

## **4. METHODOLOGY**

### **4.1. Problem Statement Introduction**

#### **4.1.1. Problem Statement**

The problem statement of this research is “What are the strength and weakness points in the marketing mix of teppanyaki area in Osaka Restaurant, Roosendaal that affect the customer’s loyalty?”

This problem statement explained the intention of this research, which is to find out the strength and weakness points in the teppanyaki area of Osaka Restaurant based on their marketing mix that affects the customer’s loyalty.

#### **4.1.2. Research Questions**

- What is the marketing mix?
- What are the strengths and weaknesses of teppanyaki area in customer’s view based on the price?
- What are the strengths and weaknesses of teppanyaki area in customer’s view based on the place?
- What are the strengths and weaknesses of teppanyaki area in customer’s view based on the promotion?
- What are the strengths and weaknesses of teppanyaki area in customer’s view based on the product?
- What are the strengths and weaknesses of teppanyaki area in customer’s view based on the physical evidence?
- What are the strengths and weaknesses of teppanyaki area in customer’s view based on the people?
- What are the strengths and weaknesses of teppanyaki area in

customer's view based on the process?

- What are the strength and weakness points that affect customers' returning to the teppanyaki area?
- What could be suggested to the manager of the restaurant in order to keep the old customers and win new customers?

The research questions are broken down from the problem statement. First of all the writer needs to know what are the marketing mix in teppanyaki area and rephrase them into questions in the questionnaires. Then from each points of the marketing mix a conclusion is drawn from the questionnaires, which is favorable to the customers and which is not favorable. After knowing the strength and weakness points for each marketing mix variable, it will be narrowed down into the ones that actually affect the customer's loyalty. Finally, after knowing the important factors of teppanyaki area, a suggestion will be made for the manager of the restaurant, in order to keep the old customers and win new customers.

## **4.2. Research Process**

### **4.2.1. Planning of the Research Process**

There are two methods of research that will be employed in order to gain the data needed.

- Questionnaire

In order to know more about what the customers think of teppanyaki area's strength and weakness, the writer will use the method of questionnaire. This method is chosen because of its efficiency. By using the questionnaire, data will be collected without taking much of the guests' time.

There will be 50 questionnaires given to the customers of

Osaka's teppanyaki as a sample that will represent the population of Osaka's teppanyaki customers. The sampling method is random, which means that the questionnaires will be given to whomever happen to be in the teppanyaki area at the moment. The questionnaires will be given during the period of February 2-5, 2009. However if there are questionnaires left, they will be given during the next week.

This period is chosen because it is the mid season of Osaka's teppanyaki, which means that it will not be too busy. The guests will be given the questionnaires at the same time that the warm towel is given. The guests who are given these questionnaires are the guests who are in a group with no more than 5 persons, considering that the more people there are in the group, the less attention they will give to the dining experience in general.

- In-depth Interview

The in-depth interview will be conducted a week after all of the questionnaires are filled. This interview will be done with two servers of Osaka's teppanyaki. The questions in this interview will be based on how the guests answer the questionnaires given to them. This in-depth interview is needed to cross-check the result of the questionnaires, so that it will be from both sides of the service process and avoid objective bias. Another reason for this interview is to find out the strengths and weaknesses of Osaka's teppanyaki in its own employees' perspective.

#### **4.2.2. Actual Research Process**

- Questionnaire

The questionnaire was planned to be done in the period of February 2-5, 2009, but because the translating process took more time than planned, it has to be delayed into the period of February 9-15, 2009. Another change made about the time planning is that originally the questionnaires will only be given to the guests on Monday until Thursday, because on weekends the teppanyaki area is very busy and therefore is not conditioned for the guests to concentrate. After giving out the questionnaires, though, it was found out that in regular days there are so few complaints made by the customers, because it was not so busy. To make the questionnaire more valid to the real condition, it was decided that the questionnaires will also be given out on Friday, Saturday, and Sunday.

On February 9, 2009, there were ten customers out of sixteen who were willing to cooperate and fill up the questionnaires. All of the questionnaires are valid because all of the questions are answered.

On February 10, 2009, there were only three customers coming in teppanyaki area and they were not given the questionnaires by their server, so there was no questionnaire filled on that day.

On February 11, 2009, there were seventeen questionnaires given, but one questionnaire was not filled by the customer and another one is not valid because not all of the questions are answered. Total of the customers on that day is twenty seven people.

On February 12, 2009, there were eleven questionnaires given to thirty people, and one of them is not valid. It was a pity because actually the one which was not valid consisted of an unusual answer that can bring this research to a new view.

