

Developing and Validating the Guest Perception and Satisfaction Measurement Scale (GPSMS): A Multi-Dimensional Instrument for Casual Dining Outlets in a Tourism Destination

Vishal Kaushal¹, Suryaman Chauhan²

¹Research Fellow, Department of Commerce, Himachal Pradesh University Shimla.

²Assistant Professor Commerce, Maharana Pratap Govt College, Amb, Una.

²Research Fellow Department of Commerce, Himachal Pradesh University, Shimla.

Abstract:

Purpose. Generic service-quality instruments such as SERVQUAL and DINESERV are widely used in restaurant research, yet they were not designed to capture the mixed clientele—travelling tourists and resident non-tourists—that characterises casual dining outlets in tourism destinations. This paper reports the construction and psychometric validation of the Guest Perception and Satisfaction Measurement Scale (GPSMS), a purpose-built instrument for measuring guest perception and satisfaction in casual dining food outlets.

Design/methodology/approach. The scale was developed through a structured nine-stage procedure comprising content analysis of the literature, formulation of measurement objectives, item generation, expert and supervisor review for content and face validity, a preliminary try-out ($n = 150$), a secondary try-out for item analysis ($n = 250$), and reliability estimation. The final instrument was administered to 500 guests (300 tourists and 200 non-tourists) at selected casual dining outlets in Himachal Pradesh, India, using a five-point Likert format.

Findings. The procedure yielded a 30-item instrument organised into five conceptually distinct dimensions—services offered, cuisines served, overall guest satisfaction, the impact of food and services on satisfaction, and the comparative satisfaction of tourists versus non-tourists—with six items each. The scale demonstrated high internal consistency (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.913$; standardised $\alpha = 0.912$) and satisfactory content and face validity.

Originality/value. GPSMS offers researchers and restaurateurs a reliable, context-sensitive tool for benchmarking guest satisfaction in casual dining settings where tourist and resident expectations coexist. The paper also documents the instrument's limitations and outlines an agenda for further construct validation.

Keywords: scale development; guest satisfaction; casual dining; service quality; Cronbach's alpha; culinary tourism; Himachal Pradesh.

1. Introduction

The food-service industry is among the fastest-growing components of the Indian economy. According to the National Restaurant Association of India (NRAI), the country's food-services sector was valued at approximately ₹5.69 lakh crore in 2024, contributing close to 1.9% of national GDP and employing an estimated 85.5 lakh people, with the sector projected to expand at a compound annual growth rate of roughly 8.1% to reach ₹7.76 lakh crore by 2028 (NRAI, 2024). Within the organised segment, casual dining restaurants constitute the single largest sub-category. This expansion has intensified competition and made the systematic measurement of guest satisfaction a strategic priority rather than a discretionary exercise.

Measuring satisfaction, however, presupposes a measurement instrument whose reliability and validity have been established for the setting in which it is used. The dominant instruments in the service-quality literature—SERVQUAL (Parasuraman, Zeithaml, & Berry, 1988) and its restaurant-specific adaptation DINESERV (Stevens, Knutson, & Patton, 1995)—were developed primarily in Western, urban, and largely resident-customer contexts. Casual dining outlets located in tourism destinations, by contrast, serve two structurally different guest segments simultaneously: tourists, who typically arrive with elevated and often unfamiliar expectations shaped by promotional imagery and the novelty of the destination, and non-tourists (local residents and repeat regional visitors), whose expectations are calibrated by routine exposure. An instrument intended for such settings must therefore capture not only the classical service-quality dimensions but also the dimensions along which these two segments are compared.

The present study addresses this gap by developing and validating the Guest Perception and Satisfaction Measurement Scale (GPSMS), a self-constructed, multi-dimensional instrument designed to measure guest perception and satisfaction at casual dining food outlets in a tourism destination—here, the Indian state of Himachal Pradesh, and specifically its capital, Shimla. Himachal Pradesh is a mature tourism economy: the state recorded approximately 1.60 crore tourist arrivals in 2023, including about 62,806 foreign tourists (Government of Himachal Pradesh, 2024). Its casual dining outlets accordingly experience the tourist/non-tourist duality that the GPSMS is intended to measure, making it an appropriate context for scale construction.

