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Abstract
The study investigated modern and traditional restaurants patronage among selected undergraduates residing in Tanke, Ilorin South Local Government Area, Kwara-State, Nigeria. Three research questions were raised and two null hypotheses were formulated and tested at 0.05 level of significance. There are 23,450 populations of undergraduates’ residents in Tanke, Ilorin Kwara State, Nigeria. Multistage sampling technique was used to select 150 respondents conveniently. Questionnaire was used to solicit information from the respondents. The findings revealed that the respondents agreed that modern restaurants observed hygienic practices better than traditional restaurants with the grand mean scores of 2.82 and 2.32. In addition, the grand mean score of modern and traditional restaurants reasons for patronage were 3.01 and 2.54 respectively. Conclusively, food is a basic necessity of life.
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Introduction
Clothing, shelter and food are the three basic necessities that human beings need in order to live. Although food was considered only as a mean of survival during long periods of human history, people have been demanding more sophisticated food and a food culture might emerge. Beginning in the 20th century ethnic cuisine from all continents, gourmet foods, organic, home-grown foods and food art reflect how far food has evolved from fare that fulfills hunger (Hotelli- ja ravintolamuseo, 2003).

Food is the basic necessity of life. Everybody eats food and most people enjoy it. It is the core product of restaurant; it plays a pivotal role in the eatery experience. Food quality has been generally accepted as a major factor influencing customer patronage, satisfaction and post-dining behavioral intentions (Ofurum and Agwu 2011). According to Rajput et al, (2012) and Han et al (2009) the nutrients must be consumed in the proper proportion and amount. Some other factors need to be inclusive in good restaurants: environment, food safety, price and food handling are very important. Olusanya, et al, (2014).

Restaurants are establishments in which foods are quickly prepared, ordered and picked up from the counters after payment. Okhiria and Karim (2005) opined that there are various kinds of restaurants such as: stands and kiosks where shelter may or may not be provided for the customers. This is common among the traditional restaurants, Foods and drinks are ready for the customers to pick up or consume within the premises in a moderate price. From the 1960s, the number of restaurants in Finland increased substantially and the industry began to gain more variety in the 1980’s, sped up by Alko’s more liberal policy and the economic boom of the late 1980’s (Häkkinen, 2010). The restaurant sectors, together with hotels, have expanded largely in terms of employment, which increased by 35.0% in the 1990s and 9.0% in the 2000s according to a MARA report (Matkailu- ja Ravintolapalvelut MaRa, 2013). There is also a growing trend of eating out in Finland, according to the same report. Consumers find it more convenient nowadays to eat outside their homes because of their tight schedules. Salami and Ajobo (2012) perceived increase in the number of restaurants that crop up in every location globally today. Thus suggesting that this sector is gaining acceptance among customers. In addition, both modern and traditional restaurants in Nigeria are beehives of
activities and are gaining a lot of attention in the world. Tabassum and Rahman (2012) asserted that acceptance and utilization of restaurants in every growing location of the world is a product of globalization. Thus every society is now consuming foods through restaurants. Customers are attracted with dedicated service with high quality food Yousef et al (2016) and Mohammed (2012). Ryu and Han (2011) and Kotler (2011) asserted that they seek quality food and services to have an unforgettable experience and satisfaction of needs.

Raja, et al (2014) and Kotler et al (2012) asserted that customer’s satisfaction become the most important part in the business field because when the customer is satisfied, then it will provide the profitable business to the industry. In addition, Ahsan et al (2014) explained that restaurants mostly pay attention to the manner in which customers are being served and continuously worked upon the outstanding service quality. Also, Yousef et al (2016) explained that customer satisfaction is the consequence of customer expectation and customer perception of service quality. Brunner-Sperdin et al (2012) stated that emotional experience during service consumption is a centered factor which affects the customer satisfaction. On the other hand, Keshavarz et al (2015), Chen et al (2013), Mola et al (2011), Poon et al (2005) and Oliver (1999) argued that quality gap is the main cause of customer dissatisfaction. Customer overall satisfaction levels are associated with a possibility of repurchase restaurant (Choi et al (2001) and a high level of customer satisfaction caused in a higher share of purchases and better relationship continuity in the restaurant industry (Kim et al (2002).

According to Mustapha et al, (2014) they explained further the reasons of patronizing restaurants: that they do not only help customers to satisfy their hunger but it is also creating need for convenience, pleasure, entertainment, time saving, social interaction and mood transformation. Besides consumers’ experience excitement, pleasure and sense of personal wellbeing, they also enjoyed getting the foods of their choice easily and conveniently. Also, Lundberg (2001) opined that some other factors like quality of food, persuasive services provided, freshness of food, packaging style delivery servicing timings, variety of foods, late offerings, friends gathering and co-operation of staff are also important. In addition, there are two kinds of restaurants: traditional and modern.

