

Hue Knew? The Subtle Power of Restaurant Signage Colors

Alexandria Yoon Jee Han

Annenberg School for Communication and Journalism, University of Southern California

RESTAURANT SIGNAGE

Hue Knew? The Subtle Power of Restaurant Signage Colors

Consumer evaluations of restaurants often begin before any direct interaction with the menu, staff, or food, and exterior signage is a key component of these early impressions (Song et al., 2022). Prior research has shown that visual attributes such as color can shape perceptual and affective responses in commercial environments, influencing judgments of warmth, arousal, trust, or quality depending on the hue presented (Elliot, 2015; Labrecque & Milne, 2011; Song et al., 2022). Warm colors, including red and yellow, have been associated with heightened stimulation and greater focus, whereas cooler colors, such as blue and green, are linked with calmness and cognitive clarity (Jonaskaite & Mohr, 2025; Labrecque & Milne, 2011).

In food related contexts, color cues can influence expectations about taste, flavor intensity, or health, and may shift perceptions of overall product appeal (Spence, 2015; Steiner & Florack, 2023; Wadhera & Capaldi-Phillips, 2014). For restaurants, exterior design elements, including signage, function as quick heuristics that may signal category, price point, or dining experience (Song et al., 2022). Because signage is often encountered briefly in spaces with high visual traffic, the color palette may meaningfully contribute to whether the establishment appears inviting, affordable, or high quality.

These dynamics have clear relevance for restaurant operators, who frequently make strategic choices about exterior branding with the goal of attracting first-time customers. Warm palettes appear more frequently in fast-food branding, possibly due to their associations with energy and appetite, whereas cooler palettes are common among establishments emphasizing calmness, or a health-oriented identity (Song et al., 2022, 2023). Insights into how color shapes expectations of quality, price fairness, or desirability can support menu positioning, storefront design, and broader marketing strategy.

RESTAURANT SIGNAGE

Within this context, the central question concerns whether the color of a restaurant sign influences consumers' immediate evaluations of the establishment. Based on prior work linking warm colors with stimulation and approach-oriented responses, it was hypothesized that participants viewing the red and yellow sign would report higher desire-to-eat ratings than those viewing the blue and green sign. Further expectations included potential differences in perceived restaurant attractiveness, quality, price fairness, and behavioral intentions.

Method

Participants

A total of 201 participants (61 males, 115 females, 16 non-binary, four who preferred not to say, and five unspecified) were recruited for a study described as "Restaurant Signage." Participation was voluntary, and no compensation was provided. Participants were limited to friends and family of the survey creators. Most participants were aged 18 - 24 (25.5%), followed by participants aged between 35 - 44 (24.5%). Most identified as Asian (53.7%), followed by Black or African American (35.8%) and White (29.9%). Because this experiment involved color perception, participants were asked whether they had difficulty distinguishing between colors. Responses from participants who indicated color vision difficulties were excluded from the analyses. See Appendix A for detailed demographic statistics.

Materials and Procedure

An online experiment was used to collect data from participants between December 5th and December 8th, 2025. The independent variable was restaurant sign color (either red + yellow or blue + green). The dependent variables consisted of 27 questions and were divided into four sections, including impulse, appeal, expectations, and behavior. The first section, impulse, assessed participants' immediate reactions and emotional responses to restaurant signs. An

RESTAURANT SIGNAGE

example question from this section was: “This restaurant sign makes me want to eat at this restaurant.” The next section, appeal, examined perceptions of attractiveness and trustworthiness, as well as the likelihood of recommending the restaurant to others. An example question from this section was: “I would recommend this restaurant to a friend based on this sign.” The expectations section assessed anticipated food quality, restaurant quality, cleanliness, and price perception. An example question from this section was: “Based on this sign, I expect the food to taste good.” The final section, behavior, examined situational decisions and contextual choices, including restaurant type, expected meal, service quality, and dining companions. An example question from this section was “If you were nearby and looking for a place to eat right now, what would you most likely do after seeing this sign?” Most questions were answered via 7-point Likert scales, ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree.” The remaining questions used multiple-choice response formats. See Appendix C for a full overview of all independent and dependent variables.

