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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine consumers' expectations regarding food, service, and amenities provided by on-site fast food restaurants in hotels. In relation to this, the study investigated several sub-issues which were consumers' attitudes combined with expectations concerning fast food restaurants in hotels, the consumers' preferred attributes of these restaurants and the factors that impact consumer attitudes, the correlation between consumers' expectations of these restaurants and the performance the restaurant provides for consumers, and the influence of consumers' expectations and restaurant performance on consumer satisfaction.

Data for the study were collected from 324 customers at in-hotel fast food restaurants in Las Vegas. The survey was conducted at three McDonald's which are located at Barbary Coast, Circus Circus, and Fitzgeralds and Burger King which is at Riviera hotel from April 27 through May 12 of 1993.

The results of data analysis show that customers of in-hotel fast food restaurants were mostly satisfied with food, service, and amenities provided by these fast food restaurants. Especially, features such as "appropriate temperature of the food," "employees' greeting you with a smile," and "quiet eating atmosphere" had a great influence on customer satisfaction. The main attributes of customers' expectations of in-hotel fast food restaurants were "cleanliness," "neatness of establishment," "convenience of location," "comfortable room temperature," and "availability of food on the menu" by utilizing importance-performance
analysis technique. Among these five attributes the attribute "convenience of location" was the most satisfactory factor to customers because of low expectation and high performance. The best attributes of these restaurants performance were "neatness of establishment," "cleanliness," and "convenience of location." Whereas, the worst attribute was "quiet eating atmosphere."

The findings of the study will help fast food operators to understand customers' expectation of in-hotel fast food restaurants and to develop their marketing strategy which will be focused on making their products and advertisements consistent with customers' perceived expectations of the restaurants.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

In the United States, the baby-boom generation of the 1960s and 1970s and the increase of dual income earning families have fueled the expansion of fast food restaurants (Rice, 1985). These two factors have led fast food restaurants to offer larger options and more sophisticated decorations. Expansion has especially been marked by a rapid growth of chain restaurants such as McDonald's, Wendy's, Burger King and pizza-oriented restaurants (Martin, 1992). These companies offer convenience, quick served food, and friendly employee service.

A 1986 report by the National Restaurant Association showed that 140,700 fast-food units with sales of $53 billion were in operation (Emerson, 1990; Foodservice Equipment & Supplies Specialist, 1987). In 1992, the number of units increased to 180,125 with more than $80 billion sales volume (Foodservice Equipment & Supplies Specialist, 1993).

There also has been another substantial factor in the growth of fast food restaurants. The fast food restaurant operators continuously draw their consumers to their properties by focusing on changing consumer eating patterns. The National Restaurant Association in 1989 reported that consumers were health-conscious and concerned about nutrition (Clark, 1991), and that fast food restaurants were expanding their menus to include low calorie and low sodium items in order to meet the demands of their increasingly sophisticated consumers (Restaurants and Institutions, 1989).
The convenience and consistency of products as well as the variety of menus are the main reasons influencing the consumer's choice of a fast food restaurant (Emerson, 1990; Powers, 1988). According to a study conducted by the National Restaurant Association (1983), consumers ate at a fast food restaurant primarily because of their lack of time and the convenience offered by the restaurant. These primary features might also be important to guests in hotel properties (Powers, 1988). For example, La Quinta Motor Inns has on-site franchised restaurants serving quick breakfasts for guests (Nation's Restaurant News, 1985). A 1992 statistical analysis showed that 23 chain hotels operate 385 fast food restaurants on their properties (Directory of chain restaurant operators 1992).

The recent penetration of fast food restaurants into hotel operations is an ongoing trend. Despite this new market development of fast food restaurants, few studies have been conducted in this area, especially from the perspective of hotel operations. Examining whether this new type of restaurant operation is satisfying consumers' expectations would be helpful in both hotel and restaurant marketing.

1. Problem Recognition

The current data (CGS Information Services, 1992) show that many hotels have fast food restaurants in their properties (Table 1.1). For example, Circus Circus Enterprises, Inc., a family-oriented hotel in Las Vegas, Nevada, has three on-site fast food restaurants. Hilton Hotels Corporation operates 300 fast food restaurants. In response to this trend, nationally recognized fast food restaurants, such as McDonald's,
### Table 1.1. Fast Food Restaurants in Chain Hotels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Trading Style</th>
<th>Type of food service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aztar Crop.</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Ramada Exp. Hotel &amp; Casino TropWorld Casino Tropicana Casino Hotel</td>
<td>Cafeteria(2) Family Restaurant(7) Fast Food(2) Table Cloth(6) Dinnerhouse(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glacier Park, Inc.</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Glacier Park Lodge Lake McDonald Lodge Many Glacier Hotel Prince of Wales Hotel Rising Sun Motor Inn Swift Current Motor Inn Village Inn</td>
<td>Family Restaurant(3) Fast Food(2) Table Cloth(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilton Hotels Corp.</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Conrad Hotels Hilton Garden Inn Hilton Hotels Hilton Inn Hilton Suites</td>
<td>Family Restaurant(700) Fast Food(300) Table Cloth(100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Florida Resort Inns, Inc.</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Colonial Gateway Inn Comfort Gateway Inn Holiday Inn Howard Johnson International Gateway</td>
<td>Cafeteria(1) Family Restaurant(5) Fast Food(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams Investment Co.</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Econo Lodge Days Inn Howard Johnson</td>
<td>Fast Food(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Stormont Companies</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Atlanta Marriot Gwinnett Place Emory Inn Marriot Baypoint Resort Northic Waterside Marriot Hotel</td>
<td>Dinnerhouse(7) Family Restaurant(4) Fast Food(1) Table Cloth(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motel Properties, Inc.</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Clarion Buccaneer Resort Comfort Inn Comfort Inn Island Suites</td>
<td>Dinnerhouse(1) Family Restaurant(2) Fast Food(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hagadone Hospitality Co.</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Best Western Coeur D'Alene Resort Holiday Inn Kootenai River Inn</td>
<td>Table Cloth(1) Dinnerhouse(3) Family Restaurant(3) Fast Food(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitol Hotel Group</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>Arlington Hilton Days Inn Hyatt Regency, etc</td>
<td>Cafeteria(1) Dinnerhouse(21) Family Restaurant(21) Fast Food(1) Table Cloth(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Trading Style</td>
<td>Type of food service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITT Sheraton Corp.</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Sheraton Hotels</td>
<td>Cafeteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dinnerhouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Family Restaurant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fast Food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Table Cloth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circus Circus Ent., Inc.</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>Circus Circus</td>
<td>Dinnerhouse(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excalibur</td>
<td>Family Restaurant(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Silver City, etc</td>
<td>Fast Food(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inn America Hospitality Inc.</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>Holiday Inn</td>
<td>Family Restaurant(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clarion Hotel, etc</td>
<td>Dinnerhouse(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fast Food(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Table Cloth(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tollman-Hundley Hotels</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>Days Inn</td>
<td>Dinnerhouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Holiday Inn</td>
<td>Table Cloth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Family Restaurant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fast Food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Carolina Management</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Comfort Inn</td>
<td>Dinnerhouse(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sheraton Inn</td>
<td>Family Restaurant(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Days Inn, etc</td>
<td>Fast Food(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrah's Reno</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>Harrah's Reno</td>
<td>Dinnerhouse(25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Harrah's Lake Tahoe</td>
<td>Family Restaurant(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Harrah's Del Rio, etc</td>
<td>Fast Food(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoney's Inns</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>Shoney's Inn</td>
<td>Dinnerhouse(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Family Restaurant(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fast Food(30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TW Recreational Services, Inc.</td>
<td>UT</td>
<td>Bryce Canyon Lodge</td>
<td>Family Restaurant(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zion Lodge, etc</td>
<td>Fast Food(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WY</td>
<td>Canyon Lodge</td>
<td>Cafeteria(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lake Lodge, etc</td>
<td>Dinnerhouse(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Family Restaurant(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fast Food(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Table Cloth(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nightclub/Bar(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowbird Corp.</td>
<td>UT</td>
<td>Cliff Lodge</td>
<td>Dinnerhouse(17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Inn</td>
<td>Fast Food(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lodge at Snowbird</td>
<td>Table Cloth(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tidewater Inn Management</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>Comfort Inn</td>
<td>Dinnerhouse(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hampton Inns</td>
<td>Family Restaurant(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Holiday Inns</td>
<td>Fast Food(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hotel Group, Inc.</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Embassy Inn</td>
<td>Dinnerhouse(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hampton Inn</td>
<td>Family Restaurant(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elm Inn, etc</td>
<td>Table Cloth(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fast Food(1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Burger King, and Wendy's, are continuously attempting to develop their market in unconventional areas (Nation's Restaurant News, 1985).