Traditional restaurants are known as “Bukataria” the word “Buka” in Southern Nigerian context connotes local restaurants set up by ageing and matured women. They are usually scattered around the major cities close to motor parks, artisan shops and markets. These restaurants are patronized mainly by lower class status such as artisans, mechanics, construction workers, market women because the foods are affordable and easily accessed. Essentially, traditional restaurants serve indigenous dishes such as Amala, Pounded Yam, Foofoo, Eba and other varieties of dishes which cut across the Nigerian ethnic groups accompanied with soups like Vegetable Soup, Melon soup, Bitter-leaf Soup, Okro Soup, Craincrain drawing Soup. Also included in the menu lists are: Boiled Rice, Boiled Beans and Fried Plantain (Anyakoha 2015).

Modern Restaurants are also known as Luncheonettes. Mohsin (2005) opined that the critical success of these establishments are the fast quality services rendered. Examples of these outlets in Nigeria are: Mr Biggs, Tantalizers, Tastee Fried Chicken Skippers, Creamy Inn, Chicken Republic etc. These restaurants provide satisfaction to the customers. In addition, they provide conducive environment for eating, enjoy the company of friends, family and love ones. Attention is given to food quality, taste, interior decoration, tangibles and location. This is a medium where customer might relax, enjoy and socialize themselves (Soderlund and Ohman 2005).

In New Zealand, restaurant can offer different cuisine and concepts, as well as establishment styles, and operate under different management structures. Nevertheless, while the industry is
diverse, commercial restaurants all share similar attributes as they offer food and beverages to customers for consumption on the premises in return for monetary gains (Brotherton, 2003: Kiefer, 2002). Chen, (2014), in New Zealand the restaurant industry generates over $5 billion in annual turnover and employs over 80,000 people. As Auckland is New Zealand’s largest city, it dominates the industry. (Cho (2009) and Hospitality New Zealand, (2012)). According to Auckland Region Restaurant Record (2012), it is estimated that there are 2000 restaurants in the Auckland area.

In Finland, there are: Casual Dining and Fine Dining restaurants. Casual Dining restaurants are defined as “appealing to a wide audience, provide a variety of food items, from appetizers and salads to main dishes and desserts,” and “offering comfortable atmospheres with mid-range prices” (Jacquelyn, 2001). Fine Dining restaurants are defined as “full service restaurants with upscale menu and extensive beverage offerings”, with “more sophisticated décor and ambiance, the wait staff is usually highly trained and there is often a dress code for patrons” (Trends in Fine Dining, 2011 and Tran 2015).

Modern restaurants have become one of the most profitable industry in the world. The chain is satisfying the demand of customers in variety of range of products and services. Facilities available for hygienic practices in restaurants include adequate gadgets for cleaning the environment, available functional toilet, adequate utensils for cooking and eating, Borehole and well water safe for cooking and drinking and adequate dirty bins for waste disposal.

In addition, consumers consider restaurants food hygiene practices. Food hygiene is more than just cleanliness, it includes all practices involved in protecting food from risk of contamination including harmful bacterial poisoning and foreign bodies in the food prepared. Customers consider price, food quality, eating image, environment, quick service, service quality, and customer demographic as some of their reasons for patronage.

Customers select their restaurants of choice based on many factors. Most people believe high quality, good tasting food is the first priority in restaurants selection. Besides, they also dine where the natives eat, and authentic cuisine is offered (Ayseozfar-ozcelik (2007 and Deng, Lu, Wei and Zhang (2006). According to Gustafsson et al, (2005), individuals have the right to inspect food, they eat to be free from food and water borne diseases that will be suitable to consumers’ satisfaction. Everyone, including farmers and growers, manufacturers and processors, food handlers, undergraduates and other consumers have responsibilities to ensure that the food they consume is suitable and safe. Price quantity and safety of foods served in restaurants and school environments have been the concern. Namkung (2007) opined unhygienic environment where most restaurants are located contributes in transmission of food borne diseases. Health experts in Nigeria have said that the shortage of water may affect the success of any safety campaign. Where and how individuals eat food is essential to their health. It has been observed that undergraduates of the University of Ilorin, Nigeria prefer to eat outside their homes and hostels due to their hours of lectures, tutorials and their practical that make some of them feel busy, tired or lazy to cook after the daily activities. It is on this premise that influence on traditional and modern restaurants among selected undergraduates in University of Ilorin, Ilorin Kwara State, Nigeria was based.

