Exploratory Study on Effects of Restaurant Attributes on Perception of Price and Brand Reputation
- Comparison Between Locals and Tourists -

SungPo Yi[1], Jinkyung Choi[2]*

[1]*School of Hospitality and Tourism Management, Florida International University*
[2]*Department of Foodservice Management, Woosong University*

Abstract

This study examines the effects of restaurant attributes on customers' perceptions of price and brand reputation. Four restaurant attributes were used to represent restaurant quality. Multiple regression was conducted to measure the relationships between the four restaurant attributes and price and brand reputation. Further, an independent T-test was used to compare differences between perceptions of locals and tourists with regard to restaurant quality under two categories (price and brand reputation) after they selected a restaurant. Results of this study revealed that residency did not have a significant impact on customers' perceptions of price or brand reputation, whereas restaurant attributes did have an impact. Taste was a predictor of perceived price, whereas service and atmosphere were predictors of brand reputation. In addition, comparison of restaurant attributes between locals and tourists showed that sanitation and service were significantly different in accordance with price and atmosphere, whereas taste and service were significantly different in accordance with brand reputation. Locals showed higher means for each restaurant attribute compared to tourists.

Key Words: Price, brand reputation, restaurant quality, tourists, locals

I. Introduction

Relationship marketing is important to retain the loyalty of customers (Olsen & Connolly 2000; Sin et al. 2006). This loyalty can be explained by loyalty theory concerning the relationships between customers and brands (Fournier 1998). Fournier's study (1998) suggested that not all relationships between customers and brands are alike. Particularly, the products in the restaurant industry are composed of goods and intangibles which are such as service, atmosphere, taste of food, and others. These intangible products are judged based on the subjective views of individuals. According to Mak et al. (2012), previous researchers categorized factors influencing food consumption as the individual, the food, and the environment. The individual has been in the center of studies explaining the variation in food consumption (Rozin 2006). However, the environment, which can be described as cultural, social, economic, and physical influences (Mak et al. 2012), has rarely been taken into consideration in a particular study of tourist behaviors when dining out at a restaurant. While the importance of tourists' food consumption has been recognized, little research has comprehensively explored and compared tourists' perceived value of restaurant quality in terms of price and brand reputation. This study attempts to address the relationships between price and restaurant quality as well as between brand reputation and restaurant quality. In order to explore these relationships, this study utilized the restaurant attributes of taste, atmosphere, sanitation, and service. Moreover, these attributes and their relationships with price and brand reputation were compared between residents and tourists to verify whether tourists have a different view of restaurants when it comes to price and brand reputation.

1. Relationships Between Price and Perceived Quality in a Restaurant Setting

Price is known as "worth what paid for" within a pricing theory context (Monroe 1990). Early studies have shown that price-quality associations do exist (Bliemel 1984). Price - quality behaviors were indicated in a review of psychological studies showing that price can be divided by both price and quality into subjective feelings (Emery 1970). Bliemel's price-quality evaluation model suggests that customers put objective price and quality distinctions into subjective value

*Corresponding author: Jinkyung Choi, Assistant Professor, Department of Foodservice Management, Woosong University
Tel: 82-42-630-925   Fax: 82-42-630-9251   E-mail: choi3728@wsu.ac.kr

space (Bliemel 1984; Laroche & Tiffili 1999). These studies indicated that individuals see price and quality relationships differently. Also, price plays an important role not only in forming customer's quality perception in a different segment, but also in separating it in the same segment (ex. Taco Bell and McDonald's) (Lewis & Shoemaker 1997).

Considering the price and quality relationship, price itself plays a crucial role in the marketing arena. Previous studies have found that price influences customers' purchase of a product (Naipaul & Parsa 2001; Manning & Sprott 2009). Naipaul and Parsa's study (2001) demonstrated that customers who were seeking a quick low-priced service restaurant responded more favorably to a price ending in 9 rather than a price ending in 0. In contrast, customers who were seeking a fine dining restaurant responded more favorably to a price ending in 0 rather than a price ending in 9 (Naipaul & Parsa 2001). These findings suggested that a lower price does not always attract customers when it comes to price-quality relationships. A higher quality of product can be expected to be labeled with a higher price than a lower quality product. Also, customers placed a great deal of weight on brand reputation when they were familiar with the product (Sivakumar 1995; Sivakumar & Raj 1997).

