

Designing and Validating a Scale for Measuring Customer Perceptions in the Food Sector: A Reliability and Validity Analysis

Neha¹, Dr. Jai Pal Sharma²

¹Research Scholar, Department of Commerce, Maharshi Dayanand University, Rohtak, Haryana India

²Principal Gaur Brahman Degree College, Rohtak, Haryana India

Abstract—In order to measure the perception of customer particularly in food sector, this study aimed at developing and validating a measurement scale of customer perception in food sector. Items were generated using a systematic scale development process. Data was collected from 600 respondents residing in Haryana, a State in the Northern part of India, for analyzing the data EFA and CFA has been used to initially explore the factors and then to confirm the factors extracted in step one using SPSS and confirmatory factor analysis using AMOS software respectively. In the context of the food industry, the study provides a measurement scale for customer perceptions. The present study will be useful for the retail managers to identify key improvement areas that will help to increase the revenue as well as develop the reputation of the restaurants and outlets. It also contributes to increasing the knowledge of academicians and researchers about the key determinant that affects customers' perception of retail food outlets. This study will be useful for the retail food outlets to formulate their strategies which will make them able to create strong relationship with the existing customers along with attracting the potential customers.

Index Terms—Customer Perception, Food Sector, Scale Development, Food Quality, Service Quality, Atmosphere, Price, Convenience

I. INTRODUCTION

According to the Report available on Mordor Intelligence: “The India Foodservice Market size is estimated at 77.54 billion USD in 2024, and is expected to reach 125.06 billion USD by 2029, growing at a CAGR of 10.3% during the forecast period (2024-2029)”. People in India are becoming more open to trying out different foods and dining experiences. As a result of this, Specialty restaurants

that provide distinctive and creative dining experiences have grown much. The food service industry in India is expanding due to factors such as changing lifestyles, rising urbanization, and the growing popularity of eating out.

In the present scenario, people visit a restaurant not just a place to satisfy hunger but people prefer to visit a restaurant to celebrate special occasions, relax, enjoy with friends and family (Ha & Jang, 2012). Further, their study highlighted that customer perception plays an important role in shaping behavioral intentions. Customers who get services are susceptible to being taken advantage of; they are aware of this and are unlikely to forget or forgive unfair treatment easily (Seiders & Berry, 1998). As consumer reactions to unfair service encounters tend to be more intense than those to perceivably fair service, justice is particularly important (Schneider & Bowen, 2016). Given that it costs more to acquire new clients than it does to keep existing ones, such customer turnover can be expensive (Hart et al., 1990). Therefore, customer retention is preferred than attracting new customers (Blodgett et al., 1993). Furthermore, several industries have looked into the advantages of fostering and preserving customer loyalty among current customers and customer loyalty depends major on customer satisfaction (Han & Ryu, 2009). Whereas customer satisfaction depends upon a customers' expectations and (Blodgett et al., 1993; Han & Ryu, 2009; Namin, 2017). Perceptions of fairness are influenced by a company's complaint handling policies, the customer's interactions with company representatives, and the results of service recovery (Maxham Iii & Netemeyer, 2002). (Lockwood & Pyun, 2020) in their study concluded that customer perception of the luxury hotel

servicescape seemed to be primarily influenced by "aesthetic quality," which was followed by "functionality," "ambiance," "spaciousness," and "physiological conditions." The study (Ryu & Shawn Jang, 2008a) developed a scale of customer perception towards the physical environment of upscale restaurant settings. This study took into consideration the perception of customers towards only the physical factors such as Facility Aesthetics, Ambience, Lighting, Table setting, Layout, and Service staff. Another study (Stevens et al., 1995) used a scale called "Dineserv" to measure the service quality of the restaurants. Most of the existing studies on customer perception in the context of the food sector have been based either on service quality, environmental factors, or food quality independently whereas customer perception is influenced by a combination of factors. There is a need for a more inclusive approach to analyse customer perception. Therefore, this study aimed at addressing the gap by developing a scale which incorporates multiple factors that may affect customer perception.

