International Social Sciences and Humanities
UMJember Proceeding Series (2023) Vol. 2 No 3: 932-940

Proceedings of the ICON 2023
International Conference

Impact Of Retail Service Quality On Purchasing Decisions In Traditional Retail

Feti Fatimah[1]
[1]Universitas Muhammadiyah Jember

Correspondence: Feti Fatimah
Email: fetifatimah@unmuhjember.ac.id

Accepted : Juli 2023
Published: September 2023

Abstract: This study was conducted with traditional retail customers. The purpose of this study is to determine the impact of retail service quality on purchasing decisions in traditional retail. This study used tools such as observations, interviews, and questionnaires to examine his 80 respondents using targeted sampling techniques aimed at determining the respondents' perceptions of each variable. Data was collected from The analyzes used included data instrumentation tests (validity and reliability tests), multiple regression analysis, classical acceptance tests (normality tests, multicollinearity tests, and heteroscedasticity tests), hypothesis tests (t test and F-test), and coefficient of determination analysis. Regression analysis revealed that the variables ``physical aspect'', ``trustworthiness'', ``relationship'', ``problem-solving'', ``policy'', ``ability'' and ``empathy'' had a positive impact on purchasing decisions. You can see that there are t Test Scores: Physical aspects, reliability, personal interactions, problem-solving, policy, competence, and empathy all greatly influence purchasing decisions. Physical aspects, trustworthiness, personal interaction, problem-solving, guidelines, competence, and empathy greatly influence purchasing decisions, as the F-test is calculated as Fcount > Ftable.

Keywords: Retail, Service Quality, Purchasing Decisions. Traditional Retail

INTRODUCTION

Retail is a business activity that sells goods to consumers for their own family consumption, as well as household needs, not for business [1]. The retail sector is currently growing in all areas, both urban and rural [2] [3]. Retail is divided into two groups, namely traditional retail and modern retail. Traditional retail is retail with conventional and traditional management. Modern retail is the development of modern retail [4].

Retail development continues to run from the traditional to the modern. The development of modern retail cannot be prevented because of the development of people's mindset and behavior [5][6]. However, the traditional retail system is still needed by retailers who have small capital and there are still people who feel more comfortable shopping at traditional retailers than modern retailers, so traditional retail and modern retail must synergize [7] [8].Traditional retail must continue to evaluate itself so that it can continue to go hand in hand with modern retail and the level of sales continues to increase [3][9] [10][11].

Sumbersari District in Jember Regency has an area called the campus area because there are several public and private universities. In this campus area there are many traditional retail and modern retail establishments, so that traditional retail can continue to develop, it must continue to innovate, especially in service quality, for customer satisfaction. Research that connects between customer satisfaction and customer loyalty is a research conducted to [12] and [13]. The novelty of this research is examining how traditional retail can develop and go hand in hand with modern retail through retail service quality. On the other hand, the

consumer decision-making process refers to the behavior or actions that precede, influence, and follow decisions related to obtaining products that satisfy consumer needs [14].

METHOD

Variable identification

The variables used in this study are dependent variables that depend on other variables and independent variables that do not affect other variables. The independent variables in this study are Physical Aspects (X1), Reliability (X2), Personal Interaction (X3), Problem Solving (X4), Policy (X5), Competence (X6), Empathy (X7). The dependent variable in this study is the purchase decision (Y).

Population, Sample, Sampling

The population of this study is traditional campus retail customers. The survey sample includes 80 of his consumers. The sampling technique used is non-probabilistic sampling with targeted sampling techniques. A sampling technique that does not provide equal opportunity or opportunity for all items or members of a population to be sampled. The non-probabilistic sampling technique used is saturated sampling. Saturated sampling is a sampling technique that uses all members of the population as samples. Targeted sampling is used because researchers believe they can be representative of specific individuals, and because researchers have specific criteria that are considered representative of the sample as a whole.

