

*Full Length Research Paper*

# Customer satisfaction and perceptions about food services on the University for Development Studies Campus, Ghana

Donkoh S. A.<sup>1\*</sup>, Quainoo A. K.<sup>2</sup>, Cudjoe E.<sup>3</sup> and Kaba N. C.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics, Faculty of Agriculture, University for Development Studies, Tamale, Ghana.

<sup>2</sup>Department of Biotechnology, Faculty of Agriculture, University for Development Studies, Tamale, Ghana.

<sup>3</sup>Departments of Agronomy, Faculty of Agriculture, University for Development Studies, Tamale, Ghana.

Accepted 20 March, 2012

Customers' perceptions about food and service attributes are considered to be very crucial in influencing their satisfaction and behavioral intentions in the food and service industry. This study focused on customer satisfaction and the general perception about food services of two restaurants on the Nyankpala Campus of the University for Development Studies, Tamale, Ghana. The study further looked at the challenges the restaurants encounter in acquiring and storing agricultural produce in the industry. The two restaurants were Alimento (A) and Lovely Sisters (B), purposively sampled, based on their high levels of patronage. A semi-structured questionnaire was designed and administered to a total of 240 respondents in both restaurants during the second session of 2009/2010 academic year. The main methods of analysis were principal component analysis and a multiple regression to find out the factors that influenced the levels of patronage so as to make recommendations for improvements. The study revealed that while only 38.8% of the customers were satisfied with the services of Restaurant A, as much as 81.7% of the customers in Restaurant B were satisfied. The principal components that influenced patrons' frequency of visits to Restaurant A were cleanliness of eating area, cleanliness of serving area, appearance of staff and relaxed atmosphere. For Restaurant B, efficiency of service, friendliness of servers and pleasing appearance of food were the principal components that influenced patrons' frequency of visit. Regression of patron's frequency of visits on the principal components confirmed the significance of the factors in influencing the dependent variable. It is important that apart from reducing the price, Restaurant A improves upon its assurance and empathy dimensions while Restaurant B also improves upon its tangibility dimensions. Also, in order to avert the seasonal shortages of produce, it may be necessary for the restaurateurs to put up simple storage structures to store their raw materials.

**Key words:** Food service, perceptions, principal components, regression coefficients.

## INTRODUCTION

The Oxford Advanced Learner's dictionary defines food simply as things that people or animals eat. Human

beings and animals depend on food for their physiological needs to survive. The failure to supply the body with sufficient quantities of food can result in diseases and death.

Vlisides et al. (2000) note that food is important not only for its nutritional value, but also for its social

---

\*Corresponding author. E-mail: [sammidonkoh@yahoo.com](mailto:sammidonkoh@yahoo.com).

significance, such as sacrifices, prestige and expression of friendship. Restaurants are one of the major food industries that have played a significant role in serving consumers with already prepared food. A restaurant prepares and serves food, drink and dessert to customers. Meals are generally served and eaten on premises, but many restaurants also offer take-away and food delivery services. Restaurants vary greatly in appearance and offerings, including a wide variety of cuisines and service models. To receive regular patronage, restaurants have also gone beyond just serving tasty and nutritious dishes to providing additional services such as music, games and other forms of entertainments, all geared towards meeting the demands of the consuming public. Other measures such as cleanliness, mode of service or operations, advertisements, location and accessibility, creativity in using indigenous materials for construction are used as forms of baits to attract consumers. People are attracted to patronize restaurants for several reasons, such as to save money and time for other things, to have a variety of foods and to meet new friends, among others.

While a number of food vendors can be found on the Nyankpala campus of the University for Development Studies, two restaurants, namely "Alimento" and "Lovely Sisters" are the main places from which students and staff buy food and drinks. The former is much more popular and also more expensive than the latter.

Identifying the empirical reasons why people patronize restaurants was the source of motivation for this study. Thus, the main objective of this study was to investigate why staff and students of the University for Development Studies patronize the food services of the two main restaurants on the Nyankpala campus. However, the essence was not to find out directly why patrons preferred one to the other.

