

Public Policy in Food Safety for Restaurants and Its Impact on Customer Attachment: A Study from Thailand

Suphattra Yodsurang^a, Amnuay Boonratmaitree^b, Chairit Thongrawd^c,
^{a,b}College of Innovation Management, Rajamangala University of Technology
Rattanakosin, ^cCollege of Logistics and Supply Chain, Suansunandha
Rajabhat University, Bangkok, Thailand, Email: ^aBluessky28@gmail.com,
^bAm091107@hotmail.com, ^cchairit.th@ssru.ac.th

This study aims to investigate the impact of public policy regarding food safety on customer attachment in the restaurant industry of Thailand. For a better understanding, primary data was collected using a survey questionnaire from restaurant customers. A final sample of 408 respondents was observed for both descriptive and regression analyses. It is found that there is a significant relationship between various factors of food safety and the sensory perception of the food, its appearance, as well as the behaviour of the staff and customer attachment to the restaurants. The role of food safety signals and the restaurant environment cannot be ignored while dealing with customer attachment. As per the implications, this study has contributed to the field of public policy in terms of food safety and its ultimate influence on customer attachment. New insight into the dimensions of food safety is providing significant theoretical and empirical contributions to the literature and academic field. However, this study has observed several limitations too. Firstly, it is based on a sample of general customers who were visiting restaurants with no specific classification in terms of frequency of visit. Secondly, the study does not focus on the moderating effect of demographic factors like gender, age, education, and monthly income, which can affect food safety and the restaurant attachment relationship. Future studies can address these limitations with better sampling and the application of some advanced techniques like structural equation modelling.

Key words: *Public policy, food safety, customer attachment, restaurants, Thailand.*

Introduction and Literature Review

In various economies, the assurance system, titled food safety, is becoming more stringent (Henson & Caswell, 1999). Public and private quality control mechanisms are playing a significant role in this system (Bennett et al., 1994; Fulponi, 2006; Henson, 2008; Henson & Reardon, 2005). For public quality control, core examples include direct regulation from the government and product liability (Lebow, 1996; Polinsky & Shavell, 2009), while private quality control indicators the certification from the third party (Anderson, Daly, & Johnson, 1999; Caswell & Anders, 2011; Jahn, Schramm, & Spiller, 2005). Various agreements are identified in literature, covering the context of food safety. For example, implementation of the sanitary and phytosanitary agreement, as defined by the world trade organisation, integrates the relationship between public and private quality systems (Henson & Loader, 2001; Howse, 1999; Victor, 1999; Wouters & Geraets, 2012).

The regulatory system in any country is assumed to be the combination of core standards to define and monitor issues like food quality (Locke, Qin, & Brause, 2007; O'Rourke, 2003). In this regard, it is facing various challenges as regulatory authorities are facing new potential challenges regarding food risks. There is increasing pressure from consumers in both developed and developing economies to tackle the problem of low quality food (Kamran & Omran, 2018; O'Rourke, 2003; Renting, Marsden, & Banks, 2003; Seegebarth, Behrens, Klarmann, Hennigs, & Scribner, 2016). Meanwhile, food quality and safety regulations are assumed to be efficient tools for better operational and serving outcomes in the hospitality industry.

Private control systems and related standards are increasingly responding to the growing threats involved with food quality with more strict compliance from businesses (hotels and restaurants) who are involved in these activities. Various numbers of issues are highlighted in literature linked to food safety regulations. Intensity is seriously observed in both developed and developing economies. These issues fall under the title of food safety control systems (Lee et al., 2015; Tian, 2016), government approaches to various regulations (Demeritt, Rothstein, Beaussier, & Howard, 2015; Andhika, 2018), strategic responses for the stated regulations by various parties (Ortega & Tschirley, 2017; Spink, Fortin, Moyer, Miao, & Wu, 2016), links between public and private food quality control systems (Corini & van der Meulen, 2018), and various trade implications for food safety controls (Unnevehr & Jensen, 1999).

Customer satisfaction and attachment to the products or services of a businesses is not something new in the literature (Chienwattanasook & Jermsittiparsert, 2019; Jermsittiparsert, 2019). However, in the restaurant industry, customer attachment has several dimensions. For example, research (Maharani, 2013) has pointed out that positive feelings from people who

regularly visit restaurants are developed if the restaurants regularly satisfy their needs. Maharani's study indicates that feeling more associated with a restaurant specifies an increasing level of familiarity and increase in social intimacy too.

