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Abstract-The purpose of this paper was to examine the relationship between customer satisfaction, service quality and customer’s re-patronage intentions in the context of restaurant industry in Nigeria. The respondents were 377 restaurant customers who completed the self-administered questionnaire. Pearson correlation analysis indicated that service quality and customer satisfaction had a direct positive effect on customer’s patronage intentions. Multiple linear regression highlighted customer satisfaction as a stronger predictor of re-patronage intentions compared to service quality. Possible interpretations, limitations, and implications for marketing professionals are discussed.
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I. INTRODUCTION

In today’s fast-paced and increasingly competitive market, the bottom line of a firm’s marketing strategies and tactics is to make profits and contribute to the growth of the company. Customer satisfaction, quality and retention are global issues that affect all organizations, be it large or small, profit or non-profit, global or local. Many companies are interested in studying, evaluating and implementing marketing strategies that aim at improving customer retention and maximizing share of customers in view of the beneficial effects on the financial performance for the firm. There has been a strong advocacy for the adoption of customer retention as one of the key performance indicators (Kaplan & Norton, 2001). For instance, a study of Reichheld & Sasser (1990) reported a high correlation between customer retention and profitability in a range of industries. However, the fragmentation of media choices and the dynamic nature of the market, coupled with an increased number of more demanding and affluent consumers, brought greater challenges to marketing practitioners in retaining their customers. Quality and customer satisfaction have long been recognized as playing a crucial role for success and survival in today’s competitive market. Not surprisingly, considerable research has been conducted on these two concepts. Notably, the quality and satisfaction concepts have been linked to customer behavioural intentions like purchase and loyalty intention, willingness to spread positive word of mouth, referral, and complaint intention by many researchers (Olsen, 2002; Kang, Nobuyuki & Herbert, 2004; Soderlund & Ohman, 2005). The most commonly found studies were related to the antecedents, moderating, mediating and behavioural consequences relationships among these variables - customer satisfaction, service quality, perceived value and behavioural intentions. However, there have been mixed results produced. As many industry sectors mature, competitive advantage through high quality service is an increasingly important weapon in business survival. The fast-food industry has certainly not been exempted from increased competition or rising consumer expectations of quality. In Malaysia, the fast-food industry is undergoing a dramatic transformation and experiencing heightened competition. Fast-food is an important but often neglected area of study (Kivela, Inbakaran & Reese, 1999). The fact is that fast-food business is regarded as a low credence service and the quality of the services are difficult to prove until customers patronise the fast-food business. Moreover, the quality of the service that customers encounter may be different each time they re-visit that particular fast food centre, thus influencing the level of satisfaction and eventually affecting their re-patronage intentions. Given these important issues that need to be addressed, the main purpose of this study was to examine the factors that affect customers’ repatronage intentions in the fast food context. Specifically, this paper aims to examine the nature and strength of relationships between customer satisfaction, service quality and customer’s re-patronage intentions. The predictive ability of satisfaction and service quality on patronage intention will also be analyzed.

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE CUSTOMER SATISFACTION AND SERVICE QUALITY

The interest in studying satisfaction and service quality as the antecedents of customer behavioural intentions in this paper has been stimulated, firstly, by the recognition that customer satisfaction does not, on its own, produce customer lifetime value (Appiah-Adu, 1999). Secondly, satisfaction and quality are closely linked to market share and customer retention (Fornell, 1992; Rust & Zahorik, 1993; Patterson & Spreng, 1997). There are overwhelming arguments that it is more expensive to win new customers than to keep existing ones (Ennew & Binks, 1996; Hormoz & Giles, 2004). This is in line with Athanassopoulos, Gounaris & Stathakopoulos’s (2001) arguments that customer replacement costs, like advertising, promotion and sales expenses, are high and it takes time for new customers to become profitable. And lastly, the increase of retention rate implied greater positive word of mouth (Appiah-Adu, 1999), decrease price sensitivity and future transaction costs (Reichheld & Sasser, 1990) and, finally, leading to better business performance (Fornell, 1992; Ennew & Binks, 1996; Bolton, 1998; Ryals, 2003).
From the literature that has been reviewed so far, customer satisfaction seems to be the subject of considerable interest by both marketing practitioners and academics since 1970s (Churchill & Surprenant, 1982; Jones & Suh, 2000). Companies and researchers first tried to measure customer satisfaction in the early 1970s, on the theory that increasing it would help them prosper (Coyles & Gokey, 2002). Throughout the 1980s, researchers relied on customer satisfaction and quality ratings obtained from surveys for performance monitoring, compensation as well as resource allocation (Bolton, 1998) and began to examine further the determinants of customer satisfaction (Swan & Trawick, 1981; Churchill & Surprenant, 1982; Bearden & Teel, 1983). In the 1990s, however, organizations and researchers have become increasingly concerned about the financial implications of their customer satisfaction (Rust & Zahorik, 1993; Bolton, 1998).

