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**Abstract**

The study was undertaken to investigate the restaurant switching intention among existing customers of ethnic Indian restaurants in Helsinki and to explore implications of the existing consumers’ switching intention on new ethnic Indian restaurants. It has practical significance for both existing and to-be-opened new ethnic Indian restaurants in Helsinki in understanding consumers’ restaurant switching behaviour and in formulating strategies to retain/attract consumers and overall marketing strategies. The Push-Pull-Mooring (PPM) migration model of service switching by Bansal et al. (2005) is used in the study to investigate the switching intention. According to the model, the combined impact of push, pull, and mooring variables creates switching intention. Where push factors push customers away from their current service providers, pull factors pull/attract them towards alternative service providers, and mooring factors play moderating role with push and pull factors as well as affect switching intention directly. Following the PPM model of service switching, a theoretical framework for the study was developed using the most relevant push variables (i.e. food quality, service quality, and price), pull variable (i.e. alternative attractiveness), and mooring variables (i.e. attitude towards switching, social norm towards switching, and variety-seeking tendency). A quantitative survey was conducted among a sample population of 64 respondents seen coming out of four different ethnic Indian restaurants in four different locations of Helsinki. The findings from the survey were interpreted as per the groundings of the PPM model. The findings revealed that 45.3% of the existing customers have positive switching intention, which was assumed to be the product of the combined impact of the push, pull, and mooring variables selected for the study. Among the push variables, the findings revealed that ‘service quality’ plays the dominant role in creating switching intention followed by ‘food quality’ and ‘price’. It was recommended that any new ethnic Indian restaurant should exclusively consider the implications of the push factors into their overall marketing strategy towards existing customers since the impact of the push factors could be influenced or controlled to some degree by the restaurants as these factors are directly related with the operations of restaurants. On the other hand other factors are related with the customers’ cognitive and other psychological processes over which the restaurants has no direct control.
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1 Introduction

In the service industry, consumers’ service provider switching is a common practice. In service literature, service-provider switching is defined as a consumer ceasing a trade relationship with an existing service provider in favour of a new service provider (Bansal et al., 2005). Consumer-switching behaviour (CSB) has impact on a business enterprise’s survival, profitability, and growth (Keaveney, 1995). Being a member of food service industry, restaurant industry is not immune from such impacts of consumer service switching. Arguably, the study of CSB can help reveal how vulnerable a restaurant or any other business enterprise is to its competitors’ initiative of stealing away its customers with high switching intention. Furthermore, the study of CSB in the context of restaurant business in a metropolitan city, such as Helsinki, can reveal crucial information that can help a proposed new restaurant to shape their marketing strategies. A properly designed research can help such a new restaurant to gather crucial information such as the percentage of consumers in the market with high switching intention and the likelihood of those consumers’ switching in favour of the new restaurant. This thesis aims to gather such information with the objectives to investigate the switching intention and explore its implications on new ethnic Indian restaurant in Helsinki. The author of the study has an active intention to start a new ethnic Indian restaurant in Helsinki. It is to the belief of the author that the current study will undoubtedly facilitate the formation of an effective marketing strategy for the new restaurant.

This study aims to observe and estimate existing consumers’ switching intention in favour of new ethnic Indian restaurants in Helsinki, Finland from the perspective of Push, Pull, and Mooring Migration Model of Service Switching by Bansal et al. (2005). According to the model, combined impact of push, pull, and mooring factors create switching intention among consumers, where push factors force a consumer to leave their current service provider, pull factors attract them to new service provider, and mooring factors give moderating effect to push and pull factors and thereby either encourage or discourage switching alongside affecting switching intention directly. Push, pull, and mooring variables are the independent variables and the switching intention is the sole dependent variable in the study. In total, eight variables were considered in the current study, seven of whom were independent belonging to the three types of variables i.e push, pull, and mooring.

The reason for choosing the PPM Model of Service Switching is that unlike many other models it offers a unifying framework for understanding the complexity of the process of consumer switching. Other prominent models (such as SPSM, Agency Theory of Consumer Switching, Model of consumers’ service switching Behaviour etc.) view consumer-
switching process simply as a cause-effect type of relationship and do not reflect all the components of a given phenomenon (Nimako, 2012).

The study followed a quantitative research approach. Required information for the research was collected from primary sources only through a quantitative survey. The survey questionnaire was designed based on PPM Migration Model of Service Switching. The research has significance to both the existing and ‘to be opened’ new ethnic Indian restaurants in Helsinki. The information derived from the study may help ethnic Indian restaurants in Helsinki in understanding CSB and in formulating effective customer retention policies and as well as overall marketing policy.

1.1 Research Objectives and Questions

The two action verbs used in the title of the thesis, i.e. observe and estimate, indicate that the overall goals of the study are to observe and estimate existing consumers’ switching intention. Observation and estimation are done in the current thesis to achieve the following two objectives:

- **RO1**: To investigate the existing consumers’ switching intention in favour of new ethnic Indian restaurants in Helsinki.
- **RO2**: To explore the implications of the existing consumers’ switching intention towards proposed ethnic Indian restaurant in Helsinki.

In line with the PPM migration model of service switching, investigation of consumer switching intention requires identifying push, pull, and mooring variables relevant for the research and assessing their impact on the switching intention. Thus, corresponding research questions for the study include the following:

- **RQ1**: What push, pull, and mooring variables are relevant while investigating existing consumers’ switching intention in favour of new ethnic Indian restaurant?
- **RQ2**: What is the impact of each of the relevant push, pull, and mooring variables on the existing consumers’ switching intention?
- **RQ3**: What is the combined impact of the push, pull, and mooring factors on the existing consumers’ switching intention?
- **RQ4**: What are the implications of the existing consumers’ switching intention towards proposed ethnic Indian restaurant in Helsinki?

The first research question is addressed in the second chapter of Literature Review. Later questions are addressed in the findings and analysis chapters.
1.2 Delimitation of the Study

Due to time and resource constraints, the author was forced to limit the scope of the study. Delimitation of the study is discussed below.

Only the most important push, pull, and mooring variables are selected for the study considering time and fund constraints. Inclusion of all the variables as suggested by Bansal et al. (2005) would have resulted in a lengthy list of questions in the survey questionnaire. Then it would have been very difficult to conduct full-fledged lengthy survey because of time constraints. Moreover, such a lengthy survey would have required the author to pay the respondents for their time, which was not possible due to fund constraints.

Moreover, relationship between demographic data with any of the variables of the study is not shown. The decision to exclude some of the push and mooring variables are subjective in nature. Absence of such subjectivity could have increased the credibility of the research. Therefore, the information derived from this research should be inferred considering the above-mentioned limitations.
2 Theoretical framework

The chapter starts with giving overview of the PPM migration model of service switching and its relationship with the current study. The next sections of the chapter discuss in details the push, pull, and mooring factors relevant for the study and switching intention. Finally, the last section of the chapter presents a theoretical framework for the current study based on the discussions in the previous sections of the chapter.