The rest of the paper is divided into six sections: literature review followed by research methodology, data analysis, results and discussion, limitations and future research directions, and conclusion.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

(Han & Ryu, 2009) studied the importance of price perception and role of physical environment in building customer perception which in turn increases customer level of satisfaction and customer loyalty. The study of (Wall & Berry, 2007) stated that food quality is the basic requirement whereas services offered and ambience, too, play a significant role in shaping customer perception, furthermore consumers' expectations of the service are favorably correlated with their perceptions of mechanic clues (i.e., ambience or design etc), humanic clues (i.e., performance, appearance or behaviour of employees) have a greater influence than technical clues. In order to convey a consistent service message, managers should ideally orchestrate both mechanical and human indications. A study based on e-service quality (Udo et al., 2010) highlighted that while a lower perceived risk may result in a more positive perception of the quality of the web service, this does not always transfer into satisfied customers. Although different

PC skill sets may have an impact on how convenient services are perceived, they don't appear to have an impact on how customers rate the quality of web services, their level of satisfaction, or their behavioral intents to use the e-service. In the study of (Durna et al., 2015) it was shown that servicescape had a significant impact on image perception and image perception further significantly impacts customer revisit intention and word-of-mouth.

To assess the service quality (Parasuraman et al., 1985) were the first to develop a scale called SERVQUAL having two sets of 22 items to measure out of that one set was used to measure customer perception whereas the other set for assessing customers' expectations. The perceived quality of the service was evaluated based on the difference between expectations and perceptions. SERVQUAL scale consists of five dimensions i.e., Tangibility, Reliability, Responsiveness, Assurance, and Empathy. (Ganguli & Roy, 2010) argued that traditional businesses like restaurants and barbershops still depend on interactions between people and hence identified nine dimensions of service quality in case of hybrid services. These nine dimensions are "Customer service, reputation, price, staff competence, tangibles, technology security, and information quality, ease of subscription, technology convenience, and technology usage easiness and reliability". In the study of (Yang et al., 2004) a scale was developed to measure customer perception of online service quality and provided six dimensions for online service quality i.e., "reliability", "responsiveness", "competence", "ease of use", "security", and "product portfolio". A scale called CC-Qual was developed by (Marimon et al., 2019) using 21 items in order to conceptualize customer perception towards service quality of collaborative consumption services. The proposed scale consists of five dimensions i.e., "site organization", "platform responsiveness and agility", "legal protection and trustworthiness", "interaction with the peer service provider" and "social interaction". Out of these five dimensions, the first three were related to website interaction and were online in nature, whereas "interaction with the peer service provider" was related to interaction with a service provider, and "social interaction" was both on- and offline elements. With the major focus on innovativeness the study of (E. Kim et al., 2018) developed a multi-dimensional scale in the food sector

to identify the customer perception of restaurant innovativeness. This study stated four dimensions of innovation i.e., “menu innovativeness”, “technology-based service innovativeness”, “experiential innovativeness”, and “promotional innovativeness”.

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

From the existing literature review, the researcher tried to find out the pertinent instruments (either scale or items) that can be used to develop the questionnaire

for the present study. The pre-existing scale items were modified to adapt in the food sector. As a result, the literature review's findings were used to develop an item pool as shown in Table 1. Likert’s 5-point scale was used for framing the questionnaire. Two marketing experts and four research scholars were asked to participate to validate the questionnaire. After removing the grammatical errors, and unclear or confusing terms, a final number of 42 items were used to collect data.

