

**ISTANBUL AYDIN UNIVERSITY  
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**



**EVALUATION OF SERVICE QUALITY OF TOURISM INDUSTRY BASED  
ON SERVQUAL MODEL–A COMPARATIVE STUDY BETWEEN  
ISTANBUL AND BARCELONA**

**M.Sc. THESIS**

**Azadeh TAGHINIA HEJABI  
(Y1312.130005)**

**Department of Business Administration  
Business Management Program**

**Thesis Advisor: Asst. Prof. Dr. İlkey KARADUMAN**

**JULY 2016**



T.C.  
İSTANBUL AYDIN ÜNİVERSİTESİ  
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ MÜDÜRLÜĞÜ

**Yüksek Lisans Tez Onay Belgesi**

Enstitümüz İşletme İngilizce Ana Bilim Dalı İşletme Yönetimi İngilizce Tezli Yüksek Lisans Programı **Y1312.130005** numaralı öğrencisi **Azadeh TAGHINIA HEJABI**'nin "EVALUATION OF SERVICE QUALITY OF TOURISM INDUSTRY BASED ON SERVQUAL MODEL: A COMPERATIVE STUDY BETWEEN ISTANBUL AND BARCELONA" adlı tez çalışması Enstitümüz Yönetim Kurulunun 19.07.2016 tarih ve 2016/15 sayılı kararıyla oluşturulan jüri tarafından **aybırılıgı** ile Tezli Yüksek Lisans tezi olarak **kabul** edilmiştir.

Öğretim Üyesi Adı Soyadı

İmzası

Tez Savunma Tarihi :27/07/2016

1)Tez Danışmanı: Yrd. Doç. Dr. İlkay KARADUMAN

2) Jüri Üyesi : Yrd. Doç. Dr. Nurgün KOMŞUOĞLU YILMAZ

3) Jüri Üyesi : Yrd. Doç. Dr. İlge KURT

Not: Öğrencinin Tez savunmasında **Başarılı** olması halinde bu form **imzalanacaktır**. Aksi halde geçersizdir.



*Dedicated to my beloved spouse,*

## **FOREWORD**

With my regards and appreciate , sincere thanks to Asst. Prof. Dr. İlkey KARADUMAN, thesis advisor , for his adept guidance,worthy suggestion , deeply coopration and encoragment during my master course as well as prepration thesis.

My warm thanks to Prof. Luis Codo for support and guiding me during my Erasmus period at Universitat Oberta de Catalunya ,Barcelona, Spain.

My special thanks to my husband for his encouragement and support me during the master course.

I proudly announce my pleasure to thanks to all of professors of Department of Business Administration, Istanbul Aydin University for their timely help and support me during my master course.

**July 2016**

**Azadeh TAGHINIA HEJABI**

---

## TABLE OF CONTENT

	<u>Page</u>
<b>FOREWORD</b>	
<b>TABLE OF CONTENT</b> .....	<b>iv</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b> .....	<b>vi</b>
<b>ÖZET</b> .....	<b>vii</b>
<b>ABSTRACT</b> .....	<b>viii</b>
<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>1</b>
1.1. Heritage Tourism .....	2
1.2. Tourist Satisfaction .....	3
1.3. Characteristics of Services .....	3
1.4. Service Quality (SERVQUAL) Dimensions .....	4
<b>2. LITERATURE REVIEW</b> .....	<b>6</b>
2.1. Definition of Service Quality Terms .....	6
2.2. Revolution of Quality of Service.....	10
2.3. Entertainment Services .....	14
2.4. Service Quality and Management Theories .....	17
2.4.1. The human relations movement.....	19
2.4.2. Service quality: an organizational commitment.....	20
2.4.3. Service quality and organizational impact.....	22
2.4.4. Culture and service quality .....	23
2.4.5. Behaviorism and organizational humanism.....	25
2.4.6. SERVQUAL and demography .....	28
2.5. Service Quality Model (SERVQUAL).....	29
2.5.1. The basic element of SERVQUAL.....	39
2.5.2. Service quality factors.....	40
2.5.3. Statistics and design aspects .....	43
2.5.4. Service quality and measurement .....	44
2.5.5. SERVQUAL instrument .....	46
2.6. Perceived Service Value and Quality .....	48
2.7. Quality of Service and Customer Fulfilment.....	52
<b>3. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND HYPOTHESIS</b> .....	<b>56</b>
3.1. Statement of the Problem .....	56
3.2. Significance of the Study.....	56
3.3. Scope of Study.....	57
3.4. Objective of the Study .....	57
3.5. Hypothesis .....	57
<b>4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND FINDING</b> .....	<b>59</b>
4.1. Methodology.....	59
4.2. Sample design.....	59
4.2.1 The instrument.....	59

4.2.2.Data Analysis.....	60
4.2.3.Description of the measurement instrument.....	60
4.2.4.Statistical analysis .....	62
4.2.4.1.Demographic analysis .....	62
4.2.5.Statistical analysis of tourist satisfaction.....	64
4.2.5.1.Correlation analysis .....	65
4.2.5.2.Interpretation of hypothesis.....	68
4.2.5.3.Regression analysis .....	69
4.2.5.4.Comparison of dimensions .....	71
<b>5.CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY AND DIRECTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH.....</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>74</b>
<b>APPENDICES.....</b>	<b>89</b>
<b>RESUME.....</b>	<b>.....</b>



## LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
<b>Table1-1:</b> The five dimensions of SERVQUAL .....	5
<b>Table 4-1:</b> Cronbach's Alpha Scores of Satisfaction variables .....	60
<b>Table 4-2:</b> Labels for the created dimensions of tourist satisfaction .....	61
<b>Table 4-3:</b> Demographic data of tourist in Istanbul.....	62
<b>Table 4-4:</b> Demographic data of tourist in Barcelona .....	63
<b>Table 4-5:</b> Correlation analysis of satisfaction variables of tourists at Barcelona	66
<b>Table 4-6:</b> Correlation analysis of satisfaction variables of tourists at Istanbul....	66
<b>Table 4-7:</b> Correlations between touristic service quality dimensions and overall tourists' satisfaction in Barcelona .....	67
<b>Table 4-8:</b> Correlations between touristic service quality dimensions and overall tourists' satisfaction in Istanbul.....	68
<b>Table 4-9:</b> Regression model summary of satisfaction variables in Barcelona.....	70
<b>Table 4-10:</b> Regression model summary of satisfaction variables in Istanbul .....	70
<b>Table 4-11:</b> Descriptive Statistics on tourists' Perception of Service Quality in Barcelona and Istanbul (N=100) .....	71

**TURİZM SEKTÖRÜNDE HİZMET KALİTESİNİN SERVQUAL  
MODELIYLA DEĞERLENDİRİLMESİ: BARCELONA VE İSTANBUL  
ÜZERİNE KARŞILAŞTIRMALI BİR ÇALIŞMA**

**ÖZET**

Bu çalışma, hizmet kalitesi kavramını ele alarak hizmet kalitesi boyutlarının modelini ortaya koymakta ve Barcelona ile İstanbul'daki turist memnuniyetinin karşılaştırılmasını amaçlamaktadır. Bu amaçla turistlerin memnuniyetini ölçmek için beş-puanlık bir Likert ölçekli anket uygulanmaktadır. Verilerin 50 tanesi Barcelona'daki katılımcılardan ve diğer 50 tanesi İstanbul'daki katılımcılardan elde edilmiştir. Veriler istihdam korelasyonu, aşamalı regresyon ve t-testi analizi uygulanmak suretiyle SPSS 18 yazılımı kullanılarak analiz edilmiştir. Sonuçlar, her iki şehirde bulunan turistlerin genel memnuniyet düzeyleri arasında anlamlı farklılıklar olduğunu göstermektedir.

