Adoptability of Solo Dining Practices in Restaurant Businesses: A Study from the Perspective of Diffusion of Innovations and Organizational Readiness

Prof. Dr. Mehmet Sarioğlan • Batuhan Gürs

ÖZGÜR PRESS

Adoptability of Solo Dining Practices in Restaurant Businesses: A Study from the Perspective of Diffusion of Innovations and Organizational Readiness

Prof. Dr. Mehmet Sarioğlan
Batuhan Gürs

ÖZGÜR PRESS

Published by
Özgür Yayın-Dağıtım Co. Ltd.
Certificate Number: 45503

15 Temmuz Mah. 148136. Sk. No: 9 Şehitkamil/Gaziantep
+90.850 260 09 97
+90.532 289 82 15
www.ozguryayınlari.com
info@ozguryayinlari.com

Adoptability of Solo Dining Practices in Restaurant Businesses: A Study from the Perspective of Diffusion of Innovations and Organizational Readiness

Prof. Dr. Mehmet Sarioğlan • Batuhan Gürs

Language: English
Publication Date: 2026
Cover design by Mehmet Çakır

Print and digital versions typeset by Çizgi Medya Co. Ltd.

ISBN (PDF): 978-625-8813-10-4

DOI: https://doi.org/10.58830/ozgur.pub1339

Suggested citation:
Sarıoğlan, M., Gürs, B. (2026). *Adoptability of Solo Dining Practices in Restaurant Businesses: A Study from the Perspective of Diffusion of Innovations and Organizational Readiness.* Özgür Publications. DOI: https://doi.org/10.58830/ozgur.pub1339. License: CC-BY-NC 4.0

The full text of this book has been peer-reviewed to ensure high academic standards. For full review policies, see https://www.ozguryayinlari.com/

Contents

1. Introduction

Solo dining eating alone in a public restaurant is becoming an increasingly visible consumption practice. Solo dining differs from eating alone at home or in the office; its focus is on the individual eating alone in a public restaurant setting (Her & Seo, 2018; Huang, Feng, & Wong, 2025). This rise is driven by demographic and lifestyle-based transformations. The increase in solo dining is linked to societal factors such as the proliferation of single-person households, individualized lifestyles, and the difficulty of finding dining companions due to busy schedules (Her & Seo, 2018; Huang et al., 2025). The literature highlights that solo dining is increasingly being addressed across different disciplines; however, studies have long been fragmented and focused on limited areas (Huang et al., 2025).

solo dining is a rising trend are supported by both industry data and academic studies. For example, a study systematically evaluating the solo dining literature reports that eating out alone has rapidly gained popularity in recent years, and search interest for the term solo dining has increased significantly, especially in the post-pandemic period (Huang et al., 2025). Similarly, it is noted that solo dining is a strengthening practice in different geographies; starting in Europe, Australia, and the USA, it is becoming more socially acceptable in Asia as well (Moon, Bonn, & Cho, 2020). Moon et al. (2020) emphasize the global nature of this trend by pointing to report findings on solo diner rates in Europe, the fact that a significant portion of online reservations in Australia consist of solo diners, and the prevalence of eating out alone in national surveys in South Korea.

However, solo dining can also raise concerns for some consumers because it involves performing an activity traditionally considered social in a public space alone. The presence of other customers, particularly in a restaurant setting, has been considered a critical factor influencing the intention and experience of solo dining (Her & Seo, 2018; Hwang, Shin, & Mattila, 2018). Her and

Seo (2018) demonstrate that the characteristics of other consumers in the restaurant e.g., mostly solo diners vs. group diners and the level of crowding can be decisive in determining the intention to solo dining ; this influence can operate through expectations of solitude and negative evaluations from others. Therefore, solo dining is discussed not only as a matter of individual preference but also as a consumption process shaped by social environment and spatial conditions (Her & Seo, 2018; Hwang et al., 2018).

In the current literature, the phenomenon of solo dining has primarily been addressed through the lens of individuals' experiences, emotional responses, and intentions. It is particularly emphasized that eating alone in a public restaurant can create feelings of loneliness and anxiety about being negatively judged by others (Her & Seo, 2018). In this context, solo dining has long been perceived as a deviation from the norm and has been described as a socially uncomfortable experience in cultures where collective dining practices are dominant (Hwang et al., 2018). Hwang et al. (2018) demonstrate that the solo dining experience varies depending on spatial proximity and the identity of other customers in the vicinity; the presence of customers dining in groups at nearby tables can negatively impact the solo diner experience.

However, more recent studies reveal that approaches associating solo dining solely with negative emotions are limited. Brown et al. (2020) state that solo dining is not always mandatory or undesirable; for some consumers, it is a conscious choice offering variety in experience, flexibility, and personal space. In this study, solo dining is considered a practice that diversifies the restaurant experience and appeals to different customer segments; it is argued that viewing solo diners as a group completely excluded from or dissatisfied with the restaurant experience is reductionist (Brown et al., 2020). Similarly, Bocanegra et al. (2022) consider solo dining as a social and experiential phenomenon, emphasizing that this practice should be evaluated not as anincompleteform of eating alone, but as an experience that generates its own unique meanings.

Another prominent focus in the solo dining literature is the impact of the restaurant environment and physical arrangements on this experience. Moon et al. (2020) demonstrate that perceived spatial boundaries and psychological space influence solo diners' satisfaction and intention to revisit. According to the study, the presence of physical and psychological boundaries reinforces solo diners' perceived sense of territoriality,which in turn increases experience satisfaction (Moon et al., 2020). Similarly, Im and Seo (2024) reveal that the restaurant experiencescape is decisive in solo diners' emotions and satisfaction; specifically, fair treatment of staff and reactions from other customers shape

the solo dining experience. These findings suggest that solo dining is closely related not only to individual psychology but also to the physical and social environment of the restaurant (Im & Seo, 2024).

However, a common feature of these studies is that they largely address solo dining from a consumer perspective. The literature does not directly address questions such as why restaurant businesses implement solo dining only to a limited extent, under what conditions they are ready for this practice, or what organizational and operational factors influence this decision (Brown et al., 2020; Bocanegra et al., 2022; Im & Seo, 2024). This situation points to a significant gap in explaining why solo dining has not become a systematic and widespread practice in restaurants despite increasing consumer demand .

Despite the increasing interest in consumer experience in the solo dining literature, how restaurant businesses evaluate this practice as a service model has been addressed to a limited extent. While current studies reveal that solo dining is creating increasing demand, they do not offer systematic findings on how restaurants respond to this demand (Brown et al., 2020; Huang et al., 2025). Brown et al. (2020) state that restaurants often perceive solo diners as a secondary customer segment and that operational priorities are shaped around group diners . This situation may cause solo dining to remain limited in practice, despite being a potential opportunity for restaurants (Brown et al., 2020).

solo dining is addressed within the restaurant context has largely been shaped by service environment and experience design. Im and Seo (2024) show that the experiences of solo diners are influenced not only by the physical atmosphere but also by employee-customer interactions and the reactions of other customers. This study emphasizes that social elements such as employee interactional fairness and the stares of other customers can increase the negative feelings of solo diners (Im & Seo, 2024). Similarly, Her and Seo (2018) reveal that the intention to solo dine is closely related to perceptions of crowdedness and the presence of other customers in the restaurant environment . These findings demonstrate that solo dining is a multidimensional experience that needs to be managed in a restaurant setting (Her & Seo, 2018; Im & Seo, 2024).

Technology and design-focused studies have also offered suggestions for transforming the solo dining experience. Khot et al., (2019) discuss how the social aspects of solo dining can be reimagined through technology by designing a robotic dining companion for solo diners . In this study, it is stated that a robotic companion can make the experience of solo diners more enjoyable and interactive (Khot et al., 2019). Wang et al. (2025), on the

other hand, examine solo dining behavior in the context of data physicalization and self-reflection, showing that the use of technology can support mindful and conscious eating behaviors during solo dining. While these studies offer innovative approaches to enriching the solo dining experience, they do not focus on the capacity of restaurant businesses to implement such applications (Khot et al., 2019; Wang et al., 2025).

A key problem that has emerged in the literature at this point is that solo dining is mostly defined through thecustomer experience.Findings on how restaurant businesses evaluate the organizational, operational, and physical conditions they face before adopting this practice are limited (Brown et al., 2020; Im & Seo, 2024). However, the implementation of solo dining in a restaurant setting is directly related to elements such as table arrangement, service flow, staff task allocation, and spatial adequacy (Moon et al., 2020). This situation demonstrates that solo dining is not merely a consumer preference, but also a decision requiring planning and implementation for restaurant businesses. In this context, the existing literature is insufficient to explain why solo dining has not become widespread in restaurants; in particular, the lack of quantitative studies that directly address thereadinessof businesses for this practice is noteworthy (Huang et al., 2025; Brown et al., 2020).

Implementing solo dining in restaurants requires a transformation process that goes beyond existing service routines. Solo dining is considered a practice that directly affects a restaurant's service capacity, spatial layout, and operational flow (Brown, Buhalis & Beer, 2020). Therefore, its adoption cannot be explained solely by increased demand; it will be linked to the business's willingness and capacity to implement this change. Brown et al. (2020) state that restaurants often evaluate solo dining in the context of table efficiency, revenue optimization, and service priorities, and therefore approach the practice cautiously.

solo dining in restaurants necessitates a rethinking of physical space. Moon et al. (2020) reveal that perceived spatial adequacy and limitations influence solo diners' satisfaction with their experience and their intention to revisit. The study indicates that the seating arrangement and physical layout of the restaurant play a role in individuals developing a sense of control and ownership over the space (Moon et al., 2020). These findings demonstrate that the feasibility of solo dining is directly linked to spatial capacity.

However, solo dining is not limited to physical arrangements. Im and Seo (2024) show that the social and organizational dimensions of the restaurant experience influence the emotional responses of solo diners . Employees' attitudes towards interactional justice and the service process are decisive in

whether the solo dining experience is evaluated positively or negatively (Im & Seo, 2024). This reveals that the implementation of solo dining is related to staff behavior, role coordination, and service processes.

Technology and design-based studies also demonstrate that solo dining can be transformed within the existing restaurant model. Khot et al., (2019) suggest that this practice can be reimagined with new service formats through a robotic dining companion designed to support the solo dining experience. Similarly, Wang et al. (2025) show that the use of technology during solo dining has an impact on eating behavior and awareness. However, these studies do not directly address the capacity of restaurant businesses to implement such innovations (Khot et al., 2019; Wang et al., 2025). In this context, solo dining represents the adoption of a new service model for restaurant businesses. Implementing this practice requires a combined assessment of factors such as compatibility with the business's existing service approach, perceived operational challenges, and spatial adequacy (Brown et al., 2020; Moon et al., 2020). This necessitates considering solo dining as a process of change and adaptation for restaurants.

solo dining as a practical decision for restaurants necessitates evaluating this practice within the context of innovation adoption. Brown et al. (2020) note that while solo dining offers potential benefits for restaurants, businesses often approach this practice cautiously, assessing potential risks before implementing it. These assessments demonstrate that both the perceived benefits and the operational challenges that solo dining may create for the business are considered (Brown et al., 2020). Therefore, solo dining is not a spontaneously adopted practice for restaurants, but rather an innovation that can be accepted under specific conditions.

Evaluating innovations within the restaurant context raises the question of how well the practice aligns with existing service concepts. Moon et al. (2020) demonstrate that the physical and psychological boundaries of restaurants influence the perception of space in solo diners, while also emphasizing that these boundaries are related to how the establishment structures its service layout. The restaurant's existing layout, table arrangements, and circulation areas are among the factors determining the compatibility of a new practice like solo dining (Moon et al., 2020). This indicates that the adoption of solo dining is shaped not only by intention but also by perceptions of the practice's compatibility with the existing structure.

solo dining are also a determining factor in the adoption process. Im and Seo (2024) show that solo diners' experiences are sensitive to disruptions in the service process and social interactions. The study indicates that

employee attitudes and the perception of fairness in the service flow can negatively affect the experience (Im & Seo, 2024). These findings show that restaurant businesses must consider issues such as staff training and service coordination before implementing solo dining. Such requirements can increase the perceived complexity of solo dining from a business perspective (Brown et al., 2020). On the other hand, there are examples in the literature suggesting that solo dining could be a viable practice on a limited scale. Brown et al. (2020) note that restaurants have developed practices for solo diners based on specific hours, specific areas, or limited table numbers, and that such trials can reduce the perception of risk. These practices allow solo dining to be perceived not as a completely irreversible change, but as an innovation that can be implemented gradually and in a controlled manner (Brown et al., 2020). The increasing visibility of solo dining practices in the sector is influencing businesses' perceptions of this innovation. Huang et al. (2025) state that solo dining examples have become more visible through media, social platforms, and industry reports; this contributes to solo dining being perceived as a morefamiliarpractice for restaurants. In this context, solo dining emerges as an innovation with different perceived characteristics for restaurant businesses, and is evaluated accordingly. Implementing solo dining in restaurants requires managing organizational change rather than simply responding to new customer behavior. For restaurant businesses, adopting such a practice represents a decision-making process between maintaining existing operations and implementing a new form of service (Brown, Buhalis & Beer, 2020). In this process, businesses evaluate the potential benefits that solo dining can provide while also considering the effort, coordination, and resource requirements necessary for its implementation (Brown et al., 2020).

Implementing a new practice at the organizational level is related to the willingness of business members to carry out this change and their belief that they can successfully implement it. Shea et al. (2014) define organizational readiness for change through the shared commitment of organization members to implementing the change and their shared perception of competence to carry it out. This approach reveals that change is possible not only through a decision by top management, but also through a shared readiness throughout the organization (Shea et al., 2014). Similarly, in the context of restaurants, the adoption of a new practice such as solo dining depends on the support and belief of different actors within the business that they can implement this change.

Solo dining in restaurants requires specific adaptations in staff job descriptions, service flow, and customer interaction styles. Im & Seo (2024) demonstrate that employee behavior and perception of interactional fairness

have an impact on the solo dining experience. These findings reveal that solo dining is not only a physical arrangement but also an application requiring organizational coordination (Im & Seo, 2024). Therefore, the readiness of the business for solo dining plays a decisive role in the successful implementation of this practice. It has been noted that when organizational readiness levels are low, businesses may resist change and new practices may not be implemented sustainably (Shea et al., 2014). This provides an important framework for explaining why solo dining is implemented to a limited extent in restaurants. Despite increasing consumer demand, businesses need to clarify their perception of their ability to manage this change before implementing solo dining (Brown et al., 2020). In this context, solo dining is considered not only a market trend for restaurant businesses but also a practice directly related to their level of organizational readiness (Shea et al., 2014; Brown et al., 2020).

This study examines solo dining not just as a growing consumer demand for restaurant businesses, but as a practice that requires planning and management. While the literature extensively explores solo dining through the experiences, emotions, and social perceptions of individuals, assessments of the process by which restaurant businesses implement this practice remain limited (Brown, Buhalis & Beer, 2020; Im & Seo, 2024). Existing studies reveal that solo dining is becoming widespread and accepted in various contexts, but they do not directly address the decision-making processes of restaurants regarding this practice (Huang, Feng & Wong, 2025).

Dining in restaurant businesses requires considering multiple dimensions together, such as compatibility with existing service concepts, adequacy of physical space, and internal organizational coordination. Moon et al. (2020) demonstrate that the physical layout and perceived spatial boundaries of restaurants have an impact on the solo diner experience. Similarly, Im and Seo (2024) show that employee behavior and perception of interactional fairness shape the solo dining experience in the service delivery process . These findings reveal that implementing solo dining in a restaurant setting is not merely a technical intervention like table arrangement; it requires organizational and operational adaptations. In this context, restaurants' approaches to solo dining are considered not merely a response to potential customer demand, but a decision-making process requiring change. Brown et al. (2020) state that restaurants often approach solo dining cautiously, harboring various reservations before implementation due to factors such as table efficiency, service flow, and revenue optimization. This provides an important basis for explaining why solo dining, although a visible trend, has not become a widespread and systematic practice in restaurants (Brown et al., 2020).

The starting point of this study is to address the question ofwhy solo dining is not implementedin restaurant businesses not only through market demand or customer attitudes, but also through the capacity of the business to implement this practice. The organizational change readiness approach offers a suitable framework for explaining the adoption of a new practice like solo dining by emphasizing the commitment of business members to implementing the change and their shared perception of competence to carry out this change (Shea (et al., 2014). This framework reveals that implementing solo dining in restaurants is a process that requires not only desire but also readiness. Accordingly, this study aims to examine solo dining as a viable service approach for restaurant businesses, analyzing their perceptions, readiness levels, and spatial adequacy assessments regarding this practice. Focusing on the pre-adoption phase of solo dining, the study aims to reveal the conditions under which restaurant businesses evaluate this practice and their readiness to implement it.

2. Theoretical Background

2.1. Characteristics of Innovation and Organizational Readiness

One of the most common theoretical approaches to explaining the adoption of innovations is Diffusion of Innovations Theory . Rogers (2003) states that among the key factors influencing the speed of innovation adoption, the perceived characteristics of the innovation play a central role. According to Rogers,innovation characteristicsreflect how potential adopters perceive the innovation, and these perceptions directly influence adoption behavior. İdentifies five fundamental characteristics of innovations as relative advantage, adaptability, complexity, trialability, and observability .

