

Service Delivery and Drivers of Customer Satisfaction as Determinants of Public Relations of Food Establishments in Region XI

Aniceto R. Viray Jr.¹, Vicente Salvador E. Montaña²,
University of Mindanao, Professional Schools, Davao City, Philippines^{1&2}
arv_jr1210@yahoo.com¹
vicente_montano@umindanao.edu.ph²

*Corresponding author

Abstract- *This study sought to determine how service delivery and drivers of customer satisfaction influence public relations of food establishments in Region XI. Using the quantitative non-experimental utilizing descriptive-correlational design, study was conducted in the different areas of Region XI. Equal distribution method was utilized in which the researcher selected 50 establishments from the different parts of Region XI that equally represented each area of the region. Quota samples of approximately 10 questionnaires were collected for each dining establishment. This study used SERVQUAL to determine the level of service delivery along with other adopted questionnaires for the other variables. The study found out that the overall level of service delivery, customer satisfaction, and public relations of dining establishments in Region XI are all moderate. Moreover, it revealed that there is a significant relationship between service delivery and customer satisfaction and public relations in dining establishments of Region XI. Finally, the indicators tangibles, empathy and assurance of service delivery and the indicators end result, timeliness, information, staff competence; staff attitude and look and feel of customer satisfaction all predict public relations in the dining establishments in Region XI.*

Keywords- *business administration; service delivery; customer satisfaction; public relations; Philippines*

1. INTRODUCTION

Over the years, the restaurant industry has grown and has become large and ubiquitous. People find themselves hungry with no time to cook so they eat out. The result is the booming restaurant industry. However, distinguishing and creating sustainable competitive advantage could be considered as one of the most critical undertakings for this business venture. Notwithstanding the expanding pressure from fast-food and other food service outlets entering the market, food establishments or restaurants additionally need to adjust to the changing preference of the general consumer (Moolman, 2011; Vanniarajan & Meharajan, 2012).

More specifically, the food industry is confronted with challenges such as maintaining quality service delivery and ensuring customer satisfaction and good public relations. These are vital and pivotal components especially in this service industry. Thus, quality in service sustains customers' confidence and is essential for a competitive advantage. The quality of the relationship between the service provider and its customers marks the success or failure of the service provider (Panda, 2003), which helps determine customer satisfaction. But despite knowledge on this, the restaurant industry is undergoing major changes due to rapid urbanization and changing lifestyles, which cause the increase in eating out trend and sways consumers' choice on which types of restaurant to

be visited. Adding to the dilemma, this industry sometimes falls short of being able to measure the value of public relations to their business (Lymperopoulous, Chaniotakis & Soureli, 2006)[33].

As explored in the vast literature, various authors have already examined service quality, food quality and customer satisfaction constructs in different settings in different countries, such as in the healthcare industry (Yeşilada & Direktör, 2010)[50], the hotel industry (Dedeoğlu & Demirer, 2015)[17], retail settings (Anselmsson & Johansson, 2014)[6]; Omar, Shaharudin, Jusoff, & Ali, 2011), tourism industry (Debata, Patnaik, Mahapatra, & Sree, 2015)[16]; Al-Tit & Nakhleh, 2014)[4], the gaming industry (Wu, 2014), as well as the food industry (Marinelli, Simeone, & Scarpato, 2015)[34]; Wang, 2015[46]; Kafetzopoulos, Gotzamani, & Psomas, 2014)[28]; Bujisic, Hutchinson, & Parsa, 2014)[13]; Jang & Ha, 2014; Wettstein, Hanf, & Burggraf, 2011)[47].

Hence, the growing number of studies devoted to such topics that are being published is a clear evidence to the increased importance of these constructs. However, although a significant amount of research on service quality, satisfaction, and repurchase intention are established in the marketing literature, little attention has been paid to exploring the impact of service quality and perceptions on satisfaction and intention towards public relations in the dining service industry.

It is based on these scenarios that the researcher is very much interested to investigate the nature of food establishments/restaurants especially in terms of public relations and its relationship with drivers of customer satisfaction and service delivery.

2. RESEARCH OBJECTIVE

This study aimed to determine which domains in the service delivery and customer satisfaction significantly influences public relations among customers in selected food establishments in Region XI.

- a. To describe the level of service delivery in the selected food establishments in terms of *tangibles, empathy, assurance, responsiveness, and reliability*.
- b. To ascertain the level of customer satisfaction in selected food establishments in terms of *end result, timeliness, information, staff competence, reliability/trustworthiness, staff attitude, fairness, access, look and feel, safety & security, convenience, and values and cost*.
- c. To assess the level of public relations in selected food establishments in terms of *control mutuality, trust, satisfaction, commitment, exchange relationship, and communal relationship*
- d. To determine any significant relationship between the following the level of service delivery and public relations of selected food establishments; and the level of customer satisfaction and public relations of selected food establishments.
- e. To determine which domains in the service delivery and customer satisfaction significantly influences public relations among customers in selected food establishment.

3. HYPOTHESIS

The following hypotheses were tested at 0.05 level of significance: a) There is no significant relationship between the service delivery and public relations of selected food establishments; a) There is no domain of service delivery and drivers of customer satisfaction best influences public relationships among customers in selected food establishments in Region XI.

4. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This section presents the related studies gathered by the researcher which were taken from books, magazines, instructional materials and from the internet.

4.1 Service Delivery

Service quality has been characterized as the general evaluation of an administration by the clients (Eshghi, Roy & Ganguli, 2008)[19], while different studies characterized it as the degree to which an administration lives up to client's needs or desires (Asubonteng, McCleary & Swan, 1996[7]; Wisniewski and Donnelly, 1996; Wisniewski, 2001[48]; Munusamy, Chelliah & Mun, 2010)[36].

The early study of Parasuraman, Zeithaml and Berry (1998)[39] mentioned that service quality is an extraneously seen attribution in light of the client's experience about the administration that the client saw through the administration experience.

In the eatery business specifically, service quality alludes to the level of administration gave by eatery representatives, which thus relies on the connections amongst clients and eatery workers (Ha and Jang, 2010). These interpersonal administration encounters eventually serve as a path for clients to assess the nature of the administration conveyance, and to frame their general quality view of the eatery (Ryu, Lee & Kim, 2012)[42].

