

The Evaluation of Restaurants Websites: American Pizza Restaurants Case Study

Yousery Nabil Elsayed^{1,2} Mohamed H. Hefny³ Mostafa N. Marghany¹ Ahmed M. Radwan¹
¹Helwan University ²Umm Al Qura University ³Virginia Tech University

Abstract

Many Authors highlighted the advantage of being affiliated in hospitality industry. This was challenged by the evolution of technology and new generations' characteristics. Today's Internet afforded limitless opportunities for independent restaurants to stand against the affiliated ones. The wide spread of smartphones created an opportunity to reach customers anywhere and opened a channel of distribution for restaurants products targeting new generations, who were recognized as technology savvy customers.

The research aimed to evaluate the restaurants' websites in today's business environment. This research used restaurant's website assessment tool and word cloud analysis technique. The authors developed a website checklist, which was customized for restaurants. The study started with sixty-seven restaurants (i.e., twenty-eight independent restaurants, thirty-nine chain restaurants) and ended with forty-seven restaurants (i.e., twelve independent restaurants, thirty-five chain restaurants) which were included in the research sample. The research findings highlighted several issues in restaurants' websites' performance and how far the affiliation supported restaurants' websites compared with independent ones. A list of recommendations was developed to help restaurants' owners in maximizing the impact of affiliation on their business and to develop their restaurants' websites.

Keywords: Restaurants Websites; Affiliated Restaurants; Independent Restaurants; Restaurants Business Environment.

Literature Review

Since the late 1990s, information technology has been playing a vital role in reshaping the hospitality industry (Wang et al., 2015). The sky rocketing increase of numbers of internet users supported the fact that Internet is the backbone of today's businesses, and hospitality is not an exception (Jeon and Jeong, 2017). This motivated many hospitality and tourism practitioners to pay more attention to their online presence to develop and maintain relationships with their customers by decreasing the gap between them, while enlarging their market share (Diaz and Koutra, 2013; Law et al., 2010; Ponte et al., 2015). Restaurant website is one of the Internet distribution channels that can boost distribution and revenue using its popularity (Kimes, 2011).

Many authors (e.g., Aaberge et al., 2004; Litvin et al., 2005; Beldona and Cai, 2006; Bai et al., 2007; Park and Gretzel, 2007; Bai et al., 2008; Law and Bai, 2008; Diaz and Koutra, 2013; Wang et al., 2015; Ali, 2016; Jeon and Jeong, 2017) discussed the importance of websites as a marketing tool for the hospitality and tourism operations. Consequently, restaurants' practitioners are in need to know more about Internet marketing in order to develop high-quality websites for their restaurants, due to the fact that website quality has a great impact on online consumers' purchase intention (Hsu et al., 2012; Kim and Lennon, 2013). Unfortunately, many hospitality e-marketing researches handled hotel sector challenges, despite the fact that restaurant sector has a high potential for internet marketing (Hwang et al., 2011).

Pizza restaurants represented a large sector of the U.S. restaurant industry, with 76,723 locations and total sales of \$44.43 billion, representing for the year ending in September 2015 (PMQ Pizza Magazine, 2017). Based on the size and importance of this sector of the U.S. restaurant industry, National Restaurant Association launched Pizzeria Industry Council to engage the senior

executives from the pizza restaurants sector in discussing and addressing issues of interest to pizza operators (National Restaurant Association, 2013).

Unlike individual restaurants, chain restaurants benefit from restaurant chains ability to build strong brands and strengthen their competitiveness in effort to increase their market share (Han et al., 2015). Chain restaurants share a brand name, menu items, food supplies, quality of products and services, and marketing plans (Luca, 2011). Hashim and Murphy (2007) concluded this as affiliated hospitality operations had more online presence compared to non-affiliated operations. This was supported by Leung et al. (2011) who found that affiliated operations had a higher passion towards the adoption of Web 2.0 applications than independent operations. A good example of how affiliations influenced the online presence was Pizza Hut which gained 29 million likes on its Facebook page, followed by Domino's Pizza with 16 million likes.

Hospitality operations websites' quality received a great attention by hospitality practitioners and researchers due to their role in developing the business (Ali, 2016). Jeon and Jeong (2017) suggested that maintaining quality websites helps in retaining customers and encourages them to revisit the website by developing their loyalty to the business. In their studies, researchers have examined aspects that go beyond the quality of presented information, accessibility, and ease of use (Herrero and San Martin, 2012). Some researchers assessed the relationship between website service quality and customer experience (Chiou et al., 2010). According to Casaló et al. (2008), other researchers studied the relationship between website quality and the hospitality operation's image (As cited in Jeon and Jeong, 2017, p. 439).

Moustakis et al. (2004) stated that the term website quality is a multidimensional construct used to assess website's content and design. Although there were many definitions by many authors, the current study adopted the definition suggested by Chang and Chen (2008) who defined website quality as "*users' evaluation of whether a web site's features meet users' needs and reflect the overall excellence of the website*" (p. 821). Bai et al., (2008) pointed to this definition's uniqueness as it reflects the centrality of customers in assessing websites.