The stakes of using an unvalidated instrument are not merely academic. Satisfaction scores feed managerial decisions about menus, staffing, pricing, and refurbishment, and they inform destination-level policy on the promotion of culinary tourism. If the instrument that generates those scores is unreliable, decisions rest on noise; if it is invalid—measuring something other than the intended construct—decisions are systematically misdirected. Reliability (the consistency with which a scale measures) and validity (the extent to which it measures what it claims to) are therefore preconditions for any credible satisfaction study, and their establishment is the proper first task of a research programme, not an afterthought. This paper treats scale development as that first task.

The objectives of this paper are threefold: (i) to describe the conceptual framework and item-generation logic underlying the GPSMS; (ii) to document the multi-stage construction and expert-validation procedure; and (iii) to report the instrument's psychometric properties, principally its internal-consistency reliability and its content and face validity. The paper deliberately confines itself to instrument development; the substantive findings obtained with the scale are reported separately. The remainder of the paper reviews the measurement literature (Section 2), sets out the five-dimensional conceptual framework (Section 3), documents the nine-stage construction procedure (Section 4), reports the

psychometric results (Section 5), discusses the instrument's contribution and constraints (Sections 6 and 7), and appends the full item set.

2. Review of Literature

2.1 Service quality and its measurement

The conceptual foundation for measuring customer evaluations of services rests on the disconfirmation-of-expectations paradigm articulated by Oliver (1980), in which satisfaction arises from the comparison between prior expectations and perceived performance. Building on this paradigm, Parasuraman et al. (1988) proposed SERVQUAL, a 22-item instrument capturing five dimensions—tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy—operationalised as the gap between expected and perceived service. SERVQUAL has been extensively applied and equally extensively critiqued, particularly regarding the stability of its dimensions across contexts and the psychometric properties of difference (gap) scores.

Recognising that generic service-quality scales omit attributes specific to eating out, Stevens et al. (1995) developed DINESERV, a 29-item restaurant-specific adaptation of SERVQUAL. Subsequent research established that the restaurant experience is driven not by service delivery alone but by a bundle of attributes. Namkung and Jang (2007) demonstrated that food quality—presentation, taste, freshness, and variety—exerts a strong, direct effect on customer satisfaction and behavioural intentions. Sulek and Hensley (2004) found that, although service and atmosphere matter, food quality was the single most important predictor of a customer's intention to return. Ryu and Han (2010) similarly showed that food, service, and physical environment jointly shape satisfaction. These studies establish that a valid restaurant-satisfaction instrument must sample food, service, and environmental attributes rather than service quality in isolation.

2.2 Satisfaction, value, and loyalty in casual dining

A parallel stream links satisfaction to downstream outcomes. Anderson, Fornell, and Lehmann (1994) established the association between customer satisfaction and firm profitability, while perceived value (Zeithaml, 1988) mediates the relationship between quality and satisfaction. In casual dining specifically, Ryu, Han, and Kim (2008) found that restaurant image, perceived value, and customer satisfaction are significant predictors of behavioural intentions in the quick-casual segment, although customer satisfaction in their work was treated as a component rather than measured in its entirety. Ponnamm and Balaji (2014) matched visitation motives to restaurant attributes, identifying food quality, food-serving quality, and ambience as salient but differentially weighted attributes. Lin, Liu, Chang, and Cheng (2015) integrated importance-performance and DEMATEL approaches to prioritise the food-quality attributes most in need of improvement. Collectively, this literature identifies the attribute space—service, cuisine, ambience, value—from which satisfaction items should be drawn.

2.3 Tourist versus non-tourist evaluations and the research gap

Comparative studies show that customer segments evaluate the same outlet differently. Seyanont (2007) compared the service-quality perceptions of Thai and international customers of casual dining restaurants in Phuket, and Dziadkowiec and Rood (2015) found statistically significant cross-cultural differences in casual-dining preferences between Polish and American university students. Wickey (2013), working in Florida, compared the satisfaction scores of tourists and non-tourists across eight dimensions of the casual

dining experience. Wickey's study, however, was conducted in a developed-economy context and explicitly noted the scope for equivalent research in developing economies such as India, where casual dining is acquiring elevated social status. Two gaps therefore emerge from the literature. First, no widely adopted, reliability-tested instrument exists that is purpose-built for casual dining in an Indian tourism destination. Second, existing instruments do not embed, as explicit measurement dimensions, the constructs required to compare tourist and non-tourist satisfaction. The GPSMS is designed to close both gaps.