Barcelona'da ortalama oranlamanın "Güven" boyutundaki ortalama oranlamadan belirgin bir şekilde daha yüksek olduğu dikkat çekmektedir. Başka bir deyişle, "Personelin bilgisi", "Emniyet ve güvenlik Düzeyi", "Halkın İngilizce dil seviyesi" gibi bazı değişkenlerde olmak üzere; Barcelona İstanbul'dan daha iyi durumdadır. Bu çalışma turizm endüstrisine ilişkin materyal içermektedir ve bu husustaki uygulanabilir çözümler makul düzeyde önerilmektedir. İlgili araştırma, turistlerin memnuniyeti ile ilgili materyalleri içermekte ve buna ilişkin etkileri müzakere edilmektedir. Ayrıca, öneriler de turistik hizmetlerin kalitesinin iyileştirilmesi için sunulmaktadır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** *Müşteri algısı, Hizmet Kalitesi, SERVQUAL modeli, Müşteri tatmini*



**EVALUATION OF SERVICE QUALITY OF TOURISM INDUSTRY BASED  
ON SERVQUAL MODEL–A COMPARATIVE STUDY BETWEEN  
ISTANBUL AND BARCELONA**

**ABSTRACT**

This study deals with the concept of service quality and has demonstrated the model of service quality dimensions; it aims to compare the tourists' satisfaction between Barcelona and Istanbul. For this purpose a questionnaire with five-point Likert scale is applied to measure tourist's satisfaction. Data was obtained from 50 respondents in Barcelona and 50 in Istanbul. Data was analyzed using SPSS 18 software by employing correlation, stepwise regression and t-test analysis. Results indicate that there are significant differences between overall satisfaction levels of tourists between two cities.

It is worth noting that in Barcelona the average rating significantly is higher than the average rating in "Assurance" dimension, in other word in some variables such as "Knowledge of staff", "Level of safety and security", and "Level of English language of people" Barcelona is better than Istanbul. The study contains material relevant to the tourism industry, and implementable solutions are sufficiently suggested. The research contains relevant materials to the tourist's satisfaction, and implications are discussed and recommendations are offered for improving touristic services quality.

**Keyword:** *Service quality, Customersatisfaction, SERVQUAL Model , Perception*

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

Tourism is one of the largest and the major industries in the world from its growth rate and economic impact dimensions. The number of tourists and the amount of money that the tourism industry makes is increasing every year. Tourism industry deals with of various activities in terms of service in travels, transpiration, facilities of eating, drinking, shopping, entertainment business and accommodation for individuals and group of people who are intend to travel around the world. The United Nation World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) claims that tourism is currently the world's largest industry with 9% GDP direct, indirect and included impact.

Regarding growth of tourism industry there are optimistic views from many researchers. It has been believed that the tourism will play a crucial role in the economy of the many countries. According to report of The World Tourism Organization in 2010, tourism has a large positive impact on economies as it creates a tremendous number of job opportunities. The report also shows that market of tourism industry is highly competitive.

In other word, in this competitive marketplace, attracting, satisfying, retaining the valuable customers is an essential issue. From a tourism perspective, local festivals and events are considered as a good tourism source, particularly for local tourism destinations.

On the other hand, the main goal of tourism managers are enhancing the service quality as well as customer satisfaction they accept as true that this will have an positive outcome on customers' future behavioral intentions and loyalty that will result in increased revenues for these attractions and as well as destinations.

Hermon et al. (1999) believed that the topic of satisfaction in tourism industry has been one of the most popular themes in the marketing field for the past few decades. Furthermore, it has been stated that there is positive relation between level of customer satisfaction and revisit and recommend a destination in many studies (Lee & Beeler, 2009; Yoon & Uysal, 2005).

In recent years, a lot of research has been performed on the service quality and satisfaction concepts in the tourism field as a means to increase profitability and performance (Baker & Crompton, 2000; Tian-Cole & Crompton; 2003; Tian-Cole et al., 2002). According Dabholkar et al. (2000) customer satisfaction can be affected directly by perceived quality of service.

The preference of the people has been changed; they are seeking something new, in traditional culture and heritage tourism areas. Heritage tourism, has become as a part of “cultural tourism” which is now one of important variables to build the tourism strategies in the seasonal and geographic spread of tourism in many countries (Richards G., 2001).

Therefore this research is going to perform a comparative study between Barcelona and Istanbul in case of tourist satisfaction trough SERVQUAL model.

### **1.1 Heritage Tourism**

Heritage is defined as the basics of our value. Heritage tourism is defined as markets and the industry, which have built around heritage. There is a critical association between tourism industry and heritage values (Richards, 2001). ‘Heritage’ and ‘Culture’ have become mutual terms. For example, the use of the culture is related to civilization’s history, beliefs, values and traditions that are marked in an artistic system.

Cultural heritage tourism related to visiting places that are considerable to the past or present cultural characters of specific group of people. For new guests, the heritage has root in the customs, practices and language which are brought from their respective origin.

Through cultural tourism people can use this opportunity to understand their culture by visiting attractions, cultural, historical places and contributing in cultural events.

As it is described by the National Association of State Arts Agencies, cultural heritage tourism is based on places, traditions, art forms and celebrations and that people reflecting several character of their country.

In other word, Hollinshead (1993) reported that the heritage tourism is supposed as segment which has the most growing rate of the tourism industry due to of increasing specialization of tourism dimensions.

Silberberg (1995) found a common pattern of heritage tourists through analyzing demographic variables. The study also showed tourist marketers can use tourists' demographic data in order to better understand their behavior.

Further, so due to strong relationship between heritage tourism and tourist satisfaction this study focused tourists satisfaction to help to draw tourism strategies to attract customers.

## **1.2 Tourist Satisfaction**

According to Chen & Chen (2010) satisfaction is related to assessment of the customer's perception and his/her expectation. Obviously, dissatisfaction will come into sight if the presentation of the service meet the exception, In simple words, when experiences of a tourist compared to the expectation and perception results the satisfaction can be measured. Therefore, it is understood that tourists satisfaction can be affected two different dimensions; First, the expectation of the tourist before travel; Second it is related to evaluation level of tourist about quality of delivered services after the travel. In other words, tourist satisfaction is directly caused by the value of tourist expectation and perception (Xia et al., 2009; Song et al., 2011, Huang & Su, 2010 and Chen & Chen, 2010).

Furthermore, Lee & Beeler (2009) understood that consumer loyalty and satisfaction are interconnected. Several authors such as Sadeh et al. (2011) tried to examine whether the satisfaction is related to loyalty or not. Further, Huang et al (2006) stated that there is positive relation between the level of tourist's satisfaction and intention level for revisiting and encourage other tourists to visit the place.

## **1.3 Characteristics of Services**

Berry (1980) describes services as acts, performances or efforts. Whereas goods can be identified as object, devices and materials. Kandampully (2002) believes that a customer can obtain a title to the goods and its ownership by purchasing goods, in

contrast, a service user just obtains the right of service and for only a specific amount of time. These are four unique characteristics that describe the difference between a service and a product. a) intangibility; b) heterogeneity; c) inseparability; and d) perishability.

**Intangibility:** Intangibility is the main attribute that differentiates a service from a product (MacKay & Crompton, 1988). Lovelock and Gummesson (2004) indicated three dimensions of intangibility: a) physical intangibility; b) mental intangibility; and c) generality. Physical intangibility means it cannot be touched. Mental intangibility related to the level of visualization of service that can provide a clear image before purchase.

**Heterogeneity:** Klassen et al (1998) reported that the heterogeneity nature of a service is related to variety of its delivery from one time to the next due to of changeability of customer's preferences. Heterogeneity changes from one service to another and from day-to-day.

**Inseparability:** Inseparability refers to a service can be produced and consumed simultaneously. Kandampully (2002) indicates that service despite of goods is normally sold, and then created and used simultaneously. Svensson (2003) believes that the creation, delivery, and consumption of a service occur in simultaneous processes.

**Perishability:** Services are perishable. It means that it cannot be saved, stored for reuse, resold, or returned as a product (Lovelock & Gummesson, 2004).

#### **1.4 Service Quality (SERVQUAL) Dimensions**

SERVQUAL is a model of service quality, which was first devolved by Parasuraman in 1985. These models of service quality are the most popular and widely used as a reference in marketing services. SERVQUAL is multiple-item scale for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality (Parasuraman, et al, 1985). The five dimensions of SERVQUAL are also known as rater, namely: reliability, assurance, tangible, empathy and responsiveness (Zeithaml, et al, 1996). Table 1-1 shows the five dimension of SERVQUAL model that effect on customer perception toward service quality.

