Abstract

Globally, there is a growing demand for food in a restaurant as a result of higher incomes, changes in consumption patterns and household composition, and the time pressures created by dual-working families. The trend is getting higher, especially in Yogyakarta. As the result, the foodservice industry in Yogyakarta has become highly competitive. Therefore, the number of food service outlets has been increasing to meet the demand. In order to succeed in this competitive industry, restaurant operators need to understand the factors (and the relative importance) that influence restaurant patrons’ decision when selecting a restaurant. Multiculturalism is an intrinsic part of the historical formation and development of the Indonesia, especially in Yogyakarta. The purpose of this study is to investigate: 1) customers' authentic expectation for food, as well as the overall experience 2) the amount of authenticity customers can accept in a future Thai restaurant experience and 3) what customers want from Thai restaurants to serve them when they are coming for the dining experience. To obtain the data, 150 questionnaires were distributed to guests in 2 Thai restaurants in Yogyakarta.
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Abstrak

Introduction

The global food industry is now pushed by “consumer demands” or more demand-driven than supply driven. Food industry business today depends upon winning consumer’s trust and choice. As the former capital and the center of several kingdoms in the past, Yogyakarta with its people is rich of cultural heritage. The demand for food in Yogyakarta has increased dramatically. According to the Statistic Centre Department of Yogyakarta, the average household expenditure for food increased 4.52% from Rp. 169,955 to Rp. 178,001\(^1\). The growth demand of food has prompted an expansion of Yogyakarta’s food service industry. It creates an increasing demand on it. The expansion number of food service outlet has lead to more intense competition of foodservice industry in Yogyakarta.

In Yogyakarta, ethnic food already exists for several years ago, and it shows a positive impact on foodservice industry. One popular ethnic food is Thai food, people seem quite familiar and also like the taste of this food, because Thai food relatively closes with Indonesian food; it tastes spicy, salty or sweet because of the similar ingredients used to make it. Moreover Thai food has a positive effect because it is healthier compared to other international foods which caused by more vegetables serving than the other international food. The reason why Thai food has become famous is because it offers very flavorful dishes. However, Thai cuisine is not easy for individual to try and prepare at home. So people will more likely to go to the restaurant rather than try to make it. Another factor is because the rareness of Thai instant food in the market, compare to other International food, such as: Italian food (Pizza and Spaghetti). This condition leads people in Yogyakarta to go to a restaurant to have such kind of Thai food. According to Macey (2001), Indonesian people, especially in Yogyakarta which surrounded by multiethnic from many different areas are more willing to try new things and are open to new flavors. Customers are willing to try new ethnic flavors, so the demand for ethnic cuisines is increasing rapidly. The increase in ethnic populations in Yogyakarta is reflected in the number of restaurants that offer these groups a taste of home.

Findings from several studies show that restaurant consumers use different criteria when making restaurant decisions (Johns and Pine, 2002; Koo et al., 1999). Examples of these criteria are: food quality, service quality, restaurant physical settings, and variety of choices on the menu. The criteria also vary according to the type of...
restaurant (Elder et al., 1999) and dining occasion (Auty, 1992; June and Smith, 1987; Koo et al., 1999). Thai food industry must be able to satisfy the quality and commitment toward international food standards with proper tracking and tracing by monitoring with high standards, food safety with minimum risks throughout supply chains should be fulfilled because consumer trust is based on traceable facts in quality and safety.

**Literature Review and Hypotheses**

**Perception**

A product’s success depends largely on the way consumers perceive and process marketing stimuli which is designed to promote it (Sukalakamala and Boyce, 2007). One of the key elements of a successful marketing strategy is the development of product and promotional stimuli that consumers will perceive as relevant to their needs (Pedraja and Yague, 2001). Marketers attempt to influence consumer perceptions by creating an image of brand that connotes value and reliability. Consumers will interpret and act differently on something new offered for them. Upon entering a restaurant, customers will have certain perceptions of the dining experiences they are about to encounter (Sukalakamala and Boyce, 2007). When people had less experience with Thai food, it is because they had less experience with ethnic food than the culture-oriented customers, they primarily looked for good food in a warm comfortable atmosphere. Dining in an ethnic restaurant was just another dining experience for them. Picture or process of understanding of each person will depend on internal factor such as belief, experience, necessary and emotion as well as external characteristic of stimulates perception (Sukalakamala and Boyce, 2007).

