University of Central Florida

STARS

2013

Guest Satisfaction Analysis Of A Casual Dining Restaurant: A Comparison Of Tourist Vs Non-tourist Satisfaction Scores.

Jessica Wickey
University of Central Florida

GUEST SATISFACTION ANALYSIS OF A CASUAL DINING RESTAURANT: A
COMPARISON OF TOURIST VS NON-TOURIST SATISFACTION SCORES

by

JESSICA LYNN WICKEY
B.S. Florida Gulf Coast University, 2010

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Science
in the Rosen College of Hospitality Management
at the University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Fall Term
2013

ABSTRACT

Purpose - The purpose of this study is to analyze guest/customer satisfaction surveys of a casual dining restaurant in the Orlando, Florida area; specifically, to analyze if there is a difference between satisfaction levels of tourist and non-tourist guests.

The guest satisfaction surveys were analyzed on eight dimensions of satisfaction; Pace of Service, Service Overall, Server Communication & Accuracy, Food (Taste & Quality), Food Preparation, Bar (Beer, Wine, & Cocktail), Gratefulness, and Atmosphere in whole (including atmosphere and cleanliness).The eight dimensions were evaluated in the GPS (guest pulse survey) based on a Net Promoter Score, or NPS® system, and were compared by guest type: tourist versus non-tourist. Multiple linear regression analyses results concluded that the dimensions of Pace, Service Overall, Food, Food Preparation, and Atmosphere were predicators of Overall Satisfaction for tourist respondents. Service Overall, Server Communication, and Gratefulness were predictors of Overall Satisfaction for non-tourist respondents.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to give special thanks to Christopher McCarthy, without you I would have never made it through the first step. I would also like to thank Blanche Greaux, your constant support and unrelenting drive to push me to finish has been appreciated, I don't know what I would do without you. And finally to Greg Byrd, thanks for always believing in me, it means the world to me.

For my professors and my thesis committee:

Dr. Kevin Murphy, Dr. Paul Rompf, and Dr. HeejungRo, your guidance and support made this process one of the best learning experiences I could have ever imagined. Dr. Okumus, thank you for your constant cheerleading efforts and open availability throughout my studies at the Rosen College of Hospitality Management.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE:
INTRODUCTION

Customer satisfaction is essential for corporate survival. Several studies have found that it costs about five times as much in time, money, and resources to attract a new customer as it does to retain an existing customer (Pizam & Ellis, 1999). Exploring and observing expectations is important, as unfulfilled expectations can create disgruntled customers, who may silently exit or spread negative word-of-mouth (Kim, Ng, Kim 2009). Using guest surveys to monitor feedback and conduct a service recovery, if necessary, can potentially stop negative word of mouth before it is spreads.

Businesses want an opinion of them: they need to know how they are doing, and if a service failure is happening, how can they recover from it; and how can they keep the consumer happy and returning. Businesses need to lock in customer loyalty, and surveys are a window into consumers' emotional persona; a way to see inside a consumer's world and collect consumer contact information. According to a NY Times article, "There is no way to determine exactly how many consumer satisfaction surveys are completed each year, but Mindshare Technologies, a small company that conducts and analyzes on-the-spot electronic surveys, says it completes 175,000 surveys every day, or more than 60 million annually" (NY Times, 2012). The importance of surveys is proven by the magnitude of the amount of surveys collected daily.

Orlando, Florida is a destination for travel, with Walt Disney World, Universal Studios, and the new convention center attracting visitors from around the world. The U.S

Travel Association (USTA, www.ustravel.org, 2012) rated the top United States destinations for food-related travel as:

1. California

2. *Florida*

3. New York

4. Texas

5. North Carolina

6. Georgia

With Florida being ranked number two in the nation as a top destination for food-related travel, it seems imperative to understand the peak consumer, and evaluate what makes them satisfied while dining at a casual dining restaurant.

According to a recent study conducted by Croes, et al (2012), "as tourists become more satisfied with their restaurant experiences, their likelihood to revisit or encourage others to visit Aruba increases" (p. 120). This study was conducted on an island destination, where tourists travel to vacation. Positive dining experiences shaped the consumer's pleasure not only with the restaurant but also with the location of the restaurant. When used in comparison to Orlando and the tourists traveling here, it is clear that it is essential to make tourist's dining experiences throughout Orlando superb so that the city can capture their loyalty as well as their willingness to return and spread positive word of mouth.

Food tourism is one of the fastest growing areas in the tourism industry currently; however little published empirical research on tourists' motivation, satisfaction or behavioral

intentions have been conducted (Zhang, 2012). This study will look at the the difference in satisfaction needs of tourists and non-tourists.

The purpose of this study is to analyze guest/customer satisfaction surveys of a casual dining restaurant in the Orlando, Florida area; specifically, to analyze if there is a difference between satisfaction levels of tourist and non-tourist guests. The eight dimensions of the restaurant experience: Pace of Service, Service Overall, Server Communication & Accuracy, Food (Taste & Quality), Food Preparation, Bar (Beer, Wine, & Cocktail), Gratefulness, and Atmosphere in whole (including atmosphere and cleanliness) were used (See Appendix A). The researcher provides previous literature review for each dimension, as available, and will be assessed and explained further in the study.

In order to understand how a casual dining restaurant is defined or interpreted, a scholarly definition was provided via DiPietro and McLeod. "The definition of a casual-dining restaurant is one that has consistent standards and menus, typically more themes than other segments, trendier and higher-priced food items than limited-service restaurants, higher service levels than quick-service restaurants, and more highly trained and knowledgeable staff" (DiPietro & McLeod, 2011, p. 72). Throughout this study, the casual dining restaurant guest satisfaction scores will be evaluated and interpreted, providing results and offering conclusions for such.

Problem Statement

There currently is little to no research analyzing the difference between tourist and non-tourist satisfaction levels in their restaurant experience while dining at a casual dining

restaurant. The gap in this particular research is beneficial to industry leaders as well as educators. With Florida ranked one of the top destinations for food-related tourist travel as well as tourism, industry leaders need to understand what tourist and non-tourist consumers expect, and what satisfies them during their dining experience.

Research Purpose

The purpose of this study is to analyze guest/customer satisfaction surveys of a casual dining restaurant in the Orlando, Florida area; specifically, to analyze if there is a difference between satisfaction levels of tourist and non-tourist guests.

Research Objectives

1. To analyze and compare the different dimensions of guest satisfaction scores between tourists and non-tourists.
2. To evaluate and understand *what dimensions are most satisfying or dissatisfying to the tourist guest.*
3. To evaluate and understand *what dimensions are most satisfying or dissatisfying to the non-tourist guest.*

Research Questions

The primary research questions addressed in this study are:

1. Is there is a difference in the level of overall guest satisfaction between tourist and non-tourist guests at a casual dining restaurant?

2. What dimensions contribute the *most* to tourist overall satisfaction?

3. What dimensions contribute the *most* to non-tourist overall satisfaction?

Research Significance

The Orlando, Florida area receives over 51 million visitors a year (visitorlando.com, 2012). Of that total numbers of visitors, more than 75% of them are considered tourist, or having traveled for more than 50 miles for food or lodging accommodations (Croes, 2012). Understanding what satisfies visitors while dining gives the owners and managers of these casual dining establishments an edge over the enormous amusements parks and attractions.

Small restaurants are always looking for ways to attract and retain tourists and their dollars spent from the mega-amusement parks such as Disney and Universal Studios. The researcher plans to evaluate and provide solid data as to what a tourist consumer likes and dislikes while dining at a casual dining restaurant.

Chapter Summary

Customer or guest satisfaction, as it will interchangeably be referred to throughout the remainder of this study, is essential for restaurant survival; specifically in the casual dining sector. The significance of this study will help casual dining owners and managers by giving them the ability to capitalize on more than 51 million consumers and visitors who visit the Orlando, Florida area each year by understanding what makes the tourist and non-tourist guest satisfied during their dining experience.

CHAPTER TWO:
LITERATURE REVIEW

Satisfaction is not a universal phenomenon and not everyone gets the same satisfaction out of the same hospitality experience. The reason is that customers have different needs, objectives and past experiences that influence their expectations (Pizam & Ellis, 1999). Does this mean demographics affect the outcome of guest satisfaction surveys? Are tourists more prone to "bad" or negative guest service survey results? Davis and Stone's research explained "The same customer may also have different needs and expectations on different meal occasions, or at different times of the day" (Davis & Stone, 1985). Throughout the literature review, the research will provide support for each scale or dimension used in the guest satisfaction survey.

Are guest satisfaction scores relevant in today's restaurants? Within the hospitality industry, and particularly within the context of intangible components such as quality service, it is important for establishments to assess themselves and assess the achievements of competitors on a regular basis (Tobin, 2006). In today's fiercely competitive marketplace, characterized by similarly priced look-alike products offered from a variety of retailing firms, clear winners will be ones that provide excellent service quality (Parasuraman, 1988).

Do guest satisfaction surveys directly relate to guest retention and attraction? Past research in customer satisfaction and service quality has resulted in increasing research efforts to look at new ways to evaluate these concepts. Historically, the assumption has been that a linear relationship exists between satisfaction/dissatisfaction and disconfirmation or performance evaluations (Pizam & Ellis, 1999). Despite what seems like agreement on the

importance of customer satisfaction, there is little consensus on the details of what constitutes satisfaction or even how to quantify the difference customer satisfaction makes. Also in debate is how customer satisfaction should be measured, with what frequency, and to what level of aggregation (Gupta, 2007).

Customer satisfaction can also be defined as satisfaction based on an outcome or a process (Pizam &Ellis, 1999); does this process depend on where you dine? Outcome definition of customer satisfaction characterizes satisfaction as the end-state resulting from the experience of consumption (Vavra, 1997). Will consumption satisfaction be higher for tourists or non-tourists?

Using guest satisfaction surveys or comment cards help identify critical incidents (both good and bad) and serve to enhance the quality of service management (Scriabina & Fomichov, 2005). The popularity of the comment card method can be attributed to its ability to provide regular, timely feedback at, or near, the time of service (Prasad, 2003).

The purpose of this study is to analyze guest satisfaction surveys of a casual dining restaurant in the Orlando, Florida area; specifically, to analyze if there is a difference between satisfaction levels of tourist and non-tourist guests. Do local residential non-tourists continually project lower scores than non-residential tourist guests?

Study Relevance

The current study is relevant when analyzing guest satisfaction scores and surveys. Gupta's study has quantified the connection between return and actual traffic counts; even considering the caveat that the data covers a relatively brief time span, his models show that

the relationship is distinct for each restaurant concept, and can offer no blanket rule. One restaurant concept alone could count on gaining another 1,100 customers' comeback score by one percentage point (Gupta, 2007). Increasing guest satisfaction scores by even one percentage can make a difference in sales and in turn profit for the company. Satisfaction of customers also happens to be the cheapest means of promotion (Pizam & Ellis, 1999).

According to the National Restaurant Association (restaurant.org, 2011), travelers and visitors account for approximately 40% of sales at fine-dining restaurants and 25% of sales at casual-dining restaurants (Restaurant, Food & Beverage Market Research Handbook, 2011). Understanding what makes the dining experience "great" or "satisfying" for the guest or consumer can benefit casual dining chains enormously.

Many studies reviewed used "scenario based" surveys and concluded results from them. In this case, actual data was taken from consumers directly after they dined, and could interpret their experience immediately. In contrast to previous studies, this study used information collected directly after the dining experience, within 48 hours of the consumers dining experience.

Assessing Customer Satisfaction

There are several ways to assess the quality of services and customer satisfaction through subjective, or soft, measures of quality, which focuses on perceptions and attitudes of the customer rather than more concrete objective criteria. These soft measures include customer satisfaction surveys and questionnaires to determine customer attitudes and perceptions of the quality of the service they are receiving (Hayes, 1997). Many restaurants

now have some sort of customer satisfaction surveys or feedback platform in which to gather information and feedback on a consumer's visit. If properly designed, administered and analyzed, the process of monitoring customer satisfaction can be beneficial to any hospitality enterprise and make the difference between offering a mediocre product and an excellent, quality product (Pizam & Ellis, 1999). Restaurateurs who fail to measure up will soon see declining customer counts as guests switch to competing restaurants (Kim, Ng, Kim 2009).

Customer or Guest Satisfaction

In research, one of the most prominent and researched categories is guest satisfaction. Guest satisfaction has been analyzed in a myriad of areas throughout the hospitality and tourism industry. Restaurants, hotels, theme parks, cruise ships, airlines, and resorts are analyzed using multiple factors. Service failures and recovery, types of complaints, repeat patronage and return intentions, and customer loyalty and perceived fairness are all topics that have been studied in depth within the hospitality industry.

Emerging as a concept in the early 1970's, customer satisfaction was researched in social psychology, consumer behavior, and the marketing fields. Early research encompassed the manufacturing industry, and their relation to goods and services. While focusing on the interest in selling goods and services, service quality became a topic of contention for researchers. The importance of service quality and its relation to service industries started our delve into customer satisfaction research. It was not until the 1990's that customer satisfaction in the hospitality industry begun to be analyzed and investigated, with emphasis on the theoretical frameworks developed by marketing researchers and consumer

9

behaviorists for lodging, food service, restaurants, and tourism (Oh & Parks, 1997; Pizam & Ellis, 1999).

