



META ANALYSIS ON VEGETARIAN CUSTOMER BACKGROUND AND SATISFACTION DIFFERENCE

Shwu-Huey Wang*¹, Yu-Ling Pang²

^{1,2}Department of Innovative Product Design and Entrepreneurship Management

Far East University, TAIWAN, R.O.C.

**Corresponding Author*

ABSTRACT-----

In order to deeply explore the relationship between demographics and vegetarian restaurant, the study employed independent sample t-test and one-way ANOVA to analyze if there is significant difference in the various variables. If there does exist significant difference, then the study went further to conduct multiple comparison test to understand the results. The results indicated that some of the hypotheses are not supported, while some of which are only partly supported. It is referential for the policy makers and practitioners that in the modern era, consumers are willing to pay more and more attention in health so that it is understandable that why vegetarian restaurants are so popular in the modern society.

KEY WORDS: Demographics, Satisfaction, Vegetarian Restaurant-----

1. INTRODUCTION

It is because that in the modern era, consumers are willing to pay more and more attention in health, therefore, vegetarian restaurants have attracted so much of consumers' eyesight. In order to understand the differences among demographic terms, the study employed independent sample t-test and one-way ANOVA to analyze if there is significant difference in the various variables. Please refer to the following text for details.

2. THE DEMOGRAPHICS AND SATISFACTION DIFFERENCE

2.1 The demographics of the participants

Based on the collected 579 valid questionnaires, the study presents the demographic results of the participants as follows (Table 1):

In gender aspect, female accounts for more in the whole participants, which including a total of 309, explains for 53.4% of the whole. As to age, 41-50 is the biggest group, which covers 189 participants totally, and accounts for 32.6% of the total. In terms of occupation, the number of government employee is the first big group, which covers 205 participants totally, and indicated 35.4% of the total. Regarding monthly income, the



group of NT\$50,000 and above is the biggest group, which totally covers 189 participants, and replied to 30.4% of the total. In terms of education, the group of college/university is the number one big group which has 259 participants totally, and explained for 44.4% of the total.

Table 1 Demographic results of the participants

Demographics	Categories	Numbers	Frequency
Gender	Male	270	579
	Female	309	
Age	20 or under	22	579
	21-30	117	
	31-40	115	
	41-50	189	
	51-60	97	
	61 and above	39	
	Occupation	Agriculture Forestry, Fisheries and Animal Husbandry	
Industry		36	
Business		39	
Public employee		205	
Service		114	
Professional		38	
Student		36	
Housekeeping		77	
None		18	
Others		5	
Monthly Income	NT\$20000	151	579
	NT\$20001- NT\$30000	95	
	NT\$30001- NT\$40000	87	
	NT\$40001-NT\$50000	70	
	Above NT\$50000	176	
Education	High school and under	239	579
	College/University	259	
	Master	77	
	Doctor	4	



2.2 Demographic and customer satisfaction

The study analyzed the participant demographic and customer satisfaction from the constructs of price, promotion, environment, foods, and service. The results are reported as the following:

2.3 Gender and satisfaction

The study conducted independent sample t-test to analyze if there is significant difference between gender and the constructs of the restaurant satisfaction, the results are reported in Table 2. It is found that there is no significant difference between gender and restaurant satisfaction (which including price, promotion, environment, foods and service). Female accounts for the majority of the participants, which is in light with the results of the prior research (Wang, 2000; Chiu, 2009; Liao, 2013). In addition, the mean of the items lied between 3.46 and 4.53, which implies the participants that the participants' attitude toward the vegetarian restaurant tends to be higher. In the price construct, the item "The thing that the restaurant would not increase the price at their will would increase my dining satisfaction" received the highest mean, and female satisfaction (M=3.93) is higher than that of male (M=3.89). In the promotion construct, the item "The full discount coupon of the restaurant would increase my dining satisfaction" owned the highest mean, and male satisfaction (M=4.17) is higher than that of female (M=4.06). In the environment construct, the item "The clean and hygiene environment of the restaurant would increase my dining satisfaction" obtained the highest score, and female satisfaction (M=4.45) is higher than that of male (M=4.44). In the food construct, the item "The diversified foods of the restaurant would increase my dining satisfaction" received the highest score, and male satisfaction (M=4.46) is higher than that of female (M=4.53). In the service construct, the item "The service team of the restaurant is kind and polite, which would increase my dining satisfaction" owned the highest mean, and male satisfaction (M=4.10) is higher than that of female (M=4.18).