Table 1 Items pool and their Source

Sr. No.	Statements	References
Quality of Food offered		
1	The restaurant serves tasty food	(W. G. Kim et al., 2009) (Tan et al., 2014) (Marinkovic et al., 2015) (Namkung & Jang, 2007)
2	The presentation of food was visually appealing/ attractive.	(W. G. Kim et al., 2009) (Namkung & Jang, 2007)
3	The food was served at the appropriate temperature.	(Kivela et al., 1999) (Tan et al., 2014) (Namkung & Jang, 2007)
4	The restaurant serves nutritious/healthy food.	(Kivela et al., 2000) (W. G. Kim et al., 2009) (Namkung & Jang, 2007)
5	Food offered have good portion.	(Tan et al., 2014)
6	The restaurant serves my food exactly as I ordered it	(Gaurangbhai Shah Kalgi, 2018)
7	The restaurant offers fresh food.	(Kivela et al., 1999) (Tan et al., 2014) (Marinkovic et al., 2015) (Namkung & Jang, 2007)
8	Good quality of food is offered.	(Kivela et al., 1999) (W. G. Kim et al., 2009)
9	There is variety in the menu.	(Kivela et al., 1999) (W. G. Kim et al., 2009) (Tan et al., 2014) (Marinkovic et al., 2015) (Namkung & Jang, 2007)
10	The restaurant has an adequate number of employees.	(Ryu & Shawn Jang, 2008b)
11	The restaurant has polite employees.	(Kivela et al., 1999)
12	The staff have knowledge of food.	(Kivela et al., 1999),
13	The staff of the restaurant is friendly.	(Kivela et al., 1999),
14	The staff of the restaurant is efficient in handling complaints.	(Kivela et al., 1999),
15	Employees are readily helpful to the customers.	(Kivela et al., 1999),
16	The restaurant maintains speed and quality of services during busy hours.	(Tan et al., 2014)
17	The restaurant billed my order accurately.	(Liu et al., 2015)
18	The restaurant shows sincere interest in correcting anything wrong.	(Sureshchandar et al., 2001)
19	The restaurant provides prompt and quick service.	(Tan et al., 2014)
20	The interior design of the restaurant was visually appealing.	(Marinkovic et al., 2015) (Jeong & Jang, 2011)
21	The Lighting of the restaurant creates a warm atmosphere	(Ryu & Shawn Jang, 2008b)
22	The background music of the restaurant relaxes me.	(Ryu & Shawn Jang, 2008b)
23	The aroma in the restaurant is pleasant.	(Ryu & Shawn Jang, 2008b)
24	Employees in the restaurant were neat and well-dressed.	(Tan et al., 2014) (Ryu & Shawn Jang, 2008b)
25	Dining areas in the restaurant were thoroughly clean.	(Tan et al., 2014) (Marinkovic et al., 2015)
26	The restaurant has comfortable seat and furniture	(Chun & Nyam-Ochir, 2020)
27	The restaurant has high quality furniture.	(Ryu & Shawn Jang, 2008b)

28	The tableware and floor are clean	(Tan et al., 2014)
29	The restroom of the restaurant is clean	(Tan et al., 2014)
30	The restaurant has artistic-looking display.	(Durna et al., 2015; Tan et al., 2014)
31	The restaurant looks classy.	(Durna et al., 2015)
32	This store has a warm, inviting atmosphere	(Sureshchandar et al., 2001)
33	This store is located near to residence	(Gaurangbhai Shah Kalgi, 2018)
34	The restaurant provides convenient parking facilities to the customers	(Kivela et al., 2000) (Marinkovic et al., 2015)
35	The location of the restaurant is accessible	(Gaurangbhai Shah Kalgi, 2018)
36	The restaurant has convenient operating time	(Gaurangbhai Shah Kalgi, 2018)
37	The price of the restaurant is reasonable/appropriate	(Marinkovic et al., 2015) (Jani & Han, 2011)
38	The dining experience was worth of money	(Ryu et al., 2008)
39	The quality of food offered was worth the prices.	(Marinkovic et al., 2015)
40	Prices are in line with expectations	(Marinkovic et al., 2015)
41	Prices are acceptable when compared to prices in other restaurants	(Marinkovic et al., 2015) (Jani & Han, 2011)
42	The restaurant offered good value for the price	(Ryu et al., 2008)

The questionnaire was divided into two parts, the first of which focused on the demographic and academic profiles of respondents. In the second part items related to customer perception were asked and respondents marked their level agreement for each item on scale of 1 to 5 where 1 represents strongly disagree to 5 strongly agree (Lockwood & Pyun, 2020). Data was collected using a purposive sampling technique from the target sample residing in different states in Haryana. Data was collected in both online and offline mode. For the offline mode, the researcher personally visited the restaurants and asked the people present over there to fill out the questionnaire whereas in the online mode, Google Forms was used to collect data. After examining the questionnaire, the incomplete questionnaire was eliminated and data of 600 respondents were taken into the study. Population demographics who participated in the study has been shown in Table 2.