This study has considered the factor of customer attachment as a key dependent variable in the restaurant industry of Thailand, as defined by public policy through food safety. The rest of the paper is structured as follows: The present sector provides a discussion about the introduction and some literature background. Section two defines the variables and their measurement. Section three indicates the results and related discussion. Section four shows the conclusion and recommendations.

Variables and Research Design

This study has considered the factor of public policy in terms of food safety in the region of Thailand. To measure the factor of food safety, factors like the sensory perception of food, appurtenances, behaviour of the working staff, food safety signals, official inspection certificates, and restaurant environment were observed. For the measurement of sensory perception of the food (SPF), four items were selected. Four items were also selected for the appearance and behaviours of work staff (ABWSF). For food safety signals and official inspection certificates (FSS), seven items were selected. For the restaurant environment (RE), five items were observed. All these measures were extracted from the literature. To reflect the factor of customer attachment, factors like restaurant dependence (RD), restaurant identity (RI), restaurant affection (RA), and experiential commitment (EC) were selected. After the selection of these factors, questionnaires were developed and distributed among various customers who continually visited restaurants in different local areas. A final sample of 408 was collected and found to be valid for the descriptive and regression analysis. Details of the findings are as follows:

Results and Discussion of the Study

Descriptive findings are presented in Table 1 with their mean scores, standard deviations, range of the responses, percentiles, skewness, and kurtosis respectively. The total number of respondents were 408, which were found to be valid for data analysis with no missing observations. For restaurant dependence, the highest mean score was 3.397, as associated with RD2. For restaurant identity, both items have shown a mean score of above 3 and deviation of 1.16 and 1.115 respectively. For restaurant effect, RA1 has a mean score of 2.718, 3.04 for RA2, and 3.17 for RA3. Similarly, for experiential commitment, the minimum average score was 2.971 while the maximum was 3.306. For rest of the items, the trend in average score along with deviation from the mean value and other descriptive statistics are also presented under Table 1.

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics

Variables	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev	Min	Max	p1	p99	Skew.	Kurt.
Restaurant Dependence									
RD1: My restaurant is providing the best facilities.	408	2.909	1.352	1	5	1	5	.087	1.884
RD2: I frequently enjoy my best time in the restaurant.	408	3.397	1.179	1	5	1	5	-.293	2.11
RD3: Dining facilities are very friendly and I frequently depend on this.	408	3.047	1.363	1	5	1	5	-.093	1.83
Restaurant Identity									
RI1: I identify strongly with this restaurant.	408	3.429	1.165	1	5	1	5	-.579	2.733
RI2: I feel this single friendly restaurant is part of me.	408	3.485	1.115	1	5	1	5	-.346	2.358
Restaurant Affection									
RA1: I am very attached to this restaurant.	408	2.718	1.404	1	5	1	5	.216	1.743
RA2: I have strong feelings for this restaurant.	408	3.044	1.288	1	5	1	5	-.075	1.972
RA3: This restaurant means a lot to me.	408	3.172	1.262	1	5	1	5	-.23	1.972
Experiential Commitment									
EC1: This restaurant takes great care of my needs.	408	3.306	1.211	1	5	1	5	-.237	2.064
EC2: My experience with this restaurant is very necessary.	408	3.027	.822	2	4	2	4	-.05	1.487
EC3: I am committed to experiencing this restaurant.	408	2.971	.817	2	4	2	4	.054	1.504
EC4: Dining with this restaurant has great personal meaning for me.	408	3.076	1.194	1	5	1	5	-.069	2.165
Sensory Perception of Food									
SPF1: Food smells weird.	408	3.277	1.202	1	5	1	5	-.374	2.229
SPF2: Food looks fresh.	408	3.331	1.31	1	5	1	5	-.358	1.951

