The Relationships between Food Quality, Service Quality, Perceived Value-for-Money, Desires-congruence and Self-congruence on Consumer Satisfaction and In Turn Lead to Behavioural Intentions and Consumers’ Post-purchase Attitude in the Restaurant Industry

By
SITI NURAFIFAH JAAFAR

A dissertation submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the award of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

2010
ABSTRACT

Review of customer-satisfaction studies in restaurants (1980s-2009) shows that very little emphasis is placed on food, the core product in restaurants. At transaction-specific level, most studies examine service attributes rather than food-related attributes. At overall satisfaction level, most studies examine SERVQUAL dimensions which do not include an item related to food. It is also noted that the measurement of antecedents and consequences of consumer satisfaction are imbalance with most studies focusing on measuring certain variables, whilst neglecting others. For instance, service quality (antecedent) and intention to return (consequence) have frequently been examined in the past compared to other variables such as desires-congruence (antecedent) and intention to switch (consequence). This study is therefore aimed to examine the extent to which 'food quality', in the presence of other variables [i.e. service quality (staff behavior), service quality (environmental quality), perceived value-for-money, desires-congruence and self-congruence], influence consumer satisfaction and in turn lead to behavioural intentions (i.e. 'intention to return', 'intention to recommend' and 'intention to switch') and consumers' post-purchase attitude in the restaurant industry, through an extended version of consumer satisfaction model adapted from Ekinci et al (2008).

The specific objectives of this research are: 1) to examine the elements of restaurants in terms of influencing consumers' eating-out experience in restaurants; 2) to explore consumers' view on 'food quality', in relation to restaurants' dining; 3) to test the extended model of 'consumer satisfaction' adapted from Ekinci et al. (2008); 4) to examine the effect of 'food quality', 'service quality', 'desires-congruence', 'self-congruence', 'perceived value-for-money' on 'consumer satisfaction'; 5) to investigate the effect of 'consumer satisfaction' on 'consumers' behavioural intentions' and 'post-purchase attitude towards the service firm'; and 6) to determine the path through which 'food quality', 'service quality', 'desires-congruence', 'self-congruence', 'perceived value-for-money' influence 'consumer satisfaction' and whether 'consumer satisfaction' mediates the link between these variables and 'consumers' behavioural intentions' and 'post-purchase attitude towards the service firm'. Two data-collection methods were used to achieve these objectives. Face-to-face interviews were conducted to explore factors that influence eating-out experience and to understand consumers' opinion on the quality characteristics of food in restaurants. Surveys were carried out to investigate the relationships between 'food quality' and other variables (e.g. service quality, perceived value-for-money) on consumer satisfaction, behavioural intentions and post-purchase attitude towards restaurants.

Content analysis was used to analyse qualitative data. The findings of the interviews suggested four themes that influence consumer eating-out experience: (1) service delivery, (2) food, (3) environment and (4) price/value-for-money, that supports the literature that 'food', 'service delivery', 'environment', 'price' and 'value-for-money' are the common aspects influencing consumers' eating-out experience. Also, the quality characteristics
of food addressed were 'taste', 'freshness', 'appearance', 'accuracy of meal to the consumers' expectation', 'how properly the food is cooked', 'portion size', 'smell', 'fat content in food', 'authenticity of food' and 'temperature of food'. These results of interviews were used to develop food-quality measurements and modify the existing measurements for service quality which are adapted from Ekinci et al. (2008). These measurements were used in the quantitative research – survey by means of questionnaires.

Survey was carried out in a town in the South East of England. Initially, questionnaires were administered face-to-face before mail questionnaire administration took place due to a low response rate (n=38) in the first approach. 301 usable questionnaires obtained were subjected to data analyses, including descriptive statistics analysis, normality test of data, factor analysis, correlation analysis, reliability test, regression analysis and comparison of means analysis.

Results demonstrated that a significant relationship was found between 'ideal self-congruence', 'desires-congruence', 'perceptions of service quality (staff behaviour)', 'perceived value-for-money' and consumer satisfaction. Food quality and service quality (environmental), however, were insignificant in predicting consumer satisfaction. Consumer satisfaction had an influence on 'consumers' post-purchase attitude' and 'behavioural intentions' in restaurants. Results also support the important role of consumer satisfaction as mediating variable between the antecedents variables ('food quality', 'service quality', 'perceived value-for-money', 'desires-congruence' and 'ideal self-congruence') and 'intention to return', 'intention to recommend', 'intention to switch' and 'consumers' post-purchase attitude towards the service firm'. Model-testing demonstrated that both direct and indirect paths significantly predicted behavioural intentions and post-purchase attitudes towards service firm. However, the indirect path mediated through consumer satisfaction explained higher total percentage of variance in behavioural intentions and post-purchase attitude towards service firm.

The present study provides additional knowledge to the research of 'consumer satisfaction' despite various research limitations mentioned previously. This research has supplied variables that are important in determining 'consumer satisfaction' in restaurants which could be examined in future research. These include 'perceived value-for-money', 'desires-congruence', 'service quality (staff behaviour)' and 'ideal self-congruence'. In addition, the consequences of 'consumer satisfaction' were revealed in this study. They are 'intention to return', 'intention to recommend', 'intention to switch' and 'post-purchase attitude towards the service firm'. This study also confirmed the link between 'consumer satisfaction' and its antecedents and consequences. It is anticipated that the findings of this doctoral research may close the gap in the literature and provide knowledge concerning 'consumer satisfaction' and suggest areas of future research.
DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY

I hereby declare that this thesis has been composed by myself and has not been presented or accepted in any previous application for a degree. The work, of which this is a record, has been carried out by myself unless otherwise stated and where the work is mine, it reflects personal views and values. All quotations have been distinguished by quotation marks and all sources of information have been acknowledged by means of references including those of the Internet.
### LIST OF TABLES

| Table 1.1: | The Price, Menu Breadth, Level of Service and Example of Restaurants | 6 |
| Table 1.2: | Different Characteristics of Restaurants as classified by Ninemeier and Hayes (2006:12) | 7 |
| Table 2.1: | Environment-related Attributes and Consumer Satisfaction: A Review of Studies Measuring Transaction-specific Satisfaction in Restaurant (1996 to 2009) | 32 |
| Table 2.2: | Food-related Attributes and Consumer Satisfaction: A Review of Studies Measuring Transaction-specific Satisfaction in Restaurants (1997 to 2009) | 33 |
| Table 2.3: | Staff Behaviour-related Attributes and Consumer Satisfaction: A Review of Studies Measuring Transaction-specific Satisfaction in Restaurants (1997 to 2009) | 34 |
| Table 2.4: | Other Attributes and Consumer Satisfaction: A Review of Studies Measuring Transaction-specific Satisfaction in Restaurant (1997 to 2007) | 35 |
| Table 2.5: | The Antecedents of Overall Consumer Satisfaction that has been examined in Studies Measuring Overall Satisfaction in Restaurants for the Year 1980s to 2009 | 45 |
| Table 2.6: | The Consequences of Overall Consumer Satisfaction that has been examined in Studies Measuring Overall Satisfaction in Restaurants for the Year 1981 to 2009 | 48 |
| Table 3.1: | Five Dimensions of SERVQUAL and Definition | 58 |
| Table 3.2: | Measurement Items Related to ‘Food’ Added into the Original SERVQUAL Instrument in the Study of Johns and Tyas (1996) | 68 |
| Table 3.3: | Dimensions of Service Quality and Its Examples found from the Study of Oyewole | 77 |
| Table 4.1: | The Differences between Service Quality and Consumer Satisfaction | 99 |
Interviews

Table 6.6: Influence of Décor in Eating Out Experience 174
Table 6.7: The Design and Layout Criteria as Revealed in the Interviews 175
Table 6.8: Criteria of Value-for-Money 177
Table 6.9: Types of Freshness of Food 180
Table 7.1: Summary of Descriptive Statistics for Consumers’ Perception towards Study Constructs 197
Table 7.2: The t-value and Eta-squared Value for Food Quality Items 199
Table 7.3: The t-value and Eta-squared Value for Service Quality (Staff Behaviour) Items 200
Table 7.4: The t-value and Eta-squared Value for Service Quality (Environmental) Items 202
Table 7.5: Rotated Component Matrix for Quality Dimension Scales 209
Table 7.6: Correlation Analyses for Food-quality Scores and Overall Food-quality Score 211
Table 7.7: Correlation Analyses for Service-quality Scores and Overall Service-quality Score 211
Table 7.8: Rotated Component Matrix for Quality Dimension Scales 212
Table 7.9: Correlation Coefficients between Variables 213
Table 7.10: The Hypotheses Tested in the Present Study 216
Table 7.11: The Regression Model Statistics – The Relationships between Antecedents of Consumer Satisfaction and Consumer Satisfaction 217
Table 7.12: The Regression Model Statistics - The Relationships between Consumer Satisfaction on Behavioural Intentions and Post-purchase Attitude towards the Service Firm 219
Table 7.13: The Regression Model Statistics of Independent, Dependent and Mediating Variables 221
**Table 7.14:** The Regression Model Statistics: The Effect of Consumer Satisfaction as Mediator  

**Table 8.1:** Regression Summary of the Relationships between Independent Variables and Consumer Satisfaction  

**Table 8.2:** Regression Summary of the Relationships between Consumer Satisfaction and Intention to Return, Intention to Recommend, Intention to Switch and Consumers' Post-purchase Attitude towards the Service Firm  

**Table 8.3:** The Relationship between Independent, Mediating and Dependent Variables in the Past Studies
LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1: The Growth of Eating Places by Sector in the UK for the Year 2000 to 2005 1

Figure 1.2: Comparison of Goods and Service Packages in Hospitality Industry. Adapted from Management and Service Operations, Sasser et al (1978) 5

Figure 4.1: The Extended Model of the Antecedents and Consequences of Consumer Satisfaction 112

Figure 4.2: Research Model of the Antecedents and Consequences of Consumer Satisfaction Adapted from Ekinci et al. (2008) 114

Figure 5.1: The Link between Two Data Collection Methods in this Study 122

Figure 5.2: The Relationship between Aim of Study with Structure of Interview 123

Figure 5.3: The Step-by-Step Deductive Approach of Content Analysis 129

Figure 5.4: Research Model of the Antecedents and Consequences of Consumer Satisfaction 131

Figure 5.5: Guildford Borough Map and the Sampling Locations 149

Figure 5.6: Procedural Guidelines for Selecting the Respondents for the Self-administered Questionnaire 151

Figure 5.7: Normal P-P Plot of Regression Standardized Residual of Dependent Variables 159

Figure 5.8: Scatterplot of Regression Standardized Residual of Dependent Variables 160

Figure 6.1: Themes Revealed from the Interviews 169

Figure 7.1: Sample Representation by Gender 189

Figure 7.2: Sample Representation by Age Group 190

Figure 7.3: Sample Representation by Annual Personal Income (GBP) 190

Figure 7.4: Sample Representation by Highest Educational Level Attained 191
Figure 7.5: Sample Representation by Employment Status

Figure 7.6: Sample Representation by Types of Restaurant Visited

Figure 7.7: Sample Representation by Reason for Eating Out

Figure 7.8: Sample Representation by Company when Eating Out

Figure 7.9: Model of Consumer Satisfaction and Intention to Return based on the Findings of the Present Study

Figure 7.10: Model of Consumer Satisfaction and Intention to Recommend based on the Findings of the Present Study

Figure 7.11: Model of Consumer Satisfaction and Intention to Switch based on the Findings of the Present Study

Figure 7.12: Model of Consumer Satisfaction and Post-purchase Post-purchase Attitude towards the Service Firm, based on the Findings of the Present Study

Figure 8.1: The Research Models of Consumer Satisfaction based on the Findings of the Present Study

Figure 9.1: The Objectives of Present Study

Figure 9.2: Research Model of the Antecedents and Consequences of ‘Consumer Satisfaction’ Adapted from Ekinci et al. (2008)
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ABSTRACT</th>
<th>ii</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY</td>
<td>iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF TABLES</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF FIGURES</td>
<td>ix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TABLE OF CONTENTS</td>
<td>xi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</td>
<td>xix</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.0 Background of Study 1
1.1 The Characteristics of Different Types of Restaurant 4
1.2 Aim and Objectives of Study 8
1.2 The Structure of the Thesis 9

## CHAPTER 2: CONSUMER SATISFACTION

2.0 Introduction 12
2.1 What is Consumer Satisfaction? 13
  2.1.1 Nature of Consumer Satisfaction Evaluation 14
  2.1.2 Satisfaction as an Outcome and a Process 15
  2.1.3 Consumer Satisfaction for Goods and Services 16
  2.1.4 Different Levels of Consumer Satisfaction 18
2.2 Consumer Satisfaction Measurement 18
  2.2.1 Expectancy-disconfirmation Measures 18
    2.2.1.1 Criticism of expectancy-disconfirmation Measures 19
  2.2.2 Performance-only Measures 22
2.3 Consumer Satisfaction Measurement in the Restaurant
### Industry

2.3.1 Studies Measuring Transaction-specific Satisfaction 24
2.3.2 Studies Measuring Overall Satisfaction 36

2.3.2.1 The Effect of Various Antecedents of Consumer Satisfaction in Restaurant 43
2.3.2.2 The Consequences of Consumer Satisfaction in Restaurant 47

2.4 Summary 49

#### CHAPTER 3: ANTECEDENTS AND CONSEQUENCES OF CONSUMER SATISFACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>The Antecedents of Consumer Satisfaction</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.1</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.1.1</td>
<td>The importance of Quality</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.1.2</td>
<td>Definition of Quality</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.1.3</td>
<td>The Concept of Perceived Quality</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.1.3.1</td>
<td>Dimensions of Service Quality</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.1.3.2</td>
<td>Measurements of Service Quality</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.1.3.3</td>
<td>Measurements of Service Quality in the Restaurant Industry</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.2</td>
<td>Perceived Value</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.3</td>
<td>Desires-congruence</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.4</td>
<td>Self-congruence</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>The Consequences of Consumer Satisfaction</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.1</td>
<td>Consumer Loyalty</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.1.1</td>
<td>The Concept of Consumer Loyalty (Behavioural Dimension)</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.1.2</td>
<td>Measurements of Behavioural intentions in the Restaurant Industry</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2.2 Consumers' Post-Purchase Attitude towards the Service Firm  
(Conceptualisation and Measurement) 94
3.3 Summary 95

CHAPTER 4: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CONSUMER SATISFACTION  
AND ITS ANTECEDENTS AND CONSEQUENCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.0</th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>98</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>The Relationship of Service Quality and Consumer Satisfaction</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>The Relationship between Food Quality and Consumer Satisfaction</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>The Relationship between Perceived Value-for-Money and Consumer Satisfaction</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>The Relationship between Desires-congruence and Consumer Satisfaction</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>The Relationship between Self-congruence and Consumer Satisfaction</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>The Relationship between Consumer Satisfaction and Behavioural Intention</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>The Relationship between Consumer Satisfaction and Consumers' Post-Purchase Attitude to the Service Firm</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>The Indirect Effect between Antecedents of Consumer Satisfaction and Consequences of Consumer Satisfaction</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4.9 | Hypotheses and a Research Model  
4.9.1 The Positive and Negative Features of the Ekinci’s Model | 111 |
| 4.10 | Summary | 114 |

CHAPTER 5: METHODOLOGY

| 5.0 | Introduction | 117 |
5.1 Objectives of the Research 117
5.2 Research Philosophy 118
5.3 Research Design 120
5.4 Preliminary Study: Interviews 122
  5.4.1 The Interview Schedule 125
  5.4.2 The Process of Ethical Approval 126
  5.4.3 The Sampling for the Interview Respondents 127
  5.4.4 The Analyses of Interview Data 128
5.5 Data Collection: Questionnaire Survey 130
  5.5.1 Designing the Questionnaire 130
  5.5.2 Piloting the Questionnaire 136
  5.5.3 Sampling Process 147
    5.5.3.1 Population and Sample 147
    5.5.3.2 Sampling Methods 148
  5.5.4 Data Analysis 154
    5.5.4.1 Descriptive Statistics Analysis 154
    5.5.4.2 Normality Test of Data 154
    5.5.4.3 Factor Analysis 154
    5.5.4.4 Correlation Analysis 156
    5.5.4.5 Reliability Test 156
    5.5.4.6 Regression Analysis 156
    5.5.4.7 Comparison of Means 163
5.6 Summary 164

CHAPTER 6: FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION OF THE INTERVIEW

6.0 Introduction 167
6.1 The Background of Participants 167
6.2 Results and Discussion 168
  6.2.1 Factors influencing Eating Out Experience in Restaurants 169
    6.2.1.1 The Service Delivery 169
6.2.1.2 The Food
6.2.1.3 The Environment of Restaurant
6.2.1.4 The Price and Value-for-Money
6.2.1.5 The Relative Importance of Restaurant Attributes

6.2.2 The Characteristics of Good/Poor Quality Food
6.2.2.1 Tastiness of Food
6.2.2.2 Freshness of Food
6.2.2.3 Appearance of Food
6.2.2.4 Accuracy of Food to Consumer Expectation
6.2.2.5 How Properly the Food is Cooked
6.2.2.6 Portion Size
6.2.2.7 Smell of Food
6.2.2.8 Fat Content in Food
6.2.2.9 Authenticity of Food
6.2.2.10 Temperature of Food

6.3 Summary

CHAPTER 7: FINDINGS OF THE MAIN SURVEY

7.0 Introduction
7.1 Demographic Profiles of Respondents
7.1.1 Gender
7.1.2 Age
7.1.3 Annual Personal Income
7.1.4 Highest Educational Level Attained
7.1.5 Employment Status
7.2 Eating Out Profiles of Respondents
7.2.1 Types of Restaurant Visited
7.2.2 Reason for Eating Out
7.2.3 Company of Eating Out
7.3 Descriptive Statistics of the Study's Constructs
7.3.1 Consumer Perceptions towards Quality Dimensions 198
7.3.2 Food Quality 198
7.3.3 Service Quality (Staff Behaviour) 200
7.3.4 Service Quality (Environmental) 201
7.3.5 Perceived Value-for-Money 203
7.3.6 Self-congruence 204
7.3.7 Desires-congruence 204
7.3.8 Behavioural Intentions (Intention to Return, Intention to Recommend and Intention to Switch) 206
7.3.9 Consumers' Post-purchase Attitude towards the Service Firm 208
7.3.10 Consumer Satisfaction 208
7.3.11 Normality of Data 209
7.4 Validity of the Measurement Scales 209
7.5 Reliability of the Measurement Scales 212
7.6 Correlation Analyses 213
7.7 Model Assessment and Tests of Hypotheses 215
7.7.1 The Relationships between Independent Variables and Consumer Satisfaction 216
7.7.2 The Relationships between Consumer Satisfaction and Dependent Variables 218
7.7.3 The Mediating Effect of Consumer Satisfaction in the Relationships between Independent Variables and Dependent Variables 219
7.8 Summary 228

CHAPTER 8: DISCUSSION OF MAIN SURVEY FINDINGS

8.0 Introduction 231
8.1 The Quality Dimensions in Restaurants and Consumer Perceptions on Quality Dimensions 231
8.1.1 The Validity and Reliability of Quality Measures in Restaurants
8.1.2 Consumer Perceptions on Quality Dimensions in Restaurants
8.2 The Model of Consumer Satisfaction based on the Findings of the Present study
8.2.1 The Antecedents of Consumer Satisfaction
8.2.2 The Consequences of Consumer Satisfaction
8.2.3 The Sub-models of Consumer Satisfaction based on Findings of the Present Study and from the Regression Analyses
8.3 Summary

CHAPTER 9: SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

9.0 Introduction
9.1 Achieving the Study's Objectives
9.1.1 The Elements of Restaurant Perceived to Influence Consumers' Eating out Experience
9.1.2 Consumers' Views on Food Quality
9.1.3 Model Testing
9.2 Theoretical Implications
9.3 Managerial Implications
9.4 Summary of Study's Contributions
9.4.1 Scale and Measurement
9.4.2 Antecedents of 'Consumer Satisfaction'
9.4.3 Consequences of 'Consumer Satisfaction'
9.4.4 The Model of 'Consumer Satisfaction' in the Present Study
9.4.5 Other Key Findings
9.5 Limitations and Future Research
APPENDICES
Appendix I 271
Appendix II 272
Appendix III 273
Appendix IV 274
Appendix V 275
Appendix VI 276
Appendix VII 281
Appendix VIII 288
Appendix IX 289

REFERENCES 295
ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Alhamdulillah, all praise be to Allah, the Compassionate, the Merciful, by whose Grace and Blessings, finally I completed my thesis.

I would like to express my sincere gratitude and appreciation to many people who made this thesis possible. Special thanks to my supervisors, Dr. Margaret Lumbers and Dr. Anita Eves for their valuable guidance, advice and continuous support in the PhD program.

An honorable mention goes to my parents; Jaafar Mohd Tahrim and Kartini Mohamad as well as the whole family members for the love, support and prayers.

Deepest appreciation is extended to Noor, Norazila, Rofizah, Norizah, Samia, Joom and Aryati for always be by my side during my ups and downs in completing my PhD study. Many people will walk in and out of our lives but only true friends will leave footprints in your heart (Eleanor Roosevelt). You guys have certainly leave footprints in my heart. Thank you friends!

My word of thanks also goes to Maltika, Azizul Yadi, Basyeer, Khaled, Sameer Hosany and Mehdi for lending me their hands when I need help in doing my PhD research.

To my fellow Malaysian friends in Surrey, thank you so much for becoming my family when I was away from home.

Many more persons participated in various ways to ensure my research succeeded besides people mentioned above, I am thankful to all of them.
Chapter One

Introduction

1.0 Background of Study

Eating out is defined as the consumption of all foods taken place outside one’s own household (Warde and Martin, 2005: p.43). Interview findings showed that the events associated with eating out are restaurant meals and snacks in cafés with friends (Warde and Martin, 2005). It is known that commercial provision is the main event that defines eating out. EuroMonitor (2006b) reported that most consumers in the UK eat out at the main types of commercial foodservices each year i.e. fast food, restaurants, cafes and canteens. This may be reflected by the clearly increases in the number of fast-food outlets in the UK compared to other foodservices (Figure 1.1).

Figure 1.1: The Growth of Eating Places by Sector in the UK from 2000 to 2005.

In 2008, the Office for National Statistics announced recession in the UK (Boulnois, 2009). Recession-induced consumer purchasing attitudes with regard to eating out. Many consumers were 'rationalising' which means that they were eating out
1.0 Background of Study

Eating out is defined as the “consumption of all foods taking place outside one’s own household” (Warde and Martens, 2000: p.43). Interview findings showed that the most-mentioned events associated with eating out are restaurant meals, bar meals in pubs and snacks in cafes with friends (Warde and Martens, 2000). It demonstrated that commercial provision is the main event that defines eating out. Euromonitor (2006b) reported that most consumers in the UK eat out at three main types of commercial foodservices each year i.e. fast food restaurants, full-service restaurants and cafes/bars. Demand for fast food may be reflected by the steady increase of the number of fast-food outlets in the UK compared to other foodservices (Figure 1.1).

Figure 1.1: The Growth of Eating Places by Sector in the UK from 2000 to 2005.

In 2008, The Office for National Statistics announced recession in the UK (Bould, 2009). Recession impacted consumer purchasing attitudes with regard to eating out. Many consumers were ‘trading down’ which means that they were eating out
less and often staying at home (Teather and Tryhorn, 2008). However, working urban residents remained quite willing to spend money at chains perceived as offering good value (Euromonitor, 2009a). It indicates that even during recession, the demand for fast-food restaurants remains unchanged and in fact is booming (Symons and Hammet, 2009). Sales in fast-food outlets and cafés/bars grew by 1 percent in 2008, with the total industry valued at £13.3 billion for fast food and £8.7 billion for cafés/bars (Euromonitor, 2009b). For instance, McDonald's reported its "strongest ever" sales in the UK and a 25 percent boost in profits was reported for pizza delivery chain Domino's (Symons and Hammet, 2009). Following that, Domino’s created 1,500 new jobs (Symons and Hammet, 2009). Similarly, KFC announced 9,000 extra jobs and 200 new restaurants in February, 2009 (Symons and Hammet, 2009).

Contrasted to fast-food businesses, the full-service restaurant sales fell slightly in 2008, from £15.23 billion in 2007 to £15.20 billion and there were 32,836 outlets down from a 2007 level of 32,886 (Euromonitor, 2009b). In response to this, operators in other sectors e.g. full service restaurants, offered a range of promotions (i.e. a half-price bottle of wine, free entrees) to emphasise their value positioning (Euromonitor, 2009a).

With the growth of the fast-food industry, fast food has received a lot of attention regarding its effect on consumers’ nutrient intake and public health (Jekanowski, 1999). Operators have attempted to overcome this criticism in several ways. Pizza Express, Frankie & Benny's and similar chains increasingly modify their menus to include more interesting and sophisticated pizzas, while also placing a greater emphasis on developing healthy alternatives to pizza, particularly the range of salads (Euromonitor, 2006b). Similarly, McDonalds focus on products with an healthy image, away from burgers, to satisfy consumers’ expectations for fresh, healthy and ‘value for money’. The company now refers to its burgers as ‘sandwiches’ and has nearly transformed itself into something more like bakery fast food than traditional burger fast food (Euromonitor, 2006b). In a survey of
eating out in 2006, Euromonitor demonstrated that, within the sector of fast-food restaurants, bakery-products food outlets received the highest number of visits, followed by middle-eastern fast-food outlets, burger, fish, chicken and others. It shows that consumers place more interest on bakery products.

Another issue regarding restaurants' food perceived as important by restaurant consumers is the quality of food. The Food and Beverage 2012 Survey performed by Deloitte company indicated that there is an increased interest in quality, variety and good food compared with a few years ago (Deloitte, 2007). Euromonitor (2006c) stated that consumer interest in gastronomy was boosted by unprecedented media coverage and this clearly had a positive effect on the number of people eating in full-service restaurants. Another trend with regards to quality of food is a shift in tastes resulting in consumers searching for alternative cuisine and exploring innovative food such as Indian food, Chinese food and Thai food. The ranking of Asian restaurants in the UK could reflect this. Report on eating out in full-service restaurants produced by Euromonitor (2006c) indicated that the top three restaurants in the UK are casual-dining eating places (e.g. cafes), Asian restaurants, European and Pizza. These factors have affected the growth of the full-service restaurant sector. The growth is contributed to by the growth of restaurants at the upper end of the market, such as those operated by celebrity chefs, which are heavily promoted (Euromonitor, 2006a).

Research indicates that 'food' affects consumer satisfaction in restaurants. In particular, food-related factors that affected consumer satisfaction in the studies reviewed were 'food quality', 'variety', 'taste', and 'presentation'. For instance, Arora and Singer (2006) examined the link between 'food quality', 'service quality', 'location', 'ambiance' and 'menu prices' with satisfaction in a fine-dining restaurant. Results showed that overall performance of restaurants with food quality and service influenced consumer satisfaction. Satisfaction with food quality during lunch time and dinner was a significant finding in the study by Law et al. (2004). In Law et al. (2004), 'food quality' was measured together with other
food attributes e.g. variety of food, which did not have impact on satisfaction in fast-food restaurants. In a similar restaurant setting, Pettijohn et al. (1997) found 'food quality' was more important than the other food attributes in the study-menu variety. In chain restaurants, Gupta et al. (2007) found that 'food quality' was an attribute measured with other items such as ‘accurate order of food’, ‘deliciousness of food’, ‘temperature of food’ and ‘presentation of food’. 'Food quality' was rated the least satisfactory compared to other food items, showing that attention should be given to this factor.

These studies, however, examined the impact of food on 'consumer satisfaction' at attribute level. Only Namkung and Jang (2007) examined the impact of food quality on consumer satisfaction within a model of consumer satisfaction. In this study, 'food quality' consisted of items such as ‘taste of food’, ‘variety of food’, ‘healthy options’, ‘presentation of food’, ‘freshness of food’ and ‘temperature of food’. 'Taste of food' and 'presentation of food' were the two greatest factors that impact on consumer satisfaction. Namkung and Jang (2007) however did not investigate other factors that have influence on 'consumer satisfaction', such as service quality. It is argued that investigating the effect of food quality together with other factors may better explain overall consumer satisfaction. To have a concise model of consumer satisfaction, the present study attempts to investigate the relationship between 'food quality' and 'consumer satisfaction' in the context of UK restaurants by adapting the existing model of consumer satisfaction by Ekinci et al. (2008).

1.1 The Characteristics of Different Types of Restaurant

The restaurant business involves delivering a 'meal experience' to the customers and the meal experience has two main components, which are the food and beverage product and the service element (Merricks and Jones, 1986). The proportion of product and services delivered in this business differs according to the types of hospitality establishment. This proportion as suggested by Sasser et al (1978) is shown in Figure 1.2.
Figure 1.2 shows that the hospitality industry consists of several forms of business that offer a package of service and goods. The proportion of service and goods delivered to customers varies accordingly to these businesses. For instance, take-away meal business offers goods with very limited services. On the other hand, motel accommodation is largely different from the take-away meal business because it delivers services more than goods. The context of the present study is a restaurant type that delivers almost similar proportion of goods and services. This is possibly because there is a much broader consideration of quality factors with respect to restaurant-food service, including the food itself, the location and the service provided (Meiselman, 2001).

The subject of the present study are restaurant consumers who have eaten a meal (not a snack between meals) and been served at the table. This criterion has been determined in order to ensure that only respondents who experienced the meal experience in restaurants are qualified for the study. This qualifying condition may be applicable in various types of restaurant.
Establishment where customers may have eaten in and received table service at either low, medium or high price are ‘restaurants’ and ‘popular catering’ (Office for National Statistics, 1992). According to this terminology, restaurants are foodservice operation that provide food and drink generally at a high price with a high level of service. ‘Popular catering’ includes cafes, pizza, grills, specialist coffee shops, roadside restaurants and steakhouses that provide food and drink generally at low or medium price with limited levels of service (Cousins et al, 2002). In another restaurant classification, Wyckoff and Sasser (1978) grouped restaurants into two i.e. fast-food and service restaurants. Service restaurants are divided into three – coffee-shop restaurant, specialty or family restaurant and full-service or atmosphere restaurant. These restaurants (fast-food and service restaurants) can be differentiated by several characteristics as shown in Table 1.1.

Table 1.1: The Price, Menu Breadth, Level of Service and Example of Restaurants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fast-food</th>
<th>Coffee shop</th>
<th>Specialty/family</th>
<th>Full-service atmosphere</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menu breadth</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Moderate or full</td>
<td>Limited or moderate</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Limited or self-service</td>
<td>Limited counter or table-service</td>
<td>Table service</td>
<td>Full tableservice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example</td>
<td>Burger King McDonald’s KFC</td>
<td>Denny’s Sambo’s</td>
<td>Red Lobster Steak and Ale</td>
<td>Davre’s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Wyckoff and Sasser (1978: xxvii)

Table 1.1 shows that restaurants vary accordingly to the menu offered and the price range. As the price increases, the menu breadth is wider and more service is provided. Lundberg and Walker (1993:31) stated that ‘as menu price increases, so usually does service’. Anker and Batta (1987:23) stated that service may vary from simple to complex depending on the style or type of restaurant, the menu involved and the price to be paid.
Ninemeier and Hayes (2006) made another restaurants' classification. There are four types of restaurants according to this classification as shown in Table 1.2: up-scale, casual-service, family-service and quick-service restaurants.

Table 1.2: Different Characteristics of Restaurants as classified by Ninemeier and Hayes (2006:12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Upscale</th>
<th>Casual-service</th>
<th>Family-service</th>
<th>Quick-service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest quality of food and beverage products</td>
<td>Moderately priced</td>
<td>Appeals to families and others desiring familiar menu items (i.e. home-cooked foods enjoyed when growing up)</td>
<td>Provide a limited menu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest quality of service</td>
<td>Has wider range but less formal menu</td>
<td>Offers menu featuring items traditionally available for breakfast, lunch and dinner, which are offered throughout the time the property is open for business</td>
<td>Provide limited service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most serve alcoholic beverages</td>
<td>Less formal atmosphere and often an ethnic or theme environment</td>
<td>• Many serve alcoholic beverages</td>
<td>Low check averages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer extensive wine lists</td>
<td>Many serve</td>
<td>Number of guests served per labour hour is more than in upscale restaurant, but much less than in family-service or quick-service</td>
<td>Number of guests served per labour hour is much higher than in upscale, casual-service or family-service restaurant properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of guests served per labour hour is lower than other restaurants</td>
<td>Number of guest served per labour hour is more than in upscale restaurant, but much less than in family-service or quick-service</td>
<td>• Many do not serve alcoholic beverages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.2 shows that this restaurant classification focussed primarily on the level of service offered in restaurants then moves onto other characteristics such as menu breadth, provision of alcoholic drinks and number of guests served per labour hour.

The context of the present study is restaurants that offer full menu and table service. Therefore, there is a possibility that respondents in the present study may have visited all kinds of restaurants except the fast-food restaurant because this restaurant offers limited service which does not match the sample for the present study that requires customers who visit table-service restaurants.
1.2 Aim and Objectives of Study

Following on from the discussion in the previous section, the overall aim for the current study is to investigate:

*The extent to which food quality, in the presence of other variables [i.e. service quality (staff behaviour), service quality (environmental), perceived value-for-money, desires-congruence and self-congruence], influence consumer satisfaction and in turn lead to behavioural intentions and consumers' post-purchase attitude in the restaurant industry.*

With respect to restaurant consumers, the specific objectives of the present study are:

1) To examine the elements of restaurants in terms of influencing consumers' eating-out experience in restaurants.

2) To explore consumers' view on 'food quality', in relation to restaurants' dining.

3) To test the extended model of 'consumer satisfaction' that examines the relationship between 'food quality', 'service quality', 'desires-congruence', 'self-congruence', 'perceived value-for-money' and variables including 'consumer satisfaction', 'behavioural intentions' and 'post-purchase attitude towards the service firm', that has been adapted from Ekinci et al. (2008).

4) To examine the effect of 'food quality', 'service quality', 'desires-congruence', 'self-congruence', 'perceived value-for-money' on 'consumer satisfaction'.

5) To investigate the effect of 'consumer satisfaction' on 'consumers' behavioural intentions' and 'post-purchase attitude towards the service firm'.

6) To determine the path through which 'food quality', 'service quality', 'desires-congruence', 'self-congruence', 'perceived value-for-money' influence 'consumer satisfaction' and whether 'consumer satisfaction'
mediates the link between these variables and 'consumers' behavioural intentions' and 'post-purchase attitude towards the service firm'.

1.2 The Structure of the Thesis

This thesis consists of eight chapters:

Chapter Two is the first part of the literature review. This chapter encompasses the conceptualisation and general measurement of consumer satisfaction. Another section in this chapter explains the measurement of consumer satisfaction, specifically in restaurants. The two major approaches applied in measuring 'consumer satisfaction' are also explained in this chapter.

Chapter Three addresses the conceptualisation and measurement of the four antecedents and the three consequences of consumer satisfaction that were examined in the present study. The antecedents discussed were 'food quality', 'service quality', 'perceived value-for-money', 'desires-congruence' and 'self-congruence'. Meanwhile, 'consumers' behavioural intentions' and 'consumers' post-purchase attitude towards the service firm' were the consequences of 'consumer satisfaction' discussed in this chapter.

Chapter Four elucidates the relationship between 'consumer satisfaction' and its antecedents and consequences, as discussed in chapter three. These relationships formed the hypotheses and research framework for the present study.

Chapter Five discusses the methodology employed in the present study which is developed aligned with the research objectives. Two methods of data collection in this study were interview and questionnaire survey.

Chapter Six presents and discusses the findings of the exploratory interviews which were conducted in a town in the South East of England.
Chapter Seven reports the results of the survey carried out by means of face-to-face questionnaires and mail questionnaire, which were conducted in a town in the South East of England.

Chapter Eight discusses results of the main survey in relation to the existing literature.

Chapter Nine summarises the findings of the present study according to the research objectives. This chapter also discusses the contribution of study, limitations and recommendations for future research.
Chapter Two

Consumer Satisfaction

2.0 Introduction

Consumer satisfaction studies have increased since the 1970s as researchers have become more cognizant of the role of consumer satisfaction on business success (Jones, 1999). Anderson et al. (1994) suggested that higher consumer satisfaction should increase loyalty, reduce price elasticity, increase market share from competitors, lower transaction costs, reduce failure and the costs of attracting new consumers and help build a firm's reputation in the marketplace. Satisfied consumers tend to complain to the establishment from which they came, to overcome the uncomfortable feelings that accompany consumption experiences (Nyhus, 1999).

Despite its importance, the definition of consumer satisfaction lacks uniformity. It may be because satisfaction is not a universal phenomenon, but rather everyone gets a different aspect or level of satisfaction from a hospitality experience (Pizam and Ellis, 1999). It may result from a process or a complex process involving extensive interaction and other factors (Psychological and Physiological Activity - Homburg and Park, 1997). It also varies across types of offering: services versus goods (Vesalainen et al., 2006). On that basis, measuring satisfaction has to be based on how it is defined and the context it applies to.

While researchers have measured satisfaction based on several theories, the widely-accepted one is expectation-disconfirmation theory (Oliver, 1980). This theory suggested that satisfaction is the result of disconfirmation between expectation and perceived performance (Oliver, 1980). Positive disconfirmation (perceived performance above the expectation) increases consumer satisfaction, while negative disconfirmation (perceived performance
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2.0 Introduction

Consumer satisfaction studies have increased since the 1970s as researchers have become aware of the role of consumer satisfaction on business success (Jones and Suh, 2000). Anderson et al. (1994) suggested that higher consumer satisfaction should increase loyalty, reduce price elasticity, insulate current market share from competitors, lower transaction costs, reduce failure costs and the costs of attracting new consumers and help build a firm’s reputation in the marketplace. In contrast, dissatisfied consumers tend to complain to the establishment or seek compensation from them, to overcome the uncomfortable feelings they felt due to failed consumption experiences (Nyer, 1999).

Despite its importance, the definition of consumer satisfaction lacks uniformity. It may be because satisfaction is not a universal phenomenon, but that everyone gets a different aspect or level of satisfaction from the same hospitality experience (Pizam and Ellis, 1999). It may result from a very simple process or a complex process involving extensive cognitive, affective and other undiscovered psychological and physiological dynamics (Oh and Parks, 1997). It also varies across types of offering: services or goods (Veloutsou et al., 2005). On that basis, measuring satisfaction has to be based on how it is defined and the context it applies to.

While researchers have measured satisfaction based on several theories, the widely-accepted one is expectation-disconfirmation theory (Yi, 1990). This theory suggested that satisfaction is the result of disconfirmation between ‘expectation’ and ‘perceived performance’ (Oliver, 1980). Positive disconfirmation (perceived performance above the expectation) increases consumer satisfaction, while negative disconfirmation (perceived performance
below the expectation) decreases consumer satisfaction. Notwithstanding its popularity, this theory has been subject to criticism. Particularly, the use of expectation as a comparison standard and the application of the difference score to measure consumer satisfaction (Yuksel and Yuksel, 2001). This has led to the emergence of another consumer-satisfaction measure i.e. performance-only measures.

This chapter aims to explore the conceptualisation and measurement of consumer satisfaction. It has three sections. Section 2.1 discusses the concept of consumer satisfaction. The measurement of consumer satisfaction is then addressed in Section 2.2. Section 2.3 presents an exploration of measurement of consumer satisfaction in the restaurant industry.

2.1 What is Consumer Satisfaction?

Without a standardised definition of satisfaction, researchers are unable to: select an appropriate definition for a particular context; develop valid measures of satisfaction; or compare and interpret empirical results (Giese and Cote, 2000). The difficulty to having a uniform definition of satisfaction may be because satisfaction is not a universal phenomenon, but everyone gets different levels of satisfaction from the same service experience (i.e. hospitality) (Pizam and Ellis, 1999). Davis and Stone (1985) stated that even the same consumer may have dissimilar needs and expectations on different meal occasions or at different times of the day. This happens because consumers' minds work like a black box (Yuksel and Yuksel, 2001), where an observer of consumers can only see what goes in and what comes out, but not what happens inside (Oliver, 1997). Thus, satisfaction may result from a very simple process or a complex process involving extensive cognitive, affective and other undiscovered psychological and physiological dynamics (Oh and Parks, 1997). Literature demonstrated that the most discussed issues in defining satisfaction involved the idea of whether satisfaction is evaluated cognitively or affectively; whether satisfaction is an outcome from the experience of consumption; or that satisfaction is evaluated during the service-delivery process. Besides, defining satisfaction depends on the
context of study (either in goods or service firms) and level of satisfaction (overall satisfaction or transaction-specific satisfaction).

2.1.1 Nature of Consumer-satisfaction Evaluation

The most discussed issue regarding definition of satisfaction has been whether it is a cognitive evaluation or an emotional state (affective in nature) (Oh and Parks, 1997). Cognitive evaluation of satisfaction is studied mainly in terms of the disconfirmation paradigm where satisfaction is the result of the comparison between expectations and performance (Homburg et al., 2006). In contrast, when satisfaction is judged by means of affective processes, it is concerned with feelings such as joy, happiness or disgust experienced by individuals during the acquisition and consumption of the product or service (Homburg et al., 2006). Oliver (1980) proposed that the disconfirmation paradigm is cognitive in nature because the comparison process in disconfirmation judgements requires planned processing of information. In contrast, the affective process is thought to be not under conscious control.

However there are contradictory views as to whether satisfaction should be evaluated affectively or cognitively. The World Trade Organisation (1985) proposed that consumer satisfaction is a psychological concept that involves the good feeling and pleasure that results from gaining what one hopes for and expects from an appealing product and/or service. Westbrook (1980) argued that satisfaction is not solely a cognitive phenomenon but it comprises an element of feeling, where satisfaction is created if the consumer feels good and dissatisfaction is created by a bad feeling. Churchill and Surprenant (1982) proposed that the satisfaction response comprised both cognitive and affective dimensions. Similarly, Homburg et al. (2006) found in their longitudinal study on consumer evaluation of a newly-created CD-ROM tutorial that both, cognitive and affective factors explained the variance in satisfaction judgements well and that the strength of association increases over time. In another study, satisfaction is expressed better in an affective way than cognitively. Findings of a study by Giese and Cote (2000) revealed that, when the interview respondents were asked "How do you, in general, define
64 percent of respondents mentioned satisfaction as an affective summary response such as 'I'm happy', 'I feel good', 'I like it', or 'I'm comfortable'. This method of study however, differed from Homburg et al. (2006) where Giese and Cote (2000) applied a qualitative approach to explore consumer perception of the definition of satisfaction while Homburg et al. (2006) compared the difference between two approaches of defining satisfaction by mean of a quantitative approach.

### 2.1.2. Satisfaction as an Outcome and a Process

The literature indicates that studies of consumer satisfaction emphasised the term satisfaction as either an outcome or as a process (Yi, 1990). More precisely, Giese and Cote (2000) stated that consumer satisfaction can be defined by emphasising the evaluation processes or as a response to an evaluation process. The outcome-oriented approach defines consumer satisfaction as the end-state resulting from the experience of consumption (Vavra, 1997). In contrast, definition of consumer satisfaction as a process suggests that assessment of satisfaction is made during the service delivery process (Pizam and Ellis, 1999). For instance, Williams and Buswell (2003) stated that consumer satisfaction is intruded upon by all aspects of the service delivery processes (encounters with staff; tangible elements; time it takes the service to be delivered and whether or not it has been delivered correctly) or; the outcomes of the experience. It shows that the process definitions emphasised the perceptual, evaluative and psychological processes contributing to consumer satisfaction (Vavra, 1997). On the other hand, satisfaction as outcome is viewed as a result of an emotional response to an experience (Westbrook and Reilly, 1983) or a comparison of rewards and costs based on the anticipated consequences (Churchill and Surprenant, 1982). Yi (1990) proposed that the process-oriented approach is more beneficial than the outcome-oriented approach. This approach examines the entire consumption experience and identifies the important processes which may lead to consumer satisfaction using unique measures that captures unique components of each stage (Yi, 1990).
2.1.3. Consumer Satisfaction for Goods and Services
Yi (1990) suggested that definitions of satisfaction differ according to the level of specificity, such as satisfaction with products or consumption experience or with the sales person. Satisfaction with goods frequently focussed on the product itself and whether the product does what it is supposed to do (Veloutsou et al., 2005). It suggests that satisfaction of product is evaluated by the features and functions of the product. On the other hand, satisfaction with a service firm involved a consumer’s assessment of either pure service or both the product and service of a firm (Schneider and White, 2004). An example of pure service is an entertainment experience, such as watching actors in a Shakespeare play, while service that has tangible components includes the dining experience where both a physical meal and the delivery of meal is provided (Schneider and White, 2004). Grönroos (1984) proposed that satisfaction with the service offering may arise from both functional and technical dimensions, which include the tangible and intangible dimensions of the total offering. Technical quality involved what is provided, and functional quality considered how it is provided (Grönroos, 1983). In a restaurant, technical quality includes the quality of food while functional quality comprises, for instance, the manners of the personnel involved in the delivery of service products. Because service involves interaction between the consumer and the service provider, different consumers might have different demands that need to be met, or different service personnel might go about meeting the same consumer demands somewhat differently at different points of time (Schneider and White, 2004). In a restaurant, some consumers may require a special meal to adhere to their diets, but some consumers may not have that requirement. Consumers may also seek different environments for eating out for special occasions and leisure.

2.1.4. Different Levels of Consumer Satisfaction
There are two distinct "types" of consumer satisfaction: transaction-specific and overall satisfaction (Jones and Suh, 2000). Transaction-specific satisfaction is related to "satisfaction at a specific encounter with the organisation that may vary from experience to experience, whereas overall
satisfaction is relatively stable over time and resembles an overall attitude” (Veloutsou et al., 2005: p.610). Overall satisfaction is also a post-choice evaluative judgement of a specific purchase occasion (Bitner and Hubbert, 1994). There were contradictory views on which type of satisfaction should be used to measure consumer satisfaction. Nicholls et al. (1995) proposed that satisfaction can differ with each component of service. Their study indicated that satisfaction is derived from the individual components of the service, such as representative’s ‘courtesy’, ‘attentiveness’, ‘ability’, ‘accuracy’ and ‘professionalism’, as well as ‘speed and promptness’ in completing the transaction. Ekinci et al. (2008) argued that transaction-specific satisfaction should be captured immediately after each service interaction with the service encounter, if a service firm provides multiple-service encounters. This notion demonstrated that measuring transaction-specific satisfaction is quite problematic as researchers have to be sure that consumers recorded the exact satisfaction evaluation at the time they experience each transaction. Anderson and Fornell (1994) proposed that nearly all satisfaction research has adopted the overall satisfaction formulation because it is more fundamental and useful than transaction-specific satisfaction in predicting consumer's behavioural intentions and firm's past, present and future business performance.

With regards to the discussion above, the present study measures the outcome-oriented approach of consumer satisfaction, with the understanding that satisfaction is evaluated affectively, at overall level, in one particular service firm – restaurant. On that basis, the definition of consumer satisfaction by Oliver (1997:13) is followed to measure consumer satisfaction in this study – “Satisfaction is the consumer’s fulfilment response. It is a judgement that a product or service feature, or the product or service itself, provided (or is providing) a pleasurable level of consumption-related fulfilment, including levels of under-or-over fulfilment”.
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2.2 Consumer-satisfaction Measurement

Consumer satisfaction has been measured mainly with the expectancy-disconfirmation paradigm in which satisfaction is viewed as a result of discrepancy between 'expectation' and the perception of the service. Another approach applied to measure consumer satisfaction discussed here is performance-only measures.

2.2.1. Expectancy-disconfirmation Measures

The expectancy-disconfirmation paradigm (EDP) continues to be the dominant measurement framework used in the investigation of consumer satisfaction (Pizam and Milman, 1993). This framework views expectations as the primary determinant of consumer dis/satisfaction (Yuksel and Yuksel, 2001). In a study of flu shots, Oliver (1980) found that disconfirmation is positively related to consumer satisfaction. Positive disconfirmation is formed when 'perceived performance' is above the expectation leading to increased consumer satisfaction. Negative disconfirmation, which is the result of 'perceived performance' being below the expectation decreases consumer satisfaction.

Two approaches have been adopted to investigate confirmation and disconfirmation of expectation; an inferred approach and direct method (Yuksel and Yuksel, 2001). The inferred approach is an approach where the discrepancy between 'expectation' of 'performance' and evaluation of outcomes is calculated. This technique requires responses from two separate data sets: consumer-service expectation and consumer-perceived performance. The scores of 'performance' are subtracted from 'expectation' scores to form the 'confirmation/disconfirmation' score. In contrast, the direct approach requires the application of summary-judgement scales to measure confirmation and disconfirmation such as a Likert-type scale of "better than expected" to "worse than expected". Thus, the researcher avoids the need to calculate difference in scores, since a direct question on the extent to which the service experience exceeded, met or fell short of expectations, could be asked (Yuksel and Rimmington, 1998).
2.2.1.1 Criticism of Expectancy-disconfirmation Measures

Although the expectancy-disconfirmation paradigm is widely accepted in consumer satisfaction research, there are considerable criticisms for including ‘expectations’ and for using difference scores in examining consumer satisfaction (Yuksel and Yuksel, 2001). These criticisms are discussed further in the following sections.

- Criticism on Expectation Measure

The use of expectation in measuring consumer satisfaction creates the issue of: (1) expectation measure leads to high expectation ratings; (2) experience affects expectation responses (3) expectation may not occur in certain situations; and (4) uncertainties on how and when consumers use and interpret expectation.

Expectation measure leads to a high expectation rating (Dorfman, 1979). This is because respondents may feel motivated to demonstrate an “I have high expectations” social norm and indicate that they desire the maximum amount of quality on every attribute (Yuksel and Yuksel, 2001). If this happens, managers would find it difficult to satisfy consumers, as expectations will never be met or exceeded.

At any time of service experience, expectation responses are expected to be contaminated by experience. A contamination effect occurs when the consumer is asked after the service episode about his or her prior expectations (Gilbert et al., 2004). Gronroos (1993) stated that expectations are biased by consumers’ experience in which service experience may lower or raise the consumers’ reported expectation. On that basis, Carman (1990) suggested that expectation should be measured before the service experience takes place. It should be measured before service is provided in order to have value on the measurement and to avoid the risk of the response of expectation being contaminated by perceptions of the actual service provided (Getty and Thompson, 1994). Weber (1997) argued that measuring expectation at this stage is too problematic. Gilbert et al. (2004) stated that the
prior service expectation may change throughout the service encounter because service encounter has a series of events starting from 'the lighted parking lot, to the entrance, to the waiting line, to the order taker, to the time between order and the food served, the accuracy of the food served versus the food order, to the self-service counter, then to the seating, the look, feel and taste of the meal itself, and the ambiance within the establishment' (Gilbert et al., 2004: p.373).

There are certain situations where expectation may not occur in advance or may not be well-formed and thus measuring it may not be valid (Crompton and Love, 1995). Many hospitality and tourism services are based heavily on experience and credence properties, which may only be available or may be more easily judged only after, rather than before, the consumption experience (Ngobo, 1997). For instance, Yuksel and Yuksel (2001) stated that tourists may not have well-formed expectations because they have a lack of experience with a service or lack of familiarity with a destination. Hospitality services also comprised various levels of encounters and this may create uncertainty and ambiguity, which may inhibit the formation of pre-purchase expectations (Jayanti and Jackson, 1991). Therefore, the use of pre-purchase expectations might be less meaningful for experiential services than tangible consumer goods (Yuksel and Yuksel, 2001).

Researchers have been unsure when 'expectation' does occur and how individuals interpret and evaluate consumer satisfaction. It is uncertain whether consumers use a comparison standard (e.g. expectation) in their evaluation of satisfaction, either before or after purchasing products or experiencing service (Yuksel and Yuksel, 2001). The reason is because there has been inadequate research evidence on whether hospitality and tourism consumers use only pre-purchase expectations in their post-purchase service evaluations (Westbrook and Reilly, 1983). Uncertainties about the kind of services and products lead to differences in satisfaction processes (Yuksel and Yuksel, 2001). For example, the experience of staying in a familiar hotel is different from the same kind of experience in an unfamiliar hotel, and these
experiences are dissimilar to dining experiences in familiar or unfamiliar restaurants. The uncertain nature of expectation may possibly be interpreted differently by consumers. It is possible that consumers will be confused when answering questions about their expectations (Spreng et al., 1998). Some respondents may adopt a predictive expectation in their interpretation of the question, while still others may use a normative interpretation.

- **Criticism on Difference Score**

The use of difference scores as measures of constructs has a variety of potential problems (Peter et al., 1993). One is the misleading interpretations of the difference score of 'expectation' and 'perception of performance'. Teas (1993) argued that the difference scores may result in misleading interpretations resulting from simple arithmetic. For example, a 7-point scales of expectations and performance yield six ways of producing a -1 value of 'performance minus expectation' score (e.g. P=1 - E=2; P=6 - E=7).

