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ABSTRACT
This research aims to find the factors that affect consumer’s satisfaction at Parklatz Café in Ponorogo City, East Java, Indonesia. This research is quantitatif using a survey of 124 respondents. The respondents were asked to give their responses on a five-point Likert scale through a questionnaire. The data analyzed with exploratory factor analysis (EFA) using Varimax rotation, which reduced the data into several factors. The findings of this study indicate that product, service satisfaction, price satisfaction, promotion, and customer hospitality influence customer satisfaction of Parklatz Café in Ponorogo City.
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INTRODUCTION

Food industry especially cafe and bar sector rose significantly in 2012 and 2013. In America the business grew to 10,631 Unit in 2013 or 2.4% since 2003. In addition, GDP growth in this sector reaches about 2,648 Million in 2012, or 1.7% rose from 2002 to 2012 (Connor & Whiteford, 2014).

Consumer satisfaction may refer to personal perception of product or services or might be performance in relation to his expectation (Sit, et. al., 2009). In highly competitive business environment, consumer satisfaction gave a huge play role and impact to the company. The company will produce a high quality product and improve their quality of product in order to reach the brand image to their consumer (Torres-Moraga, Vasquez-Paraga, Zamora-Gonzales, 2008).

The more quality the product, the more loyalty the company gain from the consumer. The consumer loyalty would spread from consumer after consumer by the word of mouth power (Tsai, Lin, Li, 2014; Oh & Kim, 2017). Indeed, the modern word of mouth power supported by social media such as Instagram, Twitter, Facebook, even personal messages on chat app such as Whatsapp or Telegram and the oldest one BBM. Therefore, the brand image of a product should be built from the valuable identity or symbolic meaning (Anisimova, 2016). In other word the costumer will felt their own value of the experiences they tried (Heri, 2017). This is also part of consumer or costumer services which lead to their satisfaction and loyalty to the company (Fraering & Minor, 2013). To achieve the consumer satisfaction company need to provide all services so the costumer felt the superior value (Kriswandari, 2017).

In other word, hospitality could be improved in other field of services. Such as Financial services in Bank prosperity services in restaurant or cafe (Oh & Kim, 2017; Awan, Bukhari, Iqbal, 2011; Qin & Prybutok, 2009; Andaleeb & Conway, 2006), comfort services in beauty salon or beauty services it-self (Sachdev & Verma, 2004), even in educational services it would be improved (Kriswandari, 2011). Indeed, product quality (Kurniati, Silvia, Efendi, 2016) which built brand image (Winarno, 2010) with a symbolic value and the services that the company gave (Anisimova, 2016; Sachdev & Verma, 2004) would affect the price of the product (Kaura, Prasad, Sharma, 2015).

Many studies have attempted to propose some factors that affect customer’s satisfaction. Maritn-Consugera, Molina, Esteban, (2007) stated that price is the factor that influence the income or inflow of resources. Therefore, pricing decision is a need in a company that affect to the loyalty of consumer or costumer if the company or the manager understood how the consumer and costumer respond to the price changes (Nazari, Hosseini, Tabatabaie, 2014; Malik, Ghafoor, Hafiz, 2012). The price defined as what is given up or sacrificed to obtain a product or service (Razak, Nirwanto, Triatmanto, 2016). The price also suggested by Kotler and Armstrong (2012) as the
amount of money charged for a product or a service or the sum of the values that customers exchange for the benefits of having or using a product or service.

Furthermore, Razak, Nirwanto, Triatmanto (2016) stated that customer perceived a certain price, which the high-low of the price of a product could significantly affected consumer intention to purchase a product. On the other hand, the price of food in the item menu could greatly influence the customer perception (Razak, Nirwanto, Triatmanto, 2016). Whether the product is high-cost or low-cost, as long as it meets the consumer expectation, it always came with good perception to the company. Indeed, fairness of price would lead to better perception of the product and the company (Malik, Ghafoor, Hafiz, 2012). According to Hermann, et.al (2007), price fairness was influenced by procedural and distributive consideration. Whereas the fairness of perceived price is playing significant role in decision making in order to balance the consumer price perception (Kaura, Prasad, Sharma, 2015).

