The Antecedents of Satisfaction and Revisit Intention for Full-Service Restaurants:
An Empirical Study of the Food and Beverage Industry in Jakarta

Adilla Anggraeni, Binus Business School, Bina Nusantara University, Indonesia

Lucina Iswi Hapsari Sulistyo, Faculty of Economics and Communication, Bina Nusantara University, Indonesia

Natalia Affandy, Binus Business School, Bina Nusantara University, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research is to identify the factors influencing customers' satisfaction and revisit intentions for full-service restaurants in Jakarta. The recent economic crisis is known to have had a great impact on consumer behavior with regard to restaurants. Therefore, this study is primarily focused on exploring the effects on the traditional antecedents of satisfaction and revisit intentions as full-time restaurants attempt to come up with better marketing strategies. This study involved 150 respondents who recently visited a full-service restaurant within the period of one month prior to the data collection. A confirmatory factor analysis and a reliability analysis were used to test the reliability and validity of the measurements. The hypotheses testing was conducted using a simple and multiple linear regression analysis to test the suitability of the proposed model for measuring satisfaction and revisit intentions. The results of the study showed that atmosphere has a significant influence on customer satisfaction and revisit intention. Customer satisfaction was also found as one of the most significant factors impacting revisit intention in the full-service restaurant industry. Therefore, restaurant managers can use a combination of good price and exciting atmosphere to enhance satisfaction and revisit intention. This study provides insights on full-service restaurants in Indonesia which have not received much attention in both marketing and hospitality literature.

KEYWORDS

Customer Satisfaction, Full-Service Restaurant, Revisit Intention, Service Marketing, Service Quality

1. INTRODUCTION

This research is a synthesis between previous studies conducted by Marinkovic and Senic (2014) with the title "The antecedents of satisfaction and revisit intentions for full-service restaurants" and another study conducted by Ryu and Lee (2012) titled "The influence of the quality of the physical environment and service on restaurant image, customer perceived value, customer satisfaction, and behavioral intentions".

In recent years, Indonesia's market for consumer food service has indicated favorable sales and firmly fixed growth. The effect of the strengthened economy has led to rising disposable incomes which then increased the purchasing power of consumers. In addition to that, the full-service restaurant sector in Indonesia has undergone stable growth that can be seen from the newly emerging fancy and trendy full-service restaurants, especially in the areas of north and south Jakarta. The definition of a full–service restaurant is any restaurant that provides customers with full table service (Barrows, 2008). According to data provided by the Central Bureau of Statistics in Indonesia (2015), there were 1,361 restaurants in Jakarta, which was an increase of 46.6% compared to the number of restaurants in 2014.

The rapidly growing restaurant business in Jakarta creates challenges for restaurant owners, not only to be able to differentiate themselves and create a competitive advantage, but also to identify and understand the factors which will lead to customer satisfaction and those which will make them revisit the restaurant.

The growing number of full-service restaurants in Jakarta that serve a wide variety of food from international to local tastes serves the needs for Generation Y in Jakarta who exhibits variety-seeking behavior. However, it creates competition among many established full-service restaurants in Jakarta. Hence, it is important to understand the factors that influence repeated patronage, because in the end, repeated patronage can lead to long-term relationships between customers and the business.

Seurat Group (2015), a marketing consultant based in the United States, found that the millennial generation was always looking for novelty in terms of brand and taste experiences. Millennials were more reluctant to choose the same place to eat and tended to seek variety with each new dining occasion. Moreover, the increasing competitive landscape in terms of the food service industry, including full-service restaurants, creates challenges for restaurant owners to attract repeated patronage from millennials, given the fact that they are always seeking a new experience, authenticity, and they are interested in trying novel products (Crecca, 2015).

The full-service restaurant industry is considered to be low margin, highly competitive, with moderate buyer and supplier power, and high threats of new entrants and substitutes (Market Line Europe Industry Profile, 2015). A study conducted by Parsa, Self, Njite, and King (2005) found that 60% of the established restaurants did not last their first year, and 80% did not make it through their fifth year. This may mean that restaurants will need to improve their service and offerings to ensure customer satisfaction and encourage them to revisit. As suggested by Kivela, Inbakaran, and Reece (1999), food quality is fundamental for overall customer satisfaction and behavior intentions.

Additionally, research conducted by Namkung and Jang (2010) found that features in service quality such as guaranteed service, as well as helpful and well-informed restaurant staff enhanced customers' dining experience and satisfaction. Dulen (1999) stated that the important elements of consumer dining experience in the full-service restaurant industry consisted of food quality, atmosphere, and service quality.

Moreover, Hanayasha and Hilman (2015) also noted that customer satisfaction can instill customers' trust in the products or services leading to repurchase behavior in the future. Many restaurants have realized that the competitions can be quite strict, and the millennial customers represent an attractive segment due to their buying power (Focsht, Schloffer, Maloles, & Chia, 2009). As a young generation, they may have different priorities compared to the previous generations (Valentine & Powers, 2013), and they represent a challenge in the restaurant industry (Lukovitz, 2009, in Jang, Kim, & Bonn, 2011). However, extant literature has also shown that there is still a limited understanding of the motivations and consumption patterns of these millennial customers (Noble, Haytko, & Phillips, 2009).

Even though many studies have discussed restaurant characteristics and their relationship with the revisit intention of customers, to the best of the authors' knowledge, very few studies have discussed the factors influencing the revisit intention of full-service restaurants, especially for millennial customers. This indicates the importance of a study to be conducted to test the relationship between the elements of customer dining experience which include price, atmosphere, quality of interaction

and food quality, customer perceived value, customer satisfaction, and revisit intentions. Full-service restaurants were chosen because of their dominance in terms of the market value in Indonesia.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Elements of Dining Experience

According to Campbell-Smith (1967), the key elements that increased the appeal of a meal experience were food, atmospherics, and service, which customers also used in evaluating restaurant quality (Dulen, 1999).