For a considerable length of time, numerous scientists have built up a service point of view (Zeithaml, 2009[54], Ramsaran-Fowdar, 2007)[41]. The idea of service quality ought to be by and large drawn nearer from the client's perspective since they may have distinctive qualities, diverse ground of appraisal, and distinctive conditions (Chang, 2008). By conveyance quality administration, organizations can at last enhance fulfillment and minimize benefit disappointments, and effectively pull in and hold clients (Tesfom & Birch, 2011)[44].

In the work of Kumra (2008)[31], service quality is portrayed as not just required in the last item and administration, additionally included in the creation and conveyance prepare, consequently worker inclusion in process upgrade and duty is vital to deliver last tourism items or administrations. The significance of sustenance quality was additionally specified by speedy serve administrators.

Numerous researchers contend that the way of service quality requires a particular way to deal with recognize and measure service deliver. The elusive, multifaceted nature of numerous administrations makes it harder to assess the nature of an administration contrasted with items. Since clients are frequently required in service generation, a refinement should be drawn between the procedure of administration conveyance and the genuine yield of the service which is called specialized quality. Different scientists propose that the apparent nature of administration is the consequence of an assessment procedure in which clients contrast their impression of service conveyance and the normal result (Lovelock and Wirtz, 2007)[32].

Among the many measures of service delivery or service quality, it is the work of Parasuraman et al. (1988)[39] that became widely used in this particular research. They came up with five dimensions of this particular variable which cut across various industries. The five dimensions identified to measure service quality are tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance and empathy. Using a five-dimension scale composed of 21 service attributes, the SERVQUAL survey measures the gaps between customer perceptions and expectations.

4.2 Customer Satisfaction

Fulfillment can be identified with a man's emotions that can be joy or dissatisfaction coming about because of looking at an administration or item's apparent execution or result in connection to the purchaser's desires (Kotler and Keller, 2009)[30]. Service providers and scholars have long recognized the importance of customer satisfaction as contributing to market share and return on investment for companies. Dealing with the client encounter has increased much consideration from advertisers and analysts in light of the essential part it plays toward fulfilling clients, making a dependable client base, and, in this way, accomplishing a reasonable upper hand (Berry, Carbone & Haeckel, 2002[11]; Berry, Wall & Carbone, 2006[10]; Pine and Gilmore, 1998[40]; Verhoef et al., 2009)[45].

Accordingly, one key challenge to service marketers is to identify the critical factors that determine customer satisfaction (Heung & Ngai, 2008)[25]. Hence, it is important to understand what 'customer satisfaction' actually means. In business circles, the term refers to the kind of products and services a company provide in order to meet and exceed its customers' expectations. Organizations within the same market sector must assess the quality of their services if they are to attract and retain customers. The two usual conceptualizations of satisfaction are transaction-specific satisfaction and cumulative satisfaction (Aldlaigan and Buttle, 2002[3]; Yi and La, 2004)[51].

Customer satisfaction reciprocates consumer loyalty since is the aftereffect of the relationship between a client's presumption and a client's emotions. By method for clarification, consumer loyalty is distinguished as the qualification between accepted nature of administration and the client's association or sentiments in the wake of having seen the administration. Consumer loyalty relies on upon such measurements as confirmation, responsiveness, dependability, compassion and physical assets, and further parts, for example, individual, cost and situational components that may emerge as the service quality (Bateson & Hoffman, 2000).

Zeithaml and Bitner (2003)[55] espoused that customer satisfaction has turned into a noteworthy patron for improving an administration organization, for example, long haul benefit, client steadfastness, and client maintenance. That implies for instance that it is essential to urge the staff to convey the right support of the right individuals in sensible time and indicating great way. Fulfilled clients may likewise give positive verbal exchange and hence draw in new clients and make long haul business benefit.

4.3 Correlations between Measures

Researchers recently have recommended that considering the collaboration amongst brand and client experience is one reality of seeing how client experience is produced in utilization settings (Verhoef et al., 2009)[45]. However, much of this research focused on either the influence of

service delivery and restaurant environment (Han & Ryu, 2009[23]; Wu & Liang, 2009)[49] or the influence of customer satisfaction on customer loyalty (Keng, Huang, Zheng, & Hsu, 2007)[29].

No empirical research has yet verified the relationships between service delivery, customer satisfaction and public relations or the customer's view on the brand image. This is despite the recommendation of Hau-siu Chow, Lau, Wing-chun Lo, Sha & Yu (2007)[24] that the influence of these two variables to the reputation and image of a restaurant is worth investigating.

However, a few propositions made such as that of Zeithaml and Bitner (1996)[53] suggested that satisfaction with quality in its delivery of service has been recognized to positively affect the association's advertising and client steadfastness, which prompts expanded authoritative benefits (Young, 2000).

Likewise, perceptions of quality was also found to be an important influence on word-of-mouth communications which were established in the studies of Parasuraman et al (1988)[39], Angela, (2006), Ben (2007)[9], Berry et al. (2006)[10], Cronin and Taylor (1994)[15]. In the same manner, Hoyer and MacInnis (2001) suggested that, fulfilled client is the key component to shape the foundation of any fruitful business since; consumer loyalty urges clients to re-buy the items and administrations, guarantees mark steadfastness and enhances the business picture by expanding positive informal, henceforth, expanding its level of public relations which results to various fulfilled clients speaking to the picture or accomplishment of a business.

Many service delivery errors and problems can occur and that is not beneficial for the reputation of the organization (Gonzalez & Garzia, 2008)[21]. Ha and Jang (2009)[22] contends that administration disappointment happens when client observations do not meet client desires in view of their picture and relations with the general population. Consequently, it might prompt an obliterated relationship between the client and the association.

Moreover, Boonlertvanich (2011) regarded re-purchase intention and word-of-mouth as sub-dimensions of customer loyalty and good public relations and it indicated that customer satisfaction is a key driver to increase these aspects. Finally, consistent with Ahmed et al. (2010)[2], this study found that customer satisfaction mediates the relationship between service quality and customer retention.

