JOURNAL OF TOURISM AND SERVICES
Issue 22, volume 12, ISSN 1804-5650 (Online)
www.jots.cz

Investigation of the Effect of Restaurant Atmosphere on Behavioral Intention

Üzeyir Kement
Ordu University, Ordu, Turkey
Sinan Çavuşoğlu
Bingöl University, Bingöl, Turkey
Aziz Bükey
Bingöl University, Bingöl, Turkey
Murat Göral
Bingöl University, Bingöl, Turkey
Ahmet Uslu
Bingöl University, Bingöl, Turkey

Received: 21 February 2021. **Revision received**: 10 March 2021. **Accepted**: 21 March 2021

Abstract
The present study aims to examine the effect of restaurant atmosphere on behavioral intention. The study sample group consists of 412 guests visiting the à la carte restaurants residing in Bodrum destination. The questionnaire was applied to restaurant customers between June-December 2018. The convenience sampling method was used within the scope of the research. SPSS and AMOS statistical programs were utilized to calculate the validity and reliability of the questionnaire and test the hypotheses. When the study results are examined, it can be noted that the spatial layout & employee factor and view from the window had a positive effect on the revisit intention, word-of-mouth intention, and willingness to pay more. Furthermore, it was determined that the ambiance affected the willingness to pay more positively. Nonetheless, it has been identified that there was no statistically significant effect of the ambiance and facility aesthetics on the revisit intention and word-of-mouth intention. Finally, it was figured out that facility aesthetics did not statistically significantly affect willingness to pay more.

Key Words: Restaurant atmosphere, Behavioral intention, Tourism

JEL Classification: Z30, Z33, Z39

Reference: Kement, Ü., Çavuşoğlu, S., Bükey, A., Göral, M., Uslu, A. (2021). Investigation of the Effect of Restaurant Atmosphere on Behavioral Intention. *Journal of Tourism and Services*, 22(12), 222-242. doi: 10.29036/jots.v12i22.245

1. Introduction

This study aims to determine the effect of the restaurant atmosphere (Kotler, 1973) on behavioral intention, which is an effective means of marketing. Kotler (1973) states that consciously designed spaces have an effect in determining consumer behavior. The client, who constantly interacts with atmospheric elements from the very first moment of restaurant selection up to leaving the restaurant, experiences the product he buys and the restaurant atmosphere. In this context, considered as a product, it may be interpreted that the atmosphere affects the customers cognitively and sensitively (Ünal et al., 2014). In the context of the purpose; to determine the effect of spatial order and employee factor on behavioral intention, to determine the effect of ambiance on behavioral intention, to determine the effect of an esthetic factor on behavioral intention, to determine the effect of view from the window on behavioral intention are the objectives of the research.

May be expressed as an augmented product, the restaurant atmosphere allows the interaction between customers except for the basic products of a restaurant (food and beverage), addresses the senses outside the sense of taste, and affects people's purchasing behavior (Palit et al., 2019). When people firstly walk into a restaurant, they encounter the atmosphere of the restaurant before they get to tasting and are served. According to Jalil et al. (2016), today's customers eat out more and are now making efforts to find the products and atmosphere that suit their wishes when making the restaurant selection decision.

The expectations of the customers in the restaurant businesses will not only be focused on the served meals. Apart from eating and drinking, many atmospheric variables can directly affect the behavior of individuals visiting restaurants (Jalil et al., 2016). In the following part of the study, the studies exploring the relationship between these two variables and the results of these studies in the literature were included to find an answer to the research problem formulated as "Does the restaurant atmosphere affect behavioral intention?", and then moved on to develop research hypotheses.

In this study, the scale developed by Heung and Gu (2012) has been used instead of the Dinescape scale commonly used in the literature because it covers the view from the window dimension, which is believed to be an important part of the restaurant atmosphere. It is noticed in the literature that the studies concerning the restaurant atmosphere in à la carte restaurants are quite limited. What is more, it has been observed that this type of research has not been carried out before in Bodrum, which is one of the important tourist destinations of Turkey and hosts tourists from all over the world. The international popularity of the chosen destination enables data to be collected at a high level of qualitative diversity from the research sample. Taken from these points, this current research differs from the others and owns an original value. In addition, in this study, measuring the effect of restaurant atmosphere on behavioral intention in à la carte restaurants, where free choice of food and waiter attitude are thought to be more important, is one of the factors that make this study unique.

In today's competitive conditions where customer profiles have turned into a more heterogeneous structure, restaurateurs try to gain competitive advantage by developing new processes and production methods to ensure food quality and security (Bozkurt and Göral, 2013). But, there are other factors that customers are interested in. The restaurants handle the restaurant atmosphere as a significant competitive argument. It is anticipated that the results obtained from this study will also serve as a guide for restaurant businesses. For that reason, this study is thought to have an additional contribution to the literature in that it examines a different culture and includes a specific type of restaurant, covering à la carte restaurants operating in Bodrum, which is one of Turkey's major tourist destinations.

Oliver (1996) voiced that measurements in the short and long term will bring different results. The author states that short-term measurements will generally affect the intention to recommend more. However, he puts forward that long-term measurements will affect attitudes and loyalty more. On the other side, Heung and Gu (2012) suggest that long-term research should be conducted to fully understand the behavioral intention of restaurant customers. The study was carried out between June-December 2018. As for the sampling method, convenience sampling method that is included in the non-random sampling method was used. Aaker et al. (2007, p. 393) asserted that non-random sampling methods could be referred on the condition that the universe is homogeneous or random sampling is not possible. In this sampling method, the subjects in the sample are determined statistically and in a non-random way (Robson, 2002, p. 46). Due to these reasons, statistical generalization of the results of studies based on samples determined by non-random sampling method can be quite difficult. However, just it is the case in this study, convenience sampling method can be used so as to make some predictions about the current situation in the light of the information obtained based on a specific sample in which there is no definite information about the elements and the number of elements in the universe. Convenience sampling method is considered as fast and less costly way to obtain data in a swift fashion (Karamustafa and Yıldırım, 2007, p. 66).

2. Conceptual Framework

2.1. Behavioral Intention

In terms of tourism businesses, the customer is divided into two classes; first class customer and returning customer. In the most general form (Huang and Hsu, 2009), this classification is not a typological classification but a behavioral classification. The first-class customer refers to customers who prefer any tourist business for the first time, whereas returning customer refers to the customer who displays the same behavior as visiting the same destination or business once again. Depending on his previous experiences, the decision-making processes of the first class and returning customers also vary. The decisions of first-class customer are based on information retrieved from various sources. On the other side, the returning customer exhibits a behavioral intention depending on the experience gained during the first encounter with the business (Um et al., 2006). Many studies in the literature (Taylor and Todd, 1995; Hansen et al., 2004; Vesci and Botti, 2019) illustrates that this attitude may then be grown into different forms of behavior, such as transferring satisfaction or dissatisfaction to others, revisiting or not visiting, willingness to pay more or not. These studies examining the behavioral outcomes of individuals' attitudes are mostly based on the theory of planned behavior, which was derived from the Theory of Reasoned Action by Fishbein and Ajzen (1975). Theory of Reasoned Action assumes that human behavior depends on will. In theory, it is stated that consumers will decide by choosing among various alternatives according to their motivation and rationality. According to the Theory of Reasoned Action, the intention has two predecessors, namely one's attitude and social norms. Attitude highlights an individual's positive or negative evaluations concerning a behavior. Yet, the social norm is about how an individual displays a behavior in society (Ajzen, 1985). The theory of Reasoned Action has showed up with the inclusion of a third to these predecessors by which the intent is determined (Forward, 2009). This third constituent is known to be the perceived behavioral control. Contrary to attitude and social norm, perceived behavioral control can measure the behaviors that are not under the control of will (Stone et al., 2009). For instance, an individual may wish to revisit a restaurant since he likes the atmosphere, but he may not be able to fulfil this wish because the restaurant is not in the city where he lives.