Rogers (2003) defines relative advantage asthe degree to which an innovation is perceived as better than the idea or practice it replaces.Consistency refers to the extent to which an innovation is perceived as consistent with the existing values, past experiences, and needs of potential adopters. Complexity is related to how difficult the innovation is perceived to understand and use. According to Rogers, innovations perceived as complex are adopted more slowly than those perceived as simpler. Trialability refers to the degree to which an innovation can be tested on a limited scale; observability refers to the degree to which the results of the innovation can be seen by others. Particularly emphasizes that these characteristics should be evaluated not asobjectivequalities, but through the perceptions of the adopters. According to Rogers, the factor influencing the adoption of innovations is not the characteristics defined by experts or change agents, but how potential adopters perceive these characteristics. Therefore, the characteristics of innovations gain meaning from the perspective of individuals or organizations.

This approach to the perceived characteristics of innovations was discussed in more detail in an organizational context by Moore and Benbasat (1991). Based on Rogers' classification of innovation characteristics, developed a

scale to measure how individuals perceive these characteristics in the process of adopting an innovation. The study states that the dimensions of relative advantage, adaptability, complexity, trialability, and observability are related to individuals' tendencies to accept or reject an innovation. Similarly, Tornatzky and Klein (1982), in their meta-analysis examining numerous empirical studies, found that relative advantage, adaptability, and complexity were among the characteristics most consistently associated with innovation adoption. This theoretical framework provides a suitable foundation for understanding how restaurant businesses evaluate a new service practice such as solo dining. However, the adoption of innovations in an organizational context is not limited solely to the perceived characteristics of the innovation; these characteristics must be considered in conjunction with the level of readiness within the organization.

The role of perceived innovation characteristics in the adoption process has long been debated, not only at the individual level but also in an organizational context. In a comprehensive review examining numerous empirical studies on innovation adoption, Tornatzky and Klein (1982) state that the perceived relative advantage, adaptability, and complexity of the innovation are consistently related to adoption decisions. The study specifically emphasizes that relative advantage and adaptability have a positive effect on adoption, while complexity has a negative effect (Tornatzky & Klein, 1982). These findings suggest that how organizational members evaluate the innovation is more decisive than its technical characteristics.

Similarly, Moore and Benbasat (1991), highlighting the central role of perception in the adoption of innovations, proposed a framework for measuring how individuals interpret the characteristics of innovation as defined by Rogers. Moore and Benbasat (1991) consider relative advantage as the potential forimprovementcompared to existing practices, while they define compatibility through the consistency of the innovation with ways of doing business, values, and needs. Complexity, on the other hand, is associated with the perception that the innovation is difficult to learn and use. The authors state that these perceptions directly influence individuals' tendencies to accept or reject an innovation (Moore & Benbasat, 1991).

This approach to the perceived characteristics of innovations has been similarly addressed in the information systems and organizational innovation literature. Lyytinen and Damsgaard (2001), in explaining the adoption of innovations in organizations, state that the compatibility of the innovation with existing systems and the level of uncertainty it will create in the implementation process are critical. According to the authors, organizations are particularly

cautious towards innovations that are perceived as incompatible with existing operations or difficult to implement (Lyytinen & Damsgaard, 2001). This situation shows that the perceived complexity and compatibility of innovations shape decision-making processes at the organizational level.

Greenhalgh et al. (2004), in their comprehensive review conducted in the context of health and public organizations, state that perceived characteristics of innovations arenecessary but not sufficientconditions for adoption. The study defines relative advantage, compatibility, complexity, trialability, and observability asstandard innovation characteristics"; however, it emphasizes that the impact of these characteristics in an organizational context should be evaluated together with the organization's readiness for change (Greenhalgh et al., 2004). Especially in complex service innovations, the degree to which the innovation is compatible with the organizational structure and its adaptability become decisive in the adoption process. In this context, the perceived characteristics of innovations offer a fundamental starting point for explaining why organizations adopt or delay a new practice; however, for these perceptions to translate into action at the organizational level, a readiness to implement change is necessary.

While the perceived characteristics of innovations offer an important framework for explaining how organizations evaluate a new practice, it is emphasized that adoption in an organizational context cannot be reduced solely to perception. Weiner (2009) states that the key element determining the success of change in organizations is the level of readiness of organizational members to implement that change. According to Weiner, organizational readiness is related to theshared commitmentof organizational members to implementing the change and theirshared beliefthat they can bring the change to life. This approach addresses the adoption of innovation not merely as a technical or structural issue, but through the collective perceptions of organizational members (Weiner, 2009). Organizational Readiness for Change is built upon this theoretical framework. Implementing The Change (ORIC) approach was made measurable by Shea et al. (2014). Shea et al. (2014) state that ORIC consists of two basic dimensions: commitment to change (change commitment and change capability Change competence refers to the extent to which organizational members are willing and determined to implement a particular change, while change competence reflects the shared belief of organizational members that they can successfully implement that change (Shea et al., 2014).

Shea et al. (2014) emphasize that organizational readiness is not simply the sum of individual attitudes, but rather a shared psychological state within the

organization. In this context, ORIC considers that organizational members must not onlywantchange, but alsobelieve they can makethat change. The authors state that even if commitment to change is high, implementations may fail if change competence is low. This clearly reveals the multidimensional nature of organizational readiness.

Greenhalgh et al. (2004) also place similar emphasis on the adoption of organizational innovations, stating that the perceived characteristics of innovation can only be effective if the organization has the capacity to support change. The study indicates that the implementation of innovations within an organizational context is closely related to factors such as leadership, resources, personnel capacity, and internal coordination (Greenhalgh et al., 2004). This approach demonstrates that organizational readiness is a condition thatmakes innovation characteristics functional.In this context, there is a complementary relationship between the perceived characteristics of innovations and organizational readiness. Even if the relative advantage, adaptability, or trialability of an innovation are perceived positively, the adoption process may be interrupted if organizational members do not perceive themselves as competent to implement the change (Weiner, 2009; Shea et al., 2014). Therefore, innovation adoption at the organizational level is considered a process that requires the joint evaluation of perceived innovation characteristics and organizational readiness. Innovations and organizational readiness is addressed indirectly but consistently in the organizational innovation literature. Tornatzky and Klein (1982) state that relative advantage and adaptability are strongly related to adoption decisions, emphasizing that this relationship cannot be considered independently of organizational conditions. Similarly, Greenhalgh et al. (2004) argue that for innovation characteristics to be effective within an organizational context, the organization must have the capacity and willingness to implement that innovation. This approach shows that innovation characteristics alone do not explain adoption, but only gain meaning in conjunction with organizational readiness.

Moore and Benbasat (1991) state that the perceived characteristics of innovations influence individuals' attitudes and intentions toward innovation; and that when these attitudes are shared at the organizational level, they can shape adoption decisions. The study indicates that a positive perception of relative advantage and adaptability creates a stronger tendency to accept innovation. This suggests that organizational members' perception of innovation as valuable and appropriate can contribute to developing a shared commitment to change.

Weiner (2009) emphasizes that one of the fundamental elements underlying organizational readiness is the shared perception of organizational members regarding thevalueof change. According to Weiner, when organizational members perceive a change as valuable and necessary, their level of commitment to the change increases; this strengthens the likelihood of the change being implemented. This approach suggests that characteristics such as the perceived relative advantage and adaptability of innovation are key to organizational readiness for change. This suggests it may be related to the commitment dimension.

On the other hand, the perceived complexity of innovations makes organizational readiness particularly important for change. This is associated with the efficacy dimension. Shea et al. (2014) state that the shared belief of organizational members that they can implement a change is affected by the perceived difficulty level of the change. When innovation is perceived as complex and difficult to implement, the belief of organizational members that they can successfully implement the change may weaken. This shows that the perception of complexity can be a limiting factor in organizational readiness.

Trialability and observability are considered characteristics that reduce the perceived uncertainty of innovations. Rogers (2003) states that the ability to test innovations on a limited scale and to observe their results facilitates the adoption process. Similarly, Greenhalgh et al. (2004) state that opportunities for testing and feedback reduce organizational members' perceptions of risk regarding the innovation and can increase confidence in its implementation. In this context, trialability and observability are considered elements that support organizational readiness, especially the change competence dimension. This literature review reveals that the perceived characteristics of innovations are multifacetedly related to organizational readiness, and that the adoption of innovations by organizations requires a simultaneous consideration of these two constructs.

The relationship between perceived characteristics of innovations and organizational readiness demonstrates that innovation adoption within an organizational context is not limited solely to cognitive evaluations. Greenhalgh et al. (2004) state that innovation adoption requires the perception of beingfeasiblewithin the organization; this perception depends not only on the relative advantage of the innovation but also on how compatible it is with the organization's existing structures. The study notes that, particularly with complex innovations, the organizational context and implementation conditions can either strengthen or limit the impact of innovation characteristics.

This approach suggests that the impact of perceived characteristics of innovations on organizational readiness is related to concrete implementation conditions rather than abstract evaluations. Lyytinen and Damsgaard (2001) emphasize that theimplementation contextplays a critical role in the adoption of innovations in organizations, and that the integration of the innovation with existing systems can be decisive in the adoption process. According to the authors, organizations evaluate not only the benefit of the innovation but also how this innovation can be implemented within the existing operation.

Similarly, Kapoor et al. (2014) state that when evaluating the perceived characteristics of innovations at the organizational level, the organization's resources and structural conditions shape these perceptions. In this study, the presence or absence of the necessary infrastructure for implementing the innovation is considered an influential factor in organizational members' perception of the innovation as feasible. This shows that organizational readiness is not only a psychological state but also an evaluation process related to the actual conditions of the organization.

The organizational readiness literature also emphasizes thefavorability of conditionsin implementing change. Shea et al. (2014) state that change competence reflects the shared beliefs of organizational members about their ability to implement change; these beliefs are based on an assessment of existing resources, skills, and structural conditions. In this context, it is stated that the perception of change competence may weaken when organizational members experience uncertainty about how to do it. This relationship between perceived characteristics of innovations and organizational readiness makes the importance of the implementation context more visible. Greenhalgh et al. (2004) state that, especially in service innovations, the physical and operational environment in which the implementation will take place can directly affect the adoption of the innovation. This approach shows that organizational readiness is not only based on intentions and perceptions, but also on the evaluation of the concrete conditions in which the innovation will be implemented. In this context, to better understand the impact of perceived innovation characteristics on organizational readiness, the context in which the innovation will be implemented needs to be considered as a separate dimension. Especially in service businesses, the physical and operational conditions of the implementation are among the key factors shaping organizational members' perceptions of their ability to carry out the change.

H1: The perceived relative advantage of solo dining positively influences the business's readiness to implement a solo dining model.

H2: The perceived suitability of the solo dining practice positively influences the establishment's readiness to implement change towards a solo dining practice.

H3: The perceived complexity of solo dining negatively impacts the business's readiness to implement change towards solo dining.

H4: The perceived trialability of solo dining positively influences the business's readiness to implement a solo dining concept.

H5: The perceived observability of solo dining positively influences the business's readiness to implement change towards solo dining.

2.2. Spatial Adequacy and Organizational Readiness

The organizational readiness literature emphasizes that the successful implementation of change is related not only to psychological commitment but also to the adequacy of the conditions under which the change will be implemented. Armenakis et al. (1993) define readiness as thecognitive antecedent of resistance or support to change,stating that members' belief in their ability to implement change is based on an assessment of the concrete requirements of that change. This approach demonstrates that readiness involves not only an attitudinal but also a contextual evaluation process.

Weiner (2009) defines organizational readiness as the shared commitment of organizational members to implementing change . commitment) and belief in collective competence (change) Weiner defines change readiness as the ability to implement change. According to Weiner, change readiness reflects the assessments of organizational members regarding their capacity to implement change, and these assessments are shaped by the demands of the task, the availability of resources, and the perception of situational factors. In this context, physical and structural conditions are among the important determinants of organizational readiness.

The applied science literature also clearly demonstrates the role of organizational context and infrastructure on readiness. Helfrich et al. (2009) state that organizational readiness is related not only to individual beliefs but also to the quality of the context in which the implementation will take place. In the ORCA approach, developed based on the PARIHS framework, organizational context is considered a multidimensional structure including elements such as leadership, culture, resources, and physical environment (Helfrich et al., 2009). In this context, the adequacy of the physical environment in which the implementation will take place is considered an integral component of organizational readiness.

Lehman et al. (2002) emphasize the importance of considering organizational resources and physical conditions when assessing organizational readiness. In the ORC model, physical resources, equipment, and infrastructure, as well as personnel competence, are considered necessary conditions for implementing change (Lehman et al., 2002). According to the authors, even with high motivation for change, the implementation process is likely to be hampered if sufficient resources are not available.

Similarly, Scaccia et al. (2015) define organizational readiness asbeing willing and able to implement an innovationand explain this situation through three components: motivation, general organizational capacity, and innovation-specific capacity. General organizational capacity includes elements such as physical spaces, infrastructure, and operational arrangements; innovation-specific capacity refers to the concrete conditions required by a particular application (Scaccia et al., 2015). This approach shows that spatial adequacy is related to both the general and application-specific dimensions of organizational readiness. In this context, spatial adequacy is considered not only a supportive element of organizational readiness, but also a structural condition that directly influences members' belief in their ability to implement change.

In the organizational readiness literature, assessments regarding the feasibility of implementing change are based not only on the motivation and attitudes of organizational members, but also on the existence of the concrete conditions required for change. Weiner (2009) states that change competence reflects the shared beliefs of organizational members about their ability to implement change, and these beliefs are tasks. demands, resource availability, and situational It is stated that change is shaped depending on how thefactorsare evaluated. In this context, physical space is considered a fundamental resource in fulfilling the tasks required by change (Weiner, 2009).

Holt et al. (2007) emphasize that readiness for change is a multidimensional construct and that individuals' tendencies to support change are related to their perceptions of the impact of change on the organization. The study states that perceptions of how much change will challenge existing ways of doing business and how much it will alter the current order affect the level of readiness (Holt et al., 2007). This approach shows that changes necessitated by spatial and physical arrangements create a direct impact felt by organizational members.

Application research particularly emphasizes the role of spatial and structural conditions on organizational readiness. In their systematic review of organizational readiness measures, Miake-Lye et al. (2020) found that the majority of assessment items reflect the organization's inner The study indicates that the focus is on thesetting,that is, structural features, resources,

and the climate of implementation. The study shows that physical spaces and infrastructure facilities are frequently included in assessments of readiness for implementation (Miake-Lye et al., 2020). These findings demonstrate that spatial adequacy plays a central role in measuring organizational readiness.

Vakola (2014) states that readiness for change is not only a cognitive attitude but also a process involving organizational members' assessments ofhowthe change will be implemented. The study emphasizes that perceptions of the extent to which change will affect daily operations and whether the existing system can accommodate this change are decisive factors in readiness (Vakola, 2014). In this context, spatial arrangements are among the key elements determining how change will materialize within the organization.

Armenakis et al. (1993) state that readiness for change is closely related to members' beliefs about the feasibility of change. They argue that if the physical and structural conditions necessary for implementing change are perceived as uncertain or inadequate, members' tendency to support change may weaken (Armenakis et al., 1993). This approach suggests that spatial adequacy is particularly important for organizational readiness for change. This reveals that it is one of the key elements that fuels the efficacy dimension.

In light of this literature, spatial adequacy is considered not merely a complementary element of organizational readiness, but a structural condition playing a central role in the formation of shared beliefs about the feasibility of implementing change.

The extent to which innovation-specific requirements align with the organization's existing capacity is crucial in translating organizational readiness into practice. Scaccia et al. (2015) relate organizational readiness not only to general capacity but also to the capacity specific to the conditions required by a particular innovation. In the $R = MC^2$ approach, innovation-specific capacity includes tangible elements such as physical spaces, infrastructure, and operational arrangements necessary for the implementation of a specific application (Scaccia et al., 2015). This approach demonstrates that spatial adequacy occupies a central position in the innovation-specific dimension of organizational readiness.

Studies focusing on the context of application reveal that the physical environment and spatial arrangements directly influence change processes. Miake-Lye et al. (2020) found that in organizational readiness assessments, inner The study indicates that the setting dimension is dominant, and that structural features and items related to physical conditions hold a significant place within this dimension. It states that assessments of the suitability of

the environment in which the application will be carried out are an integral part of the perception of readiness (Miake-Lye et al., 2020). These findings demonstrate that spatial adequacy is a directly, not indirectly, represented element in organizational readiness measurements.

Helfrich et al. (2009), while examining the role of organizational context in implementation success, consider the physical environment as one of the fundamental components of context. Within the ORCA framework, the suitability of physical spaces and the adequacy of infrastructure are considered among the factors supporting the sustainable implementation of the project (Helfrich et al., 2009). This approach reveals that spatial adequacy should be considered not only during the implementation phase but also in pre-implementation readiness assessments.

In the organizational change literature, the tangible experience of the effects of change on daily operations is considered a factor that strengthens or weakens the perception of readiness. Vakola (2014) states that readiness for change is closely related to the extent to which organizational members evaluate the change in relation to their existing work arrangements. It is noted that in changes requiring the reorganization of physical space, this effect becomes more visible, and organizational members evaluate the change more carefully (Vakola, 2014).