Specifically, the study sought to:

1. Assess the level of satisfaction of customers;
2. Investigate the factors that influenced customers' level of patronage of the restaurants; and
3. Find out the challenges restaurant operators encounter in acquiring and storing agricultural produce for operation.

It is anticipated that this research will give insight into the opinions and attitudes of patrons to the proposed restaurants, reveal factors about what they want, and what they expect. The research will also reveal areas that restaurant operators should target for improvement.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

Several studies have established a link between restaurant attributes and customer satisfaction. In

general, as summarized in Liu and Jang (2009) the factors that affect customer satisfaction are food quality, service, the atmosphere or physical environment and price. These are discussed as follows.

### Food quality

In a number of empirical studies, food quality has emerged as the most important determinant of customer satisfaction (Namkung and Jang, 2007; Peri, 2006; Sulek and Hensley, 2004). Namkung and Jang (2007) reported in Lim (2010) investigated into the relative factors that constitute food quality as follows: presentation; health options; taste; freshness; variety; and temperature.

### Service quality

Lim (2010) intimates that since there are many restaurant options available, patrons will not hesitate to leave an establishment for a new one if the restaurant fails to provide quality service. He observes further that perceived quality service is a matter of the restaurant knowing its customers, managing its employees to meet the needs of customers, and delivering to customers what was promised. Parasuraman et al. (1988) define perceived quality service as the overall excellence or superiority of the service based on customers' judgment. They argue that since the definition of quality service varies depending on the person and the location or time, service evaluation is often subjective, as it is based on a comparison of the person's expectations and perceived performance. Against the backdrop of subjectivity in evaluation, Parasuraman et al. (1988) developed the instrument called "SERQUAL". This instrument measures that gap between customers' expectations on service and actual service perceived. The instrument consists of five service dimensions as follows: tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, empathy and assurance. The tangibles include the physical appearance of the facilities, equipment, personnel and materials used to communicate with customers. Elements within the tangibles dimensions are cleanliness, space, atmosphere, appearance of service and location. Measuring elements of responsibility and reliability are speed, willingness to respond, accuracy and dependability.

Assurance is defined as an employee's knowledge and awareness of other employees and their talents to provide faith and confidence. Empathy represents caring, and giving attention to individual customers. Stevens et al (1995) also developed the "DINESERV" instrument based on the SERVQUAL instrument to estimate overall service quality perceived from customers in restaurants. Thus, by implementing the DINESERV instrument, restaurant operators were able to identify problems with customers' views of restaurant service quality.

## Atmosphere

Lim (2010) argues that while the quality of food and service is paramount, a pleasing atmosphere may contribute to even a greater level of overall satisfaction of the customer and his/her subsequent patronage. He stresses that environmental elements in the restaurant have a huge impact on the emotional responses and behavior of customers. These environmental elements include lighting, music, temperature, scent, smell and furnishing.

## Price

The price of a product is highly related to its perceived value (Lim, 2010).

Chen et al. (1994) define perceived price as the customer's acceptable, reasonable and fair judgment about a service's average price in comparison to its competitors. Lim (2010) observes that customers are likely to come back again and again if price is perceived to be fair. On the other hand if they perceive that the price is unfair they will complain and finally defect to other restaurants. Abdullah and Rozario (2009) have also explained in detail, the models used to explain the determinants of customer satisfaction. Principal component and regression analyses are two of such important models. The two methods of analysis are explained as follows.

## Principal component analysis

Principal component analysis has been described as a mathematical procedure that uses an orthogonal transformation to convert a set of observations of possibly correlated variables into a set of uncorrelated variables called principal components (Malhotra, 2004). Principal component analysis is usually done when we have a number of observed variables that are believed to influence a given dependent variable, but then these variables are so many that they are correlated. In this case we want a smaller number of important variables (called principal components) that will account for most of the variance in the observed variables. The principal components are then used as explanatory variables in the regression analysis.