Perceptions which come from the 5 senses are used to set the difference of marketing strategies in order to generate better perceptions. The processes of perception are consist of (1) selective exposure, (2) selective attention, (3) selective comprehension and (4) selective retention (Sererat, 2537 in Tiatrakoon, 2006). Perception is a cognitive process that enables us interpret and understand our surrounding (Kreitner and Kinicki, 2001). Recognition of objective is one of this process’s major functions. Perception is the process of interpreting messages from our senses to provide order and meaning to the environment. Perception helps sort out and organize the complex and varied input received by our senses of sight, smell, touch, taste and hearing. People frequently base their actions on the interpretation of reality that their perceptual system
provides, rather than reality itself (Sukalakamala and Boyce, 2007). Perception has three components; a perceiver, a target that is being perceived and some situational context in which the perception is occurring. Each of these components influences the perceiver’s impression or interpretation of the target. The perceiver’s experience, needs and emotions can affect his or her perception. Perception involves interpretation and the addition of meaning to the target and ambiguous targets are especially susceptible to interpretation and addition. Every instance of perception occurs in some situational context, and this context can affect what one perceives (John, 1996).

Expectation

Customer expectation will be influenced by a customer's perception on the product or service and can be created by previous experience, advertising, hearsay, awareness of competitors, and brand image. The level of customer service is also a factor, and a customer might expect to encounter efficiency, helpfulness, reliability, confidence in the staff, and a personal interest in his or her patronage. The intangible characteristic of services makes these factors difficult to evaluate prior to the actual purchase. Accordingly, restaurant patrons often rely on tangible clues such as restaurant facilities, décor, and atmosphere to guide them in forming expectations about the restaurants (Bitner, 1990; Wall and Berry, 2007).

Consumers tend to evaluate the experience by determining whether the service has met their expectations or not. The marketing literatures note that satisfied consumers are likely to have favorable post-dining behavioral intentions such as loyalty, recommendation, and willingness to pay more (Ladhari et al., 2008). Understanding the process of consumers’ decision-making helps restaurateurs to identify factors that contribute to consumer behavior in each stage.

Consumer Satisfaction

Regarding to the number of products and service producers, customer has more various choices. There are also increasing number of researcher that interested and work themselves on the topic of customer satisfaction in order to work on the best solution in fulfilling satisfaction of customers.

According to Schnaars (1991, in Tjiptono, 2007), basically, the goal of a business is to create satisfied customers. The creation of satisfied customer can give several benefits, among them are: a harmonic relationship between the company and its customers, giving excellent foundation to repurchase and
revisit to get their loyalty, and created a certain mouth to mouth recommendation word of mouth) that beneficial to the company (Tjiptono, 2007). Further, some experts defined what customer satisfaction or dissatisfaction is. Assael (2004) said that satisfaction occurs when consumer expectations are met or exceeded and the purchase decision is reinforced. If a customer satisfied, that means that a product of service has met his expectations and that he was not dissatisfied by it. Customer satisfaction is doubtlessly very important. A loyal customer, however, is more than a customer who frequently purchases from a company.

**Word Of Mouth**

Arndt (1967) defines WOM as “Oral person-to-person communication between a receiver and a communicator whom the receiver perceives as non-commercial, regarding a brand, product or service.”. However, it is important to point out that WOM need not necessarily be brand, product or service-focused. It may also be organisation-focused. Neither need WOM be face-to-face, direct, oral or ephemeral, the electronic community, for example, generates virtual WOM which is not face-to-face, not direct, not oral, and not ephemeral (Buttle, 1998). As noted, personal influence is powerful because consumers generally regard friends and relatives as more credible and trustworthy than commercial sources of information. Moreover, information from reference and family groups means reducing the risk in a purchase decision. The importance of word of mouth is related to cultural value.