Results

Participants’ desire to eat at the restaurant differed by sign color, with those who viewed the red + yellow sign reporting higher desire ($M = 4.85$, $SD = 1.62$) than those who saw the blue + green sign ($M = 4.33$, $SD = 1.78$), indicating a significant effect of color on appetite ($t(196) = 2.13$, $p = .017$). Participant’s willingness to recommend the restaurant to friends also varied, with red + yellow signs receiving higher ratings ($M = 4.58$, $SD = 1.77$) than blue + green signs ($M = 4.13$, $SD = 1.79$), suggesting a modest but significant influence on social intentions ($t(199) = 1.81$, $p = .036$).

Expectations of restaurant quality were also higher for red + yellow signs ($M = 5.20$, $SD = 1.40$) compared to blue + green signs ($M = 4.82$, $SD = 1.57$), reflecting a significant effect of

RESTAURANT SIGNAGE

color on perceived quality ($t(198) = 1.81, p = .036$). Similarly, perceptions of reasonable pricing were higher for red + yellow signage ($M = 4.82, SD = 1.66$) compared to the blue + green signage ($M = 4.11, SD = 1.87$), indicating that color influenced price perceptions as well ($t(199) = 2.85, p = .002$). Behavioral intention ratings indicated that seeing the restaurant sign, regardless of whether it was red + yellow ($M = 11.48, SD = 1.99$) or blue + green ($M = 11.08, SD = 1.82$), had some influence on participants' decisions to choose that restaurant. While the difference between sign colors was not statistically significant ($t(199) = 1.47, p = .072$), these results suggest that the presence of a sign itself can shape immediate dining choices.

Finally, participants judged red + yellow signs as more appropriate for a restaurant ($M = 4.85, SD = 1.69$) than blue + green signs ($M = 4.37, SD = 1.63$), indicating a modest but significant effect on perceptions of color appropriateness ($t(199) = 2.06, p = .021$). A chi-square analysis showed that sign color was modestly associated with perceived restaurant type ($\chi^2(30) = 49.42, p = .014$), whereas immediate behavioral choices did not differ significantly between colors ($\chi^2(4) = 1.58, p = .812$). See Appendix B for complete statistical tables.

Discussion

The results of this study indicate that restaurant sign color exerts a modest, yet meaningful influence on consumer perceptions. Participants who viewed the red + yellow sign consistently rated the restaurant higher across several evaluative dimensions compared to those who viewed the blue + green sign. These findings support the broader literature showing that visual cues, especially those encountered early in the consumer journey, shape impressions before any direct interaction with products or services. In line with prior research, such as Labrecque & Milne's 2011 study demonstrating that warm colors increase perceptual stimulation and attention, the red + yellow sign appeared to generate more favorable impressions of the

RESTAURANT SIGNAGE

restaurant's appeal, even in the absence of additional information such as menus or branding. Notably, behavioral intention showed a non-significant trend favoring red + yellow signs, suggesting that while warm colors may enhance evaluative judgments, the presence of signage itself may exert a more universal effect on immediate decision-making.

The influence of color on appetite, recommendation likelihood, and perceived quality mirrors findings in food and hospitality research, where warm color palettes tend to heighten arousal and appetite, whereas cooler colors support impressions of calmness or healthfulness. Participants who viewed the red + yellow sign expressed stronger desire to eat and greater willingness to recommend the restaurant, consistent with theories of affective priming and the role of hue in shaping taste expectations and emotional responses.

Price perception was also significantly influenced by sign color, with the red + yellow sign perceived as more reasonably priced. This finding suggests that color can shape economic judgments, with warmer tones communicating approachability and value. One possibility is that participants drew on existing associations between red + yellow palettes and well-known fast-food brands, which commonly use these hues to signal affordability. However, the chi-square analysis showed that red + yellow signs were more likely to be categorized as casual dining, fine dining, or diner establishments, indicating that color may operate beyond brand-specific associations and instead function as a broader cue for restaurant positioning. At the same time, immediate behavioral choices such as deciding to enter the restaurant or check the menu online were not significantly influenced by color, suggesting that these actions may rely more heavily on situational or informational factors beyond signage alone.