SPF3: Feeling sick after eating food.	408	3.061	1.353	1	5	1	5	-.099	1.911
SPF4: Whether foreign objects are found in the food/drink served.	408	2.926	1.411	1	5	1	5	.099	1.704
Appearance and Behaviours of Staff									
ABWSF1: Clothes of the staff appear clean.	408	3.887	1.043	1	5	1	5	-.983	3.607
ABWSF2: Whether the staff handles money while serving.	408	3.897	1.053	1	5	1	5	-.905	3.284
ABWSF3: Staff members have long fingernails.	408	3.765	1.191	1	5	1	5	-.674	2.49
ABWSF4: Staff using reasonable head coverings.	408	3.936	1.047	1	5	1	5	-.785	2.94
Food Safety Signals and Official Inspection Certificates									
FSS1: Restaurant provides disinfection equipment.	408	3.75	1.047	1	5	1	5	-.67	2.927
FSS2: Restaurant posts up business license.	408	3.684	1.165	1	5	1	5	-.542	2.389
FSS3: Statement about the supply source of raw materials.	408	3.706	1.052	1	5	1	5	-.659	2.896
FSS4: Restaurant posts up health certificates.	408	3.821	1.106	1	5	1	5	-.799	2.93
FSS5: Restaurant claims its tableware has been disinfected.	408	3.721	1.082	1	5	1	5	-.607	2.667
FSS6: Official notice of food safety grades.	408	3.74	1.038	1	5	1	5	-.706	2.956
FSS7: Restaurant provides disposable towels.	408	3.679	1.027	1	5	1	5	-.528	2.712
Restaurant Environment									
RE1: Restaurant is a chain of a well-known brand.	408	3.694	1.009	1	5	1	5	-.536	2.764
RE2: Price of menu.	408	3.787	1.009	1	5	1	5	-.713	3.176
RE3: Popularity and crowdedness of the restaurant.	408	3.725	.865	1	5	1	5	-.626	3.627

RE4: Scales of the restaurant.	408	3.762	1.122	1	5	1	5	-.663	2.631
RE5: Interior and exterior decoration.	408	3.75	1.052	1	5	1	5	-.705	3.031

Table 2 considers the effect of food safety indicators in terms of SPF, ABWSF, FSS, and RE on the first three measures of customer attachment. These are under the title of restaurant dependence, which considers the three items as described earlier. It was found that the effect of SPF1 on RDI, RD2, and RD3 was highly significant and negative. This indicates that the factor of food smell negatively and significantly affects all three dimensions of restaurant dependence. All the factors show coefficients significant at 1 percent, providing a confidence level of 99 percent. Through SPF2, the effect on RDI was negatively insignificant, but for RD2 and RD3, it had a highly positive and significant effect. This means that if the food looks fresh, it positively and significantly determines the level of RD2 and RD3 respectively.

The rest of the indicators of the sensory perception of the food have shown their insignificant influence on the values of RD1, RD2, and RD3. Through the appearance and behaviours of work staff or ABWSF, all factors have also shown their insignificant influence on all three dimensions of restaurant dependence, except for ABWSF4. This shows that using reasonable head coverings has a significant and positive influence on RD2 and RD3. Food safety signals and official inspection certificates involve FSS. The first factor of FSS1 has shown an adverse impact on RD1. The factor of FSS3 has shown a positive and significant influence on RD3, while FSS4 has explained a significant and direct impact on the value of RD2 in the restaurant industry of Thailand. As per the explained variation, Model 2 indicates the value of R2 at .276, followed by Model 1 and Model 3 respectively.

Table 3 provides findings for the regression output, covering the impact of food safety measures on restaurant attachment in terms of restaurant identity (RI), as measured by RI1-RI2. It shows the factor of food smell has an adverse influence on RI1, significant at 1 percent. All other indicators of SPF have shown an insignificant impact on both RI1 and RI2. Through ABWSF3, the effect on RI1 was -.174, which is an adverse effect with a 5 percent level of significance. This means that more the less cleanliness of staff members, in terms of long hairs, adversely the effect on RI in the restaurant industry of Thailand. The factor of FSS2 has a positive and significant impact on RI1, with a coefficient of .115 and standard error of .0588. In addition, the effect on RI2 through FSS3 was 0.193, significant at 5 percent. The rest of the indicators under the title of FSS have shown an insignificant influence on the value of RI in the restaurant sector of Thailand. Additionally, the factor of RE1 has shown a positive and significant influence on the value of RI2, while RE2 or price of the menu indicates the direct and significant impact of .286 and .207 on RI1 and RI2 respectively. This

means that the price of the menu specifies a significant and direct impact on both measures of restaurant identity.

