

# The Influence of Marketing Mix and Service Quality on Consumer Loyalty through Consumer Satisfaction of Yamaha Filano Consumers

Nanang Andhiyan Mergining Mei<sup>1✉</sup>, Anna Kridaningsih<sup>2</sup>, Totok Yulaidin<sup>3</sup>, Nikita Cahya Sabrina<sup>4</sup>,  
Fajrin Rean Alfa Avrillia<sup>5</sup>

(1,3,4,5) Management Study Program, Universitas Bina Sehat PPNI, Mojokerto, Indonesia

(2) Management Study Program, Universitas Mayjen Sungkono, Mojokerto, Indonesia

**Abstract:** Previous studies have extensively examined the relationships among marketing mix, service quality, customer satisfaction, and customer loyalty in tourism, retail, and service industries. However, empirical evidence focusing on premium scooter consumers, particularly Yamaha Grand Filano users, remains limited, and findings regarding the direct effect of marketing mix on loyalty are still inconsistent. This study aims to investigate the influence of marketing mix and service quality on consumer loyalty through consumer satisfaction among Yamaha Grand Filano consumers. The study employed a quantitative explanatory approach using Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) with SmartPLS 4.1. The findings indicate that marketing mix and service quality significantly affect consumer satisfaction. Service quality and consumer satisfaction also have significant positive effects on consumer loyalty, whereas marketing mix does not directly influence consumer loyalty. Furthermore, consumer satisfaction significantly mediates the effects of marketing mix and service quality on consumer loyalty. The study contributes to the marketing literature by extending the satisfaction-mediated loyalty framework to the premium motorcycle segment and provides managerial insights for strengthening customer retention strategies.

## Article history:

Received: 30 June 2026

Revised: 23 August 2026

Accepted: 23 August 2026

Published: 28 August 2026

## Keyword:

Marketing Mix, Service Quality,  
Consumer Satisfaction, Consumer  
Loyalty

This is an open-access article under the [CC-BY-SA License](#).



**How to cite:** Mei, N. A. M., Kridaningsih, A., Yulaidin, T., Sabrina, N. C., & Avrillia, F. R. A. (2026). The Influence of Marketing Mix and Service Quality on Consumer Loyalty through Consumer Satisfaction of Yamaha Filano Consumers. *PERSEPTIF: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Humaniora*, 4(3), 622-634. <https://doi.org/10.70716/perseptif.v4i3.694>

## INTRODUCTION

The Indonesian motorcycle market remains highly competitive, particularly in the automatic scooter segment. According to the Asosiasi Industri Sepeda Motor Indonesia (2026), approximately 6.4 million motorcycles were sold in Indonesia in 2025, with sales projected to increase to 6.7 million units in 2026. Although this projection indicates sustained market demand, it also reflects an increasingly competitive environment in which motorcycle manufacturers and dealers must not only attract new customers but also maintain existing customers through effective marketing strategies and consistent service performance. In this context, customer loyalty becomes an important strategic outcome because loyal consumers are more likely to repurchase, recommend a brand, and maintain their preference despite competitive alternatives (Oliver, 1999).

This competitive condition is particularly relevant to the premium automatic scooter segment. Yamaha Grand Filano Hybrid Connected represents Yamaha's premium scooter offering that combines design, technological features, comfort, and lifestyle-oriented positioning. However, product attributes alone may not be sufficient to establish long-term consumer loyalty. Consumers evaluate

their overall experience through the marketing activities surrounding the product and the quality of services provided by dealers and workshops. Therefore, understanding how marketing mix and service quality contribute to satisfaction and subsequent loyalty is important for explaining consumer behavior in this segment.

The marketing mix provides a strategic framework through which firms create and communicate value to target consumers. The expanded 7P framework consists of product, price, place, promotion, people, process, and physical evidence (Booms & Bitner, 1981; Kotler & Keller, 2016). In the motorcycle market, these dimensions are reflected in product design and features, price competitiveness, dealer accessibility, promotional activities, employee performance, purchasing and service processes, and the physical environment of dealerships and workshops. Previous empirical studies have demonstrated that marketing mix influences customer satisfaction and, in some contexts, customer loyalty (Ayuni & Kristianto, 2025; Chien et al., 2024; Ardani, 2021). However, the strength and significance of its direct effect on loyalty are not consistently demonstrated across different research contexts.

Service quality represents another important determinant of consumer evaluation. The SERVQUAL framework conceptualizes service quality through tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy (Parasuraman et al., 1988). For motorcycle consumers, these dimensions can be reflected in dealership facilities, employee responsiveness, reliability of maintenance services, after-sales support, and the ability of service personnel to address customer needs and complaints. Previous studies have shown that service quality can influence both satisfaction and loyalty (Andrianto & Santoso, 2019; Imran et al., 2023; Mei et al., 2024). Nevertheless, the extent to which service quality contributes to loyalty may depend on the satisfaction generated by consumers' overall experience.

Consumer satisfaction provides an important mechanism for understanding these relationships. Based on Expectation Confirmation Theory, satisfaction results from consumers' evaluation of whether actual performance meets or exceeds their expectations (Oliver, 1980). When consumers perceive that products, marketing activities, and services provide value consistent with or beyond their expectations, they are more likely to develop favorable evaluations and subsequent loyalty. Empirical studies have demonstrated the importance of satisfaction in connecting marketing mix and service quality with loyalty (Andri et al., 2022; Andrianto & Santoso, 2019; Ardani, 2021; Mei et al., 2025). Thus, examining satisfaction as a mediating variable provides a more comprehensive explanation of how marketing and service-related factors are translated into consumer loyalty.