It should however, be noted that principal component analysis is step to factor analysis, which is similar to regression analysis in that each variable is expressed as a linear combination of underlying factors (Malhotra, 2004). The amount of variance a variable shares with other variables included in the analysis is referred to as communality. The co variation among the variables is described in terms of a small number of common factors plus a unique factor for each variable. However these factors are not observable. If the variables are

standardized, the factor model may be represented as:

$$X_i = A_{i1}F_1 + A_{i2}F_2 + A_{i3}F_3 + \dots + A_{im}F_m + V_i U_i \quad (1)$$

where:  $X_i$  =  $i$ th standardized variable;  $A_{ij}$  = standardized multiple regression coefficient of variable  $i$  on common factor  $j$ ;  $F$  = common factor;  $V_i$  = standardized regression coefficient of variable  $i$  on common factor  $j$ ;  $U_i$  = the unique factor of variable  $i$ ; and  $m$  = number of common factors.

The unique factors are uncorrelated with each other and with the common factors. The common factors themselves can be expressed as linear combinations of the observed variables.

$$F_i = W_{i1}X_1 + W_{i2}X_2 + W_{i3}X_3 + \dots + W_{ik}X_k \quad (2)$$

where:  $F_i$  = estimate of the  $i$ th factor;  $W_i$  = weight or factor score coefficient; and  $k$  = number of variables.

## Regression analysis

Regression analysis on the other hand, is a statistical procedure for analyzing associative relationships between a metric dependent variable and one or more independent variable. Among others, regression analysis helps us understand how the typical value of the dependent variable changes when any of the dependent variables is varied, while the other independent variables are held constant. Regression analysis is widely used for prediction and forecasting.

A multiple regression model is of the form:

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \dots + \beta_k X_k + U \quad (3)$$

where:  $Y$  = dependent variable;  $X$  = independent variables;  $U$  = error term with a mean zero and constant variance; and  $\beta$  = parameters to be estimated. They measure the effects of the independent variables on the dependent variable.

Equation 3 is estimated by the following equation:

$$\hat{Y} = a_0 + b_1 X_1 + b_2 X_2 + b_3 X_3 + \dots + b_k X_k \quad (4)$$

where:  $\hat{Y}$  = Estimated value of the dependent variable  $Y$ ; and  $b$  = the estimated value of the parameters  $\beta$ .

## METHODOLOGY

The methodology of the present study involves a principal component analysis used to extract the principal factors among the various factors that influence respondent's frequency of visits to restaurants. These components were first extracted based on their communalities / extraction values and further based on their

**Table 1.** Categories of respondents.

Category	Restaurant A		Restaurant B	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Students	98	81.5	112	93.3
Teaching staff	19	15.8	2	1.6
Non-teaching staff	3	2.5	6	5
Total	120	100	120	100

**Table 2.** Sex of respondents.

Sex	Restaurant A		Restaurant B	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Male	96	80	102	85
Female	24	20	18	15
Total	120	100	120	100

extraction sums of squares loadings. The initial variables (common factors) considered for the principal component analysis are as given in Tables 6 and 7.

However, these were reduced to three each for the two restaurants (unique factors). Two multiple linear regression equations were also estimated to find out the extent to which the explanatory variables (principal factors) influenced the dependent variable.

These are specified in the regression equations as follows. For Restaurant A, the empirical model is of the form:

$$Y = b_0 + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + b_3X_3 + e \quad (5)$$

where;  $Y$ = Number of visits to the restaurant per week;  $X_1$ =Cleanliness of eating place;  $X_2$ =Taste of food;  $X_3$ = Appearance of food;  $e$ = is the sample error term of the population error term error term;  $U$ , also with mean zero and constant variance. The rest are as defined earlier.

The explanatory variables for Restaurant B are as follows:

$X_1$ = Efficiency of service;  $X_2$ = Friendliness of staff;  $X_3$ = Appearance of food

#### Data source

As indicated earlier, the research was conducted in two restaurants at the Nyankpala campus of the University for Development Studies in the Tolon Kumbungu District of Northern Region. Purposive sampling was employed to select the two restaurants based on students and staff patronage. The restaurants were Alimento (A) and Lovely Sisters (B). Both qualitative and quantitative data were collected from patrons of the two restaurants using a semi-structured questionnaire. After the questionnaire was developed, it was pre-tested to assess the strength and weakness for content validity. A simple random sampling procedure which gives each member of the population an equal chance to be interviewed was employed to interview 120 patrons of each restaurant, making it a total of 240.

