www.ijprems.com
editor@ijprems.com

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF PROGRESSIVE RESEARCH IN ENGINEERING MANAGEMENT AND SCIENCE (IJPREMS)

Vol. 04, Issue 05, May 2024, pp: 2493-2506

e-ISSN : 2583-1062

Impact Factor: 5.725

A STUDY ON THE CHALLENGES FACED BY THE RESTAURANTS IN THE HYDERABAD REGION

K. Sridevi[1], Dr. Suchi Swetha Pradhan[2]

[1]Department of Management Studies KG Reddy College of Engineering and Technology,Chilkur, Moinabad,

Ranga Reddy District, Telangana, India.

[2]Associate Professor KG Reddy College of Engineering and Technology, Chilkur, Moinabad, Ranga Reddy District, Telangana, India.

DOI: https://www.doi.org/10.58257/IJPREMS34585

ABSTRACT

A restaurant, business is meant for preparing and serving food and drinks to the customers in exchange for money. Basically meals are taken and eaten at one place in terms of restaurants but in recent days we can see an innovative things in restaurants industry also that is food supply which means that a person can order the food from home and he can get what he wants form the delivery. Restaurants distinguish greatly in its appearance and offerings, including a wide variety of cuisines and service models from the range of inexpensive fast food restaurants and cafeterias to mid-priced family restaurants, to high-priced luxury establishments. This paper is fully focus on o Know the Major challenges faced by the restaurants in terms of demand, and know how they forecast the demand.

Keywords: Role of restaurants, demand and supply..

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 ORIGIN OF FOOD

Food is any type of nutritious substance that animals or people eat or drink or that plants will absorb in order to live and grow. Food contains carbohydrates, proteins, fats and supplements as vitamins and minerals as a source of energy for activities.

From the very past, human beings used to get food through two methods: one is hunting & gathering and the other is agriculture. But today, for the ever increasing population of the world the majority of the food that is consumed is supplied by the food industry.

The right to food is a human right derived from the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), recognizing the "right to an adequate standard of living, including adequate food", as well as the "fundamental right to be free from hunger".

Many cultures have recognizable dish or a cuisine, a specific set of cooking traditions where various spices or a combination of flavors unique to that culture are used, and also which evolved over the time. Some popular types of foods include Italian, Japanese, French, Indian, Chinese, Cajun, American, Thai, African, and Nepalese.

Food is usually eaten and typically enjoyed through the sense of taste, which is essentially necessary. Certain tastes of the past are more enjoyable than others, for determined purposes. Aesthetically pleasing which is attractive and eye-appealing presentation can drive the people to consume food. A common saying from the very old past is that these people "eat with their eyes". Food presented in a clean and appealing way which stimulates the appetite especially with the appearance and aroma will encourage a good flavor, even if it is unsatisfactory.

The term "cooking" include a vast range of tools, methods, and combinations of ingredients that are used to improve the flavor, taste or making the food easily digestible. Cooking technique, which can be also known as culinary art, generally requires the measurement, selection, and combination of ingredients in an orderly procedure which is an effort to get the desired result.

1.2 FOOD PROCESSING

Food processing means transforming agricultural products into food or one form of food into other forms. Food processing includes many forms of processing the foods such as grinding the grain to make flour for home cooking to complex industrial methods used to make convenience foods. Primary food processing makes most foods edible, and secondary food processing involves a process that turns the ingredients into familiar foods that can be directly consumed are used to make other forms of food and tertiary food processing involves processing secondary food that has been facing the criticism of promoting over nutrition and obesity, that containing too much of sugar and salt levels, too little fiber, and being unhealthful.

www.ijprems.com
editor@ijprems.com

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF PROGRESSIVE RESEARCH IN ENGINEERING MANAGEMENT AND SCIENCE (IJPREMS)