Data Collection Technology

In this study, data will be collected through interviews, questionnaires and observations. Questionnaire results are calculated using the Likert scale.

Data Analysis

Instrumental data tests (validity and reliability tests), multiple regression analysis, classical acceptance tests (normality test, multicollinearity test, heteroscedasticity test) and hypothesis tests (t-test, F-test, coefficient of determination) were used for data analysis**.**

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Data Analysis

Quantitative analysis is a method of analysis using numbers that can be counted or measured. Quantitative analysis aims to quantitatively estimate the magnitude of the impact of a change on one or more other events using statistical analysis tools. The processing of data by quantitative analysis is carried out in several stages as follows:

Data Instrument Testing

1. Data Validity Testing

Validity tests are used to test how well the meter's accuracy can reveal the concept of the symptom/event being measured. A survey item is validated if r count > r table (n-2) values. A complete validity check is shown in Table 1.

Table 1 Validity Testing Results

No	Variable/Indicator	r count	r table	Information
	Physical Aspects			
1	X1.1	0,669	0,2199	
2	X1.2	0,865	0,2199	
3	X1.3	0,812	0,2199	
	Reliability			
1	X2.1	0,733	0,2199	
2	X2.2	0,792	0,2199	
3	X2.3	0,753	0,2199	
	Personal Interaction			
1	X3.1	0,694	0,2199	
2	X3.2	0,860	0,2199	

No	Variable/Indicator	r count	r table	Information
3	X3.3	0,793	0,2199	
	Problem Solving			
1	X4.1	0,890	0,2199	
2	X4.2	0,864	0,2199	
	Policy (			
1	X5.1	0,776	0,2199	
2	X5.2	0,818	0,2199	
3	X5.3	0,745	0,2199	
	Competence			
1	X6.1	0,710	0,2199	
2	X6.2	0,847	0,2199	
3	X6.3	0,822	0,2199	
	Empathy			
1	X7.1	0,831	0,2199	
2	X7.2	0,796	0,2199	
	Buying decision			
1	Y.1	0,781	0,2199	
2	Y.2	0,803	0,2199	
3	Y.3	0.624	0,2199	
4	Y.4	0,784	0,2199	

From Table 1, we can see that the correlation between each metric and the total configured value of each variable gives valid results because r count > r table. From this we can conclude that all propositional positions are declared valid.

2. Data reliability check

Reliability testing is used to test how reliable the meter can be used again for the same study. The study uses the alpha formula for reliability testing. The results of the reliability tests for each variable are summarized in Table 2 below

Table 2 Reliability Test Results

No	Variabel	Alpha hitung
1	*Physical Aspects* (X_1)	0,687
2	Reliability (X_2)	0,635
3	*Personal Interaction* (X_3)	0,687
4	*Problem Solving* (X_4)	0,699
5	*Policy* (X_5)	0,676
6	*Competence* (X_6)	0,694
7	*Empathy* (X_7)	0,690
8	Buying decision (Y)	0,741

The reliability test results show that all variables have sufficient alpha coefficients or meet the criterion of reliability greater than 0.600, so the terms for each of these variable concepts are suitable as future measurement tools.

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

A good regression equation model satisfies the requirements of classical assumptions, such as that all data are normally distributed, that the model has no symptoms of multicollinearity, and that there is no heteroscedasticity. The analysis so far proves that the equation model proposed in this study satisfies the requirements of the classical assumptions, so the equation model in this study is considered good. Based on the multiple regression estimation by the program SPSS version 22.0, the results in Table 3 are obtained.