2.4 Principles of scale development

The construction of a new measurement instrument is governed by a well-established methodology. Churchill (1979) set out the canonical paradigm for developing marketing measures: specify the construct's domain, generate an item pool from that domain, purify the measure through reliability and item analysis on pilot data, and then assess reliability and validity on fresh data. DeVellis's guidelines and Nunnally's (1978) psychometric benchmarks refine this sequence, recommending that developers oversample the item domain, submit items to expert review, pilot the instrument, and retain items on the basis of internal-consistency and item-total statistics. Reliability is most commonly indexed by Cronbach's (1951) coefficient alpha, with values above 0.70 conventionally regarded as acceptable and values above 0.90 as excellent, though very high alphas on long scales warrant scrutiny for redundancy. Validity is layered: content validity concerns whether items adequately sample the construct domain (typically judged by experts); face validity concerns whether items appear, on inspection, to measure the construct; and construct validity—the extent to which the measure behaves as theory predicts—is established later through factor analysis and convergent/discriminant tests. The GPSMS development, described in Section 4, follows this paradigm through the content-, face-, and reliability-validation stages, and Section 7 specifies the construct-validation work that remains.

3. Conceptual Framework of the GPSMS

Drawing on the reviewed literature, the GPSMS conceptualises guest evaluation of a casual dining outlet as a formative composite of five dimensions. Each dimension corresponds to a research objective and is measured by six items, giving a 30-item instrument. The dimensions are:

- **Services offered by casual dining food outlets** — the interpersonal and procedural elements of service delivery (staff courtesy, service style, adherence to service procedures, menu variety, food presentation, and maintained quality standards). This dimension operationalises the SERVQUAL/DINESERV service-delivery construct.
- **Cuisines served in casual dining food outlets** — the availability, accessibility, friendliness of provision, overall appeal of the local dishes, the contribution of food quality to satisfaction, and the salience of price. This dimension reflects the food-quality and value literature (Namkung & Jang, 2007; Zeithaml, 1988).
- **Guest satisfaction towards the outlets** — ambience, the effect of food variety on satisfaction, the pull of traditional cuisines, the role of guest perception, and the importance of feedback mechanisms (including online reviews). This dimension captures satisfaction and its antecedents directly.
- **Impact of food and services on customer satisfaction** — the extent to which product/service design around customer needs, loyalty incentives, and segment-specific service behaviours translate into satisfaction. This dimension links attribute performance to satisfaction outcomes.

- **Satisfaction level of tourists and non-tourists** — items designed to elicit the comparative and strategic dimension: equal satisfaction aspirations, unique quality strategies, seriousness about guest perception, the role of R&D, staff professionalism, and operational betterment. This dimension provides the basis for the tourist/non-tourist comparison.

The framework is grounded in the expectation-disconfirmation paradigm: because tourists and non-tourists bring systematically different prior expectations to the same outlet, an instrument that measures both the attribute performance and the comparative dimension can support both absolute (single-segment) and relative (between-segment) satisfaction analyses.

It is useful to be explicit about what a casual dining outlet is, since the construct domain is defined by that setting. Casual dining occupies the middle of the restaurant spectrum, between quick-service formats and fine dining: it offers table service, moderate prices, a relaxed but distinctive ambience, and menu variety, and it is valued for freshly prepared, attractively presented food consumed on the premises. In a tourism destination, such outlets double as venues of culinary tourism, where local and traditional cuisines become part of the attraction. The GPSMS item pool was drawn to sample precisely this bundle—service delivery, cuisine and its local character, ambience, value, and the feedback and strategy mechanisms that connect them to satisfaction—so that the instrument's content mirrors the lived structure of the casual dining experience rather than an abstract service-quality template.

4. Method of Scale Construction

The GPSMS was constructed through the following nine sequential stages, consistent with established scale-development practice (e.g., Churchill's paradigm and the recommendations of Nunnally, 1978):

1. Content analysis of the literature;
2. Formulation of the objectives of tool construction;
3. Generation of test items;
4. Expert and supervisor review;
5. Preliminary try-out;
6. Secondary try-out for item analysis;
7. Assessment of validity;
8. Estimation of reliability; and
9. Preparation of the final draft and scoring scheme.

