

Effects of Service Quality and Customer Satisfaction on Repurchase Intention in Restaurants on University of Cape Coast Campus

Ishmael Mensah

University of Cape Coast, Ghana

Rebecca Dei Mensah

University of Cape Coast, Ghana

Abstract: *This study sought to examine the effects of service quality and customer satisfaction on the repurchase intentions of customers of restaurants on University of Cape Coast Campus. The survey method was employed involving a convenient sample of 200 customers of 10 restaurants on the University of Cape Coast Campus. A modified DINESERV scale was used to measure customers' perceived service quality. The results of the study indicate that four factors accounted for 50% of the variance in perceived service quality, namely; responsiveness-assurance, empathy-equity, reliability and tangibles. Service quality was found to have a significant effect on customer satisfaction. Also, both service quality and customer satisfaction had significant effects on repurchase intention. However, customer satisfaction could not moderate the effect of service quality on repurchase intention. This paper adds to the debate on the dimensions of service quality and provides evidence on the effects of service quality and customer satisfaction on repurchase intention in a campus food service context.*

Keywords: campus, restaurant, customer satisfaction, repurchase intention, service quality, university

JEL Classification: G2, L80, L66

Biographical note: Ishmael Mensah is an Associate Professor at the Department of Hospitality and Tourism Management of the University of Cape Coast. He holds a Ph.D in Tourism from the same university as well as post-graduate certificates in Hospitality Administration and Event Planning & Tradeshow Management from Georgia State University. He is also a Certified Hospitality Educator (CHE) by American hotel and Lodging Educational Institute and a member of the Institute of Hospitality (MIH). His research interests include environmental management in tourism, destination marketing and service quality.

Rebecca Dei Mensah is a Senior Lecturer in the Department of Human Resource Management of the School of Business, University of Cape Coast. She holds an MBA from the University of Ghana and a PhD in Human Resource Management from Kenyatta University. Contact details of the author: ikmensah@ucc.edu.gh

1 INTRODUCTION

The university food service sector is considered as one of the largest sectors of the foodservice industry (Andaleeb & Caskey, 2007). The sector also has a lot of prospects as the college student market has been growing globally (Garg,

2014; Kim, Moreo & Yeh, 2004). The story is not different in Ghana where the number of university food service establishments on university campuses has been on the ascendancy largely in response to an increase in the number of universities and student enrolment. There has been a steady increase in the number of private tertiary institutions

while public universities also continue to expand especially with the upgrading of some polytechnics into technical universities and the creation of new public universities in the Volta and Brong Ahafo Regions. Enrolment in the universities and polytechnics increased by 6.3% and 8.9% respectively during the 2014/2015 academic year (Graphiconline, 2015). The increase in student enrolment signifies an increase in the demand for food on the campuses. However, increase in the number of restaurants on university campuses has also heightened competition and this makes the delivery of service quality imperative. The provision of service quality is also a source of competitive advantage to restaurants (Chow et al., 2007; Martins, 2016). Quality service delivery is a vital strategic resource that can be leveraged to attain a sustained competitive advantage in the restaurant industry (Jin, Line & Goh, 2013). The National Restaurant Association (2009) indicated that 60 percent of new restaurants fail because they are not able to satisfy their customers. Thus, customer satisfaction is a major determinant of a company's long-term profitability, customer retention and loyalty (Zeithaml & Bitner, 2003; Spyridou, 2017).

University food service establishments have peculiar challenges which inhibit the delivery of quality service. One major challenge is the negative perception. According to Kwun (2011), the perceptions of campus foodservices tend to be unfavorable as a result of various situational, contextual, and environmental constraints such as captive environment, repetitive consumption of limited and monotonous menu items, mediocre execution of food and service, and facility in general.

Several studies on consumer behavior in restaurants suggest that service quality significantly influences consumers' decisions on restaurants (Clemes, Gan & Sriwongrat, 2013). Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry (1991) defined service quality as the overall evaluation of a specific organization that results from comparing its performance with consumers' general expectations of how the organization should perform. There has been a plethora of studies on service quality in general and service quality in restaurants in particular yet analysis of service quality in university food service systems has been neglected (Ruetzler, 2008). In spite of the growing competition among campus food service operators, research on service quality in the area has been limited. There is empirical evidence to the fact that the service quality of restaurants in general, in Ghana need improvement. Mensah (2009) found a negative gap between customers' expectations and perceptions of service quality of restaurants in Cape Coast. Kwabena, Brew and Addae-Boateng (2013) found out that 30% of customers of selected chop bars in Koforidua were not satisfied with the quality of service. Though there has been a modicum of studies on service quality in the food service industry in Ghana (Kwabena, Brew & Addae-Boateng, 2013; Mensah, 2009).

Yet these studies did not examine the relationship between service quality and customer satisfaction in a university campus context despite the fact that the campus foodservice market is different. According to El-Said and Fathy (2015) the campus foodservice market is more complex, diverse and dynamic rendering the measurement of service quality and identification of the determinants of service quality difficult.

It is against this background that this study seeks to examine the effects of service quality and customer satisfaction on the repurchase intentions of customers of restaurants on University of Cape Coast Campus. This paper will specifically explore the determinants of perceived service quality of restaurants on University of Cape Coast Campus employing a modified DINESERV scale and examine how that influences customers' satisfaction and repurchase intentions.