While satisfaction has been examined by many researchers in different industries (Fornell, 1992; Anderson & Sullivan, 1993; Bolton, 1998; Caruana, 2002; Ranaweera & Prabhu, 2003), service quality is also likely to influence consumer behavioural intentions (Bitner, 1990; Cronin & Taylor, 1992, 1994; Choi et al., 2004). Cronin, Brady & Hult (2000) stated that examining only one variable at a time may confound the understanding of consumer decision-making and this may lead to inappropriate marketing strategies. This view is supported by Caruana (2002) and it is crucial to study the effect of other constructs such as quality on behavioural intentions in addition to customer satisfaction. Hence, this study incorporated service quality into the model in examining customer’s repatronage intentions in the restaurant context.

### III. DEFINITION OF SERVICE QUALITY, CUSTOMER SATISFACTION AND REPATRONAGE INTENTION

There are many researchers who have defined service quality in different ways. For instance, Bitner, Booms and Mohr (1994) define service quality as the consumer’s overall impression of the relative inferiority/superiority of the organization and its services. While other researchers (Cronin & Taylor, 1994) view service quality as a form of attitude representing a long-run overall evaluation, Parasuraman, Zeithaml & Berry (1985) defined service quality as a function of the differences between expectation and performance along the quality dimensions. This has appeared to be consistent with Roest & Pieters (1997) definition that service quality is a relativistic and cognitive discrepancy between experience-based norms and performances concerning service benefits. Many researchers (Oliver, 1981; Brady & Robertson, 2001; Lovelock, Patterson & Walker, 2001) conceptualize customer satisfaction as an individual’s feeling of pleasure or disappointment resulting from comparing a product’s perceived performance in relation to his or her expectations. Generally, there are two general conceptualizations of satisfaction, namely, transaction-specific satisfaction and cumulative satisfaction (Boulding et al., 1993; Jones & Suh, 2000; Yi & La, 2004). Transaction-specific satisfaction is a customer’s evaluation of his or her experience and reactions to a particular service encounter (Cronin & Taylor, 1992; Boshoff & Gray, 2004), and cumulative satisfaction refers to the customer’s overall evaluation of the consumption experience to date (Johnson, Anderson & Fornell, 1995).

Intentions are subjective judgements about how a person will behave in the future and usually serves as dependent variables in many service research and satisfaction models (Boulding et al., 1993; Soderlund & Ohman, 2003). Rust, Zahorik & Keiningham (1995) argues that repurchase intentions and actual repurchase patterns are not necessarily the same. Butcher (2005) agreed that repurchase intention is regarded as a sound service outcome that is measurable. While Soderlund & Ohman (2003) consider repurchase intentions as intentions-as-expectations, Hellier et al., (2003) defined repurchase intention as the individual’s judgement about buying again a designed service from the same company, taking into account his or her current situation and likely circumstances.

### IV. DISTINCTION BETWEEN SERVICE QUALITY AND CUSTOMER SATISFACTION

A review of the emerging literature suggests that there appears to be relative consensus among marketing researchers that service quality and customer satisfaction are separate constructs which is unique and share a close relationship (Cronin & Taylor, 1992; Oliver, 1993). Most researchers in the services field have maintained that these constructs are distinct (Bittner, 1990; Carman, 1990; Boulding et al., 1993; Spreng & Mackoy, 1996). Table 1 identifies a number of key elements that distinguish customer satisfaction from service quality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Customer satisfaction</th>
<th>Service quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Customer satisfaction can result from any dimension, whether or not it is quality related</strong></td>
<td>The dimensions underlying quality judgements are rather specific.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Customer satisfaction judgements can be formed by a large number of non-quality issues, such as needs, equity, perceptions of fairness.</strong></td>
<td>Expectations for quality are based on ideals or perceptions of excellence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Satisfaction judgements do require experience with the service or provider.</strong></td>
<td>Quality perceptions do not require experience with the service or provider.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Customer satisfaction is believed to have more conceptual antecedents.</strong></td>
<td>Service quality has less conceptual antecedents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from various sources (Taylor, 1993; Oliver, 1993; Rust & Oliver, 1994; Spreng & Mackoy, 1996; Choi et al., 2004; Grace & Cass, 2005).
V. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The paper developed a conceptual framework (see figure 1), which aims to examine the predictive ability as well as the nature and strength of relationship between service quality, customer satisfaction and repatronage intentions. All constructs were conceptualized to fit better into the current study setting. Based on the original view of Parasuraman, Zeithaml & Berry(1985), service quality was conceptualized as a function for the differences between expectation and performance along with fast-food attributes such as food quality, service transaction, environment, convenience issues, and its overall images.

