CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Respondents Characteristic

1. Visited Warunk Upnormal

Table 4.1

Have Visited Warunk Upnormal

No.	Have Visited Warunk Upnormal	Amount	Percentage (%)
1.	Yes	200	100
2.	No	0	0
	Total	200	100

Source: Appendix 4a, Processed

According to Table 4.1 it is known that all of the respondents have visited Warunk Upnormal, which means that the criteria required for this research has been fulfilled.

2. Age

Table 4.2

Age

No.	Age	Amount	Percentage (%)
1.	≤ 16 Years old	0	0
2.	> 16-22 Years old	72	36.0
3.	> 22-28 Years old	94	47.0
4.	> 28-37 Years old	13	6.5
5.	> 37-45 Years old	20	10.0
6.	> 45 Years old	1	0.5
	Total	200	100

Source: Appendix 4a, Processed

According to Table 4.2 it is known that all of the respondents are older than 16 years old, which means that the criteria required for this research has been fulfilled. The majority of respondents are in the age group of >22-28 years old and followed by >16-22 years old group.

3. Lives in Surabaya

Table 4.3

Lives in Surabaya

No.	Lives in Surabaya	Amount	Percentage (%)
1.	Yes	200	100
2.	No	0	0
	Total	200	100

Source: Appendix 4a, Processed

According to Table 4.3 it is known that all of the respondents lives in Surabaya, which means that the criteria required for this research has been fulfilled.

4.2 Descriptive Statistics of Research Variables

Descriptive Statistic used to find out the responds of respondents towards the researched variables through maximum and minimum values (Durianto et al., 2001:43). In this research scale that is used is 1-5, so the minimum and the maximum value can be shaped into an interval such as the following:

$$\frac{Maximum\ Value - Minimum\ Value = 5 - 1 = 0.8}{Total\ Scale}$$

Therefore, it can be obtained from the variables in the following table of Table 4.4

Table 4.4

Interval Assessment

Interval Range	Assessment
1.00-1.80	Strongly Disagree
1.81-2.60	Disagree
2.61-3.40	Neutral
3.41-4.20	Agree
4.21-500	Strongly Agree

Source: Durianto *et al.,* (2001:43)

According to table 4.4, it can be explained that the choices of respondents strongly disagrees when the value is 1.00 and strongly agree if 5.00.

4.2.1 Descriptive Statistic of Experiential Marketing

Table 4.5

Descriptive Statistic of Experiential Marketing

No.	Pernyataan	Mean	Std. Deviation	Criteria
1.	Warunk Upnormal menawarkan lingkungan yang indah.	3.41	1.013	Agree
2.	Suhu ruangan di Warunk Upnormal nyaman.	3.35	1.097	Neutral
3.	Lagu yang dimainkan di Warunk Upnormal.menyenangkan	3.29	1.050	Neutral
4.	Bau di Warunk Upnormal menyenangkan.	3.32	1.045	Neutral

Table 4.5 Continued

5.	Rasa makanan yang disajikan Warunk Upnormal nikmat.	3.34	1.025	Neutral
6.	Warunk Upnormal menawarkan suasana yang nyaman.	3.33	1.084	Neutral
7.	Makan di Warunk Upnormal memberikan perasaan menyenangkan.	3.36	1.061	Neutral
8.	Warunk Upnormal memberi inspirasi terhadap variasi pembuatan Indomie.	3.23	1.050	Neutral
9.	Warunk Upnormal memberi inspirasi terhadap pembuatan variasi makanan	3.27	1.060	Neutral
10.	Warunk Upnormal memberi inspirasi terhadap variasi pembuatan minuman .	3.32	1.037	Neutral
11.	Bahasa tubuh staff Warunk Upnormal baik.	3.31	1.081	Neutral
12.	Kesopanan dari staff Warunk Upnormal baik.	3.22	1.036	Neutral
13.	Penampilan staff Warunk Upnormal baik.	3.34	1.090	Neutral
14.	Warunk Upnormal memfasilitasi pelanggan untuk berinteraksi antara satu dengan yang lain.	3.29	1.048	Neutral
15.	Warunk Upnormal memberikan tempat yang baik untuk customernya berkomunikasi dengan kolega	3.29	1.077	Neutral
Average		3.31	1.057	Neutral

Source: Appendix 4b, Processed

According to Table 4.5 it is known that variable Experiential Marketing (X1) is measured using 15 parameters. Total average value of

experiential marketing is 3.31 and the standard deviation is 1.057. It shows that the answers of the respondents towards Experiential Marketing is neutral. According to the result taken from Table 4.5 the respondents have perception that Warunk Upnormal have a decent experiential marketing.