2 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Service Quality

The university food service sector is considered as one of the largest sectors of the foodservice industry (Andaleeb & Caskey, 2007). The sector also has a lot of prospects as the college student market has been growing globally (Garg, 2014; Kim, Moreo & Yeh, 2004). The story is not different in Ghana where the number of university food service establishments on university campuses has been on the ascendancy largely in response to an increase in the number of universities and student enrolment. There has been a steady increase in the number of private tertiary institutions while public universities also continue to expand especially with the upgrading of some polytechnics into technical universities and the creation of new public universities in the Volta and Brong Ahafo Regions. Enrolment in the universities and polytechnics increased by 6.3% and 8.9% respectively during the 2014/2015 academic year (Graphiconline, 2015). The increase in student enrolment signifies an increase in the demand for food on the campuses. However, increase in the number of restaurants on university campuses has also heightened competition and this makes the delivery of service quality imperative. The provision of service quality is also a source of competitive advantage to restaurants (Chow et al., 2007). Quality service delivery is a vital strategic resource that can be leveraged to attain a sustained competitive advantage in the restaurant industry (Jin, Line & Goh, 2013). The National Restaurant Association (2009) indicated that 60 percent of new restaurants fail because they are not able to satisfy their customers. Thus, customer satisfaction is a major determinant of a company's long-term profitability, customer retention and loyalty (Zeithaml & Bitner, 2003).

University food service establishments have peculiar challenges which inhibit the delivery of quality service. One major challenge is the negative perception. According to Kwun (2011), the perceptions of campus foodservices tend to be unfavorable as a result of various situational, contextual, and environmental constraints such as captive environment, repetitive consumption of limited and monotonous menu items, mediocre execution of food and service, and facility in general.

Several studies on consumer behavior in restaurants suggest that service quality significantly influences consumers' decisions on restaurants (Clemes, Gan & Sriwongrat, 2013). Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry (1991) defined service quality as the overall evaluation of a specific organization

that results from comparing its performance with consumers' general expectations of how the organization should perform. There has been a plethora of studies on service quality in general and service quality in restaurants in particular yet analysis of service quality in university food service systems has been neglected (Ruetzler, 2008). In spite of the growing competition among campus food service operators, research on service quality in the area has been limited. There is empirical evidence to the fact that the service quality of restaurants in general, in Ghana need improvement. Mensah (2009) found a negative gap between customers' expectations and perceptions of service quality of restaurants in Cape Coast. Kwabena, Brew and Addae-Boateng (2013) found out that 30% of customers of selected chop bars in Koforidua were not satisfied with the quality of service. Though there has been a modicum of studies on service quality in the food service industry in Ghana (Kwabena, Brew & Addae-Boateng, 2013; Mensah, 2009). Yet these studies did not examine the relationship between service quality and customer satisfaction in a university campus context despite the fact that the campus foodservice market is different. According to El-Said and Fathy (2015) the campus foodservice market is more complex, diverse and dynamic rendering the measurement of service quality and identification of the determinants of service quality difficult. It is against this background that this study seeks to examine the effects of service quality and customer satisfaction on the repurchase intentions of customers of restaurants on University of Cape Coast Campus. This paper will specifically explore the determinants of perceived service quality of restaurants on University of Cape Coast Campus employing a modified DINESERV scale and examine how that influences customers' satisfaction and repurchase intentions.

2.2 Satisfaction

Zeithaml and Bitner (2003) define satisfaction as a customer's judgment that a product or service provides a pleasurable level of consumption-related accomplishment. Determinants of satisfaction include perception of service quality, product quality, price, situation factors, and personal factors (Zeithaml & Bitner, 2003). The expectancy-disconfirmation theory has been described by Oh (1999) as one of the most common and widely accepted theories for the analysis of customer satisfaction in the service industry. Oliver (1981) employed the expectancy-disconfirmation model to explain that customer satisfaction is determined by comparing customers' expectations and perceptions of performance. The theory posits that customer satisfaction is measured by the gap between customer expectation and perceived performance. Thus, if perceived performance exceeds expectation of the performance, the expectation is positively disconfirmed and the customer is satisfied as the actual performance exceeds the customer's expectations. On the contrary, if the perceived performance falls short of expectations, the resultant effect is a negative disconfirmation as the customer becomes dissatisfied with the performance.

However, there appears to be a lack of consensus on how best to conceptualize customer satisfaction. In the view of Crompton and Love (1995) point to the lack of consensus in the conceptualization of satisfaction, indicating that it remains an elusive, indistinct and ambiguous construct. There are however two general conceptualizations of satisfaction in the literature. These are transaction-specific satisfaction and cumulative satisfaction (Namkung & Jang, 2007). Transaction-specific satisfaction describes a customer's judgement of a product or service at a particular point in time (Cronin & Taylor, 1992) while cumulative satisfaction is a customer's evaluation of the total consumption experience with a product or service over time, which has a direct effect on post-purchase behavioural intentions such as change in attitude, repeat purchase and brand loyalty (Johnson & Fornell, 1991). Jiang, and Rosenbloom (2005) explain that customers' overall satisfaction is a better indicator of satisfaction than transaction-specific measures.

A number of factors including the physical environment, food and price have been found to influence customer satisfaction. Chang, (2000) and Chebat & Michon, (2003) found out that the physical environment directly influences customer satisfaction. Also, Susskind and Chan (2000) indicate that good food, good service and a pleasant setting are the three components that contribute to overall customer satisfaction with the restaurant. Johns and Pine (2002) refer to the servicescape as the fundamental factors that contribute to customer satisfaction in restaurants. These include the food (hygiene, balance, and healthiness), physical provision (layout, furnishing, and cleanliness), the atmosphere (feeling and comfort), and the service received (speed, friendliness, and care) during the meal experience.