Many scholars proposed and used different approaches to evaluate hospitality website quality (e.g., Gregory et al., 2010; Wang et al., 2015). Consumer usability and business functionality are the most common approaches used to evaluate website quality (Gregory et al., 2010). They explained that the consumer usability approach deals with the website's content, the ability to navigate through data, the availability of information, the ability to communicate, and the ability to purchase. Park and Gretzel (2007) identified nine factors that can be used in assessing a website from the consumer usability approach, these factors were gathered from tourism and non-tourism studies and included: (1) "*Information Quality*"; (2) "*Ease of Use*"; (3) "*Security/Privacy*"; (4) "*Visual Appearance*"; (5) "*Personalization*"; (6) "*Responsiveness*"; (7) "*Interactivity*"; (8) "*Trust*"; and, (9) "*Fulfillment*".

The business functionality approach in evaluating website quality can be related to the concept of the balanced scorecard in evaluating a company's performance (Gregory et al., 2010). In the same line, researchers like (So and Morrison, 2004) used the modified balanced scorecard approach in evaluating the effectiveness of national tourism organizations in the East Asia region in using their websites for Internet marketing. Their websites' evaluation criteria included four perspectives: technical, marketing, customer, and destination information. The current study developed an assessment tool that combined the two approaches to website evaluation by assessing each website's availability of information, ability to navigate, privacy and trust, while assessing the use of the website in marketing as well.

Methodology

Population and Sampling Technique

The business environment varied from place to another. Based on this fact, the research sample was selected from ten college towns within the same state (i.e., Kentucky State), in order to compare between restaurants working in similar business environment. The research targeted pizza restaurants in: Bowling Green; Columbia; Highland Heights; Louisville; Lexington; Morehead; Murray; Richmond; Williamsburg; and Wilmore. A college town was identified a society where one or more university or college is located, and that university/college shapes the culture and character of the community (Gumprecht, 2003). Gumprecht added that college towns were also known for their distinctive market environments due to the high densities of youth who were considered as early adopters of new trends in shopping.

Yellow Pages 2016 was used to select the sample out of the identified towns. The study used a stratified sampling technique that divided pizza restaurants into two strata: i.e. independent (twelve restaurants) and chain (thirty-five restaurants). Stratified sampling was identified as a useful technique that divides the targeted population into subgroups, called strata, in order to get a more accurate and representative sample (Loveric, 2011; McMillan, 2012; De Vaus, 2013; Rossi et al., 2013).

Data Collection and Coding

Yellow Pages 2016 and Google search engine afforded rich resources to identify valid websites to be included in the sample. In addition to this, each restaurant's website was visited to assure the followings: 1) its status as being chain or independent; 2) its location in a college town at Kentucky; 3) it has a working website. For instance, four chain restaurants were excluded as they were out of the State of Kentucky to be thirty-five chain restaurants out of the initially identified thirty-nine. These excluded four restaurants that were found on Yellow Pages as they do not have valid websites. Another example was at the independent restaurants sample, as fourteen independent restaurants were avoided for different reasons as they closed their business, for they were sold, or having no websites. Thus, the final filtered investigated sample composed of twelve independent restaurant (out of twenty-eight initially identified independent restaurants) and thirty five chain restaurants (out of thirty-nine initially identified chain restaurants).

The research used two tools for examining the restaurants' websites' contents. The first tool was an assessment tool which was developed and customized based on previous studies (i.e., Nassar, 2002; Vrana et al., 2004; Hashim et al., 2007; Elsayed, 2008). The assessment tool included three-point Likert scale (1= No, 2= Partially, 3= Yes). The restaurant website assessment tool was divided into five main sections (i.e. information and process; value added; relationships; design and usability; and trust). This assessment tool criteria included forty-nine items with eleven subsections (i.e. sales and orders; location and contact information; sales promotions; goods and services; event information; web; customer service; navigation; technical; copyright and security; and branding). The Second tool was word cloud composition software to reflect the most repeated words in each restaurant website. The research used free word cloud software (i.e. WORDSIFT).

The study used codes to reflect the investigated restaurants in the sample. The sample included twelve independent restaurants. These restaurants were coded with IR and followed by a number (e.g., IR4) to reflect the restaurant. Moreover, the sample encompassed thirty-five chain restaurants which were coded with CR and followed by a number (e.g., CR1)

Data Analysis

A mixed approach has been adopted in this study by investigating the quality of in investigated sample website. Mixed research approach combined elements from both qualitative and quantitative approaches (Creswell, 2013). In this study, the mixed methodology helped researchers to get a better in-depth understanding of the phenomena being studied, which agreed with Johnson et al. (2007) conclusions about the use of the mixed approach. In our case the website assessment tool results were analyzed by using essential statistical tools (i.e. mean, standard deviation, mode, and median), which were used to compare between chain and independent restaurants website’s performance and this results were supported by a qualitative content analysis technique. Every single website was browsed and notes were taken about it and its performance. These qualitative notes enriched the research results. The same technique was followed at the word cloud, as a free word cloud software was adopted. The Word Cloud software counted the repeated words in the targeted websites to generate word clouds which highlighted the most repeated words by colors and font size. Word cloud is a visually appealing text summarization that can be used to identify the words with high frequencies in a text. This tool can be used as a first step in getting better analysis and understanding (Sinclair and Cardew-Hall, 2008; Burch et al., 2013). A qualitative noted were also taken during this process and answered why and why not this was repeated and this was not represented in the cloud as will be seen at the results part of this research.

