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Abstract
This study investigates the relationship between perceived brand fit and intention to purchase in the context of a co-branded hotel-restaurant. In particular, it examines if co-branding of a hotel in a Thai hotel chain with an independently owned theme restaurant stimulates intention to purchase among hotel guests. This study was conducted using a survey of hotel guests in public areas on the hotel premises. Data regarding guest perceptions of brand fit was analysed using multiple regression and the chi-square test. The findings indicate that two components of perceived brand fit, namely perceived fit (overall) and complementary fit (in terms of product usage and product goals), are statistically significant and positively related to intention to purchase. Theoretical conclusions regarding a co-branding model are discussed and managerial implications for development of an appropriate hotel-restaurant co-branding marketing strategy are provided.
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Introduction
Today’s markets contain many products that look similar and companies use co-branding of their products to distinguish them from their competitors (Muller, 2005). Co-branding is ‘the paring of two or more recognized brands within one space’ (Boone, 1997: 34). It is an important strategy for restaurant businesses exemplified by the success of T.G.I Fridays within Holiday Inn hotels (Hahm and Khan, 2001); Doubletree Hotel Corporation co-branded with the New York Restaurant Group, Marriott Hotels co-branded with Ruth’s Chris and Benihana, Four Seasons Hotels with Bice Ristorante (MarriottDining, 2008; Strate and Rappole, 1997), and Sheraton Hotels co-branding concept with the Sheraton Cuisine brand including Starbucks coffee, Vie de France baked goods, and Robert Mondavi wines (Boone, 1997). While co-branding of a hotel with an international restaurant chain is used to improve the profitability of hotel restaurants, few studies have been conducted into this phenomenon (Boone, 1997; Hadjicharalambous, 2006; Jevons and Gabbott, 2005; Keller, 2003; Rutherford, 2002; Sandeberg and Ostlund, 2003; Washburn et al., 2000). In particular, two important questions are considered here: what determines consumers’ willingness to use a co-branded hotel restaurant, and what makes a co-branded product distinctive from other competitors? This article uses a conceptual framework adapted from that...
proposed by Boo and Matilla (2002), and finds that consumer intention to purchase in a co-branded context is a consequence of perceived brand fit. This study utilizes a survey of guests staying at the Amari Orchid Resort and Tower Hotel in Pattaya Thailand in order to examine and develop this framework.

**Literature review**

Studies of the co-branding of hotels and restaurants have focused on three main areas: first, hotel-restaurant co-branding strategy and operation; second, the impact of hotel-restaurant co-branding on profitability; and third, how the strategy of a co-branded hotel restaurant impacts consumers, and how to exceed consumer expectations by adding value to a service offering. Recent studies include those by Caruana and Fenech (2005), Cronin et al. (2000), Heinonen (2004), Patterson and Spreng (1997) and Zeithaml (1988). The concept of co-branding has been applied across a range of study areas including store brands (retail establishments), professional business services, management consulting services (such as IT, logistics, and environmental consulting) and the service industry. These studies indicate that co-branding has an effect on a consumer’s brand knowledge by affecting brand image and brand awareness. The concept of brand image examines the overall information that a consumer holds about a brand, including important information such as quality and value.

**Perceived brand fit related to intention to purchase**

Intention to purchase is defined as a set of alternatives under consideration by the consumer with the choice among product alternatives influenced by the context of the purchase decision (Simonson and Tversky, 1992: 281). There are several factors influencing consumer purchase intention which have been investigated. Two factors which have a significant effect and influence consumer intention to purchase are brand familiarity and brand knowledge, as discussed in studies by Carrillat et al. (2005), Keller (1993), Laroche et al. (1996) and Stokes (1985). Laroche et al. (1996) found that brand familiarity and brand confidence are determinants of purchase intention. Thus, in order to increase a consumer’s intention to purchase a brand, marketers must develop consumers’ brand confidence by providing product information and direct experience (Laroche et al., 1996).

A consumers’ perception of brand fit and whether two product categories are compatible is expected to play an essential role in respect of a consumer’s evaluation of a co-branded product (Simonin and Ruth, 1998). Perceived fit has been defined as an association between two brands that share essential product attributes (Bridges et al., 2000), or the extent to which the brand image from an original brand transfers to and affiliates with a second brand when two brands are co-branded (DelVecchio and Smith, 2005; Simonin and Ruth, 1998). Perceived fit is important because it increases the positive value for the consumer and reduces the likelihood of negative outcomes from purchase of a co-branded product or service (DelVecchio and Smith, 2005).