On the other hand, when customers only knew the price, they paid less attention to intrinsic factors, as compared to when customers only knew the brand name. Customers can be influenced to change the possibility of purchasing products by a certain price level (compared to with other similar products from competitors) (Shoemaker et al. 1995). In contrast, customers can be reluctant to switch products due to price. For example, price was one of the switching barriers for customers in various settings (Han et al. 2011). Kwun and Oh (2004) found that before customers gain experience, perceived price was one of the important factors that had a negative relationship with perceived quality. The price customers pay for what they receive can be used as the cost that customers pay for a product. The cost is also known to have a relationship with the quality of the service as well as the perceived customer value. In a study predicting the effect of an airline's service quality on customers' perceptions of customer value and the effects of costs on customers' value perceptions, mainly service quality and costs influenced customers' perceptions of customer value (Brodie et al. 2009). Supporting such findings, Huber et al. (2010) suggested that companies should try to reduce service failures of their brands in order to protect customers' value perception towards the company.

A restaurant is a place that provides both tangible and intangible goods. Services are intangible goods and defined as 'service is the act of filling the needs, wants, and desires of the customers. Service is what servers provide to meet the expectations of the guests when they come to dine. Servers who deliver this intangible goods influence customers' experience at the restaurant. It was found that service providers' communication styles significantly affected customer satisfaction (Webster & Sundaram, 2009) and their interpersonal skills such as professionalism, politeness, or other characteristics helped create an expectation of the dining experience event (Sulek & Hensley, 2004). Unlike service, atmosphere, sanitation, and taste of food can be explained as tangible goods. Atmosphere is 'designed environments that create or reinforce a buyer's leanings toward consumption of a product. Sulek and Hensley (2004) explained that the atmosphere of the dining area involves greater complexity which included temperature, lighting, color, music, noise level, and etc. Sanitation is an important factor customers select a restaurant. For instance, restaurant customers remember sanitation issues longer and are more likely to avoid that a restaurant in the future if it is not clean (Wakefield & Blodgett 1996). Previous researchers (Cullen 2004; Henson et al. 2006; Kivera et al. 2000) found that sanitation of the restaurant was a significant factor for customers when deciding where to dine out. Also sanitation was further determined to be one of the attributes of the physical environment (Kim et al. 2009). Knight et al. (2007) found that people who perceived that a restaurant was "not at all" committed to food safety were less likely to choose that restaurant. Taste of food is one of the most important factors when customers select a restaurant. Previous studies recognized that taste is one of the most influential elements of food quality and customer satisfaction (Cullen 2004; Koo et al., 1999; Webster & Sundaram, 2009). Any interaction that consumers experience at restaurants builds value toward the restaurant. Therefore, the effects of these attributes of a restaurant on price do exist. From the review of previous studies, this study posits that perceived quality of restaurant has a relationship with perceived price. Therefore, a proposed hypothesis is:

Hypothesis 1: customers' perceived price is positively related to quality of restaurant such as service, taste, sanitation, and atmosphere.

2. Relationships Between Brand and Perceived Quality in a Restaurant Setting

Brand relationship was defined as "a voluntary or imposed interdependence between a person and a brand characterized by a unique history of interactions and an anticipation of future occurrences" (Fournier 1994). Also, Fournier (1998) indicated that brand relationships were composed of many different characteristics of an individual. Customer-brand relationship was viewed as the "reciprocity, mutual exchange and fulfillment for promises" (Dall'olmo Riley & Chernatony 2000). These promises consist of a bundle of attributes including tangible or invisible ones that customers purchase (Ambler & Styles 1996). Unlike other physical goods, hospitality brands deliver intangible and complex services that are perceived differently when it comes to the purchasing of products. Moreover, as stated earlier, familiarity plays an essential role when taking brand reputation into consideration. Understanding a brand relationship is becoming an essential part of research on customers and brands (Breivik & Thorbjornsen 2008; Huber et al. 2010; Smit et al. 2007). Berry (2000) noted that in the service sector, customers perceived brand from not only a product but also a service experience. His assertion was also supported in the study of Brodie et al. (2009) that service delivered by employees of the organization was the determinant of brand meaning. In a restaurant setting, food is not the only product evaluated by customers, but also the brand's promise of food safety, atmosphere, and service (Kim et al. 2004; Walker 2007). Therefore, this study hypothesized a relationship between brand and quality of restaurant such as atmosphere, taste, sanitation, and service. Therefore a proposed hypothesis is:

Hypothesis 2: customers' perceived brand reputation is positively related to quality of restaurant such as service, taste, sanitation, and atmosphere.