On February 13, 2009, there were sixty three people ate in teppanyaki area, but because most of them were in a big group it wasn't possible to give them the questionnaires. There were only eight questionnaires given and two of them were not valid. There were some important suggestions in them, though.

On February 14, 2009, because it was Valentine's Day, the teppanyaki area is full and even has to make a turnover in some tables. Total of the guests coming that day is 123 people, but only two people filled in the questionnaires. The main cause is because there were so many big groups and the others were mostly couples who were not willing to participate because they had other events to attend.

On February 15, 2009, there were 19 customers on the teppanyaki area and ten questionnaires were given. As the writers only need six more valid questionnaires, only six of them are taken as valid questionnaires.

Overall, there were 281 guests who came to dine in Osaka's teppanayaki in the period of February 9-15, 2009 and 50 valid questionnaires were filled. The questionnaires will represent 17.80% of all guests in that period. It is a small number but because most of people who came in the same time hold the same perspective, it is valid enough.

- In-depth Interview

The in-depth interview is cancelled because of the lack of time caused by the delay of questionnaire process. It also happened that several of teppanyaki service personnel dined in Osaka on February 9, 2009, so instead of an interview, they answered the questionnaires as a customers but also gave out their view as an employee. It will be pointless to interview them for a second time after the questionnaire.

- Desk Research

Because the cancellation of the in-depth interview, a desk research is conducted, to gain some details about the things asked in the questionnaires. The research consists of an interview with the manager, asking the facts and details about the company and an observation of the job description of the employees.

The interview with the manager was done on Sunday, February 15, 2009. The process went quite smoothly. The writers asked the questions that had been designed before and added some questions as the interview went on, and every answers was taken on note.

### **4.3. Research Elements**

#### 4.3.1 Questionnaire

One of the elements of the research is the questionnaire. The questionnaire design is as the following:

Geachte gast,

Wij, Fitria en Mega, zijn twee studenten van de hotel management school, in Indonesië. We doen een onderzoek naar de tevredenheid van de klanten in de Osaka Restaurant om onze laatste opdracht voor de Christelijke Hogeschool



4. Heb u het japanse teppanyaki gedeelte bij Osaka ooit aanbeveelt aan andere mensen?/*Have you ever recommend Osaka's teppanyaki to other people?*
  1. Ja/*Yes*
  2. Nee/*No*
  3. Dat zal ik gaan doen/*I will*
5. Is het makkelijk om bij de Osaka te komen?  
*Is it easy to reach the location of Osaka's building?*
  1. Ja/*Yes*
  2. Nee/*No*. Waarom niet/*Why?....*
6. Had u een probleem met parkeren?  
*Do you have a problem with the parking arrangement?*
  1. Nee/*No*
  2. Ja/*Yes*. Waarom/*What?....*
7. Werd u meteen en vriendelijk begroet toen u aankwam bij de Osaka?  
*Were you greeted properly and immediately when you arrived at Osaka?*
  1. Ja/*Yes*
  2. Nee/*No*
8. Werd u naar uw stoel begeleid?  
*Were you escorted to your seat?*
  1. Ja/*Yes*
  2. Nee/*No*
9. Welk menu heeft u vandaag gekozen?  
*What menu did you pick today?*
  1. A la carte
  2. Een menu zonder toetje/*Menu without dessert*
  3. Een menu met toetje/*Menu with dessert*
  4. Een menu met Fujiyama/*Menu with Fujiyama*
  5. Een vegetarisch menu/*Vegetarian menu*
10. Waren al uw bestellingen goed opgenomen en gebracht?  
*Were all of your orders taken and brought correctly?*
  1. Ja/*Yes*
  2. Nee/*No*

Op een schaal van 1 tot 5 (1=het slechtst en 5=het beste), hoe zou u uw maaltijd dan beoordelen op het gebied van:

*On the scale of 1-5 (1 = the worst, 5 = the best), how would you rate your meal in the term of:*

11. Smaak/ <i>Taste</i>	1	2	3	4	5
12. Presentatie/ <i>Presentation</i>	1	2	3	4	5

Op een schaal van 1 tot 5 (1=het slechtst en 5=het beste), hoe zou u uw serveerster dan beoordelen op het gebied van:

On the scale of 1-5 (1 = the worst, 5 = the best), how would you rate your server in the term of:

13. Verschijning/ <i>Appearance</i>	1	2	3	4	5
14. Snelheid/ <i>Speed</i>	1	2	3	4	5
15. Kennis van het menu/ <i>Menu knowledge</i>	1	2	3	4	5
16. Vriendelijk heid/ <i>Friendliness</i>	1	2	3	4	5
Service in het algemeen <i>Overall service</i>	1	2	3	4	5