Despite these findings, an important empirical gap remains. First, much of the existing evidence concerning the relationships among marketing mix, service quality, satisfaction, and loyalty has been generated in tourism, hospitality, banking, retail, marketplace, and other service-oriented contexts (Andri et al., 2022; Ardani, 2021; Azhar et al., 2019). Consequently, the applicability of these relationships to the premium motorcycle segment cannot be assumed without empirical examination. Second, previous findings regarding the direct relationship between marketing mix and loyalty are not entirely consistent. While some studies report a significant direct relationship (Ayuni & Kristianto, 2025), other studies indicate that satisfaction plays an important mediating role between marketing-related factors and loyalty (Andrianto & Santoso, 2019; Mei et al., 2025). This inconsistency suggests that the relationship between marketing mix and loyalty requires further investigation through a model that explicitly incorporates consumer satisfaction. Third, empirical evidence specifically examining

Yamaha Grand Filano consumers remains limited, particularly concerning the simultaneous roles of marketing mix and service quality and the mediating function of satisfaction.

The novelty of this study lies in the integration and empirical testing of marketing mix and service quality as antecedents of consumer loyalty, with consumer satisfaction positioned as a mediating mechanism, specifically among Yamaha Grand Filano consumers. Unlike previous studies that predominantly examine these relationships in tourism, hospitality, banking, retail, marketplace, or general motorcycle contexts, this study focuses on the premium automatic scooter segment represented by Yamaha Grand Filano. More importantly, the study examines whether marketing mix and service quality generate loyalty directly or whether their effects are realized through consumer satisfaction. This distinction is particularly relevant because the previous literature reports inconsistent findings regarding the direct effect of marketing mix on loyalty. By testing both direct and indirect relationships within a single PLS-SEM model, this study contributes empirical evidence regarding the mechanism through which marketing and service factors are transformed into loyalty in the premium motorcycle market. The findings therefore extend the existing consumer loyalty literature from predominantly service-sector settings to a specific premium motorcycle context and provide a more contextualized explanation of loyalty formation among Yamaha Grand Filano consumers.

Accordingly, this study aims to analyze the direct effects of marketing mix and service quality on consumer satisfaction and consumer loyalty, as well as the effect of consumer satisfaction on loyalty and its mediating role in the relationships between marketing mix, service quality, and consumer loyalty among Yamaha Grand Filano consumers. The findings are expected to contribute to marketing literature by providing empirical evidence from the premium motorcycle segment and to provide practical implications for Yamaha dealers in developing marketing strategies and service improvements that strengthen consumer satisfaction and long-term loyalty.

## RESEARCH METHOD

### Research Design

This study employed a quantitative explanatory research design to investigate the causal relationships among marketing mix, service quality, consumer satisfaction, and consumer loyalty among Yamaha Grand Filano consumers. An explanatory approach was selected because the study aimed to test both direct and indirect effects among variables based on an established theoretical framework (Hair et al., 2022). The research adopted a cross-sectional survey design in which data were collected from respondents at a single point in time through structured questionnaires.

The study examined four constructs: marketing mix (X1), service quality (X2), consumer satisfaction (Z), and consumer loyalty (Y). Marketing mix was measured using the 7P dimensions proposed by Booms and Bitner (1981) and further discussed by Kotler and Keller (2016). Service quality was assessed using the SERVQUAL dimensions developed by Parasuraman et al. (1988), including tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy. Consumer satisfaction was measured based on Expectation Confirmation Theory (Oliver, 1980), whereas consumer loyalty indicators referred to Oliver (1999).

All items were measured using a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 ("strongly disagree") to 5 ("strongly agree").

### Data Collection Procedure

Primary data were collected through a structured questionnaire distributed directly and electronically to Yamaha Grand Filano consumers. Prior to large-scale distribution, the questionnaire

was reviewed to ensure clarity and relevance to the research objectives. Participation was voluntary, and respondents were informed that their responses would be used solely for academic purposes.

### Data Analysis Technique

Data analysis was conducted using Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) with SmartPLS 4 software (Ringle et al., 2024). PLS-SEM was selected because it is appropriate for predictive and exploratory models involving mediation effects and does not require strict assumptions regarding data normality (Hair et al., 2022; Muhson, 2022).

The analysis consisted of two stages. First, the measurement model (outer model) was evaluated through convergent validity, discriminant validity, composite reliability, and Cronbach's alpha. Indicators with outer loading values greater than 0.70 and Average Variance Extracted (AVE) values above 0.50 were considered valid, while composite reliability and Cronbach's alpha values exceeding 0.70 indicated satisfactory reliability (Hair et al., 2022).

Second, the structural model (inner model) was assessed using the coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ), path coefficients, effect significance, and mediation analysis through bootstrapping procedures. Hypotheses were accepted when p-values were lower than 0.05.

### Research Hypotheses

Based on the conceptual framework, the study proposed the following hypotheses:

H1: Marketing mix positively and significantly affects consumer satisfaction.

H2: Service quality positively and significantly affects consumer satisfaction.

H3: Marketing mix positively and significantly affects consumer loyalty.

H4: Service quality positively and significantly affects consumer loyalty.