As the restaurant market expands, consumers' attitudes of fast food restaurants in hotels create a new issue of whether they expect the same features as those found in conventional areas. Many studies have been conducted, focusing only on the overall consumer attitudes of typical fast food restaurants, without specifying their market segments (National Restaurant Association, 1983). Unfortunately, however, studies of unconventional areas such as hotels, hospitals, prisons, and schools have not been conducted.

2. Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of this study is to examine consumers' expectations regarding food, service, and amenities provided by on-site fast food restaurants in hotels. In relation to this, consumers' attitudes combined with expectations concerning fast food restaurants in hotels are examined. This study also investigates the consumers' preferred attributes of fast food restaurants in hotels and the factors that impact consumer attitudes. The study further discusses several additional aspects of consumers' attitudes. Specifically, the following four sub-issues are considered in this study.

1) What are the major features consumers encounter at fast
What factors contribute to consumers' expectations?

3) How do consumers' expectations of fast food restaurants in hotels correlate with the performance the restaurant provides for consumers?

4) What influence do consumers' expectations and restaurant performance have on consumer satisfaction?

Finally, the results of this study will be incorporated into a comprehensive plan to suggest a marketing strategy tailored to consumers' expectations for fast food restaurants in hotels.

3. Delimitations

This study is a replication and extension of previous research of consumers' expectations related to the performance the restaurant offers. Since it is unique to investigate consumers' expectations regarding fast food restaurants in hotels, this study follows the general methodology used by consumer behavior researchers. This study does not establish hypotheses because it is conducted as an exploratory study.

The survey method of this study employed a self-administrated questionnaire. The survey was conducted at a fast food restaurant in a hotel by the researcher. The sample included consumers who dined at the restaurant. The survey required a quick
response from the consumer without disturbing the restaurant business or the respondents. Many empirical studies (Aaker and Keller, 1990; Asam and Bucklin, 1973; Chon et al 1991; Reibstein et al 1980; Swan and Combs, 1976) have shown that a self-reported questionnaire survey is appropriate for the study of consumer attitudes.

The survey target was limited to nationally recognized burger chain restaurants in hotels, which are ranked within the top 100 (Nation's Restaurant News, 1992). Because these restaurants have dominated the fast food service market, the study of burger chain restaurants may contribute to the generalizability of the survey results.

The geographical setting was the city of Las Vegas. In general, it is impossible to conduct a survey throughout the country. Therefore, Las Vegas was selected as the geographical location for the survey. This city was chosen because the city is dominated by hotels and there are several fast food properties in these hotels.

4. Significance of the Study

This study will contribute to the understanding of consumers' attitudes of fast food restaurants in hotels. The results of the study can be used to develop a marketing strategy for fast food operators. By understanding consumer preferences, operators can provide consumers with features which meet their needs and wants and, ultimately, benefit the restaurant.

In addition, hotel operators may utilize the study findings in order to increase
their marketing information data base. Consumers' preferred attributes of fast food restaurants in hotels will enable them to improve the fast food property's performance. This study will also promote future research in the area of consumers' expectations and the performance of fast food restaurants in hotels.

5. Definition of Terms

1) Fast food restaurant(s): The term "fast food restaurant(s)" is defined as those types of establishments which are primarily self-service and which may offer carry out as well as on premise service (National Restaurant Association, 1983). In this study this term embraces nationally recognized fast food restaurants which are ranked within the top 10 based on their sales volume.

2) Consumer: The term "consumer" is used synonymously with "customer," "patron" or "guest" of the fast food restaurant.

6. Organization of the Study

This study focuses on investigating consumers' attitudes of hotel fast food restaurants and also their expectations and satisfaction related to the performance of on-site hotel fast food restaurants in Las Vegas. In Chapter I, the study's problem, purposes, and delimitations were described with a brief mention about fast food restaurant trends. Chapter II includes a review of the literature related to consumers'
attitudes and importance-performance analysis. A detailed explanation about the
survey methodology will be provided in Chapter III. Chapter IV will display the
survey results. In conclusion, Chapter V will discuss and interpret the results and give
suggestions for future research.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In an attempt to provide adequate background information and a better understanding of consumers' attitudes as related to fast food consumption, this chapter will include the following subjects: (1) consumer preferences for fast food; (2) review of consumer attitudes; (3) analysis of the importance-performance instrument; and (4) summary.

1. Consumer Preferences for Fast Food

During the last decade studies on consumer preferences have been recognized as a core marketing tool by fast food operators (Emerson, 1990; Harris, 1990; National Restaurant Association, 1983; Manzl, 1990; Powers, 1988; Swinyare and Struman, 1989). This point of view in understanding consumer preferences is a prerequisite for developing adequate marketing strategies, providing quality food service, and operating the restaurant. Fast food operators, therefore, pay great attention to the unexpected change of consumer concerns. For example, the survey conducted in 1975 (Emerson) explained the most important issues in consumers' mind to be related to the hygiene of fast food restaurants. In contrast, today's fast food restaurant operators should think more specifically about keeping up with consumer preferences and needs such as diversified menus, healthy and nutritious fast foods, quality service, and overall
restaurant amenities (Chaudhry, 1992).

Researchers (Address to security analysts, 1989; Christiansen, 1989; National Restaurant Association, 1983) pointed out that the main determinants of consumers' choice of fast food restaurants were convenience, cleanliness and lack of time. These attributes have contributed to both the success of fast food restaurants and consumers' satisfaction. In addition, continuous menu development by fast food restaurants has met consumer demands for nutritious and healthful foods by adding new products and altering existing menu items. In response to these trends, major burger chain restaurants have test-marketed new health products and the use of more healthy frying oil. McDonald's, the number one fast food restaurant chosen by consumers (Nation's Restaurant News, 1988), has tested carrot and celery sticks, Wendy's is experimenting with a grilled-chicken sandwich, and Burger King has a flame-broiled sandwich on its menu (Nation's Restaurant News, 1990).