3. Tourists' Perceived Quality of Restaurant Attributes

Previous studies have provided various theories regarding customers' motivation for choosing a restaurant or particular food. Customers have different degrees of needs and desires when deciding where to dine out and what to eat. Tourists who are visiting a place for a limited period of time away from their daily setting might have different preferences in selecting food or a restaurant compared to residents. A previous study showed that factors influencing tourists' attitudes toward food and eating might be different from those of the home setting since they are in an unfamiliar environment (Mak et al. 2012). According to Fischler

(1988), customers can be categorized into two groups: those who have a tendency to search and try new and unfamiliar food, and those who do not like to try unfamiliar food. Tourists are likely to hesitate to taste new and strange foods that might spoil their trip (Fischler 1988). However, a study conducted by Sparks et al. (2003) found that about 50 percent of respondents rated trying new, exciting, and different foods and indulging themselves as very important reasons for eating out when on vacation.

Tourists' perceptions of food are claimed to be closely connected with the perception of the place they visit (Fischler 1988; Quan & Wang 2003). Tourists who have never previously visited a location may choose a restaurant through a different process than that used by local residents. According to the social science literature, the tourist experience is in sharp contrast to the daily experience though the tourist experience might be an extension of daily life (Quan & Wang 2003). Also, the tourist experience is viewed as a customer experience in the marketing and management literature (Swarbrooke & Horner 2007; Woodside et al. 2000). Food consumption in tourism has been regarded as a "peak" tourist experience since tourists are seeking an extraordinary experience. According to Quan and Wang (2004), the peak tourist experience and the extension of the customer experience are interrelated although the tourist experience cannot be equated with an extension of the customer experience. However, it is unclear if food in tourism is viewed as a "peak" tourist experience or as an extension of the customer experience. Gyimothy et al. (2000) found that approximately 34 to 54 percent of tourists considered restaurants as an important factor when visiting a destination. Additionally, restaurants are viewed as part of the total tourist package (Sparks et al. 2000). Although the tourist experience is considered an extension of the customer experience in the marketing and management literature, the tourist experience can be explained differently from that of residents.

According to the phenomenological model of culinary tourism experiences in Hjalager (2003), tourist attitudes and preferences for food and beverages are categorized as existential, experimental, diversionary, and recreational. What existential gastronomy tourists tend to look for in restaurants is that they are reasonable in price and have a unique atmosphere. The location of a restaurant, its decoration, and its ambience are considered to be important factors in increasing tourists' gastronomic experience (Sparks et al. 2000). The experimental gastronomy tourists pursue new

menu items with trendy and stylish foods. They like to patronize local coffee shops and restaurants that have unique menu items and décor. Tourists are also influenced by the appearance of the restaurant when they consume local food and beverages (Kim et al. 2009). Both experimental and existential tourists prefer restaurants that serve local cuisine so that they can experience local life (Cohen & Avieli 2004). They seek local dishes and food and avoid expensive restaurants not only because of price but because of "manufactured" decorations and atmosphere (Kivela & Crotts 2006). Price is one of the tangible attributes that customers consider when they experience dining out. Unlike food, service cannot be evaluated before it is experienced, but price can represent food and service before customers experience them. Price might not be an absolute predictor of the quality of the food or service; however, it can be a good indicator to customers who have not dined at the restaurant. A previous study showed that price was a consideration when customers took their family along, but not much for business meals (Koo et al., 1999). In addition, existential gastronomy tourists tend to look for reasonably priced food when selecting a restaurant (Kivela & Crotts 2006). Brumback (1999) found that tourists expected high quality food and service as well as various dining venues and menu options. However, recreational gastronomy tourists did not care about service quality since they were seeking to enjoy the time (Cohen & Avieli 2004).

Recreational gastronomy tourists seek foods that are similar to their home foods and beverages and tend to prepare their own meals while away from home. Therefore, restaurant atmosphere and service quality do not influence the choice of food or restaurant by these recreationalists. Both diversionary and recreational tourists seek to enjoy the time free away from ordinary daily life and they care little for the authenticity of the cuisine (Cohen & Avieli 2004). Their propensity to pay more for local food is lower than that of existential tourists. Therefore, price plays an important role for different types of tourists. Diversionary gastronomy tourists prefer familiar food to exotic food. Since they look for familiar food, the chain restaurants are popular among this group of tourists. In other words, brand reputation plays a crucial role for diversionary gastronomy tourists.