Xi and Shuai (2009) found out that students' satisfaction with institutional foodservice depends on food quality, food variety and price fairness. This is corroborated by the results of a similar study by Ng (2005) which revealed that food quality and price and value are significant in measuring students' satisfaction with university dining facilities.

2.3 Effect of service quality on customer satisfaction and repurchase intention

Satisfaction is generally viewed as a broader concept than service quality (Bowden, 2009; Zeithaml and Bitner, 2003). Thus, service quality is a subset of satisfaction. Satisfaction comprises of both cognitive and affective evaluations while service quality is essentially a cognitive evaluation. Furthermore, perceived service quality a long-run overall evaluation of a product or service, whereas satisfaction is a transaction-specific evaluation (Cronin & Taylor, 1992; Parasuraman, Zeithaml, & Berry, 1988). Bitner and Hubbert (1994) point to an emerging consensus that satisfaction is the outcome of individual service transactions and the overall service encounter, whereas service quality is the customer's overall impression of the relative inferiority/superiority of the organization and its services.

There is enough evidence that service quality is an antecedent of customer satisfaction (Cronin & Taylor, 1992; H. Lee, Lee, & Yoo, 2000; Ting, 2004). However, Parasuraman, Zeithaml and Berry (1988) hold a different view that satisfaction is rather an antecedent to perceived service quality. Bitner (1990) developed a model of service encounter evaluation and empirically proved that satisfaction was an antecedent of service quality. Cronin and Taylor (1992) also found out that service quality was an antecedent of customer satisfaction whereas customer satisfaction was not a significant determinant of service quality. H. Lee, Lee, and Yoo (2000) examined the direction of causality between service quality and satisfaction, and the results showed that perceived service quality was an antecedent of satisfaction, rather than vice versa. Ting (2004) also found out that service quality better explains customer satisfaction, and that the coefficient of the path from service quality to customer satisfaction was greater than the coefficient of the path from customer satisfaction to service quality in the service industry.

However, other studies have shown that perceived service quality has a positive effect on customer satisfaction (Iglesias & Guille'n, 2004; Lenka et al., 2009). In the same vein, restaurant service quality is an important determinant of customer satisfaction (Kim et al., 2009; Ladhari et al., 2008; Harrington et al., 2011; Ma et. al, 2017). Ladhari et al. (2008) in a study on determinants of dining satisfaction and post-dining behavioral intentions, concluded that perceived service quality influenced customer satisfaction through both positive and negative emotions. This leads to the formulation of the following hypothesis:

H1 Service quality has no effect on customer satisfaction

The positive links between service quality, satisfaction and repurchase intentions have been established. Dabholkar, Shepherd, and Thorpe (2000) noted that satisfaction acts as a mediator between perceived quality and behavioral intentions. Cronin and Taylor (1992) on the other hand demonstrated that perceived service quality led to satisfaction, and that satisfaction, in turn, had a significant positive effect on repurchase intentions. Hong and Goo (2004) also found out that the path from service quality through customer satisfaction to loyalty was significant in Taiwanese service firms. Also, Bougoure and Neu (2010), found customer satisfaction to mediate the effects of service quality on behavioural intentions among customers of fast food establishments in Malaysia. based on the foregone, two hypotheses are proposed:

H2 service quality has no effect on repurchase intention

H3 customer satisfaction does not moderate the effect of service quality on repurchase intention

Studies specifically in the restaurant industry have lent further credence to the fact that service quality is an important factor influencing customer satisfaction and repurchase intentions (Jen & Hu, 2003; Kim, Ng, & Kim, 2009; Liu & Jang, 2009; Chatzigeorgiou & Simeli, 2017). Chow et al. (2007) in a study on full-service restaurants in southern China found significant links between service quality and customer

satisfaction, as well as between service quality and customer loyalty. The following hypothesis is therefore proposed:

H4 customer satisfaction has no effect on repurchase intention

The hypothesized paths are presented in the research model in Figure 1.




Figure 1: Research Framework

3 METHODOLOGY

3.1 Questionnaire development

A self-administered questionnaire was used for data collection. The questionnaire was in three parts, namely perceived service quality, customer satisfaction and socio-demographic characteristics of respondents. A number of instruments have been developed to measure service quality. The original SERVQUAL instrument by Parasuraman et al. (1988) is a 22-item scale that measures service quality along five dimensions and it is the foundation of on which all other scales have been built. To overcome the shortcomings of the SERVQUAL scale, the SERVPERF scale was developed by Cronin and Taylor (1992) which is more effective in explaining the service quality constructs and variations in service quality scores within the restaurant industry (Jain and Gupta, 2004).subsequent to the SERVPERF scale, Ryu and Jang (2008) developed the DINESCAPE, a six-factor scale which was specifically tailored to measure facility aesthetics, ambience, lighting, service product, layout, and social factors in a restaurant context.

Also, in an effort to adapt SERVQUAL to the restaurant industry, Stevens et al. (1995) developed the DINESERV instrument. However, one of the important components of the restaurant experience, "food quality," was not included in the DINESERV scale.

This study therefore employed a modified DINESERV scale by including items relating to food quality.