**Hypotheses**

Based on problem formulation and the literature review previously described, the proposed hypotheses in this research would be as follows:

H$_1$: Perception has positive influence on expectation of Thai food dining experience

H$_2$: Perception and expectation has positive influence on overall satisfaction of Thai food dining experience

H$_3$: Satisfaction has positive influence to the word of mouth of Thai food dining experience

**Research Model and Research Method**

**Research Model**

The model used in this research described the relationship between perception and expectation, the influence of perception, the influence of perception to overall satisfaction, the influence of expectation to overall satisfaction, and the influence of overall satisfaction to word of mouth. The research model of this research is:
Type of Research Design

For this research, the author uses the Survey method. Questions are carefully chosen or crafted, sequenced, and precisely asked to each participant. The goal of the survey is to derive comparable data across subsets of the chosen sample so that similarities and differences can be found. When combined with statistical probability sampling for selected participants, survey findings and conclusions are projectable to a large and diverse population.

Population and Samples

Population in this research is Thai food customers who came and having meal in some Thai food restaurants. The sample size has been determined as much as 150 customers. This was based on advice of Roscoe (1975) in Sekaran (2003) which stated that for multivariate research, sample size must be several times more than the variable used (preferably 10 times more). Here, the authors choose two Thailand restaurants as the object of this research, they are Orient and Phuket. Orient is located in Ambarukmo Plaza at the food court and Phuket is located at Jl. HOS Cokroaminoto 240 Yogyakarta. They were chosen, because both of them can represent Thai restaurants in Yogyakarta. The different between them are on is food court and the other is table services.

Operational Definition of Variables

a. Perception

Based on Assael (2004), perception is the process by which consumers select, organize, and interpret stimuli to make good sense into the Thai food they consumed. The indicators used to measure this variable are (Sukalakamala and Boyce, 2007):

1) Thai food can fulfill my desire of ethnic cuisine experience
2) Thai food is healthy
3) Thai food is affordable
4) Thai food offer me many choices
b. Expectation

Customer expectation is the needs, wants, and preconceived ideas of a customer about Thai food they consumed. The indicators used to measure this variable according to Sukalakamala and Boyce (2007) are:

1. This restaurant gave me good taste of Thai food as I expect
2. This restaurant gave me good services as I expect
3. This restaurant’s price is affordable as I expect
4. Thai food offer me many choices of menu as I expect
5. Overall, this restaurant can fulfill my expectations

Likert scale (5 point) is going to be used to measure and to give point on each question.

c. Satisfaction

Satisfaction according to Assael (2004) occurs when consumer expectations are met or exceeded and the purchase decision is reinforced when they consume Thai foods menu. The indicator to measure this variable according to Sukalakamala & Boyce (2007) are :

1. This restaurant gives excellent satisfaction services (friendly services)
2. This restaurant gives excellent satisfaction services in term of short time waiting
3. This restaurant gives excellent satisfaction services (helpful waiters)
4. This restaurant has a comfortable interior design that satisfied me
5. The foods can satisfied my taste bud
6. I feel satisfied because I can customized my order
7. I feel satisfied because this restaurant provide a detail menu explanation
8. Overall, I feel satisfied with this Thai restaurant

Likert scale (5 point) is going to be used to measure and to give point on each question.

d. Word of Mouth

Word of Mouth here means oral person-to-person communication between a customer who already has experience of Thai food and a transform it to receiver perceives as non-commercial, regarding a brand, product or service. The indicators used to measure this variable according to Sukalakamala and Boyce (2007) are :

1. In the future I will recommend this Thai restaurant to the other
2. I will tell all good things about this restaurant to other people (Family,
Friends, etc)

Likert scale (5point) is going to be used to measure and to give point on each question.