**Table1-1:** The five dimensions of SERVQUAL

<b>Dimension</b>	<b>Definition</b>
Reliability	Ability to perform the promised service dependably and accurately
Assurance	Employees' knowledge and courtesy and their ability to inspire trust and confidence
Tangible	Appearance of physical facilities, equipment, personal and communication materials
Empathy	Caring, individualized attention given to customers
Responsiveness	Willing to help customers and provide prompt service

**Source:** Parasuraman, Zeithaml and Berry (1988)

## **2. LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **2.1 Definition of Service Quality Terms**

*"Services are activities, benefits, and satisfactions, which are offered for sale or are provided in connection with the sale of goods" (Riddle, 1986).*

This definition of services, formulated by The Committee on Definitions of the American Marketing Association, embodies a dynamic approach to service by allowing goods to be associated with services. Unfortunately, little consensus exists on the definition of service. Also, The notion that service is perishable, continues, and therefore lacking after production, after delivery (Rouffaer, 1991).

The proposition that the service industry has unique characteristics has become widely accepted. In addition to intangibility, the fundamental differences of simultaneous production and consumption, heterogeneity, and perishability, make up the most noted important differences between services and manufactured goods.

Simultaneous production and consumption implies that production and consumption cannot be separated.

Heterogeneity is concerned with the variation and lack of uniformity in the services being performed. Perishability means that the service cannot be inventoried or saved (Lewis & Chambers, 1989).

The concept of tangibility is central to the marketing of services and directs managerial action. A transformation of the intangible into a tangible by establishing degrees to which services can provide a clear concrete image to the customer would provide management an opportunity to build on the strength of imagery to attract customers (McDougall & Snetsinger, 1990). Rouffaer (1991) developed his "G.O.S." Model by combining three basic elements to propose a total concept of service. The three basic components are goods ('G') objectively measurable service elements ('O'), and subjectively measurable service components ('S'). This concept

combines goods with imagery to produce degrees of tangibility within the service experience. The framework which exists today for providing service is one that has been developed by service providers who have stereotyped the customer. Service providers may not really know what the customer expects, nor who she or he may be. A consumer will mostly assess service, appropriate to the current situation, influenced by cultural background, and experience. Developing insights into customer types on a psychological level could aid the provider no end. Cultivating skills on a social level is a necessary step (Rouffaer, 1991). Labor shortages, high labor intensity, turnover, and training of a poor standard, leave customers confronted by service providers not properly equipped to satisfy the customer's 'emotional hunger' (Smith, 1991).

The stereotyped customer is offered a diverse selection of options in most markets which are intended to create product differentiation by the service provider. The majority of these choices stem from the use of technology to improve service quality. It should be pointed out that many of the most popular technological innovations have strong consumer demand and may be necessary for an organization to uphold market share and face the competition rather than gain a competitive advantage (Reid Sc Sandler, 1992).

Dimensions of service quality:

Defined as tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy (Parasuraman et al., 1988). In the interest of clarity, the subsequent terminologies are explained:

*Assurance*: Defined as the knowledge and courtesy of employees as well as the ability of the employee to inspire trust and confidence .

*Empathy*: Defined as the "caring, individualized attention the firm provides its customers".

*Entertainment industry*: Defined as those establishments chiefly engaged in operating facilities or offering services to meet cultural, recreational, and entertainment interests of customers that are serviced (U.S. Census Bureau, 2007).

*Reliability*: Defined as the "ability to accomplish the promised service dependably and accurately".

*Responsiveness*: Defined as the "willingness to help customers and provide prompt



service" .

*Service quality*: Defined as "the customer's perception of the service component of a product" (Zeithaml & Bitner, 2003).

Service quality design and delivery factors, defined as people, product, and digital process resources. The resources are used to execute both entertainment service designs and to experience entertainment service delivery. The service design-and delivery factors fuse two established three category typologies from the services marketing literature. The first typology is an important and influential classification of service factors advanced by Lovelock and Yip (1996), which differentiates the types of service provider strategies. The second typology is a more recent framework by Dedeke (2003), which identifies value determinants of service consumption.

SERVQUAL, defined as a multi leveled instrument that can be used in order to obtain information about client expectations and perceptions of service quality (Zeithaml & Bitner, 2003).

Special events, defined as "specific rituals, presentations, performances, or celebrations that are planned and fashioned to mark special occasions or to achieve particular social, cultural, or corporate aims and goals" (Beech & Chadwick, 2004).

*Tangibles*: Defined as the "physical facilities, equipment, and appearance of personnel" (Parasuraman et al., 1988).

Definition of service quality has been stated as being the understanding of the way the individual thinks about service quality features important to the customers. Three key concepts linked to comprehending service quality are: consumer fulfilment, quality of service, and consumer value (Cronin and Taylor, 1992; Oliver, 1993; Zeithaml, 1988). Customer satisfaction is a main cognitive and affective reaction to a service incident (Oliver, 1980). Satisfaction or dissatisfaction from customers' experiences will result when they compare the difference between their perception and expectation of service quality. Service quality may be measured on a cumulative basis (Cronin and Talor, 1992). The value of service quality might be poor or high, depending on many factors as discussed by Zeithaml (1988).

A decade ago, quality of service quantification was explained, by Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry (1985), Excellence of service evaluation is harder to assess than an evaluation of excellence of goods. Quality of service insights correlate with

customer anticipation and service received. Evaluations while not limited to service outcome may in fact pertain to analyses of delivery of service. Parasuraman's (1985) definition of quality of service is as follows: "perceptions resulting from a comparison of consumer expectations with actual service performance." Understanding quality of service proves immensely tricky for consumers; due largely to the varied number of invisible conditions necessary to establish product excellence; and limited impartial factors to assess when discussing service excellence. Professionals in the arena of marketing, formulated two abstractions to aid an individual when discerning excellence of service: objective (or mechanistic) quality involves a tangible feature of the goods which can be objectively appraised, while perceived (or humanistic) quality involves the subjective response of people to objects which is highly relative and likely to differ between judges (Holbrook & Corfman, 1985; Parasuraman. Etal., 1988). Parasuraman, et al. (1985, 1988) defined service quality as the complete appraisal of a specific service that results from comparing performance of a business with the customer's general expectations of how businesses in that particular industry should perform. Fisk, et al. (1993) believed focusing on increasing service quality, tallied with total quality management and customer satisfaction in the arena of business research since the early 1980s. Much of the research conducted in services marketing is on service quality, which is influenced by the previous work of Parasuraman and his colleague. These authors have developed a concept the Gaps Model and measured their results by SERVQUAL, a survey instrument for assessing service quality. The SERVQUAL scale is used across service industries and is still debated in the literature over its dimensionality and applicability.

Andreoli (1996) remarked that in order to have a returning customer, the consumer should feel welcomed, respected and appreciated. Moreover that the service being offered appeals enough to get the customer to return. Service quality, representing the long-term component of service satisfaction, is "a measure of how well a delivered service meets customer expectation" (Webster, 1991).

Service excellence suggests personnel have to demonstrate customer centric proficiencies; deference, positive thought, benevolence (Gallup Organization 1988). The Gallup group analysed associations between people, benevolence, and geniality

in relationships in a social setting. Lewis and Booms (1983) quantified quality of service as a measure of how well the service level delivered matches customer expectations. Delivering quality service means conforming to customer expectations on a consistent basis (as cited by Parasuraman, et al., 1985). Wyckoff (1984) suggested quality of service can be explained thusly“Quality is the amount of intended brilliance, and one’s ability to control the variables necessary to reach that brilliance, in meeting the customer’s expectations”.

## **2.2 Revolution of Quality of Service**

The early 1980's, brought about a period whereby the self-satisfaction and assuredness of manufacturers were questioned. This led to a leveling out for product demand and their associated revenues.

Overseas competition began to challenge the North American dominance, along with the recession. In addition to this, competitors, particularly those in Japan, were not playing by the established game rules. As reported by Dean (1998), Total Quality Control is the system which was implemented in Japan to continue improvement.

The development of higher quality goods at lower prices started a trend that the North Americans had failed to do. This led to a period, where all management parties had to be re-educated (Clemmer, 1992). Similarly Brown (1992) stated that the Japanese were now chiefly the leaders of reverse engineering. Brown (1992) also said the faster and cheaper your product is the more chance you will have of owning the market. Backman and Veldkamp (1995) state that service quality and service management are now the major components within the public and private sectors. The focus on service in business and government is clear, with the growing number of awards for quality, the emphasis given to quality in the press, and the emerging academic interest. Because of this, many companies and government departments are fostering the philosophy of service marketing as their main focus in trying to compete within the marketplace.