2.1 Overview of PPM Migration Model of Service Switching

Bansal et al. (2005) formulated Push-Pull-Mooring (PPM) migration model of service switching in their bid to present a unifying framework for understanding the complexity of the process of consumer switching. The model is based on the theory of planned behaviour by Ajzen (1991) where attributes such as attitude, subjective norm, and perceived behavioural control are conceptualised to influence intention of an individual to perform a particular behaviour and intention, in turn, influences the individual to perform the behavioural act. In PPM model of service switching by Basal et al. (2005), consumers’ switching from their current service provider(s) to new one(s) is the ultimate behavioural act. According to the authors, the model is comprised of three types of factors- push, pull, and mooring. Combined impact of these three factors creates switching intention among consumers and the intention, in turn, influences consumer to switch from their current service provider to new one(s).

The PPM migration model of service switching contributed to the services marketing literature in a number of ways. Most importantly, it was first to propose a unifying framework for understanding consumer service switching behaviours at a time when marketing literature lacked comprehensive composite models of service provider switching. In their study, Bansal et al. (2005) admitted that their PPM migration model of service switching failed to include every moderating factor such as personal traits and culture, and hoped that future researches would fulfil the gaps in the model.

Bansal et al. (2005) conceptualised that mooring factors have moderating effect on push and pull factors as direct relationship with switching intention. In the current study, only the direct relationships of the mooring factors are considered. Switching intention derived from the study after considering all the relevant factors is taken as the antecedent and predictor of the act of switching. Accordingly, survey questionnaire for the study is created based on the selected relevant factors only.
2.2 Push Factors

According to the PPM model of migration proposed by Bogue (1977), push factors are those negative factors existing at the place of origin that push people away from the place of origin. They are "the factors that motivate people to leave an origin" (Stimson and Minnery, 1998) and "factors at the origin that are assumed to have a negative influence on the quality indicators of life" (Moon 1995). According to the authors, in the service sector push factors are those negative factors that push consumers away from existing service provider(s). Push effects have a direct and positive relationship with switching intention - a consumer is more likely to switch if pushed away. The authors identified low service quality, low satisfaction, low value, low trust, low commitment, and high price perception as push factors. According to past researches in the restaurant sector (e.g. Soriano, 2002), quality of food, quality of service, and price of the meal are the most important sources of consumer satisfaction in restaurant industry. These three factors can thus be considered as the most important push factors in the context of a restaurant because consumers' negative evaluation of these factors may influence them to leave their current restaurant where they usually dine and switch to new one(s). Hence, these three factors are only considered as push factors in the current study and discussed further.

2.2.1 Food Quality

Food quality is a fundamental element of the overall restaurant experience (Ryu et al., cited in Bashir et al., 2015) and it is an essential condition to satisfy the needs and expectations of customers (Peri, cited in Bashir et al., 2015). Food quality is the most important reason why customers return to a restaurant (Soriano, 2002). Simply if customers are satisfied with the quality of food they decide to stay and if they are dissatisfied they will switch to a new restaurant. Food quality is therefore the most important criteria based on which customers make their decision to stay in the existing restaurant or switch to a new one. Food quality has many aspects such as taste, presentation and appearance (Hyun, 2010). Therefore, an overall satisfaction with food quality thus indicates satisfaction with taste, presentation, and appearance.

2.2.2 Service Quality

The term quality is common in human migration research as well, where "quality of life" is investigated through examination of variables such as physical and economic factors related with the place of origin (Boyle et al., cited in Bansal et al., 2005). In a service environment, perceived quality influences repurchase decision of consumers both directly and
indirectly (Zeithaml et al., 1996). Past researches on service quality in the context of restaurant (e.g. Dulen; Susskind and Chan; Ryu and Han, cited in Markovic et al., 2011) suggested that food quality, physical environment, and services rendered by employees are the major components of overall restaurant service quality. Food quality is discussed in the previous section. Therefore, service quality is referred to as physical environment and services rendered by employees in the context of the current study.

2.2.3 Price

Economic variables, namely the price, influence service-switching intention (Bansal et al., 2005). Bansal et al. (2005) considered it appropriate to use pricing issues in their model of service migration since economic variables play critical role in human migration models (Bogue, cited in Basal et al.). Consumers are likely to be inspired to switch from their current service provider to alternative ones, if they perceive that they can get better or the same service at a lower price. Past researches on the issue (e.g. Dabholkar and Walls, cited in Bansal et al., 2005) suggest that consumers would switch if they perceive that their current service provider's prices are high. Drawing from the past researches, Bansal et al. (2005) conceptualised that higher the perceived price higher the likelihood that consumers will intend to switch service provider.

2.3 Pull Factors

Pull factors are the positive factors at the target destination that draw prospective migrants to the destination (Moon 1995) and are attributes of the destination that are appealing to the migrants (Dorigo and Tobler, cited in bansal et al., 2005). Like the push factors, these are attributes associated with the place and not characteristics related with the migrants. According to Bansal et al. (2005), in service environment, the pull factors are those that attract customers towards alternative service provider(s). Pull effects have a direct and positive relationship with switching intention- a consumer is more likely to switch if pulled away. The authors identified alternative attractiveness as the only pull factor in this research context.

2.3.1 Alternative Attractiveness

Alternative attractiveness is the positive characteristics of competing service providers that positively influence a consumer’s intentions to switch (Jones et al., cited in Bansal et al., 2005). In service marketing context, alternative attractiveness is the level of services
expected by consumers from next best alternative to the current service provider. The concept of alternative attractiveness is based on consumer perception and hence may not reflect the existing competitive environment accurately. Alternative attractiveness is related with the concept of service augmentation in the service literature which “involves incorporating ‘extras’ into the service offer to differentiate it from competing offerings” (Berry and Parasuraman, cited in Zeithaml, Berry, and Parasuraman, 1996). Therefore, it is similar to the idea of differentiation. However, it is not related with superior service offering with lot of extras, rather it works in ‘like with like’ comparison. In the context of restaurant, differentiated services offered by competitors may influence consumers to abandon their current restaurant service provider and switch to the competitors. Bansal et al. (2005) proposed, “The higher the alternative attractiveness of competing service providers, the higher is the likelihood that consumers will tend to switch service providers.”