Table 2 Population Demographics

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Female	275	45.8
Male	325	54.2
Age		
21-40 years	426	71.0
41-60 years	76	12.7
Above 60 years	8	1.3
Upto 20 years	90	15.0
Marital Status		
Married	272	45.3

Unmarried	328	54.7
Occupation		
Any Other	35	5.8
Govt. Sector	196	32.7
Private Sector	100	16.7
Self-employed	54	9.0
Student	215	35.8
Qualification		
Graduation	215	35.8
Others	13	2.2
Post-Graduation & Above	296	49.3
Upto 12th	76	12.7
Monthly Income		
Above Rs. 70,000	134	22.3
From Rs. 20,000 to 50,000	218	36.3
From Rs. 50,000 to 70,000	44	7.3
Upto Rs. 20,000	204	34.0

IV. RESULTS

Factor analysis technique is the most common technique and has been used in various scale development study. In the first stage, factors were identified using an exploratory factor analysis technique and in the second stage the explored factors were confirmed using a confirmatory factor analysis technique (Latif, 2018; Marimon et al., 2019; Ryu & Shawn Jang, 2008a). Therefore, the present study also used an exploratory factor analysis technique for the extraction of factors and thereafter used confirmatory factor analysis.

Exploratory Factor Analysis: The performing the test IBM SPSS 21 software was used. First of all, KMO and Bartlett’s Test was performed on the data. The KMO measure determines whether there are modest partial correlations between the variables, which suggests that there are some common causes between them. The Bartlett test determines if the correlation matrix is an identity matrix, which would mean that there is no connection at all between the variables. The Bartlett test must be significant and the KMO value larger than 0.5 for a factor analysis to be appropriate. Table 3 shows the results of KMO and Bartlett’s test, the value of KMO is greater than 0.5 i.e., 0.805 and Bartlett’s test is also significant. Therefore, the exploratory factor analysis can be used.

Further reliability tests and exploratory factor analysis (EFA) using Varimax rotation were conducted. The number of components to be extracted was determined using eigenvalue, and variance was explained. The factor structure was assessed based on the factors loading, cross-loading, and failure to load. The initial factor structure resulted in 9 factors with an eigenvalue greater than 1, where some of the items failed to load whereas a few items were double-loaded. One item from convenience i.e., C1 item was removed due to the factor not being loaded and two items from food quality (F6, F7), three items from service quality (SQ3, SQ6, SQ9), three items from atmosphere (A7, A8, A9), and one item from price (P3) were excluded due to double loading of factors. After removing the items that failed to load, that failed to load onto respective factors and factors that contained only one item, factor analysis was re-run and five factors were extracted as shown in Table 4 and Table 5.

Table 3 KMO and Bartlett's test

KMO Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.801
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	9714.737
	Df	465
	Sig.	.000

Table 4 Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues		Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative Percentage	Total	Percentage of Variance	Cumulative Percentage
1	17.092	17.092	5.299	17.092	17.092	4.949	15.963	15.963
2	13.625	30.717	4.224	13.625	30.717	4.226	13.631	29.595
3	12.141	42.858	3.764	12.141	42.858	4.071	13.133	42.728
4	9.197	52.055	2.851	9.197	52.055	2.831	9.133	51.860
5	8.036	60.091	2.491	8.036	60.091	2.551	8.231	60.091
6	3.186	63.277						
7	3.045	66.322						
8	2.745	69.067						
9	2.601	71.668						
10	2.381	74.049						
11	2.263	76.312						
12	2.125	78.437						
13	1.860	80.296						
14	1.754	82.051						
15	1.739	83.790						
16	1.646	85.436						
17	1.557	86.993						
18	1.427	88.420						
19	1.331	89.751						
20	1.298	91.050						
21	1.160	92.210						
22	1.121	93.331						
23	1.013	94.344						
24	.946	95.290						
25	.875	96.165						

26	.811	96.976						
27	.726	97.702						
28	.684	98.387						
29	.670	99.056						
30	.480	99.536						
31	.464	100.000						
"Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis".								

Table 5 Rotated Component Matrix

Rotated Component Matrix ^a					
	Component				
	1	2	3	4	5
F1			.798		
F2			.814		
F3			.775		
F4			.746		
F5			.700		
F8			.673		
F9			.790		
SQ1		.857			
SQ2		.852			
SQ4		.686			
SQ5		.824			
SQ7		.720			
SQ8		.725			
SQ10		.736			
A1	.859				
A2	.853				
A3	.826				
A4	.785				
A5	.784				
A6	.695				
A10	.754				
A11	.695				
C2					.814
C3					.772
C4					.798
C5					.765
P1				.779	
P2				.642	
P4				.813	
P5				.783	
P6				.718	

Confirmatory factor analysis: This analysis was used to confirm the factor structure of the suggested scale using 31 items that represented a five-dimension model. "IBM SPSS AMOS 26" was used to assess the convergent, discriminant, and goodness of fit variables. In order to evaluate how well a given model

fits the observed data, the current study uses the following metrics: "Tucker-Lewis index" (TLI), "Goodness of Fit index" (GFI), "Chi-square" (CMIN), "Standardized Root Mean Square Residual" (SRMR), "Root Mean Square Error of Approximation" (RMSEA), "Comparative Fit Index" (CFI), and "Tucker-Lewis index" (TLI).