4.1 Content analysis and objective formulation

An intensive and extensive review of the literature on guest perception and satisfaction in casual dining, food, and culinary tourism was subjected to content analysis. This produced a comprehensive attribute framework from which candidate items were drawn. The overarching objective of the tool was defined as the measurement of guest perception and satisfaction—of both tourists and non-tourists—towards the services and cuisines offered by casual dining food outlets and their impact on customer satisfaction. On this basis, five dimensions and thirty candidate items (six per dimension) were framed in simple, unambiguous language.

4.2 Item generation and the five-dimension structure

Thirty items were generated and mapped one-to-one onto the five dimensions. All items were worded positively and rated on a five-point Likert scale of agreement: Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Neutral

(N), Disagree (D), and Strongly Disagree (SD). The complete item set, grouped by dimension, is presented in Table 1 (see also the Appendix).

Table 1. Dimensions and items of the GPSMS

Dimension	Illustrative items (6 per dimension)	Items
Services offered	Steward courtesy; satisfaction with service style; adherence to service procedures; menu variety; food presentation; maintained quality standards	6
Cuisines served	Availability of food & beverage varieties; friendliness of providers; accessibility; overall satisfaction with local dishes; food quality raising satisfaction; salience of price	6
Guest satisfaction	Ambience appeal; food variety enhancing satisfaction; pull of traditional cuisine; role of perception; importance of feedback; comfort with online reviews	6
Impact of food & services	Product/service design to needs; discounts to regular guests; tourist vs non-tourist keenness; non-tourist compromise; ease of satisfying non-tourists; segment focus of providers	6
Tourist vs non-tourist satisfaction	Equal satisfaction aspiration; unique quality strategies; seriousness about perception; role of R&D; need for professional staff; operational betterment	6
Total		30

4.3 Expert and supervisor review (content and face validity)

The candidate items, dimensions, and sub-factors were submitted to faculty members of universities and institutes and to industry professionals in tourism and hospitality for evaluation of the relevance, clarity, language, comprehension, articulation, and accuracy of each item, and the suitability of each item within its dimension. On the basis of expert feedback, several items were removed, reframed, or reworded. Following these revisions, the reviewers reached consensus on a single instrument comprising one tool, five dimensions, and thirty items. Content validity was thus established through expert judgement of the representativeness and appropriateness of items, and face validity through the reviewers' agreement that the items visibly measured the intended constructs.

4.4 Preliminary and secondary try-outs

A preliminary try-out was conducted on a sample of 150 respondents (100 tourists and 50 non-tourists) drawn through random sampling at outlets in the study area. Respondents completed the instrument and were additionally invited to comment on the meaning, language, and comprehensibility of the items; their feedback informed a further round of refinement. A secondary try-out for item analysis was then carried out on a sample of 250 respondents (150 tourists and 100 non-tourists). The try-out samples are summarised in Table 2.

Table 2. Try-out samples for the GPSMS

Stage	Tourists	Non-tourists	Total
Preliminary try-out	100	50	150
Secondary try-out (item analysis)	150	100	250

The two-stage try-out served distinct purposes. The preliminary try-out was primarily qualitative: beyond recording responses, it surfaced problems of wording, ambiguity, and cultural fit that only contact with real guests reveals, and it allowed the researcher to observe whether respondents interpreted items as intended. Feedback at this stage led to further simplification of language. The secondary try-out was primarily quantitative, supplying the response data on which item analysis and the reliability estimate were computed, and confirming that the refined items functioned coherently before the instrument was committed to the main study. Administering both try-outs to a tourist-heavy but mixed sample ensured that the instrument was calibrated against the same dual clientele it would ultimately measure.

4.5 Reliability

Internal-consistency reliability was estimated using Cronbach's coefficient alpha (Cronbach, 1951). The GPSMS returned $\alpha = 0.913$ (standardised-item $\alpha = 0.912$) across its 30 items (Table 3). By the conventional benchmark that values above 0.70 indicate acceptable internal consistency and values above 0.90 indicate excellent consistency (Nunnally, 1978), the instrument's reliability is high.