Armenakis et al. (1993) emphasize that the credibility of change messages must be supported by concrete indicators of the feasibility of the change. The presence of clear indications that physical and structural conditions are adequate strengthens members' belief that the change can actually be implemented (Armenakis et al., 1993). This reveals that spatial adequacy is a critical element supporting the cognitive and behavioral components of organizational readiness.

In this context, spatial adequacy is considered a construct that embodies the innovation-specific capacity dimension of organizational readiness and plays a decisive role in the formation of shared beliefs about the feasibility of change.

In organizational readiness theory, change competence (change) Change efficacy refers to the shared belief among organizational members that they can successfully implement change. Weiner (2009) clearly states that this belief is not merely an abstract feeling of confidence; rather, it is based on how organizational members evaluate the tasks required by the change, the available resources, and the situational conditions. In this context, change efficacy reflects a collective evaluation process regarding whether the change isfeasible(Weiner, 2009).

In this evaluation process, physical and spatial conditions play a central role in shaping perceptions regarding the feasibility of change. Helfrich et al. (2009), when defining the organizational context, consider the physical environment as the concrete ground where the implementation takes place, and state that the suitability of this ground directly affects the success of the implementation. In the ORCA approach, the adequacy of physical spaces is considered an integral part of the organization's capacity to support change (Helfrich et al., 2009).

Similarly, Scaccia et al. (2015) state that innovation-specific capacity is one of the key elements that strengthens organizational members' belief that they can implement change. Within the $R = MC^2$ framework, the availability of the physical spaces and infrastructure required for innovation indicates that the organization is not only willing but alsocapableof implementing change (Scaccia et al., 2015). This reveals that spatial adequacy plays a direct role in the formation of the perception of change competence.

The organizational change literature shows that when the effects of change on daily operations are concretely visible, organization members evaluate change more realistically. Vakola (2014) states that readiness for change is closely related to perceptions of the extent to which the change will alter the existing work order. Changes requiring the reorganization of physical space are among the situations where this effect is clearly felt and directly influences organization members' assessments of their readiness for change (Vakola, 2014).

Armenakis et al. (1993) emphasize that for readiness for change to develop, organization members must be convinced of the feasibility of the change. In this persuasion process, having concrete indicators and evidence of how the change will be implemented is critical (Armenakis et al., 1993). Indicators that physical and spatial conditions are adequate strengthen organization members' belief that they can successfully implement the change.

In this context, spatial adequacy emerges as a structural condition that particularly nourishes the change adequacy dimension of organizational readiness. The existence or perception of feasibility of the physical and spatial arrangements required by innovation increases the collective confidence of organization members in implementing the change and contributes to strengthening organizational readiness.

H6: The restaurant's spatial adequacy for solo dining positively influences the establishment's readiness to implement a solo dining model.

2.3. Organizational Readiness and Adaptation

The organizational change literature emphasizes that the adoption of innovations is not a one-time decision, but a process of adjustment and adaptation that develops over time. Weiner (2009) defines organizational readiness as a collective psychological state that emerges before the implementation of change, and states that this state directly affects the process of implementing the change. In this context, readiness is considered a prerequisite that makes it possible to initiate change; adaptation, on the other hand, refers to the integration of this change into daily operations (Weiner, 2009). Armenakis et al. (1993) state that the success of organizational change is closely related to how organizational members respond to the processes of understanding, accepting, and implementing the change. Cognitive readiness for change involves organizational members being convinced of the necessity and feasibility of the change; this persuasion process shapes how the change will be adapted within the organization (Armenakis et al., 1993). This approach shows that readiness is the starting point of the adaptation process.

Holt et al. (2007) examine readiness for change through individuals' tendencies to support change and their perceptions of the personal and organizational consequences of change. The study states that assessments of how change will affect daily tasks, role assignments, and working methods determine the adaptation process (Holt et al., 2007). This reveals that adaptation is not only a structural but also a perceptual process. The implementation and adaptation literature shows that organizations' capacity to integrate new practices into existing processes is closely related to their readiness level. Lehman et al. (2002) emphasize that for organizational change to be sustainable, innovation must be adapted to the organization's routines. In this process, elements such as physical arrangements, workflows, and personnel interactions are among the key components of adaptation (Lehman et al., 2002).

In their study examining the role of organizational readiness in the implementation process, Miake-Lye et al. (2020) state that organizations with high levels of readiness can adapt to change more quickly and with less resistance. Conversely, in organizations with low levels of readiness, change is implemented in a fragmented manner and struggles to integrate into daily operations (Miake-Lye et al., 2020). These findings demonstrate a direct relationship between organizational readiness and adaptation. In this context, organizational readiness provides a foundation that makes it possible to initiate change, while adaptation is considered a process that ensures this change becomes permanent within the organization. Organizational adaptation is

related not only to the initiation of a new practice, but also to the extent to which it can be integrated into the daily functioning of the organization. Weiner (2009) states that organizational readiness is a state that arises before the implementation of change; adaptation, on the other hand, refers to the process by which this change becomes part of organizational routines over time. In this context, adaptation is considered a process that ensures the continuity and permanence of change (Weiner, 2009).

Armenakis et al. (1993) emphasize that for successful adaptation of organizational change, the change messages must be perceived as meaningful and credible by the organization's members. They state that change remains superficial within the organization when clarity is lacking regarding why the change is necessary, how it will be implemented, and how it will affect existing processes (Armenakis et al., 1993). This demonstrates that adaptation is possible not only through structural adjustments but also through the internalization of change by the organization's members. Holt et al. (2007) consider adaptation as a process in which individuals transform their behaviors into supportive behaviors towards change. The study states that perceptions of how change reshapes work roles, responsibilities, and daily tasks influence the level of adaptation to change (Holt et al., 2007). This approach reveals that adaptation is a process experienced at both the organizational and individual levels.

Lehman et al. (2002) state that the adaptation of new practices in organizations requires making these practices compatible with existing procedures and routines. The study emphasizes that for innovation to be permanent within the organization, personnel must perceive this practice as a natural part of their daily workflow (Lehman et al., 2002). This demonstrates that adaptation involves not only a technical but also a behavioral dimension. In their systematic review of applied research, Miake-Lye et al. (2020) state that the adaptation process cannot be considered independently of the organizational context. The study indicates that organizations consider their existing physical, structural, and cultural conditions when adapting new practices; these conditions determine how and to what extent the change will be adapted (Miake-Lye et al., 2020). These findings demonstrate that adaptation is not a standard process, but rather a process shaped in a way specific to each organization.

Vakola (2014) states that organizational adaptation is completed when the change isnormalizedby the organization's members. The adaptation process is complete when the change, initially perceived as a temporary or exceptional practice, becomes a regular part of daily operations over time (

Vakola, 2014). In this context, organizational readiness constitutes the initial condition for adaptation; adaptation, in turn, demonstrates how this readiness is reflected in practice. The relationship between organizational readiness and adaptation offers a complementary framework explaining how changecomes to workwithin an organization. Weiner (2009) states that organizational readiness is a collective state that arises before the implementation of change, while adaptation occurs when this change becomes ingrained in organizational routines. This distinction shows that readiness is a precondition that makes change possible, while adaptation is the way in which this possibility is realized in practice (Weiner, 2009).

Armenakis et al. (1993) state that the adoption of change within an organization is possible when cognitive readiness for change is reflected in behavioral responses. Clarifying perceptions of why change is necessary, how it will be implemented, and how it will affect existing processes facilitates the adaptation of change to the daily practices of organizational members (Armenakis et al., 1993). In this context, adaptation is considered not only as the acceptance of change but also as its transformation into concrete behaviors. Holt et al. (2007) state that the level of readiness for change increases the likelihood that individuals will exhibit behaviors that support change. The study indicates that assessments of how change will affect individuals' roles and responsibilities are crucial in the adaptation process (Holt et al., 2007). This approach demonstrates that adaptation encompasses not only organizational decisions but also adjustment processes occurring at the individual level.

The literature highlights that adaptation occurs in different ways among organizations. Lehman et al. (2002) state that the permanent adoption of new practices within an organization depends on their restructuring in a way that is compatible with existing procedures. In this process, instead of implementing the innovation verbatim, organizations adapt it to their own conditions and carry out adaptation through this adaptation (Lehman et al., 2002). Miake-Lye et al. (2020) state that adaptation cannot be considered independently of the organizational context; organizations shape new practices in accordance with their existing resources, structural characteristics, and operational realities. These findings reveal that adaptation progresses through organization-specific decisions and practices rather than a standard process (Miake-Lye et al., 2020). Vakola (2014) states that adaptation is complete when the change is perceived by organization members as anormalandfamiliarpractice. The adaptation process is complete when the change, initially seen as a temporary or experimental practice, becomes a natural part of daily operations over time. At this point, organizational readiness emerges as a key factor determining the speed and scope of adaptation.

In this context, organizational readiness and adaptation are considered as complementary processes representing different stages of change. Readiness makes it possible to initiate change, while adaptation ensures that this change becomes permanent and functional within the organization.

H7: The establishment's readiness to implement the change towards solo dining positively influences its adaptation to the solo dining practice.

2.4. Demographic and Operational Differences

The adoption and implementation of innovations in service businesses can vary depending on the demographic and operational characteristics of the organizations. Literature on application and organizational change shows that the structural characteristics of organizations shape their readiness for change and their adaptation processes. Lehman et al. (2002) state that the success of organizational change is related to factors such as the size of the organization, its personnel structure, and its existing operational capacity. This approach reveals that innovations are not evaluated similarly in all organizations and that contextual differences are significant (Lehman et al., 2002).

Organizational size is a variable frequently emphasized in change processes. Scaccia et al. (2015) state that organizational capacity is decisive in the adoption of innovations and that this capacity is related to the human resources, physical resources, and operational flexibility of the organization. It is noted that larger and more resource-rich organizations have more options for testing and adapting new practices; conversely, smaller organizations evaluate change under more limited conditions (Scaccia et al., 2015).

Operational structure also plays a significant role in evaluating innovations. Miake-Lye et al. (2020) state that organizations' existing workflows and operational structures determine how new practices are adapted. The study indicates that organizations with high operational complexity handle change more carefully and gradually, while organizations with simpler operational structures can integrate innovations more quickly (Miake-Lye et al., 2020). These findings demonstrate that operational differences directly affect adaptation processes.

Demographic characteristics can also lead to differences in responses to organizational change. Holt et al. (2007) show that individual characteristics of organizational members, such as age, experience, and job roles, influence how they perceive and support change. The study indicates that employees with higher levels of experience evaluate change by comparing it to existing practices, while less experienced employees may have a higher perception of uncertainty regarding change (Holt et al., 2007). This demonstrates that

demographic diversity within the organization should be considered in the readiness and adaptation processes.

Vakola (2014) states that responses to organizational change are influenced not only by individual attitudes but also by the overall functioning of the organization. The study indicates that employees with different job descriptions and levels of responsibility experience the effects of change in different ways (Vakola, 2014). This suggests that demographic and operational differences must be addressed simultaneously in the organizational readiness and adaptation processes. In this context, demographic and operational differences are considered key contextual variables for understanding how organizations evaluate innovations, under what conditions they can adopt them, and how they manage adaptation processes.

Demographic and operational differences directly influence how innovations are evaluated and implemented in service businesses. Especially in labor-intensive sectors of service production, operational characteristics such as personnel structure and division of labor become decisive in readiness for and adaptation to change. (Lehman, Greener) Simpson (2002) notes that when the division of labor and personnel roles within an organization are unclear, integrating new practices into daily operations becomes difficult. This indicates that uncertainties in the operational structure can weaken perceptions of the feasibility of change (Lehman et al., 2002).

The literature on the subject reveals that organizations' existing operational routines shape how they respond to innovations. Miake-Lye et al. (2020) state that organizations consider their existing workflows and operational workloads when evaluating new practices. The study indicates that organizations with high operational intensity approach change more cautiously and gradually, which can slow down the adaptation process (Miake-Lye et al., 2020). Conversely, it is emphasized that organizations with more flexible operational structures have a wider scope for experimenting with and adapting innovations.

Demographic differences also lead to variations in responses to change. Holt et al. (2007) state that the experience levels and positions of organization members influence how they perceive change. The study indicates that individuals who have worked in the organization for a long time evaluate change by comparing it to existing practices; this can lead to more cautious attitudes towards change (Holt et al., 2007). In contrast, employees who have been in the organization for a shorter period may perceive change as a natural part of the existing order.

Vakola (2014) emphasizes that attitudes towards organizational change can differ depending on employees' roles and levels of responsibility within the organization. The study states that employees with managerial responsibilities view change as a strategic necessity, while those at the operational level perceive change through daily workload and task changes (Vakola, 2014). This indicates that perceptions of change are not homogeneous, even within the same organization.

Scaccia et al. (2015) state that such demographic and operational differences should be considered in organizational capacity assessments. Within the framework of $R = MC^2$, existing operational structures and human resource characteristics, as well as the motivation levels of organizations, shape the adoption of innovations (Scaccia et al., 2015). This approach reveals that demographic and operational differences are an integral part of organizational readiness and adaptation processes. In this context, demographic and operational differences offer an important framework for explaining why organizations adopt innovations at different speeds and in different ways.

The impact of demographic and operational differences on organizational readiness and adaptation becomes more pronounced in the context of service businesses. In sectors where service production occurs simultaneously with the customer and operational processes are directly related to physical space, the structural characteristics of organizations determine how change will be assessed and implemented. Lehman et al. (2002) emphasize that the adaptation of new practices in service organizations depends on their alignment with existing workflows and operational realities. In this process, personnel structure, task distribution, and physical working conditions are considered together (Lehman et al., 2002).

Operational intensity in service businesses is one of the key factors shaping attitudes toward change. Miake-Lye et al. (2020) state that in organizations with high operational load, new practices are addressed more cautiously and gradually. In this study, the risk of disruption to the daily service flow is considered a significant factor in evaluating change (Miake-Lye et al., 2020). This indicates that operational differences are effective not only in the implementation phase but also in assessing readiness for change. Demographic structure also leads to differentiation in responses to change within the service context. Holt et al. (2007) state that employees' experience level and roles within the organization affect how change is perceived. It is noted that personnel who have worked in the same operational structure for a long time in service businesses may perceive change as a threat to the existing operation; conversely, employees with more flexible or diverse job experiences

may accept change more easily (Holt et al., 2007). This situation shows that the adaptation process to change in service organizations is not homogeneous.

Vakola (2014) states that organizational change has more visible effects in the context of service, and therefore employees experience change more intensely. In situations where physical space, customer interaction, and workflows are subject to change, the adaptation process is directly felt in the daily practices of employees (Vakola, 2014). In this context, demographic and operational differences stand out as factors determining how change is received and internalized within the organization. Scaccia et al. (2015) state that organizations consider their own capacities and contextual characteristics when evaluating innovations, and that these characteristics shape how change is adapted. In service businesses, this capacity assessment is carried out through elements such as personnel structure, operational flexibility, and physical conditions (Scaccia et al., 2015). This shows that demographic and operational differences make organizational readiness and adaptation processes more critical in the service context. In this context, demographic and operational differences are considered key contextual factors explaining why the adoption and adaptation of innovations in service businesses varies from organization to organization.

H8: Restaurant employees' perceptions of readiness to implement the solo dining practice differ significantly depending on their position.

H9: Restaurant employees' perceptions of readiness to implement the solo dining practice differ significantly according to their level of industry experience.

3. Method

3.1. Research Objective and Methodological Approach

This research is designed to quantitatively evaluate the feasibility of adopting solo dining practices as an innovative service approach in restaurant businesses and their readiness level before implementation. The study examines the solo dining phenomenon from a business perspective rather than a consumer experience perspective, focusing on the perceptual, organizational, and structural conditions that influence its implementation. In this respect, the research aims to investigate why solo dining practices have not yet become widespread in restaurants, within the context of businesses' readiness for change and their capacity for implementation.

A quantitative research approach was adopted in this study. Quantitative research is a methodological approach that allows for testing relationships between variables through measurable indicators and aims to produce generalizable findings (Creswell, 2017). This approach, in particular, allows for the evaluation of abstract constructs such as perceptions, attitudes, and readiness levels using standardized measurement tools. In the present study, theoretical constructs such as perceived characteristics of innovation, spatial adequacy, and organizational readiness were addressed through quantitative measurement.

The research design was a cross-sectional survey. The study was planned as a cross-sectional survey design. A cross-sectional survey design is a research design that aims to describe the current situation by collecting data from a large number of participants over a specific period of time (Creswell, 2017). This design offers a suitable framework for making visible, at a specific moment, the current perceptions and readiness levels of restaurant businesses towards solo dining practices. Since the aim of the study is to reveal the extent to which businesses are ready for this practice under current conditions, rather than

to track change over time, a cross-sectional approach was preferred instead of a longitudinal design.

This research focuses on scale development and validation. In this context, the study involves testing a measurement tool developed based on existing theoretical approaches, through pilot and main application phases. Cohen et al. (2007) emphasize that the quantitative approach in scale development studies allows for the statistical evaluation of item performance and psychometric properties. In this research, the readiness and applicability level for solo dining practices were measured through a structured questionnaire; the obtained data were evaluated using statistical analyses.

Following this methodological approach, the study aims to quantitatively reveal how restaurant businesses evaluate solo dining practices as an innovation, and the perceptual and organizational conditions for implementing this innovation.