VI. THE DIRECT EFFECT OF SERVICE ON REPATRONAGE INTENTIONS

Substantial empirical and theoretical evidence in the literature suggests that there is a direct link between service quality and behavioural intentions(Bitner,1990; Bolton & Drew, 1991). Among the various behavioural intentions, considerable emphasis has been placed on the impact of service quality in determining repeat purchase and customer loyalty (Jones & Farquhar,2003). As pointed out by Bolton(1998), service quality influences a customer’s subsequent behaviour, intentions and preferences. When a customer chooses a provider that provides service quality that meets or exceeds his or her expectations, he or she is more likely to choose the same provider again. Besides, Cronin & Taylor(1994) also found that service quality has a significant effect on repurchase intentions. Other studies which support that repurchase intentions are positively influenced by service quality include Zeithaml, Berry & Parasuraman(1996), Cronin & Taylor(1992,1994), Cronin, Brady & Hult(2000), and Choi et al.,(2004). Hence, it was hypothesized that:

H1: Service quality is positively related to re-patronage intentions.

VII. THE DIRECT EFFECT OF CUSTOMER SATISFACTION ON REPATRONAGE INTENTIONS

A wide variety of studies has been done to support the link between customer satisfaction and behavioural intentions (Fornell,1992; Rust & Zahorik,1993; Taylor & Baker, 1994; Patterson & Spreng,1997). Bearden & Teel(1983) argue that customer satisfaction is important to marketers because it is generally acceptable assumed to be a significant determinant of repeat sales, positive word of mouth, and customer loyalty. Similarly, Anderson & Sullivan(1993) have also argued that the more satisfied the customers are, the greater is their retention. This view is also supported by Ranaweera & Prabhu(2003) study that the effects of customer satisfaction on customer retention are found to be significant and positive. Specifically, the levels of customer satisfaction will influence the level of repurchase intentions and this is supported by past research in a wide variety of studies(Rust & Zahorik,1993; Taylor & Baker,1994; Patterson & Spreng,1997; Bolton, 1998; Hellier et al., 2003). On the basis of the above, it was then hypothesized that:

H2: Customer satisfaction is positively related to re-patronage intentions.

VIII. THE RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF SERVICE QUALITY AND CUSTOMER SATISFACTION FOR THE PREDICTION OF CUSTOMER REPATRONAGE INTENTIONS

Both service quality and customer satisfaction have widely been recognized as antecedents of repurchase intentions. However, it is believed that fast –food centre owners would like to know which of these variables exerts the strongest influence on re-patronage intentions. A recent study reveals that customer satisfaction is a better predictor of intentions to repurchase than service quality (Ravald & Gronroos,1996). Evidence is provided by Cronin & Taylor(1992) who found a much stronger relationship between customer satisfaction and repurchase intentions than the relationship between service quality and repurchase intentions. Academically, from a practitioner’s point of view, customer satisfaction is deemed to be more influential on repurchase intentions (Dabholkar,1995). Parasuraman, Zeithaml & Berry(1994) also revealed in their analyses that customer satisfaction is likely to achieve a greater level of statistical significance when both service quality and customer satisfaction have a significant effect on repurchase intentions.

H3: Customer satisfaction will be a stronger predictor of customer’s repatronage intention than service quality.

IX. RESEARCH METHODS

There are two major categories of restaurants in Nigeria(1) fast food centres and (2) family restaurant. Nigeria is Perhaps, not particularly known for the family restaurant scene and research has not been conducted on fast food restaurant. Hence, this paper focused only on the fast- food outlets as there is lack of studies carried out in this context in Nigeria. The sampling unit in this study was all fast food outlets in Lagos and Ogun state-Nigeria, which serves all manner of fast foods. A sample size of 420 was targeted and the subjects are the customers who visited the fast-food outlets at least three times in the past six months and involve an exchange of money for services rendered. A filtering question was used to screen qualified respondents who met the requirement.