Increased global competition, has led to increasingly critical approaches to quality management. Specifically at management and leadership level (Forsberg, 1999).

Nitechi (1997) suggests that service quality has been studied the most in marketing research in the past decade. A continued theme in investigative literature is that excellence in service, when viewed by customers, is indicative of what the consumer both imagines is possible and how well an organization executes and accomplishes offering the service.

Brown (1992) classifies quality, as that which mirrors customer fulfilment. He posits that quality is no way variable; by that, it cannot be low or high, it must be unconditional. Products or services have quality or they do not. Godfrey and Krammerer (1993) define service quality as being able to have universal goals of lower costs, higher revenues, inspired employees and happy customers. It is their belief, that since the 1980's, perception has changed. Moving away from the idea that quality means adhering to specifications and reducing the costs of poor quality. Rather, it means sustaining and exceeding customer needs and expectations by delivering the correct features, exact documentation, accurate invoices, punctual delivery, friendly support, and no disappointments, either on the receipt of the goods or services, or while they are in use. Also, they posit, that a customer's happiness depends on being able to manage effectively, all processes surrounding the service or product. Furthermore, an organization must ensure business processes like registrations, program development and delivery, invoicing, promotions as well as supplier relationships, support systems and employee interactions run smoothly, while also taking into consideration both the internal and external clients.

As Green (1999) states quality management must balance the realities of the organization with human resources in achieving quality objectives. Principles of organization can be found in the technical aspects of quality management while principles that have a human quantity are less pronounced and tend to be communicatively focused in quality management. As a quality manager, particularly one who demands success, it is of the most importance these skills are balanced.

According to Berry and Parasuraman (1991) it is less difficult to imitate product than an organisation's service quality. Zeithaml, Parasuraman and Berry (1992) agree service quality has become the primary focus because a nation's economy is purely driven as a service economy. Three quarters of the Gross National Product (GNP) are service based and nine tenths of new jobs created by such an economy. It

is stated by Berry (1984) that in 1978, Americans spent six billion dollars on services. In the current climate, less than 50% of an average family budget goes towards services. What separates the successful from the ordinary is service, according to Brown (1992). Service means more than pleasing the customer. It means having an all encompassing and genuine service culture in one organization. Clemmer (1992) highlights four truisms regarding a typical modern customer:

*Firstly*, a customer expects greatly increased levels of quality of service.

*Secondly*, competitors are working tirelessly to manipulate customer with a perceived quality of service greater than the one ,have been offering.

*Thirdly*, the winner takes it all.

*Finally*, irrespective of whatever success be enjoying at the moment, aggressive plans to increase quality service initiatives are vital to ensure continued growth. Similarly, Zeithaml et al. (1992) have observed that service excellence pioneers. “Use service to be different; they use service to increase productivity; they use service to earn the customers’ loyalty; they use service to fan positive word of mouth advertising; they use service as shelter from price competition”. Agencies in a governmental capacity differ from private business in relation to their clients, posits Brown (1992). The clientele base of public service agencies is far more expansive.

As tax payers, we are all potential customers. And as such, those taxes need to be well spent. Brown (1992) suggests there are two major stumbling blocks to quality service that are lacking from the private sector. It usually operates in an unchallenged environment with few, if any, competitors. Thus, one may assume there is no apparent need to worry about quality of service as the customer has no other option but to return. Also, there is a very ordered structure within the public sector. As such, a lot of the decisions are made by people, whose distance and contact is greatly removed from the very customers for whom they are supposed to be providing. It is not uncommon to find policies and procedures created to support an organisations internal functions rather than functions which support the external client.

General business, the everyday public, public service employees and community groups are the four groups from which customers are served by the public sector. One or all of these groups may hold a potential customer, which can indeed make

service matters problematic. Brown (1992) says it is crucial the public sector alters the ways it does business to better serve the many groups.

MacKay and Crompton (1990) say that an advantage was made traditionally by the recreation and leisure industries, by charging lower prices for similar services. However, because North Americans are in a period of economic limitation, tax support for recreation programs are slowly being removed. There is no apparent agreement as to which costs should be recuperated by user fees; direct or indirect, the trend appears to include a large percentage of indirect costs. The advantage that agencies once had with price has been eroded. Furthermore they assert there can only be an increase in this erosion.

Godbey (1989) feels the economic constraints felt by the North Americans, led to them discontinuing their participation in leisure and recreation. Furthermore, he believes that with increased standards of education, customers demand a higher degree of quality in the services they receive. Also, with an increased elderly population, they too have become more discerning.

Survival seems less certain, with this new sophisticated customer base. One cannot take for granted this rapidly changing economy. Gunther and Hawkins (1996) state that in order to be successful in the marketplace one must have more than just quality in the products and services being offered and delivered. A solid commitment to customers and an understanding on an emotional level and receptiveness to changing needs are crucial. With a drop in the amount of leisure time available, that spare time which remains are more highly stratagised.

Godbey (1989) believes that leisure and recreation agencies must make huge leaps in order to maintain their position. Backman and Veldkamp (1995) suggest “many leisure service customers were deciding to utilize leisure service providers who serve while discontinuing involvement with those who merely supply”.

According to Clemmer (1992) money and time spent in acquisition and retention of customers is unbalanced. An investment of millions of dollars in marketing strategies to attract customers in the first place, is pointless, if you only invest a few thousand in trying to get them to return. Brown (1992) asserts that to guarantee

revenue, a return customer is one that you should cherish. It can cost almost six times more to acquire a new customer, than it would to retain them.

### **2.3 Entertainment Services**

The entertainment services section is used to describe why the entertainment services are of importance to society and how, in the marketplace these services are used.

The purpose of this section is to describe and show how the three service quality factors affect the management of entertainment services. The background of service quality was explored in an effort to better understand the historical perspective of the construct.

Jeffres & Dobos (1993) state that entertainment plays an important part in sustaining well-being, whether that to be personally or for society as a whole. Special event entertainments services are those that do not occur regularly scheduled but are of particular importance to the consumer. As such, special event entertainment services are perfect for investigation into an analysis of service quality design and delivery factors (people, product, and digital processes) (Dedeke, 2003; Lovelock & Yip, 1996).

A definition of special events can be those that are of a particularly special occasion, or, are constructed to reach defined targets (Beech & Chadwick, 2004).

Starting with approaches in total quality management (Deming, 1966), which highlighted touchable features of products or services, the attitude to quality has slowly come to be explained through a multi-faceted model used for understanding the theory behind service quality perception. The influential investigation concluded by Parasuraman et.al (1985) posited a view for framing and conveying service quality design and delivery factors. The methodology employed by the authors, for assessing the five underlying factors that describe service quality has become the standard in the arena. To express and articulate their five point model, the authors followed a two-step procedure:

(a) investigations into service quality were reviewed, and (b) they reported the

findings garnered through a thorough study into quality in four service sectors. Using this procedure, they identified five underlying factors: (a) tangibles, (b) reliability, (c) responsiveness, (d) assurance, and (e) empathy.

This model crafted by Parasuraman et al. (1985) outlined potential gaps between perceptions and actions of both management and customers, those that could result in customer dissatisfaction. Lauded by Brown and Bond (1995), the model was seen as one of the most valuable influences to services literature. Additional research in service quality now includes a vast arena of topics; including information systems and technology, tourism and Web design (e.g., Grover, Cheon, & Teng, 1996; Parasuraman, Zeithaml, & Malhotra, 2002; Pitt, Watson, & Kavan, 1995; Ritchie, 1991).

Nevertheless, the entertainment industry has not been subjected to the same level of treatment, rigorous or otherwise, as has been afforded to other sectors. In this section adds available literature regarding service quality assessment of special event entertainment services. Entertainment services perform a unique function in preserving personal and societal well-being, because they are specifically designed and delivered to enrich leisure and enjoyment experiences (Jeffres & Dobos, 1993), which relieve the hyperactive, work-stressed modern American social norm. Consequently, entertainment service quality research contributes to both the wealth and wellness of American society. Within this entrenched and expanding intersection of entertainment service demand and supply trends lies the particular form of entertainment services called special event entertainment services. Special events are a subsection of the more broad classification of entertainment services. Allen (2000) defines a special event as any event that is planned and staged in advance for an audience or for personal entertainment.