3.5. Statistical Analysis

Data analysis method that used in this research is Structural equation modeling (SEM). The path diagram of the SEM model can be described as follows:

Based on that path diagram, the mathematical models of SEM were as follows:

\[ \eta_1 = \gamma_1 \xi_1 + \xi_1 \] (1)
\[ \eta_2 = \gamma_2 \xi_1 + \beta_1 + \xi_2 \] (2)
\[ \eta_3 = \beta_2 + \xi_3 \] (3)

where:
\[ \xi_1 : \text{Perception} \]
\[ \eta_1 : \text{Expectation} \]
\[ \eta_2 : \text{Satisfaction} \]

\[ \eta_3 : \text{Word of Mouth} \]
\[ \gamma, \beta : \text{Path coefficient} \]
\[ \zeta : \text{Structural error} \]

Assumption and goodness of fit tests were conducted prior to the use of model or the analysis result in testing the hypotheses.

a. Assumption Test

The assumption tests that really need to be done in a SEM model are normality test, and multicolinearity test. Those tests are as follows:

1) Normality test

This test is used to see whether the data are normally distributed or not. Normality is one important condition in SEM. Normality Data should be checked before use it to structural test. Abnormal distribution will create standard failure and it makes chi square unmatched, especially for maximum estimation method likehood
That is why estimation should be implemented to the abnormal variables. When the chi square’s result for each manifest have probability (p) more than 0.05, means that those are normal distribution. (Setyo Hari Wijanto, 2008).

2) Multicolinearity test

This test is aimed to ensure that variables inside the data is not correlated each other. Multicolinearity test in SEM model used Determinant of Sample Covariance Matrix. According to Tabachnick and Fidell (Ferdinand, 2002). Small Determinant of Sample Covariance Matrix indicates multicolinearity.

b. Goodness of Fit Test

Goodness of fit tests that going to be used was as follows:

1) χ² test

χ² test aimed to ensure that the analyzed model fit or supported by the data. χ² test conducted by testing the fitness between population and sample matrix covariance (Ferdinand, 2002). A good model seems to have population matrix covariance with sample matrix covariance. The testing is conducted using chi square statistic (χ²). In order to fulfill that condition, therefore, chi square (χ²) must be not significant (p>α). if α=0.05, thus p>0.05.

2) Comparative Fit Index (CFI)

CFI is another alternative measurement index which has range of score 0-1. CFI score that closer to 1 show a better model (Ferdinand, 2002). For a good model, the score should be on ≥0.95.

3) Goodness of Fit Index (GFI)

Goodness of Fit Index (GFI) is a fit index between population matrix covariance and sample matrix covariance.

4) Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index (AGFI)

Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index (AGFI) is an index that fit the determination coefficient (R²) in multiple regressions. According to Ferdinand (2002) a good score of AGFI is ≥0.90.

5) Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA)

Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) is statistic that used to compensate chi square statistic (χ²) on big sample size. The criteria that used to measure model validity based on RMSEA statistic is, when RMSEA statistic≤0.08 thus, the model is accepted (Ferdinand, 2002).

Result and Discussion

Data Validity

a. Normality

Normality Data should be checked before use it to structural test. Abnormal distribution will create standard failure and
it makes chi square unmatched, especially for maximum estimation method likelihood (ML). That is why estimation should be implemented to the abnormal variables (Setyo Hari Wijanto, 2008).

From table above, chi square’s result for each manifest have probability (p) more than 0.05, means that those are normal distribution. Based on that result, the data can be used directly without any normalization action.

b. Multicolinearity

There is no exogenous put into this model in terms of variable connectivity. Because of the reason that exogen variable can’t be evaluated, so there is no need to test multicolinearity.