The concept of behavioral intention is periodically encountered in marketing literature. Zeithaml et al. (1996) worded that behavioral intention holds a fundamental role in ensuring bolstering and maintaining the relationship between the customer and the business. It is expected that the low perceived service quality related to the services provided by the business will turn into negative behavioral intention while high levels of perceived service quality will turn into positive behavioral intention. In their study, Cronin and Taylor (1994) linked behavioral intention with customer satisfaction and concluded that satisfaction might affect attitude and attitude might affect behavioral intention. Zabkar et al. (2010), on the other hand, focused on the past strategies to increase customer satisfaction. However, since behavioral intention is a better performance benchmark today, they indicated that customers strive to create positive behavioral intention. It may be expressed that the common aspect of the approaches in the marketing field that they divide the behavioral intention into two classes as positive and negative, focusing on the outcomes for businesses.

Behavioral intention is expressed as the tendency to behave according to the feelings, knowledge and evaluations of the individuals gone through in their previous experiences (Keun et al., 2014). Additionally, according to Jin et al. (2015), behavioral intention represents an individual's attempt to achieve a goal, and this state is a direct indication of the behavior of customers. From another perspective, behavioral intention can be explained as a criterion for customers to revisit the businesses, recommending the businesses to someone else through word of mouth intention, and willing to pay more for the goods/services they will buy (Yu et al., 2014). The revisit intention refers to the fact that a customer has a desire to re-purchase from the same business based on his previous experiences (Çavuşoğlu and

Bilginer, 2018). Word of mouth intention is defined as a type of communication emerged as a result of transferring the values that a person has perceived about goods and services to other individuals without a commercial purpose (Kement et al., 2018). Lastly, willingness to pay more is explained as the maximum amount of money the customer will spend on the product and the measure of the value that the individual determines as a result of his consumption or usage experience (Agnihotri et al., 2019). In this context, that can be stated that behavioral intention is directly or indirectly associated with many variables in the literature and it is generally examined as a dependent variable in these studies. This may be due to the fact that behavioral intention is quite determinant factor in purchasing decision processes.

2.2. Restaurant Atmosphere

Various academic fields such as psychology, tourism and marketing attach more importance to the impact of the physical environment on human psychology and behavior (Donovan and Rossiter, 1982; Turley and Milliam, 2000; Liu and Jang, 2009; Kim and Moon, 2009). The literature in these fields signifies that the response by customer to the physical environment is associated with their emotional state, especially in the case of hedonic consumption (Wakefield and Blodgett, 1996; Lucas, 2003; Ryu and Jang, 2007). While many types of services are beneficiary or function-oriented, eating in restaurants is often hedonic or emotion-centered (Wakefield and Blodgett, 1996; Ryu and Jang, 2007; Kim and Moon, 2009). The reason why it is the case is that the service areas of a restaurant can develop or hinder the feelings of customers (Jang and Namkung, 2009). Mehrabian and Russell (1974) explained this situation within the context of environmental psychology model. In the Mehrabian-Russell model, behavior is characterized as a function with both personal and environmental factors. The model reveals that emotional responses are a mediator in the relationship between environmental stimuli and human behaviors. The physical environment influences an individual's emotional state so that it forces an individual to constitute an approach to the environment or to form an avoidance behavior. The Mehrabian-Russell Environmental Psychology Model is a disparate application of Stimulus Organism Response (S.O.R.) model. In the S.O.R. model, the most crucial suggestion developed to understand the individual behavior was asserted by Kurt Lewin. As a result of such an approach and explanation, 'black box' model or stimulus and response model descriptions were introduced (Mehrabian and Russell, 1974). Stimulants are outside the humans and they are consisted of various physical atmospheric elements. The organism appoints to internal processes and structures intervening between final actions or reactions with external stimuli to the individual (Bagozzi, 1986). This state amounts that the effect of the atmosphere on consumer behavior mediates the emotional state of the consumer. The Environmental Psychology Model put forward by Mehrabian and Russell (1974) is based on the identification of the measurement and direction of response in the SOR model. According to the Environmental Psychology Model, the responses exhibited to a stimulus in the physical environment may be disclosed in three dimensions; pleasure, arousal and dominance. According to this established model, it was received that these dimensions affect individuals and conceive Approach Avoidance Behavior (Heung and Gu, 2012).

Approach behavior incorporates staying with others in the environment, researching, and the desire to form relation with them, and it helps increase customer satisfaction (Booms and Bitner, 1980). On the other way, avoidance behavior includes running away from the environment and ignoring communication attempts coming from the others (Donovan and Rossiter, 1982). It is considered that both approach and avoidance affect behaviors such as purchasing / using / willing to paying more/revisiting (Chang, 2000; Donovan and Rossiter, 1982; Wakefield and Blodgett, 1996). Even though the M-R model was not formerly established for consumer behavior studies, it has been confirmed that atmospheric consumption is pertinent to explain the effect of consumer behavior on different consumer environments (Donovan and Rossiter, 1982; Liu and Jang, 2009; Ryu and Jang, 2007). By applying Mehrabian and Russell's model, a great deal of studies have been conducted on the role of environmental stimuli as a predictor of consumer behavior such as emotional reactions like pleasure or arousal and the

extra time spent in a store and the actual increased spending (Donovan and Rossiter, 1982; Wakefield and Blodgett, 1996). Briefly, according to the M-R model proposed by Mehrabian and Russell (1974), a person's inner emotional position is led by environmental stimuli and this affects the behavioral intention of customers.

Despite the great contribution of the M-R model to the literature, it cannot be negated that atmospheric factors supplied only limited information about the customer satisfaction of perceived quality in many service environments. Because environmental stimuli are only a subset of general service elements. That is, other aspects of service stimuli, in addition to environmental stimuli, may have significant but distinctive roles in service environments. For example, in a restaurant, product stimulants such as taste, freshness and presentation of the food along with the physical environment create a stimulus group that may function as an important determinant of emotional reactions and future behavior (Kivela et al., 1999). Due to the hedonic nature of a quality restaurant experience, it will inevitably help feel satisfaction and generate revisits in the future (Stevens et al., 1995). In other words, the atmospheric elements supplied by the business, such as aesthetics, ambiance, spatial order, employee factor and landscape, can be critical constituents of restaurant service quality. Therefore, general service stimuli need to be taken into account in order for customers to better understand the restaurant experience.

In the literature, the restaurant atmosphere was put into different dimensions by the authors in different ways (Table 1). In a study by Bitner (1992), it was stated that the restaurant atmosphere consists of 3 dimensions as ambience, spatial order and sign/symbol/artefact called SERVICESCAPE. Berman and Evans (1992) correlated atmospheric elements with business image and examined it under four factors: external factors, internal factors, store layout and view. Turley and Milliman (2000) developed it by including a new dimension by adding the employee factor to the scale of Berman and Evans. Raajpoot (2002) developed the TANGSERV scale as a measurement tool to affirm physical evidence that creates the atmosphere on food and beverage businesses. In this context, it is seen that the physical evidence of the scale is classified into the dimensions of ambiance, aesthetics, social, goods or services and functions. Ryu and Jang (2007) developed a new scale called DINASCAPE with the help of the scales in the literature. They identified the sub-dimensions of the restaurant atmosphere as aesthetics, lighting, ambiance, layout, table layout and staff. Heung and Gu (2012) developed a new scale by adding the landscape dimension to the DINESCAPE scale created by Ryu and Jang. In this study, the restaurant atmosphere scale (aesthetics, ambiance, spatial order/employee factors and landscape), which was formed by adding "landscape" dimension by Heung and Gu (2012), was used.