On the other hand, promotion has its own role to the product and the successful of selling it (Park & Lennon, 2009). Although, promotion became the last thing thought by the company, it could affect a lot to the price of product, and indeed, to the consumer decision whether to purchase it or not (Honea & Dahl, 2005). Stimulating interest to the brand, creating positive brand attitude, showing how the product could satisfy consumer wants, needs and desire, can be define as promotion goals (Graeff, 1995). The type of promotion could be categorized in form of price-based promotion (Walters & Bommer, 1996) and non-price-based promotion (Parson, 2003).

Rowley (1998) stated that tools of promotion consist of some tools such: advertising, direct marketing, sales promotions, public relations and publicity, personal selling, and sponsorship. Osman, Fah & Foon (2011) stated that promotion is the techniques to attract the consumer or customer to purchase more or to try a product or service. Promotion also can be defined as marketing and communication activities that could change the price-value relationship of product or service that perceived by target (Andreiti, et., al., 2013). Furthermore, the tools of promotion for food or cafe is product promotion (Carlson, 2018) such as extra product and extra volume (Smith & Sinha, 2000), sales promotion (Santini, et., al., 2015) such as Card sales (Schultz & Block, 2014), coupons, discount day, price adjustment, and display (Schultz & Peltier, 2013).

However, there have been no previous studies that have conducted research related to customer satisfaction in relation to the use of exploratory factor analysis. This paper presents to analyze the practice of Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) in a research which works to identify the relationship between factors. This paper aimed to perform in how EFA conducted which can be used in the several research, where the factors need to be grouping and then confirmed to assess the degree to which the data meet the expected structure.
RESEARCH METHOD

The data for this study were collected from the customer of Parklatz café through questionnaire survey method. The customer of Parklatz café largely are students of university, lecturer, and some are local community around the university. The average customer of Parklatz café per day is around 30 persons. The most customer visits to Parklatz café in every weekend, where the football match was exhibited on a large screen to watch together. The number of visitors increased to 60 to 100 persons on weekend. Therefore, based on the average consumer that visiting to the Parklatz café, researcher asks to 200 consumers of Parklatz café to respond. At the end, total 124 respondents were received to be analysed.

Parklatz café located at the only one biggest International University at Ponorogo, with thousand potentials consumers and customers. With one uniqueness most of the consumer is male gender which stay around the university area. Related to this, consumer or customer satisfaction can be influenced by many factors depend on the situation and the background of the company of the café and bar sector. Therefore, it is important to know the determinant factors of consumer or customer satisfaction of in Parklatz Café in Ponorogo City in order the owners could determine an exact decision in managing their strategies.

The respondents consisted of 92.7% male and 7.3% female. Majority of respondent were student of university with a percentage of about 67.2%, followed by lecturer of university around 22.1%, university staff 5%, teachers of Madrasah between 2.5% and other occupation about 3.2%. Mostly respondents about 83.9% ever hang out to Parklatz café and purchase the food and beverages product of café, while 16.1% are never came to café or just heard about it. Specifically, about 16.1% were regular customer and around 22.6% were probably regular customer, while the rest of 61.3% respondents were irregular customer. Meanwhile, based on intensity of customer visiting, 110 visitors came less than 3 times in a week, 12 of them came around 4 to 6 times in a week and the rest of a total of 76.6% respondents aged 20-29 years old, 11.3% aged 30-39 years old, 10.5% aged less than 20 and 1.6% aged 40-49 years old. Finally, a total of 36.1% respondents have 144 RM or bellow of income, while respondent with 145 RM – 430 RM of income respectively reach 0.8% under the 144 RM or bellow of income, as 15.1% have income between 431 RM to 718 RM, while the rest of about 13.4% respondent have income around 719 RM and above. Details of entire respondents under this study are presented in table below.
Table 1. Respondent’s Profile