Table 6 Fit Indices of SEM Model

Fit Indices	Value	Recommended Value	Source
CMIN/DF	4.4	≤5	(Latif, 2018)
GFI	0.85	≥0.80	(Nguyen & Chinda, 2018)
CFI	0.85	>0.70	(Nguyen & Chinda, 2018)
RMSEA	0.75	≤0.08	(Nguyen & Chinda, 2018)

The fit indices for CMIN/Df as shown in Table 6 is ≤5 (Latif, 2018) and fit indices for GFI, CFI, and RMSEA are ≥0.80, >0.70, and ≤0.08 (Nguyen & Chinda, 2018) and the values obtained during confirmatory factor analysis were 4.4 for CMIN/df, 0.85 for GFI, 0.85 for CFI and 0.75 for RMSEA. The results described in Table 6 showed a satisfactory fit for the five-factor model based on the indices found using confirmatory factor analysis.

V. RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY ANALYSIS

Through confirmatory factor analysis, the measurement model was assessed using two characteristics of the data quality: construct validity and construct reliability. The internal consistency of multiple indicators for each construct was determined using reliability analysis (Lu et al., 2009). A common method for assessing a construct's reliability in the past has been to utilize Cronbach's Alpha. Recently, though, (Cronbach & Shavelson, 2004) acknowledged that using the Alpha coefficient alone would not be sufficient to determine reliability. As a result, composite reliability is applied, which makes use of

each item's standardized loadings and measurement errors (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). Convergent validity is proven when a block of items measuring an identical construct converge in their depiction of the underlying concept (Latif, 2018). To assess convergent validity, the "Average Variance Extracted" (AVE) statistic is calculated. To find the AVE, divide the total of each squared factor loading by the total number of indicators. Convergent validity is established with an AVE score of .50 or above

(Fornell & Larcker, 1981). To composite reliability can be calculated using the formula:

$$CR = \frac{(\sum \lambda_i)^2}{(\sum \lambda_i)^2 + (\sum \epsilon_i)}$$

where item i corresponding error variance is denoted by ϵ and item i standardised factor loading is represented by λ .

The error variance is computed using the values of standardized loading (λ) value by the following formula:

$$\epsilon_i = 1 - \lambda_i^2$$

The results of AVE and Composite Reliability are shown in Tables 7 and 8, respectively. Since each construct's AVE value was more than .50, convergent validity was proven.

. AVE may be calculated using the following formula:

$$\frac{\sum \lambda_i^2}{\sum \lambda_i^2 + \sum (1 - \lambda_i^2)}$$

where λ is the standardized factor loading for item i

Table 7 Items loading and Composite Reliability

Items	Dimensions	Estimate	Composite Reliability
F9	Food quality	.752	0.877
F8		.583	
F5		.647	
F4		.647	
F3		.725	
F2		.817	
F1		.787	
SQ10	Service Quality	.672	0.889
SQ8		.688	
SQ7		.654	
SQ5		.786	
SQ4		.619	
SQ2		.838	
SQ1		.843	
A11	Atmosphere	.649	0.910

Items	Dimensions	Estimate	Composite Reliability
A10		.676	
A6		.629	
A5		.719	
A4		.724	
A3		.802	
A2		.876	
A1		.879	
C5	Convenience	.698	0.801
C4		.696	
C3		.662	
C2		.774	
P6	Price	.632	0.807
P5		.745	
P4		.781	
P2		.530	
P1		.672	

Table 8 Value of AVE and its sqrt

Construct	No of Items	AVE	Sqrt
Food Quality	7	0.507	0.712
Service Quality	7	0.538071	0.733533
Atmosphere	8	0.562272	0.749848
Convenience	4	0.502235	0.708685
Price	5	0.5409788	0.73551261

When a scale meant to have a low correlation with a measure of a different dimension turns out to have a low correlation, discriminant validity has been proven (Latif, 2018). If the construct's AVE is greater than squared of inter-correlation of the other construct, AVE is proved. The results affirm discriminant validity, as the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) exceeded the squared correlation for each construct pair (refer to Table 9).