Table 1. **Restaurant Atmosphere Scales**

Researcher/s	Scale	Sub dimensions
Bitner (1992)	SERVICESCAPE	Ambiance Spatial order Sign / symbol / artefact
Berman & Evans (1992)	ATMOSPHERIC ELEMENTS	External factors Internal factors Store layout View
Turley & Milliman (2000)	ATMOSPHERIC ELEMENTS	External factors Internal factors Store layout View Employee Factor
Raajpoot (2002)	TANGSERV	Ambiance Aesthetic Social

		Goods or service Function
Ryu & Jang (2007)	DINASCAPE	Aesthetic Ambience Spatial order / employee factors
Heung & Gu (2012)	EXTENDEN DINESCAPE	Aesthetic Ambience Spatial order / employee factors Landscape

Source: own research

Heung and Gu (2012) indicated that the restaurant atmosphere includes five dimensions such as aesthetics, ambiance, spatial layout & employee factor and landscape (view form window). The aesthetics involves physical elements just like interior decoration, color, cleaning and so on. As a function of architectural design to create an attractive image (Jalil et al., 2016). The ambiance refers to non-material background characteristics such as the environment, music, smell and temperature that directly affect the perceptions of individuals through the senses (Albayrak and Tüzünkan, 2015). Also, the spatial layout refers to the design of objects such as chairs, tables, furniture, tables, corridors, toilets in the service environment. Jalil et al. (2016) describe the employee factor as the speed of service taking place in the physical environment and the willingness of the employee to serve. As for the last dimension, view from window is about how the outside location looks like from the place the customer sit at the restaurant and refers to the scenery that the customer gets within his sight. View from window is considered to be an important part of the experience of customers (Karaca and Köroğlu, 2018). That is why good scenery may be the prime reason for preferring a restaurant. Therefore, when booking, customers usually request tables that are close to the window. As the atmosphere of the environment has the probability to affect the expectations and emotions of the customers, it may result in behavioral consequences such as revisiting, recommending to other people and willing to pay more. This situation may help the businesses to increase their sales as well as to make more profits (Wahab et al., 2018).

2.3. The Effect of Restaurant Atmosphere on Behavioral Intention

It has been detected that in many studies in the literature, the atmosphere of the restaurant has an effect on the dimensions of behavioral intention (revisit, word-of-mouth intention, willingness to pay more) (Milliman, 1986; Areni and Kim, 1994; Wakefield and Baker, 1998; Kivela et al., 1999; Summers and Hebert, 2001; Sweeney and Wyber, 2002; Caldwell and Hibbert, 2002; Wilson, 2003; Heung and Gu, 2012; Jalil et al., 2016; Han and Hyun, 2017; Wahab et al., 2018).

As a result of the study, Bitner (1992) concluded that atmospheric elements have an impact on consumer behavior by using the atmospheric elements (spatial order, ambient conditions and symbols-artefacts) on the Servicescape scale. As an element of ambience, Wilson (2003) examined the effect of music on the consumers and their intention to buy. As a result of the study carried out in restaurant businesses, it was found that type of music that was not suitable for the atmosphere forced consumers to "avoidance" behavior and negatively affected the duration of their stay in the restaurant. Moreover, it was determined in the study that music genres create different effects on the perceived atmosphere, and it has the potential to change the time spent by the customers. Besides, it has been determined that customers' willingness to pay more can be increased by determining suitable atmospheric environments. Sweeney and Wyber (2002) identified that music influenced the customer's behavioral intention, increasing the willingness to buy and recommend the business to others. Similarly, Milliman (1986) and Caldwell and Hibbert (2002) ended that music prolongs consumption time in the business and is one of the atmospheric factors that directly affect the purchasing behavior. Wakefield and Baker (1998) suggest

that the overall architectural design and décor of a business are key environmental elements in creating excitement among customers. Kivela et al. (1999) argued that physical environment and food quality are significant determinants of customer satisfaction and behavioral intention. Areni and Kim (1994) and Summers and Hebert (2001) concluded that atmospheric elements such as spatial order and aesthetics affect behavioral intention.

In a study including 10 restaurants operating in mid and luxury level in Hong Kong, Heung and Gu (2012) aimed to reveal the effects of restaurant atmosphere on customer satisfaction and behavioral intention. As a result of the analyzes performed, it was achieved that the restaurant atmosphere (aesthetics, ambiance, spatial order/employee factor and landscape) has significant effects on the dining experience of the consumers. It has been found they it particularly has a positive effect on their revisit intention and intention to pay more. In their study on seafood restaurants in Johor Bahru, Malaysia, Wahab et al. (2018) obtained that the atmosphere of the restaurant positively affects the behavioral intention. Phan et al. (2020) claim that factors such as trust, customer value and customer satisfaction, which are closely related to the restaurant atmosphere, are determinants of word of mouth intention. 24. Jupowicz-Ginalska and Patak (2018) points out that, in addition to family and friend recommendations, even the opinions that are not known by whom are expressed in online content are effective in people's decisions and intentions.

In a study on two restaurant businesses operating in Istanbul province, Karaca and Köroğlu (2018) identified the fact that the restaurant atmosphere affects the revisit intention. In support with the previous study, Han and Hyun (2017) detected with the study carried out on customers visiting five-star hotel restaurants in Korea that the physical environment, service, and the quality of the food indirectly and positively influence the revisit intention. Also, Küçükergin and Dedeoğlu (2014) found out that the spatial layout and ambiance perceptions of the customers visiting the fast food businesses in Izmir have an impact on their revisit intention. Niemczyk (2014) implies that the degree of satisfaction with the restaurant atmosphere results in customers' behavior with the revisit intention. In parallel with our study, Wahab et al. (2018), conducted a study in the sea restaurants in Johor Bahru, Malaysia. They concluded that the restaurant atmosphere affected behavioral intention positively. According to another study performed in restaurants in Malaysia, Jalil et al. (2016) specified that the restaurant atmosphere dimensions (aesthetics, ambiance, spatial layout & employee factor, and view from the window) affected behavioral intention (revisit intention, word of mouth intention and willingness to pay more). Under the light of the researches in the literature, the following hypotheses have been formed:

H_{1a}: Spatial layout & employee factor affect revisit intention positively.
H_{1b}: Ambiance affects revisit intention positively.
H_{1c}: Aesthetic affects revisit intention positively.
H_{1d}: View from the window affects revisit intention positively.
H_{2a}: Spatial layout & employee factor affect word of mouth intention positively.
H_{2b}: Ambiance affects word of mouth intention positively.
H_{2c}: Aesthetic affects word of mouth intention positively.
H_{2d}: View from the window affects word of mouth intention positively.
H_{3a}: Spatial layout & employee factor da affect willingness to pay more positively.
H_{3b}: Ambiance affects willingness to pay more positively.
H_{3c}: Aesthetic affects willingness to pay more positively.
H_{3d}: View from the window affects willingness to pay more positively.

3. Methods

3.1. Questionnaire Design

The questionnaire form used in this study consists of two parts. In the first part, the participants were asked about their gender, age, education and income level to determine their demographic characteristics. In the second part, 17 questions were used to measure the restaurant atmosphere (Ryu and Jang, 2007; Turley and Milliman, 2000; Heung and Gu, 2012) while 8 questions were utilized to measure the behavioral intention (Han et al., 2009). The expressions used to measure the restaurant atmosphere and behavioral intention have been adapted to the five-point Likert scale and were coded between 1-5 points, including degrees ranging from "Strongly disagree to Strongly agree". In order to determine the content and appearance validity of the expressions, the questionnaire form was reviewed by taking the opinions of the experts. In addition to that, after the expressions have been translated into Turkish, they have been back-translated into English and checked whether there is a change in the meaning of the expressions. Consequently, a questionnaire was applied to a group of 50 restaurant customers in order to determine the fact that the expressions in the questionnaire form are comprehensible. As a result of the findings obtained, it was found that the expressions were valid and reliable.

3.2. Sample Design and Data Collection

The population of the research is constituted of individuals visiting the à la carte restaurants operating in Bodrum destination. The questionnaire was applied to restaurant customers between June-December 2018. Sampling method has been utilized in that no statistical information could be reached in the literature about the population of the research and it was not possible to reach to the whole population. A table has been proposed by Krejcie and Morgan (1970) to determine the sample size compared to the size of the population. In the calculation of the sample size at the 0,05 level of significance and the sample error of 0.05, the number of 387 questionnaires is found to be sufficient for the samples in the population sizes greater than 10,000. However, in this study, the number of samples was determined as 412 considering that it could represent the population. Lastly, easy sampling method was used in the selection of the guests to be surveyed and 412 questionnaire forms were applied.

When the answers of the participants about the demographic characteristics are examined (Table 2), it may be witnessed that 54.1% of the participants were male while 45.9% were female. When the education level of restaurant customers is examined, it is noticed that 42.5% of them have undergraduate, 20.1% associate degree and 14.6% of them have high school degree. As for the age, it may be observed that 19.7% of restaurant customers are in the 25-34 age range, 17.2% are 35-44, 16% are 18-24 and 14.8% are 45-54. It was also concluded that 24.8% of the participants belonged to the high-income group, 22.1% were medium, and 21.4% were from low income group.