2.4 Mooring Factors

The simplicity of a push-pull model of human migration does not capture all the complexity of human migration decisions. Presence of intervening obstacles/opportunities complicates simple comparison between push and pull factors, for example, the high cost of moving or family obligations at the place of origin may prevent migration (Boyle et al., cited in Bansal et al, 2005). Thus, an individual may not migrate even when strong push and pull factors are present, largely due to contextual or situational constraints (Lee, cited in Bansal et al., 2005) that are usually person-specific, but also can operate for a large number of people (Gardner, cited in Bansal et al., 2005). Similarly, in a service context, even when push and pull factors are strong (e.g. low service quality at the existing service provider and availability of attractive alternative service providers) a consumer may want to stay with the current service provider when mooring variables are strong (e.g., high costs of switching or unfavourable social norms) (Bansal et al., 2005). Bansal et al. (2005) define mooring variables as those that constrain the consumers' service switching decisions by acting as a moderator of the push-pull relationship with switching intentions. According to the authors, mooring variables also have a direct and negative relationship with switching intentions- the more a consumer feels "moored" (i.e. secure/safe) to the service provider, the less likely he or she is to switch. However, in the current study moderating role of the mooring factors are ignored and only their direct relationship with switching intention is considered.
In service switching context, drawing from the past research of Bansal et al. (2005) proposed switching costs, subjective norms (social influences), attitudes toward switching, past behaviours, and variety-seeking tendencies as mooring factors. Bansal et al. (2005) identified unfavourable attitude towards switching, unfavourable subjective norms, infrequent prior switching behaviour, high switching cost, and low variety seeking as mooring/moderating effects that diminish the switching intention of consumers from one service provider to another service provider. Therefore, favourable attitude towards switching, favourable subjective norms towards switching, frequent prior switching behaviour, low switching cost, and high variety seeking lead to high switching intention. This study only considers a selected few mooring factors, such as attitude towards switching, subjective/social norm towards switching, and variety-seeking tendencies, due to resource constraints mentioned earlier in Chapter 1.

2.4.1 Attitude towards Switching

Attitude toward a particular behaviour refers to the degree to which an individual has a favourable or unfavourable appraisal or evaluation of the behaviour in question (Ajzen and Fishbein, cited in Ajzen, 1991). In the case of the current study, attitude is defined as a consumer’s favourable or unfavourable appraisal or evaluation of the act of switching from their current restaurant service provider to others. Attitude is the sum of products of beliefs an individual has about outcomes of a given behaviour and the individual’s evaluations of the outcomes as good or bad (Ajzen and Fishbein, cited in Ajzen, 1991). In the restaurant service switching context, if a consumer believes that switching from their current restaurant service provider would bring them positive outcome, they are likely to switch. If they perceive that a negative outcome, they are unlikely to switch. Attitude has significant impact on intentions and acts as a predictor of intention to perform a particular behaviour (Ajzen, 1991). Stronger attitude leads to stronger intention to perform a particular behaviour. Therefore, a favourable attitude towards switching from current restaurant service provider to other(s) predicts a positive intention to switch and in turn, the intention predicts a strong probability of the occurrence of switching action. Similarly, an unfavourable attitude towards switching from current restaurant service provider to other(s) leads to no intention of switching and hence the probability of the occurrence of switching action is nil.

2.4.2 Subjective/Social Norms towards Switching

The subjective/social norm is the sum of products of normative beliefs of an individual that are perceived pressure from specific influential people or groups (e.g. family, friends, col-
leagues, etc.) and the individual's motivation to comply with the expectations of these people or groups (Ajzen and Fishbein, cited in Ajzen, 1991). In simple terms, subjective norm is the perceived social pressure felt by an individual to perform or not to perform a particular behaviour.

2.4.3 Variety Seeking Tendencies

In consumer behaviour literature, variety seeking is defined as switching between consumption substitutes where the substitutes are similar in characteristics and are not materially different in relation to the one(s) substituted. According to Bansal et al. (2005) variety seeking tendency is the state of consumers’ mind where they are not satisfied with a single product rather they want a portfolio of different products. Therefore, a restaurant must provide a portfolio of different products to satisfy customers with variety seeking tendency. In restaurant industry, taste of the same recipe may vary restaurant to restaurant and some consumers may have the tendency to seek different variety of taste of the same recipe as well by switching between restaurants. Pursuit of variety often indulges a consumer not only to switch away from the recently consumed brand, but also from the brand(s) the consumer will switch to (Bansal et al., 2005).

2.5 Switching Intention

As discussed earlier, push and pull factors moderated by mooring factors create service provider switching intention among consumers. In the theory of planned behaviour, intention is defined as the willingness of an individual to perform a particular behaviour (Ajzen, 1991). According to Ajzen (1991), intention reflects the motivational factors that encourage an individual to perform an action and indicates how hard someone is willing to try or how much effort someone is ready to exert to perform certain behaviour (Ajzen, 1991). Therefore, in restaurant context, switching intention is a consumer’s level of willingness or the amount effort he is ready to exert to switch from his current restaurant service provider to new ones.

2.6 Conclusion

In summary, the Push-Pull-Mooring (PPM) migration model is used as the sole basis of this study to observe and estimate the switching intention of existing customers towards new ethnic Indian restaurant in Helsinki,
Finland. By reviewing relevant literature, and considering theoretical relevance of variables and the scope of the current study, only the most important push, pull, and mooring factors were selected for the current study. Accordingly, these selected factors formed the basis of the survey questionnaire for the study. The conceptual framework in the next section presents these selected factors and their influences on switching intention. In the study, it is assumed that each factor creates ‘strong switching intention’ as well as ‘moderate switching intention’. Sum of ‘strong switching intention’ and ‘moderate switching intention’ is ‘gross switching intention’ (i.e. the overall switching intention created by an individual factor). These three terms are used in the study alongside terms suggested by the PPM model whereby ‘strong switching intention’ is considered to have stronger resistance to the effect of customer retention policies adopted by organisations than ‘moderate switching intention’.

Drawing from the literature review, the following conceptual framework is designed for the current study in Figure 1 below.
Adapted from: Bansal et al. (2005)
3 Methodology

The chapter identifies and discusses the research approach, data collection sources and method, sampling method and size adopted in the study in the first three sections. In the final section of the chapter, the survey questionnaire adopted in the study and its interpretations are discussed.

3.1 Research Approach

The approach to a research can be quantitative, qualitative, or mixed (Stake, 1995). Quantitative approach is used with the assumption that a numerical analysis of data can produce a valuable insight into the way people make decisions. The approach focuses on accumulating numerical data and generalizing it across groups of people or explaining a particular phenomenon. Quantitative methods put emphasis on objective measurement and the numerical, mathematical, or statistical analysis of data collected through questionnaires, survey, and polls (Babbie, 2010). Qualitative approach, on the other hand, is a naturalistic interpretive approach whereby researchers “study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of or interpret phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them” (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000:3). Mixed approach to research is where both the quantitative and qualitative approaches are used.

Quantitative approach is appropriate when there is a need to apply a measure to quantify the outcome. Such is the case in the current study. Moreover, the PPM migration model of service switching by Bansal et al. (2005) is based on quantitative measure. Thus, a quantitative approach to the current study is justifiable.