A perceived fit model proposed by Aaker and Keller (1990) has three dimensions: complementary, substitutability and transferability fit. The first dimension, ‘complementary’, is the joining of two products to satisfy a particular need. The degree of fit of two products is measured in terms of their product features, product concepts or schema, product usage, and product goal (Martin and Stewart, 2001). Product features are evaluated on the similarity of the tangible or physical product characteristics, or the relatedness of two product categories, which ‘stretch’ the requirement of one product to another product category; for example, when one brand is a type of toothpaste and the other is mouthwash (Herr et al., 1996). Similarity of product concepts or brand image occurs when related products share product features. Product usage is not necessarily focused on how the two products features are similar, but on how the two products can be used for different occasions. Thus, product usage is transferred from one product to another; for example, in the context of hotel and restaurant co-branding, customers stay in the hotel and use the accommodation for resting and sleeping, with the restaurant used as a place to eat and be entertained. Last, product goal similarity is based on the two products providing information that is useful and accessible to consumers in specific circumstances. Thus, ‘consumers receiving information about the association of two products infer a common goal affecting their intention, and are then ready to transfer from one to another’ (Martin and Stewart, 2001: 474). The second dimension of fit, ‘substitutability’, is when one product can be used to replace the other and still provide the same level of satisfaction.
Finally, the third dimension of fit, ‘transferability’, is how consumers perceive the link between the skills and assets associated with the two brands; for example, if the quality of the equipment used and skill of employees’ performance in the second brand is of the same quality as the core brand or original brand (Aaker, 1990). The two dimensions of fit that are most appropriate and able to be used in the study of a co-branded hotel and restaurant are ‘complementary fit’ and ‘transferability fit’, as in the context examined here, restaurants and hotels are not substitutes for one another.

**Perceived fit (overall)**

Perceived brand fit has been investigated by several researchers (Kahle and Homer, 1985; Misra and Beatty, 1990; Till and Busler, 2000). In a study carried out by Till and Busler (2000), the most crucial aspects that impact ‘fit’ between a celebrity and a product brand are a good match of attributes and belongingness, leading consumers to create an attitude towards a brand but not purchase intention. Misra and Beatty (1990) assert that fit is the match of personality and attribute between two brands. Guillet and Tasci (2010) consider perceived fit implies familiarity with a brand, which is derived from a good match between brands. It is postulated that the perceived fit (overall) component in general is based on the perception of belonging together, the match-up and the compatibility in terms of brand image.

**Complementary fit on product usage and product goal**

Complementary fit is described as two products having dissimilar attributes but ‘fitting’ each other because they meet consumers’ particular needs (Hahm and Khan, 2001). This study requires the complementary fit dimension of the products to be evaluated on two product characteristics: product usage and product goal. This is because, first, with respect to the concept of product usage, hotel products provide a bundle of features that are used together such as accommodation, fitness centres, business centres and restaurants, all complementing each other. The focus for product usage is not on how the two products features are similar, but rather, on how the two products can be used for different purposes. In summary, the complementary fit based on product usage is due to the perception of two products with dissimilar physical form as complementary to each other on different occasions.

Complementary fit in terms of a product goal, on the other hand, is when the two products jointly contribute to the achievement of some end. Consumers receive information from the association of the two products about how they may help achieve a common goal, and this knowledge affects their behaviour or their intention (Martin and Stewart, 2001). Bagozzi and Dholakia (1999) note that goals play a vital role in the purposive behaviour of the consumer, representing the elements of the core self, a sense of unity and identity that direct consumer behaviour across a range of circumstances (Houston and Walker, 1996). Purchase goals represent the basic consequence, need or purpose that each consumer wishes to achieve (Boo, 2003; Martin and Stewart, 2001). Purchase goals can manifest both unconsciously and consciously. In this research, the study of complementary fit on product goal is focused on conscious goals. These goals have been derived from internal reactions to product and service attributes that stimulate the intention to purchase (Bagozzi and Dholakia, 1999). Hence, complementary fit due to the product goal in general is based on the perception of two products providing pieces of a solution for the achievement of consumer purchase goals.

**Purpose of the study**

As delineated above, it appears that a co-branded hotel and restaurant creates distinctive and unique products and services distinguishable from the competition. If a product is distinctive from others the chance of increasing profits is improved (Muller, 2005). Scholarly research has paid attention to hotel restaurant co-branding, but it has been research from a perspective of co-branding strategy, and rarely on the perception of perceived brand fit consequences.