4.2.2 Descriptive Statistics of Service Quality

Table 4.6

Descriptive Statistics of Service Quality

No.	Statement	Mean	Std. Deviation	Criteria
1.	Warunk Upnromal bersih.	3.32	1.042	Neutral
2.	Karyawan Warunk Upnormal rapi.	3.31	1.040	Neutral
3.	Material furniture yang digunakan Warunk Upnormal baik.	3.27	1.021	Neutral
4.	Peralatan yang digunakan Warunk Upnormal dalam melayani pelanggan kompleks.	3.38	1.086	Neutral
5.	Warunk Upnormal memberikan jasa sesuai yang dijanjikan.	3.32	1.060	Neutral
6.	Warunk Upnormal memberikan barang yang sesuai dengan pesanan customer.	3.39	1.060	Neutral

Table 4.6 Continued

7.	Karyawan Warunk Upnormal memberikan layanan dengan cepat.	3.35	1.120	Neutral
8.	Karyawan Warunk Upnormal membantu permasalahan pelanggan dengan cepat.	3.35	1.045	Neutral
9.	Karyawan Warunk Upnormal menanggapi komplain pelanggan dengan cepat.	3.31	1.064	Neutral
10.	Karyawan Upnormal sopan dalam melayani pelanggan.	3.35	1.060	Neutral
11.	Karyawan Warunk Upnormal terampil dalam menyediakan jasa.	3.26	1.051	Neutral
12.	Karyawan Warunk Upnormal mendukung reputasi Warunk Upnormal.	3.33	1.004	Neutral
13.	Warunk Upnormal mampu menyediakan pesanan khusus pelanggan.	3.28	1.028	Neutral
14.	Karyawan Warunk Upnormal memberikan perhatian kepada pelanggan secara personal.	3.34	1.058	Neutral
15.	Karyawan Warunk Upnormal benar-benar memperhatikan komplain pelanggan.	3.33	1.043	Neutral
Average		3.33	1.052	Neutral

Source: Appendix 4b, Processed

According Table 4.6 it is known that Service Quality (X2) variable measured using 15 parameters. And the average of service quality variable is 3.33 with standard deviation of 1.052. This shows that the statements from the respondents towards service quality is neutral. Which means that Warunk Upnormal gives a decent service quality towards the customers.

4.2.3 Descriptive Statistics of Customers Satisfaction

Table 4.7

Descriptive Statistics of Customers Satisfaction

No.	Statement	Mean	Std. Deviation	Criteria
1.	Suasana di dalam Warunk Upnormal yang menyenangkan memberi rasa puas	3.29	1.035	Neutral
2.	Sikap dari karyawan Warunk Upnormal yang menyenangkan menimbulkan rasa puas	3.32	1.050	Neutral
3.	Penyajian makanan di Warunk Upnormal yang indah memberi rasa puas	3.31	1.076	Neutral
4.	Warunk upnormal yang memberikan kejelasan informasi mengenai menu serta harganya menimbulkan rasa puas	3.29	1.068	Neutral
5.	Pelayanan yang diberikan Warunk Upnormal setara dengan harga yang harus dibayar	3.32	1.102	Neutral
Average		3.31	1.066	Neutral

Source: Appendix 4b, Processed

According to Table 4.7 it is known that Customers Satisfaction (Y1) Variable, which was measured using 5 parameters, have an average value of 3.31 and standard deviation value of 1.066. Which shows that the statements of the respondents towards customers satisfaction is neutral.