Table 3 Results of Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

No	Variabel	Koefisien Regresi	*Standart Error*
1	Konstanta	1,890	0,767
2	*Physical Aspects* (X_1)	0,192	0,069
3	Reliability (X_2)	0,195	0,058
4	*Personal Interaction* (X_3)	0,313	0,086
5	*Problem Solving* (X_4)	0,294	0,118
6	*Policy* (X_5)	0,264	0,094
7	*Competence* (X_6)	0,295	0,095
8	*Empathy* (X_7)	0,258	0,150

Based on table 3, it can be seen that the regression equation formed is:
$Y = 1{,}890 + 0{,}192\ X_1 + 0{,}195\ X_2 + 0{,}313\ X_3 + 0{,}294\ X_4 + 0{,}264\ X_5 + 0{,}295\ X_6 + 0{,}258\ X_7 + 0{,}120\ e$
Keterangan:

Y = Keputusan Pembelian
X_1 = *Physical Aspects*
X_2 = Reliability
X_3 = *Personal Interaction*
X_4 = *Problem Solving*
X_5 = *Policy*
X_6 = *Competence*
X_7 = *Empathy*

From this formula we can interpret:

1. The constant 1,890 represents the magnitude of purchase decisions when physical dimensions, trustworthiness, personal interaction, problem-solving, policy, competence, and empathy are zero.
2. $\beta 1 = 0.192$ means that each unit's physical aspect variables influence purchase decisions by 0.192, assuming constant trustworthiness, personal interaction, problem-solving, policy, competence, and empathy. This also suggests that physical aspects have a positive impact on purchasing decisions, implying that better physical aspects increase purchasing decisions. 3. $\beta 2 = 0.195$ means that each unit's reliability variable influences purchase decisions by 0.185, assuming constant physical aspects, personal interactions, problem-solving, guidelines, competence, and empathy. increase. This also suggests that reliability has a positive impact on purchasing decisions, i.e., more reliable products offered lead to increased purchasing decisions.
4. $\beta 3 = 0.313$ means that each unit's personal interaction variables influence purchase decisions by 0.313, assuming constant physical dimensions, reliability, problem-solving, policy, competence, and empathy. increase. This also suggests that face-to-face interactions have a positive impact on purchase decisions, implying that better locations influence increased purchase decisions.
5. $\beta 4 = 0.294$ indicates that each unit's problem-solving variables influence his purchase decision by 0.294, assuming constant physical aspects, reliability, personal interactions, politics, competence, and empathy. is showing. This also suggests that problem solving has a positive impact on purchasing decisions, i.e. better problem solving influences an increase in purchasing decisions.
6. $\beta 5 = 0.264$ means that each unit's policy variables influence purchase decisions by 0.264, assuming constant physical dimensions, trustworthiness, personal interaction, problem-solving, politics, competence, and empathy. This also suggests that policies have a positive impact on purchase decisions, i.e. better policies lead to higher purchase decisions.
7. $\beta 6 = 0.295$ means that each unit competency variable influences the purchase decision by 0.295, assuming constant physical aspects, trustworthiness, personal interaction, problem-solving, guidelines, and empathy. This also suggests that competencies have a positive impact on purchasing decisions, i.e., improving competencies influences an increase in purchasing decisions. 8. $\beta 7 = 0.258$ means that the variables empathy influence each unit purchase decision by 0.258, assuming constant physical aspects, reliability, personal interaction, problem solving, policies, and abilities To do. This also suggests that competencies have a positive impact on purchasing decisions, i.e., improving competencies influences an increase in purchasing decisions.

Hypothesis Testing

1. t test

The hypotheses in this study were tested for validity using subtests. The test is performed by examining the t-count statistic using the t-table statistics and the significance level (p-value). If the calculated significance level is less than 0.05, the hypothesis is accepted; conversely, if the calculated significance level is greater than 0.05, the hypothesis is rejected.