The questionnaire was administered to respondents during the

second trimester of the 2009/2010 academic year. Key informants interview was also employed to seek information from restaurant operators on challenges in acquiring agricultural produce and food storage.

The Data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Scientists (SPSS) version 16.

## RESULTS

Here, we present the socio-economic characteristics of respondents as well as a descriptive analysis of the satisfaction levels of respondents. It also discusses the principal components that influenced the level of patronage of the restaurants and some of the difficulties that the restaurant owners face in their restaurant operation.

### Characteristics of respondents

The following tables present the categories as well as the sex distribution of the respondents who visited the restaurants. We observe in Table 1 that students were the group with the highest patronage in both Restaurant A (81.8%) and Restaurant B (93.3%) respectively. Also, males recorded 80 and 85% from restaurants A and B respectively, indicating that males patronized the restaurant more than females (Table 2). This is understandable, considering the fact that females generally prefer to cook their own food.

### Services on offer at the restaurants

It was observed that the services of the restaurants were almost the same. Both served the following meals; "Banku" with soup, "fufu" with soup, kenkey and fish/

**Table 3.** Respondents perception about prices of services on offer.

Level	Restaurant A		Restaurant B	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
High	25	20.8	3	2.5
Moderate	93	77.5	91	76.3
Low	2	1.5	26	21.3
Total	120	100	120	100

**Table 4.** Respondents' main reason for visiting the restaurant.

Reason	Restaurant A		Restaurant B	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
No time to cook	113	94.2	77	64.2
Value for money	3	2.5	17	14.2
Change of taste	4	3.3	26	21.7
Total	120	100	120	100

**Table 5.** Satisfaction levels of respondents.

Level	Restaurant A		Restaurant B	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Not at all satisfied	71	58.8	18	15
Satisfied	47	38.8	98	81.7
Extremely satisfied	2	2.5	4	3.3
Total	120	100	120	100

beans, rice (Jollof rice, plain rice with stew as well as rice and beans, locally called 'waakye'). Soft drinks were also on sale at both restaurants. However, pastries were sold only in restaurant A.

The perceptions of respondents regarding the prices of the food and services on offer at the two restaurants are shown in Table 3. Generally, prices of food were rated moderate at both restaurants. However, the prices in Restaurant A were considered more expensive than the ones in Restaurant B. When asked their reasons for patronage, 'no time for cooking' came up with the highest percentage at both restaurants) as the main reason for patronage by respondents (94.2 and 64.2% for restaurant A and B respectively (Table 4).

Also from Table 5, we observe that about 82% of the respondents were satisfied with the food service in restaurant B as against 38.8% in restaurant A. The percentage of respondents who were not satisfied in Restaurant A (58.8) was greater than those who were satisfied (41.2).

Tables 6 and 7 below give detailed levels of satisfaction of respondents based on a 6-point scale. Respondents were asked to rate the perception items as follows: satisfied (5 and 6); neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (4

and 3); and dissatisfied (2 and 1).

Thus, the higher the mean score the greater the level of satisfaction. In Table 6, we observe that the item with the highest mean score is 'relaxed atmosphere' (5.3), followed by 'location' (5.0), 'temperature of food' (4.1) and 'cleanliness of eating area' (3.9). 'Efficiency of service' (1.9) and 'friendliness of staff' (2.2) came last.

From Table 7 however, the item with the highest mean score is 'friendliness of servers' (4.6), followed by 'helpfulness of staff' (4.4) and 'cleanliness of serving area' (4.0) as well as 'cleanliness of eating area' (4.0). On the other hand the lowest level of satisfaction was scored by 'relaxed atmosphere' (2.3), and 'avail-ability of new items' (2.7). While, the highest mean score in Restaurant A is bigger than that of Restaurant B, its lowest mean score is smaller than that of Restaurant B.

