

**Customer Satisfaction with Restaurant Service: Customer Survey Analysis**

---

**Table of Contents**

- Customer Satisfaction with Restaurant Service: Customer Survey Analysis .....1
- 1.1. Introduction .....1
- 1.2. Market Segmentation .....2
- 1.3. Comparison of Customer Rating of Restaurant Selection Factors.....5
- 1.4. Customer Satisfaction .....6
- 1.5. Customer Perception of Restaurant .....8
  - 1.5.1. Customer Perception of Food Quality .....8
  - 1.5.2. Restaurant Food Quality and Customer Satisfaction .....9
  - 1.5.3 Customer Perception of Employee Service.....10
  - 1.5.4. Restaurant Employee Service and Customer Satisfaction .....11
  - 1.5.5. Customer Perception of Restaurant atmosphere.....12
  - 1.5.6. Restaurant Atmosphere and Customer Satisfaction .....13
- 1.6. Recommendations and conclusion .....14
- References .....16

---

**List of Tables**

**Table 1: Comparison of Customer patronage of restaurants - Gender ..... 2**  
**Table 2: Comparison of Customer patronage of restaurants - Age ..... 3**  
**Table 3: Comparison of Customer patronage of restaurants - Income ..... 4**  
**Table 4: Customer Rating of Restaurant Selection Factors- Independent Sample T test ..... 5**  
**Table 5: Customer Rating of Restaurant Satisfaction- Independent Sample T test..... 7**  
**Table 6: Customer Perception of Food Quality- ANOVA ..... 9**  
**Table 7: Food Quality and Customer Satisfaction ..... 9**  
**Table 8: Customer Perception of Employee Service- ANOVA ..... 11**  
**Table 9: Employee service and Customer Satisfaction ..... 11**  
**Table 10: Customer Perception of Interior Quality- ANOVA ..... 13**  
**Table 11: Restaurant and Customer Satisfaction ..... 13**

---

## 1.1. Introduction

Customer satisfaction and long-lasting association with the customers is the principal goal of the hospitality industry. The same goal is followed by almost all other industries as well. A long lasting relationship mainly focuses on how loyal and satisfied customers are. Hence, it is clear that the satisfaction and loyalty of customers is largely dependent on various service initiatives and their quality. Establishments including hotels are focused on paying attention to their customers for a longer time and creating a brand value. In establishments, particularly the ones in hospitality, vital requirements for success include enhancement in customer satisfaction and improvement in meeting with the demands of the customers (Kim et al., 2009).

Over time, service quality has become an indispensable component in the restaurant business. It gives an organization competitive advantage to stand ahead from the rest of its competitors. Nalini and Samuel (2011) suggested that one of the most vital features that seize a business in aiding its customers get complete satisfaction in the service provided is quality. To be able to achieve this, every business should be able to distinguish the true expectations and requirements of their consumers. Experts in this field argue that if an organization wants to develop a sustainable future, they should make it their prime responsibility to know the requirements of their customers (Ryu and Jang, 2008).

The underlying principles relating to CRM (customer relationship management) suggest that carrying out a business is endorsed by the way of taking into consideration and giving importance to customer loyalty and hence the development of the growth customer satisfaction rate. He et al., (2011) developed the satisfaction-profit chain which is regarded as a compelling model of customer satisfaction. Oliver (1997) further puts forth that numerous research studies are being conducted to measure customer satisfaction and the characteristics are observed in various ways. Barber et al., (2011) observed that customer satisfaction can be explained in terms of the gratification of consumers in reaction to the consumers' purchase and experience. It has been observed that customer satisfaction is pleasurable contentment and the factor, customer dissatisfaction, is argued as non-pleasurable contentment.

From this introduction, it is clear that it is important to analyse the customer satisfaction of a restaurant. This study will adopt a quantitative approach analysing the customer satisfaction of Corsica and comparing the same with that of their competitor. Vino's. The collected data using customer satisfaction survey's are analysed using SPSS version 20.0.

## 1.2. Market Segmentation

**Table 1: Comparison of Customer patronage of restaurants - Gender**

**Crosstab**

			X25 -- Competitor		Total
			Corsica's	Vino's	
X22 -- Gender	Male	Count	54	52	106
		% within X25 -- Competitor	54.0%	52.0%	53.0%
	Female	Count	46	48	94
		% within X25 -- Competitor	46.0%	48.0%	47.0%
Total		Count	100	100	200
		% within X25 -- Competitor	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

### Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	<sup>a</sup>	1	.777		
<sup>b</sup>	.020	1	.887		
Likelihood Ratio	.080	1	.777		
Fisher's Exact Test				.887	.444
Linear-by-Linear Association	.080	1	.777		
N of Valid Cases	200				

0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 47.00.