Special events are defined as events that mark special occasions or are designed to achieve particular objectives (Beech & Chadwick, 2004). Extending that definition into the expanded multimedia entertainment services market, special event



entertainment services are defined as planned entertainment services with high personal relevance that are not available in their entirety as regularly scheduled venue or performance content.

The definition of special event entertainment services embraces the *special event* aspect because the event is planned ahead of time and is neither a spontaneous nor a standardized entertainment offering. In addition, *special entertainment* is intrinsically a subjectively valued offering because it is characterized by high personal relevance or involvement. The subjective nature of special event entertainment services makes them highly malleable and widely applicable to individual situations. In one setting, a magic show planned for a birthday party could be a special event entertainment service. Yet, for a disinterested birthday client the event is specially planned but not actually special in terms of its personal relevance. Similarly, a DVD recording of the birthday party magic show could be a special event entertainment service for a Mother's Day or Christmas present, because it is planned and captures personally relevant special memories.

The characteristic that makes an entertainment service special is its preplanned personal relevance for the audience or customer. In the services marketing nomenclature, special event entertainment services have inherent simultaneity, or co-creation by provider and consumer, because the entertainment service is made special by customer preplanning and intrinsic involvement. Because special event entertainment services rely intimately on customer-perceived value, this service-offering category is ideal for researching service quality design and delivery factors (Bateson, 1979; Lovelock, 1981).

The impact of special event entertainment services has been evaluated in the literature. Gursoy et al. (2004) devised an instrument to identify what, if any, effect a given special event or entertainment service delivers to the individuals experiencing the event. The authors' results indicate that the model for perceptions

regarding entertainment services comprises four dimensions: (a) community cohesiveness, (b) economic benefits, (c) social incentives, and (d) social costs.

As a result, the entertainment business, more than most industries, serves personal and societal well-being (Jeffres & Dobos, 1993). Special event entertainment services emphasize the personal involvement and meaning of the customer. Therefore, the entertainment services arena represents a particularly good service category for the study of service quality design and delivery factors (Bateson, 1979; Lovelock, 1981).

## **2.4 Service Quality and Management Theories**

Management plays a crucial role in convincing of recreational service. Kraus and Curtis (1986) mention that even though noticeably influence on developing professional management methods has come from private industry, it would be wrong to assume that the only place management skills were required is in profit making organizations. What they believe is when more than two people work together; the process of management comes into play. They add that the key to successful performance in any organization is the efficient use of the available human and physical resources. The basic element of management is the dynamic and ever changing process by which both the activities and physical resources are set in motion, organized and coordinated towards successfully completing established goals and objectives.

Howard and Crompton (1984) state that "...in the absence of a unified theory of management... we were confronted with a diversity of management ideas ranging from the classical functional approach to the more contemporary behavioral and systems perspectives". As stated by Jamieson and Wolter (1999), management is a dynamic process and change is necessary. As a result, managers are required to create new ways to respond to economic trends and consumer demands.

### **The Scientific Management Movement**

Frederick W. Taylor was considered the Father of Scientific Management which dominated the era from the late 1890's through to 1920. The Scientific Management movement was very systemic in nature, where each job was broken down into

fundamental elements and a standard time required to complete each task was determined. It was believed that once standard times were established, it would be easier to calculate the optimum time required to finish an entire job in the most efficient manner (Howard & Crompton, 1980; Jamieson & Wolter, 1999; Galbraith, 2000).

This management style is most appropriate for manual labour functions or work situations where a great deal of routine or repetitive work is involved. An example of how this theory was applied could be found in the Parks Maintenance Division of the City of Los Angeles Parks and Recreation maintenance management program, which is based on motion time measurement. This department identified the tasks necessary to maintain a facility and the work units needed to complete the task in order to determine exactly how many of these work units were required at each facility. It was then determined how much time was required to complete each of these tasks and map them out on route sheets which were distributed to each employee. Examples of these jobs include mowing grass, planting flowers, repairing fences, playgrounds and other maintenance items (Kraus and Curtis, 1986).

This model of management which emphasises rules rather than people and competence over favouritism, has had the most impact on recreation and leisure services. For the most part, this is due to the fact that recreation and park service's form part of a larger public bureaucratic structure which already conforms to formal organizational philosophies.

Criticisms of the scientific management theory include the fact that it focuses on structural design, which adds to the neglect of the essential human component of motivation and employee satisfaction.

In an effort to make larger, more diverse recreation, many agencies tried to separate these two into separate recreation components. In addition, many of the recreation and leisure departments were further subdivided by function; for example aquatics, outdoor recreation, fitness, or by client groups; such as seniors, youth or adults, etc. One of the major drawbacks of this design is that employees begin to identify with the goals of their particular interest group as opposed to, and sometimes at the expense of, the organizational goals. They work less cooperatively with others who may be offering similar services.

### **2.4.1 The human relations movement**

Management's concern for the physical components of the production process carried over into the late 1920's. At that time, there was the understanding that eliminating physical impediments could improve efficiency. According to Howard and Crompton (1980), research at that time focussed on the effects of things like lighting, rest periods, room temperatures and wage incentives.

Kraus and Bates (1975) describe the movement as a way of making staff "...feel important, consulting them, recognizing their contributions". This was seen as critical to achieving higher levels of motivation and productivity. Rather than focusing on the physical and organizational requirements of the company, emphasis is placed on interpersonal processes, communications and understanding small group dynamics (O'Marrow & Carter, 1997).

Since recreation agencies are people focused, Howard and Crompton (1980) contend it is not surprising to find literature on recreation supervision emphasizing a human relationship orientation. "Recreation organizations were generally small, characterized by frequent, informal, face-to-face interactions between administrators and staff".

Overall, there was a paternalistic concern for employees' happiness and morale. In turn, this led to a number of company sponsored recreation and leisure opportunities being offered through the employer. Over the years, a large number of corporations have developed a variety of recreation services for their employees and families, often complete with facilities like golf courses, lake resorts, swimming pools and fitness facilities.

According to Howard and Crompton (1980), the most predominant criticism against the human relations movement was that it represented a cynical attempt to manipulate people. Management simply wanted the employee to fit the corporate image. It was a method for controlling human behavior.

### **Classical Management Theories**

The municipal recreation and park movement underwent its greatest period of growth during the late 1940's. At the same time, the classical theories were at their peak in popularity, and firmly established as the prevailing public administration organizational model (Kraus and Curtis, 1986; O'Marrow & Carter, 1997). The

traditional approaches to conceptualizing the administrative process, referred to as the Classical Management Theories, come from men like Frederick Taylor, Max Weber, Luther Gulick and Henry Fayol. It was felt that there was a lack of harmony between management and workers which resulted in a poor and inefficient workforce.

Some of the characteristics of the classical bureaucratic model were identified by the hierarchal structure, division of labour, unity of command, limited control and departmentalization principles. As pointed out by Howard and Crompton (1980), there was a need to bring more administrative rationality and efficiency into the business sector, especially during the chaotic days of the depression. Traditionally, we were used to seeing recreation and park agencies characterized by rigid organizational structures, with management and employee roles and responsibilities well defined. Some advantages to this type of organizational structure were said to be that people work better when there is no confusion over what is expected of them. Formalizing employee roles and interactions within the work setting tends to reduce confusion and foster certainty and predictability. Well defined rules or goals and objectives by the organization can contribute to the organization's overall efficiency. However, it was also viewed as a very rigid way to manage with little regard for the human side of employees (Howard & Crompton, 1980; O'Marrow & Carter, 1997).

#### **2.4.2 Service quality: an organizational commitment**

The majority of the service quality research focuses on only the customers' perceptions of the service quality received from the service organization. That is, they tend to focus on the customers' evaluation of the outcomes of service. While this is important, there is also a requirement to understand the factors internal to the organization which may influence the service delivery (Baker, 1993; Bright, 1994).

Research indicates that an important aspect to the provision of quality services may be management's and front line employees' understanding of their customers' service expectations (Parasuraman, et al., 1992; Bitner, Booms & Tetreault, 1990; Solomon & Surprenant, 1985; Bateson, 1985). An organization's service environment (climate), as perceived by the customer, is the result of interactions among management, front line employees, and customers (Schneider, 1990; Gronroos, 1983).