However, several limitations warrant consideration. The convenience sample recruited online limits the generalizability of these findings, as does the use of a single restaurant image

RESTAURANT SIGNAGE

and only two-color combinations. All measures relied on self-report, which may not fully capture real-world behavior. Future research could also examine additional color palettes, varied typography and imagery combinations, distinct restaurant categories, and naturalistic decision contexts such as field experiments or eye-tracking studies. Additionally, the images used as the independent variables had menu items listed on the signage, which may have had an influence on the results of multiple questions, but most notably, questions about restaurant type, price, and perceived quality.

Collectively, these findings underscore the strategic importance of color in restaurant marketing. Even subtle design elements can influence perception, from appetite and quality judgments to category classification, while the presence of signage itself affects behavioral intentions. Restaurateurs and marketers can leverage these insights to enhance appeal, communicate value, and position their establishments effectively.

References

- Elliot A. J. (2015). Color and psychological functioning: A review of theoretical and empirical work. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00368>
- Jonauskaite, D., & Mohr, C. (2025) Do we feel colours? A systematic review of 128 years of psychological research linking colours and emotions. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 32, 1457-1486. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-024-02615-z>
- Labrecque, L., & Milne, G. (2011). Exciting red and competent blue: The importance of color in marketing. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 40(5), 711-727. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-010-0245-y>
- Song, H., Ding, Q. S., Xu, J. B., Kim, J., & Chang, R. C. (2023). Typographic design of outdoor signage, restaurant authenticity, and consumers' willingness to dine: Extending semiotic theory. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 35(7), 2388-2409. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-05-2022-0572>
- Song, H., Yang, H., & Ma, E. (2022). Restaurants' outdoor signs say more than you think: An enquiry from a linguistic landscape perspective. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 68. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2022.103054>
- Spence, C. (2015). On the psychological impact of food color. *Flavour*, 4(21). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13411-015-0031-3>
- Steiner, K., & Florack, A. (2023). The influence of packaging color on consumer perceptions of healthfulness: A systematic review and theoretical framework. *Foods*, 12(21). <https://doi.org/10.3390/foods12213911>

RESTAURANT SIGNAGE

Wadhera, D., & Capaldi-Phillips, E. D. (2014). A review of visual cues associated with food on food acceptance and consumption. *Eating Behaviors*, *15*(1), 132-143.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eatbeh.2013.11.003>

RESTAURANT SIGNAGE

Appendix A

		age			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	18 - 24	30	14.9	15.3	15.3
	25 - 34	50	24.9	25.5	40.8
	35 - 44	48	23.9	24.5	65.3
	45 - 54	38	18.9	19.4	84.7
	55 - 64	25	12.4	12.8	97.4
	65 - 74	2	1.0	1.0	98.5
	75 - 84	2	1.0	1.0	99.5
	85 or older	1	.5	.5	100.0
	Total	196	97.5	100.0	
Missing	System	5	2.5		
Total		201	100.0		

		gender			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	61	30.3	31.1	31.1
	Female	115	57.2	58.7	89.8
	Non-binary/third gender	16	8.0	8.2	98.0
	Prefer not to say	4	2.0	2.0	100.0
	Total	196	97.5	100.0	
Missing	System	5	2.5		
Total		201	100.0		

RESTAURANT SIGNAGE

		Statistics							
		white	black_african american	asian	hawaiian_paci fisclander	nativeamerica n	mideast_north african	other	prefnottosay
N	Valid	60	72	108	27	35	23	23	3
	Missing	141	129	93	174	166	178	178	198
Mean		1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Median		1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Std. Deviation		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000

colorblindness					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Prefer not to say	7	3.5	3.5	3.5
	No	133	66.2	67.2	70.7
	Unsure	58	28.9	29.3	100.0
	Total	198	98.5	100.0	
Missing	System	3	1.5		
Total		201	100.0		

Appendix B

Group Statistics					
	iv	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
wannaeat	1	99	4.85	1.619	.163
	2	99	4.33	1.784	.179

Independent Samples Test											
Levene's Test for Equality of Variances				t-test for Equality of Means							
		F	Sig.	t	df	Significance One-Sided p	Significance Two-Sided p	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
										Lower	Upper
wannaeat	Equal variances assumed	.225	.636	2.128	196	.017	.035	.515	.242	.038	.993
	Equal variances not assumed			2.128	194.166	.017	.035	.515	.242	.038	.993