Computed only for a 2x2 table

The above table presents a cross tab analysis of the gender of the respondents who visit Corsica and Vino's. It is observed that there is minimum variation among respondents with respect to their gender.

**Table 2: Comparison of Customer patronage of restaurants - Age**

**Crosstab**

			X25 -- Competitor		Total
			Corsica's	Vino's	
X23 -- Age	18 - 25	Count	4	25	29
		% within X25 -- Competitor	4.0%	25.0%	14.5%
	26 - 34	Count	16	42	58
		% within X25 -- Competitor	16.0%	42.0%	29.0%
	35 - 49	Count	25	17	42
		% within X25 -- Competitor	25.0%	17.0%	21.0%
	50 - 59	Count	46	14	60
		% within X25 -- Competitor	46.0%	14.0%	30.0%
	60 and Over	Count	9	2	11
		% within X25 -- Competitor	9.0%	2.0%	5.5%
Total		Count	100	100	200
		% within X25 -- Competitor	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	<sup>a</sup>	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	53.351	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	47.502	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	200		

0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.50.

From the above table it is evident that the number of customers who visit Corsica's who are less than 25 is only 4%, while 25% of the customers who visit Vino's are less than 25. Similar pattern is observed among those who are between 26-34 (only 16% of customers of Corsica's are between 26-34. From this analysis, one can conclude that the patrons who visit Corsica's belong to the older crowd and are

often over 35. Furthermore, with a p value of 0.002, it is concluded that there is a significant difference between the customer patronage of the two restaurants based on age.

**Table 3: Comparison of Customer patronage of restaurants - Income**

**Crosstab**

			X25 -- Competitor		Total
			Corsica's	Vino's	
X24 -- Income	\$20 - \$35,000 annually	Count	2	12	14
		% within X25 -- Competitor	2.0%	12.0%	7.0%
	\$35 - \$50,000 annually	Count	14	19	33
		% within X25 -- Competitor	14.0%	19.0%	16.5%
	\$50 - \$75,000 annually	Count	25	22	47
		% within X25 -- Competitor	25.0%	22.0%	23.5%
	\$75 - \$100,000 annually	Count	29	26	55
		% within X25 -- Competitor	29.0%	26.0%	27.5%
	> \$100,000 annually	Count	30	21	51
		% within X25 -- Competitor	30.0%	21.0%	25.5%
Total		Count	100	100	200
		% within X25 -- Competitor	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	<sup>a</sup>	4	.043
Likelihood Ratio	10.637	4	.031
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.973	1	.008
N of Valid Cases	200		

0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.00.

From the above table it is observed that Corsica customers are mostly those who earn \$50,000 and more annually. It is observed that comparatively, Vino's is able to draw in some customers who earn between \$20-\$ 35,000 annually (12% of its customers) and \$35=\$ 50,000 (19% of its customers). From this analysis, one can conclude that the patron's who visit Corsica's earn a relatively higher annual

income. Furthermore, with a p value of 0.008, it is concluded that there is a significant difference between the customer patronage of the two restaurants based on income.

### 1.3. Comparison of Customer Rating of Restaurant Selection Factors

**Table 4: Customer Rating of Restaurant Selection Factors- Independent Sample T test**

Group Statistics					
	X25 -- Competitor	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
X17 -- Satisfaction	Vino's	100	5.96	.974	.097
	Corsica's	100	4.78	1.160	.116
X18 -- Return in Future	Vino's	100	5.55	.978	.098
	Corsica's	100	4.37	1.041	.104
X19 -- Recommend to Friend	Vino's	100	5.36	.948	.095
	Corsica's	100	4.17	1.035	.104
X20 -- Frequency of Patronage	Vino's	100	2.53	.658	.066
	Corsica's	100	1.85	.880	.088
X21 -- How Long a Customer	Vino's	100	2.70	.644	.064
	Corsica's	100	1.58	.713	.071

Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
X17 -- Satisfaction	Equal variances assumed	6.679	.010	7.793	198	.000	1.180	.151	.881	1.479
	Equal variances not assumed			7.793	192.232	.000	1.180	.151	.881	1.479
X18 -- Return in Future	Equal variances assumed	.546	.461	8.260	198	.000	1.180	.143	.898	1.462
	Equal variances not assumed			8.260	197.238	.000	1.180	.143	.898	1.462
X19 -- Recommend to Friend	Equal variances assumed	.240	.624	8.476	198	.000	1.190	.140	.913	1.467
	Equal variances not assumed			8.476	196.497	.000	1.190	.140	.913	1.467
X20 -- Frequency of Patronage	Equal variances assumed	21.174	.000	6.185	198	.000	.680	.110	.463	.897
	Equal variances not assumed			6.185	183.337	.000	.680	.110	.463	.897
X21 -- How Long a Customer	Equal variances assumed	8.949	.003	11.659	198	.000	1.120	.096	.931	1.309
	Equal variances not assumed			11.659	195.943	.000	1.120	.096	.931	1.309

The above table presents an independent sample t-test comparison of the customer rating of the most important factors which guide their choice of place to eat. It is observed that the patrons of both the

restaurants have a similar perception with regards to those which they consider most important. From the table, it can be concluded that the customers strongly identify that the quality of food (Corsica Mean= 3.6, Vino's Mean= 3.52) and atmosphere (Corsica Mean= 3.1, Vino=3.26). In comparison, it is observed that the customers gave relatively less importance to price ranking (Corsica Mean= 1.44, Vino's Mean= 1.44) and employee service (Corsica Mean= 1.86, Vino's Mean= 1.96). It is further observed that there is limited difference between the factors which are given the highest importance when the 2-tailed test is considered. Therefore, it can be concluded that the most important factors which are considered to drive customer choice of restaurants include food quality, atmosphere quality, price and employee services.

#### **1.4. Customer Satisfaction**

Some confusion has been observed in the interpretation of the concept of quality and satisfaction. The Expectancy-Disconfirmation theory has been the source for deriving the most commonly accepted structure for understanding both aspects. According to this theory the level of a consumer's disconfirmation defines quality and satisfaction (He et al., 2011). Both the aspects appear quiet similar when this definition is considered.

For example, Oliver (1999) proposed that quality is mainly a cognitive response to the service or product whereas satisfaction is not only cognitive response but also an affective response. Han et al., (2011) added that quality is a definite belief assessment whereas satisfaction is more of a general assessment facet. As it is evident from the narrative that satisfaction and quality are diverse from each other, researchers have put forth empirical and theoretical proof for the connection between satisfaction and quality (Kim et al., 2009). They suggest that satisfaction is succeeded by quality. Bagozzi's (1992) cited in He et al., (2011) appraisal-emotional response-coping framework is the base for this connection. In service marketing this framework, if applied, suggests that emotive satisfaction can be achieved by the cognitive quality evaluations of the customer. Therefore, complete customer satisfaction can be predicted by using quality as the key determinant.

When considering a service framework, service quality is found to have two dimensions which are technical service quality and functional service quality (Gro'nroos, 1984). Functional quality is linked with the relations of the customer with the service provider and the process of service delivery. On the other hand the quality of service output is referred to as technical service quality (Sharma and Patterson, 1999).

In a restaurant scenario, employee's performance can be related to functional service quality, whereas the food quality is related to the technical service. Earlier studies have acknowledged that the given

facets of quality perception, food quality and service quality, have an affirmative association with customer satisfaction ( Namkung and Jang, 2007).

Therefore it is established that the customer satisfaction can be analysed in response to service quality of food, employee services as well as restaurant atmosphere.

**Table 5: Customer Rating of Restaurant Satisfaction- Independent Sample T test**

**Group Statistics**

	X25 -- Competitor	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
X13 -- Food Quality Ranking	Vino's	100	3.52	.643	.064
	Corsica's	100	3.60	.532	.053
X14 -- Atmosphere Ranking	Vino's	100	3.26	.691	.069
	Corsica's	100	3.10	.732	.073
X15 -- Prices Ranking	Vino's	100	1.26	.441	.044
	Corsica's	100	1.44	.574	.057
X16 -- Employees Ranking	Vino's	100	1.96	.695	.070
	Corsica's	100	1.86	.876	.088