Tansik (1990) indicated that front line employees who have high contact with the

customer are involved in a three way interaction between customers, front line employees and the service delivery process. Therefore, the service encounter may involve several dyadic relationships or the relationships may involve other participants. This implies there is a need to address the relationships between management, employees and their customers. Thus, this triadic service encounter suggests that the perceptions of management and front line employees have of their organization may influence their understanding of their customers' service quality expectations.

According to Crosby (1979), there were four pillars for which a successful quality service oriented organization rests.

The first is management participation. Crosby (1979) uses the word participation instead of support because it has to be an involvement rather than a direction at this level of the organization. Management provides the example therefore..."causing management at all levels to have the right attitude about quality, and the right understanding is not just vital - it is everything".

Brown (1992) feels service standards which were created independently by senior management and put on employees' desks no longer meet the needs of the modern work place. He describes this type of management as counter productive. Employees become annoyed and feel that past work was unsatisfactory. Therefore, any service program must involve individuals from every level of the organization. Brown (1992) states without question, standards have a place in today's work place, but they must be thought of as tools rather than an end in themselves.

The second pillar discussed by Crosby (1979) is professional quality management. A support system within and between organizations committed to defining programs required to support the internal clients.

Original programs were the third pillar and were described as an improvement program or the quality standards. They must be created by representatives from all levels of the organization and followed by all employees at every level.

The final pillar is recognition. Crosby (1979) describes it as a vital component of any quality program, but one that is often overlooked or conducted improperly. The

more successful recognition programs were those whose winners were nominated by their peers. Once again emphasising involvement at every level of the organization.

### **2.4.3 Service quality and organizational impact**

According to Berelson & Steiner (1964) perceptions may be characterized by a "complex process by which individuals select, organize, and interpret sensory stimulation into a meaningful and coherent picture of the world". In other words, perceptions are one's own view of the world. Davis (1977) clarified the point.

*"I act on the basis of my perception of myself and the world in which I live. I react not to an objective world, but to a world seen from my own beliefs and values".*

Campbell (1967) has suggested that the various specific relationships in which an individual finds himself are among the most pertinent factors that influence his social attitude.

In managing in the service economy, Heskett (1986) outlines those functions that successful managers in the service industry know and do. He calls this the strategic service vision, a logical organized plan for implementing new business and ideas in the changing environment of the service industry. This changing service economy can be described as, manned mostly by "white-collar" workers, being labor intensive, dealing with consumers, and nearly all producing intangible products. Service providers who know when personal contact is important are able to concentrate this contact at critical moments in the service delivery process.

Heskett's strategic service vision is a proposal of four ideas for service managers for developing and maintaining a competitive advantage. By targeting a market segment, conceptualizing how service will be perceived by consumers, focusing on operating strategy, and designing an efficient service delivery system, management will be rewarded handsomely. The most successful service firms distinguish themselves from their competitors in order to achieve a distinctive position. This produces either improved service, reduced cost, or both.

A better understanding of the qualitative side of hospitality service will aid management in its delivery of higher service quality. A distinction must be made between "service" and "hospitality". Service is the systematic approach to assuring customer satisfaction and encompasses all policies and procedures established by the organization to meet guest expectation. Hospitality on the other hand is the interpersonal (*human*) act of caring for the guest so as to meet or preferably exceed

the guest's expectations.

Unfortunately, many hospitality organizations find it difficult to provide service because they do not know what guest benefits drive their users, what specific behavior they need from their team, and how to monitor and measure customer satisfaction (Smith & Umbreit, 1991).

To date, the important relationship between quality of service, customer fulfilment, and buying behavior is relatively unfamiliar. This fact does not excuse service providers from knowing how best to assess quality of service, what areas of an individual service best defines its worth, and whether consumers actually purchase from firms that have the highest levels of perceived service quality or from those with which they are most "*satisfied*" (Cronin & Taylor, 1992).

The finger has been pointed at management's inability to let go of the old "*die-hard*" notions and traditional industrial cultures that just don't work anymore in the service sector (Shames & Glover, 1989). In order to deliver service, the cultures of the service providers, consumers, operating unit, and community must all be considered. While the service industry continues to grow, such problems as widespread consumer dissatisfaction with service, increased complexity of service jobs, and labor shortages (especially in the labor intensive hospitality industry) will manifest themselves and continue to make a significant contribution to the increasing number of problems faced by the hospitality industry (Barrington & Olson, 1988).

In order to work toward a possible first step in addressing how quality of service is measured in the hospitality industry, especially in light of the increasing problems facing the service industry in general, this research has hypothesized that from management's perception, no difference exists in the level of quality of service, but rather in the delivery of the service (Lewis, 1987).

#### **2.4.4 Culture and service quality**

As companies become global marketers, across-different-culture investigations have more relevance. Businesses must analyse and adopt an appropriate marketing mix.

Increased global sectors have raised the bar for all types of competitiveness within the marketing arena. Global competition require service quality and quality products constructed to match consumer necessity. Many researchers have discussed and addressed the problems related to across-different-cultures. Cross-cultural comparisons are further complicated by cultural differences.



Moreover, marketers should acquire specific schooling in, values, social issues and political institutions of the host country. The best recommendation for cross-cultural studies is understanding cultural differences, especially for Asian markets which are very different from USA and European markets as shown in the following research: Kasemson (1995) studied the relationships between US and Thai consumers in their perceptions of product attributes, lifestyles and their willingness to purchase foreign consumer electrical appliances (FCEA).

Malika (1996) studied the impact of culture on the overseas operations of US multinationals in the United Kingdom and in Thailand (foreign direct investment). She found that managers of US multinationals had perceived important cultural differences which affected the way they had to conduct business in the United States, Thailand and the United Kingdom. She also perceived greater differences between the U.S. and Thai cultures than between the U.S. and the United Kingdom cultures.

As service firms achieve greater prominence in international business (U.S. Congress 1986; Cateora 1990), researchers are beginning to ask how service and service quality of the firm affect entry into foreign markets. (Carman and Langeard 1980; Cowell 1983; Sharma and Johanson 1987; Erramilli 1990). However, the international marketing literature presents few concrete answers to these questions.

Service firms face different obstacles from merchandising product firms when expanding cross culturally. Reardon, et al. (1996) examined the challenges and responses of various service firms that have expanded internationally. Their findings indicate that the most cited problem, the service quality problem, is closely followed by marketing related problems and cultural differences.

Simpson (1995) researched the airline service quality expectations and perceptions between Europe and the United States. The study focused on gap 5 of the service quality model (Parasuraman, et al., 1990) and compared the five dimensions of SERVQUAL survey instrument (reliability, assurance, tangibles, empathy, and responsiveness). The survey examined the different expectations and perceptions based on passenger nationality or airline origin. The SERVQUAL survey instrument has been replicated domestically in many service industries; this research has investigated the applicability of a portion of the service quality focused on gap 5 in a service industry in an international environment. Research has also investigated whether or not U. S. airlines were positioned to implement service quality-based

strategies across different cultural markets, based on passenger expectations and perceptions of existing service of indigenous and foreign airlines. The researcher found that (1) the study of the international airline industry confirmed the usefulness of the SERVQUAL model (2) significant differences were found for Tangibles and Reliability by European and U.S. Passengers (3) expectations of U.S. passengers were statistically higher than for European passengers on international airlines and, from this finding, the researcher concluded that perceptions and expectations were affected to some degree by culture bias or nationality (4) U.S. and European airlines were unable to meet the expectations of passengers (5) there were significant differences in terms of perceptions of service quality delivered between European and U.S. passengers. It was found that European airlines had a higher service quality than U.S. airlines.

#### **2.4.5 Behaviorism and organizational humanism**

During the later years of the 1950's and the early 1960's, a management style of new perspectives began to challenge the classical theories. Management researchers began to question the rigidity and began focusing on organizational flexibility and humanism. However, unlike the human relations who focused exclusively on people and neglected structure, the new theorists integrated both the human and structural aspects of management.

These management theories which followed the scientific and classical theories became more people oriented. Rigid organizational structures were being questioned, while flexibility and human relations were being addressed. It was thought that there should be a balance between the formal requirements of the organization and the informal characteristics of the employees. It was also believed that people were more likely to strive for success and be more productive if they worked in an environment which was nurturing and supportive (Howard & Crompton, 1980; Jamieson & Wolter, 1999; Zaleznik, 1992).