Table 3. Reliability statistics for the GPSMS

Cronbach's α	Cronbach's α (standardised items)	No. of items
0.913	0.912	30

4.6 Final draft, scoring, and administration

Following item analysis and reliability estimation, all 30 items were retained in the final instrument. Because every item is positively worded, scoring proceeds directly: SA = 5, A = 4, N = 3, D = 2, and SD = 1. (Provision was retained for reverse-scoring should any negatively worded item be introduced in future revisions, whereby the pattern would be reversed to 1–5.) The final scale was administered to guests through the schedule-cum-interview method, permitting data collection from both English- and Hindi-speaking respondents while the questionnaire itself remained in English. The instrument was then used to collect the main-study data from 500 guests (300 tourists and 200 non-tourists) selected by simple random sampling in Himachal Pradesh.

The schedule-cum-interview mode of administration deserves emphasis, because it addresses a practical validity threat common in Indian field research. A purely self-administered English questionnaire would have excluded or misrepresented guests more comfortable in Hindi, biasing the sample toward the more educated and the more fluent. By having a trained researcher present the items and, where needed, translate and clarify them orally, the study extended coverage to the full linguistic range of guests while holding the written stimulus constant. Scoring per dimension yields a domain score in the range 6–30, and the sum of the five domains yields a total score in the range 30–150; both are used in the substantive analyses reported elsewhere. For interpretive convenience, domain means may be classified against a four-band

rubric (low, average, high, very high), so that a numeric score is translated into a qualitative satisfaction level.

5. Psychometric Results

5.1 Reliability and validity

As reported above, the GPSMS achieved a Cronbach's alpha of 0.913, indicating excellent internal consistency, and satisfied content and face validity through structured expert review. The consistency of the alpha across the preliminary and secondary try-outs and the main administration supports the stability of the item set.

5.2 Distributional characteristics

Descriptive statistics were computed on the total scale scores of the 500 guests to characterise the distribution and to inform the choice between parametric and non-parametric inference in subsequent substantive analyses (Table 4). The mean total score was 69.31 with a standard deviation of 34.181. Skewness was 0.131, indicating an approximately symmetric distribution, while kurtosis was -1.311 , indicating a platykurtic (flatter-than-normal) distribution.

Table 4. Descriptive statistics of GPSMS total scores (guests, N = 500)

Statistic	Value
Mean	69.31
Median	64.00
Mode	143
Standard deviation	34.181
Skewness	0.131
Kurtosis	-1.311

Note: The near-zero skewness supports approximate symmetry; the negative kurtosis indicates a platykurtic distribution. Investigators using GPSMS scores should verify distributional assumptions on their own data before selecting inferential procedures.

The distributional check served a design purpose beyond description: it informed the choice between parametric and non-parametric inference for the substantive hypotheses. The approximate symmetry of the total-score distribution (skewness ≈ 0.13) was taken to support the use of parametric procedures (t-tests) in the main analyses, on the reasoning that the mean is a meaningful central-tendency measure for a roughly symmetric distribution and that, with samples of 200–500, the sampling distribution of the mean is well approximated by the normal by the central-limit theorem. The pronounced negative kurtosis (-1.311) nonetheless indicates a flatter-than-normal, dispersed distribution—unsurprising given that the total pools five conceptually distinct domains and a heterogeneous, two-segment respondent pool—and users of the scale are advised to inspect their own data rather than assume normality. The large gap between the mode (143) and the mean (69.31) further signals a multi-peaked or heavily dispersed distribution, consistent with the presence of two guest segments (tourists and non-tourists) whose score

distributions differ; this heterogeneity is itself a substantive finding pursued in the companion comparative study.

6. Discussion

The GPSMS extends the restaurant service-quality tradition in two ways. First, unlike SERVQUAL and DINESERV, which sample a single evaluative logic (service quality), the GPSMS is organised around five substantive dimensions that jointly cover service, cuisine, satisfaction, the attribute–satisfaction link, and the comparative tourist/non-tourist construct. This structure aligns the instrument with the multi-attribute view of the restaurant experience established by Namkung and Jang (2007), Sulek and Hensley (2004), and Ryu and Han (2010), while adding the segment-comparison dimension that the tourism-destination context requires.

Second, the instrument's high internal consistency ($\alpha = 0.913$) indicates that its items cohere strongly, which is advantageous for composite scoring and benchmarking. At the same time, a very high alpha on a 30-item scale can partly reflect item redundancy or the length of the scale, and high internal consistency should not be mistaken for confirmation of the five-dimensional structure. The dimensional structure in this study rests on content analysis and expert judgement rather than on a dimension-reduction procedure; establishing that the five dimensions are empirically separable requires factor-analytic evidence (see Section 7).