Customers look for the best available information when deciding where to dine out. Cullen (2004) found that 71 percent of the respondents considered "good reputation" as one of the important attributes when selecting a restaurant for a social occasion. Reputation of the restaurant can be obtained from external information sources. Existential gastronomy tourists look for local cuisine and avoid manufactured food, so they might pay attention to the opinions of locals when selecting a restaurant. "Word of mouth," such as recommendations from family, friends, or local people in the area appeared to be an important information source for restaurant selection (Sparks et al. 2003).

As mentioned above, many factors influence customers' decision making processes in their restaurant selection. Preferences on the part of individuals, however, might be different between residents and tourists. Also, the purpose of eating out might be different between tourists and residents. Tourists may like to make a memorable occasion with people who are dining with them, while residents may dine out as part of their routine. As related literature has shown, the order of restaurant selection criteria was mixed and there was no absolute preference by the customer when selecting a restaurant. Therefore, the present study posits that restaurant preferences of tourists differ from those of residents in relation to price and brand reputation. Hence, this study posits that the quality of restaurant attributes in accordance with price and brand reputation differs between residents and tourists. Hence, proposed hypotheses were

Hypothesis 3: customers' perceived quality of restaurant in accordance with price differs between locals and tourists.

Hypothesis 4: customers' perceived quality of restaurant in accordance with brand reputation differs between locals and tourists.

II. Materials and Methods

1. Participants

Data for this study was collected in the Miami Beach area, Florida, which is known to both locals and tourists as having various types of restaurants. The survey was administered by five field workers about two weeks from February 2 to 14, 2008. Participants were chosen randomly by the field workers and were asked to answer questions related to their perception of the price and brand reputation of a restaurant in relation to the quality of the restaurant such as taste, atmosphere, sanitation, and service. A total of 375 surveys were collected of the 510 distributed.

2. Measures

The questionnaires were developed from previous literature (Kim et al., 2004; Kivela & Crotts 2006; Walker

2007) and screened by four experts in the hospitality and tourism areas. For the statistical analysis, the Statistical Program for the Social Sciences (version 20.0, 2012, SPSS Inc. Chicago, IL) was used. Descriptive statistics, independent sample T-test, multiple regression were run to analyze the data collected.

From the literature review, atmosphere, taste, sanitation, and service were asked about. Two sets of questions were asked of the respondents. One set was to measure the relationship between price and restaurant quality, while the other set was for brand reputation and restaurant quality. For price and restaurant quality, price was measured asking, "Do you agree with the importance of price factor when selecting a restaurant?" Brand reputation and restaurant quality brand were measured asking, "Do you agree with the importance of brand reputation factor when selecting a restaurant?" Atmosphere, taste, sanitation, and service were measured through asking, "When selecting a restaurant, would you have a higher expectation regarding these factors?" in the two questionnaires. The questions were identical for two sets of questionnaires and the questions were measured on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). In order to measure service, four questions were asked: "speedy and efficient," "kindness and concern," "communication," and "professionalism" - Questionnaire set for price and restaurant quality; Cronbach's alpha=0.81 (speedy and efficient; kindness and concern; communication; professionalism), brand reputation and restaurant quality; Cronbach's alpha= 0.86 (speedy and efficient; kindness and concern; communication; professionalism). The reason for asking about the service in such detail was due to the language barriers and cultural differences that tourists might have. The questionnaire asked participants' for their demographic information such as age, gender, ethnicity, educational level, income, marital status, and status of residency.

Ⅲ. Results and Discussion

1. Profile of Respondents

Table 1 presents the demographic characteristics of the respondents. The survey was collected from 375 respondents. The majority of respondents (53.9%) were between 20-29 years old. More than half of the respondents were male (53.0%), while 47.0% of the respondents were female. The respondents were Caucasian (45.0%), Asians (20.5%), Hispanics (23.2%), Afro-Americans (4.9%), and other (6.5%). About 32.3% of the respondents had a university