Independent Samples Effect Sizes					
	Standardizer ^a	Point Estimate	95% Confidence Interval		
			Lower	Upper	
wannaeat	Cohen's d	1.703	.302	.022	.582
	Hedges' correction	1.710	.301	.022	.580
	Glass's delta	1.784	.289	.007	.569

a. The denominator used in estimating the effect sizes. Cohen's d uses the pooled standard deviation. Hedges' correction uses the pooled standard deviation, plus a correction factor. Glass's delta uses the sample standard deviation of the control (i.e., the second) group.

Group Statistics					
	iv	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
rectofriend	1	101	4.58	1.768	.176
	2	100	4.13	1.790	.179

Independent Samples Test											
Levene's Test for Equality of Variances				t-test for Equality of Means							
		F	Sig.	t	df	Significance One-Sided p	Significance Two-Sided p	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
										Lower	Upper
rectofriend	Equal variances assumed	.012	.911	1.810	199	.036	.072	.454	.251	-.041	.949
	Equal variances not assumed			1.809	198.898	.036	.072	.454	.251	-.041	.949

RESTAURANT SIGNAGE

Independent Samples Effect Sizes					
		Standardizer ^a	Point Estimate	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
rectofriend	Cohen's d	1.779	.255	-.023	.533
	Hedges' correction	1.786	.254	-.023	.531
	Glass's delta	1.790	.254	-.026	.532

a. The denominator used in estimating the effect sizes.
 Cohen's d uses the pooled standard deviation.
 Hedges' correction uses the pooled standard deviation, plus a correction factor.
 Glass's delta uses the sample standard deviation of the control (i.e., the second) group.

Group Statistics					
iv		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
quality	1	101	5.20	1.400	.139
	2	99	4.82	1.567	.158

Independent Samples Test											
Levene's Test for Equality of Variances				t-test for Equality of Means							
		F	Sig.	t	df	Significance		Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
						One-Sided p	Two-Sided p			Lower	Upper
quality	Equal variances assumed	1.585	.209	1.808	198	.036	.072	.380	.210	-.034	.794
	Equal variances not assumed			1.806	194.595	.036	.072	.380	.210	-.035	.795

Independent Samples Effect Sizes					
		Standardizer ^a	Point Estimate	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
quality	Cohen's d	1.485	.256	-.023	.534
	Hedges' correction	1.491	.255	-.023	.532
	Glass's delta	1.567	.242	-.038	.521

a. The denominator used in estimating the effect sizes.
 Cohen's d uses the pooled standard deviation.
 Hedges' correction uses the pooled standard deviation, plus a correction factor.
 Glass's delta uses the sample standard deviation of the control (i.e., the ...

Group Statistics					
iv		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
reasonableprice	1	101	4.82	1.658	.165
	2	100	4.11	1.874	.187

RESTAURANT SIGNAGE

Independent Samples Test											
Levene's Test for Equality of Variances						t-test for Equality of Means				95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Significance One-Sided p	Significance Two-Sided p	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
reasonableprice	Equal variances assumed	1.630	.203	2.853	199	.002	.005	.712	.250	.220	1.204
	Equal variances not assumed			2.851	195.586	.002	.005	.712	.250	.219	1.204

Independent Samples Effect Sizes					
		Standardizer ^a	Point Estimate	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
reasonableprice	Cohen's d	1.769	.402	.123	.681
	Hedges' correction	1.775	.401	.122	.679
	Glass's delta	1.874	.380	.097	.660

- a. The denominator used in estimating the effect sizes.
 Cohen's d uses the pooled standard deviation.
 Hedges' correction uses the pooled standard deviation, plus a correction factor.
 Glass's delta uses the sample standard deviation of the control (i.e., the second) group.