### Factors influencing frequency of visits to restaurants

From the principal component analysis, the principal factors that influenced respondents' visits to Restaurants A were cleanliness of eating area, cleanliness of serving area, appearance of staff and relaxed atmosphere. For

**Table 6.** Descriptive analysis of satisfaction levels for restaurant A on a six-point scale (%).

Perception item	Satisfied		Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied		Dissatisfied		Means
	(6)	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	
Taste of food	1.7	3.3	11.7	51.7	16.7	15	2.8
Pleasing appearance of food	6.7	12.5	29.2	35	10	6.7	3.5
Variety of healthy menu	7.5	16.7	38.3	22.5	7.5	7.5	3.3
Freshness of food	3.3	21.7	26.7	42.5	1.7	4.2	3.8
Availability of new items	--	5.8	20	20	35	19.2	2.6
Appropriate temperature of food	9.2	25	37.5	22.5	1.7	4.2	4.1
Efficiency of service	0.8	2.5	2.5	19.2	36.7	38.3	1.9
Friendliness of staff	1.7	5	1.7	22.5	39.2	30	2.2
Helpfulness of staff	3.5	4.2	4.2	36.7	32.5	20	2.7
Hours of operation	13.3	14.2	34.2	25	8.3	5	2.7
Cleanliness of serving area	5	18.3	31.7	29.2	4.2	11.7	3.6
Cleanliness of eating area	17.5	12.5	34.2	20	11.7	5	3.9
Appearance of staff	18.3	12.5	24.2	25	16.7	16.7	3.1
Location	45	20.8	25.8	7.5	0.8	--	5.0
Relaxed atmosphere	51.7	39.2	5	3.5	1.7	--	5.3

Respondent's satisfaction levels from perception items rated on a 6-point scale. Consumers were dissatisfied about efficiency of service which had a mean score of (1.9) followed by friendliness of staff (2.2). However, location and relaxed atmosphere recorded a high mean value of (5.0) and (5.3) respectively.

**Table 7.** Descriptive analysis of satisfaction levels for restaurant B on a six-point scale (%).

Perception item	Satisfied		Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied		Dissatisfied		Means
	(6)	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	
Taste of food	4.2	22.5	32.5	35	4.2	1.7	3.8
Pleasing appearance of food	4.2	11.7	4	36.7	3.3	3.5	3.7
Variety of healthy menu	--	5.8	22.5	52.5	14.2	5	3.1
Freshness of food	4.2	10	30	47.5	5	3.3	3.5
Availability of new items	--	5.8	10	42.5	34.2	7.5	2.7
Appropriate temperature of food	5	15	41.7	32.5	4.2	1.7	3.8
Efficiency of service	19.2	24.2	27.5	22.5	5	1.7	4.2
Friendliness of staff	29.2	29.2	24.2	16.7	0.8	--	4.7
Helpfulness of staff	4.2	16.7	30	42.5	5	1.7	4.4
Hours of operation	19.2	26.7	34.2	14.2	4.2	1.7	3.7
Cleanliness of serving area	3.3	29.2	39.2	20	6.7	1.7	4.1
Cleanliness of eating area	3.3	20	52.5	22.5	1.7	--	4.0
Appearance of staff	0.8	3.5	26.7	45	20.8	4.2	3.5
Location	9.2	17.5	39.2	21.7	57.5	7.5	3.8
Relaxed atmosphere	2	5.8	19.2	34.2	22.5	16.7	2.8

Satisfaction levels from perception items rated on a six-point scale does not seem to be very high. From the table the highest mean score was (4.6) for friendliness of servers. Helpfulness of staff (4.4) and cleanliness of serving area and cleanliness of eating area (4.0). On the other hand the lowest level of satisfaction comes from relaxed atmosphere (2.3), and availability of new items (2.7). No perception item fell in the satisfied region.

Restaurant B, the principal factors were efficiency of service, friendliness of staff and pleasing appearance of the food. However, the regression analysis of the principal factors on the frequency of visits to the restaurants showed that cleanliness of eating area, taste

of food and pleasing appearance of food were the significant determinants of the frequency of visits to Restaurant A. For Restaurant B, the significant determinants were efficiency of service, friendliness of staff and pleasing appearance of food. Also, the R-

**Table 8.** OLS Estimates of the determinants of visits to Restaurant A.

Variable	Coefficient	Standard error	T-Ratio
Constant	0.8	0.1	6.5
Cleanliness of eating area	0.5	0.2	2.9
Taste of food	0.5	0.2	3.0
Pleasant appearance of food	0.4	0.2	2.1

Dependent variable is frequency of visits per week; R-Squared = 0.61.

