is 0.388 and the VIF is 2.577, the Product variable is 0.299 and the VIF is 3.350, and the Trust variable is 0.277 and the VIF is 3.611. If the tolerance value is >0.1 and the VIF <10, then there is no multicollinearity problem.So it can be concluded that the independent variable(independent)there is no multicollinearity or non-multicollinearity.

Test Heteroscedasticity

Imam Ghozali (2021) stated that the heteroscedasticity test aims to determine whether there is unequal variance in the residuals from one observation to another in a regression model. A good regression model is one that does not exhibit heteroscedasticity (homoscedasticity). If the significance value is >0.05, heteroscedasticity is not present.

Table 12. Heteroscedasticity Test Results

Coefficientsa

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	1,352	.714		1,895	.061
	quality of service	-.023	.047	-.075	-.493	.623
	business location	-.001	.001	-.4.987	-1,335	.190
	product	.035	.053	.122	.655	.514
	trust	.076	.056	.265	1,368	.175

a. Dependent Variable: ABS_RES

Source: Processed primary data, 2026

Based on table 4.12 above, it shows that the Service Quality Variable has a significant value of 0.623, the Business Location Variable has a significant value of 0.190, the Product Variable has a significant value of 0.514, and the Trust Variable has a significant value of 0.175. Thus, each variable has a significant value of more than 0.05, indicating that the data does not experience heteroscedasticity.

Multiple Linear Analysis

This analysis is used to determine the influence of service quality factors (X1), business location (X2), product (X3), and trust (X4) on customer satisfaction (Y).

Table 13. Results of multiple linear analysis tests

	B	Bias	Std. Error	Sig. (2-tailed)	BCa 95% Confidence Interval Lower	Upper
(Constant)	4.110	-.072	1,225	.005	1,814	6,086
Quality of Service	-.064	-.006	.068	.312	-.193	.051
Business Location	.392	-.002	.099	<.001	.221	.576
Product	.333	.001	.097	<.001	.122	.538
Trust	.129	.010	.115	.246	-.063	.413

Source: Processed primary data, 2026

From table 12 above, it shows that the multiple linear regression equation in this study is as follows:

Y = a + b1X1 + b2X2 + b3X3 + b4X4 + e

Y =4,110 -,064X1 + ,392X2 + ,333X3 + ,129X4 + e

Information:

Y = Customer Satisfaction (Dependent Variable, predicted value)

a = Constant

b1'2'3'4 = Regression Coefficient

X1 = Service Quality

X2 = Business Location

X3 = Product

X4 = Trust

The multiple regression analysis indicates that customer satisfaction in culinary micro-enterprises in Bima City is influenced by service quality, business location, product, and trust. The constant value of 4.110 shows that customer satisfaction remains positive even when all independent variables are assumed to be zero. Service quality has a negative but statistically insignificant regression coefficient, indicating that it does not significantly affect customer satisfaction. In contrast, business location and product have positive and significant regression coefficients, demonstrating that improvements in these variables increase customer satisfaction. Trust also has a positive regression coefficient, suggesting a positive relationship with customer satisfaction, although its partial effect is not statistically significant.

Hypothesis Testing

Test ResultsBootstrap for Coefficients

The results of the bootstrap test are used to see whether the independent variable has a significant partial effect on the dependent variable, which can be seen using the bootstrap test, namely:

Table 14. Test ResultsBootstrap for Coefficients

	B	Bias	Std. Error	Sig. (2-tailed)	BCa 95% Confidence Interval Lower	Upper
(Constant)	4.110	-.072	1,225	.005	1,814	6,086
Quality of Service	-.064	-.006	.068	.312	-.193	.051

Business Location	.392	-.002	.099	<.001	.221	.576
Product	.333	.001	.097	<.001	.122	.538
Trust	.129	.010	.115	.246	-.063	.413