Table 2. **Demographic profile of respondents**

Variables	**Categories**	**n**	**%**
Gender	Male	223	54.1
	Female	189	45.9
Perception of Income status	Very low	73	17.7
	Low	88	21.4
	Medium	91	22.1
	High	102	24.8
	Very High	58	14.1
Educational status	Elementary / secondary school	48	11.7
	High school	60	14.6
	Associate degree	83	20.1
	Undergraduate education	175	42.5
	Graduate education	46	11.2
Age	<18	35	8.5

	18-24	66	16
	25-34	81	19.7
	35-44	71	17.2
	45-54	61	14.8
	55-64	53	12.9
	65≤	45	10.9

Source: own research

3.3. Data Analysis

SPSS and Amos statistical programs were utilised in the study to calculate the validity and reliability of the questionnaire and to test the hypotheses. As for reliability, Cronbach Alpha (CA) analysis (Hair et al., 2010) was carried out. In addition, confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) (Suhr, 2006) was performed for construct validity. To measure the convergent validity, composite reliability (CR) and average variance extracted (AVE) (Bagozzi and Yi, 1988); (Hair et al., 2012) were used. Furthermore, to test the discriminant validity, maximum shared variance square (MSV), average shared variance square (ASV), and AVE root square were applied (Fornell and Larcker, 1981); (Hair et al., 2010). Path analysis was applied through structural equation modelling to test the hypotheses.

4. Results

4.1. Confirmatory Factor Analysis and Descriptive Statistics

To measure the reliability of the scales used in the model proposal, Cronbach Alpha scores were examined and it was found that the reliability of the scales is greater than 0.70, and therefore it was found to be good (Hair et al., 2010). Next, the construct, discriminant and convergent validity of the scales were studied to measure the validity.

CFA was performed to test the construct validity. CFA concedes whether a previously used scale complies with the original factor structure when used in the present study and to what extent it fits (Suhr, 2006). Compliance statistics are examined along with CFA results. To put it another way, DFA explains the extent to which the designed model corresponds to the real one, and thus it illustrates the structural validity of the model (Bagozzi et al., 1991). In terms of congruity statistics, absolute compliance and comparative compliance criteria are examined (McDonald and Ho, 2002). Chi square (CMIN), chi-square/degree of freedom (CMIN/df), RMSEA and GFI values are examined as absolute criterion. Concerning the absolute fit indices, Chi square (CMIN), chi-square/degree of freedom (CMIN/df), RMSEA and GFI values are examined. However, for the comparative fit, CFI, TLI and NFI values are examined. While with the absolute fit tests the sample data and the compatibility of model is explored, the unrelated degree of all variables is examined by comparative fit tests (Byrne, 2013). In factor analysis, factor loads are expected to be to at least 0.30 for 350 samples and above. It was observed that the factor loads of the expressions belonging to the scales in the research model are above 0.50. In addition, it is assumed that CMIN/df value from the fit indices be lower than 5 (Wheaton et al., 1977). The RMSEA value is expected to be between 0.05 and 0.08 at the 0.05 reliability level (Rigdon, 1996). GFI value should be above 0.90 (Shevlin and Miles, 1998), NFI value needs to be above 0.90 (Hu and Bentler, 1999), CFI value should be above 0.90 (Bentler and Bonnet, 1980) and TLI value needs to be above 0.80. They are prerequisites for ensuring the structural validity of the research model (Byrne, 2013). According to the results of the research, goodness of fit of the model was calculated (CMIN=520,556, DF=254, X^2/df=2,049, RMSEA=.051, NFI=.928, GFI=.907, CFI=.962, IFI=.962, TLI=.955, p<0,001) and the goodness of fit of the model was found to be at good level.

To determine the concurrent validity, AVE and CR results were referred. It may be seen that CR values are above 0,50 (Bagozzi and Yi, 1988), AVE values are above 0,50 and lower than the CR level (Fornell and Larcker, 1981). In this respect, it may be commented that the study has the concurrent validity (Table 4).

Table 3. **Descriptive statistics, correlation and discriminant validity**

Constructs		X	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	SL&EF	3,95	,923	**0,787**						
2	Ambiance	3,96	,897	,702**	**0,800**					
3	Facility aesthetics	4,03	,888	,698**	,693**	**0,819**				
4	VW	4,05	,998	,574**	,576**	,626**	**0,866**			
5	Revisit Intention	3,88	,969	,565**	,511**	,571**	,580**	**0,794**		
6	WOM Intention	3,95	1,04	,553**	,512**	,489**	,454**	,448**	**0,860**	
7	WPM	3,57	1,13	,409**	,414**	,388**	,361**	,386**	,496**	**0,819**

SL&EF: Spatial layout & employee factor, VW: View from the window, WPM: Willingness to Pay More

***Note:** The results written in bold numbers in the sections of each scale refer to the square root of the AVE values, p=<0,001*

Source: own research

The MSV, ASV and AVE square root values (Hair et al., 2010) have been screened to determine the discriminant validity (Table 3). It was detected that MSV values of variables are smaller than AVE values, whereas ASV values of the variables were found to be smaller than the MSV values. Furthermore, it was found that AVE square root values were higher than the correlation values among the scales (Table 4).

Table 4. **Construct & Convergent Validity and Reliability Scores**

Construct and Measurement Items	CR	AVE	MSV	ASV	CFA
Seating arrangement gives me enough space					0,794
Layout makes it easy to move around.					0,736
Layout creates adequate dining privacy.					0,781
Employees are neat and well-dressed.					0,796
Attractive employees make me feel good.					0,837
The number of employees is adequate.					0,809
SL&EF (Spatial Layout & Employee Factor) ***CA:0,90***	0,91	0,62	0,49	0,35	
Plants/flowers make me feel happy.					0,781
Paintings/pictures are visually appealing.					0,752
Temperature is comfortable.					0,817
Aroma is enticing.					0,826
Lighting creates a comfortable atmosphere.					0,823
AMB (Ambiance) ***CA:0,89***	0,89	0,64	0,49	0,33	
Overall interior design is attractive					0,790
Furniture is of high quality					0,766
Table setting (including tableware, linens) is visually attractive.					0,865
Background music is pleasing.					0,861
FA (Facility Aesthetics) ***CA:0,89***	0,89	0,67	0,39	0,29	
View from the restaurant window is visually appealing	0,86	0,75	0,34	0,26	0,862

View from the window makes me feel comfortable.					0,876
VW (View from the window) ***CA:0,86***					
I am willing to visit this restaurant when traveling to Bodrum.					0,841
I plan to visit this restaurant when traveling to Bodrum.					0,816
I will make an effort to visit this restaurant when traveling to Bodrum.					0,735
RINT (Revisit Intention) ***CA:0,83***	0,84	0,63	0,34	0,27	
I will encourage my friends and relatives to visit this restaurant when traveling to Bodrum.					0,850
I will say positive things about this this restaurant.					0,871
WOM (WOM Intention) ***CA:0,85***	0,85	0,74	0,31	0,24	
It is acceptable to pay more for this restaurant					0,860
I am willing to pay more for this restaurant					0,834
I am willing to spend extra in this restaurant.					0,775
WPM (Willingness to Pay More) ***CA:0,86***	0,86	0,67	0,25	0,17	

CR: Composite reliability, CA: Cronbach Alpha, AVE: Average variance extracted, CFA: confirmatory factor analysis, MSV: Maximum shared variance square, ASV: average shared variance square, p=<0,001

Source: own research

In this context, it can be said that the measurement model has the discriminant validity. Moreover, kurtosis (K) and skewness (S) values were gone over to analyses the distribution of normality of the variables used in the study (Table 5) and it was obtained that all variables has normal distribution (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2013; Shao, 2002).