**Table 9.** OLS Estimates of the determinants of visits to Restaurant B.

Variable	Coefficient	Standard error	T-Ratio
Constant	11.0	2.0	5.5
Efficiency of service	1.7	0.2	6.9
Friendly staff	1.8	0.2	7.5
Pleasant appearance of food	0.6	0.2	3.3

Dependent variable is frequency of visits per week; R-Squared = 0.74.

squared values of 0.61 and 0.74 mean that the models were good in explaining 61 and 74% of the variations in the dependent variables in Restaurants A and B respectively (Tables 8 and 9).

### Food storage

We found that both restaurants had no storage facilities. The restaurateurs gave the reasons as follows: “food storage would involve high cost of constructing storage facilities”; “it would also involve management and maintenance in and around the structures, including control of pest and insect attack” “storing produce will also lead to a divided attention”; and finally, “storing food would predispose their establishment to more unforeseen circumstances such as food poisoning.”

### Challenges in acquiring agricultural produce

The major challenge in the restaurant industry, according to the restaurateurs, is seasonal food storage. The operators argued that since farmers do not produce all year round, there are times when food stuff is scarce and affects their operations.

Another challenge is poor packaging and improper handling of produce by farmers. The restaurateurs said farmers had little or no knowledge in proper packaging of produce. They stressed that farmers do not use the right containers to store their produce, and this adversely reduces the quality of the produce. For example, they mentioned that improper packaging and handling inflicts open wounds and bruises on tubers, which serve as entrance for disease-causing organisms, and thus, reduce the quality and the shelf life of the produce.

Cereals are also contaminated by foreign materials such as weed seeds, stones and other unwanted materials which pose a problem of additional cost of separating contaminants from the produce. Finally, fluctuations in the prices of farm produce as a result of seasonal shortage, was mentioned as a major challenge in the successful operation of the restaurants.

### DISCUSSION

The findings of this present study confirm that of the theoretical and empirical literature reviewed earlier. For instance, in the principal component analyses it was clear that the atmosphere, food quality and service quality determined the level of satisfaction of customers of both restaurants. Similarly, patrons had earlier indicated that the prices charged were generally moderate. This is consistent with other studies. For example, in Ryu and Han (2010), quality of food and service as well as physical environment were all significant determinants of customer satisfaction. Also, in Qin and Prybutok (2009), service quality and food quality were two main factors that influenced customer satisfaction. Furthermore, Abdulai and Rozario (2009) found positive significant relationship between place and service quality and customer satisfaction. However, they found a negative relationship between food quality and customer satisfaction.

For the purpose of formulating specific policies for the two restaurants, it is necessary for us to identify the differences in the aforementioned findings. First, while customers in Restaurant B were generally satisfied, those of Restaurant A were not. Secondly, when asked the reasons for their patronage in both restaurants, the main reason for both restaurants was ‘no time to cook’.

However, the percentage of patrons that gave this reason was greater in Restaurant A. Similarly, greater percentages of respondents in Restaurant B cited other reasons such as 'value for money' and 'change of taste' as why they patronized the restaurant. These reasons go to buttress the fact that customers in Restaurant B are more satisfied than those in A, and that by implication, the latter only go there because they do not have time to cook. Besides, patrons in Restaurant A generally saw the price to be higher than those in Restaurant B. For example, while 20.8% of Restaurant A patrons said the price was high, only 2.5% of Restaurant B customers thought they were paying a high price. Also, 21.3% in Restaurant B, as opposed to just 1.5% in Restaurant A saw the price they were paying to be low.

Also, it is worth-stressing that while most of the patrons in both restaurants are students, Restaurant A serves a greater percentage (15.8) of teaching staff than Restaurant B (1.6). Could it be that the expectations of the teaching staff are high, considering the fact that most of them are married and therefore are served with better meals at home, hence their low level of satisfaction? On the other hand it is mind-bothering, why considering their relatively good economic background; the teaching staff think that the price they are paying is high. A direct observation confirmed the fact that the prices at Restaurant B were lower than in Restaurant A, but as indicated earlier, one would think that considering the higher percentage of teaching staff in the latter, prices should not be perceived to be high.