Part One, which was the modified DINESERV scale elicited data on customers' perceptions of service quality in the restaurants based on 35 items. Repurchase intention which was measured with a single item (I will dine in this restaurant again) was included in this part. Part Two was designed to elicit consumers' level of satisfaction with the service quality of the restaurants based on seven items, namely food, menu, price, service, environment, facilities and layout. A five-point

Likert-type scale, ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5) was used for the service quality items as well as repurchase intention. However, a five-point rating scale ranging from very dissatisfied (1) to very satisfied (5) was used for measuring satisfaction.

Part Three elicited customers' socio-demographic information such as age, gender, level of education and occupation.

3.2 Data collection procedures

The study was undertaken in 10 restaurants on the University of Cape Coast Campus between 3rd and 24th April, 2016. The study followed an explanatory cross-sectional design. The target population was all customers of restaurants on UCC campus who were 18 years and above and had had at least a meal at the restaurant. The 10 restaurants were purposively selected because whilst there are a number of food service establishments on campus, not all of them can be described as restaurants. The selected restaurants had ample sitting space, a wider variety of both local and continental menu items and provided table, counter and take away service. Due to lack of a sampling frame, the convenience sampling method was employed. Because respondents should have had at least a meal in the selected restaurants a filter question was first posed to qualify respondents. According to Edvardsson (2005) service quality perceptions are formed during the production, delivery and consumption process. In view of this, only customers who had finished their meals were approached. Questionnaires were distributed among customers who had finished eating and were willing to take part in the survey after permission had been sought from the management of the restaurant. A sample size of 250 comprising 25 from each restaurant was deemed suitable for the study but 200 questionnaires were found to be suitable for the analysis. It has been recommended by Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson (2010) that a minimum sample size of 100 is suitable for conducting an Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA). Thus the sample size of 200 was deemed suitable for the study.

A pre-test of 22 questionnaires was conducted at a restaurant outside UCC campus prior to the actual data collection in order to assess the survey instrument (Cooper & Schindler, 2006). This afforded the researcher the opportunity to elicit feedback from respondents regarding the legibility and clarity of the questions as well as to determine the reliability of the scale used.

4 RESULTS

4.1 Socio-demographic characteristics of respondents

From Table 1, respondents were mainly young, single students and of Christian religious persuasion. Nearly two-thirds (64.5%) were less than 30 years old. Their ages reflected the fact that they were mostly undergraduate students (66%). Specifically, 71% were single while the greater majority (94%) were Christians.

Table 1: Socio-demographic characteristics of respondents (N = 200)

Characteristic	Frequency	Percent	Characteristic	Frequency	Percent
Age:			Marital status:		
< 30	129	64.5	Single	142	71.0
30-49	47	23.5	Married	51	25.5
50+	24	12.0	Separated	7	3.5
Gender:			Religion:		
Male	126	63.0	Christian	188	94.0
Female	74	37.0	Muslim	9	4.5
			Others	3	1.5
Occupation:			Education:		
Lecturer	39	19.5	Primary	3	1.5
Administrator	20	10.0	Secondary	14	7.0
Student	88	44.0	Tertiary	132	66.0
Professional	23	11.5	Postgraduate	51	25.5
Businessman/ woman	10	5.0			
Other	20	10.0			

Source: Fieldwork (2016)

4.2 Exploratory factor analysis

An EFA was performed on the data using principal component analysis with VARIMAX factor rotation. The Bartlett Test of Sphericity produced a result of $X^2 = 2773.612$, which was statistically significant ($p = 0.000$) while the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin value was 0.876, which is higher than the recommended value of 0.6 (Kaiser, 1974).

The data was thus suitable for factor analysis. Subsequently, five items that loaded less than 0.4 were removed from the dataset (Armor, 1974) and excluded from further analysis. Four factors emerged and were renamed according to the predominant themes namely; (1) responsiveness-assurance, (2) empathy-equity, (3) reliability and (4) tangibles. As shown in Table 2, the level of internal consistency in each sub-dimension was acceptable with the Cronbach's Alpha estimates ranging from 0.75 to 0.89, which exceeded the cut-off point of 0.70 indicating the internal consistency of the measured items (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). The four factors cumulatively explained 50% of the variance.

Table 2: Varimax rotated factor analysis of determinants of perceived service quality of restaurants on UCC campus

Factors	Factor loadings	% of variance explained	Eigenvalue
Responsiveness – Assurance		33.51	5.45
Staff are willing to handle my special requests	0.71		
Staff are able to answer my questions correctly	0.70		
Staff make me feel special	0.67		
	0.64		
	0.63		
	0.61		
	0.60		
	0.57		
	0.57		

Staff are readily available to answer my questions Staff provide prompt and quick service Staff make me feel personally safe Staff can identify my personal needs and wants Staff maintain standard of service every time Staff appear to be well-trained Staff make me feel comfortable	0.52		
Empathy – Equity Staff seem to have my best interest at heart Staff do not discriminate against customers Staff are friendly Staff are professional Staff provide food to customers at reasonable prices Staff are sympathetic and reassuring Staff are courteous and polite	0.80 0.75 0.74 0.70 0.69 0.68 0.62	6.12	4.78
Reliability Staff serve my food as exactly ordered Staff serve my food in the time promised Staff quickly correct anything that is wrong Staff usually provide me with an accurate bill	0.77 0.66 0.55 0.52	6.07	2.74
Tangibles Restaurant has menu that is visually attractive Restaurant has clean restrooms Restaurant has a visually attractive dining area Restaurant has visually attractive surroundings	0.71 0.63 0.57 0.49 0.42 0.40	4.32	2.63

Restaurant has comfortable seats in dining room Restaurant has a comfortable dining area			
Perceived service quality		50.02	

Notes: KMO (0.876);
Barlett’s test of sphericity (approx $X^2 = 2773.612$; $p = 0.000$); Only loadings 0.40 and above are displayed.