H5: Consumer satisfaction positively and significantly affects consumer loyalty.

H6: Consumer satisfaction mediates the relationship between marketing mix and consumer loyalty.

H7: Consumer satisfaction mediates the relationship between service quality and consumer loyalty.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Results

#### Measurement Model Assessment (Outer Model)

The measurement model was evaluated to assess convergent validity, discriminant validity, and internal consistency reliability. Convergent validity was examined using outer loading and Average Variance Extracted (AVE), while discriminant validity was assessed using cross-loading and the Fornell-Larcker criterion. Internal consistency reliability was evaluated using Cronbach's Alpha, rho\_A, and Composite Reliability.

#### Convergent Validity

Convergent validity was initially assessed based on the outer loading values of each indicator. In general, an outer loading of 0.70 or higher is considered desirable. However, indicators with loadings between 0.40 and 0.70 may be considered for retention when their removal does not substantially improve construct reliability or AVE and when their retention is theoretically justified (Hair et al., 2022).

The results presented in Table 1 show that the outer loading values range from 0.622 to 0.870. Most indicators exceed the recommended value of 0.70. Two indicators, X1.8 (0.622) and X2.1 (0.692), have loadings slightly below 0.70. These indicators were retained because the corresponding

constructs still demonstrate acceptable AVE and internal consistency reliability. Overall, the indicator loadings provide adequate support for convergent validity.

**Table 1.** Outer Loading Values

| Construct                 | Indicator | Outer Loading | Evaluation |
|---------------------------|-----------|---------------|------------|
| Marketing Mix (X1)        | X1.3      | 0.770         | Acceptable |
|                           | X1.4      | 0.781         | Acceptable |
|                           | X1.5      | 0.831         | Acceptable |
|                           | X1.6      | 0.746         | Acceptable |
|                           | X1.7      | 0.768         | Acceptable |
|                           | X1.8      | 0.622         | Retained   |
| Service Quality (X2)      | X2.1      | 0.692         | Retained   |
|                           | X2.2      | 0.816         | Acceptable |
|                           | X2.3      | 0.706         | Acceptable |
|                           | X2.5      | 0.747         | Acceptable |
| Consumer Satisfaction (Z) | Z.1       | 0.781         | Acceptable |
|                           | Z.2       | 0.794         | Acceptable |
|                           | Z.3       | 0.870         | Acceptable |
| Consumer Loyalty (Y)      | Y.1       | 0.843         | Acceptable |
|                           | Y.2       | 0.706         | Acceptable |
|                           | Y.3       | 0.841         | Acceptable |

Convergent validity was further assessed using AVE. As presented in Table 2, the AVE values are 0.571 for marketing mix, 0.550 for service quality, 0.666 for consumer satisfaction, and 0.639 for consumer loyalty. All values exceed the recommended threshold of 0.50, indicating that each construct explains more than 50% of the variance in its respective indicators. Therefore, the four constructs demonstrate satisfactory convergent validity.

**Table 2.** Construct Reliability and Convergent Validity

| Construct                 | Cronbach's Alpha | rho_A | Composite Reliability | AVE   |
|---------------------------|------------------|-------|-----------------------|-------|
| Marketing Mix (X1)        | 0.850            | 0.866 | 0.888                 | 0.571 |
| Service Quality (X2)      | 0.726            | 0.734 | 0.830                 | 0.550 |
| Consumer Satisfaction (Z) | 0.751            | 0.776 | 0.857                 | 0.666 |
| Consumer Loyalty (Y)      | 0.719            | 0.748 | 0.841                 | 0.639 |

The reliability results also show that all Cronbach's Alpha values exceed 0.70, ranging from 0.719 to 0.850, while Composite Reliability values range from 0.830 to 0.888. These results indicate satisfactory internal consistency reliability for all constructs. Thus, the measurement model meets the criteria for both convergent validity and construct reliability.

### Discriminant Validity

Discriminant validity was assessed using cross-loading and the Fornell-Larcker criterion. The cross-loading assessment examines whether an indicator loads more strongly on its intended construct than on the other constructs in the model.

As shown in Table 3, each indicator has its highest loading on the construct it is intended to measure. For example, X1.5 loads 0.831 on marketing mix, higher than its loadings on consumer loyalty (0.156), consumer satisfaction (0.407), and service quality (0.084). Similarly, Z.3 loads 0.870 on consumer satisfaction, higher than its loadings on consumer loyalty (0.270), marketing mix (0.549), and service quality (0.333). This pattern is consistently observed across the indicators, providing evidence of discriminant validity.