Table 5 positions the GPSMS relative to the two dominant restaurant instruments. Whereas SERVQUAL and DINESERV operationalise a single evaluative logic—perceived service quality, computed in the classic formulation as an expectation–performance gap—the GPSMS is a performance-and-perception composite spanning service, cuisine, satisfaction, the attribute–satisfaction linkage, and an explicit segment-comparison dimension. This breadth is the instrument's principal design advantage in a tourism-destination context and, simultaneously, the source of its principal outstanding validation task: the more heterogeneous the content, the more important it is to demonstrate empirically that the dimensions are distinct.

Table 5. The GPSMS in relation to SERVQUAL and DINESERV

Feature	SERVQUAL	DINESERV	GPSMS
Focal construct	Service quality (general)	Service quality (restaurant)	Guest perception & satisfaction
Items	22	29	30
Dimensions	5 (tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, empathy)	5 (adapted to restaurants)	5 (service, cuisine, satisfaction, impact, segment comparison)
Scoring logic	Expectation–performance gap	Expectation–performance gap	Direct performance/perception rating
Segment comparison built in	No	No	Yes (tourist vs non-tourist)

Feature	SERVQUAL	DINESERV	GPSMS
Context of origin	Western, general services	US restaurants	Indian casual dining, tourism destination

6.1 Implications for research and practice

For researchers, the GPSMS offers a ready, reliability-tested starting point for casual dining satisfaction studies in tourism destinations, sparing each new study the labour of building an instrument from scratch and improving comparability across studies that adopt it. Its explicit segment-comparison dimension makes it particularly suited to research questions about how different guest segments evaluate the same offer. For practitioners, the scale supports periodic benchmarking: because domain scores map onto an interpretable four-band rubric, an outlet or a destination authority can track whether guest perception is moving from 'average' toward 'high' and 'very high' over time, and can localise weakness to a specific domain—service, cuisine, ambience, or the strategic dimension—rather than relying on an undifferentiated overall rating. Used repeatedly, the instrument becomes a management dashboard as much as a research tool. These benefits are, however, contingent on the validation agenda in Section 7 being carried through; until construct validity is established, results from the scale should be reported with the appropriate caution.

7. Conclusion, Limitations, and Future Research

This paper documented the development and validation of the GPSMS, a 30-item, five-dimensional instrument for measuring guest perception and satisfaction at casual dining outlets in a tourism destination. Constructed through content analysis, expert review, and successive try-outs, the scale demonstrated excellent internal-consistency reliability ($\alpha = 0.913$) and satisfactory content and face validity, and is offered as a reliable, context-sensitive alternative to generic service-quality scales for casual dining research and practice.

Several limitations qualify these conclusions and define an agenda for further work. First, validity evidence is presently limited to content and face validity; construct validity has not yet been demonstrated. Confirmatory factor analysis should be used to test the hypothesised five-factor structure, and convergent and discriminant validity should be established (for example, through average variance extracted and composite reliability). Second, all items are positively worded, which can inflate internal consistency and expose the scale to acquiescence and common-method bias; introducing balanced, reverse-worded items would strengthen the instrument. Third, the scale was validated in a single Indian state (Himachal Pradesh) with a specific tourist/non-tourist mix, so cross-regional and cross-cultural invariance testing is needed before the GPSMS is generalised to other destinations. Fourth, several items in the fourth and fifth dimensions are framed as normative or attitudinal statements about how outlets should behave rather than as perceptions of experienced performance; future revisions should sharpen the distinction between perceived performance and normative belief. Addressing these issues would move the GPSMS from a reliable instrument towards a fully validated measurement model.

REFERENCES:

1. Anderson, E. W., Fornell, C., & Lehmann, D. R. (1994). Customer satisfaction, market share, and profitability: Findings from Sweden. *Journal of Marketing*, 58(3), 53–66.