| No | Content                         | Frequency | Percentage |
|----|---------------------------------|-----------|------------|
| 1  | Gender                          |           |            |
|    | Male                            | 115       | 92.7%      |
|    | Female                          | 9         | 7.3%       |
| 2  | Occupation                      |           |            |
|    | Student of University           | 83        | 67.2%      |
|    | Lecturer of University          | 28        | 22.1%      |
|    | Staff of University             | 6         | 5%         |
|    | Teacher of Madrasah             | 3         | 2.5%       |
|    | Other Occupation                | 4         | 3.2%       |
| 3  | Visitor                         |           |            |
|    | Yes                             | 104       | 83.9%      |
|    | Never                           | 20        | 16.1%      |
| 4  | Potential Customer              |           |            |
|    | Regular Customer                | 20        | 16.1%      |
|    | Probably Regular Customer       | 28        | 22.6%      |
|    | Irregular Customer              | 76        | 61.3%      |
| 5  | Visiting Intensity (in a week)  |           |            |
|    | Less than 3 times               | 110       | 88.7%      |
|    | 4 to 6 times                    | 12        | 9.7%       |
|    | More than 7 times               | 2         | 1.6%       |
| 6  | Age of Customer (in yeras)      |           |            |
|    | Bellow 20                       | 13        | 10.5%      |
|    | 20-29                           | 95        | 76.6%      |
|    | 30-39                           | 14        | 11.3%      |
|    | 40-49                           | 2         | 1.6%       |
| 7  | Income (in RM)                  |           |            |
|    | Bellow 144                      | 45        | 36.1%      |
|    | 145 – 430                      | 44        | 35.3%      |
|    | 431 – 718                      | 19        | 15.1%      |
|    | 719 or above                    | 16        | 13.4%      |

Meanwhile, to running the collected data from the respondent, twenty-two variables are composed based on the theoretical framework. The twenty-two variables that allegedly influence the consumer satisfaction in Parklatz café Ponorogo presented on the table 2 below.

Table 2. Variables that allegedly influence the consumer satisfaction

| X   | Variables                                      |
|-----|-----------------------------------------------|
| 1   | Direct marketing                              |
| 2   | Disseminating promotions through electronic media (advertising) |
| 3   | Sales promotion                               |
| 4   | Fairness of food price                         |
| 5   | Suitable price of food with the quality        |
| 6   | Fairness of beverages price                    |
| 7   | Suitable price of beverages with the quality   |
| 8   | Product variety                               |
| 9   | Product Favourable                            |
10 Product quality
11 Featured product or brand image
12 Product return services
13 Empathy services of the café employee
14 Responsiveness of the café employee
15 Compliment to costumer from the café staff and employee
16 Free charge of wi-fi services
17 Reliability of the café employee
18 Delivery services of café
19 Promotion
20 Price satisfaction
21 Product satisfaction
22 Parklatz café services satisfied the consumer

Those twentytwo items in table 2 were converted to questionnaire and analysed using exploratory factor analysis (EFA). The principal component analysis with varimax rotation was applied. Keiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) score and Bartlett’s test was verified (Hair, et., al., 2010). The adequacy of data to factor analysis is usually evaluates by Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) Measure and Bartlett’s test of sphericity. Kaiser (1974) had suggested that for KMO in the 0.90s adequacy is marvellous, in the 0.80s is meritorious, in the 0.70s is middling, in the 0.60s is mediocre, in the 0.50s is miserable and below 0.5 – unacceptable. The Bartlett’s test of sphericity should be significant (p<0.05). Following phase of factor analysis is the choice of number of factors. The most popular criteria are: “Kaiser rule – retain only those factors with an eigenvalue larger than 1; and Cattell criterion – a scree-plot”.