Vol. 04, Issue 05, May 2024, pp: 2493-2506

e-ISSN : 2583-1062

Impact Factor: 5.725

2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE

1. Frances Betty Fraikue (2016) in her study, "Reasons for Eating Out and Socio-Demographic Characteristics of Customers" stated that Dining out is a form of leisure time that is spent outside the household preparation. As more women are working outside the home for to support the family, eating out has increased with a lot of restaurants and thus, consumption of food outside the home has become a necessity. The primary objective of this study was to evaluate the reasons for eating out and secondary objective being to find the significant relationship between reasons for eating out and socio-demographic characteristics of customers and hence, found the reasons for eating out which include certain needs like physiological needs (for hunger), social needs (like occasions), esteem needs (for status purpose), convenience (to save time), business needs (for meetings) and health reasons (nutritious & nourishing food). According to her study, the other reasons include for eating out include variety in menu choice, women's involvement in workforce, influence by advertisements, sometimes when there is no other choice and during travelling. Moreover, the study determines there was no significant relationship between reasons for eating out and socio-demographic characteristics.
2. Vimal Chandra Verma & Devashish Das Gupta (2018) their study called "An Investigative Study of Factors Influencing Dining Out in Casual Restaurants among Young Consumers" focused on knowing the influencing factors for eating in restaurants especially referring the young consumer's attitude and preferences by conducting a survey in Lucknow, India. The aim of this study is to find the motivational factors for dining out considering the students as consumers who are dynamic in their taste and preferences and emerging group of consumers for restaurants. According to their study, the basic factors that influence young adults for consuming outside food were found to be store-oriented dinners, prudent dinners, seeking for fast-food, specialty dinners, social media savvy, cooking novices (not knowing how to cook), quality conscious dinner, food portion (quantity) seekers and culinary (washing dishes) dislike.
3. Epter (2009) in his study "Eating Out in Modern American Society: Why Do People Make the Choice to Eat outside the Home?" said that socialization is one of the common reasons to dine out. Later, he found special occasion as another most important reason followed by socializing with friends and relatives and also convenience as other reasons for dining out.
4. Y Prabhavathi, N T Krishna Kishore & M. Ramesh Kumar (2014) in their study, titled "Consumer Preferences and Spending Pattern in Indian Fast Food industry" stated that fast food industry is becoming a growing sector in food industry of Indian economy due to the reasons like growth in the nuclear families coming in numbers, increase in per capita income and economic growth as well as globalization. And the analysis on reasons behind the young consumers eating fast food revealed that taste is major reason followed by alternative to home cooked food and convenience as other factors. They even expressed that wider variety of menu and the relaxation provided by the outlets were the other reasons for which young consumers prefer to consume fast food. On the other end they found that young consumers are seeking for healthy food where they expect food which is home-cooked, more of vegetables ingredients and nutritious to suit their healthy lifestyle.

OBJECTIVES:

The major objective of the study is "To study the factors that impact the Young Adults to eat out".
The others objectives are:

- To extract the factors those influence the consumers' preferences to eat out.
- To study the demographic profile of consumers preferring to Eat-Out.
- To analyze the factors that impact young adults' preferences when they decide to eat out.

HYPOTHESIS OF THE STUDY:

Null Hypothesis:

- **H01:** There is a significant difference in the preferred reasons to eat outside food across the various demographic factors like gender, age, family size and occupation.
- **H02:** There is no significant relation between the determined factors and the choice of eating out.

Alternative Hypothesis:

- **H11:** There is no significant difference in the preferred reasons to eat outside food across the various demographic factors like gender, age, family size and occupation.
- **H22:** There is a significant relation between the determined factors and the choice of eating out.

www.ijprems.com
editor@ijprems.com

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF PROGRESSIVE RESEARCH IN ENGINEERING MANAGEMENT AND SCIENCE (IJPREMS)

Vol. 04, Issue 05, May 2024, pp: 2493-2506

e-ISSN : 2583-1062

Impact Factor: 5.725

3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Need For the Study

The study deals with the relation between young adults and their preferences towards consuming outside food rather than consuming home cooked food. Here, home cooked food means the food that is prepared in the home, outside food means the food that is available outside the premises of home and young adults mean the people ranging in age from their late teens or early twenties to their thirties. Formally people belonging to the age group of 18-35 will be called as young adults. India is a country which is having highest number of young adults in the world. In which, students being consumers are more dynamic and emerging group of consumers for outlets that provide food. Not only the group of young adults, but even the people of other age group are also consuming outside food more frequently.