3.2. Research Design

This research was conducted using a cross-sectional survey to reveal the current perceptions, evaluations, and readiness levels of restaurant businesses regarding solo dining practices. A cross-sectional survey design was used. This design allows for the description of the current state of an issue by collecting data from a large number of units at a specific point in time (Creswell, 2017). This design is commonly preferred, particularly for examining time-sensitive variables such as attitudes, perceptions, and organizational evaluations, which are not expected to show significant changes in the short term. Reveal how restaurant businesses evaluate solo dining practices under current conditions and to what extent they are ready to adopt this practice. To this end, instead of a longitudinal design aimed at tracking change over time, a cross-sectional approach reflecting the current situation has been adopted. Creswell (2017) states that cross-sectional designs offer a suitable framework, especially in studies conducted with the aim oftaking a snapshot of the current situation. This study also aims to make visible the current perceptions and readiness levels of businesses regarding this innovation in a context where solo dining practices are not yet widespread.

The cross-sectional survey design offers a structure compatible with the quantitative measurement tools used in the research. Data collected through surveys reflect the perceptions and evaluations that participants hold at a particular moment. Cohen et al. (2007) emphasize that when used with standardized measurement tools, the survey design allows for the comparison of data obtained from different units and the production of generalizable

results. In this context, data obtained from restaurant businesses allows for the quantitative analysis of general trends and readiness levels regarding solo dining practices. The research design also supports the scale development aspect of the study. In scale development studies, collecting data from a sufficient number of participants within a specific time period is important for evaluating the performance and structural characteristics of the items (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007). The cross-sectional design provides a suitable basis for comparing the data obtained in the pilot and main application phases and for testing the psychometric properties of the measurement instrument.

In this context, a cross-sectional survey design was considered a suitable research design to systematically and comparatively examine restaurant businesses' perceptions of readiness and feasibility regarding solo dining practices within a specific time context.

3.3. Population, Sample, and Sampling Strategy

The research population consists of food and beverage establishments operating in Istanbul, Izmir, and Antalya, provinces in Turkey where restaurant business is concentrated and which represent different tourism and urban dynamics. These provinces offer a suitable population for the research context due to their differing characteristics in terms of population density, gastronomic diversity, tourism mobility, and restaurant business. Since the study aims to evaluate the perception and readiness of businesses for solo dining practices in a context where this innovation is not yet widespread, the population includes independent and chain restaurants operating in these three provinces.

The study sample consists of restaurant businesses operating in the specified provinces that voluntarily agreed to participate in the research. Businesses that are already actively offering solo dining were not included in the sample. This choice is related to the fact that the focus of the research is onpre-implementation readiness and feasibility perceptionsrather thanadopted outcomes of the practice .In this way, perceptions of solo dining can be examined independently of post-experience evaluations. The study utilized a convenience sampling strategy, a type of non-probability (non-random) sampling method. Non-probability sampling is a sampling approach where not all units in the population have an equal probability of being selected; instead, data is collected from units that are accessible and willing to participate in the research (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007). This approach is widely used in social sciences, particularly in studies where access to businesses is limited and voluntariness is important.

In this research, accessibility and willingness to participate in businesses were adopted as the main criteria in determining the sampling strategy. Cohen et al. (2007) state that voluntary sampling makes participants more open and cooperative in the research, which can positively affect data quality. In this context, it is expected that the data obtained from the businesses participating in the research will reflect perceptions of solo dining practices in a more informed and thoughtful manner. As a result of the sampling strategy, the generalization of the findings directly to the entire restaurant universe is limited. However, since the main objective of the study is to explore and explain the feasibility and organizational readiness of solo dining practices for businesses, the chosen sampling approach is considered consistent with the research objectives.

3.4. Data Collection Tool

In this research, a survey form was used as a data collection tool. Surveys are a common quantitative data collection tool that allows for the standardized measurement of participants' perceptions, attitudes, and evaluations through structured questions. Cohen et al. (2007) state that surveys offer advantages, particularly in terms of collecting data from a large number of participants in a short time and ensuring the comparability of the obtained data. In the present study, the survey method was chosen to systematically measure the perceptions and readiness levels of restaurant businesses towards solo dining practices.

The survey form is structured into two main sections. The first section includes descriptive questions about the business and the participant's role within it. This section includes variables such as the province in which the business operates, the type of business (independent/chain), the size of the business, the customer profile it serves, and the participant's position within the business. This information is collected to enable the analysis of demographic and operational differences in later stages of the study. İncludes scale items designed to measure the adoptability of solo dining and the level of readiness before its implementation. The items in this section were developed to encompass theoretical constructs such as perceived novelty, spatial adequacy, and organizational readiness. Cohen et al. (2007) emphasize that structured scale items play a significant role in quantitatively measuring abstract concepts and contribute to reducing measurement errors. Likert -type rating scale, allowing participants to indicate their level of agreement with each statement . Likert -type scales are commonly used in measuring attitudes and perceptions, allowing participants to express their opinions in a graded manner (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007). The rating scale used in this study aims to

quantitatively assess participants' perceptions of solo dining practices and the readiness of their establishments for this practice.

During the development of the survey form, care was taken to ensure that the items were clear, understandable, and measured a single judgment. Furthermore, attention was paid to ensuring that the items were consistent with the current functioning and operational realities of restaurant businesses. This approach was adopted to enable participants to correctly evaluate the questions within their own context and to minimize measurement errors.

3.5. Scale Development Process and Theoretical Foundations

This research involves the development of an original measurement tool aimed at assessing the feasibility and readiness level of solo dining practices for restaurant businesses. The scale development process was carried out systematically based on relevant theoretical frameworks. Cohen et al. (2007) emphasize the importance of clearly defining the constructs to be measured and constructing items that represent these constructs in scale development studies. Accordingly, the scale items included in this study were developed based on established theoretical approaches found in the literature.

The first dimension of the scale, the perceived characteristics of innovation, is addressed within the framework of Diffusion of Innovations Theory. Items related to this dimension aim to measure how organizations perceive the relative advantage, adaptability, complexity, trialability, and observability characteristics of innovations. Rogers (2003) states that these characteristics play a decisive role in the adoption of innovations. Furthermore, Moore and Benbasat (1991), with their scale developed to measure the perceived characteristics of innovation, demonstrated that these concepts can be operationalized within an organizational context. In this study, solo dining practice is considered as a service innovation, and the items are derived in accordance with this theoretical framework.

The second dimension of the scale, organizational readiness, was addressed through perceptions of collective commitment and competence towards change. Weiner (2009) defines organizational readiness as the shared commitment of organizational members to implementing change and their shared belief that they can accomplish this change. Within this framework, the developed items aim to measure the willingness of businesses to implement solo dining practices and whether they perceive themselves as having the capacity to do so. Furthermore, the ORIC approach developed by Shea et al. (2014) was used as an important reference point in measuring organizational readiness.

The third dimension of the scale, spatial adequacy, encompasses perceptions of whether the service environment and physical arrangements support solo dining practices. Items related to this dimension are based on the servicescape literature, which addresses how the service environment affects customer experience and operational functioning. Bitner (1992) emphasizes the role of the physical environment in service delivery, while Robson et al. (2011) discuss the effects of the service environment on business practices in detail. In this study, spatial adequacy was measured through the perception of the physical and operational conditions necessary for implementing solo dining practices.

The item pool created during the scale development process was kept broad to encompass the relevant theoretical frameworks; subsequently, the performance of the items was evaluated through a pilot study, and the scale was reviewed to create its final form.

3.6. Pilot Study

In this research, a pilot study was conducted to evaluate the validity and reliability characteristics of the developed measurement instrument and to improve the scale before the main application. The pilot study is considered one of the fundamental stages of the scale development process and aims to test the functionality of the items included in the measurement instrument. Cohen et al. (2007) emphasize that pilot studies play a critical role, particularly in narrowing the item pool, identifying wording problems, and reducing measurement errors.

Answerability, and extent to which the developed scale items represent the theoretical constructs they are intended to measure. In this context, the pilot application was conducted with participants working in restaurant businesses who share similar characteristics with the main study sample. The pilot sample's ability to represent the main study sample is important for ensuring that the findings make a meaningful contribution to the scale development process (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007).

Data obtained during the pilot study were primarily analyzed to examine the descriptive properties of the items. The distribution characteristics were evaluated by examining the mean, standard deviation, skewness, and kurtosis values of the items. At this stage, extreme values, items showing low variance, and statements not specifically answered by the participants were identified. Cohen et al. (2007) state that such statistical indicators in the pilot phase provide important clues in identifying items that should be removed from the scale.

Item-total correlations were also examined in the pilot study. Item-total correlations indicate the extent to which each item is consistent with the overall structure of the scale. Items with low correlation values were considered to not contribute sufficiently to the integrity of the scale, and their removal or revision was considered. This process aims to improve the internal consistency of the scale (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007).

The internal consistency of the scale was assessed using the Cronbach's alpha coefficient. In pilot analyses, items that reduced the reliability of the scale were identified by considering thealpha values when items are removed". If the pilot data were suitable for factor analysis, exploratory factor analysis was applied to explore the dimensional structure of the scale. At this stage, the final set of items was created by considering factor loadings, total variance explained ratios, and possible cross-loadings. Based on the findings of the pilot study, items with wording problems were corrected, unnecessary or repetitive items were removed from the scale, and a revised questionnaire form was created for use in the main application.

Before proceeding with hypothesis testing, the psychometric suitability of the scale items was evaluated. This process included corrected item-total correlations and Cronbach's calculus (CPC). Alpha coefficients, factor loadings, common variance values, and cross-loading patterns were considered together. Items showing low item-total correlation, reducing the internal consistency of the scale, or not loading stably into the expected structure in exploratory factor analysis were removed from the final analyses. This process was implemented to ensure that hypothesis testing was conducted only on variables that were more consistent in terms of reliability and factor structure. A summary of the item removal process is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Item Screening and Scale Refinement Process

Construct	Initial Items	Retained Items	Removed Items	Reason for Removal	Final Decision
Relative Advantage	7	RA1–RA5	RA6, RA7	Low corrected item -total correlations ; reliability improved after deletion	Retained
Compatibility	7	—	C1–C7	Low reliability ; unstable two- factor structure ; insufficient psychometric performance	Excluded
Complexity	7	CX2–CX4	CX1, CX5, CX6, CX7	CX1 showed weak / negative item -total performance ; remaining items showed unstable factor separation	Retained after refinement
Trialability	5	T2–T5	T1	Reliability improved after deletion	Retained
Observability	5	—	O1–O5	Weak reliability ; did not form an independent and stable factor	Excluded
Spatial Adequacy	8	MY4, MY6, MY8	MY1, MY2, MY3, MY5, MY7	Unstable factor structure ; retained items loaded clearly on the intended factor	Retained with caution
ORIC Commitment	5	ORIC-C2–ORIC-C5	ORIC-C1	Reliability improved after deletion	Retained
ORIC-Efficacy	5	ORIC-E3–ORIC-E5	ORIC-E1, ORIC-E2	Reliability and factor separation concerns	Retained
Adaptation	6	AD1–AD6	—	All items showed acceptable reliability and factor loadings	Retained

3.7. Data Collection Process and Ethical Principles

The data collection process for the research was conducted using a survey form that was developed and updated based on the results of the pilot study. Data was collected from business owners, managers, and employees knowledgeable about operational processes working in restaurant businesses in Istanbul, Izmir, and Antalya. It was considered important for participants to have knowledge of the current operation and decision-making processes of the business in order to make more informed evaluations of solo dining practices.

The data collection process was carried out using online and/or face-to-face options, depending on the accessibility of the businesses and the preferences of the participants. Online data collection allowed participants to respond to the survey without time and location constraints, while face-to-face applications were preferred, especially in situations where direct contact with businesses was possible. Creswell (2017) states that flexible planning of the data collection process in quantitative research can increase participation rates and positively affect data quality.

Participation in the study was entirely voluntary. Before the data collection process began, participants were clearly and understandably informed about the purpose, scope, and data usage of the study. Participants were explicitly told that they would not face any sanctions if they chose not to participate in the study or withdrew at any stage. This approach aimed to ensure that the research was conducted in accordance with ethical principles (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007).

The research placed particular emphasis on ethical principles. Participants' personal information was not collected, and the survey form did not contain any personally identifiable details. The principles of anonymity and untraceability ensured data privacy by preventing participants' responses from being linked to them (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007). The data obtained were used solely for scientific purposes and were not shared with third parties.

Informed consent was obtained from participants during the data collection process. Informed consent means that participants voluntarily participate with sufficient knowledge about the nature, aims, and potential outcomes of the research (Creswell, 2017). In online applications, consent was obtained through approval of the information text at the beginning of the survey; in face-to-face applications, consent was obtained verbally and/or in writing. The data collection process, conducted within this ethical framework, aims to protect participants' rights and ensure the reliability of the data obtained.

3.8. Data Analysis

The analysis of the data obtained from the research was carried out using the statistical software package. Statistic is widely preferred for conducting basic psychometric analyses, such as descriptive statistics, reliability analyses, and factor analyses, due to its open-source nature and user-friendly interface. In this study, which involved scale development and validation, the data analysis process was planned and carried out in two stages. In the first stage, the data obtained from the pilot study were analyzed. The main purpose of this stage was to evaluate the item structure and psychometric properties of

the developed measurement instrument and to improve the scale before the main application. Descriptive statistics were first calculated on the pilot data; the mean, standard deviation, skewness, and kurtosis values of the items were examined. These analyses were used to evaluate the distribution characteristics of the items and their level of discrimination in terms of respondents (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007).

Item-total correlations were also calculated during the pilot phase. Item-total correlations indicate the extent to which each item is consistent with the overall structure of the scale. Items with low correlation values were considered to contribute only minimally to the integrity of the scale, and their removal or revision was considered. The internal consistency of the scale was evaluated using the Cronbach's alpha coefficient; items that reduced reliability were identified by considering thealpha when the item is removedvalues.

If the pilot data were suitable for factor analysis, exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was applied to examine the dimensional structure of the scale. In this analysis, the suitability of the items to the factor structure was evaluated by considering factor loadings, total variance explained ratios, and possible cross-loadings. Cohen et al. (2007) emphasize that such analyses performed in the pilot phase are critical for item reduction and structure clarification in the scale development process.

Revised as a result of the pilot study were analyzed. In this stage, descriptive statistics were first calculated to examine the general characteristics of the sample and the distributions of the variables. The reliability of the scale was retested on the main data set, and Cronbach's alpha coefficients were evaluated. The findings were reported to demonstrate that the scale provides consistent and reliable measurements in the main application as well. In the analysis of the main study data, confirmatory approaches were used to evaluate the structural validity of the scale. Considering the data structure and sample size, the aim was to examine the consistency of the factor structure, as established in the pilot phase, within the main dataset. In this context, the direction and magnitude of factor loadings, interdimensional relationships, and the overall internal consistency of the scale were evaluated. Whether the measurement instrument supports the theoretically predicted structure was interpreted based on the obtained statistical indicators.

In this main study, comparative analyses were conducted to examine whether restaurant businesses' perceptions of solo dining practices and their organizational readiness levels differed according to various demographic and operational variables. Independent samples t-tests were used for two-group comparisons, and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used when

comparing more than two groups. These analyses were applied to determine whether there were significant differences in perception and readiness levels according to variables such as business type, business size, province of operation, and the participant's role within the business. If significant differences were identified in the ANOVA results, appropriate post-hoc comparisons were performed to determine which groups showed the difference.

The study also included correlation analyses to examine the relationships between perceived characteristics of novelty, spatial adequacy, and organizational readiness. Correlation analyses reveal the direction and strength of the relationship between variables and help determine which dimensions of readiness for solo dining exhibit stronger relationships. These analyses allowed for the quantitative testing of the relationships predicted within the theoretical framework of the study.

Multiple regression analyses were conducted to identify factors predicting readiness for solo dining practices. In the regression analyses, perceived novelty characteristics and spatial adequacy dimensions were considered as independent variables; organizational readiness or inclination to implement was modeled as the dependent variable. This approach aims to reveal under what conditions businesses perceive solo dining practices as more feasible. In all statistical analyses, the significance level was accepted as .05. The findings were interpreted in line with the research objectives and theoretical framework; and the implications of the results regarding the applicability of solo dining practices for businesses were discussed.

4. Findings

The valid sample included in the study consisted of 396 participants. The demographic and occupational characteristics of the participants are presented in Table 2. When the gender distribution is examined, it is seen that the sample has a balanced structure. The ratio of male and female participants is equal; male participants constitute 50.0% of the sample, and female participants constitute 50.0% . This indicates that there is no significant representation imbalance in terms of gender. In terms of age distribution, a significant portion of the participants are concentrated in older age groups. 36.4% of participants are in the 61–80 age range, and 35.4% are 81 years and older. This is followed by the 45–60 age group with 21.0% . The proportion of participants in the 18–29 and 30–44 age ranges is lower. This distribution indicates that the sample consists more of experienced participants familiar with business processes, rather than younger employees. In terms of educational level, the sample shows that participants with postgraduate education are predominant. 41.2% of participants have postgraduate degrees, 33.6% have bachelor's degrees, 17.2% have associate degrees, 6.1% have high school diplomas, and 2.0% have primary school diplomas. This finding indicates that the participant profile generally has a high level of education. This supports the suitability of the sample for evaluating the innovative and operational aspects of the solo dining practice. An examination of the distribution of professional experience reveals that participants represent varying levels of experience. The highest percentage, at 29.0%, belongs to participants with 20–24 years of experience. This is followed by 2–9 years (21.0%), 0–1 year (18.4%), 25 years and over (17.7%), and 10–19 years (13.9%). This distribution indicates that the study includes the views of both less experienced and long-serving participants in the sector.