The extraction of factors is usually conducted by principal components analysis (PCA). Principal component analysis is usually used in typical EFA – it is one of the techniques used for calculation of factor loadings. PCA is used as the adaptation of classical Hotteling’s principle components analysis for factor analysis, and in practically is the most popular. The next step of factor analysis is the choice of rotation method. The goal of rotation is to simplify and clarify the data structure (Malina, 2004). On the basis of loadings values we could indicate the variables with practically importance – it should be above ±0.5. The analysis could be finished by interpretation of factors, using loading for all variables).

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The result of this study indicated that, there are four factors emerged after analysis data, namely, product services, price satisfaction, promotion, customer hospitality. The examination method of KMO that used to measure sampling adequacy suggested that the sample was factorable where about 0.898, and Bartlett’s test of sphericity scored 1980.484 with significant level of 0.000 less than 0.05, which means there are correlations between variables. Table below shows KMO and Bartlett’s test.
Based on principal component analysis illustrate each variable extraction value. For example, extraction value of variable X1 is 0.692 which mean that about 69.2% of variance can be explained by the form of X1 variable factors. Meanwhile, 0.775 is the amount of X2 variable extraction, which indicates that 77.5% of variance can be explained by the form of X2 variable factors. In line with previous variables, extraction value of variable X3 is 0.768 which mean that about 76.8% of variance can be explained by the form of X3 variable factors. Meanwhile, 0.771 is the amount of X4 variable extraction, which indicates that 77.1% of variance can be explained by the form of X4 variable factors.

Another variable example, extraction value of variable X5 is 0.846 which mean that about 84.6% of variance can be explained by the form of X5 variable factors. Meanwhile, 0.785 is the amount of X6 variable extraction, which indicates that 78.5% of variance can be explained by the form of X6 variable factors. In line with previous variables, extraction value of variable X7 is 0.830 which mean that about 83.0% of variance can be explained by the form of X7 variable factors. Meanwhile, 0.637 is the amount of X8 variable extraction, which indicates that 63.7% of variance can be explained by the form of X8 variable factors.

On the other hand, the rest extraction value has same explanation. For example, extraction of variable X9 is 0.628 which mean that about 62.8% of variance can be explained by the form of X9 variable factors. Meanwhile, 0.747 is the amount of X10 variable extraction, which indicates that 74.7% of variance can be explained by the form of X10 variable factors. In line with previous variables, extraction value of variable X11 is 0.587 which mean that about 58.7% of variance can be explained by the form of X11 variable factors. Meanwhile, 0.345 is the amount of X12 variable extraction, which indicates that 34.5% of variance can be explained by the form of X12 variable factors, and so on.

This research is research in the field of social science. The minimum value of cumulative percentage for social science research is 60%. In this research, the percentage of 68.015% was obtained greater than 60%, means that the formation of these seven factors has been considered valid and acceptable. According to Truong & McColl (2011), factor loadings should be greater than 0.5 for better results. Meanwhile, table 9 illustrate that Factor I consist of X10, X7, X5, X8, X13, X4, X17, X6, X14, X11,
X1, X9, X3, X22, X18, X21, X20, and X2. Factor II consists of X2 and X19, while factor III consists of X20 and X15. On the contrary, there is no variable entered into factor IV. Whereas, the eigenvalues and the scree plot showed that there are four factors. As well as the trend that appears on 2 variables and 2 factors that exist, X2 on factor II already appear in factor I and X20 on factor III already appear on factor I. Similar to the unique trend, there are two variables that had no loading in all factors (X12 and X16).

On the other hand, based on Analysis of rotation method using varimax with kaiser normalization, can be seen that there are several changes due to the rotation method. But, there is still a problem, namely cross-loading in the X7 (loaded in Factor I and III) and also X22 (loaded in Factor I and II). Indeed, there are still two variables not load to any factors. Therefore, X7, X22, X8 and X12 must be removed.