**Independent Samples Test**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower		Upper
X13 -- Food Quality Ranking	Equal variances assumed	5.667	.018	-9.959	198	.339	-.080	.083	-.245	.085
	Equal variances not assumed			-9.959	191.245	.339	-.080	.083	-.245	.085
X14 -- Atmosphere Ranking	Equal variances assumed	.079	.779	1.590	198	.113	.160	.101	-.038	.358
	Equal variances not assumed			1.590	197.348	.113	.160	.101	-.038	.358
X15 -- Prices Ranking	Equal variances assumed	22.080	.000	-2.487	198	.014	-.180	.072	-.323	-.037
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.487	185.617	.014	-.180	.072	-.323	-.037
X16 -- Employees Ranking	Equal variances assumed	6.836	.010	.894	198	.372	.100	.112	-.121	.321
	Equal variances not assumed			.894	188.245	.372	.100	.112	-.121	.321

The above table presents an independent sample t-test comparison of the customer satisfaction with their restaurant. From the table, it can be concluded that the customers strongly identify that the satisfaction (Corsica Mean= 4.78, Vino's Mean= 5.96), future return (Corsica Mean= 4.37, Vino Mean

=5.55), and recommendations to a friend (Corsica Mean= 4.17, Vino=5.36). In comparison, it is observed that the customers were not customers of the restaurants for a long time as frequency of patronage (Corsica Mean= 1.85, Vino's Mean= 2.55) and length of being a customer (Corsica Mean= 1.58, Vino's Mean= 2.6). It is further observed that there is a significant difference between the rating of Vino's and Corsica's with those who visited Vino's presenting greater satisfaction scores. Therefore, it can be concluded that,

**Hypothesis 1 – Corsica’s customers report higher satisfaction than Vino’s customers.**

is Rejected

## **1.5. Customer Perception of Restaurant**

### **1.5.1. Customer Perception of Food Quality**

According to Namkung and Jang, (2007) one of the most crucial elements of the whole dining experience is the food quality. The significance of food quality in the case of restaurants has been empirically scrutinized in previous studies; for example, Clark and Wood (1999) recognized that a primary factor that influences a customer’s loyalty to a restaurant is food quality. To this Suskind and Chan (2000) added that in a customer’s perception, the key determinant in visiting a restaurant is the quality of food.

Mattila (2002) insisted that a major predictor of the loyalty of a customer in casual dining restaurants is food quality. If compared with food quality, other features of the restaurant like service quality and environment components become secondary. In a recent test conducted by Namkung and Jang (2007) it was revealed that food quality impacts customer satisfaction. They discovered optimistic association between the quality of food and satisfaction/behavioural intentions. Out of those characteristics, appeal comprises of various items like presentation, taste, colour, temperature, texture, and portion size. In addition, Namkung and Jang (2007) assess the food quality by the menu item variety, presentation, healthy options, freshness, taste, and temperature. Thus it is concluded that food quality is an important aspect to be studied.

**Table 6: Customer Perception of Food Quality- ANOVA**

		ANOVA				
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
X2 -- Attractive Interior	Between Groups	11.520	1	11.520	14.765	.000
	Within Groups	154.480	198	.780		
	Total	166.000	199			
X7 -- Appears Clean and Neat	Between Groups	12.500	1	12.500	9.480	.002
	Within Groups	261.080	198	1.319		
	Total	273.580	199			
X8 -- Fun Place to Go	Between Groups	14.045	1	14.045	19.138	.000
	Within Groups	145.310	198	.734		
	Total	159.355	199			
X10 -- Reasonable Prices	Between Groups	1.445	1	1.445	1.654	.200
	Within Groups	172.950	198	.873		
	Total	174.395	199			

The above table compares the customer views on the quality of food across the two different restaurants. It is clearly observed that there is a significant difference between the mean rating given to quality of food ( $p= 0.001$ ), portions of food ( $p=0.003$ ), food taste ( $p=0.001$ ) and value for money ( $p=0.005$ ). From the above analysis it can be concluded that there is a difference in perception of quality of food across the two restaurants.