**Table 3.** Cross-Loading Values

| Indicator | Consumer (Y) | Loyalty (Z)  | Consumer Satisfaction (X1) | Marketing Mix (X2) | Service Quality |
|-----------|--------------|--------------|----------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|
| X1.3      | 0.031        | 0.352        | <b>0.770</b>               | 0.196              |                 |
| X1.4      | -0.086       | 0.335        | <b>0.781</b>               | 0.087              |                 |
| X1.5      | 0.156        | 0.407        | <b>0.831</b>               | 0.084              |                 |
| X1.6      | 0.063        | 0.449        | <b>0.746</b>               | 0.144              |                 |
| X1.7      | -0.087       | 0.364        | <b>0.768</b>               | 0.006              |                 |
| X1.8      | 0.120        | 0.217        | <b>0.622</b>               | 0.190              |                 |
| X2.1      | 0.393        | 0.216        | 0.187                      | <b>0.692</b>       |                 |
| X2.2      | 0.428        | 0.252        | 0.098                      | <b>0.816</b>       |                 |
| X2.3      | 0.340        | 0.163        | 0.018                      | <b>0.706</b>       |                 |
| X2.5      | 0.247        | 0.417        | 0.129                      | <b>0.747</b>       |                 |
| Y.1       | <b>0.843</b> | 0.284        | 0.057                      | 0.331              |                 |
| Y.2       | <b>0.706</b> | 0.327        | 0.165                      | 0.310              |                 |
| Y.3       | <b>0.841</b> | 0.289        | -0.068                     | 0.470              |                 |
| Z.1       | 0.409        | <b>0.781</b> | 0.280                      | 0.253              |                 |
| Z.2       | 0.237        | <b>0.794</b> | 0.311                      | 0.284              |                 |
| Z.3       | 0.270        | <b>0.870</b> | 0.549                      | 0.333              |                 |

Discriminant validity was further examined using the Fornell–Larcker criterion. Under this criterion, the square root of the AVE of each construct should be greater than its correlations with the other constructs.

**Table 4.** Fornell–Larcker Criterion

| Construct                        | Consumer Loyalty (Y) | Consumer Satisfaction (Z) | Marketing Mix (X1) | Service Quality (X2) |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| <b>Consumer Loyalty (Y)</b>      | <b>0.799</b>         |                           |                    |                      |
| <b>Consumer Satisfaction (Z)</b> | 0.372                | <b>0.816</b>              |                    |                      |
| <b>Marketing Mix (X1)</b>        | 0.045                | 0.483                     | <b>0.756</b>       |                      |
| <b>Service Quality (X2)</b>      | 0.476                | 0.358                     | 0.150              | <b>0.742</b>         |

The diagonal values represent the square root of the AVE for each construct. The square root of AVE is 0.799 for consumer loyalty, 0.816 for consumer satisfaction, 0.756 for marketing mix, and 0.742 for service quality. Each diagonal value is greater than the correlations between the corresponding construct and the other constructs. Therefore, the Fornell–Larcker criterion is satisfied. Taken together, the outer loading, AVE, reliability, cross-loading, and Fornell–Larcker results indicate that the measurement model demonstrates adequate convergent validity, discriminant validity, and internal consistency reliability. Therefore, the measurement model was considered satisfactory for proceeding to the structural model assessment.

### Structural Model Assessment (Inner Model)

After establishing the adequacy of the measurement model, the structural model was evaluated to determine the explanatory power of the proposed relationships among the constructs. The coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ) and Adjusted  $R^2$  were examined for the endogenous constructs, namely consumer satisfaction and consumer loyalty.

**Table 5.** R<sup>2</sup> and Adjusted R<sup>2</sup> Values

| Endogenous Construct             | R <sup>2</sup> | Adjusted R <sup>2</sup> |
|----------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|
| <b>Consumer Satisfaction (Z)</b> | 0.317          | 0.301                   |
| <b>Consumer Loyalty (Y)</b>      | 0.294          | 0.269                   |

The R<sup>2</sup> value for consumer satisfaction is 0.317, indicating that marketing mix and service quality jointly explain 31.7% of the variance in consumer satisfaction. After accounting for the number of predictors, the Adjusted R<sup>2</sup> is 0.301, indicating an adjusted explanatory contribution of 30.1%. The remaining variance in consumer satisfaction is associated with factors outside the proposed model.

For consumer loyalty, the R<sup>2</sup> value is 0.294, indicating that marketing mix, service quality, and consumer satisfaction jointly explain 29.4% of its variance. The Adjusted R<sup>2</sup> value is 0.269, corresponding to an adjusted explanatory contribution of 26.9%. Thus, the model demonstrates relatively greater explanatory power for consumer satisfaction than for consumer loyalty.

### Direct Effect and Hypothesis Testing

The direct relationships among the constructs were evaluated using the bootstrapping results. The assessment considered the path coefficient ( $\beta$ ), t-statistic, and p-value. A relationship was considered statistically significant at the 5% significance level when the p-value was below 0.05.

**Table 6.** Direct Effects and Hypothesis Testing

| Hypothesis | Structural Path                          | $\beta$ | t-statistic | p-value | Decision      |
|------------|------------------------------------------|---------|-------------|---------|---------------|
| <b>H1</b>  | Marketing Mix → Consumer Satisfaction    | 0.439   | 5.617       | <0.001  | Supported     |
| <b>H2</b>  | Service Quality → Consumer Satisfaction  | 0.292   | 2.965       | 0.003   | Supported     |
| <b>H3</b>  | Marketing Mix → Consumer Loyalty         | -0.163  | 1.247       | 0.213   | Not Supported |
| <b>H4</b>  | Service Quality → Consumer Loyalty       | 0.390   | 3.323       | 0.001   | Supported     |
| <b>H5</b>  | Consumer Satisfaction → Consumer Loyalty | 0.311   | 3.062       | 0.002   | Supported     |

The results show that marketing mix has a positive and statistically significant effect on consumer satisfaction ( $\beta = 0.439$ ,  $t = 5.617$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). Thus, H1 is supported. Among the predictors of consumer satisfaction, marketing mix exhibits a larger path coefficient than service quality, indicating a stronger relationship with consumer satisfaction within the estimated model.