Scope Of the Study:

The study was aimed to determine various reasons for which young adults prefer eating outside food rather than consuming home-cooked food and the demographics of these young adults and their influence on choosing to eat out confined to only Hyderabad region.

Data collection method:

- **DATA SOURCE:**
  In this study, both primary and secondary sources were used to collect the data. The primary data was collected through interview method by interviewing the respondents orally and also through survey method by e-mailing the questionnaire. The secondary data was collected from internet and journals.
- **SAMPLING SIZE:**
  The sample size chosen for this study was 120 respondents.
- **SAMPLING METHOD:**
- **RESEARCH TESTS:**

To analyze the data collected, following tests were used.

- Exploratory Factor Analysis
- One way ANOVA
- One sample T-test
- Regression

4 DATA ANALYSIS &INTERPRETATION

OBJECTIVE: To extract the factors those influence the consumers' preferences to eat out.

EXPLORATORY FACTOR ANALYSIS:

Factor analysis is a method of reducing the data into Factors. Data reduction will be done by converting the manifest (observed) variables into latent (unobservable) variables called as factors. This will be done by grouping the manifest variables based on their similarity of extraction value.

Here, there are 29 manifest variables concerned with preferences toward eating out.

KMO and Bartlett's Test		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.900
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	2274.315
	Df	406
	Sig.	.000

a) Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy – This measure varies between 0 and 1, and values closer to 1 are considered as better.
   Here, the value is .900 which shows a good sampling adequacy.

b) Bartlett's Test of Sphericity resulted in chi-square test value of 2274.315 with 406 degrees of freedom which indicates that null hypothesis can be rejected as there is no inter correlation among variables at 5% level of significance.

Communalities		
	Initial	Extraction
[I will prefer outside food when I don't know how to cook particular dish.]	1.000	.517
[I will prefer outside food when parents are out of town.]	1.000	.586
[I will prefer outside food when I'm lack of special appliances to prepare the dish.]	1.000	.666
[I will prefer outside food when the dish requires lot of utensils.]	1.000	.801
[I will prefer outside food when I am lack of some special ingredients.]	1.000	.758
[I will prefer outside food when I'm not feeling to cook.]	1.000	.654
[I will prefer outside food when I'm not able to spend time in cooking.]	1.000	.603
[I will prefer outside food when I am away from my home during lunchtime.]	1.000	.692
[I will prefer outside food when restaurants provide attractive offers.]	1.000	.723
[I will prefer outside food to reedeem unexpected free coupons.]	1.000	.692
[I will prefer outside food to spend time with friends.]	1.000	.613
[I will go restaurants to take selfies.]	1.000	.756
[I will prefer outside food when the restaurant is near to me.]	1.000	.698
[I will prefer outside food when home food is not tasty.]	1.000	.792
[I will prefer outside food when its quality is good.]	1.000	.759
[I will prefer outside food when its quantity is good.]	1.000	.726
[I will prefer going outside to eat for relaxation.]	1.000	.691
[I will prefer going outside to eat to feel the experience of restaurant services.]	1.000	.723
[I will prefer going outside to eat when the restaurant provide free Wi-Fi.]	1.000	.782
[I will prefer outside food when I feel bored with regular dishes in home.]	1.000	.696
[I will prefer outside food because I'm interested in experiencing new varieties.]	1.000	.635
[I will prefer outside food when I am affordable.]	1.000	.707
[I will prefer going to restaurants for celebrating occasions.]	1.000	.703
[I will prefer outside food when I fell sick.]	1.000	.571
[I will prefer outside food when I don't have energy to cook.]	1.000	.680
[I will prefer outside food when it is of reasonable price.]	1.000	.692
[I will prefer outside food when I am lack of no other suitable option.]	1.000	.749
[I will prefer outside food when I am not able to decide what to cook.]	1.000	.769
[I will prefer outside food when it matches my diet.]	1.000	.591
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.		
Rotated Component Matrix[a]		