4.3 Reliability Analysis

The reliability of the constructs used in this study is reported in Table 3. Cronbach’s alpha was used to assess the internal consistency of the result measurements. All values exceeded the suggested cut-off point of .70 [service quality = 0.93; satisfaction = 0.85 and repurchase intention 0.88] (Nunally, 1978).

The mean scores of the service quality dimensions indicate that generally respondents had a favourable perception of service quality since they were in agreement with the statements relating to the various dimensions of service quality as shown in Table 2. However, there was a greater level of agreement to the fact that restaurant staff provided them with accurate bills (Mean = 4.15, SD = 0.72) and that the restaurant had comfortable seats in the dining area (mean

Table 3: Reliability analysis of constructs

Variable	M	SD	Cronbach alpha
Service quality			.932
<i>Responsiveness- Assurance</i>			.892
Staff are willing to handle my special requests	3.82	.84	.829
Staff are able to answer my questions correctly	3.86	.77	
Staff make me feel special	3.52	.92	
Staff are readily available to answer my questions	3.86	.95	
Staff provide prompt and quick service	3.78	.88	
Staff make me feel personally safe	3.85	.83	
Staff can identify my personal needs and wants	3.46	.95	
Staff maintain standard of service every time	3.76	.91	
Staff appear to be well-trained	3.69	.92	
Staff make me feel comfortable	3.97	.76	
<i>Empathy - Equity</i>			.751
Staff seem to have my best interest at heart	3.72	.87	
Staff do not discriminate against customers	3.79	.89	
Staff are friendly	3.96	.84	
Staff are professional	3.68	.95	
	3.89	.93	.759
	3.65	.85	
	3.92	.82	

Staff provide food to customers at reasonable prices	4.02	.67	
Staff are sympathetic and reassuring	4.01	.72	
Staff are courteous and polite	4.11	.67	
<i>Reliability</i>	4.01	.86	
Staff serve my food as exactly ordered			
Staff serve my food in the time promised			
Staff quickly correct anything that is wrong			
Staff usually provide me with an accurate bill			
<i>Tangibles</i>			
Restaurant has menu that is visually attractive			
Restaurant has clean restrooms			
Restaurant has a visually attractive dining area			
Restaurant has visually attractive surroundings			
Restaurant has comfortable seats in dining room			
Restaurant has a comfortable dining area			
Satisfaction			.848
Food	3.70	.99	
Menu	3.13	1.12	
Price	3.44	.96	
Service	3.53	.98	
Ambience	3.65	.94	
Facilities	3.29	1.08	
Layout	3.49	1.07	
Repurchase intention	4.13	.83	.882

Source: Fieldwork, 2016

= 4.11, SD = 0.67). however, the statement that restaurant staff could identify their needs and wants had the lowest mean of 3.46 and standard deviation of 0.95 suggesting respondents were neutral on the issue. With regards to customer satisfaction, though customers were satisfied with all the aspects of the service, they were more satisfied with the food (Mean = 3.70, SD = 0.99) and less satisfied with the menu (Mean = 3.13, SD = 1.12) and facilities (mean = 3.29, SD = 1.08), though the high standard deviation indicates that perceptions vary among respondents. Repurchase intention had one of the highest mean scores (Mean = 4.13, SD = 0.83) indicating respondents generally had intentions of patronizing the restaurants again.

4.4 Testing of hypotheses

The study employed four independent variables, namely service quality, customer satisfaction, repurchase intention and the interaction between service quality and customer

satisfaction (SQ*CS). Two models were used, in the first model, service quality was entered as the independent variable with customer satisfaction as the dependent variable. The overall model was significant ($R^2 = 0.322$; $F = 93.75$; $P < 0.01$). In the second model, service quality, satisfaction and the interaction effect of service quality and satisfaction (SQ*CS) were entered as independent variables with Repurchase Intention as the dependent variable. The second model was also significant ($R^2 = 0.347$; $F = 93.75$; $P < 0.01$). The first hypothesis seeks to examine the effect of service quality on customer satisfaction. The results in Table 4 indicate, a standardized (β -value) of 0.568 indicating that service quality has a significant effect on customer satisfaction. The result means that service quality can contribute about 57% to customer satisfaction. The significance of the effect of service quality on the customer satisfaction is given by the p -value of $p < 0.001$. Thus the hypothesis is supported.

Results of the study also supports the second hypothesis that service quality has a significant effect on repurchase intention. The standardized (β -value) of 0.790 means that the service quality can contribute about 79% to repurchase intention, which is quite significant ($p < 0.01$). Thus service quality influences customers' intention to purchase from the restaurants again.

The third hypothesis proposes that customer satisfaction has a significant effect on repurchase intention. From the results, customer satisfaction contributes about 71% (β -value of 0.711) to repurchase intention and this was significant at $p < 0.01$, which indicates a strong effect of customer satisfaction on repurchase intention. This means that the hypothesis is supported.