Customer satisfaction can be defined as an outcome or as a process depending on the desired aspect of satisfaction emphasized (Yi, 1990).Satisfaction can be viewed as an outcome that results from the purchase act or consumption experience (Heitmann, Lehmann & Herrmann, 2007). These definitions include: "an outcome of purchase and use resulting from the buyer's comparison of the rewards and costs of purchase in relation to the anticipated consequences" (Churchill & Suprenant, 1982, p. 493); "a post-evaluative judgment concerning a product or service" (Yuksel & Rimmington, 1998, p. 60); and "the summary psychological state resulting when the emotion surrounding disconfirmed expectations is coupled with the consumer's prior feelings about the consumption experience" (Oliver, 2010, p. 6).

When satisfaction is defined using a process-oriented approach, the evaluation process is an important element of customer satisfaction and that it extends beyond the post-usage judgment (Walker, 1995; Yi, 1990). According to the process view of customer satisfaction, the definition is as follows:"the customer's response to the evaluation of the perceived discrepancy between prior expectations (or some other norm of performance) and the actual performance of the product as perceived after its consumption" (Tse & Wilton, 1988, p. 204) or "the dynamic flow of multidimensional interactions among mental and overt behavior activities that unfold after the purchase" (Tse, Nicosia & Wilton, 1990, p.179).

According to Fisk, service evaluation is a three-stage process: pre-consumption, consumption, and post-consumption; in his model he specifically points out that service evaluation is more than simple judgment (as cited in Walker, 1995, p. 7).

Clarke (2001) and Yi (1990) quantify elements of satisfaction as an evaluation of emotion related to consumption experience, rather than as an emotion itself. Oliver (2010) and Sengunder (2002) view the determination of satisfaction or dissatisfaction as as an end-state of a psychological process, viewed as the consumer's fulfillment response.

Separate from service quality, customer loyalty, and behavioral intentions in the marketing and services literature, customer satisfaction is viewed as a related construct. Customer satisfaction and service quality literature both explore the variance between customer expectations and perceptions, but the term "expectations" is defined differently. Customer satisfaction literature considers expectations to be customers' prediction of the service transaction while service quality literature views expectations as the customers' desired service (Danaher & Mattsson, 1994; Parasuraman et al, 1988). Additionally, customer satisfaction is considered to be transaction or situation-specific, whereas service quality assessment is considered to be an overall judgment of, or attitude towards the organization (Danaher & Mattsson, 1994; Parasuraman, Zeithaml & Berry, 1988). According to Parasuraman et al (1988), customer satisfaction is related to service quality in that (1) there are five generic dimensions of service quality (reliability, assurance, tangibles, empathy and responsiveness) that must be present in the service delivery process for customer satisfaction to result and (2) repeated incidents of satisfaction over time can create the perception of service quality.

The literature also indicates that there is a relationship between customer satisfaction and loyalty; however satisfaction does not necessarily equal loyalty (Oliver, 1999). Like satisfaction, there is no single clear-cut definition of loyalty, but the fundamental themes when defining loyalty include a deeply held commitment to consistently rebuy or revisit a preferred product or service provider, repeat purchasing behavior, and positive attitude towards the buyer (i.e. recommending to others)(Kandampully & Suhartanto, 2003; Oliver, 1999). While satisfaction is important (because a dissatisfied customer is almost guaranteed not to return), a predominant theme is that satisfaction alone is insufficient because it does not guarantee that customers will return (Dube et al, 1994).

Definition of Tourist and Non-tourist

A tourist can be defined as "a person who leaves their hometown (permanent place) on a temporary basis for the purpose of seeking new experiences, fun and entertainment, participating in sports or sporting events, seeing cultural and historical places, or visiting attractions. On the condition that she/he should stay no less than 1 day and no longer than 12 months, make use of a tourist facility for accommodations and spend her/his own money (not business stipend) throughout their holiday" (tugberkugurlu.com, 2011). A more thorough definition would include travelers on business spending their own money, visiting relatives, attending conferences, or trade associations events. "Because travel and tourism is not generally classified as a separate industry in economic data sources, determining its importance and tracking its performance can be difficult" (Wilkerson, 2003, p. 47).

In contrast to the definition given above, a non-tourist is someone who is local to the area, and resides within a 50 mile radius of the location (Croes, 2012). For the purpose of this study, a tourist or non-residential guest is one who has traveled more than 50 miles to dine or drink in this casual dining restaurant, and a non-tourist or residential guest is one who lives within the 50 mile radius.

Dimensions of Restaurant Experience

The guest satisfaction surveys were analyzed on eight scales or dimensions of satisfaction; Pace of Service, Service Overall, Server Communication & Accuracy, Food (Taste & Quality), Food Preparation, Bar (Beer, Wine, & Cocktail), Gratefulness, and Atmosphere in whole (including atmosphere and cleanliness). The following literature supports each dimension, while providing background for the researcher's hypotheses.

Pace of Service

This scale asks the guest or consumer to evaluate how the "pace" of their meal or visit to the establishment went; was it too fast, too slow, or just about right? The pace of the meal is also related to the rate at which your service was provided. This includes the wait time to be seated, the delivery of beverages and food, and the presentation of the check and change. This dimension of guest satisfaction is important to evaluate in guest satisfaction; a rushed meal can make a guest feel unappreciated, and on the opposite side, a long wait can make a guest feel unnoticed. This satisfaction level can sometimes make or break a visit for the guest or consumer. An extremely important component of service overall quality within the

hospitality industry is reasonable service times. This relationship is particularly significant within the context of casual dining establishments since other elements of the traditional restaurant experience are scaled down to better fit the needs of the rapidly emerging casual and fast-casual target markets (Tobin, 2006). Noone et. al (2007) proposed that an inappropriately slow pace leads to feelings of anxiety and frustration as the customer is waiting for the next step. Conversely, when the pace is too fast, the customer is unable to linger and savor the experience.

Service Overall

The scale "Service Overall" contains dimensions grouped by traits of service, attentiveness, value, knowledge, appearance, and ability to create a great experience.

The research supporting service overall is covered in many journals and handbooks within the hospitality industry. A renewed emphasis on customer service is also being observed through the segment, as chains recognize that stepping up customer service becomes one area where restaurants can differentiate themselves; however, as restaurants raise their level of service, customer expectations have also increased (Food & Beverage Market Research Handbook, 2011). Service in general is one of the main reasons for repeat or return consumers.

Server Communication and Accuracy

"Server Communication and Accuracy" is divided into three separate categories which are as follows: communicated specials, took order accurately, and bill accuracy. The restaurant industry remains an economic powerhouse because of its ability to sell a desirable dining experience to customers. These sales rely on the communicative abilities of restaurant staff, especially servers (Kleman, 2008). The ability to communicate specials, menu items, drinks, and suggest items that suit the guest needs (and wants) is imperative to be a great server. Accuracy is also necessary for proper communication to be effective.

A good server and manager, regardless of staffing levels, should be able to identify guests who are being well served and guests who are not (Susskind, 2010). Server accuracy is essential for guest satisfaction.

Food – Taste and Quality

Research empirically examined the effect of perceived food quality on customer satisfaction and behavioral intentions in the restaurant consumption context (Young, 2007). The findings support the hypothesized positive linkages among food quality, satisfaction, and behavioral intentions. Another segment to this scale is: regardless of the severity of the service failure, each one should be carefully addressed and managed to minimize further discomfort to the guest. That said, operators making mistakes with their food are at a greater risk of losing their guests (Susskind & Viccari, 2011). The food quality will highly affect the return intentions of guests.

When considering the predictive power of food quality as a fundamental element of the restaurant experience, restaurateurs should not underestimate quality food a restaurant has to offer (Young, 2007). Namkung and Jang reported "food quality has been generally accepted as a fundamental element of the overall restaurant experience", (2007). The different categories that depict "food taste and quality" were overall taste and overall quality of the food.

Food Preparation

To make customers satisfied, it is important to serve food within the appropriate temperature range and to maintain it at the proper temperature during consumption. Thus, restaurant operators have to pay attention to food temperature at the time of service to customers. In addition, they need to use food plates with appropriate temperatures to maintain food quality (Young, 2007). In this dimension, "food preparation", the category of the food being prepared correctly is divided into three sections; prepared exactly as ordered, appropriate temperature, and delicious appearance. This dimension is different from quality of the food in that it signifies if the food was prepared properly from the kitchen.

Bar

According to the National Restaurant Association, beverage sales account for approximately 21% of total revenues in full-service restaurants (www.restaurant.org, 2011). Total sales at full-service restaurants for 2011 are projected at $194.6 billion; beverage sales will account for approximately $40.9 billion (Food & Beverage Market Research Handbook,

2011). With beverage sales grossing such large numbers (over $40 billion in sales),

restaurateurs need to understand and provide excellent beverage service and options.

According to Technomic (www.technomic.com, 2012), the restaurant chains

represented in Table 1 have the highest annual alcoholic beverage sales. The top grossing

chain was Chili's Bar & Grill with $560 million, followed by Applebee's Neighborhood Grill

& Bar with $525 million.

Table 1: Casual Chain Restaurant Annual Alcohol Sales in Millions

Chili's Bar & Grill	$560
Applebee's Neighborhood Grill & Bar	$525
T.G.I.Friday's	$455
Buffalo Wild Wings	$430
Olive Garden	$300
Outback Steakhouse	$270
Red Lobster	$195
Hooters	$195
The Cheesecake Factory	$180
Ruby Tuesday's	$135

(www.technomic.com, 2012)

Beer

"Although the domestic beer market was down 2.7% by volume, gross revenues were up 1.3%. Some of this revenue growth could be attributed to the strong growth in craft beer, which outperformed the overall beer market again, and was up 7.3% by volume and 10.3% in sales" (Beverage World, 2010).The following data represented in Table 2 is a demographic profile of the beer consumer (Behavioral Tracking Study, Miller Brewing Company, 2011).

Table 2: Demographic Profile of Beer Consumer

Gender	Male	77%
	Female	23%
Age	21-27	23%
	28-34	18%
	35-44	26%
	45 and older	34%
Income	Less than $30,000	32%
	$40,000-$49,999	23%
	More than $50,000	45%
Ethnicity	African-American	12%
	Caucasian	74%
	Hispanic	11%
	Other	3%

(Behavioral Tracking Study, Miller Brewing Company, 2011)

Wine

According to 2010 Consumer Tracking Study, conducted for the Wine Market Council by Merrill Research (www.merrill.com, 2010), 30% of U.S. adults are considered wine drinkers. Core wine drinkers account for 91% of wine consumption by volume, with marginal wine drinkers consuming the remaining 9%. The mean age of core wine drinkers is 45.6 years. Among core wine drinkers, 54% are male and 46% are female.

Among those who drink wine, distribution by frequency of consumption is at 9% daily, 29% more than once per week, 19% once per week, 22% two-to-three times per month, 11% once per month, and 10% once every two or three months.

Cocktails

In a survey reported by Nation's Restaurant News (Brandau, 2011), the overwhelming majority of the consumers surveyed indicated that they order the same drink at least 50 percent of the time when they visit a casual dining restaurant, with half of them saying they do so at least 75 percent of the time; a significant majority also appears to be in an experimental mood (2011). Data found in the study is provided by Nation's Restauant News (2011) is represented in Table 3 below.

Table 3: Consumer Data on Cocktail Preferences

How likely are you to try an adult beverage you have never tasted when at a casual-dining restaurant?	"somewhat likely"	58%
	"very likely"	14%
When asked what they would like to see more of on casual dining beverage menus	"more drink specials."	41%
Other drink options	Frozen drinks	39%
	Regular sodas	34%
	Domestic bottled beer	33%
	Domestic draft beer	32%
	Imported or super premium bottled beer	31%
	Imported or super premium draft beer	30%
	Mixed drinks and spirits	15%
Non-Alcoholic Options	Milkshakes	30%
	Regular coffee	29%
	Regular iced tea	28%
	Smoothies	25%
Distribution of adults by alcohol consumption characteristics	Core wine drinker (once per week or more frequently)	20.4%
	Marginal consumer of wine (once every two or three months)	13.9%
	Drink beer or spirits only	26.3%
	Do not consume alcoholic beverages	39.4%

Catering to the needs and wants of a casual dining guest or consumer includes the offering of a full bar. Capturing the sales from spirits, wine, and beer can increase sales overall exponentially.

Overall Host/Hostess Service

In Jones study on "Managing perceptions of waiting times in service queues", he identified eight propositions relating to the psychology of waiting lines:

- Unoccupied time feels longer than occupied time

- Pre-process waits feel longer than in-process waits

- Anxiety makes wait feel longer

- Uncertain waits seem longer than certain waits

- Unexplained waits seem longer than explained waits

- Unfair waits seem longer than equitable waits

- More valuable the service, the longer people will wait

- Solo waiting feels longer than group waiting

Possible controls to influence some propositions:

- Design of the queuing system and selection of opening hours; design of the waiting area; provide explanations and status updates

Some combative suggestions for managing the perceptions of waiting times are: to control and prioritize queue management; regularly monitor both perceived and actual wait times; and encourage managers to be creative and proactive in terms of initiating action aimed at ensuring each aspect of waiting in line is managed effectively. In this dimension of "overall

host/hostess service", this is the first interaction the guest has with the staff of the establishment; creating a warm and inviting atmosphere here is essential.