Table 2

The Impact of Food safety on Restaurant Attachment (Restaurant Dependence)

	(RDI)	(RD2)	(RD3)
VARIABLES	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
SPF1: Food smells weird	- 0.363***	- 0.273***	- 0.222***
	(0.0631)	(0.0580)	(0.0643)
SPF2: Food looks fresh	-0.0553	0.134***	0.170***
	(0.0600)	(0.0498)	(0.0594)
SPF3: Feeling sick after eating this food	0.0658	0.0654	0.0826
	(0.0668)	(0.0509)	(0.0690)
SPF4: Whether foreign objects are found in the food/drink served	0.0320	0.0794	0.0101
	(0.0596)	(0.0503)	(0.0565)
ABWSF1: Clothes of the staff appear clean	-0.0772	0.130	0.0154
	(0.118)	(0.109)	(0.116)
ABWSF2: Whether the staff handles money while serving	0.0106	0.0711	-0.0120
	(0.104)	(0.104)	(0.107)
ABWSF3: Staff members have long fingernails	-0.0125	-0.0494	-0.00286
	(0.0794)	(0.0734)	(0.0849)
ABWSF4: Staff using reasonable head coverings	-0.0208	0.165*	0.215**
	(0.0957)	(0.0861)	(0.0907)
FSS1: Restaurant provides disinfection equipment	-0.182*	0.0683	0.0934
	(0.0982)	(0.0763)	(0.0927)
FSS2: Restaurant posts up business license	0.0293	-0.0980	0.0727
	(0.0701)	(0.0596)	(0.0654)
FSS3: Statement about the supply source of raw materials	-0.0525	0.0352	0.181*
	(0.101)	(0.0968)	(0.109)
FSS4: Restaurant posts up the health certificates	0.0327	0.151**	-0.0889
	(0.0890)	(0.0747)	(0.0811)
FSS5: Restaurant claims its tableware has been disinfected	-0.0657	-0.0687	-0.0456
	(0.0962)	(0.105)	(0.0933)
FSS6: Official notice of food safety grades	0.0665	0.214**	0.275***
	(0.113)	(0.0951)	(0.0991)
FSS7: Restaurant provides disposable towels	0.130	-0.154*	-0.0699
	(0.106)	(0.0900)	(0.102)

RE1: Restaurant is a chain of a well-known brand	0.276***	0.0490	0.141
	(0.0901)	(0.0802)	(0.0982)
RE2: Price of menu	0.227**	-0.00847	0.0582
	(0.110)	(0.0960)	(0.0992)
RE3: Popularity and crowdedness of the restaurant	0.3610	0.9741	0.5710
	(0.1524)	(0.369)	(0.1697)
RE4: Scales of the restaurant	0.0881	0.0512	-0.0288
	(0.0752)	(0.0667)	(0.0788)
RE5: Interior and exterior decoration	-0.0538	0.0665	-
	(0.0698)	(0.0637)	0.240***
Constant	0.149	0.505	1.034***
	(0.398)	(0.316)	(0.399)
Observations	408	408	408
R-squared	0.230	0.276	0.191

Robust standard errors in parentheses, *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

Table 3

The Impact of Food safety on Restaurant Attachment (Restaurant Identity)

	(1)	(2)
VARIABLES	Model 1	Model 2
SPF1: Food smells weird	-0.305***	0.0176
	(0.0546)	(0.0517)
SPF2: Food looks fresh	0.0782	-0.0327
	(0.0525)	(0.0427)
SPF3: Feeling sick after eating this food	-0.0110	-0.0578
	(0.0499)	(0.0542)
SPF4: Whether foreign objects are found in the food/drink served	0.0499	0.128**
	(0.0493)	(0.2507)
ABWSF1: Clothes of the staff appear clean	-0.130	-0.115
	(0.105)	(0.103)
ABWSF2: Whether the staff handles money while serving	0.183*	0.0282
	(0.103)	(0.138)
ABWSF3: Staff members have long fingernails	-0.174**	0.0509
	(0.0684)	(0.0705)
ABWSF4: Staff using reasonable head coverings	0.0944	0.0290
	(0.0870)	(0.0851)