Service quality also has a positive and significant effect on consumer satisfaction ( $\beta = 0.292$ ,  $t = 2.965$ ,  $p = 0.003$ ); therefore, H2 is supported. These results indicate that both marketing mix and service quality are positively associated with consumer satisfaction.

In contrast, marketing mix has a negative but statistically non-significant direct effect on consumer loyalty ( $\beta = -0.163$ ,  $t = 1.247$ ,  $p = 0.213$ ). Therefore, H3 is not supported. The negative coefficient should not be interpreted as evidence of a negative effect because the relationship is statistically non-significant. Instead, the result indicates insufficient statistical evidence to establish a direct effect of marketing mix on consumer loyalty.

Service quality has a positive and significant effect on consumer loyalty ( $\beta = 0.390$ ,  $t = 3.323$ ,  $p = 0.001$ ), supporting H4. Furthermore, consumer satisfaction positively and significantly affects consumer loyalty ( $\beta = 0.311$ ,  $t = 3.062$ ,  $p = 0.002$ ), supporting H5. These findings demonstrate that service quality and consumer satisfaction are significant direct predictors of consumer loyalty in the proposed model.

## Indirect Effects

The mediating role of consumer satisfaction was further examined using the specific indirect effects obtained from the bootstrapping procedure.

**Table 7. Specific Indirect Effects**

| Hypothesis | Indirect Path                                                                      | $\beta$ | t-statistic | p-value | Decision  |
|------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|-------------|---------|-----------|
| H6         | Marketing Mix $\rightarrow$ Consumer Satisfaction $\rightarrow$ Consumer Loyalty   | 0.137   | 2.504       | 0.013   | Supported |
| H7         | Service Quality $\rightarrow$ Consumer Satisfaction $\rightarrow$ Consumer Loyalty | 0.091   | 2.057       | 0.040   | Supported |

The indirect effect of marketing mix on consumer loyalty through consumer satisfaction is positive and statistically significant ( $\beta = 0.137$ ,  $t = 2.504$ ,  $p = 0.013$ ). Therefore, H6 is supported. Notably, the direct relationship between marketing mix and consumer loyalty is not significant ( $\beta = -0.163$ ,  $p = 0.213$ ), whereas its indirect relationship through consumer satisfaction is significant. This result indicates that consumer satisfaction constitutes an important mechanism through which marketing mix is associated with consumer loyalty.

Service quality also has a positive and statistically significant indirect effect on consumer loyalty through consumer satisfaction ( $\beta = 0.091$ ,  $t = 2.057$ ,  $p = 0.040$ ), supporting H7. Since service quality also has a significant positive direct relationship with consumer loyalty ( $\beta = 0.390$ ,  $p = 0.001$ ), the results indicate that service quality is associated with consumer loyalty both directly and indirectly through consumer satisfaction.

Overall, six of the seven hypothesized relationships are statistically supported. Marketing mix and service quality significantly predict consumer satisfaction, while service quality and consumer satisfaction significantly predict consumer loyalty. Marketing mix does not demonstrate a significant direct relationship with consumer loyalty; however, its indirect relationship through consumer satisfaction is significant. These findings highlight the important role of consumer satisfaction in connecting marketing-related factors with consumer loyalty.

## Discussion

### The Effect of Marketing Mix on Consumer Satisfaction

The findings demonstrate that the marketing mix has a positive and significant effect on consumer satisfaction ( $\beta = 0.439$ ,  $t = 5.617$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). Beyond its statistical significance, the magnitude of the coefficient indicates that marketing mix has a stronger relationship with consumer satisfaction than service quality ( $\beta = 0.292$ ) within the proposed model. This finding suggests that consumers' satisfaction with the Yamaha Grand Filano is closely associated with their overall evaluation of the marketing offering rather than with a single marketing element.

This relationship can be explained by the multidimensional nature of the marketing mix. Consumers evaluate not only the functional attributes of a motorcycle but also whether the price is perceived as reasonable relative to the benefits offered, whether promotional information corresponds to the actual product experience, whether dealerships are accessible, and whether the purchasing and service processes are convenient. When these elements provide a coherent value proposition, the gap between consumer expectations and actual experience is reduced, thereby increasing satisfaction. In this context, the marketing mix functions not merely as a tool for attracting consumers before purchase but also as an important determinant of their post-purchase evaluation.

The finding is consistent with the marketing perspective of Kotler and Keller (2016) and the empirical findings of Ardani (2021) and Chien et al. (2024), which indicate that well-managed marketing mix elements contribute to customer satisfaction. However, the present study extends this argument by showing that a favorable marketing mix does not automatically translate into loyalty, as

demonstrated by the non-significant direct relationship between marketing mix and consumer loyalty. Thus, the theoretical contribution of this finding lies in distinguishing between the ability of the marketing mix to create immediate positive evaluations in the form of satisfaction and its ability to generate longer-term behavioral outcomes such as loyalty.

From a managerial perspective, these results imply that Yamaha dealers should manage the marketing mix as an integrated customer value system rather than emphasizing promotional activities alone. Product attributes, pricing, promotion, distribution accessibility, employee interactions, service processes, and physical facilities need to provide a consistent experience because consumer satisfaction appears to depend on the combined evaluation of these elements.