Restaurants websites’ Results

The comparison between chain and independent restaurants was started by running of the restaurant website assessment tool on the research sample. This tool revealed major results summarized in Table 1. A quick scan on table 1 pointed to existing differences between chain and independent restaurants websites. Both of the two groups had strong points and weaknesses.

Table 1. Summary of Restaurant Website Assessment Tool Results

Main Sections	Sub-sections	Items	Independent Restaurants					Chain Restaurants				
			Mean	Percentage	Median	SD	Mode	Mean	Percentage	Median	SD	Mode
Information and Process	Sales and orders	1. Are the restaurant’s prices existing on the website?	2.83	94.43	3.00	0.58	3.00	2.77	92.37	3.00	0.65	3.00
		2. Are they updated ?	2.83	94.43	3.00	0.5774	3.00	2.77	92.37	3.00	0.65	3.00
		3. Does the restaurant have a real time online ordering facility for customers?	1.83	61.10	1.00	1.03	1.00	1.83	60.94	1.00	0.98	1.00

		Location and contact information							
		8. Does restaurant's website show its e-mail address?	7. Does the restaurant's website provide a map showing its location?	6. Is the restaurant's address clearly displayed?	5. Are restaurant's customers informed that their online transactions are secured?	4. Is online ordering simple and easy to complete?			
		1.33	2.50	3.00	1.50	1.83			
		44.44	83.33	99.99	50.00	61.10			
		1.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	1.00			
		0.78	0.90	0.00	0.90	1.03			
		1.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	1.00			
		1.91	2.94	3.00	1.86	1.83			
		63.79	98.08	99.99	61.90	60.94			
		1.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	1.00			
		1.01	0.34	0.00	1.00	0.98			
		1.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	1.00			
		1.50	2.50	3.00	1.50	1.83			
		50.00	83.33	99.99	50.00	61.10			
		1.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	1.00			
		0.90	0.90	0.00	0.90	1.03			
		1.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	1.00			
		1.17	2.94	3.00	1.86	1.83			
		39.04	98.08	99.99	61.90	60.94			
		1.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	1.00			
		0.57	0.34	0.00	1.00	0.98			
		1.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	1.00			
		1.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	1.00			
		1.11	2.94	3.00	1.86	1.83			
		37.14	98.08	99.99	61.90	60.94			
		1.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	1.00			
		0.47	0.34	0.00	1.00	0.98			
		1.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	1.00			

		Sales promotions			Goods and services		Sales promotions
		18. Does the restaurant's website display photos?	17. Is the restaurant's e-menu always available?	16. Does the restaurant's website provide an e-menu for customers?	15. Are all types of the meals shown clearly on the website?	14. Does the restaurant's website homepage show the restaurant's ranking?	13. Does the restaurant's website offer online sales promotions to customers?
20. Does the restaurant's website mention the opening hours?	2.67	2.75	2.83	2.83	2.92	1.25	2.58
	88.88	91.66	94.43	94.43	97.21	41.66	86.10
	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	3.00
	0.78	0.45	0.58	0.58	0.29	0.62	0.51
	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	3.00
	2.89	2.94	2.89	2.83	2.91	1.34	2.74
	96.18	98.08	96.18	94.27	97.13	44.76	91.42
	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	3.00
	0.47	0.24	0.47	0.57	0.37	0.76	0.61
	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	3.00

Value Added								
	Web					Event information		
	27. Does the restaurant have a blog on its website?	26. Does the restaurant have a customer social media (e.g. Facebook or Twitter) on its website?	25. Does the restaurant have video clips (online videos) on its website?				24. Does the restaurant's website offer links to other useful information (e.g. BBC Weather)?	23. Does the restaurant's website have links to local events?
28. Does the restaurant's website offer virtual tours?	1.00	1.17	2.50	1.08	1.00	1.75	21. Does the restaurant's website contain any facilities for customers with special needs (e.g. disabled, special menus for diabetes)?	1.17
	33.33	38.90	83.33	36.11	33.33	58.33		38.88
	1.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	1.00	2.00		1.00
	0.00	0.58	0.80	0.29	0.00	0.62		0.58
	1.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	1.00	2.00		1.00
	1.11	1.17	2.83	1.00	1.11	2.26		1.86
	37.14	39.04	94.27	33.33	37.14	75.23		61.90
	1.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	1.00	3.00		1.00
	0.47	0.57	0.51	0.00	0.40	0.85		1.00
	1.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	1.00	3.00		1.00