FSS1: Restaurant provides disinfection equipment	-0.0358	-0.0815
	(0.0774)	(0.0734)
FSS2: Restaurant posts up business license	0.115*	-0.0277
	(0.0588)	(0.0513)
FSS3: Statement about the supply source of raw materials	0.0461	0.193**
	(0.0946)	(0.0929)
FSS4: Restaurant posts up the health certificates	0.0234	0.0695
	(0.0775)	(0.0759)
FSS5: Restaurant claims its tableware has been disinfected	0.00857	-0.0862
	(0.0959)	(0.0765)
FSS6: Official notice of food safety grades	0.0887	-0.0621
	(0.0995)	(0.0871)
FSS7: Restaurant provides disposable towels	-0.00827	-0.0434
	(0.0854)	(0.0863)
RE1: Restaurant is a chain of a well-known brand	-0.0396	0.131*
	(0.0754)	(0.0713)
RE2: Price of menu	0.286***	0.207**
	(0.0910)	(0.0943)
RE3: Popularity and crowdedness of the restaurant	0.0365	0.6741
	(0.2571)	(0.8368)
RE4: Scales of the restaurant	-0.0566	0.0329
	(0.0588)	(0.0686)
RE5: Interior and exterior decoration	0.0495	0.282***
	(0.0631)	(0.0625)
Constant	0.343	0.997***
	(0.269)	(0.322)
Observations	408	408
R-squared	0.279	0.239

Robust standard errors in parentheses, *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

Table 4 provides an output for the impact of food safety measures on the value of restaurant attachment, as reflected by restaurant affection. It shows weird food smells have an adverse impact on the value of all three measures of restaurant affection in Model 1, Model 2 and Model 3. Meanwhile, factors like the fresh look of food have shown a positive and direct influence on RAI2 and RAI3. This means that the fresher the look of the food, the more customers will attach to their restaurants in Thailand. The rest of the indicators in Table 4 show a insignificant impact on all three measures of RA in the restaurant sector of Thailand. Through BWSF4, the factor of RAI3 has shown a positive and significant influence in the full sample of the study. The factor of restaurants posting up their business licenses also had a

positive influence on the value of RA1 in the full sample of the study. It means that the posting of a restaurant licence can also positively influence customer attachment in the restaurant sector. FSS5 has demonstrated its negative and adverse influence on the value of RA1, whereas the factor of FSS5 positively affects the value of RAI2.

In addition, it is observed that the more the official notice of food safety grades, the more the influence on the customer attachment in terms of RA3 in the full sample of the study. Factors like RI1 and RI4 have shown their positive and negative influence on RA1.

Table 4

Impact of Food safety on Restaurant Attachment (Restaurant Affect)

	(1)	(2)	(3)
VARIABLES	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
SPF1: Food smells weird	-0.0377	-0.294***	-0.241***
	(0.0684)	(0.0582)	(0.0625)
SPF2: Food looks fresh	0.165***	-0.0450	0.181***
	(0.0596)	(0.0482)	(0.0518)
SPF3: Feeling sick after eating this food	0.0691	0.414***	0.250***
	(0.0634)	(0.0523)	(0.0552)
SPF4: Whether foreign objects are found in the food/drink served	0.176	0.000119	0.0537
	(0.597)	(0.0428)	(0.0494)
ABWSF1: Clothes of the staff appear clean	0.170	0.0359	0.123
	(0.114)	(0.0931)	(0.0811)
ABWSF2: Whether the staff handles money while serving	0.0452	0.154	-0.0194
	(0.116)	(0.103)	(0.0936)
ABWSF3: Staff members have long fingernails	-0.0577	0.0891	0.0619
	(0.0862)	(0.0650)	(0.0878)
ABWSF4: Staff using reasonable head coverings	0.00249	-0.130	0.170*
	(0.108)	(0.0859)	(0.0876)
FSS1: Restaurant provides disinfection equipment	0.138	0.0709	-0.0265
	(0.0985)	(0.0721)	(0.0799)
FSS2: Restaurant posts up business license	-0.194***	0.00291	0.0266
	(0.0716)	(0.0572)	(0.0603)
FSS3: Statement about the supply source of raw materials	-0.133	-0.0256	-0.0988
	(0.0991)	(0.0799)	(0.0920)

FSS4: Restaurant posts up the health certificates	0.00176	-0.0455	0.0116
	(0.110)	(0.0877)	(0.0814)
FSS5: Restaurant claims its tableware has been disinfected	-0.186*	0.186**	-0.0629
	(0.0965)	(0.0757)	(0.0954)
FSS6: Official notice of food safety grades	0.161	-0.00950	0.325***
	(0.123)	(0.0968)	(0.0847)
FSS7: Restaurant provides disposable towels	0.0573	0.102	0.0544
	(0.125)	(0.116)	(0.0936)
RI1: Restaurant is a chain of a well-known brand	0.204**	0.0215	0.0849
	(0.0988)	(0.0761)	(0.0792)
RI2: Price of menu	0.0113	-0.0102	-0.112
	(0.115)	(0.111)	(0.0883)
RI3: Popularity and crowdedness of the restaurant	-0.0669	0.0472	0.0157
	(0.0445)	(0.0338)	(0.0363)
RI4: Scales of the restaurant	-0.138*	-0.0259	-0.0150
	(0.0787)	(0.0561)	(0.0705)
RI5: Interior and exterior decoration	0.275***	-0.0334	0.0830
	(0.0770)	(0.0605)	(0.0649)
Constant	0.391	-0.601	-0.160
	(0.466)	(0.397)	(0.392)
Observations	408	408	408
R-squared	0.223	0.453	0.315