Atmospherics is a term used to express the practice of designing an asset environment to generate certain emotional effects in the customer that will lead to the enhancement of the intensity to purchase or re-purchase (Kotler, 1973).

Bitner (1992) has identified that there are three dimensions of atmospherics, or also defined as SERVICESCAPE. The servicescape includes the ambient conditions, spatial layout and functionality, as well as signs, symbols, and artifacts of a place (Heung & Gu, 2012). Atmosphere plays an important role in determining a customer's overall impression and dining experience (Khan & Afsheen, 2012), and it creates a significant impact on guest satisfaction (Marinkovic, Senic, Ivkov, Dimitrovski, & Bjelic, 2014). Furthermore, the physical environment (atmosphere) of a restaurant might influence customers when deciding for a place to dine (Spence & Piqueraz-Fiszman, 2014).

Thus, it can be hypothesized, that:

H1: Atmosphere has a significant impact on customer satisfaction.

Grönroos (1984) categorized service quality into two different dimensions: functional and technical service quality. The functional service quality incorporates interactions between customers, the service providers, and all the processes involved, whereas technical service quality refers to the quality of the service output (Sharma & Patterson, 1999, in Ha & Jang, 2012).

A full-service restaurant itself is a dine-in establishment, which provides not only food but complete service experiences to its customers (Han, Back, & Barrett, 2010). It differs from a limited service restaurant (such as a fast food restaurant) by design, as the staff in limited service operations perform fewer services for their customers (Susskind & Curry, 2016). Service quality itself becomes an inseparable part of the restaurant service.

In service businesses, the service employees and the service are often regarded as synonymous from the customer's perspective (Bowen & Schneider, 1985), and the interactions with the service employees are the most important influence on the customer's service quality assessment (Brown & Swartz, 1989) and on the overall service satisfaction (Crosby & Stephens, 1987; Hennig-Thurau & Thurau, 2003).

Service quality and customer satisfaction have become the most core marketing priorities since they are prerequisites of consumer loyalty, such as repeat sales and positive word-of-mouth (Han & Ryu, 2009; Liu & Jang, 2009b).

A study conducted by Al-Tit (2015) found that service quality in a restaurant context has a positive impact on customer satisfaction and may result in positive revisit intentions. Moreover, service quality has been considered as one of the determinants of customer satisfaction, which may lead to positive revisit intentions (Kim, Hertzman, & Hwanng, 2010).

Thus, it can be hypothesized that:

H2: Service quality has a significant impact on customer satisfaction.

Price plays an important role in determining customer behavior, especially in the restaurant industry due to the variability of service provided; moreover, customers might also have different expectations and actual experiences (Parasuraman, Zeithaml, & Berry, 1994). The intangible nature of hospitality products and services can lead to greater challenges in doing price settings and adjustments. Customers may evaluate the reasonability of a price attached to a certain good as well as the fairness of it. Price reasonability is defined as a customer's perception of the difference between the expected and actual service/goods received as a result of a transaction (Kahneman, Knetsch, & Thaler, 1986). Dodds, Monroe, and Grewal (1991) mentioned that customers often use price as an indicator for expectation of service performance.

An element of price that becomes an important consideration of the customers is price fairness. Price fairness can be defined as an individual's judgments and perceptions related to whether the price that he or she paid is just compared to the ones that other people paid (Xia, Monroe, & Cox, 2004). It was found that fairness of price might affect customer satisfaction (Ryu, Lee, & Kim, 2012) besides other behavioral reactions such as choice of product or brand and the quantity that they purchase (Mazumdar, Raj, & Sinha, 2005) and intention to buy (Bolton, Keh, & Alba, 2003. The behavioral reactions of receiving unfair prices can also be in the form of doing no action, acting self-protectively, or even being vengeful (Malc, Mumel, & Pisnik, 2016).

Thus, it can be hypothesized that:

H3: Price fairness has a significant impact on satisfaction.

Good food is commonly viewed as an essential component of customer satisfaction and repeat patronage decisions in the restaurant industry (Namkung & Jang, 2007; Sulek & Hensley, 2004).

Peri (2006) claimed that it is essential for full-service restaurants to provide outstanding food quality in order to ensure customer satisfaction. Sulek and Hensley (2004) stated that in full-service restaurants specifically, food quality is one of the important factors besides service quality in affecting customer revisit intentions. Moreover, food quality is confirmed to have a positive impact towards customer satisfaction and revisit intentions (Bujisic, Hutchinson, & Parsa, 2014).

Hence, it can be hypothesized that:

H4: The quality of the food has a positive influence on customer perceived value.

It was found that perceived value, in a customer's point-of-view, influences a customer's behavior (Doods, 1991). Baker, Grewal, and Parasuraman (1994) defined perceived value as the benefits received by customers in return for what they paid for it. In addition, research conducted by Patterson and Spreng (1997) found that customer satisfaction is significantly affected by perceived value. Thus, based on these findings, the following hypothesis was developed:

H5: Customer perceived value has a positive influence on customer satisfaction.

Weiss, Feinstein, and Dalbor (2004) stated that restaurant atmosphere is one of the aspects that influenced the revisit intention of customers. This statement is supported by Sulek and Hensley (2004) who confirmed the impact of physical environment on repeated patronage. Customers' perceptions of the servicescape can result from a holistic evaluation of the restaurant including other service quality as well as the servicescape itself (Kim & Moon, 2009). Thus, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H6: Atmosphere has a significant impact on revisit intention.

Even though price has been found to influence satisfaction, a study conducted by Lee (1998) found that the customers would tend to revisit or repurchase provided that the customers considered the price set by a business establishment as fair. However, if the price was not considered worth the sacrifice, even if the customers were satisfied, they would not repurchase or revisit. A study conducted by Bei and Chiao (2001) found that price influenced customer loyalty in a way that would result in revisit intention. Therefore, another hypothesis is proposed related to price:

H7: Price fairness has a significant impact on revisit intention.