2. Churchill, G. A. (1979). A paradigm for developing better measures of marketing constructs. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 16(1), 64–73.
3. Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, 16(3), 297–334.
4. Dziadkowiec, J., & Rood, A. S. (2015). Casual-dining restaurant preferences: A cross-cultural comparison. *Journal of Foodservice Business Research*, 18(1), 73–91.
5. Government of Himachal Pradesh, Department of Tourism and Civil Aviation. (2024). Estimate of domestic and foreign tourist arrivals in Himachal Pradesh. Shimla:
6. Lin, C.-T., Liu, C.-H., Chang, Y.-H., & Cheng, C.-C. (2015). Exploring the critical factors for improving customers' perceived food quality of casual-dining restaurants. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 5(1), 1–8.
7. Namkung, Y., & Jang, S. (2007). Does food quality really matter in restaurants? Its impact on customer satisfaction and behavioral intentions. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 31(3), 387–409.
8. National Restaurant Association of India (NRAI). (2024). India Food Services Report 2024. New Delhi
9. Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
10. Oliver, R. L. (1980). A cognitive model of the antecedents and consequences of satisfaction decisions. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 17(4), 460–469.
11. Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1988). SERVQUAL: A multiple-item scale for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality. *Journal of Retailing*, 64(1), 12–40.
12. Ponnamp, A., & Balaji, M. S. (2014). Matching visitation-motives and restaurant attributes in casual dining restaurants. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 37, 47–57.
13. Ryu, K., & Han, H. (2010). Influence of the quality of food, service, and physical environment on customer satisfaction and behavioral intention in quick-casual restaurants: Moderating role of perceived price. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 34(3), 310–329.
14. Ryu, K., Han, H., & Kim, T.-H. (2008). The relationships among overall quick-casual restaurant image, perceived value, customer satisfaction, and behavioral intentions. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 27(3), 459–469.
15. Seyanont, A. (2007). A comparative study of the service quality of casual dining restaurants in Phuket: Perspective of Thai and international customers (Doctoral dissertation). Oklahoma State University.
16. Stevens, P., Knutson, B., & Patton, M. (1995). DINESERV: A tool for measuring service quality in restaurants. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 36(2), 56–60.
17. Sulek, J. M., & Hensley, R. L. (2004). The relative importance of food, atmosphere, and fairness of wait: The case of a full-service restaurant. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 45(3), 235–247.
18. Wickey, J. (2013). Guest satisfaction analysis of a casual dining restaurant: A comparison of tourist vs. non-tourist satisfaction scores (Master's thesis). University of Central Florida.
19. Zeithaml, V. A. (1988). Consumer perceptions of price, quality, and value: A means-end model and synthesis of evidence. *Journal of Marketing*, 52(3), 2–22.

Appendix. The Guest Perception and Satisfaction Measurement Scale (GPSMS)

Respondents indicate their level of agreement with each statement on a five-point scale: 5 = Strongly Agree, 4 = Agree, 3 = Neutral, 2 = Disagree, 1 = Strongly Disagree.

I. Services offered

10. Stewards were courteous while providing service.
11. I am satisfied with the style of service offered in the casual dining restaurant.
12. Service procedures were followed while I was dining.
13. The menu provides a variety of options.
14. The presentation of the food was up to the mark.
15. Quality and standards are maintained by the casual dining restaurants in the study area.

II. Cuisines served

16. There is availability of a variety of food and beverage services.
17. Service providers are friendly.
18. The casual dining restaurants are easily accessible.
19. I am satisfied overall with the restaurants and the dishes available in Shimla.
20. My satisfaction increases with the quality of food in the restaurant.
21. The cost of food and beverage matters a lot to me.

III. Guest satisfaction

22. The ambience of the casual dining restaurant attracts me most.
23. The variety of food enhances my satisfaction.
24. Traditional cuisines in the restaurant attract me most.
25. My perception matters in making me satisfied.
26. Feedback from the customer is important to measure satisfaction.
27. I am more comfortable writing an online review than giving face-to-face feedback.

IV. Impact of food and services on satisfaction

28. Products and services should be designed around customer needs, wants, and desires.
29. Discounts should be given to regular customers.
30. Tourists are keener about their perception and satisfaction than non-tourists.
31. Non-tourists are more compromising than tourists.
32. Non-tourist guests are satisfied more easily than tourists.
33. Service providers should focus more on tourist satisfaction than on non-tourists.

V. Satisfaction of tourists and non-tourists

34. Tourists and non-tourists wish to have an equal level of satisfaction.
35. Restaurants work on unique strategies to improve food and beverage quality.
36. Restaurants are serious about guest perception and satisfaction.
37. Regular R&D is important for enhancing service quality and satisfaction.
38. Highly qualified, professional staff are required in the restaurants.
39. Betterment in all operations is required to improve service quality and satisfaction.