Based on the above statement, the differences among the varied constructs are minuscule. It is inferred that though the participants presented high satisfaction on the constructs of the vegetarian restaurant, they positioned the vegetarian restaurant on the traditional restaurant and regarded the satisfaction constructs did not present specifically different. The satisfaction is therefore not significantly different in terms of gender. Therefore, hypothesis H1-1 is not supported; there is no significant difference between gender and satisfaction.

**Table 2 Independent sample t-test on satisfaction--- Gender**

Constructs	Gender	Mean	Standard Deviation	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		T-test for Equality of Means		
				F test	Sig.	t value	Sig.	Mean Deviation
Price	Male	3.76	0.65	0.79	0.37	-1.39	0.16	-0.07
	Female	3.84	0.67					
Promotion	Male	3.66	0.63	1.40	0.23	-0.63	0.52	-0.03
	Female	3.69	0.66					
Environment	Male	3.87	0.57	0.02	0.87	-1.39	0.16	-0.06
	Female	3.94	0.54					
Foods	Male	4.22	0.51	0.02	0.86	-1.56	0.11	-0.06
	Female	4.29	0.49					
Service	Male	3.99	0.61	0.13	0.71	-0.88	0.37	-0.04
	Female	4.04	0.61					

Note : * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$

2.4 Age and satisfaction

The study conducted one-way ANOVA to explore if there is significant difference between age and the constructs of satisfaction. The results are revealed as Table 3. It is found that there is no significant difference between age and the constructs of satisfaction, which including price, environment, foods, and service ($p > 0.05$). Notably, there is significant difference only between age and promotion ($p < 0.05$). To be prudent, the study conducted Scheffe test to deeply understand where the significant difference really exists. Based on the results



reported in Table 4, it is found that there is significant difference between the group of 20-30 years old and the group of 61 years and above. It is inferred that the group that aged less than 30 years old are still young, probably they just graduated, so they do not have abundant wealth so the group presented significantly different with the group of 61 years and above.

Based on the results, in terms of age, the group aged between 41 and 50 accounts for the most, it is analogized that the group rushed for health or diet and then become the main consumption group of vegetarian restaurant. Meanwhile, the mean value of varied age group falls between 3.68 and 4.26 on satisfaction. In addition, according to Table 5, in the price construct, the two items obtained the highest score, which including “The rational price would increase my dining satisfaction” and “The thing that the restaurant would not increase the price at their will would increase my dining satisfaction”, of which, the group aged 21 to 30 received the highest satisfaction (M=3.99). In the promotion construct, the item “The restaurant discount card would increase my dining satisfaction” obtained the highest score; the group aged 51 to 60 owns the highest satisfaction (M=4.23). In the environment construct, the item “The clean and hygiene environment of the restaurant would increase my dining satisfaction” received the highest score, the group aged 20 or under owns the highest satisfaction (M=4.63). In the food construct, the item “The not-oily foods of the restaurant would increase my dining satisfaction” reported the highest score, the group aged 61 and above received the highest mean (M=4.18).

Based on the above statement, the participants aged differently presented varied in mean, only the younger participants (aged 20 or under) presented significant higher than that of the group aged 61 and above. Therefore, H1-2 is partly supported; there is significant difference between age and satisfaction.

Table 3 Results of one-way ANOVA--- Age

Constructs	Mean	Standard Deviation	F test	Significance
Price	3.80	0.66	0.82	0.53
Promotion	3.68	0.64	3.46	0.04**
Environment	3.91	0.56	0.88	0.49
Foods	4.26	0.50	0.48	0.79
Service	4.02	0.61	1.51	0.18

Note : *p<0.05 ; **p<0.01 ; ***p<0.001



Table 4 Results of Post Hoc Analysis on satisfaction---Age

Constructs	Age	Mean Deviation	Standard Error	Significance
Promotion	21-30	0.15	0.14	0.95
	31-40	0.23	0.14	0.79
	41-50	0.31	0.14	0.46
	51-60	0.34	0.15	0.38
	61 and above	0.54	0.17	0.043*
	20	-0.15	0.14	0.95
	31-40	0.07	0.08	0.97
	41-50	-0.15	0.14	0.95
	51-60	0.07	0.08	0.97
	61 and above	0.15	0.07	0.048*