2.2. Customer Satisfaction and its Impact on Revisit Intentions

Customer satisfaction is defined as a customer response related to service fulfillment following a consumption or experience (Oliver, 1997). It is subjective in nature and can be assessed after purchase and consumption (Um, Chon, & Ro, 2006).

It is also a key factor in determining the future purchase intention of customers (Moslehi, 2016). A previous study conducted by Howard and Sheth (1969) described customer satisfaction as perceived fairness towards the cost incurred and benefit(s) received by customers following the service experience. Oh (1999) claimed that customer satisfaction is a reliable predictor towards revisit intentions. It was confirmed that customer satisfaction has a positive relationship with customer loyalty which determines behavioral intention for revisiting (Ranaweera & Prabhu, 2003).

A research conducted by Getty and Thompson (1994), regarding the relationship between service quality, satisfaction, and behavioral intentions found that customer behavioral intentions, which include intention to recommend and repurchase, are the results of their perception of satisfaction and service quality. Another study by Soderlund and Ohman (2005) in a restaurant context indicated that customer satisfaction is related to two constructs of intentions, as expectations and wants.

Tellis (1998) mentioned that the degree of customer loyalty can be measured by assessing the frequency of revisiting the service following the first dining experience. Oliver (1997) described revisit intention as the tendency of a customer to repeat patronage in the future, subsequent to the first visit. With these points in mind, the following hypothesis is suggested:

H8: Customer satisfaction has a significant impact on revisit intention.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Measures

This study aimed to identify the main factors of satisfaction and revisit intentions in the restaurant sector. The study consisted of two parts; the first part was a focus group aimed at identifying the reasons for visiting full-service restaurants as well as gaining some insights into the names of restaurants that the respondents had visited in the past.

The second part was a survey research. For the survey research, a questionnaire containing the measures of variables under study was concocted. The questionnaire included the measurements of atmosphere, service quality, price, food quality, perceived quality, customer satisfaction, and customer revisit intentions. Reliable and relevant literature was reviewed in choosing the statements.

Several variable measurements were adopted from a study by Ryu, Lee, and Kim (2012) which included: atmosphere (four indicators), service quality (four indicators), food quality (six indicators), and customer satisfaction (three indicators). Measurements of perceived value (three indicators) and revisit intention (two indicators) were adopted from research by Jani and Han (2010). Another indicator used to measure revisit intentions was obtained from a study conducted by Dagger and O'Brien (2010).

The variables in this study were measured using a six-point Likert scale applied in the questionnaire (Table 1). For questions about the variables that included 'atmosphere', 'food quality', 'service quality',

Table 1. Operationalization of the variables

No.	Variables	Statements	Answer Options
1	Atmosphere (Adapted from Ryu et al., 2012)	(1) The restaurant had an attractive interior design.	Strongly disagree – Strongly agree
		(2) The background music was pleasing.	
		(3) The dining areas were thoroughly clean.	
		(4) The employees were neat and well dressed.	
2	Food quality (Adapted from Ryu, Lee, & Kim, 2012)	(1) The food was delicious.	Strongly disagree – Strongly agree
		(2) The food was nutritious.	
		(3) The restaurant offered a variety of menu items.	
		(4) The restaurant offered food made of fresh ingredients.	
		(5) The smell of the food was enticing.	
		(6) The food presentation was visually attractive.	
3	Service quality (Adapted from Ryu, Lee, & Kim, 2012)	(1) The employees served my food exactly as I ordered it.	Strongly disagree – Strongly agree
		(2) The employees provided quick service.	
		(3) The employees were always willing to help me.	
		(4) The employees made me feel comfortable in dealing with them.	
4	Price (Adapted from Jani & Han, 2011)	(1) The food prices at this restaurant were reasonable.	Strongly disagree – Strongly agree
		(2) The prices charged by this restaurant were appropriate as compared with any other similar restaurants.	
5	Perceived value (Adapted from Jani & Han, 2011)	(1) This restaurant offered good value for the price.	Strongly disagree – Strongly agree
		(2) The restaurant experience was worth the money.	
		(3) This restaurant provided me with great value compared to other similar restaurants.	
6	Customer satisfaction (Adapted from Ryu et al., 2012)	(1) I was very satisfied with my overall experience at this restaurant.	Strongly disagree – Strongly agree
		(2) Overall, this restaurant put me in a good mood.	
		(3) I really enjoyed myself at this restaurant.	
7	Revisit intention (Adapted from Jani & Han, 2012)	(1) I would like to come back to this restaurant in the future.	Strongly disagree – Strongly agree
		(2) I would consider revisiting this restaurant in the future.	
	Revisit intention (Adapted from Dagger & O'Brien, 2010)	I consider that I made a good decision to visit this restaurant.	
The in-text citation "Jani & Han, 2012" is not in the reference list. Please correct the citation, add the reference to the list, or delete the citation.			
The citation "Dagger & O'Brien, 2010" matches the reference "Dagger, O'Brien, 2010", but an accent or apostrophe is different.			

'price', 'perceived value', 'customer satisfaction', and 'revisit intention', the respondents' responses were ranked from strongly agree (1) to strongly disagree (6).

In the first part of the survey, the respondents had to answer the filter questions to ensure that they fulfilled the qualifications to participate in the questionnaire. For instance, their ages had to be in the age range of Generation Y, which is 22-36 years old (McCrindle & Wolfinger, 2010) and they should have visited full-service restaurants at least one time within the previous month of answering the questionnaire.

The second part of the questionnaire consisted of some behavioral questions related to the respondents' habit of eating out at full-service restaurants and the amount of money spent for each visit. The third part consisted of the variable-related questions of the study. To measure the variables, the authors used a six-point Likert scale.

The study utilized judgment sampling, involving 150 respondents as participants. The questionnaires were distributed to the respondents using an online method.