	Component					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
[I will prefer outside food when I don't know how to cook particular dish.]	.274	.215	.602	.166	.062	-.034
[I will prefer outside food when parents are out of town.]	-.086	.315	.601	.112	.322	.042
[I will prefer outside food when I'm lack of special appliances to prepare the dish.]	.309	.108	.644	-.094	.367	.033
[I will prefer outside food when the dish requires lot of utensils.]	.372	.021	.687	.029	.142	.412
[I will prefer outside food when I am lack of some special ingredients.]	.342	-.008	.562	.120	.237	.505
[I will prefer outside food when I'm not feeling to cook.]	-.056	.314	.682	.226	.096	.163
[I will prefer outside food when I'm not able to spend time in cooking.]	.179	.318	.658	.180	.037	.051
[I will prefer outside food when I am away from my home during lunchtime.]	.012	.633	.460	.121	.228	-.118
[I will prefer outside food when restaurants provide attractive offers.]	.260	.331	.166	.029	.719	-.002
[I will prefer outside food to redeem unexpected free coupons.]	.281	.085	.223	.187	.696	.194
[I will prefer outside food to spend time with friends.]	-.074	.604	.255	.213	.354	.091
[I will go restaurants to take selfies.]	.769	-.098	.074	-.014	.312	.229
[I will prefer outside food when the restaurant is near to me.]	.506	.164	.248	.060	.472	.357
[I will prefer outside food when home food is not tasty.]	.713	.024	.286	.338	.213	-.202
[I will prefer outside food when its quality is good.]	-.025	.200	.325	.614	.470	.118
[I will prefer outside food when its quantity is good.]	.138	.178	.101	.634	.198	.474
[I will prefer going outside to eat for relaxation.]	.225	.528	.199	.226	.117	.507
[I will prefer going outside to eat to feel the experience of restaurant services.]	.488	.361	.109	.060	.111	.572
[I will prefer going outside to eat when the restaurant provide free Wi-Fi.]	.862	.051	.009	.087	.142	.090
[I will prefer outside food when I feel bored with regular dishes in home.]	.369	.290	.182	.655	-.111	-.037
[I will prefer outside food because I'm interested in experiencing new varieties.]	.225	.628	.051	.421	.094	.028
[I will prefer outside food when I am affordable.]	.233	.526	.166	.547	.215	.058
[I will prefer going to restaurants for celebrating occasions.]	.130	.771	.283	-.022	.027	.106
[I will prefer outside food when I fell sick.]	.643	.095	.089	.167	.105	.318
[I will prefer outside food when I don't have energy to cook.]	.508	.299	.447	.311	-.141	.128
[I will prefer outside food when it is of reasonable price.]	.208	.598	.137	.269	.333	.297

[I will prefer outside food when I am lack of no other suitable option.]	.296	.605	.351	.317	-.025	.266
[I will prefer outside food when I am not able to decide what to cook.]	.711	.383	.334	.002	.066	.022
[I will prefer outside food when it matches my diet.]	.688	.263	.125	.146	.004	.107
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.						

Interpretation: The above table shows that, by conducting principal component analysis 6 factors can be extracted. By considering the highest component value with corresponding variable, factors will be determined.

For example: The first variable is considered under factor 3 as its third component value is higher. Similarly, the eighth variable is considered under factor 2 as its second component value is higher. The similar process was applied to all these 29 variables and nearly 6 factors were determined.