4.4 Theoretical Framework

This study is anchored on existing theories about service quality and customer satisfaction and related propositions indicating correlations of the two to public relations. First, this is anchored on the theory of Parasuraman et al. (1988) [39] defining perceived service quality as a form of attitude, related but not equal to satisfaction, and fallout from a consumption of expectations with perceptions of service or performance. They elaborated that service quality comprises the following five dimensions:

tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy.

On the other hand, most studies on consumer satisfaction have been conducted within the Comparison Standards (CS) paradigm, which posits that consumers hold pre-consumption preferences, observe product performance, compare performance with their standards, form confirmation or disconfirmation perceptions, combine these perceptions with standards levels, and then form summary satisfaction judgments (Gilmore & Dolezal, 2000)[20].

5. METHOD

5.1 Research Design

The researcher has chosen to use a non-experimental quantitative research method. Bryman and Bell (2005)[12] describes that a quantitative method means that data is collected with the aim to try theories. The difference between making a qualitative or quantitative study is that the qualitative study goes to the heart of the problem and has an inductive approach. The quantitative research design reaches a broader part of the problem and has a more deductive approach. Quantitative research focuses on measurement, causality, generalization and replication.

In this quantitative study, the researchers utilized the descriptive-correlational design. A descriptive study is one in which information is collected without changing the environment (i.e., nothing is manipulated). Moreover, according to Shaughnessy, Zechmeister and Jeanne (2011)[43], a descriptive study is useful to evaluate thoughts, opinions and feelings on which scientific judgments may be based as it also provides essential knowledge about the nature of objects and persons.

5.2 Population and Sample

The target populations of the study are customers from selected restaurants in Region XI. Quota sampling was used in targeting how many respondents will be employed. According to Dodge (2003), Quota sampling is a method for selecting survey participants that is a non-probabilistic version of stratified sampling.

In this study, the researcher selected 50 restaurants from the different parts of the region that equally represented each area of the region. According to Muller and Woods

(1994)[35], restaurants can be classified into five types: quick service, midscale, moderate upscale, upscale and business dining. The researcher selected restaurants any of these types of restaurants as long as they possess the following features to establish the parameters in choosing the respondents: narrow menus, a focus on price-sensitive customers and the development of "habit-forming" purchases.

A total of 500 questionnaires were distributed equally across these restaurants (10 questionnaires for each restaurant). The sample of population was not focused on any specific target group except that all respondents were Filipino citizens who were customers of the particular dining establishment. Therefore, it is not possible to make any kind of generalizations about different groups.

5.3 Research Instrument

The survey instruments used in this study were standardized questionnaires. To determine the level of service delivery, this study used SERVQUAL by Parasuman et al. (1988)[39], being the most utilized model in service quality research and applications. The customer satisfaction questionnaires were adopted on the Drivers of Satisfaction developed and prepared by the Office of the King County Executive (Measuring Customer Satisfaction: Improving the experience of King County's customers) while, the survey questionnaire on public relations was developed by Hon and Grunig (1999)[26].

6. RESULTS

6.1 Level of Service Delivery

Shown in Table 1 is the summary of the level of service delivery in selected food establishments in Region XI. The overall mean is 3.10 with a standard deviation of 0.86. This means that the ratings of the respondents for the items of the five indicators are moderate. Among the dimensions of service delivery, *tangibles* obtained the highest overall mean score based on the feedback of the customers which is 3.19 or a descriptive equivalent of *Moderate*. The *reliability* gained the second highest overall mean score among the dimensions of service delivery which is 3.14 or a descriptive equivalent of *Moderate*.

Table 1 Level of Service Delivery in Selected Food Establishments in Region XI

| Indicator | SD | Mean | Descriptive Level |
|----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|
| Tangibles | 1.25 | 3.19 | Moderate |
| Reliability | 1.12 | 3.14 | Moderate |
| Responsiveness | 0.96 | 2.99 | Moderate |
| Assurance | 1.08 | 3.12 | Moderate |
| Empathy | 1.06 | 3.05 | Moderate |
| Overall | 0.86 | 3.10 | Moderate |

Next is the *assurance* with an overall mean score of 3.12 or a descriptive equivalent of *Moderate* followed by *empathy* with an overall mean score of 3.05 or a

descriptive equivalent of *Moderate* and last is the *responsiveness* with an overall mean score of 2.99, still having a descriptive equivalent of *Moderate*.

6.2 Level of Customer Satisfaction

Indicated in Table 2 is the summary of the level of customer satisfaction. It was observed that the overall mean is 3.18 with a standard deviation of 0.60. This means that the responses of the respondents on the items of customer satisfaction are moderate.

Among the twelve indicators of customer satisfaction, the results revealed that *Value and Cost* gained the highest

mean score of 3.36 or a descriptive equivalent of *Moderate*. It was then followed by *Fairness*, 3.30; *Timeliness* 3.26; *Look and Feel*, 3.23; *Access*, 3.21; *Convenience*, 3.20; *Safety and Security*, 3.17; *Trustworthiness as well as Staff Attitude*, 3.14; *End Result*, 3.11; *Information*, 3.09; and last is *staff competence*, 3.03. All indicators have *Moderate* descriptive equivalent.

Table 2 Level of Customer Satisfaction

| Indicator | SD | Mean | Descriptive Level |
|-------------------|------------|-------------|-------------------|
| End Result | 1.06 | 3.11 | Moderate |
| Timeliness | 0.95 | 3.26 | Moderate |
| Information | 0.92 | 3.09 | Moderate |
| Staff Competence | 1.07 | 3.03 | Moderate |
| Trustworthiness | 0.71 | 3.14 | Moderate |
| Fairness | 0.98 | 3.3 | Moderate |
| Access | 0.97 | 3.21 | Moderate |
| Look & Feel | 1.04 | 3.23 | Moderate |
| Safety & Security | 0.63 | 3.17 | Moderate |
| Convenience | 1.16 | 3.2 | Moderate |
| Value & Cost | 1.05 | 3.36 | Moderate |
| Overall | 0.6 | 3.18 | Moderate |

6.3 Level of Public Relations

The overall standard deviation within the six indicators of public relations is 0.86 which implies consistency of respondents' response. As seen in Table 3, the overall mean is 3.07 or a descriptive level of *Moderate*. Looking at the indicators of public relations, *Control Mutuality*

gained the highest mean score which is 3.16 or a descriptive equivalent of *Moderate*. *Control Mutuality* is followed by *Communal Relationship* with 3.14 mean score; *Satisfaction*, 3.07; *Trust and Commitment*, 3.06; and *Exchange Relationship*, 2.91. All indicators have *Moderate* descriptive equivalent.