**1.5.2. Restaurant Food Quality and Customer Satisfaction**

**Table 7: Food Quality and Customer Satisfaction**

a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	4.770	.340		14.039	.000
	X1 -- Excellent Food Quality	-.002	.081	-.003	-.029	.977
	X3 -- Generous Portions	-.004	.057	-.006	-.062	.951
	X4 -- Excellent Food Taste	-.222	.084	-.288	-2.648	.009
	X5 -- Good Value for Money	.080	.066	.120	1.214	.226

Dependent Variable: Customer Satisfaction

**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	a	.080	.060	.90096

Predictors: (Constant), X5 -- Good Value for Money, X4 -- Excellent Food Taste, X3 -- Generous Portions, X1 -- Excellent Food Quality

The above table presents a linear regression model when identifies the relationship between food quality and customer satisfaction. It is observed that there is no significant association between food quality ( $p=0.977$ ), food portions ( $p=0.951$ ), and value for money ( $p=0.226$ ). However, it is observed that good taste is found to be associated with customer satisfaction ( $p=0.009$ ), however the beta value is negative ( $p=-0.222$ ). Hence, it can be concluded that there is no association between customer satisfaction and customer perception of food quality. Hence,

**Hypothesis 4 – Customer perceptions of food quality are related positively to customer satisfaction.**

**Is rejected**

### **1.5.3 Customer Perception of Employee Service**

He et al., (2011) maintain that the reliability of the services is a key aspect that holds up good quality service. Moreover, reliability helps in increasing the levels of customers' satisfaction. According to Hendrikse & Jiang (2011) reliability consists of the employees' performance and the standards that they maintain while providing their services over a long course of time. Thus, reliability increases the levels of customer satisfaction as the customers would be very satisfied with the standard of services that they will be getting from the organizations (Helgesen, 2006). When it comes to hospitality industry, reliability becomes particularly vital as any variation in the constancy of good services will result in a negative impact on their name. Additionally they will have to work hard on frequently training their employees keeping in mind the issues that their customers faced and the manner in which they handle those issues. Hence, the employees need to be updated on all the current issues and be trained to deal with the same (Han et al., 2011). Therefore, it can be concluded that customer perception of employee service is most important factor impacting their satisfaction.

**Table 8: Customer Perception of Employee Service- ANOVA**

		ANOVA				
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
X6 -- Friendly Employees	Between Groups	117.045	1	117.045	119.366	.000
	Within Groups	194.150	198	.981		
	Total	311.195	199			
X11 -- Courteous Employees	Between Groups	38.896	1	38.896	54.821	.000
	Within Groups	140.484	198	.710		
	Total	179.380	199			
X12 -- Competent Employees	Between Groups	63.845	1	63.845	105.073	.000
	Within Groups	120.310	198	.608		
	Total	184.155	199			

The above table compares the customer views on the type of employee service across the two different restaurants. It is clearly observed that there is a significant difference between the mean rating given to employee friendliness ( $p= 0.000$ ), employee courteousness ( $p=0.000$ ) and employee competence ( $p=0.000$ ). From the above analysis it can be concluded that there is a difference in perception of quality of food across the two restaurants.

**1.5.4. Restaurant Employee Service and Customer Satisfaction**

**Table 9: Employee service and Customer Satisfaction**

a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.532	.220		16.058	.000
	X6 -- Friendly Employees	.111	.082	.148	1.351	.178
	X11 -- Courteous Employees	.028	.094	.028	.296	.768
	X12 -- Competent Employees	-.057	.094	-.059	-.607	.545

Dependent Variable: Customer Satisfaction

**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	a	.018	.003	.92796

Predictors: (Constant), X12 -- Competent Employees, X11 -- Courteous Employees, X6 -- Friendly Employees

The above table presents a linear regression model when identifies the relationship between restaurant employee service and customer satisfaction. It is observed that there is no significant association between friendly employees ( $p= 0.178$ ), courteous employees ( $p=0.768$ ), and competent employees ( $p=0.0.545$ ).

Hence,

**Hypothesis 2 – Customer perceptions of restaurant employees are related positively to customer satisfaction.**

is Rejected

### **1.5.5. Customer Perception of Restaurant atmosphere**

In 1970s the concept that physical environment is a significant part of the service experience was introduced. Kotler (1973) suggested that besides product and service, there is more to a customer's experience. This refers to atmosphere, that is the physical environment, as a promising influence on the purchase decision. Brady and Cronin (2001) used the meta-analysis and established that service quality has various aspects, out of which tangible physical environment emerged as an important factor that was often neglected. This environment comprises of design, ambient conditions, physical and social factors, which collectively are vital interpreters of service quality.

In recent times, many authors like Lucas (2012) have referred to the servicescape, the physical facilities, as an indicator of quality. Servicescape is an extensively used term that describes the physical atmosphere of a service company. It comprises of the interior and exterior design, ambient conditions like odour, noise temperature and other tangible parts like brochures, business cards and other communication material (e.g.Bruggen et al., 2011; Kim et al., 2009).