Items	Factor Number	Extraction
Accessibility and Nearness		
[I will go restaurants to take selfies.]	1	0.756
[I will prefer going outside to eat when the restaurant provide free Wi-Fi.]	1	0.782
[I will prefer outside food when home food is not tasty.]	1	0.792
[I will prefer outside food when I am not able to decide what to cook.]	1	0.769
[I will prefer outside food when I don't have energy to cook.]	1	0.68
[I will prefer outside food when I fell sick.]	1	0.571
[I will prefer outside food when it matches my diet.]	1	0.591
[I will prefer outside food when the restaurant is near to me.]	1	0.698
Socialization and Celebrations		
[I will prefer going to restaurants for celebrating occasions.]	2	0.703
[I will prefer outside food because I'm interested in experiencing new varieties.]	2	0.635
[I will prefer outside food to spend time with friends.]	2	0.613
[I will prefer outside food when I am away from my home during lunchtime.]	2	0.692
[I will prefer outside food when I am lack of no other suitable option.]	2	0.749
[I will prefer outside food when it is of reasonable price.]	2	0.692
Convenience and Comfort		
[I will prefer outside food when I don’t know how to cook particular dish.]	3	0.517
[I will prefer outside food when I'm lack of special appliances to prepare the dish.]	3	0.666
[I will prefer outside food when I'm not able to spend time in cooking.]	3	0.603
[I will prefer outside food when I'm not feeling to cook.]	3	0.654
[I will prefer outside food when parents are out of town.]	3	0.586
[I will prefer outside food when the dish requires lot of utensils.]	3	0.801
Affordability		
[I will prefer outside food when I feel bored with regular dishes in home.]	4	0.696
[I will prefer outside food when its quality is good.]	4	0.759
[I will prefer outside food when its quantity is good.]	4	0.726

[I will prefer outside food when I am affordable.]	4	0.707
Offers and Coupons		
[I will prefer outside food to redeem unexpected free coupons.]	5	0.692
[I will prefer outside food when restaurants provide attractive offers.]	5	0.723
Experience		
[I will prefer going outside to eat for relaxation.]	6	0.691
[I will prefer going outside to eat to feel the experience of restaurant services.]	6	0.723
[I will prefer outside food when I am lack of some special ingredients.]	6	0.758

Interpretation: From the table above, the factors that impact the consumer preferences to eat outside food can be named as follows:

- Accessibility and Nearness
- Socialization and Celebration
- Convenience and Comfort
- Offers and Coupons
- Experience
- Affordability

From the analysis of the study internally, there are two other factors that were found named as:

- Varieties
- Taste

OBJECTIVE: To study the demographic profile of consumers preferring to Eat-Out.

ONE WAY ANOVA: This analysis is used to determine the association between demographic profile and the factors that impact the consumers' decision to eat outside food.

Gender:

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Varieties	Between Groups	.230	1	.230	.354	.553
	Within Groups	76.585	118	.649		
	Total	76.815	119			
Taste	Between Groups	.976	1	.976	1.757	.188
	Within Groups	65.550	118	.556		
	Total	66.527	119			
Accessibility and Nearness	Between Groups	6.515	1	6.515	8.040	**.005**
	Within Groups	95.616	118	.810		
	Total	102.131	119			
Socialization and Celebration	Between Groups	.038	1	.038	.055	.815
	Within Groups	82.180	118	.696		
	Total	82.219	119			
Convenience and Comfort	Between Groups	.260	1	.260	.340	.561
	Within Groups	90.129	118	.764		
	Total	90.389	119			

Offers and Coupons	Between Groups	.299	1	.299	.333	.565
	Within Groups	106.126	118	.899		
	Total	106.425	119			
Experience	Between Groups	.111	1	.111	.124	.725
	Within Groups	105.288	118	.892		
	Total	105.399	119			
Affordability	Between Groups	.001	1	.001	.001	.972
	Within Groups	87.624	118	.743		
	Total	87.624	119			

Interpretation: The above table determines that there is statistically no significant difference between Accessibility & Nearness and gender as F=8.040 and Sig. (p) =0.005, on the other hand the significant value (Sig.) of all other factors is greater than p=0.05. Hence null hypothesis is accepted by stating there is statistically significant difference between gender and the factors that influence consumers' choice to eat outside food excluding the factor Accessibility & Nearness.