Table 3 Level of Public Relations

| Indicator | SD | Mean | Descriptive Level |
|------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|
| Control Mutuality | 0.74 | 3.16 | Moderate |
| Trust | 1.08 | 3.06 | Moderate |
| Commitment | 0.87 | 3.06 | Moderate |
| Satisfaction | 0.97 | 3.07 | Moderate |
| Exchange Relationships | 1.08 | 2.91 | Moderate |
| Communal Relationships | 0.56 | 3.14 | Moderate |
| Overall | 0.64 | 3.07 | Moderate |

6.4 Significance of the Relationship between Levels of Service Delivery and Public Relations in Selected Food Establishments in Region XI

Table 4 showed the results of test of relationship between service delivery and public relations. The overall *r-value* is 0.330 with the *p-value* of 0.000 lower than 0.05 signified rejection of the null hypothesis. This implies that the dimensions of

service delivery are positively correlated to the variables of public relations and there is a significant relationship

between the levels of service delivery and public relations. This means that the service quality can In Table 4, it can also be observed that all dimensions: *tangibles*, *reliability*, *responsiveness*, *assurance*, and *empathy* showed a significant relationship to *control mutuality*, *trust*, *commitment*, *satisfaction*, *exchange relationships*, and *communal relationship* as their individual *p-values* are less than 0.05.

6.5 Significance of the Relationship between Levels of Customer Satisfaction and Public

Table 5 presents the results of test of relationship between levels of customer service and public relations. As revealed in the table, the r-value of 0.449 with $p < 0.01$ warrants the rejection of the null hypothesis. This implies that in general, there is a significant relationship between customer satisfaction and public relations which further means that the higher the satisfaction of the customers is, the higher the level of public relations it creates. Particularly, the data revealed that among the indicators of customer satisfaction, *Staff Competence* and *Trustworthiness* were found to have no significant relationship with *Commitment*. This implies that the customer's level of satisfaction on the staff's apparent commitment to their work and the eagerness to help customers in energy to maintain and promote order to satisfy them do not influence the level of public relations in terms of Commitment.

6.6 Significance of the Influence of Service Delivery and Customer Satisfaction to the Public Relations

Multiple regression was used to determine whether all or any of the five domains of service delivery and twelve domains of customer satisfaction significantly predicts public relations of dining establishments. The results revealed (see Table 6) that service delivery and customer satisfaction were found to be significant predictors of public relations as the *p-value* signified rejection of null hypothesis which is less than 0.05 and F-value of 9.442. The analysis revealed that when service delivery and customer satisfaction were regressed with public relations, it generated an R^2 of .250, meaning 25% of the variance of service delivery and customer satisfaction was attributed to public relations. This means that 75% of the variation can be attributed to other variables not covered in the study. Correspondingly, the analysis further revealed that *convenience* gained the highest degree of influence for the drivers of customer satisfaction to public relations having the highest beta coefficient of 0.171 and *responsiveness* with beta coefficient of 0.118.

Table 4
Significance on the Relationship between Service Delivery and Public Relations in Selected Food Establishments in Region XI

| Service Delivery | Public Relations | | | | | | Overall |
|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | Control Mutuality | Trust | Commitment | Satisfaction | Exchange Relationship | Communal Relationship | |
| Tangibles | .287** (.000) | .146** (.001) | .102* (.023) | .170** (.000) | 0.159** (.000) | .234** (.000) | .241** (.000) |
| Reliability | .315** (.000) | .172** (.000) | 1.05* (.019) | .166** (.000) | .171** (.000) | 1.92** (.000) | .250** (.000) |
| Responsiveness | .310** (.000) | .148** (.000) | .105* (.019) | .183** (.000) | .205** (.000) | .224** (.000) | .261** (.000) |
| Assurance | .382** (.000) | .241** (.000) | .128** (.004) | .187** (.000) | .186** (.000) | .132** (.003) | .298** (.000) |
| Empathy | .442* (.000) | .186** (.000) | .092* (.039) | .183** (.000) | .155** (.001) | .117** (.009) | .265** (.000) |
| Overall | .438** (.000) | .226** (.000) | .135** (.003) | .225** (.000) | .221** (.001) | .230** (.000) | .330** (.000) |

Table 5 Significance on the Relationship between Levels of Customer Service and Public Relations

| Customer Satisfaction | Public Relations | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------|--------|------------|--------------|------------------------|-----------------------|---------------|
| | Control Mutuality | Trust | Commitment | Satisfaction | Exchange Relationships | Communal Relationship | Overall |
| End Results | .287** | .267** | .144** | .197** | .135** | .420** | .311** |

| | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| | (.000) | (.000) | (.001) | (.000) | (.002) | (.000) | (.000) |
| Timeliness | .255** | 0.254** | .150** | .205** | .179** | .360** | .308** |
| | (.000) | (.000) | (.001) | (.000) | (.000) | (.000) | (.000) |
| Information | .232** | .161** | .097* | .214** | .219** | .336** | .276** |
| | (.000) | (.000) | (.029) | (.000) | (.000) | (.000) | (.000) |
| Staff Competence | .131** | .194** | .006 | .187** | .179** | .113** | .208** |
| | (.003) | (.000) | (.142) | (.000) | (.000) | (.012) | (.000) |
| Trustworthiness | .282** | .137** | .069 | .113** | .142** | .311** | .221** |
| | (.000) | (.002) | (.122) | (.011) | (.001) | (.000) | (.000) |
| Staff Attitude | .272** | .315** | .214** | .169** | .131** | .159** | .292** |
| | (.000) | (.000) | (.000) | (.000) | (.003) | (.000) | (.000) |
| Fairness | .249** | .278** | .270** | .188** | .141** | .201** | .303** |
| | (.000) | (.000) | (.000) | (.000) | (.002) | (.000) | (.000) |
| Access | .151** | .177** | .188** | .238** | .167** | .250** | .264** |
| | (.001) | (.000) | (.000) | (.000) | (.000) | (.000) | (.000) |
| Look and Feel | .204** | .217** | .128** | .293** | .325** | .171** | .319** |
| | (.000) | (.000) | (.004) | (.000) | (.000) | (.000) | (.000) |
| Safety and Security | .209** | .193** | .187** | .121** | .174** | .303** | .260** |
| | (.000) | (.000) | (.000) | (.007) | (.000) | (.000) | (.000) |
| Convenience | .267** | .297** | .200** | .156** | .118** | .150** | .274** |
| | (.000) | (.000) | (.000) | (.000) | (.008) | (.001) | (.000) |
| Value and Cost | .246** | .297** | .245** | .163** | .117** | .199** | .287** |
| | (.000) | (.000) | (.000) | (.000) | (.009) | (.000) | (.000) |
| Overall | .374** | .382** | .266** | .306** | .270** | .388** | .449** |
| | (.000) | (.000) | (.000) | (.000) | (.000) | (.000) | (.000) |