1) Latent Variable Measurement Result

Perception, Expectation, Satisfaction, and Word of Mouth are latent and cannot be measured directly, but represent by the indicators (manifest). This is the result of confirmatory factor analysis result to evaluate the manifests in representing the variables. From the table under shows t-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Chi Square</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
<th>Result.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>EXP1</td>
<td>3.713</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>EXP2</td>
<td>5.327</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>EXP3</td>
<td>3.462</td>
<td>0.177</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>EXP4</td>
<td>1.243</td>
<td>0.537</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>EXP5</td>
<td>3.524</td>
<td>0.172</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>PERC1</td>
<td>3.761</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>PERC2</td>
<td>4.525</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>PERC3</td>
<td>2.401</td>
<td>0.301</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>PERC4</td>
<td>3.715</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>PERC5</td>
<td>3.781</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>PERC6</td>
<td>2.550</td>
<td>0.279</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>SAT1</td>
<td>3.402</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>SAT2</td>
<td>4.374</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>SAT3</td>
<td>6.345</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>SAT4</td>
<td>6.102</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>SAT5</td>
<td>4.129</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>SAT6</td>
<td>4.684</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>SAT7</td>
<td>3.590</td>
<td>0.166</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>SAT8</td>
<td>5.451</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>WM1</td>
<td>4.252</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>WM2</td>
<td>4.936</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data Screening Result
result of all manifests is more than 2, means these manifests is significantly represent the latent, means that it is valid. The manifest for one particular latent has to be uni dimension; it is proven with the result of construct reliability more than 0.7, which is 0.858 for Perception manifest, 0.832 for Expectation manifest, 0.914 for Satisfaction manifest, and 0.752 for Word of Mouth manifest.

Model Fit Test

Model showed (pic. 4.1) was tested in term of model fit with empirical data by collecting empirical data (table 4.3). It shows some sign of goodness of fit index already fulfill the requirement of model acceptance; one of them is the chi square result is 208.96 with the probability result (p) 0.119. The result of p>0.05 shows that there is no significant difference between

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latent</th>
<th>Manifest</th>
<th>□ Stand.</th>
<th>Stand. error</th>
<th>t-value*</th>
<th>Reliabilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>Perc1</td>
<td>0.7023</td>
<td>0.5068</td>
<td>8.5598</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perc2</td>
<td>0.7069</td>
<td>0.5003</td>
<td>9.0583</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perc3</td>
<td>0.6832</td>
<td>0.5332</td>
<td>9.1451</td>
<td>0.858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perc4</td>
<td>0.6505</td>
<td>0.5768</td>
<td>8.5366</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perc5</td>
<td>0.6997</td>
<td>0.5104</td>
<td>9.0222</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perc6</td>
<td>0.8014</td>
<td>0.3578</td>
<td>9.5271</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exp1</td>
<td>0.6802</td>
<td>0.5373</td>
<td>Ref</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exp2</td>
<td>0.7804</td>
<td>0.3910</td>
<td>7.641</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exp3</td>
<td>0.7094</td>
<td>0.4968</td>
<td>7.1225</td>
<td>0.832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exp4</td>
<td>0.6294</td>
<td>0.6039</td>
<td>6.9448</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exp5</td>
<td>0.7248</td>
<td>0.4747</td>
<td>7.2845</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sat1</td>
<td>0.7325</td>
<td>0.4634</td>
<td>Ref</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sat2</td>
<td>0.7708</td>
<td>0.4059</td>
<td>8.0586</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sat3</td>
<td>0.7950</td>
<td>0.3680</td>
<td>7.5281</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sat4</td>
<td>0.8001</td>
<td>0.3598</td>
<td>7.7872</td>
<td>0.914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sat5</td>
<td>0.8315</td>
<td>0.3086</td>
<td>8.2288</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sat6</td>
<td>0.6996</td>
<td>0.5106</td>
<td>6.8854</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sat7</td>
<td>0.6444</td>
<td>0.5847</td>
<td>6.8996</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sat8</td>
<td>0.7606</td>
<td>0.4215</td>
<td>7.7388</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>Wm1</td>
<td>0.9465</td>
<td>0.1041</td>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>0.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word of Mouth</td>
<td>Wm2</td>
<td>0.5789</td>
<td>0.6649</td>
<td>8.0395</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source : SEM test result

* t-test is more than 2 (Ferdinand, 2005)
sample covariant and estimated covariant, means the model is supported by the samples to explain the estimation (population) (Barbara, 1996:748).