Age:

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Varieties	Between Groups	1.431	4	.358	.546	.702
	Within Groups	75.383	115	.656		
	Total	76.815	119			
Taste	Between Groups	2.957	4	.739	1.337	.260
	Within Groups	63.570	115	.553		
	Total	66.527	119			
Accessibility and Nearness	Between Groups	5.735	4	1.434	1.711	.152
	Within Groups	96.396	115	.838		
	Total	102.131	119			
Socialization and Celebration	Between Groups	1.071	4	.268	.379	.823
	Within Groups	81.148	115	.706		
	Total	82.219	119			
Convenience and Comfort	Between Groups	2.104	4	.526	.685	.604
	Within Groups	88.285	115	.768		
	Total	90.389	119			
Offers and Coupons	Between Groups	3.127	4	.782	.870	.484
	Within Groups	103.298	115	.898		
	Total	106.425	119			
Experience	Between Groups	3.154	4	.788	.887	.474
	Within Groups	102.245	115	.889		

www.ijprems.com
editor@ijprems.com

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF PROGRESSIVE RESEARCH IN ENGINEERING MANAGEMENT AND SCIENCE (IJPREMS)

Vol. 04, Issue 05, May 2024, pp: 2493-2506

e-ISSN : 2583-1062

Impact Factor: 5.725

	Total	105.399	119			
Affordability	Between Groups	1.708	4	.427	.572	.684
	Within Groups	85.917	115	.747		
	Total	87.624	119			

Interpretation: In the above table, there is no significant value that is less than p=0.05. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted and it is interpreted as there is statistically significant difference between age and the factors that influence consumers' choice to eat outside food.

Family size:

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Varieties	Between Groups	.927	4	.232	.351	.843
	Within Groups	75.887	115	.660		
	Total	76.815	119			
Taste	Between Groups	2.069	4	.517	.923	.453
	Within Groups	64.458	115	.561		
	Total	66.527	119			
Accessibility and Nearness	Between Groups	4.964	4	1.241	1.469	.216
	Within Groups	97.167	115	.845		
	Total	102.131	119			
Socialization and Celebration	Between Groups	1.715	4	.429	.612	.655
	Within Groups	80.504	115	.700		
	Total	82.219	119			
Convenience and Comfort	Between Groups	1.560	4	.390	.505	.732
	Within Groups	88.829	115	.772		
	Total	90.389	119			
Offers and Coupons	Between Groups	1.730	4	.432	.475	.754
	Within Groups	104.695	115	.910		
	Total	106.425	119			
Experience	Between Groups	2.380	4	.595	.664	.618
	Within Groups	103.019	115	.896		
	Total	105.399	119			
Affordability	Between Groups	1.720	4	.430	.576	.681
	Within Groups	85.904	115	.747		
	Total	87.624	119			

Interpretation: In the above table, there is no significant value that is less than p=0.05. Hence, accepting the null hypothesis it can be interpreted as there is statistically significant difference between family size and the factors that influence consumers' choice to eat outside food.

Occupation:

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Varieties	Between Groups	.978	2	.489	.755	.472
	Within Groups	75.836	117	.648		
	Total	76.815	119			
Taste	Between Groups	1.235	2	.617	1.106	.334
	Within Groups	65.292	117	.558		
	Total	66.527	119			
Accessibility and Nearness	Between Groups	3.512	2	1.756	2.084	.129
	Within Groups	98.618	117	.843		
	Total	102.131	119			
Socialization and Celebration	Between Groups	.776	2	.388	.558	.574
	Within Groups	81.442	117	.696		
	Total	82.219	119			
Convenience and Comfort	Between Groups	.936	2	.468	.612	.544
	Within Groups	89.452	117	.765		
	Total	90.389	119			
Offers and Coupons	Between Groups	1.263	2	.632	.703	.497
	Within Groups	105.162	117	.899		
	Total	106.425	119			
Experience	Between Groups	.218	2	.109	.121	.886
	Within Groups	105.181	117	.899		
	Total	105.399	119			
Affordability	Between Groups	.159	2	.080	.107	.899
	Within Groups	87.465	117	.748		
	Total	87.624	119			