This extensively intricate physical environ has been accepted in several service establishments like hotels, hospitals, airlines, restaurants, and banks. The environment constantly requires elaborate designs, interior and exterior decorations, layouts to achieve different organizational and marketing objectives (e.g. Gu et al., 2011; Yang et al., 2013). The layout and design of a dining room can add to the satisfaction and pleasure of the whole dining experience and additionally assists with employee productivity (Ryu and Jang, 2008). Similarly in hotels or restaurants, cleanliness in the building exterior, entry or the dining/guest room, influences the perception of customers regarding the quality of service (e.g. Barber and Scarcelli, 2010;).

In the service literature, the connection of satisfaction to service quality, and the ways in which it is evaluated have been the main focus of research (e.g. Ryu and Jang, 2008; Barber et al., 2011). Hence it is concluded that customer perception of interior atmosphere is most important factor which impacts their customer satisfaction.

**Table 10: Customer Perception of Interior Quality- ANOVA**

		ANOVA				
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
X7 -- Appears Clean and Neat	Between Groups	12.500	1	12.500	9.480	.002
	Within Groups	261.080	198	1.319		
	Total	273.580	199			
X8 -- Fun Place to Go	Between Groups	14.045	1	14.045	19.138	.000
	Within Groups	145.310	198	.734		
	Total	159.355	199			
X10 -- Reasonable Prices	Between Groups	1.445	1	1.445	1.654	.200
	Within Groups	172.950	198	.873		
	Total	174.395	199			
X2 -- Attractive Interior	Between Groups	11.520	1	11.520	14.765	.000
	Within Groups	154.480	198	.780		
	Total	166.000	199			

The above table compares the customer views on their views on restaurant interior across the two different restaurants. It is clearly observed that there is a significant difference between the mean rating given to attractiveness of interior ( $p= 0.000$ ), cleanliness and neatness ( $p=0.002$ ), fun places to go ( $p=0.000$ ). From the above analysis it can be concluded that there is a difference in perception of interior quality across the two restaurants.

### 1.5.6. Restaurant Atmosphere and Customer Satisfaction

**Table 11: Restaurant and Customer Satisfaction**

a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	4.416	.464		9.512	.000
	X2 -- Attractive Interior	.104	.098	.101	1.065	.288
	X7 -- Appears Clean and Neat	-.166	.068	-.207	-2.433	.016
	X8 -- Fun Place to Go	-.124	.106	-.115	-1.163	.246
	X10 -- Reasonable Prices	.020	.070	.020	.280	.780

Dependent Variable: Customer Satisfaction

#### Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	a	.057	.037	.91197

Predictors: (Constant), X10 -- Reasonable Prices, X2 -- Attractive Interior, X7 -- Appears Clean and Neat, X8 -- Fun Place to Go

The above table presents a linear regression model when identifies the relationship between restaurant atmosphere and customer satisfaction. It is observed that there is no significant association between attractive interior ( $p= 0.288$ ), fun place ( $p=0.246$ ), and reasonable price of ambience ( $p=0.720$ ). However, it is observed that appears clean and need is found to be associated with customer satisfaction ( $p= 0.016$ ) and positive beta value ( $p=0.166$ ). Since atleast one factor, is found to show a significant positive score, it can be concluded that there is association between customer satisfaction and customer perception of restaurant atmosphere. Hence,

**Hypothesis 3 – Customer perceptions of restaurant atmosphere are related positively to customer satisfaction.**

**Is accepted.**

### 1.6. Recommendations and conclusion

Following recommendations are proposed for Corsica's

1. Identify measures to improve restaurant food menu as well as interior so as to attract customers below the age of 35. It is recommended that Nick invest money in making the restaurant interior more colourful and offer some varieties of food which appeals to the younger crowd.

2. Identify measures to provide some value meals which will help draw in the crowd which has a lower annual income. It is suggested that Nick include some value meals, combo offers or some happy hour times which will help draw in customers by providing meal at a slightly subsidised rate.
3. Identify measures to improve food quality, restaurant atmosphere as well as restaurant employee service as all these factors are found to be at a lower score when compared to Vino's.
4. Since the patronage of Vino's in terms of loyalty and frequency of visit is slightly higher, it is recommended that Nick offer some services which will help improve the restaurant demand.