Behaviorism and organizational humanism took into account the significant contribution supervisors had on the organization's behavior and the influence which quality supervision had on how well the working group responded. Improved employee morale and productivity were associated with management roles characterized by genuine concern for the work conditions of the employees. According to Wren (1972) the combination of supervision, morale and productivity

became the cornerstone of the human relations movement. The human relations movement held an essentially positive view of people, suggesting that people tend to strive to fulfill their potentialities when their working environment is considered to be supportive.

The human relations model stimulated the organizational design which sought to reduce rigid organizational policy. This allowed employees to express what was assumed to be a natural urge to satisfy personal need within the work place. This replaced the scientific theory's primary focus on organizational structure and authority relationships. To attain the goal of higher self-fulfilment and need satisfaction, organizational humanists advocated for a democratic, participative approach to management.

Employees of less importance within a structure, who aid in the process of making decisions, feel worthwhile and thus increase their commitment to the targets of a company and also benefit greatly from job satisfaction.

Service quality versus manufacturing quality the methods of management from the scientific to the classical theorists have proven to be more than useful in the past. The advantage to their methods is that they were simple to understand, and easy to teach. But these methodologies came from another time, when manufacturing was the cornerstone of our economy (Brown, 1992). According to Clemmer (1992), the world of management is in the midst of a revolution.

Executives and academics alike are re-constructing management practices for a rapidly changing world. Until now, we have had little reason to question our management theories because we have been world leaders in productivity. Clemmer states that growth, expansion and success can hide a number of serious problems. "Unhappy employees can be bought off with higher wages or replaced; poor quality products can be repaired or replaced; customers can be bought with expensive sales and marketing efforts or replaced. In a world of plenty, there is always more where that came from". Quality management has been around for some time in manufacturing. According to Godfrey and Kammerer (1993) product specifications and requirements, inspections to these written specifications and systems of rewards and punishments go back a thousand years. They state that since the 1950's, manufacturers have been required to develop quality management approaches that continuously eliminate waste, improve customer satisfaction and involve every member of the organization in the decisions to improve processes. Godfrey and

Kammerer (1993) feel that the lessons learned by these manufacturing companies offer guidelines for quality management, especially those in service companies.

Berry and Parasuraman (1991) explain that although both service and product marketing begin with a yearning for classification and functions of product design, in general, products were produced before being sold and services were sold before generally being produced. Quality control principles and practices, entirely relevant to evaluation and guaranteeing quality, were ineffectual in understanding quality of service. Services are intangible because they were performances and expectations rather than objects. Berry and Parasuraman (1991) believe that the consumer has to experience an imperceptible service to totally comprehend it. A consumers understanding of risk is often high, as before purchase, they can't be tasted smelled or even touched. (O'Sullivan & Spangler, 1998).

Zeithaml, Parasuraman and Berry (1992) state that the conditions which are used by consumers in their evaluation of services are often multifarious and puzzling to recognize. In addition, services can be incredibly diverse in their performance and can fluctuate wildly from source to source. It can also be terribly difficult to separate production and consumption within said services. It is quite usual for quality of service to become apparent at the delivery stage. More often than not, as the supplier and consumer interact. However, whereas a supplier of goods would normally have a warehouse acting as a kind of link between the two, service providers do not have such a luxury.

Zeithaml et al. (1992) list the following characteristics which help differentiate a service from a manufactured good: intangibility, inseparability of production and consumption, heterogeneity, and perishability.

1. Intangibility – in the way goods can be seen felt or tasted, services are different. They act as performances.
2. Inseparability of production and consumption - which characterizes most services. The customer is frequently present during the production; there is high interaction.
3. Heterogeneity - there are high potential variables in service performance; it is difficult to standardize service because it is performed, usually by humans.
4. Perishability - services cannot be saved; it is difficult to synchronize supply and demand.

This chapter concentrates on an evaluation of the literature dealing with, service quality, and service quality measurement within the service industry. Special

emphasis is placed on management's perception of service quality. The definition and objectives of service delivery are reviewed along with organizational structure and management impact.

#### **2.4.6 SERVQUAL and demography**

Demographic factors include: age, ethnicity, gender, income, marital status, educational level, employment category, and so on. Some researchers found that demographic characteristics were of particular importance for the “Gap 5” analysis of service quality, Gagliano and Hathcote (1994) studied customer expectations and perceptions of service quality in retail apparel specialty stores by using the SERVQUAL scale. They measured the difference among demographic characteristics. The researchers analyzed the gap factor in the analysis of variance (ANOVA) and found 0.01 level of significant differences of race, marital status, and income; but year and sex proved insignificant at the 0.10 level. Webster (1989) studied expectations of professional service by collecting data from doctor and lawyer services, and nonprofessional services and from other services.

He used the SERVQUAL survey instrument and found that when related to population, characteristics such as year, sex, social group classification as well as income were important for the expectation of service quality when the customers determined to select a particular scale, especially for the nonprofessional services.

Richard and Allaway (1993) studied “Gap 5” by focusing on the home-delivery pizza market. From their research, they got five factors and each factor was matched with the dimensional pattern found in the original study of Parasuraman and his coauthors. Gagliano and Hathcote (1994) measured the difference among demographic characteristic in analysis presumed quality of service ideals. Factor analysis was conducted by using principal axis factor analysis and this was followed by the use of oblique rotation. The researchers reanalyzed using a four dimensional-factor analysis:

Personal attention, Reliability, Tangible, and Convenience. Each factor had greater eigenvalues.

Carman (1990) used the same analysis techniques as were investigated as per the system laid out by Parasuraman (1988). The researcher found the number of factors that were quite similar to Parasuraman, et al. He also demonstrated the construct validity problems and suggested that SERVQUAL scales should add more items.

Le'vy (1997) studied organizational determinants of customer satisfaction in the service sector by using factor analysis followed by orthogonal rotation and identified seven factors from his research.

## **2.5 Service Quality Model (SERVQUAL)**

SERVQUAL MODEL, introduced in 1985 in the USA by Parasuraman, the SERVQUAL template came into being. It allowed identification and cause of differentiation among a consumers presupposition and belief. At first, ten factors were assessed in analysing quality of service. Consumer reaction, capability, means of entry, consideration, communication, how reliable it is, how credible, how secure, knowledge of the consumer, plus perceptibility. Where a calculation is made to assess the difference between the expectation of a consumer and his or her experience. This tool has now turned out to be the standard by which one can ascertain the degree to which a consumer is fulfilled. Parasuraman, Zeitham and Berry (1988) have posited that one must know precisely the expectations of an individual, and accordingly lay foundations for standards of excellence, give strength to workers to ensure quality of service is delivered, and safeguard against failing to deliver when the business has guaranteed it.

A more intelligible variety, named RATER, was offered in the early nineties (1992) by Zeitham and his collaborators. It is easy enough in its application to monitor an individual's experience of service excellence and is now broadly used by organisations within the service delivery sector. RATER is effective at connecting distances in assumed and recognised service. It attributes five characteristics of quality of service. How reliable is the service, what assurances have been given, substantiations, ability to understand, and response. (The RATER Model – Service Quality Dimensions, 2010). These degrees support twenty two lines of enquiry inside the SERVQUAL assessment device. Its directive is to examine fundamental strands of company ability, competency and resource within a business. Nyeck, Morales, Ladhari, Pons, (2002) investigators proficiency in assessing various industries of service, including the financial and medical sectors, banking and sectors within education remain the ideal advantage of the template.

It should be noted that this model garners more success, if utilised with other quality of service models (Parasuraman).

Knowledge of a consumers needs is crucial. One can see clearly the way in which a consumer assesses excellence of provision of service and final product. As a business gathers information relative to a consumers needs, satisfaction of these needs is therefore easier to fulfill. The ability to comprehend a consumers degree of fulfilment, will aid no end towards enabling a business' strategy for future endeavours. (Hayes, 2008), consumers needs are constantly changing and in fact have grown substantially in recent years (Pizam & Ellis, 1999). A common conception is that the task of selling a service remains far easier to an existing consumer, than trying to sell the same service to a consumer that is unfamiliar. Of course, a fulfilled consumer, even a satisfied one, is pretty much guaranteed to repeat purchase. They will also more often than not, relay their positive experiences to their contemporaries. It has been claimed by Simon and Homburg (1998) that a consumer directly correlates to profitability within a business. Such an individual has the overarching power to choose to buy or not. Garnering positive and importantly, trustworthy feedback, is vital for a business, as it could be in a much stronger position to build foundations of lasting association (Raab, Alhami, Gargeya, 2008).