Table 9 Discriminant Validity

	Food Quality	Service Quality	Atmosphere	Convenience	Price
Food Quality	0.712				
Service Quality	0.007	0.733			
Atmosphere	0.144	-0.06	0.759		
Convenience	0.014	0.039	-0.028	0.718	
Price	-0.034	0.049	0.011	-0.049	0.697

VI. DISCUSSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The study of (Ryu & Shawn Jang, 2008) focuses on the impact of only the physical environment of the restaurant whereas the study of (Stevens et al., 1995) service quality was studied. But in the case of restaurants, cafes, fine-dine restaurants, etc the main product that is to be served is food. Further, customer perception is influenced by a combination of factors. Therefore, this study aimed at addressing the gap by developing a scale which incorporates multiple factors that may affect customer perception and to extend the existing research in the field of the food sector. The research gap was identified and the researchers developed and validated a scale to determine the constructs that may have positive or negative impact on customer perception. For this purpose, data was collected from a sample of 600 respondents residing in Haryana. Factor analysis technique is the most common technique and has been used in various scale development study. In the first stage, factors were identified using an exploratory factor analysis technique (using IBM SPSS 21) and in the second stage the explored factors were confirmed using a confirmatory factor analysis technique (using IBM SPSS AMOS 26) (Latif, 2018; Marimon et al., 2019; Ryu & Shawn Jang, 2008a). Five factors were extracted using an exploratory factor analysis technique i.e., “food quality, service quality, atmosphere, convenience, and price”. The present study is different from (Ryu & Shawn Jang, 2008a) and (Stevens et al., 1995) and various other previous studies because the present study was not limited to only one dimension but covered almost every dimension of the food sector.

This research holds significance both in theory and in practice. From a theoretical standpoint, the availability of this tool will prompt urgently needed empirical research on a variety of dimensions and their effects on perceptions of overall service quality, image, mood, emotions, satisfaction, and approach/avoidance behaviors in the restaurant business. It contributes to increasing the knowledge of academicians and researchers about the key determinant that affects customers’ perception of retail food outlets. Furthermore, from a practical standpoint, the present study will be useful for the retail managers to identify key improvement areas that will help to increase the revenue as well as develop the reputation of the

restaurants and outlets. This study will be useful for the retail food outlets to formulate their strategies which will make them able to create strong relationship with the existing customers along with attracting the potential customers.

The research study has limits that should be acknowledged to create opportunities for further investigation. Firstly, the present study constraint was the limited sample size. It is recommended that the researchers choose a notably big sample size for their research. Furthermore, the study was limited to Haryana only, future research can be done in other parts of the county to generalize the result to the present study. Furthermore, the impact of the customer perception on customer satisfaction and their behavioral intention was not identified in this study.

VII. CONCLUSION

The present study considered food quality and focussed on other dimensions. A final data of 600 respondents was analyzed. To develop a scale to measure customer perception, the present study explored the factors with the help of exploratory factor analysis using IBM SPSS 21 and further confirmed those factors with Confirmatory factor analysis using IBM SPSS AMOS 26. Five factors i.e., “food quality, service quality, atmosphere, convenience, and price” were extracted using an exploratory factor analysis furthermore the extracted factors were confirmed along with reliability and validity tests. It contributes to increasing the knowledge of academicians and researchers about the key determinant that affects customers’ perception of retail food outlets. The present study will also be useful for the retail managers to identify key improvement areas that will help to increase the revenue as well as develop the reputation of the restaurants and outlets. This study will be useful for the retail food outlets to formulate their strategies which will make them able to create strong relationship with the existing customers along with attracting the potential customers.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. G. Blodgett, D. H. Granbois, and R. G. Walters, “The effects of perceived justice on complainants’ negative word-of-mouth behavior and repatronage intentions,” *J. Retail.*,