Table Test Results t

No	Variabel	Sig hitung	t hitung	Keterangan
1	*Physical Aspects* (X_1)	0,003	1,815	Signifikan
2	Reliability (X_2)	0,004	1,940	Signifikan
3	*Personal Interaction* (X_3)	0,001	3,537	Signifikan
4	*Problem Solving* (X_4)	0,015	2,487	Signifikan
5	*Policy* (X_5)	0,009	2,689	Signifikan
6	*Competence* (X_6)	0,008	2,738	Signifikan
7	*Empathy* (X_7)	0,004	2,049	Signifikan

From Table 4, we can see that the comparison of the significance level and the significance table is:

a. The results of the physical aspects test show that the calculated significance value is greater than or equal to 0.003 and less than 0.05, with t count (1.815) > t table (1.6663), indicating that the physical aspects hypothesis has a significant impact on purchasing decisions. This also indicates that H0 is rejected and H1 is accepted. In other words, physical aspects influence purchasing decisions. This means that the more influence the physical aspect has, the better the purchasing decision will be.
b. The results of the reliability test are a calculated significance value of 0.004 greater than 0.05 and a t count (1.940) < 3. The t table (1.6663) is accepted, implying that the reliability hypothesis has a significant impact on purchase decisions. This also shows that H0 is rejected and H2 is accepted, which means that reliability influences the buying decision, i.e. the higher the reliability, the better the buying decision.
c. The results of the face-to-face interaction test show that the calculated significance value is greater than or equal to 0.001 and less than 0.05, with t-count (3.537) > t-table (1.6663), indicating that the face-to-face interaction hypothesis has a significant impact on purchase decisions. This also shows that H0 was rejected and H3 was accepted, i.e. personal interaction influences the purchasing decision. This means that the better the influence of personal interactions, the better the purchasing decision.
d. The calculated significance value for the problem-solving test result is greater than or equal to 0.015 and less than 0.05, t count (2.487) > t table (1.6663). This means that problem-solving hypotheses have a significant impact on purchasing decisions. This also shows that H0 is rejected and H4 is accepted, i.e. problem solving influences the purchase decision, i.e. the greater the impact of problem solving, the better the purchasing decision.
e. The significant arithmetic value of the policy test result is greater than or equal to 0.009 and less than 0.05, t count (2.689) > t table (1.6663). This means that policy hypotheses have a significant impact on purchasing decisions. This also shows that H0 was rejected and H5 was accepted. This means that people influence their buying decisions: the better the policy, the better the buying decision.
f. The calculated significance value for the competency test results is greater than or equal to 0.008 and less than 0.05, with t count (2.738) > t table (1.6663), indicating that the competency hypothesis is accepted to have a significant impact on purchasing decisions. I mean This also shows that H0 is rejected and H6 is accepted, i.e. competencies influence purchasing decisions, i.e. better competencies influence better purchasing decisions. increase.
g. The calculated significance value for the empathy test result is greater than or equal to 0.004 and less than 0.05 with t count (2.049) > t table (1.6663). This means that the empathy hypothesis has a significant impact on purchasing decisions. This also indicates that H0 is rejected and H7 is accepted. That means that empathy influences buying decisions, or better empathy influences better buying decisions..

2. F test

To test the effect of the independent variable, test it together with the F-test. The statistical calculation results in Table 3 show a significance value of 0.000. Using a significance level of 0.05, the significance level is less than the significance level, and Fcount > Ftable indicates that physical aspects, reliability, personal interaction, problem solving, policy, competence, and empathy all have a significant impact on purchase decisions. Given -tan accepted.

Table F Test Results

No	Criteria	
1	F count (83,710)	F table (2,1397)
2	Significance value (0,000)	Significance level (0,05)

Based on Table 5, we find that Fcount > Ftable (83.710 > 2.1397), followed by physical aspects, trustworthiness, personal interaction, problem solving, policy, competence, and empathy have a 5% significant impact on purchasing decisions. , in which case H0 was rejected. Thus, the hypothesis that physical aspects, trustworthiness, personal interactions, problem-solving, politics, competence, and empathy significantly influence purchase decisions (H1 acceptance) proved true.

Coefficient Of Determination

The coefficient of determination is a quantity that indicates the variation in the dependent variable that can be explained by the independent variables. In other words, the coefficient of determination measures how well the independent variable explains the dependent variable.