The purpose of this study is to answer the question ‘what is the relationship between perceived brand fit and intention to purchase?’ The findings of this study are important as they reveal crucial components that determine consumers’ willingness to purchase or not to purchase within a co-branded hotel and restaurant. Additionally, it will also benefit future research because the findings develop a modified conceptual framework applicable to co-branded hotels and restaurants. Moreover, it helps to improve co-branding strategy and managers’ understanding of consumer behaviour regarding intention to
purchase in hotel and restaurant co-branding, particularly in relation to perceived fit between the brands.

Thus, based on the theory of hotel restaurant co-branding (Boo and Matilla, 2002) and the perceived brand fit model proposed by Aaker and Keller (1990) in the literature, the following hypotheses were developed for this study:

- **H1**: If perceived fit (overall) is high then intention to purchase is high.
- **H2**: If complementary fit on product usage is high then intention to purchase is high.
- **H3**: If complementary fit on product goal is high then intention to purchase is high.

**Methodology**

A quantitative approach to surveying guests was used as the principle research method in this study. The study area selected was one of the luxury hotel chains in Thailand called the ‘Amari Hotel Resort and Spas’. This hotel was founded in 1965, and the hotel group is managed by a hotel management company (Thammarak, 2004). With a total of 16 properties in the group, the hotels are located throughout Thailand, covering the areas of Bangkok, Chiangmai, Pattaya, Koh Chang, Koh Samui, Trang and Loei (Amari.com, 2007). The Henry J. Bean Bar and Grill restaurant group (the co-branded restaurant) presents an all-American style bar and grill, famous for well-made drinks, cocktails and food served from the open grill. With its Tex Mex style dishes, it provides a unique dining style.

The pilot test and main study data were collected from an Amari Hotel located in Bangkok, Thailand. For the pilot test, a total of 88 questionnaires were collected and the data entered into the SPSS program. The pilot test results indicated that the scales for perceived fit overall, complementary fit and transferability fit were reliable (alpha value above the acceptable level, \( \alpha > .75 \)).

In the main study, data was collected from a sample of guests staying at the Amari Orchid Resort & Tower located in Pattaya, Thailand. The survey was conducted on a daily basis over a three-month period, between 10 am and 5 pm each day, in the common hotel areas of the lobby, open bar and swimming pool. Once guests had been approached and agreed to participate, they were provided with stimulus material, including a menu and photos of the Henry J. Bean Bar and Grill restaurant. The participants were then asked to fill out the questionnaire and answer the questions based mainly on 7-point Likert scales. The questionnaire was left with a participant to answer and the researcher collected it after 15–20 minutes. Only the researcher collected the data as per hotel policy as the management was concerned about guest privacy.

The research instrument for this study is a self-administered questionnaire. The participants were instructed to fill in a questionnaire consisting of two main parts. The first part collected information from the respondents about their hotel experience and general knowledge about the core brand (Amari hotels), as well as how they perceived brand fit between the hotel and a co-branded restaurant, followed by questions asking of their intention to purchase in the co-branded restaurant. The second part of the survey questionnaire concerned participants’ demographics, including their age, sex, occupation and nationality.

The research instrument for perceived fit was developed from measurement scales proposed by Boo (2003), Martin and Stewart (2001) and Parasuraman et al. (1988). The measurement scale is organized into two categories: the first category measures perceived fit (overall); the second category measures complementary fit in terms of product usage and product goal. The perceived fit (overall) measurement scale was developed from the work of Boo (2003) and consists of three items: the first item measures if there is a good match between hotel and restaurant co-branding; the second item measured for the overall feeling about hotel and restaurant belonging together; and the last item measured if the hotel and restaurant were compatible in terms of brand image. This measurement scale was used to measure fit of hotel and restaurant co-branding and adopted a 7-point Likert scale (see Appendix 1).

The complementary fit category was organized into two sets of items. The first set of items measured the complementary fit based on product usage, and the second measured the complementary fit based on product goal. The complementary fit based on product usage measurement scale was adapted from a scale proposed by Martin and Stewart (2001). This measurement scale consisted of three items: the first item measured consumer agreement about the hotel and restaurant co-branding being complementary to each other; the second item measured if the hotel should provide a branded restaurant; and the last item measured the importance of having a facility like a...
co-branded restaurant within the hotel. The second set of questions measured the complementary fit based on the product goal. A measurement scale was developed for this study due to the lack of previous research related to the context of this study. The item measured ‘What is dining at the Henry J. Bean Bar and Grill restaurant offering customers?’ with fixed choice responses (‘yes’ or ‘no’) required for seven questions covering the areas of location, entertainment (business purposes), food and beverage attractiveness, pleasant environment, leisure, brand image, and not overpriced (see Appendix 1). The items that were used to measure intention to purchase were developed from a scale proposed by Axelrod (1968) and Wells (1961). In general, participants have different profiles and characteristics, so it is vital to assess the intention to purchase among different customer segments in order to provide in-depth and more meaningful results (Hair, 2003). Details of this scale are provided in Appendix 2.