Robust standard errors in parentheses, *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table 5 provides the outcomes for the effect of food safety factors on the value of customer attachment. It is found that SPFI has shown a negative and significant impact on EC1, EC2 and EC4, with the coefficients of -.333, -.0675 and -.226 respectively. This means that the factor of food smell has an adverse influence on the experiential commitment of the customers in the restaurant sector of Thailand. This means that there is a significant need to establish an active public policy regarding food safety. The factor of fresh food look or SPF2 has shown a positive and significant influence on EC1 with a coefficient of .104 and standard error of 0.0456. If a customer feels sick after eating food from a specific restaurant, it has an adverse influence on the value of EC1 with the coefficient of -.117, with the standard error of 0.0487.

Meanwhile, if there is a foreign object in the food, it will also negatively affect customer attachment to the restaurant. With clean clothes, it is found that customer attachment in terms of EC1 has shown a positive and significant relationship. A factor like ABWSF is negatively

and significantly associated with EC1 in the full sample of the study. However, both RI1 and RI2 positively impact EC1 with the coefficients of 0.261 and 0.293 respectively. In terms of explanatory power, Model 1 indicates an R2 of 38.9 percent, while Model 4 shows 28.8 percent.

Table 5

Impact of Food safety on Restaurant Attachment (Experiential Commitment)

	(EC1)	(EC2)	(EC3)	(EC4)
VARIABLES	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
SPF1: Food smells weird	-0.333*** (0.0590)	-0.0675* (0.0390)	0.0213 (0.0376)	-0.226*** (0.0604)
SPF2: Food looks fresh	0.104** (0.0456)	-0.00933 (0.0343)	-0.0297 (0.0335)	0.0741 (0.0472)
SPF3: Feeling sick after eating this food	-0.117** (0.0487)	-0.0534 (0.0386)	-0.0115 (0.0373)	0.0481 (0.0581)
SPF4: Whether foreign objects are found in the food/drink served	-0.0800** (0.0406)	0.0491 (0.0338)	0.00957 (0.0350)	-0.163*** (0.0499)
ABWSF1: Clothes of the staff appear clean	0.189* (0.111)	-0.0526 (0.0679)	-0.00804 (0.0700)	0.185** (0.0914)
ABWSF2: Whether the staff handles money while serving	0.174 (0.107)	-0.0204 (0.0657)	0.0364 (0.0619)	-0.101 (0.105)
ABWSF3: Staff members have long fingernails	0.0361 (0.0881)	0.00804 (0.0504)	-0.0822 (0.0534)	-0.0501 (0.0786)
ABWSF4: Staff using reasonable head coverings	-0.267*** (0.0803)	0.0113 (0.0603)	-0.103* (0.0613)	-0.0167 (0.0884)
FSS1: Restaurant provides disinfection equipment	-0.0427 (0.0717)	0.0567 (0.0567)	0.0246 (0.0548)	-0.0569 (0.0750)
FSS2: Restaurant posts up business license	-0.0551 (0.0505)	-0.0124 (0.0415)	0.0814* (0.0430)	-0.172*** (0.0587)
FSS3: Statement about the supply source of raw materials	-0.00830 (0.0893)	-0.0787 (0.0675)	0.0249 (0.0664)	-0.0878 (0.0916)