Note : *p<0.05 ; **p<0.01 ; ***p<0.001

Table 5 Descriptive statistic results---Age

Constructs	Items	Age	Mean	Standard Deviation	95% Confidence interval of the difference	
					Lower limit	Upper limit
Price	The high price would have impacts on my dining satisfaction.	20	3.73	0.76	3.39	4.07
		21-30	3.76	0.87	3.60	3.92
		31-40	3.54	0.96	3.36	3.72
		41-50	3.59	0.83	3.47	3.71
		51-60	3.57	0.84	3.40	3.74
	61and above	3.59	0.81	3.32	3.85	
	The rational price would increase my dining satisfaction.	20	3.73	0.93	3.31	4.14
		21-30	3.99	0.73	3.86	4.13
		31-40	3.92	0.76	3.78	4.06
		41-50	3.86	0.71	3.76	3.96
51-60		3.85	0.80	3.68	4.01	



		61 and above	3.85	0.74	3.60	4.09
	The thing that the restaurant	20	3.95	0.84	3.58	4.33
	would not increase the price at	21-30	3.99	0.77	3.85	4.13
	their will would increase my	31-40	3.90	0.88	3.74	4.07
	dining satisfaction.	41-50	3.90	0.71	3.80	4.00
		51-60	3.86	0.77	3.70	4.01
		61 and above	3.85	0.77	3.59	4.10
Promotion	The restaurant discount card	20	3.82	1.00	3.37	4.26
	would increase my dining	21-30	4.08	0.81	3.93	4.23
	satisfaction.	31-40	4.11	0.84	3.96	4.27
		41-50	4.11	0.82	3.99	4.23
		51-60	4.23	0.77	4.07	4.38
		61 and above	4.05	0.91	3.75	4.35
	The free beverage of the	20	3.82	0.90	3.42	4.22
	restaurant would increase my	21-30	3.73	1.00	3.54	3.91
	dining satisfaction.	31-40	3.57	1.02	3.38	3.75
		41-50	3.39	0.94	3.25	3.52
		51-60	3.33	1.02	3.12	3.54
		61 and above	3.15	0.93	2.85	3.46
	The free deserts of the restaurant	20	4.14	0.71	3.82	4.45
	would increase my dining	21-30	3.62	1.04	3.43	3.81
	satisfaction.	31-40	3.63	0.98	3.44	3.81
		41-50	3.50	0.92	3.37	3.63
		51-60	3.39	1.01	3.19	3.60
		61 and above	3.13	0.83	2.86	3.40
	The full discount coupon of the	20	4.05	0.84	3.67	4.42
	restaurant would increase my	21-30	3.77	0.85	3.61	3.93
	dining satisfaction.	31-40	3.59	0.88	3.43	3.76
		41-50	3.58	0.89	3.45	3.70
		51-60	3.48	1.05	3.27	3.70
		61 and above	3.31	.83	3.04	3.58
Environ-m	The inconvenient parking would	20	3.82	1.00	3.37	4.26
ent	have impacts on my dining	21-30	4.08	0.81	3.93	4.23
	satisfaction.	31-40	4.11	0.84	3.96	4.27



	41-50	4.11	0.82	3.99	4.23
	51-60	4.23	0.77	4.07	4.38
	61 and above	4.05	0.91	3.75	4.35
The convenient traffic would increase my dining satisfaction.	20	3.64	0.90	3.24	4.04
	21-30	3.84	0.85	3.68	3.99
	31-40	3.69	0.90	3.52	3.85
	41-50	3.63	0.88	3.51	3.76
	51-60	3.73	0.88	3.55	3.91
	61 and above	3.67	0.66	3.45	3.88
The clean and hygiene environment of the restaurant would increase my dining satisfaction.	20	4.64	0.58	4.37	4.894
	21-30	4.56	0.54	4.45	4.65
	31-40	4.48	0.70	4.34	4.60
	41-50	4.46	0.63	4.37	4.55
	51-60	4.25	0.90	4.06	4.42
	61 and above	4.34	0.74	4.14	4.62
The features of the internal decorate would increase my dining satisfaction.	20	3.64	0.90	3.24	4.04
	21-30	3.84	0.85	3.68	3.99
	31-40	3.69	0.90	3.52	3.85
	41-50	3.63	0.88	3.51	3.76
	51-60	3.73	0.88	3.55	3.91
	61 and above	3.67	0.66	3.45	3.88
The external architecture features of the restaurant would increase my dining satisfaction.	20	3.73	0.76	3.39	4.07
	21-30	3.76	0.87	3.60	3.92
	31-40	3.54	0.96	3.36	3.72
	41-50	3.59	0.83	3.47	3.71
	51-60	3.57	0.84	3.40	3.74
	61 and above	3.59	0.81	3.32	3.85
The wide space and smooth moving line of the restaurant would increase my dining satisfaction.	20	3.73	0.93	3.31	4.14
	21-30	3.99	0.73	3.86	4.13
	31-40	3.92	0.76	3.78	4.06
	41-50	3.86	0.71	3.76	3.96
	51-60	3.85	0.80	3.68	4.01
	61 and above	3.85	0.74	3.60	4.09
The tender lights and lighting of	20	3.95	0.84	3.58	4.33