3.2 Data Collection Sources and Collection Method

Data for a research can be collected through different sources, i.e. primary and/or secondary. Data collected from the original source are called primary data (Sing and Mangat, 1996). Data that are already collected by someone else, for example, by agencies, individuals, etc. and are available in the unpublished or published records are known as secondary data (Sing and Mangat, 1996). In this study, data is collected only from primary source through quantitative survey with predetermined questionnaire. The survey was conducted among the target population of the research who are the existing consumers of ethnic Indian food in Helsinki.
3.3 Sampling Method and Sampling Size

A non-probability sampling method is used in this research to form the sample size of the target population. The method does not create a representative sample (Paul, 2014: 45), but a sample that the researcher has interest in studying (Laerd, 2016). A core characteristic of non-probability sampling method is that sample selection is influenced by the subjective judgment of the researcher (Laerd, 2016), unlike probability sampling method where there is no such scope. This subjective influence is often seen as a weakness of the method. However, the use of non-probability sampling method is often inspired by practical and theoretical reasons. The practical reasons that justify the use of the method include:

- It is cheaper, quicker, and easier than probability sampling method.
- The use of probability method is not possible because the criteria cannot be met.

The first reason motivated the researcher to adopt non-probability sampling method.

Three commonly used non-probability sampling methods include convenience sampling, purposive sampling, and snowball sampling (Paul, 2014: 45). Convenience sampling refers to the sample that is formed with units that are the easiest to reach (Laerd, 2016), e.g. friends, family, colleagues, passer-by, etc. The technique helps the researcher to collect basic information quickly (Paul, 2014: 45). Purposive sampling refers to formation of a sample with subjects that have some characteristics which are relevant for the purposes of the study, for example, conducting surveys among shoppers at shopping malls/outlets. The technique relies on the subjective judgement of the researcher in choosing sample units (Laerd, 2016). The technique is based on the knowledge of the researcher of the concerned population and the purpose of the research (Paul, 2014: 45). Snowball sampling is a derivative of purposive sampling. It is used when the target population is hidden and/or is hard to access, e.g. patients with STDs namely HIV/AIDS, drug addicts, etc. The sample is achieved based on the suggestion(s) of respondents who have already participated in the study (Paul, 2014: 45).

The non-probability sampling method used in this thesis is purposive sampling. The sample subjects, i.e. existing consumers of ethnic Indian food can easily be accessed in and around existing ethnic Indian restaurants in Helsinki. There are several ethnic Indian restaurants in Helsinki of Bangladeshi, Indian, and Nepalese origin. Bangladeshi, Indian, and Nepalese foods/restaurants are commonly termed as Indian food/restaurants. Four loca-
tions each with at least one reputed Indian restaurant around Helsinki were chosen as venues for the survey. Choosing different locations of the city as venues were important to obtain a heterogeneous sample. Heterogeneous sampling, also called maximum variation sampling, is a purposive sampling technique that is used to obtain wide range of perspectives relating to the study topic (Laerd, 2016) from which generalisation to a broader population can be drawn. The survey resulted in 64 total respondents.

Survey Questionnaire and Its Interpretation

The questionnaire consists of two sections with only fourteen questions in total that are sequentially numbered, i.e. 1-14 (see Appendix 1). The questionnaire was prepared in a self-reporting/self-administered format. In a self-reporting/self-administered format, respondents provide their answers without the intervention of the investigators (Mitchell and Jolley, 2013). The questionnaire included only fixed-choice questions where the respondents had to choose from the options provided. Before participating in the survey, each respondent was briefed about the purpose of survey and was provided with instructions to undertake the survey.

Section 1 of the questionnaire consists of six questions (Q1-Q6) asking for personal details. These questions collect demographic data such as age, sex, occupation, annual income, residency status, and ethnicity respectively. Section 2 of the questionnaire consists of eight questions (Q7-Q14) asking opinions of the respondents on issues associated with the variables selected for this study. Details of these questions (i.e. Q7-Q14) are discussed four different sections below (3.4.1-3.4.4) by distributing them according to their relationship with four different variables of the study.

3.3.1 Push Variables

Q7, Q8, and Q9 are associated with push variables food quality, service quality, and price respectively.

Q7 and Q8 require the respondents to express their satisfaction with food quality and service quality respectively of their preferred ethnic Indian restaurants on a scale of satisfaction that include- very dissatisfied, dissatisfied, unsure (neutral), satisfied, and very satisfied as options for answers. In this regard, both ‘very dissatisfied’ and ‘dissatisfied’ indicate a positive relationship with switching intention with the first one indicating stronger switching intention and the later one indicating relatively weaker switching intention or,
say, moderate switching intention. Likewise, both ‘very satisfied’ and ‘satisfied’ indicate a negative relationship with switching intention with the first one indicating greater degree than the later one.

Q9 requires a respondent to express their opinion on the statement “Price charged for food & services at your preferred ethnic Indian restaurant is fair relative to the market” on the scale of agreement that includes- strongly disagree, disagree, unsure (neutral), agree, and strongly agree as options for answers. In this regard, both ‘strongly disagree’ and ‘disagree’ indicate a positive relationship in varying degrees mentioned earlier. Likewise, both ‘strongly agree’ and ‘agree’ indicate a negative relationship in varying degrees mentioned earlier.

3.3.2 Pull Variable

Q10 is associated with the sole pull variable of alternative attractiveness. It requires a respondent to express whether he thinks that new ethnic Indian restaurant would be much fairer than his currently preferred restaurant and that he would be more satisfied with their services on the same scale of agreement as in Q9. In this case, both ‘strongly agree’ and ‘agree’ indicate a positive relationship with switching intention in varying degrees. Likewise, both ‘strongly disagree’ and ‘disagree’ indicate a negative relationship with switching intention in varying degrees.

3.3.3 Mooring Variables

Q11, Q12, and Q13 are associated with the mooring variables of attitude towards switching, social norm towards switching, and variety seeking tendencies respectively.

Q11 requires a respondent to express how desirable it is for him to switch from his currently preferred ethnic Indian restaurant to a newly opened ethnic Indian restaurant on a scale of desirability that include five options (i.e. very undesirable, undesirable, neutral, desirable, and very desirable) for answer. In this regard, both ‘very desirable’ and ‘desirable’ indicate a positive relationship with switching intention in varying degrees. Likewise, both ‘strongly undesirable’ and ‘undesirable’ indicate a negative relationship with switching intention.

Q12 requires a respondent to express his opinion on the statement “People I care about would approve my switching from my currently preferred ethnic Indian restaurant to a new
ethnic Indian restaurant” on the scale of agreement as in Q9. Q13 requires a respondent to express his opinion on the statement “I am open to try different Indian/Pakistani/Bangladesh ethnic foods offered by new restaurant” on the scale of agreement as in Q9. In the cases of Q12 and Q13, both ‘strongly agree’ and ‘agree’ indicate a positive relationship with switching intention in varying degrees. Likewise, both ‘strongly disagree’ and ‘disagree’ indicate a negative relationship with switching intention in varying degrees.

3.3.4 Switching Intention

Q14 is associated with switching intention, the only dependent variable of the study. It requires a respondent to rate the probability of his switching from existing Indian restaurant to a new Indian restaurant in the future on a scale of likelihood that includes five options (i.e. extremely unlikely, unlikely, neutral, likely, and extremely likely) for answer. Both ‘extremely likely’ and ‘likely’ indicate that a respondent has a positive switching intention with the former one expressing stronger switching intention and the later one expressing moderate switching intention. Likewise ‘extremely unlikely’ and ‘unlikely’ indicate that the respondent has a negative switching intention with the former one expressing greater degree than the later one.
4 Findings

This chapter presents findings from the survey. In five consecutive sections, i.e. section 4.1-4.5, findings associated with demographics, push variables, pull variable, mooring variable, and switching intention are presented respectively.