4.2.4 Descriptive Statistics of Repurchase Intention

Table 4.8

Descriptive Statistics of Repurchase Intention

No.	Statement	Mean	Std. Deviation	Criteria
1.	Saya bersedia untuk kembali ke Warunk Upnormal di waktu yang akan datang	3.30	1.080	Neutral
2.	Warunk Upnormal menjadi salah satu pertimbangan utama saya untuk memenuhi kebutuhan makan di café.	3.34	1.045	Neutral
3.	Saya sudah merencanakan untuk kembali ke Warunk Upnormal di waktu yang akan datang	3.36	1.089	Neutral
Average		3.33	1.071	Neutral

Source: Appendix 4b, Processed

According to Table 4.8 it is known that Repurchase Intention (Y2) variable which was measured using 3 parameters have a total average value of 3.34 with standard deviation of 1.071. This means the respondents is neutral.

4.3 Structural Equational Modelling Test (SEM)

4.3.1 Normality Test

Normality test is the distribution in variable data metric in creating normal distribution, the degree in which the sample data's distribution correlates to normal distribution (Hair *et. Al.*, 1998).

Normality test is divided into two:

1. Univariate normality.
2. Multivariate normality.

The result of univariate normality test is the following table:

Table 4.9

Univariate Normality Test

Variable	Skewness		Kurtosis		Skewness & Kurtosis		Information
	Z-Score	P-Value	Z-Score	P-Value	Chi-Square	P-Value	
$X_{1.1}$	-2.201	0.028	-0.123	0.902	4.861	0.088	Normal
$X_{1.2}$	-1.176	0.24	-2.095	0.036	5.773	0.056	Normal
$X_{1.3}$	-0.993	0.321	-1.573	0.116	3.458	0.177	Normal
$X_{1.4}$	-1.133	0.257	-2.341	0.019	6.765	0.034	Not Normal
$X_{1.5}$	-1.245	0.213	-1.54	0.123	3.922	0.141	Normal
$X_{1.6}$	-1.713	0.087	-1.351	0.177	4.762	0.092	Normal
$X_{1.7}$	-1.034	0.301	-1.808	0.071	4.34	0.114	Normal
$X_{1.8}$	-1.231	0.218	-2.046	0.041	5.704	0.058	Normal
$X_{1.9}$	-0.879	0.38	-2.058	0.04	5.008	0.082	Normal
$X_{1.10}$	-2.358	0.018	-0.718	0.473	6.075	0.048	Normal
$X_{1.11}$	-1.166	0.244	-2.039	0.041	5.517	0.063	Normal
$X_{1.12}$	-0.509	0.611	-2.206	0.027	5.127	0.077	Normal

Table 4.9 Continued

$X_{1.13}$	-0.792	0.428	-2.299	0.022	5.911	0.052	Normal
$X_{1.14}$	-1.156	0.248	-1.734	0.083	4.345	0.114	Normal
$X_{1.15}$	-1.309	0.19	-1.765	0.078	4.83	0.089	Normal
$X_{2.1}$	-2.082	0.037	-0.719	0.472	4.853	0.088	Normal
$X_{2.2}$	-0.868	0.386	-2.027	0.043	4.86	0.088	Normal
$X_{2.3}$	-0.954	0.34	-1.426	0.154	2.943	0.23	Not Normal
$X_{2.4}$	-2.225	0.026	-1.547	0.122	7.341	0.025	Not Normal
$X_{2.5}$	-1.377	0.168	-1.36	0.174	3.746	0.154	Normal
$X_{2.6}$	-1.433	0.152	-1.687	0.092	4.898	0.086	Normal
$X_{2.7}$	-0.823	0.411	-2.641	0.008	7.653	0.022	Not Normal
$X_{2.8}$	-1.378	0.168	-1.602	0.109	4.464	0.107	Normal
$X_{2.9}$	-1.336	0.182	-1.503	0.133	4.044	0.132	Normal
$X_{2.10}$	-0.737	0.461	-1.704	0.088	3.446	0.179	Normal
$X_{2.11}$	-0.481	0.63	-1.638	0.101	2.915	0.233	Normal
$X_{2.12}$	-1.526	0.127	-1.144	0.252	3.639	0.162	Normal
$X_{2.13}$	-1.29	0.197	-0.784	0.433	2.279	0.32	Not Normal
$X_{2.14}$	-0.739	0.46	-1.741	0.082	3.576	0.167	Normal
$X_{2.15}$	-2.069	0.039	-0.657	0.511	4.71	0.095	Normal
$X_{2.16}$	-0.351	0.726	-2.334	0.02	5.571	0.062	Normal
$Y_{1.1}$	-1.611	0.107	-1.08	0.28	3.761	0.152	Normal
$Y_{1.2}$	-0.861	0.389	-2.306	0.021	6.056	0.048	Not Normal
$Y_{1.3}$	-1.419	0.156	-1.582	0.114	4.514	0.105	Normal
$Y_{1.4}$	-1.473	0.141	-1.552	0.121	4.579	0.101	Normal
$Y_{1.5}$	-0.887	0.375	-2.351	0.019	6.315	0.043	Not Normal
$Y_{2.1}$	-0.814	0.416	-2.329	0.02	6.088	0.048	Not Normal
$Y_{2.2}$	-1.458	0.145	-1.672	0.095	4.921	0.085	Normal
$Y_{2.3}$	-1.044	0.296	-2.197	0.028	5.919	0.052	Not Normal