	the restaurant would increase my dining satisfaction.	21-30	3.99	0.77	3.85	4.13
		31-40	3.90	0.88	3.74	4.07
		41-50	3.90	0.71	3.80	4.00
		51-60	3.86	0.77	3.70	4.01
		61 and above	3.85	0.77	3.59	4.10
Foods	The diversified foods of the restaurant would increase my dining satisfaction.	20	4.32	0.78	3.97	4.66
		21-30	4.43	0.71	4.30	4.56
		31-40	4.43	0.63	4.32	4.55
		41-50	4.41	0.66	4.32	4.51
		51-60	4.36	0.69	4.22	4.50
		61 and above	4.21	0.69	3.98	4.43
	The not-oily foods of the restaurant would increase my dining satisfaction.	20	4.55	0.59	4.28	4.81
		21-30	4.39	0.65	4.27	4.51
		31-40	4.47	0.64	4.35	4.59
		41-50	4.36	0.63	4.27	4.45
		51-60	4.31	0.74	4.16	4.46
		61 and above	4.59	0.49	4.43	4.75
	The tasty foods of the restaurant would increase my dining satisfaction.	20	4.50	0.51	4.27	4.73
		21-30	4.56	0.62	4.44	4.67
		31-40	4.54	0.56	4.43	4.64
		41-50	4.47	0.64	4.37	4.56
		51-60	4.46	0.69	4.32	4.60
		61 and above	4.36	0.74	4.12	4.60
	The food display way of the restaurant would increase my dining satisfaction.	20	3.77	0.92	3.36	4.18
		21-30	3.82	0.91	3.65	3.99
		31-40	3.85	0.90	3.69	4.02
		41-50	3.90	0.77	3.79	4.01
		51-60	3.79	0.79	3.63	3.95
		61 and above	3.77	0.87	3.49	4.05
	The often-changed foods of the restaurant would increase my dining satisfaction.	20	4.14	0.83	3.77	4.51
		21-30	4.05	0.87	3.89	4.21
		31-40	4.26	0.77	4.12	4.40
		41-50	4.25	0.70	4.15	4.36
		51-60	4.14	0.73	4.00	4.29



		61 and above	4.21	0.73	3.97	4.44
Service	The service team of the restaurant is pretty professional, they understand customers' demands.	20	3.95	0.89	3.56	4.35
		21-30	4.02	.83	3.87	4.17
		31-40	3.88	.72	3.74	4.01
		41-50	4.05	.70	3.95	4.15
		51-60	3.89	.85	3.71	4.06
		61 and above	4.23	.70	4.00	4.46
	The service team of the restaurant is kind and polite, which would increase my dining satisfaction.	20	4.18	.66	3.89	4.48
		21-30	4.21	.81	4.06	4.35
		31-40	4.14	.76	4.00	4.28
		41-50	4.15	.61	4.07	4.24
		51-60	3.98	.66	3.85	4.11
		61 and above	4.28	.72	4.05	4.52
	The service personnel would notify me while they are serving, which made me with the feeling of being respected.	20	3.91	.92	3.50	4.32
		21-30	4.02	.88	3.86	4.18
		31-40	3.90	.84	3.74	4.05
		41-50	3.90	.82	3.78	4.02
		51-60	3.81	.83	3.65	3.98
		61 and above	3.92	.85	3.64	4.20
	The tidy and neat clothing and grooming of the service personnel would have impacts on my dining satisfaction.	20	3.95	.95	3.53	4.38
		21-30	4.10	.72	3.97	4.24
		31-40	4.04	.64	3.93	4.16
		41-50	4.11	.75	4.00	4.21
		51-60	3.88	.84	3.71	4.05
		61 and above	4.03	.81	3.76	4.29

2.5 Occupation and satisfaction

The study conducted one-way ANOVA to explore if there is significant difference between occupation and the constructs of satisfaction (price, environment, promotion, foods, and service). According to the results reported in Table 6, there is no significant difference between occupation and satisfaction ($p > 0.05$). Only in the promotion construct, the p value is 0.047. To be cautious, the study subsequently conducted Scheffe test to go further explore where the difference exists. Based on Table 7, the pair of students and public employees presented significant difference. It is inferred that students are still going to school; they are not independent economically; while the public employees are economically stable, so they don't have so much satisfaction on



the restaurant when compared with that of the students. Therefore, different occupation presented significant difference on satisfaction. Hypothesis H1-3 is partly supported; there is significant difference in occupation.