In terms of position, the sample is predominantly composed of participants in decision-making or managerial roles. 40.4% of participants are senior managers, and 37.4% are business owners. Service chefs constitute 14.4%

of the sample, kitchen chefs 6.8%, and employees 1.0% . This distribution is consistent with the study's focus on solo dining in restaurant businesses. This indicates that the survey collected data from individuals who may have knowledge about the adoptability and feasibility of the practice . The fact that the target audience in the Solo Dining survey form is defined as employees who are knowledgeable about the restaurant's operational and/or managerial processes is consistent with this sampling structure. The research sample consists of participants with professional and managerial qualifications who can evaluate the solo dining practice. The high representation of senior managers and business owners in the sample strengthens the data source for this study in terms of evaluating business-level structures such as organizational readiness, spatial adequacy, and adaptation. Relevant data are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Demographic and professional characteristics

Characteristic	Category	n	%
Gender	Male	198	50.0
	Female	198	50.0
Age	18–29	7	1.8
	30–44	22	5.6
	45–60	83	21.0
	61–80	144	36.4
	81 and over	140	35.4
Education Level	Primary School	8	2.0
	High School	24	6.1
	Associate Degree	68	17.2
	Bachelor's Degree	133	33.6
	Postgraduate	163	41.2
Professional Experience	0–1 year	73	18.4
	2–9 years	83	21.0
	10–19 years	55	13.9
	20–24 years	115	29.0
	25 years and over	70	17.7
Position	Employee	4	1.0
	Kitchen Chef	27	6.8
	Service Supervisor	57	14.4
	Senior Manager	160	40.4
	Business Owner	148	37.4
Total		**396**	**100.0**

Before proceeding with hypothesis testing, the factor structure and internal consistency of the scales used in the study were evaluated. For this purpose, exploratory factor analysis and Cronbach's theorem were used. Alpha reliability analyses were performed. In the initial analyses, items showing low item-total correlation, unstable loading in the factor structure, or reducing the internal consistency of the relevant structure were removed from the analysis. As a result of this process, a more consistent and interpretable measurement structure was achieved.

The exploratory factor analysis resulted in a final measurement structure grouped under seven factors. These factors are Relative Advantage, Complexity, Trialability, and Spatial Advantage . The Adequacy, ORIC-Commitment, ORIC-Efficacy, and Adaptation constructs are used. In the final factor solution, the factor loadings of the conserved items range from .646 to .834. The fact that all items load above the .40 threshold indicates that the items have sufficient power to represent the relevant factors. Furthermore, no significant cross-loading problem was observed in the final solution. This indicates that the measurement construct is acceptably decoupled in terms of factors.

The Relative Advantage dimension consisted of items RA1–RA5, and these items showed factor loadings between .734 and .789. This dimension's Cronbach's The alpha coefficient was calculated as .831. This value indicates that the Relative Advantage structure has a good level of internal consistency. Therefore, it can be said that the items related to the perceived advantages that solo dining will provide to the business form a consistent structure.

The complexity dimension is represented by items CX2, CX3, and CX4. The factor loadings of these items range from .786 to .794. Cronbach's The alpha coefficient was found to be .704. This value indicates that the Complexity dimension shows an acceptable level of internal consistency. In the initial analyses, some complexity components separated from the structure, so only the more stably charged components were preserved in the final analyses.

The trialability dimension consisted of items T2–T5. The factor loadings of the items ranged from .698 to .817, and Cronbach's The alpha coefficient was calculated as .757. This result indicates that the items regarding the limited, phased, or pilot-based feasibility of solo dining constitute a reliable construct.

Spatial The adequacy dimension is represented by items MY4, MY6, and MY8. The factor loadings of these items range from .698 to .777. Cronbach's The alpha coefficient was calculated as .618. Although this value is lower compared to other constructs, it is considered acceptable because the factor loadings are at an acceptable level and the dimension is deemed important in

terms of the theoretical model of the study. Adequacy was preserved in the final analyses. However, a relatively more cautious approach was taken when interpreting the findings regarding this dimension.

The ORIC-Commitment dimension consisted of ORIC-C2–ORIC-C5 items. These items showed strong factor loadings between .747 and .834. Cronbach's The alpha coefficient was found to be .806. This result indicates that the dimension of commitment to change towards solo dining practice has a good level of reliability.

The ORIC-Efficacy dimension consists of items ORIC-E3–ORIC-E5. The absolute values of the factor loadings of these items range from .769 to .819. Although these items are negatively loaded in the factor analysis, this is technically due to the reversal of the factor orientation and does not weaken the items' ability to represent the factor. Cronbach's The alpha coefficient of .749 indicates that the ORIC-Efficacy dimension has an acceptable level of internal consistency.

The adaptation dimension consisted of items AD1–AD6. The factor loadings of these items ranged from .646 to .795, and Cronbach's The alpha coefficient was calculated as .843. This value indicates that the Adaptation dimension has strong internal consistency. Therefore, it can be said that the items measuring operational and managerial adaptation capacity for solo dining practices form a reliable structure.

In contrast, the Compatibility and Observability dimensions were not included in the final measurement structure. The Compatibility dimension showed low internal consistency and did not form a unidimensional, stable structure in the factor analysis. The Observability dimension was also excluded from subsequent analyses because it did not show an independent and reliable factor structure. This decision ensured that hypothesis testing was conducted only on psychometrically stronger and conceptually more consistent structures . Factor loadings and Cronbach's axis were used to determine the final factor structure. Alpha coefficients are given in Table 3 .

Table 3. EEA and reliability results

Construct	Item	Factor Loading	Cronbach's
Relative Advantage	RA1	.734	.831
	RA2	.754	
	RA3	.785	
	RA4	.758	
	RA5	.789	
Adaptation	AD1	.742	.843
	AD2	.780	
	AD3	.795	
	AD4	.762	
	AD5	.758	
	AD6	.646	
ORIC Commitment	ORIC-C2	.747	.806
	ORIC-C3	.834	
	ORIC-C4	.801	
	ORIC-C5	.789	
Trialability	T2	.698	.757
	T3	.817	
	T4	.766	
	T5	.750	
Spatial Adequacy	MY4	.758	.618
	MY6	.777	
	MY8	.698	
Complexity	CX2	.794	.704
	CX3	.786	
	CX4	.786	
ORIC-Efficacy	ORIC-E3	.769	.749
	ORIC-E4	.819	
	ORIC-E5	.806	

Before proceeding with hypothesis testing, the psychometric suitability of the measurement structure was evaluated through exploratory factor analysis and reliability analyses. First, the suitability of the sample for factor analysis was examined and the Kaiser–Meyer– Olkin value was found to be at an acceptable level (KMO = .751). The Bartlett sphericity test is also significant,

χ^2 (378) = 3509.716, p < . 001. These results show that the correlation structure between the variables is suitable for factor analysis.

The exploratory factor analysis resulted in a final measurement structure grouped under seven factors. This structure explains 61.116% of the total variance. Since an explained variance ratio above 50% is generally considered sufficient in the social sciences, the obtained value was deemed appropriate in terms of the explanatory power of the measurement structure . The factor loadings of the retained items in the final structure ranged from .646 to .834. The fact that all items loaded above the .40 threshold and did not exhibit problematic cross-loading supports the items' ability to represent the relevant factors. Furthermore, the common variance values ranged from .435 to .715, indicating that the items contributed sufficiently to the factor structure.

Reliability analyses have also generally supported the final measurement construct. Cronbach's Alpha coefficients were calculated as .831 for Relative Advantage, .757 for Trialability, .806 for ORIC-Commitment, .749 for ORIC-Efficacy, and .843 for Adaptation. These values indicate that the internal consistency of the relevant constructs is acceptable and at a good level. The Complexity dimension also showed internal consistency close to the acceptable limit with its final three-item structure. Spatial Cronbach's adequacy dimension Although the alpha value is relatively low, the factor loadings of the items in this dimension are strong, and the structure is theoretically consistent with the study's model. Therefore, Spatial Adequacy was preserved in the analyses, but a cautious approach was taken when interpreting the findings.

To support convergent validity, composite reliability and mean explained variance values were also examined based on final factor loadings. Composite reliability values ranged from approximately .789 to .884, exceeding the acceptable threshold. Mean explained variance values ranged from .555 to .637, surpassing the .50 threshold. These results indicate that the items in the final construct are sufficiently correlated with their respective factors and provide supporting evidence for the convergent validity of the measurement construct.

Furthermore, when interfactor correlations were examined, no excessively high correlations were found between the constructs. While this does not mean that the variables are completely independent of each other, it indicates that there is no serious discriminant problem in the measurement model. It is expected that the highest correlations in the correlation matrix would be between the ORIC sub-dimensions and the overall ORIC score; because the overall ORIC variable consists of a composite structure of ORIC-Commitment and ORIC-Efficacy dimensions.

During the process of improving the measurement structure, items showing low item-total correlation, unstable loading in the factor structure, or reduced internal consistency were removed from the analyses. The Compatibility and Observability dimensions were not included in the final model. The Compatibility dimension showed low internal consistency and did not cluster into a single structure in the factor analysis. The Observability dimension was also removed from subsequent analyses because it did not form an independent and stable factor structure. This decision ensured that hypothesis testing was conducted only on statistically and conceptually more stable structures.

Finally, a preliminary assessment was also conducted regarding common method bias. In the exploratory factor analysis, the variance explained by the first factor was 13.058%, and no dominant factor structure was found. This finding provides preliminary support for the idea that common method bias does not constitute a dominant problem explaining the measurement structure alone. However, this result was considered only a preliminary diagnostic indicator and not a definitive test of common method bias.

Overall, the final measurement structure provides sufficient psychometric support for proceeding to hypothesis testing in terms of factor loadings, explained variance ratio, internal consistency coefficients, composite reliability, and mean explained variance values.

After determining the final measurement structure, descriptive statistics and correlation coefficients for the variables used in the study were examined. Average values generally indicate that participants' perceptions of solo dining practices are at a moderate to high level. The highest average was for Spatial dining . This was obtained in the adequacy dimension (M = 4.0682, SS = .55536). This finding indicates that participants have a relatively strong perception that their establishments are spatially suitable for solo dining.

This is followed by Relative Advantage (M = 3.9035, SS = .76895), ORIC-Efficacy (M = 3.8847, SS = .80358), and the overall Organizational Readiness variable (M = 3.7394, SS = .60458), respectively. These results indicate that participants perceive solo dining as somewhat advantageous and have a positive perception of their businesses' capacity to implement this practice. However, the relatively low average Adaptation score (M = 3.5455, SS = .85077) suggests that the perception of readiness or competence does not directly translate into a strong tendency towards adaptation.

When the skewness and kurtosis values of the variables are examined, it is seen that all values are within acceptable limits. Skewness values range from -.156 to -1.121, and kurtosis values range from -.393 to 1.231. These values

indicate that there is no serious normality problem in the distributions of the variables that would prevent parametric analyses. Therefore, it was deemed appropriate to apply correlation and regression analyses in the next stage.

When the correlation results were examined, a positive and significant relationship was found between Relative Advantage and Organizational Readiness ($r = .217$, $p < .01$). This finding indicates that as the perception that solo dining will provide an advantage to the business strengthens, the level of organizational readiness also increases. Relative Advantage is also positively and significantly related to ORIC-Efficacy ($r = .325$, $p < .01$). This relationship shows that the perceived advantage particularly strengthens the belief in the business's capacity to implement this practice.

Spatial There is also a low but significant correlation between Adequacy and ORIC-Efficacy ($r = .126$, $p < .05$). This result indicates that the perception of spatial adequacy is related to the perception of the establishment's ability to implement solo dining practices. In contrast, Spatial The relationship between adequacy and overall organizational readiness is not significant. This suggests that spatial adequacy may be a factor supporting the perception of implementation capacity rather than overall readiness.

A positive and low-level statistically significant correlation was found between Complexity and ORIC-Commitment ($r = .103$, $p < .05$). However, this correlation is quite weak and should be interpreted cautiously. The lack of a significant correlation between Complexity and overall Organisational Readiness and ORIC-Efficacy suggests that the perception of complexity in solo dining is not a strong predictor of readiness. Similarly, the Trialability variable did not show a significant correlation with Organisational Readiness, ORIC-Commitment, ORIC-Efficacy, and Adaptation.

Another noteworthy finding is the lack of a significant relationship between overall Organizational Readiness and Adaptation ($r = .001$, $p > .05$). This result indicates that restaurant owners' perception of their readiness for solo dining is not directly related to their tendency to adapt to this practice . Similarly, the lack of a significant relationship between ORIC-Commitment and ORIC-Efficacy dimensions and Adaptation suggests that the expected link between readiness and adaptation is not supported in this sample.

Overall, the correlation findings indicate that readiness for solo dining is particularly associated with perceived relative advantage, while the tendency to adapt is not directly explained by the readiness variables. Descriptive statistics and correlation coefficients for the research variables are given in Table 4.

Table 4. Descriptive statistics and correlations

Variable	M	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Relative Advantage	3.9035	.76895	-1.121	1.231	—							
2. Complexity	3.6035	.89894	-.530	-.217	-.139**	—						
3. Trialability	3.6212	.87501	-.277	-.234	-.054	-.004	—					
4. Spatial Adequacy	4.0682	.55536	-.156	-.393	.063	-.009	.016	—				
5. ORIC Commitment	3.5941	.91497	-.522	-.326	.002	.103*	-.079	-.010	—			
6. ORIC-Efficacy	3.8847	.80358	-.892	.603	.325**	-.065	-.017	.126*	-.014	—		
7. Adaptation	3.5455	.85077	-.317	-.342	.027	.067	-.031	.058	-.022	.027	—	
8. Organizational Readiness	3.7394	.60458	-.381	-.084	.217**	.034	-.071	.076	.747**	.654**	.001	—

After descriptive statistics and correlation analyses, regression analyses were performed to test the research hypotheses. In the first regression model, Relative Advantage, Complexity, Trialability, and Spatial Factors were considered. The effect of adequacy variables on organizational readiness was investigated. Since the compatibility and observability dimensions were removed from the final measurement structure, this model was created to test hypotheses H1, H3, H4, and H6. When the regression coefficients are examined, it is seen that the Relative Advantage variable has a significant and positive effect on Organizational Readiness ($B = .172$, $\beta = .219$, $t = 4.411$, $p < .001$). This finding indicates that as restaurant businesses perceive solo dining as more advantageous for the business, their organizational readiness for this practice increases. Therefore, hypothesis H1 is supported.

In contrast, the effect of the Complexity variable on Organizational Readiness is not significant ($B = .044$, $\beta = .065$, $t = 1.317$, $p = .189$). This result indicates that the perception of the complexity of solo dining does not significantly explain organizational readiness. Therefore, H3 is not supported. the trialability variable on organizational readiness was also found to be insignificant ($B = -.041$, $\beta = -.060$, $t = -1.218$, $p = .224$). This finding indicates that the trialability of solo dining does not have a decisive effect on organizational readiness in this sample. Therefore, H4 is not supported.

Similarly, Spatial The Adequacy variable also did not show a significant effect on Organizational Readiness in the main model ($B = .069$, $\beta = .064$, $t = 1.298$, $p = .195$). Although participants' perceptions of spatial adequacy

were generally high, this perception did not significantly explain overall organizational readiness. Therefore, H6 was not supported in the main model.

In the second regression model, the effect of the Organizational Readiness variable on Adaptation was tested. The findings show that the Organizational Readiness variable does not have a significant effect on Adaptation (B = .002, β = .001, t = .022, p = .982). This result indicates that restaurant owners' belief that they are ready for solo dining does not directly explain their tendency to adapt to this practice . Therefore, H7 is not supported.

Overall, regression coefficients indicate that Relative Advantage is the only significant variable explaining organizational readiness for solo dining. In contrast, Complexity, Trialability, and Spatial Advantage are less significant variables. Adequacy is not a significant predictor in the main model . Furthermore, the lack of a significant effect of organizational readiness on adaptation indicates that perceived readiness does not automatically translate into a tendency to adapt. The coefficients for the main regression analyses are given in Table 5a.

Table 5a . Regression Coefficients for Main Hypothesis Testing

Model	Dependent Variable	Predictor	B	SE	β	t	p	Decision
Model 1	Organizational Readiness	Relative Advantage	.172	.039	.219	4.411	< . 001	Supported
		Complexity	.044	.033	.065	1.317	.189	Not supported
		Trialability	-.041	.034	-.060	-1.218	.224	Not supported
		Spatial Adequacy	.069	.054	.064	1.298	.195	Not supported
Model 2	Adaptation	Organizational Readiness	.002	.071	.001	.022	.982	Not supported

After descriptive statistics and correlation analyses, regression analyses were performed to test the research hypotheses. In the first regression model, Relative Advantage, Complexity, Trialability, and Spatial Factors were considered. The effect of adequacy variables on organizational readiness was investigated. This model was constructed to test hypotheses H1, H3, H4, and H6, as the Compatibility and Observability dimensions were removed from the final measurement structure.