Table 6 Significance of the Influence of Service Delivery and Customer Satisfaction to the Public Relations in Selected Food Establishments in Region XI

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the estimate |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| 1 | .500 ^a | .250 | .233 | .56497 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), value and cost, look and feel, staff competence, responsiveness, empathy, end result, safety and security, reliability/trustworthiness, tangibles, access, information, convenience, assurance, timeliness, reliability/trustworthiness, fairness, staff attitude

| Model | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|-------------------|
| Regression | 51.233 | 17 | 3.014 | 9.442 | .000 ^b |
| Residual | 153.850 | 482 | .319 | | |

| | | | | | |
|-------|---------|-----|--|--|--|
| Total | 205.083 | 499 | | | |
|-------|---------|-----|--|--|--|

- a. Dependent variable: Public Relations
- b. Predictors: (Constant), value and cost, look and feel, staff competence, responsiveness, empathy, end result, safety and security, reliability, tangibles, access, information, convenience, assurance, timeliness, reliability/trustworthiness, fairness, staff attitude Coefficients

| Model | Standard Coefficient (Beta) | T | Sig. |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|--------|-------|
| Constant | | 7.053 | 0.000 |
| Tangibles | 0.004 | 0.056 | 0.955 |
| Reliability | -0.032 | -0.424 | 0.671 |
| Responsiveness | 0.118 | 2.066 | 0.039 |
| Assurance | 0.079 | 1.275 | 0.203 |
| Empathy | 0.020 | 0.353 | 0.724 |
| End result | 0.087 | 1.276 | 0.203 |
| Timeliness | 0.072 | 1.021 | 0.308 |
| Information | -0.010 | -0.155 | 0.877 |
| Staff competence | 0.074 | 1.563 | 0.119 |
| Trustworthiness | -0.033 | -0.626 | 0.532 |
| Staff attitude | -0.131 | -0.551 | 0.582 |
| Fairness | 0.066 | 0.532 | 0.595 |
| Access | 0.027 | 0.457 | 0.648 |
| Look and feel | 0.158 | 2.947 | 0.003 |
| Safety and security | 0.087 | 1.78 | 0.076 |
| Convenience | 0.171 | 0.813 | 0.417 |
| Value and cost | 0.120 | 0.862 | 0.389 |

- a. Dependent variable: Public Relations

7. DISCUSSION

7.1 Service Delivery in Selected Food Establishment

The results of the data on the level of service delivery in selected food establishments in Region XI showed that all indicators obtained *moderate* descriptive levels. This means that the respondents have no strong opinion regarding the physical appearance of facilities, equipment, staff, and written materials of a food establishment; the ability of a food establishment to perform the promised service dependably and accurately; the employees' knowledge and courtesy and the service provider's ability to inspire trust and confidence; the treatment of the employees to the customers; and the willingness to help customers and provide prompt service.

The results revealed that *Tangibles* obtained the highest mean score among all the indicators which indicates that customers appreciated this aspect the most. It translates to the restaurant's interiors, the appearance and condition of the cutlery, tableware, and uniform of the staff, the appearance and design of the menu, restaurant signage

and advertisements (Zeithaml, Bitner & Gremler, 2006)[52].

This implies that the restaurants were able to maintain good physical appearance of facilities, equipment, staff, and other materials of their establishment and created the highest impact to the satisfaction of the customers as also found by Zafar et al. (2012) in his study of restaurants in Pakistan. Bujisic et al. (2014)[13] which revealed a high value of ambience in the delivery of service in the restaurant industry.

On the other hand, though responsiveness was rated as one of the dimensions that are of utmost importance in the study of Baker (2010)[8], this was not met by the dining establishments based on the responses of the respondents. This dimension, according to Baker, centered around behaviors of being sensitive to the customer's mood and adjusting service style based on the customers mood. It may be of value for establishments to train servers on sensing and altering behavior based on customers displayed mood and body language in order to meet their expectations. Nevertheless, though the respondents ranked the dimensions of service delivery differently, all

five dimensions have been found to be important to the customers.

Hence, based on the data gathered, the results indicate a phenomenon of social concordance among respondents. This assertion is manifested on the standard deviation whose measures are less than one. The measure is an indicative that the customer perceptual response towards service delivery of selected food establishments has less variations. Likewise, the mean suggests that the respondents have no strong opinion with respect to service delivery. The numerical values of mean of each indicator of service delivery fall on the same categorical mean range, consequently, it has the same descriptive scale, that is, no strong opinion. With this information, it is safe to claim that the customer's perceived level of service delivery of selected food establishments in region XI is moderate.

7.2 Level of Customer Satisfaction in Selected Food Establishments in Region XI

Data on the level of customer satisfaction in selected food establishments in Region XI revealed that all twelve dimensions obtained a moderate level though it was found that among the twelve indicators of customer satisfaction, the results revealed that *Value and Cost* gained the highest mean score. Based on the literature, *Value and Cost* refers to the establishments' value of food and services whether these matters correspond to its costs. Hence, this implies that this is the aspect where the respondents felt they are most satisfied compared to the other aspects being studied consistent with the findings of Hyun (2010)[27] mentioning price as a pivotal factor influencing customer satisfaction. The overall standard deviation obtained by this dimension is 0.60 which implies a fair consistency to the feedback of the customers.