Table 6 Results of one-way ANOVA--- Occupation

Constructs	Mean	Standard Deviation	F test	Significance
Price	3.80	0.66	1.34	0.21
Promotion	3.68	0.64	1.91	0.047*
Environment	3.91	0.55	1.10	0.35
Foods	4.26	0.50	1.44	0.16
Service	4.01	0.61	1.28	0.24

Note : *p<0.05 ; **p<0.01 ; ***p<0.001

Table 7 Results of Scheffe multiple comparison test

Dependent variable	Occupation	Mean Deviation	Standard Error	Significance
Promotion	Industry	-0.32	0.22	0.98
	Business	-0.27	0.21	0.99
	Public employees	-0.27	0.19	0.99
	Service	-0.38	0.20	0.93
	Professional	-0.38	0.22	0.96
	Student	-0.51	0.22	0.79
	House keeping	-0.19	0.20	1.00
	None	0.04	0.24	1.00
	Others	-0.06	0.34	1.00
	Agriculture, Forestry, Fisheries and Animal Husbandry	0.32	0.22	0.98
	Business	0.05	0.14	1.00
	Public	0.05	0.11	1.00



employees			
Service	-0.05	0.12	1.00
Professional	-0.05	0.14	1.00
Student	-0.18	0.15	0.99
House keeping	0.13	0.12	0.99
None	0.37	0.18	0.91
Others	0.26	0.30	1.00
Agriculture, Forestry, Fisheries and Animal Husbandry	0.27	0.21	0.99
Industrty	-0.05	0.14	1.00
Public employees	0.00	0.11	1.00
Service	-0.11	0.11	1.00
Professional	-0.10	0.14	1.00
Student	-0.24	0.14	0.97
House keeping	0.07	0.12	1.00
None	0.32	0.18	0.96
Others	0.21	0.30	1.00
Agriculture, Forestry, Fisheries and Animal Husbandry	0.27	0.19	0.99
Industry	-0.05	0.11	1.00
Business	-0.00	0.11	1.00
Service	-0.11	0.07	0.98
Professional	-0.10	0.11	1.00
Student	-0.24	0.11	0.88
House keeping	0.07	0.08	1.00
None	0.32	0.16	0.91
Others	0.20	0.29	1.00



Agriculture,			
Forestry,			
Fisheries and	0.38	0.20	0.93
Animal			
Husbandry			
Industry	0.05	0.12	1.00
Business	0.11	0.11	1.00
Public			
employees	0.11	0.07	0.98
Professional	0.00	0.12	1.00
Student	-0.13	0.12	0.99
House keeping	0.19	0.09	0.90
None	0.43	0.16	0.66
Others	0.32	0.29	0.99
Agriculture,			
Forestry,			
Fisheries and	0.38	0.22	0.96
Animal			
Husbandry			
Indusrty	0.05	0.14	1.00
Business	0.10	0.14	1.00
Public			
employees	0.10	0.11	1.00
Service	-0.00	0.12	1.00
Student	-0.13	0.14	1.00
House keeping	0.18	0.12	0.98
None	0.43	0.18	0.80
Others	0.31	0.30	0.99
Agriculture,			
Forestry,			
Fisheries and	0.51	0.22	0.79
Animal			
Husbandry			
Indusrty	0.18	0.15	0.99



Business	0.24	0.14	0.97
Public employees	0.24	0.11	0.025*
Service	0.13	0.12	0.99
Professional	0.13	0.14	1.00
House keeping	0.32	0.12	0.72
None	0.56	0.18	0.88
Others	0.45	0.30	0.98
Agriculture, Forestry, Fisheries and Animal Husbandry	0.19	0.20	1.00
Indusrty	-0.13	0.12	0.99
Business	-0.07	0.12	1.00
Public employees	-0.07	0.08	1.00
Service	-0.19	0.09	0.90
Professional	-0.18	0.12	0.98
Student	-0.32	0.12	0.72
None	0.24	0.17	0.99
Others	0.13	0.29	1.00
Agriculture, Forestry, Fisheries and Animal Husbandry	-0.04	0.24	1.00
Indusrty	-0.37	0.18	0.91
Business	-0.32	0.18	0.96
Public employees	-0.32	0.16	0.91
Service	-0.43	0.16	0.66
Professional	-0.43	0.18	0.80
Student	-0.56	0.18	0.45



