Consumer’s Behavioral Intention toward “Green” Restaurant: Empirical Evidence from Indonesia
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ABSTRACT

This study specifically discusses the relationships between consumers’ environmental concern, attitude, subjective norms, perceived behavioral control, and their behavioral intention toward “green” restaurant. Such a study is important because behavioral intentions towards “green” practice in the restaurant industry is still an under-explored topic in the literature, despite the “green” trend. This study adopted Theory of Planned Behavior as the theoretical framework with additional environmental concern construct as antecedent. The findings from this research illustrate that customer’s environmental concern has a positive influence with behavioral intention toward “green” restaurant especially indirectly through attitude and perceived behavioral control. This study recommends that this topic of research needs to be explored more to understand the “green” restaurant customers and to develop marketing strategies to promote “green” restaurant in Indonesia.
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INTRODUCTION

Nowadays, the society has become more concerned about the environment and considered environmental protection as their responsibility (Euromonitor, 2015; Hsu, Chang, & Yansritakul, 2017). Millennials are very concerned about the environment’s problem and corporate’s responsibility, therefore they are more likely to buy from a company that engage in social and environmental sustainability (Kotler, Bowen, Makens, & Baloglu, 2017). Environmental concern (EC) is a term used for the whole range of environmentally related perceptions, emotions, knowledge, attitudes, values and behaviors (Bamberg, 2003). Several previous researches have shown that EC can affect behavioral intention toward sustainable product or services. (Paul, Modi, & Patel, 2016), prove that EC has positive and significant effect on green product purchase intention directly and more significantly through theory of planned behavior (TPB) construct. Similarly, (Chen & Tung, 2014) study shown that consumers will form a more favorable attitude toward visiting green hotels if they have a high level of environmental concern, therefore they will be more likely to visit green hotel.

The restaurant industry has big impact on the environment (Tan et al., 2018). Restaurants drain resources by using excessive energy, non-recycled products, hazardous chemicals as cleaning agents, and increasing carbon footprint through product transportation to restaurant locations (Dipietro & Gregory, 2013). Even so, “green” practice in the restaurant industry is still an under-explored topic in the literature, despite the “go green” trend. (Kim, Lee, & Fairhurst, 2017; Myung, Mcclaren, & Li, 2012). Myung et al., 2012 reviewed 58 articles on green practices published between 2000 and 2010 in 25 hospitality journals. Only 6 articles out of 58 were about restaurant. Similarly, Kim, Lee, & Fairhurst, 2017 found only 15 articles out of 146 articles on green practices published between 2000 and 2014 in 8 hospitality journals were covering the restaurant industry.

Empirically, consumers from developed countries have higher environmental concern than those who are from developing countries (Paul et al., 2016). Previous researches had utilized the extended TPB (with environmental concern) to explain consumers’ behavior in developing nations with different context: Paul et al. (2016) studied green product purchase intention in Indian context. Meanwhile Albayrak et al. (2013) investigated consumers’ intention to subscribe e-invoice in Turkey. This study attempts to investigate consumer’s behavioral intention toward “green” restaurant in the context of developing country (Indonesia) using the Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) with Environmental Concern as the antecedent.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Green Restaurant and Green Context

Green restaurant is defined as “new or renovated structures designed, constructed, operated, and demolished in an environmentally friendly and energy-efficient manner” (Lorenzini, 1994 in (Hu, Parsa, & Self, 2010)). Meanwhile, according to (Schubert et al., 2010), “green” restaurant is any restaurant that actively engage in “green” practices. Similarly, Jang et.al (2011) defined “green” restaurant as restaurant that implement “green” practices including recycle and compost making, water and energy efficiency, waste management, and offering organic and locally-sourced menu. The term “green” can be used interchangeably with “eco-friendly” “sustainable”, or
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“environmentally friendly”, meanwhile all these terms explain all forms of activities that are good for the environment (Ham & Han, 2013; Manaktola & Jauhari, 2007).