X. DESIGN AND PROCEDURE

This study design is cross-sectional in nature and was conducted using self- administered questionnaires with the consent from the fast food outlets owner/managers. Pilot testing was conducted using a small convenience sample of 35 respondents, including the fast food managers who checked for any ambiguities and confusion in the first draft of the questionnaires. Data was collected from the customers who visited the various fast food outlets from January 2010 to April 2010. The respondents were informed that their participation was on a voluntary basis and all information provided would be kept private and confidential. Questionnaires were distributed only to those who qualified and agreed to participate in the study. The researcher then
briefly explained the nature and requirement of the survey before the respondent filled up the questionnaire.

XI. MEASURES

The multiple-items used to measure service quality were taken from Parasuraman, Zeithaml & Berry (1985) and Kivela, Reece & Inbakaran (1999). A total of 14 items was used and includes the additional item (i.e., operating hours convenience) based on the suggestions of the fast food outlets managers during the pilot testing. Single-item approach was used for the satisfaction and repatronage intention construct. Typically, assessment of reliability in terms of internal consistency cannot be computed for single-item measurement (Soderlund & Ohman, 2003). Rossiter (2002) has strongly argued that intentions should not be captured with multiple-item scales, as they invite the possibility of a confounded measurement. Though Churchill (1979) argued that single items are unreliable, Rossiter (2002) opposed this by demonstrating that the main issue is the validity problem rather than reliability problem. This is further supported by Westbrook & Oliver (1981) who indicated that single item rating scales were common among researchers in testing customer satisfaction. As the three main constructs were measured, using a five-point Likert scale. Selected demographic data was also collected at the end of the questionnaire.

XII. RESULTS

The statistical package for social sciences, windows version 13.0 (SPSS 13.0) was used to analyse the data collected.

The results for direct effect of service quality on repatronage intention revealed an r-value of 0.537 and the correlation is significant at p<.01. Based on this result, H1 was supported. Therefore, service quality has a positive relationship to repatronage intention. The strength of this relationship is considered moderate at 0.29 as measured by r-square value. As for the effect of customer satisfaction on repatronage intentions, it was found the satisfaction also has a positive influence on repatronage intention (r=0.822, P<.01). Therefore, H2 was also supported and the strength of the

**Table 2** provides a matrix of the correlation coefficient for the main measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Repatronage intention</th>
<th>Service quality</th>
<th>Customer satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Repatronage intention</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.537**</td>
<td>.822**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.(2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service quality</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.(2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer satisfaction</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.(2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
relationship between satisfaction and repatronage intention was relatively higher (r² = .68). It was also found that service quality is positively correlated with satisfaction (r = .486, P < .01). While the overall findings of the present study were similar to those in the services management literature, the results were somewhat different from Croin & Taylor’s (1992) findings that service quality was not able to influence repurchase intention directly. The results of this paper also differs from Hellier et al.’s (2003) study which found that customer satisfaction will not influence repurchase intentions directly. These differences could be due to different context and research methodology applied.

XIV. PREDICTING REPATRONAGE INTENTION

A multiple linear regression analysis was conducted to investigate the influence of service quality and satisfaction on repatronage intention. The test of multiple linear regression assumption found expected patterns for non-violation of the assumptions and this result supports the use of multiple linear regression as an appropriate statistical analysis for this study. Table 3 and 4 provide the results of the multiple linear regression analysis. Based on the results in Table 3, it seems that all three models have worked well in explaining the variation in repatronage intention (model 1: F = 153.402; df = 375; P = .0001; model 2: F = 509.763; df = 374; P = .0001; model 3: F = 30.831; df = 374; P = .0001). Overall, model 2 was better fitted compared to model 1 and 3 as indicated by F-value.

The proportion of explained variance as measured by R-square for model 2 was among the highest (R² = 0.70) compared to models 1 (R² = 0.29) and 3 (R² = 0.675). In other words, 70% of the variation in repatronage intention is explained by service quality and satisfaction in model 2. As indicated by the unstandardized coefficients (Table 4), both service quality (t = 5.533, P = .0001, b = 0.974) were found to exert a significant positive influence on repatronage intention. Lastly, the beta values for model 2 given in Table 4 seems to indicate customer satisfaction (β = 0.733) as a more important predictor of repatronage intention than service quality (β = 0.18). This supported H3 that customer satisfaction was a stronger predictor of customer’s repatronage intention than service quality. Hence, the result supports Allen, Machleit & Schultz Kleine’s (1992) argument that emotions act as a better predictor of behaviour than cognition does. Parasuraman, Zeithaml & Berry (1994) also mentioned that customer satisfaction is frequently more statistically significant, and tends to achieve a greater level of statistical significance compared to service quality. However, the result differs from Choi et al.’s (2004) study in health-care context, in which they found that service quality emerged as a more important determinant of behavioural intentions. However, a review by Dabholkar (1995) suggests that the relationship is situation-specific and therefore depends on the context of the service encountered.