### **The Effect of Service Quality on Consumer Satisfaction**

Service quality has a positive and significant effect on consumer satisfaction ( $\beta = 0.292$ ,  $t = 2.965$ ,  $p = 0.003$ ). This finding can be explained by the experiential characteristics of motorcycle ownership. The relationship between consumers and automotive brands does not end when a vehicle is purchased; instead, it continues through maintenance, repairs, warranty services, spare-part availability, complaint handling, and interactions with dealership personnel. Consequently, the quality of these post-purchase interactions can shape consumers' overall evaluation of the brand.

From the SERVQUAL perspective (Parasuraman et al., 1988), reliable service reduces uncertainty, responsiveness reduces the perceived cost of obtaining assistance, and assurance and empathy strengthen consumers' confidence in service providers. These mechanisms help explain why positive service encounters generate satisfaction. The result is consistent with Andrianto and Santoso (2019) and Imran et al. (2023), who reported a positive relationship between service quality and customer satisfaction.

Nevertheless, the path coefficient of service quality toward satisfaction ( $\beta = 0.292$ ) is lower than that of marketing mix toward satisfaction ( $\beta = 0.439$ ). This difference suggests that satisfaction among the respondents is not formed exclusively through service encounters. Consumers may evaluate their ownership experience more broadly by considering product characteristics, price-value perceptions, promotional promises, dealership accessibility, and other marketing-related factors. Thus, service quality should be understood as one important component of the satisfaction formation process rather than its sole determinant.

Practically, this result emphasizes the importance of maintaining consistent service quality after the purchase. Responsiveness to complaints, service reliability, employee competence, and ease of maintenance should be treated as part of the overall ownership experience because weaknesses in after-sales service may undermine satisfaction even when consumers initially have favorable perceptions of the product.

### **The Effect of Marketing Mix on Consumer Loyalty**

One of the most important findings of this study is that marketing mix does not have a statistically significant direct effect on consumer loyalty ( $\beta = -0.163$ ,  $t = 1.247$ ,  $p = 0.213$ ). This result deserves particular attention because it indicates that favorable marketing activities do not necessarily translate directly into long-term consumer commitment.

A possible explanation is that marketing mix activities are particularly effective in shaping consumer perceptions, purchase considerations, and satisfaction, whereas loyalty represents a more enduring behavioral and attitudinal outcome. Consumers may respond positively to product features, competitive prices, attractive promotions, accessible dealerships, or other marketing stimuli without necessarily developing a commitment to repurchase the same brand. In the motorcycle market, loyalty may also depend on factors beyond the firm's immediate marketing mix, including accumulated ownership experience, after-sales support, switching opportunities, competing models, resale considerations, and changing consumer preferences.

Importantly, the negative path coefficient should not be interpreted as evidence that an improved marketing mix reduces loyalty because the relationship is statistically non-significant. Rather, the result indicates insufficient empirical evidence for a direct marketing mix–loyalty relationship in the present sample.

This finding provides a useful contrast to studies that report a significant direct relationship between marketing activities and customer loyalty. Such differences may arise because the effect of marketing strategy is context-dependent. Differences in product category, consumer involvement, market competition, respondent characteristics, and the inclusion of mediating variables may change the observed relationship. In a durable product category such as motorcycles, loyalty may require accumulated positive experiences rather than being an immediate response to marketing stimuli.

The finding becomes theoretically more meaningful when considered together with the mediation result. Although the direct effect of marketing mix on loyalty is not significant, its indirect effect through consumer satisfaction is significant ( $\beta = 0.137$ ,  $t = 2.504$ ,  $p = 0.013$ ). Therefore, the marketing mix appears to contribute to loyalty primarily by first creating satisfaction. This provides evidence that satisfaction is an important explanatory mechanism connecting marketing activities with subsequent consumer loyalty.

For managers, the implication is that increasing promotional intensity or modifying individual marketing mix elements should not be regarded as sufficient strategies for generating loyalty. Marketing initiatives should instead be evaluated according to whether they improve the consumer's overall experience and satisfaction. A promotion that increases sales but creates expectations that the actual ownership experience cannot fulfill, for example, may have limited potential to generate long-term loyalty.

### **The Effect of Service Quality on Consumer Loyalty**

Unlike marketing mix, service quality has a positive and significant direct effect on consumer loyalty ( $\beta = 0.390$ ,  $t = 3.323$ ,  $p = 0.001$ ). This finding indicates that service experiences are particularly important for maintaining the consumer–brand relationship after purchase. Among the direct predictors of consumer loyalty in the structural model, service quality has a larger path coefficient than consumer satisfaction ( $\beta = 0.311$ ), highlighting the importance of service-related interactions in encouraging continued relationships with the brand.

This relationship is understandable in the context of motorcycle ownership because consumers repeatedly interact with dealerships and authorized service networks throughout the product life cycle. Reliable maintenance, responsive complaint handling, employee competence, spare-part support, and convenient service processes reduce the risks and inconvenience associated with vehicle ownership. Repeated positive service encounters can therefore strengthen consumer confidence and make continued engagement with the same brand more attractive.

The finding is consistent with Herawati and Sulistyowati (2019) and Mei et al. (2024), who reported that service quality contributes positively to customer loyalty. However, the present findings provide an additional insight: service quality operates through two pathways. It has a significant direct effect on loyalty and also a significant indirect effect through satisfaction. This suggests that service quality can strengthen loyalty not only because consumers become satisfied but also because reliable service itself provides relational and functional reasons for maintaining the relationship with the brand.