Gratefulness

Guest complaints, handled properly, can lead to loyal patronage for restaurants. Restaurant managers must recognize that not all disgruntled restaurant patrons voice their discontent while at the restaurant – many wait until later, expressing dismay about serious complaints in letters (Customer Satisfaction & Loyalty, 2009). Making sure the guest has left feeling the restaurant and staff were "grateful" for their visit can stop any negative word of mouth (WOM) or service failure that has possibly occurred. This is the last step before the guest or customer is leaving, and the last opportunity to make a service recovery.

Atmosphere

According to an article in the Food and Beverage Market Research Handbook, casual dining restaurants are categorized as offering "full dinners with complete table service, with alcoholic beverages available at most, and meals are served in an upscale dining environment, sometimes referred to as dinner houses". The atmosphere in many casual dining establishments is consistent with music playing, some sort of hip track; a bar in the center of the restaurant; a dining room scattered with booths and tables ranging in size from a two top to a ten top; and artifacts on some walls, and televisions on the others. This atmosphere has been consistent with many chain restaurants in the United States. "Before the recession, many consumers wanted an amped-up dining environment where they could

exercise their buying power under bold decor, loud music, bright lights, and fast service. Now that many consumers have lost some of that power, experts say they are looking for more soothing environments where they can escape reality" (Nation's Restaurant News, 2010). According to Consumer Reports, noise from loud customers and crowded tables was the complaint cited most often in their recent survey of 70,403 customers who made 158,744 visits to 101 restaurant chains (Food & Beverage Market Research Handbook, 2011). Some critics have begun to post the ambient sound levels in their critical reviews of restaurants; they include: The Charleston Post and Courier, San Francisco Chronicle, (Minneapolis-St. Paul) Star Tribune, and The Washington Post.

With the turn in the economy, discretionary spending has taken a hard hit, specifically with dining out at casual dining restaurants (Food & Beverage Market Research Handbook, 2011). Competition from similar chains, some of which have overbuilt; more premium menu offerings from quick-service and fast-casual competitors; the expansion of upscale steakhouses; and grocery chains' efforts to sell more prepared meals (Food & Beverage Market Research Handbook, 2011) have created more and more competition in general. This has created a wave of reimaging concepts, and refocusing on the new consumer, while changing with the current times. Some examples of new images and restructuring of concepts are:

- Lone Star Steakhouse has renovated its locations to look more like a genuine steakhouse
- Red Lobster has installed wood-fire grills, part of an on-going plan to boost the chain's number of menu items and present lighter, more healthful fare

- Ruby Tuesday's removed all old style artifacts and replaced with wall paper and watercolor photographs

The atmosphere in a restaurant can make or break an experience for the guest or consumer. Crafting that perfect space while dining is something many casual dining organizations struggle with daily, as evidenced with the image changes most have gone through. "From handcrafted materials to restaurants that feel custom-made for a particular neighborhood to a more modest luxury experience, consumers want restaurants to appeal to all five senses" (Nation's Restaurant News, 2010).

A number of factors contribute to the dining dimension atmosphere including décor, noise level, temperature, cleanliness, odors, lighting, color, and music (Sulek & Hensley, 2004). The way the restaurateur expresses these characteristics helps to create an expectation of the dining experience even before the customer is served; problems with any of these features can annoy customers and cause them to shorten their stays (Sulek & Hensley, 2004). Producing an atmosphere catering to travelers comfort is essential.

Hypotheses

Past research in customer satisfaction and service quality has resulted in increasing research efforts to look at new ways to evaluate these concepts. Historically, the assumption has been that a linear relationship exists between satisfaction/dissatisfaction and disconfirmation or performance evaluations (Pizam, 1999). Despite what seems like agreement on the importance of customer satisfaction, however, there is little consensus on the details of what constitutes satisfaction or even how to quantify the difference customer

24

satisfaction makes. In addition to identifying critical incidents of service failure or success, a challenge of satisfying customers in the restaurant industry today is trying to balance customer needs throughout varying restaurant segments and differences in consumer demographic groups (Harrington, et al, 2012).

Customer satisfaction is of key importance in the restaurant industry. Many studies have found that customer satisfaction is directly linked to customer retention and shown that more positive emotions led to satisfaction, whereas emotions such as anger led to increased customer dissatisfaction (Noone, Kimes, & Mattila, 2007). Customer satisfaction is usually highly dependent on perceived restaurant quality. Customers are more likely to be satisfied with a meal if they have low expectations about the experience and the establishment meets or exceeds those expectations (Harrington, et al., 2012).

There are a multitude of factors involved with guest satisfaction; however little research has been done on tourist versus non-tourist of a casual dining restaurant; the hypotheses suggested are there for analysis of data, to give insight into what tourists and non-tourists expect in guest satisfaction. Therefore hypothesis one suggests:

- **H1:** There will be a ***statistically significant*** difference in the level of overall guest satisfaction between tourists and non-tourists at a casual dining restaurant.

There are eight specific dimensions analyzed of guest satisfaction in this study, and the hypotheses reflect the dimensions evaluated. Throughout the eight dimensions, the guest is asked to evaluate the pace, service overall, server communication and accuracy, food taste and quality, food preparation, bar, gratefulness, atmosphere, and overall satisfaction with the

dining experience. Similar to Fisk's service evaluation process, this study is delving deeper into the stages of consumption, by acutely asking detailed questions that provide results for each stage.

Understanding the literature regarding the importance of the eight dimensions of guest satisfaction while dining describes the scales used to evaluate customer satisfaction.

Previous research states, "the top five attributes described as drivers of positive experiences were quality of food/drink, quality of service, friendliness of staff, atmosphere of restaurant, and speed of service", (Harrington et al., 2012). Therefore, H2a-H2d for tourist data states:

- **H2a:** The dimension of Pace will have a significant positive relationship with "Overall Satisfaction" for tourist guests.

- **H2b:** The dimension of Service Overall will have a significant positive relationship with "Overall Satisfaction" for tourist guests.

- **H2c:** The dimension of Food – taste and quality will have a significant positive relationship with "Overall Satisfaction" for tourist guests.

- **H2d:** The dimension of Atmosphere will have a significant positive relationship with "Overall Satisfaction" for tourist guests.

And H3a-H3d for non-tourist data states:

- **H3a:** The dimensions of Pace will have a significant positive relationship with "Overall Satisfaction" for non-tourist guests

- **H3b:** The dimension of Service Overall will have a significant positive relationship with "Overall Satisfaction" for non-tourist guests

- **H3c:** The dimension of Food – taste and quality will have a significant positive relationship with "Overall Satisfaction" for non-tourist guests

- **H3d:** The dimension of Atmosphere will have a significant positive relationship with "Overall Satisfaction" for non-tourist guests

<u>**Demographics Found in the Restaurant**</u>
<u>**Food and Beverage Market Research Handbook**</u>

Lunch

The biggest spenders on lunch at full-service restaurants are the same customers who spend big on full-service dinners—middle-aged married couples enjoying a leisurely meal. Householders aged 35-to-54 spend 9% to 10% more than average on this item. Married couples without children at home (many of them empty-nesters) spend 23% more than average on lunch at full-service restaurants. Couples with school-aged or adult children at home spend 34% to 35% more, in part because their households are larger than average (Restaurant Food & Beverage Handbook, 2011).

Dinner

The biggest spenders on dinners at full-service restaurants are middle-aged married couples enjoying a leisurely meal. Householders ranging in age from 35-to-64 spend 9% to 16% more than average on this item. Those with school-aged or adult children at home spend 34% to 51% more than average on this item (Restaurant Food & Beverage Handbook, 2011).

Household Types

Not surprisingly, middle-aged consumers spend the most at restaurants because they have the highest incomes and typically the largest households; overall, householders ages 35-to-54 spend 17% to 21% more than average (Restaurant Food & Beverage Handbook, 2011). Older consumers, particularly empty-nesters, are far more likely to choose full service over quick-service restaurants. Among householders under age 25, fast-food meals claim 60% of the restaurant budget. The fast food share declines with age and drops below the full-service share in the 45-to-54 age group. The need to provide meal options for children is one reason for this shift in restaurant preference. Among household types, single parents with children devote the largest share of their dining-out spending to quick-service restaurants (49%). In contrast, married couples without children at home (most of them empty-nesters) spend only 30% of their restaurant dollars at fast-food establishments (Restaurant Food & Beverage Handbook, 2011).

Household Income

Households with incomes of $100,000 or more spend nearly twice the average at restaurants. While accounting for only 18% of total households, the $100,000-plus income group accounts for 36% of spending for dining out. These affluent households account for 48% of spending for dinner at full-service restaurants and 48% of spending for restaurant food while traveling (Restaurant Food & Beverage Handbook, 2011).

Married couples with school-aged or older children at home spend more eating out than any other household type – 49% to 51% more than average. Married couples without children at home spend more than average on full-service meals for all day parts (Restaurant Food & Beverage Handbook, 2011).

Education

Restaurant spending is highest in the West and lowest in the Midwest. Households in the Northeast are the biggest spenders on full-service dinners (14% above average) and quick-service breakfast (26% above average) but spend 15% less than average on full-service lunches (Restaurant Food & Beverage Handbook, 2011).

Spending on eating out rises with education, in part, because educated householders typically have higher incomes. College graduates spend 39% more than the average householder at restaurants, spending 51% to 57% above average on full service lunches and dinners. College graduates, who comprise 29% of households, account for more than 40% of

spending on full-service lunches and dinners (Restaurant Food & Beverage Handbook, 2011).

Chapter Summary

The literature review presented relevance for the dimensions used in the guest satisfaction survey, including pace of service, service overall, server communication and accuracy, food (taste and quality), food preparation, bar (beer, wine, cocktail, and host), gratefulness, and atmosphere. Customer satisfaction and relevance was also discussed in this chapter and along with supporting literature provided an insight into customer satisfaction. Finally, casual dining guest demographics were discussed as related from the Restaurant Food and Beverage market research Handbook.

CHAPTER THREE:
METHODOLOGY

The preceding chapters set the groundwork for the proposed area of research for this study, including the relevant research of guest and consumer satisfaction, and the eight dimensions of satisfaction used in the survey of casual dining consumers. The following objectives guide the present research:

1. To analyze and compare the different dimensions of guest satisfaction scores between tourist and non-tourist.

2. To evaluate and understand *what dimensions are most satisfying or dissatisfying to a tourist guest*

3. To evaluate and understand *what dimensions are most satisfying or dissatisfying to the non-tourist guest*

Research Questions

As stated earlier in the study, the primary research questions addressed in this study are:

1. Is there is a difference in the level of overall guest satisfaction between tourist and non-tourist guests at a casual dining restaurant?

2. What dimensions contribute the *most* to tourist overall satisfaction?

3. What dimensions contribute the *most* to non-tourist overall satisfaction?

Research Purpose

As stated previously, the purpose of this study is to analyze guest/customer satisfaction surveys of a casual dining restaurant in the Orlando, Florida area; specifically, to analyze if there is a difference between satisfaction levels of tourist and non-tourist guests.

All hypotheses that are guiding this study will be tested using the IBM SPSS Statistics software system 21. For the purpose of this study, all data was collected anonymously, and labeled as 1- 1,001, with 1,001 surveys collected. Each survey was analyzed separately, with 488 tourist surveys collected, and 513 non-tourist surveys collected. The importance in analyzing each hypothesis for significance will benefit the study as a whole, and the industry with its results.

Population

The sampling frame for this study entailed all restaurant diners who came into the casual dining restaurant located in Orlando, Florida on International Drive from February 2011 through February 2013. All dining guests are given a receipt at the end of their meal asking them to fill out an online survey answering questions concerning their visit. The guests then have 48 hours after their visit to take the online survey and complete it. After they have finished the survey, a code for an $8 discount off of their next visit is given to them. The code for the $8 discount is valid for any location, across the nation or wherever

this casual dining chain is located. Guests are only allowed to fill out one survey per every seven calendar days allotted by the email address provided when they sign in to take the survey. The survey can only be taken for up to 48 hours after the visit. The casual dining chain has purposely allowed only a 48 hour window in which to take the survey to accurately capture the guest or consumers visit. This assures that the visit will be fresh in their memory, and therefore the data collected will be concisely more accurate than trying to recall a visit a week or even a month later. The timing of the administration of the comment card or guest satisfaction survey as in this case, and the service encounter may provide a good measure of convenience and the overall dining experience (Keith &Simmers 2011).