Multiple regression was used as the main method to analyse data in this study for three reasons. First, it can use both categorical and continuous independent variables; second, it is able to incorporate multiple independent variables; and third, it can be used for analysing experimental and non-experimental research (Keith, 2006), with this study being non-experimental. Moreover, the regression technique is the foundation of multivariate data analysis and a method that helps to give a better understanding about the interactions between large numbers of variables and their relative strength (Cronin and Taylor, 1992; Williams, 2003).

Results

A total of 377 questionnaires were obtained during three months from the beginning of June to the end of August 2008. The respondents’ ages ranged from 18 to over 55 years with the majority in the age group of 25–34 years (32%). Slightly over half of the respondents were male (57%). Leisure travellers dominated in this study (85%), while 15% were business travellers. Participants in this study were from all around the globe. European participants dominated at over one-third of the whole (32.7%), with North Asian (28.2%), South East Asian (20.0%), South or North American (8.2%), Middle Eastern (5.8%), Australian/Oceanic (4.5%) and African (0.5%). The hypothesis test results are discussed as follow.

The multiple regression technique was used to test H1: If perceived fit (overall) is high then intention to purchase is high. The ITP variable (dependent variable) was created from a three-item 7-point Likert scale by accumulating the score from each item. The perceived fit (overall) variable (independent variable) was created from a three-item 7-point Likert scale by accumulating the score of each item. The results of hypothesis test H1 are summarized in Table 1. These indicate that the perceived fit (overall) was related to intention to purchase and explains a total of 13% of the variance in intention to purchase ($R^2 = .129$, $F_{(1,273)} = 40.262$, $p < .001$). There was a positive and significant relationship between perceived fit (overall) and intention to purchase ($\beta = .359$, $t = 6.345$, $p < .001$). Thus, H1 was supported.

The multiple regression technique was conducted to test H2: If complementary fit on product usage is high then intention to purchase is high. The intention to purchase variable used the same research instrument of H1. The complementary fit on product usage was created from a three-item 7-point Likert scale by accumulating the score of each item. The results of hypothesis test H2 are summarized in Table 2. The complementary fit on product usage explained a total of 22% of the variance in intention to purchase ($R^2 = .216$, $F_{(1,274)} = 75.429$, $p < .001$). There was a positive and significant relationship between complementary fit on product usage and intention to purchase ($\beta = .465$, $t = 8.685$, $p < .001$). Thus, H2 was supported.

The multiple regression technique was conducted to test H3: If perceived fit (overall) is high then intention to purchase is high. The intention to purchase variable used the same research instrument of H1. The complementary fit on product usage was created from a three-item 7-point Likert scale by accumulating the score of each item. The results of hypothesis test H3 are summarized in Table 2. The complementary fit on product usage explained a total of 22% of the variance in intention to purchase ($R^2 = .216$, $F_{(1,274)} = 75.429$, $p < .001$). There was a positive and significant relationship between complementary fit on product usage and intention to purchase ($\beta = .465$, $t = 8.685$, $p < .001$). Thus, H3 was supported.
three circumstances: ‘I might dine-in sometime in the future’; ‘I would certainly dine in this restaurant’; and ‘I would consider dining in this restaurant’. The five product goals were: leisure, food and beverage, pleasant environment, convenient location and business. Other product goals such as to have American food were not included due to the small number of results for these responses (Field, 2000). The hypothesis test (H3) was based on three separate cross-tabulations. The first results are summarized in Table 3. These indicate the chi-square test between the intention to purchase item ‘I might dine in this restaurant sometime in the future’ and the five product goals produced a significant association between ‘dine sometime in future’ with only two of the product goals: leisure ($\chi^2(2) = 6.707, p < .05$) and business purposes ($\chi^2(2) = 9.369, p < .01$).

The second results are summarized in Table 4. These indicate that there was a significant association between ‘I would certainly dine-in in this restaurant’ and four product goals: leisure ($\chi^2(2) = 9.383, p < .01$), pleasant environment ($\chi^2(2) = 7.959, p < .05$), convenient location ($\chi^2(2) = 18.637, p < .001$) and business purposes ($\chi^2(2) = 9.381, p < .01$).