Peter et al. (1993) argued that the difference score also had reliability and validity problems. According to them, the measure of expectation and performance was made on an identical scale and subtracted from one another. As an instance, Parasuraman et al. (1988) measured expectation by 'level of service that should be provided by the firm' and performance by 'level of service that is actually provided'. Because of this, it is no surprise that both measures are correlated, therefore leading to lower reliability (Peter et al., 1993). Researchers therefore suggested that if consumer satisfaction is evaluated by the discrepancy between expectation and performance, the direct comparison measure should be used. For instance, Tse and Wilton (1988) compared the performance of direct measure (i.e. "very much poorer than expected" to "very much better than expected") and difference score. Results revealed that the 'direct measure' empirically outperformed the 'difference score' measure. By the same token, Brown et al. (1993) found that the direct comparison approach had better psychometric properties, reduced respondents burden because they responded to only half as many items and produced favourable empirical results.
2.2.2. Performance-only Measures

Knowing that applying expectancy-disconfirmation measures is problematic, researchers applied performance-only measures to evaluate consumer satisfaction. Crompton and Love (1995) stated that measuring expectation will not yield more useful information than that gained from the perception scores alone. Therefore, the expectation score should be dropped. Furthermore, when a service or product performs well, the consumer will be satisfied regardless of any confirmation-disconfirmation effect (Erevelles and Leavitt, 1992).

Research indicates that performance-only measures are better than expectation-disconfirmation measures. This method is more straightforward and convenient to use and applicable for the human cognitive process (Meyer and Westerbarkey, 1996). Dorfman (1979) identified that the expectation-minus-performance measure, did not correlate highly with the overall measure of satisfaction along with the straight-performance model. Tse and Wilton (1988) provided strong theoretical support in favour of extending the expectations-disconfirmation model to incorporate the direct influences of perceived performance. These authors demonstrated that in many consumption situations, perceived performance might indeed outweigh expectations in determining consumer-satisfaction/dissatisfaction judgements.

Researchers have applied the single-item measure or multiple-item measures to examine satisfaction. It has been suggested that multiple-item measures are more reliable and valid than the use of single-item measure. Westbrook and Oliver (1981) compared the reliability and validity of five scales: verbal, graphic, Likert, semantic differential and inferential measures. They found that Likert scales and semantic-differential scales appeared to outperform other satisfaction scales in terms of reliability and validity. Yi (1990) explained that the Likert scale is the scale that ranges from 'strongly agree' to 'strongly disagree'. Respondents indicate their agreement with the statements related to variables that are measured. For instance, Gilbert and Veloutsou (2006) employed a 1 to 5 'strongly disagree-strongly agree' scale to examine nine
statements related to satisfaction with 'personal' and 'settings' of restaurant. Another scale, semantic-differential scales is the scale that measures the connotative meaning to express a variable (e.g. overall satisfaction) (Yi, 1990). For example, Ekinci et al. (2008) examined overall satisfaction using two types of scales – 'delighted-terrible' and 'satisfied-dissatisfied' scale. Babin et al. (2005) measured two items of overall satisfaction by one type of scale which is the 'agree-disagree' scale and one item measured with 'bad-good' scale and percentage score scale.

2.3 Consumer-satisfaction Measurement in the Restaurant Industry

Section 2.3 concentrates on studies drawn specifically from the restaurant sector. A high level of consumer satisfaction leads to increased consumer loyalty (Anderson and Sullivan, 1993). Increasing consumer loyalty leads to increased profit for the businesses (Bolton, 1998). The realisation of the vital role of consumer satisfaction in the profitability of organisations suggested that one should not be surprised that a great deal of research has been devoted to investigating the process by which consumers form judgements about a service experience in hospitality and tourism firms (Yuksel and Rimmington, 1998).

In the restaurant industry, researchers have followed two approaches to study consumer satisfaction: (1) examining consumer satisfaction at the attribute level and; (2) investigating the process of consumer satisfaction. In the first approach, studies attempt to better understand consumer satisfaction on a market segment level. These studies have simply been descriptive, comparing consumers' attribute-specific ratings in pre-specified or demographic-based market segments (Barsky, 1992). This measurement of satisfaction is known as transaction-specific satisfaction. In the second approach, consumer satisfaction has been studied by looking at the process of satisfaction in the model with satisfaction being frequently operationalised as overall satisfaction. Oh and Parks (1997) stated that studying consumer satisfaction at the attribute-level did not provide experimental control over the effects of
consumers' attitudes towards the focal brands, and they have often exposed validity problems. Thus, the long-term aspect of consumer satisfaction processes should be considered in designing a consumer satisfaction study because knowing the process of consumer satisfaction particularly in the hospitality industry, will result in consumers' repeat visits over an extended period of time (Oh and Parks, 1997).

Thirty-five studies of consumer satisfaction in the restaurant sector published from 1980s to date are reviewed to determine the current development of consumer satisfaction research in this industry, focussing on the factors and restaurant attributes that influence consumer satisfaction and the effects of consumer satisfaction to other factors (e.g. behavioural intentions). Studies are grouped by the approach used to study consumer satisfaction; either by studying consumer satisfaction at transaction-specific (attribute) level, or examining the process of overall consumer satisfaction. Within these categories, the setting of study, variables measured and the outcome of study are examined.

2.3.1. Studies Measuring Transaction-specific Satisfaction

Fourteen studies that have measured transaction-specific satisfaction in restaurants from year 1990 to date are reviewed. These studies are: Davis and Vollman (1990); Oh and Jeong (1996); Pettijohn et al. (1997); Davis and Heineke (1998); Kivela et al. (1999a, 1999b and 2000); Yuksel and Yuksel (2002); Gilbert et al. (2004); Law et al. (2004); Sulek and Hensley (2004); Veloutsou et al. (2005); Gilbert and Veloutsou (2006); Gupta et al. (2007); Hensley and Sulek (2007); and Liu and Jang (2009). These studies examined 'consumer satisfaction' with various restaurant attributes and studies differ in the approach of measuring satisfaction.

Davis and Vollmann (1990) examined the influence of wait times on customer satisfaction in the fast-food restaurants using survey method. Findings demonstrated that customers were less satisfied with the service if they had to wait for long time for the service. In addition, the time of day and store location
significantly influenced the relationship between waiting time and customer satisfaction, but the type of day (weekday or weekend) did not. For instance, customers at lunch would be more dissatisfied with longer waiting times than customers at dinner times. The downtown customers were more dissatisfied with longer waiting times than were suburban customers.

Oh and Jeong (1996) investigated the effectiveness of predicting customer satisfaction on the expectation-based market levels in the fast-food restaurants industry. 19 attributes and a single overall indicator were used to measure customer satisfaction. The 19 attributes examined in this study were ‘cleanliness’, ‘neat establishment’, ‘restaurant spaciousness’, ‘comfortable seating’, ‘quiet atmosphere’, ‘convenient location’, ‘dining-room temperature’, ‘quick food delivery’, ‘no waiting’, ‘employee attitude’, ‘employees’ greeting’, ‘responsiveness’, ‘menu item availability’, ‘tastiness of food’, ‘price of food’, ‘food quality’, ‘ingredient freshness’, ‘temperature of food’ and ‘portion size’. These attributes were examined for the expectation scores and the perception of performance scores. Five-factor structure formed using Factor Analysis for expectations scores include ‘product’, ‘service’, ‘amenity’, ‘appearance’ and ‘convenience’. Three-factor structure for the perception of performance scores were attributes related to food, service delivery and environment.

Following this, cluster analysis was carried out and the outcome of the analysis showed that customers were clustered into four groups: (1) neat service seeker, (2) convenience seeker, (3) classic diner and (4) indifferent diner. ‘Neat Service Seeker’ is the customers that have the highest expectation on ‘appearance’ and lowest on ‘amenity’. Besides, ‘service’ was quite important to this group compared to ‘product’ and ‘convenience’. The ‘Convenience Seeker’ group showed very high expectations solely on ‘convenience’. Customers that expressed above-average (i.e., a factor score of zero) expectations on all the expectation factors were labelled ‘Classic Diner’. ‘Indifferent Diner’ was a group of customers who showed expectations on only one factor: amenity.
Results also showed that overall satisfaction could be explained by all three performance factors (i.e. food, service and environment). In addition, different groups of customers perceived satisfaction differently. Customer satisfaction was explained by 37 percent on the aggregate level. This figure increased significantly on the three market segments based on expectation scores i.e. 'convenience seeker', 'classic diner' and 'indifferent diner'. This finding implies that customers' expectations are effective criteria for segmenting the fast-food market. In addition, predicting customer satisfaction by perceived performance of the expectation-based market segments was proven to be more precise and parsimonious.

Pettijohn et al. (1997) examined the relative importance of satisfaction dimensions in the fast-food restaurants. The dimensions of satisfaction in this study were 'food quality', 'cleanliness', 'value', 'price', 'convenience', 'speed of service', 'courtesy', 'menu variety' and 'store atmosphere'. Findings showed that 'food quality' was significantly more important than the remaining variables in predicting consumer satisfaction. This study also revealed that highly-satisfied customers are more likely to return to the restaurant. In addition, highly satisfied customers had positive attitudes about an establishment compared to low-satisfied customers.

Davis and Heineke (1998) examined the influence of 'wait times' on customer satisfaction in the fast-food restaurants. In this study, 'wait time' was classified into the following types: (1) 'perceived wait time', (2) 'actual wait time' and (3) 'the disconfirmation between perceived and actual wait time'. The findings showed that all three types of wait times influenced customer satisfaction but the relative importance of each of these variables predicting satisfaction depends on the differences in the needs of the customers. This study found that satisfaction on the 'wait times' depend on how critical the time is for customers. When time is not critical, the differences between perceived wait times and disconfirmation are very small.
Kivela et al. (1999a, 1999b and 2000) examined consumer satisfaction in a themed restaurant by measuring the scores of importance and performance (expectation met) of 28 (items) restaurant attributes related to 'food', 'service', atmosphere', 'convenience', 'new dining experience', 'consistent standard of food and service' and 'feeling comfort during dining'. These scores were then used to calculate satisfaction score by multiplying the importance and performance scores of each attribute. Weiss et al. (2004) applied similar method as Kivela et al. (1999a, 1999b and 2000), however they had removed items related to reservation and convenience of parking because these criteria were not related to the restaurant they examined. Neither of the studies measured overall satisfaction, so restaurant attributes affecting overall satisfaction are unknown.

Yuksel and Yuksel (2002) investigated consumer satisfaction with a table-service restaurant amongst tourists, and grouped respondents into tourist segments including 'value seekers', 'service seekers', 'adventurous-food seekers', 'atmosphere seekers' and 'healthy-food seekers'. Respondents were asked to rate the level of satisfaction and performance of the attributes. Attributes that are included related to service quality and staff attitude, product quality and hygiene, adventurous menu, price and value, atmosphere and activity, healthy food, location and appearance, availability of non-smoking area and visibility of food preparation area. Consumers' overall satisfaction was predicted by regressing the subjects' satisfaction scores on the factor scores of performance perception. Findings showed that 'service quality' was perceived to be important by certain groups of respondents: 'adventurous-food seekers' and 'healthy-food seekers'. Tourists clustered into 'value seekers', 'service seekers' and 'atmosphere seekers' perceived product quality to be more important to determine satisfaction compared to other factors.

Gilbert et al. (2004) and Veloutsou et al. (2005) applied a tool known as the 'Consumer Satisfaction Index' (CSI) to examine consumer satisfaction in the fast-food restaurants. This tool comprises two aspects of consumer
satisfaction: satisfaction with service personnel and service setting. The dimension of service personnel consists of items such as 'provider courtesy', 'timely service', 'competent employees', 'easy to get help', 'employees listen', 'treatment received', 'prompt help', 'fair treatment', 'helpful personnel'. The service-setting dimension includes 'convenient operating hours', 'neat and clean place', 'easy access to service', 'security within the organisation', 'security outside the organisation', 'service costs reasonable', 'organisation delivers what it promises' and 'organisation backs up its promises'. Gilbert and Veloutsou (2006) later applied only 9 items from 17 items to measure consumer satisfaction in the restaurant context. These items are: 'provider courtesy', 'timely service', 'competent employees', 'easy to get help', 'convenient operating hours', 'neat and clean place', 'treatment received', 'security within the organisation' and 'security outside the organisation'. The most important factors affecting consumer satisfaction were not reported in these studies: Gilbert et al. (2004), Veloutsou et al. (2005) and Gilbert and Veloutsou (2006). It is probably because the main aim of these studies was to test the applicability of the survey tool across countries and industries.

Law et al. (2004) measured overall consumer satisfaction at different meal times (i.e. lunch, tea and dinner) in fast-food restaurants. In this study, satisfaction level of factors such as 'different waiting time', 'price of food', 'variety of food', 'convenience', 'environment', 'seat availability', 'staff quality' and 'quality of food' were measured. Law et al. (2004) proposed that overall satisfaction in fast-food restaurants is the result of an accumulation of satisfaction with attributes in the restaurant. Results showed that consumers' satisfaction with 'waiting time', 'staff attitude', 'food quality' and 'food variety' resulted in overall consumer satisfaction towards the restaurant.

Sulek and Hensley (2004) examined the relative importance of 'food', 'atmosphere' and 'fairness of wait' on 'customer satisfaction' and 'repeat patronage decision' in the full-service restaurants. Results showed that 'food quality' was the most significant factor influencing customer satisfaction followed by restaurants' atmosphere and the fairness of the seating order. In
addition, only ‘food quality’ significantly predicts ‘repeat patronage’. This finding suggests that food that was prepared the way customers enjoy it can attract the customers back for many return visits (Sulek and Hensley, 2004).

Gupta et al. (2007) examined consumer satisfaction with attributes related to ‘food’, ‘value’, ‘service’, ‘greeting’ and ‘restaurant setting’ in chain restaurants. The dimension of ‘food’ consisted of items in regards to ‘accuracy of food order’, ‘deliciousness of food’, ‘temperature of food’, ‘presentation of food’ and ‘overall quality of food’. ‘Value’ was measured using four items – ‘overall value for money’, ‘total cost appropriate for the food and service received’, ‘menu prices too high or not’ and ‘pleased with the amount of food you were served’. The dimension of ‘service’ involved items such as ‘overall level of service’, ‘food served in timely manner’, ‘attentive service’, ‘server appearance’, ‘prompt approach and take order’ and ‘friendly service’. The dimension of ‘greeting’ comprised ‘cheerful, friendly and attentive greeting’ and ‘seated quickly at the table’. The two items relating to restaurant setting were ‘the interior of restaurant is clean, comfortable and inviting’ and ‘table clean and dry’. Consumer satisfaction responses towards the attributes were compared to their responses on willingness to return to that particular restaurant.

Results of the study by Gupta et al. (2007) demonstrated that for the overall attribute, ‘overall food quality’ had the lowest satisfaction level while ‘a clean, comfortable and inviting restaurant’ had the highest satisfaction rating. For the detailed attributes, the value-attribute measuring the perceived value in the level of menu prices scored lowest in respondent satisfaction, while the attribute describing server appearance as being ‘neat and clean’ recorded the highest satisfaction rating. When these responses were compared to the respondents’ willingness to return to the restaurant, the factor that had a low performance but high responsiveness to respondents’ willingness to return was ‘deliciousness of food’ followed by ‘appropriateness of cost’, ‘attentiveness of service’, ‘timely service’ and ‘promptness of service’. Thus, food was significant in willingness to return.
Hensley and Sulek (2007) investigated the relationship between consumer satisfaction at attribute-level with overall satisfaction in a full-service restaurant. This involved consumer satisfaction with waits in multi-stages (wait time for seating, wait time for food, wait time for check and wait time for change), 'wait area comfort', 'host staff politeness', 'seating comfort', 'food quality', and 'server attentiveness' were measured. These factors were then regressed against 'overall satisfaction'. Results indicated that satisfaction with 'waiting time for seating', 'waiting time for food', 'staff politeness', 'food quality' and 'server attentiveness' particularly affected overall satisfaction.

Liu and Jang (2009) examined the attributes of Chinese restaurants that influenced American customers' satisfaction and behavioural intentions. The attributes were classified into four categories i.e. food-related attributes, service-related attributes, atmosphere-related attributes and other attributes. Food-related attributes included 'food presentation', 'variety', 'healthy options', 'taste', 'freshness', 'temperature' and 'safety'. Service-related attributes consisted of seven items including 'employees are friendly and helpful', 'employees are attentive', 'employees have knowledge on the menu', 'service is prompt', 'service is dependable and consistent', 'employee serve food exactly as ordered' and 'employees provide an accurate guest check'. Atmosphere-related attributes included in this study are 'internal design and décor', 'lighting', 'music', 'temperature', 'odours', 'cleanliness' and 'employee appearance'. Other attributes included in this study are perceived fairness of price, food authenticity and environmental authenticity. Results showed that all categories of attributes influenced customer satisfaction. However, the key attributes that predicts customer satisfaction and behavioural intentions are 'food taste', 'service reliability' and 'environmental cleanliness'.

It is noted from the studies mentioned above that the most-examined restaurant attributes are attributes related to settings and environment of restaurant (34 items) followed by food-related attributes (15 items), attributes regarding staff behaviour and service delivery (11 items) and other attributes such as price/value-for-money (4 items) and 'wait time' (8 items). The review
of these studies has shown that most studies examined the level of consumer satisfaction for each attribute, but that these studies did not report the impact of these attributes on overall consumer satisfaction. Studies that examined this relationships (e.g. Law et al., 2004; Hensley and Sulek, 2007) found that 'food quality', 'waiting time' and 'staff behaviour' affected consumer's overall satisfaction.

This review demonstrated that there were only a few common attributes examined in different restaurant settings. Table 2.1 to Table 2.4 summarised attributes that have been examined in the past studies. Table 2.1 illustrates the attributes related to the restaurant setting. The attributes related to food are shown in Table 2.2. Table 2.3 depicts the attributes related to staff behaviour and service delivery. Other attributes such as price, value-for-money and wait times are shown in Table 2.4. In each table, symbols indicate the type of restaurant which the study examined, while the different colour shadings of boxes specify whether or not each attribute is examined in each study and the relation of each attribute to overall satisfaction.
Table 2.1: Environment-related Attributes and Consumer Satisfaction: A Review of Studies measuring Transaction-specific Satisfaction in Restaurants (1996 to 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Full-service restaurant</th>
<th>Fast-food restaurant</th>
<th>Chain restaurant - no description</th>
<th>Study that reports the influence of overall food, service and environmental factors on customer satisfaction.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neat and clean place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff appearance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of restaurant comfort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenient operating hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security within the organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security outside the organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feels comfortable to eat there</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(general)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy access to service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant appearance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant temperature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offers new dining experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View from restaurant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining privacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment/atmosphere (general)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation delivers what it promises</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation backs up its promises</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wait area comfort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seating comfort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness of seating order</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The interior of restaurant is clean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The interior of restaurant is inviting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handling of telephone reservations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking convenience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience (general)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seat availability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A place frequented by locals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity and entertainment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impression from the road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenient location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of non-smoking area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility of food-preparation area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aroma in restaurant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff cleanliness/appearance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant spaciousness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- Attributes not examined
- Satisfaction with attributes are examined but its relation to overall satisfaction was not reported
- Satisfaction with attributes are examined and its relation to overall satisfaction was found
- Satisfaction with attributes are examined and its relation to overall satisfaction was not found

- Restaurants in general
- Full-service restaurant
- Fast-food restaurant
- Chain restaurant - no description
- Study that reports the influence of overall food, service and environmental factors on customer satisfaction.

Through a review of 12 studies, inconsistency in the measurement of attributes related to the physical setting of restaurants examined was
observed (Table 2.1). Only one attribute was examined in half of 12 studies reviewed which was 'neat and clean place'. Other attributes were examined in four-or-less studies. It shows that researchers agreed that this attribute is important in influencing consumer satisfaction in restaurants. Review also showed that, although many studies examined the effect of attributes of physical setting of restaurant on consumer satisfaction, the findings were not reported. It is assumed that reporting the impact of these attributes on overall consumer satisfaction is vital to ensure that restaurant management knows the area that needs to be improved and to assist in allocating budget for improvement.

Table 2.2: Food-related Attributes and Consumer Satisfaction: A Review of Studies measuring Transaction-specific Satisfaction in Restaurants (1997 to 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of food</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tastiness of food</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The presentation of meal appealing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshness of food</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutritious food</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menu item variety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food served at proper temperature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food of a consistent standard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount of food were served</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of adventurous menu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of local dishes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of interesting food</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of healthy food</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hygienic food preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- Attributes not examined
- Satisfaction with attributes are examined but its relation to overall satisfaction was not reported
- Satisfaction with attributes are examined and its relation to overall satisfaction was found
- Satisfaction with attributes are examined and its relation to overall satisfaction was not found
- Restaurants in general
- Full-service restaurant
- Fast-food restaurant
- Chain restaurant - no description either it is full service or fast food restaurant
- Study that reports the influence of overall food, service and environment factors on customer satisfaction.
Review of 9 studies in Table 2.2 shows that 'quality of food' was an important factor that impact overall consumer satisfaction in restaurant. Four studies reported that 'quality of food' influenced customer satisfaction, indicating the importance of this factor in creating satisfied customers. Review also showed that each attribute was treated as a single attribute related to food. In contrast, another study (e.g. Namkung and Jang, 2007) applied a different approach by treating food-related attributes such as 'tastiness of food', 'presentation of meal' and 'freshness of food' as the components of quality food. For that reason, it is also possible to assume that these factors may be important in determining consumer satisfaction in restaurants.

Table 2.3: Staff Behaviour-related Attributes and Consumer Satisfaction: A Review of Studies measuring Transaction-specific Satisfaction in Restaurants (1997 to 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Behaviour-related Attributes</th>
<th>Attentiveness of staff</th>
<th>Courtesy of staff</th>
<th>Competency of staff</th>
<th>Staff willing to help</th>
<th>Timely service</th>
<th>Efficiency of service</th>
<th>Service of a consistent standard</th>
<th>Staff willing to serve</th>
<th>Knowledgeable staff</th>
<th>Staff's ability to handle complaints</th>
<th>Staff's service attitude (general)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert and Veloutsou (2006)</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hensley and Sulek (2007)</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kivela et al. (1999a, 1999b)</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuksel and Yuksel (2002)</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert et al. (2004)</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veloutsou et al. (2005)</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gupta et al. (2007)</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liu and Jang (2009)</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulek and Hensley (2004)</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pettijohn et al. (1997)</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oh and Jang (1996)</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- Attributes not examined
- Satisfaction with attributes are examined but its relation to overall satisfaction was not reported
- Satisfaction with attributes are examined and its relation to overall satisfaction was found
- Satisfaction with attributes are examined and its relation to overall satisfaction was not found
- Restaurants in general
- Full-service restaurant
- Fast-food restaurant
- Chain restaurant - no description either it is full-service or fast-food restaurant
- Study that reports the influence of overall food, service and environmental factors on customer satisfaction.

Table 2.3 shows that the most frequent attribute related to staff behaviour examined in the past studies were 'attentiveness of staff' and 'courtesy of staff'. These factors also influenced consumer satisfaction, showing their role
in consumers’ experience in the restaurant. The review also indicates that, regardless of the degree of service offered to consumers in a restaurant i.e. fast-food or full-service, these two factors were examined in the past research. It shows that researchers are aware of the importance of these factors in a restaurant. Other significant factors examined in the studies are ‘competency of staff’, followed by ‘staff willing to help’ and ‘timely service’. Law et al. (2004) reported that staffs’ service attitude affects consumer satisfaction. On that basis, it is worth noting that staff behaviour in general affects consumer satisfaction, regardless of the specific staffs’ behaviour depicted in delivering service in a restaurant.

Table 2.4: Other Attributes and Consumer Satisfaction: A Review of Studies measuring Transaction-specific Satisfaction in Restaurants (1997 to 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Price/value-for-money</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable price for food or service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good value for money spent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price (general)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prices shown clearly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wait time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No waiting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wait time for seating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wait time for food</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wait time for check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wait time for change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wait time in general</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived wait time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual wait time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference between expected waiting time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and actual waiting time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- Attributes not examined
- Satisfaction with attributes are examined but its relation to overall satisfaction was not reported
- Satisfaction with attributes are examined and its relation to overall satisfaction was found
- Satisfaction with attributes are examined and its relation to overall satisfaction was not found
- Restaurants in general
- Full-service restaurant
- Fast-food restaurant
- Chain restaurant - no description either it is full-service or fast-food restaurant
- Study that reports the influence of overall food, service and environment factors on customer satisfaction.

The least popular attributes used to examine consumer satisfaction in the restaurants were ‘price or value-for-money’ and ‘wait time’ (Table 2.4). The
only item on price that has been examined in full-service and fast-food restaurants was ‘price for food and service is reasonable’, showing that reasonable price is perceived as important in any kind of restaurants. On top of that, ‘price’ affected consumer satisfaction (Law et al., 2004). ‘Wait time’ was also the least popular item examined in the consumer satisfaction studies. This may be because it is actually related to how efficient the service staff are. For that reason, measuring the staff efficiency is considered sufficient to represent consumers’ wait time in a restaurant. From the review, it is also observed that study that examined ‘wait time’ tended to examine different aspects of wait time. Hensley and Sulek (2007) examined wait time at multi-stages of the service encounter i.e. ‘wait time for food’, ‘wait time for bill’ and ‘wait time for change’ in full-service restaurants. Law et al. (2004) examined consumer satisfaction towards the ‘difference between expected waiting time and actual waiting time’ in a fast-food restaurant. Both studies, Hensley and Sulek (2007) and Law et al. (2004) discovered that ‘wait time’ impact overall consumer satisfaction, suggesting that consumers’ ‘wait time’ is important in restaurants.

2.3.2. Studies measuring Overall Satisfaction


Swan and Trawick (1981) is one of the early studies in satisfaction research that investigated the relationships between ‘expectation’, ‘perceived disconfirmation’, ‘inferred attribute-level disconfirmation’, ‘satisfaction’ and ‘intentions’ in the full-service restaurants. Results revealed that satisfaction was predicted primarily by ‘inferred disconfirmation’ followed by ‘expectation’.
Results also showed that 'intentions' were predicted most strongly by satisfaction followed by 'inferred disconfirmation' and then by 'expectations'.

Cadotte et al. (1987) examined the alternative standards of performance in satisfaction judgement using the disconfirmation model in three types of restaurants i.e. fast-food restaurants, family restaurants and atmosphere/specialty restaurants. However, only results for fast-food restaurant are reported in detail. The pre-consumption variables examined in this study include 'product-type norm', 'best-brand norm' and 'brand expectations'. 'Performance', 'disconfirmation' and 'satisfaction' are the post-consumption variables. The 'product-type norm' is concerned with customers' beliefs about the attributes in restaurants including 'food quality', 'speed of service', 'employee friendliness', 'atmosphere/décor', 'cleanliness', 'price/value' and 'quality of employee service'. The 'best-brand norm' was examined by asking respondents to write all the restaurants in the particular category (e.g. fast food) that they would consider dining and select one restaurant they considered the best. Then, the list of attributes that was previously mentioned was used to assess their beliefs about the attributes of that one chosen restaurant. 'Performance' score was obtained by averaging across multi-attribute belief scales on the seven attributes. The 'disconfirmation' was examined for the differences in the overall performance with performance in the product category (product norm), best brand and expectations.

Results showed that customer satisfaction increase when the disconfirmation increase in the consumption experience. Cadotte et al. (1987) further explained that the disconfirmation in expectations has a slightly larger effect on satisfaction than 'product norm' or 'best-brand norm disconfirmation'. This study shows that satisfaction involves evaluation and that evaluation is the result of a comparison process with standards other than expectations.

Fornell et al. (1996) applied a tool known as the 'American Customer Satisfaction Index' (CSI) to examine consumer satisfaction in various
industries including restaurants that are categorised under retail industry. This study investigated the relationships between the antecedents of customer satisfaction, including 'perceived quality', 'perceived value' and 'customer expectations', and consequences of customer satisfaction that includes: 'customer complaints' and 'customer loyalty'. Findings showed that quality better predicts satisfaction than value in retail industry. This implies that quality is relatively more central to market behaviour in this sector. Fornell et al. (1996) explained that this may be due to the location-driven nature of this sector. It is argued that this finding is not conclusive because this study did not report in details the relationships between all variables for the restaurant industry. Results represent retail sector on a whole which include department stores, discount stores, restaurants and supermarkets.

Cronin et al. (2000) assessed the effects of 'quality', 'value' and 'customer satisfaction' on consumers' behavioural intentions in multiple-service industries including fast-food restaurants. In fast-food restaurants, satisfaction was directly influencing behavioural intentions. In addition, 'service quality' had a direct effect on consumers' behavioural intentions. The significant indirect relationship was found between 'service value' and 'service quality', on behavioural intentions through satisfaction.

McDougall and Levesque (2000) examined the link between 'service quality' (core quality and relational quality), 'perceived value-for-money', 'consumer satisfaction' and 'behavioural intentions'. Two types of behavioural intentions were - 'intention to return' and 'intention to switch'. Result showed that only 'intention to return' is affected by consumer satisfaction in the restaurant.

Brady et al. (2001) re-tested Cronin et al. (2000) model in a comparison study between American and Ecuadorian fast-food restaurants customers. Results showed, in both samples, a significantly positive relationship between 'service quality' and 'customer satisfaction' and also a relationship between 'satisfaction' and 'behavioural intentions' was found. In addition, 'service value' and 'satisfaction' drove consumers' behavioural intentions in North
America whilst Latin Americans were found to emphasise satisfaction through 'service quality'. This finding implied that cultural background influences how consumers perceive satisfaction and behavioural intentions.

Seidman and Johnson (2002) investigated the effect of 6 dimensions of service quality, such as 'physical environment', 'reliability', 'responsiveness', 'assurance', and 'empathy' on different types of satisfaction: (1) 'satisfaction with task', (2) 'satisfaction with food' and (3) 'overall satisfaction'. Findings showed that consumers' satisfaction with task and overall satisfaction are affected by 'responsiveness', 'assurance', 'empathy' and 'physical environment'. Consumers' satisfaction with food was impacted on by 'responsiveness', 'assurance' and 'physical environment'.

Iglesias and Guillén (2004) examined the effect of 'perceived quality' and 'total perceived price' on consumer satisfaction in a restaurant. Only 'perceived quality' was found to influence consumer satisfaction in this study.

Tam (2004) investigated the relationships between 'perceived service quality', 'customer satisfaction', 'perceived sacrifice', 'perceived value' and 'intended post-purchase behaviour' in family/popular chains restaurants. It was revealed that 'perceived service quality' has a positive effect on 'customer satisfaction' and 'perceived value'. In addition, 'perceived value' has both a direct and indirect effect through 'customer satisfaction' on 'behavioural intentions'. However, 'perceived value' has a greater influence on 'post-purchase behaviour' than 'customer satisfaction'.

Babin et al. (2005) examined the effect of perceived service value, service quality and 'positive and negative affect' on consumer satisfaction and examined the effect of consumer satisfaction on 'intention to recommend' in a family-style restaurant. Findings demonstrated that all determinants of satisfaction, except 'negative affect' influencing 'consumer satisfaction' and that 'consumer satisfaction' has an impact on 'intention to recommend'.
Lee et al. (2005) studied the impact of service value and service quality consisting of five dimensions such as 'tangibles', 'responsiveness', 'assurance', 'empathy' and 'sensory', on consumer satisfaction and the effect of consumer satisfaction on 'intention to recommend' and 'intention to return' in a family restaurant. Service value and the 'empathy' of service quality dimension were found to influence consumer satisfaction. 'Intention to recommend' and 'intention to return' were both found to be affected by consumer satisfaction.

Andaleeb and Conway (2006) examined the impact of factors that determine consumer satisfaction in full-service restaurants. These factors are price and service quality (consisting of three dimensions such as 'responsiveness', 'reliability/food quality' and 'physical quality'). Findings showed all factors except 'physical quality' does not predict consumer satisfaction. This has confirmed the fact that satisfaction is the function of 'price', 'responsiveness' and 'reliability/food quality'.

Arora and Singer (2006) investigated the influence of consumer satisfaction on 'intention to return' and 'intention to recommend' in a fine-dining restaurant. The function of 'performance' and 'expectation' of attributes such as: 'food quality', 'service', 'ambiance' and 'convenience', on consumer satisfaction was also examined. Results showed that the overall performance of the restaurant and performance with food quality and service influences consumer satisfaction. Consumer satisfaction was found to affect 'intention to return' and 'intention to recommend'. Findings of this study indicated that consumer satisfaction mediates the relationship between 'performance' and 'expectation' and 'intention to return' and 'intention to recommend'.

Chow et al. (2007) examined the relationship between 'service quality', 'customer satisfaction' and 'repeat patronage'. In this study, 'service quality' was categorised into three dimensions including 'interaction quality', 'physical quality' and 'outcome quality'. Interaction quality was measured by attitude, behaviour, and expertise. Physical quality was measured by ambient...
conditions, design and social factors. Outcome quality was measured by waiting time, tangibles and valence. Results indicated that 'interaction quality' and 'physical quality' significantly influences 'service quality'. Results showed that 'service quality' influences customer satisfaction and frequency of patronage. Surprisingly, result shows that customer satisfaction does not predict repeat patronage of a restaurant, suggesting that a favourable attitude may not necessarily lead to repeat purchases (Dick and Basu, 1994).

Ladhari et al. (2007) investigated the determinants and consequences of dining satisfaction with restaurant services. The determinants of satisfaction examined in this study were 'positive emotions', 'negative emotions', 'perceived service quality' while the consequences of satisfaction examined were 'recommendation', 'loyalty' and 'willingness to pay more'. Results showed that there is a significant positive relationship between 'negative consumption emotions' and 'satisfaction'. Satisfaction has a significant effect on the three behavioural intentions; 'recommendation', 'customer loyalty' and 'willingness to pay more'. It was also revealed that the effect of 'perceived quality' on satisfaction is mediated by 'emotional responses'. This study added to the literature another variable that is involved in satisfaction judgement which is 'emotions'.

Namkung and Jang (2007) studied the effect of 'quality of food' on consumer satisfaction and the effect of consumer satisfaction on 'intention to return' and 'intention to recommend' in mid-and upper-scale restaurants. Result showed that 'quality of food' affected consumer satisfaction and behavioural intentions are affected by consumer satisfaction. Which type of behavioural intentions was affected by consumer satisfaction, however, was not reported.

Ryu et al. (2008) investigated the relationships between 'image', 'perceived value', 'customer satisfaction' and 'behavioural intentions' in the quick-casual restaurant industry. Results indicated that restaurant image significantly influences 'perceived value' and that 'perceived value' is significant in predicting customer satisfaction. In addition, 'image', 'perceived value',
'customer satisfaction' are also significant predictors of customers' behavioural intentions. Customer satisfaction was also found as a mediating variable in the relationship between 'restaurants' image' and 'perceived value' on behavioural intentions.

In the study of Ekinci et al. (2008), the relationship between antecedents and consequences of consumer satisfaction were examined in a restaurant setting. The antecedents of consumer satisfaction measured in the studies were 'desires', two types of self-congruence – ideal and actual, and two dimensions of service quality – 'physical quality' and 'staff behaviour'. The consequences of consumer satisfaction measured were 'intention to return' and 'consumer's post-purchase attitude towards the service firm'. The outcomes illustrated that all antecedents except 'actual self-congruence' impact consumer satisfaction and consumer satisfaction was found to affect consumers' intention to return and consumers' post-purchase attitude towards the service firm.

Heung and Ngai (2008) investigated the mediating effects of 'perceived value' and customer satisfaction between benefits that related to value (i.e. core, tangible and intangible benefits) and 'customer loyalty' in Chinese restaurants. 'Core benefits' relate to the actual outcomes or the core service as perceived by the customer (e.g. food, in the case of this study) (Kotler, 1998). Tangible benefits are benefits that are produced and consumed simultaneously through the interaction and encounter process in the delivery or service (e.g. physical environment, comfort in the dining area, cleanliness, etc.) (Heung and Ngai, 2008). The intangible benefits are concerned with the interaction between the service provider and customers that are assessed in a highly-subjective manner (e.g. responsiveness of restaurant staff, professional behaviour of restaurant staff, caring restaurant staff, etc.) (Heung and Ngai, 2008). Results showed that 'perceived value' and 'customer satisfaction' mediates the relationship between 'value-related benefits' and 'customer loyalty'. In addition, 'intangible benefits' and 'perceived value' were found to predict customer satisfaction. Customer loyalty is positively affected by 'perceived value' and 'customer satisfaction'.
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Kim (2009) investigated the influence of customer orientation of service employees (COSE) on consumers' perceptions of relational benefits which in turn led to 'favourable inequality', 'customer satisfaction' and 'repurchase intention'. COSE was defined as "the behaviour of service employees when serving the needs and wishes of existing and prospect customers" (Hennig-Thurau and Thurau, 2003: p.27). The concept of 'relational benefits' referred to the belief that the customer stays in a long-term relationship only when the relationship gives benefit to them (Gwinner et al., 1998). The favourable inequity was concerned with what is fair and what is hedonically desirable to the customer (Oliver and Swan, 1989). Findings indicated that 'relational benefits' in terms of 'confidence benefits' positively and significantly affects customer satisfaction. Customer satisfaction was also found to be positively and significantly affected by the favourable inequity. In addition, a positive and significant affect was found between customer satisfaction and repurchase intention.

Wu and Liang (2009) investigated the relationships between variables that are the service encounters elements (i.e. restaurant environment factors, interaction with service employees, interaction with other consumers and experiential value including fair price, excellent service, aesthetics) and 'customer satisfaction' in luxury-hotel restaurants. Results showed that only interactive relationships with service employees directly and positively affect consumer satisfaction. Restaurant environment factors and interactions with other consumers indirectly and positively influence consumer satisfaction through experiential value.

2.3.2.1 The Effect of Various Antecedents of Consumer Satisfaction in Restaurants

The antecedents of consumer satisfaction and its relationship to consumer satisfaction examined in studies from 1981 to date is summarised in Table 2.5. In this table, symbols indicate the type of restaurant the study examined, while the different shadings of boxes specify whether or not each antecedent of
consumer satisfaction is examined in each study and shows its relation to overall satisfaction.
Table 2.5: The Antecedents of Overall Consumer Satisfaction that have been examined in Studies measuring Overall Satisfaction in Restaurants from the 1980s to 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SQ: Responsiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQ: Reliability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQ: Physical quality or physical design or tangibles or core quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQ: Staff behaviour or relational quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQ: Assurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQ: Empathy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQ: Interaction quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQ: Outcome quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation with food quality or service or ambiance or convenience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall performance of restaurant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance with food quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance with service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance with ambiance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance with convenience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactions with service employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactions with other customers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived service value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive affect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favourable inequality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative affect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desires</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal self-congruence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual self-congruence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive emotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative emotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disconfirmation in expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product norm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best-brand norm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inferred disconfirmation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm image</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- Factors not examined
- Factors that have impact on overall satisfaction
- Factors that have no impact on overall satisfaction
- Restaurants in general
- Full-service restaurant
- Fast-food restaurant
Table 2.5 demonstrates that 14 out of 20 studies examined quality as determinant of consumer satisfaction. Several studies (e.g. Andaleeb and Conway, 2006), measured 'service quality', in which every study applied either general service quality or at least one of the SERVQUAL dimensions as suggested by Parasuraman et al. (1986, 1988). Only one study examined the variable of 'quality of food' which was Namkung and Jung (2007). It is argued that 'quality of food' should be emphasised in the study of consumer satisfaction in restaurants because food is the core product in the restaurant. Table 2.5 shows contradictory methods of assessing quality in restaurants: it was assessed either by measuring the service quality, consisting of the element related to quality of food, or the quality of food which is actually an exclusive aspect in a restaurant. For instance, Lee et al. (2005) added a dimension called 'sensory' to determine service quality in restaurants. This dimension consisted of items related to quality of food. Results showed that the sensory dimension does not influence consumer satisfaction. Namkung and Jang (2007) examined 'quality of food' as an aspect of quality in restaurants and it was found to affect consumer satisfaction. In the study of Arora and Singer (2006), general performance of 'quality of food' was measured and was found to impact on consumer satisfaction. In one study i.e. Andaleeb and Conway (2006), 'quality of food' was measured within one of the service quality dimensions - 'reliability'. It was called the dimension of 'reliability/food quality'.

Among all service quality dimensions, 'physical quality' was found to be the most common service quality dimension that affected consumer satisfaction, followed by 'responsiveness', 'staff behaviour' and 'empathy'. 'Physical quality' was found to predict consumer satisfaction in 4 out of 6 studies that examined this factor (e.g. Ekinci et al., 2008; McDougall and Levesque, 2000; Seidman and Johnson, 2002). The dimension of 'responsiveness' was also found to predict consumer satisfaction. Review also showed that when the dimensions of 'staff behaviour' and 'empathy' were examined, these dimensions affected consumer satisfaction (e.g. McDougall and Levesque, 2000; Seidman and Johnson., 2002; Lee et al., 2005 ;Ekinci et al., 2008). It indicates that staff
behaviour and staffs' empathy towards customers are the most influential service quality dimensions to predict satisfaction.

Besides ‘quality’, ‘perceived value’ also predicted consumer satisfaction in all studies that examined ‘perceived value’ (e.g. McDougall and Levesque, 2000; Babin et al., 2005; Lee et al., 2005). Other antecedents of consumer satisfaction revealed were ‘experiential value’, ‘firm’s image’, ‘relational benefits’, ‘favourable inequality’, ‘negative emotions’, ‘positive affect’, ‘product norm’, ‘best-brand norm’, ‘disconfirmation in expectations’, ‘inferred disconfirmation’, ‘desires’ and ‘ideal self-congruence’. This suggests that there are various factors that influence satisfaction judgement in restaurants. Further study needs to examine these factors as there is limited research involving those factors.

This review also revealed that ‘service quality’ in general, ‘physical quality’ and ‘perceived value’ were examined across different types of restaurants. In addition, studies found that these variables affect consumer satisfaction in these restaurants. This finding, however, is not conclusive because studies did not examine similar antecedents of consumer satisfaction. Thus, comparing these studies is somewhat difficult.

2.3.2.2 The Consequences of Consumer Satisfaction in Restaurants

The consequences of consumer satisfaction and its relationship to consumer satisfaction examined in studies from 1981 to the present year are summarised in Table 2.6. In this table, symbols indicate the type of restaurant the study examined while the different shadings of boxes specify whether or not each consequence of consumer satisfaction is examined in each study and shows its relationship with satisfaction.
Table 2.6: The Consequences of Overall Consumer Satisfaction that have been examined in Studies measuring Overall Satisfaction in Restaurants from 1981 to 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intention to return</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to recommend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to switch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumers' post-purchase attitude towards the service firm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to pay more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer complaints</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer loyalty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- Factors not examined
- Factors examined in the study but the results is not reported
- Factors that have impact on overall satisfaction
- Factors that have no impact on overall satisfaction
- Restaurants in general
- Full-service restaurant
- Fast-food restaurant

Table 2.6 shows that most studies reviewed examined behavioural intentions in general. Specifically, 'intention to return' was examined in 7 out of 18 studies (e.g. McDougall and Levesque, 2000; Lee et al., 2005; Arora and Singer, 2006; Namkung and Jang, 2007; Ekinci et al., 2008). It is followed by 'intention to recommend', measured in 6 studies (e.g. Ladhari et al., 2007; Ryu et al., 2008). Only one study investigated the effect of consumer satisfaction on 'intention to switch', which is the study by McDougall and Levesque (2000). Similarly, 'post-consumption attitude' was only examined by Ekinci et al. (2008) in restaurants.

It is interesting to note that, among the four consequences of consumer satisfaction, only 'intention to switch' was not affected by consumer satisfaction. All studies that examined 'intention to return', 'intention to recommend' and 'consumers' post-purchase attitude towards the service firm' found positive relationships between these variables and consumer satisfaction. In addition, the review demonstrated that consumer satisfaction
had an effect on these variables in a restaurant setting generally and in full-service restaurants. Because there were limited studies in fast-food restaurant, whether or not this effect occurs in this type of restaurant is unknown.

2.4 Summary

This chapter discussed the conceptualisation and measurement of ‘consumer satisfaction’. It is noted that consumer satisfaction can be evaluated cognitively or affectively by consumers. Consumer satisfaction can be evaluated during the service delivery process or during the end-state resulting from the consumption experience. Another important point is that evaluation of satisfaction differs for goods and services. This chapter also outlined the development of the most popular measures of consumer satisfaction i.e. expectancy-disconfirmation measures, followed by criticisms of it, which led to the development of performance-only measures.

The final section of this chapter described the various approaches used to investigate consumer satisfaction in the restaurant context i.e. measuring transaction-specific satisfaction and overall satisfaction. This review of customer satisfaction studies (1980s-2009) shows that very little emphasis is placed on food, the core product of all restaurants in the examination of consumer satisfaction. At transaction-specific level, most studies examined service attributes rather than food-related attributes. At overall satisfaction level, most studies examined SERVQUAL dimensions which do not include an item related to food. It is also noted that the measurement of antecedents and consequences of consumer satisfaction are imbalanced as most studies have focussed on measuring certain variables, whilst neglecting others. For instance, service quality (antecedent) and intention to return (consequence) have frequently been examined in the past.

The present study uses the consumer satisfaction model of Ekinci et al. (2008), and therefore examines similar variables - ‘service quality’, ‘ideal self-congruence’, ‘desires-congruence’, ‘intention to return’ and ‘consumers’ post-purchase attitude towards the service firm’. It is argued that, because many
researchers have overlooked measuring quality of food in the service quality dimensions, the significant role of value in the business, and the limited number of studies that investigate various kinds of behavioural intentions, the present study should include another two antecedents of consumer satisfaction (i.e. 'food quality' and 'perceived value-for-money') and two consequences of consumer satisfaction (i.e. 'intention to recommend' and 'intention to switch') into the model. The antecedents and consequences of consumer satisfaction examined in the present study are discussed in detail in the next chapter.
Chapter Three
Antecedents and
Consequences of Consumer Satisfaction

3.0 Introduction

One area of research on consumer satisfaction is the research involved in understanding the link between the causes and effects of satisfaction. To understand the link between the causes and effects of satisfaction, it is necessary to encourage certain actions to improve the business. Because it is important to measure satisfaction by investigating the values in terms of relationships in terms of consequences as these may predict.

According to Yi (1990), the antecedents of consumer satisfaction are: "expectations", "perceived quality", and "disconfirmation". Researchers have investigated the antecedents of satisfaction, often measuring more than one antecedent. The most antecedents are perceived value, "desires-congruence". The antecedents are assumed to examine the direction of effect of these antecedents on consumer satisfaction and consumer post consumption attitude and behaviors (e.g. Ekkehl et al., 2000).

Besides, antecedents of consumer satisfaction were considered to examine the direction of effect of these antecedents on consumer satisfaction. The consequences of satisfaction focus on how satisfaction influences the consumers' behavior and attitude after the meal consumption. Various consequences of consumer satisfaction or dissatisfaction occur after consumption. The consumer may take no action at all or another may make some internal resolve (e.g. intention to repeat, intention to recommend or "intention to switch") or take some public actions (e.g. make public complaint) by
CHAPTER THREE
ANTECEDENTS AND CONSEQUENCES OF CONSUMER SATISFACTION

3.0 Introduction
One area of interest in research on consumer satisfaction is the research involving the causes and effects of the cognitions of satisfaction (Oliver, 1980). In order to understand the link between the causes and effects of consumer satisfaction, it is necessary to encourage certain actions to reach an optimal level of satisfaction (Anderson and Sullivan, 1993). In other words, examining consumer satisfaction alone may not improve the business because it is important to measure satisfaction by investigating the chain of relationships in terms of so-called antecedents and consequences as these may predict consumer loyalty towards a firm.

According to Yi (1990), the main antecedents identified by consumer research are: 'expectations', 'perceived quality' and 'disconfirmation'. Other antecedents are 'perceived value', 'desires-congruence' and 'self-congruence'. Researchers have investigated the antecedents of consumer satisfaction, often measuring more than one antecedent of consumer satisfaction at a time, to discriminate these antecedents (Cronin et al., 2000). Besides, antecedents of consumer satisfaction were measured to examine the direction of effect of these antecedents on consumer satisfaction and consumer' post consumption attitude and behaviours (e.g. Ekinci et al., 2008).

The consequences of satisfaction focus on how satisfaction influences the consumers' behaviour/attitude after the meal consumption. Various consequences of consumer satisfaction or dissatisfaction occur after consumption. The consumer may take no action at all, or he/she may make some internal resolve (e.g. intention to return, intention to recommend or intention to switch) or take some public actions (e.g. make public complaint by
contacting retailers, manufacturers, consumer organisations and governmental agencies) (Day, 1977). Findings of a number of empirical studies indicate that there is a link between consumer satisfaction and consumer behaviour. For instance, positive relationships have been observed between consumer satisfaction and loyalty (Anderson and Sullivan, 1993; Fornell, 1992; Rust and Zahorick, 1993; Taylor and Baker, 1994) and between consumer satisfaction and the propensity to recommend the supplier's offer to other consumers (Hartline and Jones, 1996; Parasuraman et al., 1988; Selnes, 1993).

There are many antecedents and consequences of consumer satisfaction examined in previous studies. The present study examined the variables as in the model of consumer satisfaction in the study by Ekinci et al. (2008). In addition, this study includes other variables that were perceived to be related with consumer satisfaction, but are as yet understudied (e.g. self-congruence and desires-congruence).

The antecedents of consumer satisfaction examined in this study are 'perceived quality' (i.e. service quality and food quality), 'perceived value-for-money', 'desires-congruence' and 'self-congruence'. The consequences of consumer satisfaction reviewed are consumers' behavioural intentions (i.e. 'intention to return', 'intention to recommend' and 'intention to switch') and 'post-purchase attitude towards the service firm'. In order to address these variables and their connection to consumer satisfaction, the current chapter is divided into two sections:

1. The conceptualisation and measurement of the antecedents of consumer satisfaction.
2. The conceptualisation and measurement of the consequences of consumer satisfaction.
3.1 The Antecedents of Consumer Satisfaction

This section discusses the antecedents of consumer satisfaction that are examined in the present study, such as 'perceived quality', 'perceived value', 'desires-congruence' and 'self-congruence', in four different subsections.

3.1.1 Quality

Quality is a broad area, but, in this section, its importance, definition, conceptualisation and measurement are discussed. This section also demonstrates service quality research in the restaurant industry, which is the context applied to the present study.

3.1.1.1 The Importance of Quality

Quality has come to be recognised as a strategic tool for attaining operational efficiency and improved business performance. This is true for both the goods and services sectors.

Jain and Gupta (2004: 26)

It can be assumed that quality is crucial in any business. According to a survey by Organization Dynamics Inc. (Salazar, 1995), quality should be the number one concern of managements worldwide. During their survey, nearly two-thirds of the respondents, senior managers from Fortune Global 500 companies, agreed that quality is a key determinant of their companies' success.

3.1.1.2 Definition of Quality

Quality is the totality of features and characteristics of a product or service that bear on its ability to satisfy stated and implied needs.

Stebbing (1990) as taken from ISO 8402 1986

This definition demonstrates that quality is related to the offering of the firm and quality is evaluated by their ability to satisfy the needs of individuals that consume or experience it. It has been found that quality is a vague term...
(Schneider and White, 2004) and a delicate and abstract construct which is difficult to define and assess (Parasuraman et al., 1985).

Besides difficulties of defining the term quality, standardising the definition of quality for all establishments is also problematic. Kasper, et al. (1999: 184) stated that formulating a comprehensive and uniform definition is a big problem. It is because quality is being defined in many different ways and even within organisations; different departments (e.g. production and marketing) may have different views on the meaning of quality (Oude Ophius and Van Trijp, 1995). Garvin (1988) provides some examples of views of quality made by different groups. For example, philosophy researchers concentrate on the definitional issue. In economics, quality is related to profit maximisation and market stability. Researchers in marketing discuss quality as determinants of buying behaviour and consumer satisfaction, and in operations management, quality is part of engineering practices and manufacturing control. Because researchers’ backgrounds differ, the approaches used to define quality differ.

Several approaches have been used to define quality: user-based, manufacturing-based, product-based and value-based (Garvin, 1988). A user-based approach definition of quality is a subjective evaluation of quality by the consumer or “end-user” (Thorner and Manning, 1983). It implies that quality is all about ‘fitness for use’ (Juran, 1988). Quality, as perceived by the consumer is associated with abstract descriptions, such as personal preferences, namely something that is liked, disliked, excellent, superior, great or good (Thorner and Manning, 1983). These features however, do not produce real evidence about the degree of quality because consumers are assumed to have different wants or needs that best satisfy their preferences and perception of the best quality (Edwards, 1968 and Kuehn and Day, 1962). Despite that, Schneider and White (2004) stated that this view has been particularly appealing in defining quality in the area of services.
The manufacturing-based approach definition of quality is an approach used by the technician and technologist to define quality (Thorner and Manning, 1983). In addition, Jelsøe, et al. (1992) stated that, in the manufacturing-based approach, quality parameters are specified in properly-defined and scientific terms. Quality defining by this approach implies that quality is 'conforming to requirement' (Crosby, 1984).

Quality as a product-based approach is seen as a direct outcome of the number of features or attributes of a product: ‘quality is zero defects’ Schneider and White (2004). This approach suggests that the performance of attributes of a product leads to the evaluation of quality.