When it comes to consumer preferences for fast food restaurants, speed in order and service is an indispensable attribute. According to data from the Washington Post (1990), one of the important attributes consumers considered was quickness provided by fast food restaurants. Besides this, they perceived fast food restaurants as very different from other restaurants, considered location to be a very important attribute, and preferred fast food restaurants because they were good places to eat with children. Considering consumer preferences of fast food restaurants, these all attributes interact and influence these preferences.

Studies of consumer preferences are very complicated and difficult to explain
because several attributes of consumers' concerns interact with each other to reach a
decision. This complexity and difficulty has drawn research attention from many
different, but related, areas such as marketing, sociology and social psychology, and
economics. These interdisciplinary research efforts have resulted in more systematized
approaches to the topic and refined research methods in the field.

2. Review of Consumer Attitudes

Most nationally recognized fast food restaurants, especially McDonald's and
Burger King, have implemented quality measurement programs in an attempt to relate
consumer evaluations of quality to product/service attributes (Emerson, 1990; Hauser
and Clausing, 1988). They conduct surveys that elicit consumer evaluations of food,
service and amenities (National Restaurant Association, 1983), plus information about
consumers' recent experiences at these restaurants. This information is used to identify
service improvement opportunities and predict restaurants' effect on consumer
satisfaction and/or attitudes, as well as to evaluate the organizational units providing
the service (Bolton and Drew, 1991). According to the National Restaurant
Association (1983), consumers patronizing fast food restaurants have a unique
expectation of food, service, and amenities. First of all, they expect consistency in
food, cleanliness, quick service, and tasty food provided from one visit to the next.
They also like their food to have a pleasing appearance, the appropriate temperature,
and to contain fresh ingredients.
Research (Anderson, 1973; Cardozo, 1965; Oliver and Bearden, 1985; Oliver and DeSarbo, 1988; Olshavsky and Miller, 1972; Tse et al, 1990; Webster, 1991; Westbrook and Oliver, 1991) shows that the notion of satisfaction has been the key component in understanding consumer behaviors in various disciplines. Cardozo (1965) stated that consumer satisfaction with a product was influenced by the effort expended to acquire the product and the expectations concerning the product. Beginning with his early work, the field of consumer satisfaction matured into a research stream exemplified by: (1) variations in the expectancy disconfirmation model (Bearden and Teel, 1983; Churchill and Suprenant, 1982; LaBarbera and Mazursky, 1983; Oliver, 1980; Woodruff et al, 1983); (2) other perspectives of interest including equity (Huppertz et al, 1978) and attribution (Folkes, 1984); and (3) models extending satisfaction to the redress process (Day, 1980; Richins, 1983).

When it comes to the consumer purchase decision-making process, numerous variables are thought to influence the process as the many models of consumer behavior demonstrate. Consumers' perceptions and attitudes have been studied by many researchers (Anderson, 1973; Halstead, 1989; LaTour and Peat, 1979; Oliver and DeSarbo, 1988; Olshavsky and Miller, 1972; Reibstein et al, 1980; Swan and Combs, 1976) who have focused on expectations of perceived product performance and consumer satisfaction. Figure 2.1 combines several theories into a contemporary model to show both extrinsic and intrinsic influences on consumer behaviors. It presents a consumer decision-making process concerning the purchase of goods and services.
Literature related to consumer expectation and satisfaction consistently indicates that an individual's expectations are confirmed when a fast food restaurant performs as expected, negatively disconfirmed when the fast food restaurant performs more poorly than expected, and positively disconfirmed when the fast food restaurant performs better than expected. Dissatisfaction appears when the individual's expectations are negatively disconfirmed (Day, 1977; Monroe and Krishnan, 1983).

**Figure 2.1 A Contemporary Consumer Decision-Making Model**

Extrinsic Influences:
- Culture
- Socioeconomic level
- Reference groups
- Household

Intrinsic Influences:
- Needs
- Experience
- Personality & self-image
- Perceptions & attitudes

Need arousal ➔ Information retrieval ➔ Evaluating alternative choices ➔ Consumption decision ➔ Postconsumption feelings


Having roots in this concept, expectancy disconfirmation has two processes consisting of the confirmation of expectations and the disconfirmation of those expectations through performance comparisons. Oliver (1980) noted that consumers
were believed to form their expectations on product performance characteristics prior to product purchase. Subsequent purchase and continuous experience reveal actual performance levels of a product that are compared to expectation levels estimated by a better-than, worse-than method. A judgment that results from this comparison is labeled as negative disconfirmation if the fast food restaurant performs worse than expected, positive disconfirmation if better than expected, and simple confirmation if as good as expected.

Suppose that consumers at fast food restaurants expect their meal within five minutes after arrival based on their past experience. It is most likely that service will take close to five minutes, and possibly less. If not, it results in negative disconfirmation (Goering, 1985).

Consumer expectations are heavily influenced by past personal experience. As mentioned by Olshavsky and Miller (1972), the effects on disconfirmation of expectancy for a product may result in either negative or positive directions. Two levels of expectation and two levels of product performance can create four conditions: high expectation-high performance, high expectation-low performance, low expectation-high performance, and low expectation-low performance. Disparity between expectations and the actual product performance (Anderson, 1973; Cardozo, 1965; Churchill and Surprenant, 1982; Oliver, 1979; Oliver, 1980; Olshavsky and Miller, 1972; Olson and Dover, 1979; Swan and Trawick, 1980; Tse and Wilton, 1988), especially in the case of high expectation-low performance (regarded as negative disconfirmation) (Oliver, 1980) and low expectation-high performance
(labeled as positive disconfirmation) (Cardozo, 1965), has been explained by four theories:
(1) cognitive dissonance (assimilation); (2) contrast; (3) generalized negativity; and (4) assimilation-contrast (Anderson, 1973) (see Figure 2.2).

Anderson (1973) explained that according to the cognitive dissonance (assimilation theory), consumers will minimize the difference between expectations and product performance by adjusting their perceptions of the product to be more consistent with their expectations. In the contrast theory, consumers want to magnify the disparity between the product received and the product expected. The generalized negative theory states that any disparity between expectations and reality results in a generalized negative state, causing the product to receive a more unfavorable rating than if it had coincided with expectations. Finally, the assimilation-contrast approach maintains that consumers want to accept or reject this difference on the basis of their perceptions.

The effects of expectancy disconfirmation are related to satisfaction/dissatisfaction with a product (e.g., fast food restaurant) (Anderson, 1973; Swan and Trawick, 1980; Tse and Wilton, 1988), because satisfaction is accomplished as a result of a subjective comparison between expected and received product attribute levels (Andreason, 1977; Day, 1977; Oliver, 1977, 1981). In fact, consumer satisfaction resulting from expectations and disconfirmation has a definite impact on attitude change, repeat purchase, and brand loyalty (Churchill and Suprenaut, 1982). Therefore, the evaluations of consumer expectations of fast food restaurants and the actual performance have been seriously considered by restaurant operators and marketers.
Figure 2.2 Theories of Disconfirmation of Expectations

3. Analysis of Importance-performance Instrument

Importance-performance analysis has been frequently used to measure consumer attitudes toward salient product or service attributes (Hawes and Rao, 1985) and to examine both the importance of certain selected attributes and the perceived performance of those attributes (Alberty and Mihalik, 1989; Chon et al, 1991; Dolinsky and Caputo, 1991; Fletcher et al, 1992; Hollenhorst et al, 1992; Martilla and James, 1977; Mengak et al, 1986; Ortinau et al, 1989; Sethna, 1982). This quick and simple method has helped marketers in decision-making processes (Hollenhorst et al, 1992; Mengak, 1985). Though evidence is clear that this analytical tool has been popular for research, especially in such areas as education, the automobile industry, and the housing industry (Alberty and Mihalik, 1989; Hawes and Gilson, 1983; Martilla and James, 1977; Sethna, 1982), little is found in the research of restaurant industries.