		Design and Usability						Relationships	
								Navigation	
37. Is the restaurant's website easy to be browsed by smart phones?		2.92	97.21	3.00	1.00	3.00	31. Is the language used on the website clear and understandable to customers?	30. Can customers make complaints online (e.g. by e-mails)?	29. Does restaurant collect customer feedback online?
	2.50	2.92	97.21	3.00	1.00	3.00	32. Does the restaurant's website offer frequently asked questions (FAQs) with answers?	1.83	1.75
	83.33	97.21	99.99	86.09	33.33	99.99	33. Does the restaurant's website reflect its image?	61.10	58.33
	2.50	3.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	3.00	34. Is the restaurant's website free of pop ups?	1.00	1.00
	0.52	0.29	0.00	0.51	0.00	0.00	35. Are all site links clearly visible (e.g. not hidden by advertisements)?	1.03	0.97
	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	3.00	36. Does the restaurant's website use images as communication tools with customer?	1.00	1.00
	2.97	3.00	3.00	2.94	1.69	3.00	37. Does the restaurant's website use images as communication tools with customer?	2.37	2.66
	99.04	99.99	99.99	98.08	56.18	99.99	38. Does the restaurant's website use images as communication tools with customer?	79.04	88.56
	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	3.00	39. Does the restaurant's website use images as communication tools with customer?	3.00	3.00
	0.17	0.00	0.00	0.24	0.96	0.00	40. Does the restaurant's website use images as communication tools with customer?	0.94	0.77
	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	3.00	41. Does the restaurant's website use images as communication tools with customer?	3.00	3.00

Trust									
Copyright and security	45. Is any copyright material appropriately referenced?	2.17	72.23	3.00	1.03	3.00	2.54	84.75	3.00
	44. Does the restaurant's website have a privacy statement?	1.33	44.44	1.00	0.78	1.00	2.31	77.13	3.00
Technical	43. Are all the fonts on the restaurant's website more than 10pt?	2.92	97.21	3.00	0.29	3.00	2.37	79.04	2.00
	42. Does the restaurant's website use contrasting colors, which are separated by black or white borders?	1.75	58.33	1.00	0.97	1.00	1.43	47.61	1.00
	41. Are all the links from the restaurant's website active?	2.75	91.66	3.00	0.62	3.00	2.94	98.08	3.00
	40. Can the restaurant's web page be downloaded easily on different browsers/PCs?	3.00	99.99	3.00	0.00	3.00	3.00	99.99	3.00
	39. Is the restaurant's website compatible with different browsers (e.g. Firefox, Google Chrome, and Internet explorer)?	3.00	99.99	3.00	0.00	3.00	3.00	99.99	3.00
	38. Does the restaurant's website offer updated services (e.g. Domino's speak up app.)?	1.17	38.88	1.00	0.39	1.00	1.17	39.04	1.00
	37. Does the restaurant's website have a mobile app?	1.00	33.33	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	33.33	1.00
	36. Does the restaurant's website have a social media link?	1.00	33.33	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	33.33	1.00
	35. Does the restaurant's website have a contact form?	1.00	33.33	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	33.33	1.00
	34. Does the restaurant's website have a feedback form?	1.00	33.33	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	33.33	1.00

		46. Does the restaurant's website show terms and conditions?	1.33	44.44	1.00	0.78	1.00	2.14	71.42	3.00	1.00	3.00
	Branding	47. Does the restaurant have a branded e-mail?	1.33	44.43	1.00	0.78	1.00	2.31	77.13	3.00	0.96	3.00
		48. Does the restaurant have a trademark (e.g. Papa John's)?	1.50	50.00	1.00	0.90	1.00	2.26	75.23	3.00	0.98	3.00
		49. Does the restaurant's website have a branded domain name/ URL (e.g. http://www.papajohns.com)?	3.00	99.99	3.00	0.00	3.00	3.00	99.99	3.00	0.00	3.00

Chain restaurants' performance were better than independent ones at "Information and Process" section -at the restaurant website assessment tool - , which revealed the majority of chain restaurants (34 out of 35 chain restaurants) supported their restaurants by equipping them with location enabled technology, to declare to customers the nearest branch to their locations. The results also demonstrated that 19 chain restaurants used copyright, branding (e.g., trademark, branded email and URL), and tried to secure their customers via practices like privacy statement, terms and conditions. Further, a minority (5 out of 12 of independent restaurants represent 41.6 percent) provided online ordering service (e.g. IR4). This service was highlighted as an important element in websites quality (Razi et al., 2004; Combe, 2006).

In certain points at the assessment, both of independent and chain websites were similar. The majority of independent and chain restaurants (42 out of 47 that achieved 89.5 percent) exhibited menu prices (Independent restaurants standard deviation was 0.5773 and chain restaurants standard deviation was 0.6456) at their websites, to facilitate online ordering and to attract customers. This finding agreed with (Law and Hsu, 2005; Zwicky, 2006) who highlighted the importance of displaying prices and facilitating ordering in any website working in tourism field. Only five restaurants (10.5 percent) did not display their updated prices on their websites (e.g., IR20, CR20). Similarly, almost 85 percent of independent and chain pizza restaurants (40 out of 47) provided professional description on their websites for their promotions, goods, and services (e.g., opening times, menu offers, availability of menu, types of meals, restaurant and menu photos), but there was a massive lack of information for customers with special needs (e.g., disabled persons facilities, special menus for diabetes) on restaurants websites. Only 34 percent of restaurants (16 out of 47) provided services for special needs customers, (i.e., 15 Chain restaurants and 1 independent). Chain restaurants were slightly at better situation in relation to special needs services information (Mean= 1.8571).