The value-based approach defines quality in terms of costs and prices (Garvin, 1988). This view suggests that quality is a function of consumer benefit relative to cost. Holbrook and Corfman (1985) agree that a quality product is one that provides performance or conformance at an acceptable price or cost.

3.1.1.3 The Concept of Perceived Quality

The present study investigates quality in the service firm. Researchers suggested that to examine quality in a service firm, one should measure ‘perceived quality’ (Gronroos, 1983). As Gronroos (1983) stated, when manufacturers of goods are also considered providing service as part of their package, it may be more appropriate to talk about total perceived quality. Consumers do not always differentiate between quality of product and quality of service. They regard these elements as a package and service quality is one element of the service equation. According to Parasuraman et al. (1988), perceived service quality can be defined as a global judgement or attitude relating to the superiority of a service relative to competing offerings.

There are two key concepts in the development of service-quality perceptions. One concept is concerned with the notion that service quality lies within the disconfirmation paradigm. The other idea is that service quality is an attitude-
based view. According to the disconfirmation paradigm, service quality involves a comparison of expectations with performance. Service quality is a measure of how well the service level delivered matches consumer expectations (Lewis and Booms 1983). Delivering quality service means conforming to consumer expectations on a consistent basis. This concept has been criticised by many researchers. Cronin and Taylor (1992) pointed out that the disconfirmation paradigm applies to the conceptualisation of consumer satisfaction. According to them, the concept of service quality should be the consumers' attitude towards the service, suggesting that perceived service quality can be obtained from the evaluation of performance for specific service attributes. Research of service quality in service firms has established many service attributes in service firms. These attributes were grouped into service-quality dimensions. The following sub-section discusses the dimensions of service quality.

3.1.1.3.1 Dimensions of Service Quality

According to Schneider and White (2004: p.30), it is important to know 'what things people consider when figuring out if service was good or bad'. This could be achieved by evaluating consumer perception of the performance of service-quality dimensions since people base their evaluations of service quality on multiple aspects of their service experience. Most researchers agree that service quality is multidimensional (e.g. Parasuraman et al., 1985; 1988; Gronroos, 1990; and Gummesson, 1992), but contradictory views are found concerning the number of service dimensions that should be measured and whether there is consistency in the dimensions considered across people and across different types of service (Schneider and White, 2004).

Two major schools of thought in 'service quality' research are North American and Nordic European schools (Ekinci, 2008). The North American school introduced the SERVQUAL dimensions consisting of ten service quality dimensions (Parasuraman et al., 1985). Later, Parasuraman et al. (1988) reduced these dimensions to five dimensions after high correlation was found among the ten dimensions. The Nordic European school proposed two and
three-dimensional quality models. For instance, Gronroos (1984) suggested that the two dimensions of service quality consist of what consumers obtained from the service firm and how consumers obtained services. Lehtinen and Lehtinen (1991) proposed that service quality can be understood by two approaches: three-dimensional and two-dimensional. The service quality dimensions of Parasuraman et al. (1988), Lehtinen and Lehtinen (1991) and Gronroos (1984) are discussed further.

- **Parasuraman’ SERVQUAL Dimensions**

SERVQUAL model of service quality is discussed first since it became of central importance and is in widespread use in services research (Schneider and White, 2004). The SERVQUAL dimensions were found by Parasuraman et al. (1985, 1988) through focus groups. They found several common themes emerged across various facets of service that consumers considered in judging the quality of a service. These dimensions are ‘tangibles’, ‘reliability’, ‘responsiveness’, ‘competence’, ‘courtesy’, ‘credibility’, ‘security’, ‘access’, ‘communication’ and ‘understanding the consumer’. After an iterative process of survey administration and a series of revisions and refinements, the five-factor SERVQUAL dimensions were formed (Schneider and White, 2004). This includes ‘reliability’, ‘tangibles’, ‘responsiveness’, ‘assurance’ and ‘empathy’. The definitions of these dimensions are depicted in Table 3.1

**Table 3.1: Five Dimensions of SERVQUAL and Definition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>Delivering the promised performance dependably and accurately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangibles</td>
<td>Appearance of the organisation’s facilities, employees, equipment, and communication materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td>Willingness of the organisation to provide prompt service and help consumers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance</td>
<td>Ability of the organisation’s employees to inspire trust and confidence in the organisation through their knowledge and courtesy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>Personalised attention given to a consumer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Parasuraman et al. (1985)*
The Lehtinen and Lehtinen Model
There are two approaches introduced by Lehtinen and Lehtinen (1991) to understand consumer satisfaction. The first approach suggested that service quality has three main dimensions that are 'physical quality', 'interactive quality' and 'corporate quality'. 'Physical quality' represents the physical elements of service that comprises the physical product and physical support. Physical product(s) is defined as the goods consumed during the service production process e.g. a restaurant meal. Physical support is a framework that assists the process of providing the service which can be divided into two categories: the environment and instruments. The environment includes the interiors, decorations and the layout of a service production setting. Instruments include equipment e.g. plates, cutleries, etc. in a restaurant.

'Interactive quality' is the dimension of quality that explains the interaction between the customer and interactive elements of the service firm. The interactive element can be the interactive persons (e.g. a waiter in restaurants) and interaction equipment (e.g. a vending machine). In addition, the interactive quality is produced both in the interaction between the customer and restaurant staff, and the contact between the customer and other customers in the restaurant business.

'Corporate quality' is the dimension of quality that concerns with how customers and potential customers view the firm, its image or profile. This quality dimension develops during the history of the service organisation. For that reason, a completely new restaurant has no corporate quality compared to the franchising restaurant concept which is an established firm with its image.

Lehtinen and Lehtinen (1991) also proposed that service quality was formed by 'process quality' and 'output quality'. Process quality is the customers' subjective evaluation about the service production process. Customers evaluate process-quality based on their views on the production process and their feeling of how well they fit into it. This evaluation is influenced by their
participation with the process that varies between very heavy (or intense) and very light (or casual). For instance, intense participations involves when a customer uses an automatic bank teller in order to obtain a banking service. On the other hand, a light participation is experienced by a customer of a petrol station where the tank is filled by an attendant, and the only form of customer participation consists in the customer giving a credit card or signing a receipt.

The second dimension, output quality, is a consumers' evaluation of the result of a service production process. The 'output quality' can be divided into two categories: tangible (or physical) and intangible elements. For instance, 'car wash' provides a tangible output where evaluation can be made by people who did not involve in the production process. On the other hand, the intangible output can be found in the tourism industry where only the customers who feel and experience the output can judge the process. These two-quality dimensions are related to Gronroos' quality dimensions (functional and technical quality).

- **The Gronroos Model**

Gronroos (1984) divides service quality into three dimensions which are 'technical quality', 'functional quality' and 'image'. 'Technical quality' represents what consumers obtain from the service firm e.g. meal in restaurant while 'functional quality' refers to how consumers obtain services. 'Image' refers to how consumers perceive the firm (Gronroos, 1984). This quality dimension is anticipated to be built up mostly by the technical and functional quality of the services and other marketing strategies (e.g. advertising, public relations).

It can be concluded that the typology of service quality dimensions mentioned previously i.e. SERVQUAL dimensions, Lehtinen and Lehtinen's dimensions and Gronroos's dimensions, suggested that service quality can be grouped either by the aspects related to the service delivery or by the offerings of the firm. The dimensions or characteristics which are used to give shape to the service, allow freedom to the supplier to amend the service offerings with the
aim of meeting market developments (Van Der Hart, 1991). Better understanding of the interaction and direction of these items is precious when attempting to improve perceptions of quality in a particular service (Dotchin and Oakland, 1994).

### 3.1.1.3.2 Measurements of Service Quality

The two main research instruments that have been developed over the years to examine the concepts of quality in the service industry are the SERVQUAL scale and the SERVPERF scale.

SERVQUAL is an instrument developed by Parasuraman et al. (1985) based on the concept of the expectancy-disconfirmation paradigm. This theory suggests that service quality is the difference between consumers' perceptions and expectations. Through a series of investigations, Parasuraman et al. (1985) found that consumers judge service quality by using the same general criteria, regardless of the type of service. These criteria are the 22-items of the SERVQUAL instrument. These evaluations are collected using a 7-point Likert scale. These items accounted for five dimensions: (1) the reliability of the service provider; (2) the responsiveness of the service provider; (3) the tangible aspects of the service; (4) the assurance provided by the service staff; and (5) the empathy shown. Each of the 22 items is measured against two constructs; one assesses the perceived performance of a service provider, the other construct measures the consumers' expectations regarding the level of service to be received. Calculating the difference between the 22 items, for the two constructs, forms the service quality score.

The SERVQUAL scale has been applied by many researchers in various service industries by means of measuring service quality. According to Schocker and Srinivasan (1979), SERVQUAL can be used as a strategic tool for positioning products or services in the business. By comparing consumer expectations of service versus perceived service across dimensions, managers can identify service shortfalls and use this information to allocate
resources to improve service quality (Parasuraman et al., 1994). Thus, the SERVQUAL scale has greater interest for practitioners because of its richer diagnostic value (Carrillat et al., 2007).

However, the principles of SERVQUAL have been debated by researchers. The main issues for debate are:

1. the universality of service-quality dimensions
2. the SERVQUAL focus on service-delivery process and
3. the use of difference scores in SERVQUAL scale.

- Criticism on the Universality of Service-quality Dimensions
While Parasuraman et al. (1985) proposed that the SERVQUAL scale was universal to any service context; this notion has been argued by many researchers because studies have failed to identify the underlying dimensions of the SERVQUAL. For example, Hedval and Paltschik (1989) identified two dimensions of service quality; 'willingness and ability to serve' and 'physical and psychological access', which are both unique to the traditional retailing environment. For service-quality evaluation in hospitality settings, such as hotels or restaurants, several studies suggested that two- or three-dimensional structure may be more suitable for the evaluation of service quality of hotels (Ekinci, 2002). For instance, Ekinci and Riley (2003) revealed that service-quality dimensions of hotels include 'physical quality' and 'staff behaviour'. Jun and Chai (2001) claimed that six key service-quality dimensions were identified by internet banking users. These included 'reliable', 'prompt responses', 'access', 'ease of use', 'attentiveness' and 'security and credibility'.

Concluding the above discussion, service-quality dimensions tend to be context-bounded and service-type-dependant (Paulin and Perrien, 1996; Mehta et al., 2000). It is because the operational definitions of the SERVQUAL dimensions may be very specific to the retail environment, thus making replications impossible in different situations (Ekinci, 2002). It is thus necessary to add and expand on certain dimensions that have different
weights of importance across different services (Carman, 1990). In order to do this, Gronroos (2001) proposes that the SERVQUAL scales should be applied carefully. The scaling procedure should capture the dimensions to draw valid conclusions and the reliability and validity of the scale must be established before making decisions (Ekinci, 2002).

- **Criticism on SERVQUAL’s Focus on Service-delivery Process**
  Besides the issue of universality of dimensions, the SERVQUAL scale has been criticised because it focuses on the service-delivery process rather than the technical outcome of the service encounter. Mangold and Babakus (1991) stated that because of SERVQUAL’s focus on the functional aspects of the service-delivery process, it does not allow for accurate evaluations of service quality to be made. Schneider and White (2004) suggested that the SERVQUAL scale and its dimensions can be used as a basis for the development of service-quality survey; however, one needs to ensure that the tangible issues are covered in the measurement of service quality as suggested by Gummeson (1992).

Other researchers proposed that SERVQUAL should examine other quality dimensions. Sureschandar et al. (2001, p.112) argued that SERVQUAL excludes other crucial aspects of service quality that should be included in the measurement, such as “features associated with the service i.e. the service product or core service, the systemation or standardisation of service quality to establish a seamless service experience, and the image of goodwill to society-that the organisation may attempt to create". Brady et al. (2002) emphasised that the value of service, the physical environment in which the service is delivered, and other uncontrollable factors associated with the service encounter (such as emotions and behaviour) should all be included in assessments of service quality, in addition to the provision of quality services. By the same token, Liljander and Strandvik (1997: p.168) found “the effect of consumers’ emotions on their evaluations of satisfaction with service quality and proposed that ‘emotions’ should conceptually be included in, and combined with, cognitive evaluations of service”. As a conclusion,
SERVQUAL measures only certain aspects of service quality, and it fails to capture other potentially less-controllable components that may have a greater impact upon evaluations of the quality of the service provision (Coulthard, 2004).

- **Criticism on the Use of Difference Scores in SERVQUAL Scale**

  Many researchers have argued that the use of SERVQUAL difference score is problematic. It has been argued that the difference between perception and expectation as a measurement of a psychological process is insufficient (Van Dyke et al., 1997). Moreover, the expectation construct is somewhat vague. Even when researchers specify which expectation respondents should use, respondents still have difficulty in differentiating types of expectations (Dabholkar et al., 1996).

  Besides, measuring expectations and perceptions separately can lead to several psychometric problems that affect reliability and discriminant validity (Coulthard, 2004). According to Cronin and Taylor (1992 and 1994), SERVQUAL is associated with low reliability. Low reliability score affects discriminant validity (Peter et al., 1993). A low reliability score weakens correlations between component scores (expectation score and perception score). Peter et al. (1993: 658) explained, “the reliability of the difference score variable formed by subtracting scores on two measures with average reliability of .70 and a correlation of .40 is only .50. Thus, while the average reliability of the two component measures is .70, which is considered acceptable, the correlation between the measures attenuates the reliability of the difference score measure to a level most researchers would consider unacceptable”. SERVQUAL also suffers poor predictive and convergent validities (Van Dyke et al., 1997). As Van Dyke points out, it is not suitable to use Cronbach's alpha as a reliability measure when measuring difference scores. This is because the reliability of a difference score is dependent on the reliability of the component scores and the correlation between them.
In response to these criticisms, another model was proposed by Cronin and Taylor (1992) called SERVPERF, which was based on the assumption that performance-based measures are superior indicators of service quality. Cronin and Taylor (1992) provided empirical evidence across four industries (namely banks, pest control, dry cleaning and fast food) to confirm the superiority of this 'performance-only' instrument over the disconfirmation-based SERVQUAL scale. Findings of this study also revealed that the SERVPERF scale explains more of the variation in service quality than does SERVQUAL through the use of a single-item scale. The SERVPERF scale is found to be more efficient, as a result of eliminating the expectation measure. The analysis of the research model indicates that, without an 'expectation' measure, empirical support for the notion that perceived service quality leads to satisfaction was found, showing that, even by measuring a 'perception' score alone, satisfaction can be predicted. Thus, the weight of the evidence clearly supports the use of performance-based measures of service quality (Cronin and Taylor, 1992).

Following the publication of Cronin and Taylor's (1992) findings, a number of researchers have arrived at similar conclusions with respect to the superiority of performance measures (Jain and Gupta, 2004).

Brady et al. (2002), in a cross-sectional empirical test demonstrated that the replication of the study of Cronin and Taylor (1992) successfully duplicated their finding as to the superiority of the performance-only measurement of service quality. Besides, service quality is also found to be the antecedent of satisfaction.

Jain and Gupta (2004) examined the comparative assessment of the unweighted and weighted versions of SERVQUAL and SERVPERF scales in the Indian context in terms of the scale's validity, ability to explain variance in the overall service quality, power to distinguish among service objects/firms, parsimony in data collection, and scale's diagnostic ability to provide insights for managerial interventions in case of quality shortfalls. Results indicate that
the SERVPERF scale provided a more convergent and discriminant valid explanation of service quality and was able to explain a greater proportion of variance (0.294) in the overall service quality than is the case with other scales. Findings also showed that adding importance weights into the measure was not able to enhance the explanatory power of the SERVPERF and the SERVQUAL scales. This outcome conforms to Cronin and Taylor (1992) who also found that adding importance weights did not improve the predictive ability of either scale.

Jain and Gupta (2004) revealed that all four scales (unweighted scales of SERVQUAL and SERVPERF and weighted scales (of SERVQUAL and SERVPERF) have the discriminatory power to discriminate among the objects (i.e., restaurants). This implies that either one of the scales can be used to compare quality assessment across service firms. In terms of parsimony in data collection, the unweighted performance-only scale turns out to be the best choice, as it requires less informational input (i.e. only perception measure) than that required by the other scales. The test of diagnostic ability of the scale in providing insights for managerial intervention demonstrates that all four multi-item scales have diagnostic power to suggest areas for managerial actions, but these scales vary in terms of the areas and the orders of the actions needed.

Recognising controversies in relation to their service-quality measure (SERVQUAL), Parasuraman et al. (1994) evaluated the performance of four alternative measures, SERVQUAL, SERVPERF, a summary disconfirmation measure (Brown et al., 1993), and a three-column disconfirmation scale that compared a consumers’ desired and adequate expectations to their performance perceptions. Findings revealed that both SERVPERF and the summary disconfirmation measure surpassed SERVQUAL. However, Parasuraman et al. (1994) recommended continuing using the gap score because of its greater diagnostic power.
In conclusion, service quality can be measured by either SERVQUAL or SERVPERF scales. SERVQUAL measures 'expectations' and 'performance perceptions' whereas SERVPERF only measures 'performance perceptions'. SERVPERF uses only performance data because it assumes that respondents provide their ratings by automatically comparing performance perceptions with performance expectations. Thus, SERVPERF assumes that directly measuring performance expectations is unnecessary. Researchers have proven that SERVQUAL and SERVPERF scales both can predict service quality. However, SERVPERF outperforms SERVQUAL in terms of its validity, ability to explain a greater proportion of variance and parsimony in data collection. For this reason, the performance-only measure is employed in the present study.

3.1.1.3.3 Measurements of Service Quality in the Restaurant Industry

The provision of a quality product or service is a major contributing factor for success or failure of a business (East, 1993). This has lead to increased interest to better understand, measure and improve service quality (Mersha and Adlakha, 1992). In the restaurant context, researchers have examined quality dimensions through the application of gap theory by employing instruments, such as SERVQUAL, or its modified versions (e.g. DINESERV). Researchers, who criticised the use of gap theory, introduced measuring service quality by performance-only measures. Measuring service quality is also concerned with the issue of the quality attributes examined. This section describes the development of research into service quality, using examples of several studies carried out in the restaurant context. These studies are grouped into three: studies that applied the SERVQUAL scale or SERVQUAL-based scale (gap score); performance-only measures; and studies that used a qualitative approach.

- Studies that Applied the SERVQUAL Scale and SERVQUAL-based Scale (Gap Score)

Studies that applied the SERVQUAL scale or SERVQUAL-based scale (gap score) are: Bojanic and Rosen (1994), Lee and Hing (1995), Stevens et al.
Bojanic and Rosen (1994) were among the earliest researchers to apply SERVQUAL to examine service quality in the restaurant context. Results showed that the highest expectation score was rated for the quality dimension of ‘assurance’ followed by ‘reliability’, ‘tangibles’, ‘access’, ‘responsiveness’, ‘knowing the consumer’. The quality score (gap score) showed that the largest gap was found in the dimension of ‘reliability’ and ‘responsiveness’ while the lowest was found in ‘knowing the consumer’ dimension. This shows that, because consumers did not expect too much from the ‘knowing the consumer’ dimension, the gap score was low. The outcome of regression analysis of these dimensions with overall quality demonstrated that the most significant predictors of overall quality were ‘knowing the consumer’, ‘reliability’ and ‘assurance’. This analysis denotes an indirect method of determining the importance of each variable in the evaluation of service quality.

Johns and Tyas (1996) tested the applicability of the SERVQUAL scale to examine service quality in one particular catering business i.e. Nelson Hind and their competitors in the restaurant and coffee shops. Johns and Tyas (1996) argued that items dealing specifically with food quality and with value for money should be included. Therefore, the food-quality attributes were included after discussion with supervisory catering staff, foodservice employees and consumers. The food-related items that are included in the questionnaire are shown in Table 3.2.

**Table 3.2: Measurement Items related to ‘Food’ added into the Original SERVQUAL Instrument in the Study of Johns and Tyas (1996)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New measurement items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appearance of the food is attractive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food is hygienically prepared and served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They serve the food at the correct temperature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumers can always find something they like on the menu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They serve good portions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The food tastes good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The choice of food is balanced and healthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They offer a good choice of dishes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They regularly change the selection of dishes they offer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The food they serve is fresh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Johns and Tyas (1996)
Analysis of data demonstrated that the internal reliability of the scale was high and closely similar to values obtained by other researchers (Johns and Tyas, 1996). However, the factor structure obtained from factor analysis differed from the one reported by Parasuraman et al. (1988) and Babakus and Mangold (1992) as it did not confirm the five-structure model, but items concerned with ‘food’, ‘service staff’ and ‘efficiency’ were grouped into distinct factors. This suggests that evaluation of service quality in this study is specific to the offerings of the firm.

Sohail (2005) adapted the SERVQUAL scale to measure service quality in a seafood restaurant in Malaysia. More measurement items related to food were added under the dimension of ‘reliability’. These items were ‘variety of menu’, ‘food presentation is appealing manner’, ‘freshness of food served’, ‘appropriate temperature of food’, ‘taste of food’, ‘nutritional value of food served’ and ‘consistency of food standard’. Sohail (2005) found that all measurement items which include items related to food, were above the cut-off point of alpha value; α=0.60, which range from 0.682 to 0.867. The performance scores were found to be lower than the expectation score for all but two items; ‘willingness of staff to serve’ and ‘friendliness of staff’. The highest difference in scores was found for the item ‘feeling of comfort while dining’ and ‘appearance of restaurant’ followed by ‘efficiency of service’, ‘nutritional value of food served’, ‘cleanliness of restaurant’ and ‘sympathy of staff towards complaint-handling’. These findings suggest that consumer’s perceived service quality for these items were low, thus improvement on these items should be made.

Lee and Hing (1995) applied the SERVQUAL scale to Chinese and French fine-dining restaurants. They however provided examples for each item. For instance, one item statement in SERVQUAL scale refers to whether the firm has modern-looking equipment. Lee and Hing (1995) provide examples, such as dining facilities, bar facility, crockery and cutlery in the statement to assist understanding among respondents. Another modification made to the measure is that this study measured the un-weighted quality score
(performance score minus expectation score) and weighted quality score (mean service quality score multiplied by the points out of 100 allocated to the importance of that dimension in evaluating service quality).

Findings of their study demonstrated that restaurant consumers placed the highest expectation on ‘assurance’ and ‘reliability quality’ dimensions while the ‘tangibles’ dimension was rated the lowest expectation. Patrons’ perception however differed between the two restaurants. Higher perception was found for ‘assurance’, ‘reliability’ and ‘responsiveness’ dimensions for the French restaurant while the dimensions of ‘tangibles’, ‘reliability’ and ‘assurance’ were rated the highest in the Chinese restaurant. The unweighted quality score illustrates that the French restaurant is closer to meeting the expectations of its patrons along all dimension of service quality than is the Chinese establishment. The ‘empathy’ and ‘reliability’ dimensions were the most below consumer expectations in the French restaurant. In the Chinese restaurant, the scores were low for all intangible dimensions. For both restaurants, the weighted quality scores indicate that improved ‘empathy’ and ‘reliability’ would contribute most to increasing consumers’ perceptions of the service experience. This result supported the findings of Fick and Ritchie (1991) and Bojanic and Rosen (1994) that ‘assurance’ and ‘reliability’ are the two most important expectations of restaurant patrons.

Lee and Ulgado (1997) compared consumer service-quality evaluation of fast-food restaurants among US and South Korean consumers by applying the 22-item SERVQUAL scales. They found that there were significant differences between US and South Korean patrons in terms of their expectations and perceptions of fast-food restaurant services (McDonald). US consumers perceived ‘low food prices’ and ‘assurance’ to be very important in their evaluations of fast-food establishments. For Korean consumers, in contrast, ‘reliability’ and ‘empathy’ were more important than price, suggesting that fast-food restaurants play different roles in different societies (Lee and Ulgado, 1997).
Building on the SERVQUAL scale and using the lessons learned in developing and refining LODGSERV, Stevens et al. (1995) developed the instrument called DINESERV to measure service quality in the restaurant industry (fine-dining, casual-dining and fast-food restaurants). The initial instrument contained 40 items and was tested by conducting telephone interviews with 200 respondents of a fine-dining restaurant, 198 for casual-dining restaurants and 198 for quick-service restaurants. After confirmatory factor analysis, the survey items were reduced to 29 items with 6 service-quality dimensions i.e. ‘tangibles’, ‘reliability’, ‘responsiveness’, ‘assurance’ and ‘empathy’, which is similar to the SERVQUAL dimensions. This instrument was proven reliable (alpha values for five dimensions of service quality ranged from .8883 to .9180). Results showed that the ‘reliability’ dimension was the most important in the restaurant context followed by ‘tangibles’, ‘assurance’, ‘responsiveness’ and ‘empathy’. This scale, however, despite being reliable and fit for the restaurant context, lacked food-related items.

Using the DINESERV scale, Kim et al. (2003) examined service quality to validate the dimensions and evaluate service quality in casual-dining restaurants in Korea. Factor analysis indicated that tangibles had three sub-dimensions i.e. ‘appearance of physical facilities and staff’, ‘menu of the restaurant’ and ‘comfortableness and cleanliness of restaurant’. In addition, the dimension of responsiveness was found to overlap with the ‘assurance’ dimension. The ‘responsiveness’ items sometimes loaded higher than ‘reliability’ dimension. The authors suggested that this may be because the ‘reliability’ dimension has low reliability or because DINESERV was originally tested in another culture, thus the responsiveness dimension might be ambiguous to Korean diners. For that reason, the result of this study may not be generalised to other cultures.

Heung et al. (2000) examined the traveller’s ‘desired level’, ‘adequate level’ and ‘perceived level’ of service in four types of restaurants; Chinese, casual-dining, full-service and quick-service restaurants, using the 33-item service scale.
quality attributes adapted from the DINESERV scale. By knowing the desired and adequate level of expectations, authors measure the Measure of Service Adequacy (MSA) (perception minus adequate level of service) and Measure of Service Superiority (MSS) (perception minus desired level of service) values. A positive value of MSA designates that the perceived level of service is well above what consumers consider to be an adequate level. The MSS value shows whether the restaurants exceeded the travellers desired service level. Results showed that Chinese restaurants received the highest value of MSA followed by full-service restaurant, casual-dining restaurant and quick-service restaurant. The lowest MSS value was found for Chinese restaurants, than other restaurants i.e. full-service, casual-dining and quick-service. This study also found that consumer’s expectations of all types of restaurant are dissimilar. In the fast-food restaurant, the highest expectation score was rated for factors; ‘prompt and quick service’ and ‘convenient operating hours’. ‘Attractive surrounding areas’ is the least important quality attribute (the lowest expectation scores) for full-service and quick-service restaurants while the attribute of ‘consumers feel special’ and ‘clean dining equipment’ respectively were rated the lowest in casual-dining restaurant and Chinese restaurants. This finding therefore did not confirm the result of the previous DINESERV study by Stevens et al. (1995), which concluded that the expectations of all types of restaurants are similar. Despite that, Heung et al. (2000) revealed the attributes defining adequate service that are common across all restaurant types are ‘employees adjust to maintain quality’, ‘employees care about guests’, ‘consumers feel safe’, ‘menu is readable’ and ‘dining areas are clean’.

Rajpoot (2002) further explored the domain of tangible quality construct and developed the TANGSERV scale. The initial 55-items were analysed with exploratory factor analysis, resulting in the final set of 13-items that represented three latent variables; layout/design (e.g. decorations), product/service (e.g. food presentation) and ambient/social (e.g. light). This scale covers more tangible quality aspects, as well as recognising the impact
of product/service on the quality perceptions that had been overlooked by SERVQUAL and DINESERV.

- **Studies that Applied the Performance-only Scale**

  The development of service-quality measures moved from 'gap scores' to 'performance-only scores', as many researchers criticised the measuring of an expectation score (e.g. Dabholkar et al., 1996) and the issue of gap scores' lack of reliability and validity (e.g. Jain and Gupta, 2004). Although the application of performance-only measures is still lagging behind the SERVQUAL scale, researchers have increasingly started making use of this measure of service quality (Jain and Gupta, 2004), including in the restaurant context.

  Weaver et al. (2001) investigated the difference in consumers' perception of dining experiences between a student-operated, on-campus, fine-dining restaurant and other comparable restaurants located in the down-town area of Blacksburg, Virginia. Some original DINESERV items, such as 'clean restrooms and interior decoration' were deleted because they were not under the control of the class nor applicable to the restaurant under study. New items to evaluate food presentation, taste and quantity were added. A value of 1.5 or less (between Strongly Agree and Agree) was set as the benchmark to represent a positive perception. Findings showed that the attributes that achieved this benchmark were 'staff members were clean and neat', 'dining area was clean', 'staff members were appropriately dressed', 'menu was easily read' and 'food was well-presented', 'food was well-prepared as ordered' and 'employees answer questions completely'. The mean scores of the attributes in the on-campus restaurant, were also compared to the mean scores rated in the other restaurant by subtracting scores. A negative mean difference score represented a more favourable experience for that particular item with the on-campus restaurant while a positive mean difference denotes a more favourable experience on that item with the comparable restaurants. Weaver et al. (2001) found that only the 'service delivery is in acceptable time' item was rated more favourably in the on-campus restaurant than other
restaurants. Meanwhile, it was rated less favourably than the other restaurants on four items; 'menu is varied', 'staff provides an accurate guest check', 'during busy time, employees adjust to maintain service quality' and 'personnel seems experienced'. Results also showed that there was no significant difference on the rate of overall satisfaction between the restaurant under research and competing restaurants, concluding that consumers were satisfied with the experience in the restaurant, however there is scope for improvement since competing restaurants were favourably rated in many aspects (e.g. 'hot dishes were served hot', 'employers answer questions completely' and 'special requests handled').

Reimer and Kuehn (2005) examined the effect of the servicescape on quality perception. Servicescape is a term used to describe the physical surroundings of a service company, including the exterior and interior design, ambient conditions, such as temperature, noise, odour, as well as tangible parts of the service such as business cards, brochures, and other communication material (Bitner, 1992 and Wakefield and Blodgett, 1996 as in Reimer and Kuehn, 2005). In this study, 'servicescape' is included in SERVQUAL as a new dimension in order to measure industry-specific characteristics (Parasuraman et al., 1988, 1991; Carman, 1990 and Buttle, 1996). Results show that 'servicescape' has a direct and indirect effect on perceived service quality, which lead to high overall effect of servicescape. Servicescape is found to be more important in predicting consumer's evaluations of service quality in hedonic services (e.g. restaurant) than in utilitarian service (e.g. telephone repair).

Fu and Parks (2001) examined the evaluation of service quality among older people using the SERVQUAL scale by applying a combination scale of expectations and perceptions (i.e. much worse than expected to much better than expected). This study found that older people perceived 'reliability' and 'responsiveness', which are related to the speed and accuracy of service, as one dimension and 'assurance' and 'empathy', which are concerned with how individuals' needs are perceived as one dimension. This finding is in line with
the notion that service-quality dimensions are contextual and not universally applicable (Carman, 1990)

Recent studies found that there were two service-quality dimensions in restaurants, instead of the five initial SERVQUAL dimensions. For instance, Ekinci et al. (2008) confirmed two service-quality dimensions in restaurants; physical quality and staff behaviour. Madanoglu (2004) successfully validated these dimensions by employing the confirmatory factor-analysis approach, suggesting that these two dimensions (tangibles and intangibles) are critical in measuring service quality. In addition, Madanoglu (2004) suggested that a service-quality model measuring 'physical quality' and 'staff behaviour' was plausible, as his findings implied that the fit between collected data and posited relationship was reasonably acceptable. The posited model achieved a reasonable predictive validity which is demonstrated by the practical and statistical significance of the explained variance through intention to return and intention to recommend a particular restaurant.

- Other Studies that applied Qualitative Approach
The issue of dimensionality of service quality has also been investigated using qualitative methods (e.g. Johns and Howard, 1998, Oyewole, 1999, and Bartlett and Han, 2007). These studies explored the attributes that consumers think important to their perception of quality in restaurants.

Johns and Howard (1998: p.248) applied the profile accumulation technique, where open-ended questions such as "The things I liked best / found least satisfactory about this meal experience were.... and The reason I liked this aspect / this aspect was unsatisfactory was because...." were asked to obtain the aspects and attributes of pizza restaurants that affected respondents meal experience. Results indicated that respondents structure their perceptions of quality according to aspects of the meal experience, such as 'service', 'food', 'price/value', 'environment', 'staff', 'atmosphere', 'drink' and 'location'. Attempts have been made to accommodate these attributes on the five-quality dimensions of Parasuraman et al. (1986), ten-quality dimensions of

Oyewole (1999) carried out a study to determine the dimensions of service quality in fast-food restaurants from the consumer’s perspective. Respondents were asked to list all characteristics that they personally consider when evaluating the quality of services in a fast-food restaurant. As a result, 93 items were obtained. These items involved attributes related to ‘hygiene and efficiency’, ‘courtesy’, ‘health consciousnesses’, ‘child-friendly’, ‘ease of complaint’, ‘comforts’, ‘orderliness’, ‘availability’, ‘expeditiousness’, and ‘communication’. Examples of attributes for each dimension are shown in Table 3.3.
Table 3.3: Dimensions of Service Quality and Its Examples found from the Study of Oyewole

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Examples of attributes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hygiene and efficiency</td>
<td>Cleanliness to food quality and taste, workers, facilities, toilets, tables and employee work area. Efficiency of service such as fill orders accurately, give the correct change and serve food at the right temperature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtesy</td>
<td>The way consumers are treated by the employees while served i.e. politely treated, treated with courtesy, treated with smile.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health-consciousness</td>
<td>Low fat and calories in foods, availability of health-food choices, given nutritional information on foods, display of government health certifications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child-friendly</td>
<td>Child menu coming with toys, convenient child menu, availability of a play area for kids.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of complaint</td>
<td>Availability of consumer complaint toll-free number, readily displayed on menu boards, and take-out bags.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comforts</td>
<td>Comfortable seats, enough space to move around, playing background music.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orderliness</td>
<td>Single waiting line for all consumers, two-way video screen at drive-through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>Late-hour operation, early-hour operation, hours of operation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expeditiousness</td>
<td>No crowding, variety of menu choices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Being told when order will be ready, being asked if anything else is wanted, and employees wearing name tags.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Oyewole (1999: p.74-75)

These dimensions provided a wider scope of aspects that were perceived important in restaurants, compared to the dimensions of SERVQUAL (Parasuraman et al., 1986). Although Oyewole’s dimensions are designed specifically for fast-food restaurants, it is assumed that only a few attributes are unique to fast-food restaurants (e.g. two-way video screen at drive-through). For that reason, it is assumed that these dimensions could be applied to measure service quality in restaurants.

Bartlett and Han (2007) applied a qualitative approach to explore how consumers view service quality in higher-quality restaurants. The SERVQUAL dimensions such as ‘tangibles’, ‘reliability’, ‘responsiveness’, ‘assurance’ and ‘empathy’ were used as the framework of interview. Results demonstrated that many items (attributes mentioned by respondents) did not fit within the SERVQUAL dimensions. The tangibles dimension comprised items such as ‘cleanliness’, ‘space’, ‘atmosphere’, ‘appearance of server’ and ‘location’. The dimensions of responsiveness and reliability were merged and consisted of items such as ‘speed’, ‘willingness to respond’, ‘accuracy’ and ‘dependability’. The dimension of assurance was combined with empathy. This dimension involved attributes related to ‘knowledge of server’, ‘trained professional’, 77
'communication of server with consumers' and 'sense of caring demonstrated by the server'. Findings also showed that there were other factors that influenced service quality, which were 'quality of food', 'price', 'festival time' ('many of the worst experiences occurred during the time of festivals'), 'the interaction when service problems occur' and 'providing extras (e.g. providing complimentary items or discounts). Overall, from interview findings, Bartlett and Han (2007) showed that tangibles appeared to play a large part in how people viewed service quality.

In conclusion, the previous discussion on service-quality research demonstrated that restaurant attributes related to food, service, staff behaviour and the environment of a restaurant (e.g. decoration) are used to evaluate quality in restaurants. These attributes are tangible and intangible in nature. While many researchers agree on the importance of these elements in evaluating quality in restaurants, the measurement items applied in each study differ. For instance, some studies used the SERVQUAL scale without any modification, focussed on the service delivery in the service firm such that there was no measure on food-related items. Another scale, DINESERV modified from the SERVQUAL scale, measures limited range of food-related items. It is known that there is inconsistency in the items used to measure service quality in restaurants. The present study examines quality in restaurants by separating 'service quality' and 'food quality', in order to emphasise that food quality should not be so neglected in restaurants.

3.1.2 Perceived Value
Perceived value has important managerial meaning and is an important concept for understanding buyer behaviour. For example, perceived value can be used to develop segment strategies (e.g. Brusco et al., 2003; Sinha and DeSarbo, 1998). Consumer value assists in understanding buyer behaviour, such as shopping and product choice (e.g. Holbrook, 1994; Zeithaml, 1988). From the consumers' viewpoint, obtaining value is a primary purchase goal and critical to all successful exchange transactions (Holbrook, 1994).
Snoj et al. (2004: p.158) found that common denominators of different authors' definitions of consumer perceived value were that:

1. value is related to consumers' expertise or knowledge of buying and using a product;
2. value is related to consumer perception and cannot be objectively defined by an organisation;
3. consumer perceived value is a multidimensional concept; and
4. value denotes a trade-off between benefits and sacrifices perceived by consumers in a supplier's offering.

Most marketing research on value is based on the concept of trade-off (e.g. Zeithaml, 1988; Woodruff et al., 1993; Zeithaml et al., 1996; Gronroos, 1997; Slater and Narver, 2000; Ulaga and Chacour, 2001). This is derived from the economic theory of utility (Lancaster, 1971). This approach explains that value is conceptualised as consumers' perceived net trade-off received from all relevant benefits and costs or sacrifices delivered by a product, service or supplier. Perceived benefits are a combination of different attributes of products either tangible, intangible, intrinsic or extrinsic that are available in relation to a particular buy-and-use situation (Monroe, 1991). Perceived sacrifices are a mixture of a price and other costs involved to gain a product (Anderson et al., 1993). Kotler (1972) stated that this trade-off occurs during transaction. According to Kotler (1972), a transaction is the process of exchanging values between two parties. Things that have value are goods, services, money and other resources (e.g. time, energy and feelings).

Measures representing what consumers have to sacrifice to obtain the service are the following: (1) price (Zeithaml, 1988; Dodds et al., 1991); (2) time (Lovelock, 2001; Kotler, 2003); (3) physical effort (Lovelock, 2001; Kotler, 2003); and (4) psychic effort (Lovelock, 2001). The most popular form of perceived sacrifice is described in monetary terms (Anderson et al., 1993). This include purchase price, together with other incurred costs such as maintenance cost that relates to the risk of failure or poor performance of the product (Payne and Holt, 2001). Consumers judged value in two ways. Some
consumers perceive value as when there is an overall perception of low pricing while other consumers perceive value as trade-off between price and quality (Zeithaml, 1988).

Researchers have various views on how consumers perceived pricing and its effects on their value perception. Grewal et al. (1998) stated that, according to the most common value-for-money conceptualisation, a reduction in price is probably perceived as a gain since the consumer tends to compare the reduced price against the original price. Dickson and Sawyer (1985) argued that most consumers do not always remember or know actual prices, instead they determine prices in ways meaningful to themselves. Several researchers have suggested that this is because consumers have a high price range in mind that is compared with the perception of value (e.g. too high a price signifies non-affordability and minimal value, whilst too low a price denotes poor quality and no value) (Patterson and Spreng, 1997). Another view by Gabor (1977) proposed that consumers determine prices based on their price expectations that are influenced by three factors- 'fair price', 'past price', and 'quality perceptions'. Fair price is concerned with a consumers' assessment regarding the products' cost and price knowledge of other related products. Consumers tend to judge the price according to what they paid in the past. Consumers also relate quality perception to price. These studies suggested that the extent to low and high price is perceived differently by different consumers.

Quality of product or service represents the benefit a consumer gets from their purchase and how a consumer perceives value depends on how quality is perceived in relation to price. According to Payne and Holt (2001), perceived benefits (in term of quality) represent a combination of a number of elements a buyer receives (i.e. physical attributes, service attributes and technical support) available in relation to the use of the product, the purchase price and other indicators of perceived quality. In marketing research, consumers' evaluation of quality relies mostly on such cues as packaging, advertising, branding or word-of-mouth; on the other hand, price may be perceived not
only as a sacrifice but also as an indication of extra quality, value to some extent of prestige (Garvin, 1988). From the perspective of economists, consumers with sufficient information yield a positive correlation between prices and costs, that is, higher product quality depends only on higher cost due to additional capital, labour or material required Garvin (1988). Rust and Oliver (1994) argue that a service may be of excellent quality, but still be rated as of poor value if its price is too high. In contrast to all of the above views, Sweeney and Soutar (2001) argued that price and quality contribute separately to perceived value and that they should be measured separately.

The notion that perceived value is a single-item scale that is represented by the measure of 'value-for-money' is argued by several researchers. Bolton and Drew (1991) point out that perceived value should not be viewed as the outcome of a trade-off between a single overall quality and sacrifice, because perceived value is more complex. Al-Sabbahy et al. (2004) agreed that the single-item scale does not fully address the concept of perceived value, since it is constructed with multiple dimensions. For instance, Sweeney and Soutar (2001) developed a multiple-item scale for the identification and evaluation of the construct in the retail sector, suggesting that perceived value consists of four dimensions: (1) emotional value, the utility derived from feelings or affective states that a product/brand generates; (2) social value, the utility derived from the product's ability to enhance the social concept; (3) functional/price for money value which refers to the utility derived from the brand due to the reduction of its perceived short term and longer term costs; and finally (4) the functional value that refers to the utility delivered from the perceived quality and expected performance. Thus, many researchers have recommended that perceived value should be measured in terms of multiple-item scales (Gallarza and Saura, in press; Sweeney and Soutar, 2001; Sweeney et al., 1996).

In the present study, a single-item scale of perceived value-for-money is used because studying the multi-dimension nature of perceived value is not the
focus of this study. This study focusses more of the influence it has on the consumer satisfaction, behavioural intentions and post-purchase attitude.

3.1.3 Desires-congruence

Values that link to desires or wants have been shown to be a powerful force in governing the behaviour of individuals in all aspects of their lives (Rokeach, 1968, Yankelovich, 1981). Values are the symbol of consumers’ most basic and fundamental needs and goals, as well as consumers’ mental representations of the important end states they are trying to achieve in their lives (Peter and Olson, 1987). Values represent broad life goals such as the need to be successful and secure (Peter and Olson, 2002). Value can be recognised as both tangible and intangible. Individuals express their satisfaction towards particular values as achieving basic life goals. Internal feelings that are intangible and subjective include for instance; ‘I feel secure’, ‘I am respected by others’ or ‘I am successful’ (Peter and Olson, 2002). Functional and psychosocial consequences are more tangible and are more obvious when they occur (i.e. ‘I got compliments when I wore that silk shirt’) (Peter and Olson, 2002).

There are two types or levels of values: instrumental and terminal (Rokeach, 1973). Instrumental values are ways of behaving that have positive value for a person (having a good time, acting independently, showing self-reliance) (Peter and Olson, 2002). This type of value or desire is associated with consumer needs or product benefits that can be obtained from product attributes (Ekinci et al., 2008). Terminal values are psychological states (e.g. happy, at peace, successful) (Peter and Olson, 2002). This value is at a higher level, where desires are associated with the consumers’ life (Ekinci et al., 2008). Both instrumental and terminal values (goals or needs) represent the most personal consequences people are trying to achieve in their life (Peter and Olson, 2002). It shows that there is connection between instrumental values and terminal values. Spreng and Olshavsky (1993) explained that a high-level value might be to live a long and healthy life, and one can eat foods that provide the benefit of reducing one’s risks of
developing sickness or fatal illness. This desired benefit may be specified in terms of certain attributes (e.g. cholesterol content) and certain types and levels of attributes (e.g. cholesterol-free).

Using desires as a comparison standard is theoretically persuasive because they are the focus of human perception and judgement (Ekinci et al., 2008). For example, the means-end models imply that product attributes are linked to consumer values (Gutman, 1982). The means-end chain model involves ‘attributes’, ‘functional consequences’, ‘psychosocial consequences’ and ‘values’ (Peter and Olson, 2002). For instance, a product e.g. flavoured potato chips may have positive and negative attributes, including barbecue flavour and high calories (Peter and Olson, 2002). The functional consequences for the barbecue flavour may be that it tastes good and that will lead to the guests enjoying themselves more as a result of psychosocial consequences. With that consequence, positive values are achieved as a result of social recognition. ‘High calories’ could lead to ‘gain weight’. This consequence then makes the individual ‘not attractive to others’ and therefore results in negative values, such as low level of self-esteem. Mean-ends models imply that product attributes are linked to consumer values (Ekinci et al., 2001) and conclude that the values-consequences linkage is one of the critical linkages in the model (Rokeach, 1973).

Desires or values have been said to be related to other concepts such as ‘expectation’ and ‘self concept’. Parasuraman et al. (1988) in Ekinci and Sirakaya (2004) stated that the ‘should’ type of expectation reflects consumers’ desires and wants and therefore, must be used to measure service quality. However, empirical studies have shown that this was not a good formulation, as it caused various reliability and validity problems in measurement (Teas, 1993). Other researchers argued that desires/value and expectation differ. Spreng and Olshavsky (1993) argue that expectations are beliefs about the attributes or performance levels that will occur in the future whilst desires are beliefs about the product attributes or performance that will lead to higher-level values. Past research suggests that desires-congruence
can be a better predictor of satisfaction than the disconfirmation-of-expectations (e.g. Barbeau, 1985; Wirtz and Mattilla, 2001).

Desires are also related to self-concept, as core values are central to peoples' self-concept, which is their knowledge about themselves. Consumers' core values have a major influence on their cognitive processes and choice behaviours (Peter and Olson, 2002); therefore they are of particular interest to marketers. For instance, the growing core value of protecting the environment has created many marketing opportunities. Thus, in the 1990s, McDonald's changed from polystyrene shell containers for its hamburgers to quilted paper wrappers (Peter and Olson, 2002).

Researchers measured desires-congruence to examine values. Desires-congruence is the outcome of the comparison process between desires and performance (Sirgy, 1984). It is the subjective assessment of the comparison between what consumers desired and what they received from the performance of the firms' goods and services (Wirtz and Mattilla, 2001). Because values are likely to be applied through means-end linkages to consequences, desired consequences become the standard for comparing perceived consequences attained from a use occasion (Clemons and Woodruff, 1991).

It is important to point out the difference between self-congruence and desires-congruence because the present study examined both concepts. According to Ekinci et al. (2008), self-congruence and desires-congruence seem to be very much similar because both concepts involve cognitive process which starts with evaluating attributes of a particular service against some reference. The reference for each concept differs (Sirgy et al., 1997). In self-congruence, the reference may be the actual self-concept (or ideal self-concept) and the attributes are symbolic in nature. In desires-congruence, the reference is the goals or desires while the service benefits are tangible, functional and performance-like. With this in mind, consumers can compare
the perceived performance against their desires after considering their past experiences with similar services, brands or perceived reference prices.

The investigation of the concept of value is much needed for several reasons. Firstly, values are examined less frequently and usually measured alone. Studying only one type of knowledge gives marketers an incomplete understanding of consumers’ product knowledge, where the vital connections among attributes, consequences and values are missed (Peter and Olson, 2002). Secondly, Spreng et al. (1996) stated that there were methodological issues experienced previously in value research. According to Ekinci et al. (2001), past studies that examined the relationship between value and other concepts (e.g. consumer satisfaction) needs further elaboration because these studies applied experimental research design. On that basis, the present study examined the effect of value on satisfaction by assessing desires-congruence using a two-stage process. First, the overall service performance was compared against the respondents' desires (goals) to capture any discrepancy. Then, the intensity of this discrepancy was evaluated in terms of being "good" or "bad" (Ekinci et al., 2008).

3.1.4 Self-congruence
Self-concept is innermost to the understanding of the formation of image congruence (Hogg et al., 2000). Self-concept is defined as "the totality of an individual's thoughts and feelings, having reference to himself as an object" (Rosenberg, 1979; p.7). It reflects how individuals evaluate themselves in an objective way to create a self-image about their identity (Ekinci et al., 2008). Because self-concept is the value to the individual, an individual's behaviour will therefore be directed toward the protection and enhancement of their self-concept (Grubb and Grathwohl, 1967). Epstein (1980) stated that self-concept is formed by two motives: 'self-esteem' and 'self-consistency'. The self-esteem motive refers to the tendency to seek experiences that enhance self-concept. The self-consistency motive signifies the tendency for an individual to act consistently with her view of herself (Sirgy, 1982).
Self-concept is multidimensional. Jamal and Goode (2001) synthesised that a variety of different conceptualisations for self-concept have been used in the literature such as 'actual self', 'ideal self', 'social self' and 'ideal social self'. 'Actual self' concerns with how an individual in fact sees himself/herself. The concept 'ideal self' dealt with how an individual would like to see himself/herself. 'Social self' denotes how an individual feels others see himself/herself and 'ideal social self' reflects how an individual would like others to see himself/herself. Consumers refer to these types of self-concept to evaluate products or services, by defining themselves through their consumption episodes and the products that they purchase (Reed, 2002). In line, Elliot (1997) suggested that consumers consume the symbolic meaning of products, as portrayed in their images, rather than consuming products for their material utilities.

On that basis, Sirgy (1982) proposed that self-concept and product images share a degree of communality and concluded that there can be a degree of congruence between the two. The greater the degree of congruence between self-concept and a product's image, the higher the probability of symbolic consumption (Ekinci et al., 2008). Congruence between self-concept image and product image then becomes the determinant of various outcomes such as product selection decisions, consumer satisfaction and re-purchase intentions (Ekinci and Riley, 2003).

It is noted from the literature that most studies examined the effect of actual self and ideal self on consumer preference, satisfaction and attitude on goods or services. Findings of previous studies showed that ideal self-congruence better predicts various consumer behaviours and attitudes compared to actual self-congruence. For instance, ideal self-congruence is a better predictor of product preference (Malhotra, 1988; Hamm and Cundiff, 1969; Jamal and Goode, 2001; Ericksen, 1996; Mehta and Durvasula, 1998), product evaluation (Graeff, 1996), brand preference (Hong and Zinkhan, 1995), consumer satisfaction (Jamal and Goode, 2001) and intention to purchase (Ericksen, 1996). Jamal (2004), however, stated that self-image congruence
may not be an important factor in the purchase and evaluation of all product categories. For instance, products that are prominent in nature and rely heavily on images may not need self-image to evaluate those products (Mehta and Durvasula, 1998; Zinkham and Hong, 1991).

There is an ongoing debate relating to self-congruence measurement over whether to use the "absolute difference" or "the direct-score formula" (Sirgy and Su, 2000). The usual practice for measurement of self-congruence has been to employ the gap-score formula (Sirgy and Ericksen, 1992). This measure indicates the degree of match/mismatch between the product concept (e.g. restaurant) and self-concept for each respondent (Ekinci and Riley, 2003).

Semantic differential scales or likert-type scales are a common or traditional method of measuring self-concept (Jamal and Goode, 2001). For instance, a self-concept profile of a person i.e. personality characteristics (e.g. exciting vs. calm) is generally obtained. Then the person's perceptions of a brand on the same traits are attained. By comparing the two profiles, the researchers identify the match or gaps between the person's self concept and his or her perception of the personality of the brand. This method has three problems: (1) the use of discrepancy scores; (2) the possible use of irrelevant images; and (3) the possible use of compensatory decision rule (Sirgy et al., 1997).

Sirgy et al. (1997) introduced the new method of direct measurement of self-image congruence experience through the use of product-user images and self-images. This method encouraged subjects to evoke the product-user image at the moment of response, instead of through the use of some fixed images. This score formula requires neither self-ratings (actual or ideal) nor product ratings, thus is much simpler (Sirgy and Su, 2000). Testing which method better predicts 'self-concept', Sirgy et al. (1997) found significant support that the new method better predicts 'self-concept', compared with the traditional method.
The present study examined the relationship of ideal self-congruence on consumer satisfaction in a service context i.e. restaurant, to fill the gap of limited research of self-concept in the service context. Ekinci and Riley (2003) argued that it is almost easier to imagine congruence between self-concept and services than it is with inanimate products. It is because the congruence might be closer in the service firm as a result of consumers actually being part of the product and because 'service itself has more of an experiential component and participatory aspect' (Ekinci and Riley, 2003: 201). Following Ekinci et al. (2008), who adopted Sirgy's method, the direct measure of self-congruence is employed in the present study.

3.2 The Consequences of Consumer Satisfaction

This section addresses the consequences of consumer satisfaction examined in the present study. These include behavioural intentions; 'intention to return to a firm', 'intention to recommend' and 'intention to switch to another firm' and 'consumer post-purchase attitude towards the service firm'. The first section discusses the conceptualisation of the consumer behavioural dimension of loyalty and involves behavioural intentions and the measurement of behavioural intentions. The following section explains the conceptualisation and measurement of consumers' post-purchase attitude towards the firm.