The differences between the two restaurants can also be seen in terms of the principal component analysis and the regression results. Clearly, by the SERVQUAL Model, 'tangibility' and 'assurance' are the two important factors determining customer satisfaction, and for that matter frequency of visit in Restaurant A and B respectively. Thus, while the findings in Restaurant A are consistent with that of Tat et al. (2011), the results in Restaurant B confirm that of Festus et al. (2006) and Landrum et al. (2006). It is important that apart from reducing the price, Restaurant A improves upon its assurance and empathy dimensions while Restaurant B also improves upon its tangibility dimensions, if they want to maintain their customers and even attract more. Furthermore, in order to avert the seasonal shortages of produce, it may be necessary for the restaurateurs to put up simple storage structures with which they will be able to store their raw materials.

In conclusion, this study has combined two important statistical tools, namely, principal components and

regression analyses to unearth what patrons perceive to be the qualities of a good restaurant as well as the factors that influence the frequency of their visits. Many studies hardly combine the two, and we think that this is a good contribution.

## REFERENCES

- Abdullah DN, Rozario MA (1999). Influence of service and product quality towards customer satisfaction: A case study at the staff cafeteria in the Hotel Industry. *World Acad. Sci. Eng. Technol.*, p. 53.
- Chen LJ, Gupta A, Rom W (1994). A study of price and quality in service operations. *Int. J. Serv. Ind. Manage.*, 5(2): 23-34.
- Festus O, Maxwell KH, Godwin JU (2006). Service quality, customer satisfaction, and behavioral intentions in the service factory. *J. Services Marketing*, 20/1, pp. 59-72.
- Landrum H, Prybutok VR, Zhang XN (2006). A comparison of Magal's service quality instrument with SERVPERF. *Info. Manage*, 44: 104-113.
- Lim H (2010). Understanding America customer perceptions on Japanese food and services in the U.S. UNLV Thesis/ Dissertations/Professional papers/capstones. Paper 654. <http://digitalcommons.library.univ.edu/theses/dissertations/165>. Accessed (14/1/2012).
- Liu Y, Jang S (2009). Perceptions of Chinese restaurants in the U.S.: What affects customer satisfaction and behavioral intentions? *Int. J. Hospitality Manage.*, 28(3): 338-348.
- Malhotra NK (2004) *Marketing Research: An Applied Orientation*, 4th edition, London. Prentice-Hall International, London.
- Namkung Y, Jang S (2007). Does food quality really matter in restaurants? Its impact on customer satisfaction and behavioural intentions. *J. Hospitality Tourism Res.*, 931(3): 387-409.
- Parasuraman A, Berry L, Zeithaml V (1988). SERVQUAL: A multiple-item scale for measuring consumer perceptions, *J. retailing*, 64(1): 12-40.
- Peri C (2006). The universe of food quality. *Food Qual. Prefer.*, 17(1-2): 3-8.
- Qin H, Prybutok VR (2009). Service quality, customer satisfaction, and behavioral intentions in fast-food restaurants", *Int. J. Qual. Serv. Sci.*, 1(1): 78-95
- Ryu K, Han H (2010). Influence of the quality of food, service, and physical environment on customer satisfaction and behavioural intention in quick-causal restaurants: Moderating role of perceived price. *J. Hospitality Tourism Res.*, 34(3): 310-329
- Stevens P, Knutson B, Patton M (1995). Dineserv: A tool for measuring service quality in restaurants. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 36(2): 56-60.
- Sulek JM, Hensley RL (2004). The relative importance of food, atmosphere, and fairness of wait. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 45(3): 235-247.
- Tat HH, Sook-Min S, Ai-Chin T, Rasli A, Hamid ABA (2011) Consumers' Purchase Intentions in fast food restaurants: An Empirical study on undergraduate students. *The Special Issue on Contemporary Issues in Business*.
- Vlisides CE, Chiang W, Pan W (2000). Popularity factors of " All-you-can-eat" Chinese buffet. *Food Res. Int.*, 12(1): 1-24.