The population for this study was selected due to the location of the casual dining restaurant; this location on International Drive provided the researcher access to both tourist and non-tourist dining guests. The purpose of this study, as earlier stated is to analyze guest satisfaction surveys of a casual dining restaurant in the Orlando, Florida area; specifically, to analyze if there is a difference between satisfaction levels of tourist and non-tourist guests, therefore the population represented at this specific location was appropriate for this study. This is a convenience sample using data from one location provided to the researcher by the restaurant company.

Sample

The sampling frame used in this study is a casual dining restaurant in the Orlando, Florida area; on International Drive. The sample consists of tourists and non-tourists who dine and drink in the establishment. The guests who fill out the guest satisfaction survey then

become the respondents used for this study. A stipulation for the survey consists of having a

United States postal address. If the respondent did not have a United States postal address,

consisting of one of the 50 United States, the respondent was considered invalid and could

not take the survey.

Data has been collected over a twenty-five month period. In order to confirm the

validity of the guest as tourist versus non-tourist status, the researcher contacted the general

manager and confirmed the guest satisfaction surveys were in fact completed by guests that

had traveled more than 50 miles to dine there for tourist, or were within a 50 mile radius for

non-tourist. Each guest satisfaction survey is labeled anonymously from 1-1,001 and labeled

as tourist or non-tourist by the one demographic question asked on the survey; their address.

By using the zip code as listed on their address, the researcher labeled each survey as either

tourist or non-tourist. "Because travel and tourism is not generally classified as a separate

industry in economic data sources, determining its importance and tracking its performance

can be difficult" (Wilkerson, 2003, p. 47).

Most researchers would likely agree with the definition of travel and tourism

provided by the Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA) in its national travel and tourism

satellite accounts: "the economic activity generated inside the United States by 'visitors' of

all types—for business and pleasure, by residents and nonresidents alike—and outside the

United States by U.S. residents" (Okubo, 1992). This being said, for this study tourist versus

non-tourist was determined by analyzing the zip codes for each of the completed surveys. If

the zip code was from more than 50 miles away from the restaurant, they were considered

tourist, and coded as such; The BEA then attributes various proportions of output and

employment in an industry to travel and tourism based on the share of its products that are consumed by visitors as opposed to non-visitors. These proportions range from greater than 75 percent for the hotel and air transportation industries to less than 5 percent for the railroad and retail trade industries (Wilkerson, 2003). Second unlike establishments in the amusement/recreation industry, few visitors come to an area just for the restaurants (Wilkerson, 2003). Establishing the individual surveys as tourist or non-tourist for this study falls well into the BEA's 75 percent forecast for food and beverage consumption.

Procedures

As stated previously, the study was conducted using secondary data collected from a casual dining restaurant in the Orlando, Florida area. The data collected was from February 2011 through February 2013. The data collected came in the form of an online survey guests who had dined in the restaurant where given on their receipt. The online survey took around five to seven minutes to complete, depending on the users internet speed. The guest was asked to put the store number, their email, and a survey code (printed on the receipt) in order to begin the survey. Guest satisfaction surveys were then coded into eight dimensions by the NPS system. Each of the eight dimensions (Pace of Service, Service Overall, Server Communication & Accuracy, Food (Taste & Quality), Food Preparation, Bar (Beer, Wine, & Cocktail), Gratefulness, and Atmosphere in whole (including atmosphere and cleanliness) in the guest satisfaction survey were then evaluated and analyzed comparing tourist versus non-tourist guests.

<u>**Survey Instrument**</u>

The eight dimensions evaluated in the GPS (guest pulse survey), are analyzed using a Net Promoter Score, or NPS® system that many fortune 500 companies use worldwide.

This casual dining restaurant chain uses a system that analyzes Net Promoter Score, or NPS® through a GPS (Guest Pulse Score) system. This is a reliable system that many other companies use within the sector of hospitality and customer service. Over 100 companies use this same system when collecting guest satisfaction surveys and comments, see Appendix 2. The Net Promoter Score is based on the fundamental perspective that every company's customers can be divided into three categories: Promoters, Passives, and Detractors. By asking one simple question — How likely is it that you would recommend [your company] to a friend or colleague? Customers respond on a 0-to-10 point rating scale and are categorized as follows:

- **Promoters** (score 9-10) are loyal enthusiasts who will keep buying and refer others, fueling growth.
- **Passives** (score 7-8) are satisfied but unenthusiastic customers who are vulnerable to competitive offerings.
- **Detractors** (score 0-6) are unhappy customers who can damage your brand and impede growth through negative word-of-mouth. (netpromoter.com, 2012)

Net Promoter Score is calculating by subtracting the percentage of Detractors (those who answer 0-6) from the percentage of Promoters (those who answer 9 or 10). However,

there is more that goes into analyzing NPS scores: simply measuring an organization's score doesn't directly lead to success. Net Promoter Score programs need additional questions to dig into the "Why" and drive additional improvements. Due to the simple nature of the Net Promoter Score, it's easy to rally the entire organization around this loyalty metric and hold employees accountable for their customer interactions. Selecting a customer feedback tool with built-in alerts makes it easy to immediately follow up with dissatisfied customers, resolve their problems and turn dissatisfied employees into promoters. In essence a service recovery can be handled easily if the organization or business knows exactly where the failure went wrong.

The Net Promoter Score method has been embraced by companies world-wide as a standard for measuring and improving loyalty (cvent.com, 2012). See Appendix B for companies who use the Net Promoter Score method. For the purpose of this study, the NPS was calculated and labeled Overall Satisfaction, and is used as the dependent variable for this research.

The survey consisted of 53 questions; all tailored to gather a guest's satisfaction experience while dining in the restaurant. Of the 53 questions, the Net Promoter Score method runs a factor analysis combing the 53 questions into nine dimensions.

Variables

The dependent variable for this study is Overall Satisfaction, as stated previously. The independent variables for this study are the eight sub-dimensions of satisfaction; Pace, Service Overall, Server Communication, Food, Food Preparation, Bar, Gratefulness, and Atmosphere.

Data Collection and Analysis

Secondary data was collected from a casual dining restaurant from February 2011 through February 2013 as previously stated. Due to the strict anonymity of the data, the researcher was only allowed to view the results without any demographic information except their address. Each survey was then labeled from 1-1,001; the researcher collected 1,001 surveys in total. The variables of tourist and non-tourist were also divided for data analysis to be interpreted and evaluated.

After the data was programmed into SPSS version 21 statistical analysis package, the eight dimensions of guest satisfaction were analyzed, starting with running a frequencies statistics on each dimension. The mean, mode, median, and standard deviation were calculated for aid in interpreting the data. An independent T-test was used for analysis of hypothesis one. A multiple linear regression analysis was run to provide a P value for each of the eight dimensions, and aid in analyzing hypotheses two through three. An R Square number was calculated for each of the eight dimensions to explain the predictors of Overall Satisfaction. The independent variables are the eight dimensions of satisfaction (Pace of

Service, Service Overall, Server Communication & Accuracy, Food (Taste & Quality), Food Preparation, Bar (Beer, Wine, & Cocktail), Gratefulness, and Atmosphere in whole (including atmosphere and cleanliness), and the dependent variable is Overall Satisfaction.

Chapter Summary

This chapter provided a conceptual overview and the methodology used to analyze the research of guest satisfaction surveys. The population was defined as all guests who dined in the casual dining restaurant from February 2011 through February 2013. The sample consisted of the guests who completed a guest satisfaction survey, making this a convenience sample.

1,001 separate surveys were analyzed against Overall Satisfaction and the eight dimensions of satisfaction; both tourist and non-tourist were analyzed using a multiple linear regression analysis to generate a P value of statistical significance, to find which of the eight independent variables are the predictors of the dependent variable, Overall Satisfaction.

This study will attempt to test the hypotheses and answer the earlier stated research questions. The results of previously mentioned analysis will be provided in subsequent chapters.

CHAPTER FOUR:
RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The following chapter will provide results for the study, and explain which predictors or guest dimensions positively or negatively affected overall satisfaction. For ease of reading, the data has been broken up into Tourist satisfaction scores and Non-tourist satisfaction scores with results shown separately. The data was collected in the form of online surveys the respondents filled out after their dining experience at the casual dining restaurant. An independent sample T-test and a multiple regression analysis results will be discussed as they are related to the hypotheses. Along with the multiple regression analysis results, guest surveys s completed, and guest survey score ranking and the NPS system used in this study will be discussed. A summary will conclude this chapter.

Survey Response

The survey used in this study was collected from guests who dined in the casual dining restaurant from February 2011 through February 2013 and filled out the survey online, using the company's website and the 1,001 surveys were collected using the NPS system, as discussed in the previous chapter.

The data was reported as a normalized score based on a 100 point scale. A factorial analysis was conducted by the NPS system. Fifty-three questions were asked of each respondent; a factorial analysis was conducted by NPS, ending with the eight dimensions of satisfaction, and the one dimension of overall satisfaction. The results compiled in the study are on a 100 point scale, as each dimension is on a 100 point scale.

The data was collected by the casual dining restaurant; the casual dining restaurant conducted and performed the factor analysis; each question was categorized into one of the eight dimensions or independent variables used in this study. The questions represented in Table 4 were asked of the respondents, then categorized in each of the individual dimensions, providing the final results analyzed in this study.

Table 4: Survey Questions

Dimension:	Pace of Service	Answer:
Questions:	Thinking about the time it took for this visit, did it take:	• Much too long • A little too long • Just the right amount of time • A little too rushed
	Which of the following, if any, took too long?	• Time to be greeted when entering restaurant • Time to be seated • Time for server to greet table/take drink order • Time to receive drinks after ordering them • Time for server to take order • Time to refill drinks • Time to receive entrees • Time to receive the bill • Time to process the payment
Dimension:	**Service Overall**	
	Please rate the overall service provided by your SERVER or BARTENDER:	
	Please rate your SERVER or BARTENDER on each of the following, using the same scale as the previous question	
Dimension:	**Server Communication and Accuracy**	
	Did anyone tell you about any specials or featured food or drink promotions?	
	Who told you about the specials or featured food or drink promotions?	• Bartender • Manager • Server • Host/Hostess
	Did your SERVER or BARTENDER make any suggestions/recommendations on what you might like to order?	• Yes • No
	Were the recommendations good - did they make sense for your occasion and tastes?	• Yes • No
	Was your order taken correctly?	• Yes • No
	Was your bill accurate?	• Yes • No
Dimension:	**Food – Taste and Quality**	

Dimension:	**Food - Taste and Quality**	**Answer:**
	Please rate the overall TASTE of your food	
	Rate the overall QUALITY of your food	
Dimension:	**Food Preparation**	
	Which of these special requests did you make, if any?	• Requested special preparation • Requested item(s) to be left off • Requested item(s) to be substituted • Required items to be put on the side • Requested extra items(s)
	Did we prepare what you ordered exactly as you ordered	• Yes • No
	Were any items sent back to the kitchen?	• Yes • No
	Was your food served at the appropriate temperature - that is cold items cold and hot items hot?	• Yes • No
	Did the food look delicious and appetizing -- like it had been carefully placed on the plate and made to order for you?	• Yes • No
Dimension:	**Bar (Including Host/Hostess Service)**	
	Please rate the overall taste of the Beer / Wine / Cocktail you ordered.	
	Please rate the overall service you received from the HOSTS/HOSTESSES who greeted you at the front of the restaurant and sat you at your table:	
	When you first entered the restaurant, did you receive a friendly welcome?	• Yes • No
	Were the doors opened for you upon your arrival by the restaurant staff?	• Yes • No
	Did the HOST/HOSTESS greet you?	• Yes • No
	Did you have to wait to be seated?	• Yes • No
	Did the HOST/HOSTESS greet you?	• Immediately • In less than 1 minute • Longer than 1 minute to be greeted
	Did you have to wait to be seated?	• Yes • No
	When the HOST/HOSTESS seated you, did they tell you your server's name?	• Yes • No

Dimension:	Gratefulness	Answer:
	How much do you agree with the following statement about the staff you encountered?	- I felt a personal connection with the staff - The staff made my visit better than expected - The staff helped me select the best items to match my mood and occasion - The staff love their jobs - The staff really care about their customers
	Did you leave the restaurant with the feeling the staff was genuinely grateful for your visit?	- Yes - No
	Did someone invite you back for another visit?	- Yes - No
	How likely will you be to visit ******** in the next month?	- Definitely Will Visit - Probably Will Visit - Might or Might Not Visit - Probably Not Visit - Definitely Not Visit
Dimension:	Atmosphere	
	Please rate the overall RESTAURANT ATMOSPHERE	
	Please rate the overall CLEANLINESS of the restaurant.	

Data Analysis and Findings

As previously stated, the purpose of this study is to analyze guest/customer

satisfaction surveys of a casual dining restaurant in the Orlando, Florida area; specifically, to

analyze if there is a difference between satisfaction levels of tourist and non-tourist guests.

The research questions directed this study to this finding:

1. Is there is a difference in the level of overall guest satisfaction between tourist

   and non-tourist guests at a casual dining restaurant?

2. What dimensions contribute the *most* to tourist overall satisfaction?

3. What dimensions contribute the *most* to non-tourist overall satisfaction?

While the hypotheses provide a theoretical basis for carrying out the study:

- **H1:** There will be a *statistically significant* difference in the level of overall guest satisfaction between tourist and non-tourist at a casual dining restaurant.