3.1.1. Procedures

The survey involved a sample size of 150 respondents who recently visited a full-service restaurant in the city of Jakarta, Indonesia. The authors conducted the survey through an online questionnaire to reach the qualified respondents.

The collected information in this study was analyzed using IBM SPSS 22 software. The methods used in the data analysis were through simple and multiple linear regression analyses.

The measurement was first pre-tested to ensure the validity and reliability of the measurement. One of the internal forms of consistency reliability is the coefficient alpha, commonly known as Cronbach's Alpha, which was used to measure the internal consistency reliability in this research. A value equal or exceeding 0.7 is considered as acceptable (Shukla, 2008). A content validity analysis was utilized in this research to examine the compatibility, sampling acceptability, and the inclusivity of the content of the measurement instrument.

3.2. Findings and Discussion

3.2.2. Validity

To determine the validity of questions in each of the variables, a Confirmatory Factor Analysis was used. The analysis was utilized to determine and ensure that each question item was acceptable and valid to be used or ignored. Four main criteria are considered in identifying a validity analysis: (1) a KMO value is required to be > 0.5 to be applied for each question item; (2) a component matrix or factor loading is required to be > 0.7 to be applied for each question item; and (3) the cumulative percentage (%) is required to be over 60% to be applied for each variable. Questions for each of the variables are considered valid if all of the 4 criteria have been met and passed. Moreover, a summary of the KMO values is provided in Table 4, the commonalities are outlined in Table 5, the cumulative percentages are listed in Table 6, and the component matrix is presented in Table 7. Table 2 shows the KMO Value Summary.

Overall, the results of the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy for each variable used in the study exceeded the acceptable level, which was 0.5. Thus, all the variables involved in this study were considered as appropriate for the study. Moreover, the KMO value indicates that the items involved in the variables were applicable and relevant. Therefore, all the variables consisting of atmosphere, food quality, service quality, price, value, customer satisfaction, and revisit intention were appropriate to be used in the study. Table 3 shows the commonalities summary.

The communalities result summary indicates that the percentages of variance from the pre-test responses of all the variables are considered appropriate because all of the values exceed the acceptable level, which is above 0.5.

Moreover, the cumulative percentage of variance is descriptively shown by the current and initial principle of items in the variables. In this study, it has been confirmed that all the variables

Table 2. KMO value summary (Pre-test)

Variable	KMO Value	Acceptable Level	No. of Items	Conclusion
Atmosphere	0.835	>0.5	4	Appropriate
Food quality	0.859	>0.5	6	Appropriate
Service quality	0.812	>0.5	4	Appropriate
Price	0.728	>0.5	3	Appropriate
Value	0.71	>0.5	3	Appropriate
Customer satisfaction	0.72	>0.5	3	Appropriate
Revisit intention	0.721	>0.5	3	Appropriate

Table 3. Communalities summary (Pre-test)

Variable	Communalities	Acceptable Level	Conclusion
Atmosphere	ATM1: 0.724	>0.5	Appropriate
	ATM2: 0.758		
	ATM3: 0.768		
	ATM4: 0.759		
Food quality	FQ1: 0.729	>0.5	Appropriate
	FQ2: 0.593		
	FQ3: 0.728		
	FQ4: 0.689		
	FQ5: 0.638		
	FQ6: 0.665		
Service quality	SQ1:0.798	>0.5	Appropriate
	SQ2: 0.686		
	SQ3: 0.671		
	SQ4: 0.663		
Price	PRICE1: 0.772	>0.5	Appropriate
	PRICE2: 0.748		
	PRICE3: 0.763		
Value	VALUE1: 0.723	>0.5	Appropriate
	VALUE2: 0.854		
	VALUE3: 0.811		
Customer satisfaction	CS1: 0.782	>0.5	Appropriate
	CS2: 0.725		
	CS3: 0.749		
Revisit intention	RV1: 0.81	>0.5	Appropriate
	RV2: 0.803		
	RV3: 0.72		

Table 4. Cumulative percentage (%) summary (Pre-Test)

Variable	Cumulative Percentage (%)	Acceptable Level	Conclusion
Atmosphere	75.22%	>60%	Appropriate
Food quality	67.34%	>60%	Appropriate
Service quality	70.45%	>60%	Appropriate
Price	76.08%	>60%	Appropriate
Value	79.59%	>60%	Appropriate
Customer satisfaction	75.19%	>60%	Appropriate
Revisit intention	77.74%	>60%	Appropriate

Table 5. Component matrix value summary (Pre-test)

Variable	Component Matrix Value	Acceptable Level	Conclusion
Atmosphere	ATM1: 0.851	>0.7	Valid
	ATM2: 0.871		
	ATM3: 0.876		
	ATM4: 0.871		
Food quality	FQ1: 0.854	>0.7	Valid
	FQ2: 0.77		
	FQ3: 0.853		
	FQ4: 0.83		
	FQ5: 0.799		
	FQ6: 0.815		
Service quality	SQ1: 0.894	>0.7	Valid
	SQ2: 0.828		
	SQ3: 0.819		
	SQ4: 0.814		
Price	PRICE1: 0.879	>0.7	Valid
	PRICE2: 0.865		
	PRICE3: 0.873		
Value	VALUE1: 0.85	>0.7	Valid
	VALUE2: 0.924		
	VALUE3: 0.901		
Customer satisfaction	CS1: 0.885	>0.7	Valid
	CS2: 0.851		
	CS3: 0.865		
Revisit intention	RV1: 0.9	>0.7	Valid
	RV2: 0.896		
	RV3: 0.848		

Table 6. R square for H1, H2, H3, and H4

Model Summary				
Model	**R**	**R Square**	**Adjusted R Square**	**Std. Error of the Estimate**
1	.691[a]	.477	.463	1.23265

a. Predictors: (Constant), ATM, PRICE, SQ, VALUE

Table 7. ANOVA for H1, H2, H3, and H4

ANOVA[a]						
Model		**Sum of Squares**	**df**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**Sig.**
1	Regression	201.214	4	50.303	33.107	.000[b]
	Residual	220.315	145	1.519		
	Total	421.529	149			

a. Dependent variable: CS
b. Predictors: (Constant), ATM, PRICE, SQ, VALUE

that consisted of atmosphere, food quality, service quality, price, value, customer satisfaction, and customer revisit intention have a cumulative percentage (%) above the acceptable level of 60%.