All the investigated restaurants collected customers' location information and customers contact details. Collecting these two information were identified as successful tactics for hospitality websites (Vrana et al., 2004; Hashim et al., 2007). Generally, the investigated sample were interested in communicating with customers and exhibiting certain promotional events (e.g., restaurant's birthday), furthermore, they had a great performance in using images as a communication tool with customers. Their weakness was they did not display any local or national events or special news (e.g., weather conditions).

The adaptability of hospitality websites with different internet browsers was identified as one of the foundations in the success of websites (Kim and Lee, 2006). The investigated restaurants, both independent or chain, were easy to be navigated and browsed by smartphones and different browsers such as Firefox and Google Chrome.

The use of social media and mobile applications varied between chain and independent restaurants websites. The majority of pizza chains websites (31 out of 35 chain restaurants representing 88.6% of the chain sample) posted their social media (e.g., Facebook, Twitter, Blog) at their websites and used them to communicate. Meanwhile, independent pizza restaurants had less percent with 66.6 (8 out of 12 independent restaurants) of the investigated sample.

Mobile applications had low presence at restaurants websites. Only one chain restaurant (i.e., CR7) tried to exceed its customer's expectation by launching two mobile applications which considered a step forward. These applications were Speak up App and another mobile application for tracking pizza by following its manufacturing and delivering processes. "Speak Up" application at CR7 website was a mobile application on iPhone and Android that allows customers to place their orders by speaking them. A customer would order his pizza, for example, by saying to his phone "I'd like a large pizza with extra cheese, chicken, and onion".

Chain restaurants superiority was asserted at the electronic customer relationship assessment points, as 24 out of 35 of the investigated chain restaurants (68.6 percent) were keen to build relationships and raising customer's purchase intention. On the other side, only 4 independent restaurants websites (33.3 percent) were keen to collect online customers' feedback and to invite customers to communicate and to complaint via emails. This finding met with Tice (2012) summary of innovative ideas (e.g., Speak Up App) that chain restaurants launched to keep in touch with their customers and to build an effective electronic customer relationships.

In the assessment tool results, a minority of restaurants achieved low scores in their website performance which revealed weaknesses at "providing online ordering facility", "showing location map", "inviting customers to collect their feedback" and "the sufficiency of website data". This was a weakness in their online performance based on several researches findings and recommendations (e.g., Aaberge et al., 2004; Litvin et al., 2005; Beldona and Cai, 2006; Bai et al., 2007; Park and Gretzel, 2007; Hudson, 2008; Mills et al., 2008; Bai et al., 2008; Law and Bai, 2008; Diaz and Koutra, 2013; Wang et al., 2015; Ali, 2016; Jeon and Jeong, 2017). These researches helped to identify IR10, IR20, CR11, CR32 as restaurants which had very poor awareness about the value of having a website.

On the other hand, Seven independent restaurants and twenty chain restaurants achieved high scores at the evaluation process of their websites as they kept: (1) updating their special offers for the chain of restaurants; (2) providing a location details; (3) displaying a map for each restaurant; (4) presenting each restaurant menu with the timing of delivery (e.g., CR5); (5) posting restaurant social media websites at the restaurant web page; (6) collecting customers

feedback. These practices were stated by scholars as it contributed into building a positive online image (Susan, 2005; Chu, 2009; Needles and Thompson, 2013; Brightlocal, 2016).

Word Cloud Instrument Evaluation Results

A free Word Cloud generator (Wordsift.org) was used to check the most common words in websites. The most repeated words in each restaurant website were listed in tables no. 2 and no. 3. Every restaurant name appeared was coded as “CR” reflected chains and “IR” meant independent. Research assessment was held on assessing a sample of forty seven restaurants through previously mentioned word cloud instrument; Restaurants sample was divided into twelve independent restaurants were selected out of twenty eight and thirty five out of thirty nine chain restaurants.

Word cloud instrument evaluated eleven independent restaurants while the last one website was launched for only online ordering with no data about the restaurant.

Thirty three chain restaurants websites were assessed out of thirty five as the remaining two restaurant websites contained only photos which did not allow the software to generate a word cloud for these two restaurants.

Table 2. The Most Common Words for the investigated Chain Restaurants

NO.	Restaurant Code	1 st Most Common Word	2 nd Most Common Word	3 rd Most Common Word	4 th Most Common Word
1	CR1	CR1	CR1	Location	Fast
2	CR2	CR2	CR2	LOUISVILLE	SITE
3	CR3	CR3	CR3	ITALIAN	CHEESE
4	CR4	CR4	CR4	ORIGINAL	WEBSITE
5	CR5	CR5	LOCATION	MILE	CARD
6	CR6	CR6	DESSERT	CR6	SALAD
7	CR7	CR7	CR7	ORDER	CHEESE
8	CR8	CR8	Order	Chicken	Large
9	CR9	CHEESE	SAUCE	CR9	Pizza
10	CR10	CR10	CR10	CR10	ORDER
11	CR13	CR13	BRAND	PIZZA	LOCATION
12	CR14	CHEESE	CR14	SAUCE	ONION
13	CR15	CR15	CR15	CHEESE	ORDER
14	CR16	CR16	WISEGUY	ONION	ITALIAN
15	CR18	COUNTRY	CR18	LOUISVILLE	CR18
16	CR19	CR19	CR19	Benny	Menu
17	CR20	CR20	CR20	Franchise (34)	Location (18)