Table 5. **Normality Test**

Construct and Measurement Items		**Skewness**	**Kurtosis**
SL&EF (Spatial Layout & Employee Factor)	SL&EF1	-1,150	0,798
	SL&EF2	-1,445	1,763
	SL&EF3	-0,769	-0,188
	SL&EF4	-0,824	-0,051
	SL&EF5	-0,677	-0,274
	SL&EF6	-0,846	-0,149
AMB (Ambiance)	AMB1	-1,042	0,580
	AMB2	-1,416	1,873
	AMB3	-0,664	-0,209
	AMB4	-0,841	0,140
	AMB5	-0,839	0,093
FA (Facility Aesthetics)	FA1	-1,023	0,814
	FA2	-1,514	2,317
	FA3	-0,847	0,248
	FA4	-1,009	0,499
VW (View from the window)	VW1	-1,053	0,720
	VW2	-1,242	1,043
RINT (Revisit Intention)	RINT1	-0,811	0,008
	RINT2	-0,958	0,143
	RINT3	-0,628	-0,446
WOM (WOM Intention)	WOM1	-1,048	0,472
	WOM2	-0,945	0,245
WPM (Willingness to Pay More)	WPM1	-0,625	-0,644
	WPM2	-0,645	-0,631

	WPM3	-0,160	-1,196

Source: own research

4.2. Structural Equation Model

The hypotheses were tested with the help of structural equation modelling (Table 6). The goodness of fit of the model was found to be good (CMIN=564,206, DF=257, X^2/df=2,195, RMSEA=.054, NFI=.922, GFI=.898, CFI=.956, IFI=.956, TLI=.949).

Table 6. **Path Analysis**

Construct	Hypothesis		Beta (ß)	SD	*t*	*p*	R^2	Result
Revisit Intention (RINT)	H_{1a}	SL&EF»RINT	,270	,091	3,183	,001***	0,54	Supported
	H_{1b}	AMB»RINT	-,010	,097	-,111	,911		Not Supported
	H_{1c}	FA»RINT	,142	,108	1,530	,126		Not Supported
	H_{1d}	VW»RINT	,414	,077	5,581	,000***		Supported
WOM Intention (WOM)	H_{2a}	SL&EF»WOM	,398	,102	4,359	,000***	0,44	Supported
	H_{2b}	AMB»WOM	,165	,108	1,794	,073		Not Supported
	H_{2c}	FA»WOM	-,029	,119	-,298	,766		Not Supported
	H_{2d}	VW»WOM	,204	,083	2,682	,007*		Supported
Willingness to Pay More (WPM)	H_{3a}	SL&EF»WPM	,201	,123	2,071	,038*	0,27	Supported
	H_{3b}	AMB»WPM	,212	,132	2,118	,034*		Supported
	H_{3c}	FA»WPM	-,009	,145	-,083	,934		Not Supported
	H_{3d}	VW»WPM	,180	,101	2,181	,029*		Supported

*** *p=<0,001, * p=<0,05*

Source: own research

The estimated R^2 values for revisit intention were found as (0.54), WOM intention were (0.44), and willingness to pay more were (0.27) respectively. The results of the path analysis have been estimated, and it was observed that SL&EF (ß=0.270, p=<0.001) and VW (ß=0.414, p=<0.000) have a significant positive effect on revisit intention. Therefore, H_{1a} and H_{1d} hypotheses were supported. On the other hand, AMB (ß=-0,010, p=<0,911) and FA (ß=0,142, p=<0,126) do not have a significant positive effect on revisit intention. Hence, H_{1b} and H_{1c} hypotheses were not supported. SL&EF (ß=0.398, p=<0.000) and VW (ß=0.204, p=<0.007) have a significant positive effect on WOM intention. For that reason, H_{2a} and H_{2d} hypotheses were supported. Conversely, AMB (ß=0,165, p=<0,073) and FA (ß=-0,029, p=<0,766) do not have a significant positive effect on WOM intention. Accordingly, H_{2b} and H_{2c} hypotheses were not supported. SL&EF (ß=0.201, p=<0.038), AMB (ß=0.212, p=<0.034) and VW (ß=0.180, p=<0.029) have a significant positive effect on willingness to pay more. Consequently, H_{3a}, H_{3b} and H_{3d} hypotheses were supported. Contrarily, FA (ß=-0,009, p=<0,934) does not have a significant positive effect on willingness to pay more. Consequently, H_{3c} hypothesis was not supported.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

In this study, it was intended to investigate the effect of restaurant atmosphere on behavioral intention. The restaurant atmosphere consists of four sub-dimensions: spatial layout & employee factor, ambiance, facility aesthetics and view from the window. However, behavioral intention used in this study has been addressed under three dimensions; revisit intention, word-of-mouth intention, and willingness

to pay more. When the study results are examined, it can be noted that the spatial layout & employee factor and view from the window had a positive effect on the revisit intention, word-of-mouth intention and willingness to pay more. Furthermore, it was determined that the ambiance affected the willingness to pay more positively. Nonetheless, it has been identified that there was no statistically significant effect of the ambiance and facility aesthetics on the revisit intention and word-of-mouth intention. Finally, it was figured out that facility aesthetics did not have a statistically significant effect on willingness to pay more.

In parallel with the results of this study, many studies in the literature show that restaurant atmosphere affects behavioral intention dimensions (Bitner, 1992; Areni and Kim, 1994; Wakefield and Baker, 1998; Kivela et al., 1999; Summers and Hebert, 2001; Khoiriyana and Untoro, 2018; Wahab et al., 2018; Jalil et al., 2016). When the restaurant atmosphere is examined in terms of dimensions, Bitner (1992) concluded that atmospheric elements influence consumer behavior by using the atmosphere elements (spatial order, ambient conditions and symbols-artefacts) on the Servicescape scale. Sriwongrat (2008) figured out that atmospheric elements, such as spatial order and cleanliness of facilities, affect behavioral intention to a great extent. Areni and Kim (1994) and Summers and Hebert (2001) identified that spatial order affects behavioral intention. Wakefield and Baker (1998) argued that the overall architectural design and décor of a business was an important determinant of behavioral intention. Kivela et al. (1999), on the other hand, claimed that the physical environment in general is an critical determinant of behavioral intention. In a similar study, Khoiriyana and Untoro (2018) concluded that physical factors such as spatial layout & employee factor and facility aesthetics affected behavioral intention. On the other hand, they did not reach a statistically significant effect in other sub-dimensions. While this result supports this current study at the spatial layout dimension, it possesses the converse result in facility aesthetics dimension. This difference may have originated from the iconic design of the Double Decker Solo Baru restaurants that were handled in that study. It can be expected that restaurants involving iconic and nostalgic elements would affect the behavioral intention by awakening aesthetic perception on customers.

According to this study by Heung and Gu (2012) on restaurant businesses in Hong Kong, they found that the restaurant atmosphere (aesthetics, ambience, spatial order/employee factor and landscape) has a positive effect on the revisit intention and their intention to pay more. The authors searched the effect of restaurant atmosphere dimensions such as aesthetics, ambience, spatial order/employee factor and landscape on behavioral intent dimensions separately, and they concluded that other sub-dimensions positively affect the intention to revisit, recommendation and willingness to pay more, except for the ambience. They came to the conclusion that the ambience affects the dimension of revisits and recommendation, but they ended that it did not affect the intention to pay more dimension.

In the studies conducted by Jalil et al. (2016) and Wahab et al. (2018), they obtained the conclusion that the restaurant atmosphere affects the behavioral intention. Considering other results in the literature it may seem, surprising that there is no significant relationship between elements such as ambience and aesthetics and behavioral intention. However, Liu and Jang (2009) concluded that there is no significant relationship between ambience and perceived value, which is one of the most important antecedent of behavioral intention, is consistent with this result. The reason why the ambiance and facility aesthetics did not affect the behavioral intention in our study may be explained with the population of the research. Bodrum is a highly developed destination in terms of tourism. Since there are many tourist facilities and restaurants, there are plenty of options for tourists. This state can make the decision-making process of tourists more complicated. Also, because each culture has its specific characteristics, behavioral intention may vary according to cultural characteristics. Therefore, as the research population investigates a different culture, it is expected to contribute to the literature in this scope. From another point of view, this result may indicate that tangible elements are more effective than intangible elements such as ambiance in the decision processes of restaurant customers. On the other hand, it can be interpreted that physical evident can be determinant in the behavioral intention of restaurant customers. Also Chang

(2012) concluded that aesthetics do not effect behavioral intention, as in the current study. This result can be explained as follows; in major destinations such as Bodrum, almost all restaurant have a certain aesthetic standard, which make the aesthetic elements not a discriminating factor for tourists. This article has been designed to investigate the key role of the restaurant atmosphere in terms of determining behavioral intention of customers such as revisit, recommendation (wom), and willingness to pay more. The findings of this study indicate that such type of atmospheres have significant effects on the behavioral intention of customers.