Table 6 Coefficient Of Determination Test Results

No	Criteria	Koefisien
1	*R*	0,945
2	*R Square*	0,890
3	*Adjusted R Square*	0,890

As a result of the regression calculation in Table 4.21, we can see that the determined coefficient of determination is 0.890. This means that 89.0% of the variation in purchasing decision variables can be explained by physical aspects, trustworthiness, personal interactions, problem-solving, policy, competence, and empathy, while the remaining 0.110 or 11.0% can be explained by other variables that are not submitted. The survey includes information such as price, inventory, and more.

DISCUCCION

Statistical test results clearly show that all independent variables influence the dependent variable in some cases. The effects of seven independent variables are positive. H. The better the physical aspect, reliability, personal interaction, problem-solving, politics, competence, and empathy, the higher the purchasing decision. These results are consistent with the proposed hypothesis. The results of this study contradict those of previous studies. Explanations for each variation effect are given below.

Influence of Physical Aspects on Purchasing Decisions

Hypothesis testing shows that physical aspects influence purchasing decisions. Based on the results of the calculations performed, the significance level is 0.003, which is less than 0.05, t count (1.815) > t table (1.6663), meaning the hypothesis is accepted. This statistical test proves that physical aspects such as store paint color, building shape, and parking space influence purchasing decisions. This means that physical aspects influence purchasing decisions.

Physical Aspects can influence purchasing decisions, because the concept of Physical Aspects itself is basically relative, which depends on the perspective or characteristics used to determine characteristics and specifications. If analyzed further, Physical Aspects will be profitable in the long run due to external benefits derived from customer satisfaction and internal benefits derived from improvements in the efficiency of

Physical Aspects. Physical Aspects is a potential strategic weapon to defeat competitors. So only companies with the best Physical Aspects will grow rapidly, and in the long term traditional retail will be more successful. Physical Aspects is an understanding that the Physical Aspects owned by retailers have a high selling value. Good Physical Aspects can improve retail image in the eyes of consumers. Good Physical Aspects are needed so that consumer desires can be fulfilled. Consumer desires that are fulfilled in accordance with their expectations will make consumers loyal to these retailers. Consumers will be satisfied if the results of their evaluation show that the retail Physical Aspects are good.

Impact of Reliability on Purchasing Decisions

Hypothesis testing shows that reliability does not influence purchase decisions. Based on the results of the calculations performed, the significance level is greater than 0.05 at 0.004, t count (1.940) > t table (1.6663), meaning the hypothesis is accepted. This statistical test proves that there are credibility effects, including consideration of the consumer, price matching the value of the product, and consideration of consumer needs influencing purchasing decisions.

This fact indicates that price is now one of the main factors influencing consumer purchasing decisions. The selling price is basically the presentation to the consumer. If the consumer agrees to the price, the product will be sold, but if the consumer refuses, the selling price will need to be confirmed. Post-purchase disagreements may arise among consumers because the price is considered too high, or because it does not match expectations or previous descriptions. Therefore, a good pricing strategy is required. Pricing strategy is very important to attract consumer attention. A fair price is a price that satisfies the consumer according to the quality of the product. Marketers try to achieve specific goals through pricing components.

The impact of personal interactions on purchasing decisions.

Hypothesis testing has shown that location influences purchasing decisions. Based on the results of the calculations performed, the significance level is 0.001, which is less than 0.05 and t count (3.537) > t table (1.6663), meaning the hypothesis is accepted. This statistical test has a location effect, such as whether the location is accessible by all types of public and private vehicles, whether the location is clearly visible from the main road, and whether the provision of ample parking affects purchases. It proves that. decision. This means that face-to-face interactions influence purchasing decisions. Personal interaction is a retailer's ability to respond to customer requests, inspire customer confidence, and achieve customer trust, and is one of the contextual factors that influences purchasing decisions.

Effect of Problem Solving on Purchasing Decisions.