18	CR21	CR21	CR21	Restaurant	Menu
19	CR23	Add	CR23	Cheese	Chicken
20	CR24	CR24	CR24	Mozzarella	Cheese
21	CR25	Wing	CR25	CR25	Topping
22	CR26	STYLE	BEER	BRONZE	GOLD
23	CR27	Order	CR27	CR27	Sauce
24	CR28	Select	Sauce	Pizza	Store
25	CR29	CR29	CR29	Sauce	Cheese
26	CR30	Classic	Sauce	CR30	Peperoni
27	CR32	CR32	CR32	Quality	Location
28	CR33	CHICKEN	CR33	CR33	CHEESE
29	CR34	CR34	Cheese	CR34	Green
30	CR35	Recipe	Posted	CR35	CR35
31	CR36	CR36	Cheese	Pepper	Pizza
32	CR37	CR37	Chicken	Cheese	Sauce
33	CR38	Pizza	Chicken	CR33	Premium

Table 3. The Most Common Words at the Investigated Independent Restaurants

NO	Code	Common Word “1”	Common Word “2”	Common Word “3”	Common Word “4”
1	IR4	Pizza	Cheese	Chicken	IR4
2	IR5	Pizza	Tomato	IR5	Lexington
3	IR6	Sauce	Pizza	Chicken	Onion
4	IR7	Medium	Chicken	Spicy	Shrimp
5	IR10	Pizza	Mozzarella	Cheese	House
6	IR11	IR11	Bowling green	Morgan Town	Pizza
7	IR12	IR12	Fundraising	Lexington	Kentucky
8	IR15	IR15	Pizza	Detroit	Authentic
9	IR19	Mozzarella	Cheese	Garlic	Sauce
10	IR20	Spaghetti	Pizza	Cheese	Sauce
11	IR28	Pizza	Special	Gourmet	IR28

The restaurant brand name was the most repeated words in word clouds evaluation for the majority of both independent and chain (82.85 percent of chain restaurants (29 restaurants out of 35) and 41.66 percent of the independent restaurants sample (5 restaurants out of 12 restaurants). It was a double edged blade, as it could affect the quality of the website and it could be replaced by more profitable and useful contents. Zwicky (2006) pointed to price, location and quality of services provided as the most important information at hospitality websites. Table 2 and 3 revealed a minority of restaurants realized that and their most repeated words were describing their products and their quality (e.g., CR6 and IR6). The word cloud could not be generated for total of three restaurants (chain and independent) as their websites contained pictures and location information only.

To conclude the data analysis part, chain restaurants had a better performance than independent ones, as they supported their websites with advanced technology. For example, locating themselves to their customers' addresses through the GPS Service helped them to provide fast ordering service (e.g., CR5). Chain restaurants tried to meet their customer expectations by affording mobile applications. Both of independent and chain had deficiencies such as focusing on repeating their names rather than their quality of services at their websites.

Conclusion and Implications

The study endeavored to investigate the impact of affiliation on restaurants websites. The new customers' criteria highlighted the importance of restaurants websites as a competitive advantage in daily restaurant business. The researchers developed a checklist to investigate a sample of pizza restaurants located in Kentucky State in United States of America, specifically in College Towns. The research findings confirmed the advantages of being affiliated as the chain restaurants had privileges in many aspects, e.g. information and process. The research pointed to certain shortages at a minority of chain and independent restaurants websites as they neglected the importance of having a website and did not exhibit a high performance at building relationships with electronic customers.

Fund was a natural limitation faced the research. The Restaurants websites were evaluated using manual assessment instrument and a free software (Wordsift.org). The use of other paid software should enhance the quality of results and afford further evidences. The sample of this study was in the USA in order to evaluate pizza restaurants websites in college towns. For future researches, focusing on other cities, states, or countries could reveal other findings. The same research idea can be repeated with other types of restaurants via assessing their performance at different eMarketing tools and investigating customers' perspectives

Based on the study findings and related literature, the following recommendations were developed to help restaurant owners and practitioners to build a website that can compete in today's business environment. The recommendations were summarized in the following points:

1. Restaurants Managers and owners at independent and chain restaurants should test their website presence regularly by:
 - A. setting a plan to check their official websites and maintain them..
 - B. keeping their websites up to date to meet recent market trends
 - C. maintaining the clarity and quality of the website information.
2. Hoteliers should start in launching their own restaurants application to: facilitate their services (e.g. ordering online service), offering promotions, raising customers' purchase intention, and maintaining electronic customer relationships.
3. Restaurants websites should declare their services for special needs customers and

- accommodate their needs, e.g. special menus for diabetes.
4. Restaurant websites should reflect local community events and use them in promoting the restaurant.
 5. Local authorities and restaurants association are advised to launch training programs for the restaurants practitioners to develop a positive image of their restaurants through their official websites.
 6. Restaurants should keep their official websites easy for browsing and avoid any complicated designs.
 7. Restaurants managers should design their websites to convince the customers to order, not - only - to present the menu items or the restaurant location
 8. To sustain the restaurant website success, you need to work on keeping it linked with social media, to continuously work on increasing its number of clicks and online orders.