- **H2a:** The dimension of Pace will have a significant positive relationship with "Overall Satisfaction" for tourist guests.

- **H2b:** The dimension of Service Overall will have a significant positive relationship with "Overall Satisfaction" for tourist guests.

- **H2c:** The dimension of Food – taste and quality will have a significant positive relationship with "Overall Satisfaction" for tourist guests.

- **H2d:** The dimension of Atmosphere will have a significant positive relationship with "Overall Satisfaction" for tourist guests.

- **H3a:** The dimensions of Pace will have a significant positive relationship with "Overall Satisfaction" for non-tourist guests

- **H3b:** The dimension of Service Overall will have a significant positive relationship with "Overall Satisfaction" for non-tourist guests

- **H3c:** The dimension of Food – taste and quality will have a significant positive relationship with "Overall Satisfaction" for non-tourist guests

- **H3d:** The dimension of Atmosphere will have a significant positive relationship with "Overall Satisfaction" for non-tourist guests

Table 5: Variable Means Table

	Mean		T Value	P Value
Variables	**Tourist (n= 488)**	**Non-Tourist (n = 513)**		
Pace	88.18	88.43	-.69	.493
Service Overall	87.21	84.69	5.60	.000
Server Comm.	86.11	86.63	-1.34	.182
Food	88.90	88.86	.089	.929
Food Prep.	96.36	96.50	-.72	.469
Bar	85.54	86.09	-1.00	.319
Gratefulness	84.44	84.95	-1.38	.169
Atmosphere	88.05	88.45	-1.13	.261
Overall Satisfact.	77.80	83.38	-11.52	.000

The empirical results found that within the variable Overall Satisfaction, tourist means was 77.80, and non-tourist was 83.38. According to the means provided by the data analysis, there is a statistically significant difference in means between tourist and non-tourist in the dimension Overall Satisfaction (t= -11.52, $p < .01$), therefore supporting hypothesis one:

46

H1: There will be a *statistically significant* difference in the level of overall

guest satisfaction between tourist and non-tourist at a casual dining restaurant.

In addition, the empirical results found that within the variable Service Overall,

tourist means was 87.21, and non-tourist was 84.69. According to the means provided by the

data analysis, there is a statistically significant difference in means between tourist and non-

tourist in the dimension Service Overall (t= 5.60, $p < .01$).

Table 6: Standard Deviation Table

	N		Std. Deviation	
	Type		Type	
	Tourist	Non-Tourist	Tourist	Non-Tourist
Pace	488	513	5.752	5.796
Service Overall	488	513	5.704	8.317
Server Comm.	488	513	6.099	6.423
Food	488	513	6.028	6.056
Food Prep	488	513	3.156	3.149
Bar	488	513	8.660	8.797
Gratefulness	488	513	5.452	6.280
Atmosphere	488	513	5.583	5.792
Overall Satisfaction	488	513	7.606	7.726

As represented in Table six, the standard deviation, or the square root of the variance

for the variables is low.

Tourist Regression Analysis Results

In order to examine the effects of attributes among tourists, a regression model was estimated using the eight independent variables: Pace of Service, Service Overall, Server Communication & Accuracy, Food (Taste & Quality), Food Preparation, Bar (Beer, Wine, & Cocktail), Gratefulness, and Atmosphere. The regression model was significant (F = 30.49, P < .001), therefore providing statistical data that Overall Satisfaction and the eight predictors of satisfaction for tourist respondents are viable. The model summary provides the R Square of the correlation coefficient for the data analyzed. The square of the correlation coefficient explains what proportion of the variability of the dependent variable overall satisfaction is explained by the regression model. The correlation coefficient is a symmetric measure; the adjusted R Square equals .326, therefore the proportion of variability is approximately 32.6%. 32.6% of the variance can be explained by the five predictors.

Table 7: Coefficient Table - Tourist Results

Variables	Beta Tourist (n=488)	T Value	P Value
Pace	.135	3.167	.002
Service Overall	.126	2.773	.006
Server Comm.	-.060	-1.502	.134
Food	.216	4.328	.000
Food Prep.	.232	6.021	.000
Bar	.002	.055	.956
Gratefulness	.086	1.738	.083
Atmosphere	.155	3.350	.001

According to the results provided by the coefficients (Table 6), five of the variables are significant predictors of Overall Satisfaction at $\alpha = .01$ level. The empirical results conclude that Tourist respondents found that they enjoyed their dining experience when the Pace, Service Overall, Food taste and quality, Food Preparation, and Atmosphere were provided. These results coincide with other researchers findings, therefore supporting H2a, H2b, H2c, and H2d:

- **H2a:** The dimension of Pace will have a significant positive relationship with "Overall Satisfaction" for tourist guests.

- **H2b:** The dimension of Service Overall will have a significant positive relationship with "Overall Satisfaction" for tourist guests.

- **H2c:** The dimension of Food – taste and quality will have a significant positive relationship with "Overall Satisfaction" for tourist guests.

- **H2d:** The dimension of Atmosphere will have a significant positive relationship with "Overall Satisfaction" for tourist guests.

The dimension Pace, with a value of (β = .135, T = 3.167, p = .002), we can conclude there is a positive linear relationship between the Overall Satisfaction and Pace. Simlarly, the dimension Service Overall, with a value of (β = .126, T = 2.773, p = .002), we can conclude there is a positive linear relationship between the Overall Satisfaction and Service Overall. Also, the dimension Food, encompassing taste and quality, with a value of (β = .216, T = 4.328, p = .000), we can conclude there is a positive linear relationship between the Overall Satisfaction and Food. Namkung and Jang (2007) reported food quality is a leading factor in outpacing competitors and maximizing success, reporting fresh tasty food is of utmost importance when looking to outpace competitors, making food quality one of the best avaneues to maximize success and profits in the restaurant business. The empirical results from Tourist respondents show that if their food was prepared correctly and tastily, they were satisfied with their dining experience.

The dimension Food Preparation, with a value of (β = .232, T = 6.021, p = .000), we can conclude there is a positive linear relationship between the Overall Satisfaction and Food Preparation. Finally,the dimension of Atmosphere, with a value of (β = .155, T = 3.350,

p = .001), we can conclude there is a positive linear relationship between the Overall Satisfaction and Atmosphere.

The standardized regression coefficient (β) score in the dimensions Food (β = .216) and Food Preparation (β = .232) are higher than other dimensions. These findings indicate Food and Food Preparation are better predictors of Overall Satisfaction for tourist respondents than the other dimensions.

Non-Tourist Regression Analysis Results

In order to examine the effects of attributes among non-tourists, a regression model was estimated using the eight independent variables: Pace of Service, Service Overall, Server Communication & Accuracy, Food (Taste & Quality), Food Preparation, Bar (Beer, Wine, & Cocktail), Gratefulness, and Atmosphere. The regression model was significant (F = 18.56, P < .001), therefore providing statistical data that Overall Satisfaction and the eight predictors of satisfaction for non-tourist respondents are viable. 21.5% of the variance can be explained by the three predictors.

Table 8: Coefficients Table - Non-Tourist Results

Variables	Beta Non-Tourist (n=513)	T Value	P Value
Pace	-.001	-.019	.985
Service Overall	.231	5.755	.000
Server Comm.	.174	3.979	.000
Food	.047	.997	.319
Food Prep.	-.065	-1.637	.102
Bar	.073	1.721	.086
Gratefulness	.223	4.424	.000
Atmosphere	.025	.531	.596

According to the results provided by the coefficients (Table 7), three of the variables are significant predictors of overall satisfaction at $\alpha = .01$. The empirical results conclude that Non-tourist respondents found that they enjoyed their dining experience when the Service Overall, Server Communication, and Gratefulness dimensions were provided. These results coincide with other researcher's findings, therefore supporting H3b:

H3b: The dimension of Service Overall will have a significant positive relationship with "Overall Satisfaction" for non-tourist guests; other researchers agree; an important factor driving satisfaction in the service environment is service quality (Andaleeb, 2006). The dimension Service Overall, with a value of ($\beta = .231$, T = 5.755, p = .000), we can conclude there is a positive linear relationship between Overall Satisfaction and Service Overall.

Additionally, upon further analyzing the linear regression results we can conclude the dimension Server Communication, with a value of ($\beta = .174$, T = 3.927, p = .000), and the

dimension Gratefulness, with a value of (β = .223, T = 4.464, p = .000 level), there is a positive linear relationship between Overall Satisfaction and Server Communication and Gratefulness.

The standardized regression coefficient (β) score in the dimensions Servive Overall (β = .231) and Gratefulness (β = .223) are higher than other dimensions. These findings indicate Service Overall and Gratefulness are better predictors of Overall Satisfaction for non-tourist respondents than the other dimensions.

Conversely, H3A, H3c, and H3d were not supported in the regression analysis performed. Pace with a value of (β = -.001, T = -.019, p = .985) , Food – taste and quality with a value of (β = .047, T = .997, p = .319), and Atmosphere with a value of (β = .025, T = .531, p = .596) were not predictors of Overall Satisfaction for non-tourist guests.

Guest Survey's Completed

This category of results is under scrutiny as to whether or not to be regarded when analyzing guest satisfaction; however there is much debate in regards to how much or how many surveys can one person fill out? Businesses of all sizes, desperate to lock in customer loyalty, see surveys as a window into the emotional world of their customers and a database that will offer guidance on how to please them (NY Times, 2012). Research has found that a guest will fill out a survey or comment card only if the service was excellent or poor, usually the in between or mediocre get left out. The amount of guest satisfaction surveys collected may lead researchers to find that a particular type of guest is more likely to fill out satisfaction surveys, and other types may not be as apt to do so. Consumers have begun

revolting. Survey analysts say response rates have been falling by one or two percentage points a year. "Back in the '70s and '80s, we were getting a response rate of 30 to 50 percent, sometimes higher," Pingitore says. Today, "it's between 17 and 25 percent" (nextavenue.org, 2012). The drop in response rates, however, means companies are likely to survey consumers even more. That's the only way they'll be able to reach enough customers to get valid results (nextavenue.org, 2012).

The aggregated results for collected surveys for the months of February 2011 through February 2013 were 1,001 surveys. This included 488 tourist samples, and 513 non-tourist samples, as previously stated in the methodology section of this article. The Net Promoter Score used in this study constructed the overall satisfaction score which was used as the dependent variable. Each individual survey submission was analyzed and given a NPS score, by using the mathematical equation described above.

Chapter Summary

The final results from the online survey collected during the months of February 2011 through February 2013 were discussed in detail. Non-Tourist guest overall means score for Service Overall and Overall Satisfaction were higher than tourist guests, supporting hypothesis one. Five of the eight dimensions of satisfaction positively affected Overall Satisfaction for the tourist guests. Pace, Service Overall, Food, Food Preparation, and Atmosphere all directly affected how a tourist guest viewed their dining experience. Three dimensions positively affected non-tourist Overall Satisfaction while dining; they were Overall Service, Server Communication, and Gratefulness. Using the linear regression

model, the final data was evaluated and described. Guest survey's completed were briefly

dicussed, with 488 tourist survey's completed, and 513 non-tourist survey's completed.

CHAPTER FIVE:
IMPLICATIONS TO THE INDUSTRY

Tourist Satisfaction Conclusions

Concluding results for Tourist respondents empirically showed that Pace of Service, Service Overall, Food Taste & Quality, Food Preparation, and Atmosphere restaurant experience dimensions were predictors of Overall Satisfaction. What does this mean for the industry? How can we understand and evaluate what the predictors tell the casual dining segment in terms of Overall Satisfaction?

Pace of Service

In the dimension Pace of Service, guests were asked to evaluate if their pace of service was satisfactory or not.

Training the staff to be able to read the guests and their anticipated experience is vital for creating a pleasurable experience while dining. For some tourist guests, they may be coming in from the amusement parks, or from one of the multiple attractions in the Orlando area. These types of guests want in-and-out service. They are most likely tired and hot, with tired and hot children who are ready for a meal, shower, and bed. These types of tourist consumers will expect a fast and efficient Pace of Service; a pace that will have them in and out in under an hour.

Another type of tourist guest will be the guest of leisure. This type of guest is on vacation, not wearing a watch, without a care in the world. These tourist guests are looking to

relax, spend money on fruity drinks, and savor each bite of a succulent steak. For these tourist consumers, their Pace of Service will be one of leisure. A few drinks before they order the meal; followed by a long savory meal of salads, steaks, ribs, and chicken; topped off with a nice Brandy, Courvoisier, or Grand Marnier with a chocolate treat. These guests will allow ample time to enjoy each course, taste each plate, and finish it off with a coffee and smile. Catering to these travelers will not only boost sales of after dinner drinks and Rib eyes, they will also create memorable experiences for the guests. This type of leisure service feeds the guests literally as well as figuratively. They are now relating this excellent meal and service with a cognitive feeling of happiness. They have now related the experience with the feeling. This can all be managed with the Pace of Service.