- vol. 69, no. 4, pp. 399–428, 1993, doi: 10.1016/0022-4359(93)90015-B.
- [2] S. H. Chun and A. Nyam-Ochir, “The effects of fast-food restaurant attributes on customer satisfaction, revisit intention, and recommendation using DINESERV scale,” *Sustainability*, vol. 12, no. 18, 2020, doi: 10.3390/SU12187435.
- [3] L. J. Cronbach and R. J. Shavelson, “My current thoughts on coefficient alpha and successor procedures,” *Educ. Psychol. Meas.*, vol. 64, no. 3, pp. 391–418, 2004, doi: 10.1177/0013164404266386.
- [4] U. Durna, B. B. Dedeoglu, and S. Balıkçıoğlu, “The role of servicescape and image perceptions of customers on behavioral intentions in the hotel industry,” *Int. J. Contemp. Hosp. Manag.*, vol. 27, no. 7, pp. 1728–1748, 2015, doi: 10.1108/IJCHM-04-2014-0173.
- [5] C. Fornell and D. F. Larcker, “Structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error: Algebra and statistics,” *J. Mark. Res.*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 382–388, 1981, doi: 10.1177/002224378101800313.
- [6] S. Ganguli and S. K. Roy, “Service quality dimensions of hybrid services,” *Manag. Serv. Qual.*, vol. 20, no. 5, pp. 404–424, 2010, doi: 10.1108/09604521011073713.
- [7] G. K. Shah, “A study on service quality and customer satisfaction of chain restaurants in selected cities of Gujarat,” 2018.
- [8] J. Ha and S. C. Jang, “The effects of dining atmospherics on behavioral intentions through quality perception,” *J. Serv. Mark.*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 204–215, 2012, doi: 10.1108/08876041211224004.
- [9] H. Han and K. Ryu, “The roles of the physical environment, price perception, and customer satisfaction in determining customer loyalty in the restaurant industry,” *J. Hosp. Tour. Res.*, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 487–510, 2009, doi: 10.1177/1096348009344212.
- [10] C. W. Hart, J. L. Heskett, and W. E. Sasser, “The profitable art of service recovery,” *Harvard Bus. Rev.*, vol. 68, no. 4, pp. 148–156, 1990.
- [11] D. Jani and H. Han, “Investigating the key factors affecting behavioral intentions: Evidence from a full-service restaurant setting,” *Int. J. Contemp. Hosp. Manag.*, vol. 23, no. 7, pp. 1000–1018, 2011, doi: 10.1108/09596111111167579.
- [12] E. H. Jeong and S. C. S. Jang, “Restaurant experiences triggering positive electronic word-of-mouth (eWOM) motivations,” *Int. J. Hosp. Manag.*, vol. 30, no. 2, pp. 356–366, 2011, doi: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2010.08.005.
- [13] E. Kim, L. Tang, and R. Bosselman, “Measuring customer perceptions of restaurant innovativeness: Developing and validating a scale,” *Int. J. Hosp. Manag.*, vol. 74, pp. 85–98, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2018.02.018.
- [14] W. G. Kim, C. Y. N. Ng, and Y. Kim, “Influence of institutional DINESERV on customer satisfaction, return intention, and word-of-mouth,” *Int. J. Hosp. Manag.*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 10–17, 2009, doi: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2008.03.005.
- [15] J. Kivela, R. Inbakaran, and J. Reece, “Consumer research in the restaurant environment. Part 3: Analysis, findings and conclusions,” *Int. J. Contemp. Hosp. Manag.*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 13–30, 2000, doi: 10.1108/09596110010304984.
- [16] J. Kivela, J. Reece, and R. Inbakaran, “Consumer research in the restaurant environment. Part 2: Research design and analytical methods,” *Int. J. Contemp. Hosp. Manag.*, vol. 11, no. 6, pp. 269–286, 1999, doi: 10.1108/09596119910281766.
- [17] K. F. Latif, “The development and validation of stakeholder-based scale for measuring university social responsibility (USR),” *Soc. Indic. Res.*, vol. 140, no. 2, pp. 511–547, 2018, doi: 10.1007/s11205-017-1794-y.
- [18] C. H. Liu, S. F. Chou, B. Gan, and J. H. Tu, “How ‘quality’ determines customer satisfaction: Evidence from the mystery shoppers’ evaluation,” *TQM J.*, vol. 27, no. 5, pp. 576–590, 2015, doi: 10.1108/TQM-01-2013-0004.
- [19] Lockwood and K. Pyun, “Developing a scale measuring customers’ servicescape perceptions in upscale hotels,” *Int. J. Contemp. Hosp. Manag.*, vol. 32, no. 1, pp. 40–59, 2020, doi: 10.1108/IJCHM-04-2017-0208.
- [20] S. Lu, C. C. Lin, and C. J. Tu, “Corporate social responsibility and organisational performance in container shipping,” *Int. J. Logist. Res. Appl.*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 119–132, 2009, doi: 10.1080/13675560902749373.