4.1 Demographics

Of the 64 respondents 54.7% of the sample population (i.e. 35 respondents) was male and 45.3% (i.e. 29 respondents) was female (Figure 2).

![Figure 2: Distribution of Respondents' Gender](image)

Respondents' ages ranged from 18 to above 65 years, with an approximate mean of 46 years. People in the age group of 26-35 years formed the highest proportion (31.3% i.e. 20 respondents) of the total sample population followed by the age groups 36-45 years (28.1% i.e. 18 respondents), 18-25 years (18.8% i.e. 12 respondents), 46-55 years (15.6% i.e. 10 respondents), 56-65 years (4.7% i.e. 3 respondents), and 65+ years (1.5% i.e. 1 respondent) respectively (see Figure 3).
Figure 3: Distribution of Respondents’ Age

Figure 4 below shows the distribution of the respondents’ ethnicity. As can be seen, Finns formed the highest proportion of the population (57.8% i.e. 37 respondents) followed by Asian (22% i.e. 14 respondents), Other European (9.3% i.e. 6 respondents), African (6.2% i.e. 4 respondents), and Other ethnicity (4.7% i.e. 3 respondents).

Figure 4: Distribution of Respondents’ Ethnicity
Analysing the respondents’ occupation it was seen that full-time personnel formed the highest proportion of the total sample population, i.e. 39.1% or 25 out of 64 respondents, followed by part-time personnel (15.6% i.e. 10 respondents), unemployed (15.6% i.e. 10 respondents), self-employed (14.1% i.e. 9 respondents), retired (9.4% i.e. 6 respondents), student part-time (3.1% i.e. 2 respondents), and student (3.1% i.e. 2 respondents) (see Figure 5).

Figure 5: Distribution of respondents’ Occupation

Considering income level of the participants in the survey, respondents were categorised into four earning groups in the study i.e. lower income’, ‘lower middle income’, ‘upper income’, and ‘upper middle income’. Unfortunately, only four of the total respondents disclosed their income level, while the rest of the respondents avoided answering the related question. Hence, the data related to the respondents’ income level is not used in the study.

Finally, of the 64 respondents, 82.8%, i.e. 53 customers are resident of Helsinki, while 17.2%, i.e. 11 customers are non-resident (see Figure 6 below).
Tabulation of demographic data with details is presented in Table A1 of Appendix 2.

4.2 Push Variables

4.2.1 Food Quality

Of the sample population, 45.3%, i.e. 29 of the 64 respondents expressed that they were generally ‘satisfied’ and 25% i.e. 16 respondents expressed that they were ‘very satisfied’ with the food quality of their currently preferred ethnic Indian restaurants (see Figure 7 below and Table A2 in Appendix 2). In contrast, 14%, i.e. 9 respondents expressed that they were generally ‘dissatisfied’ and 7.8% i.e. 5 respondents expressed that they were ‘very dissatisfied’ with the food quality. While, 7.8% i.e. 5 respondents expressed neutral opinion with regard to food quality. Therefore, 70.3% (25%+45.3%) i.e. 45 of the 64 respondents indicated that they have negative switching intention in terms of food quality, while 21.8% (7.8%+14%) i.e. 14 of the 64 respondents indicated that they have positive switching intention in terms of food quality. Hence, it can be concluded that 21.8% of the existing customers of ethnic Indian restaurants in Helsinki has a positive switching intention in terms of food quality (refer to section 3.4.1).
4.2.2 Service Quality

Survey data revealed that 40.6% i.e. 26 of the 64 respondents were generally 'satisfied' and 18.8% i.e. 12 of the 64 respondents were 'very satisfied' with the service quality of their currently preferred ethnic Indian restaurants (see Figure 8 below and Table A2 in Appendix 2). On the other hand, 20.3% i.e. 13 of the 64 respondents were generally 'dissatisfied' and 9.4% i.e. 6 respondents were 'very dissatisfied with the service quality of their currently preferred ethnic Indian restaurants, while 10.9% i.e. 10 of the 64 respondents expressed neutral opinion with regard to service quality. As ‘service quality’ is referred to as ‘the physical environment and the services rendered by employees of a restaurant’ in the current study, the above-mentioned data could mean that 59.4% (40.6%+18.8%) i.e. 38 of the 64 respondents expressed satisfaction, while 29.7% (20.3%+9.4%) i.e. 19 of the 64 respondents expressed dissatisfaction with the physical environment and the services rendered by employees of their currently preferred ethnic Indian restaurants. Hence, it can be concluded that 29.7% of the existing customers of ethnic Indian restaurants in Helsinki has a positive switching intention in terms of service quality (refer to section 3.4.1).
4.2.3 Price

Of the total respondents, 57.8% or 37 respondents generally agreed and 17.2% or 11 respondents strongly agreed on the statement “Price charged for food & services at your preferred ethnic Indian restaurant is fair relative to the market”, while 12.5% or 8 respondents generally disagreed and 7.8% or 5 respondents strongly disagreed on the same statement (see Figure 9 below and Table A3 in Appendix 2). Therefore, in gross, 75% (57.8%+17.2%) i.e. 48 of the 64 respondents indicated that they have a negative switching intention in terms of price, while 20.3% (12.5%+7.8%) i.e. 13 of the 64 respondents indicated a positive switching intention in terms of price. Hence, it can be concluded that 20.3% of the existing customers of ethnic Indian restaurants in Helsinki has a positive switching intention in terms of price (refer to section 3.4.1).
4.3 Pull Variable: Alternative Attractiveness

Of the total respondents, 23.4% i.e. 15 of the 64 respondents generally agreed and 7.8% i.e. 4 of the 64 respondents strongly agreed on the statement "All in all, new restaurant would be much fairer than my preferred ethnic Indian restaurant and I would be much more satisfied with their services", while 31.3% i.e. 20 of the 64 respondents generally disagreed and 15.6% i.e. 10 of the 64 respondents strongly disagreed on the same statement (see Figure 10 below and Table A3 in Appendix 2). As the statement is interpreted to indicate alternative attractiveness, the sole pull variable, the survey data is interpreted to reveal that a gross of 31.2% (23.4%+7.8%) i.e. 19 of the 64 respondents indicated that they have a positive switching intention in terms of alternative attractiveness, while 46.9% (31.3%+15.6%) i.e. 30 of the 64 respondents indicated a negative switching intention in terms of alternative attractiveness. Hence, it can be concluded that 31.2% of the existing customers of ethnic Indian restaurants in Helsinki has a positive switching intention in terms of alternative attractiveness (refer to section 3.4.2). It is to be noted that alternative attractiveness received the highest rate of neutral response of 21.9% than any other variable of the study.
Figure 10: Respondents on whether new restaurants would be fairer and whether they would be more satisfied with new restaurants

