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Predictors of the Intention to Return to Real Good Food

Customers are likely to return to restaurants when they have a good experience. As such, it is important to determine how factors such as quality of service or enjoyment of food impact customers’ intentions to return. The restaurant, Real Good Food, recently had a grand opening in which they assessed customers regarding their enjoyment of the food, perceived quality of service, their level of excitement about the grand opening, and rating of happiness when leaving the restaurant. The purpose of this study was to determine how these four qualities predict the customer’s intentions to return to the restaurant.

**Method**

The present study utilized a correlational design. Data collection methods included the use of an in-person questionnaire administered at the end of the participants’ visit to the restaurant.

**Participants**

Participants consisted of 1,150 customers who attended the grand opening to Real Good Food. No demographic data was collected.

**Measures**

Each customer was assessed using the following measures.

***Enjoyment.*** Enjoyment (Enjoy) assessed subjective perception of enjoyment of the meal using a 10-point Likert scale, with higher scores indicating a greater enjoyment of the meal.

***Excitement.*** Excitement (Excite) assessed subjective perception of excitement regarding the opening of the restaurant using a 10-point Likert scale, with higher scores indicating a greater excitement.

***Quality.*** Quality (Qual) assessed subjective perception of the quality of service received while in the restaurant using a 10-point Likert scale, with higher scores indicating a greater perceived quality.

***Happiness.*** Happiness (Happy) assessed subjective perception of happiness at the end of the meal using a 10-point Likert scale, with higher scores indicating a greater happiness.

***Intent.*** Intent (Intent) assessed intention to return to the restaurant using a 10-point Likert scale, with higher scores indicating a greater intention of return.

**Planned Analysis**

The present study planned to utilized correlation, simple regression, and multiple regression to assess the relationships between predictors, as well as predictors and the outcome variable.

**Results**

Descriptive statistics can be found in Table 1. There were no missing data in the dataset, thus analysis proceeded with tests of assumptions. Descriptive statistics and inspection of histograms reveal that the data do not violate the assumption of univariate normality. Data appear to be normally distributed across all variables in the model. Further supporting this, the skew for all variables were less extreme than ± 3.00 (Enjoy = -0.59, Qual = -1.45, Excite = -0.13, Happy = 0.16, Intent = 0.15) and kurtosis for all variables was less than ± 10.00 (Enjoy = 0.47, Qual = 3.77, Excite = -0.24, Happy = -0.30, Intent = -0.40) . Scatterplots were run to assess the assumption of homoscedasticity. This assumption does not appear to be violated for the variables of enjoyment of the food, excitement about the opening, and happiness, as the variance across each variable appears to be stable. There is less variance in the low end of enjoyment of the food, but this does not appear to be significant. The variable of quality of service does not appear to meet the assumption, with much greater spread in the data near the middle of the scale. Finally, the assumption of linearity appears to be met for all variables. These violations should be kept in mind throughout the remainder of analysis.

Both enjoyment of the food and quality of the service were significantly correlated with intent to return (Table 2). Thus, the relationship between intent to return and these two predictors were assessed through regression analyses. Enjoyment of the food explained 8% of the variance in intent to return, *R* = .28, *F*(1, 1148) = 93.80, *p* < .001 (Table 3). Adding the quality of the service variable to the model (Model 2) explained 28% of the variance in intent to return, *R* = .54, *F*(2, 1147) = 242.00, *p* < .001 (Table 4). Model comparison of the two models indicated that the model with both predictor variables of enjoyment of the food and quality of the service was significantly better than a model with only the predictor for enjoyment of the food, *F*(1, 1147), *ΔR2* = .20, *p* < .001.

**Discussion**

The purpose of the current project was to assess predictors of the intention to return to Real Good Food restaurant. Customers (*N* = 1,150) who attended the grand opening of the restaurant were assessed for their enjoyment of the food, perceived quality of service, their level of excitement at the grand opening, and their level of happiness. Correlation and regression analyses were used to assess whether these variables predicted the intentions of the customer to return to the restaurant.

Correlation analyses demonstrated that neither excitement for the grand opening, nor level of customer happiness were significantly related with intent to return to the restaurant. Thus, these variables were not included for further analyses. The remaining variables were submitted to two simple regression analyses, the first contained the predictor assessing enjoyment of food and the second with the predictor enjoyment and the variable measuring quality of service. When both enjoyment and quality were included in the model both were significant predictors of intention (Model 2; Table 4).

In summation, these results indicate that both enjoyment of the meal and quality of service are significant predictors of customers’ intention to return. However, if comparing the two, quality of service is a better predictor of whether or not a customer will return. In conclusion, if Real Good Food wants to increase customer return rates they should focus on promoting quality of service, but enjoyment of meals should not be neglected. However, considering that the quality of service variable appears to be heteroscedastic according to scatterplots, these results should also be reconsidered using alternative methods and analyses to confirm.

Table 1.

*Correlation Matrix for Intent to Return to the Restaurant*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Enjoy | Qual | Excite | Happy | Intent |
| Enjoy | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |
| Qual | .33\*\*\* | 1.00 |  |  |  |
| Excite | -.04 | -.04 | 1.00 |  |  |
| Happy | -.03 | -.06 | -.03 | 1.00 |  |
| Intent | .28\*\*\* | .53\*\*\* | -.01 | -.02 | 1.00 |

*Note*. \*\*\* *p* < .001

Table 2.

*Descriptives of Predictors of Intent to Return to the Restaurant*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Enjoy | Qual | Excite | Happy | Intent |
| Mean | 6.60 | 5.65 | 6.30 | 7.12 | 5.00 |
| Median | 6.80 | 5.90 | 6.30 | 7.10 | 4.90 |
| SD | 1.77 | 1.24 | 1.70 | 0.79 | 1.91 |
| Min | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.87 | 4.70 | 1.00 |
| Max | 10.00 | 10.00 | 10.00 | 8.30 | 10.00 |
| Skewness | -0.58 | -1.45 | -0.13 | 0.02 | 0.15 |
| Kurtosis | 0.46 | 3.77 | -0.24 | -0.30 | -0.40 |

Table 3.

*Regression of Enjoyment of Food onto Intent to Return to the Restaurant*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | β | Estimate | SE | *t* |
| Intercept |  | 3.04 | 0.21 | 14.56\*\*\* |
| Enjoyment | .28 | 0.30 | 0.03 | 9.69\*\*\* |

*Note.* \*\*\* *p* < .001

Table 4.

*Regression of Enjoyment of Food and Quality of Service onto Intent to Return to the Restaurant*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | β | Estimate | SE | *t* |
| Intercept |  | -0.13 | 0.25 | -0.53 |
| Enjoyment | .11 | 0.12 | 0.03 | 4.29\*\*\* |
| Quality | .50 | 0.77 | 0.04 | 18.98\*\*\* |

*Note.* *\*\*\* p* < .001