3.2.1 Consumer Loyalty

Consumer loyalty is considered a critical factor to organisational success and profit (Oliver, 1997). This is because loyal consumers towards a service or product tend to repeat purchases more regularly and spend more money (Selin et al., 1988). Satisfying existing consumers is more cost effective, because they do not need as much promotional material or support in the decision-making process (Rundle-Thiele and Mackay, 2001; Olsen, 2002) and are easier to entertain than non-regular consumers (Tepeci, 1999). Jones and Sasser (1995) suggested that loyal consumers will also actively promote the organisation by engaging in positive word-of-mouth, such as referring new consumers and persuading existing consumers to buy more (Gremler and Brown, 1996). The benefits of consumer loyalty suggest that studying
consumer loyalty in business is important. To discuss types of consumer loyalty, it is worth reviewing the definitions of consumer loyalty.

The academic literature contains many definitions of loyalty, but what exactly constitutes loyalty is still inconclusive (Kandampully and Suhartanto, 2003). According to Uncles et al. (2003), loyalty is something that consumers may exhibit to brands, services, stores, product categories and activities (e.g. playing football). This definition however is too simple, as it does not explain the conceptualisation of consumer loyalty. Perhaps, because loyalty itself is multidimensional, its definition differs accordingly to the dimensions it has. Research indicates that loyalty is a multidimensional construct (Julander et al., 1997), with the majority of researchers viewing loyalty as consisting of two dimensions: behavioural and attitudinal (Rundle-Thiele and Mackay, 2001). Generally, behavioural loyalty concerns consumer behaviour aimed at maintaining their relationship with the service or product (Oliver, 1997) while, attitudinal loyalty relates to the feeling consumers attach to the service or product (Fournier and Yao, 1997). The behavioural approach of consumer loyalty is discussed in the next section, because it is examined in the present study.

3.2.1.1 The Concept of Consumer Loyalty (Behavioural Dimension)
From the behavioural perspective, consumer loyalty is concerned with consumer behaviour aimed at maintaining their relationship with the service or product. Their loyalty-related behaviours may include repeat purchase of a product or re-patronise a service. According to Bowen and Shoemaker (1998), loyalty applies to aspects of consumer behaviour such as repeat purchase, focussing on specific brand or service. Similarly, Oliver, (1997: p.392) defined behavioural consumer loyalty as “a deep commitment to rebuy or re-patronise a preferred product or service consistently in the future, despite situational influences and marketing efforts having the potential to cause switching behaviour”. Other researchers argued that consumer behavioural loyalty means more than just repurchase or re-patronage. Reichheld (2002) stated that loyal consumers value the relationship with the company. As a
result, consumers make the company a preferred supplier by not switching to another company for a small difference in price or service; instead they provide honest and constructive feedback, they buy more from the company, they never abuse company personnel and they provide passionate referrals. In addition to repurchases from the same service provider and continued recommendations of the company, a loyal consumer maintains a positive attitude towards the service provider (Kandampully and Suhartanto, 2000).

The present study examines behavioural intentions because behavioural intentions have been found to be influenced by consumer satisfaction. Behavioural intention refers to people’s beliefs about what they intend to do in a certain situation (Ajzen and Fishbein, 1980). Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) first conceptualised behavioural intention as a substitute indicator of actual behaviour. According to the theory of reasoned action (Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975), behaviour can be predicted from intentions that correspond directly (in terms of action, target, context, and time) to that behaviour.

Consumers used specific indicators to express their favourable or unfavourable behaviours towards a service or product. Specific indicators of favourable post-purchase behavioural intentions have consisted of saying positive things about the company to others (Boulding et al., 1993), recommending the company or service to others (Reichheld and Sasser, 1990), and remaining loyal to the company (LaBarbera and Mazursky, 1983; Rust and Zahorick, 1993). On the other hand, unfavourable behaviours have included different types of complaining behaviours (e.g., complaining to sellers, friends, or external agencies) (Namkung and Jang, 2007), considering switching to competitors, and decreasing the amount of business with a company (Fornell and Wemerfelt, 1987; Zeithaml et al., 1996). Zeithaml et al. (1996) stated that behavioural intentions can be seen when a consumer decides to remain or leave the company. This suggests that a consumers' behavioural intentions are clear signs of whether a consumer will become loyal to a firm or not (Zeithaml et al., 1996).
The consumers' behavioural intentions examined in the present study, as the consequences of consumer satisfaction, are 'intention to return to a firm', 'intention to recommend' and 'intention to switch to another firm'.

'Intention to return to a firm' can be defined as a consumers' likelihood of repurchasing the same service (Ekinci et al., 2008). Many studies have confirmed the influence of consumer satisfaction on this behaviour (e.g. Cronin and Taylor, 1992; Arora and Singer, 2006; Ekinci and Sirakaya, 2004; Ekinci et al., 2008; Lee et al., 2005; McDougall and Levesque, 2000; and Namkung and Jang, 2007). In addition, past research suggests that behavioural loyalty represented by 'intention to repurchase' is the most powerful outcome of consumer satisfaction (Ekinci et al., 2008). It is therefore a must to examine 'intention to return' in the present study.

Following the definition by Ekinci et al. (2008), 'intention to recommend' can be defined as consumers' likelihood of recommending the same service to other people. The importance of consumers' word-of-mouth for service firms has been well established (Mangold and Miller, 1999). For instance, the impact of consumer satisfaction on 'intention to recommend' was found in several studies (e.g. Babin et al., 2005; Lee et al., 2005; Arora and Singer, 2006; and Namkung and Jang, 2007). Loyal consumers tend to make positive recommendations to friends (Gremler and Brown, 1999; Jones and Sasser, 1995; Kandampully and Suhartanto, 2003). This behaviour demonstrates that when a service experience is particularly enjoyable and/or beneficial, consumers will be motivated to encourage their friends and family to participate in similar service experience (Babin et al., 2005).

In the present study, 'intention to switch to another firm' is defined as consumers' likelihood of switching to another service. Bansal et al. (2005) stated that several authors had identified a number of variables that might influence switching behaviour. One of them was consumer satisfaction. The relationship between consumer satisfaction and the 'intention to switch' however has rarely been examined in past research, particularly in restaurants. A study by McDougall and Levesque (2000) failed to prove the
relationship between consumer satisfaction and 'intention to switch' in the restaurant context. It is hard to draw any conclusions from only one study and there is a need for further study. Furthermore, loyalty can not be based only on purchase behaviour (e.g. repeat purchase, though it is a very important issue), because it does not show a consumers' motivation for purchase by design (Shoemaker and Lewis, 1999; Lee and Cunningham, 2001). It is assumed that studying other types of behavioural intentions might better lead to an understanding of loyalty. For that reason, studying the relationship of 'intention to switch' together with 'intention to repurchase' and 'intention to recommend' is much needed.

3.2.1.2 Measurements of Behavioural Intentions in the Restaurant Industry

According to Jones and Sasser (1995), measuring consumer intention is the simplest way of measuring loyalty. Through this measurement, consumers are asked about their intent to rebuy the product or service that they have consumed or experienced, which will strongly indicate their future behaviour (Jones and Sasser, 1995). Researchers have also examined a number of other behavioural intentions, such as 'recommending a firm to other people' (e.g. Babin et al., 2005), 'switching to another firm' (e.g. McDougall and Levesque, 2000), 'paying a price premium to the company' (Baker and Crompton, 2000). Studies that have examined behavioural intentions in restaurants are described below.

Arora and Singer (2006) studied the effect of variables such as consumer satisfaction, post-visit attitude and perceived value, on intention to visit and intention to recommend the restaurant to others. Behavioural intentions were measured using a 9-point Semantic Differential scale with the end points "Very likely," "Very unlikely." Findings indicated the importance of attitudes, value and satisfaction in return patronage while, in terms of the magnitude of impact, favourable attitudes had a greater role in recommending the
restaurant to others, while value had a relatively greater role in personal intention to visit the restaurant.

In line with Arora and Singer (2006), Namkung and Jang (2007) applied multi-item measures of behavioural intentions; such as intention to return (I would like to come back to this restaurant in the future) and intention to recommend (I would recommend this restaurant to my friends or others and I would say positive things about this restaurant to others). These items were operationalised using a 7-point scale (1=extremely disagree and 7=extremely agree), as developed by Zeithaml et al. (1996). This study aimed to examine the relationship between food quality, consumer satisfaction and behavioural intentions. Results demonstrated that satisfaction mediated the relationship between food quality and post-dining behavioural intentions.

McDougall and Levesque (2000) also measured three aspects of behavioural intentions. Besides items related to 'intention to return' and 'intention to recommend', they added an item of 'intention to switch'. This study investigated the connection between antecedents of consumer satisfaction (i.e. service quality) on consumer satisfaction and behavioural intentions. Items related to behavioural intentions were: (1) 'If it were easy, I'd switch to another restaurant'; (2) 'If people asked me, I would strongly recommend that they deal with this restaurant'; and (3) 'Next time, I'll go back to this restaurant'. These items were measured on seven-point Likert scales from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree. Findings showed that consumer satisfaction was a strong predictor of consumer loyalty intentions (Item 1 and 2), and a significant but weaker predictor of intention to switch.

In contrast to the above mentioned studies, there have been few studies that have measured a single-item behavioural intention which is 'intention to return'. Ekinci et al. (2008) measured the item - 'how likely is that you would return to this restaurant?' in studying the link between antecedents and consequences of consumer satisfaction. A 7-point scale was used to measure 'intention to return', anchored by 'extremely unlikely/likely', adopted from Cronin and Taylor (1992) in Ekinci et al. (2008). This study found that almost
all antecedents of consumer satisfaction influenced consumer intention to return, however this effect was mediated through satisfaction.

Kivela et al. (1999b) and Weiss et al. (2004) also measured only one item for behavioural intention, which was 'intention to return'. Respondents were asked to answer the question – ‘Will you return to this restaurant?’ with the anchored scale of 1 = I will definitely not return and 2 = I will definitely return. These studies, however, differed from other studies as consumer satisfaction was measured indirectly through the calculation of 'expectations met' scores multiplied by the 'importance' scores. Kivela et al. (1999b) and Weiss et al. (2004) both found that return intent could be explained by consumer satisfaction with the food and atmosphere offered in the restaurant and consumers' dining frequency.

The present study examines three items of behavioural intentions, as measured in past studies: 'intention to return', 'intention to recommend' and 'intention to switch'. These items are measured using a 7-point scale anchored by 'extremely unlikely/likely' as in Ekinci et al. (2008), who adopted the scale from Cronin and Taylor (1992).

3.2.2 Consumers' Post-purchase Attitude towards the Service Firm (Conceptualisation and Measurement)

According to Fishbein and Ajzen (1975), attitude is defined as an individual's positive and negative feelings (evaluative affect) about performing the target behaviour. Attitude toward behaviour refers to the degree to which a person has a favourable or unfavourable assessment of the behaviour in question. Ekinci et al. (2008: p.43) stated that consumer's overall attitude to a service firm is defined as 'a global image of that firm which can be developed before or after purchasing'. Because the present study adopted the scale used by Ekinci et al. (2008), this definition is borrowed. In addition, Ekinci et al. (2008) examined consumer evaluation of services at post-purchasing phase, therefore consumers' post-purchase attitudes after purchasing is examined in the present study.
Attitude is said to be a similar concept to satisfaction. Oliver (1980) argued that the two concepts can be distinguished on the basis of their antecedents. According to Ekinci et al. (2008), satisfaction is more emotional and specific to a single transaction and it requires consumption experience. Meanwhile, consumers' attitude can be cognitive and affective, has image characteristics and may exist without consumption experience through past experiences or marketing communications.

To obtain responses for consumers' post-purchase attitude in the current study, respondents will be asked to provide judgements of their overall feelings towards the service firm. Ekinci et al. (2008) adopted this procedure from the work of Maio and Olson (1994). The consumers' post-purchase attitude measures involved three items, 7-point semantic differential scales anchored by "dislike/like", "positive/negative" and "worthless/valuable". These measures were found reliable and valid in a series of studies by Ekinci and colleagues (e.g. Ekinci and Sirakaya, 2004; Ekinci et al., 2008). For that reason, this measure is adopted to measure consumers' overall attitude towards the firm in the present study.

3.3 Summary
This chapter discussed the conceptualisation and measurement of antecedents (i.e. 'perceived quality', 'perceived value', 'desires-congruence' and 'self-congruence') and consequences (i.e. 'intention to return to a firm', 'intention to recommend', 'intention to switch to other firm' and 'consumer overall attitude of service firm') of consumer satisfaction that are examined in the present study.

The most common determinant of consumer satisfaction studied in the past is 'perceived quality'. Review of service-quality research however demonstrated that there is inconsistency in the items used to measure service quality in restaurants. Most studies have concentrated on the service-delivery process, with limited attention given to attributes related to the quality of food. It is argued that although service delivery is important in restaurants, the aspect of
food as a core product should receive more attention. In order to emphasise the importance of the quality of food in restaurants, the present study examines quality in restaurants by measuring perceived quality in two separate constructs: 'service quality' and 'food quality'.

There are antecedents and consequences of consumer satisfaction that are still under-researched. For instance, desires-congruence and self-congruence have been examined in the past, but a very limited number of studies have investigated these concepts in the restaurant industry or their relationship to consumer satisfaction. There are also a limited number of studies that have examined the effect of consumer satisfaction on 'post-purchase attitude towards the service firm'. This is probably because researchers had been focussing on the impact of behavioural intentions, rather than consumer post-purchase attitude. Despite measurement of behavioural intentions being popular among researchers, not many studies have included an item on 'intention to switch'. It is assumed that, by including these concepts in the study, the present study may fill the gap in the literature.

The research framework is formed to include all antecedents and consequences of consumer satisfaction, as mentioned previously, in a single theoretical framework, which is discussed in the next chapter.
Chapter Four

The Relationship between Consumer Satisfaction and its Antecedents and Consequences

4.0 Introduction

The relationship between consumer satisfaction examined in the present study (Chapter 3) are "perceived quality", "perceived-value-for-money", "congruence" and "self-serving bias". The consequences of consumer satisfaction discussed were: "intentions to recommend"

Therefore, the relationship between consumer satisfaction and its antecedents as discussed. In addition, the connection between consumer satisfaction, "intention to return to a firm", "intentions to recommend", "towards" other firm" and "indicators", post-purchase attitude towards the firm, and "consequences" are discussed. As stated in Chapter 3 and is examined. These relationships then form the hypotheses and research model for the current study.

4.1 The Relationship of Service Quality and Consumer Satisfaction

Kasper et al. (1999) pointed out that there is an issue of whether perceived quality is an antecedent of satisfaction (Cronin et al., 2000). Whether satisfaction is an antecedent of quality (Babin, 1995; Bitner, & Brown, 1994).
4.0 Introduction

The determinants of consumer satisfaction examined in the present study (as outlined in Chapter 3) are 'perceived quality', 'perceived-value-for-money', 'desires-congruence' and 'self-congruence'. The consequences of consumer satisfaction discussed were 'intention to return to a firm', 'intention to recommend', 'intention to switch to other firm' and 'consumers' post-purchase attitude towards the service firm'. These variables are included in the research framework presented in this chapter to investigate their relationships with consumer satisfaction. Literature demonstrates that these relationships exist. Therefore, the relationship of 'perceived quality', 'perceived-value-for-money', 'desires-congruence' and 'self-congruence' on consumer satisfaction is discussed. In addition, the connection between consumer satisfaction and 'intention to return to a firm', 'intention to recommend', 'intention to switch to other firm' and 'consumers' post-purchase attitude towards the service firm' are discussed. In addition, the role of consumer satisfaction as a mediating variable in linking its antecedents and its consequences is addressed. These relationships then form the hypotheses and research model for the current study.

4.1 The Relationship of Service Quality and Consumer Satisfaction

Kasper et al. (1999) pointed out that there is an issue of whether perceived quality is an antecedent of satisfaction (Law, et al., 2004) or whether satisfaction is an antecedent of quality (Bitner, 1990; Bolton and Drew, 1991).
Satisfaction term is confusing whenever consumers perceive service quality as satisfactory or meeting expectations (Gonzalez and Brea, 2005). Thus, it is important to theoretically define what satisfaction and service quality are.

Several researchers agree that service quality and satisfaction are different. Crompton and MacKay (1989) argued that satisfaction is a psychological outcome that emerges from an experience. On the other hand, service quality is concerned with the attributes of the service itself. Bolton and Drew (1991) and Parasuraman et al., (1988) distinguished service quality from consumer satisfaction by viewing service quality as global evaluations that were composites of consumers’ experiences with an organisation (global level evaluations), while satisfaction referred to evaluations of specific experiences with an organisation (encounter service evaluations). Oliver (1997) also argues that service quality and satisfaction differ. Service quality is a judgement about a service’s overall excellence or superiority. Conversely, consumer satisfaction involves “judgement of a product or service feature, or the product or service itself that provides a pleasant level of consumption-related fulfilment, including levels of under-fulfilment or over-fulfilment” (Oliver, 1997: p.13). Oliver (1997) added that product must be experienced to make a satisfaction judgement, but that is not the case for determining quality judgements. The differences in how consumers judge service quality and consumer satisfaction is simplified in Table 4.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Quality</th>
<th>Consumer Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluated using specific clues</td>
<td>Evaluation more holistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on perceptions of ‘excellence’</td>
<td>Based on needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>Emotional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Williams and Buswell (2003: p.60)

Based on the above mentioned arguments, it is assumed that service quality and consumer satisfaction are separate constructs with a close relationship (Lee and Shanklin, 2003). For that reason, researchers became interested in identifying the causal relationship between these two constructs (Bolton and
Drew, 1991; Cronin and Taylor, 1992). Recent studies have found that service quality impacts consumer satisfaction, particularly in the restaurant industry (e.g. Iglesias and Guillén, 2004; Babin et al., 2005; Andaleeb and Conway, 2006; Ekinci et al., 2008;). These studies differ in the number of service-quality dimensions examined. For instance, Bojanic and Rosen (1994), Johns and Tyas (1996) and Sohail (2005) examined SERVQUAL dimensions as proposed by Parasuraman et al. (1986), which are 'reliability', 'tangibles', 'assurance', 'responsiveness' and 'empathy'. Later, the number of service-quality dimensions researched was reduced. Andaleeb and Conway (2006) examined only three dimensions namely 'responsiveness', 'reliability', and 'tangibles'. Ekinci et al. (2008) and McDougall and Levesque (2000) investigated only two dimensions of service quality, 'physical quality' and 'staff behaviour'. Babin et al. (2005) and Iglesias and Guillén (2004) examined the general single measure of service quality (service quality in general).

In general, findings of the studies mentioned previously showed that service quality impacts on satisfaction. The issue is how many dimensions should be examined for the present study. The unidimensional view of service quality, as in the study of Babin et al. (2005) and Iglesias and Guillén (2004), is rejected because measuring a unidimensional factor is insufficient to fully represent information for service quality (Bagozzi and Yi, 1988; Parasuraman et al., 1994). The present study does not employ the initial five-factor SERVQUAL dimensions because many studies have found that, in the restaurant context, the service-quality dimension is not as important as in the retail context (as in Parasuraman et al., 1986). This notion suggests that, although the five-factor conceptualisation does not appear to hold in the context of the restaurant industry in most studies, the service-quality concept does appear to be multidimensional.

The present study follows the notion that service quality has two dimensions; 'physical quality' and 'staff behaviour', as in Ekinci et al. (2008). Physical quality involves measurement items related to the setting of the restaurant (e.g. décor), while staff behaviour is concerned with the performance of
employees during interactions with consumers (e.g. courtesy of employees). In the study of Ekinci et al. (2008), both service-quality dimensions: 'physical quality' and 'staff behaviour', were positively related to consumer satisfaction, concluding that service quality is the antecedent of consumer satisfaction. McDougall and Levesque (2000) found that core quality (the element that is delivered) and relational quality (the way the element is delivered) had direct effect on consumer satisfaction.

The physical-quality dimension has a positive effect on consumer satisfaction (Bitner, 1992). In addition, many studies in restaurants revealed that physical aspects of the restaurant setting e.g. 'neatness and cleanliness of restaurant' and 'staff appearance' are among the important factors that influence consumer satisfaction (e.g. Gilbert and Veloutsou, 2006; Kivela et al., 1999a, 1999b and 2000; Weiss et al., 2004, Yuksel and Yuksel, 2002; Gilbert et al., 2004, Veloutsou et al., 2005; Gupta et al., 2007).

Factors related to staff behaviour have long been used by consumers to evaluate service, and it has been recognised as a determinant of consumer satisfaction. The SERVQUAL dimensions consisting of items related to staff behaviour were found to influence consumer satisfaction e.g. 'responsiveness' in Andaleeb and Conway (2006) and Seidman and Johnson (2002) and 'empathy' in Lee et al. (2005) and Seidman and Johnson (2002). Studies of transaction-specific satisfaction have also revealed that 'staff behaviour' or service-related factors are among the important factors influencing consumer satisfaction in restaurants. For instance, Hensley and Sulek (2007) found that waits in multi-stages (wait time for seating, wait time for food, wait time for bill and wait time for change), 'host staff politeness' and 'server attentiveness' were critical factors affecting consumer satisfaction. Similarly, the findings of Law et al. (2004) showed that consumer's satisfaction with 'waiting time' and 'staff attitude' were main factors influencing overall consumer satisfaction. The review of consumer satisfaction studies in Chapter Two (Section 2.3.1) revealed that most studies had found that 'attentiveness of staff', 'courtesy of staff', 'competency of staff', 'staff willingness to help' and 'timely service' to be
the most important service attributes, as perceived by restaurant consumers. Bitner (1990 and 1992) stated that consumer assessment of a service firm is caused by the service employees' attitudes, behaviour and skills. According to Ekinci et al. (2008) factors related to service staff affect consumer evaluation at two levels. The behaviour of employees (who has contact with consumers) is vital in satisfying consumers' consumption needs or executing a discrete exchange at the encounter level. Ekinci et al. (2008) further mentioned that consumer-oriented employees who demonstrate positive behaviour (e.g. understanding the consumer, competent, reliable behaviour) may create a positive image and a long-lasting relationship with consumers.

4.2 The Relationship between Food Quality and Consumer Satisfaction

Despite extensive service quality research in restaurants, many studies have focussed on the service-delivery process, with limited assessment of the quality of the core product - food (e.g. Bojanic and Rosen, 1994; Lee and Hing, 1995; Stevens et al., 1995; Lee and Ulgado, 1997; Heung et al., 2000; Kim et al., 2003). A few authors have recognised this limitation and examined 'quality of food' in their studies. Andaleeb and Conway (2006) argued that little attention has been placed on attributes of food quality that is supposed to be what customers desire most in a restaurant. For that reason, Andaleeb and Conway (2006) added two items related to 'freshness of food' and 'temperature of food' representing 'food quality' in one of the service-quality dimensions: 'reliability'. Similarly, Sohail (2005) included food items: 'variety of menu', 'food's presentation is appealing manner', 'freshness of food served', 'appropriate temperature of food', 'taste of food', 'nutritional value of food served' and 'consistency of food standard' in the 'reliability' dimension.

Other studies created new quality dimensions to examine items representing quality of food. Lee et al. (2005) stated that adding the sensory dimension (consisting of 'presentation of food' and 'consistency in serving fresh food') was important because this dimension is the core quality in the restaurant.
context and plays a key role in a consumer’s evaluation of specific restaurant performance. By the same token, Johns and Tyas (1996) formed a new dimension called ‘food’ to examine its effect on consumer satisfaction. Food items studied were ‘appearance of the food is attractive’, ‘food is hygienically prepared and served’, ‘food served at the correct temperature’, ‘consumers can always find something they like on the menu’, ‘good portions size’, ‘food tastes good’, ‘availability of balanced and healthy food’, ‘offer a good choice of dishes’, ‘regularly change the selection of dishes’ and ‘food they serve is fresh’.

Namkung and Jang (2007) investigated the impact of the ‘food quality’ dimension on consumer satisfaction and behavioural intention. The ‘food quality’ dimension consisted of food items that were synthesised from the literature - ‘presentation of food’, ‘variety of food’, ‘availability of healthy options’, ‘taste of food’, ‘freshness of food’ and ‘temperature of food’. Following this direction, the present study separates ‘food quality’ from ‘service quality’. By doing this, it is anticipated that the importance of ‘quality of food’ in restaurants can be emphasised.

According to Peri (2006), food quality is an essential condition to satisfy the needs and expectations of consumers. Findings of previous studies supported the notion that ‘food quality’ affects consumer satisfaction. For instance, Hensley and Sulek (2007) found that ‘food quality’ had a direct effect on overall satisfaction together with other factors: transaction-specific satisfaction which is satisfaction with ‘waiting time for seating’ and ‘waiting time for food’, ‘staff politeness’, and ‘server attentiveness’. Similarly, Law et al. (2004) found that ‘food quality’ and ‘food variety’ were among the important factors affecting overall consumer satisfaction towards the restaurant, other factors being: ‘waiting time’ and ‘staff attitude’. Specifically studying the effect of food quality attributes on consumer satisfaction, the results of Namkung and Jang (2007) demonstrated that ‘quality of food’ affected consumer satisfaction, with the ‘taste of food’ and ‘presentation of food’ being the greatest contributors to
consumer satisfaction. Findings of these studies suggest that 'food quality' is crucial in consumer assessment of a restaurant.

4.3 The Relationship between Perceived Value-for-Money and Consumer Satisfaction

According to Spreng et al. (1993), perceived value is of significance to marketing scholars because it affects the direction of 'satisfied' or 'dissatisfied' and the degree of satisfaction/dissatisfaction experienced. Value has a direct impact on consumer satisfaction (Anderson et al., 1994; Day and Crask, 2000; Ravald and Gronroos, 1996). Fornell et al. (1996) proposed that overall consumer satisfaction consisted of price (or value)-driven satisfaction and quality-driven satisfaction. They claimed that the first determinant of overall consumer satisfaction is perceived quality/performance, and the second determinant of overall consumer satisfaction is perceived value.

The review of consumer satisfaction studies in the restaurant industry demonstrated that not all studies reviewed (Section 2.3.2) examined the effect of perceived value on consumer satisfaction. However, it is interesting to note that all studies that examined this effect found positive relationships between perceived value and consumer satisfaction (e.g. McDougall and Levesque, 2000; Babin et al., 2005; Lee et al., 2005). Perceived value predicts consumer satisfaction in multiple industries. For instance, Bruhn and Grund (2000) revealed that consumer perceived value was the determinant of consumer satisfaction in twenty industries studied, including hospitality firms, healthcare, retailing, banking and telecommunication. It shows that perceived value is a common factor influencing consumer satisfaction for various businesses.
4.4 The Relationship between Desires-congruence and Consumer Satisfaction

Research indicates that values influence satisfaction. Peter and Olson (2002) stated that satisfying a value usually elicits positive affect (happiness, joy, satisfaction), whereas blocking a value produces negative affect (frustration, anger, disappointment). For instance, buying a first car satisfies the values of independence and freedom for many peoples, and generates positive affective feelings of pride and satisfaction. In contrast, the value of one's security is not satisfied (blocked) if a new bicycle lock is broken by a thief, which could create substantial negative affect (anger, frustration, fear) (Peter and Olson, 2002).

To examine value, researchers have measured desires-congruence by studying the discrepancy between 'desires' and 'performance' of service. Value has been found to have a significant effect on satisfaction judgement. Spreng and Olshavsky (1993) examined consumer satisfaction towards cameras in an experimental design study. Result showed that desires congruency had a powerful effect on satisfaction judgements, rather than the disconfirmation of expectations, which had no effect on satisfaction. Spreng et al. (1996) investigated the effect of desires congruency on different types of satisfaction and found that it had a significant effect on different types of satisfaction: attribute satisfaction, information satisfaction and overall satisfaction. In hotels and restaurants, Ekinci and Sirakaya (2004) and Ekinci et al. (2008) also found that desires-congruence influenced consumer satisfaction. Kitson (1927) stated that to strengthen the buyer's desire for an object, strong feelings of pleasantness should be aroused within him/her. This suggests that service providers should customise delivery of services according to consumers' personality traits (Ekinci and Sirakaya, 2004). For instance, if a consumer was identified as being egocentric, the strategy of delivering services would be different from a traditional consumer. All in all, the greater the pleasantness is, the greater the desire.
4.5 The Relationship between Self-congruence and Consumer Satisfaction

In service firms, particularly hotels and restaurants, ideal self-congruence was a better indicator of consumer satisfaction (Ekinci and Riley, 2003; Ekinci et al., 2008) and overall attitude (Ekinci and Riley, 2003). In hospitality firms, actual self-congruence was found to be significantly related to service quality (Ekinci and Riley, 2003). The relationship between actual self-congruence and consumer satisfaction may not be significant because often consumers do not want to describe themselves, but to superimpose their 'ideal' self in purchase situations, particularly when the actual self-concept dimension is perceived to be negative (Ekinci and Sirakaya, 2004). These findings demonstrated that 'ideal self-congruence' better influenced various aspects of consumers' consumption of goods and services, in contrast to actual self-congruence. Hong and Zinkhan (1995) noted that this happened because consumers have a strong desire to reach their ideal state, which will serve to improve their self-esteem. For instance, in the service context, when consumers have a wide range of restaurants to choose from, a specific restaurant may upgrade consumer's actual self to ideal self by providing a brand new concept that satisfies consumers' higher needs (e.g. friendliness, attractive environment) and functional needs such as convenient place for eating (Ekinci and Sirakaya, 2004).

4.6 The Relationship between Consumer Satisfaction and Behavioural Intention

Oliver (1980) mentioned that consumer loyalty (e.g. 'revisit intention' and willingness to provide positive word-of-mouth communication) is a function of consumer satisfaction. In the present study, three items of behavioural intentions are measured: 'intention to return', 'intention to recommend' and 'intention to switch' to examine consumer loyalty. The effect of consumer satisfaction on intention to return is widely examined, and many studies have confirmed this relationship. In the restaurant context, studies revealed that
consumer satisfaction had a positive effect on intention to return (e.g. Lee et al., 2005; Arora and Singer, 2006; Ekinci et al., 2008). Some studies found that increased satisfaction is associated with increased intention to recommend or word-of-mouth communication (e.g. Babin et al., 2005; Namkung and Jang, 2007). This implies that, when a consumer is satisfied with the restaurant, they will have greater intention to revisit the restaurant and recommend the restaurant to others.

There have been limited studies that examine 'intention to switch' in restaurants. For instance, McDougall and Levesque (2000) examined this effect. However they found that the two variables ('consumer satisfaction' and 'intention to switch') have no effect. Studies in other service firms e.g. banks (Athanassopoulos, 2000) and insurance (Crosby and Stephens, 1987), however, found a positive effect between consumer satisfaction and intention to switch. According to Rust and Zahorick (1993), researching consumer-switching behaviour is vital in a service context because consumer switching to other firms has a negative effect on market share and profitability. Losing consumers leads to lack of sales revenue and increases the cost of attracting new consumers (offensive marketing), which includes promotion, discounts, effort to know consumer needs, and time to build sustainable relationships (Rust and Zahorick, 1993). Another reason studying intention to switch is important is because Lin and Matilla (2006) stated that restaurant consumers who have had a dissatisfying experience may not complain. Instead they are more likely to 'vote with their feet' and switch to a new service provider. This suggests that studying the impact of consumer satisfaction on this factor is as important as 'intention to return' and 'intention to recommend'.

4.7 The Relationship between Consumer Satisfaction and Consumers' Post-purchase Attitude to the Service Firm

Oliver (1980) suggests that 'consumer satisfaction' predicts consumers' post-purchase attitude to the service firm. Based on this theory, a consumer
approaches a service with a pre-purchase attitude, based on their past experiences, word-of-mouth communications or marketing promotions. Satisfaction is formed during consumption, where expectation and the degree of disconfirmation are the comparison standard. Oliver (1980) mentioned that satisfaction at this stage is specific to time and situation. Therefore, when it appears at the post-purchasing stage, it deteriorates with the consumers' pre-purchase attitude and the consumers' post-purchase overall attitude to the service firm is developed. On the whole, when consumers are satisfied with products or services provided by a service firm, their attitudes toward the service firm, its products, or services become more favourable (LaBarbera and Mazursky, 1983; Blackwell et al., 2001).

4.8 The Indirect Effect between Antecedents of Consumer Satisfaction and Consequences of Consumer Satisfaction

Consistent with the study by Ekinci et al. (2008), the present study examines the mediating effect of consumer satisfaction on the relationship between its antecedents ('service quality', 'food quality', 'perceived-value-for-money', 'desires-congruence' and 'self-congruence') and the consequences of consumer satisfaction ('intention to return', 'intention to recommend', 'intention to switch' and 'consumers' post-purchase attitude towards the service firm'). Findings of the study of Ekinci et al. (2008) revealed that 'service quality', 'desires-congruence' and 'self-congruence' affected 'intention to return' and 'consumers' post-purchase attitude towards the service firm', through 'consumer satisfaction'.

Though Ekinci et al. (2008) did not examine 'food quality', 'perceived-value-for-money', 'intention to recommend' and 'intention to switch' in their model, it is assumed that the general idea that consumer satisfaction has a mediating role in the relationship between its determinants and consequences is applicable to the present study. Furthermore, previous studies support this relationship. For instance, perceived value influences consumer's intention to
return (e.g. Spreng et al., 1993; Liljander and Strandvik, 1995; Patterson and Spreng, 1997; and Tam, 2004) and intention to recommend (e.g. Oh, 1999; Lee et al., 2007). The findings of Namkung and Jang (2007) demonstrated that there is an indirect effect of 'food quality' on 'intention to return' through satisfaction. Namkung and Jang (2007) suggested that, although the significance value of the indirect effect was lower than the direct effect, results still succeeded in underlining the role of satisfaction as a mediating variable between food quality and intention to return. As for service quality, most studies in the past have confirmed the notion that consumer satisfaction mediates the impact of this variable on revisit intention (e.g. Cronin et al., 2000; Brady et al., 2001; Ekinci et al., 2008) and intention to recommend (e.g. Cronin et al., 2000).

As mentioned previously, previous research that examines the direct effect of determinants of consumer on 'intention to switch' is limited. Similarly, the indirect effect of this relationship is hardly found in the literature. However, behavioural intentions in general are well-recognised to be the consequence of consumer satisfaction. Because intention to switch represents behavioural intentions, it is assumed that there may be either a direct or indirect effect of consumer satisfaction on intention to switch.

### 4.9 Hypotheses and Research Model

Considering the aforementioned arguments and findings of past studies, the present study examines the effect of food quality and other antecedents on consumer satisfaction in restaurants. The mediating effect of consumer satisfaction between 'food quality' and other antecedents of consumer satisfaction on 'intention to return', 'intention to recommend', 'intention to switch' and 'consumers' post-purchase attitude towards the service firm' are further examined. The following hypotheses are proposed:

**H1:** Perceptions of the quality of food will have an effect on consumer satisfaction
H2: Ideal self-congruence will have an effect on consumer satisfaction  
H3: Desires-congruence will have an effect on consumer satisfaction  
H4a: Perceptions of the quality of the physical environment will have an effect on consumer satisfaction  
H4b: Perceptions of staff behaviour will have an effect on consumer satisfaction  
H5: Perceptions of perceived value-for-money will have an effect on consumer satisfaction  
H6: Consumer satisfaction will have an effect on consumers' post-purchase attitude towards the service firm  
H7: Consumer satisfaction will have an effect on intention to return  
H8: Consumer satisfaction will have an effect on intention to recommend  
H9: Consumer satisfaction will have an effect on intention to switch  
H10: Consumer satisfaction will mediate the impact of the five antecedents variables – food quality, environmental quality, staff behaviour, ideal self-congruence, desires-congruence and perceived value-for-money – on intention to return  
H11: Consumer satisfaction will mediate the impact of the five antecedents variables – food quality, environmental quality, staff behaviour, ideal self-congruence, desires-congruence and perceived value-for-money – on intention to recommend  
H12: Consumer satisfaction will mediate the impact of the five antecedents variables – food quality, environmental quality, staff behaviour, ideal self-congruence, desires-congruence and perceived value-for-money – on intention to switch  
H13: Consumer satisfaction will mediate the impact of the five antecedents variables – food quality, environmental quality, staff behaviour, ideal self-congruence, desires-congruence and perceived value-for-money – consumers' post-purchase attitude towards the service firm

These hypotheses form the research model that is adapted from Ekinci et al. (2008). The following section discusses the positive and negative features of
the Ekinci model that led to the reason why this model was chosen in this study.

4.9.1 The Positive and Negative Features of the Ekinci's Model
The Ekinci et al (2008) model is a comprehensive model of what leads to consumer satisfaction and what consumer satisfaction may contribute in two service firms, namely hotel and restaurant. The antecedents of consumer satisfaction are actual self-congruence, ideal self-congruence, desires congruence and service quality. The consequences are the consumers' overall attitude to the service firm and their intention to return. This model was tested through mail questionnaire survey among restaurant and hotel customers who visited those premises within the last four weeks of service consumption. The sample size for restaurant customers is 185.

The structural model was examined using the partial least-squares method. Other analyses involved are validity test, a test to examine the explanatory power of the model and hypotheses tests. Validity test was carried out to examine the validity of three pairs of constructs, namely actual self congruence and ideal self congruence, two service quality dimensions – physical quality and staff behaviour AND consumer satisfaction and consumers' overall attitude to the service firm. The goodness-of-fit value was used to test the explanatory power of the model.

Results show that all constructs examined in the present study have low correlation with each other, showing the validity of measures. Results also supports 11 out of 12 hypotheses constituting that (1) consumer satisfaction has multiple antecedents; (2) ideal self-congruence is an antecedent of satisfaction; (3) service quality has two dimensions (i.e. physical quality and staff behaviour), which have positive effects on satisfaction; (4) desires-congruence is a significant determinant of satisfaction; (5) satisfaction is a better reflection of the consumers' overall attitude to a service firm as opposed to service quality; (6) both satisfaction and the consumers' overall attitude to a service firm have positive effects on intention to return; (7)
satisfaction mediates the relationships between its antecedents and consequences. The summary of Ekinci et al (2008) model is shown in Figure 4.1.

**Figure 4.1: The Extended Model of the Antecedents and Consequences of Consumer Satisfaction**

This model was selected as the framework for the present study because it confirms the requirements of Oh and Park (1997). These requirements include that customer satisfaction model must be developed for a specific market to determine a generalisable causal relationship of the model constructs for that particular market. In addition, Oh and Park (1997) suggests that the causal relationship should be tested with structural equation modelling technique. This technique allows complex phenomena to be modelled statistically and tested (Schumacker and Lomax, 2004). It also takes measurement error into account when statistically analysing data from the measurement instruments, and thus provides better recognition of the validity and reliability of the scores (Schumacker and Lomax, 2004).
The model of Ekinci et al (2008) conforms to the requirements of Oh and Park (1997). It has been tested in a specific context i.e. hospitality firms. It has also applied structural equation modelling to test the model of customer satisfaction. Furthermore, results show that the model has good explanatory power. The value of the average variance extracted (AVE) for each construct exceeded .50 showing that convergent validity was established (Fornell and Lacker, 1981). The constructs were also reliable where the Cronbach alpha values range from 0.83 to 0.98, which indicates that the measures were reliable (Nunnally, 1978).

It is argued that the model has several drawbacks, although the Ekinci et al (2008) model surpassed the criteria of good customer satisfaction model by Oh and Park (1997). This model, however, lacks several other important factors that determine consumer satisfaction and its consequences. In particular, this model does not examine other antecedents of customer satisfaction, such as food-quality variables, on customer satisfaction. It is argued that a study of customer satisfaction in restaurants should emphasise more on 'quality of food' because it is the core-product attribute in the restaurants. In addition, other variables should be added into the model in order to have a more comprehensive model of consumer satisfaction.

The present study investigates whether the success of the model can be replicated in a specific context (i.e. restaurants) by forming a research model that re-examines several constructs similar to the Ekinci et al (2008) model including service quality, self-congruence, desires-congruence, consumer satisfaction, consumers' overall attitude to the service firm and intention to return. However, one component of self-congruence i.e. actual self-congruence was not examined in the present study because Ekinci et al (2008) revealed that that factor is insignificant in predicting consumer satisfaction. Several other constructs (i.e. perceived value-for-money, intention to switch and consumers' overall attitude to the service firm) were added into the model in order to fill the gap of the Ekinci et al (2008) model with the literature as shown in Figure 4.2. Besides that, the present study re-
names the 'physical quality' dimension of service quality into 'environmental quality' in order to differentiate the construct of 'food quality' with 'physical quality' because 'food quality' itself is physical in nature.

The discussion above leads to the modification of the Ekinci et al (2008) model to the present research' model as shown in Figure 4.2.

**Figure 4.2: Research Model of the Antecedents and Consequences of Consumer Satisfaction Adapted from Ekinci et al. (2008)**

This chapter discussed the relationship of consumer satisfaction and its antecedents (food quality, service quality, self-congruence, desires-congruence and perceived-value-for-money) and consequences (intention to return, intention to recommend, intention to switch and consumer's post-purchase attitude towards the service firm). Past studies have shown that; 'food quality', 'service quality', 'self-congruence', 'desires-congruence' and 'perceived-value-for-money', influenced 'consumer satisfaction'. These
variables also influenced the consequences of consumer satisfaction (e.g. intention to return), indirectly through consumer satisfaction. Consumer satisfaction itself influenced behavioural intentions and post-purchase attitude. On that basis, 14 hypotheses were proposed to study the relationship of consumer satisfaction and its antecedents and consequences. The research model, adapted from Ekinci et al. (2008) was demonstrated in this chapter. This model leads to the decision on the methods and measurements used to examine the variables for the present study, which is discussed in the next chapter.
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5.0 Introduction

This chapter addresses the methodological approach employed in this study. Section 5.1 outlines the objectives of study. Section 5.2 discusses the theory of research that guides the research technique for the present study. Section 5.3 explains the research design for this study that includes two data-collection methods: interviews and the questionnaire survey. Section 5.4 elaborates the process of interview involved in the present study. Section 5.5 presents the discussion on 'designing the questionnaire' and process of survey data collection. Section 5.6 summarises the overall content of this chapter.

5.1 Objectives of the Research

1. To examine the elements of restaurants in terms of influencing consumers' eating-out experience in restaurant.
2. To explore consumers' view on 'food quality', in relation to restaurants' dining.
3. To test the extended model of 'consumer satisfaction' that examines the relationship between 'food quality', 'service quality', 'desires-congruence', 'self-congruence', 'perceived value-for-money' and variables including 'consumer satisfaction', 'behavioural intentions' and 'post-purchase attitude towards the service firm', that has been adapted from Ekinci et al. (2008).
4. To examine the effect of 'food quality', 'service quality', 'desires-congruence', 'self-congruence', 'perceived value-for-money' on 'consumer satisfaction'.
5. To investigate the effect of 'consumer satisfaction' on 'consumers' behavioural intentions' and 'post-purchase attitude towards the service firm'.
6. To determine the path through which 'food quality', 'service quality', 'desires-congruence', 'self-congruence', 'perceived value-for-money' influence 'consumer satisfaction' and whether 'consumer satisfaction' mediates the link between these variables and 'consumers' behavioural intentions' and 'post-purchase attitude towards the service firm'.

5.2 Research Philosophy

The research approach used in the study deal with ways of looking at the world and ways to observe, measure and understand social reality. There are three broad approaches in researching social science. They are positivism, interpretivism and realism in which each approach is related to various social theory and research techniques (Saunders et al., 2003).

Positivism is the research approach that has been used to investigate research involving natural sciences (Saunders et al., 2007). Positivists seek rigorous, exact measures and objective research and test hypotheses by analysing numbers from the measures (Neuman, 2000). This largely involves quantitative data and often uses experiments, surveys and statistics. Through this approach, positivists believe that individual behaviour can be examined through precise empirical observations which could confirm the causal laws that can predict general patterns of human activity (Neuman, 2000).

Despite that, positivism is not relevant to the actual lives of real people because people have been measured as numbers. Notions such as 'fact' and 'objectivity' are as much values as other forms of language, meaning and need to be interpreted rather than be merely accepted (Lincoln and Gube, 1985).

Following that, another approach - interpretivism evolved to examine social sciences. Interpretivists are concerned with how people manage everyday life, how people interact and how they get things done (Saunders et al., 2007). In order to investigate these meanings, interpretivist researchers normally examine
a detailed reading or examination of text, which can refer to conversations, written words or pictures (Neuman, 2000). This is often achieved through participant observations and field research.

Another approach that is compatible with the measurement of phenomena and with the interpretation of meanings is the realism or critical approach. Realism is a research philosophy that applies the principles used by positivist and interpretivist researchers (Blumberg et al., 2005). Through this approach, the phenomenon can be described objectively and accurately. Simultaneously, the individuals' subjective interpretation towards their action and behaviour can be captured. Realism emphasises the objective and subjective dimensions of social behavior, therefore realists tend to use a mixture of methods (i.e. a combination of qualitative and quantitative) and combine different objectives (i.e. mixture of exploratory, descriptive and explanation research).

The present study relies upon theory testing rather than theory building. This study examined the relationship between 'food quality' and other variables with consumer satisfaction and behavioural intentions based on an existing model of consumer satisfaction by Ekinci et al. (2008). Quantitative research can be used to examine this relationship through data-collection methods and analysis of the quantitative data. This approach enables researchers to generalise statistically the regularities in human social behaviour through selecting a sample of sufficient numerical size (Saunders et al., 2007). Based on this rationale, this study adopts a positivist approach. Despite that, this study also used a qualitative method to investigate attributes that influenced consumer's eating-out experience in restaurants and attributes that consumers perceived to be the quality determinants of food. Interviews were used for these purposes because interviews are more efficient for collecting information about peoples' experiences and opinions (Thomas, 2003). These rationales suggest that this study used positivist approach with a slight use of interpretivist approach.
5.3 Research Design

The research design is the 'framework or plan for a study used as a guide in collecting data and analysing it' (Churchill and Brown, 2004: 4). The development of research design is based on the type of research methodology chosen (Neuman, 2000). There are three general categories of research: exploratory, descriptive and explanatory or hypothesis-testing (Neuman, 2000). The characteristics of each type of research are described in Table 5.1.

Table 5.1: The Characteristics of Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exploratory</th>
<th>Descriptive</th>
<th>Explanatory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conducted when not much is known about the situation in hand</td>
<td>Used to ascertain and describe the characteristics of the variables of interest in a situation</td>
<td>Explains the nature of certain relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carried out when no information is available on how similar problems or research issues have been solved in the past</td>
<td>Frequently undertaken in organisations to learn about the characteristics of a group of employees.</td>
<td>Establishes the differences among groups or the independence of two-or-more factors in a situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performed to better comprehend the nature of the problem since very few studies might have been conducted in that area</td>
<td>To understand the characteristics of organisations and common practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishes when some facts are known, but more information is needed for developing viable theoretical framework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Sekaran (2003: p.119-124)

Table 5.1 shows that the chosen research design depends on the purpose of the research. The researcher should first concentrate on what they are trying to investigate because it dictates the methodological choices (Punch, 2005). The more knowledge known about the research area, the less descriptive the nature of research needs to be. Through appropriate choice of research design, researchers should be able to obtain the information wanted through approaches that generate data to the research problem in the best possible way (Gauri and Grønhaug, 2002).
The main aim of the present study is to examine the effect of food quality and other variables (service quality, desires-congruence, ideal self-congruence and perceived-value-for-money) on consumer satisfaction and behavioural intentions and post-purchase attitude. This could be achieved by using a quantitative approach because it involves hypothesis-testing. Quantitative methods emphasise testing and verification and focus on hypothesis-testing (Reichardt and Cook, 1979). The initial aim of this study involved the use of a quantitative method. However, as many studies of consumer satisfaction in the past have placed less attention on the 'food quality', there was a need to explore the importance of food compared to other aspects in the restaurant by means of a qualitative approach. In addition, previous studies showed that there was no consensus on what food-quality attributes are (Namkung and Jang, 2007). By exploring the specific components making up 'food quality', the present study was able to compile a set of 'food-quality' elements as viewed by restaurant consumers. The methodological approaches applied in the present study begin with exploring the importance of food in restaurants and the elements of 'food quality' through an exploratory approach, by means of interviews. The findings from the interviews (as reported in Chapter 6) enabled the modification of the measurement items of 'food quality' and 'service quality' of an existing questionnaire by Ekinci et al. (2008). The next stage of study which involved a questionnaire survey examined the main research question which is to study the effect of food quality and other variables using an explanatory approach. Before beginning the main data collection, questionnaires are piloted. These processes are simplified in Figure 5.1.
Considering the methodological approaches shown in Figure 5.1, it is assumed that the present study adopted mixed methods to answer the research questions given in the previous section. A combination of qualitative and quantitative approaches to answer the research questions are considered relevant because the outcomes of interviews were used for constructing the questionnaire. A qualitative research can be used to obtain background information on context and subjects, to seek for hypotheses and to aid scale construction (Punch, 2005). It shows that 'qualitative' and 'quantitative' approaches are connected because the evidence found in the qualitative study can be used to produce hypotheses which can be tested quantitatively (Bullock et al., 1995).

Figure 5.1 illustrates two data-collection methods used in this study. Section 5.4 discusses the interviews and section 5.5 discusses the questionnaire surveys.

5.4 Preliminary Study: Interviews

Face-to-face interviews were conducted on an exploratory basis to achieve the following objectives:
1) To examine the elements of restaurants in terms of influencing consumers' eating-out experience in the restaurants.

2) To explore consumers' views on 'food quality', in relation to restaurants' dining.

This information was used to modify the measurement items related to 'food quality' and 'service quality' (as discuss in Section 5.5.1).

The interview format can be differentiated into three forms: structured, semi-structured or unstructured. Structured interviews are interviews that are conducted when the information needed is known at the beginning (Sekaran, 2003). Unstructured interviews have a list of topics that the interviewer would like to cover in the interview but not a list of questions (Wilson, 1996). Finally, a semi-structured interview consists of the initial questions with an 'active follow up strategy', questions, prompts, probes, statements and other interventions that will always be improvised and invented during the interview (Wengraf, 2001).

According to Wengraf (2001), the level of theoretical knowledge known in the research area determines the format of interview. The structure of the interview depends on the aim of study, for example, whether the study aims to build models or theory or to test the theory or model. Figure 5.2 demonstrates this notion.

Figure 5.2: The Relationship between Aim of Study with Structure of Interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model-building</th>
<th>Model-testing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theory-building</td>
<td>Theory-testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unstructured</td>
<td>Lightly-structured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heavily-structured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fully-structured</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Wengraf (2001)

Figure 5.2 demonstrates that, as the research aim moves from model-or-theory building to model-or-theory-testing, the format of interview becomes more
structured. According to Wengraf (2001), research that starts at the beginning of
the research cycle, aiming to build a theory or model of a particular area requires
an unstructured or lightly-structured interview. On the other hand, an existing
model or theory that has been found in the literature is tested by a more heavily-
structured or fully-structured interview. This concludes that the more knowledge
is known of the research area, the more structured the interview should be.

In the present study, knowledge of the research area, that is 'the restaurant
attributes', is known. Previous studies acknowledged the attributes in
restaurants. Pizam and Ellis (1999) classified important attributes in a restaurant-
meal experience into three categories: 'material product', 'environment' and
'behaviour and attitude'. These categories and attributes within these categories
are depicted in Table 5.2.

### Table 5.2: Attributes in the Restaurant-meal Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material product</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Behaviour and attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of F&amp;B</td>
<td>Cleanliness of restaurant</td>
<td>Friendliness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portion size</td>
<td>Location and accessibility</td>
<td>Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of menu choices</td>
<td>Size and shape of room</td>
<td>Courtesy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and beverage consistency</td>
<td>Furniture and fittings</td>
<td>Efficiency and speed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of tastes, textures,</td>
<td>Colour scheme</td>
<td>Helpfulness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aromas, colours</td>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>Professionalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correct F&amp;B temperatures</td>
<td>Temperature and ventilation</td>
<td>Responsiveness to special requests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance of F&amp;B</td>
<td>Acoustics (noise level)</td>
<td>Responsiveness to complaints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price of meal/drinks/service</td>
<td>Spaciousness of restaurant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of menu items</td>
<td>Neatness of restaurant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employees' appearance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Availability of parking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hours of operation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Pizam and Ellis (1999: p.334)

Past studies in the field of 'service quality' and 'consumer satisfaction' have
examined some, if not all of the attributes in Table 5.2 (e.g. Kivela et al., 1999a,
1999b and 2000; Law et al., 2004; Weiss et al., 2004; Veloutsou et al., 2005;
Gilbert and Veloutsou, 2006; Gupta et al., 2007; Hensley and Sulek, 2007)

Despite that, studies have placed less attention on the 'food' factor than other
factors in restaurants (e.g. service-related attributes). As previously mentioned in
Chapter 2 (Section 2.3.1), several studies have examined food-related factors to examine consumer satisfaction (i.e. Kivela et al. 1999a, 1999b and 2000; Yuksel and Yuksel, 2002; Weiss et al., 2004). These studies, however, did not report the relationship of 'quality of food' and overall 'consumer satisfaction' in eating-out experience, which the present study researches.

The process of interviewing for the present study involved planning and preparing interview schedule, performing pilot-testing, modifying interview schedules, requesting ethical approval, recruiting participants, interviewing procedures and analysis.