Source: Primary data, 2026

The bootstrapping results reveal that not all independent variables significantly influence customer satisfaction among culinary micro-enterprises in Bima City. Service quality produced a significance value of 0.312, which exceeds the 0.05 threshold, indicating that it does not have a statistically significant effect on customer satisfaction. Therefore, the hypothesis proposing a significant relationship between service quality and customer satisfaction was rejected. In contrast, business location showed a significance value of <0.01, demonstrating a positive and statistically significant effect on customer satisfaction. Similarly, the product variable also obtained a significance value of <0.01, confirming that product quality significantly enhances customer satisfaction. Meanwhile, trust recorded a significance value of 0.246, which is greater than 0.05, indicating that trust does not significantly affect customer satisfaction. These findings suggest that business location and product quality are the primary determinants of customer satisfaction, whereas service quality and trust did not exhibit significant direct effects in this study.

Table 16. Results of the F-Statistic Test (Simultaneous)

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	484,722	4	121,180	53,788	<,001(b)
	Residual	205,018	91	2,253		
	Total	689,740	95			

a. Dependent Variable: Customer Satisfaction

b. Predictors: (Constant), Trust, Service Quality, Business Location, Product

Source: Processed primary data, 2026

Based on table 4.16 above, it is known that the calculated F is 53.788 and the significant value is<,001, which is smaller than 0.05, means that simultaneously there is an influence between the variables of Service Quality, Business Location, Product,

and Trust on customer satisfaction of micro businesses in the culinary sector in Bima City.

Coefficient of Determination (R2)

The coefficient of determination is used to determine the extent to which an independent variable explains the dependent variable. The greater the R^2 value, the greater the influence of service quality, business location, product, and trust on customer satisfaction.

Table 17. Test of the Coefficient of Determination (R2)

Model Summary[b]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Standard Error of the Estimate
1	,838(a)	,703	,690	1,501

a. Predictors: (Constant), Trust, Service Quality, Business Location, Product
b. Dependent Variable: Customer Satisfaction
Source: Primary data 2026

Based on the Coefficient of Determination Test in Table 4.17 above, the Adjusted R Square value is 0.690, or 69%. This indicates that the variables of service quality, business location, product, and trust together explain 69% of the influence on customer satisfaction.. While the remaining 31% is influenced by other variables outside the research.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the statistical analysis, this study concludes that business location and product quality have a significant positive partial effect on customer satisfaction among culinary micro-enterprises in Bima City. In contrast, service quality and trust do not have a statistically significant partial influence on customer satisfaction. Nevertheless, when analyzed simultaneously, service quality, business location, product quality, and trust collectively have a significant effect on customer satisfaction, indicating that these variables together contribute to customers' overall evaluation of culinary micro-businesses. These findings highlight the importance of providing quality products and selecting strategic business locations while maintaining balanced improvements across other business aspects. This study has several limitations. First, the sample was limited to 96 respondents and therefore may not fully represent the entire population of culinary micro-business customers in Bima City. Second, the adjusted coefficient of determination (Adjusted R^2) was 0.690, indicating that 69% of the variation in customer satisfaction is explained by the

four independent variables, while the remaining 31% is influenced by other factors not included in this study.

Based on these findings, culinary micro-business owners are encouraged to prioritize continuous product innovation and maintain strategic, accessible business locations to enhance customer satisfaction. Although service quality and trust were not found to have significant partial effects, both factors should still be consistently maintained because they contribute to customer loyalty and long-term business sustainability. Furthermore, local government and related institutions should support culinary micro-enterprises through training, product development, marketing assistance, and location planning. Future studies are recommended to include additional variables, larger sample sizes, and more advanced analytical techniques, such as Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) or Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM), to obtain more comprehensive findings.

REFERENCES

Agustina, R. F., & Nuryani, Y. (2026). *Pengaruh Kepercayaan Pelanggan dan Kepuasan Pelanggan terhadap Loyalitas Konsumen Platform Shopee (Studi Kasus pada Masyarakat Kecamatan Ibun Kabupaten Bandung).* MUARA EKONOMI: Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Ekonomi, Manajemen & Bisnis**,** 2(1), 1–11.

Anwar, S., Marlius, D., & Yani, S. P. (2025). *Kepuasan Konsumen Dilihat dari Kualitas Pelayanan, Promosi dan Kepercayaan.* Economics and Digital Business Review**,** 7(1), 291–306.