**Problem Statement**

Food is one of the basic needs of life which is essential for survival. Where and how people eat food is essential to their health. It has been observed that undergraduate students of the University of Ilorin Nigeria prefer to eat outside their homes and hostels were problems stated.
Justification of the Study
The study will enlighten the stakeholders to be conscious of where to eat, their location, components, concepts of modern and traditional restaurants. In addition, the food preparation, hygienic practice and basic infrastructure available to meet the comfortability of the customer. Furthermore, it will the customers to be conscious of the type of restaurant to be patronized.

Research Questions
i. What are the socio-economic characteristics of selected Nigerian undergraduates based on gender, religion and parental background?
ii. What are the infrastructures available for hygienic practices of modern and traditional restaurants observed by the respondents?
iii. What are the reasons for patronizing modern and traditional restaurants by the respondents?

Research Hypotheses
Two null hypotheses were formulated and tested at 0.05 level of significance

H01 There is no significant difference between modern and traditional restaurants on facilities available for hygienic practices
H02 There is no significant difference between traditional and modern restaurants.

Research Methodology
Research Design: Descriptive design was used for the study.

Population of the Study: The respondents consisted of those residing in; 1) Oke-Odo, 2) Mountain of Fire, 3) Sanrab, 4) Ajanaku and 5) Mark. There are 23,450 total population of undergraduates residing in these wards (Landlord Association Handbook).

Sampling Procedure: Purposive random sampling technique was adopted to select 150 respondents from the five (5) areas using multi stage techniques purposively from the five areas conveniently.

Validation and Reliability: The questionnaire was validated by three experts from the department of Home Economics and Food Science of University of Ilorin, Nigeria. Pilot study was carried out with 20 respondents. The score obtained was subjected to Cronbach alpha coefficient statistics formula to determine the reliability co-efficient. The reliability attained was subjected to Cooper and Schindler (2008) that indicated 0.70 as acceptance reliability coefficient.

Instrumentation: Structured questionnaire was used to solicit information from the respondents. 150 copies of questionnaire were distributed and retrieved with the help of two research assistants. 4-likert scale of Strongly Agree (4), Agree (3), Strongly Disagree (2), Disagree (1) to measure responses of the research questions was employed. 2.50 (4+3+2+1 = 10/4 = 2.50) mean score was used as the decision rule. Any item below 2.50 was termed disagreed while item that scored above 2.50 was termed as agreed.

Data Analysis: Descriptive analysis such as frequency, percentage and mean were used to analyze the data. Chi-Square was used as inferential statistics to measure the two hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance.
**Findings**

Table 1: Socio economic characteristics of the respondents N=150

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gender: Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>92</td>
<td>61.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>37.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Religion: Christian</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>42.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Islam</td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>56.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Age: Below 20years</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20years-22years</td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>47.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23years-25years</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26years and above</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Parent Occupation:</td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>42.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entrepreneur</td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government worker</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Feeding Allowance of the</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>49.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>students</td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>40.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bimonthly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field survey (2016)

Figure 1: Pie charts representing socio-economic characteristics of respondents

Source: Field survey (2016)
Table 1 indicated socio economic characteristics of the respondents. The data revealed that 92 (61.59%) of the respondents were male, 58 (37.75%) were females, 85 (56.95%) practiced Islam and 65 (42.3%) respondents were Christians. On age, 71 (47.80%) respondents were with the age range of 20-22, below 20years and 23-25years were 31 (21.19%), while 26 years and above were 9(3.9%) respondents. This implied that majority of the respondents are: 92(61.59%) male, 85(56.95%) practiced Islam, 71(47.80%) are between ages 20-22 years and majority of their parents are government workers.

Table 2: Facilities available for hygienic practices in modern and traditional restaurants observed by respondents. N=150

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Modern Restaurants</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Traditional Restaurants</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Adequate cleaning gadgets for the environment</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Available functioning toilets</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Clean and adequate cooking utensils</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dust bins for Refuse disposal</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Clean water for cooking and drinking</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grand Mean</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey (2016)

Figure 2: Bar chart representing infrastructure available for hygienic practices in modern and traditional restaurants observed by respondents.

Table 2 indicated facilities available for hygienic practices in modern and traditional restaurants observed by the respondents in the study area. The respondents agreed that modern restaurants observed hygienic practices better than traditional restaurants with the grand mean scores of 2.82 and while respondents disagreed with traditional restaurants with the grand mean score of 2.32 that is less than 2.50 decision rule. This implied that the grand mean score of the modern restaurants was significantly higher than the traditional restaurants. Soderlund et al (2005) stated that made restaurant provide satisfaction to their customers. In addition, the modern restaurants provide conducive environment for eating, attention given to food quality, taste and interior decoration.
Furthermore, facilities available for hygienic practices in modern restaurants in the study areas were better than the traditional restaurants. Adequate gadgets for cleaning the environment, available functional toilet, adequate utensils for cooking and eating. Mohsin (2005) opined that the critical success of these establishments are the fast quality services as well as outlet ambiances which are parts of the total added values.

