

Study of Demand for Restaurant Service Quality

Yi-Chan Chung

Department of Business Administration, Yuanpei University of Medical Technology, Taiwan
Corresponding Author: Yi-Chan Chung.

ABSTRACT: Market of restaurants is successively full and the restaurants should recognize customers' demand and enhance their satisfaction with service quality in order to strengthen competitiveness. By Kano Model analysis, this study obtains 2 items which can both highly enhance customer satisfaction and highly lower customer dissatisfaction: employees' active and individual concern and comfortable service for customers. Restaurant M can improve these two items to upgrade customer satisfaction.

KEYWORDS: Kano model, service quality, customer satisfaction

Date of Submission: 06-10-2019

Date of acceptance: 22-10-2019

I. INTRODUCTION

Market competition is gradually severe. Restaurant M should control customers' demand in order to attract more customers and result in higher profits. According to SERVQUAL proposed by Parasuraman et al. (1988), this study classifies dimensions of service quality into Responsiveness, Tangibility, Reliability, Empathy, and Guarantee. Based on questionnaire data, it obtains "service quality attributes of outcome improvement" which can both enhance customer satisfaction and lower customer dissatisfaction. The result acquired by the analysis serves as reference for the restaurant to improve service quality and reinforce competitiveness.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Literature review includes two parts: study of service quality and Kano two-dimensional quality model.

2.1 Service quality

Tsiotsou (2006) argued that service quality is customers' general evaluation on advantages, disadvantages and ranking of products. Cronin and Taylor (1992) stated that service quality is consumers' overall evaluation on things. Andrew (2002) defined service quality as the degree to satisfy customers' needs and expectation. Lovelock & Wright (2002) generalized characteristics of service quality below: (1) Authenticity, (2) Tangibility, (3) Responsiveness, (4) Guarantee, (5) Empathy. Parasuraman et al. (1988) argued that service quality includes 5 dimensions: (1) Reliability; (2) Responsiveness; (3) Guarantee; (4) Empathy; (5) Tangibility. According to SERVQUAL proposed by Parasuraman et al. (1988), this study divides dimensions of service quality into Responsiveness, Tangibility, Reliability, Empathy, and Guarantee. The measures are modified according to questionnaires of Ugboma et al. (2007), Chung & Chen (2015), Parasuraman et al. (1988) and Ha (2003) and the business characteristics of Restaurant M.

2.2 Kano Model

Kano questionnaire aims to investigate customers' perception with and without quality item. Options of responses are "I like it that way", "Take it for granted", "It does not matter", "Can be tolerated" and "Dislike". Kano et al. (1984) classified quality into five elements: Attractive Quality Element (A), One-Dimensional Quality Element (O), Must-Be Quality Element (M), Indifferent Quality Element (I), Reverse Quality Element (R).

Matzler and Hinterhuber(1998) proposed categories of two-dimensional quality elements. As to the validation of improvement of certain quality attribute by "customer satisfaction coefficient", the calculation formulas of coefficients are shown below:

C (1): coefficient to enhance customer satisfaction = $(A+O)/(A+O+M+I)$

C (2): coefficient to lower customer dissatisfaction = $(O+M)/(A+O+M+I) \times (-1)$

A: Attractive Quality; O: One-Dimensional Quality; M: Must-Be Quality; I: Indifferent Quality

III. RESEARCH METHOD

This study divides measurement dimensions of quality into Responsiveness, Tangibility, Reliability, Empathy, and Guarantee. Quality measurement items are modified according to questionnaires of Ugboma et al. (2007), Chung & Chen (2015), Parasuraman et al. (1988) and Ha (2003) and business characteristics of the

restaurant. Research subjects are customers of Restaurant M. From June 1 to 30, 2019, it retrieved 61 questionnaires. The variables measured are the following: (1) Responsiveness: employees can immediately respond to customers’ demand (Item1); employees are not too busy to respond to customers (Item2); employees are willing to assist with and serve customers (Item3). (2) Tangibility: employees’ costumes and appearance are tidy and neat (Item4); interior facilities, circulation and signs are clear (Item5); interior professional devices and tidy appearance of facilities (Item6); service facilities meet the customers’ demand (Item7). (3) Reliability: employees provide reliable service (Item8); employees accomplish the commitment to customers (Item9); employees accomplish the things at once (Item10). (4) Empathy: employees show active and individual concern for customers (Item11); employees treat customers’ benefits are the priority (Item12); employees recognize individual customers’ demands (Item13); they provide service needed by customers according to their demand (Item14). (5) Guarantee: they can respond to customers’ questions by sufficient professional knowledge (Item15); they provide reliable service for customers (Item16); employees provide responsible service (Item17); product prices are indicated clearly (Item18).