5.4.1 The Interview Schedule

The process of interviews began with the preparation of an interview schedule. An interview schedule is a list of questions that helps to remind an interviewer of the questions to be asked (Rapley, 2005) and also assists to answer the theory-questions represented in the central research question (Wengraf, 2001). It is formed by gathering information from the relevant academic and non-academic literature together with researcher's ideas of the important topics that should be covered in the interview (Rapley, 2005). In the present study, interview schedule has been developed with reference to the objectives of the study, literature on the topic area (i.e. consumer satisfaction, restaurant attributes and food quality) and also researcher's thoughts arising from the literature. Generating a question list by combining these sources is important to ensure that the questions achieve what is intended. The initial interview schedule (See Appendix I) for this study consisted of four main questions regarding eating-out experience, views on food quality and personal information. Prompts were created to elicit more information on each main question.

After piloting the interview on 6 people, the interview questions were modified to form the final interview schedule as in Table 5.3
Table 5.3: The Final Interview Schedule for the Present Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Thinking about your recent visit to a restaurant, could you please describe that particular restaurant?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Still thinking about your recent visit to that particular restaurant, could you please explain the reason you choose this restaurant?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Still thinking about your visit to that particular restaurant, could you please explain about your dining experience on that day?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>If interviewees mentioned the following; 1. Good food / bad food 2. Good service / bad service 3. Good servers / bad service 4. Good atmosphere / bad atmosphere 5. OR other words to describe experience on food, service, servers or atmosphere; The following questions were used to elicit responses : 1. Could you say more about..........? 2. What did you mean by..........?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>If interviewees provide less information in question No.4, the following question will be asked; Besides that, is there anything else regarding your experience on that day that you would like to share?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>You have mentioned (name all elements in the restaurant that have been mentioned by respondent). Which of these being the most important to you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Often, people seek for a quality food in a restaurant. In your opinion, what is a quality food?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>In your opinion, what is a poor-quality food in a restaurant?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>May I ask a few questions about you? Please complete the multiple choice answer sheet (See Appendix II). If you find any questions offensive, please feel free to refuse to answer them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Which of the following age groups do you belong to?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Which of the following represents your monthly income?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The finalised interview schedule (Table 5.3) consisted of 11 questions, including the introductory questions about eating out, eating-out experience, interviewee perceptions of food quality and personal information. However, whilst this provided the framework for the interview, there was flexibility to ensure elicitation of other factors.

5.4.2 The Process of Ethical Approval

The present study included university staff and students, therefore required ethical approval from the University Ethic's Committee. Application for ethical approval involved submitting required documents, including the protocol of the study, interviewee's consent form and the information sheet for potential
participants. Recruiting interviewees began once ethical approval was obtained from the University Ethic’s Committee (See Appendix III).

5.4.3 The Sampling for the Interview Respondents
The sample of study involved academic staff, administration staff and students in the university. University is a place consisting of people from various backgrounds, which could represent the demographic background of people who eat out. Two methods were used to recruit participants: sending university internal emails and publicising on the university notice boards. Upon participants’ consent to take part in the study, respondents were asked to set the date and venue of the interview. General criteria for the selection of participants were stated in the email and notices (See Appendix IV and Appendix V for sample of email and notices). The overall inclusion criteria are:

1. Anyone who is studying or working in the University of Surrey.
2. Must have visited restaurants recently, at most two weeks before the interview.
3. Must have eaten in the restaurant (not take-away).

Through face-to-face interviewing, questions can be adapted as necessary and doubts can be clarified to ensure the researcher has understood the interviewee responses (Sekaran, 2003). In addition, the interview allows the researcher to note facial expression and body language demonstrated by the interviewees to address their discomfort, dissatisfaction and disagreement regarding the interview topic (Sekaran, 2003).

Interviews involved 15 respondents. Interviews were tape-recorded with the consent of the participants. The average length of interview for each person was 20 to 30 minutes.
5.4.4 The Analyses of Interview Data

All interviews were digitally recorded with the permission of respondent. The interviews were transcribed verbatim. A sample of an interview transcript can be found in Appendix VI. According to Atkinson and Heritage (1984), producing and using transcripts are research activities involving close, repeated listening to recordings which often reveals unnoted frequent features of the talk.

Qualitative data can be approached with either deductive or an inductive perspective (Bryman, 2008). A deductive perspective uses existing theory to shape the research process and data analysis while an inductive perspective involves building theory that is grounded in the data. Researchers who used deductive perspective are normally interested with language (Tesch, 1990). Content analysis can be used when researchers are interested on the content of text. Where an inductive approach is used, researchers seek universal explanations of phenomena (Bryman, 2008).

The present study used a deductive approach to analyse data in order to modify an existing scale adapted from Ekinci et al. (2008). By using this approach, the existing theory could provide initial analytical framework and the research could be linked into the existing body of knowledge in the subject area (Saunders et al., 2007). Content analysis was used as the technique to analyse interview data. Content analysis is "a technique for making replicable and valid inferences from texts (or other meaningful matter) to the contexts of their use" (Krippendorff, 2004: 18). According to Mayring (2000), applying the procedures of qualitative content analysis is appropriate when the research question for a research is not highly open-ended, less explorative in nature and study seeks to search for 'categories'. Content analysis was appropriate for the present study because the objective of the interview in the present study fitted the criteria of Mayring (2000). The deductive approach of content analysis was adopted according to Mayring (2000), which is depicted in Figure 5.3.
Figure 5.3 illustrates that the deductive approach of content analysis as proposed by Mayring (2000) begins with developing the research question. When the research question is known, the aspects of analysis, main categories and sub-categories are determined and are defined theoretically. The next step is to code the text according to the category which has been defined in the earlier step. The present study employed the manual-coding approach. Manual coding involved the researcher reading through the information that was collected (i.e. notes, transcripts, etc.). A highlighter was used to mark what had been assumed to be categories and also sub-categories within categories (Swift, 1996). In the present study, the two major categories which were central to the research objectives or research hypothesis were 'the characteristics of food quality' and 'the elements of restaurant'. Therefore, the variables that were found in the interview data were grouped into these categories. This process was repeated until the researcher felt fairly confident that the set of variables found were those that could be
measured. The categories were then revised and checked with the research question. The final step was to interpret the results.

The present study used this approach because, according to Yin (1994), if the research question and objectives of study are developed from the existing theory, the analysis should make use of the existing theory. Therefore, through the deductive approach, analysis made reference to the theoretical background as in the literature and the research objectives. For instance, past studies have shown that when determining service quality in restaurants, there are many attributes and these can be categorised into 'food', 'service' and 'environment' (Weiss et al., 2004). These factors are important for 'consumer satisfaction' and the 'intention to return' to the restaurant. The notion that restaurant attributes can be divided into three categories (i.e. food, service and atmosphere) was used for the present study. Categories were formed and definition of these categories was prepared. Coded data were then grouped into the appropriate categories. Next, categories and coding were revised to ensure that the findings were relevant to the research objectives and theoretical background.

5.5 Data Collection: Questionnaire Survey

A questionnaire is a written set of questions, which is an efficient tool for data collection if researcher is familiar with what is required and how to measure the variables involved (Sekaran, 2003). The present study employs a self-administered questionnaire. A self-administered questionnaire is an instrument that is used to obtain information from people who filled the instrument themselves (Bourque and Fielder, 1995).

5.5.1 Designing the Questionnaire

When designing each question in the questionnaire, researchers could adopt questions from existing questionnaires, adapt questions from existing questionnaires or develop his/his own questions (Bourque and Clark, 1994). In the present study, an established scale was employed. However, certain
measurement items are modified based on the results in the qualitative phase (i.e. interviews).

The main research aim is to examine the influence of food quality and other variables ('service quality', 'desires-congruence', 'ideal-self-congruence' and 'perceived-value-for-money') on 'consumer satisfaction' and 'behavioural intentions' and 'post-purchase attitude' in restaurants. This is depicted in the model adapted from Ekinci et al. (2008) (Figure 5.4). The shaded boxes indicate the new variables added to the model of Ekinci et al. (2008).

**Figure 5.4: Research Model of the Antecedents and Consequences of Consumer Satisfaction**

![Research Model of the Antecedents and Consequences of Consumer Satisfaction](image)

Source: Adapted from Ekinci et al. (2008)

A questionnaire (Appendix VII) is therefore designed to examine the relationships of variables as in Figure 5.4. It is based on the questionnaire employed in the study of Ekinci et al. (2008). A cover letter (See Appendix VIII) was included at the beginning of the questionnaire to state information regarding the purpose of study and to inform respondents that they are not obliged to participate in the study and are free to withdraw from the study at any time without needing to
justify their decision, without prejudice and without penalty. In addition, respondents were asked to provide their name and address for the draw. The questionnaire consists of six sections:

- **Section 1** involves 5 questions on consumers' perception of the performance of 10 'food-quality' items, 10 'service-quality' items, 'overall quality of food', 'overall quality of service' and consumers' perception on 'value-for-money'.
- **Section 2** covers 4 questions related to consumers' perception of 'ideal self-congruence' and 'desires-congruence'.
- **Section 3** examines consumers' overall satisfaction and overall post-purchase attitude towards the service firm.
- **Section 4** assesses 3 items of behavioural intentions; 'intention to return', 'intention to recommend' and 'intention to switch'.
- **Section 5** is designed to collect consumers' eating-out profile including type of restaurant, name and location of the restaurant, reason of eating out and company while eating out.
- **Section 6** questions consumers' background; gender, age group, level of education and net monthly income.

The measurement of variables examined in the present study is discussed in the next section.

**Measurement Scales**

Most scales used to measure constructs in the present questionnaire are adopted from the study of Ekinci et al. (2008), who borrowed these scales from various sources. This includes the measurement for 'service quality', 'desires-congruence', 'ideal self-congruence', 'consumer satisfaction', 'consumers' post-purchase attitude towards the service firm' and 'intention to return'. Slight modifications were made to the measurement items of 'service quality' based on the result of the interview findings. Ten measurement items for 'food quality' found in the interview (reported in Chapter 6) are included in the questionnaire plus one overall food-quality question, adapted from similar scale format as
‘service quality’ in Ekinci et al. (2008). Ten measurement items for ‘service quality’ consisting of original items of Ekinci et al. (2008) and new items were included. One item on value-for-money was added to the questionnaire with similar scale measuring ‘overall service quality’ employed in Ekinci et al. (2008). Besides ‘intention to return’, the present study includes other items of behavioural intentions: ‘intention to recommend’ and ‘intention to switch’. These variables were examined using the same scale used to measure ‘intention to return’ in the study of Ekinci et al. (2008). The measurement scales and items for each construct are discussed in the following sections.

- Measurement of Food Quality
  This construct was measured to examine consumers’ perception of the performance of ‘food quality’ in a restaurant. The quality characteristics of food included in this measure were obtained from the interview, which include:
  1. The food was presented and arranged nicely on the plate
  2. The food was tasty
  3. The food contained fresh ingredients
  4. The food smelt nice
  5. The food looked appetising
  6. The food was properly cooked
  7. The food contained too much fat
  8. The food was about the right size
  9. The food was served at an appropriate temperature
  10. The food was as I expected
  These items were measured using a 5-point Likert-type scale with ‘1’ strongly disagree and ‘5’ strongly agree. Another scale examined ‘overall food quality’ was measured with a 7-point, single item anchored by ‘extremely low quality/extremely high quality’ adopted from Ekinci et al. (2008) to examine the criterion validity for two service-quality scales (Cronin and Taylor, 1992).
Measurement of Service Quality

This construct was measured to examine consumers' perception of the performance of 'service quality' in the restaurant. According to Ekinci et al. (2008), service quality consists of two dimensions- 'physical quality' and 'staff behaviour'. 'Physical quality' comprises items related to the aspect of environment in the restaurant while the dimension of staff behaviour represents items related to the staff behaviour in restaurant. The results of interviews confirmed that factors related to the staff behaviour and restaurant environment were important in consumer eating-out experience. This was similar to the service-quality scale as in Ekinci et al. (2008). However, Ekinci et al. (2008) did not examine 'promptness of service' and 'efficiency of service' in their scale – the service-delivery elements that were found to be important in the interview. In addition, Ekinci et al. (2008) also did not examine the item on attractive layout in restaurant. For that reason, additional factors revealed from the interview were added to the measurement. Besides, slight modifications were made to the wording for the items- 'the restaurant was tidy', and 'staff were talented and displayed a natural expertise', to better reflect the interview findings. The measurement items of service quality are:

1. The décor was beautifully coordinated with great attention to detail
2. The layout in restaurant was attractive
3. The restaurant was clean and tidy
4. The restaurant provided comfortable rooms
5. Staff were helpful and friendly
6. Staff seemed to anticipate what I wanted
7. Staff listened to me
8. Staff were competent
9. Staff were efficient in service
10. Staff were prompt in service

The 5-point Likert-type scale with '1' strongly disagree and '5' strongly agree were used to examine this construct. 'Overall service quality' was measured with a 7-point, single item anchored by 'extremely low quality/extremely high quality'
adopted from Ekinci et al. (2008) to examine the criterion validity for two service-quality dimensions (Cronin and Taylor, 1992).

- **Measurement of Perceived Value-for-Money**
  This construct explains how consumer perceived the trade-off between what is gained and sacrificed (in term of money) in an eating-out experience. Consistent with the measure of 'overall quality', 'overall perceived value-for-money' is examined with a 7-point, single-item scale with a scale of 'poor-good' - 'extremely poor value for money/extremely good value for money'.

- **Measurement of Ideal Self-congruence**
  This construct is measured to assess how consumers' perceived the service providers' image of restaurant matches up their ideal self-image (Ekinci et al., 2008). Following Ekinci et al. (2008) whom adopted Sirgy and Su (2000) scales, the direct measure of self-congruence was employed in the present study. The scale format of 5-point Likert-type scale with '1' strongly disagree and '5' strongly agree was used to measure two items representing ideal self-congruence, as below:
  1. The typical consumer of this restaurant reflects the type of person I am
  2. The typical consumer of this hotel is very much like the person I admire

- **Measurement of Desires-congruence**
  Measuring desires-congruence informed the subjective assessment of the comparison between what consumers desired and what they received from the performance of the firms' goods and services (Wirtz and Mattila, 2001). There are two stages in measuring desires-congruence as proposed by Spreng and Mackoy (1996). First, the overall service performance is compared against the respondents' desires (goals) to capture any discrepancy by the following question:
    
    How big was the difference between what you desired, and what you actually received?
This item was measured by a 7-point scale, '1=exactly as I desired' and '7=extremely different than I desired' with the label of midpoint, 'somewhat different than I desired'. Next, consumer evaluated the intensity of this discrepancy on an 11-point scale where '−5' was labelled as 'very bad' and '+5' as 'very good'.

- **Measurement of Consumers' Overall Attitude towards the Service Firm**
  To obtain responses for consumers' overall attitude, respondents were asked to provide judgements of their overall feelings towards the service firm. Ekinci et al. (2008) adopted this procedure from the work of Maio and Olson (1994). The consumer's overall attitude measures involved a three-items, 7-point semantic differential scale anchored by “dislike/like”, “positive/negative” and “worthless/valuable”.

- **Measurement of Overall Satisfaction**
  Overall satisfaction was examined by employing two-item scales of Spreng and Mackoy (1996). Respondents were asked to rate a question - *Overall, how do you feel about the food and service at the restaurant?* on two 7-point scales anchored by ‘terrible/delighted’ and ‘completely satisfied/completely dissatisfied’.

- **Measurement of Behavioural Intention**
  This construct was measured to assess how likely consumers would return and recommend a restaurant and switch to other restaurant. These items were measured by a 7-point anchored by 'extremely unlikely/likely' as in Ekinci et al. (2008), whom adopted the scale from Cronin and Taylor (1992).

5.5.2 **Piloting the Questionnaire**
The present study involved two stages of piloting the questionnaire. The outcome of the pilot study assisted to improve the quality of the questionnaire. Piloting the questionnaire gives early warning of errors related to research protocols, proposed methods or proposed research instruments (Van Teijlingen and
Hundley, 2001). Thus, after the pilot survey, the questionnaire was modified to prepare for the main survey.

- **Pilot Study: Stage I**

During the first stage of the pilot study, the content of the initial questionnaire was pre-tested on 14 respondents. Pre-testing the questionnaire is important to assess respondents' understanding towards the questions, the scales and the instructions (Alreck and Settle, 1995). It is also important to observe how convenient respondents felt with the questionnaire by asking their opinions about the questionnaire.

The first stage of the pilot study demonstrated that respondents took an average of 10 to 15 minutes to complete the questionnaire. Some feedbacks were obtained from the respondents, involving the issue on the length of the questionnaire, the format of the questionnaire, grammatical errors, and the difficulty to understand questionnaire items.

Responding to the feedback obtained from this pilot study, changes were made to the original questionnaire. The summary of changes made to the initial questionnaire after the first stage of pilot study is shown in Table 5.4.

**Table 5.4: Summary of the Modification of Initial Questionnaire in Forming the Final Questionnaire after Pilot Study I**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Types of changes</th>
<th>Initial Questionnaire</th>
<th>Final Questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The items is split into two different item because of double-barreled effect (i.e. respondents may have bias towards evaluating two things at one time)</td>
<td>1.2 The restaurant was clean and tidy</td>
<td>1.2 The restaurant was clean 1.11 The restaurant was tidy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The item is split into two different item because of double-barreled effect (i.e. respondents may have bias towards evaluating two things at one time)</td>
<td>1.7 Staff were helpful and friendly</td>
<td>1.6 Staff were helpful 1.17 Staff were friendly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The initial questionnaire has two items to examine consumer satisfaction i.e.:

1. 7-point scale (terrible-delighted)
2. 7-point scale (completely satisfied-completely dissatisfied)

The item is separated into two because respondents have expressed how confused they are for rating two different things (i.e. food and service) at one time. This could help reducing bias towards double-barreled question.

The meal was as I expected

The food met my expectation

Overall, how do you feel about the food and service at the restaurant?

Overall, how do you feel about the food you received in this restaurant?

Overall, how do you feel about the service you received in this restaurant?

Overall, how do you feel about your dining experience in this restaurant?

Only terrible-delighted scale of consumer satisfaction was examined in the final questionnaire. This is because this scale has been widely accepted.
The question about categorising the type of restaurant is removed because during pilot study, respondents expressed that the descriptions are too long which could create confusion. There is a possibility that different respondent may categorise similar restaurant type differently because people may have different understanding.

The following describe 3 categories of restaurants from fast food (category A) to more formal dining (category C).

Category A.
Category B.
Category C.

Question 16
Please indicate the category of restaurant of which your evaluation in Section 1 to Section 4 are based:
Category A
Category B
Category C
None of these categories

- Pilot Study: Stage II

A total of 60 usable questionnaires were obtained from the large-scale pilot survey, administered to the university staff and students of a university in South East England. This range is assumed to be sufficient because, according to Blumberg et al. (2005), the minimum participation of the pilot study is 5, and the maximum is 100.

The purpose of this pilot study was to assess the reliability and validity of the scales. The discriminant and convergent validity of the scale were assessed with the correlation analysis and exploratory factor analysis with Varimax rotation (Churchill, 1979). The reliability of the scale was assessed by Cronbach's alpha statistic. Although this pilot study was aimed to examine the validity and reliability of the scales, feedback obtained from the respondents was also considered in developing the final questionnaire.
Factor analysis was used to identify and validate the dimensions of the quality attributes that were used to examine consumer perception of quality in a restaurant. Four dimensions were formed in this analysis, which were named food quality I, food quality II, service quality (staff behaviour) and service quality (environmental) (Table 5.5).

Table 5.5: Assessment of Measurement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Standardised factor loading</th>
<th>Cronbach alpha (α)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food quality 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.829</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.759</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.710</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.707</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.655</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.650</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.604</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food quality 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.862</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.521</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service quality:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.772</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physical quality</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.764</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quality</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.699</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.611</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service quality:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.881</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staff behaviour</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.850</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.828</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.775</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.660</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.623</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Desires congruence is a formative measure, four items are single-measure items: intention to return, intention to recommend, intention to switch and overall value for money, so they are not included.

The dimensions of service quality revealed in this study validated the dimensions of service quality in the reference study of Ekinci et al. (2008). The food quality items were split into two groups. All four dimensions were tested for reliability.
Cronbach alpha statistics for these dimensions were: food quality I ($\alpha=0.91$), food quality II ($\alpha=0.52$), service quality (staff behaviour) ($\alpha=0.84$) and service quality (environmental) ($\alpha=0.92$). Nunnally (1978) suggested that the acceptable $\alpha$ value for a reliable construct is 0.60. Based on the analysis, ‘food quality II’ had $\alpha$ value below 0.60. The dimension of food quality II consist of two items i.e. ‘the food contained too much fat’ and ‘the food was about the right size’. This construct was considered unreliable and the related items were removed from the scale.

Correlation analysis was used to examine convergent validity and concurrent validity. Convergent validity is achieved when measures of constructs that are theoretically related to each other are, in fact, observed to be related to each other. Conversely, measures of constructs that are not related theoretically to each other are, in fact observed to be related to each other is concurrent validity. In order to examine the convergent and concurrent validity, all items representing food quality and overall food-quality score and also service-quality items and overall service-quality score were subjected to correlation analyses. The outcome for correlation analyses aimed to examine convergent and concurrent validity and is presented according to the quality dimensions (i.e. food quality and service quality) followed by the correlation table for construct validity. The study's constructs were also subjected to correlation analysis aiming to check for the concurrent and convergent validity of the study's constructs. The correlation table for food-quality dimension is shown in Table 5.6. Table 5.7 depicts the correlation table for service-quality dimension. Finally, correlation table for all constructs examined in this study is shown in Table 5.8.
Table 5.6: Correlation Table for Food-quality Items and Overall Food-quality Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 PRE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 TASTE</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 FRESH</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 SMELT</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 APP</td>
<td>.72**</td>
<td>.77**</td>
<td>.85**</td>
<td>.84**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 PC</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 FAT</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 SIZE</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 TEMP</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 EXP</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 OVERALL</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>.79**</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: PRES: The food was presented and arranged nicely on the plate, TASTE: The food was tasty, FRESH: The food contained fresh ingredients, SMELT: The food smelt nice, APP: The food looked appetising, PC: The food was properly cooked, FAT: The food contained too much fat, SIZE: The food was about the right size, TEMP: The food was served at an appropriate temperature, EXP: The food met my expectation and OVERALL: Overall food quality. *Significant at p<.05. **Significant at p<.01.

As shown in Table 5.6, all food-quality items were significantly correlated with overall food quality except for two items – ‘the food contained too much fat’ and ‘the food was about the right size’. It indicates that concurrent validity does not exist between these two items and overall food-quality score. Meaning, these two items are considered to be a weak determinant of food quality. Similarly, the two items – ‘the food contained too much fat’ and ‘the food was about the right size’ have low correlation with other food-quality items. This implies that convergent validity does not exist between these items with almost all the rest of food-quality items.
Table 5.7: Correlation Table for Service-quality Items and Overall Service-quality Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>DECOR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>LAYOUT</td>
<td>0.54**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CLEAN</td>
<td>0.55**</td>
<td>0.47**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>COMFORT</td>
<td>0.71**</td>
<td>0.55**</td>
<td>0.56**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>HELP &amp; FRIEND</td>
<td>0.43**</td>
<td>0.43**</td>
<td>0.44**</td>
<td>0.50**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ANT</td>
<td>0.37**</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
<td>0.49**</td>
<td>0.39**</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>LIST</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
<td>0.28*</td>
<td>0.37**</td>
<td>0.43**</td>
<td>0.72**</td>
<td>0.54**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>COMP</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.39**</td>
<td>0.40**</td>
<td>0.38**</td>
<td>0.75**</td>
<td>0.55**</td>
<td>0.78**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>EFFICIENT</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.36**</td>
<td>0.49**</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
<td>0.66**</td>
<td>0.59**</td>
<td>0.70**</td>
<td>0.87**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>PROMPT</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.38**</td>
<td>0.47**</td>
<td>0.37**</td>
<td>0.59**</td>
<td>0.54**</td>
<td>0.63**</td>
<td>0.78**</td>
<td>0.89**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>OVERALL</td>
<td>0.40**</td>
<td>0.43**</td>
<td>0.58**</td>
<td>0.43**</td>
<td>0.72**</td>
<td>0.61**</td>
<td>0.72**</td>
<td>0.82**</td>
<td>0.82**</td>
<td>0.74**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ANT: Staff anticipated what I want. HELP: Staff were helpful, PROMPT: Staff were prompt. LIST: Staff listened to me. COMP: Staff were competent. FRIEND: Staff were friendly. NS: Not Significant. *Significant at p<.05. **Significant at p<.01. Figures in italic font were t-value. Figures in bold font were eta-squared values.

Table 5.7 shows that four items have lower correlation with overall service-quality score i.e. 'restaurant had beautiful décor', 'restaurant was comfortable', 'restaurant had attractive layout' and 'restaurant was clean', compared to the rest of other service-quality items. This indicates that concurrent validity is achieved, however the correlation strength for these four items is lower than the correlation between items related to service delivery and overall service quality i.e. 'staff were helpful and friendly' (r=0.72), 'staff anticipated what I wanted' (r=0.61), 'staff listened to me' (r=0.72), 'staff were competent' (r=0.82), 'staff were efficient' (r=0.82) and 'staff were prompt' (r=0.74). This indicates that four items that related to the environmental aspect in restaurant are not a strong predictor of service quality. This supports the outcome of factor analysis that separates these four items with other items that related to the service delivery.

In terms of convergent validity, four items related to environment are found to be correlated to each other. Similarly, quality items related to service delivery were also correlated with each other. A significant high correlation was found between 'staff were efficient' and 'staff were competent' as well as between 'staff were
prompt' and 'staff were efficient'. It is assumed that respondents may have understood the term 'efficient' somewhat as similar meaning to 'competent' and 'prompt'. It is also possible that this may bring confusion in the further study. For that reason, the item 'staff were efficient' is removed in the final questionnaire.

Table 5.8: Means, Standard Deviations and Correlations (between Constructs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PVFM</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>7.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQC</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQEQ</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQSB</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATT</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INRET</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTREC</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTSW</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 5.8 shows that all constructs were significantly related, except for one construct, 'self-congruence'. 'Perceived value-for-money (PVFM)', 'food quality (FQ)', 'service quality (staff behaviour) (SQSB)', service quality (environmental quality) (SQEQ)', 'consumers' post-purchase attitude towards the service firm (ATT)', 'intention to return (INTRET)', 'intention to recommend (INTREC)', 'intention to switch (INTSW) and 'consumer satisfaction (CS)' were significantly related with one other except to 'self-congruence'. As these constructs were related to each other, the inter-relationships of these constructs could be proven in an inter-relationship model, if further analysis is carried out. Table 5.8 also illustrates that, although constructs were related to each other, the relationships were not strong showing that each construct was different from the others. Thus, construct validity was established.

Following the outcome of correlation analyses presented in Table 5.6, Table 5.7 and Table 5.8, changes have been made to the initial questionnaire. Other
modifications made to the initial questionnaire included adding an additional question regarding employment status, modifying answer options for questions related to reason for eating out, company of eating out and income. These modifications are summarised in Table 5.9.

**Table 5.9: Summary of the Modification of Initial Questionnaire in Forming the Final Questionnaire after Pilot Study II**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Types of changes</th>
<th>Initial Questionnaire</th>
<th>Final Questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>The item is removed because it is highly correlated with item ‘staff were prompt’ and ‘staff were competent’</td>
<td>1.18 Staff were efficient in service</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The item is removed. Factor analyses shows that these two items are separated from other food-quality items. These two items have low reliability (( \alpha = 0.52 )). These two items did not highly correlated with overall food-quality score indicating that these two items are not really criteria of food quality.</td>
<td>1.6 The food was about the right size 1.12 The food contained too much fat</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Chapter 5: Methodology

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **6** | A part of question 5 was removed because similar question was asked in another section in the questionnaire. | Among examples of restaurants below, which restaurant best represents the restaurant you have been to?  
- Fast food restaurant (e.g. McDonald restaurant)  
- Popular quick service restaurant (e.g. Pizza Hut restaurant)  
- Full waiter-service restaurant  
Now, imagine the kind of person who typically visits this restaurant... |
| **9** | A slight change was made to the answer options. | Question 18  
What was the reason for eating out this specific occasion?  
- Leisure  
- Family celebration  
- Businesses  
- Time (lack of time to cook)  
- If other, please specify:  
Question 17  
What was the reason for eating out on this specific occasion?  
- Leisure  
- Celebration  
- Business  
- Convenience (lack of time to cook)  
- If other, please specify:  

### Additional question about personal adjectives was asked.

Respondents were asked to write the adjectives that they have imagined. This helps respondents to recall the adjective that they have imagined.

Respondents were asked to write adjectives without having to write the adjectives.

### Changes made to the answer options according to the feedback obtained from the pilot study.

Question 19  
Who do you eat out with on this specific occasion?  
- Family  
- Friend  
- Relative  
- If other, please specify:  

Question 18  
Who do you eat out with on this specific occasion? Please tick (√) all that applies to you.  
- Immediate family, including children  
- Relative(s)  
- Friend(s)  
- Boyfriend/girlfriend/partner  
- Work colleague  
- Business clients  
- No one  
- If other, please specify:  

146
11 Changes made to the answer options according to the UK education system. | Question 22 | Which of the following represents your highest education level? | Question 21 | Which of the following represents your highest education level? |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Less than high school</td>
<td>- Less than secondary school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- High school</td>
<td>- Completed secondary school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Some college, but no degree</td>
<td>- Completed university diploma/degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Bachelor degree</td>
<td>- Completed postgraduate degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12 A question on employment status was added into the questionnaire to examine the influence of employment status with constructs (e.g. consumer satisfaction) | - | Question 22 | What is your employment status? |

13 Changes were made to the question regarding income. The annual income was asked instead of monthly income because it can better reflect the national data. | Question 23 | Which of the following represents your net monthly income? | Question 23 | Which of the following represents your gross annual income? |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Below £500</td>
<td>- Up to £15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- £500 - £1000</td>
<td>- £15,001 to £30,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- £1001 - £1500</td>
<td>- £30,001 to £45,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- £1501 - £2000</td>
<td>- £45,001 to £60,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Over £2001</td>
<td>- £60,001 to £75,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- £75,001 to £100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- £100,001 and more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.9 shows the modification made on the initial questionnaire in forming the final questionnaire. The final questionnaire is attached in Appendix IX.

5.5.3 Sampling Process

5.5.3.1 Population and Sample

A sample is "a group of units chosen to be included in a study" (Sarantakos, 1998: p.468). The present study aimed to investigate satisfaction from the perspective of restaurant patrons. The population of this study was restaurant patrons. Considering the availability of resources, particularly the financial
support and time available, collecting data from the entire population was not possible. For that reason, a specific condition was applied to select the sample for study. English consumers were selected as the sample for this study because they were the largest population in the UK (Office for National Statistics, 2001). It is important that the present study selected restaurant patrons who ate in and who had been served in the restaurant to ensure that the overall dining experience could be captured by the consumers. Finally, this study required consumers who had visited restaurants recently to ensure that they were able to recall their experience in the restaurant.

5.5.3.2 Sampling Methods

'Sampling' is a method to choose a sample in a research (Sarantakos, 1998). Sampling methods can either be probability or non-probability methods (Sekaran, 2003). Each element in the population has a known chance to be selected as a sample subject, if probability method is used. This method can be carried out by random sampling, systematic sampling, or stratified sampling. On the other hand, each element in non-probability sampling is selected from the population in a non-random manner. These include convenience sampling, judgement sampling, quota sampling, and snowball sampling.

The non-probability sampling is chosen for collecting data in this study. This sampling method is assumed to be appropriate for the present study because non-probability sampling can be used in a study where the researcher has specific criteria of how and why people get included in the study and the researcher does not have enough information about the population to undertake probability sampling of that particular sample (Denscombe, 2007). From the various types of non-probability sampling available, convenience sampling was used to obtain data. In convenience sampling, the researcher takes whatever sample is available, as long as the sample fits the research context and purposes (Punch, 2005).
Stages of Sampling

A town in the South East of England was chosen as the sampling location. Within this town, sampling was carried out at several locations as illustrated in Figure 5.5.

Figure 5.5: Guildford Borough Map and the Sampling Locations

Figure 5.5 shows the sampling locations (marked with yellow round marker). Initially, sampling involved face-to-face administered questionnaires to the consumers in Guildford town centre, because it was the main spot where potential respondents could be found. Self-administered survey was selected because it could provide a higher response rate and it could establish rapport and motivate respondents to take part in the study (Sekaran, 2003). This however did not happen in the present study. After sampling for two weeks, Stage II was carried out as a result of a low response rate (n=38) in Stage I. In Stage II, mail questionnaire was chosen for sampling because a wide geographical area could be covered (Sekaran, 2003). Following that, other locations in Guildford (as in Figure 5.5) were included as sampling locations. Both stages used convenience sampling method. Incentive in a form of a chance to win a shopping voucher was also offered to the respondents in both sampling stages (stage I and stage II), in order to increase response rate.
Stage I: Self-administered Questionnaire
In this stage, potential respondents were approached. Once consent was obtained, the procedure for administering the survey as shown in Figure 5.6 was carried out.
As shown in Figure 5.6, the procedure for administering the questionnaire started with the researcher introducing herself and the study to the potential respondent. The screening questions (Question 1 to Question 4) were then asked and if all
questions were answered 'yes', the next step was continued. On the other hand, if any of the screening questions were answered 'no', the procedure was ended. After screening, the potential respondent was asked for confirmation of willingness to participate in the survey. When they agreed, they were asked if they would like to complete the questionnaire at that point or later at their own convenience. The respondent who preferred to complete the questionnaire at that point was given a questionnaire attached to a clipboard and a pen. The researcher allocated space and time for the respondent to complete the questionnaire. When a participant preferred to complete the questionnaire at a later time, a questionnaire with a cover letter containing information about the study, together with a FREEPOST, researcher-addressed envelope, was provided.

- **Stage II: Mail Questionnaire**
  This first stage of sampling was terminated after two weeks due to a low response rate (n=38). A mail questionnaire was then used for sampling. The questionnaire, together with a cover letter informing potential participants about the study and a researcher-addressed FREEPOST envelope was inserted in the mailbox in the housing areas as marked in Figure 5.5. Similar to stage I, samples must be selected based on several criterion, thus the qualifying conditions were clearly stated in the cover letter. Based on those conditions, the potential respondents had to self-assess whether they were qualified to take part in the study. The potential respondents were free to decide on their participation and could return the completed questionnaire at their convenience by the deadline stated in the cover letter.

- **Sample Size**
  In total, 320 questionnaires were obtained in this study. 38 questionnaires were obtained from stage I of sampling while 282 questionnaires were obtained from stage II of sampling. T-test analyses were carried out to examine the influence of
approach of sampling on how respondents responded to the constructs examined in this study. The result of the analyses is shown in Table 5.10.

Table 5.10: The t-test Result examining the Influence of Sampling Method on the Construct' Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>Method of Sampling</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FQ</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>34.14</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQSB</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>24.97</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEQQ</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>20.32</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>-.72</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATT</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVFM</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTRET</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTREC</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTSW</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-.68</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 5.10 demonstrates that sampling method did not significantly influence how respondents responded to the questionnaire. P values for all comparison of construct' scores were above 0.05, showing that there was no significant difference in respondents' responses with the different sampling approaches. Further analyses regarding sample size were carried out in order to ensure that sample size was sufficient for multiple-regression analyses. This is discussed in section 5.5.4.6.
5.5.4 Data Analysis
The completed questionnaires obtained from the main survey was prepared by coding the questions for analysis. Data were analysed with statistical software – Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) version 16. Analyses involved deriving descriptive statistics, normality test of data, factor analysis, correlation analysis, t-test analysis and regression analysis.

5.5.4.1 Descriptive Statistics Analysis
This analysis provided summary statistics including mean, median and standard deviation. This information was also used to describe the characteristics of the sample and to check the variables for any violation of the assumptions underlying other statistical techniques (e.g. t-test, ANOVA) (Pallant, 2001).

5.5.4.2 Normality Test of Data
The normality test of the variables was conducted after cleaning the data and before conducting further statistical analysis, using either statistical or graphical methods (Hair et al., 2006; Tabachnick and Fidell, 2007). Two of the more common statistical measures of normality are: skewness and kurtosis. The value of skewness and kurtosis provide information on the distribution of data when compared with a normal distribution. Skewness measures the symmetry of a distribution while kurtosis measures the peakedness or flatness of a distribution (Hair et al., 2006). Normal distribution is achieved when the value of skewness is within the range of -1 to +1 (Hair et al., 2006). The graphical method to test normality is discussed in section 5.5.4.6.

5.5.4.3 Factor Analysis
Factor analysis with principal component extraction and Varimax rotation was carried out on all quality items (food, staff behaviour and environmental quality) to identify the underlying dimensions. According to Hair et al. (2006), several criteria support the factorability of data:
1. The correlation matrix should exhibit at least some correlations of 0.3 and above.

2. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy (KMO) value should exceed 0.6 (Kaiser, 1970, 1974).

3. The Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity (Bartlett, 1954) should achieve statistical significance of $p < 0.05$.

An eigenvalue test and the scree test were used to determine the number of factors that could be extracted to capture quality dimensions in restaurants. Factors with an eigenvalue of 1.0 and above are considered significant and accepted for further investigation (Pallant, 2001). Scree test involves inspecting the change (or elbow) in the shape of the plot. All factors above the elbow or break in the plot should be retained because these factors contribute the most to the explanation of the variance in the data set (Pallant 2001). The significant-factor loading based on sample size, as suggested by Hair et al. (2006) was used to identify significant-factor loading in this study. Factor loadings range from +1 to -1. This guideline is shown in Table 5.11.

**Table 5.11: Guidelines for Identifying Significant-factor Loadings based on Sample Size**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor loading</th>
<th>Sample size needed for significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.30</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.35</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.40</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.45</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.50</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.55</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.60</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.65</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.70</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.75</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The sample size obtained in this study was 301 (this is discussed in section 5.5.4.6.). The significant-factor loadings used in this study were set to 0.35 as sample size obtained was more than 250 and below 350.
5.5.4.4 Correlation Analysis

This analysis is the widely-used technique to examine construct validity (Sekaran, 2003). Correlation analyses were carried out between all variables;

- Independent variables; food quality, service quality I (staff behaviour), service quality II (environmental quality), perceived value-for-money, desires-congruence and self-congruence.
- Dependent variables; intention to return, intention to recommend, intention to switch and overall consumer attitude to the service firm.
- Mediating variable; overall consumer satisfaction

Correlation coefficients provide information on the strength and direction of the relationship between two variables (Pallant, 2001).

Construct validity is established through measuring convergent and discriminant validity. Convergent validity is established when two instruments measuring the concept are highly correlated. On the other hand, discriminant validity is ascertained when the measurements have a low correlation with a variable that is supposed to be unrelated to this variable (Sekaran, 2003).

5.5.4.5 Reliability Test

Cronbach’s alpha statistic was used to examine the internal consistency (reliability) of the food quality, service quality (staff behaviour) and service quality (environmental quality) scales. When the items and the subsets of the items measuring similar construct are highly correlated, inter-item consistency reliability is achieved (Churchill, 1979). Nunnally and Bernstein (1994) suggested that a coefficient alpha value of 0.70 for exploratory measures indicates a strong item covariance or homogeneity. In addition, Sekaran (2003) stated that the higher the coefficient, the better the measuring instrument is in terms of reliability.

5.5.4.6 Regression Analysis

The objective of multiple regression analysis is to predict a single dependent variable when the problem involves two-or-more independent variables (Hair et
The present study used multiple regression analysis to examine the relationships between six independent variables and four dependent variables. The effect of the mediating variable was also tested on this relationship. The independent variables examined in this study were: 'food quality', 'service quality (staff behaviour)', 'service quality (environmental)', 'perceived value-for-money', 'ideal self-congruence' and 'desires-congruence'. Dependent variables were: 'intention to return', 'intention to recommend', 'intention to switch' and 'post-purchase attitude towards the service firm'. The mediating variable was 'consumer satisfaction'. It is assumed that, by having a number of variables, using multiple regressions is suitable to examine multiple relationships.

There are several statistical criteria that need to be examined when using multiple-regression analysis for hypotheses testing (Hair et al., 2006). These statistical criteria and their rule of thumbs as in Hair et al. (2006) and Pallant (2001) are depicted in Table 5.12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statistical Criteria</th>
<th>Rule of Thumb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Statistical significance (P value) of overall regression model.</td>
<td>$P &lt; 0.05^{*}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Multiple $R^2$ signifies how much variance in the dependent variable is explained by the model.</td>
<td>Multiple $R^2$ ranges from 0 to + 1.0. The larger $R^2$ indicates stronger relationship between independent and dependent variables.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Beta coefficients provide size of influence and the direction (positive/negative) of independent variable upon dependent variable.</td>
<td>The higher the beta values, the greater influence that particular independent variable has on the dependent variable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The significance of beta coefficient indicates whether the variable is making a statistically-significant unique contribution to the model.</td>
<td>Sig. value $&lt; 0.05$ indicates independent variable is making significant unique contribution to predict dependent variable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *Hair et al. (2006) *Pallant (2001)

The statistical criteria and rule of thumb for regression model illustrated in Table 5.12 were used to interpret the outcome of multiple-regression analyses in this study.
This study examined the mediating effect of consumer satisfaction between antecedents and consequences of consumer satisfaction. In order to examine these relationships, the Baron and Kenny (1986) procedure was followed. According to Baron and Kenny (1986), a mediating effect occurs when:

1. There is a significant relationship between independent variables and the mediating variable.
2. There is a significant relationship between independent variables and the dependent variable.
3. The significant relationship between the independents variables and the dependent variable disappear (fully mediated) or the significance of that particular relationship is reduced (partially mediated) when the mediating variable was included into the model.

Multiple regressions make a number of assumptions about the data to ensure that data are not violated (Pallant, 2001). Basic assumptions for regression models relate to sample size, normality, homoscedasticity, multicollinearity and outliers (Hair et al., 2006 and Tabachnick and Fidell, 2007). The data of the main survey were tested for the assumptions of multiple regressions. The outputs of the tests are discussed in the following sections.

Sample Size

320 questionnaires were obtained in this study. 19 questionnaires cannot be used because 11 questionnaires contained incomplete responses and 8 cases were outliers. Finally, 301 usable questionnaires were subjected for further analyses. The formula to calculate sample-size requirement for multiple regression is $N > 50 + 8m$, where $m$ is the number of independent variables (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2007). The present study had six independent variables; ‘food quality’, ‘service quality (staff behaviour)’, ‘service quality (environmental)’, ‘perceived value-for-money’, ‘ideal self-congruence’ and ‘desires-congruence’. Using the formula proposed by Tabachnick and Fidell (2007), the present study should have a sample size of more than 98 ($50 + 8(6)$). The sample size obtained
in this study was 301 which exceeded the rule of thumb. It is important that a study has an adequate sample size to ensure that the results of the study can be generalised to other samples (Pallant, 2001).

- **Normality of the Data**
The normal probability plot is a graphical method that can be used to examine normality of data. Through this observation, normal distribution is achieved when points (data) lie in a reasonably straight diagonal line from bottom left to top right (Pallant, 2001). The normal probability plots for four dependent variables are shown in Figure 5.7.

**Figure 5.7: Normal P-P Plot of Regression Standardised Residual of Dependent Variables; (a) Intention to Return, (b) Intention to Recommend, (c) Intention to Switch and (d) Post-purchase Attitude towards the Service Firm**

It is observed in Figure 5.7 that the normal probability plot for four dependent variables are somewhat normal as the line representing the actual data
distribution closely follows the straight diagonal line. These plots represent a normal distribution in the data.

- Homoscedasticity of Residuals

Pallant (2001: p.137) stated that "homoscedasticity is obtained when the variance of the residuals about predicted dependent variable scores are the same for all predicted scores". In the scatterplot of the standardised residuals, residuals should be roughly rectangularly distributed, with most of the scores concentrated in the centre (along the 0 point) (Pallant, 2001). The scatter plots of regression standardised residual for four dependent variables are demonstrated in Figure 5.8.

**Figure 5.8: Scatterplot of Regression Standardised Residual of Dependent Variables; (a) intention to Return, (b) Intention to Recommend, (c) Intention to Switch and (d) Post-purchase Attitude towards the Service Firm**

Figure 5.8 shows four scatterplots of the regression standardised residual of dependent variables. It is observed that the scatterplot of the standardised residuals for all dependent variables are to some extent rectangularly distributed,
with most of the scores concentrated in the centre (along the 0 point). It is assumed that homoscedasticity of residuals is achieved.

**Multicollinearity**

There are three ways to examine multicollinearity in the data: (1) the correlation between independent variables is less than 0.90, (2) the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) value should be below 10 and, (3) the tolerance value should be above 0.10 (Hair et al. 2006). It is observed in the correlation matrix (see Table 7.7 in Section 7.6) that none of the independent variables of the present study has r value of more than 0.90. This shows that multicollinearity did not occur; therefore, all variables could be used in further analysis (Pallant, 2001). Table 5.13 depicts the VIF and tolerance values in the present study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships examined</th>
<th>VIF value</th>
<th>Tolerance value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent variables and mediating variable (consumer satisfaction)</td>
<td>1.09 - 2.59</td>
<td>0.39 - 0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to return</td>
<td>1.06 - 2.33</td>
<td>0.43 - 0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to recommend</td>
<td>1.05 - 2.42</td>
<td>0.41 - 0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to switch</td>
<td>1.08 - 2.64</td>
<td>0.38 - 0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-purchase attitude towards restaurant</td>
<td>1.06 - 2.32</td>
<td>0.43 - 0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent variables and dependent variables</td>
<td>1.09 - 2.33</td>
<td>0.43 - 0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to return</td>
<td>1.07 - 2.44</td>
<td>0.41 - 0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to switch</td>
<td>1.11 - 2.65</td>
<td>0.38 - 0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-purchase attitude towards restaurant</td>
<td>1.09 - 2.32</td>
<td>0.43 - 0.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Independent variables are ‘food quality’, ‘service quality(staff behaviour’, ‘service quality(environmental), ‘perceived value-for-money’, ‘ideal self-congruence’, ‘desires-congruence’

Table 5.13 illustrates that none of the VIF values exceeds the cut-off value of 10. In addition, none of variables have a tolerance value of less than 0.10. It is concluded that the present data passed the three assessments of multicollinearity.
Outliers

Three ways to verify the presence of outliers in the data are by observing (1) boxplot, (2) standardised residuals and (3) Mahalanobis and Cook's distance value. Examination of outliers was carried out by observation on boxplots. Scores that appear as little circles with a number attached are outliers (Pallant, 2001). These numbers are the ID number of the case. Scores that are marked with asterisk (*) are extreme points which are the extreme outliers. None of the cases was marked with asterisk. Thus, all cases were retained at this stage.

Next, examination of the standardised residuals was carried out. Outliers are cases which have residuals beyond the range of +3.3 and -3.3 (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2007). The standardised residuals for all relationships models identified 4 cases that fell outside the recommended standardised residuals. These cases were ID 108, ID 242, ID 130 and ID 201. All cases which were identified as outliers were removed.

Another essential method to examine the presence of outliers is by examining the value of Mahalanobis distance and Cook's distance. In order to identify which cases are outliers, the critical chi-square value must be determined using the number of independent variables as the degrees of freedom (Pallant, 2001). The guidelines for determining the critical chi-square value based on the number of independent variables is shown in Table 5.14. Once critical value has been determined, the value of Mahalanobis distance (which could be created by SPSS) is compared with this critical value. Outliers are the cases which have a critical value that exceeds this value.
Table 5.14: Guidelines to Determine the Critical Chi-Square Value based on Number of Independent Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Independent Variable</th>
<th>Critical Chi-Square Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>22.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>24.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Pallant (2001, p. 144, as proposed by Tabachnick and Fidell, 1996)

The present study had six independent variables, so the critical value was 22.46 (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2007). Outliers were the cases which have a critical value that exceeded this value. As for Cook’s distance value, outliers are the cases which have this value of more than 1 (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2007). Only four cases (ID 291, ID 263, ID 159 and ID127) were found to have a critical value of more than 22.46 and none of the cases had Cook’s distance values of more than 1. All cases identified as outliers were removed. All together, 8 cases were removed.

5.5.4.7 Comparison of Means

Comparison of means is used to assess differences between groups or conditions (Pallant, 2001). The appropriate test depends on the numbers of groups to be compared. Independent Samples t-test is used to compare the mean scores of two different groups of people or conditions. Mean scores for the same group of people on two different occasions can be compared with Paired Samples t-test (Pallant, 2001). Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) is used to compare mean scores of two or more different groups. For both t-tests and ANOVA, significant difference in the mean scores is obtained if the p value is equal or less than .05.

The present study used Independent Sample t-test and Analysis of Variance to compare means of responses and demographic background of respondents.
Paired Samples t-test was used to compare means of items used to examine ‘food quality’, ‘service quality (staff behaviour)’ and ‘service quality (environmental)’. In order to determine the effect size among the scores of all quality dimensions examined in this study, eta squared was calculated using this formula: $\frac{t^2}{t^2+N -1}$ (Cohen, 1988). The guideline to interpret ‘eta squared’ is shown in Table 5.15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eta squared</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.01</td>
<td>Small effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.06</td>
<td>Moderate effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.14</td>
<td>Large effect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.15: Guidelines to Interpret Eta Squared

In ANOVA analyses, Post-Hoc test is used to identify the specific group that result in the significance difference in the ANOVA table (Pallant, 2001). Because of unequal sample size for demographic variables, this study used Gabriel and Hochberg procedures for Post-Hoc test. Gabriel’s procedure can be used when the sample size within the group are slightly different, whilst Hochberg’s procedure is suitable for the group that has very different sample sizes (Field, 2000).

5.6 Summary

This chapter has discussed the methodology employed in the present study which is developed aligned with the research objectives. Two method of data collection are used: interview and questionnaire survey. Findings of interview led to the formation of the questionnaire. In the questionnaire design section, the measurements of variables that were examined in the study were described. The questionnaire has been pre-tested for its content and has been revised before proceeding to the pilot study with a larger sample. The large-scale pilot study proved that the scales were reliable and valid, however two items from the food quality dimension were removed. The main survey was conducted with a sample
of English patrons who ate in and who had been served in a restaurant recently (past 2 weeks). Sampling involved two stages. A face-to-face administration questionnaire was carried out in stage I. Mail questionnaire was used in stage II as a result of a low response rate in Stage I. The types of analyses used for analysis data were discussed. The results for the interviews are discussed in the next chapter.
Chapter Six

Findings and Discussion of the Interview

6.0 Introduction

This chapter discusses the findings of the interview. The interviews were conducted on an voluntary basis to investigate the themes that affect guest experience and the themes contributing to quality of food. The interviews were used in constructing a questionnaire. Section 6.1 describes the backgrounds of interview participants. Section 6.2 discusses the findings of interviews including the themes interfering customers setting out experience in restaurants with food that satisfy customers.

Another theme discussed in this section is the interview with interviewers. We ask 'what is a quality?'

6.1 The Background of Participants

Interviews were conducted with 15 participants in a restaurant business. The average length of interview for each person was about 60 minutes. Interviews were conducted at the respondents' place or in the respondents' restaurants. The summary of participants' perspectives is given below.
CHAPTER SIX
FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION OF THE INTERVIEW

6.0 Introduction
This chapter discusses the findings of the interview. The interviews were conducted on an exploratory basis to investigate the themes that affect consumers' eating-out experience and the themes contributing to quality of food. These themes were used in constructing a questionnaire. Section 6.1 demonstrates the backgrounds of interview participants. Section 6.2 discusses the findings of interviews involving the themes influencing consumers' eating-out experience in restaurants which coincides with factors that satisfy consumers. Another theme discussed in this section is concerns with consumers' view on 'what is a quality food'.

6.1 The Background of Participants
Interviews were conducted with 15 participants on a face-to-face basis. The average length of interview for each person was 20 to 30 minutes. Interviews were conducted at the respondents' office or in teaching rooms in the university. The summary of participants' backgrounds is shown in Table 6.1.
Table 6.1: Profiles of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Income/month (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>More than 1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>1000-1499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>1000-1499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>More than 1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>More than 1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>1000-1499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>More than 1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>1000-1499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>More than 1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Up to 25</td>
<td>Less than 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>Less than 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>More than 1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>More than 1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>More than 1500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of participants were aged between 25 to 34 years. Most of the participants received more than £1000 income monthly. Participants can be classified into two main groups: university staff and students. University staff included lecturers, research staff, administration staff and supporting staff. Participants had visited and ate in table-service restaurants. All participants ate out for leisure purposes.

6.2 Results and Discussion

Content analysis was used to analyse information from the interviews. Two themes obtained from the interview were (1) factors influencing consumer eating-out experience in restaurant, and (2) quality attributes of food. These themes are summarised in Figure 6.1.
6.2.1 Factors Influencing Eating-out Experience in Restaurants

Factors influencing eating-out experience as explained by participants included: (1) service delivery, (2) food, (3) environment of restaurant, and (4) price and value-for-money.

6.2.1.1 The Service Delivery

This theme involved aspects related to restaurant staffs' behaviour in delivering the service and their ability to perform their work. These include four themes: attentiveness of restaurant staff, promptness of restaurant staff in service delivery, friendliness and competency in delivering service.
Participants have expressed their good feeling when restaurant staff were attentive during delivering service. Table 6.2 illustrates the forms of staff attentiveness in restaurant as addressed in the interviews.