The fourth hypothesis proposes that customer satisfaction moderates the effect of service quality on repurchase intention. However, with a β -value of -0.805 at $P = 0.126$, the result indicates that customer satisfaction does not significantly moderate the effect of service quality on repurchase intention. The interaction between the two constructs is however inversely related to repurchase intention which means that the two constructs do not increase together. When there is an increase in one, then there is a decrease in the other and vice versa. Hence the hypothesis is not supported

Table 4: Summary of hierarchical regression analysis for effects of service quality and satisfaction on repurchase intention ($N = 200$)

Regression Models	B	SE B	β	P-Value	R^2	F for change in R^2
Satisfaction [Model 1]	0.033	0.003	0.568	0.000	0.322	93.752
Service quality						
Repurchase intention [Model 2]	0.046	0.014	0.790	0.001		3.644

Service quality	0.11	0.05	0.71	0.05	0.34	
Satisfaction	6	9	1	0	7	
Service quality x satisfaction	-	0.00	-	0.12		
	0.00	1	0.80	6		
	1		5			

Source: Fieldwork, 2016

5 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The study underscores the importance of the responsiveness and assurance dimensions in the determination of service quality. In this study, the two dimensions combined to contribute 33% to the variance in service quality. Customers who were mainly students, lecturers and other administrative staff of the university place much premium on responsiveness probably due to the fact that they have very little time to spare and as such would want prompt service. This is against the background that some previous studies in Ghana have pointed to the lack of responsiveness in food service delivery (Mensah, 2009). Assurance is also an important dimension of service quality since customers want to be safe and secure and to be reassured that staff have the capacity to deliver quality service. Surprisingly, food did not contribute significantly to the variance in perceived service quality. This could probably be due to the fact that the restaurants offered similar menu. In view of the similarities of food offered by the restaurants, what puts one restaurant ahead of the other is the service, especially in terms of responsiveness, assurance, empathy and reliability. Moreover, tangibles only accounted for 4.32% of the variance and this is indicative of the importance customers of campus restaurants attach to the functional quality.

The results of this study have reaffirmed the importance of service quality and customer satisfaction to repurchase intention in the campus food service segment. The study found both service quality and customer satisfaction to influence repurchase intention. This coincides with the results of previous studies. (Chow et al., 2007; Cronin & Taylor, 1992; Jen & Hu, 2003; Kim et al., 2009). Thus operators of restaurants on campus must put in a lot of effort to improve upon service quality. This is the surest bet to ensuring customer loyalty. This is because the study revealed that customers' perceived service quality is a significant predictor of customer satisfaction whilst customer satisfaction in turn is a significant predictor of repurchase intention. From the study, service quality contributes, more than half (57%) to satisfaction while satisfaction contributes 71% to repurchase intention. According to Gupta et al. (2007), the link between customer satisfaction and repeat buying is an important contributor to a restaurant's profits. In the end, it is restaurants that meet or exceed their customers' expectations that will remain profitable because their customers will keep coming back for more and this will boost their sales and bottom-line.

Though results of the study indicate that service quality influences satisfaction and satisfaction in turn influences repurchase intention, there is no evidence to support the

assertion that satisfaction moderates the effect of service quality on repurchase intention. Though some studies have proven that satisfaction moderates the effect of service quality on repurchase intention (Bougoure & Neu, 2010; Dabholkar et al., 2000), in this study, there is no evidence to that effect. The effect of the interaction between customer satisfaction and service quality on repurchase intention rather had an inverse relationship with repurchase intention.

Thus, managers of campus foodservice establishments should improve the quality of services in order to remain competitive in the burgeoning campus foodservice market. They should pay particular attention to the responsiveness and assurance of their staff. Regular training of staff and queue management will help to improve assurance and responsiveness respectively.

A major limitation to this study is that data was collected from a single public university and this limits the generalizability of the findings for the entire campus foodservice market. To address this problem, it is recommended that future studies should draw samples from both public and private universities in different parts of a country to reflect the entire campus foodservice market.

Also, future studies should examine other factors apart from service quality which influence customer satisfaction with campus food services.

REFERENCES

- Almanza, B. A., Jaffe, W., Lin, L. (1994). Use of the service attribute matrix to measure consumer satisfaction, *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 17(2), 63-75.
- Andaleeb, S. S. & Conway C. (2006). Customer satisfaction in the restaurant industry: an examination of the transaction-specific model, *Journal of Services Marketing*, 20(1), 3-11.
- Andaleeb, S.S. & Caskey, A. (2007). Satisfaction with food services: Insight from a college Cafeteria, *Journal of Foodservice Business Research*, 10(2), 51-65.
- Armor, D.J. (1974). Theta reliability and factor scaling, in H.L. Costner (Ed.), *Sociological Methodology* (pp.17-50), Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Berry, L.L., Zeithaml, V.A. & Parasuraman, A. (1985). Quality counts in services, too, *Business Horizons*, May-June, pp. 44-52.
- Bitner, M. J. (1990). Evaluating service encounters: The effects of physical surroundings and employee responses, *Journal of Marketing*, 54(2), 69-82.
- Bitner, M.J. & Hubbert, A.R. (1994). Encounter satisfaction versus overall satisfaction versus service quality: the consumer's voice, in Rust, R.T. and Oliver, R.L. (Eds), *Service Quality: New Directions in Theory and Practice*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Bougoure, U. S., & Neu, M. K. (2010). Service quality in the Malaysian fast food industry: An examination using DINESERV, *Services Marketing Quarterly*, 31(2), 194-212.
- Bowden, J. (2009). Customer engagement: A framework for assessing customer brand relationships: The case of the restaurant industry. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 18, 574-596.
- Brady, M.K., & Cronin, J.J. (2001). Some new thoughts on conceptualizing perceived service quality: a