Op een schaal van 1 tot 5 (1=het slechtst en 5=het beste), hoe zou u uw kok dan beoordelen op het gebied van:

On the scale of 1-5 (1 = the worst, 5 = the best), how would you rate your cook in the term of:

17. Smaak/ <i>Taste of food</i>	1	2	3	4	5
18. Kook attractie/ <i>Cooking attraction</i>	1	2	3	4	5
19. Interactie met gasten/ <i>Interaction with the guests</i>	1	2	3	4	5
20. Snelheid/ <i>Speed</i>	1	2	3	4	5
Service in het algemeen <i>Overall service</i>	1	2	3	4	5

Op een schaal van 1 tot 5 (1=het slechtst en 5=het beste), hoe zou u het japanse teppanyaki dan beoordelen op het gebied van:

On the scale of 1-5 (1 = the worst, 5 = the best), how would you rate the teppanyaki area in the term of:

21. Schoonheid/ <i>Cleanliness</i>	1	2	3	4	5
22. Tafel opgedekt/ <i>Table set up</i>	1	2	3	4	5
23. Achtergrond muziek <i>Background music</i>	1	2	3	4	5
24. Verlichting/ <i>Lighting</i>	1	2	3	4	5
Sfeer in het algemeen <i>Overall atmosphere</i>	1	2	3	4	5

25. Wat vindt u van de prijs van het menu bij het japanse teppanyaki gedelte van Osaka? / *What do you think of the price of the menu in Osaka's teppanyaki?*

1. Goedkoop/*Cheap*

2. Hetzelfde als bij andere teppanyaki restaurants/*The same with other*

*teppanyaki restaurants*

3. Een beetje duur/*Quite expensive*
  4. Duur/*Expensive*
26. Vind u dat de prijs waard is wat u krijgt?  
*Do you think that the price is worthy for what you get?*
1. Ja/*Yes*
  2. Nee/*No*. Waarom niet/*Why?* ....
27. Welke voorzieningen heeft u in de Osaka wel eens gebruikt? (u kunt er meerdere kiezen) / *Which one(s) of these facilities in Osaka have you ever used? (You can choose more than one)*
1. Kinderstoel/*Chair for kids*
  2. Kidsaka/*Playground*
  3. Toilet
  4. Gehandicapte toilet/*Toilet for the handicapped*
  5. Plaats voor het verwisselen van luiers/*Diaper change place*
  6. Rookkamer/*Smoking room*
  7. Lounge
  8. Terras/*Terrace*
28. Heeft u ooit een probleem gehad met de voorzieningen?  
*Have you ever had a problem with the facilities?*
1. Nee/*No*
  2. Ja/*Yes*. Wat/*What?* ...
29. Wilt u nog een keer gaan eten in het japanse teppanyaki gedeelte van Osaka na vandaag? / *Will you dine in Osaka's teppanyaki again after today?*
1. Ja/*Yes*
  2. Nee/*No*. Waarom niet/*Why?*...
30. Heeft u enkele suggesties voor Osaka en vooral voor het teppanyaki gedeelte?  
*Do you have any suggestions for Osaka Restaurant in general and especially for teppanyaki area?*

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

Bedankt voor uw medeweking  
*Thank you for your assistance*  
*Terima kasih atas kerjasamanya*

Fitria en Mega

The questionnaire is made bilingual, partly because not every customer understands English, but the writers have a lack of Dutch fluency, so it is better that the English version is also put in the questionnaire to help the guests understand the questions. As a consequence of making the questionnaire bilingual, the questionnaire takes four pages and therefore makes the guests reluctant to fill it. To make the questionnaire look simpler, it was printed on the front and back of the paper so that there are only two pieces of paper used.

The first part of the questionnaire, in which gender and age are asked, is to find out the demographic aspect of teppanyaki's customers. The living place will give us information about the geographic aspect of the teppanyaki's customers.

The first question is asked to find out the status of the guests, if they are first-time guests, a returning guest (2-5 times), or a regular guest (more than 5 times).

The second question is to find out where Osaka's teppanyaki is most visible and what is the most effective means of marketing should be maintained.

The third question is to find out which one of the five factors in the teppanyaki that attracts the guests most, whether it is the food, price, atmosphere, place, or service/people.

The fourth question is to find out if the guest is a loyal guest or not, whether they have recommended Osaka's teppanyaki to other people or not. A third option, "I will", is added, to find out whether after this they will recommend Osaka's teppanyaki to other people, in case this is the first time they eat in Osaka's teppanyaki.