- [21] F. Marimon, J. Llach, M. Alonso-Almeida, and M. Mas-Machuca, "CC-Qual: A holistic scale to assess customer perceptions of service quality of collaborative consumption services," *Int. J. Inf. Manag.*, vol. 49, pp. 130–141, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2019.03.009.
- [22] V. Marinkovic, V. Senic, and P. Mimovic, "Factors affecting choice and image of ethnic restaurants in Serbia," *Br. Food J.*, vol. 117, no. 7, pp. 1903–1920, 2015, doi: 10.1108/BFJ-09-2014-0313.
- [23] J. G. Maxham III and R. G. Netemeyer, "Modeling customer perceptions of complaint handling over time: The effects of perceived justice on satisfaction and intent," 2002.
- [24] Namin, "Revisiting customers' perception of service quality in fast food restaurants," *J. Retail. Consum. Serv.*, vol. 34, pp. 70–81, 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.jretconser.2016.09.008.
- [25] Y. Namkung and S. C. Jang, "Does food quality really matter in restaurants? Its impact on customer satisfaction and behavioral intentions," *J. Hosp. Tour. Res.*, vol. 31, no. 3, pp. 387–409, 2007, doi: 10.1177/1096348007299924.
- [26] N. H. Nguyen and T. Chinda, "Interrelationships among key profit factors of Vietnamese residential projects using structural equation modeling," *Songklanakarin J. Sci. Technol.*, vol. 40, no. 2, pp. 467–474, 2018, doi: 10.14456/sjst-psu.2018.49.
- [27] Parasuraman, V. A. Zeithaml, and L. L. Berry, "A conceptual model of service quality and its implications for future research," *J. Mark.*, vol. 49, no. 4, pp. 41–50, 1985, doi: 10.1177/002224298504900403.
- [28] K. Ryu, H. Han, and T. H. Kim, "The relationships among overall quick-casual restaurant image, perceived value, customer satisfaction, and behavioral intentions," *Int. J. Hosp. Manag.*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 459–469, 2008, doi: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2007.11.001.
- [29] K. Ryu and S. Jang, "DINESCAPE: A scale for customers' perception of dining environments," *J. Foodserv. Bus. Res.*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 2–22, 2008, doi: 10.1080/15378020801926551.
- [30] B. Schneider and D. E. Bowen, "Understanding customer delight and outrage," 2016.
- [31] K. Seiders and L. L. Berry, "Service fairness: What it is and why it matters," *Acad. Manag. Perspect.*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 8–20, 1998, doi: 10.5465/ame.1998.650513.
- [32] P. Stevens, B. Knutson, and M. Patton, "DINESERV: A tool for measuring service quality in restaurants," *Cornell Hotel Restaur. Adm. Q.*, vol. 36, no. 2, pp. 56–60, 1995, doi: 10.1177/001088049503600226.
- [33] G. S. Sureshchandar, C. Rajendran, and T. J. Kamalanabhan, "Customer perceptions of service quality: A critique," *Total Qual. Manag.*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 111–124, 2001, doi: 10.1080/09544120020010138.
- [34] Q. Tan, A. Oriade, and P. Fallon, "Service quality and customer satisfaction in Chinese fast-food sector: A proposal for CFFRSERV," 2014.
- [35] G. J. Udo, K. K. Bagchi, and P. J. Kirs, "An assessment of customers' e-service quality perception, satisfaction and intention," *Int. J. Inf. Manag.*, vol. 30, no. 6, pp. 481–492, 2010, doi: 10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2010.03.005.
- [36] E. A. Wall and L. L. Berry, "The combined effects of the physical environment and employee behavior on customer perception of restaurant service quality," *Cornell Hotel Restaur. Adm. Q.*, vol. 48, no. 1, pp. 59–69, 2007, doi: 10.1177/0010880406297246.
- [37] Z. Yang, M. Jun, and R. T. Peterson, "Measuring customer perceived online service quality: Scale development and managerial implications," *Int. J. Oper. Prod. Manag.*, vol. 24, no. 11, pp. 1149–1174, 2004, doi: 10.1108/01443570410563278.

Website

<https://www.mordorintelligence.com/industry-reports/india-foodservice-market>