The first regression model was found to be statistically significant, $F(4, 391) = 6.133$, $p < .001$. However, the explanatory power of the model is

limited; the independent variables explain 5.9% of the total variance in the Organizational Readiness variable ($R^2 = .059$, adjusted $R^2 = .049$). This result indicates that the model is generally significant but its power to explain organizational readiness remains at a low level.

When the independent variables were examined separately, only the Relative Advantage variable was found to have a significant and positive effect on Organizational Readiness ($\beta = .219$, $p < .001$). This finding indicates that as restaurant businesses perceive solo dining as more advantageous for their operations, their organizational readiness for this practice increases. Therefore, hypothesis H1 is supported. In contrast, the effect of the Complexity variable on Organizational Readiness is not significant ($\beta = .065$, $p = .189$). This result indicates that the perception of operational complexity of solo dining does not significantly explain organizational readiness. Therefore, H3 is not supported.

Similarly, the Trialability variable was found to have no significant effect on Organizational Readiness ($\beta = -.060$, $p = .224$). This finding indicates that whether the solo dining practice is piloted, limited, or phased does not have a decisive effect on organizational readiness in this sample. Therefore, H4 is not supported. Spatial The Adequacy variable also did not show a significant effect on Organizational Readiness in the main model ($\beta = .064$, $p = .195$). Although participants rated their spatial adequacy level as high, this perception did not significantly explain overall organizational readiness. Therefore, H6 was not supported in the main model. The main regression coefficients are given in Table 4a.

In the second regression model, the effect of the Organizational Readiness variable on Adaptation was tested. The model is not statistically significant, $F(1, 394) = .000$, $p = .982$. Furthermore, the explanatory power of the model is close to zero ($R^2 = .000$). The effect of the Organizational Readiness variable on Adaptation is also not significant ($\beta = .001$, $p = .982$). This result shows that restaurant owners' belief that they are ready for solo dining does not directly explain their tendency to adapt to this practice . Therefore, H7 is not supported.

Overall, main regression analyses show that Relative Advantage is the most significant variable in explaining organizational readiness for solo dining. In contrast, Complexity, Trialability, and Spatial Advantage are also significant variables. Adequacy did not have a significant effect on overall organizational readiness. Furthermore, the lack of a significant effect of organizational readiness on adaptation indicates that the perception of readiness does not

automatically translate into a tendency to adapt to practice. Summary statistics for the main regression models are given in Table 5b.

Table 5b. Model Summary for Main Regression Analyses

Model	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	F	df	p	Durbin -Watson
Model 1	.243	.059	.049	6.133	4,391	< . 001	1.952
Model 2	.001	.000	-.003	.000	1,394	.982	1.853

Following the main regression analyses, the two sub-dimensions of the Organizational Readiness variable, ORIC-Commitment and ORIC-Efficacy, were evaluated separately. The purpose of these additional analyses was to examine whether novelty characteristics affect the commitment and efficacy dimensions of organizational readiness differently. The effect of the ORIC sub-dimensions on the Adaptation variable was also tested.

In the first additional regression model, Relative Advantage, Complexity, Trialability, and Spatial Factors were considered. The effect of adequacy variables on ORIC-Commitment was examined. Analysis of the coefficients revealed that the Relative Advantage variable did not have a significant effect on ORIC-Commitment (B = .015, β = .013, t = .252, p = .801). This result indicates that the perceived advantage of solo dining does not directly explain the business's commitment to this change.

In the same model, the Complexity variable showed a positive and significant coefficient on ORIC-Commitment (B = .106, β = .104, t = 2.060, p = .040). However, this finding should be interpreted cautiously, as the overall model in which this variable is included is not statistically significant. Therefore, the effect of Complexity on ORIC-Commitment should be considered not as the main finding, but as a limited and supporting observation. Trialability (B = - .081, β = - .078, t = - 1.547, p = .123) and Spatial The variables Adequacy (B = - .015, β = - .009, t = - .176, p = .860) also did not show a significant effect on ORIC-Commitment .

In the second additional regression model, the effect of the same independent variables on ORIC-Efficacy was tested. In this model, the Relative Advantage variable has a significant and positive effect on ORIC-Efficacy (B = .330, β = .315, t = 6.550, p < .001). This finding indicates that as restaurant owners perceive solo dining as more advantageous, their perception of their capacity to implement this practice also strengthens. Spatial in the same model The Adequacy variable also showed a significant and positive effect on ORIC-Efficacy (B = .154, β = .106, t = 2.228, p = .026). This result indicates that

the perception that the physical/spatial conditions of the establishment are suitable for solo dining supports the perception of competence to implement the practice. In contrast, Complexity (B = - .018, β = - .021, t = - .430, p = .667) and Trialability (B = - .001, β = - .002, t = - .033, p = .973) did not show a significant effect on ORIC-Efficacy .

In the third additional regression model, the effect of ORIC-Commitment and ORIC-Efficacy variables on Adaptation was examined. The findings show that neither of the ORIC sub-dimensions has a significant effect on Adaptation. The effect of the ORIC-Commitment variable is not significant (B = -.020, β = -.022, t = -.427, p = .670). Similarly, the ORIC-Efficacy variable did not show a significant effect on Adaptation (B = .028, β = .026, t = .522, p = .602). This result indicates that organizational readiness, even when its commitment and competence dimensions are considered separately, does not explain the tendency to adapt to solo dining practices.

Overall, the additional regression coefficients indicate that innovation characteristics operate differently on two dimensions of organizational readiness: Relative Advantage and Spatial Advantage . Adequacy showed a significant impact, particularly on ORIC-Efficacy, while the ORIC-Commitment dimension was not strongly explained by the same variables. This finding suggests that, in the context of solo dining, businesses' perception ofhaving the capacity to perform this practiceis more closely related to innovation characteristics than their perception ofbeing willing to perform this practice. Additional regression coefficients for the ORIC sub-dimensions are given in Table 6a.

Table 6a . Supplementary regression results

Model	Dependent Variable	Predictor	B	SE	β	t	p	Decision
Model 1	ORIC Commitment	Relative Advantage	.015	.060	.013	.252	.801	Not significant
		Complexity	.106	.052	.104	2,060	.040	Significant, but model not significant
		Trialability	-.081	.053	-.078	-1.547	.123	Not significant
		Spatial Adequacy	-.015	.083	-.009	-.176	.860	Not significant
Model 2	ORIC-Efficacy	Relative Advantage	.330	.050	.315	6,550	< .001	Significant
		Complexity	-.018	.043	-.021	-.430	.667	Not significant
		Trialability	-.001	.044	-.002	-.033	.973	Not significant

Table 6a . Supplementary regression results

Model	Dependent Variable	Predictor	B	SE	β	t	p	Decision
		Spatial Adequacy	.154	.069	.106	2.228	.026	Significant
Model 3	Adaptation	ORIC Commitment	-.020	.047	-.022	-.427	.670	Not significant
		ORIC-Efficacy	.028	.053	.026	.522	.602	Not significant

the explanatory power of the additional regression models is examined, it is seen that the ORIC sub-dimensions exhibit a different structure. In the first model, Relative Advantage, Complexity, Trialability and Spatial Adequacy variables were included in the model to explain the ORIC-Commitment variable. However, this model is not statistically significant, $F(4, 391) = 1.689$, $p = .152$. The explanatory power of the model is also quite low ($R^2 = .017$, adjusted $R^2 = .007$). This result indicates that the innovation features examined do not adequately explain the ORIC-Commitment dimension.

In the second model, the effect of the same independent variables on ORIC-Efficacy was tested. This model is statistically significant, $F(4, 391) = 12.985$, $p < .001$. The model explains 11.7% of the variance in the ORIC-Efficacy variable ($R^2 = .117$, adjusted $R^2 = .108$). Although this value is not very high, it offers a stronger explanatory power compared to the ORIC-Commitment model . This finding shows that perceptions of novelty regarding solo dining practice are particularly more effective in explaining the perception of the practice competence of the business.

In the third model, the effect of ORIC-Commitment and ORIC-Efficacy variables on Adaptation was examined. The model is not statistically significant, $F(2, 393) = .231$, $p = .794$. The explanatory level of the model is also negligible ($R^2 = .001$, adjusted $R^2 = - .004$). This result shows that the sub-dimensions of organizational readiness do not explain the tendency to adapt. Therefore, the lack of support for the Organisational Readiness → Adaptation relationship obtained in the main regression model has also been confirmed by the sub-dimension analyses. The Durbin -Watson values are examined, no significant problem is observed in terms of autocorrelation in the models. The Durbin -Watson value was calculated as 2.087 for the ORIC-Commitment model, 1.799 for the ORIC-Efficacy model, and 1.865 for the Adaptation model. These values indicate that the regression models are within acceptable limits in terms of error terms.

Overall, the model summaries reveal that the sub-dimensions of ORIC are not explained in the same way. While novelty features did not form a significant model for ORIC-Commitment, they did provide a significant and more explanatory model for ORIC-Efficacy . Conversely, neither of the ORIC sub-dimensions explained the tendency towards adaptation. The summary results of the additional regression models for the ORIC sub-dimensions are given in Table 6b.

Table 6b. Supplementary regression results

Model	Dependent Variable	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	F	df	p	Durbin -Watson
Model 1	ORIC Commitment	.130	.017	.007	1.689	4,391	.152	2,087
Model 2	ORIC-Efficacy	.342	.117	.108	12.985	4,391	< .001	1.799
Model 3	Adaptation	.034	.001	-.004	.231	2,393	.794	1.865

Following regression analyses, it was examined whether the Organizational Readiness variable differed according to the participants' positions and professional experience levels. In this context, one-way analysis of variance was performed to test hypotheses H8 and H9. For the position variable, the groups consisted of Employee, Head Chef, Service Chef, Senior Manager, and Business Owner categories. The professional experience variable was evaluated with categories of 0–1 year, 2–9 years, 10–19 years, 20–24 years, and 25 years and over. These categories are consistent with the option structure in the Solo Dining questionnaire.

When organizational readiness averages are examined according to the position variable, it is seen that the lowest average is in the Head Chef group (M = 3.2978, SS = .72111). This is followed by the Employee group (M = 3.3646, SS = 1.17722). In contrast, the Senior Manager (M = 3.7943, SS = .54332) and Business Owner (M = 3.7762, SS = .60614) groups have higher organizational readiness averages. This distribution shows that the perception of readiness for solo dining is particularly higher in decision-making positions.

A one-way analysis of variance based on position revealed a statistically significant difference between the groups, $F(4, 391) = 4.623$, $p = .001$. The effect size was calculated as $\eta^2 = .045$. This value indicates that the position variable has a small differentiating effect on organizational readiness. However, the assumption of homogeneity of variance was not met because the Levene test was significant. Furthermore, since there were only four participants in

the employee group, the results regarding the position variable should be interpreted carefully.

When examining the average organizational readiness scores according to the professional experience variable, it is observed that the lowest average is among participants with 0–1 year of experience (M = 3.4167, SS = .57672). The highest average was obtained among participants with 25 years and more of experience (M = 3.9637, SS = .53861). This is followed by participants with 10–19 years of experience (M = 3.9220, SS = .54569). This finding indicates that as sectoral experience increases, the perception of organizational readiness for solo dining practices generally also increases.

A one-way analysis of variance based on professional experience revealed a statistically significant difference between the groups, $F(4, 391) = 10.908$, $p < .001$. The effect size was calculated as $\eta^2 = .100$. This value indicates that professional experience has a more significant differentiating effect on organizational readiness compared to position. Therefore, H9 is supported. Descriptive statistics and ANOVA results regarding organizational readiness according to position and professional experience are given in Table 7a.

Table 7a . Differences by position and professional experience

Variable	Category	n	M	SD	F	p	η^2	Decision
Position	Employee	4	3.3646	1.17722	4.623	.001	.045	Supported
	Kitchen Chef	27	3.2978	.72111				
	Service Supervisor	57	3.7251	.58608				
	Senior Manager	160	3.7943	.54332				
	Business Owner	148	3.7762	.60614				
Professional Experience	0–1 year	73	3.4167	.57672	10.908	< . 001	.100	Supported
	2–9 years	83	3.6255	.67836				
	10–19 years	55	3.9220	.54569				
	20–24 years	115	3.8025	.53068				
	25 years and over	70	3.9637	.53861				

-Howell post hoc test was used to determine which categories caused the differences between groups . According to the Games- Howell results, the average organizational readiness score of the Head Chef group was significantly

lower than that of the Senior Manager group (mean difference = -.496, p = .014). Similarly, the average score of the Head Chef group was also significantly lower than that of the Business Owner group (mean difference = -.478, p = .021). This finding indicates that the perceived readiness for solo dining is lower among head chefs compared to managers and business owners.

Other pairwise comparisons in the position variable are not statistically significant. In particular, although the difference between the Head Chef and Service Chef groups approached the significance level, it was not found to be statistically significant (p = .073). Therefore, it can be said that the main differentiation in terms of position occurs between head chefs and senior managers and business owners. In line with these results, H8 is supported, but this finding should be interpreted cautiously due to the very small employee group.

In post hoc comparisons for the professional experience variable, Tukey HSD results were evaluated. Accordingly, the average organizational readiness of participants with 0–1 year of experience was significantly lower than that of participants with 10–19 years of experience (mean difference = -.505, p < .001). Similarly, participants with 0–1 year of experience reported significantly lower perceptions of organizational readiness than those with 20–24 years of experience (mean difference = -.386, p < .001) and those with 25 years or more of experience (mean difference = -.547, p < .001).

In addition, participants with 2–9 years of experience had significantly lower average organizational readiness than those with 10–19 years of experience (mean difference = -.296, p = .027). This same group also had significantly lower perceived organizational readiness than participants with 25 years or more of experience (mean difference = -.338, p = .003). These findings suggest that participants, particularly those in the early stages of their careers, have lower perceived organizational readiness for solo dining compared to more experienced groups.

Overall, post hoc analyses show that organizational readiness differs significantly in terms of position and professional experience. The main difference in terms of position is found between kitchen chefs and decision-makers, while significant differences exist between groups with less professional experience and those with longer experience. Significant post hoc comparisons regarding position and professional experience are presented in Table 7b.

Table 7b. Differences by position and professional experience

Variable	Post Hoc Test	Comparison	Mean Difference	p
Position	Games - Howell	Kitchen Chef Senior Manager	-.496	.014
	Games - Howell	Kitchen Chef Business Owner	-.478	.021
Professional Experience	Tukey HSD	0–1 year < 10-19 years	-.505	< . 001
	Tukey HSD	0–1 year < 20-24 years	-.386	< . 001
	Tukey HSD	0–1 year < 25 years and over	-.547	< . 001
	Tukey HSD	2–9 years < 10-19 years	-.296	.027
	Tukey HSD	2–9 years < 25 years and over	-.338	.003

In the final stage of the research, the hypothesis results were summarized based on the measurement model, correlation, regression, and difference analyses performed. The findings show that organizational readiness for solo dining is explained by a limited number of variables. In the main regression model, only the Relative Advantage variable was found to have a significant and positive effect on Organizational Readiness. Therefore, H1 is supported. This result indicates that when restaurant businesses perceive solo dining as more advantageous compared to their existing service processes, their level of organizational readiness for this practice increases.

In contrast, since the Compatibility and Observability dimensions were not included in the final measurement structure, the hypotheses regarding these structures were not tested. The Compatibility dimension showed low internal consistency and did not form a stable structure in the factor analysis. The Observability dimension also did not show an independent and reliable factor structure and was therefore excluded from subsequent analyses. For this reason, hypotheses H2 and H5 were not evaluated within the scope of the final model.

Complexity, Trialability, and Spatial In the main regression analysis The effects of adequacy variables on organizational readiness were not found to be significant. Therefore, H3, H4, and H6 are not supported. These findings indicate that the complexity, trialability, and spatial adequacy of solo dining are not direct determinants of overall organizational readiness. However, further analyses of spatial adequacy may be necessary. The fact that adequacy has a significant effect on ORIC-Efficacy suggests that the perception of spatial

adequacy is more closely related to the ability to implement the application than to general readiness. The study also tested the effect of the Organizational Readiness variable on Adaptation. However, this relationship was not found to be significant. Therefore, H7 is not supported. This result shows that restaurant businesses believing they are ready for solo dining does not automatically mean they will adapt to this practice . In other words, the perception of readiness does not automatically translate into a tendency to adapt.

Difference analyses showed that organizational readiness varied according to certain occupational characteristics. Analyses based on the position variable revealed significant differences between groups, with kitchen chefs, in particular, having a lower perception of organizational readiness compared to senior managers and business owners. Therefore, H8 is supported. However, this result should be interpreted cautiously due to the small number of participants in the employee group.

Analyses based on the variable of professional experience also showed that organizational readiness differed significantly. Participants with less experience reported a lower perception of organizational readiness, especially compared to groups with 10 years or more of experience. This finding indicates that the perception of readiness for solo dining strengthens as sectoral experience increases. Therefore, hypothesis H9 is supported.

Overall, the hypothesis results indicate that organizational readiness for solo dining is particularly related to perceived relative advantage, but this readiness does not directly translate into an adaptation tendency. Furthermore, it was determined that position and professional experience variables created significant differences in the perception of organizational readiness. The general results regarding the hypothesis tests are given in Table 8.