Green practices have become a major concern in the restaurant industry as a means to increase social benefits and to sustain business in the long run (MS & Parsa, 2006). In the hospitality industry, the practice of "green" has many understandings of various approaches. According to (Manaktola & Jauhari, 2007), lodgings that implements "green" practices are those who committed to carrying out environmentally friendly practices such as saving water, saving energy, and reducing solid waste. According to (Myung et al., 2012), the practice of "green" aims to minimize the impact on the environment by implementing practices to reduce waste and to use sustainable resources and supplies. "Green" practice according to (Dipietro & Gregory, 2013) is anything that an organization can do to minimize the carbon footprint and the negative impact that an organization can have on the environment.

On this study, the term “green” restaurant is in accordance to (Schubert et al., 2010) definitions, “any restaurant that actively engage in “green” practices”. Whereas the "green" practices that can be done by restaurants include energy and water efficiency, reducing and recycling waste, offering local or organic food menus, participating in environmental protection programs, not using hazardous chemical products, and using reusable equipment (Dipietro & Gregory, 2013; Jang et al., 2011; Schubert et al., 2010).

Environmental Concern

Over the years, environmental concern has been the subject of research from various academics and marketing practitioners (Albayrak, 2013). Environmental concern (EC) refers to the degree of people's awareness of environmental problems and supports efforts to resolve them and / or shows a willingness to contribute personally to give solutions (Dunlap & Michelson, 2002). According to (Bamberg, 2003), EC is a term used for the whole range of environmentally related perceptions, emotions, knowledge, attitudes, values and behaviors (Bamberg, 2003).

The relationship between EC and behavior has been explored in various contexts. Several studies show that there is a relationship between consumers’ Environmental Concern with environmentally friendly behavior, both directly and indirectly through the Theory of planned Behavior constructs (attitude, subjective norm, and perceived behavioral control) (Albayrak, 2013; Bamberg, 2003; Paul et al., 2016). Previous research (Albayrak, 2013) in the context of e-invoice’s shows that EC is a determinant of consumer behavior who are sensitive to the environment, and positively influences consumer behavior. (Bamberg, 2003) study shows that participants with higher EC level are more likely to use the offered brochure about ‘green’ electricity products. Meanwhile, studies Paul et al. (2016) show that EC has a significant and positive influence on the environmentally friendly product purchase intention both directly, and more significantly through variable theory of planned behavior.

H1: Environmental Concern has positive effect on Attitude

H2: Environmental Concern has positive effect on Social Norm

H3: Environmental Concern has positive effect on Perceived Behavioral Control

H4: Environmental Concern has positive effect on Behavioral Intention
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**Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB)**

Theory of planned behavior (TPB) is an extension of Theory of Reasoned Action. Previous theories have limitations related to behavior where people have non-volitional control. The central factor in TPB is the intention of individuals in carrying out a certain behavior. Intention is assumed to capture the motivational factors that influence behavior. These factors can indicate how much people are willing to try, or how much effort they are planning, to carry out a behavior. As a general rule, the stronger the intention to perform a behavior, the more likely the behavior is carried out (Ajzen, 1991). TPB postulates three independent determinants of behavioral intention, attitude, subjective norm, and perceived behavioral control.

Attitude is the degree to which a person has a favorable or unfavorable evaluation of the specific behavior. Subjective norm is the perceived social pressure to perform or not to perform the behavior. Perceived behavioral control is people’s perception of the ease or difficulty of performing the behavior of interest (Ajzen, 1991). Behavioral intention is one’s affirmed likelihood to perform a certain action. (Oliver (1997) cited in (Han, Hsu, & Lee, 2009)). Intention is considered as precursor to and best predictor of behavior (Ajzen, 2002).