Interpretation: In the above table, there is no significant value that is less than p=0.05. Hence, accepting the null hypothesis it can be interpreted as there is statistically significant difference between occupation and the factors that influence consumers' choice to eat outside food.

ANOVA – Gender					
Consumer Preference					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.

www.ijprems.com
editor@ijprems.com

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF PROGRESSIVE RESEARCH IN ENGINEERING MANAGEMENT AND SCIENCE (IJPREMS)

Vol. 04, Issue 05, May 2024, pp: 2493-2506

e-ISSN : 2583-1062

Impact Factor: 5.725

Between Groups	5.865	1	5.865	5.431	.021
Within Groups	127.435	118	1.080		
Total	133.300	119			

Interpretation: In the above table, the significant value is greater than p=0.05. Hence, accepting the null hypothesis it can be interpreted as there is statistically significant difference between Gender and Consumer preference.

ANOVA – Age					
Consumer Preference					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	2.684	4	.671	.591	.670
Within Groups	130.616	115	1.136		
Total	133.300	119			

Interpretation: In the above table, the significant value is greater than p=0.05. Hence, accepting the null hypothesis it can be interpreted as there is statistically significant difference between Age and Consumer preference.

ANOVA – Family Size					
Consumer Preference					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	2.991	4	.748	.660	.621
Within Groups	130.309	115	1.133		
Total	133.300	119			

Interpretation: In the above table, the significant value is greater than p=0.05. Hence, accepting the null hypothesis it can be interpreted as there is statistically significant difference between Family Size and Consumer preference.

ANOVA – Occupation					
Consumer Preference					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1.578	2	.789	.701	.498
Within Groups	131.722	117	1.126		
Total	133.300	119			

Interpretation: In the above table, the significant value is greater than p=0.05. Hence, accepting the null hypothesis it can be interpreted as there is statistically significant difference between Occupation and Consumer preference.

OBJECTIVE: To analyze the factors that impact young adults' preferences when they decide to eat out.

ONE SAMPLE T-TEST:

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Consumer Preference	120	2.85	1.058	.097
Varieties	120	3.6433	.80343	.07334
Taste	120	3.1167	.74769	.06825
Accessibility and Nearness	120	3.0271	.92641	.08457

Socialization and Celebration	120	3.4778	.83121	.07588
Convenience and Comfort	120	3.2069	.87153	.07956
Offers and Coupons	120	3.2750	.94569	.08633
Experience	120	3.2861	.94112	.08591
Affordability	120	3.4396	.85810	.07833

One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 3					
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Consumer Preference	-1.553	119	.123	-.150	-.34	.04
Varieties	8.772	119	.000	.64333	.4981	.7886
Taste	1.709	119	.090	.11667	-.0185	.2518
Accessibility and Nearness	.320	119	.749	.02708	-.1404	.1945
Socialization and Celebration	6.297	119	.000	.47778	.3275	.6280
Convenience and Comfort	2.601	119	.010	.20694	.0494	.3645
Offers and Coupons	3.185	119	.002	.27500	.1041	.4459
Experience	3.330	119	.001	.28611	.1160	.4562
Affordability	5.612	119	.000	.43958	.2845	.5947

Interpretation: From the above table, it can be interpreted that Consumer preference and the factors such as Taste, Accessibility & Nearness and Convenience & Comfort were found to be insignificant as their significant values (Sig.) are greater than p = 0.05, whereas the other factors like Varieties, Socialization & Celebration, Offers & Coupons, Experience and Affordability are said to be significant since their significant values (Sig.) are less than p = 0.05

REGRESSION: Regression is a technique used to determine the statistical relation between two or more variables where a change in dependent variable is associated with and depends on, a change in one or more independent variables.