FSS4: Restaurant posts up the health certificates	-0.0119 (0.0679)	0.0383 (0.0503)	-0.0231 (0.0516)	-0.0214 (0.0737)
FSS5: Restaurant claims its tableware has been disinfected	0.00535 (0.0809)	-0.0531 (0.0608)	0.0996* (0.0600)	0.0611 (0.0883)
FSS6: Official notice of food safety grades	-0.106 (0.0843)	0.0818 (0.0610)	0.00780 (0.0590)	0.130 (0.0982)
FSS7: Restaurant provides disposable towels	-0.0730 (0.0938)	-0.0226 (0.0648)	0.0237 (0.0662)	-0.0743 (0.103)
RI1: Restaurant is a chain of a well-known brand	0.261*** (0.0756)	-0.0321 (0.0556)	-0.0724 (0.0540)	0.297*** (0.0740)
RI2: Price of menu	0.293*** (0.0895)	0.107* (0.0590)	-0.00727 (0.0641)	0.0257 (0.0928)
RI3: Popularity and crowdedness of the restaurant	0.0334 (0.0327)	-0.0274 (0.0288)	-0.0316 (0.0288)	-0.0287 (0.0347)
RI4: Scales of the restaurant	-0.0837 (0.0650)	-0.0469 (0.0500)	0.00559 (0.0471)	-0.0955 (0.0668)
RI5: Interior and exterior decoration	-0.0458 (0.0718)	-0.0599 (0.0459)	-0.0244 (0.0453)	0.197*** (0.0673)
Constant	0.173 (0.396)	3.216*** (0.271)	3.189*** (0.279)	0.721** (0.319)
Observations	408	408	408	408
R-squared	0.389	0.048	0.040	0.288

Robust standard errors in parentheses, *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$.

Conclusions and Recommendations

This study has examined public policy in terms of food safety and its impact on customer attachment in the region of Thailand. For this purpose, this research has conducted a questionnaire survey to collect data from various customers in the restaurant industry of Thailand. Findings through regression analysis specify that for regarding customer attachment, various factors play a significant role. More specifically, factors like the sensory perception of the food in terms of food smell need significant attention. Some of the indicators have shown a positive relationship with customer attachment in the restaurant industry of Thailand. The appearance and behaviour of working staff are found to be



significant determinants of customer attachment to restaurants. However, factors like food safety signals have shown little to no impact on customer attachment in the restaurant sector of Thailand.

Additionally, restaurant environments need to be restructured and redefined to get better findings regarding the impact of food safety on the customer attachment in Thailand. As per the implications, this study has contributed to the field of public policy in terms of food safety and its ultimate influence on customer attachment. New insight into the dimensions of food safety provides significant theoretical and empirical contributions to the literature and academic field. Currently, a reasonable gap is present in the field of public policy regarding restaurant food safety and its relationship with customer attachment. Therefore, this study has provided academic implications.

The study's findings are very beneficial for the policymakers, students, and restaurant managers to recognise trends in the hospitality sector while considering food safety and customer attachment. However, this study has observed several limitations too. First, it is based on a general sample of the customers who were visiting restaurants with no specific classification in terms of frequency of visitation. Second, the study does not focus on the moderating effect of demographic factors like gender, age, education, and monthly income, which can affect the food safety and restaurant attachment relationship. Future studies can address these limitations with better sampling and application of some advanced analysis techniques like structural equation modelling.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, S. W., Daly, J. D., & Johnson, M. F. (1999). Why firms seek ISO 9000 certification: regulatory compliance or competitive advantage? *Production and operations management*, 8(1), 28-43.
- Andhika, L. R. (2018). Discretion and Decentralization: Public Administrators Dilemmas in Bureaucracy Innovation Initiatives. *Otoritas: Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan*, 8(1), 17-31.
- Bennett, S., Dakpallah, G., Garner, P., Gilson, L., Nittayaramphong, S., Zurita, B., & Zwi, A. (1994). Carrot and stick: state mechanisms to influence private provider behaviour. *Health policy and planning*, 9(1), 1-13.
- Caswell, J. A., & Anders, S. M. (2011). Private versus third party versus government labeling. *The Oxford handbook of the economics of food consumption and policy*, 472-498.
- Chienwattanasook, K. & Jermsittiparsert, K. (2019). Factors Affecting Art Museum Visitors' Behavior: A Study on Key Factors Maximizing Satisfaction, Post-Purchase Intentions and Commitment of Visitors of Art Museums in Thailand. *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*, 6(2), 303-334.
- Corini, A., & van der Meulen, B. (2018). Regulating food fraud: Public and private law responses in the EU, Italy and the Netherlands. *A handbook of food crime. Immoral and illegal practices in the food industry and what to do about them. Policy Press and Bristol University, Bristol, UK*, 159-174.
- Demeritt, D., Rothstein, H., Beaussier, A.-L., & Howard, M. (2015). Mobilizing risk: explaining policy transfer in food and occupational safety regulation in the UK. *Environment and planning A*, 47(2), 373-391.
- Fulponi, L. (2006). Private voluntary standards in the food system: The perspective of major food retailers in OECD countries. *Food policy*, 31(1), 1-13.
- Henson, S. (2008). The role of public and private standards in regulating international food markets. *Journal of International Agricultural Trade and Development*, 4(1), 63-81.
- Henson, S., & Caswell, J. (1999). Food safety regulation: an overview of contemporary issues. *Food policy*, 24(6), 589-603.
- Henson, S., & Loader, R. (2001). Barriers to agricultural exports from developing countries: the role of sanitary and phytosanitary requirements. *World development*, 29(1), 85-102.
- Henson, S., & Reardon, T. (2005). Private agri-food standards: Implications for food policy and the agri-food system. *Food policy*, 30(3), 241-253.