Hypothesis testing shows that problem solving influences purchasing decisions. Based on the results of the calculations performed, the significance level is 0.015, which is less than 0.05, t count (2.487) > t table (1.6663), meaning the hypothesis is accepted. This statistical test proves its effectiveness in solving problems such as resolving consumer complaints and replacing damaged goods. This means that problem solving influences purchasing decisions.

Problem Solving is an important aspect of marketing because having Problem Solving skills makes consumers feel cared for. With this Problem Solving, it is hoped that consumers will want to buy at traditional retailers again and encourage consumers who have already bought to buy products more frequently, so that repeat purchases will occur.

Influence of Policy on Purchasing Decisions.

Hypothesis test results showed that policy influences purchasing decisions. Based on the results of the calculations performed, the significance level is 0.009, which is less than 0.05, t count (2.689) > t table (1.6663), meaning the hypothesis is accepted. This statistical test proves that the policy has an impact. This also includes compliance with established rules for employees. Employees are friendly to customers, and well-groomed employees influence purchasing decisions. This means that politics influences purchasing decisions.

Policy is a provision that is applied for the convenience of consumers and all employees to provide the best service to consumers, where this will influence purchasing decisions. The better the employees and staff provide service to consumers, the more interested consumers will be in making purchases, thus the better the

policies provided by employees, the more likely they are to make purchasing decisions. Policy is a part that is no less important than the other elements of the marketing mix because it is all actors who play an important role in the delivery of services so that they can influence buyer perceptions.

Influence of competence on purchasing decisions.

Hypothesis testing shows that ability influences purchasing decisions. Based on the results of the calculations performed, the significance level is 0.008, which is less than 0.05, t count (2.738) > t table (1.6663), meaning the hypothesis is accepted. This statistical test proves that the influence of competencies, including employee skills and knowledge, influences purchasing decisions. This means you have the power to influence purchasing decisions.

Impact Of Empathy On Purchasing Decisions

Hypothesis testing showed that empathy influences purchase decisions. Based on the results of the calculations performed, the significance level is 0.004, which is less than 0.05, t count (2.049) > t table (1.6663), meaning the hypothesis is accepted. This statistical test proves that the empathy effect exists. This includes identifying and meeting customer needs and ensuring that consumers are compensated when retailers make mistakes in providing services that influence their purchasing decisions. This means that empathy influences purchasing decisions.

CONCLUSION

The results of the statistical surveys carried out, i.e. the results of this study, can be summarized as follows: (1) Physical aspects greatly influence purchasing decisions in traditional retail. This is supported by the t-test results, with arithmetic significance less than alpha-alpha (0.003 <0.05). (2) Reliability strongly influences purchasing decisions in traditional retail. This is supported by the t-test results, which have a calculated significance below alpha (0.004 < 0.05). (3) Face-to-face interactions greatly influence purchasing decisions in traditional retail. This is supported by the t-test results, where the calculated significance is less than alpha (0.001<0.05). (4) Problem solving has a significant impact on purchasing decisions in traditional retail. This is supported by the t-test results, where the calculated significance is less than alpha (0.015<0.05). (5) Politics greatly influences purchasing decisions in traditional retail. This is supported by the t-test results, which have a calculated significance less than alpha (0.009 < 0.05). (6) Competencies strongly influence purchasing decisions in traditional retail. This is supported by the t-test results, where the calculated significance is less than alpha (0.008<0.05). (7) Empathy greatly influences purchasing decisions in traditional retail. This is supported by the t-test results, where the calculated significance is less than alpha (0.004 < 0.05). Based on the conclusions of the above study results, the proposals for this study are: To motivate customers to buy, businesses must maintain and improve their physical dimensions, authenticity, personal interaction, problem solving, policy, competence and empathy. Products, places, advertising, people/employees, physical evidence, processes. The results of the coefficient of determination test indicate that additional variables should be considered in this study. There are many other variables that can affect customer satisfaction, such as equipment, so further research should add more variables that can affect customer satisfaction.