In summary, it was hypothesized that complementary fit based on product goals was related to intention to purchase. Interestingly, the intention to purchase item ‘I would certainly dine in this restaurant’ has a significant statistical relationship with four main product goals: leisure, pleasant environment, convenient location and business purposes (entertaining customer). It was found

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. Product usage regression results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complementary fit on product usage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Un-standardized coefficients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized coefficients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta($\beta$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.429***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1,274)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complementary fit on product usage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent variable: ITP, $R^2 = .216$, *** $p < .001$.

| Table 3. Chi-square tests of dine-in sometime in the future and product goal |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Purchase goal                | $\chi^2$                     | df                | $P$ value         | Valid case (N)   |
| Leisure                      | 6.707                        | 2                 | .035*             | 276              |
| Food & Beverage is Attractive| 2.376                        | 2                 | .305              | 276              |
| Pleasant Environment         | .710                         | 2                 | .701              | 276              |
| Convenient Location          | 3.247                        | 2                 | .197              | 276              |
| Business Purposes            | 9.369                        | 2                 | .009**            | 276              |

* $p = < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

| Table 4. Chi-square tests of would certainly dine-in this restaurant and product Goal |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Purchase goal                | $\chi^2$                     | df                | $P$ value (2 sided) | Valid case (N)   |
| Leisure                      | 9.383                        | 2                 | .009**            | 262              |
| Food & Beverage is Attractive| 1.364                        | 2                 | .505              | 262              |
| Pleasant Environment         | 7.959                        | 2                 | .019*             | 262              |
| Convenient Location          | 18.637                       | 2                 | .000***           | 262              |
| Business Purposes            | 9.381                        | 2                 | .009**            | 262              |

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$. |
that convenient location ($\chi^2(2) = 18.637, p < .001$) shows the strongest relationship when compared with the remaining three product goals. The intention to purchase item ‘I would consider dining in this restaurant’ had a significant statistical relationship with only the two product goals of pleasant environment and convenient location.

As for the first item, convenient location had the strongest relationship ($\chi^2(2) = 14.197, p < .01$). For the intention to purchase item ‘I might dine in this restaurant sometime in the future’, only two products goals showed a significant statistical relationship: leisure and business purposes. Concluding, four of the main product goals: leisure, pleasant environment, convenient location and business purposes (entertaining customer) were related to intention to purchase. The findings confirmed that the complementary fit on product goal was related to intention to purchase; therefore H3 was supported.

### Discussion and conclusion

The findings demonstrate that in the case examined, the perceived fit components: perceived fit (overall) and complementary fit in terms of both product usage and product goal are the most important components relating to intention to purchase in a co-branded hotel restaurant. The results of the investigation support the assertion in H1; namely, perceived fit (overall) is related to intention to purchase. The perceived fit (overall) component explained 13% of the variance in intention to purchase. The findings provide some evidence that the brands in this study belong together; and are compatible in their brand image.

The study’s findings also support a relationship between complementary fit and intention to purchase, in two key aspects: the dominance of complementary fit based on both product usage and on product goals. Product usage explained 22% of the variance in intention to purchase (H2). These findings were similar to a previous study presented by Hahm and Khan (2001), who wrote that complementary fit can be found between two products which do not feature the same attributes such as accommodation and restaurant. Thus, a key aspect influencing successful co-branding is the synergy effect, whereby two brands are complementary to each other (Hahm and Khan, 2001).

The results support that product goal is related to intention to purchase (H3). As previously discussed, complementary fit based on product goal is related to intention to purchase in co-branded products, and depends on the consequence, needs or purpose that an individual consumer desires to achieve (Boo, 2003; Martin and Stewart, 2001). Consumers perceive a common goal can be achieved which affects their intention and then transfers to the other product’s brand (Kao, 2007; Martin and Stewart, 2001).

Finally, perceived brand fit is important for consumer to purchase, because it increases the positive value and reduces the negative outcomes. Likewise, the perception of a complementary fit is in regard to knowledge and attitude towards the two brands. This means that the positive attitude from a hotel is transferred to a co-branded restaurant driving consumer purchase. The two brands in this study share complementary usage (one is a place to sleep and one is a place to dine). Two products that are a fit and complementary to each other represent an opportunity for a successful co-branding strategy.