Arianto, N. (2018). *Pengaruh Kualitas Pelayanan terhadap Kepuasan dan Loyalitas Pengunjung dalam Menggunakan Jasa Hotel Rizen Kedaton Bogor.* Jurnal Pemasaran Kompetitif**,** 1(2), 83–101.

Dharman, D. (2024). *Pengaruh Kualitas Produk, Kualitas Pelayanan, Strategi Pemasaran Syariah terhadap Kepuasan Konsumen dan Kepercayaan Konsumen pada UMKM Mohawi Konawe Kepulauan.* Journal of Management and Creative Business**,** 2(2), 209–228.

Fuadi, S., Febriyanto, F., & Kurniawan, R. J. (2024). *Pengaruh Kualitas Produk dan Lokasi terhadap Kepuasan Pelanggan dengan Loyalitas Pelanggan sebagai Variabel Intervening pada Ayam Geprek Agan 15A Kota Metro.* Derivatif: Jurnal Manajemen**,** 18(2), 219–232.

Gultom, D. K., Arif, M., & Fahmi, M. (2020). *Determinasi Kepuasan Pelanggan terhadap Loyalitas Pelanggan melalui Kepercayaan.* Maneggio: Jurnal Ilmiah Magister Manajemen**,** 3(2), 171–180.

Khoiriyah, H., & Habib, M. A. F. (2024). *Pengaruh Inovasi Produk dan Kualitas Pelayanan terhadap Kepuasan Konsumen pada MD Café Nganjuk.* Maslahah: Jurnal Manajemen dan Ekonomi Syariah**,** 2(2), 300–312.

Komala, R., & Selvi, E. (2021). *Pengaruh Kualitas Layanan dan Kepercayaan terhadap Kepuasan Pelanggan Jasa Transportasi Online.* Jurnal Manajemen, 13(3), 483–491.

Lubis, R., Nazaruddin, N., Nur, M., Anwardi, A., & Ihsanhamdy, M. (2025). *Analisis Pelayanan terhadap Kepuasan dan Loyalitas Konsumen di UMKM Nagih Kuliner Menggunakan Metode IPA dan SEM.* Matrik: Jurnal Manajemen dan Teknik Industri Produksi**,** 25(2), 165–176.

Nando, I. H., & Hadisuwarno, H. (2023). *Pengaruh Kualitas Produk, Kualitas Pelayanan, dan Lokasi terhadap Kepuasan Pelanggan di Restoran I'am Geprek Bensu Harapan Indah.* Jurnal Kajian Ekonomi dan Manajemen Indonesia, 1(1), 25–39.

Oscar, B., & Megantara, H. C. (2020). *Pengaruh Atribut Produk terhadap Keputusan Pembelian Produk Muslim Army.* Pro Mark**,** 10(1).

Rozi, I. A., & Khuzaini, K. (2021). *Pengaruh Harga, Keragaman Produk, Kualitas Pelayanan dan Promosi terhadap Keputusan Pembelian di Marketplace Shopee.* Jurnal Ilmu dan Riset Manajemen (JIRM**)**, 10(5).

Wibowo, W. T., Winarso, W., Kurniawan, D., Nursal, M. F., & Handayani, M. (2025). *Pengaruh Kualitas Pelayanan dan Lokasi terhadap Minat Pelanggan pada Bengkel Jihan Product.* SINERGI: Jurnal Riset Ilmiah**,** 2(8), 3420–3439.

Widodo Ismanto, Zulkifli, Munzir, Tanjung, R., & Anggraini, D. (2021). *Pengaruh Lokasi Usaha dan Kualitas Pelayanan terhadap Kepuasan Konsumen.* Universitas Riau Kepulauan**,** 10, 409–424.

Widiyaningsih, W. (2018). *Tanggung Jawab Pelaku Usaha Pangan Siap Saji Dihubungkan dengan Asas Keamanan dan Keselamatan Konsumen.* Syiar Hukum: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum**,** 16(2), 233–251.