These intentions include the intention or willingness of consumers to repurchase services or products from a company, recommend the company (or say good things about the company), or are willing to pay a premium price (Namkung & Jang, 2007; Zeithaml, Berry, & Parasuraman, 1996). In this study, behavioral intention refers to the likelihood of "green" restaurant consumers towards revisiting intention of "green" restaurants (Han et al., 2009). Revisit Intention itself is the perceived likelihood of coming back to the same destination, which is a favorable post consumption behavior (Seetanah, Teeroovengadum, & Nunkoo, 2018).

In several studies with different contexts, these three determinants have different impacts on behavioral intention. In the study (Paul et al., 2016), of the three TPB variables, attitude was found to be the strongest predictor of environmentally friendly product purchase intention, followed by perceived behavioral control. Almost similar results were found in the study (Yadav 2016) in the context of organic food. But, the subjective norm was found to have no effect on organic food purchase intention. Studies (Nimri, Patiar, Kensbook, & Jin, 2019) in the context of environmentally friendly hotels show that Perceived Behavioral Control has the most influence in determining the intention to stay in "green" hotel, compared to other TPB constructs. Studies (Raab, Baloglu, & Chen, 2018) also show restaurant managers tend to implement environmentally friendly practices due to the influence of subjective norms and perceived behavioral control, but not significantly influenced by attitude.

H5: Attitude has positive effect on Behavioral Intention

H6: Social Norm has positive effect on Behavioral Intention

H7: Perceived Behavioral Control has positive effect on Behavioral Intention

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Standard Value</th>
<th>Value Obtained</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$P (\chi^2)$</td>
<td>$&gt; 0.05$</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Not Fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>$&lt; 0.08$</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>Not Fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>GFI</td>
<td>$&gt; 0.90$</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>Not Fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>AGFI</td>
<td>$&gt; 0.90$</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>Not Fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NFI</td>
<td>$&gt; 0.90$</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>Good Fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>NNFI</td>
<td>$&gt; 0.90$</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>Good Fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>$&gt; 0.90$</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>Good Fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>IFI</td>
<td>$&gt; 0.90$</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>Good Fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>RFI</td>
<td>$&gt; 0.90$</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>Good Fit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square=1849.75, df=198, $p$=0.000000, RMSEA=0.166
RESEARCH METHOD

This study is using quantitative method. Quantitative research is a research methodology that attempt to quantify the data and usually applies some statistical analysis (Malhotra, 2010). Current study also uses primary data. Primary data is the data originated by the researcher for particular purpose to address the research problem (Malhotra, 2010). The data was collected with online, self-administered questionnaire. The questionnaire was disseminated with purposive sampling using Google Form. The respondents were the one who had been to the “green” restaurant and also aged between 17 – 33 years old (Millennials according to Solomon, (2017)).

Before the questionnaire was disseminated, wording test and pretest with similar target respondents as main test had been done. After the pretest and the main test, statistical analysis was done with CB-SEM to analyze the measurement and structural models. CB-SEM was used because the theoretical model consisted of five constructs, which have reflectively measured indicators (Wijanto, 2015).

Characteristic of the Sample

The respondents were both female and male who had been to the “green” restaurant aged 17-33 years. This particular age group is considered as Millennials (Solomon, 2017). Millennials are very concerned about the environment’s problem and corporate’s responsibility, so they are more likely to buy from company that does “green” practice (Kotler et al., 2017). Even more, Millennials were raised with the three R mantra (reduce, reuse, recycle), according to (Thieme, Royne, Levy, & Mcenteet, 2015), 91% of the consumers stated if they don’t switch to more environmentally friendly purchase behavior, the future generations will be suffering. Millennials are also targeted by the restaurant owner since they don’t cook their own food (Euromonitor, 2019). The number of samples used in this study is 412 respondents. According to (Hair Jr., Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2014), models with seven or fewer constructs, lower communalities, and/ or having fewer than three measured items, the minimum sample is 300.