Practically, this finding indicates that after-sales service should be regarded as a loyalty-building strategy rather than merely an operational support activity. Investments in employee responsiveness, service reliability, complaint resolution, maintenance convenience, and consistency across customer touchpoints may have long-term consequences for consumer retention.

## The Effect of Consumer Satisfaction on Consumer Loyalty

Consumer satisfaction has a positive and significant effect on consumer loyalty ( $\beta = 0.311$ ,  $t = 3.062$ ,  $p = 0.002$ ). This result indicates that consumers who evaluate their experience with the Yamaha Grand Filano positively are more likely to maintain a favorable relationship with the brand.

The finding can be interpreted through Expectation Confirmation Theory (Oliver, 1980). Satisfaction develops when actual product and service experiences meet or exceed prior expectations. Once consumers repeatedly obtain outcomes consistent with their expectations, uncertainty regarding future purchases is reduced. This accumulated positive evaluation can encourage repurchase intentions, recommendation behavior, and continued preference for the brand. Thus, satisfaction serves as an important bridge between consumers' evaluation of their current experience and their future behavioral intentions.

The finding is consistent with Azhar et al. (2019) and Andri et al. (2022). However, satisfaction should not be interpreted as the sole determinant of loyalty. The Adjusted  $R^2$  for consumer loyalty is 0.269, indicating that the predictors included in this model explain 26.9% of the adjusted variance in consumer loyalty. A substantial proportion of loyalty is therefore associated with factors outside the present model. This suggests that future studies could consider other determinants such as brand trust, perceived value, brand image, switching costs, customer engagement, or product experience.

The practical implication is that customer satisfaction should be monitored beyond the initial purchasing transaction. For durable products such as motorcycles, satisfaction can evolve throughout the ownership cycle. Therefore, firms should evaluate satisfaction at multiple touchpoints, including purchase, maintenance, complaint resolution, and other after-sales interactions.

## The Mediating Role of Consumer Satisfaction

The mediation analysis provides one of the central contributions of this study. Consumer satisfaction significantly mediates the relationship between marketing mix and consumer loyalty ( $\beta = 0.137$ ,  $t = 2.504$ ,  $p = 0.013$ ) as well as the relationship between service quality and consumer loyalty ( $\beta = 0.091$ ,  $t = 2.057$ ,  $p = 0.040$ ). However, the pattern of mediation differs between the two antecedent variables.

For marketing mix, the direct effect on loyalty is not significant, whereas the indirect effect through satisfaction is significant. This pattern indicates that satisfaction is a particularly important mechanism through which marketing mix is associated with loyalty. In other words, marketing strategies appear more likely to contribute to loyalty when consumers first translate those marketing experiences into favorable satisfaction evaluations. This finding helps explain why an attractive marketing strategy alone may be insufficient to secure long-term customer commitment.

For service quality, both the direct effect on loyalty ( $\beta = 0.390$ ,  $p = 0.001$ ) and the indirect effect through satisfaction ( $\beta = 0.091$ ,  $p = 0.040$ ) are positive and significant. This pattern indicates that service quality is associated with loyalty both directly and through increased satisfaction. Therefore, service quality has a broader role in the loyalty formation process than marketing mix in the present model.

These mediation patterns contribute theoretically by demonstrating that consumer satisfaction should not merely be treated as another independent predictor of loyalty. Instead, satisfaction functions as an explanatory mechanism that connects consumers' evaluations of marketing and service experiences with subsequent loyalty. The findings therefore support a process-oriented understanding of loyalty formation: managerial inputs influence consumer evaluations, which subsequently contribute to longer-term relational outcomes.

From a managerial perspective, the findings suggest that marketing and service strategies should be integrated around the objective of creating satisfactory ownership experiences. For Yamaha dealers, promotional attractiveness may help initiate consumer interest, but sustainable loyalty requires that marketing promises be supported by product performance and satisfactory ownership

experiences. At the same time, consistent service quality can strengthen loyalty directly while also enhancing satisfaction. Therefore, customer retention strategies should integrate marketing activities, service delivery, and satisfaction management rather than treating them as separate managerial functions.

Overall, the findings show that consumer loyalty is not generated uniformly by all marketing-related factors. Marketing mix primarily contributes to loyalty through consumer satisfaction, whereas service quality contributes both directly and indirectly. This distinction provides a more nuanced explanation of the mechanisms underlying consumer loyalty and highlights consumer satisfaction as a central connecting construct in the proposed model.

## CONCLUSION

This study examined the relationships among marketing mix, service quality, consumer satisfaction, and consumer loyalty among Yamaha Grand Filano consumers using the PLS-SEM approach. The findings demonstrate that both marketing mix and service quality significantly influence consumer satisfaction. However, only service quality has a direct and significant effect on consumer loyalty, whereas marketing mix does not directly influence loyalty. Consumer satisfaction significantly affects consumer loyalty and serves as a mediating variable in the relationships between marketing mix and consumer loyalty, as well as between service quality and consumer loyalty. These findings indicate that consumer loyalty in the premium motorcycle market is primarily developed through customer satisfaction and service experiences rather than marketing activities alone. Therefore, Yamaha dealers should prioritize improving service quality, strengthening after-sales services, and optimizing marketing programs that enhance customer experiences and satisfaction.