The component matrix value consists of component loading that shows associations between variables and the items or components of each variable. The component matrix value summary reveals that all of the variables have exceeded the acceptable level of >0.7, which indicates that all of the variables have correlations between their components, so the measurements are valid.

3.3. Multiple Regression Analysis

There were two multiple regression analyses conducted in order to test the relationship between four independent variables and a dependent variable and three independent variables and a dependent variable.

3.3.1. Atmosphere, Service Quality, Price, and Value Towards Customer Satisfaction

The first multiple regression tested the relationship between four independent variables, which were atmosphere, service quality, price, and value towards one dependent variable which was customer satisfaction. This involved four hypotheses that were tested, which are (Tables 6-8):

H1: Atmosphere has a significant impact on customer satisfaction.
H2: Service quality has a significant impact on customer satisfaction.
H3: Price has a significant impact on satisfaction.
H5: Customer perceived value has a positive influence on customer satisfaction.

Table 6 shows that the value of R Square is 0.477, which means 47.7% of the data is plotted around the regression line. Moreover, the value also indicates that 47.7% of the variance in the customer satisfaction is explained by the independent variables, and the rest (52.3%) is unable to be explained by the independent variables.

In this case, all the determinants of customer satisfaction which had a significant influence were atmosphere, service quality, price, and value, in which their sig. values were 0.001, 0.008, 0.004, and 0.000 respectively. The beta coefficient (marked as B) reflects the level of impact of each independent

Table 8. Coefficients for H1, H2, H3, and H4

Coefficients[a]					
Model	**Unstandardized Coefficients**		**Standardized Coefficients**	**t**	**Sig.**
	B	**Std. Error**	**Beta**		
1 (Constant)	2.655	1.001		2.651	.009
SQ	-.172	.064	-.197	-2.688	.008
VALUE	.441	.104	.406	4.251	.000
PRICE	.287	.097	.251	2.967	.004
ATM	.213	.060	.267	3.549	.001

a. Dependent variable: CS

variable on the dependent variable. It has been confirmed through the beta coefficient that both significant variables had a high beta coefficient value, which were 0.213 for atmosphere, -0.172 for service quality, 0.287 for price, and 0.441 for value. The perceived B-value was the highest compared to the other two variables with a value of 0.441. However, service quality shows a comparatively low effect toward revisit intention with a value of -0.172.

It is interesting to know that service quality was shown to negatively affect customer satisfaction. It was revealed that despite being significant, service quality had an inverse relationship with customer satisfaction.

3.3.2. Atmosphere, Price, and Customer Satisfaction Towards Revisit Intention

The second multiple regression tested the relationship between three independent variables, atmosphere, price, and customer and one dependent variable, which was revisit intention. This involved three hypotheses being tested, which were (Tables 9-11):

H6: Customer satisfaction has a significant impact on revisit intention.
H7: Atmosphere has a significant impact on revisit intention.
H8: Price has a significant impact on revisit intention.

Table 9 reveals that the value of R Square is 0.515, which means that 51.5% of the data was plotted around the regression line. Moreover, the value also indicates that 51.5% of the variance in the revisit intention is explained by the independent variables, while the rest (48.5%) is unable to be explained by the independent variables. Table 10 shows that as a group, the determinants of revisit intention have a significant impact on purchase intention since the ANOVA significant value is less than 0.05. However, not all the determinants were shown to have a significant impact on restaurant revisit intention.

Table 9. R Square for H6, H7, and H8

Model Summary				
Model	**R**	**R Square**	**Adjusted R Square**	**Std. Error of the Estimate**
1	.718[a]	.515	.505	1.32942

a. Predictors: (Constant), PRICE, ATM, CS

Table 10. ANOVA for H6, H7, and H8

ANOVA[a]					
Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	273.896	3	91.299	51.659	.000[b]
Residual	258.033	146	1.767		
Total	531.929	149			

a. Dependent variable: RV
b. Predictors: (Constant), PRICE, ATM, CS

Table 11. Coefficients for H6, H7, and H8

Coefficients[a]					
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	.201	.979		.206	.837
ATM	.139	.061	.155	2.283	.024
CS	.547	.083	.487	6.552	.000
PRICE	.273	.087	.213	3.141	.002

a. Dependent variable: RV

Moreover, in this case, the determinants of revisit intention that had a significant influence were customer satisfaction and price, where their sig. values were 0.000 and 0.002 respectively. The beta coefficient (marked as B) reflected the level of impact of each independent variable on the dependent variable. Both independent variables with significant influence toward the dependent have high beta coefficient values, 0.139 for atmosphere, 0.547 for customer satisfaction, and 0.273 for price. The customer satisfaction B-value was the highest compared to the other two variables with a value of 0.547. However, atmosphere had a comparatively low effect on revisit intention with a value of 0.139.

3.3.3. Food Quality and Perceived Value

This study involved one simple linear regression, which was to test the relationship between one independent variable, which was food quality on one dependent variable, which was value. This involved one hypothesis being tested (Tables 12-14):

Table 12. R Square for H4

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.344[a]	.119	.113	1.45913

a. Predictors: (Constant), FQ

Table 13. ANOVA for H4

ANOVA[a]					
Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	42.381	1	42.381	19.906	.000[b]
Residual	315.101	148	2.129		
Total	357.481	149			

a. Dependent variable: VALUE
b. Predictors: (Constant), FQ

Table 14. Coefficients for H4

Coefficients[a]					
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	7.347	.788		9.325	.000
FQ	.146	.033	.344	4.462	.000

a. Dependent variable: VALUE

H4: The quality of the food has a positive influence on customer perceived value.