**Table 6.2: Example of Staff' Attentiveness as revealed in the Interviews**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forms of Staff' Attentiveness</th>
<th>Extracts from the Interview</th>
<th>Participant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During meals, participants liked being asked by waiters whether 'everything is ok'.</td>
<td>&quot;The waiter was attentive. That was very good. They (waiters) checked that we had everything.&quot;</td>
<td>No.5, Male/45-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another respondent expressed that restaurant staff were attentive in such a way that they asked consumer's opinion about the food during having the meals.</td>
<td>&quot;I like it when staff served you and they asked you whether 'do you have any complaints about the food'. They asked you whether the food was ok or not. It shows how concerned they are&quot;</td>
<td>No.11, Female/age up to 25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"The word 'service' commonly carries a connotation of interpersonal attentiveness" (Johns, 1999: p.963) which indicating that attentiveness is essential in service delivery. Previous studies have supported this idea. Heung et al. (2000) found that airport-restaurant consumers expressed adequate service was obtained when restaurant staff cares about guests. Andaleeb and Conway (2006) revealed that staff attentiveness together with 'helpful', 'prompt', 'neat appearance', 'understood needs', 'courteous' and 'knowledge of menu' became an important factor that explain customer satisfaction in the full-service restaurant industry.

Besides attentiveness of service, speed of service created favourable eating-out experience. A consumer expressed her favourable experience getting a meal within a short period of time:

"I like it when they served very quickly. Once we order it, we got the food in less than 20 minutes" (No.11, Female/age up to 25)
Speed of service was important in various types of restaurant: fast-food restaurants (e.g. Law et al., 2004), and table-service restaurants (e.g. Andaleeb and Conway, 2006) It is because consumers were highly sensitive to the speed of service delivery (The Wall Street Journal, 1990). As an instance, slow-service delivery may influence consumers' overall perceptions of service quality (Maister, 1985). Therefore, if consumers expected a service to be delivered promptly, they are likely to assess the service more highly (Dabholkar, 1996).

During waiter-consumer interaction, friendliness of waiter and chef resulted in pleasant eating-out experience. Table 6.3 shows the restaurant' staff behaviour concerning friendliness, as expressed in the interviews.

**Table 6.3: Restaurant' Staff Behaviour concerning Friendliness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position of Restaurant Staff</th>
<th>Extracts from the Interview</th>
<th>Participant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waiter</td>
<td>&quot;I think service wise, they were good. Most of the time, I found young people (waiters) smile and bubbly serving. I never saw anybody showing their tiredness on the consumers. It makes me and my family happy. &quot;</td>
<td>No.1, Male/age 25-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chef</td>
<td>&quot;They (waiters) were very nice. Nice people working in there. They came over and introduced themselves. They said hello but not all at one time either. It was a warm welcome. And of course the head chef came out as well at the end of the day and said hello. It was very good. We had a great time there.&quot;</td>
<td>No.5, Male/age 45-54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results of interview indicated that friendliness of restaurant staff was expressed by smiling and greeting. These actions will give positive dining experience to restaurant consumers. According to Silverstro and Johnston (1990: 1849), friendliness is "the warmth and personal approachability (rather than physical approachability) of the service, particularly of contact staff including cheerful attitude, the ability to make the consumer feel welcome". Wall and Berry (2007) explained that a restaurant has humanic clues which involved body language,
tone of voice, and level of enthusiasm, which could be represented by the warm, friendly smile and sincere greeting of a restaurant hostess. It is assumed that the outcome of the interview tended to support the findings of past studies.

Competency and efficiency of restaurant staff while delivering service also created a pleasant eating-out experience. The forms of staff competency and efficiency in delivering service mentioned in the interviews are shown in Table 6.4.

Table 6.4: Example of Staff Competency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forms of Staff Competency</th>
<th>Extracts from the Interview</th>
<th>Participant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waiter was knowledgeable.</td>
<td>&quot;There was one Polish waiter. He had learnt all about cheese. It was great to have him explained about various types of cheese, as well as its taste and originality. He even recommended us a good cheese. It was a fantastic experience we had in that restaurant!&quot;</td>
<td>No.5, Male/age 45-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiter was able to handle special request</td>
<td>&quot;I wanted a vegetarian meal but they didn't have vegetarian options for a particular menu (that I would like to order). So, I asked them to remove any chicken or beef in that particular menu. They did it. I was delighted with that&quot;</td>
<td>No.11, Female/age up to 25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similar to the present interview results, Pizam and Ellis (1999) stated that the service attribute involved in a restaurant-meal experience included the competency of restaurant staff, their responsiveness to special requests and their responsiveness to complaints. Similarly, Namkung and Jang (2008) revealed that service provider's traits are critical attributes that affect diner's high satisfaction. Therefore, employees should have the knowledge, skills, and motivations to take steps to correct any flaws and make the dining experience better for the customers (Namkung and Jang, 2008).

6.2.1.2 The Food

This theme is related to favourable or unfavourable experience related to food experienced by the consumers in the restaurants. Three main criteria related to
food addressed in the interviews were ‘tastiness of food’, ‘freshness of food’ and ‘appearance of food’. The extracts that addressed these aspects are illustrated in Table 6.5.

Table 6.5: The Common Food Criteria as Revealed in the Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food Criteria</th>
<th>Extracts from the Interview</th>
<th>Participant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taste</td>
<td>&quot;I think the main reason we went there was because the food is always good. It tastes nice. We all had something different from the menu and none of us could decide whose meal had the most delicious taste. We had a great time back there and this restaurant would definitely be my favourite.&quot;</td>
<td>No.9, Female/age 35-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshness</td>
<td>&quot;Food was excellent! We had a fresh seafood dish. Having a fresh food gives certain level of confidence that the food is good to eat. One thing when you go to the restaurant is because of freshness of food.&quot;</td>
<td>No.6: Female/age 25 – 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance</td>
<td>&quot;Before I try the food in restaurant, I prefer it to look nice. It gives me a good feeling. ... They decorated the food so you feel like ‘Oh! They really make something very nice to eat’, before I eat it. So, it’s good.&quot;</td>
<td>No.3: Female/age 25 – 34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These findings support the idea that ‘taste of food’, ‘freshness of food’, and ‘appearance of food’ in a restaurant influence both customers’ selection of restaurant and customers’ eating-out experience. These findings of the current study are consistent with past studies that have noted that the most essential part of the restaurant experience is ‘food quality’, which includes an appealing taste, freshness, menu item variety, and appealing presentation, influencing customer satisfaction (Johns and Tyas, 1996; Kivela et al., 1999; Raajpoot, 2002). This is possibly because ‘food quality’ is an important characteristic of food in the food-consumption experience (Fischer, 2005) and it was a dominant factor in the food choice (Jang et al., 2009).

6.2.1.3 The Environment of the Restaurant

This theme is related to the environmental aspects in a restaurant that influenced respondents’ eating-out experience. These included aspects of décor in
restaurant, cleanliness in restaurant and design and layout of restaurant. Table 6.6 illustrates how décor influences peoples' pleasantness in eating out.

Table 6.6: Influence of Décor in Eating-out Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pleasantness in Eating Out</th>
<th>Extracts from the Interview</th>
<th>Participant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Décor creates positive experience</td>
<td>“I like this restaurant which had a lot of old photographs on the wall. I was not only enjoying the food and the environment, but also enjoying the history of the restaurant.”</td>
<td>No.3, Female/age 25-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Décor creates negative experience</td>
<td>“The décor in this restaurant was awful. I've not enjoying it. The décor was really cheap and old fashioned. The dining area was painted with 'coating' paint. The furniture was cheap. It was not enjoyable at all”</td>
<td>No.10, Male/age 55-64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These findings support the idea that restaurant décor was an important factor to enhance restaurant-patrons’ culinary experiences (Sparks et al., 2003). Managers should consider their target customers’ tastes and preferences when decorating a restaurant in order to create favourable dining atmospherics (Liu and Jang, 2009).

Cleanliness was important in a restaurant, however participants did not relate it to their satisfaction in a restaurant.

“Toilet was very important to restaurant. It's good that the toilets in that restaurant were very clean” (No.9, Female/age 35-44)

The only environmental aspect found as a common attribute examined in the past studies is ‘cleanliness’ (See section 2.3.1). Some respondents expressed the importance of cleanliness in a restaurant in general, others addressed the importance of the cleanliness of everything in a restaurant. Kwon et al. (2005) examined high-school students’ satisfaction in school foodservice and revealed that the highest mean score was rated for food hygiene followed by cleanliness of utensils, cleanliness of dining area, cleanliness of tray, staff hygiene and
cleanliness of tables and chairs. Cleanliness was vital in a restaurant because it affected consumer enjoyment and satisfaction in a restaurant. The findings of Cheol (2004) indicated that cleanliness in a restaurant affected consumers' enjoyment during eating out. Therefore, cleanliness should be maintained at all aspects to provide pleasure throughout consumer's eating-out experience.

Findings of interview also showed that restaurant consumers considered that the design and layout in a restaurant was important. The extracts that addressed participants' views about design and layout are illustrated in Table 6.7.

Table 6.7: The Design and Layout Criteria as revealed in the Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Extracts from the Interview</th>
<th>Participant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attractive layout</td>
<td>&quot;The layout in the dining area was quite versatile and very attractively done. I like the way they put things together. It was quite tricky but nicely done. I like it there very much&quot;</td>
<td>No.8, Female/age 55-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowding layout</td>
<td>&quot;The dining room was quite crowded. It may be because of the way they (restaurant management) arranged the tables. It seems like they want to fit everything within the available space.&quot;</td>
<td>No.15, Female/age 25-34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Design of a restaurant is a medium to create attention in a restaurant because it assists to create a distinctive restaurant atmosphere (Wall and Berry, 2007). Not only that, layout in a restaurant can influence restaurant customers' positive emotions in a restaurant (Liu and Jang, 2009b; Ryu and Jang, 2007). One aspect in designing layout in restaurants includes spaciousness in the dining area, which has been revealed in the interview. Spaciousness is related directly to the size of the interior space and the openness in the space (Bhatia, 2003). Factors that contributed to the openness of space are higher ceilings, large openings with a view to the outdoors and unobstructed spaces. (Scott, 1993). In addition, openness in the space can be created by having side furniture arrangement that can reduce crowding (Sinha and Prakashvati, 1995). It is therefore important to
take layout into consideration when setting up a restaurant because layout could enhance ones mood and pleasure in a restaurant (Robson, 1999).

6.2.1.4 The Price and Value-for-Money
The theme price and value-for-money relate to participants’ perception towards price and how value-for-money was obtained for the money spent.

One respondent expressed the link between reasonable price and return visit to restaurant.

“There are about 5 restaurants in the village and this particular restaurant produced the best food at the most reasonable price. Once we tried it we found ourselves keep going back there”. (No.13, Male/age 55-64)

Similar to the current interview, Almanza et al. (1994) found that consumers, particularly students, recognised the importance of reasonable price. Gupta et al. (2007) supports the link between the ‘appropriateness of cost’ and ‘consumer willingness to return to restaurants’ that were found in the present interview.

Besides price, interviewed participants revealed that value-for-money was judged by comparing the money spent with either the ‘quantity of a meal’ and/or with the ‘quality of meal’. Different criteria of value-for-money expressed by participants are shown in Table 6.8.
### Table 6.8: Criteria of Value-for-Money

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria of Value-for-Money</th>
<th>Extracts from the Interview</th>
<th>Participant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small amount of money spent for a set meal (starter and a drink).</td>
<td>&quot;I think the price of food represents value-for-money because the salad starter was £4.95 or something plus a wine.&quot;</td>
<td>No. 7, Male/age 45-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small amount of money spent but get food that tasted good and had big portion size.</td>
<td>&quot;It is extremely good ‘value-for-money’..... ‘Value-for-money’ is when I can have almost more food than I can eat with my wife. The price of food with the drink is something around £28 to 30 for two people..... The ‘value-for-money’ is based on my price threshold but of course, it balances against the food you get. The food that I had has all the flavour and it fills me up”</td>
<td>No. 13, Male/age 55-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A value-for-money meal is a meal that is equal (in term of taste and cannot be compensated with the portion size) to the money spent.</td>
<td>&quot;Sometimes restaurant charged you £7 for a meal, but they know it’s not the value for £7. They know the taste does not match up the price of £7. So they increase the portion size of the meal. I don’t like that. You come for a £7 meal, so you should get what you pay for. That is ‘value-for-money’. I think if they over-compensate quantity for quality, that’s not good.”</td>
<td>No. 6, Female/age 25-34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Besides reasonable price, interviews in the present study considered ‘value-for-money’ important but none of the participants relate it to pleasure in eating out. It is possibly because ‘value-for-money’ is a criteria that tended to create regular customers. Zeithaml (1988) suggests that majority of consumers tended to frequently eat at the same restaurants because of not only good food, quality service and a pleasant service environment, but also because they felt that the price they paid represented value-for-money. In the present study, value-for-money is judged based on the restaurant food. This is consistent with Yuksel and Yuksel (2003) who examined ‘food value-for-money’ and found the importance of this factor in influencing consumers’ decision to choose where to eat. Besides, value-for-money is also influential in affecting ‘consumer satisfaction’ and ‘behavioural intention’ (Petrick, 2001).
6.2.1.5 The Relative Importance of Restaurant Attributes

One general question aimed to obtain the relative importance of three main aspects in restaurants was asked in the interview. Results showed that the majority of participants perceived ‘food’ as the most important factor in a restaurant followed by service delivery and environment.

"I think first and foremost the food has got to be good. It can be a really plush restaurant, fabulous service but the food is no good. If the service is indifferent I might go back and see if it's better or not on another day and enjoy the meal. And the only time ambiance becomes important or the décor whatever would be if you really had nothing else to concentrate on." (No. 13, Male/age 55-64)

Themes related to service delivery were mentioned many times throughout the interview. This indicates that service delivery continues to be the most predominant in the minds of consumers. Despite that, using direct questions to investigate the relative importance of ‘service delivery’, ‘food’ and ‘environment’ revealed stronger importance of ‘food’ compared to another two factors in a restaurant. Past studies that investigated the relative importance of similar aspects in a restaurant support the current study. ‘Food quality’ was significantly more important than the other variables (i.e. ‘cleanliness’, ‘value’, ‘price’, ‘convenience’, ‘speed of service’, ‘courtesy’, ‘menu variety’ and ‘restaurant atmosphere’), mostly in predicting consumer satisfaction. Similarly, Sulek and Hensley (2004) found that ‘food quality’ was the most significant factor influencing customer satisfaction followed by restaurants’ atmosphere and the fairness of the seating order. In addition, only ‘food quality’ significantly predicts ‘repeat patronage’. This finding suggests that food that was prepared the way customers enjoy it can attract the customers back for many return visits (Sulek and Hensley, 2004). Knowing the relative importance of ‘food’ suggests that the study should include product quality in the examination of consumer behaviour in restaurants.
6.2.2 The Characteristics of Good/Poor-quality Food

When consumers were asked to describe a good/poor quality food, more than half of participants answered that it dealt with the tastiness of food, freshness of food and appearance of food. These three characteristics of ‘food quality’ discovered in the interview were also found to be the most vital components of ‘food quality’ in the past studies (e.g. DeLuco and Cremer, 1990; Dube et al., 1994; Seo and Shanklin, 2005a). It shows that part of the interview results seemed to reflect general consumers’ views of food quality.

Other factors with moderate level of importance were accuracy of food to consumer expectation, properly cooked food and quantity of food. Only two participants agreed that smell of food and fattiness of food were elements of good/poor quality food. Only one respondent expressed about authenticity of food and temperature of food in describing good/poor quality food.

6.2.2.1 Tastiness of Food

Participants pointed out that one criterion of a quality food are the taste of the food. When explaining tasty food, one respondent mentioned that it had to be nicely seasoned.

“A quality food is a tasty food. A tasty food is food that was nicely seasoned. Never add anything. In this particular restaurant, you do not need to put anything extra (such as salt and pepper) on the food. They got the flavour” (No.13, Male/age 55-64)

In addition, delicious food could be created by the good combination of ingredients.

“Food that tastes good is the result of a good combination of spices. It’s not a flat taste. It’s very colourful in the palate and also very tasteful” (No.6, Female/age 25-34)
Almost all participants recognised tastiness of food as a criteria of a quality food. This is in line with past studies. For instance, Seo and Shanklin (2005b) through ‘focus group’ research discovered that the ‘taste of food or flavour’ was the most important attribute affecting perceptions of food quality in care-food services. Other qualitative studies investigated consumers’ views on food quality, have identified ‘taste of food’ as being the most frequently-addressed themes (Holm and Kildevang, 1996). Measuring ‘taste of food’ as a food-quality component was important because it had the greatest effect on consumer satisfaction (Namkung and Jang, 2007).

6.2.2.2 Freshness of Food
Besides tastiness of food, quality of food was evaluated by the freshness of food. Freshness of food is evaluated by the freshness of ingredients and freshness of cooked food as shown in Table 6.9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Freshness of Food</th>
<th>Extracts from the Interview</th>
<th>Participant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshness of raw material in a meal</td>
<td>“A quality food should be fresh, not stale, out of date or anything else like that.”</td>
<td>No.7, Male/age 45-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshness of cooked food</td>
<td>“I would say that a quality food is fresh. It’s not like somebody cooked it in the morning and then they served it in the evening. The meat is tender and warm. I have a feeling that it has been cooked right now for you. If I can feel like that, then I think I would call it a quality food.”</td>
<td>No.1, Male/age 25-34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Besides tastiness of food, the interview outcomes revealed freshness of food as a component of quality food. Meiselman (2001) agreed that fresh ingredients was a quality criteria for a restaurant. It was important that a food ingredient was consistent throughout various meal periods because it influenced consumer expectation in a restaurant (Heung, 2002). Other studies proved that freshness of food influenced consumer satisfaction. Yuksel and Yuksel (2002) in their study of
consumer satisfaction in independent non-fast food restaurants found that fresh ingredients were a component of product-quality dimension and it was rated as the third most-influential factor affecting consumer satisfaction. It shows that freshness of food was a part of the quality aspect of food and had an impact on businesses.

6.2.2.3 Appearance of Food

Participants perceived that the appearance of food influenced the quality of food. Appearance of food dealt with how the meal was garnished.

"You can see the ingredients have been stated on the menu but the dish that you get has been presented really well-thought through. Everything has landed somewhere for a reason. For instance, there was a bit of chutney and little bit of salad and you get that on a very big plate and all the bits were really put on that plate exactly in the right spots to give a nice picture on the plate." (No.14, Female/age 55-64)

In contrast to the positive aspect of appearance, poor appearance of food has been described as a meal that was presented carelessly:

"Poor-quality food is food that is served sloppy. It's been thrown on to the plate." (No.5, Male/age 45-54)

This interview proposes that appearance of food determines quality in food. This is probably because appearance of food is one of the sensory qualities which is intrinsic to the product (Molnar, 1995). This product attribute could not be changed and is closely related to the physical product: the appearance of fresh raw materials (e.g. fruits), colour, shape, size and structure (Oude Ophius and Van Trijp, 1995). Interview findings also suggests that a quality characteristic of food includes how well the food is presented. According to Namkung and Jang (2007: p. 393), "presentation of food refers to how attractively food is presented and decorated as a tangible cue for consumer perception of quality". This definition proposed that presentation of food was a factor that did not happen
naturally. It could be created by people who prepared the food, and most importantly, it had an effect on how consumers assessed food quality. Seo and Shanklin (2005b) through focus group also discovered that 'presentation of food' is one of the important factors in evaluating food quality among residents of a care institution. In addition, presentation of food was also one of the food attributes that was important in affecting consumer's dining satisfaction and return patronage (Kivela et al., 1999b).

6.2.2.4 Accuracy of Food to Consumer Expectation
A number of participants expressed that a quality meal should be accurate to their expectation based on the menu. These participants agreed that the actual meal that has been ordered should match its menu description.

"A quality meal is when it arrived in the condition that you have expected it to be. When you see the menu, there's some description about the food. So I expect that the food will arrive in the condition that they have already described in the menu." (No.11: Female/age up to 25)

The interview results illustrated that it was important that the menu description should accurately match the actual food served to restaurant consumers. It is because consumers have placed a certain level of expectation in their minds the moment the food was ordered. Thomas and Mills (2006) in their online qualitative survey concerning expectation on restaurant menus found that the most common keyphrase addressed by participants was 'what you see is what you get'. This phrase indicated that it was important for a restaurant to present the food item as described on the menu. Other keywords in regards to accuracy of dish are "accurate representation of items, ingredient information is accurate, nutritional claims are accurate and accurate portion size" (Thomas and Mills, 2006: p.12). It shows that consumers felt consistency between item's description and actual presentation and other information associated with the menu items were important.
6.2.2.5 How Properly the Food is Cooked

Participants also expressed that quality of food is determined by how well the food is prepared and cooked.

“You know straightaway what quality food is. For example, you have a meat dish. It is a nice, lean and gently-cooked meat. It melts in your mouth. You don’t want something that is hard to chew.” (No. 8: Female/age 55 – 64)

The interviewees also pointed out that food should be prepared properly to maintain the quality of the food. Seo and Shanklin (2005a) examined the evaluation of food quality in care institutions and found that most comments of food quality were made on poor cooking of food such as ‘prime rib was not tender’, ‘consistency of soup’ and ‘chicken was too dry’. Previous study also indicated that how food was prepared affected satisfaction. Interview results of Shultz et al. (2005) revealed that staff knowledge of how to prepare and serve food properly was a key construct contributing to consumer satisfaction. It is assumed that, because of its effect on satisfaction, it is important to include this item in the food-quality dimension.

6.2.2.6 Portion Size

“Quality food should have a reasonable portion size.” (No. 9: Female/age 35 – 44)

Some interviewees expressed that a reasonable portion size of a meal is one aspect of food quality. Seo and Shanklin (2005b) named ‘portion size’ as one of the food quality attributes. This factor however, was less important than other food quality attributes such as ‘taste of food’ and ‘freshness of food’. This justified the reason why only a small number of interviewees described this factor as a quality attribute.
6.2.2.7 Smell of Food

Some participants pointed out about smell of food as an element of quality food: "The quality of food is also about the smell of food. Strange smells will make me think of poor-quality food." (No. 12: Female/age 25 – 34)

A small number of interviewees described the smell of food as a quality criteria of food. Molnar (1995) argued that smell is one aspect of the sensory quality of food and is therefore important in restaurant food. Studies that examined this factor in restaurants were limited. Despite that, it is argued that the smell of food was important because it affects appetite. Shepherd (2004) stated that the smells that come from foods and liquids within mouths were the smells that primarily determined the pleasurable qualities of foods.

6.2.2.8 Fat Content in Food

A number of participants mentioned that poor-quality food was food that contained too much fat.

"A poor-quality food can be described as food that is too fatty, like fat that comes from meats." (No.4: Female/age 45 – 54)

It was noted that some interviewees' viewed that fat content in a meal affected the quality of food. Studies that explicitly examined 'fattiness of food' as a quality attribute in the restaurant industry was hardly found. However, literature showed that this attribute is associated with health risk. As an example, Michaud et al. (2001) stated that diets high in animal fat, red meat and dairy products were highly connected to the risk of prostate cancer. In addition, Oude Ophius and Van Trijp (1995) proposed that health was actually one of the credence-quality attributes. Credence-quality attributes were attributes that are formed by the issues that are considered as being important by consumers. Individuals had to rely on judgement, and information provided by other people to confirm the existence of this quality attributes (Oude Ophius and Van Trijp, 1995).
6.2.2.9 Authenticity of Food

A respondent also explained that quality of food related to authenticity of food which normally applied to ethnic meals:

"It is quite hard for me to find proper Japanese food because it's not easy to make proper Japanese food in London and in UK....the Japanese food here is just like a combination food. It's just like a Western plus, a little bit of Japanese taste....not like the taste I want. I'm very particular with this..." (No. 3: Female/age 25 - 34)

This factor however applied only in the context of ethnic restaurants where genuineness was the important criteria consumers seek in that particular type of restaurant. Lu and Fine (1995) agreed that authentic food was a feature often presented by ethnic restaurants and was a socially-desirable image in a competitive and differentiated market for many consumers.

6.2.2.10 Temperature of Food

Temperature of food was another characteristic of quality food revealed in the interviews. Participants pointed out that a meal should be served at an appropriate temperature.

"The quality of a meal also relates to its temperature. If it's a meal that is served hot, it supposed to be hot."(No. 13: Male/age 55 - 64)

Researchers agreed that temperature was a sensory element of food quality (e.g. Johns and Tyas, 1996; Kivela et al., 1999b; Weiss et al., 2004; Namkung and Jang, 2007). Temperature of food has an influence on the perception of 'flavour' and other sensory properties - taste, smell, and sight (Delwiche, 2004). According to Pizam and Ellis (1999), 'correct food and beverage temperature' was one attribute involved in a restaurant-meal experience. Study also showed that getting the food at the appropriate temperature affected individual's eating satisfaction. Capra et al. (2005) employed four measurements of temperature of food to assess patient satisfaction in hospital foodservice: the cold drinks are just
the right temperature, the hot drinks are just the right temperature, the cold foods are the right temperature and the hot foods are the right temperature. Findings of Capra et al. (2005) found that all items of temperature influenced satisfaction. For that reason, 'temperature of food' could enhance pleasure in the consumer's meal experience (Kähkönen et al., 1995).

6.3 Summary

This chapter discussed the findings of the qualitative research for this study. The profiles of participants were reported. Two main themes revealed from the interview were explained. Firstly, four main themes that influence consumer eating out experience: (1) service delivery, (2) food, (3) environment and (4) price/value-for-money were discussed. Secondly, themes relating to the quality characteristics of food were addressed. The quality characteristics of food are 'taste', 'freshness', 'appearance', 'accuracy of meal to the consumers' expectation', 'how properly the food is cooked', 'portion size', 'smell', 'fat content in food', 'authenticity of food' and 'temperature of food'. The results of interviews supports the literature that 'food', 'service delivery', 'environment', 'price' and 'value-for-money' are the common aspects influencing consumers' eating-out experience. Apart from that, the current interview suggests the elements of 'food quality' that can be used to investigate consumers' perception towards 'food quality' in the main survey. Only 'authenticity of food' was eliminated in the 'food quality' measure because this factor better reflected ethnic restaurants, whereas the context of the present study included various kinds of restaurant in which authenticity may not be that important.
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FINDINGS OF THE MAIN SURVEY

7.0 Introduction
This chapter reports the findings of the main survey, which comprises a survey that aimed to examine the relationship of several independent variables, mediating variable and dependent variables. The independent variables include 'food quality', 'service quality (staff behaviour)', 'service quality (environmental quality)', 'desires-congruence', 'ideal self-congruence' and 'perceived value-for-money'. Mediating variable is 'consumer satisfaction'. The dependant variables examined in this study are 'intention to return', 'intention to recommend', 'intention to switch' and 'post-purchase attitude towards the service firm'. This chapter presents findings in several sections. Section 7.1 reports the demographic profiles of survey respondents. Section 7.2 presents the eating-out profile of survey respondents. The outcome of validity test of measurement scales is addressed in Section 7.3. Section 7.4 reports the outcome of reliability test of measurement scales. The descriptive statistics of the study's constructs, and the comparison of the means of study's constructs between demographic profiles and eating-out profiles are presented in section 7.5. Section 7.6 discusses the results of the correlation analyses of study's constructs. Section 7.7 presents the results of the model assessment and test of the original hypotheses. Section 7.8 summarises the overall content of this chapter.

7.1 Demographic Profiles of Respondents
This section provides brief information about the respondents' demographic profiles, including gender, age, annual personal income, level of education attained and employment status. 301 usable questionnaires were obtained from the survey.
7.1.1 Gender

The distribution of the study sample by gender is shown in Figure 7.1.

This distribution does not reflect the general UK population. According to the 2009 Euromonitor International Country Factfile report, the UK population consists of 49% male and 51% female (Euromonitor, 2009c). The representativeness of the sample was not established probably due to the method of sampling used, which was convenience sampling through mail questionnaires.

7.1.2 Age

Figure 7.2 presents the distribution of sample by age.
Figure 7.2: Sample Representation by Age Group (n=298)

Figure 7.2 shows that most restaurant visitors were respondents aged 26 to 34 years old (22.5%), followed by 35 to 44 years old (20.8%), 55 to 64 years old (17.1%) and 45 to 54 years old (15.8%). It is assumed that these age groups represent the age of working people who normally have less time to cook. Other restaurant goers came from the age group of up to 25, 65 to 74 and 75 and over.

### 7.1.3 Annual Personal Income

The distribution of sample by annual personal income is illustrated in Figure 7.3.

Figure 7.3: Sample Representation by Annual Personal Income (GBP) (n=267)
Most respondents earned about GBP15,001 to GBP30,000 annually (31.5%). This reflects the average annual earnings for residents of South-East England which is GBP28,834 in 2008 (Office for National Statistics, 2008).

7.1.4 Highest Educational Level Attained

The distribution of the sample by highest educational level attained is presented in Figure 7.4.

Figure 7.4: Sample Representation by Highest Educational Level Attained (n=297)

Figure 7.4 demonstrates that most respondents were educated, as 42.1% of respondents had completed either a university diploma or degree, while 18.9% had obtained a postgraduate degree. This is in line with the data population by educational attainment produced by Euromonitor International in 2006a, showing that the majority of the UK population had completed secondary school, and that increasing numbers went on to higher education.

7.1.5 Employment Status

Figure 7.5 demonstrates the distribution of sample by employment status.
The majority of respondents were employed (69.7%) and 5.9% were unemployed which include housewives, as illustrated in Figure 7.5. These data somewhat reflect the percentage of employed population (94.3%) and unemployed population (5.9%) in the UK (International Labour Organisation, as reported by Euromonitor International, 2009c). A considerably lower percentage of retired respondents was recorded in the sample, which accounted for 13.9%, than in the general UK population.

7.2 Eating-out Profiles of Respondents

This section summarises the eating-out profiles of respondents - types of restaurant visited, the reason for eating out and the nature of the company that respondents had when eating out on that specific occasion.

7.2.1 Types of Restaurant Visited

Figure 7.6 presents the types of restaurant visited by respondents.
More than half of the respondents ate out at full-service restaurants (62.3%), as demonstrated in Figure 7.6. This category of restaurant includes ethnic restaurants and popular-chain restaurants. It is then followed by pub restaurant (23.7%), casual restaurants, such as cafés or coffee shops, (5.7%) and restaurants within hotels or inns (5.3%).

These data were compared with the eating-out survey carried out by Mintel in 2009. Pub restaurants were the most popular eating-out venue based on the 2009 Mintel survey. It is noted that the classification of eating-out venues in Mintel's survey was different from the present study. In the present study, restaurants were classified into full-service restaurants regardless of the type of food or cuisine served. On the other hand, Mintel (2009) classified restaurant type by the food served (i.e. pizza or burger) or cuisine of the restaurant (i.e. Chinese or Indian).

If the classification used in the present study is considered in the Mintel data, it is noted that the cumulative percentage of visitors of full-service restaurants is actually higher than pub restaurants. From 2000 respondents, 210% respondents ate out at a variety of ethnic and UK-type restaurants including Chinese restaurants, pizza restaurants, Indian restaurants, British restaurants, fish-and-chip restaurants, Italian restaurants, vegetarian restaurants, Thai restaurants and
Mexican restaurants. 55% respondents went to pub restaurants, cafés or coffee shops (39%) and hotel restaurants (15%).

7.2.2 Reason for Eating Out
Figure 7.7 below presents respondents' reason for eating out on that specific occasion.

Figure 7.7: Sample Representation by Reason for Eating Out (n=300)

Figure 7.7 illustrates that the majority of respondents visited restaurants for leisure, compared with business or convenience. Similarly, MINTEL (2007) found that most diners ate out for leisure, including birthdays and just wanting to get together with friends.

7.2.3 Company during Eating Out
Persons that accompany respondents while eating out are demonstrated in Figure 7.8.
Figure 7.8: Sample Representation by Company when Eating Out (n=301)

Figure 7.8 shows that the majority of respondents have company when eating out (97.3%) while only 2.7% respondents ate out alone.

7.3 Descriptive Statistics of the Study’s Constructs

This section reports the descriptive statistics for the following study’s constructs: (1) ‘food quality’, (2) ‘service quality (staff behaviour)’, (3) ‘service quality (environmental)’, (4) ‘perceived value-for-money’, (5) ‘ideal self-congruence’, (6) ‘desires-congruence’, (7) ‘intention to return’, (8) ‘intention to recommend’, (9) ‘intention to switch’, (10) ‘consumer’s post-purchase attitude towards the service firm’ and (11) ‘consumer satisfaction’. Descriptive statistics reported in this section include mean values, standard deviation, skewness, and kurtosis values. The descriptive statistics for the study constructs are presented in Table 7.1.

The mean values for each construct were obtained and were tested for any significant differences against demographic variables using Independent Sample t-test and ANOVA. In addition, pairs of mean values within constructs were checked for significant differences using Paired Sample t-test. A significance of p<0.05 was used throughout the study in accordance with other research. The magnitude of difference for mean comparisons was determined with eta squared
(as discussed in Section 5.5.4.7). Post-Hoc procedure was used to identify differences within factors (e.g. age group, employment status). This section discusses full results of Paired Sample t-test. However, only the results that yielded significant differences between demographic and eating-out profiles were discussed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD*</th>
<th>S*</th>
<th>K*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food Quality</strong></td>
<td>The food was properly cooked</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>-97</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-point Likert scale; 1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree</td>
<td>The food looked appetising</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>-78</td>
<td>-.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The food was served at an appropriate temperature</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>-91</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The food smelled nice</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>-67</td>
<td>-.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The food was presented and arranged nicely on the plate</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>-29</td>
<td>-.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The food was tasty</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>-80</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The food contained fresh ingredients</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>-78</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The food met my expectation</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>-83</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>-57</td>
<td>-.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Food Quality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>-48</td>
<td>-.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-point scale; 1 = extremely poor quality food, 7 = extremely good value for money</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service Quality (Staff Behaviour)</strong></td>
<td>Staff were friendly</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>-93</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-point Likert scale; 1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree</td>
<td>Staff were competent</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>-85</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff listened to me</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>-77</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff were helpful</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>-65</td>
<td>-.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff were prompt</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>-79</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff anticipated what I wanted</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>-56</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service Quality (Environmental)</strong></td>
<td>Restaurant was clean</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>-71</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-point Likert scale; 1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree</td>
<td>Restaurant was tidy</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>-72</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Restaurant was comfortable</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>-.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Restaurant has attractive layout</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>-.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Restaurant has beautiful decor</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td>-.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Service Quality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>-.70</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-point scale; 1 = extremely poor service quality, 7 = extremely good service quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceived Value-for-Money</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>-.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-point scale; 1 = extremely poor value for money</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-congruence</strong></td>
<td>Type of person I would like to be</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-point Likert scale; 1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree</td>
<td>Type of person I admire</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Desires-congruence</strong></td>
<td>Difference between desired and received</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-point scale; 1 = exactly as I desired, 7 = exactly different as I desired</td>
<td>The following statement relates to the difference between what you desired to receive from this restaurant and how well you think the same restaurant met your desires. How big was the difference between what you desired, and what you actually received?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-point scale; -5 = very bad, 0 = neither bad nor good, 5 = very good</td>
<td>Good or bad of the difference (Respondents refer to their rating for question labeled 1 above to answer this question)</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intention to Return</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>-.87</td>
<td>-.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-point scale; 1 = extremely unlikely, 7 = extremely likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intention to Recommend</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>-.88</td>
<td>-.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-point scale; 1 = extremely unlikely, 7 = extremely likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intention to Switch</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-point scale; 1 = extremely unlikely, 7 = extremely likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consumers' Post-purchase attitude towards the Service Firm</strong></td>
<td>Positive/Negative</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>-.77</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-point scale; 3= positive/like/valuable, -.3=negative/dislike/worthless</td>
<td>Dislike/Like</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>-.84</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worthless/Valuable</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>-.90</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>-.71</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>-.69</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-point scale; 1 = terrible, 7 = delighted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*S.D: Standard Deviation; S.: Skewness; K.: Kurtosis; *: Single-item measure; #: Formative measure; * This score was obtained by averaging the items representing the construct
7.3.1 Consumer Perceptions towards Quality Dimensions
Table 7.1 shows that the performance of food quality was rated as the highest in restaurants ($M=4.32, S.D.=0.55$) compared to service quality (staff behaviour) ($M=4.03, S.D.=0.67$) and service quality (environmental) ($M=4.01, S.D.=0.66$). Paired Sample t-test was conducted to examine significant difference of consumer perception towards these quality dimensions. A significant difference was found between two pairs of scores: (1) an overall score of food quality and overall score of service quality (staff behaviour) and (2) overall score of food quality and overall score of service quality (environmental) at $p<.05$. The effect size for the difference in the two pairs of scores was calculated with eta squared. The eta squared values for these pairs of scores were .90 and .96 showing that a large effect size has been found (Cohen, 1988 as discussed in Section 5.5.4.7). There was no significant difference between the overall score of service quality (staff behaviour) and the overall score of service quality (environmental). These findings indicate that restaurant have performed well in delivering quality of food in comparison to other quality aspects in restaurants.

7.3.2 Food Quality
As can be seen from Table 7.1, restaurant consumers perceived the food served in restaurants as being of good quality ($M=4.32, S.D.=0.55$). The result for paired sample t-test conducted to examine significant difference of consumer perception between eight items of 'food quality' and the eta squared value is shown in Table 7.2.
### Table 7.2: The t-value and Eta-squared Value for Food-quality Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PRES</th>
<th>TASTE</th>
<th>PC</th>
<th>EXP</th>
<th>SMELT</th>
<th>TEMP</th>
<th>FRESH</th>
<th>APP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASTE</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXP</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMELT</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEMP</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRESH</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APP</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: PRES: The food was presented and arranged nicely on the plate, TASTE: The food was tasty, PC: The food was properly cooked, EXP: The food met my expectation, SMELT: The food smelt nice, TEMP: The food was served at an appropriate temperature, FRESH: The food contained fresh ingredients, APP: The food looked appetising. NS: Not significant. All items were significant at p<.005. Figures in italic font were t-value. Figures in bold font were eta-squared values.

As Table 7.2 illustrates, a significant difference was found between the pairs of ‘food quality’ items’ scores. The guidelines proposed by Cohen (1988) were used to interpret the effect of differences between scores (See section 5.4.4.7). None of the pairs had large effect in scores i.e. eta squared of less than 0.14, showing that customers perceived the performance of each item in ‘food quality’ as somewhat similar. Nine pairs of scores had moderate effect with eta squared ranging from 0.07 to 0.12. The range of eta squared for pairs of scores that had small effect was 0.02 to 0.05. These findings suggest that customers perceived the performance of each ‘food quality’ characteristic in restaurants differently. In particular, ‘food looked appetising’ was rated higher than other items (i.e. presentation, taste, food met expectation, smell, freshness).

In terms of comparing the mean score between the food quality on demographic and eating-out profiles using independent t-test, only gender was found to influence consumer’s perception of food quality. There was a significant difference in the scores for males (M=4.20, S.D=.80) and females (M=4.39, S.D=.73; t(265)=2.61, p=.009); however, the eta squared is .03 which is
very small, indicating that both scores have small effect (Cohen, 1988). These findings signify that gender may have a slight influence on the perceptions of food quality in restaurants. Males perceived food quality in restaurants was lower than females respondents.

7.3.3 Service Quality (Staff Behaviour)

In general, consumers perceived service quality in terms of staff behaviour as good ($M=4.03, S.D.=.69$). The results for the paired sample t-test conducted to examine significant difference of consumer perceptions between six items of 'staff behaviour' and the eta-squared value are shown in Table 7.3.

![Table 7.3: The t-value and Eta-squared Value for Service-quality (Staff-behaviour) Items](image)

Note: ANT: Staff anticipated what I want, HELP: Staff were helpful, PROMPT: Staff were prompt, LIST: Staff listened to me, COMP: Staff were competent, FRIEND: Staff were friendly. NS: Not Significant. *Significant at p<.005. **Significant at p<.10. Figures in italic font were t-value. Figures in bold font were eta-squared values.

Table 7.3 shows that significance difference was found between the pairs of 'service quality (staff behaviour)' scores that were compared. All pairs of 'service quality (staff behaviour)' scores were significantly different except for one pair namely 'staff listened to me' and 'staff were competent'. Only 'staff anticipated what I want' score had significant difference with all 'service-quality (staff-behaviour)' scores and, based on eta-squared, these differences had large
effect. One pair had moderate effect - 'staff were competent' and 'staff were prompt'. Several pairs had small effect of scores, (e.g. 'staff were helpful' and 'staff were prompt'). Again, these findings point to the difference in customer perception of the 'service-quality (staff-behaviour)' criteria. In specific, 'staff anticipate what consumers want' was rated lower than other items (i.e. i.e. staff were helpful, staff listened to customers, staff were competent, staff were friendly, staff were prompt).

An examination of the overall score of service quality (staff behaviour) and demographic and eating-out profiles using the independent t-test found a statistically-significant difference between gender and perceptions on service quality (staff behaviour). There was a significant difference in the scores for males ($M=3.88, S.D.=.93$) and females [$M=4.11, S.D.=.89; t(279)=2.73, p=.006$). At the same time, the eta squared = 0.3, being very small suggests that, similarly to the 'food quality' criterion discussed in the previous sub-section, gender may have a slight influence on perceptions of service quality (staff behaviour) in restaurants. Therefore, males perceived service quality (staff behaviour) in restaurants lower than females respondents.

7.3.4 Service Quality (Environmental)
In general, consumers perceived service quality in terms of staff behaviour as good ($M=4.01, S.D.=.65$). Table 7.4 presents the results for paired sample t-test conducted to examine significance difference of consumer perception between five items of 'environmental quality' and the eta-squared value.
Table 7.4: The t-value and Eta-squared Value for Service-quality (Environmental) Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CLEAN</th>
<th>DÉCOR</th>
<th>COMFORT</th>
<th>TIDY</th>
<th>LAYOUT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLEAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DÉCOR</td>
<td>13.03</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMFORT</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIDY</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>10.54</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAYOUT</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>7.55</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CLEAN: Restaurant was clean, DÉCOR: Restaurant had beautiful décor, COMFORT: Restaurant was comfortable, TIDY: Restaurant was tidy, LAYOUT: Restaurant had attractive layout. NS: Not Significant. All items were significant at p<.005. Figures in italic font were t-value. Figures in bold font were eta-squared values.

Table 7.4 shows that significant difference was found between most of the pairs of 'service quality (environmental)' items' scores that were compared. All pairs of 'service quality (environmental)' items scores were significantly different except for one pair - 'restaurant has attractive layout' and 'restaurant was comfortable'. The largest effect was found in the difference between the following pairs: (1) 'restaurant has beautiful décor' and 'restaurant was clean', (2) 'restaurant has beautiful décor' and 'restaurant was tidy', (3) 'restaurant was comfort' and 'restaurant was clean', (4) 'restaurant has attractive layout' and 'restaurant has beautiful decor' and (5) 'restaurant has attractive layout' and 'restaurant was clean'. The score differences for other pairs of 'service quality (environmental)' had a moderate effect. These findings indicate that customers differently perceived performance of each 'service quality (environmental)' criteria in restaurants. This was obviously demonstrated in the higher rating of 'cleanliness' than other items (i.e comfort, tidy, attractive layout).

An examination of the overall score of service quality (environmental) and the demographic or eating-out profiles using independent t-test found a statistically-significant difference between gender and perceptions on service quality (environmental). There was a significant difference in scores for males \(M=3.86, S.D=.81\) and females \(M=4.10, S.D=.85; t(285)=3.07, p=.002\). Again,
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gender was found to have a slight influence on 'service quality (environmental)' (eta squared=.03), which is consistent with the findings relating to the constructs analysed.

7.3.5 Perceived Value-for-Money

The rating of the perception of value-for-money shows that consumers received reasonable value-for-money (M=5.25, S.D.=1.25). An examination of the perceived value-for-money score and the demographic or eating-out profiles using ANOVA found a statistically-significant difference between this score and both age group and employment status.

Age group significantly influenced the respondents' perceptions of 'perceived value-for-money' \[F(6,289)=3.03, P=.007\]. Sample sizes within 'age group' are slightly different: 'up to 25' (n=45), '26-34' (n=67), '35-44' (n=62), '45-54' (n=47), '55-64' (n=50), '65-74' (n=15), '75 and over' (n=10). Because of slight difference in sample size, Gabriel post-hoc criterion for significance was used. Results showed that respondents aged up to 25 (M=4.87, S.D=1.38) have a significantly lower score relating to the perception towards 'perceived value-for-money' than the respondents aged 65 to 74 (M=6.07, S.D.=1.16) and over 75-year-olds (M=6.10, S.D.=1.37) at P=.015 and P=.047, respectively. The eta squared=.06 being very small indicates that age may have a slight influence on perceptions of value-for-money.

Employment status also had a significant influence on respondents' perception of value-for-money \[F(3,288)=5.49, P=.001\]. Sample sizes within 'employment status' are very different: 'employed' (n=205), 'unemployed' (n=17), 'retired' (n=39) and 'student' (n=31). Because of a big difference in sample size, Hochberg post-hoc comparisons of employment types was used: the retired group (Mean=5.97, S.D.=1.16) gave significantly higher perception ratings of perceived value-for-money than the employed group (Mean=5.20, S.D.=1.18), P =.002, and students (Mean=4.97, S.D.=1.33), P=.003. Again, the eta
squared=.05 which is very small suggests there is a small influence of respondents' employment status in influencing perception of value-for-money.

7.3.6 Self-congruence
Self-concept is defined as "the totality of an individual's thoughts and feelings, having reference to himself as an object" (Rosenberg, 1979; p.7). It reflects how individuals evaluate themselves in an objective way to create a self-image about their identity (Ekinci et al., 2008). The overall mean score of self-congruence in Table 6.3 indicated that restaurant consumers neither agree nor disagree with the idea that personalities of other peoples in the restaurants represent their identity (M=3.11, S.D.=1.02). This resulted from the mean scores of two items used to examine self-congruence; 'type of person I would like to be' (M=3.25, S.D.=1.09) and 'type of person I admire' (M=2.96, S.D.=1.07). Comparison of means suggests that demographic or eating-out profiles of respondents do not influence consumers' perception towards their self-identity.

7.3.7 Desires-congruence
Desires-congruence is the outcome of the comparison process between desires and performance (Sirgy, 1984). It is the subjective assessment of the comparison between what consumers desired and what they received from the performance of the firms' goods and services (Wirtz and Mattilla, 2001). This construct is a formative measure where item 1 and item 2 of this variable used different scales resulting in incomparable mean score. Despite that, the mean score of item 1 shows that restaurant consumers perceived service and goods are received as they desired (M=2.45, S.D.=1.11), where 1=exactly as desired, 7=exactly different as I desired. The difference between the desired service and goods and what has been received was a slightly good difference (M=1.43, S.D.=2.29). This indicates that consumers had received the experience in the restaurant as they had desired. Even if there is a difference between what consumers desired and received, it is a good difference. For instance, a customer desired the dining experience to be good but the actual experience was excellent. An examination
of the formative score of desires-congruence and the demographic or eating-out profiles found a statistically-significant difference between this score with gender, age group, education level and annual income.

There was a significant difference in scores for males (M=1.23, S.D=4.81) and females (M=2.52, S.D=4.50; t(275)=2.20, p=.03). The eta squared is .02 which is very small and signifies that gender has a slight influence on how consumers perceived the difference in what they desired and received in restaurants.

Age group significantly influenced respondent’s perception of desires-congruence [F(6,267)=2.48, P=.024]. Sample sizes within ‘age group’ are slightly different: ‘up to 25’ (n=40), ‘26-34’ (n=60), ‘35-44’ (n=60), ‘45-54’ (n=45), ‘55-64’ (n=47), ‘65-74’ (n=13), ‘75 and over’ (n=9). Post-hoc analyses using the Gabriel post-hoc criterion for significance shows that a higher perception of desires-congruence was recorded for ‘75 and over’ group (M=4.67, S.D.=1.58) than another three age groups; ‘up to 25 group’ (M=1.10, S.D. =5.56), ‘26 to 34’ group (M=1.80, S.D=4.70) and ‘35 to 44’ group (M=1.15, S.D. =4.70). These comparisons were statistically significant at P=.018, P=.017 and P=.002, respectively. Similar to ‘perceived value-for-money’, age group also has a slight influence on desires-congruence (eta=.05).

Education level attainment also significantly influenced desires-congruence [F(3,269)=5.55, P=.001]. Sample sizes (n) for each of education-level groups are ‘less than secondary school’ (n=4), ‘completed secondary school’ (n=102), ‘completed university diploma/degree’ (n=114), and ‘completed postgraduate degree’ (n=53). Gabriel post-hoc comparisons of the four education level groups demonstrate that respondents who had completed secondary school (M=3.43, S.D=4.21) perceived desires-congruence higher than respondents who had completed university diploma/degree (M=1.21, S.D. =5.03) and completed postgraduate degree (M=1.28, S.D. =3.72), which were statistically significant at P=.002 and P=.026, respectively. However, the magnitude of this influence is
small (eta squared=.06) showing that education may have a slight influence in predicting one's desire.

Desires-congruence was also significantly influenced by ‘annual personal income’; \( F(7,239) = 2.17, P = .037 \). Sample sizes (n) for each of annual income (GBP) groups are ‘up to 15,000’ (n=69), ‘15,001-30,000’ (n=79), ‘30,001-45,000’ (n=41), ‘45,001-60,000’ (n=15), ‘60,001-75,000’ (n=11), ‘75,001-100,000’ (n=4), ‘100,001 or more’ (n=5) and ‘not available’ (n=23). Through Gabriel post-hoc comparisons, respondents who earned GBP75,001 to GBP100,000 yearly (\( M=1.75, S.D=2.06 \)) perceived desires-congruence lower than respondents who did not have an income (\( M=4.39, S.D=5.58 \)), \( P=.027 \). The eta squared value is .06 which is very small, indicating the small influence of annual personal income on respondent’s perception towards the difference of service or goods received and desired.

7.3.8 Behavioural Intentions (Intention to Return, Intention to Recommend and Intention to Switch)

The consumers’ intention regarding the loyalty towards the restaurant were examined in three forms; ‘intention to return’, ‘intention to recommend’ and ‘intention to switch’. The highest intention score was rated for ‘intention to return’ (\( M=6.19, S.D.=1.01 \)) followed by ‘intention to recommend’ (\( M=5.95, S.D.=1.18 \)) and ‘intention to switch’ (\( M=4.58, S.D.=1.57 \)). It indicates that restaurant consumers have more intention to return to the visited restaurant than recommending that particular restaurant. Consumers had higher intent to return than to switch. An examination of the three types of behavioural intentions scores and the demographic or eating-out profiles found a statistically-significant difference between ‘intention to return’ score with company of eating out; and ‘intention to switch’ score with gender, education level and employment status. On the other hand, demographic or eating-out profiles of respondents do not influence consumers’ intention to recommend.
Intention to return differed significantly across the six groups relating to company when eating out, \( F(5,271)=2.75, P=.019 \). Sample sizes (n) for each of company when eat-out groups are 'immediate family including children' (n=91), 'friend(s)' (n=60), 'boyfriend/girlfriend/partner' (n=66), 'work colleague(s)' (n=10), 'a group of people' (n=43) and 'no one' (n=7). Gabriel post-hoc comparisons indicated that respondents who ate out with family (\( M=6.36, S.D.=.86 \)) had significantly higher (perception ratings of) intention to return than respondents who ate out with work colleague(s) (\( M=5.40, S.D.=.84 \)), \( P=.049 \). The eta squared=.05 signifies the small effect of respondents' company when eating out may have a small influence on respondents' intention to return to a restaurant.

Intention to switch score had statistically-significant difference with gender, education level and employment status. Intention to switch was perceived differently among male and female respondents. Male respondents (\( M=4.29, S.D.=1.55 \)) reported more intention to switch than female respondents (\( M=4.75, S.D.=1.56 \); \( t(284)=2.39, p=.018 \)). However, a very small influence of gender on consumer's intention to switch in eating-out occasion was found (eta squared=.02).

Highest education level also significantly influenced consumers' intention to switch \( F(3,279)=3.06, P=.029 \). Sample sizes (n) for each of education level groups are 'less than secondary school' (n=4), 'completed secondary school' (n=108), 'completed university diploma/degree' (n=116), and 'completed postgraduate degree' (n=55). A look at the outcome of Gabriel post-hoc comparisons of the four education-level groups demonstrate that 'less than secondary' group (\( M=6.25, S.D.=0.96 \)) had perceived a higher intention to switch than those who had completed university diploma/degree group (\( M=4.34, S.D.=1.51 \)), \( P=.021 \). Small eta squared (.03) shows that education level may have a minor influence on consumers' intention to switch.
A significant influence of employment status on perception of intention to switch was found in this study \( F(3, 277) = 3.68, P = .013 \). Sample sizes \( n \) for each employment status are: up to employed \( n = 197 \), unemployed \( n = 16 \), retired \( n = 38 \) and student \( n = 30 \). Retired group \( (M=5.26, S.D.=1.48) \) had a significantly-higher intention to switch than the employed group \( (M=4.53, S.D.=1.55) \), \( P = .049 \), and students \( (M=4.07, S.D.=1.39) \), \( P = .010 \). The influence of employment status on intention to switch is however very small (eta squared=.04).