Service Overall

Training your staff to anticipate the needs of the guests by reading body language and signs is essential for tourist guests' satisfaction. Convincing the guest they are important to the staff serving them can create that bond, that cognitive feeling of genuineness.

Menu knowledge is another factor in providing excellent service overall. It is imperative that the server or bartender have knowledge of the menu (food as well as bar), in order to give satisfactory service and receive positive survey results from tourist guests. If the staff is knowledgeable and proficient with the menu, their ability to answer questions, upsell products, and deliver tailored customer service will progressively be become easier and more polished in delivery. Conducting daily shift meetings are a clear way to ensure all staff know the appropriate food and beverage recipes, and any new items to be promoted.

Front of the house employees appearance, demeanor, and personal hygiene also play a factor in service overall. Covering up all visible tattoos, and removing all facial piercings is also required of this casual dining restaurant. Creating that "on stage" persona is a must when working in any customer service related field; specifically when providing one-on-one service in a restaurant. The demeanor of the staff can almost be a palpable experience between the staff and the guest. Portraying a positive happy demeanor is what we achieve for from all FOH staff. The guest does not want to know that "Suzy" is having a bad day; or that "John" just does not want to be here tonight. A person's demeanor is evident by body language, tone and inflection of voice, and sense of urgency or attention. And last, personal hygiene is mandatory for all staff members in every position of Front of the House hospitality organizations. Keeping clean hair, skin, and nails is imperative for positive satisfaction scores.

Was the staff attentive to the needs of the guest? Remaining diligent and aware of the tourist guests needs throughout the dining experience is crucial for positive dining satisfaction scores.

Food Taste & Quality

The Food taste and quality dimension inquires whether or not the food was satisfactory; the tourist guest's expect great food taste and quality for the value.

The data collected for this survey was collected from a casual dining restaurant; and the participants in this survey were from the 50 United States. An educated guess would be safe to assume that they have either been to this exact casual dining restaurant, or dined in

something very similar. The food must be served with the same consistency, portion size, and appearance. The tourist respondent's scores provided results supporting that indeed they were satisfied.

Food Preparation

The dimension Food Preparation combined food temperature and food service. Was the order prepared correctly and exactly as ordered? Was the hot food served hot and the cold food served cold? The server and the chef must work together, error free for the guest to provide satisfactory scores. In this dimension, both provided excellent service.

The dimensions of Food Taste & Quality, and Food Preparation were the strongest predictors of Overall Satisfaction for tourist respondents. This factor is of utmost importance in providing positive overall satisfaction.

Atmosphere

The dimension Atmosphere, including cleanliness is extremely important when dining in a restaurant. In Quick Service Restaurants, cleanliness is the number one rated important factor in guest satisfaction, casual dining is no exception to that rule. For the tourist guests, creating a comfortable room temperature while keeping the entire restaurant satisfied is imperative. The average temperature in Florida is around 90 degrees in the summer. Many tourists are not used to this kind of heat, specifically with heavy humidity accompanied. Keeping a cool room temperature without freezing the non-tourist guests can

become a science. Understanding that each person is comfortable at differing levels of temperature can make the guests experience more pleasurable. Realizing that the far café may tend to be a little warmer and the upstairs booths a little cooler can help in seating the appropriate guest in the most accommodating section. This again ties in with being able to read the guests. A large visibly hot man may want a cooler section, where as a small coat laden women may want a warmer section.

Along with temperature, the noise level and ambiance of the restaurant is part of the atmosphere of the restaurant. Seating a family with young children next to the bar during a football game is not proper "reading" of the guest. Placing an elderly couple in a quiet corner would be a perfect example of properly "reading" the guest.

In this case, the atmosphere including the ambiance, music, smell, temperature of the room, color, and cleanliness were satisfactory to the tourist guest.

Non-Tourist Satisfaction Conclusions

According to the results provided in this study, Service Overall, Server Communication and Accuracy, and Gratefulness were dimensions of the customer dining experience that had positive statistical significance to non-tourist guests. These results provide empirical data to an understanding of what residents or non-tourist expect when dining at a casual dining restaurant.

As stated previously with tourist guests, the dimension of Service Overall is important when providing excellent service. Residents or non-tourists expect that the staff

make them feel valued; have knowledge of the menu and bar (this is of utmost importance when new menu items are introduced); have neat and tidy personal appearance and hygiene; create a great experience; and an overall attentiveness to their needs. Creating repeat patronage from residents is imperative for survival in any business.

Server Communication & Accuracy

Server Communication and Accuracy is essential for satisfaction in non-tourist guests. The Overall Satisfaction of a non-tourist guest is directly proportionate to this dimension. The Staff need to be aware (again as stated before) with all new menu items and all specials for the day, week, and month. Communicating these specials to the non-tourist guests is non-negotiable. A residential or non-tourist guest who comes in and spends money on a regular basis expect a certain level of "comrade" and "inside edition" of what's offered at the restaurant. If the staff gives every table the specials and promotions for the day, and does not relate this to the residential guest, the communication barrier has been broken. Another facet of this dimension is providing the proper recommendation for the collaborating occasion. For the non-tourist consumer, did you offer them a bottle of wine to celebrate their anniversary; or a boisterously sung "happy birthday" for their little girl's birthday? Did the occasion fit the service for the non-tourist guest? Taking the correct order, serving the food or drink correctly, and providing the proper bill and/or change to the non-tourist guest in turn results in high satisfaction scores.

Gratefulness

In the dimension Gratefulness, questions regarding feelings and emotions were asked of the respondents. Did you feel a personal connection with the staff? Asking a non-tourist guest "how was your day", or "any good news this week" are small but noticeable questions to create a bond between the staff and the non-tourist guest. A further step in creating that bond would be to remember each guest, and make them feel important. "How did the big meeting go today? I know you have been looking forward to this all week". Or "did Suzy shine at her softball game over the weekend?" These are small steps to creating that cognitive bond between staff and guests, making their experience better than expected. As in the Server Communication & Accuracy dimension, Gratefulness encompasses reading guest's body language, mood and demeanor. Did the staff help the non-tourist guest select items to best match their mood and occasion?

Another component for this dimension is creating an "I love my job" demeanor from the staff. Does your staff walk around smiling, or are they downtrodden and mumbling curse words while walking through the restaurant? Residential guests who come into the establishment frequently will pick up on the negative behavior of staff. No one wants to be around a toxic and negative environment. Why hang out and spend your money there, when somewhere else may be more inviting and entertaining?

And finally, does your staff truly care about your customers and their needs; and can the customers intangibly see this in their service? Creating that feeling of gratefulness from

the staff, and morphing it onto the residential guests is vital for creating a loyal consumer, and retaining a loyal non-tourist guest.

Repeat patronage is one of the only ways to stay in business and obtain profit in this evolving industry. The economic times have cut luxury spending down, and eating out is one of the first places consumers start cutting in order to save on expenses. Training your staff to treat every guest in the restaurant as they would a guest in their home is the only way to capture that feeling of gratefulness. Screening your employees during the hiring process and conducting regular performance evaluations will help you to maintain great FOH employee results.

Creating a feeling of thankfulness and gratefulness is crucial for non-tourist guests, again to maintain repeat patronage. Valuing the non-tourist guest by creating a connection, inviting them back, and manipulating the dining experience to match the mood or occasion they are in raises the respondent satisfaction scores.

Conclusions

In conclusion, both tourist and non-tourist locations score relatively high in guest satisfaction survey results. There were no scores below 50%, indicating that the guests are receiving at minimal adequate service. The areas of excellence were in the pace of service, service overall, food quality and taste, food preparation, server communication and accuracy, atmosphere and gratefulness.

Daily shift meetings addressing the daily specials and how to "up-sell" them; and properly deliver items appropriately and timely to the guest should be monitored and

consistent. Holding the servers and bartenders accountable for their guest satisfaction scores will be necessary for consistent reliable satisfaction survey results.

Indeed it may be impractical to expect every employee to recognize each of your guests by name, but a genuine smile, a warm hello, and a sincere interaction go a long way toward giving your guest recognition (Knutson, 1988). Showing the guest you are appreciative of their time and money by inviting them back and offering a warm goodbye or hello truly go a long way. Coaching all staff to be consistent in this gesture can only benefit the restaurant.

Limitations

One of the major limitations found during this study was the lack of guest survey's being completed by tourist locations. The results totaled 488 tourist surveys' and 513 non-tourist surveys'. Over a 25 month survey collection period, this is a very small number compared to the amount of guests dining at this establishment. With sales ranging from $3,000-$19,000 per day; this low respondent rate in comparison to survey response is discussed below.

The window of time for the guests to fill out the survey is 48 hours total. After the 48 hours has passed, the survey code listed on the receipt becomes inactive. Extending the window survey time is necessary to allow guests time to get to a computer or laptop.

With all the new technology available now, an app for guests to use while in the restaurant or directly after leaving could also increase customer feedback. Creating an app that is compatible with I Phones, LG phones, and Blackberry phones or smart devices will

create an easier user friendly format for guests to take the survey. The ease of being able to complete a survey on a phone or mobile device will be beneficial for the industry in capturing more respondents. As well as creating an ease of use for the guest, the ability to capture the respondent before they leave the restaurant, while they are still "enjoying the dining experience", by an immediate survey taken on their mobile device allows the emotional experience to be captured.

Another limitation is one question that asks "Are you a resident of the 50 states", and if you are not, you become ineliglbile to take the survey. Allowing international guests and consumers to take the survey offers insight into how cultures differ in guest satisfaction, and if the pace of service matters as much to consumers from different cultural backgrounds? Will the taste of a beer or wine temperature be less or more likely to affect their guests experience? With an additional 39 million international tourists, up from 996 million in 2011, international tourist arrivals surpassed 1 billion (1.035 billion) for the first time in history in 2012 (Unwto.org, 2013). Understanding the international consumer is essential for survival.

Another limitation is the time factor of the survey. For many tech savvy survey takers, the survey is moderately long; for novice survey takers, it appears very long. Other companies use what's considered a "ticker tape" across the top or bottom of the screen with a percentage of completion. Alerting the user of how long it will take beforehand, allots for ample time to take the survey. Including the "ticker tape" with a completion rate across the screen can keep the user engaged in finishing the survey.

Consumers are seeking increased transparency from restaurants in everything from menu disclosure of calories and allergens to labor and local-sourcing practices (Restaurant trends, 2012). There are no questions regarding the menu or menu options on the survey. As stated above, consumers are looking for healthier and leaner options on menu's today; seizing that health aware and socially conscious consumer may start with a more detailed survey.

One of the struggles that restaurants have is how to communicate with guests regarding their green practices (DiPietro & Gregory, 2012). Perhaps including a question regarding the green practices they would expect at a casual dining restaurant would increase consumer awareness and repeat business.

The questions in the survey are aggregated and condensed using a factorial analysis conducted by the NPS software; from 53 questions into eight dimensions. Evaluating each individual question and analyzing them will provide a clearer understanding of each dimension. For example, asking the host/hostess service along with the bar experience can result in a lower score if one of the two stages encompassed a service failure. There is no differentiation between the variables in the dimensions.

Another survey limitation is the lack of demographics available when collecting data for this study. Understanding which individual attributes of demographics can further aide researchers in what creates a positive and satisfactory dining experience for guests. The use of secondary data limits what the researcher was able to evaluate. Providing the raw data would give a more concise and clear portrait of overall satisfaction.

The final limitation is that there was only one restaurant in the Orlando area that the researcher was able to draw data from. On a larger scale, evaluating the entire Central Florida region or all of Florida may provide a better insight into the two divided segments of tourist and non-tourist locations. Using sales from each location when evaluating the guest satisfaction scores and surveys could also benefit researchers in the areas of cleanliness and atmosphere. Answers could be found with further research and analysis.

Future Implications and Research

Another limitation comes from previous research. According to Parsa, and his study on why restaurants fail, after analyzing restaurant turnover from 1996-1999, he surmised that when density was measured by zip codes; results show that the higher the density, the higher the failure (Parsa, 2005). The location of this casual dining restaurant is on International Drive, a high density restaurant area. Would the results stay the same with a less dense area? However, would there be as many tourists there if there was not a high density of restaurants? These are questions that further research could provide, as applicable to the industry.

Continuing research with international guests or consumers is necessary to provide insight into predictors of satisfaction for the millions of cultures that visit Orlando each year. Studying cultures as a whole, or individualizing each facet can benefit the restaurant industry as a whole.

Future research done on a state-by-state study, or by a chain specific study will assist in the understanding of what predictors provide overall satisfaction for tourist and non-tourist guests.

And lastly, developing a new survey instrument, one that is created by the researcher tailored to the location or environment, with the ability to capture demographics can provide a more precise understanding of the two types of guests, and their overall satisfaction.

Managerial Implication

The significant managerial implications for this study start with the large numbers of tourists vacationing in the Orlando, Florida area, and their dollars spent are in the millions every year, as stated previously in this study. The ability to re-structure the dining experience to cater to vacationers will benefit the casual dining sector immensely.