Group Statistics					
	iv	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
signinfluence	1	101	11.48	1.993	.198
	2	100	11.08	1.824	.182

Independent Samples Test											
Levene's Test for Equality of Variances						t-test for Equality of Means				95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Significance One-Sided p	Significance Two-Sided p	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
signinfluence	Equal variances assumed	3.170	.077	1.466	199	.072	.144	.395	.270	-.136	.927
	Equal variances not assumed			1.467	197.784	.072	.144	.395	.269	-.136	.927

Independent Samples Effect Sizes					
		Standardizer ^a	Point Estimate	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
signinfluence	Cohen's d	1.911	.207	-.071	.484
	Hedges' correction	1.918	.206	-.070	.482
	Glass's delta	1.824	.217	-.062	.494

- a. The denominator used in estimating the effect sizes.
 Cohen's d uses the pooled standard deviation.
 Hedges' correction uses the pooled standard deviation, plus a correction factor.
 Glass's delta uses the sample standard deviation of the control (i.e., the second) group.

Group Statistics					
	iv	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
appropriatecolor	1	101	4.85	1.688	.168
	2	100	4.37	1.631	.163

RESTAURANT SIGNAGE

Independent Samples Test											
Levene's Test for Equality of Variances				t-test for Equality of Means							
		F	Sig.	t	df	Significance		Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
						One-Sided p	Two-Sided p			Lower	Upper
appropriatecolor	Equal variances assumed	.036	.850	2.057	199	.021	.041	-.481	.234	.020	.943
	Equal variances not assumed			2.057	198.884	.020	.041	-.481	.234	.020	.943

Independent Samples Effect Sizes					
		Standardizer ^a	Point Estimate	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
appropriatecolor	Cohen's d	1.660	.290	.012	.568
	Hedges' correction	1.666	.289	.012	.566
	Glass's delta	1.631	.295	.015	.574

a. The denominator used in estimating the effect sizes.
 Cohen's d uses the pooled standard deviation.
 Hedges' correction uses the pooled standard deviation, plus a correction factor.
 Glass's delta uses the sample standard deviation of the control (i.e., the second) group.

Case Processing Summary						
	Valid		Cases Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
	wannaeat * restauranttype	196	97.5%	5	2.5%	201

Case Processing Summary						
	Valid		Cases Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
	iv * wwyd	201	100.0%	0	0.0%	201

wannaeat * restauranttype Crosstabulation								
Count		restauranttype						
		Fast food	Casual dining	Fine dining	Cafe/Coffee shop	Diner	Other	Total
wannaeat	Strongly disagree	2	3	2	2	2	1	12
	Disagree	3	4	2	1	0	0	10
	Somewhat disagree	3	19	5	2	1	0	30
	Neither agree nor disagree	1	22	12	8	4	0	47
	Somewhat agree	3	1	8	7	2	1	22
	Agree	5	13	11	9	5	2	45
	Strongly agree	4	5	6	5	8	2	30
Total		21	67	46	34	22	6	196

RESTAURANT SIGNAGE

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	49.423 ^a	30	.014
Likelihood Ratio	53.980	30	.005
Linear-by-Linear Association	9.029	1	.003
N of Valid Cases	196		

a. 25 cells (59.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .31.

iv * wwyd Crosstabulation							
Count		Enter the restaurant immediately	Look at the menu online first	wwyd Keep walking/Ignore the restaurant	Recommend it to a friend without visiting	Other	Total
iv	1	18	48	17	14	4	101
	2	17	47	15	19	2	100
Total		35	95	32	33	6	201

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.583 ^a	4	.812
Likelihood Ratio	1.599	4	.809
Linear-by-Linear Association	.052	1	.819
N of Valid Cases	201		

a. 2 cells (20.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.99.

Appendix C**Restaurant Signage****Start of Block: Introduction**

Introduction: You are invited to take part in a short study about restaurant signs. Your responses are anonymous and confidential. You may stop at any time. The survey will take about 5 - 7 minutes.

End of Block: Introduction

RESTAURANT SIGNAGE

Start of Block: Stimulus_Red+Yellow/Blue+Green

Please look carefully at the restaurant shown below. You will answer some questions about your impressions.



End of Block: Stimulus_Red+Yellow/Blue+Green

RESTAURANT SIGNAGE

Start of Block: Likelihood & Appetite + Recommendation & Attractiveness

Q1-2) Please read each of the following statements and indicate how much you agree with each statement.