<Table 1> Demographic Profile of Respondents

Characteristics		N (%)
Age	Under 20 years	32(8.5)
	20-29	200(53.9)
	30-39	71(18.9)
	40-49	42(11.2)
	50 years and above	26(7.0)
	Non-response	4(0.8)
	Total	375(100.0)
Gender	Male	197(52.5)
	Female	175(46.7)
	Non-response	3(0.8)
	Total	375(100.0)
Race	Afro-American	18(4.8)
	Caucasian	167(44.5)
	Asian	76(20.3)
	Hispanic	86(22.9)
	Other	24(6.4)
	Non-response	4(1.1)
	Total	375(100.0)
Education Level	High School	43(11.5)
	College(2 years)	116(30.9)
	University(4 years)	121(32.3)
	Graduate school	90(24.0)
	Non-response	5(1.3)
	Total	375(100.0)
Annual income	Less than $20,000	128(34.1)
	$20,000-$39,999	74(19.7)
	$40,000-$59,999	86(22.9)
	$60,000 and above	81(21.6)
	Non-response	6(1.6)
	Total	375(100.0)
Marital Status	Married	93(24.8)
	Single	279(74.4)
	Non-response	3(0.8)
	Total	375(100.0)
Residency	Locals	231(61.6)
	Tourists	141(37.6)
	Non-response	3(0.8)
	Total	375(100.0)

education. In the income characteristics profile, 54.8 percent earned less than $39,999, while 45.2% earned over $40,000. Singles made up 74.4%, while married made up 24.8%. Lastly, 37.6% of the respondents were locals, 37.9% were tourists, and others were 24.3%.

2. Relationship Between Price and Quality of Restaurant

In order to find the relationship between price and perceived quality of restaurant, restaurant attributes such as

<Table 2> Correlation matrix perceived price and restaurant attributes

	Atmosphere	Taste	Sanitation	Service
Atmosphere	1			
Taste	0.415**[1,2]	1		
Sanitation	0.380**	0.475**	1	
Service	0.374**	0.423**	0.554**	1

[1]** Indicates Pearson's correlation significance at 0.01 (two tails)
[2]Numbers indicate what percentage of the variability is shared with each other (for example, 0.415 indicates atmosphere shares approximately 17% of its variability with taste)

<Table 3> Multiple regression analysis: variables predicting perceived price (Unstandardized coefficients and standardized coefficients)

Price - Restaurant quality relationship					
Predictor	B	beta	R	R^2	F
			0.164	0.027	2.515*[1]
Atmosphere	-0.021	-0.020			
Taste	0.209	0.086*			
Sanitation	-0.107	-0.103			
Service	0.119	0.088			

[1]*p<0.05

<Table 4> Correlation matrix between perceived brand reputation and restaurant attributes

	Atmosphere	Taste	Sanitation	Service
Atmosphere	1			
Taste	0.545**[1,2]	1		
Sanitation	0.467**	0.519**	1	
Service	0.533**	0.519**	0.553**	1

[1]** indicates Pearson's correlation significance at 0.01 (two tails)
[2]Numbers indicate what percentage of the variability is shared with each other (for example, 0.545 indicates atmosphere shares approximately 30% of its variability with taste).

<Table 5> Multiple regression analysis: variables predicting brand reputation (Unstandardized coefficients and standardized coefficients)

Brand reputation - Restaurant quality relationship					
Predictor	B	beta	R	R^2	F
			0.366	0.134	14.015***[1]
Atmosphere	0.303	0.256***			
Taste	-0.043	-0.035			
Sanitation	0.005	0.004			
Service	0.248	0.180**			

[1]**p<0.01 ***p<0.001

atmosphere, taste, sanitation, and service were entered simultaneously into a multiple regression analysis to evaluate their unique contribution in perceived value of price in restaurant selection. Table 2 presents the Pearson product correlation matrix between all study variables in accordance with price. All variables used in this study were significantly related each other. Atmosphere was significantly related to taste, sanitation, and service. The overall model was significant and accounted for 2.7% of the variance in perceived value of price (R^2=0.027; F=2.515, p<0.05). Taste was the only predictor of the quality of restaurant in the relationship with the perceived value of the price (Beta= 0.086, p<0.05) (Table 3). Results showed that hypothesis 1 was partially supported.

3. Relationship Between Brand Reputation and Quality of Restaurant

Table 4 presents the Pearson product correlation matrix between all study variables in accordance with brand reputation. All variables used in this study were significantly related each other. Atmosphere was significantly related to taste, sanitation, and service. Atmosphere, taste, sanitation, and service were entered simultaneously into a multiple regression analysis to predict the relationship with brand reputation of restaurant. The overall model was significant

and accounted for 13.4% of the variance in brand reputation (R^2=0.134 F=14.015, p<0.001). In contrast to price model, atmosphere (Beta=0.256, p<0.001) and service (Beta=0.180, p<0.01) were positively related to brand reputation (Table 5). Therefore, hypothesis 2 was partially supported by outcome of this analysis.