Table 13 shows that the value of R Square is 0.119, which means that 11.9% of the data is plotted around the regression line. Moreover, the value also indicates that 11.9% of the variance in customer satisfaction was explained by the independent variable, and the rest (88.1%) was unable to be explained by the independent variable. The findings show that food quality has a significant impact on customer perceived value, since the ANOVA significant value is lower than 0.05.

4. CONCLUSION

Based on the findings, the antecedents to customer satisfaction in full-service are atmosphere, service quality, value, and price. These findings imply that a better atmosphere, a higher perception of value, and a price that is perceived to be fair can lead to higher customer satisfaction in full-service restaurants.

It is interesting to note that service quality has a significant inverse relationship towards customer satisfaction. It should be noted that consumers can have mixed reactions as a result of one consumption event that may result in different levels of satisfaction. For example, they may be satisfied with the quality of the food but not necessarily with the way the service is being delivered. The difference in terms of the results across different studies related to service quality and customer satisfaction can possibly be explained by cultural differences of the customers.

Research results have established that the cultural background of an individual affects the importance of service quality dimensions that the individual places (Tsoukatos & Rand, 2007; Furrer, Liu, & Sudharshan 2000). In addition to that, it is acknowledged that the items used to measure the variable service quality in this study may not represent all the dimensions of SERVQUAL.

The focus group discussion conducted at the beginning of the study found that dining partners may affect a customer's perception and judgment of the importance of service and the service received during the dining experience. For instance, if the customers come in a group, the expectation levels of the service quality tend to dip. If they come alone, the expectations of the service quality would

be higher. This leads to a situation in which existing service quality may be taken for granted or the occasion where the food consumption may influence the perception of the service quality.

The findings related to customer satisfaction and revisit intention are enlightening. Besides the findings derived from the quantitative approach, the results of the focus group discussion conducted at the beginning of the study found that customers that were satisfied with the previous dining experience had more intention to revisit the restaurant. Moreover, several studies found a positive relationship between customer satisfaction and customer revisit intention (Cronin, Brady, & Hult, 2000; Kivela, Inbakaran, & Reece, 1999; Olorunniwo, Hsu, & Udo, 2006). This signifies the influence of positive past experience leading to a restaurant's revisit intention. The findings confirm research conducted by Ekinci, Dawes, and Massey (2008), which noted that satisfaction reflects a customer's overall perspective towards the dining experience. These findings indicate that positive satisfaction and a customer's overall attitude towards the dining experience lead to positive effects on revisit intention.

These findings on the relationship between food quality and customer perceived value imply that it would be advisable that restaurants continuously improve their food quality, either through the ingredients or possibly cooking style. A previous study also stated the importance of the food quality dimension of restaurant attributes to customers (Shariff, Omar, Sulong, Majid, Ibrahim, Jaafar, & Ideris, 2015).

Moreover, some respondents in the focus group discussion conducted at the beginning of the study also mentioned that the reasons for them to revisit full-service restaurants were the good quality of food and good prices; good prices mean a fair price that is worth the dining experience. Therefore, besides improving the food quality, restaurant owners should create pricing strategies that their customers consider as fair which can be done by making the portion fair with the price, using premium ingredients and improving the taste of the food.

Respondents in the focus group discussion conducted at the beginning of the study also stated that in some cases, they are not the only ones who make the decision about which full-service restaurants to dine in; their friends, relatives, or immediate family members have an influence in the decision-making process. For some of the respondents, their families, on some occasions, play the role of deciding the place to eat, even if the respondents are not satisfied with the restaurant and do not have any intention to revisit it. Therefore, restaurant owners should be able to identify who makes the decision to come to their restaurants and improve factors that contribute to their satisfaction.

Despite shedding some important notions on the field of hospitality marketing, this study is by no means exhaustive. Future studies can include all the dimensions of SERVQUAL to measure the service quality construct. In addition to that, comparisons across different types of restaurants such as fast food, casual upscale, or fine dining restaurants may also be helpful in gaining additional insights.

REFERENCES

Al-Tit, A. A. (2015). The effect of service and food quality on customer satisfaction and hence customer retention. *Asian Social Science*, *11*(23), 129–139. doi:10.5539/ass.v11n23p129

Baker, J., Grewal, D., & Parasuraman, A. (1994). The influence of store environment on quality inferences and store image. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, *22*(4), 328–339. doi:10.1177/0092070394224002

Barrows, C. (2008). Food and Beverage Management. In *The SAGE Handbook of Hospitality Management*. Sage.

Bei, L. T., & Chiao, Y. C. (2001). An integrated model for the effects of perceived product, perceived service quality, and perceived price fairness on consumer satisfaction and loyalty. *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction & Complaining Behavior*, *14*, 125–140.

Bojanic, D. C. (1996). Consumer perceptions on price, value and satisfaction in the hotel industry: An exploratory study. *Journal of Hospitality & Leisure Marketing*, *4*(1), 5–22. doi:10.1300/J150v04n01_02

Bowen, D. E., & Schneider, B. (1985). Boundary-spanning-role employees and the service encounter: Some guidelines for management and research. In J.A. Czepiel, M.R. Solomon, & C.F. Surprenant (Eds.), The Service Encounter (pp. 127–147). Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Brown, S. W., & Swartz, T. A. (1989). A gap analysis of professional service quality. *Journal of Marketing*, *53*(2), 92–98. doi:10.1177/002224298905300207

Bujisic, M., Hutchinson, J., & Parsa, H. G. (2014). The effects of restaurant quality attributes on customer behavioral intentions. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, *26*(8), 1270–1291. doi:10.1108/IJCHM-04-2013-0162

Campbell-Smith, G. (1967). *Marketing of the meal experience: A fundamental approach*. Guildford, UK: University of Surrey.