Importance-performance analysis is an evaluation of consumers' satisfaction which stems from their expectations and from their judgment of the product/service performance (Propst and Lime, 1982). A consumer's total satisfaction with a product or service reflects both the importance of the product/service features perceived by the consumer and the performance of the product/service that is provided to the consumer (Martilla and James, 1977). Swan and Combs (1976) indicated that the importance
consumers expect from a product's performance directly influences their satisfaction. Similarly, Bush and Ortinau (1986) suggested that hotel guests' perceptions of importance associated with selected hotel features not only helps in identifying consumers' critical hotel choice criteria, but also establishes a basis for determining consumers' satisfaction toward various service dimensions offered by a hotel. Consequently, to apply the importance-performance analysis technique to the evaluation of consumer attitudes toward on-site fast food restaurants, two key questions about these restaurants' features have to be carefully considered: (1) How important is this feature? and (2) How well did the feature perform?

The importance-performance analysis technique involves several processes. Alberty and Mihalik (1989) used six steps to evaluate adult education settings, as did Martilla and James (1977). Fletcher et al (1992) and Chon et al (1991), however, implemented the analysis in a three-step process. This study follows a three-step process. The first step involves identifying the important features or attributes of fast food restaurants. The twenty questionnaire items are designed to evaluate food, service, and amenities of in-hotel fast food restaurants. Next, consumers at on-site fast food restaurants in hotels were asked to evaluate the perceived importance and performance of each feature or attribute using a 5-point Likert-type scale. Third, mean scores for "importance" and "performance" of each attribute were calculated and plotted on the two-dimensional "action grid" developed by Martilla and James (1977).

As noted by Martilla and James (1977), an attribute of importance-performance analysis is that the mean importance and performance results can be graphically
displayed on an easily interpreted, two-dimensional grid (see Figure 2.3). Moreover, the four quadrants formed by the grid can enhance consumers' qualitative interpretation of the mean importance and performance rating scores associated with each attribute (Ortinau et al., 1989). Each quadrant can be described as follows:

**Figure 2.3 Example of the Traditional Importance-Performance Grid**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quadrant</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Concentrate Here</td>
<td>Very high importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Keep up the Good Work</td>
<td>Very low importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Low Priority</td>
<td>Worst performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Possible Overkill</td>
<td>Best performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

very high importance

worst performance

best performance

very low importance
A. Concentrate Here: This quadrant contains attributes which are important, but not adequately satisfying the needs of the consumer. These features will require modification and improvement if customers are to be retained. Those items identified and being modified can be promoted as new and/or improved to entice repeat consumption.

B. Keep up the Good Work: This has correlations with features which are important to consumers and for which the restaurant is performing well. Management must make efforts to keep performing at this level of excellence.

C. Low Priority: This area is composed of features which are neither important to consumers and for which the restaurant is not performing well. These attributes require no management strategy except in regard to meeting preestablished standards identified by the restaurant.

D. Possible Overkill: The attributes contained in this quadrant are not viewed as important, but are being done well. As they lack importance, less concentration is required on these features.
Management may choose to reallocate resources to the upper quadrants.

Ortinau et al (1989), however, do not feel that importance-performance analysis is adequate. They contend that the traditional importance-performance analysis has led to misinterpretations of actual performance levels. Figure 2.3 illustrates the problem. The performance axis displayed on the grid gives rise to two logical and important questions: What part of the performance scale line represents a good performance? and Where on the grid do the rating results demonstrate the best performance? To overcome these weaknesses, Ortinau et al (1989) suggested that the traditional importance-performance analysis can be methodologically advanced by integrating it with the expectation-performance paradigm used for investigating consumers' satisfaction or dissatisfaction with products and services. The performance can be evaluated by utilizing the general concept that satisfaction/dissatisfaction regarding performance results from the confirmation or disconfirmation of expectations (Anderson, 1973; Ortinau and Bush, 1987; Ortinau et al, 1989). For example, consumers are more likely to express satisfaction when in-hotel fast food restaurants' performance meet (confirm) or exceed (positively disconfirm) their expectations, and are more likely to express dissatisfaction when performances fall short of (negatively disconfirm) expectations.

4. Summary

This chapter reviewed literature related to the recent trends of fast food
restaurants, consumer attitudes toward fast food in general in light of consumers' expectation and actual product performance, and importance-performance analysis. In the past, research was conducted to explain consumers' perception of and preference for fast food. These previous research produced many suggestions useful for fast food operators to meet customers' needs for products and service. However, consumer attitudes toward fast food restaurants in non-traditional sites, for example, fast food restaurants in hotels, remains under-researched.

Previous studies focusing on consumers' expectation-performance which resulted in consumers' overall satisfaction with products and service should be developed in order to gain reliability and validity, replicating and extending the study areas. Description of consumer attitudes of the food, service, and amenities of in-hotel fast food restaurants can be facilitated by examining the extent to which consumers' expectations are met and satisfied. However, discrepancies between consumers' expectations and actual product performance are linked to consumers' satisfaction/dissatisfaction. Therefore, this disparity has to be examined closely in order to increase consumers' satisfaction (in case of low expectation and high performance) and to adjust the actual product performance to what consumers expect (in case of high expectation and low performance).

As an analytical tool to evaluate consumer attitudes of fast food restaurants, importance-performance analysis was proposed as a viable instrument. If incorporated with the expectation-performance paradigm, this approach can be further advanced in its accuracy and validity. Attractive features of in-hotel fast food restaurants perceived
by consumers should be taken into account when studying consumer attitudes of these new markets.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

1. Questionnaire Design

The purpose of this study was to evaluate consumer attitudes toward the food, service, and amenities provided by fast food restaurants in hotels, utilizing the importance-performance analysis technique.

The questionnaire administered to a sample of customers of fast food restaurants in hotels is composed of five pages, including the cover page (see Appendix 1). The questionnaire was designed to be answered by the respondent. The respondent was requested to rate the importance of attributes for an in-hotel fast food restaurant. Also, the respondent rated the actual performance of the restaurant on these same attributes.

The questionnaire contains four parts. Part I examined the consumer’s expectation of a fast food restaurant in a hotel (twenty attributes). The consumer’s expectation of each attribute has already been established at the prepurchase level. This expectation can be explained by the importance of the attribute, linked to the specification for the food, service, and amenities of an in-hotel fast food restaurant.

Part II explored the consumer’s evaluation of the actual performance of this restaurant (twenty attributes). Using the importance-performance analysis technique developed by Martilla and James (1977), the respondents were asked to rate the
importance of twenty attributes for respondents' expectations and the actual restaurant performance for these same features. In parts I and II, the questionnaire would explore "how important the feature was" and "how well the feature performed."