7.3.9 Consumers' Post-purchase Attitude towards the Service Firm
The overall measurement of consumers' post-purchase attitude towards restaurants was rated fairly positively \( (M=2.16, S.D.=0.71) \). This construct was examined using three scales. The scores for the three scales are: positive/negative \( (M=2.24, S.D.=0.76) \), like/dislike \( (M=2.16, S.D.=0.86) \) and valuable/worthless \( (M=1.89, S.D.=1.01) \). These mean scores showed that restaurants' consumers had overall positive attitude towards the restaurant. Demographic or eating-out profiles of respondents did not influence consumers' post-purchase attitude towards the service firm.

7.3.10 Consumer Satisfaction
Consumer satisfaction was measured at an overall level. The mean score for overall consumer satisfaction in Table 7.1 shows that consumers had been satisfied with their dining experience \( (M=5.63, S.D.=1.07) \). An examination of this factor with the demographic or eating-out profiles found a statistically-significant difference between this score with gender. Overall consumer satisfaction was perceived differently among male and female respondents. Male respondents reported lower satisfaction \( (M=5.45, S.D=1.13) \) than female respondents \( (M=5.75, S.D=1.02; t(296)=2.30, p=.021) \). The eta squared=.02, being very small indicate that gender may have minor influence on consumer satisfaction.
7.3.11 Normality of Data
The value of skewness should be within the range of -1 to +1 (Hair et al., 2006). As shown in Table 7.1, the Skewness and Kurtosis values ranged between -0.97 and -0.01. Only two values exceeded these values; 'intention to switch' and 'desires-congruence'. The gap between these values and the recommended range was however small, therefore, all items were retained for further analysis.

7.4 Validity of the Measurement Scales
As mentioned previously in Section 5.5.4.3, exploratory factor analysis with principal component extraction and Varimax rotation was carried out on all quality items (food, staff behaviour and environmental quality) to identify the underlying dimensions. The output of the factor analysis is presented in Table 7.5 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7.5: Rotated Component Matrix for Quality-dimension Scales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Items</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food Quality</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The food looked appetising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The food was tasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The food was properly cooked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The food met my expectation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The food contained fresh ingredients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The food was served at an appropriate temperature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The food smelt nice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The food was presented and arranged nicely on the plate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service Quality 1 (Staff Behaviour)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff were competent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff were helpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff listened to me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff were friendly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff were prompt in service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff anticipated what I wanted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service Quality 2 (Environmental Quality)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The décor was beautifully coordinated with great attention to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The layout in restaurant was attractive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The restaurant was comfortable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The restaurant was clean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The restaurant was tidy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eigenvalue</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explained Variance (%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total variance explained (61.79%)
Table 7.5 suggests that a three-factor structure was established from the factor analysis. It suggests that quality aspects in restaurants could be categorised into three: food quality, service quality (staff behaviour) and service quality (environmental quality). 'Food quality' explained 46.78% of the variance (eigenvalue=8.89), 'service quality (staff behaviour)' represented 8.11% of total variance with eigenvalue of 1.54 and 'service quality (environmental quality)' accounted for 6.90% of the variance (eigenvalue=1.31). In reference to Hair et al. (2006), this factor structure is acceptable because:

1. All three factors have Eigenvalue greater than 1.
2. All communalities are greater than 0.3 (ranging from 0.50 to 0.77).
3. Factor loadings are high and designative of a well-defined structure.

These findings confirmed the construct validity of the quality perception scales, which suggested that perceived quality in restaurants do indeed involve three dimensions: food quality, staff behaviour quality and environmental quality (environmental aspects). The variance explained by 'food quality' which accounted for 46.78% also indicates that 'food' contributes the highest overall variance of quality dimensions. It signifies that 'food quality' explained quality more than other quality aspects (i.e. staff behaviour and environmental). This contrasts with some scales which do not include the dimension relating to food quality.

The items representing food quality and service quality were also examined for their validity using correlation analyses. Items of food quality are considered valid when they are correlated with overall food-quality score. Similarly, service-quality items are valid when they correlated with overall service-quality score. The outcome of correlation analyses is shown in Table 7.6 and Table 7.7.
Table 7.6: Correlation Analyses for Food-quality Scores and Overall Food-quality Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Overall food quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The food looked appetising</td>
<td>.64**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The food was tasty</td>
<td>.67**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The food was properly cooked</td>
<td>.56**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The food met my expectation</td>
<td>.65**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The food contained fresh ingredients</td>
<td>.52**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The food was served at an appropriate temperature</td>
<td>.52**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The food smelt nice</td>
<td>.56**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The food was presented and arranged nicely on the plate</td>
<td>.59**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the 0.05 level; ** significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed tests).

Table 7.6 shows that the correlation between each food-quality item and overall food-quality score ranges from 0.52 to 0.67. It shows a significant moderate relationship between all food-quality items with overall score. This indicates convergent validity of the food-quality scale.

Table 7.7: Correlation Analyses for Service-quality Scores and Overall Service-quality Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Overall service quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Staff were helpful</td>
<td>.71**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Staff were competent</td>
<td>.69**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Staff listened to me</td>
<td>.65**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Staff were friendly</td>
<td>.65**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Staff were prompt in service</td>
<td>.61**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Staff anticipated what I wanted</td>
<td>.53**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The décó was beautifully coordinated with great attention to detail</td>
<td>.36**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The layout in restaurant was attractive</td>
<td>.37**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The restaurant was comfortable</td>
<td>.48**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The restaurant was tidy</td>
<td>.49**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The restaurant was clean</td>
<td>.42**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the 0.05 level; ** significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed tests).

A significant correlation (r value) is found between each service-quality item and overall service-quality score in Table 7.7. The r value for item 7 to 11 ranges from 0.36 to 0.49, which is lower than r value for items 1 to 6 (r = 0.53 to 0.71). This indicates that item 1 to 6 reflects service quality more than item 7 to 11 that
represents environmental characteristics in the restaurants. This may be the reason that explains the outcome of factor analysis in Table 7.5 that separates staff behaviour and environmental quality.

### 7.5 Reliability of the Measurement Scales

The result of the reliability test is presented in Table 7.8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Coefficient α</th>
<th>Corrected item-total Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food Quality</strong></td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The food looked appetising</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The food was tasty</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The food was properly cooked</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The food was served at an appropriate temperature</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The food met my expectation</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The food contained fresh ingredients</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The food smelt nice</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The food was presented and arranged nicely on the plate</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service Quality I (Staff Behaviour)</strong></td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff were helpful</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff were competent</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff listened to me</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff were friendly</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff were prompt in service</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff anticipated what I wanted</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service Quality II (Environmental Quality)</strong></td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The décor was beautifully coordinated with great attention to detail</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The layout in restaurant was attractive</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The restaurant was comfortable</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The restaurant was tidy</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The restaurant was clean</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 7.8, the internal consistency of the quality scales exceeded the recommended alpha coefficient which is $\alpha \geq .70$; food quality ($\alpha=0.90$), service quality I (staff behaviour) ($\alpha=0.88$) and service quality II (environmental quality) ($\alpha=0.85$). The item-to-total correlation coefficients for the scales for each dimension give an indication of whether the items are measuring the same thing.
(Pallant, 2001). For 'food quality', the correlation coefficient ranges from 0.65 to 0.78. The correlation coefficient for 'service quality I (staff behaviour) and service quality II (environmental quality) ranges from 0.51 to 0.79 and 0.65 to 0.67 respectively. The strength of the correlation between items within each dimension is large where the r value is .50 and more (Cohen, 1988). It gives an indication that items within all three dimensions (food, staff behaviour and environmental quality) are measuring similar things. All in all, the values of Cronbach alpha and correlation coefficients found in the analysis provide evidence of good internal consistency (Churchill, 1979).

7.6 Correlation Analyses

Correlation analyses were carried out between all variables;

- Independent variables: food quality, service quality I (staff behaviour), service quality II (environmental quality), perceived value-for-money, desires-congruence and self-congruence.
- Dependent variables: intention to return, intention to recommend, intention to switch and overall consumer attitude to the service firm.
- Mediating variable: overall consumer satisfaction

The correlation matrix for the tested variables is presented in Table 7.9.

Table 7.9: Correlation Coefficients between Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FQ</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQSB</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQEQ</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVFM</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTRET</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTREC</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.81**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTSW</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATT</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>.72**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the 0.05 level; ** significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed tests).
Table 7.9 illustrates the significant relationships between constructs. The strongest correlation was found between intention to return and intention to recommend \((r=0.81)\) and the weakest was between service quality, staff behaviour and self-congruence \((r=0.13)\).

According to Pallant (2001), two examinations should be made on the \(r\) value found in Table 7.9:

1. The correlation between independent and dependent variables should preferably be above 0.30, showing some relationship between variables.
2. There should be a low correlation among variables \(<0.90\)

It is observed from Table 7.9 that the majority of variables have an \(r\) value of more than 0.30, showing some relationship between variables. Only self-congruence was found to have an \(r\) value below 0.30 and with almost all other constructs. For instance, the lowest \(r\) value can be found for the correlation between self-congruence and service quality: staff behaviour \((r = 0.13)\). Another construct which has several \(r\) values of below 0.30 was desires-congruence. The lowest \(r\) value was 0.16, which is the correlation between desires-congruence and self-congruence. Although these two constructs were found to have lower \(r\) value than recommended by Pallant (2001), these constructs were retained for further analysis as significant relationships between these constructs and other constructs were present.

Regarding the relationships between dependent and independent variables, 'perceived value-for-money' had the highest correlation with 'intention to return' \((r=0.51)\) and intention to switch \((r=0.43)\). Meanwhile, the highest correlation was found between 'food quality' with 'intention to recommend' \((r=0.51)\) and 'consumers' post-purchase attitude towards the service firm' \((r=0.56)\). Self-congruence had the weakest relationship with all dependent variables; intention to return \((r=0.18)\); intention to recommend \((r=0.17)\); intention to switch \((r=0.14)\) and consumers' post-purchase attitude towards restaurant \((r=0.21)\).
The correlation between independent variables and the mediating variable (which is consumer satisfaction) found that service quality (staff behaviour) had the strongest relationship with consumer satisfaction ($r=0.60$). Again, the weakest relationship was reported between 'self-congruence' and 'consumer satisfaction' ($r = 0.22$).

The relationship between the mediating variable and dependent variables indicated that consumers' post-purchase attitude towards the service firm had the strongest relationship with consumer satisfaction ($r = 0.78$), while intention to switch had the weakest relationship with consumer satisfaction ($r = 0.47$).

The outcome of correlation analyses has led to the assumption that the relationships between independent, dependent and mediating variables exist. Regression analysis was used to further examine these relationships in a model, which is discussed in section 7.7.

### 7.7 Model Assessment and Tests of Hypotheses

The multiple-regression analysis was carried out after data met the assumptions of multiple-regression analyses (as discussed in Section 5.5.4.6) including assumption for sample size, normality, homoscedasticity, multicollinearity and outliers. The relationships and hypotheses in Table 7.10 were tested using multiple-regression analyses.
Table 7.10: The Hypotheses Tested in the Present Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Relationships between Independent Variables and Consumer Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1: Perceptions of the quality of food will have an effect on consumer satisfaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2: Ideal self-congruence will have an effect on consumer satisfaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3: Desires-congruence will have an effect on consumer satisfaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4a: Perceptions of the quality of the environment will have an effect on consumer satisfaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4b: Perceptions of staff behaviour will have an effect on consumer satisfaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5: Perceptions of value-for-money will have an effect on consumer satisfaction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Relationships between Consumer Satisfaction and Dependent Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H6: Consumer satisfaction will have an effect on consumers' post-purchase attitude towards the service firm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7: Consumer satisfaction will have an effect on intention to return.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8: Consumer satisfaction will have an effect on intention to recommend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9: Consumer satisfaction will have an effect on intention to switch.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Mediating Effect of Consumer Satisfaction in the Relationships between Independent Variables and Dependent Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H10: Consumer satisfaction will mediate the impact of the five antecedents variables – food quality, environmental quality, staff behaviour, ideal self-congruence, desires-congruence and perceived value-for-money – on intention to return.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H11: Consumer satisfaction will mediate the impact of the five antecedents variables – food quality, environmental quality, staff behaviour, ideal self-congruence, desires-congruence and perceived value-for-money – on intention to recommend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H12: Consumer satisfaction will mediate the impact of the five antecedents variables – food quality, environmental quality, staff behaviour, ideal self-congruence, desires-congruence and perceived value-for-money – on intention to switch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H13: Consumer satisfaction will mediate the impact of the five antecedents variables – food quality, environmental quality, staff behaviour, ideal self-congruence, desires-congruence and perceived value-for-money – consumers' post-purchase attitude towards the service firm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The outcome of hypotheses tests is presented in the following separate sections.

### 7.7.1 The Relationships between Independent Variables and Consumer Satisfaction

It is anticipated that quality of food, service quality (staff behaviour), service quality (environmental quality), perceived value-for-money, ideal self-congruence and desires-congruence are the antecedents of consumer satisfaction. Meaning that, these variables influenced consumer satisfaction in restaurants. The hypotheses below were tested to examine these relationships:

**H1:** Perceptions of the quality of food will have an effect on consumer satisfaction.

**H2:** Ideal self-congruence will have an effect on consumer satisfaction.
**H3:** Desires-congruence will have an effect on consumer satisfaction.

**H4a:** Perceptions of the quality of the environment will have an effect on consumer satisfaction.

**H4b:** Perceptions of staff behaviour will have an effect on consumer satisfaction.

**H5:** Perceptions of value-for-money will have an effect on consumer satisfaction.

The outcome of regression analysis of H1 to H5 is in Table 7.11 below.

**Table 7.11: The Regression Model Statistics – The Relationships between Antecedents of Consumer Satisfaction and Consumer Satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Dependent Consumer Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent</strong></td>
<td>( \beta ) ( t )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food quality</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQ: Staff behaviour</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQ: Environmental quality</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived value-for-money</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-congruence</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desires-congruence</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P value</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2 )</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Ratio</td>
<td>41.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** *p < 0.01, **p < 0.05; SQ = Service Quality*

As shown in Table 7.11, the independent variables are statistically significant in estimating consumer satisfaction (P=0.000). \( R^2 \) statistic shows 52 percent of the total variance for the estimation of consumer satisfaction is explained in the model. Generally, the result supports the hypothesis that independent variables are related to consumer satisfaction.

A look at the influence of each independent variable revealed four independent variables that significantly predict consumer satisfaction. Perceived value-for-money was the strongest predictor (\( \beta = .30, t = 5.24 \)). The weakest contribution was...
self-congruence ($\beta = .11, t=2.26$). This outcome indicates that consumers' perception towards value-for-money will result in their satisfaction in restaurants. On the other hand, how consumers' perceived the personalities of other people in the restaurants represent their identity will slightly influence their satisfaction in restaurants. Two factors were not significant in predicting consumer satisfaction. These were food quality ($\beta = .05, t=.73$) and service quality (environmental) ($\beta = .12, t=1.74$). Based on these results, H2, H3, H4b and H5 were accepted while H1, and H4a were rejected.

7.7.2 The Relationships between Consumer Satisfaction and Dependent Variables

It is hypothesised that consumer satisfaction will have an effect on intention to return, intention to recommend, intention to switch and overall post-purchase attitude towards the service firm. The hypotheses below were tested to examine these relationships:

- **H6**: Consumer satisfaction will have an effect on consumers' overall post-purchase attitude towards the service firm.
- **H7**: Consumer satisfaction will have an effect on intention to return.
- **H8**: Consumer satisfaction will have an effect on intention to recommend.
- **H9**: Consumer satisfaction will have an effect on intention to switch.

The outcome of regression analysis for H6 to H9 is presented in Table 7.12.
Table 7.12: The Regression Model Statistics - The Relationships between Consumer Satisfaction on Behavioural Intentions and Post-purchase Attitude towards the Service Firm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Intention to Return</th>
<th>Intention to Recommend</th>
<th>Intention to Switch</th>
<th>Post-purchase Attitude towards Service Firm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer satisfaction</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>12.12*</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>17.13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P value</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Ratio</td>
<td>146.8</td>
<td>293.5</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>417.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *p < 0.01, **p < 0.05

As illustrated in Table 7.12, consumer satisfaction is statistically significant at p=0.00 in estimating all dependent variables: intention to return, intention to recommend, intention to switch and consumers’ post-purchase attitude towards restaurant. The strongest influence consumer satisfaction has is on post-purchase attitude towards restaurant (β=.78, t=20.43). The weakest influence is on intention to switch (β=.46, t=8.77). Following this findings, H6 to H9 are accepted.

7.7.3 The Mediating Effect of Consumer Satisfaction in the Relationships between Independent Variables and Dependent Variables

Consumer satisfaction is expected to mediate the influence of five independent variables on four dependent variables. The hypotheses below were tested to examine these relationships:

H10: Consumer satisfaction will mediate the impact of the five antecedents variables – food quality, environmental quality, staff behaviour, ideal self-congruence, desires-congruence and perceived value-for-money – on intention to return.

H11: Consumer satisfaction will mediate the impact of the five antecedents variables – food quality, environmental quality, staff behaviour, ideal self-
congruence, desires-congruence and perceived value-for-money – on intention to recommend.

**H12**: Consumer satisfaction will mediate the impact of the five antecedents variables – food quality, environmental quality, staff behaviour, ideal self-congruence, desires-congruence and perceived value-for-money – on intention to switch.

**H13**: Consumer satisfaction will mediate the impact of the five antecedents variables – food quality, environmental quality, staff behaviour, ideal self-congruence, desires-congruence and perceived value-for-money – consumers’ post-purchase attitude of the service firm.

In order to examine these relationships, the Baron and Kenny (1986) procedure was followed (as discussed in Section 5.5.4.6).

In the present study, independent variables are ‘food quality’, ‘service quality (staff behaviour)’, ‘service quality (environmental)’, ‘perceived value-for-money’, ‘ideal self-congruence’ and ‘desires-congruence’. The mediating variable is ‘consumer satisfaction’. Dependent variables are ‘intention to return’, ‘intention to recommend’, ‘intention to switch’ and ‘post-purchase attitude towards service firm’. Considering this, four models were tested. Model 1, 2, 3 and 4 examined H10, H11, H12 and H13 respectively. Before testing these models, the Baron and Kenny (1986) procedures were carried out. Table 7.13 presents the outcome of regression analysis to examine condition 1 and 2 as suggested by Baron and Kenny (1986).
In Table 7.13, the regression result analysing the relationship between independent variables and consumer satisfaction (mediator) shows that a significant relationship was established ($R^2=0.52$, $P=0.000$). Condition 1 of Baron and Kenny (1986) is therefore established.

It is also noted that condition 2 of Baron and Kenny (1986) was also met where the significant relationship was established for the relationship between independent variables and dependent variables - 'intention to return' ($R^2=0.35$, $P=0.000$); 'intention to recommend' ($R^2=0.38$, $P=0.000$); 'intention to switch' ($R^2=0.25$, $P=0.000$) and 'post-purchase attitude towards the service firm' ($R^2=0.48$, $P=0.000$).

In terms of the effect of individual independent variables on dependent variables in table 7.13, there are two variables that significantly predict all four dependent variables. Perceived value-for-money significantly affected all dependent variables; intention to return ($\beta=.29$, $t=4.54$), intention to recommend ($\beta=.20$, $t=3.09$), intention to switch ($\beta=.30$, $t=4.12$) and post-purchase attitude towards
Desires-congruence was another independent variable that significantly predicts all dependent variables: intention to return ($\beta=.20$, $t=3.53$), intention to recommend ($\beta=.27$, $t=4.78$), intention to switch ($\beta=.15$, $t=2.34$) and post-purchase attitude towards restaurant ($\beta=.18$, $t=3.47$). Three dependent variables were significantly predicted by service quality (staff behaviour) - intention to return ($\beta=.16$, $t=2.20$), intention to recommend ($\beta=.20$, $t=2.70$) and post-purchase attitude towards restaurant ($\beta=.22$, $t=3.40$). Food quality was found to significantly influence intention to return ($\beta=.25$, $t=2.98$) and intention to recommend ($\beta=.25$, $t=3.04$). Service quality (environmental quality) significantly predicted only one dependent variable: post-purchase attitude towards the service firm ($\beta=.15$, $t=2.06$). Ideal self-congruence did not contribute to any dependent variables.

To complete the procedure of Baron and Kenny (1986), the mediating variable, which is consumer satisfaction, was added into the relationship model of independent variables and intention to return (model 1), independent variables and intention to recommend (model 2), independent variables and intention to switch (model 3) and independent variables and post-purchase attitude towards restaurant (model 4). If consumer satisfaction mediate the relationship between independent variables and all four dependent variables, a significant relationship between independent variables and either 'intention to return' or 'intention to recommend' or 'intention to switch' or 'post-purchase attitude towards the service firm' should disappear (fully mediated) or the significance is reduced (partially mediated). Table 7.14 presents the findings of regression analysis of model 1, 2, 3 and 4.
### Table 7.14: The Regression Model Statistics: The Effect of Consumer Satisfaction as Mediator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>MODEL 1</th>
<th>MODEL 2</th>
<th>MODEL 3</th>
<th>MODEL 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intention to Return</td>
<td>Intention to Recommend</td>
<td>Intention to Switch</td>
<td>Post-purchase Attitude towards the Service Firm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent</strong></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food quality</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>2.9*</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>2.82*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQ: Staff behaviour</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQ: Environmental quality</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-2.2**</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived value-for-money</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>3.1*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-congruence</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desires-congruence</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>2.9*</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>3.84*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer satisfaction</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>5.0*</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>8.1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P value</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Ratio</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** *p < 0.01, **p < 0.05; SQ = Service Quality

As Table 7.14 exhibits, the mediating variable (consumer satisfaction) had a significant contribution to all dependent variables: intention to return (β=.35, t=5.0), intention to recommend (β=.52, t=8.1), intention to switch (β=.21, t=2.6) and post-purchase attitude towards the service firm (β=.50, t=8.64). In addition, the R² value for model 1, 2, 3 and 4 improved after consumer satisfaction was included in the model (R² value in Table 7.13 and Table 7.14 is compared). R² for Model 1 increases from 0.35 to 0.42, 0.38 to 0.53 for Model 2, 0.25 to 0.27 for Model 3 and 0.48 to 0.61 for Model 4. This indicates that the independent variables explained more variance in the dependent variables when the mediating variable was involved in the model. Following this result, H10, H11, H12 and H13 are accepted.

In term of the significance of individual independent variables, Table 7.14 shows that only desires-congruence remained significant in predicting all dependent...
variables. It signifies that, with or without consumer satisfaction, desires-congruence significantly predicts all dependent variables. A decrease of $\beta$ and t values is present in Table 7.14 when compared with those values in table 7.13, showing partial mediation effect of consumer satisfaction in the relationships between desires-congruence and dependent variables (intention to return, intention to recommend, intention to switch and post-purchase attitude towards the service firm).

After consumer satisfaction was added in the regression model, the relationships between perceived value-for-money and three dependent variables were found significant and one variable was insignificant. Perceived value-for-money significantly predicted three dependent variables: intention to return, intention to switch and post-purchase attitude towards the service firm, however the $\beta$ and t values of these relationship decrease showing consumer satisfaction partially mediated these relationships. There was not a significant relationship between perceived value-for-money and intention to recommend, indicating full mediation of consumer satisfaction occurred in the relationship between perceived value-for-money and intention to recommend.

Results showed that food quality remained a significant influence on intention to return and intention to recommend when consumer satisfaction was inserted in the model. There was also a slight decrease in the $\beta$ and t values of these relationships in comparison to the $\beta$ and t values before consumer satisfaction was involved. It indicates that consumer satisfaction has partially mediated the relationship between food quality and intention to return and intention to recommend.

Service quality (staff behaviour) did not significantly predict intention to return, intention to recommend and post-purchase attitude towards the service firm, which was found significant before consumer satisfaction was included in the model. This signifies that consumer satisfaction has fully mediated the
relationship between service quality (staff behaviour) and the three dependent variables.

Previously, without consumer satisfaction in the model, service quality (environmental) had significantly predicted post-purchase attitude towards the service firm. When consumer satisfaction was included in the model, the relationship between service quality (environmental) and this dependent variable became insignificant showing the full mediation effect of consumer satisfaction. Apparently, a significant relationship was found between service quality (environmental) and intention to return ($\beta=-.16$, $t=-2.20$) when consumer satisfaction was included in the model, showing consumer satisfaction partially mediated this relationship.

Unsurprisingly, the relationships between self-congruence and all dependent variables were still insignificant when consumer satisfaction was entered into the regression. It shows that, with or without consumer satisfaction, self-congruence did not predict intention to return, intention to recommend, intention to switch and post-purchase attitude towards the service firm.

These findings lead to the formation of the four sub-models of consumer satisfaction in the present study which are depicted in Figure 7.9, 7.10, 7.11 and 7.12, each figure being described respectively.
Figure 7.9: Model of Consumer Satisfaction and Intention to Return based on the Findings of the Present Study

Note: Black: path examines the relationship between independent variables and dependent variables through mediator, Blue: path examines the relationship between independent variables and dependent variables, * p< 0.01, **p< 0.05

Figure 7.9 shows that both direct and indirect paths were found to significantly predict 'intention to return'. The variance explained for the direct relationship between independent variables and 'intention to return' was 35%, lower than the variance explained when consumer satisfaction exists in similar relationships (42%). These findings indicate that all dependent variables are better predicted by independent variables through consumer satisfaction. This gives an indication that 'intention to return' is best predicted when consumers are satisfied in the restaurant after receiving quality of food, the best environment, value for money and having their desires fulfilled.

Figure 7.10: Model of Consumer Satisfaction and Intention to Recommend based on the Findings of the Present Study

Note: Black: path examines the relationship between independent variables and dependent variables through mediator, Blue: path examines the relationship between independent variables and dependent variables, * p< 0.01, **p< 0.05
As shown in Figure 7.10, a significant relationship was found in the direct and indirect paths that connect the independent variables and 'intention to recommend'. The indirect path however has greater variance in predicting 'intention to recommend' as compared to the direct path where the $R^2$ values are 0.53 and 0.38, respectively. This indicates that 'intention to recommend' can best be predicted by 'food quality' and 'desires congruence' through consumer satisfaction.

**Figure 7.11: Model of Consumer Satisfaction and Intention to Switch based on the Findings of the Present Study**

Note: Black: path examines the relationship between independent variables and dependent variables through mediator, Blue: path examines the relationship between independent variables and dependent variables, * p< 0.01, **p< 0.05

Figure 7.11 shows that a significant relationship was found between two types of relationship: (1) independent variables and 'intention to switch', and (2) independent variables and 'intention to switch' through consumer satisfaction. Among these links, the second link had higher strength ($R^2=0.27$) compared to the first link ($R^2=0.25$). This finding signifies that 'intention to switch' is better predicted by independent variables through consumer satisfaction. Since the difference for $R^2$ values for both relationships is small, assuming the indirect path of the relationship is better than the direct path might be wrong. Future studies should therefore look at these relationships in order to investigate which relationship better formed the consumer satisfaction process.
Figure 7.12: Model of Consumer Satisfaction and Post-purchase Attitude towards the Service Firm, based on the Findings of the Present Study

Note: Black: path examines the relationship between independent variables and dependent variables through mediator, Blue: path examines the relationship between independent variables and dependent variables, * p< 0.01, **p< 0.05

Figure 7.12 shows the significant relationship for both direct and indirect paths between independent variables and post-purchase attitude towards the service firm. The $R^2$ value for the indirect relationship between independent variables and post-purchase attitude towards service firm through consumer satisfaction ($R^2 = 0.61$) is higher than the direct relationship ($R^2 = 0.48$). This signifies that 'post-purchase attitude towards service firm' can best be predicted by 'perceived value-for-money' and 'desires congruence' through consumer satisfaction.

7.8 Summary

This chapter discussed the findings of this study. The hypotheses tested indicated that 12 out of 14 hypotheses were accepted. These hypotheses concluded that:

1. Ideal self-congruence, desires-congruence, perceptions of service quality (staff behaviour) and perceived value-for-money have an effect on consumer satisfaction.

2. Consumer satisfaction influence consumers' post-purchase attitude of the service firm, intention to return, intention to recommend and intention to switch.
3. Consumer satisfaction mediate the relationships between the antecedents variables and intention to return, intention to recommend, intention to switch and consumers' post-purchase attitude towards the service firm.

Other key findings include:

1. Perceived value-for-money, desires-congruence, service quality: staff behaviour and food quality significantly predicted intention to return and intention to recommend.

2. Perceived value-for-money and desires-congruence significantly contributed to intention to switch.

3. Perceived value-for-money, desires-congruence, service quality: staff behaviour and service quality; and environmental quality significantly influenced post-purchase attitude towards restaurant.

4. Self-congruence did not contribute to any dependent variables.

5. Model-testing demonstrated that both lines of direct and indirect paths were found to significantly predict all dependent variables. However, independent variables mediated through consumer satisfaction explained higher total percentage of variance in all dependent variables compared to total variance in the direct path. These findings indicated that all dependents variables were better predicted by independent variables mediated through consumer satisfaction.

The next chapter discusses the findings reported in this chapter.
Chapter Eight

Discussion of Main Survey Findings
CHAPTER EIGHT
DISCUSSION OF MAIN SURVEY FINDINGS

8.0 Introduction
This chapter encompasses the key findings of the study in three sections. Section 8.1 discusses the validity and reliability of quality dimensions and consumers' perception of the quality dimensions. Section 8.2 addresses the comprehensive model of consumer satisfaction that has been developed in the present study. Finally, section 8.3 provides a summary of the overall study.

8.1 The Quality Dimensions in Restaurants and Consumer Perceptions on Quality Dimensions
This section discusses the validity and reliability of quality dimensions and consumers' perception of the quality dimensions.

8.1.1 The Validity and Reliability of Quality Measures in Restaurants
The outcomes of factor analysis suggest three quality dimensions in restaurants, which are food quality, staff behaviour and environmental quality. This is in line with the quality dimensions categorised by Soriano (2002). Soriano (2002) classified quality dimensions by referring to the offerings of a restaurant: product, service and place. In addition, the present study also found two service-quality dimensions (staff behaviour and physical quality) similar to Ekinci et al. (2008) and Madanoglu (2004). In the present study, physical quality is renamed environmental quality to differentiate it from food quality as food itself is physical in nature. The reliability of the current quality dimensions has also improved compared to previous studies. The alpha values (α) of the dimension of staff behaviour for the present study is 0.88 while α=0.87 in Madanoglu's study (2004) and α=0.85 in Ekinci et al.'s study (2008). The alpha values (α) of the dimension of environmental quality for the present study is 0.85, while it was α=0.72 in
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Madanoglu's study (2004) and α=0.70 in Ekinci et al.'s study (2008). The α value of the dimension of food quality at α=0.90 is high, indicating that the items and dimensions used to examine quality in the present study are reliable.

8.1.2 Consumer Perceptions on Quality Dimensions in Restaurants

Quality in restaurants has been assessed in many different ways. Many studies examined quality by using SERVQUAL dimensions in its entirety (e.g. Lee et al., 2004) or with certain level of modifications (e.g. Heung et al., 2000). Despite widespread application of SERVQUAL dimensions in researching quality in restaurants, these dimensions give little attention to food quality. Responding to this issue, some studies have recognised the importance of food in quality assessment in restaurants. Sohail (2005) added items related to food (i.e. 'variety of menu', 'food's presentation in appealing manner', 'freshness of food served', 'appropriate temperature of food', 'taste of food', 'nutritious of food served' and 'consistency in food standard') into the dimension of reliability. Rajpoot (2002) and Tucci and Talaga (2000) included items related to food in the tangible dimension including layout and design (e.g. decorations), product (e.g. food presentation) and ambiance (e.g. light).

The present study adopts the quality dimensions as suggested by Ekinci et al. (2008) with some modification based on the results of exploratory interviews (see Chapter 6), which suggested the importance of 'quality of food' and other quality aspects. As a result, quality is assessed through three quality dimensions: food quality, quality of service (staff behaviour) and quality of service (environmental quality).

As reported in Chapter 7 in Section 7.3, the overall restaurant quality assessment depicts that the quality of food served was better than the quality of service (staff behaviour) and environmental quality. This suggests that restaurants have given their best in delivering quality food but have given less concentration on quality of service and environment. It also gives an indication that the quality of food is as
important as quality of service and environment. Thus, restaurant management should provide the best quality as possible in these three areas.

A look at each dimension of quality has shown (in Table 7.1 in Section 7.3) that consumers have various perceptions towards the performance of items in each dimension. For instance, consumers perceived overall quality of food in restaurants to be good ($M=4.32$, $S.D.=0.55$).

Table 7.1 also shows that the item of 'food looked appetising' was rated higher than other items (i.e. presentation, taste, food met expectation, smell, freshness). Further examination demonstrated that the score of 'food looked appetising' had a significant moderating effect with the scores of other items. This indicates that consumers perceived the performance of restaurant food in terms of 'food looked appetising' is better than other food criteria. It is also observed that the three bottom-rated food quality items – taste, freshness and food met expectation had significantly lower scores than 'food looked appetising'. It indicates that restaurants have delivered the extrinsic quality of food better than the intrinsic quality of food. This is different from some earlier studies that reported the importance of these criteria for restaurants' business. For instance, taste of food is a key attribute of food that could improve consumer satisfaction (Namkung and Jang, 2008) and future behaviour intention to revisit the restaurant (Kivela et al., 1999). Besides the taste of food, freshness of ingredients in the food was also rated significantly lower than 'food looked appetising' showing that this aspect requires improvement. Studies suggest that 'freshness of food' is important in a food and in fact is a vital intrinsic quality cue, therefore should be well-delivered in restaurants (Johns and Tyas, 1996; Kivela et al., 1999; Acebrón and Dopico, 2000).

Knowing that two important elements of food were rated among the bottom of the list, it is not surprising to see that consumers rated 'food met my expectation' at the bottom of the list. This item represents how consumers felt about the food
served in restaurants and whether it met their expectations. Generally, consumers have prior expectations of what will and should emerge during the service and these expectations are updated wherever consumers receive relevant information about a restaurant and its offerings through word-of-mouth, company communications and other sources (Boulding et al., 1993). Similarly, Gustafsson et al. (2006: p.85) stated that “individuals have a cognitive picture of the meal in their brain that creates certain expectations based on earlier memories, knowledge, experiences and contexts which may influence how individual experience the meal”. Therefore, restaurants should ensure that consumers receive the standard of food quality as created by restaurants and this has to be to consumers’ expectation.

Another aspect of quality that is assessed by consumers in a restaurant is staff behaviour that reflects ‘service quality’. Consumers perceived that the overall staff behaviour delivered in restaurants as good. An examination of the performance of each item of ‘staff behaviour’ indicates that one item – ‘staff anticipated what consumers wanted’ had a significant large effect with the scores of other items representing ‘staff behaviour’ (i.e. staff were helpful, staff listened to customers, staff were competent, staff were friendly, staff were prompt). This indicates that there was a big difference in the performance of ‘staff anticipated what I wanted’ and another five ‘staff behaviour’ items. As Table 7.1 illustrates in Section 7.3, ‘staff anticipated what consumers wanted’ had the lowest mean score thus indicating the worst service-quality aspect delivered in restaurants. The ability of staff to anticipate what customers want reflects the empathy dimension in the SERVQUAL model (Parasuraman et al., 1985). This dimension dealt with personalised attention given to a customer.

Service staff are often the main contact between the restaurant and the consumers, therefore their performance will have an impact on customer satisfaction (Gustafsson et al., 2006). Gustafsson et al. (2006) proposed that knowledge related to social psychology, the theory of emotions, forms of social
interactions and rules of etiquette could be used to educate staff to meet consumers' wants and needs as well as handling various situations. This will later help the restaurant to achieve a good reputation (Finkelstein, 1989). As a conclusion, consumers in the service firm, which includes restaurants, would want "prompt service by people who know what to do and how to do it, and who care about them as valued consumers" (Fiebelkorn, 1985, p. 185).

Regarding the environment of the restaurant, consumers rated overall environment quality as good. Within this dimension, the highest rating was recorded for 'cleanliness' showing that restaurant management has put effort into keeping the restaurants clean. It has been observed that this score has a significant larger difference with other scores (i.e. comfort, tidy, attractive layout). This indicates that the performance in terms of cleanliness was better than other environmental aspects, which is a good thing. It is important to have a clean restaurant because consumers can hardly be satisfied if the restaurant is dirty, even if the interpersonal aspects and the flow of the service are flawless (Luria and Yagil, 2008). Previous studies have revealed that consumers perceived cleanliness or hygiene as one of the most important factors in restaurants (Reid, 1983; Dulen, 1999; Josiam et al., 2007). Within the environmental quality dimension, 'beautiful décor' was rated at the bottom of the list. Although some studies found that consumers perceived 'décor' as not particularly important (e.g. Aigbedo and Parameswaran, 2004), 'décor' or environment in a restaurant can actually improve the attraction of the products which could greatly impact on a meal situation (Meiselman an MacFie, 1996; Edwards et al., 2003).

8.2 The Model of Consumer Satisfaction based on the Findings of the Present Study

As previously mentioned in Chapter 1 (Section 1.0), the model of consumer satisfaction tested in the present study adapted a model of consumer satisfaction as in the study by Ekinci et al. (2008). The present study modified the model of Ekinci et al. (2008) by including other variables into the model. These variables
include food quality, perceived value-for-money, intention to recommend and intention to switch. In addition, the present study focussed entirely on restaurants.

The model of factors that impact consumer satisfaction and its consequences in hospitality firms by Ekinci et al. (2008) confirmed that consumer satisfaction has multiple antecedents (i.e. service quality, ideal self-congruence and desires-congruence). Satisfaction was also found to be a better predictor of the 'consumers' post-purchase attitude to the service firm' than service quality in this model. Satisfaction and the 'consumers' post-purchase attitude to the service firm' also have positive effects on intention to return. Moreover, the results showed that satisfaction mediated the relationships between its antecedents and consequences.

The findings of the present study indicate that:
1. The antecedents of consumer satisfaction are service quality: staff behaviour, self-congruence, desires-congruence and value-for-money;
2. The consequences of consumer satisfaction are consumer's post-purchase attitude towards restaurant: intention to return, intention to recommend and intention to switch;
3. Consumer satisfaction mediated the relationships between its antecedents and consequences.

Similar to Ekinci et al. (2008), findings of the present study proved that consumer satisfaction has multiple antecedents. Unlike Ekinci et al. (2008), the present study failed to prove that service quality (environmental) was the antecedent of consumer satisfaction. The present study also failed to prove that 'food quality' was the predictor of consumer satisfaction. However, perceived value-for-money was found to be the antecedent of consumer satisfaction in the present study. In this study, 'intention to return' and 'consumer's post-purchase attitude towards the service firm' were the consequences of consumer satisfaction. In addition, the present study revealed other consequences of consumer satisfaction which
were not examined in Ekinci et al. (2008) - 'intention to switch' and 'intention to recommend'. Similar to Ekinci et al. (2008), consumer satisfaction mediated the relationships between its antecedents and consequences in this study. These key findings are discussed further in the following subsections. All in all, the revised model of Ekinci et al. (2008) has confirmed other consequences of consumer satisfaction i.e. intention to switch and intention to recommend. These findings supported past studies (e.g. Arora and Singer, 2006; Ladhari et al., 2007; Namkung and Jang, 2007; Ryu et al., 2008) – as described in Section 2.3.2 that satisfied customers tended to recommend the restaurant to others.

### 8.2.1 The Antecedents of Consumer Satisfaction

Regression analysis was conducted to examine the relationships between all independent variables and consumer satisfaction. Independent variables were named service quality (staff behaviour), service quality (environmental), food quality, self-congruence, desires-congruence and value for money. The outcome of analysis for the relationships of these factors and consumer satisfaction are summarised in Table 8.1.

**Table 8.1: Regression Summary of the Relationships between Independent Variables and Consumer Satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Dependent Consumer Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food quality</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQ: Staff behaviour</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQ: Environmental quality</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived value-for-money</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-congruence</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desires-congruence</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: SQ = Service Quality; S = Significant; NS = Not Significant*

As illustrated in Table 8.1, 'food quality' did not influence consumer satisfaction. This is inconsistent with Namkung and Jang (2007) and Hensley and Sulek (2007), who found a direct effect of 'food quality' on overall satisfaction. These two studies did not examine a list of other antecedents of consumer satisfaction
unlike the present study. Findings of the present study showed that when food quality was tested with other antecedents of consumer satisfaction, it had little influence on consumer satisfaction. Andaleeb and Conway (2006) argued that this is probably because food quality may not be the distinguishing factor any more because restaurants are doing such a good job in that area. This finding may also explain why, despite extensive service quality research in restaurants, many studies have focussed on the service-delivery process, with limited assessment of the quality of the core product - food (e.g. Bojanic and Rosen, 1994; Stevens et al., 1995; Lee and Ulgado, 1997; Heung et al., 2000; Kim et al., 2003).

Unsurprisingly, service quality (staff behaviour) was found to be an antecedent of consumer satisfaction. Factors related to staff behaviour have been used by consumers to evaluate service, and it has long been recognised as a determinant of consumer satisfaction (Ekinci et al., 2008). 'Responsiveness', which is one of SERVQUAL dimensions, influenced consumer satisfaction in studies by Andaleeb and Conway (2006) and Seidman and Johnson (2002). Lee et al. (2005) and Seidman and Johnson (2002) found 'empathy', another dimension of SERVQUAL, influenced consumer satisfaction. Studies of transaction-specific satisfaction had also revealed that 'staff behaviour' or service-related factors were important factors influencing consumer satisfaction in restaurants. For instance, Hensley and Sulek (2007) found that waits in multi-stages (wait time for seating, wait time for food, wait time for bill and wait time for change), 'host staff politeness' and 'server attentiveness' were critical factors affecting consumer satisfaction. Similarly, the findings of Law et al. (2004) showed that consumer satisfaction with 'waiting time' and 'staff attitude' were main factors influencing overall consumer satisfaction. It is because the behaviour of employees (who have contact with consumers) is vital in satisfying consumers' consumption needs or executing a discrete exchange at the encounter level (Ekinci et al., 2008). Research has found that, at the global level, consumer-oriented employees who demonstrate empathy, understanding of the consumer,
interpersonal care, competent and reliable behaviour are able to develop a positive image and continuing relationship with consumers (Ekinci et al., 2008).

Table 8.1 shows that service quality (environment) did not significantly influence consumer satisfaction. This is inconsistent with past studies. Ekinci et al. (2008) revealed that ‘staff behaviour’ and ‘physical quality’ were positively related to consumer satisfaction. Likewise, core quality (the element that is delivered) and relational quality (the way the element is delivered) had direct effect on consumer satisfaction (McDougall and Levesque, 2000). Other studies with similar findings include those of Bitner, 1992; Kivela et al., 1999a, 1999b and 2000; Yuksel and Yuksel, 2002; Gilbert et al., 2004; Weiss et al., 2004; Veloutsou et al., 2005; Gilbert and Veloutsou, 2006 and Gupta et al., 2007. It is unclear why this factor is insignificant, because extensive research conducted on physical quality and atmospheric aspects of restaurants has previously confirmed the validity of including this factor in the model (Andaleeb and Conway, 2006). Andaleeb and Conway (2006), who found similar results to the findings of the present study, suggest that it is possible that there are some variables mediating the link between physical characteristics of a restaurant and consumer satisfaction, that require more research in the future.

A significant relationship between perceived value-for-money and consumer satisfaction was found in this study. The review of consumer satisfaction studies (as discussed in Section 2.3.2.1) in the restaurant industry demonstrated a number of studies that found the effect of perceived value on consumer satisfaction (e.g. McDougall and Levesque, 2000; Babin et al., 2005; Lee et al., 2005). The findings of the present study provide support to the marketing scholars that perceived value affects the direction of ‘satisfied’ or ‘dissatisfied’ and the degree of satisfaction/dissatisfaction experienced (Spreng et al., 1993). Literature demonstrates that perceived value had significant importance in other industries. Bruhn and Grund (2000) found that perceived value was the determinant of consumer satisfaction in twenty industries studied, including
hospitality firms, healthcare, retailing, banking and telecommunication. This suggests that perceived value is a common predictor of consumer satisfaction in businesses. Therefore, perceived consumer value must be taken into account when investigating service quality and consumer satisfaction, because taken together, value and quality may mediate between perception and satisfaction (Oh, 1999).

Desires-congruence has been found to be the function of satisfaction judgement in this study, which supports the finding of previous studies (i.e. Barbeau, 1985; Spreng and Olshavsky, 1993; Ekinci and Sirakaya, 2004; and Ekinci et al., 2008, as addressed in Chapter 4). Only Ekinci and Sirakaya (2004) and Ekinci et al. (2008) examined desires-congruence in the restaurant context. It is important to strengthen buyers' desire for an object, because desire will create strong feelings of pleasantness among buyers (Kitson, 1927). In the service context, delivery of services should be customised in line with consumers' personality traits (Ekinci and Sirakaya, 2004). For instance, the strategy of delivering services for egocentric consumers would be different from a traditional consumer. All in all, the greater the pleasantness is, the greater the desire. This leads to a need for more research investigating the influence of desires-congruence on consumer satisfaction.

Ideal self-congruence significantly predicted consumer satisfaction in this study. In service firms, particularly hotels and restaurants, ideal self-congruence has been shown as an indicator of consumer satisfaction (Ekinci and Riley, 2003; Ekinci et al., 2008). Hong and Zinkhan (1995) noted that this happened because consumers have a strong desire to reach their ideal state and that will improve their self-esteem. For instance, when consumers have a broad range of restaurants to choose from, a specific restaurant may upgrade consumers' actual self to ideal self by providing a brand-new concept that satisfies consumers' higher needs (e.g. friendliness, attractive environment) and functional needs such as convenient place for eating (Ekinci and Sirakaya, 2004).
8.2.2 The Consequences of Consumer Satisfaction

In order to examine the complete model of consumer satisfaction, the relationship between consumer satisfaction and the consequences of consumer satisfaction (i.e. intention to return, intention to recommend, intention to switch and post-purchase attitude towards the service firm), were examined. The outcome of regression analysis of these relationships is depicted in Table 8.2.

Table 8.2: Regression Summary of the Relationships between Consumer Satisfaction and Intention to Return, Intention to Recommend, Intention to Switch and Consumers' Post-purchase Attitude towards the Service Firm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Intention to Return</th>
<th>Intention to Recommend</th>
<th>Intention to Switch</th>
<th>Post-purchase Attitude towards the Service Firm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consumer</td>
<td>( \beta )</td>
<td>( t )</td>
<td>( \beta )</td>
<td>( t )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>12.12</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>17.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: S = Significant; NS = Not Significant

All four dependent variables were confirmed as the consequences of consumer satisfaction, as shown in Table 8.2. It indicates that satisfied consumers will likely return and recommends the restaurants and may be unlikely switch to other restaurants. Satisfied consumers may also have an overall positive attitude towards the restaurant. The t-values in Table 8.2 indicate that consumer satisfaction may best predict consumers' overall positive attitude towards the service firm. This finding confirms the theory of satisfaction by Oliver (1980) that consumer satisfaction influenced consumers' post-purchase attitude to the service firm. This suggests that the path and degree of satisfaction can be use to increase consumers' post-purchase attitude to the service firm (Ekinci et al., 2008). On the whole, when consumers are satisfied with products or services provided by a service firm, their attitude toward the service firm, its products, or services become more favourable (LaBarbera and Mazursky, 1983; Blackwell et al., 2001).
Consumer loyalty in general is a function of consumer satisfaction (Oliver, 1980). The outcome of this study found three types of consumers' intention influenced by consumer satisfaction: intention to return, intention to recommend and intention to switch. Among these three behavioural intentions, many studies have examined the relationships between consumer satisfaction and intention to return, as well as the relationships between consumer satisfaction and intention to recommend. Past studies revealed that consumer satisfaction has a positive effect on intention to return to restaurants (McDougall and Levesque, 2000; Lee et al., 2005; Arora and Singer, 2006; Namkung and Jang, 2007; Ekinci et al., 2008, as previously elicited in Section 2.3.2.2). Similarly, intention to recommend was also found to be a function of consumer satisfaction in several studies: i.e. Babin et al. (2005), Lee et al. (2005), Arora and Singer (2006) and Namkung and Jang (2007).

In the restaurant context, only McDougall and Levesque (2000) examined the relationship between consumer satisfaction and intention to switch. They found that consumer satisfaction was a significant but weaker predictor of intention to switch than intention to return and intention to recommend. Likewise, the findings of the present study demonstrated stronger relationships between consumer satisfaction and other consumer intentions (return and recommend) but a weaker relationship between consumer satisfaction and intention to switch. Oliver (1981) and Bearden and Teel (1983) did not conduct empirical tests of the association between satisfaction and intentions to switch but did propose a causal relationship between the two. Despite little research on intention to switch in restaurants, research in other service firms e.g. banks (Athanassopoulos, 2000) and insurance (Crosby and Stephens, 1987) has found a positive relationship between consumer satisfaction and intention to switch. The findings of the present study concluded that, when consumers were satisfied with the restaurant, they had a greater intention to revisit the restaurant, recommend the restaurant to others and they were unlikely to switch to other restaurants.
8.2.3 The Sub-models of Consumer Satisfaction based on Findings of the Present Study and from the Regression Analyses

In the previous sections, the antecedents and consequences of consumer satisfaction revealed in this study match existing literature. The antecedents are service quality (staff behaviour), perceived value-for-money, desires-congruence and ideal self-congruence. The consequences are intention to return, intention to recommend, intention to switch and consumers' post-purchase attitude towards restaurants. These outcomes support eight out of the ten hypotheses of this study. The remaining hypotheses are discussed in this section, aiming to elaborate the complete relationships of consumer satisfaction (as a mediating variable) and its antecedents and consequences. Four research models that have been developed in this study are presented in Figure 8.1.
Figure 8.1: The Research Models of Consumer Satisfaction based on the Findings of the Present Study
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Figure 8.1 shows the four models of consumer satisfaction involving the relationship between antecedents and consequences of consumer satisfaction, as found in this study. This finding suggests that a process of consumer satisfaction starts with fulfilling consumers' desire, perception towards quality, perception on value-for-money and self-congruence. This led to consumer satisfaction and in turn led to consumers' positive attitudes towards service firm and consumers' behavioural intentions. The factors that are involved in the whole process of consumer satisfaction vary. As shown in figure 8.1, desires-congruence is involved in all four models of consumer satisfaction developed in the present study, indicating the influential role of desires-congruence in predicting consumer satisfaction, intention to return, intention to recommend, intention to switch and post-purchase attitude towards service firm. Perceived value-for-money is involved in all relationships except for the model predicting intention to recommend. Perception of quality does not significantly influence the development of all consumer satisfaction models. Perception of food quality is involved in the model of intention to recommend and intention to return, while perception of environmental quality and service quality (staff behaviour) is only involved in one model i.e. model of intention to return and a model to predict consumer satisfaction, respectively.

The model that best explains consumer satisfaction in this study is the model labelled (d) in Figure 8.1 followed by (b), (a) and (c). The $R^2$ value was used to determine the model that best explained consumer satisfaction. These $R^2$ values demonstrate that, although all relationships were significant, the $R^2$ value for model (a), (b), (c) and (d) improved after consumer satisfaction was included in the model of the relationships between independent variables and dependent variables. This indicates that independent variables explained more of the variance in dependent variables when a mediating variable was included in the model. In other words, all dependent variables are better predicted by independent variables through consumer satisfaction. Among these relationships, the relationships between independent variables and consumers'
post-purchase attitude towards the restaurant became the best-fit model where independent variables through consumer satisfaction explained a total of 61% variance in consumers' post-purchase attitude towards the service firm. This is followed by intention to recommend (53%), intention to return (42%) and intention to switch (27%). Ekinci et al. (2008) supports this result, where the relationships in their study between independent variables and intention to return and consumers' post-purchase attitude towards the restaurant were also mediated through consumer satisfaction. Despite that, they did not mention which of the two forms a better consumer satisfaction model.

It is also noted in Figure 8.1 that model (c), which involved the relationship between independent variables and intention to switch, was the weakest model in comparison to other models. Perhaps, there are other variables that mediate the relationship between independent variables, consumer satisfaction and intention to switch. Bansal and Taylor (1999) proposed that other variables which could be included in a consumer satisfaction model involving intention to switch were attitude toward switching and switching costs. Further research is therefore needed to examine these relationships in order to see the improvement of the consumer satisfaction model with the presence of intention to switch.