IV. RESULTS ANALYSIS

This study conducts categorization of two-dimensional quality on service quality items. 13 items are categorized as attractive quality; 5 items are categorized as one-dimensional quality (see Table 1). This study obtains 2 items “service quality items of outcome improvement” (see Table1) which both enhance customer satisfaction and lower customer dissatisfaction: employees’ active and individual concern for customers (Item11) and reliable service for customers (Item16). The research result allows Restaurant M to improve service quality and the restaurant can keep up the good work of these service items to obtain maximum benefits. wn in the table below.

Item	A	O	M	I	R	Q	Category	C(1)	C(2)
1	30	21	3	5	2	0	A	0.864	-0.407
2	18	34	4	3	2	0	O	0.881	*-0.644
3	31	24	3	2	1	0	A	*0.917	-0.45
4	32	18	4	5	1	1	A	0.847	-0.373
5	31	21	4	3	1	1	A	0.881	-0.424
6	38	17	3	2	1	0	A	*0.917	-0.333
7	23	28	5	4	1	0	O	0.85	*-0.55
8	35	20	3	2	1	0	A	*0.917	-0.383
9	32	19	5	3	1	1	A	0.864	-0.407
10	32	20	3	3	2	1	A	*0.897	-0.397
11	30	26	3	2	0	0	A	*0.918	*-0.475
12	30	21	5	3	2	0	A	0.864	-0.441
13	30	22	5	3	0	1	A	0.867	*-0.45
14	31	23	3	3	1	0	A	*0.9	-0.433
15	20	33	4	4	0	0	O	0.869	*-0.607
16	26	27	4	2	1	1	O	*0.898	*-0.525
17	33	23	3	2	0	0	A	*0.918	-0.426
18	23	28	5	2	2	1	O	0.879	*-0.569
Total average								0.886	-0.461

Table 1: Kano customer satisfaction coefficients

Note:A: Attractive Quality; O: One-Dimensional Quality; M: Must-Be Quality; I:Indifferent Quality; R: Reverse Quality; Q: uncertain; C (1): Increased customer satisfaction coefficient; C (2): reduced customer dissatisfaction coefficient.

* denotes absolute value of coefficient > absolute value of mean of total coefficient

V. CONCLUSION

The impact of digitization on the Namibian newspaper industry are positive and negative. With digitization, it is now easier to reach a wider audience, the interaction is fast, instant and continuous and has provided a multiplicity of sources for journalists. The negative impact is that newspaper loses revenue due to

drops in circulation as well as the migration of both readers and advertisers to online platforms. Bu the study has shown that the threat of digitization on the Namibian and Newspapers in Namibia is yet to be felt as the circulation of hardcopy newspapers continue to increase. Digitization has brought more opportunities than challenges for the Namibian newspapers industry as the industry continues to thrive due to increasing sales and advertising and that advertisers are still miles away from completely embracing digital media and harnessing the power of the internet. It has also been observed that although there is willingness to migrate to online platforms by readers, factors such as internet connectivity and speed, remain immediate constraints towards full digitization of the newspaper industry.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Andrew, J.D., Clayton, F. W., and Charles, P. D. ,2002. The relationship between counselor satisfaction and extrinsic job factors in state rehabilitation agencies. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin*, 45, 223-232.
- [2]. Chung Y.C. and Chen H.C., 2015. Study on the correlation among service quality, relationship quality and customer satisfaction– A case study of H hotel. *International Journal of Latest Research in Science and Technology*, 44(4), 1-7.
- [3]. Cronin, J. J., Jr. and Taylor, S. A., 1992, Measuring service quality: a reexamination and extension, *Journal of Marketing*, 56(3), 55-68.
- [4]. Ha, M. S. ,2003. A Comparison of Service Quality at Major Container Ports: Implications for Korean Ports. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 11(2), 131-137.
- [5]. Kano, N., Seraku, N., Takahashi, F., and Tsuji, S., 1984. Attractive quality and must-be quality, *Hinshitsu (Quality, the Journal of Japanese Society for Quality Control)*, 14, 39-48.
- [6]. Lovelock, C. H., and Wirtz J. ,2011. *Service Marketing*(7ed), NY: Prentice-Hall.
- [7]. Matzler, K. and Hinterhuber, H. H., 1998. How to make product development projects more successful by integrating Kano's model of customer satisfaction into quality function deployment, *Technovation*, 18(1), 25-38.
- [8]. Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V.A. and Berry, L.L, 1988. SERVQUAL: a multiple-item scale for measuring consumer perception of service quality. *Journal of Retailing*, 64 (1), 12-40.
- [9]. Tsiotsou, R.,2006. The role of perceived product quality and overall satisfaction on purchase intentions. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 30(2), 207-220.c
- [10]. Ugboma, C., Ogwude, I. C., Ugboma, O. and Nnadi, K., 2007. Service Quality and Satisfaction Measurements in Nigerian Ports: An Exploration," *Maritime Policy & Management*, 34(4), 331-346.

Yi-Chan Chung." Study of Demand for Restaurant Service Quality" *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention (IJHSSI)*, vol. 08, no. 10, 2019, pp. 51-53