Variables Entered/Removed[b]

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	Affordability, Taste, Offers and Coupons, Varieties, Convenience and Comfort, Accessibility and Nearness, Experience, Socialization and Celebration[a]	.	Enter

a. All requested variables entered

b. Dependent Variable: Consumer Preference

Model Summary[b]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.610[a]	.372	.327	.868	1.960

a. Predictors: (Constant), Affordability, Taste, Offers and Coupons, Varieties, Convenience and Comfort, Accessibility and Nearness, Experience, Socialization and Celebration

b. Dependent Variable: Consumer Preference

Interpretation: The above table provides R and R square values. The R value 0.610 represents the simple correlation, and it indicates moderate degree of correlation. The R Square value indicates how much of the total variation in dependent variable can be explained by the independent variables. Here, it is 37.2%, which is very less.

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.243	.433		2.875	.005
	Varieties	-.247	.145	-.188	-1.705	.091
	Taste	.597	.152	.421	3.915	.000
	Accessibility and Nearness	.339	.133	.297	2.546	.012
	Socialization and Celebration	-.100	.177	-.078	-.564	.574
	Convenience and Comfort	.056	.137	.046	.409	.683
	Offers and Coupons	-.118	.113	-.105	-1.042	.300
	Experience	.269	.139	.239	1.926	.057
	Affordability	-.206	.145	-.167	-1.422	.158

Dependent Variable: Consumer Preference

From the above table, the regression equations can be framed as follows:

- Consumer Preference = 1.243 - .247 (Varieties)
- Consumer Preference = 1.243 + .597 (Taste)
- Consumer Preference = 1.243 + .339 (Accessibility & Nearness)
- Consumer Preference = 1.243 - .100 (Socialization & Celebration)
- Consumer Preference = 1.243 + .056 (Convenience & Comfort)
- Consumer Preference = 1.243 - .118 (Offers & Coupons)
- Consumer Preference = 1.243 + .269 (Experience)
- Consumer Preference = 1.243 - .206 (Affordability)

5 CONCLUSION OF THE STUDY

This study aimed to provide the factors that impact the young adults' decision to prefer eating outside food. From the responses of the questionnaire that was designed to study the preferences of consumers who prefer to eat outside food, descriptive and statistical study has been done.

From the descriptive study, it is observed that mostly male respondents are consuming outside side food compared to female respondents. In fact it can be supported by observing the patrons of restaurants which will be mostly filled by male persons especially during lunch hours. It is observed that, these patrons include consumers who are unmarried, working men and women who show interest to socialize with friends and a small range of families opting for a pleasant dining experience.

From the statistical study, it is found that the young adults prefer to eat out because of the factors like accessibility & nearness, socialization & celebration, convenience & comfort, offers & coupons, experience, affordability, taste and varieties. And also, it is found that the decision of choosing to eat-out is not affected by any of the demographics like gender, age, family size and occupation. Hence it can be concluded that the consumers of outside food are dynamic which determines that their preferences will not be same every time.

6 REFERENCES

[1] Anette Pettersson, Christina Fjellstrom. Restaurants as friends of the family: functions of restaurant visits in everyday life. Journal of Foodservice, 18 (2007) doi: 10.1111/j.1745-4506.2007.00067.x

[2] Janet Chang, An-Tien Hsieh. Leisure motives of eating out in night markets. Journal of Business Research 59 (2006) doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2006.10.002

[3] Yu-Hua Christine Suna, Alastair M. Morrison. Young Adults and their dining-out traits: Implications for restaurants. Hospitality Management 26 (2007) doi: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2006.03.003

[4] Susan Auty (1992) Consumer Choice and Segmentation in the Restaurant Industry, The Service Industries Journal,12:3, 324-339, DOI: 10.1080/02642069200000042