**Picture 4.1**
The Connection Between Variables in the Model

![Diagram showing the connection between variables](image)

**Table 4.3**
Normality Test Result

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Cut of Value</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kai Quadrate (p)</td>
<td>Samll (p &gt; 0.05)</td>
<td>208.96 (0.119)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>≥ 0.90 (max 1)</td>
<td>0.9882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>GFI</td>
<td>≥ 0.95 (max 1)</td>
<td>0.8826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>AGFI</td>
<td>≥ 0.95 (max 1)</td>
<td>0.8538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>≤ 0.08 (Min 0)</td>
<td>0.0287</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SEM test result

**Structural Test Result**

There are three function in the model explained the connectivity between variables, the first function explained the influence of perception to expectation, the second function explained the influence of perception and expectation to satisfaction, and the third function explained the influence of satisfaction to the word of mouth (WOM), as showed in picture 4.2 and table 4.4.
From table 4.5, the author explained the function model as follows:

The first function

\[ \text{Expectation} = 0.2108 \text{ perception} \quad \text{......... 1) } \]

The t-value of perception is 2.137, it is more than 2 (t-value >2), means it is significant (Ferdinand, 2005), means that perception can influencing expectation.
Gama coefficient is positive = 0.2108 means that customers’ expectation in Thai food dining experience can be higher, if the perception is higher. The increasing expectation from customers point of view explained by perception as the value of determination is $0.2108^2 = 0.0444$ or 4.44%.

The second function

$$\text{Satisfaction} = 0.03303 \times \text{Perception} + 0.2252 \times \text{Expectation} \ldots \ldots \ldots 2$$

From the second function, $t$-value is 3.439 and expectation is 2.362, the result of $t$-value is more than 2 ($t$-value > 2) means that both of them can give significant influence into satisfaction. From the amount of coefficient, perception variable is 0.3303 and expectation is 0.2252, means that partially the influence of perception is higher than expectation (0.03303 > 0.2252), but both of them also influencing satisfaction for 19.12% (table 4.6).

The third function

$$\text{Word of Mouth} = 0.5343 \times \text{Satisfaction} \ldots \ldots \ldots 3$$

Coefficient amount of satisfaction is 0.5343 means that Word of Mouth can increase when customers satisfaction of Thai food dining experience increase too. The contribution for Word of Mouth is significant, based on the result of $t$-value is higher than 2, which is 5.654.

The increasing amount of Word of Mouth can be explained by the satisfaction determination, which is 28.54%. The percentage result less than 100% also explains that Word of Mouth of Thai food dining experience can increase based on other relevant factors, such as: intensive socialization, local product blend, pricing strategy, and etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Endogenous Variables</th>
<th>Exogenous Variables</th>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Expectation</td>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>0.2108</td>
<td>0.0444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>0.3303</td>
<td>0.1912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expectation</td>
<td>0.2252</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Word of Mouth</td>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.5343</td>
<td>0.2854</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SEM test result

Coefficient gamma of perception is positive, means that customers satisfaction to the Thai food dining experience can increase when perception is increase, customers satisfaction will also increase when customers expectation to the Thai food dining experience increase too.
The connection between all variables in the model explain direct impact as stated in table 4.5 and in table 4.6, it also explain that perception can give direct contribution into Word of Mouth by means of Expectation and Satisfaction, expectation also can give contribution in terms of influence by means of Satisfaction. The ability of giving indirect influence is significant, because it significantly influencing (table 4.7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exogenous</th>
<th>Endogenous</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.0475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>Word of Mouth</td>
<td>0.2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation</td>
<td>Word of Mouth</td>
<td>0.1203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source : SEM test result

From the table above, it shows that Perception give quite big indirect impact to the Word of Mouth (0.2018), in term of the determination, the impact is $0.2018^2 = 0.0407$ or 4.07%, while the amount of Expectation is $0.1203^2 = 0.0145$ or 1.45%.

The overall impact of direct and indirect in the model is 0.5343 or as much as Word of Mouth amount. The equal amount happened because of Perception and Expectation has no direct path to the Word of Mouth, the impact had been explained by Satisfaction.