Staff competence, on the other hand, obtained the lowest mean score. This indicator is the least among the twelve which means that it is in this aspect that the customers felt the least satisfaction in the selected food establishments. Based on the literature, it refers to how the employees give personal attention, serves the customer with gladness, shows consistent courtesy towards customers, and how they are willing to answer the customers' questions and concerns.

The social concordance of response is consistent among the respondents. Again the pattern generated from the data speak clearly that they have common consensus with respect to customer satisfaction. Evidently, the standard deviations of each indicator converge to one unit of response distribution. This make sense, since the mean values are fall in the same range of descriptive scale, that is no strong opinion". Generally, it has a moderate perceptual level.

7.3 Level of Public Relations in Selected Food Establishments in Region XI

In this particular dimension, there is slight variation among respondents' response toward Public Relations of

selected food establishments. However, this little variation of response occurred with the tolerable interval of distribution, making the response falls within the same categorical measure that is nearer to one unit. The descriptive implication of this phenomenon the respondents have common perceptual level among the public relation indicators. This is the very reason that descriptively, all indicators are responded almost the same measure of mean equal three. The descriptive scale among indicators of public relations is "no strong opinion". This result clearly defined a moderate customers' perceptual level in general. However, looking at the indicators of public relations, data revealed that *Control Mutuality* gained the highest mean score with a descriptive equivalent of *Moderate* followed by *Communal Relationship*, *Satisfaction*, *Trust* and *Commitment*, and *Exchange Relationship*. All indicators have *Moderate* descriptive equivalent.

7.4 Significance of the Relationship between Levels of Service Delivery, Customer Satisfaction and Public Relations in Selected Food Establishments in Region XI

The results of the test of relationship between service delivery and public relations revealed that the level of significance (*p-value*) is less than 0.05 which means rejection of the null hypothesis. This implies that the dimensions of service delivery are positively correlated to the variables of public relations and there is a significant relationship between the levels of service delivery and public relations. Meaning, the service quality can affect the public relations of selected food establishments in Region XI.

It was also revealed that all dimensions: *tangibles*, *reliability*, *responsiveness*, *assurance*, and *empathy* showed a significant relationship to *control mutuality*, *trust*, *commitment*, *satisfaction*, *exchange relationships*, and *communal relationship*.

On the other hand, the results of the test of relationship between levels of customer satisfaction and public relations warrant the rejection of the null hypothesis. Thus, there is a significant relationship between the levels of customer satisfaction and public relations.

On the contrary, it was observed that there is no significant relationship between *staff competence* and *commitment* as well as *reliability* and *commitment*. This implies that both *staff competence* and *reliability* do not influence the commitment of the customers.

7.5 Significance of the Influence of Service Delivery and Customer Satisfaction to the Public Relations

The regression model was used to detect which indicators or domains of service delivery and customer satisfaction predict the public relations. This model fit the data based on the data screening. The proof of this is reflected in the column collinearity statistics. The tolerance values of

each indicator are greater than 10, which indicate the fitness of the model. In addition to that, the variables inflation factors (VIF) are concord to the limit value not more than 10.

One variable in the indicator (Empathy) of service delivery was deleted in the model, this indicates that it has no effect size when all predictors held constant. There are 14 indicators that are incorporated in the model and each of them has a corresponding weight that described the interrelationship among these predictors. The corresponding weight value of each predictor of public relations is reflected on the column standardized coefficient. Particularly, a beta is the coefficient of the corresponding predictor. All values reflected in the column beta is less than one, that is the weight of the indicators contributed to the model of predicting the public relations. There are indicators of service delivery that significantly predict the public relations, these are the tangible and assurance have reached the level of significant at .05. while the reliability and responsiveness no significant at all.

Looking at the indicators of customer satisfaction, there are 6 indicators qualified to predict the public relations, namely the End Results, Timeliness, Information, Staff Competence, Staff Attitude, and Look and Feel. Each individual value of significance is satisfied at the level 0.05. However, indicators of customer satisfaction that indicates no significance are the following: Safety & Security, Access, Fairness, and Trustworthiness. These results conforms to the idea of Omotayo and Joachim (2008)[38] which stated that while customer satisfaction is a key driver of public relations and customer retention, however, it does not guarantee assurance at all times. Thus, certain dimensions that influence this construct are yet to be explored.

But overall, the findings imply that in order to attract potential customers as a guarantee of future viability, it is prudent that restaurants identify their service quality dimensions with narrow 'zones of tolerance' and focus their attention on these dimensions (Zeithaml and Bitner, 2006)[52]. From this standpoint, satisfaction is viewed as an outcome that results from the purchase act or consumption experience (Heitmann, Lehmann & Herrmann, 2007). Wickey (2010) cited that the determination of satisfaction or dissatisfaction is an end state of a psychological process, viewed as the consumer's fulfillment response.

8. CONCLUSION

The findings of this study have interesting theoretical and practical implications for the service literature, service establishments, and the restaurant industry as a whole which is lucrative in size, fiercely competitive, and very important to the public palate. First, the findings revealed that in terms of the level of service delivery, among the five dimensions, Tangibles was rated the highest by the customers. Therefore, it can be concluded that customers

are primarily visual in preference with customer satisfaction.

In terms of customer satisfaction, all twelve dimensions obtained a moderate level however Value and Cost gained the highest mean score which implies that this is the area where the customers felt most satisfied compared to other areas and that they perceive the product or service as worth the expense. Hence, this points to the claim that a reasonable price level is a pivotal factor influencing customer satisfaction which is why it has always been regarded as an important criterion in restaurant marketing. In terms of public relations, all five dimensions also obtained a moderate level. Control Mutuality, in particular, gained the highest mean score. Hence, it can be concluded that the customers perceived the management to agree on who has the rightful power to influence one another. Although some imbalance is natural, stable relationships require that organizations and publics each have some control over the other.