The study used measurement scales that have been validated in earlier studies. We measured environmental concern with 3-item, 7-point Likert type scale based on Paul et al. (2016). A 3-item, 7-point Likert type scale was operationalized to measure attitude towards revisiting “green” restaurant, based on Paul et al. (2016). A 4-item, 7-point Likert type scale was used to measure subjective norms, based on Paul et al.
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(2016). We measured perceived behavioral control with 5-item, 7-point Likert type scale based on Paul et al. (2016). A 2-item, 7-point Likert type scale was used to behavioral intention, based on (Ryu, Lee, & Kim, 2012).

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

In this study, data analysis was carried out using SEM with two-step approach, measurement model analysis (Confirmatory Factor Analysis) and structural model analysis.

1. Measurement Model Analysis (CFA)

The final result of the CFA model is obtained through the Assessment of goodness-of-fit of the overall model, as well as the analysis of the model's validity and reliability. Assessment of goodness-of-fit (“GOF”) was made by multiple indicators: Statistic Chi-square ($\chi^2$), Root Mean Square of Error Approximation (RMSEA), Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR), Goodness-of-Fit Index (GFI), Adjusted Goodness-of-Fit Index (AGFI), Normed Fit Index (NFI), Non-Normed Fit Index (NNFI), Comparative Fit Index (CFI). The model fit is good when the indices $\geq 0.90$, $\chi^2 \geq 0.5$, RMSEA $\leq 0.08$, and SRMR $\leq 0.05$. All the GOF statistics were in the acceptable limit, with the exception of $\chi^2$, SRMR, and AGFI that were very close to the limit. $\chi^2 = 0$, SRMR = 0.06, and AGFI 0.90. All the data is shown in the table 2.

**Table 2. Goodness of Fit**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goodness of Fit Indices</th>
<th>Measurement Model</th>
<th>Structural Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statistic chi square ($p$-value $\geq 0.05$)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA ($\leq 0.08$)</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFI ($\geq 0.90$)</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNFI ($\geq 0.90$)</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI ($\geq 0.90$)</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFI ($\geq 0.90$)</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFI ($\geq 0.90$)</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRMR ($\leq 0.05$)</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFI ($\geq 0.90$)</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGFI ($\geq 0.90$)</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of the validity of the measurement model is done by checking whether the standardized loading factor ($\lambda$) of the observed variables in the model is more than 0.5. All the items in this study were in the acceptable limit of $> 0.5$ (all the data is shown in table 2). It shows that all the items have good validity. Meanwhile the reliability analysis of the measurement model is done by calculating the value of construct reliability (CR) and variance Extracted (VE) from the value of standardized loading factors and error variances. According to (Hair Jr. et al., 2014), a construct with CR $\geq 0.70$ and VE $\geq 0.50$ is a construct with good reliability. All constructs in this study were in the acceptable limit (all the data is shown in table 2).
Table 3. Model Construct, Reliability and Validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Measurement Items</th>
<th>Loading</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>AVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Concern</td>
<td>I am very concerned about the environment.</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I would be willing to reduce my consumption to help protect the environment.</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major social changes are necessary to protect the natural environment.</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>I like the idea of purchasing green.</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Purchasing green is a good idea.</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have a favorable attitude toward purchasing green version of a product.</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Norm</td>
<td>Most people who are important to me think I should purchase green products when going</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Most people who are important to me would want me to purchase green products when going for purchasing.</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People whose opinions I value would prefer that I purchase green products.</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived behavioral control</td>
<td>My friend’s positive opinion influences me to purchase green product.</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I believe I have the ability to purchase green products.</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If it were entirely up to me, I am confident that I will purchase green products.</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I see myself as capable of purchasing green products in future.</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have resources, time and willingness to purchase green products.</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are likely to be plenty of opportunities for me to purchase green products.</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral intention</td>
<td>I would like to come back to this restaurant in the future</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I would consider revisiting this restaurant in the future</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2. Structural Model Analysis