**Hypothesis Evaluation**

Structural result in table 4.5 proves the validity of the hypothesis empirically, the significant result means the support of the hypothesis, and the hypothesis is valid or correct. While the non-significant result means cannot support the hypothesis, the hypothesis is not valid or not correct. This table shows the hypothesis and the validity of the hypothesis (table 4.8).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Endogenous</th>
<th>Exogenous</th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Hypotesis</th>
<th>Info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Expectation</td>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>0.2108</td>
<td>2.137</td>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>Ha₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>0.3303</td>
<td>3.439</td>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>Ha₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expectation</td>
<td>0.2252</td>
<td>2.362</td>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>Ha₃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Word of Mouth</td>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.5343</td>
<td>5.654</td>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>Ha₄</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source : SEM test result
Where:

1. **Hypothesis 1**
The formula used to test the first hypothesis is as follows:

- \( H_0_1 : \gamma_{11} = 0 \) Perception does not have influence on Customers Expectation of Thai food dining experience
- \( H_a_1 : \gamma_{11} > 0 \) Perception has positive influence on Customers Expectation of Thai food dining experience

If path coefficient \( \gamma_{11} \) has \( p < \alpha \) (0.05), thus, \( H_0_1 \) is rejected.

2. **Hypothesis 2**

- \( H_0_2 : \gamma_2 = 0 \) Perception does not have influence on Customer Satisfaction of Thai food dining experience
- \( H_a_2 : \gamma_2 > 0 \) Perception has positive influence on Customer Satisfaction of Thai food dining experience

If path coefficient \( \gamma_2 \) has \( p < \alpha \) (0.05), thus, \( H_0_2 \) is rejected.

3. **Hypothesis 3**

- \( H_0_3 : \beta_1 = 0 \) Expectation does not have influence on Customer Satisfaction of Thai food dining experience
- \( H_a_3 : \beta_1 > 0 \) Expectation has positive influence on Customer Satisfaction of Thai food dining experience

If path coefficient \( \beta_1 \) has \( p < \alpha \) (0.05), thus, \( H_0_3 \) is rejected.

4. **Hypothesis 4**

- \( H_0_4 : \beta_2 = 0 \) Satisfaction does not have influence to the Word of Mouth of Thai food dining experience
- \( H_a_4 : \beta_2 > 0 \) Satisfaction has positive influence to the Word of Mouth of Thai food dining experience

If path coefficient \( \beta_2 \) has \( p < \alpha \) (0.05), thus, \( H_0_4 \) is rejected.

**Conclusions and Recommendation**

**Conclusions**

Based on the findings on the previous chapter, the conclusions were as follows:

1. The model proposed in this research proves to explain word of mouth by perception, expectation, and satisfaction.
2. Perception from the customers could give significant impact in influencing expectation and satisfaction. Expectation is the antecedent of satisfaction, while satisfaction is the antecedent of Word of mouth.
3. Customers usually have expectation on certain products prior to their satisfaction.
decision in trying and consuming products, if they perceive that the actual performance of the product could be at least matching or even better, exceeding their expectation. Customers are more likely to be satisfied. In this research, customers’ expectation has been proved have significant influence in fostering customers’ satisfaction.

4. Satisfied customers have the tendency to promote positive word of mouth. This fact is supported by the analysis result that showed positive influence from satisfaction to word of mouth.

Recommendations

Based on the proven model, positive word of mouth was significantly influenced by satisfaction from the customer, while expectation and perception were the antecedent of satisfaction. Therefore, the recommendations to the management to improve their performance were as follows:

1. To increase positive word of mouth, the management of the restaurants should conduct perception-building activities in order to stimulate positive perception of Thai food from their existing and potential customer. It could be in the form of seminars, media show, etc, to socialize and inform public about how affordable is the price of Thai foods, the benefits of Thai foods to body’s health, delicious taste, menu variation, etc.

2. Management also has to align that positive perception-building activity with the customers’ expectation to foster their satisfaction. After socializing benefits of Thai foods, the Thai food restaurants should increase their services through continuous development on the menu, quality of service, pricing strategy and so forth. Positive word of mouth could be achieved in many ways, not only by applying the model in this research.
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