In part III, the respondents were asked to express their beliefs about fast food restaurants in hotels (seven questions) and the overall satisfaction with these restaurants (one question). The seven questions addressed general attributes of the fast food restaurant: consistency, convenient service for the child, quick service, no waiting line, fresh food served with high quality, and accessibility to customers.

Finally, part IV collected the respondents' demographic data, including gender, household income and age. In this section, the questionnaire also asked how often the respondent visited these restaurants, the person accompanying them, and meal time.

The questionnaire is a slightly revised one used by the National Restaurant Association (1983). Additional questions were added for the present study.

The questionnaire was refined with a pretest. The pretest was administered to twelve graduate students in a hotel management class in the College of Hotel Administration at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. The objective of the pretest was to examine the clarity and understanding of each question. Most respondents made comments on wording and the length of the instrument. Based on the results of the pretest, the questionnaire was revised.

A five-point Likert Scale was employed in parts I and II to evaluate the consumers' expectations and the actual product performance. For the expectation evaluation, the scale ranged from 5 (very high expectation) to 1 (very low
expectation). The performance scale was measured on a five-point Likert Scale ranging from 5 (the best) to 1 (the worst).

Part III employed a five-point Likert measurement scaled from 5 (strongly agree) to 1 (strongly disagree) in order to capture the general respondent's perception of the fast food restaurant. A Delighted-Terrible (DT) scale was used to measure the degree of customer satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the in-hotel fast food restaurant. Because it indicates the superior convergent validity (Maddox, 1985), the DT scale was employed in the present study to measure consumers' satisfaction with fast food restaurants in hotels.

2. Survey Methods

Fast food restaurants in hotels were contacted to arrange for the survey. McDonald's and Burger King approved the survey at their properties in Las Vegas, i.e., McDonald's at Barbary Coast, Circus Circus, and Fitzgeralds and Burger King at Riviera. The survey period was April 27 through May 12 of 1993.

All of the customers dining at the fast food restaurant were qualified as a sample of the survey. Approximately 75 potential respondents per hour visited each restaurant. The survey was conducted at the Riviera Hotel during the first four days and 73 responses were collected. Two hundred seventy one respondents were asked to answer the questionnaire during the other eight days. A total of 344 respondents completed the survey. However, 20 out of the 344 responses were eliminated from the
data analysis because of inappropriate responses. Therefore, the sample size was 324 customers.

The survey was conducted solely by the researcher. The surveyor tried to minimize interviewer bias in sampling by approaching potential respondents randomly. However, even though great effort was made to conduct an unbiased survey, the sample is not representative of all consumers at in-hotel fast food restaurants primarily because of the restricted 14 day survey period. Also, about 30 percent of the people interviewed refused to join the survey because of time constraints and unwillingness to participate.

3. Data Analysis

Data were coded and entered into a main frame computer for analysis. Minitab was the statistical package utilized to perform all statistical analyses.

Descriptive statistics were employed to obtain frequency distributions for all items. The 20 attributes were categorized into three major areas of concern: food, service, and amenities provided by the in-hotel fast food restaurant. Additionally, means were generated for all importance and performance features. These were used to depict graphically the position of each attribute on the importance-performance grid in order to investigate how important these features were and how well they performed. The four quadrants were defined by importance and performance axes which intersected at the mean of the overall mean for each attribute. The continuum
ranged from 1.0 to 5.0 and the calculated importance mean and performance mean for each attribute were then plotted on the grid. In particular, in order to measure performance-satisfaction, the performance mean for each attribute and the overall satisfaction were regressed. Also, the discrepancy between the importance and performance ratings of the respondents was examined. Finally, t-tests were employed to compare the mean ratings of the importance and performance attributes.
Chapter IV
RESULTS AND FINDINGS

This chapter presents the results of the survey conducted at fast food restaurants in Las Vegas hotels. First, the characteristics of the sample are noted. Second, the substantial features of consumers' perceived expectations associated with restaurant performance are illustrated. Third, differences between expectations and performance impacting consumers' satisfaction/dissatisfaction with in-hotel fast food restaurants are presented. Fourth, a discussion of the customer's major concerns about fast food restaurants in hotels is included. Finally, the results of the t tests of importance-performance attributes are presented.

1. Characteristics of the Sample

The sample for this study consisted of customers at in-hotel fast food restaurants in Las Vegas. Of the 324 respondents, 155 (48 percent) were male and 164 (51 percent) were female. Five respondents did not indicate their gender. 85 respondents (26 percent) were hotel guests, 235 respondents (73 percent) were local residents, and four did not report their status.

Table 4.1 shows the age distribution of the respondents. The age group from 26 to 44 had the highest frequency of dining at fast food restaurants in hotels. Respondents above the age of 65 (17.3 percent) exceeded slightly the number of the
respondents under 25 (14.5 percent).

Table 4.1. Age Distribution of Survey Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Categories</th>
<th>Respondents (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 25</td>
<td>47 (14.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 to 34</td>
<td>70 (21.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 44</td>
<td>72 (22.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 54</td>
<td>36 (11.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 64</td>
<td>39 (12.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 65</td>
<td>56 (17.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>4 (1.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 324 (100.0%)

Note: Subtotals may not total 100 percent due to rounding.

As shown in Table 4.2, the annual household income respondents was distributed evenly for each category. Accordingly, most of the respondents could
afford to dine at fast food restaurants regardless of their income. In particular, the respondents who earned from $25,000 to $34,999 appeared to patronize in-hotel fast food restaurants more than other income groups. Unfortunately, one-eighth of the respondents refused to indicate their annual household income.

Table 4.2. Annual Household Income of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Household Income</th>
<th>Respondents (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $15,000</td>
<td>32 (9.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 to $24,999</td>
<td>41 (12.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 to $34,999</td>
<td>52 (16.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000 to $44,999</td>
<td>39 (12.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$45,000 to $54,999</td>
<td>40 (12.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$55,000 to $64,999</td>
<td>36 (11.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above $65,000</td>
<td>44 (13.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>40 (12.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 324 (100.0%)

Note: Subtotal may no total 100 percent due to rounding.
2. Substantial Features of Consumers' Importance and Performance

The consumers' expectations of in-hotel fast food restaurants and actual restaurant performance are shown in Table 4.3. This table includes mean ratings for each attribute. The critical features of consumers' importance associated with their expectation toward in-hotel fast food restaurants are ranked: (1) cleanliness; (2) neatness of establishment; (3) convenience of location; (4) comfortable room temperature; and (5) availability of food on the menu (see Table 4.4). Quick food delivery and employee attitude were less important. This is consistent with the National Restaurant Association survey (1983), where the majority of consumers at fast food restaurants had high expectations of property cleanliness. These five highly ranked features of consumers' expectations though, appear to exceed actual restaurant performance, except for the feature "convenience of location."