The structural model exhibited good fit to the data with the exception of $\chi^2$ and SRMR that were marginal fit ($\chi^2 = 0$, SRMR = 0.078). All the data is shown in the table 2. The structural model analysis shows that the path between environmental concern and attitude ($t = 12.54$), between environmental concern and subjective norm ($t = 10.46$), between environmental concern and perceived behavioral control ($t = 11.27$), between attitude and behavioral intention ($t = 2.26$), between perceived behavioral control and behavioral intention ($t = 11.21$) were positive and significant. Meanwhile the path between environmental concern and behavioral intention ($t=0.02$) and between subjective norm and behavioral intention ($t = 0.58$) were insignificant (all the data is shown in table 4). The standardized solution coefficient from the analysis is similar to beta coefficient on multiple regression, that is, coefficient values close to zero indicate a smaller effect. The biggest effect was found on the relationship between perceived behavioral control and behavioral intention (0.78), closely followed by the path environmental concern and attitude (0.7) (table 4).

Table 4. Path Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>T-value</th>
<th>Standardized Solution</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1 EC -&gt; AT</td>
<td>12.54</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2 EC -&gt; SN</td>
<td>10.46</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3 EC -&gt; PBC</td>
<td>11.27</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4 EC -&gt; BI</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>insignificant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5 AT -&gt; BI</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6 SN -&gt; BI</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>insignificant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7 PBC -&gt; BI</td>
<td>11.21</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

Our finding shows that EC was found to be significant and positive for attitude, PBC, and subjective norm (from the biggest effect to the lowest consecutively). Meanwhile, EC was found to have no direct effect on behavioral intention toward revisit intention to “green” restaurant in Indonesia. Of these three TPB variables, PBC was found to be the strongest predictor for intention to revisit “green” restaurant, followed by attitude.

The findings showed that Indonesian consumers cope up really well with the disablind factors during the decision making as the perceived behavioral control emerged as the most significant construct. This finding emphasized the criticality of control perceptions in the formation of individuals’ behavioral intentions (Nimri et al., 2019). This particular condition can facilitate and simplify the consumers decision of revisiting “green” restaurant (Yadav & Pathak, 2017). Moreover, EC also influences consumers perceived behavioral control. High EC makes people search for “green” restaurant and do research about the availability options (Paul et al., 2016). So, marketers need to focus on communicating the green practice they had done in the restaurant to enhance the perceived availability beliefs and consumers’ convenience.

In accordance with previous studies, an increase in favorable attitudes results in an increase likelihood of consumers revisiting "green" restaurants (Han & Kim, 2010). When consumers have favorable attitude, and show high environmental concern, they tend to do extra effort to protect the environment (Paul et al., 2016). That’s why consumers who are highly concerned about environment need to be targeted first as they held positive attitude towards revisiting “green” restaurant. Subjective norms did not show significant impact on the revisit intention toward “green” restaurant. This implies that visiting restaurant that
practices green is yet to become social norm in a developing country such as Indonesia. This is consistent with previous study (Paul et al., 2016; Yadav & Pathak, 2016). Consumers may also feel that approval of “significant others” is not that important for revisiting “green” restaurant. Or else, their family/friends/peer group could not provide any positive thrust concerning a reason for buying green products to consumers. Marketers need to do campaigns to create awareness of how small movements and day-to-day decision can affect the environment using “opinion leaders” like celebrities, sports star etc. The study has certain limitations that should be addressed in the future studies. This study examined customer’s intention to revisit any “green” restaurant. If the study focused on customer’s behavior in a specific segment of “green” restaurant, the findings (e.g., magnitude of the relationships among variables) would be different and more specific. With self-administered questionnaire, respondents might deliver answers according to how they believe they should behave, not how they actually behave. Future researchers can investigate consumers’ actual behavior by observing and/or interviewing in their future studies.

CONCLUSION

The findings from this research illustrate that customer’s environmental concern has a positive influence with behavioral intention toward “green” restaurant especially indirectly through attitude and perceived behavioral control. This study recommends that this topic of research needs to be explored more to understand the “green” restaurant customers and to develop marketing strategies to promote “green” restaurant in Indonesia.
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