From Measures of sampling adequacy, can be seen that all variables have MSA >0.50. This means that data can be declared eligible and can be used for further analysis. Once the data is declared eligible for factor analysis, will be conducted the extraction process factors. Based on Principal Component Analysis the variable extraction value. For example, extraction value of variable X1 is 0.689 which mean that about 68.9% of variance can be explained by the form of X1 variable factors. Meanwhile, 0.749 is the amount of X2 variable extraction, which indicates that 74.9% of variance can be explained by the form of X2 variable factors. In line with previous variables, extraction value of variable X3 is 0.772 which mean that about 77.2% of variance can be explained by the form of X3 variable factors. Meanwhile, 0.778 is the amount of X4 variable extraction, which indicates that 77.8% of variance can be explained by the form of X4 variable factors.

Another variable example, extraction value of variable X5 is 0.810 which mean that about 81.0% of variance can be explained by the form of X5 variable factors. Meanwhile, 0.807 is the amount of X6 variable extraction, which indicates that 80.7% of variance can be explained by the form of X6 variable factors. In line with previous variables, extraction value of variable X9 is 0.641 which mean that about 64.1% of variance can be explained by the form of X9 variable factors. Meanwhile, 0.752 is the amount of X10 variable extraction, which indicates that 75.2% of variance can be explained by the form of X10 variable factors and so on.

Based on Table below, factor I (Product and Service Satisfaction) contributes with the highest percentage reach about 45.87%, followed by factor II (Price Satisfaction) with 10.0%. Meanwhile, factor II (Promotion) and Factor IV (Customer Hospitality) have the percentage 8.61% and 6.19% respectively. All Factors had high percentage with 70.71% totally.
In connection with sum up, from the table 4 shows that product services are the totality of features and characteristics of a product or service that bears on its ability to satisfy given needs, and it aim to gain higher profit from sold product and indeed to insure customer loyalty, build strong barrier against the competitor (Kanovska, 2010). Product and service quality, simultaneously affects the intention of customer to purchase a product, in this case, to purchase product and hangout at parklatz café, service of product and quality directly affects satisfaction and satisfaction directly affects the positive behavioural intentions (Jahanshahi, et al., 2011).

On the other hand, Price satisfaction is a complex construct consisting of several dimensions, i.e. price-quality ratio, price fairness, price transparency, price reliability and relative price (Matzler, Wurtele & Renzl, 2006). These dimensions constitute the determinants of price satisfaction, and consequently their satisfaction could affect to customer loyalty. Then, promotion is an action-focused marketing event whose purpose
is to have a direct impact on the behaviour of the firm’s customer in order to purchase the product or services (Blattberg & Bresich, 2012). An effective promotion requires a good understanding of the process Power of persuasion and how this process affects Environmental factors (Alam, Almotairi & Gaadar, 2013).

Finally, the customer hospitality that define as the design of structure of quality and customer services which focusing on location and facilities and directly linked to customer satisfaction and the development of customer loyalty (Kuhn, et, al., 2018). In this case, parklatz café were on of food industry which directly selling the product to the customer or consumer. Which mean, hospitality have had an essential part that contributes to satisfy the physiological needs and dining experiences of the customer or consumer (Kandampully, Zhang & Jaakkola, 2017).

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings, there are four factors that can influence the consumer or customer satisfaction in Parklatz Café Ponorogo. Factor I (Product and Service Satisfaction) contributes with the highest percentage reach about 45, 87%, followed by factor II (Price Satisfaction) with 10.0%. Meanwhile, factor II (Promotion) and Factor IV (Customer Hospitality) have the percentage 8.61% and 6.19% respectively. All Factors had high percentage with 70.71% totally.

However further studies are needed to use a wider coverage of research sample and research object. The limitation of this study is that the scope of the research is only in consumer’s satisfaction at at Parklatz Café in Ponorogo City, East Java, Indonesia costhe fintech.
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