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neither agree nor disagree (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
This restaurant sign makes me want to eat at this restaurant. (1)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
I would consider eating at this restaurant if I were nearby. (2)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Q3-5) Please read each of the following statements and indicate how much you agree with each statement.

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neither agree nor disagree (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
I would recommend this restaurant to a friend based on this sign. (1)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
This restaurant looks attractive to me. (3)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
This sign makes the restaurant appear trustworthy. (5)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

End of Block: Likelihood & Appetite + Recommendation & Attractiveness

RESTAURANT SIGNAGE

Start of Block: Expectations + Price Perception

Q6-8) Please read each of the following statements and indicate how much you agree with each statement.

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neither agree nor disagree (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
Based on this sign, I expect the food to taste good. (1)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Based on this sign, I expect the restaurant to be high quality. (2)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
This restaurant seems clean and well managed. (4)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Q9-11) Please read each of the following statements and indicate how much you agree with each statement.

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neither agree nor disagree (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
This sign makes me think the restaurant has reasonable prices. (6)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
I expect the food here to be good value for the money. (7)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
This restaurant looks affordable to me. (9)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

End of Block: Expectations + Price Perception

Start of Block: Behavioral Intention + Additional Questions

RESTAURANT SIGNAGE

Q12) Please read each of the following statements and indicate how much you agree with each statement.

	Never (1)	Rarely (2)	Occasionally (3)	Sometimes (4)	Frequently (5)	Very often (6)	Always (7)
If I were choosing a place to eat right now, this sign would influence my decision. (10)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Q13-17) Please read each of the following statements and indicate how much you agree with each statement.

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Somewhat disagree (3)	Neither agree nor disagree (4)	Somewhat agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
The color of this sign feels appropriate for a restaurant. (1)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
This sign grabs my attention more than typical restaurant signs. (2)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
The sign makes me feel positive emotions (e.g., excited, happy, warm). (3)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Based on this sign, I would expect the restaurant to be busy/popular. (4)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

End of Block: Behavioral Intention + Additional Questions

RESTAURANT SIGNAGE

Start of Block: Categorical Dependent Variables

Q18) Which type of restaurant would you be most likely to choose based on this sign? Select one.

- Fast food (1)
- Casual dining (2)
- Fine dining (3)
- Café/Coffee shop (4)
- Diner (5)
- Other (6)

Q19) If you were nearby and looking for a place to eat right now, what would you most likely do after seeing this sign? Select one.

- Enter the restaurant immediately (1)
- Look at the menu online first (2)
- Keep walking/Ignore the restaurant (3)
- Recommend it to a friend without visiting (4)
- Other (5)

Q20) Based on this sign, what type of meal do you most expect the restaurant to serve? Select one.

- Breakfast (1)
- Brunch (2)
- Lunch (3)
- Dinner (4)
- Snacks/Desserts (5)
- Drinks/Café items (6)
- Other (7)

RESTAURANT SIGNAGE

Q21) Based on this sign, how would you rate the quality of service at this restaurant? Select one.

- Very poor (2)
- Poor (3)
- Average (4)
- Good (5)
- Excellent (6)
- Other (7)

Q22) Who would you most likely go to this restaurant with? Select one.

- Alone (1)
- With friends (4)
- With family (5)
- With a romantic partner (6)
- With coworkers/colleagues (7)
- Other (8)

End of Block: Categorical Dependent Variables

Start of Block: Demographics

Q23) What best describes your gender identity?

- Male (1)
- Female (2)
- Non-binary/third gender (3)
- Prefer not to say (4)

Q24) What is your race or ethnicity? (Select all that apply.)

- White (1)
- Black or African American (2)

RESTAURANT SIGNAGE

- Asian (3)
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (4)
- American Indian or Alaska Native (5)
- Middle Eastern or North African (6)
- Other (7)
- Prefer not to say (9)

Q26) Do you have difficulty distinguishing between certain colors or experience colorblindness?

- Yes (1)
- No (4)
- Unsure (5)
- Prefer not to say (2)

Q27) Please indicate who sent you this survey to complete.

- Alexandria (Aly) Han (1)
- Gloria Xue (2)
- Xiaoyi Tang (3)
- Guang (Montague) Yang (4)
- Zhoujie (Alyssa) Xu (5)

End of Block: Demographics