4. Differences in restaurant quality in accordance with price and brand reputation between locals and tourists

Restaurant attributes such as atmosphere, taste, sanitation, and service were compared under effect of price according to the respondents' status, that is, whether they were locals or tourists. Independent t-test was conducted on each restaurant attribute in accordance with price and brand reputation (Table 6).

For price and restaurant quality, locals and tourists showed significances in sanitation (p<0.01) and service (p<0.01). Locals had higher expectation of sanitation and service when selecting a restaurant along with consideration of the price factor. Concerning brand reputation of a restaurant, locals had a higher expectation for atmosphere (p<0.05), taste (p<0.05), and service (p<0.05) than tourists when selecting a restaurant. Therefore, both hypothesis 3 and hypothesis 4 were partially supported.

<Table 6> Results of Independent T-test between locals and tourists in accordance with price and brand reputation

	Price			Brand reputation		
	Locals (N=231)	Tourists (N=141)	t-value	Locals (N=231)	Tourists (N=141)	t-value
Atmosphere	4.11±0.92[1]	4.16±0.92	-0.514	4.06±0.81	3.82±0.98	2.60*[2]
Taste	4.70±0.75	4.72±0.73	-0.350	4.50±0.76	4.31±0.99	2.08*
Sanitation	4.57±0.81	4.28±1.08	2.956**	4.44±0.81	4.29±1.00	1.58
Service	4.24±0.65	4.03±0.79	2.676**	4.27±0.65	4.08±0.91	2.31*

[1]Mean±SD
[2]*$p<0.05$ **$p<0.01$

IV. Summary and Conclusion

1. Managerial Implications

The results of this research provide a better understanding of customers' perception of price and brand reputation in relation to restaurant quality such as atmosphere, taste, sanitation, and service. Although price and brand reputation have played a key role in the marketing area, tourists' expectations of the values of price and brand reputation in accordance with restaurant quality compared with those of locals have rarely been shown in the previous literature. The results of this study showed that price or brand reputation can have a positive relationship with restaurant quality such as taste, atmosphere, sanitation, and service. Customers expected a better taste when a higher price was anticipated, while customers expected better atmosphere and service when a higher brand reputation was forecast. However, in both cases, status of being a resident did not play a critical role. A better taste of food meant to customers a higher price for the food at a restaurant. Interestingly, atmosphere, sanitation, and service did not impact customers' expectations of price. The previous literature showed that customers expected better product quality when the product had a higher price (Brodie et al., 2009; Huber et al., 2010; Lewis & Shoemaker, 1997). Buying food at restaurants involves not only paying for the food but also paying for any experience customers encounter at a restaurant. It is a widespread notion that luxurious atmosphere, good service, and good hygienic conditions are characteristics of expensive restaurants. However, this study showed that perception of taste can be dominant in a relationship with price. It is suggested that restaurants offering high price menu items should pay attention to the taste of the food more than the atmosphere, sanitation, and service. In other words, good taste of food satisfies customers who pay a high price.

Brand reputation and restaurant quality relationship, good atmosphere, and service predicted a strong brand reputation.

Customers believed that high value of atmosphere and service were criteria for a strong brand reputation while taste and sanitation were not taken into consideration. The results showed that values of price and brand reputation were contradicted. However, this study was to evaluate the relationships of restaurant quality between price and brand reputation and not to measure customers' actual purchasing behaviors. Restaurants trying to establish a strong brand reputation should put an emphasis on atmosphere and service as high values. Locals put more weight on sanitation and service when a higher price was expected. However, visitors were less concerned about these values than locals. This study did not show the importance of sanitation in the relationships between price and brand reputation. However, the most important point is to satisfy customers so they will revisit the restaurant. Restaurant condition of hygiene has been recognized by customers (Cullen 2004; Henson et al. 2006; Kivera et al. 2000). Therefore, managers should not underestimate the importance of sanitation.