Theoretically, this study contributes to the understanding of the mediating role of consumer satisfaction in linking marketing mix, service quality, and consumer loyalty within the premium scooter segment. Practically, the findings provide managerial insights for developing customer retention strategies and sustaining competitive advantage in Indonesia's increasingly competitive motorcycle industry. Nevertheless, this study is limited to Yamaha Grand Filano consumers and employs a cross-sectional research design. Future research should consider broader geographical coverage, larger samples, and longitudinal approaches, while incorporating additional variables such as brand image, customer trust, perceived value, or purchase intention to enhance the explanatory power of the proposed model.

## REFERENCES

- Andri, P., Jasfar, F., & Kristaung, R. (2022). Effect of product, distribution and service quality on customer loyalty through customer satisfaction at Indonesian marketplace. *Devotion: Journal of Research and Community Service*, 3(4), 321–330. <https://doi.org/10.36418/dev.v3i4.122>
- Andrianto, Y., & Santoso, S. (2019). Effect of service quality dimension and marketing mixed dimension of consumer loyalty with consumer satisfaction as mediation. *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding*, 6(5), 768–777. <https://doi.org/10.18415/ijmmu.v6i5.1136>
- Ardani, N. N. (2021). Effect of marketing mix and service quality on customer satisfaction and loyalty (A study on PT. Mutiara Cemerlang Utama Bali). *Journal of Applied Sciences in Travel and Hospitality*, 4(2), 77–84. <https://doi.org/10.31940/jasth.v4i2.77-84>
- Asosiasi Industri Sepeda Motor Indonesia. (2026, January 12). *AISI ungkap pasar sepeda motor 2025 dan prediksi tahun 2026*. <https://www.aisi.or.id/aisi-ungkap-pasar-sepeda-motor-2025-dan-prediksi-tahun-2026/>

- Ayuni, N., & Kristianto, A. H. (2025). Model marketing mix 7P dan pengaruhnya terhadap loyalitas konsumen. *RIGGS: Journal of Artificial Intelligence and Digital Business*, 4(2), 897–902. <https://doi.org/10.31004/riggs.v4i2.585>
- Azhar, M. E., Jufrizen, J., Prayogi, M. A., & Sari, M. (2019). The role of marketing mix and service quality on tourist satisfaction and loyalty at Samosir. *Independent Journal of Management & Production*, 10(5), 1662–1678. <https://doi.org/10.14807/ijmp.v10i5.937>
- Booms, B. H., & Bitner, M. J. (1981). Marketing strategies and organization structures for service firms. In J. H. Donnelly & W. R. George (Eds.), *Marketing of services* (pp. 47–51). American Marketing Association.
- Chien, N. D., Minh, D. D., & Vui, M. T. (2024). The impact of components in marketing-mix strategy on customer satisfaction and loyalty: Case study at Codegym Vietnam Joint Stock Company, Hue Branch. *International Review of Management and Marketing*, 14(6), 186–194. <https://doi.org/10.32479/irmm.16752>
- Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2022). *A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM)* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Herawati, N., & Sulistyowati, M. (2019). Strategi meningkatkan kepuasan dan loyalitas nasabah dengan optimalisasi kualitas pelayanan, penanganan komplain dan fasilitas teknologi di Bank Mandiri Syariah Cabang Solo. *Excellent: Jurnal Manajemen, Bisnis dan Pendidikan*, 6(2), 99–113. <https://doi.org/10.36587/exc.v6i2.589>
- Imran, I., Amelia, D., Adriansyah, A., Kuliman, K., & Silvia, K. (2023). Pengaruh kualitas pelayanan terhadap loyalitas konsumen yang dimediasi oleh kepuasan konsumen: Studi kasus Sanjai Rina Kota Payakumbuh. *JEMSI (Jurnal Ekonomi, Manajemen, dan Akuntansi)*, 9(2), 473–483. <https://doi.org/10.35870/jemsi.v9i2.1064>
- Kotler, P., & Keller, K. L. (2016). *Marketing management* (15th ed.). Pearson.
- Mei, N. A. M., Kridaningsih, A., Adhafiya, W., & Rifai, B. P. (2024). Pengaruh kualitas layanan terhadap loyalitas konsumen melalui kepuasan konsumen sebagai variabel intervening pada Majapahit Tour and Travel Mojokerto. *Journal of Innovation Research and Knowledge*, 4(7), 4281–4289. <https://doi.org/10.53625/jirk.v4i7.9065>
- Mei, N. A. M., Kridaningsih, A., Andhiyan, A. P., & Agmadamara, D. Z. G. (2025). The influence of marketing mix on consumer loyalty through consumer satisfaction at the Pusat Grosir Sepatu (PGS) in Mojokerto City. *SENTRI: Jurnal Riset Ilmiah*, 4(11), 3365–3371. <https://doi.org/10.55681/sentri.v4i11.4769>
- Muhson, A. (2022). *Analisis statistik dengan SmartPLS: Path analysis, confirmatory factor analysis, & structural equation modeling*. Program Pascasarjana Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta.
- Oliver, R. L. (1980). A cognitive model of the antecedents and consequences of satisfaction decisions. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 17(4), 460–469. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3150499>
- Oliver, R. L. (1999). Whence consumer loyalty? *Journal of Marketing*, 63(Special Issue), 33–44. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00222429990634S105>
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1988). SERVQUAL: A multiple-item scale for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality. *Journal of Retailing*, 64(1), 12–40.
- Ringle, C. M., Wende, S., & Becker, J.-M. (2024). *SmartPLS 4* [Computer software]. SmartPLS GmbH. <https://www.smartpls.com>