4.4 Mooring Variables

4.4.1 Attitude towards Switching

Of the total respondents, 34.4% i.e. 22 of the 64 respondents expressed that it is generally ‘desirable’ and 14% i.e. 9 of the 64 respondents expressed that it is ‘very desirable’ for them to switch to new ethnic Indian restaurants (see Figure 11 below and Table A4 in Appendix 2). On the other hand, 39% i.e. 25 of the 64 respondents expressed that it is generally ‘undesirable’ and 7.8% i.e. 5 of the 64 respondents expressed that it is ‘very undesirable’ for them to switch to new ethnic Indian restaurants, while 4.7% i.e. 3 of the 64 respondents remained neutral in opinion in this regard. Therefore, 48.4% (34.4%+14%) i.e. 31 of the 64 respondents indicated that they have a positive switching attitude and hence a positive switching intention, while 46.8% (39%+7.8%) i.e. 30 of the 64 respondents indicated a negative switching attitude and hence a negative switching intention. Hence, it can be concluded that 48.4% of the existing customers of ethnic Indian restaurants in Helsinki has positive switching attitude and therefore a positive switching intention (refer to section 3.4.3). As seen from the above data, both positive and negative switching attitudes are nearly equal, compare 48.4% vs. 46.8%.
4.4.2 Social Norm towards Switching

Of the total respondents, 31.2% i.e. 20 of the 64 respondents generally agreed and 18.8% i.e. 12 of the 64 respondents strongly agreed that their friends, family, and social associates would approve of their switching to new ethnic Indian restaurant (see Figure 12 below and Table A3 in Appendix 2). On the other hand, 21.9% i.e. 14 of the 64 respondents generally disagreed and 12.5% i.e. 8 of the 64 respondents strongly disagreed that their friends, family, and social associates approve of their switching to new ethnic Indian restaurant. A 15.6% i.e. 10 of the 64 respondents expressed neutral opinion in this regard. Therefore, 50% (31.2%+18.8%) i.e. 32 of the 64 respondents indicated a positive switching intention in terms of social norm towards switching, while 34.4% (21.9%+12.5%) i.e. 22 of the 64 respondents indicated a negative switching intention in terms of social norm towards switching. Hence, it can be concluded that 50% of the existing customers of ethnic Indian restaurants in Helsinki has positive switching intention in terms of social norm towards switching (refer to section 3.4.3).
4.4.3 Variety Seeking Tendency

Of the total respondents, 46.9% i.e. 30 of the 64 respondents generally agreed and 7.8% i.e. 5 of the 64 respondents strongly agreed that they are open to try different ethnic Indian foods offered by new restaurants (see Figure 13 below and Table A3 in Appendix 2). On the other hand, 21.9% i.e. 14 of the 64 respondents generally disagreed and 7.8% i.e. 5 of the 64 respondents strongly disagreed that they are open to try different ethnic Indian foods offered by new restaurants, while 15.6% i.e. 10 of the 64 respondents expressed neutral opinion in this regard. Therefore, 54.7% (46.9%+7.8%) i.e. 35 of the 64 respondents indicated that they have positive variety-seeking tendency and hence positive switching intention, while 29.7% (21.9%+7.8%) i.e. 19 of the 64 respondents indicated that they have negative variety-seeking tendency and hence negative switching intention. Hence, it can be concluded that 54.7% of the existing customers of ethnic Indian restaurants in Helsinki has positive variety-seeking tendency and therefore a positive switching intention (refer to section 3.4.3).
4.5 Switching Intention

Of the total respondents, 29.7% i.e. 19 of the 64 respondents rated the probability of their switching to new ethnic Indian restaurant as ‘likely’ and 15.6% i.e. 10 of the 64 respondents rated it as ‘extremely likely’ (see Figure 13 blow and Table A5 in Appendix 2). On the other hand, 23.4% i.e. 15 of the 64 respondents rated the probability of their switching to new ethnic Indian restaurant as generally ‘unlikely’ and 15.6% i.e. 10 of the 64 respondents rated it as ‘extremely unlikely’, while, 15.6% i.e. 10 of the 64 respondents expressed neutral opinion in this regard. Therefore, a gross of 45.3% (29.7%+15.6%) i.e. 29 of the 64 respondents indicated that they have a positive switching intention, while 39% (23.4%+15.6%) i.e. 25 of the 64 respondents indicated that they have a negative switching intention (refer to section 3.4.4). Hence, it can be concluded that 45.3% of the existing customers of ethnic Indian restaurants in Helsinki has positive switching intention.
Figure 14: Respondents’ rating on the probability of their switching

Switching Intention
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- Extremely Likely: 15.6%
- Likely: 29.7%
- Unlikely: 23.4%
- Neutral: 15.6%
5 Discussion and Conclusion

The chapter presents discussions and arguments to support the major findings of the study, focuses validity and reliability issues and ethical issues, and finally ends with conclusion and recommendations.

5.1 Consideration of the results

The theoretical framework adopted in the study indicates that switching intention is the product of the combined impact of push, pull, and mooring variables (see Figure 1). Therefore, the finding from the survey that 45.3% of the existing customers of ethnic Indian restaurants in Helsinki has positive switching intention must be the product of the combined impact of the push, pull, and mooring variables used in the study (refer to section 4.5). This finding is considered as the principal finding of the study. Rest of the discussion on the findings from the survey in this chapter orbits around to justify the principal finding. Hence, the rest of the discussion evaluates making up of the net portion of the existing customers with positive switching intention (45.3%) by the influences of the three types of variables of the study i.e. push, pull, and mooring variables.

In the service sector, push factors are those negative factors that push consumers away from existing service provider. Hence, addressing them would help restaurants to retain existing customers or attract switchers from other restaurants. Among the three push factors considered in the study, the findings revealed that ‘service quality’ plays the dominant role in creating switching intention among existing customers followed by food quality and price (see Figure 15 below) (refer to section 4.2). Therefore, service quality should be given preference by new ethnic Indian restaurants over the other two push factors in devising marketing policies to attract existing customers with positive switching intention as well as new customers followed by food quality and price. As service quality is defined as physical environment and services rendered by employees in the context of the current study, new restaurants should offer better physical environment and services rendered by employees than their competitors. However in reality, food quality is the most important reason why customers return to a restaurant (Soriano, 2002). Therefore, giving less importance to the factor that define the very existence of a restaurant especially by new restaurants is not justifiable. Hence it is advised that both food quality and service quality be given equal importance.
The pull factors are those appealing attributes that attract customers to alternative service providers. The sole pull factor of the study ‘alternative attractiveness’ is associated with the concept of service augmentation which involves differentiating services by adding extras, but not lot of extras so as to attract customers. Findings from the survey revealed that the sole pull factor of the study ‘alternative attractiveness’ plays even greater role than the push factors in creating switching intention among existing customers of ethnic Indian restaurants in Helsinki as is evident from the finding that 31.2% of the existing customers are attracted towards alternative ethnic Indian restaurants (see section 4.3). This means that new restaurants can attract 31.2% of the existing customers by offering differentiated services with extras. However, further studies are required to understand the type of differentiation required to attract the existing customers with switching intention.