Table 8. Summary of hypothesis testing results

Hypothesis	Proposed Relationship / Difference	Analysis	Result
H1	Relative Advantage → Organizational Readiness	Multiple regression	Supported
H2	Compatibility → Organizational Readiness	Not tested	Excluded from the final model
H3	Complexity → Organizational Readiness	Multiple regression	Not supported
H4	Trialability → Organizational Readiness	Multiple regression	Not supported
H5	Observability → Organizational Readiness	Not tested	Excluded from the final model
H6	Spatial Adequacy → Organizational Readiness	Multiple regression	Not supported
H7	Organizational Readiness → Adaptation	Simple linear regression	Not supported
H8	Organizational Readiness differs by position	One-way ANOVA / Games - Howell	Supported
H9	Organizational Readiness differs by professional experience	One-way ANOVA / Tukey HSD	Supported

Overall, the findings indicate that organizational readiness for solo dining is associated with some novelty perceptions and professional characteristics, albeit in a limited but significant way. After refinement of the measurement model, Relative Advantage, Complexity, Trialability, and Spatial Analysis were examined. A seven-factor structure consisting of Adequacy, ORIC-Commitment, ORIC-Efficacy, and Adaptation dimensions was obtained. In the main regression analyses, the only variable that significantly explained organizational readiness was Relative Advantage. This result indicates that restaurant businesses' perception of solo dining as beneficial and advantageous increases their perceived readiness for the practice. In contrast, Complexity, Trialability, and Spatial Adequacy did not have a significant effect on overall organizational readiness. Additional analyses, Spatial The study revealed that Adequacy was only significant on ORIC-Efficacy, suggesting that the perception of spatial adequacy may be related more to implementation capacity than to overall readiness. However, neither overall Organizational Readiness nor the ORIC-Commitment and ORIC-Efficacy sub-dimensions significantly explained the Adaptation variable. This finding indicates that the perception

of readiness does not directly translate into an adaptation tendency towards solo dining. Difference analyses revealed that organizational readiness varied significantly according to position and professional experience. In particular, the fact that kitchen chefs had a lower perception of readiness compared to senior managers and business owners, and that the average organizational readiness increased with the level of experience, shows that professional position and sectoral experience are important contextual factors in the adoption of solo dining. These findings suggest that solo dining should be considered not only as an innovative service practice for restaurant businesses, but also as a multidimensional adaptation process shaped by organizational capacity, decision-maker perception, and experience level.

5. Discussion

This study examines solo dining not only as a consumer behavior or individual dining experience, but also as a matter of service innovation and readiness for implementation from the perspective of restaurant businesses. In the literature, solo dining has mostly been studied through the lens of consumers' intentions to eat alone, emotional responses, concerns about social evaluation, spatial perceptions, and experience satisfaction (Her & Seo, 2018; Hwang et al., 2018; Moon et al., 2020; Im & Seo, 2024). These studies make significant contributions to explaining the psychological and social dimensions of solo dining at the individual level. However, this study focuses on the organizational implementation dimension, which is more limitedly addressed in the literature, by examining the conditions under which this practice is considered feasible by restaurant businesses, the extent to which businesses are ready for this practice, and how perceived innovation characteristics affect readiness.

The findings show that the perception of relative advantage regarding solo dining has a significant and positive effect on the organizational readiness of businesses. This result is consistent with Rogers' (2003) approach that relative advantage is one of the key determinants in the adoption of innovations. Similarly, Moore and Benbasat (1991) state that individuals and organizational actors seeing an innovation as more beneficial compared to existing practices strengthens their tendency to adopt it. Tornatzky and Klein's (1982) meta-analysis also shows that relative advantage is one of the variables most consistently associated with the innovation adoption process. In this context, the study's finding reveals that restaurant businesses primarily consider the tangible benefits that the practice will provide to the business when considering their readiness for solo dining. Factors such as solo dining strengthening an innovative image, its potential to increase table occupancy rates, providing a competitive advantage, and generating revenue may have contributed to businesses viewing this practice as more feasible and valuable.

In contrast, the limited impact of complexity, trialability, and spatial adequacy variables on overall organizational readiness indicates that solo dining is not considered by restaurants solely as a technical or operational arrangement. While Rogers (2003) states that characteristics such as complexity, trialability, and observability are important in the adoption of innovations, Greenhalgh et al. (2004) emphasize that innovation characteristics alone are not sufficient in an organizational context; they should be evaluated together with the organization's capacity, resources, implementation conditions, and internal coordination. From this perspective, the current findings suggest that the element determining the readiness of businesses in service innovations such as solo dining is not only whether the implementation is trialable or operationally manageable, but also the perceived value and sense of applicability from the business's perspective.

When the sub-dimensions of organizational readiness are evaluated separately in the study, a more detailed picture emerges. Relative advantage, especially in relation to change... The significant effect on the efficacy dimension indicates that when businesses perceive solo dining as beneficial, they not only have a positive attitude towards the practice but also their perception of their ability to successfully implement it is strengthened. Weiner (2009) explains organizational readiness through the shared commitment of organizational members to change and their shared belief in their ability to successfully implement change. Shea et al. (2014) developed the ORIC scale based on these two dimensions, namely change. commitment and change It has been developed through efficacy . In this context, the current study shows that the perceived relative advantage of solo dining practices particularly fuels the perception ofwe can make this change."

Change in spatial adequacy The significant impact on efficacy is also one of the important findings of the study. This result shows that the solo dining practice is not an abstract service idea in the restaurant context, but is directly related to the physical space, table arrangement, seating comfort, service flow, and the customer's perception of control over the space. Moon et al. (2020) show that physical and psychological boundaries in restaurants affect solo diners' perceived territoriality, satisfaction, and intention to revisit. In the present study, the fact that spatial adequacy supports the perception of organizational adequacy shows that the belief of restaurant businesses in being able to implement solo dining largely depends on how suitable the space is for this practice. In other words, being ready for solo dining from a business perspective is related not only to managerial desire but also to the capacity of the physical space to support this service model.

However, it is noteworthy that organizational readiness did not have a significant effect on adaptation. Theoretically, organizational readiness might be expected to facilitate the implementation of change; however, in this study, the adaptation variable represents a more advanced stage after the solo dining practice begins, such as the adjustment of service processes, the adaptation of the practice according to customer feedback, the reorganization of personnel duties, and the transformation of the practice into a long-term service model. Therefore, it is understandable that the perception of readiness before implementation did not directly reflect on the adaptation capacity after implementation. Greenhalgh et al. (2004) state that the implementation process in the diffusion of service innovations is not limited only to the decision to adopt; it requires the integration of the practice into organizational processes, its reshaping through feedback, and its adaptation to local conditions. In this respect, the current finding shows that readiness for solo dining may be a necessary initial condition for adaptation, but it is not sufficient on its own.

This result also reveals that the implementation of solo dining in restaurants is a phased process. In the first stage, businesses evaluate the benefits and feasibility of the implementation; in the second stage, they question the compatibility of the implementation with organizational capacity; and in the third stage, the need for operational adaptations arises after the implementation has begun. Therefore, adaptation should be evaluated not only in terms of organizational readiness, but also in conjunction with implementation experience, staff training, customer feedback, service intensity, physical capacity, and managerial learning processes. This finding shows that in solo dining initiatives, not only the intention to adopt but also the post-implementation adaptation processes should be considered as a separate research topic.

Differences based on years of experience are also important for interpreting the study. The findings show that participants with more professional experience have higher perceptions of organizational readiness. This can be explained by the fact that experienced restaurant employees and managers have a more advanced capacity for evaluating service flow, customer profile, table management, and operational arrangements. Solo dining is not simply about arranging a single table; it also requires rethinking customer interaction, service speed, table utilization, and staff roles. Therefore, as experience increases, participants may perceive this practice as more feasible and manageable. Brown et al.'s (2020) assessment of restaurants' cautious approach to solo diners also supports this interpretation; businesses may only consider solo dining more feasible after evaluating its operational outcomes and impact on service flow.

The differences based on position indicate that the perception of readiness for solo dining varies according to the roles and responsibilities within the restaurant. Participants in managerial and business owner positions, in particular, have higher readiness perceptions, which may be related to these groups viewing solo dining as a more strategic and business-level opportunity. Conversely, participants in positions such as head chef or those with more direct operational responsibilities may have perceived the burden of the practice on daily workflow, staff coordination, and service arrangements more distinctly. Im and Seo (2024) show that staff behavior, interactional fairness, and the reactions of other customers are important in the solo dining experience. This finding suggests that the solo dining practice should be evaluated not only at the managerial decision-making level but also in conjunction with the role perception and operational support of the staff who will directly implement the practice.

The theoretical contribution of this study is to relate the solo dining literature to theories of diffusion of innovations and organizational readiness. While existing studies in the solo dining literature mostly focus on the consumer's solo dining experience, social environment, and restaurant atmosphere (Her & Seo, 2018; Hwang et al., 2018; Moon et al., 2020; Im & Seo, 2024), this study centers on the pre-implementation evaluations of restaurant businesses. In this respect, the study positions solo dining as a service innovation for restaurant businesses and reveals the importance of perceived relative advantage, spatial adequacy, and organizational adequacy in the adoption of this innovation.

The findings also show that the impact of innovation features on organizational readiness is not homogeneous. While innovation features, as Rogers (2003) points out, are theoretically important in the adoption process, the present study reveals that not every feature is equally decisive in the restaurant context. Relative advantage emerges as a stronger determinant, while spatial adequacy appears to be a contextual element that particularly supports the belief in implementability. This result indicates that organizational readiness in service innovations should be considered not only in terms of the general features of the innovation but also in conjunction with the physical and operational environment in which the service is delivered.

From a practical standpoint, restaurant businesses need to assess not only customer demand but also their level of internal preparedness before implementing solo dining. The findings suggest that for businesses to become better prepared for solo dining, the benefits of the practice need to be clearly demonstrated. Furthermore, a change in the perception of spatial adequacy is also necessary. Given its impact on efficacy, it's crucial for restaurants to

review elements such as table arrangements, individual seating areas, service flow, payment processes, and customer privacy before implementation. For solo dining to be successfully implemented, it needs to be considered not just a marketing-focused innovation, but a holistic service model encompassing service design, space planning, and staff coordination.

In conclusion, this study demonstrates that solo dining is not an automatically adopted trend for restaurant businesses, but rather a service innovation shaped by perceptions of benefit, capacity, spatial adequacy, and implementation adequacy at the business level. The findings reveal that organizational readiness for solo dining is particularly related to perceptions of relative advantage and spatial adequacy; however, post-implementation adaptation should be considered separately as a more complex and multi-stage process. Therefore, future studies should examine not only the intention behind the adoption of solo dining but also the operational problems encountered during the implementation process, staff integration, customer feedback, and the long-term adaptation strategies of businesses.

6. Conclusion and Recommendations

This study was conducted to examine the organizational readiness of restaurant businesses for solo dining and the relationship between this readiness and their tendency to adapt. In this study, solo dining is considered not merely a service for individuals dining alone, but an innovative practice related to the spatial arrangement, service design, operational capacity, and managerial decision-making processes of restaurants. Accordingly, the research evaluated the relationship between innovation characteristics, organizational readiness, and adaptation within the context of restaurant businesses.

Relative Advantage was the most significant variable in explaining organizational readiness for solo dining. In other words, as restaurant businesses perceive solo dining as a beneficial practice that contributes to existing service processes and offers a competitive advantage, their readiness for this practice increases. This result supports the idea that perceived benefit is one of the key determinants in the adoption of innovations. Considering that solo dining can offer businesses advantages such as increased table utilization efficiency, access to different customer segments, service diversity, and adaptation to changing consumer behavior, relative advantage is a key factor. The impact of the advantage dimension on organizational readiness is an expected and significant finding.

In contrast, Complexity, Trialability, and Spatial Adequacy variables did not show a significant effect on overall organizational readiness. This result indicates that the complexity, trialability, or spatial feasibility of solo dining alone is not sufficient to explain the overall perception of readiness. Specifically, Spatial It is noteworthy that although the Adequacy variable has a high mean in the descriptive statistics, it does not show a significant effect on overall Organizational Readiness. This indicates that businesses' belief that they are physically suitable for solo dining does not directly translate into organizational readiness.

However, additional analyses are needed in Spatial. The study revealed that adequacy has a significant impact on ORIC-Efficacy . This finding indicates that the perception of spatial adequacy is related to the business'scapacity to implement this practicerather than general readiness. In other words, restaurants' perception of their suitability in terms of physical layout, table arrangement, space utilization, and service flow strengthens their perception of competence for the practice. However, this perception of competence does not directly translate into a tendency to adapt.

One of the most striking findings of the study is that the Organizational Readiness variable did not show a significant effect on Adaptation. Neither general organizational readiness nor the ORIC-Commitment and ORIC-Efficacy sub-dimensions significantly explained adaptation. This result indicates that restaurant businesses' perception of readiness for solo dining does not automatically increase their tendency to adopt the practice or integrate it into their business processes. Therefore, assuming a linear and direct relationship between readiness and adaptation is insufficient in this context. For adaptation to occur, not only the perception of readiness but also additional factors such as customer demand, financial expectations, table turnover rate, service concept, business strategy, staff approach, and managerial priorities must be considered.

Difference analyses showed that organizational readiness varied significantly according to participants' positions and professional experience levels. In terms of position, it was determined that head chefs had a lower perception of organizational readiness compared to senior managers and business owners. This finding suggests that solo dining may be perceived as a more strategic and feasible innovation by decision-makers, while head chefs may evaluate it more in terms of operational burden, production process, or service flow. Therefore, perceptions of different positions within a business regarding the adoption of new service practices like solo dining are not the same.

In terms of professional experience, more experienced participants showed higher levels of organizational readiness. Participants with 10 years or more of experience, in particular, reported a higher perception of readiness compared to those with less experience. This result indicates that sectoral experience plays a significant role in assessing business capacity, customer behavior, and operational change processes. More experienced participants may have perceived solo dining as a more manageable and feasible innovation for restaurant businesses.

The study's findings theoretically demonstrate that solo dining practices can be examined within the context of innovation adoption and organizational readiness in restaurant businesses. However, the results revealed that the

impact of innovation characteristics on organizational readiness is limited and selective, particularly in relation to relative innovation . While the advantage dimension emerged as a key determinant of organizational readiness, other innovation characteristics were not equally explanatory. This suggests that, in the context of solo dining, businesses primarily focus on whether a new practice will generate tangible benefits when determining their readiness for it.

From an application perspective, this study offers some implications for restaurant managers and business owners. Businesses wishing to encourage the adoption of solo dining must first clearly articulate the benefits this practice will bring to the business. These benefits should not be limited to customer satisfaction alone; they should be linked to business-oriented outcomes such as table utilization, capacity management, service efficiency, customer segmentation, and brand differentiation. Furthermore, considering that chefs and operational staff may have a lower sense of readiness, solo dining needs to be explained and supported not only at the managerial level but also at the operational level.

The study has some limitations. First, the research was conducted with cross-sectional data; therefore, the relationships between variables should not be interpreted as a temporal or causal process. Second, data were collected via self-report and are based on participants' perceptions. Third, some scale dimensions were excluded from the final model because they did not demonstrate the expected psychometric adequacy. This indicates that measurement tools used in the context of solo dining need to be further developed and validated in the future. Fourth, the distribution is uneven across position groups; results regarding position should be interpreted cautiously, especially given the small sample size of the working group.

Future research could comparatively examine solo dining practices across different restaurant types, service concepts, and customer segments. Furthermore, qualitative research could delve deeper into the perceptions of restaurant managers, chefs, service staff, and customers regarding solo dining. Longitudinal studies would be useful in assessing whether perceived readiness translates into actual adaptation over time. Additionally, incorporating variables such as customer demand, expected economic return, operational costs, service design, and employee resistance into the model could yield stronger insights into solo dining adaptation.

In conclusion, this study demonstrates that solo dining is not merely a response to customer behavior for restaurant businesses; it is also a multi-dimensional innovation process shaped by organizational readiness, perceived advantage, spatial capacity, professional experience, and positional differences.

The findings reveal that the most critical factor in increasing restaurant businesses' readiness for solo dining is the clear perception of the relative advantage it provides to the business. However, the fact that this perceived readiness does not directly translate into adaptation indicates that more complex organizational, operational, and strategic dynamics play a role in the adoption of solo dining.

The findings of this study demonstrate that solo dining is an innovation process for restaurant businesses that is not limited solely to physical space arrangement; it is also related to multidimensional elements such as perceived benefit, organizational capacity, managerial decision-making, operational compatibility, and professional experience. Based on these results, some recommendations can be developed for both practitioners and future researchers.

First, to increase the adoption of solo dining by restaurant businesses, the relative advantages it provides to the business need to be clearly demonstrated. Findings have shown that the key variable that significantly explains organizational readiness is Relative Advantage. Therefore, solo dining should be explained to businesses not only asserving customers who dine alone,but also in terms of its potential to increase table utilization efficiency, reach different customer segments, diversify the customer experience, utilize capacity during off-peak hours, and strengthen brand image. When businesses clearly see the tangible benefits of the practice, their perception of readiness for this innovation can be expected to strengthen.

Secondly, the solo dining practice should be explained and supported in restaurants not only at the level of managers or owners, but also at the operational staff level. This study showed that kitchen chefs' perception of organizational readiness was lower than that of senior managers and owners. This result suggests that the solo dining practice may be perceived by kitchen and operations teams as an additional workload, a change in service flow, or complexity in production planning. Therefore, a joint planning process should be carried out among the kitchen, service, and management teams before implementation. How solo dining will be integrated into operational processes should be clearly defined in terms of menu design, table arrangement, service time, and staff task assignment.