Crosby, L. A., & Stephens, N. (1987). Effects of relationship marketing on satisfaction, retention, and prices in the life insurance industry. *JMR, Journal of Marketing Research*, *24*(4), 404–411. doi:10.1177/002224378702400408

Dagger, T. S., & O'Brien, T. K. (2010). Does experience matter? Differences in relationship benefits, satisfaction, trust, commitment, and loyalty for novice and experienced service users. *European Journal of Marketing*, *44*(9/10), 1528–1552. doi:10.1108/03090561011062952

Dekimpe, M. G., Steenkamp, J. E. M., Mellens, M., & Abeele, P. V. (1997). Decline and variability in brand loyalty. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, *14*(5), 399–514. doi:10.1016/S0167-8116(97)00020-7

Dodds, W. B., Monroe, K. B., & Grewal, B. (1991). Effects of price, brand, and store information on buyers' product evaluations. *JMR, Journal of Marketing Research*, *28*(3), 307–319.

Dulen, J. (1999). Quality control. *Restaurants & Institutions*, *109*(5), 38–52. PMID:10558057

Ekinci, Y., Dawes, P. L., & Massey, G. R. (2008). An extended model of the antecedents and consequences of consumer satisfaction for hospitality services. *European Journal of Marketing*, *42*(1-2), 35–68. doi:10.1108/03090560810840907

Foscht, T., Schloffer, J., Maloles, C. III, & Chia, S. L. (2009). Assessing the outcomes of Generation-Y customers' loyalty. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, *27*(3), 218–241. doi:10.1108/02652320910950204

Ha, J., & Jang, S. (2012). Variety seeking in restaurant choice and its drivers. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *32*, 155–168. doi:10.1016/j.ijhm.2012.05.007

Han, H., Back, K. J., & Barrett, B. (2010). A consumption emotion measurement development: A full-service restaurant setting. *Service Industries Journal*, *30*(2), 299–320. doi:10.1080/02642060802123400

Han, H., & Ryu, K. (2009). The roles of the physical environment, price perception, and customer satisfaction in determining customer loyalty in the restaurant industry. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research (Washington, D.C.)*, *33*(4), 487–510. doi:10.1177/1096348009344212

Hanaysha, J., & Hilman, H. (2015). Examining the role of service quality in relationship quality creation: Empirical insights from Malaysia. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, *6*(4), 458–465.

Hellier, P. K., Geursen, G. M., Carr, R. A., & Rickard, J. A. (2003). Customer repurchase intention: A general structural equation model. *European Journal of Marketing*, *37*(11/12), 1762–1800. doi:10.1108/03090560310495456

Hennig-Thurau, T., & Thurau, C. (2003). Customer orientation of service employees: Toward a conceptual framework of a key relationship marketing construct. *Journal of Relationship Marketing*, *2*(1/2), 23–41. doi:10.1300/J366v02n01_03

Heung, V., & Gu, T. (2012). Influence of restaurant atmospherics on patron satisfaction and behavioral intentions. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *31*(4), 1167–1177. doi:10.1016/j.ijhm.2012.02.004

Howard, J. A., & Sheth, J. N. (1969). *The theory of buyer behavior*. New York, NY: Wiley.

Hui, E. C., & Zheng, X. (2010). Measuring customer satisfaction of FM service in housing sector: A structural equation model approach. *Facilities*, *28*(5), 306–320. doi:10.1108/02632771011031538

Izogo, E. E., & Ogba, I. E. (2015). Service quality, customer satisfaction, and loyalty in automobile repair services sector. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, *32*(3), 250–269. doi:10.1108/IJQRM-05-2013-0075

Jani, D., & Han, H. (2011). Investigating the key factors affecting behavioral intentions: Evidence from full-service restaurant settings. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, *23*(7), 1000–1018. doi:10.1108/09596111111167579

Kahneman, D., Knetsch, J. L., & Thaler, R. H. (1986). Fairness as a constraint on profit seeking: Entitlements in the market. *The American Economic Review*, *76*(4), 728–741.

Khan, S., & Afsheen, S. (2012). Determinants of customer satisfaction in telecom industry, a study of telecom industry Peshawar KPK Pakistan. *Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research*, *2*(12), 12833–12840.

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. doi:10.1016/j.ijhm.2008.06.010

Kim, Y., Hertzman, J., & Hwang, J. (2010). College students and quick-service restaurants: How students perceive restaurant food and services. *Journal of Foodservice Business Research*, *13*(4), 346–359. doi:10.1080/15378020.2010.524536

Kivela, J., Inbakaran, R., & Reece, J. (1999). Consumer research in the restaurant environment, part 1: A conceptual model of dining satisfaction and return patronage. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, *11*(5), 205–222. doi:10.1108/09596119910272739

Kotler, P. (1973). Atmospherics as a marketing tool. *Journal of Retailing*, *49*(4), 48–64.

Lee, D. Y. (1998). *The effects of product quality and service quality on consumer satisfaction and loyalty: A study of gas station.* Unpublished master's thesis, National Cheng University, Taiwan.

Liu, Y. H., & Jang, S. (2009). The effects of dining atmospherics: An extended Mehrabian-Russell model. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *28*(4), 494–503. doi:10.1016/j.ijhm.2009.01.002

Malc, D., Mumel, D., & Pisnik, A. (2016). Exploring price fairness perceptions and their influence on consumer behavior. *Journal of Business Research*, *69*(9), 3693–3697. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.03.031

Marinkovic, V., Senic, V., Ivkov, D., Dimitrovski, D. M., & Bjelic, M. (2014). The antecedents of satisfaction and revisit intentions for full-service restaurants. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, *32*(3), 311–327. doi:10.1108/MIP-01-2013-0017

Mazumdar, T., Raj, S. P., & Sinha, I. (2005). Reference Price Research: Review and Propositions. *Journal of Marketing*, *69*(4), 84–102. doi:10.1509/jmkg.2005.69.4.84

McCrindle, M., & Wolfinger, E. (2010). *Generation defined. The ABC of XYZ: Understanding the Global Generations*. University of New South Wales.