Comparing locals and tourists, locals put a higher value on sanitation and service when restaurants offer menu items at a high price. Also, locals considered put a higher value on atmosphere, taste, and service and below high brand reputation significantly more than tourists. In both price and brand reputation categories, locals showed higher means than tourists under perceived price for several reasons. One might be that locals were less careful than tourists when it came to selecting a restaurant. Locals might have a better idea of the restaurant than tourists. The second reason is that tourists might be looking for something else which was not apparent in this study. In other words, tourist behaviors were less likely to follow the ordinary daytime routine. Perhaps, they were looking for extraordinary experiences, at least something different than locals.

Although status of residency was found not to have an impact on price or brand reputation expectation in this study, locals and tourists showed significant differences in attributes

of restaurant quality. Therefore, managers should know that locals select a restaurant with a higher value of sanitation, service, and atmosphere than tourists.

2. Limitations and suggestions for future study

This study has several concerns for future study. First, as mentioned earlier, this study did measure the relationships of restaurant quality between price and brand reputation but did not measure purchasing decision behaviors. Hence, it is difficult to conclude that customers who expect to experience a good taste of food and pay a high price would visit the restaurant. With the same sense, it is unknown if customers who expect high values of atmosphere and service under high brand reputation would visit a restaurant. Second, results can be hard to generalize since the survey was conducted in a limited geographical location. Third, this study chose only four restaurant attributes to represent restaurant quality. The perceived price ($R^2=0.027$) and brand ($R^2=0.134$) were not well explained by atmosphere, taste, sanitation, and service. The low R^2s give a clue that perceived price and brand value may be explained by some other elements at a restaurant. Thus other restaurant attributes should be included in a future study in order to determine the relationships in great detail. Lastly, relationships between price and brand reputation in regards to tourist perception should be measured for future study. As the results of this study showed, perceptions of tourists were significantly different from those of locals in terms of price and restaurant quality as well as brand reputation and restaurant quality. In order to understand tourist purchasing behaviors when selecting a restaurant, price and brand reputation relationships should be studied in accordance with customers' purchasing behaviors in ordinary daily settings.

References

Ambler T, Styles C. 1996. Brand development versus new product development: towards a process model of extension decisions. Marketing Intelligence Planning, 14(7):10-19

Berry L. 2000. Cultivating service brand equity. J. of Academic Marketing Science, 28:128-137

Bliemel FWA. 1984. Brand choice under price-quality considerations: An integrative theory. Working paper: 84-118. School of Business, Queens University, Kingston, Canada

Brodie RJ, Wittcome JRM, Brush GJ. 2009. Investigating the

service brand: A customer value perspective, J. of Business Research, 62(2):345-355

Brumback N. 1999. Roamin' holiday. Restaurant Business, 8:39

Breivik E, Thorbjornsen H. 2008. Customer brand relationships: An investigation of two alternative models. J. of the Academy of Marketing Sci., 36(4):443-472

Cohen E, Avieli N. 2004. Food in tourism: Attraction and impediment. Annals of Tourism Research, 37(4):755-778

Cullen F. 2004. Factors influencing restaurant selection in Dublin. J. of Foodservice Business Research 7:53-84

Dall'Olmo Riley F, De Chernatony L. 2000. The service brand as a relationship builder, British J. of Management 11:137-150

Emery F. 1970. Subjective economics: factors in psychology of spending. In Taylor B, Wills G. (Eds.). Pricing Strategy, pp 98-111. Princeton: Brandon Systems Press

Fischler G. 1988. Food, self and identity. Social Science Information 27:275-292

Fournier S. 1994. A person-brand relationship framework for strategic brand management, PhD Thesis, University of Florida

Fournier S. 1998. Customers and their brands developing relationship theory in customer research. J. of Customer Research 24(4):343-373

Gyimothy S, Rassing C, Wanhill S. 2000. Marketing works: A study of the restaurants on Bronholm, Denmark. International J. of Contemporary Hospitality Management 12:371-379

Hjalager A. 2003. What do tourists eat and why? Towards a sociology of gastronomy and tourism. In J. Collen and G. Richards (Eds.), Gastronomy and tourism pp. 54-74. Gravenwezel/Schilde, Belgium: Academie Voor De Streekgebonden Gastronomie

Han H, Back K, Kim Y. 2011. A multidimensional scale of switching barriers in the full-service restaurant industry, Cornell Hospitality Quarterly, 52(1):54-63

Henson S, Majowicz S, Masakure O, Sockett P, Jones A, Hart R, Carr D, Knowles L. 2006. Customer assessment of the safety of restaurants: The role of inspection notices and other information cues. J. of Food Safety, 26:275-301