Thirdly, businesses can launch solo dining not as a direct, comprehensive transformation, but as a phased and controlled implementation. While Trialability didn't significantly account for organizational readiness in its main model, pilot trials can be important for implementation . Restaurants can test the solo dining experience with specific table arrangements, time slots,

or limited menu options . This allows businesses to observe the impact of the implementation on customer demand, table turnover rate, service flow, and operational load. Such pilot programs can be particularly useful in reducing uncertainties surrounding the implementation.

Fourthly, spatial adequacy must be carefully considered in solo dining practice. The findings suggest that spatial... The study showed that the adequacy variable had no significant effect on overall organizational readiness, but it did have a significant effect on ORIC-Efficacy. This indicates that spatial adequacy particularly strengthens the perception within the business thatwe can implement this practice.Therefore, single-person seating areas, bar-style seating arrangements, window tables, arrangements that provide a sense of shared yet personal space, and table designs suitable for short-term dining experiences can be developed in restaurants. However, these arrangements should not only be based on physical capacity but also consider experiential elements such as customer privacy, comfort, visibility, and the feeling of social pressure.

Fifthly, it should be considered that adaptation to solo dining cannot be explained solely by organizational readiness. In this study, the Organizational Readiness variable did not show a significant effect on Adaptation. This finding reveals that businesses' self-perception of readiness is not sufficient for adopting the practice. Therefore, restaurants should also consider variables such as customer demand, expected economic return, income per table, operational costs, service concept, brand positioning, and competitive conditions in their adaptation decisions. Businesses should evaluate solo dining not only with the question ofis it feasible?but also with the question ofis it suitable for our business strategy and customer profile?".

Sixth, it is recommended to leverage the knowledge and experience of seasoned employees and managers. Findings have shown that the perception of organizational readiness increases with professional experience. Therefore, in new service applications such as solo dining, the opinions of managers, business owners, chefs, and service personnel with many years of industry experience should be included in the planning process. Experienced professionals can more realistically assess customer behavior, operational risks, and potential problems in the service flow. This knowledge can contribute to designing the solo dining application in a way that is more suitable for the business.

Seventh, restaurant businesses should not limit the solo dining experience solely to physical seating arrangements. For solo dining customers, factors such as menu portion sizes, service language, waiting times, reservation options, digital ordering capabilities, a sense of personal space, and social comfort are also important. Therefore, the solo dining practice should be considered as

a holistic service design. Specifically, it should ensure that customers dining alone can enjoy their meal without being disturbed, feeling pressured by visibility issues, or perceiving inadequate service.

For future research, it is suggested that new variables be added to the model explaining the solo dining practice. This study showed that organizational readiness did not explain adaptation. Therefore, in future studies, variables such as customer demand perception, expected economic benefit, perceived operational cost, employee resistance, management support, service concept alignment, brand strategy, and competitive pressure could be included in the model. These variables could provide a stronger theoretical framework for explaining the adaptation of solo dining.

Furthermore, future research could comparatively examine the solo dining practice across different restaurant types. For example, fine-dining restaurants, casual restaurants, hotel restaurants, chain restaurants, cafes, and quick-service restaurants may exhibit varying degrees of suitability for solo dining. Since customer profiles, table occupancy times, service rhythm, and revenue models differ depending on the restaurant type, the conditions for adopting solo dining may also vary. Furthermore, future studies should examine the perceptions of not only business representatives but also customers regarding the solo dining experience. Even if businesses feel ready for solo dining, how customers perceive this service is a separate research topic. On the customer side, variables such as social comfort, privacy, service expectations, price perception, attitudes towards dining alone, and restaurant atmosphere can influence the solo dining experience . Therefore, studies that consider both business and customer perspectives together can yield more holistic results.

Finally, since this study is based on cross-sectional data, longitudinal or experimental designs could be used in future research. Piloting the solo dining practice in restaurants and comparing pre- and post-implementation levels of organizational readiness, customer satisfaction, table efficiency, and adaptation could yield more robust results. This would allow for a clearer assessment of whether perceived readiness translates into actual practice behavior over time.

In general, the key recommendation for restaurant businesses is to consider solo dining not merely as a new table arrangement or service alternative, but in conjunction with the business's strategic location, customer segments, operational capacity, and employee perceptions. For this approach to be successful, businesses must first clearly define the advantages it offers, develop a shared understanding between decision-making and operational teams, and manage the adaptation process in a phased, measurable, and customer experience-focused manner.

References

Armenakis, A.A., Harris, S.G., & Mossholder, K.W. (1993). Creating readiness for organizational change . *Human Relations, 46* (6), 681–703. https://doi.org/10.1177/001872679304600601

Bitner, M. J. (1992). Servicescapes : The impact of physical surroundings on customers and employees . *Journal of Marketing, 56* (2), 57–71. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224299205600205

Bocanegra, D. C. R., Choi, J., & Mattila, A. S. (2022). table for one ? A contextual and psychological analysis of solo dining in restaurants . International Journal of Hospitality Management, 102, 103159.

Brown, L., Buhalis, D., & Beer, S. (2020). Dining alone : Improving the experience of solo restaurant goers . *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 32* (3), 1347–1365. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-06-2019-0584

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education* (6th ed.). Routledge .

Creswell, JW (2017). *Research design : Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.

Greenhalgh, T., Robert, G., Macfarlane, F., Bate, P., & Kyriakidou, O. (2004). Diffusion of innovations in service organizations : Systematic review and recommendations . *The Milbank Quarterly, 82* (4), 581–629. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0887-378X.2004.00325.x

Helfrich, C.D., Li, YF, Sharp, ND, & Sales, AE (2009). organizational readiness to change assessment (ORCA): Development of an instrument based on the PARIHS framework . *Implementation Science, 4,* 38. https://doi.org/10.1186/1748-5908-4-38

Her, E., & Seo, S. (2018). Why don't eat alone ? The effect of other Consumers on solo dining intentions and the mechanism . *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 70,* 16–24. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2017.10.019

Holt, D.T., Armenakis, AA, Feild, H.S., & Harris, S.G. (2007). Readiness for organizational change : The systematic development of a scale . *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 43* (2), 232–255. https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886306295295

Huang, H., Feng, S.S., & Wong, I.A. (2025). A systematic review of solo dining research . *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 130,* Article 104226. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2025.104226

Hwang, Y., Shin, J., & Mattila, A.S. (2018). so private, yet so public : The impact of spatial distance, other diners, and Power on solo dining experiences . *Journal of Business Research, 92,* 36–47. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2018.07.004

Im, S. Y., & Seo, S. (2024). How does it restaurant experiencescape affect solo diners ' emotions and dining Satisfaction in Korea ? *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 36* (3), 769–789. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-07-2022-0864

Kapoor, KK, Dwivedi, YK, & Williams, MD (2014). Rogers' innovation adoption attributes : A systematic review and synthesis of existing research . Information Systems Management, 31(1), 74–91. https://doi.org/10.1080/10580530.2014.854103

Khot, R. A., Arza, E. S., Kurra, H. ve Wang, Y. (2019). *FoBo: Towards designing a robotic companion for solo dining*. In *Extended Abstracts of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (CHI EA '19) (Article LBW1617, 1–6). Association for Computing Machinery. https://doi.org/10.1145/3290607.3313069

Lehman, W.E.K., Greener, J.M., & Simpson, D.D. (2002). assessing organizational readiness for Change . *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment, 22* (4), 197–209. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0740-5472(02)00233-7

Lyytinen, K., & Damsgaard, J. (2001). what's up wrong with the diffusion of innovation theory ? In MA Ardis & BL Marcolin (Eds .), *Diffusing software product and process innovations* (pp . 173–190). Springer . https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-35404-0_11

Miake-Lye, I.M., Mak, S., Shanman, R., & Shekelle, P.G. (2020). assessing organizational readiness to implement change : A systematic Review . *Implementation Science, 15,* 28. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13012-020-00991-1

Moon, S., Bonn, M.A., & Cho, M. (2020). How can solo dining Experience enhanced ? Focusing on perception territoriality . *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 88,* Article 102506. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2020.102506

Moore, G. C., & Benbasat, I. (1991). Development of an instrument to measure the perceptions of adopting an information technology innovation *Information Systems Research, 2* (3), 192–222. https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.2.3.192.

Oğurlu, Y., Avcıkurt, C., Sarıoğlan, M., Karagöz, E., & Kumaş, G. (2025). Occupational Health and Safety (OHS) Perception in Restaurant Enterprises: A Quantitative Field Survey of Employees. France: Livre de Lyon.

Oğurlu, Y. Avcıkurt, C. Demir B. & Sarıoğlan M., (2025). "Consumer Rights Awareness Among Restaurant Customers The Case of Balikesir," International Journal of Environmental Sciences, 11(8) Oct. 2025.

Robson, SKA, Kimes, SE, Becker, FD, & Evans, GW (2011). Consumers ' responses to table spacing in restaurants . *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly, 52* (3), 253–264. https://doi.org/10.1177/1938965511405388

Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusion of innovations* (5th ed.). Free Press .

Scaccia, J. P., Cook, B. S., Lamont, A., Wandersman, A., Castellow, J., Katz, J., & Beidas, R. S. (2015). A practical implementation science heuristic for organizational readiness : R = MC². *Journal of Community Psychology, 43* (4), 484–501. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.21698

Shea, C. M., Jacobs, SR, Esserman, DA, Bruce, K., & Weiner, B. J. (2014). organizational readiness for implementing change : A psychometric assessment of a new measure . *Implementation Science, 9,* Article 7. https://doi.org/10.1186/1748-5908-9-7

Tornatzky, L. G., & Klein, K. J. (1982). Innovation characteristics and innovation adoption-implementation : A meta- analysis of findings . *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management, EM-29* (1), 28–45. https://doi.org/10.1109/TEM.1982.6447463

Vakola, M. (2014). What's in there For me? Individual readiness to change and the perceived impact of organizational change . *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 35* (3), 195–209. https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-05-2012-0064

Wang, R., Lee, C., Hidayat, I., & Wang, Z. (2025). Solo dining : Antecedents of consumers ' solo dining intention and the Mitigating the role of on-site and online servicescape . International Journal of Hospitality Management, 125, 104035. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2024.104035

Weiner, B. J. (2009). A theory of organizational readiness for change . *Implementation Science, 4,* Article 67. https://doi.org/10.1186/1748-5908-4-67

Appendix A

This questionnaire was prepared within the scope of an academic study aiming to examine the adoptability and feasibility of solo dining as an innovative approach in restaurant businesses. In the study, perceptions of solo dining are addressed within the framework of organizational readiness for innovation, spatial adequacy, and operational evaluations.

The questionnaire is intended for employees who have knowledge of the operational and/or managerial processes of the restaurant. The responses will be kept completely confidential, used solely for scientific purposes, and no individual- or business-level identification will be made. Participation in the questionnaire is voluntary, and participants may withdraw from the questionnaire at any time. By completing the questionnaire, you indicate that you agree to participate in the study.

Demographic and Professional Information

Gender:
Male ( ) Female ( )

Age:
18–29 ( ) 30–44 ( ) 45–60 ( ) 61–80 ( ) 81 and above ( )

Education:
Primary Education ( ) High School ( ) Associate Degree ( ) Bachelor's Degree ( ) Postgraduate Degree ( )

Experience (Years):
0–1 ( ) 2–9 ( ) 10–19 ( ) 20–24 ( ) 25 and above ( )

Position:
Employee ( ) Head Chef ( ) Service Manager ( ) Senior Manager ( ) Business Owner ( )

Please evaluate the following statements by considering the activities and arrangements that may emerge before implementation and in the event that solo dining is implemented in your business, where solo dining is not currently practiced.

Response options:
1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Neutral
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly Agree

Dimension	Code	Item
Relative Advantage	RA1	It strengthens the innovative image of the business.
	RA2	It may increase table occupancy rates.
	RA3	It provides a competitive advantage.
	RA4	It diversifies the dining experience.
	RA5	It contributes to revenue.
	RA6	It adapts to consumer habits.
	RA7	It modernizes brand perception.
	RA8	It improves performance during low-demand periods.
Compatibility	C1	It is compatible with the overall concept.
	C2	It is suitable for the service approach.
	C3	It aligns with the target customer profile.
	C4	The physical structure supports it.
	C5	It is compatible with the values of the business.
	C6	It does not conflict with brand identity.
	C7	It can be integrated into the workflow.
	C8	It is compatible with the long-term strategy.
Complexity	CX1	It makes service processes more complex.
	CX2	It is challenging for the staff.
	CX3	It makes table management more difficult.
	CX4	It creates an additional operational burden.
	CX5	It is difficult to manage.
	CX6	It is difficult to standardize.
	CX7	It requires additional training.
Trialability	T1	It can be tried at a limited number of tables.
	T2	It can be tested as a pilot practice.
	T3	It can be implemented gradually.
	T4	It does not create a high level of risk.
	T5	It is easy to discontinue.
	T6	It can be tested through campaigns.
	T7	It can be limited to specific days or time periods.
Observability	O1	It can be observed in other restaurants.
	O2	Its outcomes can be noticed in the sector.
	O3	Competitors' experiences are known.
	O4	Customer reactions can be observed.
	O5	Examples can be seen on social media.
	O6	Its successful examples are discussed.
	O7	Its performance can be compared.
ORIC-Commitment	ORIC-C1	We are committed to implementing the practice.
	ORIC-C2	We are determined to implement it.
	ORIC-C3	We are motivated to implement it.
	ORIC-C4	We would do what is necessary.
	ORIC-C5	We want to implement it.

Dimension	Code	Item
ORIC-Efficacy	ORIC-E1	We can manage internal resistance.
	ORIC-E2	We can support the staff.
	ORIC-E3	We can coordinate roles.
	ORIC-E4	We can monitor progress.
	ORIC-E5	We can overcome difficulties.
Spatial Adequacy	MY1	The layout is suitable for comfortable seating.
	MY2	The payment/exit flow is smooth.
	MY3	The location/capacity of the restrooms is appropriate.
	MY4	The outdoor area is suitable for single-person use.
	MY5	Accessibility is sufficient.
	MY6	Service can be provided without increasing the feeling of crowding.
	MY7	Menu readability is sufficient.
	MY8	The overall spatial impression is relaxing.
Adaptation	AD1	After the solo dining practice starts, we can adjust service processes according to emerging operational problems.
	AD2	After the solo dining practice starts, we can adapt menu and presentation practices according to customer feedback.
	AD3	After the solo dining practice starts, we can integrate the practice into our restaurant's standard service processes.
	AD4	After the solo dining practice starts, we can flexibly arrange the practice according to different levels of intensity and time periods.
	AD5	After the solo dining practice starts, we can reorganize staff duties and responsibilities in accordance with the practice.
	AD6	After the solo dining practice starts, we can turn the practice into a sustainable long-term service model.

Appendix B

This appendix presents the items used in the final analyses after exploratory factor analysis and reliability analyses. The Compatibility and Observability dimensions were not included in the final analyses because they did not demonstrate sufficient psychometric structure. Among the demographic and professional variables, gender, age, education, experience, and position were used in descriptive analyses, while experience and position were used in difference analyses.

Response options:
1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Neutral
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly Agree

Construct	Code	Item
Relative Advantage	RA1	It strengthens the innovative image of the business.
	RA2	It may increase table occupancy rates.
	RA3	It provides a competitive advantage.
	RA4	It diversifies the dining experience.
	RA5	It contributes to revenue.
Complexity	CX2	It is challenging for the staff.
	CX3	It makes table management more difficult.
	CX4	It creates an additional operational burden.
Trialability	T2	It can be tested as a pilot practice.
	T3	It can be implemented gradually.
	T4	It does not create a high level of risk.
	T5	It is easy to discontinue.
Spatial Adequacy	MY4	The outdoor area is suitable for single-person use.
	MY6	Service can be provided without increasing the feeling of crowding.
	MY8	The overall spatial impression is relaxing.
ORIC-Commitment	ORIC-C2	We are determined to implement it.
	ORIC-C3	We are motivated to implement it.
	ORIC-C4	We would do what is necessary.
	ORIC-C5	We want to implement it.

Construct	Code	Item
ORIC-Efficacy	ORIC-E3	We can coordinate roles.
	ORIC-E4	We can monitor progress.
	ORIC-E5	We can overcome difficulties.
Adaptation	AD1	After the solo dining practice starts, we can adjust service processes according to emerging operational problems.
	AD2	After the solo dining practice starts, we can adapt menu and presentation practices according to customer feedback.
	AD3	After the solo dining practice starts, we can integrate the practice into our restaurant's standard service processes.
	AD4	After the solo dining practice starts, we can flexibly arrange the practice according to different levels of intensity and time periods.
	AD5	After the solo dining practice starts, we can reorganize staff duties and responsibilities in accordance with the practice.
	AD6	After the solo dining practice starts, we can turn the practice into a sustainable long-term service model.

Adoptability of Solo Dining Practices in Restaurant Businesses: A Study from the Perspective of Diffusion of Innovations and Organizational Readiness

Prof. Dr. Mehmet Sarioğlan
Batuhan Gürs

ÖZGÜR PRESS