The results on the test of the relationships between levels of service delivery and customer satisfaction towards public relations warrants the rejection of the null hypothesis indicating significant relationships between the variables. The results affirm the notion that a company's reputation is significantly influenced by the perceived level of adequate service or the customer's past experiences, their level of satisfaction which results to marketing possibilities such as the word-of-mouth communications. Hence, the results of this study support the framework created.

9. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings and conclusions of this study, maintaining good service delivery and achieving customer satisfaction is indeed a continuous process that lasts throughout the lifespan of the organization. Products and services revolve around customer demand. Hence, as long as these factors exist, dining establishments must continuously review and modify their customer strategies to meet and exceed customer expectations. Employees should be thoroughly trained on their products and services, and able to confidently answer questions and converse on the products. Implementing training and continuous education programs are very effective methods for improving and maintaining quality service and customer satisfaction.

It can be surmised that businesses must understand its customer's concerns and needs to improve customer satisfaction. The information can be gathered through customer forums and surveys, as well as through the interactions that occur during normal transactions. It is suggested to use the comments and concerns to ascertain ways the business can achieve a better response. Gather ideas from various individuals within the business to gain an insight on how the potential adjustments will impact the customer and the company.

In terms of responsiveness and public relations, the evolution of technology has made customer support more than just a phone service. Many modern businesses provide their customers with multiple customer service options, including live chat, email and video conferencing. Although traditional phone support remains, implementing multiple lines of communication improve the business responsiveness which, ultimately, improves customer satisfaction.

Finally, from a management perspective, it is vital to identify the areas where greater efforts should be allocated. Beyond the obvious approach, that areas poorly rated by customers should be carefully looked at, it is important to identify which factors more strongly affect customer's satisfaction. Managers should systematically examine current services from their customers' perspectives and redesign their service products and environment in which their services are delivered to their target customers.

10. REFERENCES

- [1] Ahmed, I., Nawaz, M. M., Usman, A., Shaukat, M.
- [2] Ahmed, N. & Rehman, W. (2010). A mediation of customer satisfaction relationship between service quality and repurchase intentions for the telecom sector in Pakistan: A Case study of university students. *African Journal of Business Management*, 4(16), 3457-3462.
- [3] Aldlaigan, A. H., & Buttle, F. A. (2002). SYSTRA-SQ: a new measure of bank service quality. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 13(4), 362-381. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09564230210445041>
- [4] Al-Tit, A. A., & Nakhleh, H. (2014). The Role of E-Marketing in the Development of Internet User Attitudes toward Tourist Sites in Saudi Arabia. *Journal of Administrative and Economic Sciences*, 7(2), 25-44.
- [5] Angela, R. (2006). *Student Services: A Student's Eye View*. College and University Publication, 81(2), 65.
- [6] Anselmsson, J., & Johansson, U. (2014). A Comparison of Customer Perceived Service Quality in Discount Versus Traditional Grocery Stores: An Examination of Service Quality Measurement Scales in a Swedish Context. *International Journal of Quality and Service Sciences*, 6(4), 369-386. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/IJQSS-03-2013-0012>.
- [7] Asubonteng, P., McCleary, K.J. & Swan, J.E. (1996). SERVQUAL revisited: a critical review of service quality, *The Journal of Services Marketing*, 10 (6), 62-81.
- [8] Baker, M. (2010). *Service behaviors and time preferences of rural and urban restaurant customers* (Master's Thesis, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia). Retrieved https://theses.lib.vt.edu/theses/available/etd-05192010-100940/unrestricted/Baker_M_T_2010.pdf from
- [9] Ben, A. M. (2007). Identifying the needs of customers in higher education. *Education*, 127(3), 332.
- [10] Berry, L. L., Wall, E. A., & Carbone, L. P. (2006). *Service Clues and Customer Assessment of the Service Experience: Lessons from Marketing*. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 20(2), 43-57.
- [11] Berry, L. L., Carbone, L. P., & Haeckel, S. H. (2002). Managing the total customer experience. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 43(3), 85-89.
- [12] Bryman, A. & Bell, E. (2005). *Företagsekonomiska forskningsmetoder*, Malmö, Liber AB.
- [13] Bujisic, M., Hutchinson, J., & Parsa, H. G. (2014). The effects of restaurant quality attributes on customer behavioral intentions. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 26(8), 1270-1291. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-04-2013-0162>
- [14] Chang, J. C. (2008). Taiwanese tourists' perceptions of service quality on outbound guided package tours: A qualitative examination of the SERVQUAL dimensions. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 15(2), 164-178
- [15] Cronin, Jr, J. J., & Taylor, S. A. (1994). SERVPERF versus SERVQUAL: Reconciling performance-based and perceptions-minus-expectations. *Journal of Marketing*, 58 (1), 125.
- [16] Debata, B. R., Patnaik, B., Mahapatra, S. S., & Sree, K. (2015). Interrelations of Service Quality and Service Loyalty Dimensions in Medical Tourism: A structural equation modeling approach. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, 22(1), 18-55. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/BIJ-04-2013-0036>.
- [17] Dedeoğlu, B. B., & Demirer, H. (2015). Differences in Service Quality Perceptions of Stakeholders in the Hotel Industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 27(1), 130-146. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-08-2013-0350>.
- [18] Dodge, Y. (2003). *The Oxford Dictionary of Statistical Terms*. doi.10.1002/pst.128.
- [19] Eshghi, A., Roy, S. K., & Ganguli, S. (2008). Service quality and customer satisfaction: An empirical investigation in Indian mobile Telecommunications services, *Marketing Management Journal*, 18 (2), 119-144.
- [20] Gilmore, S. A., and Dolezal, J. (2000): Hospital Employee Dining Environment: Employee Perceptions before, during and after Renovation. *Food service Research International*, 12 (3), 141-149.
- [21] Gonzales, V.G. and Garzia, J.S. (2008). *Measuring customer satisfaction in a service company combining approaches for quality service improvement*. Department of Terotechnology, Växjö.
- [22] Ha, J. & Jang, S. (2009). Effects of service quality and food quality: the moderating role of atmospherics in an ethnic restaurant segment. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 29(4): 520- 529.