The fifth question relates to the 'place' in marketing mix. In this question it is asked whether they could find the Osaka's building easily.

Another question related to it is number six, about the parking arrangement in Osaka's restaurant, because even if the place is good, it does not always mean that there is good enough parking arrangement.

Questions number seven, eight, and ten are about the process of the dining experience, from the moment they stepped into Osaka's door. This question came from the writer's own experience that in some restaurants or other service-oriented places in Netherlands, sometimes there is nobody to greet or offer help immediately or properly. The escorting process is also important in teppanyaki area, because the area's location is a little bit complicated and when the guests arrive to the seat there should be someone to help them with the kimono. The tenth question is asking in general, whether all of their orders are taken and brought correctly.

The ninth question is asked to find out what menu they order at the time they eat, to find out which group of menu in Osaka's teppanyaki is the most popular.

The questions number eleven until twenty-four use the rank scale to rate the experience the guests have. The first part (question number eleven and twelve) is about the food in general, from the starter/appetizer until the dessert. In this part they are asked to rate only the taste and the presentation of the food.

The second part is about the service personnel, in which the guests are asked to rate their server in the term of appearance, speed, menu knowledge, and friendliness. To make it easier for the writer to do the cross-tabulation with other variables, the guest is also asked to rate the service in overall.

The third part is about the cook, in which the guests are asked to rate their cook in the term of their food, cooking attraction, interaction with the guests, and speed. Their service in general is also asked. The taste of

food is asked again here, but in this case it is only the food that is cooked by the cook in the teppanyaki table. The gap between this answer and the answer of taste of food in general will be the guests' opinion about the starter/appetizer and dessert.

The last part of the rank scale questions is about the teppanyaki area itself in the term of cleanliness, table set-up, background music, and lighting. It is also asked about the atmosphere in general.

Question number twenty-five and twenty-six is about price, in which the guests are asked what they think about the price in teppanyaki's menu and whether they think the price is worth what they get.

Question number twenty-seven asks the guests about which one(s) of the facilities in Osaka that they have ever used, and the next question asks them whether they have a problem with the facilities they use.

Question number twenty-nine asks the guests whether they will return to Osaka's teppanyaki again.

The last question is where the guests can give suggestion to the company about what to improve in order to make them more comfortable and satisfied with their dining experience.

#### 4.3.2. Desk Research

The questions for the desk research are as the follows:

- What is the main concept of the teppanyaki area?
- How is the detail of the parking arrangement for customers in Osaka?
- When did the last price change happen and why?
- Is there any plan to change the price in the future?
- Have you ever compared the teppanyaki's menu price with other places and why?

- Why did you choose this background music?
- What effort has been done as marketing for the teppanyaki?
- What qualities do you seek in a teppanyaki server?
- Has there ever been a menu change in teppanyaki besides Christmas?
- Do you have suggestions for the next year student's thesis topic?.

#### **4.4. Research Evaluation**

After doing the questionnaires and the desk research, there are some positive and negative things to be noticed:

##### 4.4.1 Questionnaire

- The more questions were asked, the more guests would hesitate to fill it in. In this research, though, it was not possible to eliminate some questions because all of them were important for the success of the research.
- It was better to give only one or two questionnaires to people in one group because most of them would have the same answers in some questions, though they might also answer differently on some points. At the beginning, every person in a group was given the questionnaire, but soon the writers realized this fact and since Thursday the questionnaires were given to one or two persons per group.
- The timing for giving out the questionnaires had been correctly planned, because the guests did not feel disturbed and they still freshly remembered the experience.
- Not every guest could be given the questionnaires. Some of the guests, even while they were in a small group, could get too much alcohol consumption for being able to fill the questionnaire

objectively.

- There were some questionnaires that could be doubted for its objectivity. The reason was either because it was filled by the employee or ex-employee of Osaka or because the customer did not bother to read the details given. It was important to get some views by the employees, though, just because they knew the area better than anyone. Customer's laziness in reading the details was inevitable and thankfully it did not happen a lot.
- It was interesting that the guests did not only pay attention to the questions asked, but they also paid attention to the questionnaire. The writers were pleased that there were some positive comments given for the questionnaires.

#### 4.4.2 Desk Research

- There were some difficulties in asking the questions because of the language barrier, but by the effort of mixing languages and body languages, the questions have been correctly answered (though not exactly as asked).
- Some questions are sensitive to the restaurants' secret, so they were eliminated.
- There were some ambiguous answers given, for example, when the writer asked if a price benchmark had been conducted before, the answer was no, but when asked why, the manager could give an answer that implied he knew about other places' price. In cases like this, the writer will write down the original answer and add some comments on it.