Among the three mooring factors considered, social norm towards switching has lesser significance than the other two as it plays more of a passive role in creating switching intention specially in dining out alone scenario. In group dining out scenario, however, partners’ preferences of restaurant may eventually influence a customer to have positive switching intention. In this scenario, a consumer acts more like a refugee i.e. consumer who is forced to switch. On the other hand, creation of switching intention directly by attitude towards switching or by variety-seeking tendency is a commonplace. As attitude is the sum of products of beliefs an individual has about outcomes of a given behaviour and the individual’s evaluations of the outcomes as good or bad, if a customer firmly believes that switching restaurant service provider is good or favourable for him, he may switch.

![Figure 15: Comparison of Switching Intention Created by Push Variables](chart)

The pull factors are those appealing attributes that attract customers to alternative service providers. The sole pull factor of the study ‘alternative attractiveness’ is associated with the concept of service augmentation which involves differentiating services by adding extras, but not lot of extras so as to attract customers. Findings from the survey revealed that the sole pull factor of the study ‘alternative attractiveness’ plays even greater role than the push factors in creating switching intention among existing customers of ethnic Indian restaurants in Helsinki as is evident from the finding that 31.2% of the existing customers are attracted towards alternative ethnic Indian restaurants (see section 4.3). This means that new restaurants can attract 31.2% of the existing customers by offering differentiated services with extras. However, further studies are required to understand the type of differentiation required to attract the existing customers with switching intention.

Among the three mooring factors considered, social norm towards switching has lesser significance than the other two as it plays more of a passive role in creating switching intention specially in dining out alone scenario. In group dining out scenario, however, partners’ preferences of restaurant may eventually influence a customer to have positive switching intention. In this scenario, a consumer acts more like a refugee i.e. consumer who is forced to switch. On the other hand, creation of switching intention directly by attitude towards switching or by variety-seeking tendency is a commonplace. As attitude is the sum of products of beliefs an individual has about outcomes of a given behaviour and the individual’s evaluations of the outcomes as good or bad, if a customer firmly believes that switching restaurant service provider is good or favourable for him, he may switch.
even with complete disregard to other factors. Variety-seeking tendency may also inspire a customer to switch much in the same fashion in search of variety of products. It should always be recalled that pursuit of variety often indulges a consumer not only to switch away from the recently consumed brand, but also from the brand(s) the consumer will switch to (Bansal et al., 2005). Customers with variety-seeking tendency often act like nomads i.e. consumers who have the habit of moving from one service providers to another and people with multi-residence i.e. polygamous buyers.

Findings reveal that the mooring factors play even greater role than the push and pull factors in creating switching intention among existing customers of ethnic Indian restaurants in Helsinki. Survey results indicated that the mooring variables of attitude towards switching, social norm towards switching, and variety-seeking tendency are responsible for the creation of positive switching intention among 48.4%, 50%, and 54.7% of the existing customers of ethnic Indian restaurants respectively (refer to section 4.4). Data show that ‘variety seeking tendency’ plays the greatest role in creating positive switching intention among the three mooring variables considered in the study (see Figure 16 below).

![Figure 16: Comparison of Switching Intention Created by Mooring Variables](image)

Among all the seven variables considered in the study, it is seen that the push factor ‘price’ creates the lowest switching intention among the existing customers of ethnic Indian restaurants in Helsinki in gross, while the mooring factor ‘variety seeking tendency’ creates the highest switching intention (see Figure 17 below). ‘Gross switching intention'
is the total of ‘strong switching intention’ and ‘moderate switching intention’. ‘Variety seeking tendency’ leads in creating ‘gross switching intention’ among the existing customers of ethnic Indian restaurants in Helsinki (54.7%) followed by ‘social-norm towards switching’ (50%), ‘attitude towards switching’ (48.4%), ‘alternative attractiveness’ (31.2%), ‘service quality’ (29.7%), ‘food quality’ (21.8%), and ‘price’ (20.3%) (See Figure 17 below). ‘Variety seeking tendency’ also leads in creating ‘moderate switching intention’ (46.9%) followed by ‘attitude towards switching’ (34.4%), ‘social norm towards switching’ (31.2%), ‘alternative attractiveness’ (23.4%), ‘service quality’ (20.3%), ‘food quality’ (14%), and ‘price’ (12.5%). While, ‘social norm towards switching’ leads in creating ‘strong switching intention’ (18.8%) followed by ‘attitude towards switching’ (14%), ‘service quality’ (9.4%), and 4 other factors each of which influences 7.8% of the existing customers to have ‘strong switching intention’. It should be noted that ‘strong switching intention’ has stronger resistance to the effect of customer retention policies adopted by organisations than ‘moderate switching intention’. Therefore, the customers with ‘strong switching intention’ than the customers with ‘moderate switching intention’ are more unlikely to give in to customer retention initiatives of their currently preferred restaurants or are more likely to be attracted by the marketing initiatives of new restaurants.

Figure 17: Comparison of Switching Intention Created by Different Variables of the Study

The survey finding that 45.3% of the existing customers have positive switching intention is in between the lowest positive switching intention of 20.3% created by the push factor ‘price’ and the highest positive switching intention of 54.7% created by the mooring factor ‘variety-seeking tendency’. Therefore, it would be safe to conclude that 45.3% of the exist-
ing customers is most likely have been influenced to have switching intention by the combined impact of the factors discussed in the study. It should be also noted that 15.6% of the respondents rated the probability of their switching as ‘extremely likely’ which could be interpreted as 15.6% of the existing customers would switch no matter how their currently preferred restaurants try to retain them.

5.2 Validity and Reliability

Reliability in a research refers to the extent to which the adopted assessment tool in the research produces a stable and consistent result in studying the concerned phenomenon when they are applied in the same scenario repeatedly (Wilson 2010). The current research is a quantitative research and is based on the theoretical groundings of PPM model of service switching by Bansal et al. (2005) and related valid assumptions made in the study. Therefore, upon repetition, stable and consistent results will only be achieved if the same theoretical groundings and the same assumptions are applied in the similar context and with the same meaning and interpretation as applied the current thesis. Hence, the reliability of the research especially and largely depends on the validity of the assumptions made in the thesis.

However, ‘response effect’ bias poses a reasonable threat to the validity and reliability of the study. The data collected through survey represent the opinions of the respondents on relevant issues that have direct relation with measuring consumer intention. In collecting the data, no account was taken of the respondents’ mood while giving their responses in the current study. Therefore, the responses and evaluations provided by the respondents are not free from the ‘response effect’ bias. Response effects are factors that are responsible for deviating the reported responses from the true value of the variables under investigation (Bradburn and Sudman 1974). Cognitive psychologists have found that an individual's temporary mood state may influence the evaluations he/she makes (Heide and Gronhaug, 1991).