As consequence, a modified conceptual framework model of consumer perception of a co-branding hotel and restaurant considered in these terms is presented in Figure 1. The model of the relationship between perceived brand fit and intention to purchase comprises of two components: perceived fit (overall) and complementary fit (product usage and product goal).

### Theoretical and managerial implications

In this study the theoretical framework presents with two crucial components that link perceived...
brand fit and intention to purchase. First, perceived fit (overall) derives from the perception of the hotel and co-branded restaurant as being a good match, as belonging together, and as compatible in terms of brand image. Second, complementary fit on product usage is when two product classes are complementary; in this study, complementary fit based on product usage supports the choice of dining for consumers. The purchase goal is the degree to which consumers’ needs in terms of dining are met, and influences intention to purchase within a co-branded restaurant. These findings extend the understanding of the two foremost purchase goals corresponding to consumer intentions to dine-in a co-branded restaurant; first, to motivate the consumer by making use of psychological responses, and second by making use of the physical responses. The psychological response persuades the consumer to connect dining in a co-branded restaurant with enjoyment and satisfaction. In turn, the physical response focuses on the physical environment that must be pleasant, clean, hygienic, conveniently located, and able to be used for business purposes.

Additionally, in considering the managerial implications, the conceptual framework developed and tested in this study provides useful guidelines for implementing a value-based hotel and co-branded restaurant marketing strategy. For instance, the findings can be used to improve competitiveness by offering a strategy for management to achieve perceived brand fit and influencing consumer intention to purchase. The main limitation for this study lies in the selection of a single case; essentially, only one hotel chain, which has adopted a co-branded restaurant, was studied. Future researchers might also consider studying a co-branded hotel with a different type of restaurant; one, for instance, co-branding with a Starbucks Coffee establishment. Moreover, this study’s aim was not to explore cross-cultural perceptions; the participants however were from around the world, and future research could investigate cross-cultural perceptions in a co-branded hotel and restaurant context. Further study should focus on the brand alliance conceptual model as proposed by Boo and Matilla (2002) and in particular, on whether or not the consequences of perceived brand fit are linked to consumer satisfaction and loyalty.
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Appendix 1. Questionnaire

Questions used to measure intention to purchase

Q12. I might dine in the restaurant at sometime in the future.
Q14. I would certainly dine in this restaurant.
Q15. I would consider dining in this restaurant.
(Q 12, 14, 15 used 1–7 scale from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree)

Questionnaires used to measure perceived fit (overall)

Q6. My overall feeling is that there is a good match between this hotel and HJB.
Q7. The overall feeling of this hotel and HJB is that they belong together.
Q8. This hotel and HJB are compatible in terms of brand image.
(Q 6,7,8 used 1–7 scale from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree)

Questionnaires used to measure complementary fit on product usage

Q3. I feel that this hotel and the HJB restaurant complement each other.
Q4. It is a good idea for this hotel to provide the HJB restaurant for customers.
Q5. It is important to have restaurant facilities like HJB restaurant within this hotel.

Questions used to measure complementary fit on product goal

41. In your opinion what is dining at the XXXXX X XXXXX restaurant-offering customers in general? (Please tick in the correct box. You can answer more than once).

☐ Other, please specify . . . .

42. Why would you use the Henry J Bean Bar & Grill restaurant? (Please tick in the correct box. You can answer more than once).
**Appendix 2. Measurement scale of intention to purchase variable**

The intention to purchase measurement scale was created from three items with the internal scale reliability above the accepted level, \( \alpha \) value = .874, \( n = 290 \). The scale item was anchored from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree. The descriptive statistics for intention to purchase are given in Table 4–17. These indicate strong agreement that they ‘might dine in the HJB restaurant sometime in the future’ (\( \bar{x} = 5.125, \text{SD} = 1.887 \)), and ‘they would consider dining in the HJB restaurant’ (\( \bar{x} = 4.980, \text{SD} = 1.946 \)) while less in agreement that they ‘would certainly dine-in’ (\( \bar{x} = 4.412, \text{SD} = 2.129 \)).

### Descriptive Statistics of Intention to Purchase (ITP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>( \bar{x} )</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Kutosis</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q12. I might dine in the restaurant at sometime in the future.</td>
<td>5.125</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.887</td>
<td>-.212</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14. I would certainly dine in this restaurant.</td>
<td>4.412</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.129</td>
<td>-1.477</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15. I would consider dining in this restaurant.</td>
<td>4.980</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.946</td>
<td>-.558</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \alpha \) value = .874, \( n = 290 \)