Huber F, Vollhardt K, Matthes I, Vogel J. 2010. Brand misconduct: Consequences on customer-brand relationship. J. of Business Research, 63(11):1113-1120

Kim WG, DiMicelli P, Kang J. 2004. Measuring brand equity of restaurant chains. FIU Hospitality Review, 22(2):28-41

Kim YG, Eves A, Scarles C. 2009. Building a model of local food consumption on trips and holidays: A ground theory approach. International J. of Hospitality Management, 28:423-431

Kivela J. Crotts JC. 2006. Tourism and gastronomy: Gastronomy's

influence on how tourists experience a destination. J. of Hospitality and Tourism Research, 30(3):354-377

Knight AJ, Worosz MR, Todd ECD. 2007. Serving Food Safety: Customer perception of food safety at restaurants. International J. of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 19(6):476-484

Koo LC, Tao, FKC, Yeung JHC. 1999. Preferential segmentation of restaurant attributes through conjoint analysis. International J. of Contemporary Hospitality Management 11:242-250

Kwun JW, Oh H. 2004. Effect of brand, price, and risk on customers' value perceptions and behavioral intentions in the restaurant industry. J. of Hospitality & Leisure Marketing, 11(1):31-49

Laroch M, Toffoli R. 1999. Brand evaluations in fast-food franchises. J. of Business Research, 45(2):221-233

Lewis RC, Shoemaker S. 1997. Price-sensitivity measurement: A tool for the hospitality industry, Cornell Hospitality Quarterly, 38(2):44-54

Mak AHH, Lumbers M, Eves A, Chang RCY. 2012. Factors influencing tourist food consumption. International J. of Hospitality Management, 31(2):928-936

Manning KC, Sprott DE. 2009. Price endings, left-digit effects, and choice. J. of customer Research, 36(2):328-335

Monroe KB, 1990. Pricing: Making profitable decisions. New York: McGraw Hill

Naipaul S, Parsa HG. 2001. Menu price ending that communicate value and quality. Cornell Hospitality Quarterly, 42(1):26-37

Olsen MD, Connolly DJ. 2000. Experience-based travel: How technology is changing the hospitality industry. Cornell Hospitality Quarterly, 41(1):30-40

Quan S, Wang N. 2003. Towards a structural model of the tourist experience: An illustration from food experiences in tourism. Tourism Management, 25:297-305

Rozin P. 2006. The integration of biological, social, cultural and psychological influence on food choice. In Shpeherd, R. & Ratts, M. (Eds.). The psychology of food choice pp 19-39. Walllingford, Oxfordshire: CABI Publishing

Sin LYM, Tse ACB, Chan H, Heung VCS, Yim FHK. 2006. The

effects of relationship marketing orientation on business performance in the hotel industry. J. of Hospitality & Tourism Research, 30(4):407-426

Sivakumar K. 1995. The role of price and quality tiers on the cluster effect in brand choice, Marketing Letters, 6(October):265-273

Sivakumar K, Raj SP. 1997. Quality tier competition: How price change influences brand choice and category choice, J. of Marketing, 61(3):71-85

Shoemaker S. Dawson M, Johnson W. 1995. How to increase menu prices without alienating your customers. International J. of contemporary Hospitality Management, 17(6/7):553-568

Smit E, Bronner F, Tolboom M. 2007. Brand relationship quality and its value for personal contact. J. of Business Research, 60:627-633

Sparks B, Bowen J, Klag S. 2003. Restaurants and the tourist market. International J. of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 15:6-13

Sulek JM, Hensley RL. 2004. The relative importance of food, atmosphere, and fairness of wait. Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly, 45(3): 235-247

Swarbrooke J, Horner S. 2007. Customer behavior in tourism. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann

Walker JR. 2007. Introduction to hospitality management. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall

Wakefield KL, Blodgett JG. 1996. The effect of the servicescape on customers' behavioral intentions in leisure service settings. J. of Service Marketing, 10(1):45-61

Webster C, Sundaram DS. 2009. Effect of service provider's communication style on customer satisfaction in professional services setting: The moderating role of criticality and service nature. J. of Services Marketing, 23(2):103-113

Woodside AG, Crouch G, Mazanec J, Oppermann M, Sakai M. 2000. Customer Psychology of Tourism Hospitality and Leisure. New York: CABI Publishing