Moslehi, H., & Haeri, F. A. (2016). Effects of promotion on perceived quality and repurchase intention. *International Journal of Scientific Management and Development*, *4*(12), 457–461.

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 (Washington, D.C.)*, *31*(3), 387–410. doi:10.1177/1096348007299924

Namkung, Y., & Jang, S. (2008). Are highly satisfied restaurant customers really different? A quality perception perspective. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, *20*(2), 142–155. doi:10.1108/09596110810852131

Namkung, Y., & Jang, S. C. (2010). Effects of perceived service fairness on emotions, and behavioral intentions in restaurants. *European Journal of Marketing*, *44*(9/10), 1233–1259. doi:10.1108/03090561011062826

Noble, S. M., Haytko, D., & Phillips, J. (2009). What drives college-age Generation Y consumers? *Journal of Business Research*, *62*(6), 617–628. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2008.01.020

Oh, H. (1999). Service quality, customer satisfaction, and customer value: A holistic perspective. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *18*(1), 67–82. doi:10.1016/S0278-4319(98)00047-4

Oliver, R. L. (1997). *Satisfaction: A Behavioral Perspective on the Consumer*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1994). Alternative scales for measuring service quality: A comparative assessment based on psychometric and diagnostic criteria. *Journal of Retailing*, *70*(3), 201–230. doi:10.1016/0022-4359(94)90033-7

Parsa, H. G., Self, J. T., Njite, D., & King, T. (2005). Why restaurants fail. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, *46*(3), 304–322. doi:10.1177/0010880405275598

Patterson, P. G., & Spreng, R. A. (1997). Modelling the relationship between perceived value, satisfaction, and repurchase intentions in a business-to-business, services context: An empirical examination. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, *8*(5), 414–434. doi:10.1108/09564239710189835

Peri, C. (2006). The universe of food quality. *Food Quality and Preference*, *17*(1-2), 3–8. doi:10.1016/j.foodqual.2005.03.002

Ranaweera, C., & Prabhu, J. (2003). The influence of satisfaction, trust, and switching barriers on customer retention in a continuous purchasing setting. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, *14*(4), 374–395. doi:10.1108/09564230310489231

Reimer, A., & Kuehn, R. (2005). The impact of servicescape on quality perception. *European Journal of Marketing*, *39*(7/8), 785–808. doi:10.1108/03090560510601761

Ryu, K., Han, H., & Jang, S. (2010). The effect of hedonic and utilitarian values on customers' satisfaction and behavioral intention in the fast-casual restaurant industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, *22*(3), 416–432. doi:10.1108/09596111011035981

Ryu, K., Lee, H. R., & Kim, W. G. (2012). The influence of the quality of the physical environment and service on restaurant image, customer perceived value, customer satisfaction, and behavioral intentions. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, *24*(2), 200–223. doi:10.1108/09596111211206141

Shariff, S. N. F. B. A., Omar, M. B., Sulong, S. N. B., Majid, H. A. B. M. A., Ibrahim, H. B. M., Jaafar, Z. B., & Ideris, M. S. K. B. (2015). The influence of service quality and food quality towards customer fulfillment and revisit intention. *Canadian Social Science*, *11*(8).

Shukla, P. (2008). *Essentials of Marketing Research: Part II*. Bookboon.

Soderlund, M., & Ohman, N. (2005). Assessing behavior before it becomes behavior: An examination of the role of intentions as a link between satisfaction and repatronizing behavior. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, *16*(2), 169–185. doi:10.1108/09564230510592298

Spence, C., & Piqueras-Fiszman, B. (2014). *The perfect meal: The multisensory science of food and dining*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell. doi:10.1002/9781118491003

Sulek, J. M., & Hensely, R. L. (2004). The relative importance of food, atmosphere, and fairness of wait: The case of a full-service restaurant. *The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, *45*(3), 235–247. doi:10.1177/0010880404265345

Susskind, A. M., & Curry, B. (2016). The influence of table top technology in full-service restaurants. *Cornell Hospitality Report*, *16*(22), 3–9.

Tellis, G. J. (1998). *Advertising and Sales Promotion Strategy*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Um, S., Chon, K., & Ro, Y. H. (2006). Antecedents of revisit intention. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *33*(4), 1141–1158. doi:10.1016/j.annals.2006.06.003

Weiss, R., Feinstein, A. H., & Dalbor, M. (2004). Customer satisfaction of theme restaurant attributes and their influence on return intent. *Journal of Foodservice Business Research*, *7*(2), 23–41. doi:10.1300/J369v07n01_03

Xia, L., Monroe, K. B., & Cox, J. L. (2004). The price is unfair! A conceptual framework of price fairness perceptions. *Journal of Marketing*, *68*(4), 1–15. doi:10.1509/jmkg.68.4.1.42733

Zeithaml, V. A. (1988). Consumer perceptions of price, quality, and value: A means-end model and synthesis of evidence. *Journal of Marketing*, *52*(3), 2–22. doi:10.1177/002224298805200302

Zikmund, W. G., & Babin, B. J. (2007). *Exploring Market Research*. Mason, OH: Thomson Higher Education.

Adilla Anggraeni is currently a faculty member of Binus Business School, Bina Nusantara University. Her research interests include consumer behaviour, social marketing, and retail management.

Lucina Iswi Hapsari Sulistyo earned her Master in Hotel Management from Institut Vatel, Nimes, France in 2004. Her research interests include hospitality management and customer behaviour. She has extensive industrial experiences in the food and beverage industry, hotel management, legal issues in hospitality and customer complaint handling. She is pursuing a doctoral degree in Tourism from University of Udayana, Indonesia at the moment.

Natalia Affandy graduated with a bachelor's degree in marketing from Binus Business School, Bina Nusantara University in 2015.