In Figure 4.1, the means for the respondents (see Table 4.5) were plotted on the Importance-Performance grid. The point of intersection on the grid was 3.9 for Importance and 3.8 for Performance. Thirty-five percent of the attributes were contained within the "KEEP UP THE GOOD WORK" quadrant. These included: availability of food on the menu (8); quickness of food delivery (11); helpful attitude of employees (13); comfortable room temperature (14); neatness of establishment (15); cleanliness (16); and convenience of location (20). This upper right quadrant indicates that these features have highest importance and highest performance, suggesting that the fast food restaurants in hotels did a good job of providing these features.
Table 4.3. In-hotel Fast Food Restaurant Attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Responses</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td># of Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Appropriate temperature of the food</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Prices of drinks and meals</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tastiness of food</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Variety of menu</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Freshness of raw ingredients</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Size of portions</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Food quality</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. No waiting to be served or seated</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Employees' greeting you with a smile</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Quickness of food delivery</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Responsiveness to complaints</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Helpful attitude of employees</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Comfortable room temperature</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Neatness of establishment</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Cleanliness</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Comfortable seating</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Quiet eating atmosphere</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Spaciousness of establishment</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Convenience of location</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.4. Customer Attribute Rankings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th># of Responses</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th># of Responses</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>322</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1. Appropriate temperature of the food</td>
<td></td>
<td>317</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>320</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>2. Prices of drinks and meals</td>
<td></td>
<td>322</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>320</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3. Tastiness of food</td>
<td></td>
<td>317</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>319</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>4. Variety of menu</td>
<td></td>
<td>315</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>313</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>5. Freshness of raw ingredients</td>
<td></td>
<td>296</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>322</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>6. Size of portions</td>
<td></td>
<td>318</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>324</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>7. Food quality</td>
<td></td>
<td>318</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>322</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>8. Availability of food on the menu</td>
<td></td>
<td>317</td>
<td>3.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>323</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>9. No waiting to be served or seated</td>
<td></td>
<td>319</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>322</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>10. Employees' greeting you with a smile</td>
<td></td>
<td>317</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>321</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>11. Quickness of food delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td>316</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>291</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>12. Responsiveness to complaints</td>
<td></td>
<td>257</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>318</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>13. Helpful attitude of employees</td>
<td></td>
<td>304</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>323</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>14. Comfortable room temperature</td>
<td></td>
<td>318</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>323</td>
<td>4.23**</td>
<td>15. Neatness of establishment</td>
<td></td>
<td>319</td>
<td>4.06**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>321</td>
<td>4.26*</td>
<td>16. Cleanliness</td>
<td></td>
<td>319</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>322</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>17. Comfortable seating</td>
<td></td>
<td>321</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>322</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>18. Quiet eating atmosphere</td>
<td></td>
<td>321</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>319</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>19. Spaciousness of establishment</td>
<td></td>
<td>318</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>323</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>20. Convenience of location</td>
<td></td>
<td>319</td>
<td>4.24*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * the highest score among 20 attributes  ** the second highest score
Figure 4.1. Importance-Performance Matrix of In-Hotel Fast Food Restaurant Attributes
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According to the respondents though, 25 percent of the features were in need of some improvement. These were: freshness of raw ingredients (5); food quality (7); no waiting to be served or seated (9); employees' greeting you with a smile (10); appropriate temperature of the food (1); and responsiveness to complaints (12). In this quadrant, CONCENTRATE HERE, features are of high importance, but were rated low in performance. Therefore, this upper left section should receive management's priority attention.

Although attributes would improve if the existing service was modified, the greatest need for change is centered on LOW PRIORITY. These were: prices of drinks and meals (2); tastiness of food (3); variety of menu (4); size of portions (6); and quiet eating atmosphere (18). Even though customers view these features as less important, management should strive to improve their performance.

Features ranking low in importance yet high on performance with respondents are shown in the POSSIBLE OVERKILL quadrant. These are: comfortable seating (17); and spaciousness of establishment (19).

Figure 4.1 poses the critical question of "What part of the performance dimension represents a WORST versus GOOD versus BEST performance evaluation?" To answer this question, a modified grid was prepared with established latitude boundaries associated with actual performance ratings of the in-hotel fast food restaurant attributes (see Figure 4.2). The vertical dotted lines on the grid represent the latitude boundaries of the confirmation (GOOD performance) range, using a .05 level of statistical confidence. Therefore, positive disconfirmation demonstrates a BEST performance, while negative disconfirmation represents a WORST performance. The attributes "convenience of location (20)," "cleanliness (16)," and "neatness of
establishment (15)" fall into the BEST performance, whereas the attribute "quiet eating atmosphere (18)" is rated the WORST performance. Especially, the attribute "convenience of location" had the greatest effect on customer satisfaction because of low expectation and high performance (positively disconfirmed).
Figure 4.2. The Modified Importance-Performance Matrix of In-Hotel Fast Food Restaurant Attributes
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Table 4.5. Customer Importance and Performance Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th></th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total (n=324)</td>
<td>Local (n=235)</td>
<td>Guest (n=85)</td>
<td>Total (n=324)</td>
<td>Local (n=235)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Appropriate temperature of the food</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Prices of drinks and meals</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tastiness of food</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Variety of menu</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Freshness of raw ingredients</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Size of portions</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Food quality</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Availability of food on the menu</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. No waiting to be served or seated</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Employees' greeting you with a smile</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Quickness of food delivery</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Responsiveness to complaints</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Helpful attitude of employees</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Comfortable room temperature</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Neatness of establishment</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Cleanliness</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Comfortable seating</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Quiet eating atmosphere</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Spaciousness of establishment</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: the means underlined represent the highest score of each category
3. Customer Satisfaction and Its Contributing Attributes

In general, most of the respondents were satisfied with food, service and amenities provided by in-hotel fast food restaurants. The customers' overall feeling about fast food restaurants in hotels was 5.38, which is the mean value calculated by utilizing the DT scale (Delighted-7, Terrible-1). The present study also examined the factors constituting the partial predictor of satisfaction with in-hotel fast food restaurants with the multiple regression technique. The independent variables were the twenty attributes of performance in part II of the questionnaire (see Appendix 1) and the dependent variable was the customer's overall satisfaction with fast food restaurants in hotels. The stepwise method with 0.05 statistical confidence was used to analyze these data. The reason stepwise regression was used was all independent variables were expected to impact the dependent variable.

Table 4.6 shows the significant results of this analysis. The insignificant independent variables are not noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Estimators</th>
<th>t values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X1</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X10</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>14.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X18</td>
<td>0.185</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ r^2 = 0.225; \text{ adjusted } r^2 = 0.218; F = 31.00; p = 0.000; \text{ Y intercept (a) } = 3.29 \]
As a result, the regression equation is:

\[ Y = 3.29 + 0.181X_{10} + 0.208X_1 + 0.185X_{18} \]

Where:

- \( Y \) = the customers' overall feeling (satisfaction and/or dissatisfaction) about in-hotel fast food restaurants;
- \( a \) = constant (Y axis intercept);
- \( X_1 \) = appropriate temperature of the food;
- \( X_{10} \) = employees' greeting you with a smile; and
- \( X_{18} \) = quiet eating atmosphere.

The results show that three regression coefficients (E10, E1 and E18) are statistically significant. This means that higher ratings for each of the three independent variables (\( X_1, X_{10} \) and \( X_{18} \)) are correlated positively with customers' overall evaluation of in-hotel fast food restaurants. In other words, from the model, a one-unit increase in the rating of "appropriate temperature of the food" will result in a 0.208 increase in the rating of "the customers' overall feeling about these restaurants."

The factor "appropriate temperature of the food" has the greatest effect on customer satisfaction.