This finding is compared with other consumer satisfaction models developed in the previous research. The models that resulted from this study give the idea that consumer satisfaction may result in post-purchase attitude and behavioural intention, namely 'intention to return', 'intention to recommend' and 'intention to switch'. None of the previous research has examined all variables at a time as in the present study. The models that are found in the present study manage to bring together the factors that are involved in the consumer satisfaction process which was examined separately in separate studies in the previous research. The relationships between variables that were found in the previous studies are summarised in Table 8.3.
### Table 8.3: The Relationship between Independent, Mediating and Dependent Variables in the Past Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>The significant link found</th>
<th>Mediating variable</th>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
2. Food-quality performance  
3. Service-quality performance | Consumer satisfaction | 1. Intention to return  
2. Intention to recommend |
2. Perceived value  
3. Positive affect | Consumer satisfaction | 1. Intention to recommend |
2. Service quality (staff behaviour)  
3. Desires congruence  
4. Ideal self-congruence | Consumer satisfaction | 1. Intention to return  
2. Post-purchase attitude towards service firm |
2. Perceived value | Consumer satisfaction | 1. Intention to return  
2. Intention to recommend |
2. Service quality (staff behaviour)  
2. Intention to recommend |
2. Intention to recommend |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Consumer Satisfaction Components</th>
<th>Customer Satisfaction Components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ladhari et al (2007)</td>
<td>1. Service quality (general)</td>
<td>1. Intention to recommend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Negative emotions</td>
<td>2. Willingness to pay more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Customer loyalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Relational benefits</td>
<td>2. Intention to return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Favourable equity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ryu et al (2008)</td>
<td>1. Perceived service value</td>
<td>1. Intention to return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Firm’s image</td>
<td>2. Intention to recommend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Perceived service value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Expectation with service quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Expectation with ambiance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Inferred disconfirmation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Perceived service value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 8.3, the findings of the past studies differ in terms of the process of consumer satisfaction. Some studies have examined similar
independent and dependent variables as the present study while other studies examined different variables.

Food quality, service quality and perceived value are the common factors that predict consumer satisfaction as shown in Table 8.3. Food quality was found to influence consumer satisfaction in the study by Arora and Singer (2006) and Namkung and Jang (2007). This finding is in line with the study by Namkung and Jang (2007). Namkung and Jang (2007) demonstrated an indirect effect of food quality on 'intention to return' through satisfaction. They suggested that although the significance value of the indirect effect was lower than the direct effect, results still succeeded in underlining the role of satisfaction as a mediating variable between food quality and intention to return. Service quality in general predicts consumer satisfaction in many studies as depicted in Table 8.3 e.g. Babin et al (2005), Ladhari et al (2007) and Kim et al (2009). In terms of the dimension of service quality, the dimension of staff behaviour was found to influence consumer satisfaction in many studies similar to the present study. These studies include Ekinci et al (2008), McDougall and Levesque (2000) and Kim (2009). It is assumed that staff behaviour is very influential in determining consumer satisfaction in restaurants. Perceived value is a predictor of consumer satisfaction in several studies e.g. Babin et al (2005), Lee et al (2005), Heung and Ngai (2008), Cronin et al (2000) and these findings are in line with the present study.

The present study, however, provides additional factors that influence consumer satisfaction i.e. self-congruence and desires-congruence. Although self-congruence is found to have significant effect on consumer satisfaction, findings failed to prove the relationship between self-congruence and all dependent variables. This indicates that this factor, which represents a consumers' personality, does influence consumer satisfaction in restaurants, but has no effect on consumers' intention to return, recommend or switch to other restaurants, as well as consumer's post-purchase attitude towards restaurants.
This finding supports the outcome of Ekinci et al (2008) study and adds value into Ekinci et al's model. The model developed in the present study emphasise the importance of 'intention to switch' and food quality in the process of consumer satisfaction. This present study has also highlighted the quality dimension in restaurant including food quality, service quality and environmental quality which contradicted Ekinci et al (2008) that suggests that service quality involves the elements of service delivery and environmental elements in restaurants. It is concluded that the present study is not only able to adapt Ekinci et al (2008) model to examine the process of consumer satisfaction but also provides insight to the significant role of food quality and intention to switch that leads to adding knowledge to the literature related to consumer satisfaction.

The present study has emphasised the role of consumer satisfaction in predicting post-purchase attitude towards service firm, intention to recommend, intention to return and intention to switch. Based on Table 8.3, consumer satisfaction influences 'intention to return' and 'intention to recommend' in most past studies including Arora and Singer (2006), Ryu et al (2008), Lee et al (2005) and Namkung and Jang (2007). The present study found a link between consumer satisfaction and post-purchase attitude towards service firm, which was similarly found in the study by Ekinci et al (2008). With regards to the link between consumer satisfaction and intention to switch, none of the previous research found a relationship between the two. The present study has filled the gap in the literature. However the result is not conclusive due to the limited number of the study that examined this variable. Further study needs to be done to further examine the relationship.

8.3 Summary

This chapter discussed findings of the current study in relation to the existing literature. Quality dimensions which include food quality, service quality (staff behaviour) and service quality (environment) were important aspects of quality in restaurants as suggested in the literature. This study has added value to the
existing literature by proving that food quality has the largest variance in the factor analyses compared to other quality dimensions. In addition, these findings also support existing literature that consumer satisfaction does not stand on its own. In fact, consumer satisfaction has its antecedents and consequences. Consumer satisfaction also plays a role as a mediating variable in the relationship between independent variables and dependent variables. This finding strengthens the idea which had been previously discussed in the literature that independent variables better influence dependent variables with the presence of consumer satisfaction. With these findings, the next chapter summarises the whole thesis and discusses limitations of the current study, its implications and recommendations for future research.
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CHAPTER NINE
SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

9.0 Introduction

This chapter presents the summary of the study and concludes the research. It is organised into five sections. Section 9.1 concludes whether objectives of studies set at the earlier stage of research have been achieved. In section 9.2, the findings of this study are briefly summarised and interpreted. The contribution of this study to both theory and practice is outlined in section 9.3. The limitations of the study are discussed in section 9.4. Section 9.5 addresses the recommendations for future research.

9.1 Achieving the Study's Objectives

In this section, the study's objectives are compared with the outcomes of the study. The objectives of the study that were stated previously in Chapter 1, are depicted in Figure 9.1.

Figure 9.1: The Objectives of the Present Study

1) To examine the elements of restaurants in terms of influencing consumers’ eating-out experience in restaurant.
2) To explore consumers’ view on ‘food quality’, in relation to restaurants’ dining.
3) To test the extended model of ‘consumer satisfaction’ that examines the relationship between ‘food quality’, ‘service quality’, ‘desires-cogruence’, ‘self-congruence’, ‘perceived value-for-money’ and variables including ‘consumer satisfaction’, ‘behavioural intentions’ and ‘post-purchase attitude towards the service firm’, that has been adapted from Ekinci et al. (2008).
5) To investigate the effect of ‘consumer satisfaction’ on consumers’ behavioural intentions and ‘post-purchase attitude towards the service firm’.
6) To determine the path through which ‘food quality’, ‘service quality’, ‘desires-congruence’, ‘self-congruence’, ‘perceived value-for-money’ influence ‘consumer satisfaction’ and whether ‘consumer satisfaction’ mediates the link between these variables and ‘consumers’ behavioural intentions’ and ‘post-purchase attitude towards the service firm’.
9.1.1 The Elements of Restaurant Perceived to Influence Consumers' Eating-out Experience

Majority of respondents expressed that service delivery influences eating-out experience. Other factors besides service delivery were: the food, environment in restaurant and meal price/value for money. Service delivery theme includes attentiveness of restaurant staff, promptness of restaurant staff in service delivery, friendliness of restaurant staff and restaurant staffs' competency in delivering service. Themes related to 'food' encompass tastiness, freshness and appearance of food. The third theme appeared to be important in eating out was the environment in restaurant which consisted of three main categories: décor, cleanliness and design and layout. Finally, yet importantly, was the price and value for money. These themes confirmed the restaurant attributes that were identified in past consumer-satisfaction studies.

Although finding showed that themes related to service delivery were mentioned many times throughout the interview, when a direct question on 'among service delivery, food or environment, what is the most important factor to you?', more than half of respondents perceived 'food' as the most important factor. This indicates that, while service delivery continues to be the most predominant in the minds of consumers, 'food' is still the most important factor in a restaurant and affects consumer eating-out experience in a restaurant. This finding had proven the importance of food in restaurants despite very little research that had treated 'food quality' as the most vital aspect in foodservices.

9.1.2 Consumers' Views on Food Quality

Quality attributes of food include tastiness, freshness and appearance of food, accuracy of meal to the consumers' expectation, how properly the food is cooked, as well as quantity, smell, fattiness, authenticity and temperature of food. The top three components of food quality (taste, freshness and appearance of food) discovered in the interview were also found to be the most vital components of food quality in the past studies (e.g. DeLuco and Cremer, 1990;
Dube et al., 1994; Seo and Shanklin, 2005a). It shows that part of the interview findings seemed to reflect general consumers' views of food quality. The outcome of the interviews suggested the food-quality characteristics are vital in forming the measurement of 'food quality' for the questionnaire. Only one aspect, that is the authenticity of food was not included in the measurement of 'food quality' for this factor is better reflected in ethnic restaurants, whereas the context of the present study included various kinds of restaurant in which authenticity may not be the focus of this study.

9.1.3 Model-Testing

The primary aim of this study is to examine the effect of 'food quality' on 'consumer satisfaction', 'behavioural intention' and 'consumers' post-purchase attitude', in the presence of other variables including 'service quality (staff behaviour and environmental)', 'perceived value-for-money', 'desires-congruence' and 'self-congruence'. This aim has been achieved by testing the proposed model adapted from the model tested in Ekinci et al. (2008). This model is shown in Figure 9.2.
Testing the model in Figure 9.2 fulfilled the following objectives:

1) To examine the effect of 'food quality', 'service quality', 'desires-congruence', 'self-congruence', 'perceived value' on 'consumer satisfaction'.

2) To investigate the effect of 'consumer satisfaction' on 'consumers' behavioural intention' and 'post-purchase attitude towards the service firm'.

3) To determine the path through which 'food quality', 'service quality', 'desires-congruence', 'self-congruence', 'perceived value-for-money' influence 'consumer satisfaction' and whether 'consumer satisfaction' mediates the link between these variables and 'consumers' behavioural intentions' and 'post-purchase attitude towards the service firm'.

Based on the statistical results, factors that influenced 'consumer satisfaction' in restaurants are 'perceived value-for-money', 'service quality (staff behaviour)', 'desires-congruence' and 'ideal self-congruence'. 'Perceived value-for-money' is
the strongest predictor, while the weakest contribution is 'ideal self-congruence'. Ideal self-congruence represents how consumers perceived the personalities of other people in the restaurants represent their identity. 'Food quality' and 'service quality (environmental)' were not significantly influencing 'consumer satisfaction'. This indicates that restaurant consumers did not require a quality food and environment as much as 'value-for-money', 'service quality (staff behaviour)', 'desires-congruence' and 'ideal self-congruence', in order to be satisfied in their dining experience.

This study also examined the influence of 'consumer satisfaction' on the factors that reflect consumers' behaviour and attitude after dining, such as 'intention to return', 'intention to recommend', 'intention to switch' and 'consumers' post-purchase attitude towards the service firm'. 'Consumer satisfaction' was statistically significant in estimating all dependent variables: 'intention to return', 'intention to recommend', 'intention to switch' and 'consumers' post-purchase attitude towards the service firm'. The factor (consumer satisfaction) had the strongest influence on 'consumers' post-purchase attitude towards the service firm' while the weakest influence was on 'intention to switch'.

The present study also found that the effects of 'food quality' and other variables on 'behavioural intention' and 'post-purchase attitude' follow direct, and indirect paths through mediating variable: 'consumer satisfaction'. The indirect path has explained greater variance in the 'behavioural intention' (i.e. 'intention to return', 'intention to recommend' and 'intention to switch') and 'post-purchase attitude'. It shows that high perception of all independent variables (except ideal self-congruence) does not inevitably lead to high level of 'behavioural intentions' and 'post-purchase attitude'. However, high perception of all independent variables with higher perception of 'consumer satisfaction' had led to higher level of 'behavioural intention' and 'post-purchase attitude'.
An examination of each independent variable showed that a significant direct relationship was found between 'food quality', 'service quality (staff behaviour)', 'service quality (environmental)', 'perceived value-for-money' and 'desires-congruence' on 'behavioural intention' and 'post-purchase attitude'. In particular:

- 'Food quality' influenced 'intention to return' and 'intention to recommend'.
- 'Service quality (staff behaviour)' predicted 'intention to return', 'intention to recommend' and 'consumers' post-purchase attitude towards the service firm'.
- 'Service quality (environmental)' affected only one factor: 'consumers' post-purchase attitude towards the service firm'.
- Perceived value-for-money and 'desires-congruence' influenced all four variables: 'intention to return', 'intention to recommend', 'intention to switch' and 'consumers' post-purchase attitude towards the service firm'.

The indirect path of the relationships between independent variables and 'behavioural intention' as well as 'post-purchase attitude' revealed that the variables had significant association through 'consumer satisfaction'. These relationships had been affected, either partially or fully, by 'consumer satisfaction'. A partial mediation effect of 'consumer satisfaction' occurred in the relationships between:

- 'Desires-congruence' and all four dependent variables (i.e. 'intention to return', 'intention to recommend', 'intention to switch' and 'post-purchase attitude').
- 'Perceived value-for-money' and three dependent variables: 'intention to return', 'intention to switch' and 'post-purchase attitude'.
- 'Food quality' and two dependent variables: 'intention to return' and 'intention to recommend'.
- 'Service quality (environmental)' and 'intention to return'.

On the other hand, a fully-mediating effect of 'consumer satisfaction' occurred in the relationships between:
These results indicate that the five antecedents of ‘consumer satisfaction’ predict different types of consequences of ‘consumer satisfaction’. In addition, the most-obvious finding to emerge from this study is that ‘consumer satisfaction’ has a strong influence in the link between ‘perceived value-for-money’, ‘service quality (staff behaviour)’, ‘service quality (environmental)’ and certain types of ‘behavioural intention’ and ‘post-purchase attitude’. In other words, the study’ findings reflect the high connection between ‘antecedents of ‘consumer satisfaction’ and ‘consequences of ‘consumer satisfaction’. Consequently, the current-study model adopted from Ekinci et al. (2008) empirically supported this.

9.2 Theoretical Implications

The present study attempted to expand the model of Ekinci et al. (2008) that was developed based on the literature from the service-marketing discipline, including the ‘consumer satisfaction’ theory by Oliver (1980). Based on this theory, Oliver (1980) concluded that satisfaction is formed during consumption, where satisfaction at this stage is specific to time and situation. Therefore, when satisfaction appears at the post-purchasing stage, it deteriorates with the consumers’ pre-purchase attitude and the consumers’ ‘post-purchase attitude to the service firm’ is developed.

The present study expands the model of Ekinci et al. (2008) by examining other variables in the model. These variables include ‘food quality’, ‘perceived value-for-money’, ‘intention to recommend’ and ‘intention to switch’. The findings in this doctoral study indicated that ‘food quality’ failed to predict ‘consumer satisfaction’. This result may be explained by the fact that the relationship between ‘food quality’ and ‘consumer satisfaction’ has been tested in the

259
presence of other variables that has been proven (by the past studies) to significantly influence 'consumer satisfaction' (i.e. 'perceived value-for-money', 'service quality (staff behaviour)', 'desires-congruence' and 'ideal self-congruence'). This also suggests that quality food alone in a restaurant is insufficient to influence satisfaction during the dining experience. Despite this, 'food quality' was found to influence 'intention to return' and 'intention to recommend' indicating that a quality food in a restaurant may influence a consumer to return to a restaurant and recommend that particular restaurant to other people. This outcome suggests that consumer react towards how they perceived 'food quality' through behaviour, such as re-visit or spreading words about restaurant, instead of getting emotional about pleasure or displeasure of the food.

The current study also found that 'perceived value-for-money' predicted 'consumer satisfaction'. Moreover, 'perceived-value-for money' remained significant to predict 'intention to return', 'intention to switch' and 'post-purchase attitude towards the service firm' when 'consumer satisfaction' was in the equation. This indicates that 'perceived value-for-money' is important in a restaurant because it may influence consumers' satisfaction in their dining experience. This will in turn influence their intention to revisit the restaurant, their switching behaviour and 'post-purchase attitude towards the service firm'. This outcome could improve the model of 'consumer satisfaction' in terms comprehending 'consumer satisfaction' better, particularly in the restaurant context.

'Intention to switch' had a small contribution to the model of 'consumer satisfaction'. This variable was found to be a statistically-significant consequence of 'consumer satisfaction', but the weakest among other consequences (i.e. 'intention to return', 'intention to recommend' and 'post-purchase attitude towards the service firm'). Despite that, two independent variables, which were 'desires-congruence' and 'perceived value-for-money' were significant in predicting
‘intention to switch’. This gives an indication that value-for-money and the difference in what consumers received and desired in restaurants are able to influence restaurant-consumers’ switching behaviour. Further studies examining these relationships are essential to confirm the findings of the present study.

The present study proved that quality aspect in restaurant is three-dimensional. Three dimensions of quality revealed from the factor analysis are food quality, ‘staff behaviour’ and ‘environmental quality’. This finding of the current study are inconsistent with those of Ekinci et al. (2008) and Madanoglu (2004) who found two dimensions of service quality in the hotel and restaurant industries, i.e. staff behaviour and physical. This finding suggests that quality could be assessed according to the tangible and intangible aspects offered in restaurants. The fulfillment of these aspects in restaurants may lead to various consumers’ behavioural intention, particularly intention to return and intention to recommend.

The findings of this study suggest that ‘consumer satisfaction’ plays an important role in the relationships between ‘perceived value-for-money’, ‘service quality (staff behaviour)’, ‘service quality (environmental)’ and certain types of ‘behavioural intention’ and ‘post-purchase attitude’. The current findings add to a growing body of literature on the mediating role of ‘consumer satisfaction’ in determining ‘behavioural intention’ and ‘post-purchase attitude’.

The present study has proven that there are a number of consequences of ‘consumer satisfaction’. These include ‘intention to return’, ‘intention to recommend’, ‘intention to switch’ and ‘post-purchase attitude towards the service firm’. Similarly, Ekinci et al. (2008) found ‘intention to return’ and ‘post-purchase attitude towards the firm’ as the function of ‘consumer satisfaction’. The present study expanded these findings by providing another two consequences of ‘consumer satisfaction’ (i.e. ‘intention to recommend’ and ‘intention to switch’, which could be tested in future research.
A significant relationship between 'desires-congruence' and 'consumer satisfaction' was found in the present study, replicating what has been found in the study by Ekinci et al. (2008). This finding indicates that restaurant consumers used desires to evaluate satisfaction. Limited number of studies proved that desires are the comparison standard in evaluating satisfaction in the hospitality industry (except the work of Ekinci's). The present study has therefore supported Ekinci's work and filled the gap in the literature in that consumers use desires in the evaluation of 'consumer satisfaction'.

This study also highlights the importance of food in the eating-out experience and examines satisfaction according to the list of factors representing quality of food. These factors include 'food was presented and arranged nicely on the plate', 'food was properly cooked', 'food met my expectation', 'food smelt nice', 'food was served at an appropriate temperature', 'food contained fresh ingredients', 'food looked appetising' and 'food was tasty'. These factors were derived from the interviews conducted at the preliminary stage of the study and were validated through the main survey. It is anticipated that future studies could re-validate these scales to confirm their suitability for examining quality and satisfaction in restaurants.

Interviews that were used to collect preliminary data in this study highlight the important attributes related to eating-out experience (e.g. food, service, environment, price and value-for-money) which could be used in assessing quality or 'consumer satisfaction' in restaurants. Most attributes found in the interviews have been used in the past studies in examining 'consumer satisfaction'. However, other attributes (e.g. design and layout) elicited in the interviews were not always examined in the past studies. Researchers could also include other restaurant attributes into their study, making sure to include only certain attributes (which were previously mentioned) that represent the type of restaurant being studied.
9.3 Managerial Implications

The findings of this study provide insights for restaurant managers into the factors that are important in influencing 'consumer satisfaction', 'behavioural intention's and 'post-purchase attitude towards the service firm'.

Firstly, quality of food is essential in influencing consumers to re-visit a restaurant and spread positive word-of-mouth about the restaurant. Hence, restaurant management should provide food of the best quality in order to create loyal consumers. This is a worthwhile effort to help in reduce spending on securing new consumers.

Secondly, from the managerial perspective, 'perceived value-for-money' should be recognised as one of the contributing factors to consumers' satisfaction and loyalty. In the present study, 'perceived value' related to consumer perceptions of costs. It is important for the restaurants to offer food or service that constitutes value for their target consumers. As the outcome of the study shows, quality itself may not be sufficient because value can offer greater competitive control as it not only contributes to 'consumer satisfaction', but also encourages repeated purchases.

Thirdly, the discrepancy between consumers' desirability of dining experience and their actual experience in a restaurant is also important in satisfying consumers. Satisfied consumers are likely to return to the restaurant for dining, spreading good words about the restaurant, being loyal to the restaurant by not switching to other restaurants and furthermore, building a positive attitude towards the restaurant. Therefore, restaurant managers should customise various aspects in restaurants to fulfil the desires of the different groups of consumers. For instance, the style, design or décor in a restaurant can be created in line with consumers' age, education level, and income. This could
provide pleasure during the dining experience that would lead to building good rapport between loyal consumers and restaurants.

Another important finding of this study suggests the function of satisfaction in determining consumers' loyalty and positive attitude towards restaurants. Consumers who perceived high quality or good value-for-money in restaurants may not necessarily be loyal to restaurants unless they are satisfied with them. Here, restaurant managers should play an important role by not only delivering the best quality of staff behaviour, environmental quality and good value-for-money, but also in providing strategies that can make each-and-every customer happy in a restaurant. This will help in keeping existing consumers without spending a lot of money on advertising and will in turn generate profits.

The findings that emerged from this study also revealed that the performance of quality (i.e. quality of food, staff behaviour and environment) in the restaurant was reasonably good, although lower ratings were observed for several factors. These factors include 'restaurant was comfortable', 'restaurant had attractive layout', 'staff were prompt', 'restaurant had beautiful décor' and 'staff anticipated what I wanted'. This suggests that restaurant managers could use these attributes as indicators on what aspects could be improved to maintain quality in the restaurants. Among these attributes, managers should focus on the attributes that related to the quality of staff behaviour in delivering service. This is because staff behaviour exerts the strongest significant effect on customer satisfaction. This is important to avoid wasting money and other resources on recreating service attributes that do not significantly influence 'consumer satisfaction' (Hwang and Lambert, 2005).

Based on the above discussion, the present study has suggested factors that are important in restaurants. The most significant factors are 'desires', 'value-for-money' and 'quality - food, service and environment'. These factors have
different weights of importance towards consumers’ satisfaction, post-consumption behaviours and attitude towards restaurants.

9.4 Summary of Study's Contributions

The findings of this study contribute additional knowledge to the existing literature in 'consumer satisfaction' research. These involve the major findings as below:

9.4.1 Scale and Measurement

- The quality scales involving food, staff behaviour and environmental quality have been validated and found to be reliable.
- These factors were also analysed in factor analysis which resulted in the largest variance in food-quality dimension.

9.4.2 Antecedents of 'Consumer Satisfaction'

- Four variables which significantly predict 'consumer satisfaction' are 'perceived value-for-money', 'service quality (staff behaviour)', 'desires-congruence' and 'ideal self-congruence'.
- The strongest predictor of 'consumer satisfaction' is 'perceived value-for-money', followed by 'service quality (staff behaviour)', 'desires-congruence' and 'ideal self-congruence'.

9.4.3 Consequences of 'Consumer Satisfaction'

- 'Consumer satisfaction' was statistically significant in estimating all dependent variables: 'intention to return', 'intention to recommend', 'intention to switch' and 'post-purchase attitude towards the service firm'.
- The strongest influence 'consumer satisfaction' has is on 'post-purchase attitude towards the service firm' and the weakest influence is on 'intention to switch'.
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9.4.4 The Model of 'Consumer Satisfaction' in the Present Study

- Model-testing demonstrated that there is a significant direct relationship between antecedents of 'consumer satisfaction' and consequences of 'consumer satisfaction'.
- A significant indirect relationship between antecedents of 'consumer satisfaction' and consequences of 'consumer satisfaction' was also present when 'consumer satisfaction' played a mediating role.
- Independent variables through 'consumer satisfaction' explained the higher total percentage of variance in all dependent variables compared to total variance in the direct path.

9.4.5 Other Key Findings

- 'Perceived value-for-money', 'desires-congruence', 'service quality (staff behaviour)' and 'food quality' significantly predicted 'intention to return' and 'intention to recommend'.
- 'Perceived value-for-money' and 'desires-congruence' significantly contributed to 'intention to switch'.
- 'Perceived value-for-money', 'desires-congruence', 'service quality (staff behaviour)' and 'service quality (environmental)' significantly influenced 'post-purchase attitude towards the service firm'.
- 'Ideal self-congruence' did not contribute to all dependent variables.
- 'Food quality' and 'service quality (environmental)' was insignificant in predicting 'consumer satisfaction'.
- 'Food quality' significantly influences 'intention to return' and 'intention to recommend'.

9.5 Limitations and Future Research

Results of the present study must be interpreted with caution because of research limitations. Firstly, this investigation is based on a very specific context (i.e. restaurant) and location (a town in the South East of England). Secondly,
female consumers were slightly over-represented in the sample. In addition, this study used convenience sampling by mean of mail questionnaires to collect data. In order to generalise these results, replicating similar investigations in other sectors and locations by using more comprehensive sampling design is essential.

Two 'service quality' dimensions were examined in the present study. These dimensions were initially adapted from Ekinci et al. (2008). Slight modifications were made to the items in the 'service quality' dimension, based on the preliminary interviews. Modification was made in order to suit the restaurant context. Future research may identify items or dimensions of 'service quality' that are specific to their study context.

'Ideal self-congruence' was significant in influencing 'consumer satisfaction'. This factor was insignificant in predicting 'intention to return', 'intention to recommend', 'intention to switch' and 'post-purchase attitude towards the service firm'. Studies that examine this factor in the 'consumer satisfaction' research, particularly in the hospitality context, are still very limited. A continuous research examining this factor is necessary.

Future research is recommended to concentrate on investigating 'perceived value' in 'consumer satisfaction' model besides 'service quality'. This research has revealed the importance of 'perceived value' as an antecedent of 'consumer satisfaction'. The present study however only examined 'perceived value' on a monetary basis. Future research could extend this research to incorporate non-monetary aspects of 'perceived value' in the 'consumer satisfaction' model. Non-monetary aspects include time and physical effort (Lovelock, 2001). This could offer further insights of the influence of 'perceived value' to 'consumer satisfaction' and its consequences such as 'intention to return', 'intention to recommend', 'intention to switch' and 'post-purchase attitude towards the service firm'.
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The present study revealed that the model involving the relationship between independent variables and 'intention to switch' (as dependent variable) was the weakest model in comparison to other models. Perhaps there are other variables that mediate the relationship between all independent variables (i.e. 'food quality', 'service quality (staff behaviour)', 'service quality (environmental)', 'perceived value-for-money', 'desires-congruence' and 'desires-congruence'), 'consumer satisfaction' and 'intention to switch'. These include 'attitude towards switching' and 'switching costs' (Bansal and Taylor, 1999). Further research, is therefore needed to examine these relationships in order to see the improvement of the 'consumer satisfaction' model with the presence of 'intention to switch'.

The present study did not examine the impact of a respondent being a frequent user of the restaurant to their satisfaction, 'behavioural intention' and 'post-purchase attitude'. It is anticipated that consumers who have experience eating out in one particular restaurant may become familiar to the quality of food or service delivery in that restaurant. This is, however, different to a new consumer visiting a similar restaurant. Oliver (1980) suggested that satisfaction which is derived from past consumption experience in turn influences 'post-purchase attitude'. Besides, it is also possible that consumers' attitude towards the service firm could be developed through indirect past experiences (e.g., through advertising and corporate image) (Oliver, 1997). It is recommended that future research could consider these factors in studying 'consumer satisfaction', 'behavioural intention' and attitude in a restaurant.

Another limitation of this study is that participants rated their responses based on different restaurants that represent eating-out experiences in different environments. The present study classified these responses into several categories of restaurant including full-service restaurant, pub restaurant and café (as described in section 7.2.1). In order to generalise the results, it is recommended that future research could expand sampling to a larger sample size within each restaurant type.
The present study provides additional knowledge to the research of 'consumer satisfaction' despite various research limitations mentioned previously. Although 'food quality' was insignificant in predicting 'consumer satisfaction', it influenced 'intention to return' and 'intention to recommend'. Besides, this research has supplied variables that are important in determining 'consumer satisfaction' in a restaurant which could be examined in future research. These include 'perceived value-for-money', 'desires-congruence', 'service quality (staff behaviour)' and 'ideal self-congruence'. In addition, the consequences of 'consumer satisfaction' were revealed in this study. They are 'intention to return', 'intention to recommend', 'intention to switch' and 'post-purchase attitude towards the service firm'. This study also confirmed the link between 'consumer satisfaction' and its antecedents and consequences. It is anticipated that the findings of the present study may close the gap in the literature and provide knowledge to the literature of 'consumer satisfaction' which allows area of future research.
Appendices
Appendix I – Initial Interview Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want you to think of your recent visit to a restaurant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Could you please describe about this restaurant?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Could you explain about that particular experience?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If interviewees mentioned the following;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Good food / bad food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Good service / bad service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Good servers / bad service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Good atmosphere / bad atmosphere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. OR other words to describe experience on food, service, servers or atmosphere;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The following questions were used to elicit responses:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Could you say more about.........?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What did you mean by.........?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have mentioned about (name all elements in restaurant that have been mentioned by respondent e.g. food, service, environment, etc.). Which of these being the most important to you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In your opinion, what do you understand with / think of a quality food in restaurant?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May I ask a few questions about you? Please complete the multiple choice answer sheet. If you find any questions offensive, please feel free to refuse to answer them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Which of the following age groups do you belong to?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Which of the following represents your monthly income?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix II– Background of Participants Answer Sheet

Question 1
Which of the following age groups do you belong to?

a. Up to 25 years old
b. 25 to 34 years old
c. 35 to 44 years old
d. 45 to 54 years old
e. 55 to 64 years old
f. 65 years old and above

Question 2
Which of the following represents your monthly income?

a. Less than £500
b. £500 - £999
c. £1000 - £1499
d. £1500 and over
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Dear All,

**Have you eaten out in the last two weeks?**

If yes, I would be very interested to hear about your experiences. My study involves a one-to-one interview with me, and aims to investigate factors that are important in the eating out experience. The interview is conducted as part of my PhD study.

If you are interested in taking part, please contact me at msp1sj@surrey.ac.uk and I will give you fuller information.
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Free refreshment will be provided prior to the interview session

A chance to win a lunch voucher at Lakeside Restaurant worth £10

Thank you for your attention!

Siti Nurafifah Jaafar
Research Student
School of Management
University of Surrey
Appendix V – Sample of Notices

Have you eaten out in the last two weeks?

If yes, I would be very interested to hear about your experiences. My study involves a one-to-one interview with me, and aims to investigate factors that are important in the eating out experience. The interview is conducted as part of my PhD study. If you are interested in taking part, please contact me, Siti at msp1sj@surrey.ac.uk and I will give you fuller information.

What will you get?

Free refreshment will be provided prior to the interview session
A chance to win a lunch voucher at Lakeside Restaurant worth £10

Thank you for your attention!
INTERVIEWER
Thank you for participating. When was the last time you visited restaurant?

RESP-013
23rd of March..

RESP-013
Restaurant I’m going to quite often it’s near my home. It’s an ethnic restaurant. It serves Mongolian typed food and its extremely good value for money. Staffs are very pleasant and welcoming and they served my favourite beer.

INTERVIEWER
Can you explain more when you say....

RESP-013
It is extremely good value for money....Value for money is when I can have almost more food than I can eat with my wife. The price of food with the drink is something around 28 to 30 pounds for two people. I find that when I go into more traditional restaurant, they have lamb dish or chicken dish; I pay something like 15 pound just for the main course and then by the time you had a glass of wine, another 15 pounds. It’s all summed up to your bill generally gets up to nearly 60 pounds for 2 peoples. So that for me is not something I would do more than occasionally. A good value for money for me is the main course and vegetables and may be either a dessert or coffee that comes to less than about...cost about 10 pounds money to me.

INTERVIEWER
Is it more of the price...?

RESP-013
The value for money is based on my price threshold but of course, it balances against the food you get. The food that I had has all the flavour and it fills me up. I find ethnic food has all the flavour and it fills you up. And they are not expensive.

INTERVIEWER
It fills you up. Can you explain more of that?

RESP-013
I mean I’m not hungry when I come out (laugh).

INTERVIEWER
What else do you like about the food in that restaurant?

RESP-013
In this particular restaurant, I like the flavour. Well I like spicy food. It always hot. Serves hot Sometimes it comes to the table on a skillet...still frying. It’s lots of different components that’s not just piece of meat and some vegetables. There are things like lentills, rice amm may be fruit in the rice, there’s sauces...there’s different textures. Interesting to eat.

INTERVIEWER
Can you give example when you say...
Different textures... there will be some that is moist. There will be some that is highly flavoured. There will be parts might be crisp, like you have an Indian meal. I like different ammm I like the contrast between spicy and sweet.

You mean you get both taste in... 

In one meal. Yeah.

Can you give example of this food?

Well the nearest example I could give you would be... supposing you have a curry. You might have chutney with it yeah. And I just say... quite often I find the vegetable content more interesting. Always have the extra vegetables like spinach cook with lentils. It's interesting.

Interesting in terms of...

Interesting in terms of combination and the flavours.

Anything else you would like to share about the food in that particular restaurant?

I don't think so. I mean I think I aware that I supposed it's partly to do with the content of meal. I'm aware it's very filling and often there are 2-3 dishes that make up the meal dish unlike the traditional kind of meat and two vegetables and the potato. These things are much more complex.

You've mentioned that the staffs in the restaurant are welcoming. Can you explain more?

Well... they (staffs) seem to be probably a family. And they are so intense to make your experience enjoyable. They got interest in business. It's quite notable. You know, most evening in a week... if you go in there, their restaurant will be 3 quarters full as all other restaurants nearby would be sometimes empty... completely empty. Put it down to the combination the fact that food is good, and the service is very friendly, don't get the sense that there's any falseness about greeting, greet away.... in a bit little while they will bring something to nibble in a long tray dish may be some vegetables or some nuts or stuffs like that.

What kind of service do they have there?

It's just plain sort of plated service. It's nothing too fancy. It's quick. Depending on the dish you choose because they cook it as you order. Yeah it's quite quick. Very attentive.

What about the overall...
RESP-013
The overall atmosphere of the restaurant is nice because it's normally quite lot of people in there. And the décor is pretty typical...it has few picked photographs around the place. Emm silk plant...doesn't tend to be real plant because it doesn't have enough light. This restaurant has nice clean table cloths, beautiful chairs, red carpet, wood panel bar, very typical style restaurant, not part of a big chain because it's not stereotypical. The atmosphere is created by other people by the food coming in and out. Staffs chat among themselves and busying themselves. You go and look out at other place. You don't notice that.

INTERVIEWER
Why do you choose to go to this restaurant?

RESP-013
There are about 5 restaurants in the village I lived in and this particular restaurant produced the best food at the most reasonable price. Once we tried it we found ourselves keep going back there.

INTERVIEWER
How many times do you go to this kind of restaurant in a month?

RESP-013
This restaurant? Probably twice. Yeah, twice.

INTERVIEWER
What about this kind of restaurant?

RESP-013
Emm well I think in Guildford there are probably 60 restaurants to choose from. And amm I don't choose some of them because my wife is celiac which means she can't eat anything with flour in it. So going to somewhere like Pizza Express...we do occasionally go there but then she always has to have the salad because there's nothing on the menu she can eat that has no flour in it. So normally if we go somewhere like ammm Auberge. Auberge is very expensive and you want to eat out once a month. You will have to think about how much you spend. And so there are places like Pizza's which is also have pizza but they have a nice range of other dishes that she can choose from. Most restaurants are pretty good of trying to find something but say Pizza Express because it's a chain restaurant, has very limited on what it can offer. So we don't tend to go there quite often so much. We also used to like a restaurant in Guildford called 'Fish'. That restaurant closes down because of money. That was an excellent restaurant but it was quite expensive. And that's been taken over now by Thai Terrace. Thai Terrace...I don't like. The food is poor quality. And the service is (show unpleasant facial expression).

INTERVIEWER
Can you tell me more about that?

RESP-013
Poor quality. The food that comes in 'batter' often is inferior quality made. Although it looks nice on the plate, often there's more batter than the product. The starter is almost similar to the customer main course. There are lots and lots of staff there so you get a bit swamp and they are more concern getting the order than they are to an engaging with you as a customer. It's a business like. If you go out in the evening, you don't want that. A bit more dis-question about the food. I would not go there. I ever go there only in a group of people that have chosen there as a place to go. I put up with it. I put up going but it wouldn't be my top of my list to visit. May be I'm fussy.
INTERVIEWER
Anything else you would like to add about the Mongolian restaurant?

RESP-013
Not really. I mean it's a typical high street type of restaurant. I think I'm always keen to try an independent restaurant I supposed, limitations that chains have. I went to this restaurant the first time, the food was really good. So it makes us keep coming back. It builds the reputation. Obviously it's good for everybody because the place is very busy. They make their food available to take away as well. They don't have couch or anything. Go in there for takeaway food. You sit at restaurant table, wait for the food and they give you some nibbles and buy a beer while it's been done. Then, you go home.

INTERVIEWER
You have mentioned that food, service and atmosphere. Which factor is the most important to you?

RESP-013
I think first and foremost the food is gotta be good. It can be a really plush restaurant, fabulous service that the food is no good. If the service is indifferent I might go back and see if it's better or not on another day and enjoy the meal. And the only time ambiance becomes important or the décor whatever ammm would be if you really had nothing else to concentrate on. Well if I go out with my wife for dinner we chat...we talking about something amm it's the time we got into ourselves and we want a friendly but un-intrusive service, nice food and good people. We like good food and we take very little notice on the décor. I will take notice of the loos...toilets because that could be nice. Not bad sanitation. But of course you would not find that out until the end of the meal normally do you? But obviously you wanted everything to look clean. I fussy about...I check...I look at the cutlery. If the cutlery was not clean, I will send it back. Because I'm in this industry, I can recognised when something gone through the dishwasher and it's just not come clean. I like the table cloth to be clear. The surroundings must be clean because you sat very close to that. I mean you're gonna use these things. It's quite important.

INTERVIEWER
What about the food?

RESP-013
Ammm well I probably put the cleanliness of the cutlery and the food together because I'm gonna put both of them in my mouth right?. So, you know...if the cutleries are not clean, I will send it back. And because I'm in this industry I can recognised when something gone through the dishwasher and it's just not come clean. I like the table cloth to be clear. The surroundings must be clean because you sat very close to that. I mean you're gonna use these things. It's quite important.

INTERVIEWER
How do you describe restaurant food that is good in quality?

RESP-013
How do I describe it?

INTERVIEWER
Yes

RESP-013
The quality of a meal also relates to its temperature. If it's a meal that is served hot, it supposed to be hot. I look for the accuracy of the dish in comparison to what it says on the menu. I make my selection based on its menu descriptions that represents that. A quality food is a tasty food. A tasty food is food that was nicely seasoned. Never add anything. In this particular restaurant, you do not need to put anything extra (such as salt and pepper) on the food. They got the flavour. It makes me laugh sometimes when people get the meal. They put in front of them. First thing they do is pick up
the salt and throw salt all over it before they even taste it. Ammm I'm looking for _____. How they put things together and how it looks on the plate.

INTERVIEWER
Sorry...you are looking for the....

RESP-013
The preparation of the food, that's nicely prepared. I'm paying for I mean...someone else cook it for me. When I cook at home I tend to have you know...fairly high standards about how I put things together because it's a job. Then may be I'm not a normal sort of customer. I used to be terrible...used to complaint all the time because people used to put dishes on the menu and when I get them (dishes), they weren't anything like what they said they were. Actually they cooked classical French dishes and it drives me nuts. So there's all sorts of aspect and I think part of that...ammm going back to the restaurant ambiance and part of the enjoyment of eating is actually be able to see the food you're eating. I went into a restaurant...not in the UK but they do have branches in UK. They have the lights down so low that when I ordered a special on the day...barbeque flavoured...no...Caribbean flavoured rib eyes steak. Rib eye was one of my favourite parts. Problem was there was little or poor lighting. I couldn't see what I was eating and with the rib eyes sometimes you get quite a lot of fat. I'm not over keen on eating with that but I like the flavour it gives to the meat. I found it absolutely impossible to separate the two because it was so dark. When I asked them about it, they said, 'people used this lighting when they meet up with somebody. Don't have the lights up too light.' (laugh) Strange. So lighting in the restaurant can be quite important to add to the experience. Yeah.

INTERVIEWER
You mean to add to the experience...or to the quality of food...

RESP-013
Well I guess it adds to bloom them all. It adds to the quality of the food because it enables you to eat selectively if you need. Say, separate bones. It helps you doesn't it to enjoy the meal more though it's not directly part of the meal. It helps you more...yeah...

INTERVIEWER
How do you describe the poor quality of restaurant meal?

RESP-013
Poor quality food is where they've used poor quality ingredient. Say, meat that is tough or fatty or when the food itself hasn't been cooked properly. May be hasn't been cooked long enough when is hard or has been cooked too long. The temperature sometimes...I had experience where I had mesh potatoes. It's still cold in the middle. Because you know they heated that up. Ammm overcooked vegetables. Too many things on the plate like fries or potatoes or salad. No flavour. Or too much salt.

INTERVIEWER
May I ask few questions about you? You may refuse to answer if you found these questions offensive in anyways. You may use this multiple choice answer sheet to answer the questions.

RESP-013
I'm number E on your list for question one and D for question 2.

INTERVIEWER
Thank you!
Appendix VII – Initial Questionnaire

Section One

**Question 1**
Think about the last time you ate out in restaurant. This question seeks your perception on that particular restaurant. Please indicate on the scale of 1 to 5 the extent to which you agree with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The food was presented and arranged nicely on the plate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The restaurant was clean and tidy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Staff seemed to anticipate what I wanted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The food was tasty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The décor was beautifully co-ordinated with great attention to detail</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The food was about the right size</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Staff were helpful and friendly</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The restaurant provided comfortable rooms</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The food was properly cooked</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Staff were prompt in service</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The food was as I expected</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The food contained too much fat</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Staff listened to me</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Staff were competent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The food smelt nice</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The layout in restaurant was attractive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. The food was served at an appropriate temperature</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Staff were efficient in service</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. The food contained fresh ingredients</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. The food looked appetising</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 2**
Overall, how do you rate the quality of food in this restaurant?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely poor quality</th>
<th>Extremely good quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section One (continued)

Question 3
Overall, how do you rate the quality of service in this restaurant?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely poor quality</th>
<th>Extremely good quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 4
Overall, how do you rate value for money in this restaurant?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely poor value for money</th>
<th>Extremely good value for money</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section Two

Question 5
Among examples of restaurants below, which restaurant best represents the restaurant you have been to?

- Fast Food Restaurant (e.g. McDonald Restaurant)
- Popular Quick Service Restaurant (e.g. Pizza Hut Restaurant)
- Full Waiter Service Restaurant

Now, imagine the kind of person who typically visits this restaurant. Describe him or her using one or more personal adjectives such as ‘organised’, ‘classy’, ‘poor’, ‘stylish’, ‘friendly’, ‘modern’, ‘traditional’, ‘popular’ or whatever other personal adjectives you think typically describes people who patronise this restaurant.

Once you have this image in your mind, indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 14</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. The typical customer of this restaurant reflects the type of person I would like to be</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The typical customer of this restaurant is very much like the person I admire</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section Two (continued)

**Question 6**
The following statements relate to the difference between what you desired to receive from this restaurant and how well you think the same restaurant met your desires. How big was the difference between what you desired, and what you actually received?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exactly as I desired</th>
<th>Somewhat different than I desired</th>
<th>Extremely different</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 7**
How good or bad was this difference?  
(Please refer to your rating in the previous question to answer this question)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very bad</th>
<th>Neither bad nor good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section Three

**Question 8**
Overall, how much did you dislike or like this restaurant?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dislike</th>
<th>Like</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 9**
Overall, how do you feel about this restaurant?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 10**
Overall, how do you rate the value of your visit to this restaurant?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worthless</th>
<th>Valuable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section Three (continued)

**Question 11**
Overall, how do you feel about the food and service at the restaurant?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terrible</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 12**
Overall, how do you feel about the food and service at the restaurant?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely satisfied</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section Four

**Question 13**
How likely is it that you would return to this restaurant?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely unlikely</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 14**
How likely is it that you would recommend this restaurant to other peoples?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely unlikely</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 15**
Based on your experience at this restaurant, how likely is it that you would switch to another restaurant?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely unlikely</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section Five

The following describe 3 categories of restaurants from fast food (category A) to more formal dining (category C).

**Category A:**

Meals are prepared within short time (except during peak hours). Meals can be consumed on the premise or off premise. Order is placed at the counter. You wait for the order to be ready and pay at the counter. You bring the meals that you ordered to the table you choose.

*Example of Restaurant of this Category:* McDonalds Restaurant

**Category B:**

Meals are prepared within a short time (except during peak hours). Meals can be consumed on the premises or off premises. You sit at the table where the food server leads you. Orders can be placed at the counter and at some place, orders are taken by the food server at the table. You pay the food at the counter. Meals are brought to the table by the food server.

*Example of Restaurant of this Category:* Pizza Hut Restaurant

**Category C:**

Meals are prepared within longer period of time as compared to restaurants in Category A and B. Meals can only be consumed on the premise. You sit at the table where the food server leads you (unless you make reservation prior to dining). Order is placed once seated. Meals are brought to the table by the food server. You pay the food at your table. You are fully served by the food server which starts from when you enter the restaurant and ends when you are about to leave the restaurant.

*Example of Restaurant of this Category:* Full Service Ethnic Restaurants (e.g. Italian/Indian/Chinese or other ethnic restaurant) and fine dining restaurant (e.g. Gordon Ramsay Restaurant)

**Question 16**

Please indicate the category of restaurant of which your evaluations in Section 1 to Section 4 are based.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category A</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category B</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category C</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of these categories</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 17**

Please indicate the name of restaurant and the town it is based in (e.g. Pizza Hut, London):

**Name of Restaurant**

**Town**
Section Five (continued)

**Question 18**
What was the reason you eating out on this specific occasion?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leisure</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family celebration</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businesses</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(lack of time to cook)</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If other, please specify</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 19**
Who do you eat out with on this specific occasion?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If other, please specify</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 22**
Which of the following represents your highest education level?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 23**
Which of the following represents your monthly salary?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary Range</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£0 - £1000</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£1501 - £2000</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section Six

Please tick ONE option only for the following questions. Please note that you may refuse to answer any of these questions.

**Question 20**
What gender are you?

Male  O
Female  O

**Question 21**
Which age group do you belong to?

Up to 25  O
25-34  O
35-44  O
45-54  O
55-64  O
Over 65  O

**Question 22**
Which of the following represents your highest education level?

Less than high school  O
High School  O
Some college, but no degree  O
Bachelor's degree  O
Graduate degree(s)  O

**Question 23**
Which of the following represents your net monthly income?

Below £500  O
£500-£1000  O
£1001-£1500  O
£1501-£2000  O
Over £2001  O
Appendix VIII - Cover Letter for the Finalised Questionnaire

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this research which is part of a doctoral research study at the School of Management, University of Surrey, UK. This study has been granted permission from the University of Surrey Ethic’s Committee.

In this survey, we are interested in your perceptions, your satisfaction and 'willingness to return' of a restaurant that you have visited within the last four (4) weeks. This includes any restaurant where you have eaten a meal (not a snack between meals) and been served at your table.

Your response is critical to the success of this study. The questionnaire has six sections which may take 10-15 minutes to complete. You are eligible to take part in the study if you;

1. Are a native English speaker
2. Have visited a restaurant within the last four weeks.
3. Have eaten in the restaurant (not take away) and you have been served at your table.

When completing this questionnaire, please would you tick the response that best describes your opinion. Please note that there are no right and wrong answers. You are not obliged to complete the questionnaire and may discontinue completing the questionnaire at any point of time.

Responses will be used only for the purpose of analysis. All responses will be anonymous, will be treated with strict confidentiality and will be used for academic purposes only.

Completing this survey entitles you to enter a draw for a chance to win £100 worth of Marks & Spencer voucher. If you would like to be considered in the free prize draw, please fill the section at the bottom of this page. Please send the completed questionnaire using the FREE POST envelope provided once you finish completing the questionnaire. The expected month of the draw will be in September 2008.

Thank you very much for your participation and assistance!

Siti Nurafifah Jaafar
PhD Researcher
School of Management
Faculty of Management and Law
University of Surrey
Email: msp1sj@surrey.ac.uk

Name : 
Address : 

Question of Overall Experience: 

Excellent Poor 

Extremely poor 

Name for Marks & Spencer voucher

288
**Appendix IX - Final Questionnaire**

**SECTION ONE**

**Question 1**
Think about a restaurant that you ate in **within the past four weeks**. This question seeks your perception on that particular restaurant. Please indicate on the scale of 1 to 5 the extent to which you agree with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The food was presented and arranged nicely on the plate</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The restaurant was clean</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Staff seemed to anticipate what I wanted</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The food was tasty</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The décor was beautifully co-ordinated with great attention to detail</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Staff were helpful</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The restaurant was comfortable</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The food was properly cooked</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Staff were prompt in service</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The food met my expectation</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The restaurant was tidy</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Staff listened to me</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Staff were competent</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The food smelt nice</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The layout in restaurant was attractive</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The food was served at an appropriate temperature</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Staff were friendly</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. The food contained fresh ingredients</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. The food looked appetising</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 2**
Overall, how do you rate the quality of food in this restaurant?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Extremely poor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Extremely good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 3**
Overall, how do you rate the quality of service in this restaurant?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Extremely poor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Extremely good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 4**
Overall, how do you rate value for money in this restaurant?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value for money</th>
<th>Extremely poor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Extremely good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION TWO

**Question 5**

Thinking about the same restaurant you have visited, imagine the kind of person who typically visits this restaurant. Describe him or her using one or more personal adjectives such as 'organised', 'classy', 'poor', 'stylish', 'friendly', 'modern', 'traditional', 'popular' or whatever other personal adjectives you think typically describes people who patronise this restaurant. Please write these adjectives in the box below:

Referring to the adjectives you have written, please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The typical customer of this restaurant reflects the type of person I would like to be</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The typical customer of this restaurant is very much like the person I admire</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 6a**

The following statement relates to the difference between what you desired to receive from this restaurant and how well you think the same restaurant met your desires.

How big was the difference between what you desired, and what you actually received?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exactly as I desired</th>
<th>Somewhat different than I desired</th>
<th>Extremely different than I desired</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 6b**

How do you perceive this difference?

(Please refer to your rating in the question 6a to answer this question)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very bad</th>
<th>Neither bad nor good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SECTION THREE

**Question 7**
Overall, how do you feel about this restaurant?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 8**
Overall, how do you feel about the food you received in this restaurant?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terrible</th>
<th>Delighted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 9**
Overall, how much did you dislike or like this restaurant?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dislike</th>
<th>Like</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 10**
Overall, how do you feel about the service you received in this restaurant?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terrible</th>
<th>Delighted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 11**
Overall, how would you rate the value of your visit to this restaurant?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worthless</th>
<th>Valuable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 12**
Overall, how do you feel about your dining experience in this restaurant?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terrible</th>
<th>Delighted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SECTION FOUR

**Question 13**
How likely is it that you would return to this restaurant?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely unlikely</th>
<th>Extremely likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 14**
How likely is it that you would recommend this restaurant to other people?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely unlikely</th>
<th>Extremely likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 15**
Based on your experience at this restaurant, how likely is it that you would switch to another restaurant?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely unlikely</th>
<th>Extremely likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SECTION FIVE

**Question 16**
Please indicate the name of restaurant on which these responses are based and name of the town in which the restaurant is based (e.g. Pizza Hut, London):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Restaurant</th>
<th>Town</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 17**
What was the reason for eating out on this specific occasion?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leisure</th>
<th>Celebration</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Convenience</th>
<th>(lack of time to cook)</th>
<th>If other, please specify</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 18**
Who did you eat out with on this specific occasion? *Please tick (✓) all that applies to you.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Immediate family, including children</th>
<th>O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relative(s)</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend(s)</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyfriend/girlfriend/partner</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work colleague</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business clients</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No one</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If other, please specify</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

292
Please tick ONE option only for the following questions. Please note that you are not obliged to complete these questions.

**Question 19**
What gender are you?
- Male
- Female

**Question 20**
Which age group do you belong to?
- Up to 25
- 26-34
- 35-44
- 45-54
- 55-64
- 65-74
- 75 and Over

**Question 21**
Which of the following represents your highest education level?
- Less than secondary school
- Completed secondary school
- Completed university
- Diploma/degree
- Completed postgraduate degree

**Question 22**
What is your employment status?

**Question 23**
Which of the following represents your gross annual income (£)?
- Up to 15,000
- 15,001 to 30,000
- 30,001 to 45000
- 45,001 to 60,000
- 60,001 to 75,000
- 75,001 to 100,000
- 100,001 or more
- N/A
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