5.3 Ethical Consideration

The current study relied on the primary data collected from existing customers of ethnic Indian restaurants in Helsinki. Some of the data collected are personal data such as age, sex, ethnicity, occupation, etc. As personal data is involved in the study, they are required to be protected under most concerned laws in the developed countries. In the case of the current study, it is the Personal Data Act 1999 of Finland that has to be adhered to as far
as personal data is concerned. However, no names, addresses, phone numbers, or email or other electronic addresses were collected from the respondents that can identify the very respondents or trace back to them. Therefore, no risk is involved whatsoever in the current study relating to the exposure of personal data that can cause damage to the respondents in any way.

5.4 Conclusion and Recommendation

The information derived from the current study can be input into the overall marketing plan of new ethnic Indian restaurants in Helsinki in devising strategy to attract existing customers. As the author of the study has active intention of launching a new ethnic Indian restaurant in Helsinki, the information will serve in his marketing planning.

Among the push, pull, and mooring factors considered in the study, it should be noted that only the impact of the push factors could be influenced or controlled to some degree by the restaurants, while the impacts of the other factors are at the discretion of the customers. Reason for why the push factors can be controlled is that they are directly related with the operations of restaurants; while the other factors have relationship with the customers' cognitive and other psychological processes over which the restaurants could exercise no direct control. Therefore, it is advised that any new ethnic Indian restaurant should exclusively consider the implications of the push factors into their overall marketing strategy towards existing customers of ethnic Indian restaurants. It is recommended that they attract the existing customers with positive switching intention with better food quality and better service quality through differentiation. For that further studies are required to understand the kind of differentiation needed to attract the customers. As for ‘price’, it is up to the management of new restaurants to decide whether they want to attract customers with lower price expectation or they are targeting higher income group.

End of the Thesis
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Appendices

Appendix 1: Questionnaire

1. Gender?
   - Male
   - Female
   - Other

2. Age?
   - ☐ 16-25
   - ☐ 26-34
   - ☐ 35-44
   - ☐ 45-54
   - ☐ 55-64
   - ☐ 65+

3. Ethnicity?
   - ☐ Finish
   - ☐ European
   - ☐ Asian (Indian/Bangladeshi/Pakistani)
   - ☐ African
   - ☐ Other (Please specify ............................)

4. Occupation?
   - ☐ Full-time
   - ☐ Self-employed
   - ☐ Student
   - ☐ Student and part-time work
   - ☐ Part-time
   - ☐ Retired
   - ☐ Unemployed
   - ☐ Other (Please specify ............................)

5. Which income category you belong to (€)?
   - ☐ Upper Income
   - ☐ Upper Middle Income
   - ☐ Lower Middle Income
   - ☐ Lower Income

6. Do you permanently live in Helsinki?
   - ☐ Yes
   - ☐ No

7. To what extent you are satisfied with the food quality of your preferred ethnic Indian restaurant.
   - Very dissatisfied
   - Dissatisfied
   - ☐ Unsure
   - ☐ Satisfied
   - ☐ Very satisfied

8. To what extent you are satisfied with the service quality of your preferred ethnic Indian restaurant.
   - Very dissatisfied
   - Dissatisfied
   - ☐ Unsure
   - ☐ Satisfied
   - ☐ Very satisfied

9. Price charged for food & services at your preferred ethnic Indian restaurant is fair relative to the market.
   - Strongly disagree
   - Disagree
   - ☐ Unsure
   - ☐ Agree
   - ☐ Strongly agree

10. All in all, new restaurant would be much fairer than my preferred ethnic Indian restaurant and I would be much more satisfied with their services.
    - Strongly disagree
    - Disagree
    - ☐ Unsure
    - ☐ Agree
    - ☐ Strongly agree

11. For me, switching from my preferred ethnic Indian restaurant to a new restaurant in future would be:
    - Very undesirable
    - Undesirable
    - ☐ Neutral
    - Desirable
    - ☐ Very desirable

For the following statements cross (x) the box that matches your view most closely:
12. People I care about would approve my switching from my currently preferred ethnic Indian restaurant to a new ethnic Indian restaurant.
   - Strongly disagree
   - Disagree
   - Unsure
   - Agree
   - Strongly agree

13. I am open to try different Indian/Pakistani/Bangladeshi ethnic foods offered by new restaurant.
   - Strongly disagree
   - Disagree
   - Unsure
   - Agree
   - Strongly agree

14. Rate the probability that you would switch from your existing Indian restaurant to a new Indian restaurant in the future:
   - Extremely unlikely
   - Unlikely
   - Neutral
   - Likely
   - Extremely likely
## Appendix 2 Questionnaire Responses

### Table A1: Demographic Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56-65</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above 65</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finnish</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other European</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student and part-time work</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unemployed (Housewife)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>Annual Income (€)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower income</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower middle income</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper middle income</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper income</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>Resident of Helsinki</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table A2: Respondents’ Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction of Food Quality and Service Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied (a)</th>
<th>Dissatisfied (b)</th>
<th>Unsure (c)</th>
<th>Satisfied (d)</th>
<th>Very Satisfied (e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.7</td>
<td>Satisfaction/ Dissatisfaction with Food Quality</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gross Satisfaction (a+b); (d+e)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.8</td>
<td>Satisfaction/ Dissatisfaction with Service Quality</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gross Satisfaction/ Dissatisfaction (a+b); (d+e)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table A3: Respondents’ Agreement/Disagreement on Different Statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (a)</th>
<th>Disagree (b)</th>
<th>Unsure (c)</th>
<th>Agree (d)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.9</td>
<td>Price charged for food &amp; services at your preferred ethnic Indian restaurant is fair relative to the market.</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gross Disagreement/ Agreement (a+b); (d+e)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.10</td>
<td>All in all, new restaurant would be much fairer than my preferred ethnic Indian restaurant and I would be much more satisfied with their services.</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gross Disagreement/ Agreement (a+b); (d+e)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.12</td>
<td>People I care about would approve my switching from my currently preferred ethnic Indian restaurant to a new ethnic Indian restaurant.</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gross Disagreement/ Agreement (a+b); (d+e)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.13</td>
<td>I am open to try different Indian/Pakistan/Bangladesh ethnic foods offered by new restaurant.</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gross Disagreement/ Agreement (a+b); (d+e)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table A4: Respondents on switching attitude

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Very Desirable (a)</th>
<th>Desirable (b)</th>
<th>Neutral (c)</th>
<th>Undesirable (d)</th>
<th>Very Undesirable (e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.11</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gross Positive/ Negative Switching Attitudes (Pro-switching: a+b); (Against switching: d+e)</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table A5: Respondents on switching intention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Extremely Likely (a)</th>
<th>Likely (b)</th>
<th>Neutral (c)</th>
<th>Unlikely (d)</th>
<th>Extremely Unlikely (e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.14</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gross Positive/Negative Switching Intention (Pro-switching: a+b); (Against switching: d+e)</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>