Source: Appendix 5, Processed

According to Table 4.9 it is shown that univariately not all measurement having the normal distribution because there are several parameters which has p-value < 0.05, therefore multivariate normality test is required.

Table 4.10

Multivariate Normality Test

Skewness			**Kurtosis**			**Skewness and Kurtosis**	
Value	**Z-Score**	**P-Value**	**Value**	**Z-Score**	**P-value**	**Chi-Square**	**P-Value**
313.071	-1.542	0.123	1578.108	-0.601	0.548	2.740	0.254
Information			Normal				

Source: Appendix 5, Processed

According Table 4.10 the multivariate test shows that p-value is 0.254. Because of the p-value being higher than 0.05, then the normality test is considered fulfilled.

4.3.2 Validity Test

Validity test is a test that is used to determine the degree of validity of measuring tools of research towards the content or the actual meaning of the variable measured. An indicator's validity can be measured by the level of significance where it influences a variable over another. The t-value factor loading is greater than the critical value >1.96.

According to the table 4.11 it is shown that the measurement used to measure the variables proven to be valid, because there isn't any measurement which has t-value less than the cut-off which is 1.96.

Table 4.11

Validity Test Results

Variable	Parameters	Factor Loading	Cut-off	Criteria
Experiential Marketing	$X_{1.1}$	1	>1.96	Reference
	$X_{1.2}$	18.42	>1.96	Valid
	$X_{1.3}$	15.83	>1.96	Valid
	$X_{1.4}$	17.06	>1.96	Valid
	$X_{1.5}$	17.85	>1.96	Valid
	$X_{1.6}$	18.47	>1.96	Valid
	$X_{1.7}$	17.64	>1.96	Valid
	$X_{1.8}$	16.07	>1.96	Valid
	$X_{1.9}$	16.21	>1.96	Valid
	$X_{1.10}$	16.64	>1.96	Valid
	$X_{1.11}$	17.43	>1.96	Valid
	$X_{1.12}$	14.13	>1.96	Valid
	$X_{1.13}$	16.39	>1.96	Valid
	$X_{1.14}$	16.17	>1.96	Valid
	$X_{1.15}$	17.66	>1.96	Valid
Service Quality	$X_{2.1}$	1	>1.96	Reference
	$X_{2.2}$	16.45	>1.96	Valid
	$X_{2.3}$	16.67	>1.96	Valid
	$X_{2.4}$	18.77	>1.96	Valid
	$X_{2.5}$	17.44	>1.96	Valid
	$X_{2.6}$	17.53	>1.96	Valid

Table 4.11 Continued

	$X_{2.7}$	16.77	>1.96	Valid
	$X_{2.8}$	17.62	>1.96	Valid
	$X_{2.9}$	16.44	>1.96	Valid
	$X_{2.10}$	18.09	>1.96	Valid
	$X_{2.11}$	14.70	>1.96	Valid
	$X_{2.12}$	18.32	>1.96	Valid
	$X_{2.13}$	17.79	>1.96	Valid
	$X_{2.14}$	18.00	>1.96	Valid
	$X_{2.15}$	19.09	>1.96	Valid
Customers Satisfaction	$Y_{1.1}$	1	>1.96	Reference
	$Y_{1.2}$	16.94	>1.96	Valid
	$Y_{1.3}$	16.73	>1.96	Valid
	$Y_{1.4}$	17.89	>1.96	Valid
	$Y_{1.5}$	17.51	>1.96	Valid
Repurchase Intention	$Y_{2.1}$	1	>1.96	Reference
	$Y_{2.2}$	18.51	>1.96	Valid
	$Y_{2.3}$	20.34	>1.96	Valid

Source: Appendix 7, Processed

4.3.3 Reliability Test

In order to determine the trustworthiness of the information and to make sure that it is in accordance with the reality the reliability test is used. Reliability points towards the definition which dictates whether an instrument used in the research can be trusted as a tool.