Taken from the theoretical aspects, one of the most important contributions of the study is that it demonstrates a direct connection between the restaurant atmosphere and behavioral intention. From this perspective, it may be uttered that the spatial layout of the restaurant and its employee factors, the ambience and the atmosphere created by the landscape has a significant and direct impact on behavioral intent. In addition, the relationship between restaurant atmospheres and customers' behavioral intention was not only studied in terms of revisit intention dimension but also willingness to pay more and recommendation dimensions. A direct relationship between the aesthetic perception of customers and the dimensions of behavioral intention was found to be insignificant in this study. Despite that, the results may provide insight into future research as to why this link is weak. Another theoretical contribution of this study to the literature is that the atmosphere of the restaurant was discussed in four dimensions within the scope of the atmosphere scales. Being one of the restaurant atmospheres, the study particularly including "landscape" was applied to the à la carte restaurants operating in Bodrum destination. By conducting this research, it was identified that the atmosphere of the restaurant is an important predictor of behavioral intention.

Taken from the practical terms, the results of this study exhibit that restaurant managers should take the atmosphere of the restaurant into account and focus on retaining customers. The results of the present research provide restaurant managers with a set of information for basing sustainable relationships with customers. It may be worded that a good atmosphere will be sufficient in assuring customer satisfaction and creating loyal customers. For example, if operating costs grant an opportunity, restaurant managers may consider making reasonable investments that could bring additional benefits to the pay and training of employees as well as including some interior design and restaurant decorations. In the study, it may be observed that the aesthetic factor does not have any effect on any dimensions of the behavioral dimension. It may be commented that this state happens because the study was conducted in one of Turkey's most important places, Bodrum. Because there are a lot of restaurants in Bodrum and the expectations of customers visiting these businesses may not be related to aesthetic elements. However, this should not constitute an argument that encourages the facilities to underestimate the aesthetic aspects. The aesthetics of facilities can therefore be an atmosphere factor that researchers need to focus in the future. Although it was found that the landscape dimension is a far-reaching indicator of behavioral intention, such an opinion depends on the physical location of the restaurant. Landscapes should be one of the criteria of selection of restaurant owners in Turkey when starting new restaurants though various resource constraints allow restaurant managers to have very little choice of location for their restaurant.

With atmospheric elements, restaurants may ensure that customers revisit their businesses. Besides, the current customers may recommend the business to others and may facilitate the new customers favor the restaurant. It may be noticed that the customers who have experienced a good dining background may be willing to pay more. Therefore, restaurants that can increase customer satisfaction with quality service, tasty food and an ideal atmosphere can demand higher prices and make higher profits. The obtained findings indicate that the customers adopt a holistic approach when evaluating the quality of the service offered by the restaurant. Together with the qualities of the food, atmospheric elements such as ambience, aesthetic, spatial layout and view of window can also be determinant in tourists' behavior. Therefore, restaurateurs should devote time to these issues as much as they spend on the menu they prepare and they should seek professional support in these matters.

Just like in all studies, there are constraints to some of the issues discussed in this study. A more extensive model can be developed to better explain relationships. Research can be improved by analysing the effects that cannot be obtained in the study results. To extend the understanding of the relationship between atmospheric and consumer behavior, other factors such as demographic information and different types of restaurants may be covered in future research models. Since the restaurants continue to exist in a postmodern world, they serve the guests with personalized needs and perceptions, called by Urry (1990) as post tourists. Therefore, there are many more components that make up the restaurant atmosphere when compared to the past. As we go over the literature, it is visible that existing scales are limited in measuring these components and a need for creating a new scale has emerged. It is suggested that we should focus on this need in the subsequent studies. It should also be considered that the data collected belonged to a time during which the tourism season was not yet fully opened, and a small number of data were collected from foreign tourists.

Additional information:

This study was presented as a summary paper at MTCON'20 Conference on Managing Tourism Across Continents held in September 2020 online and was prepublished in Proceedings Book.

References

1. Aaker, D.A., Kumar, V. & Day, G.S. (2007). *Marketing Research* (9. Edition b.), John Wiley & Sons, Danvers.
2. Agnihotri, R., Yang, Z. & Briggs, E. (2019). Salesperson time perspectives and customer willingness to pay more: roles of intraorganizational employee navigation, customer satisfaction, and firm innovation climate. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, 39(2), 1-21. https://doi.org/10.1080/08853134.2018.1562352
3. Ajzen, I. (1985). From Intentions to Actions: A Theory of Planned Behavior. In J. Kuhl & J. Beckman (Eds.), *Action Control, From Cognition to Behaviour*, Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, BE, pp. 11-39.
4. Albayrak, A. & Tüzünkan, D. (2015). Restoran Fiziksel Çevre Elemanlarının Müşteriler Açısından Önemi: İstanbul Örneği. *16. Ulusal Turizm Kongresi Bildiriler Kitabı*, pp. 303-317.
5. Areni, C. S. & Kim, D. (1994). The influence of in-store lighting on consumers' examination of merchandise in a wine store. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 11(2), 117-125. https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-8116(94)90023-X
6. Bagozzi, R. (1986). *Principles of marketing management*. Science Research Associates, Inc, Chicago, IL.
7. Bagozzi, R.P., Yi, Y. & Phillips, L.W. (1991). Assessing construct validity in organizational research. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36(3), 421-458. https://doi.org/10.2307/2393203
8. Bagozzi, R. & Yi, Y. (1988). On the Evaluation of Structural Equation Models. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Sciences*, 16(1), 74-94. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02723327
9. Bentler, P. & Bonnet, D. (1980). Significance tests and goodness of fit in the analysis of covariance structures. *Psychological Bulletin*, 88(3), 588-606. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.88.3.588
10. Berman, B. & Evans, J.R. (1992). *Retail Management: A Strategic Approach*. Macmillian Pulishing Company, Chicago, IL.
11. Bitner, M.J. (1992). Servicescapes: The impact of physical surroundings on customers and employees. *Journal of Marketing*, 56(2), 57-71. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224299205600205