Industry Implications

As of Tuesday June 4th, 2013 revisions have been made to the existing survey, fueled by recommendations suggested in this study. A new app was created for smart phones, including iPhone's, Android's, and Blackberry devices. The consumer can now take the survey while sitting at the table, capturing the repondents actual service in real time. This also allows the establishment to provide a service recovery if there has been a service failure. The survey was minimalized from 53 questions to ten questions, decreasing the survey user time to under one minute.

APPENDIX A:
EIGHT DIMENSIONS OF GUEST SATISFACTION

Dimensions	Guest Experience
	Guest Surveys Completed
	Guest Surveys Completed
	Guest Survey Score Ranking
	% Promoters (9 -10 recommend)
	% Passives (7-8)
	% Detractors (0-6)
	NPS = % Promoters-% Detractors
1	**Pace of Service**
	% Just Right
2	**Service Overall**
	Service Overall
	Attentiveness to Needs
	Genuinely Value as a Guest
	Menu/Drink Knowledge
	Neat/Tidy Appearance
	Ability to Create Great Experience
3	**Server Communication & Accuracy**
	Communicated Specials
	Took Order Accurately
	Bill Accurate

Dimensions	Guest Experience
4	**Food**
	Overall Taste
	Overall Quality
5	**Food Preparation**
	Prepared Exactly as Ordered
	Appropriate Temperature
	Delicious Appearance
6	**Bar**
	Beer Taste
	Wine Taste
	Cocktail Taste
	Overall Host/Hostess Service
7	**Gratefulness**
	Staff Grateful for Visit
	Invited Back
8	**Atmosphere in Whole**
	Restaurant Cleanliness
	Restaurant Atmosphere

APPENDIX B:
COMPANIES USING NPS SURVEY'S

1-800-Got-Junk? (New York 2010) (Miami 2011)
Abbott Diagnostics
A&E Television Networks
Aggreko Plc
AIG
Allianz (London 2008) (Miami 2011)
American Express
America First Credit Union
Aon Corporation
Aon UK
Archstone-Smith
Ascension Health
Asurion
Aviva
Bain & Company
Belron
Brambles
Buhler
Bupa International
Cablecom
Carl Zeiss
Carolina Biological
Cancer Treatment Centers of America
CenturyLink
Charles Schwab (New York 2007) (San Francisco 2009)
Chick-fil-A
CHEP
Citrix Online
Colt
Concentra
Covance
Covario
De La Rue
Dell (London 2010) (Miami 2011) (London 2011)
eBay (Miami 2008) (London 2008) (San Francisco 2009) (New York 2010) (London 2010)
Eircom/Meteor
Elion
Enterprise Rent-A-Car (The Ultimate Question)
Expedia
Experian (New York 2007) (London 2009) (New York 2010) (London 2010) (London 2011)
Export Development Canada
FirstService
Four Seasons
Fred Reichheld
GE Consumer & Industrial
GE Healthcare (New York 2007) (San Francisco 2009)

Kronos Incorporated
Lawson Software
LEGO Company (London 2007) (Miami 2008) (London 2008)
Lenovo
Life Financial Group (London 2009) (London 2010)
Logitech (London 2008) (San Francisco 2009)
Mars Direct
Maersk-Line
Medtronic Diabetes
Mellon Investor Services
MetLife
Metro Bank
Misys Bank
Novartis
Olam
O2
Orange Business Services (Paris 2008) (London 2009) (New York 2010)
Orange France
Paul Davis Restoration
Philips (London 2007) (London 2009) (Miami 2011) (London 2011)
Philips Healthcare
Pitney Bowes MapInfo
PPR Healthcare Staffing
PricewaterhouseCoopers
Progressive Companies
PB-RH Conseil
Rackspace
Rohini Contractor
Satmetrix
Sage
San Francisco Fire Credit Union
Satrix Solutions
Sony Europe
Sony Style
Southwest Airlines
Spreadshirt
Suddenlink
Swiss Reinsurance Company (London 2007) (San Francisco 2009) (London 2009)
Symantec (Miami 2008) (London 2008) (London 2009) (New York 2010) (London 2010) (Miami 2011) (London 2011)
TD Canada Trust
TeleTech
The Millar Method
The West Paces Hotel Group
T-Mobile International
Travel Counsellors (London 2008) (London 2010)

GE Real Estate	Travelport
Genesis	tw telecom
Groupe Neuf Cegetel	USAA (New York 2010) (San Francisco 2012)
Holcim (London 2008) (London 2011)	Virgin Active
HSBC	Virgin Media (London 2008) (London 2009) (London
HSBC Global Resourcing	2011)
iBuzcon	VeriSign
IBM (London 2007) (London 2009)	Veritude
iiNet Australia	Verizon Business
ING (London 2009) (London 2011)	Verizon Wireless
Optum Insight (formerly Ingenix) (New York 2010)	VocaLink
(Miami 2011)	Weir Group PLC
Intuit (The Ultimate Question) (New York 2007) (San	Western Union
Francisco 2009) (Miami 2011)	Wright-Patterson Credit Union
Jet Blue	World Economic Forum
JDSU	Zane's Cycles (New York 2010) (Miami 2011)
	Zappos.com (San Francisco 2009) (San Francisco 2012

APPENDIX C:
SAMPLE SURVEY BEFORE FACTOR ANALYSIS

To express our thanks, at the end of the survey you will be given a coupon code for a free appetizer up to $8		
Please enter your email address so we can give you the incentive code after you finish the survey.		
Thanks for taking the time to do our guest survey! We really appreciate the feedback. We're always looking for ways to improve the ******** experience, so your opinions are very important to us. To express our thanks, at the end of the survey you will be given a coupon code for a free appetizer up to $8! Please note that in order to receive the free appetizer, you'll be asked to provide your contact information. Be sure to have a pen ready to write the free appetizer coupon code on your receipt. Please click 'Next' to begin.		
Enter the 12 character Survey Code from the section of the receipt containing the survey invitation.		
Please confirm the following:	I am a legal resident of the 50 United States or D.C. and I am 18 years of age or older.	
What time did you visit ********?	6 am - 11 am 11 am - 4 pm 4 pm – 9 pm 9 pm or later	

Thank you! When answering these questions, please think specifically about the visit to ******** where you received your invitation to participate in this survey.		
Based on your experience during this visit to ********, using a scale of 0 to 10, with 10 being Very Likely to Recommend and 0 being Will Not Recommend, how likely are you to recommend this ******** to a friend or colleague?	10 - Very likely to recommend 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 - Will not recommend	What was great about this visit that you'd like to share? _____ What, if anything, could ******** have done to improve this experience for you? Please be very specific. _____
Did you dine in the restaurant or carryout?	Dine in Carry out	
Did you visit for?	Lunch/Late lunch/Lunch appetizers Dinner/Late dinner/Dinner appetizers Happy Hour drinks and/or appetizers Late night drinks and/or appetizers (after 9:00pm) Breakfast Dessert/Coffee	
Where in the restaurant did you sit for the majority of your visit?	In the restaurant area In the bar area On the patio	
What were the main reasons for your visit? *Please select all that apply.*	Happy Hour Meeting up with friends Just to have drinks Convenient location To participate in a bar event To have a meal or snack To use coupon/gift card/promotion To watch a sporting event To have dessert For a celebration (birthday, promotion, etc.) Other. Specify	
Did you order?	Food Drinks (either alcoholic or non-alcoholic) Both food and drinks	
What FOOD items did you personally order?	Appetizers Entrees (including salads) Side orders or side salad (separate from entree)	

Please select all that apply.	Dessert	
Did you or anyone in your party order any of the following? *Please select all that apply.*	Pick 2 for $15.99 Pick 2 for $10 Monthly Drink Special Half Price Appetizers or other food specials during Happy Hour Happy Hour Drink Specials on Beer, Wine, or Cocktails Other promotion that was offered to you in the restaurant (specify) None of the above	
Did you or anyone in your party use any of the following? *Please select all that apply.*	A Loyalty Coupon Offer A coupon I got out of the paper A coupon for taking the guest satisfaction survey Other type of coupon (specify) None of the above	
What type of DRINKS did you personally order? *Please select all that apply.*	Non-alcoholic beverage Cocktail/mixed drink Beer Wine	
Please rate the overall taste of the BEER / Wine / Cocktail you ordered.	7 – Outstanding taste Thru 0 – Very poor taste	The survey will prompt you for each of the categories depending on what you select
Please rate the overall service you received from the HOSTS/HOSTESSES who greeted you at the front of the restaurant and sat you at your table:	7 – Outstanding service Thru 0 – Very poor service Or I did not interact with the host/hostess	
When you first entered the restaurant, did you receive a friendly welcome?	Yes No	
Were the doors opened for you upon your arrival by the restaurant staff?	Yes No	
Did the HOST/HOSTESS greet you?	Immediately In less than 1 minute Longer than 1 minute to be greeted	
Did you have to wait to be seated?	Yes No	
When the HOST/HOSTESS seated you, did they tell you your server's name?	Yes No I don't remember	
How much do you agree with the	See table below for possible answers:	

	Agree Completely						Disagree Completely
	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
I felt a personal connection with the staff	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
The staff made my visit better than expected	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
The staff helped me select the best items to match my mood and occasion	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
The staff love their jobs	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
The staff really care about their customers	●	●	●	●	●	●	●

following statement about the staff you encountered?		
Next, please rate the overall service provided by your SERVER or BARTENDER:	7 Outstanding Service Thru 1 Very Poor Service	
Please rate your SERVER or BARTENDER on each of the following:		

	Outstanding						Very Poor
	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Genuinely value you as a guest	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Menu/drink knowledge	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Neat/tidy appearance	●	●	●	●	●	●	●

| Ability to create a great experience for you | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● |
| Attentiveness to your specific needs | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● |

This is a quality control question; please answer this question with the number 'four'.	1-7	
Did anyone tell you about any specials or featured food or drink promotions?	Yes No	
Who told you about the specials or featured food or drink promotions?	Bartender Manager Server Host/Hostess	
Did your SERVER or BARTENDER make any suggestions/recommendations on what you might like to order?	Yes No	
Were the recommendations good - did they make sense for your occasion and tastes?	Yes No	
Was your order taken correctly?	Yes No	
Was your bill accurate?	Yes No	
Next, thinking about the time it took for this visit, did it take:	Much too long A little too long Just the right amount of time A little too rushed	
Which of the following, if any, took too long? *Please select all that apply.*	Time to be greeted when entering restaurant Time to be seated Time for server to greet table/take drink order Time to receive drinks after ordering them Time for server to take order Time to refill drinks Time to receive entrees Time to receive the bill Time to process the payment None of the above	
Next, please rate the overall TASTE of	7 - Outstanding Taste Thru	

your food.	O – Very poor taste	
And rate the overall QUALITY of your food	7 - Outstanding Taste Thru O – Very poor taste	
Which of these special requests did you make, if any? *Please select all that apply.*	Requested special preparation Requested item(s) to be left off Requested item(s) to be substituted Required items to be put on the side Requested extra items(s) Other (please specify) No special requests	
Did we prepare what you ordered exactly as you ordered	Yes No	
Were any items sent back to the kitchen?	Yes No	
Was your food served at the appropriate temperature - that is cold items cold and hot items hot?	Yes No	
Did the food look delicious and appetizing -- like it had been carefully placed on the plate and made to order for you?	Yes No	
Next, please rate the overall CLEANLINESS of the restaurant.	7 - Outstanding Cleanliness Thru 1 - Very Poor Cleanliness	
Next, please rate the OVERALL RESTAURANT ATMOSPHERE.	7 Outstanding Atmosphere Thru 1 - Very Poor Atmosphere	
Were you satisfied with the table you were seated at?	Yes No	
Next, please rate the VALUE FOR THE MONEY you received for the entire experience:	7 - Outstanding Value Thru 1 - Very Poor Value	
How does the value for the money at	******** value is much better	

******** compare to the value for the money you get at other similar casual dining restaurants?	******** value is somewhat better ******** value is about the same ******** value is somewhat worse ******** value is much worse	
Did the manager visit your table?	Yes No	
Did you leave the restaurant with the feeling the staff was genuinely grateful for your visit?	Yes No	
Did someone invite you back for another visit?	Yes No	
How likely will you be to visit ******** in the next month?	Definitely Will Visit Probably Will Visit Might or Might Not Visit Probably Not Visit Definitely Not Visit	
How often do you go to **any** ********?	4 or more times a week 2-3 times a week Once a week 2-3 times a month Once a month Once every 2-3 months 2-3 times a year Once a year Less than once a year This was my first time	
How often do you go to casual dining restaurants (Applebee's, Chili's, Red Lobster, Olive Garden, etc.) in general?	4 or more times a week 2-3 times a week Once a week 2-3 times a month Once a month Once every 2-3 months 2-3 times a year Once a year Less than once a year This was my first time	
Lastly, did the staff try to influence your ratings when you received your survey invitation?	Yes No	
In order to receive the coupon code for		

a free $8 appetizer, please enter your contact information. Your name and address are required to verify your eligibility for the coupon.

The free appetizer coupon code will be presented to you on the next page. Have a pen ready to write the code on your receipt.

Please be assured that **your contact information will remain confidential**, and will not be sold or used for any other purpose.