Housewife	-0.24	0.17	0.99
Others	-0.11	0.32	1.00
Agriculture, Forestry, Fisheries and Animal Husbandry	0.06	0.34	1.00
Industry	-0.26	0.30	1.00
Business	-0.21	0.30	1.00
Public employees	-0.20	0.29	1.00
Service	-0.31	0.29	0.99
Professional	-0.31	0.30	0.99
Student	-0.45	0.30	0.98
Housewife	-0.13	0.29	1.00
None	0.11	0.32	1.00

Note : * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$

2.6 Monthly income and satisfaction

The study conducted one-way ANOVA to explore if there is significant difference between monthly income and the constructs of satisfaction (price, environment, promotion, foods, and service). According to the results reported in Table 8, there is no significant difference between occupation and satisfaction ($p > 0.05$). It is inferred that probably because the population of eat-out goes up and up, the frequency of dining at restaurant greatly increased. Even their monthly income is less than NT\$20,000 (approximately US\$ 667), the participants were not hesitate to spend money on their favorite consumption. Therefore, there existed no significant difference between monthly income and restaurant satisfaction. In addition, vegetarian has become a popular trend in the modern society because of the promotion of news report; furthermore, modern tend to pay more attention on health care, no matter how much is their income, they have a certain degree of satisfaction on vegetarian restaurant, this is why there is no significant difference between income and satisfaction. Therefore, hypothesis H1-4 (there is significant difference between income and satisfaction) is not supported.

**Table 8 Results of one-way ANOVA---Monthly income**

Constructs	Mean	Standard Deviation	F test	Significance
Price	3.80	0.66	0.29	0.87
Promotion	3.68	0.64	0.13	0.96
Environment	3.91	0.56	0.41	0.80
Foods	4.26	0.50	0.44	0.78
Service	4.02	0.61	0.74	0.56

Note : * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$

2.7 Education and satisfaction

The study conducted one-way ANOVA to explore if there is no significant difference between education and the constructs of satisfaction (price, environment, promotion, foods, and service). However, there is significant difference between education and environment ($p < 0.05$). To be very prudent, the study then conducted Scheffe to explore the detailed situation. According to the results reported in Table 9, there is no significant difference between education and satisfaction ($p > 0.05$). Therefore, hypothesis H1-5 is partly supported; there is significant difference between education and satisfaction.

Table 9 Results of one-way ANOVA--- Education

Constructs	Mean	Standard Deviation	F test	Significance
Price	3.80	0.66	2.22	0.06
Promotion	3.68	0.64	2.21	0.06
Environment	3.91	0.56	2.58	0.036*
Foods	4.26	0.50	0.34	0.84
Service	4.02	0.61	0.74	0.56

Note : * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$

3. CONCLUSION

The study conducted independent sample t-test and one-way ANOVA to examine the relationship between the demographics and vegetarian restaurant satisfaction (including the constructs such as price, promotion,



environment, foods, and service). The results are reported as Table 10.

Table 10 The results of hypothesis

Hypothesis	Results
H1 : There is significant difference between demographics and satisfaction	Not supported
H1-1 : There is significant difference between gender and satisfaction	Not supported
H1-2 : There is significant difference between age and satisfaction	Partly supported
H1-3 : There is significant difference between occupation and satisfaction	Partly supported
H1-4 : There is significant difference between monthly income and satisfaction	Not supported
H1-5 : There is significant difference between education and satisfaction	Partly supported

REFERENCES

1. Chiou, L.- R. (2009) *A Study of the Relationship among the Consumer Motivation of Expense, Satisfaction and Loyalty*. *Journal of Chienkuo Technology University*, Vol. 29, No. 1, 2009/10/01, p. 89-108.
2. Liao, Y.- X., (2013) *The Relationships among Motivations, Considerations, and Buying Channels of Vegetarian Consumption*, *National Taichung University of Science and Technology, Master Dissertation*
3. Wang, Y.-F., (2005) . *The Path Analysis of Vegetarian Nutrition Knowledge, Attitudes, Behaviors and Cooking Practices of Adult Vegetarians in Tainan*, *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 2 (1) , pp. 51-69.