Customer satisfaction and dissatisfaction are two different aspects of the same situation. In the study discussed, measurement refers to assessment together with expectations and outcome. When the quality of service matches up to the expectations the outcome is customer satisfaction. This occurs when the expectations of the prospective customers have been attained by the service provider. It was suggested when customer expectations are not taken into account to a larger extent the result is customer dissatisfaction. In certain conditions and circumstances the customers are not satisfied as a result of failure in measuring and addressing their recommendations (Barber et al., 2011). It is therefore important steps are taken to improve this satisfaction among customers who visit Nick's restaurant thereby driving his profits.

## References

- Barber, N., Goodman, R. J., & Goh, B. K. (2011). Restaurant consumers repeat patronage: A service quality concern. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 30(2), 329-336.
- Brady, M. K., & Cronin Jr, J. J. (2001). Some new thoughts on conceptualizing perceived service quality: a hierarchical approach. *The Journal of Marketing*, 34-49.
- Brüggen, E. C., Foubert, B., & Gremler, D. D. (2011). Extreme makeover: short-and long-term effects of a remodeled servicescape. *Journal of Marketing*, 75(5), 71-87.
- Clark, M. A., & Wood, R. C. (1999). Consumer loyalty in the restaurant industry: a preliminary exploration of the issues. *British Food Journal*, 101(4), 317-327.
- Grönroos, C. (1984). A service quality model and its marketing implications. *European Journal of marketing*, 18(4), 36-44.
- Goo, J. D., & Cheon, Y. S. (2011). A Study on the Effect Analysis of Servicescape on the Post Evaluation: Centered Plan to Improve Business of Hospitality Industry in Gyeongnam. *Journal of Agricultural Extension and Community Development*, 18.
- Han, H., Kim, W., & Hyun, S. S. (2011). Switching intention model development: Role of service performances, customer satisfaction, and switching barriers in the hotel industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 30(3), 619-629.
- He, Y., Li, W., & Lai, K. K. (2011). Service climate, employee commitment and customer satisfaction: evidence from the hospitality industry in China. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 23(5), 592-607.
- Hema Nalini, M., & Samuel, S. (2011). Importance-Performance Analysis to determine Service Quality of a Restaurant Service—An Empirical Study. *Advances In Management*.
- Helgesen, Ø. (2006). Are loyal customers profitable? Customer satisfaction, customer (action) loyalty and customer profitability at the individual level. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 22(3-4), 245-266.
- Hendrikse, G., & Jiang, T. (2011). An incomplete contracting model of dual distribution in franchising. *Journal of Retailing*, 87(3), 332-344.
- Kim, W. G., & Moon, Y. J. (2009). Customers' cognitive, emotional, and actionable response to the servicescape: A test of the moderating effect of the restaurant type. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 28(1), 144-156.
- Lucas, A. F. (2012). The determinants and effects of slot servicescape satisfaction in a Las Vegas hotel casino. *UNLV Gaming Research & Review Journal*, 7(1), 1.
- Kotler, P. (1973). Atmospherics as a marketing tool. *Journal of retailing*, 49(4), 48-64.

Mattila, A. S., & Enz, C. A. (2002). The role of emotions in service encounters. *Journal of Service Research*, 4(4), 268-277.

Nadiri, H., & Tanova, C. (2010). An investigation of the role of justice in turnover intentions, job satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behavior in hospitality industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 29(1), 33-41.

Namkung, Y., & Jang, S. (2007). Does food quality really matter in restaurants? Its impact on customer satisfaction and behavioral intentions. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 31(3), 387-409.

Oliver, R. L. (1999). Whence consumer loyalty?. *the Journal of Marketing*, 33-44.

Ryu, K., & Jang, S. (2008). Influence of restaurants' physical environments on emotion and behavioral intention. *The Service Industries Journal*, 28(8), 1151-1165.

Sharma, N., & Patterson, P. G. (1999). The impact of communication effectiveness and service quality on relationship commitment in consumer, professional services. *Journal of services marketing*, 13(2), 151-170.

Susskind, A. M., & Chan, E. K. (2000). How restaurant features affect check averages: a study of the Toronto restaurant market. *The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 41(6), 56-63.

Yang, J., & Schrier, T. (2013, January). The Effects of Hotel Lobby Servicescape on Perceived Service Quality, Perceived Value, Satisfaction, and Behavioral Intentions. In *The 18 th Annual Graduate Education and Graduate Student Research Conference in Hospitality and Tourism*.