Thanks for taking our survey!

APPENDIX D:
IRB APPROVAL LETTER

NOT HUMAN RESEARCH DETERMINATION

From :   **UCF Institutional Review Board #1**
                FWA00000351, IRB00001138

To   :   **Jessica Wickey**

Date :   **March 20, 2013**

Dear Researcher:

On 3/20/2013 the IRB determined that the following proposed activity is not human research as defined by DHHS regulations at 45 CFR 46 or FDA regulations at 21 CFR 50/56:

Type of Review:	Not Human Research Determination
Project Title:	GUEST SATISFACTION ANALYSIS OF A CASUAL DINING RESTAURANT: A COMPARISON OF TOURIST VS NON-TOURIST SATISFACTION SCORES
Investigator:	Jessica Wickey
IRB ID:	SBE-13-09192
Funding Agency:	
Grant Title:	
Research ID:	N/A

University of Central Florida IRB review and approval is not required. This determination applies only to the activities described in the IRB submission and does not apply should any changes be made. If changes are to be made and there are questions about whether these activities are research involving human subjects, please contact the IRB office to discuss the proposed changes.

On behalf of Sophia Dziegielewski, Ph.D., L.C.S.W., UCF IRB Chair, this letter is signed by:

Signature applied by Patria Davis on 03/20/2013 02:14:17 PM EST

IRB Coordinator

REFERENCES

Andaleeb, S., & Conway, C. (2006). Customer satisfaction in the restaurant industry: An examination of the transaction-specific model. Journal of Services Marketing, 20(1), 3-11.

Beverage decisions. (2012). *Nation's Restaurant News,* , 1-15. Retrieved from http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?URL=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=hjh&AN=78318004&site=ehost-live

Big spenders. (2007). *Restaurant Business, 106*(2), 18-18. Retrieved from http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?URL=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=hjh&AN=24252397&site=ehost-live

Brandau, M. (2011). Survey says. *Nation's Restaurant News, 45*(5), 38-38. Retrieved from http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?URL=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=hjh&AN=59906527&site=ehost-live

Casual & fine-dining restaurants. (2012). *Nation's Restaurant News, 46*(16), 20-20. Retrieved from http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?URL=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=hjh&AN=78548022&site=ehost-live

Churchill, G., & Surprenant, C. (1982). An investigation into the determinants of customer satisfaction. Journal of Marketing Research, 19(4), 491-504.

Clarke, G. (2001). Confirming satisfaction as an attitude within the service-buying process. Journal of Consumer Behavior, 1(2), 111-123.

Croes R., Rivera, M., Pizam, A, Olsen, E., Lee, S.H., Zhong, Y.Y. (2011). Dick Pope Institue for Tourism Studies. *Winning the future in the 21st century: A tourism strategic plan for Aruba of how to*, Special Report.

Customer satisfaction. (2012). *Restaurant, Food & Beverage Market Research Handbook,* , 202-209. Retrieved from http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?URL=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=hjh&AN=78299891&site=ehost-live

CVent. Web Survey Software. (2012). Retrieved from http://www.cvent.com/en/web-survey-software/net-promoter-score.shtml?cid=70100000000FBEAAA4

Danaher, P., & Mattsson, J. (1994). Cumulative encounter satisfaction in the hotel conference process. International Journal of Service Industry Management, 5(4), 69-80.

Davis, B, & Stone, S. (1985). *Food and Beverage Management*, 2nd ed., Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford

Dining trends. (2011). *Restaurant, Food & Beverage Market Research Handbook,* , 183-186. Retrieved from http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?URL=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=hjh&AN=64157424&site=ehost-live

DiPietro, R. B., & Gregory, S. (2012). A comparative study of customer perceptions regarding green restaurant practices: Fast food vs. upscale casual. *FIU Hospitality Review, 30*(1), 1-22. Retrieved from http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?URL=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=hjh&AN=82575057&site=ehost-live

DiPietro, R. B., & McLeod, B. (2011). Perceived work status and turnover intentions of

    casual-dining restaurant employees. *FIU Hospitality Review, 29*(2), 70-87. Retrieved

    from

    http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?URL=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct

    =true&db=hjh&AN=82824890&site=ehost-live

Dube, L., Reneghan, L., & Miller, J. (1994). Measuring customer satisfaction for strategic

    management. The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly, 35(1), 39-

    47.

Gupta, S., McLaughlin, E., & Gomez, M. (2007). Guest satisfaction and restaurant

    performance. *Cornell Hotel & Restaurant Administration Quarterly, 48*(3), 284-298.

    doi: 10.1177/0010880407301735

Harrington, R. J., Ottenbacher, M. C., Staggs, A., & Powell, F. A. (2012). Generation Y

    consumers: Key restaurant attributes affecting positive and negative experiences.

    Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research, 36(4), 431-449. doi:

    10.1177/1096348011400744

Hayes, B.E. (1997). *Measuring Customer Satisfaction: Survey, Design, Use, and Statistical

    Analysis Methods*, 2nd ed., ASQ Quality Press, Milwaukee, WI

Heitmann, M., Lehmann, D., & Herrmann, A. (2007). Choice goal attainment and decision

    and consumption satisfaction. Journal of Marketing Research, 44(2), 234-250.

Hur, Y. (., & Adler, H. (2011). Employees' perceptions of restaurant brand image. *Journal of

    Foodservice Business Research, 14*(4), 334-359. doi:

    10.1080/15378020.2011.624053

Incentives drive casual-dining choices. (2010). *Nation's Restaurant News, 44*(11), 30-39.

Retrieved from

http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?URL=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=hjh&AN=51744314&site=ehost-live

Jang, Y. J., & Zhao, J. (2005). Exploring customers' motivation and satisfaction with international casual-dining restaurants in korea. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration, 6*(4), 91-106. doi: 10.1300/J149v06n04-06

Jones, P., & Peppiat, E. (1996). Managing perceptions of waiting times in service queues. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 7 (5) 47-61.

Kandampully, J., & Suhartanto, D. (2003). The role of customer satisfaction and image in gaining customer loyalty in the hotel industry. Journal of Hospitality & Leisure Marketing, 10(1/2), 3-25.

Keith, N. K., & Simmers, C. S. (2011). Measuring service quality perceptions of restaurant experiences: The disparity between comment cards and DINESERV. *Journal of Foodservice Business Research, 14*(1), 20-32. doi: 10.1080/15378020.2011.548209

Kim, H. (2011). Service orientation, service quality, customer satisfaction, and customer loyalty: Testing a structural model. Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management, 20(6), 619-637.

Kim, W. G., Ng, C. Y. N., & Kim, Y. (2009). Influence of institutional DINESERV on customer satisfaction, return intention, and word-of-mouth. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 28*(1), 10-17. doi: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2008.03.005

Kleman, E. E. (2008). "May I Interest You in Today's Special?": A Pilot Study of Restaurant

Servers' Compliance-Gaining Strategies. *Rocky Mountain Communication Review*,

5(1), 32-42.

Knutson, B. J. (1988). Ten laws of customer satisfaction. *Cornell Hotel & Restaurant

Administration Quarterly, 29*(3), 14. Retrieved from

http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?URL=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct

=true&db=hjh&AN=7198794&site=ehost-live

Namkung, Y., & Jang, S. (2007). Does food quality really matter in restaurants? it's impact

on customer satisfaction and behavioral intentions. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism

Research*, *31*, 387-412.

Net Promoter Scores. Why Net Promoter. (2012). Retrieved from

http://www.netpromoter.com/why-net-promoter/know/

Noone, B. M., Kimes, S. E., Mattila, A. S., & Wirtz, J. (2007). The effect of meal pace on

customer satisfaction. *Cornell Hotel & Restaurant Administration Quarterly, 48*(3),

231-245. doi: 10.1177/0010880407304020

Noone, B. M., & Mattila, A. S. (2009). Restaurant crowding and perceptions of service

quality: The role of consumption goals and attributions. *Journal of Foodservice

Business Research, 12*(4), 331-343. doi: 10.1080/15378020903344281

Oh, H., & Parks, S. (1997). Customer satisfaction and service quality: A critical review of the

literature and research implications for the hospitality industry. Hospitality Research

Journal, 20(3), 35-64.

Oliver, R. (1999). Whence customer loyalty. Journal of Marketing, 63(4), 33-44.

Oliver, R. (2010). Satisfaction: A behavioral perspective on the consumer (2 ed.). Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, Inc.

Okubo, Sumiye, and Mark A. Planting. 1998. "U.S. Travel and Tourism Satellite Accounts for 1992," U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis, *Survey of Current Business,* July

Parasuraman, A. A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1988). SERVQUAL: A Multiple-Item Scale for Measuring Consumer Perceptions of Service Quality. *Journal of Retailing*, *64*(1), 5-6.

Parsa, H. G., Self, J., Njite, D., & King, T. (2005). Why Restaurants Fail. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly, 46(3)* 304-322. doi: 10.1177/0010880405275598

Pizam, A., & Ellis, T. (1999). Customer satisfaction and its measurement in hospitality enterprises. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 11*(7), 326-339. Retrieved from http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?URL=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=hjh&AN=17750751&site=ehost-live

Prasad, K. (2003). A good system can resolve guest-comment-card confusion. *Hotel & Motel Management, 218*(19), 17. Retrieved from http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?URL=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=hjh&AN=11327075&site=ehost-live

Restaurant & menu preferences. (2012). *Restaurant, Food & Beverage Market Research Handbook,* , 213-215. Retrieved from

http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?URL=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=hjh&AN=78299893&site=ehost-live

Scriabina, N., and S. Fomichov (2005). 6 Ways to Benefit from Customer Complaints. *Quality Progress*, 38 (9), 49-54.

Sengunder, T. (2002). An exploratory analysis of customer satisfaction. The Journal of American Academy of Business, 2(1), 177-184.

Step up the service. (2010). *Nation's Restaurant News, 44*(11), 36-36. Retrieved from http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?URL=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=hjh&AN=51744387&site=ehost-live

Sulek, J., & Hensley, R. (2004). The relative importance of food, atmosphere, and fairness or wait: The case of a full-service restaurant. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, *45*, 235-249.

Susskind, A., & Vicarri, A. (2011). A look at the relationship between service failures, guest satisfaction, and repeat patronage intentions of casual dining guests. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, *52*(4), 438-444.

Takeout. (2006). *Restaurant Business, 105*(2), 20-20. Retrieved from http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?URL=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=hjh&AN=19746523&site=ehost-live

Tobin, E. R., & Huffman, L. M. (2006). Examining the impact of service times on overall guest satisfaction perception in the casual dining environment. *FIU Hospitality Review, 24*(1), 42-48. Retrieved from

http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?URL=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct
=true&db=hjh&AN=23856802&site=ehost-live

Tse, D., & Wilton, P. (1988). Models of consumer satisfaction formation: An extension.
Journal of Marketing Research, 25(2), 204-212.

Tse, D., Nicosia, F., & Wilton, P. (1990). Consumer satisfaction as a process. Psychology &
Marketing, 7(3), 177-193.

Tuberkugurlu.com (2011). Definition of A Tourist. Retrieved from:
http://www.tugberkugurlu.com/archive/definition-of-tourist-who-is-tourist-what-is-
the-comprehensive-definition-of-tourist

Unwto.org (2013). International Tourism Continue Robust Growth. Retrieved from:
http://media.unwto.org/en/press-release/2013-01-28/international-tourism-continue-
robust-growth-2013

Vavra, T.G. (1997). *Improving Your Measurement of Customer Satisfaction: A Guide to
Creating, Conducting, Analyzing, and Reporting Customer Satisfaction
Measurement Programs,* ASQ Quality Press

What are casual diners drinking? (2010). *Nation's Restaurant News, 44*(11), 34-34. Retrieved
from
http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?URL=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct
=true&db=hjh&AN=51744385&site=ehost-live

Walker, J. (1995). Service encounter satisfaction: conceptualized. Journal of Services
Marketing, 9(1), 5-14.

Wilkerson, C. (2003). Travel and tourism: An overlooked industry in the U.S. and tenth

district. *Economic Review (01612387), 88*(3), 45-71. Retrieved from

http://ezproxy.lib.ucf.edu/login?URL=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=hjh&AN=11000797&site=ehost-live

Yi, Y. (1990). A critical review of customer satisfaction. In V. Zeithaml (Ed.), Review of

Marketing 1990 (pp. 68-123). Chicago: American Marketing Association.

Young, N., & SooCheong (Shawn), J. (2007). Does Food Quality Really Matter in

Restaurants? Its Impact on Customer Satisfaction and Behavioral Intentions. *Journal

Of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, *31*(3), 387-410.

Yuksel, A., & Rimmington, M. (1998). Customer-satisfaction measurement: Performance

counts. Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly, 69(6), 60-70.

Zhang, T. (2012). A Study on the Effect of Food Tourism Motivation on Tourist Satisfaction

and Behavioral Intention. (English). *Tourism Tribune / Lvyou Xuekan*, *27*(10), 78-84.

doi:10.3969/j.issn.1002-5006.2012.10.010