According to the model, the value of \( r^2 \), the coefficient determination, was 0.225. This means that 22.5 percent of the variation in the customers' overall feeling about fast food restaurants in hotels (\( Y \)) is explained by the three independent variables.
4. Customer's Belief about Fast Food Restaurants in Hotels

The majority of respondents reported that they had mostly strong agreement with questions 1 to 7 in Part III of the questionnaire. As shown in Figure 4.3, the consistency of the fast food restaurant (4.55) was rated highest of all these questions. While quick service would appear to be the fast food restaurant's major attribute, the results of the present study indicated a lower rating (4.07) than the other factors. As anticipated from features of the fast food restaurant, the respondents expected the restaurant to have convenience (4.32), friendly atmosphere (4.13), short wait (4.41), fresh and high quality food (4.47), and the ease of access (4.43).

5. Significant Importance-Performance Attributes

In order to identify which attributes are related to customers' expectations and the actual in-hotel fast food restaurant performance, t tests were conducted utilizing the difference between the attributes of importance and performance. The present study though, did not investigate the confidence interval of each attribute of importance-performance because the mean score of all attributes, as shown in Table 4.4, are above three, which means no respondent gave a zero rating.

Table 4.7 presents only the significant findings of the t tests. The t values of importance-performance attributes are equal to -2.13 for quickness of food delivery, 2.51 for responsiveness to complaints, -2.09 for comfortable room temperature, -3.23 for cleanliness, and 4.11 for spaciousness of establishment. The significance levels were 0.034, 0.012, 0.037, 0.0014, and 0.0001, respectively.
1. I expect the food at fast food restaurants to be consistent from one visit to the next. (n=318)

2. I consider fast food restaurants very convenient when I dine with a child. (n=309)

3. A discourteous fast food restaurant employee could keep me from returning to the restaurant. (n=319)

4. Quick service is the most important feature at fast food restaurants. (n=320)

5. I should not have to wait very long for food I order at fast food restaurants. (n=320)

6. I expect the food at fast food restaurants to be fresh and of high quality. (n=319)

7. I think fast food restaurants are very accessible to customers. (n=319)
Table 4.7. Significant Importance-Performance Attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Quickness of food delivery</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>-2.13</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>0.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Responsiveness to complaints</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Comfortable room temperature</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>-2.09</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Cleanliness</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>-3.23</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>0.0014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Spaciousness of establishment</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p < .05, 1.96 for a two tailed t test

6. Summary

The results of the data analysis are:

1. The respondents were mostly satisfied with food, service, and amenities offered by fast food restaurants in hotels.
2. The respondents' expectations of these restaurants were a little higher than actual restaurant performance, with respect to twenty attributes.
3. The significant features derived by customers in-hotel fast food
restaurants are: consistency, convenient for children, short waiting line, fresh and high quality food, and ease of access.

4. The customer's preferred features of these restaurants include:
   convenience of location, cleanliness, neatness of establishment,
   availability of food on the menu, comfortable room temperature, helpful attitude of employees, and quickness of food delivery.

5. Three major contributing features impacting customer satisfaction are:
   appropriate temperature of the food, employees' greeting you with a smile, and quiet eating atmosphere.
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSIONS

1. Findings of the Study

The primary purpose of this study was to examine consumers' expectations regarding food, service, and amenities provided by in-hotel fast food restaurants by utilizing the importance-performance analysis technique. Data collected from 324 customers at fast food restaurants in hotels show that the respondents, most of whom were local residents, had high expectations of each attribute provided by in-hotel fast food restaurants. Most attributes of restaurants' performance though, were lower in mean score than those of customers' expectations. There was little difference between local residents and hotel guests regarding the perceived expectation and restaurants' performance. As shown in Table 4.5, however, local residents had the highest expectation for "cleanliness," whereas hotel guests had the highest expectation for "convenience of location." Both local residents and guests indicated the best performance rating on "convenience of location."

Another purpose of the present study was to investigate the degree of satisfaction/dissatisfaction in light of customers' expectations and the restaurants' performance, and the number and type of contributing factors to customer satisfaction. Most of respondents were generally satisfied with food, service, and amenities provided by in-hotel fast food restaurants. Contributing factors to satisfaction were appropriate temperature of the food, employees' greeting you with a smile, and quiet eating atmosphere (see Table 4.6). In addition, seven out of twenty
attributes were preferred by respondents in terms of their expectations (see Figure 4.1). These are "convenience of location," "cleanliness," "neatness of establishment," "comfortable room temperature," "availability of food on the menu," "helpful attitude of employees," and "quickness of food delivery." Among these seven attributes, "convenience of location," "cleanliness," and "neatness of establishment" were rated by respondents the best performance of fast food restaurants in hotels.

This study also addressed four sub-issues related to customers' attitudes toward fast food restaurants in hotels.

(1) What were the major features consumers encountered at fast food restaurants in hotels? Among twenty attributes the major features for customers, high importance and high performance (KEEP UP THE GOOD WORK), were convenience of location, cleanliness, neatness of establishment, comfortable room temperature, availability of food on the menu, helpful attitude of employees, and quickness of food delivery (see Figure 4.1). The attribute "convenience of location" was the most satisfactory factor to customers because of low expectation and high performance (positive disconfirmation).

(2) What factors contributed to consumers' expectations? As shown in Table 4.5, all respondents had the highest expectation for "availability of food on the menu" from food factors. The "helpful attitude of employees" was an important service factor to local residents, whereas "quickness of food delivery" was important to hotel guests. Of amenities provided by in-hotel fast food restaurants, local residents had a high expectation for the "cleanliness" of these restaurants, however hotel guests expected primarily the "convenience of location."

(3) How did consumers' expectations of fast food restaurants in hotels correlate...
with the performance the restaurant provides to consumers? The big difference between consumers' expectation and restaurant performance resulted in consumers' satisfaction/dissatisfaction with products, service, and amenities provided by these restaurants. The attribute of "convenience of location" was ranked as low expectation and high performance by the respondents, whereas the attribute of "freshness of raw ingredients" appeared to be high expectation and low performance. The attribute of low expectation and high performance, as mentioned in Chapter II, has a great influence on customer satisfaction on the basis of the disconfirmation theory. But the attribute of high expectation-low performance results in customer dissatisfaction.

(4) What influence did consumers' expectations and restaurant performance have on consumer satisfaction? In general, most of the respondents were satisfied with food, service, and amenities provided by fast food restaurants in hotels. "Appropriate temperature of the food," "employees' greeting you with a smile," and "quiet eating atmosphere" appear to have the greatest influence on overall consumer satisfaction (see Table 4.6).

2. Implications of the Study

The present study of consumers' expectations and performance of on-site fast food restaurants in hotels follows the same style of past research (Anderson, 1973; Cardozo, 1965; Oliver, 1980; Olshavsky and Miller, 1972; Olson and Dover, 1979; Swan and Trawick, 1980; Tse and Wilton, 1988). Importance-performance analysis is utilized to investigate consumers' attitudes toward these restaurants. This analysis explains a significant dependent variable, satisfaction, by using the mean difference
between expectation and performance. The greater the discrepancy between the expectation and the performance, the less the consumer's satisfaction with the in-hotel fast food restaurant and, therefore, the greater the need for remedial action.