- [23] Han, H., & Ryu, K. (2009). The roles of the physical environment, price perception, and customer satisfaction in determining customer loyalty in the restaurant industry. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 33(4), 487.
- [24] Hau-siu Chow, I. H., Lau, V. P., Wing-chun 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, 698–710. doi:10.1016/j.ijhm.2006.07.001.
- [25] Heung, V. C., & Ngai, E. W. (2008). The Mediating Effects of Perceived Value and Customer Satisfaction on Customer Loyalty in the Chinese Restaurant Setting. *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality & Tourism*, 9(2), 85–107.
- [26] Hon, C. L., & Grunig, J. E. (1999). *Guidelines for measuring relationships in public relations*. Gainesville, FL 32611-8400: The Institute for Public Relations.
- [27] Hyun, S. S. (2010). *Predictors of Relationship Quality and Loyalty in the Chain Restaurant Industry*. Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly, 51(2), 251.
- [28] Kafetzopoulos, D. P., Gotzamani, K. D., & Psomas E. L. (2014). The Impact of Employees' Attributes on the Quality of Food Products. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, 31(5), 500-521. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/IJQRM-05-2012-0057>.
- [29] Keng, C. J., Huang, T. L., Zheng, L. J., & Hsu, M. (2007). Modeling service encounters and customer experiential value in retailing. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 18(4), 349–367.
- [30] Kotler, P. & Keller, K. L. (2009). *Marketing management (13th end)*. New Jersey: Pearson Education Inc, Upper Saddle River.
- [31] Kumra, R. (2008). Service Quality in Rural Tourism: A Perspective Approach. *Conference on Tourism in India-Challenges Ahead, India*, 424-431.
- [32] Lovelock, C. & Wirtz, J. (2007). *Service Marketing- People, Technology, Strategy*, Pearson Prentice Hall.
- [33] Lymperopoulous, C., Chaniotakis, I. E., & Soureli, M. (2006). The importance of service quality in bank selection for mortgage loans. *Managing Service Quality*, 16(4), 365-379. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09604520610675702>.
- [34] Marinelli, N., Simeone, M., & Scarpato, D. (2015). Does Quality Really Matter? Variables That Drive Postmodern Consumer Choices. *Nutrition & Food Science*, 45(2), 255-269. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/NFS-03-2014-0022>
- [35] Muller, C. C., & Woods, R. H. (1994). An Expanded Restaurant Typology. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 35(3), 27-37. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/001088049403500312>.
- [36] Munusamy, J., Chelliah, S. and Mun, H. (2010). Service Quality Delivery and Its Impact on Customer Satisfaction in the Banking Sector in Malaysia. *International Journal of Innovation, Management and Technology*, 1 (4), 398-404.
- [37] Omar, M. W., Shaharudin, M. R., Jusoff, K., & Ali, M. N. (2011). Understanding the Mediating Effect of Cognitive and Emotional Satisfaction on Customer Loyalty. *African Journal of Business Management*, 5(17), 7683-7690.
- [38] Omotayo, O. & Joachim, A. (2008). Customer service in the retention of mobile phone users in Nigeria. *African Journal of Business Management*, 2 (2), 026-031.
- [39] 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): 12–40.
- [40] Pine, I., & Gilmore, J. H. (1998). Welcome To The Experience Economy. *Harvard Business Review*, 76(4), 97-105.
- [41] Ramsaran-Fowdar R.R. (2007). Developing a service quality questionnaire for the hotel industry in Mauritius. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 13 (1),19-27.
- [42] Ryu, K., Lee, H. & Kim, W.G. (2012). The influence of the quality of the physical environment, food, and service on restaurant image, customer perceived value, customer satisfaction, and behavioral intentions. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 24(2): 200–223.
- [43] Shaughnessy, J., Zechmeister, E. & Jeanne, Z. (2011). *Research methods in psychology* (9th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw Hill, 161–175.
- [44] Tesfom, G. & Birch, N.J. (2011). Do switching barriers in the retail banking industry influence bank customers in different age groups differently? *Journal of Services Marketing*, 25(5), 371–380.
- [45] Verhoef, P. C., Lemon, K. N., Parasuraman, A., Roggeveen, A., Tsiros, M., & Schlesinger, L. A. (2009). Customer experience creation: Determinants, dynamics and management strategies. *Journal of Retailing*, 85(1), 31–41.
- [46] Wang, E. (2015). Effect of Food Service-Brand Equity on Consumer-Perceived Food Value, Physical Risk, and Brand Preference. *British Food Journal*, 117(2), 553-564. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-09-2013-0260>.
- [47] Wettstein, N., Hanf, J. H., & Burggraf, C. (2011). Unshakable Loyalty in the Food Sector: Sustainable Customer Retention. Empirical Study of Organic Food Consumers in Germany. *Journal of Consumer Protection and Food Safety*, 6(3), 359-365. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00003-011-0668-5>.
- [48] Wisniewski, M. (2001). Using SERVQUAL to assess customer satisfaction with public sector services. *Managing Service Quality*, 11, (6), 380-388.
- [49] Wu, C. H., & Liang, R. D. (2009). Effect of experiential value on customer satisfaction with service encounters in luxury-hotel restaurants.

- International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 28 (4), 586-93.
- [50] Yeşilada, F., & Direktör, E. (2010). Health Care Service Quality: A Comparison of public and Private Hospitals. *African Journal of Business Management*, 4(6), 962-971.
- [51] Yi, Y., & La, S. (2004). What influences the relationship between customer satisfaction and repurchase intention? Investigating the effects of adjusted expectations and customer loyalty. *Psychology & Marketing*, 21(5), 351-373. <http://dx.doi.org/0.1002/mar.20009>.
- [52] Zeithaml, V. A., Bitner, M. J., & Gremler, D. D. (2006). *Service marketing: Integrating customer focus across the firm* (4th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
- [53] Zeithaml, V.A. and Bitner, M. J. (1996). *Services marketing*, New York: McGraw-Hill.
- [54] Zeithaml, V. A. (2009). Service Quality, Profitability, and the Economic Worth of Customers: What We Know and What We Need to Learn. *Journal of Academy of Marketing Science*, Volume 28(1), P.67-85.
- [55] Zeithaml, V.A., Bitner, M.J. (2003). *Service Marketing – Integrating Customer Focus Across the Firm*, McGraw-Hill Companies, USA.