- hierarchical approach", *Journal of Marketing*, 65, 34–49.
- Chang, K. (2000). The impact of perceived physical environments on customers' satisfaction and return intentions, *Journal of Professional Services Marketing*, 21(2), 75-85.
- Chryssoula Chatzigeorgiou, & Ioanna Simeli. (2017). Perception of service quality in agrotourism accommodations: Impact on guest loyalty and re-visit intentions. *Journal of Tourism, Heritage & Services Marketing*, 3(1), 33–41. <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.401375>
- Chebat, J., & Michon, R. (2003). Impact of ambient odors on mall shoppers' emotions, cognition, and spending, *Journal of Business Research*, 56, 529-539.
- Chen, W. J., & Chen, M. L. (2014). Factors affecting the hotel's service quality: relationship marketing and corporate image, *Journal of hospitality marketing & management*, 23(1), 77-96.
- Chow, I.H., Lau, V.P., Lo, T.W., Sha, Z. & Yun, H. (2007). Service quality in restaurant operations in China: decision- and experiential-oriented perspectives. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 26(3), 698–710.
- Clemes, M. D., Gan, C., & Sriwongrat, C. (2013). Consumers' choice factors of an upscale ethnic restaurant, *Journal of Food Products Marketing*, 19(5), 413-438.
- Cooper, D. R., Schindler, P. S., & Sun, J. (2006). *Business Research Methods*, McGraw-Hill Irwin, New York.
- Crompton, J. L. & Love, L. L. (1995). The predictive validity of alternative approaches to evaluating quality of a festival, *Journal of Travel Research*, 34(1), 11–25.
- Cronin, J.J. & Taylor, S.A. (1992). Measuring service quality: a reexamination and extension, *Journal of Marketing*, 56, 55-68.
- Dabholkar, P. A., Shepherd, C. D., & Thorpe, D. I. (2000). A comprehensive framework for service quality: An investigation of critical conceptual and measurement issues through a longitudinal study, *Journal of Retailing*, 76(2), 139-173.
- Edvardsson, B. (2005). Service quality: Beyond cognitive assessment, *Managing Service Quality*, 15(2), 127–131.
- El-Said, O. A., & Fathy, E. A. (2015). Assessing university students' satisfaction with on-campus cafeteria services. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 16, 318-324.
- Garg, A. (2014). Mechanic clues vs. humanic clues: Students' perception towards service quality of fast food restaurants in Taylor's University Campus, *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 144, 164-175.
- Gronroos, C. (2000). *Service Management and Marketing*, John Wiley & sons Ltd., New Jersey.
- Gupta, S., McLaughlin, E. & Gomez, M. (2007). Guest satisfaction and restaurant performance, *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 48(3), 284-298.
- Hair, J. F., Black, B., Babin, B., Anderson, R. E. & Tatham, R. L. (2010). *Multivariate Data Analysis: A Global Perspective*. Pearson Education Inc., New Jersey.
- Harrington, R. J., Ottenbacher, M. C., Staggs, A., & Powell, F. A. (2011). Generation Y consumers: Key restaurant attributes affecting positive and negative experiences, *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 36(4), 431-449.
- Hong, S. C., & Goo, Y. J. (2004). A causal model of customer loyalty in professional service firms: an empirical study, *International Journal of Management*, 21(4), 531.
- Pedraja Iglesias, M., & Jesus Yagüe Guillén, M. (2004). Perceived quality and price: their impact on the satisfaction of restaurant customers, *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 16(6), 373-379.
- Jain, S.K. & Gupta, G. (2004). Measuring service quality: SERVQUAL vs. SERVPERF scales, *VIKALPA*, 29(2), 25-37.
- Jen, W., & Hu, K.C. (2003). Application of perceived value model to identify factors affecting passenger' repurchase intentions on city bus: A case of the Taipei metropolitan area, *Transportation*, 30(3), 307–327.
- Jiang, P. J., & Rosenbloom, B. (2005). Customer intention to return online: Price perception, attribute-level performance, and satisfaction unfolding over time, *European Journal of Marketing*, 39, 150-175.
- Jiang, Y., & Wang, C.L. (2006). The impact of affect on service quality and satisfaction: the moderation of service contexts, *Journal of Services Marketing*, 20(4), 211–218.
- Jin, N., Line, N. D., & Goh, B. (2013). Experiential value, relationship quality, and customer loyalty in full-service restaurants: The moderating role of gender, *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 22(7), 679-700.
- Johns, N., & Pine, R. (2002). Consumer behavior in the food service industry: a review, *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 21, 119–134.
- Johnson, M. D., & Fornell, C. (1991). A framework for comparing customer satisfaction across individuals and product categories, *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 12(2), 267-286.
- Josiam, B. M. (2014). Assessing quality of food, service, and customer experience at a restaurant: The case of a student run restaurant in the USA, *Journal of Services Research*, 14(1), 49-73.
- Kaiser, H. F. (1974). An index of factorial simplicity, *Psychometrika*, 39, 31-36.
- Kim, W. G., Ng, C. Y. N. & Kim, Y. S. (2009). Influence of institutional DINESERV on customer satisfaction, return intention, and word-of-mouth, *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 28(1), 10-17.
- Kim, Y.-S., Moreo, P.J., & Yeh, R.J.M. (2004). Customers' satisfaction factors regarding university food court service, *Journal of Foodservice Business Research*, 7(4), 97-110.
- Kokko, T. (2005). *Offering Development in the Restaurant Sector: A Comparison between Customer Perception and Management Beliefs*, Unpublished doctoral thesis, Hanken School of Economics, Helsinki, Finland.
- Kotler, P. (2003). *Marketing Management*, (11th ed.). Prentice Hall Pearson Education International Inc., New Jersey.
- Kwabena, S. A., Brew, Y., & Addae-Boateng, S. (2013). Service quality among selected 'Chop Bar'(local restaurants) operators in Koforidua, Eastern Region, Ghana, *European Journal of Business and Management*, 5(19), 49-61.
- Kwun, D. J. W. (2011). Effects of campus foodservice attributes on perceived value, satisfaction, and consumer attitude: A gender-difference approach, *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 30(2), 252-261.
- Ladhari, R., Brun, I., & Morales, M. (2008). Determinants of dining satisfaction and postdining behavioral intentions, *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 27(2), 563–573.
- Lee, H., Lee, Y., & Yoo, D. (2000). The determinants of perceived service quality and its relationship with satisfaction, *Journal of Services Marketing*, 14, 217-231.
- Lehtinen, U. & Lehtinen, J.R. (1991). Two approaches to service quality dimensions, *The Service Industries Journal*, 11(3), 287-285.
- Lenka, U., Suar, D., & Mohapatra, P. K. (2009). Service quality, customer satisfaction, and customer loyalty in Indian commercial banks, *The Journal of Entrepreneurship*, 18(1), 47–64.
- Liu, Y., & Jang, S. (2009). Perceptions of Chinese restaurants in the U. S.: What affects customer satisfaction and behavioral intention? *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 28(3), 338–348.
- Emily (Jintao) Ma, Bob Duan, Lavender (Mengya) Shu, & Charles Arcodia. (2017). Chinese visitors at Australia wineries:

- Preferences, motivations, and barriers. *Journal of Tourism, Heritage & Services Marketing*, 3(1), 3–8. <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.401062>
- Markovic, S., Raspor, S., & Šegaric, K. (2010). Does restaurant performance meet customers' expectations? An assessment of restaurant service quality using a modified Dineserv approach, *Tourism & Hospitality Management*, 16(2), 181-195.
- Marco Martins. (2016). Gastronomic tourism and the creative economy. *Journal of Tourism, Heritage & Services Marketing*, 2(2), 33–37. <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.376346>
- Mattila, A. S. (2001). Emotional bonding and restaurant loyalty, *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 42(6), 73-79.
- Mensah, I. (2009). Customers' perception of food service quality, the case of Cape Coast, *Journal of Business and Enterprise Development*, 1(1), 138-154.
- Namkung, Y., & Jang, S. (2007). Does food quality really matter in restaurants? Its impact on customer satisfaction and behavioral intentions, *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 31(3), 387-409.
- National Restaurant Association. (2009). *Restaurant Industry – Facts at a Glance*. Retrieved from www.restaurant.org/research/ind_glance.cfm
- Ng, Y. N. (2005). *A study of Customer Satisfaction, Return Intention and words-of-Mouth Endorsement in University Dining Facilities*. Unpublished master's thesis, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma.
- Nunnally, J. C. (1978), *Psychometric Theory* (2nd ed.), McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994), *Psychological Theory*, McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Oh, H. (1999). Service quality, customer satisfaction, and customer value: A holistic perspective, *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 18, 67-82.
- Oliver, R. L. (1981), Measurement and evaluation of satisfaction processes in retail settings, *Journal of Retailing*, 57(3), 25-48.
- Oyewole, P. (2013). The role of frequency of patronage and service quality of all-you-can-eat buffet restaurant: A perspective of socio-economic and demographic characteristics of African American consumers. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 34, 202-213.
- Parasuraman, A., Berry, L.L., & Zeithaml, V.A. (1991). Refinement and reassessment of the SERVQUAL scale, *Journal of Retailing*, 67(4), 420–450.
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A. & Berry, L. L. (1988). SERVQUAL: A multiple-item scale for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality, *Journal of Retailing*, 64(1), 14–40.
- Ruetzler, T. (2008). Food, beverage, and service quality: Does culture impact satisfaction with University Food Services?, *Journal of Culinary Science & Technology*, 6(4), 308-324.
- Ryu, K., & Jang, S. (2008). DINESCAPE: A scale for customers' perception of dining environments, *Journal of Foodservice Business Research*, 11(1), 2-22.
- Anastasia Spyridou. (2017). Perceived Service Quality and Customer Revisiting Intention: The Case of "all you can eat" Asian Restaurants in Southern Taiwan. *Journal of Tourism, Heritage & Services Marketing*, 3(2), 30–38. <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1209129>
- Stevens, P. (1995). DINESERV: a tool for measuring service quality in restaurants, *Cornell Hotel & Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 36(2), 56-60.
- Ting, D. (2004). Service quality and satisfaction perceptions: curvilinear and interaction effect, *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 22(6), 407-420.
- Xi, L. & Shuai, Z. (2009). Investigation of customer satisfaction in student food service, an example of student cafeteria in NHH, *International Journal of Quality and Service Sciences*, 1(1), 113-124.
- Zeithaml, V. A., & Bitner, M. J. (2003). *Service Marketing: Integrating Customer Focus Across the Firm* (3rd ed.), McGraw-Hill/Irwin,

SUBMITTED: DEC 2017

REVISION SUBMITTED: APR 2018

ACCEPTED: MAY 2018

REFEREED ANONYMOUSLY

PUBLISHED ONLINE: 15 MAY 2018