A combined importance-performance analysis and expectation-performance paradigm can explain more easily and specifically consumer satisfaction and/or dissatisfaction with food, service, and amenities provided by in-hotel fast food restaurants. As shown in Figure 4.2, for example, attributes such as "convenience of location," "cleanliness," and "neatness of establishment" are very important for both customer and the hotel fast food restaurant indicating high expectation and high performance. The attribute "quiet eating atmosphere" though, is relatively unimportant to both of them because of low expectation and low performance. However, this attribute was the best predictor of customer satisfaction in the multiple regression. This implies that though customers did not expect a quiet atmosphere at in-hotel fast food restaurants, their satisfaction with these restaurants was strongly affected by this factor. This result has an important marketing implication. Customers' expectations of on-site fast food restaurants in hotels and the factors impacting their satisfaction are not necessarily identical.

Importance-performance analysis may be used as a powerful tool in marketing planning. For instance, in testing performance of fast food restaurants in hotels, attributes such as "convenience of location" and "cleanliness" emerge as being more crucial than the others. The strategy implications then, may be that more resources should be devoted to improving these two attributes. Managers can then identify the attributes which are most crucial to the determination of consumer satisfaction. Furthermore, the operators of these restaurants can concentrate on making their
products and advertisements consistent with customers' perceived expectations of the restaurants.

3. Suggestions for Future Research

This study should be extended to include diversified samples in order to increase the reliability and the validity of this type of research. The sample of this study was limited to customers at fast food restaurants in casino hotels. Therefore, the sample cannot represent all of the customers at in-hotel fast food restaurants. Data about hotel guests were collected from a small number of the respondents. In order to investigate guests' attitudes of in-hotel fast food restaurants, more data about guests should be included.

Although the modified importance-performance analysis technique may provide a meaningful alternative for interpreting customers' satisfaction with on-site fast food restaurants, extended importance-performance analysis should be utilized to examine consumers' attitudes of these restaurants by including the relative performance of competitors. Also, this extended importance-performance analysis should be applied periodically. Because the competitive environment is continuously changing, periodic application of this approach (Dolinsky, 1991) enables managements to keep abreast of competitors' changes and to respond accordingly.

Finally, another suggestion for future research is that researchers should focus on comparative studies of customers' attitudes of fast food restaurants located in traditional and nontraditional areas. Most fast food restaurants are expanding their market to include hotels, prisons, schools, and hospitals, as well as the traditional
areas. The understanding of consumers' attitudes of each fast food market would be of great value to fast food restaurant operators.
APPENDIX A: Survey Questionnaire

Dear Respondent:

I am a graduate student in the William F. Harrah College of Hotel Administration at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV). The purpose of this survey is to find out what you think of nationally recognized fast food restaurants. The results of this survey will provide fast food restaurant operators with new marketing strategies. In return, customers will have what they expect.

Please fill out this questionnaire and return it to the surveyor.

Thank you very much for your cooperation and have a good time in Las Vegas.

Sincerely,

Mihyoung Jeong
Graduate Researcher

John Stefanelli, Ph.D.
Professor of Food & Beverage Management
**Part I**

**Directions:** The purpose of this part of questionnaire is to identify the consumers' expectation of a fast food restaurant within a hotel. Listed below are possible reasons/attributes why people use a fast food restaurant in a hotel. Please indicate the **degree of your expectation** for each.

For example, if your expectation regarding the "appropriate food temperature" was very low, you would rate it a "1."

If your expectation was very high, you would rate it a "5."

If you expected the convenience of location of a fast food restaurant to fall somewhere between the two extremes, you would rate it a 2, 3, or 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Appropriate temperature of the food</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Prices of drinks and meals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tastiness of food</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Variety of menu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Freshness of raw ingredients</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Size of portions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Food quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Availability of food on the menu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. No waiting to be served or seated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Employees' greeting you with a smile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Quickness of food delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Responsiveness to complaints</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Helpful attitude of employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Comfortable room temperature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Neatness of establishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Cleanliness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Comfortable seating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Quiet eating atmosphere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Spaciousness of establishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Convenience of location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please continue to the next page
Directions: The purpose of this section is to learn how well this fast food restaurant performs in delivering the food and service. If a feature was very good, circle a "5." If it was very bad, circle a "1." You should circle another number if you have mixed feelings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Worst</th>
<th>The Best</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Appropriate temperature of the food</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Prices of drinks and meals</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tastiness of food</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Variety of menu</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Freshness of raw ingredients</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Size of portions</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Food quality</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Availability of food on the menu</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. No waiting to be served or seated</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Employees' greeting you with a smile</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Quickness of food delivery</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Responsiveness to complaints</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Helpful attitude of employees</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Comfortable room temperature</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Neatness of establishment</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Cleanliness</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Comfortable seating</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Quiet eating atmosphere</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Spaciousness of establishment</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Convenience of location</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please continue to the next page
Part III

Directions: The following set of statements relate to your overall feelings about a fast food restaurant in general. For each statement, please indicate the extent to which you believe the fast food restaurant has the feature described by the statement. Please circle the appropriate number that represents your belief. For example, if you strongly agree with it, you would circle "5". If you strongly disagree, you would circle "1".

Numbers mean: 5 --------- Strongly agree
                 4 --------- Agree
                 3 --------- Neutral (neither agree nor disagree)
                 2 --------- Disagree
                 1 --------- Strongly disagree

1. I expect the food at fast food restaurants to be consistent from one visit to the next. 1  2  3  4  5
2. I consider fast food restaurants very convenient when I dine along with a child. 1  2  3  4  5
3. A discourteous fast food restaurant employee could keep me from returning to the restaurant. 1  2  3  4  5
4. Quick service is the most important feature at fast food restaurants. 1  2  3  4  5
5. I should not have to wait very long on food I order at fast food restaurants. 1  2  3  4  5
6. I expect the food at fast food restaurants to be fresh and of high quality. 1  2  3  4  5
7. I think fast food restaurants are very accessible to customers. 1  2  3  4  5
8. What is your overall feeling about this fast food restaurant? (Please circle) 1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   Terrible  Unhappy  Mostly dissatisfied  Mixed  Mostly satisfied  Pleased  Delighted

Please continue to the next page
Part IV

Directions: The purpose of following questions is to gather some basic demographic information to classify the survey responses. All information will be kept confidential and will be used only for aggregate statistical purposes. Please check the appropriate category for each question.

1. Are you a guest of this hotel?
   Yes ________ No ________

2. How many times have you been to fast food restaurants within any hotel?
   ___ 1-3 times ___ 4-6 times ___ above 7 times ___ Never

3. If you have been to a fast food restaurant within a hotel, who did you accompany? (Please check as many as applicable)
   ___ children ___ friends ___ spouse
   ___ other (Please explain): ________________________
   ___ none of the above

4. Which meal did you purchase on this visit to the fast food restaurant?
   ___ Breakfast ___ Lunch ___ Dinner

5. Please indicate your gender.
   ___ Male ___ Female

6. Please check your age:
   ___ Under 25 ___ 26 to 34 ___ 35 to 44
   ___ 45 to 54 ___ 55 to 64 ___ Above 65

7. What is your likelihood of recommending this restaurant to others?

8. What is your average annual household income? (please check one)
   ___ Less than $15,000 ___ $15,000 to $24,999 ___ $25,000 to $34,999
   ___ $35,000 to $44,999 ___ $45,000 to $54,999 ___ $55,000 to $64,999
   ___ Above $65,000

9. Your occupation
   ___ Professional & technical ___ Service worker ___ Managerial
   ___ Clerical & sales ___ Blue collar
   ___ Other. Please indicate ________________________

Thank you very much for your kind participation. Please return this questionnaire to the surveyor.
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