### Table 3: Model Summary of Multiple Regression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Adjusted R²</th>
<th>Std Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
<th>Durbin Watson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R² change</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.539(a)</td>
<td>.290</td>
<td>.288</td>
<td>.977</td>
<td>.290</td>
<td>153.402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.836(b)</td>
<td>.700</td>
<td>.698</td>
<td>.636</td>
<td>.409</td>
<td>509.763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.675</td>
<td>.674</td>
<td>.661</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>30.831</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
a predictors: (Constant), Service Quality
b predictors: (Constant), Service Quality, Customer Satisfaction
c predictors: (Constant), Customer Satisfaction
d dependent Variable: Re-patronage Intentions

### Table 4: Coefficients Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.282</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.539</td>
<td>64.783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service quality</td>
<td>.935</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>12.386</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-.071</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>-.468</td>
<td>.640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service quality</td>
<td>.313</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>5.553</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Customer satisfaction</td>
<td>.974</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>22.578</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-4.93</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>-3.596</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Customer satisfaction</td>
<td>1.091</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>27.902</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model 2 fitted best compared to models 1 and 3 as indicated by F-value. The proportion of explained variance as measured by R-square for model 2 was among the highest (R² = 0.70) compared to models 1 (R² = 0.29) and 3 (R² = 0.675). In other words, 70% of the variation in repatronage intention is explained by service quality and satisfaction in model 2. As indicated by the unstandardized coefficients (Table 4), both service quality (t = 5.533, P = .0001, b = 0.974) were found to exert a significant positive influence on repatronage intention. Lastly, the beta values for model 2 given in Table 4 seems to indicate customer satisfaction (β = 0.733) as a more important predictor of repatronage intention than service quality (β = 0.18). This supported H3 that customer satisfaction was a stronger predictor of customer’s repatronage intention than service quality. Hence, the result supports Allen, Machleit & Schultz Kleine’s (1992) argument that emotions act as a better predictor of behaviour than cognition does. Parasuraman, Zeithaml & Berry (1994) also mentioned that customer satisfaction is frequently more statistically significant, and tends to achieve a greater level of statistical significance compared to service quality. However, the result differs from Choi et al.’s (2004) study in health-care context, in which they found that service quality emerged as a more important determinant of behavioural intentions. However, a review by Dabholkar (1995) suggests that the relationship is situation-specific and therefore depends on the context of the service encountered.
XV. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In summary, all the hypotheses were strongly supported and the proposed framework of the present study was able to demonstrate strong explanatory power. Notably, this study provides evidence for the direct effect of service quality and satisfaction on repatronage intention as suggested by the literature and satisfaction emerged as a stronger predictor of repatronage intentions in the fast food settings. A number of marketing implications can be drawn from this study. The descriptive result reveals that customers’ perception towards service quality level provided was consistently lower than their expectation. This implies that more effort is needed to improve the service quality level of fast food outlets. The frontline staff may well be trained to be more responsive and sensitive to customer needs, thus providing services that are more efficient and effective. In addition, the fast food atmosphere can also be improved by ensuring cleanliness and favourable ambience with appropriate music and lighting. Customer satisfaction is also very crucial for marketing planning since satisfaction does influence customer’s intention to repatronage the fast food outlets in future. Hence, marketers should look into the factors that would affect customer satisfaction level. In addition, as customer expectations are changing over time, practitioners are advised to measure their customer expectation and satisfaction regularly and handle complaints timely and effectively. The present study has a number of limitations. Firstly, the nature of sampling unit under study cannot be generalized to a larger population as only one restaurant was examined and the use of single-item measurement for satisfaction construct has low reliability (Churchill, 1979). Secondly, the causal relationship between service quality and satisfaction was not addressed in the present study. Thirdly, the use of cross-sectional data in a single industry also limits some of the conclusions obtained. In view of the limitations, future study should use different sampling units which are more generalizable and conduct the study nationwide. The proposed model can also be extended to other service industries or other types of restaurants. In terms of measurement issues, future research may use multiple items to strengthen the reliability of satisfaction construct. Also, the structural relationships among the three constructs should be examined. Additional constructs may also be added into this model, based on the literature, and be tested empirically.
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