The construct reliability which certain indicator can be determined as reliable is when the value of Construct Reliability (CR) is higher than 0.7. The Construct Reliability can be measured using the following formula (Yamin and Kurniawan, 2009):

$$CR = \frac{(\Sigma\lambda)^2}{\Sigma(\lambda)^2 + \Sigma(1-\lambda^2)}$$

Description:

CR = Construct Reliability

λ = Standardized Loading (Load / loading raw)

By using the formula for CR above, we can create the following tables regarding this research:

Table 4.12

Reliability Test X_1

Indicator	λ	λ2	ε=1-λ2
$X_{1.1}$	0.86	0.7396	0.2604
$X_{1.2}$	0.88	0.7744	0.2256
$X_{1.3}$	0.87	0.7569	0.2431
$X_{1.4}$	0.86	0.7396	0.2604
$X_{1.5}$	0.86	0.7396	0.2604
$X_{1.6}$	0.88	0.7744	0.2256
$X_{1.7}$	0.88	0.7744	0.2256
$X_{1.8}$	0.86	0.7396	0.2604
$X_{1.9}$	0.84	0.7056	0.2944
$X_{1.10}$	0.88	0.7744	0.2256
$X_{1.11}$	0.87	0.7569	0.2431
$X_{1.12}$	0.83	0.6889	0.3111
$X_{1.13}$	0.88	0.7744	0.2256
$X_{1.14}$	0.84	0.7056	0.2944

Table 4.12 Continued

$X_{1.15}$	0.87	0.7569	0.2431
Σ	12.96		3.7988
(Σλ)2	167.96	**Reliable**	
(Σλ)2+Σε	171.76		
CR	0.978		

Source: Appendix 9, Processed

Based on the result of reliability test in the table above, the results of the construct reliability can be concluded as reliable, since the CR is 0.978 which is higher than 0.7. Therefore, it can be concluded that experiential marketing variable is reliable.

Table 4.13

Reliability Test X_2

Indicator	**λ**	**λ2**	**ε=1-λ2**
$X_{2.1}$	0.86	0.7396	0.2604
$X_{2.2}$	0.88	0.7744	0.2256
$X_{2.3}$	0.83	0.6889	0.3111
$X_{2.4}$	0.88	0.7744	0.2256
$X_{2.5}$	0.88	0.7744	0.2256
$X_{2.6}$	0.89	0.7921	0.2079
$X_{2.7}$	0.88	0.7744	0.2256
$X_{2.8}$	0.88	0.7744	0.2256
$X_{2.9}$	0.87	0.7569	0.2431
$X_{2.10}$	0.87	0.7569	0.2431
$X_{2.11}$	0.85	0.7225	0.2775
$X_{2.12}$	0.87	0.7569	0.2431
$X_{2.13}$	0.87	0.7569	0.2431

Table 4.13 Continued

$X_{2.14}$	0.88	0.7744	0.2256
$X_{2.15}$	0.87	0.7569	0.2431
Σ	13.06		3.6260
(Σλ)2	170.56	**Reliable**	
(Σλ)2+Σε	174.19		
CR	0.979		

Source: Appendix 9, Processed

Based on the result of reliability test in the table above, the results of the construct reliability can be concluded as reliable, since the CR is 0.979 which is higher than 0.7. Therefore, it can be concluded that service quality variable is reliable.