- Howse, R. (1999). Democracy, science, and free trade: risk regulation on trial at the World Trade Organization. *Mich. L. Rev.*, 98, 2329.
- Jahn, G., Schramm, M., & Spiller, A. (2005). The reliability of certification: Quality labels as a consumer policy tool. *Journal of Consumer Policy*, 28(1), 53-73.
- Jernsittiparsert, K. (2019). Service Marketing Mix and Service Value: A Way to Increase Customer Satisfaction. In *Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Business and Information Management* (pp. 52-58). New York: ACM.
- Kamran, H. W., & Omran, A. (2018). Impact of Environmental Factors on Tourism Industry in Pakistan: A Study from the Last Three Decades *The Impact of Climate Change on Our Life* (pp. 197-212): Springer.
- Lebow, C. C. (1996). Federalism and Federal Product Liability Reform: A Warning Not Heeded. *Tenn. L. Rev.*, 64, 665.
- Lee, J., Castle, M., Duncan, G., Hathaway, S., van der Logt, P., Wagener, S., . . . Silva, U. (2015). Example of a microbiological criterion (MC) for verifying the performance of a food safety control system: Campylobacter Performance Target at end of processing of broiler chickens. *Food control*, 58, 23-28.
- Locke, R. M., Qin, F., & Brause, A. (2007). Does monitoring improve labor standards? Lessons from Nike. *ILR Review*, 61(1), 3-31.
- Maharani, Y. (2013). Creating Place Attachment to Restaurants with Ethnic Ambience in Attempt to Support Local Values in Bandung. *The International Journal of Social Science*, 7(1), 181-187.
- O'Rourke, D. (2003). Outsourcing regulation: Analyzing nongovernmental systems of labor standards and monitoring. *Policy Studies Journal*, 31(1), 1-29.
- Ortega, D. L., & Tschirley, D. L. (2017). Demand for food safety in emerging and developing countries: A research agenda for Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa. *Journal of Agribusiness in Developing and Emerging Economies*, 7(1), 21-34.
- Polinsky, A. M., & Shavell, S. (2009). The uneasy case for product liability. *Harv. L. Rev.*, 123, 1437.
- Renting, H., Marsden, T. K., & Banks, J. (2003). Understanding alternative food networks: exploring the role of short food supply chains in rural development. *Environment and planning A*, 35(3), 393-411.
- Seegebarth, B., Behrens, S. H., Klarmann, C., Hennigs, N., & Scribner, L. L. (2016). Customer value perception of organic food: cultural differences and cross-national segments. *British Food Journal*, 118(2), 396-411.



- Spink, J., Fortin, N. D., Moyer, D. C., Miao, H., & Wu, Y. (2016). Food fraud prevention: policy, strategy, and decision-making–implementation steps for a government agency or industry. *CHIMIA International Journal for Chemistry*, 70(5), 320-328.
- Tian, F. (2016). *A quality and safety control system for China's dairy supply chain based on HACCP & GSI*. Paper presented at the 2016 13th International Conference on Service Systems and Service Management (ICSSSM).
- Unnevehr, L. J., & Jensen, H. H. (1999). The economic implications of using HACCP as a food safety regulatory standard. *Food policy*, 24(6), 625-635.
- Victor, D. G. (1999). The sanitary and phytosanitary agreement of the World Trade Organization: An assessment after five years. *NYUJ Int'l L. & Pol.*, 32, 865.
- Wouters, J., & Geraets, D. (2012). Private food standards and the World Trade Organization: some legal considerations. *World Trade Review*, 11(3), 479-489.