REFERENCES

[1] Cardoso *et al.*, "Trust and Loyalty in Building the Brand Relationship with the Customer: Empirical Analysis in a Retail Chain in Northern Brazil," *J. Open Innov. Technol. Mark. Complex.*, vol. 8, no. 3, 2022, doi: 10.3390/joitmc8030109.

[2] Supriyanto, B. Irawan, and D. Yulisetiarini, "THE EFFECT OF MODERN RETAIL MIX , QUALITY OF SERVICE , AND STORE ATMOSPHERE ON LOYALTY WITH MODERN RETAIL CONSUMER SATISFACTION MEDIATION JEMBER," vol. 5, no. November, pp. 1–8, 2022.

[3] E. C. Chang and bo Luan, "Chinese consumers' perception of hypermarket store image," *Asia Pacific J. Mark. Logist.*, vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 512–527, 2010, doi: 10.1108/13555851011090538.

[4] E. W. Indarto, I. Suroso, S. Sudaryanto, dan N. Qomariah, "the Effect of Brand Image and Product Attributes on Customer Satisfaction and Customer Loyalty," *J. Apl. Manaj.*, vol. 16, no. 3, hal. 457–466, 2018, doi: 10.21776/ub.jam.2018.016.03.10.

[5] F. Fatimah and A. Izzuddin, "Meningkatkan Pembelian Ulang Melalui Quantitative Strategy Planning Matrix Pada Ritel Pasar," *UMMagelang Conf. Ser.*, pp. 173–183, 2021, [Online]. Available: http://journal.unimma.ac.id/index.php/conference/article/view/5852%0Ahttp://journal.unimma.ac.id/index.php/conference/article/download/5852/2664.
[6] J. R. E. Barry Berman, *Retail Management*, Eight edit. Jakarta: Penerbit Intermedia (terjemahan), 2001.
[7] M. Childs, T. Blanchflower, S. Hur, and D. Matthews, "Non-traditional marketplaces in the retail apocalypse: investigating consumers' buying behaviours," *Int. J. Retail Distrib. Manag.*, vol. 48, no. 3, pp. 262–286, 2020, doi: 10.1108/IJRDM-03-2019-0079.
[8] M. F. Najib and A. Sosianika, "Retail service quality scale in the context of Indonesian traditional market," *Int. J. Bus. Glob.*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 19–31, 2018, doi: 10.1504/IJBG.2018.094093.
[9] M. F. Najib, "How store image affect satisfaction and loyalty: A structural model for traditional market," *Adv. Soc. Sci. Educ. Humanit. Res.*, vol. 542, pp. 5–9, 2021.
[10] N. Qomariah, "Pengaruh Kualitas Layanan & Citra Terhadap Universitas," *Jurnal Aplikasi Manajemen*, vol. 10, no. 1. hal. 178, 2012.
[11] R. Suarantalla, Y. Sudodo, and K. Hermanto, "Analisis Faktor yang Mempengaruhi Eksistensi Ritel Tradisional di Kecamatan Sumbawa Menggunakan Structural Equation Modeling," *Performa Media Ilm. Tek. Ind.*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 185–198, 2020, doi: 10.20961/performa.19.2.44682.
[12] T. J. Utomo, "The Competition of Retail Business : Traditional vs Modern," *Fokus Ekon.*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 122–133, 2011.
[13] W. E. Setianingsih dan N. Nursaidah, "How Does Hotel Service Innovation Affect Experiential Value and Consumer Decisions to Stay in Hotels?," *J. Manaj. Bisnis*, vol. 14, no. 1, hal. 162–178, 2023, doi: 10.18196/mb.v14i1.16601.
[14] Y. Sugianti and O. F. Sitorus, "Eksistensi Ritel Tradisional Masa Pandemi Covid-19," *J. Pendidik. Ekon.*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 72–81, 2021, doi: 10.19184/jpe.v15i1.19315.