**Table 3: Reasons for Patronizing Modern and Traditional restaurants by the Respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Modern Restaurants</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Traditional Restaurants</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Price</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sense of personal wellbeing</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Food quality</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Eating image</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Quick Service</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Service quality</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grand Mean</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey (2016).

Figure 3: Bar chart representing reasons for Patronizing Modern and Traditional restaurants by the Respondents

Table 3 indicated reasons for patronage of modern and traditional restaurants by the respondents. The data revealed that the grand mean scores of modern restaurants was 3.01 while traditional restaurants was 2.54. This implied that respondents had reasons for patronizing modern and traditional restaurants because the grand mean scores are higher than 2.50 decision rule. Furthermore, respondents had reasons for patronizing modern and traditional restaurants. According to Mustapha, et al (2014) they opined that restaurants do not only help customers to satisfy their hunger alone but also involve in entertainment, time saving, social interaction and the mood transformation. Furthermore, they asserted that besides consumers experiencing excitement, pleasure and sense of personal wellbeing, they also enjoyed getting the foods of their choice easily and conveniently.
Table 4: Chi-square analysis of respondents on effects of infrastructure available on hygienic practices observed on the patronage of modern and traditional restaurants by the respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Cal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Modern restaurants</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>2.8240</td>
<td>4.533</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Traditional restaurants</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>2.3240</td>
<td>3.9064</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey (2016)

Table 4 indicated that chi-square analysis of respondents on effects of infrastructure available on hygienic practices observed on the patronage of modern and traditional eateries. The data shows p-value of 0.038 testing at an alpha level of $p < 0.05$. Therefore, the null hypothesis which stated that there is significant difference in the hygienic practices of modern and traditional restaurants patronized by the respondents is rejected. Consequently, there is no significant difference in the hygienic practices of modern and traditional restaurants patronized by the respondents in the study area with the mean score of 2.82 and 2.32 respectively. This implied that the respondents are satisfied with the services rendered in both restaurants.

Table 5: Chi-square analysis on reasons of Patronage of modern and traditional restaurants by the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Cal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Modern restaurants</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>5.3340</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0440</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Traditional restaurants</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>5.2578</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey (2016)

Table 5 indicated chi-square analysis on the patronage of modern and traditional restaurants by the respondents. The data revealed p-value of 0.0440 testing at an alpha of 0.05. The p-value of 0.0440 testing at an alpha of 0.05, the p-value is lesser than the alpha value ($p<0.05$). Therefore, null hypothesis which stated that there is no significant difference on the reasons of a patronage of modern and traditional restaurants by the respondents is accepted. Respondents patronized traditional restaurants to eat indigenous dishes which cut across the Nigerian ethnic groups accompanied with soups (Anyakoha 2015). Moshin (2005) opined that in modern restaurants, fast quality services are rendered. In addition, Trends in Fine Dining (2011) asserted that there are casual dining and fine dining restaurants in Finland. There restaurants are appealing to a wide audience, provide a variety of food items from appetizers and salads to main dishes and desserts with comfortable atmosphere and mid-range prices.

There was very little discussion of how this study fits into the context of other, similar studies, or in what way it contributed to the field beyond what other studies have shown.

**Conclusion**

The findings showed that restaurants provide foods and beverages. Modern restaurants practiced better hygiene more than traditional restaurants with better facilities. Customers are more conscious about the food qualities and the manner in which they are served. Apart from basic needs that restaurants provide, customers also want prestige and esteem. It is equally important for the managers to balance financial and non-financial factors that influence the customers. It can be concluded that there is positive and significant relationship between reasons for customers patronage and the facilities available in the restaurants.

**Recommendations**

The following recommendations based on the findings were itemized:

1. Modern restaurants should intensify on maintaining good hygienic practices.
2. They should make the prices of their products more moderate for more patronage for quick turnover.
3. They should also incorporate indigenous foods in their menu list.
4. They should improve on their hygienic practices, entertainment and customer service system to increase customers’ patronage.

**Limitation of the Stud**

This study is limited to Ilorin, Kwara State, Nigeria and only one selected higher institution. The focus of the study is on undergraduates that resided in Tanke.

**Future Research**

1. Comparison of restaurants in urban and rural environments.
2. Perception of customer satisfaction on service rendered.
3. Influence of modern and Traditional Restaurants in South Western Nigeria or any country.
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