Table 4.14

Reliability Test Y_1

Indicator	**λ**	**λ2**	**ε=1-λ2**
$Y_{1.1}$	0.86	0.7396	0.2604
$Y_{1.2}$	0.84	0.7056	0.2944
$Y_{1.3}$	0.87	0.7569	0.2431
$Y_{1.4}$	0.87	0.7569	0.2431
$Y_{1.5}$	0.87	0.7569	0.2431
Σ	4.31		1.2841
(Σλ)2	18.576	**Reliable**	
(Σλ)2+Σε	19.86		
CR	0.935		

Source: Appendix 9, Processed

Based on the result of reliability test in the table above, the results of the construct reliability can be concluded as reliable, since the CR is 0.935 which is higher than 0.7. Therefore, it can be concluded that customers satisfaction variable is reliable.

Table 4.15

Reliability Test X_2

Indicator	**λ**	**λ2**	**ε=1-λ2**
$Y_{2.1}$	0.88	0.7744	0.2256
$Y_{2.2}$	0.87	0.7569	0.2431
$Y_{2.3}$	0.88	0.7744	0.2256
Σ	2.63		0.6943
(Σλ)2	6.917	**Reliable**	
(Σλ)2+Σε	7.61		
CR	0.909		

Source: Appendix 9, Processed

Based on the result of reliability test in the table above, the results of the construct reliability can be concluded as reliable, since the CR is 0.909 which is higher than 0.7. Therefore, it can be concluded that repurchase intention variable is reliable.

4.3.4 Structural Equation Model Test

Structural equation model test is used in order to explain the relationship between one hypothesized variable to another. The structural equation model of this research is as the following:

CS = 0.50*EM + 0.55*SQ, Errorvar.= -0.014 , R^2 = 1.02
(0.25) (0.24) (0.0039)
1.98 2.28 -3.67

RI = 1.05*CS, Errorvar.= 0.0079, R^2 = 0.99
(0.060) (0.014)
17.38 0.58

Source: Appendix 6, Processed.

Based on the structural equation above, the conclusion is as the follows:

1. Experiential Marketing has a positive impact on Customers Satisfaction with a coefficient of 0.50. So, should the experiential marketing increases, then the customers satisfaction will also increase.
2. Service Quality has a positive impact on Customers Satisfaction with a coefficient of 0.55. So, should the service quality increases, then the customers satisfaction will also increase.
3. Customers Satisfaction has positive impact on Repurchase Intention with a coefficient of 1.05. So, should the customers satisfaction increases, then the repurchase intention will also increase.

4.3.5 Overall Model Matching Test

The purpose of overall model matching test is to determine the model which the research hypothesized is a good model to represent the result of the research (Yamin and Kurniawan, 2009: 31). The table below is the result of overall model matching test:

Table 4.16

Overall Model Matching Test

Goodness of Fit	Result	Cut of Value	Information
GFI	0.85	≥ 0.9	Marginal Fit
AGFI	0.83	≥ 0.9	Marginal Fit
NFI	0.99	≥ 0.9	Good Fit
IFI	1.00	≥ 0.9	Good Fit
CFI	1.00	≥ 0.9	Good Fit
RFI	0.99	≥ 0.9	Good Fit
RMSEA	0.0	< 0.08	Good Fit

Source: Appendix 6, Processed

Based on the result of the table above, it can be concluded that the entire value of goodness of fit is a good model for the result of this research.

4.3.6 Hypothesis Test

The testing of hypothesis is done to determine the significance of calculation with Structural Equation Model (SEM). Hypothesis testing can be done by testing the structural equations' coefficients by specifying certain level of significance. In this research the significance testing cut-off is 1.96. So should the lambda has t-count > 1.96 then it can be concluded as significant.

Hypothesis Test

Table 4.17

No.	Hypotheses	Direct/ Indirect	Loading Factor	t-Value	Cut-off	Information
1.	Experiential Marketing → Customers Satisfaction	Direct	0.50	1.98	1.96	Significant
2.	Service Quality → Customers Satisfaction	Direct	0.55	2.28	1.96	Significant
3.	Customers Satisfaction → Repurchase Intention	Direct	1.05	17.38	1.96	Significant
4.	Experiential Marketing → Customers Satisfaction→ Repurchase Intention	Indirect	0.53	1.99	1.96	Significant
5.	Service Quality → Customers Satisfaction→ Repurchase Intention	Indirect	0.57	2.26	1.96	Significant

Source: Appendix 6, Processed

4.4 Discussion

1. Impacts of Experiential Marketing on Customers Satisfaction

The descriptive statistic of experiential marketing has mean value of 3.31 and standard deviation of 1.057, this shows that majority of the respondents agrees on the measurement of experiential marketing variable, and the mean of variable customers satisfaction is 3.31 with standard

deviation of 1.066, which shows that the majority of the respondents is neutral on the measurement of customer satisfaction variable.