References

- Aaberge, T., Grøtten, I.P., Haugen, O., Skogseid, I., & Olnes, S. (2004). Evaluation of tourism web sites: A theoretical framework. *Information & Communication Technologies in Tourism*, na.
- Ali, F. (2016). Hotel website quality, perceived flow, customer satisfaction and purchase intention. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Technology*, 7(2), 213-228.
- Bai, B., Hu, C., & Jang, S. (2007). Examining e-relationship marketing features on hotel websites. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 21(2-3), 33-48.
- Bai, B., Law, R., & Wen, I. (2008). The impact of website quality on customer satisfaction and purchase intentions: Evidence from Chinese online visitors. *International Journal of hospitality management*, 27(3), 391-402.
- Beldona, S., & Cai, L. A. (2006). An exploratory evaluation of rural tourism websites. *Journal of Convention & Event Tourism*, 8(1), 69-80.
- Brightlocal (2016). Local Consumer Review Survey. BrightLocal Company. Retrieved from: <https://www.brightlocal.com/learn/local-consumer-review-survey/>
- Burch, M., Lohmann, S., Pompe, D., & Weiskopf, D. (2013). Prefix tag clouds. In *Proceedings of Information Visualisation (IV)*, 2013 17th International Conference, 45-50.
- Casaló, L., Flavián, C., & Guinalú, M. (2008). The role of perceived usability, reputation, satisfaction and consumer familiarity on the website loyalty formation process. In Jeon, M. M. & Jeong, M. (2017). Customers' perceived website service quality and its effects on e-loyalty. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 29(1), 438-457.
- Chang, H. H., & Chen, S. W. (2008). The impact of online store environment cues on purchase intention: Trust and perceived risk as a mediator. *Online Information Review*, 32(6), 818-841.
- Chiou, W. C., Lin, C. C., & Perng, C. (2010). A strategic framework for website evaluation based on a review of the literature from 1995–2006. *Information & Management*, 47(5), 282-290.
- Chu, C. (2009). Determinants of consumer engagement in electronic word-of-mouth in social networking sites (Doctoral dissertation). University of Texas, USA. Retrieved from: <https://repositories.lib.utexas.edu/bitstream/handle/2152/6585/chus00644.pdf?sequence=2&isAllowed=y>.
- Combe, C. (2006). *Introduction to e-business: Management and strategy*. Oxford, UK: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). California, USA: Sage publications.
- De Vaus, D. (2013). *Surveys in social research* (6th ed.). New York, USA: Routledge.
- Díaz, E., & Koutra, C. (2013). Evaluation of the persuasive features of hotel chains websites: A latent class segmentation analysis. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 34, 338-347.

- Elsayed, Y. (2008). Developing an EDC performance evaluation toolkit for affiliated and non-affiliated hoteliers (Doctoral dissertation). University of Wales Institute Cardiff (UWIC), UK. Retrieved from:
<http://repository.uwic.ac.uk/dspace/browse?type=author&order=ASC&rpp=20&value=Elsayed%2C+Yousery>.
- Gregory, A., Wang, Y., & DiPietro, R. B. (2010). Towards a functional model of website evaluation: A case study of casual dining restaurants. *Worldwide Hospitality and Tourism Themes*, 2(1), 68-85.
- Gumprecht, B. (2003). The American college town. *Geographical Review*, 93(1), 51-80.
- Han, S. H., Nguyen, B., & Lee, T. J. (2015). Consumer-based chain restaurant brand equity, brand reputation, and brand trust. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 50, 84-93.
- Hashim, N. H., & Murphy, J. (2007). Branding on the web: Evolving domain name usage among Malaysian hotels. *Tourism Management*, 28(2), 621-624.
- Hashim, N. H., Murphy, J., & Law, R. (2007). A review of hospitality website design frameworks. *Information and Communication Technologies in Tourism 2007*, 219-230.
- Herrero, Á., & San Martín, H. (2012). Developing and testing a global model to explain the adoption of websites by users in rural tourism accommodations. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 31(4), 1178-1186.
- Hsu, C. L., Chang, K. C., & Chen, M. C. (2012). The impact of website quality on customer satisfaction and purchase intention: Perceived playfulness and perceived flow as mediators. *Information Systems and e-Business Management*, 10(4), 549-570.
- Hudson, S. (2008). *Tourism and hospitality marketing: A global perspective*. London, UK: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Hwang, J., Yoon, Y. S., & Park, N. H. (2011). Structural effects of cognitive and affective responses to web advertisements, website and brand attitudes, and purchase intentions: The case of casual-dining restaurants. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 30(4), 897-907.
- Jeon, M. M. & Jeong, M. (2017). Customers' perceived website service quality and its effects on e-loyalty. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 29(1), 438-457.
- Johnson, R. B., Onwuegbuzie, A., & Turner, L. A. (2007). Toward a definition of mixed methods research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1(2), 1-22.
- Kim, J. & Lennon, S. J. (2013). Effects of reputation and website quality on online consumers' emotion, perceived risk and purchase intention: Based on the stimulus-organism-response model. *Journal of Research in Interactive Marketing*, 7(1), 33-56.
- Kim, S. & Lee, Y. (2006). Global online marketplace: A cross-cultural comparison of website quality. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 30(6), 533-543.
- Kimes, S. E. (2011). The future of distribution management in the restaurant industry. *Journal of Revenue and Pricing Management*, 10(2), 189-194.
- Law, R. & Hsu, C. (2005). Customers' perceptions on the importance of hotel website dimensions and attributes. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 17(6), 493-503.
- Law, R., & Bai, B. (2008). How do the preferences of online buyers and browsers differ on the design and content of travel websites?. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 20(4), 388-400.
- Law, R., Qi, S., & Buhalis, D. (2010). Progress in tourism management: A review of website evaluation in tourism research. *Tourism Management*, 31(3), 297-313.
- Leung, D., Law, R., & Lee, H. A. (2011). The perceived destination image of Hong Kong on Ctrip. com. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 13(2), 124-140.
- Litvin, S. W., Bloise, J. E., & Laird, S. T. (2005). Tourists' use of restaurant webpages: Is the internet a critical marketing tool?. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 11(2), 155-161.
- Loveric, M. (2011). *International encyclopedia of statistical science*. Springer.
- Luca, M. (2011). Three essays on quality disclosure (Doctoral dissertation). Boston University, USA. Retrieved from:

- <http://search.proquest.com.ugrade1.eul.edu.eg:2048/pqdtglobal/docview/879764363/2337C9F109C74404PQ/1?accountid=37552>
- McMillan, H. (2012). *Educational research: Fundamental for the consumer* (6th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education Inc.
- Mills, J., Han, J., & clay, J. (2008). Accessibility of hospitality and tourism websites: A challenge for visually impaired persons. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, 49(28), 38-40.
- Moustakis, V., Litos, C., Dalivigas, A., & Tsironis, L. (2004). Website quality assessment criteria. *Proceedings of the Ninth International Conference on Information Quality (ICIQ)*, 59-73.
- Nassar, M. (2002). *An evaluation of the world wide web (Web) as a strategic marketing tool for the Egyptian hotel sector* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Wales Institute Cardiff (UWIC), UK.
- National Restaurant Association (2017). National Restaurant Association launches Pizzeria Industry Council. Retrieved from: [http://www.restaurant.org/Pressroom/Press-Releases/National-Restaurant-Association-Launches-Pizze-\(1\)](http://www.restaurant.org/Pressroom/Press-Releases/National-Restaurant-Association-Launches-Pizze-(1)) - Accessed 16/12/2016.
- Needles, A. & Thompson, G. (2013). Social media use in the restaurant industry: A work in progress. *Cornell Hospitality Report*, 13(7), 6-16.
- Park, Y. A., & Gretzel, U. (2007). Success factors for destination marketing web sites: A qualitative meta-analysis. *Journal of Travel Research*, 46(1), 46-63.
- PMQ Pizza Magazine (2017). The 2016 pizza power report: A state-of-the-industry analysis. Retrieved from: <http://www.pmq.com/December-2015/The-2016-Pizza-Power-Report-A-state-of-the-industry-analysis/> - Accessed: 16/12/2016.
- Ponte, E., Carvajal-Trujillo, E., & Escobar-Rodríguez, T. (2015). Influence of trust and perceived value on the intention to purchase travel online: Integrating the effects of assurance on trust antecedents. *Tourism Management*, 47, 286-302.
- Razi, A., Tarn, M., & Siddiqui, F. (2004). Exploring the failure and success of Dotcoms. *Information Management & Computer Security*, 12(3), 228-224.
- Rossi, P. H., Wright, J. D., & Anderson, A. B. (Eds.) (2013). *Handbook of survey research*. Academic Press.
- Sinclair, J., & Cardew-Hall, M. (2008). The folksonomy tag cloud: When is it useful?. *Journal of Information Science*, 34(1), 15-29.
- So, S. I. A., & Morrison, A. M. (2004). Internet marketing in tourism in Asia: An evaluation of the performance of East Asian national tourism organization websites. *Journal of Hospitality & Leisure Marketing*, 11(4), 93-118.
- Susan, F. (2005). *The added-value of online word-of-mouth (eWOM) to advertising in new product adoption: An empirical analysis of the movie industry* (Doctoral dissertation). The City University of New York, USA.
- Tice, C. (2012). How Restaurants are using Technology to deliver better customer service. Retrieved from: <https://www.forbes.com/sites/caroltice/2012/12/07/how-restaurants-are-using-technology-to-deliver-better-customer-service/#4708e5fc6b76> - Accessed: 19/03/2017.
- Vrana, V., Zafiroopoulos, C., & Paschaloudis, D. (2004). Measuring the provision of information services in tourist hotel web sites: The case of Athens-Olympic city 2004. *Tourism and Hospitality Planning & Development*, 1(3), 255-272.
- Wang, L., Law, R., Guillet, B., Hung, K., & Fong, D. (2015). Impact of hotel website quality on online booking intentions: eTrust as a mediator. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 47, 108-115.
- Zwicky, R. (2006). *Search engine marketing*. Proceedings from the 13th International Conference on Information Technology and Travel & Tourism. Lausanne: Switzerland.