12. Booms, B. & Bitner, M. (1980). Marketing services by managing the environment. *Cornell Hotel Restaur Administration Quarterly*, 23(1), 35-39. https://doi.org/10.1177/001088048202300107
13. Bozkurt, Ö. ve Göral, M. (2013). Otel işletmelerinde yenilik stratejileri, Bozkurt, Ö., ve Mesci, M (Ed). *Otel İşletmelerinde Yenilik Yönetimi*. Sidaş Yayıncılık.
14. Byrne, B. (2013). *Structural equation modeling with Mplus: Basic concepts, applications, and programming*. Routledge, United Kingdom, UK.
15. Caldwell, C. & Hibbert, S.A. (2002). The influence of music tempo and musical preference on restaurant patrons' behavior. *Psychological Marketing*, 19(11), 895-917. https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.10043
16. Chang, K. (2000). The impact of perceived physical environments on customers' satisfaction and return intentions. *Journal of Professional Services Marketing*, 21(2), 75-85. https://doi.org/10.1300/J090v21n02_06
17. Chang, K. (2012). *The Effect of Facility Aesthetics and Music on Behavioural Intention Through Emotion in the Upscale Restaurant Environment* (Doctoral dissertation). Guelph, Ontario, Canada.
18. Cronin, J.J. & Taylor, S.A. (1994). SERVPERF versus SERVQUAL: reconciling performance-based and perceptions-minus-expectations measurement of service quality. *The Journal of Marketing*, 58(1), 125-131. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224299405800110
19. Çavuşoğlu, S. & Bilginer, S. (2018). Tüketici Deneyimlerinin Tekrar Ziyaret Etme Niyetine Etkisi: Bingöl İli Örneği. *Türk Sosyal Bilimler Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 3(1), 72-85.
20. Donovan, R. & Rossiter, J. (1982). Store atmosphere: An environmental psychology approach. *J Retail*, 58(1), 34-57.
21. Fishbein, M. & Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, Attitude, Intention and Behavior: An Introduction to Theory and Research. Reading*, Addison-Wesley, Massachusetts, MA.
22. Fornell, C. & Larcker, D. (1981). Evaluating Structural Equation Models with Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18(1), 39-50. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224378101800104
23. Forward, S. (2009). The Theory of Planned Behaviour: The Role of Descriptive Norms and Past Behaviour in the Prediction of Drivers' Intentions to Violate. *Transportation Research Part F: Traffic psychology and behaviour*, 12(3), 198-207. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trf.2008.12.002
24. Jupowicz-Ginalska, A. & Paták, M. (2018). Management of Travel and Transport Destinations' Presentation in the Travel Specialized Print Media. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Knowledge*, 6(2), 81-99. https://doi.org/10.2478/IJEK-2018-0016
25. Hair, J., Black, W., Babin, B. & Anderson, R. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis*. 7th Edition, Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ.
26. Hair, J., Sarstedt, M., Ringle, C. & Mena, J. (2012). An Assessment of the use of Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling in Marketing Research. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science (JAMS),* 40(3), 414-433. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-011-0261-6
27. Han, H. & Hyun, S. (2017). Impact of hotel-restaurant image and quality of physical-environment, service, and food on satisfaction and intention. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 63, 82-92. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2017.03.006
28. Han, H., Hsu, L.-T. & Lee, J. (2009). Empirical investigation of the roles of attitudes toward green behaviors, overall image, gender, and age in hotel customers' eco-friendly decision-making process. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 28(4), 519-528. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2009.02.004
29. Hansen, T., Jensen, J.M. & Solgaard, H.S. (2004). Predicting online grocery buying intention: a comparison of the theory of reasoned action and the theory of planned behavior. *International Journal of Information Management*, 24(6), 539-550. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2004.08.004

30. Heung, V. & Gu, T. (2012). Influences of Restaurant Atmospherics on Patron Satisfaction and Behavioral Intentions. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 31(4), 1167-1177. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2012.02.004
31. Hu, L. & Bentler, P. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural equation modeling: A multidisciplinary journal*, 6(1), 1-55. https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118
32. Huang, S. & Hsu, C.H. (2009). Effects of travel motivation, past experience, perceived constraint, and attitude on revisit intention. *Journal of Travel Research*, 48(1), 29-44. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287508328793
33. Jalil, N., Fikry, A. & Zainuddin, A. (2016). The impact of store atmospherics, perceived value, and customer satisfaction on behavioural intention. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 37, 538-544. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671(16)30162-9
34. Jang, S.S. & Namkung, Y. (2009). Perceived quality, emotions, and behavioral intentions: Application of an extended Mehrabian-Russell model to restaurants. *Journal of Business Research*, 62(4), 451-460. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2008.01.038
35. Jin, N., Lee, S. & Lee, H. (2015). The effect of experience quality on perceived value, satisfaction, image and behavioral intention of water park patrons: New versus repeat visitors. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 17(1), 82-95. https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.1968
36. Karaca, K. & Köroğlu, Ö. (2018). Restoran Atmosferinin Tekrar Ziyaret Niyetine Etkisi: Akış Deneyiminin Aracılık Rolü. *Avrasya Uluslararası Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 6(15), 776-797. https://doi.org/10.33692/avrasyad.510224
37. Karamustafa, K. & Yıldırım, M. (2007). Tüketicilerin bireysel banka tercihine ilişkin Kayseri ilinde yapılan bir araştırma. *Ekonomik ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 3(2), 56-92.
38. Kement, Ü., Çavuşoğlu, S., Bükey, A. & Başar, B. (2018). Termal Turizm İşletmelerinde Tekrar Ziyaret ve Tavsiye Etme Niyetinin İncelenmesi: Otel Ambiyansının Düzenleyici Rolü. *19. Ulusal Turizm Kongresi*, pp. 800-810.
39. Keun, S., Byon, K. & Baker III, T. (2014). Integrating event image, satisfaction, and behavioral intention: Small-scale marathon event. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 23(3), 127-138.
40. Khoiriyana, R. and Untoro, W. (2018). The Effect of Dining Atmospherics to Perceived Value, Customer Satisfaction, and Behavioral Intention with Double Decker Restaurant in Solo Baru as Research Object. *Sebelas Maret Business Review*, 2(2), 94-107.
41. Kim, W. & Moon, Y. (2009). Customers' cognitive, emotional, and actionable response to the servicescape: a test of the moderating effect of the restaurant type. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 28(1), 144-156. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2008.06.010
42. Kivela, J., Inbakaran, R. & Reece, J. (1999). Consumer research in the restaurant environment, Part 1: A conceptual model of dining satisfaction and return patronage. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 11(5), 205-222. https://doi.org/10.1108/09596119910272739
43. Kotler, P. (1973). Atmospherics as a Marketing Tool. *Journal of Retailing*, 49(4), 48-64.
44. Krejcie, R. & Morgan, R. (1970). Determining Sample Size for Research. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30(3), 607-610. https://doi.org/10.1177/001316447003000308
45. Küçükergin, K. & Dedeoğlu, B. (2014). Fast Food Restoranlarda Fiziksel Çevre, Fiyat Algısı ve Tekrar Satın Alma Eğilimi Arasındaki İlişki. *Uluslararası Alanya İşletme Fakültesi Dergisi*, 6(1), 101-107.
46. Liu, Y. & Jang, S.S. (2009). The effects of dining atmospherics: An extended Mehrabian–Russell model. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 28(4), 494-503. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2009.01.002
47. Lucas, A. (2003). The determinants and effects of slot servicescape satisfaction in a Las Vegas hotel casino. *UNLV Gaming Research & Review Journal*, 7(1), 1-19.

48. McDonald, R. & Ho, M. (2002). Principles and practice in reporting structural equation analyses. *Psychological Methods*, 7(1), 64-82. https://doi.org/10.1037/1082-989X.7.1.64
49. Mehrabian, A. & Russell, J. (1974). *An approach to environmental psychology*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
50. Milliman, R. (1986). The influence of background music on the behavior of restaurant patrons. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 13(2), 286-290. https://doi.org/10.1086/209068
51. Oliver, R.L. (1996). *Satisfaction: A Behavioral Perspective on the Consumer*. McGraw- Hill, New York, NY.
52. Niemczyk, A. (2014). The Application of Path Modelling in the Analysis of Consumer Behaviour in the Cultural Tourism Market. *Economics & Sociology*, 7(1), 204-216. https://doi.org/10.14254/2071-789X.2014/7-1/18
53. Palit, H., Kristanti, M. & Wibowo, Y. (2019). The Effect of Ergonomic Aspects on Customers' Convenience at Restaurant in Surabaya. *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality & Tourism*, 21(1), 31-49. https://doi.org/10.1080/1528008X.2018.1563017
54. Phan, Q.P.T., Pham, N. T., & Nguyen, L.H.L. (2020). How to Drive Brand Engagement and eWOM Intention in Social Commerce: A Competitive Strategy for the Emerging Market. *Journal of Competitiveness*, 12(3), 136-155. https://doi.org/10.7441/joc.2020.03.08
55. Raajpoot, N. (2002). TANGSERV: A Multiple Item Scale for Measuring Tangible Quality in Foodservice Industry. *Journal of Foodservice Business Research*, 5(2), 109-127. https://doi.org/10.1300/J369v05n02_08
56. Rigdon, E. (1996). CFI versus RMSEA: A comparison of two fit indexes for structural equation modeling. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 3(4), 369-379. https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519609540052
57. Robson, C. (2002). *Real World Research*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers. United Kingdom, UK.
58. Ryu, K. & Jang, S. (2007). The Effect of Environmental perceptions on Behavioral intentions Through Emotions: The case of Upscale Restaurants. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 31(1), 56-72. https://doi.org/10.1177/1096348006295506
59. Shao, A. (2002). *Marketing research*. An Aid to Decision Making, South Westem College Publishing. Cincinnati, OH.
60. Shevlin, M. & Miles, J. (1998). Effects of sample size, model specification and factor loadings on the GFI in confirmatory factor analysis. *Personality and Individual differences*, 25(1), 85-90. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(98)00055-5
61. Sriwongrat, C. (2008). *Consumers' choice factors of an upscale ethnic restaurant*. Doctoral dissertation. USA: Lincoln University.
62. Stevens, P., Knutson, B., & Patton, M. (1995). DINESERV: A tool for measuring service quality in restaurants. *The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 36(2), 56-60. https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-8804(95)93844-K
63. Stone, T., Jawahar, I. & Kisamor, J. (2009). Using the theory of planned behavior and cheating justifications to predict academic misconduct. *Career Development International*, 14(3), 221-241. https://doi.org/10.1108/13620430910966415
64. Suhr, D. (2006). Exploratory or Confirmatory Factor Analysis. *SAS Users Group International Conference*, pp. 1-17. Cary: SAS Institute, Inc.
65. Summers, T.A. & Hebert, P.R. (2001). Shedding some light on store atmospherics: influence of illumination on consumer behavior. *Journal of Business Research*, 54(2), 145-150. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963(99)00082-X
66. Sweeney, J.C. & Wyber, F. (2002). The role of cognitions and emotions in the musicapproach-avoidance behavior relationship. *Journal of Service Marketing*, 16(1), 51-69. https://doi.org/10.1108/08876040210419415