The first hypothesis propose that experiential marketing has a significant impact on customers satisfaction. According to the result of hypotheses testing the t-value is 1.98 which is higher than the cut-off value, this means that the result matches the hypothesis, therefore experiential marketing does have significant impact on customers satisfaction. So, it can be said that if the experiential marketing is increased then the customers satisfaction will also increase.

This research supports previous study which was done by Razi and Lajevardi (2016), which shows that experiential market had impacts on customers satisfaction. This research also supports explanation by Petrick, Morais, and Norman (2001) in Lee *et. Al.* (2010), on how companies can change the experience when customers uses a product or service in order to gain maximum satisfaction.

2. Impacts of Service Quality on Customers Satisfaction

The descriptive statistic of service quality has mean value of 3.33 and standard deviation of 1.052, which means that the majority of the respondents agrees on the measurement of service quality, and the mean of variable customers satisfaction is 3.31 with standard deviation of 1.066, which shows that the majority of the respondents is neutral on the measurement of customer satisfaction variable.

The second hypothesis propose that service quality has a significant impact on customers satisfaction. According to the result of hypotheses testing the t-value is 2.28 which is higher than the cut-off value,

this means that the result matches the hypothesis, therefore service quality does have significant impact on customers satisfaction. So, it can be said that if the service quality is increased then the customers satisfaction will also increase.

This research supports previous studies which was done by Gunarathne (2014) which shows that service quality had impacts on customers satisfaction, and study done by Susanti (2014) where the result shows that service quality influence customer satisfaction. This research also supports explanation by Cronin *et. Al.* (2000), which stated that service quality is an aspect which influence the customer satisfaction and can also impact customer loyalty.

3. Impacts of Customer Satisfaction on Repurchase Intention

The descriptive statistic of customer satisfaction has mean value of 3.31 with standard deviation of 1.066, which shows that the majority of the respondents agrees on the measurement of customer satisfaction and the mean of variable repurchase intention is 3.33 with standard deviation of 1.071, which shows that the majority of the respondents is neutral on the measurement of repurchase intention variable.

The third hypothesis propose that customer satisfaction has significant impact on repurchase intention. According to the result of hypotheses testing the t-value is 17.38 which is higher than the cut-off value, this means that the result matches the hypothesis, therefore customer satisfaction does have significant impact on repurchase intention. So, it can be said that if the customers satisfaction is increased then the repurchase intention will also increase.

This research supports previous study conducted by Razi and Lajevardi (2016) where their result of research supports their hypothesis on how customer satisfaction will have significant impact on repurchase intention.

4. Impacts of Experiential Marketing on Repurchase Intention Through Customer Satisfaction

The fourth hypothesis propose that experiential marketing has significant impact on repurchase intention through customer satisfaction (experiential marketing influences repurchase intention indirectly). According to the result of hypotheses testing the t-value is 1.99 which is higher than the cut-off value, this means that the result matches the hypothesis, therefore experiential marketing does have significant impact on repurchase intention through customer satisfaction. So, it can e said that if the experiential marketing is increased then the repurchase intention will also increase.

This research supports previous study conducted by Stania and Trenggana (2016), where their research shows that experiential marketing has significant impact on repurchase intention through customer satisfaction.

5. Impacts of Service Quality on Repurchase Intention Through Customer Satisfaction

The fifth hypothesis propose that service quality has significant impact on repurchase intention through customer satisfaction (service quality influences repurchase intention indirectly). According to the result

of the hypotheses testing the t-value is 2.26 which is higher than the cut-off value, this means that the result matches the hypothesis, therefore service quality does have significant impact on repurchase intention through customer satisfaction. So, it can be said that should the service quality increase the customer satisfaction will also increase.

This finding support the previous study conducted by Ahmed *et. al.*, (2010), where their research shows that service quality has significant impact on repurchase intention through customer satisfaction.