67. Tabachnick, B.G. & Fidell, L.S. (2013). *Using Multivariate Statistics* (sixth ed.) b.). Pearson, Boston, MA.
68. Taylor, S. & Todd, P. (1995). Decomposition and crossover effects in the theory of planned behavior: A study of consumer adoption intentions. *International journal of research in marketing*, 12(2), 137-155. https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-8116(94)00019-K
69. Turley, L. & Milliam, R. (2000). Atmospheric effects on shopping behavior: a review of the experimental evidence. *Journal of Business Research*, 49(2), 193-211. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963(99)00010-7
70. Um, S., Chon, K. & Ro, Y. (2006). Antecedents of revisit intention. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 33(4), 1141-1158. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2006.06.003
71. Urry, J. (1990). *Tourist gaze: Leisure and travel in contemporary societies (Theory, culture & society)*. Societies SAGE, SAGE, London, LD.
72. Ünal, S., Akkuş, G. & Akkuş, Ç. (2014). Yiyecek içecek işletmelerinde atmosfer, duygu, memnuniyet ve davranışsal sadakat ilişkisi. *Gazi Üniversitesi Turizm Fakültesi Dergisi*, 1(1), 23-49.
73. Vesci, M. & Botti, A. (2019). Festival quality, theory of planned behavior and revisiting intention: Evidence from local and small Italian culinary festivals. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 38, 5-15. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2018.10.003
74. Wahab, R.A., Nurdiyanah, R., Ahmad, F. & Zainal Shukri, W.H. (2018). Perceived Value, Customers'satisfaction and Behavioural Intention in Relation to Seafood Restaurants in Johor Bahru. *Malays. Appl. Biol.*, 47(4), 95-106.
75. Wakefield, K.L. & Baker, J. (1998). Excitement at the mall: determinants and effects on shopping response. *Journal of Retail*, 74(4), 515-539. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-4359(99)80106-7
76. Wakefield, K. L. & Blodgett, J.G. (1996). The effect of the servicescape on customers' behavioral intentions in leisure service settings. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 10(6), 45-61.
77. Wheaton, B., Muthen, B., Alwin, D. & Summers, G. (1977). Assessing reliability and stability in panel models. *Sociological Methodology*, 8, 84-136. https://doi.org/10.2307/270754
78. Wilson, S. (2003). The Effect of Music on Perceived Atmosphere and Purchase Intentions in a Restaurant. *Psychology of Music*, 31(1), 93-112. https://doi.org/10.1177/0305735603031001327
79. Yu, H., Zhang, J., Kim, D., Chen, K., Henderson, C., Min, S. & Huang, H. (2014). Service quality, perceived value, customer satisfaction, and behavioral intention among fitness center members aged 60 years and over. *Social Behavior and Personality: An international journal*, 42(5), 757-767. https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2014.42.5.757
80. Zabkar, V., Brenčič, M. & Dmitrovic, T. (2010). Modelling Perceived Quality, Visitor Satisfaction and Behavioural Intentions at the Destination Level. *Tourism Management*, 31(4), 537-546. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2009.06.005
81. Zeithaml, V., Berry, L. & Parasuraman, A. (1996). The Behavioural Consequences of Service Quality. *Journal of Marketing*, 60(2), 31-46. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224299606000203

Brief description of Author/Authors:

Üzeyir Kement
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3190-9079
Ordu University, Ordu, Turkey
Email: uzeyirkement@hotmail.com
Associate Professor Üzeyir Kement, is an associate professor in the department of tourism administration at Ordu University. He graduated from Gazi University in 2009 in tourism administration education. After his graduation, he worked in hotels, in the food and beverage department of hotels. In 2014 he began to work as a lecturer at Bingöl University. He received his M.S. in business administration in 2013

from Hacettepe University and his PhD in recreation management in 2015 from Gazi University. Dr. Kement has published numerous articles and has proceedings in national conferences in the field of tourism and recreation. Main research areas include tourism, recreation, gastronomy, tourism marketing, and customer relationship management.

Sinan Çavuşoğlu
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9365-8677
Department of Tourism Management, Bingöl University, Bingöl, Turkey
Email: sinankys42@gmail.com
Dr. Sinan Çavuşoğlu works as an assistant professor with the title of Doctor at Bingöl University, Social Sciences Vocational School, Department of Business Administration. He graduated from Karaelmas University Faculty of Business Administration in 2008. He received a master's degree in business administration from Karaelmas University in 2010 and a PhD in Business Administration from Hasan Kalyoncu University in 2019. Çavuşoğlu has carried out many national and international studies in the field of marketing and tourism. Main research areas marketing, customer relations, tourism, and consumer behavior.

Aziz Bükey
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5476-8408
Department of Tourism Management, Bingöl University, Bingöl, Turkey
Email: azizbukey@gmail.com
Aziz BÜKEY is a lecturer in the Department of Hotel Restaurant and Catering Services in Bingöl University Social Sciences Vocational School. In 2007, he completed the Çanakkale 18 Mart University Tourism and Hotel Management High School. In 2012, he completed his master's degree in Tourism Management at Sakarya University. Between 2009 and 2018, he served as an official in the Ministry of Internal Affairs. In 2018, he started to work as a lecturer at Bingöl University. His main research areas are tourism, strategic development, gastronomy, tourism marketing, consumer behavior, and recreation.

Murat Göral
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2374-4443
Department of Tourism Management, Bingöl University, Bingöl, Turkey
Email: goralm.mg@gmail.com
Dr. Murat GÖRAL is an assistant professor in the Department of Hotel Restaurant and Catering Services in Bingöl University Social Sciences Vocational School. In 2010, he graduated from the Düzce University Tourism Management and Hotel Management High School. In 2012, he graduated with his master's degree in Tourism Management and Hotel at Düzce University. And then, he started to work as a lecturer at Bingöl University. He received PhD in Tourism and Hotel from Atatürk Üniversity in 2020. His academic interests are tourism, innovation, leadership, tourism marketing.

Ahmet Uslu
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0273-0069
Department of Tourism Management, Bingöl University, Bingöl, Turkey
Email: Ahmetuslu1212@hotmail.com
Dr. Ahmet Uslu, is an assistant professor in the department of management and organization at Bingöl University, Social Sciences High School. He graduated from Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam University in 2007 in business administration. After that, he worked as a manager in the private sector. Between 2010 and 2013, he worked as a lecturer at Muş Alparslan University. In 2013 he began to work as a lecturer at Bingöl University. He received his M.S. in business administration in 2012 from Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam University and his received PhD in business administration in 2021 at Bingöl University. Dr. Uslu

has published numerous articles and proceedings in national and international conferences in the field of business administration. Main research areas include business management, organizational justice, organizational commitment, job satisfaction, service quality, consumer behavior, and tourism.