However, an individual's fulfilment can be problematic to assess, as quite often a consumer tends to be disingenuous when completing consumer questionnaires. Additionally, a fulfilled individual tends not to approach a business to share their feelings.

A consumer will often relay incidences of a favourable nature; however, unfavorable occurrences are related equally, leading to negative views of a company's reputability. Seriousness of attaining loyalty among consumers is clear.. Satisfied consumers nurture a company's image positively, through recommendations to contemporaries and family. Marketing these individuals becomes less important as the consumer takes it upon themselves to market the business, albeit unwittingly. (Leadership factor Ltd., 2010). A contented individual is buying four times more now, than previously (Crandall, 2010).

The idea instigated by Parasuraman et al. (1985) is dense and multifarious. That has

led to difficulties in its use and application. The SERVQUAL model was presented and initiated by Parasuraman, and has over the years, since been made valid.

Buttle's (1996) work on the merits of the survey based model, is considered the most influential. A review of a vast amount of literature on the topic of service quality indicates that the SERVQUAL instrument has never been used to assess service providers' expectations and perceptions about whether the services meet the satisfactions of their customers. Therefore, the researcher in this study utilized the SERVQUAL instrument to analyze the effective management of special event Tourism industry.

This short review of relevant literature covered the milieu of tourism, service quality models, and their application in a variety of arenas.

Substantial omissions were discovered in the literature with respect to two areas. Firstly, simultaneously applying the SERVQUAL methodology to both service providers and their customers was lacking. Plus, there were omissions in the literature when applying the SERVQUAL methodology to tourism industry.

The measurable SERVQUAL instrument was used to understand to a greater degree, the impact of service quality on both special event entertainment service providers and customers. The supply and demand of entertainment services was measured by surveying executives of nine popular metropolitan Detroit entertainment service providers as well as many of their customers. An offline survey of responses by the executives was used. The service provider SERVQUAL surveys were returned to the researcher by mail, by fax, and sometimes in person. Customers were encouraged to respond to the customer SERVQUAL survey on a Web site, by e-mail.

Management and customer expectations and perceptions of the five dimensions of service quality were compared as a way to improve the design and delivery of special event entertainment services.

Finally, because research was restricted to one particular area, with only nine executives representing the provider (supply) side of the research, it may not be representative of executives in other areas.



Traditionally, the five dimensions of service quality have not been managed by entertainment services with any particular consideration (Woodside et al., 1989). It is also common for service providers to implement entertainment services that do not meet with customers' service delivery expectations.

Conceptions of service quality were simplistic and intuitive until the growth of business research. In time, researchers realized the need for a conceptual framework to guide both theory and measurement in the study of service quality. Historically, several methods have been utilized to measure service satisfaction (Bolton & Lemon, 1999; Jones, Mothersbaugh, & Beatty, 2002; Zeithaml, Berry, & Parasuraman, 1993).

One of the most influential models was developed in the mid-1980s by Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry (1985, 1988) and by Zeithaml (1991). This approach conceived of service quality as the interaction of a number of perceptions and actions on the part of both management and customer, and defined seven potential gaps that could result in consumer dissatisfaction. Brown and Bond (1995) observed, "The gap model is one of the best received and most heuristically valuable contributions to the services literature".

Parasuraman et al. (1988) developed a model known as SERVQUAL. The SERVQUAL instrument comprises 22 Likert-scaled statements that are interval measurement ratings coded from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*).

According to Shahin (2004), the SERVQUAL instrument has dominated the methodology used to measure customers' perceptions of service quality. The instrument is adaptable to a wide variety of service encounters, including entertainment services (Shahin, 2004). Given the construct validity of the three-factor services design-and delivery system (Dedeke, 2003; Lovelock & Yip, 1996), the SERVQUAL methodology provides a reliable instrument for measuring the importance of the design and delivery factors as well as the five dimensions of service quality (tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy) for entertainment services. Moreover, this extension of service quality and satisfaction measurement to better understand the design and delivery of entertainment services (Johnson, Tsiros, & Lancioni, 1995) is both timely and seminal.

Special event entertainment services, largely based on people-processing and customer-to-staff interaction, have been effectively examined for service quality and satisfaction, using the SERVQUAL instrument (Sit & Merrilees, 2005; Sit, Merrilees, & Birch, 2003). For example, live musical performances have provided entertainment service since the time of the classical Greek civilization. Entertainment performances have been the objects of SERVQUAL analysis, which found that perceptions of musical performers were a dominant factor (Minor, Wagner, Brewerton, & Hausman, 2004).

However, entertainment equipment such as musical instruments and audiovisual systems also are important.

Another traditionally live entertainment venue that has increasingly adopted both electronic devices and digital content variations is hospitality and tourism entertainment (Minor et al., 2004). The SERVQUAL measures of hotel and resort-based forms of entertainment have proven especially effective for managing the profitable design-and-delivery satisfaction of services (Kandampully, Mok, & Sparks, 2001).

In the rapidly diffusing area of internet entertainment and web site content, a series of SERVQUAL studies have been conducted to extend service quality and satisfaction research from traditional to digital entertainment content (Van Iwaarden et al., 2003; Van Iwaarden & Van Der Wiele, 2003). These new media entertainment applications of SERVQUAL also include analyses of service satisfaction in the recent arena of mobile commerce and entertainment downloads or podcasts (Kar, Eldin, & Wang, 2004). However, it appears that the SERVQUAL instrument has never been used to assess service providers' perceptions of whether their services meet the demands of their customers.

Mueller and Bedwell (1993) state that in a service business, the product is quality. They further point out that "Quality is not an act... it is a habit. Quality doesn't just happen. You can't buy it. And no amount of advertising can turn it into an eagle". They also state that quality should not be confused with luxury. Not every customer is willing to pay for luxury, but everyone will pay for quality, whether flying first class or riding on a bargain ticket in the back of a plane. Luxury is great, but no

amount of champagne and caviar will compensate for rude employees, long lines or lost baggage. They emphasize that quality is vastly changeable for individuals at varying times, but from the customer's point of view, quality happens or doesn't happen. There is no in between.

MacKay and Crompton (1988) admit that the provision of consistently high quality recreation and leisure services is a major challenge. In order to maintain or improve service quality, the agency must first identify quality based on the individuals it serves. However, as mentioned earlier, service quality is more difficult for customers to evaluate than goods quality. Therefore the criteria customers use to evaluate service quality may be more difficult for the service provider to comprehend. Zeithmal, Parasuraman and Berry (1992) elaborate by identifying three distinctive features. The varying degrees of features like intangibility, heterogeneity and inseparability of production and consumption which were in every service.

Services were both performed and experienced, and although most services were accompanied by tangibles (like facilities, instructors, equipment) what is actually being purchased is the experience. Intangibility can make it difficult for agencies to understand how their clients evaluate their services and must exercise the control necessary to offer uniform quality service delivery. The quality of service is largely dependent upon the interaction between staff and clients. Because the interaction between individuals is likely to change daily, heterogeneity has the potential to vary daily. Finally, the inseparability of production and consumption draws reference to the way recreation services were often provided and experienced at the same time. The presence of both the provider and consumer is often required during the delivery process (MacKay & Crompton, 1988). According to Zeithaml (1981) performance and overall quality can be affected by a customer's mood and co-operation, as the consumer often participates in production of recreation service.

Time and again, service quality is identified as services which meet or exceed the customers' expectations of the service. According to Clemmer (1992) in order to define service quality in organization, it must look to the customer of the organization serves. "The customers' perceptions of the value they were receiving must become the common yardstick against which all activities throughout your

entire organization were measured". Defining service quality through the eyes of customer is a fundamental starting point to improving service quality.

Zeithaml, Parasuraman and Berry (1992) identify several factors which may influence a customer's expectation of a service. First is word of mouth, what customers hear from other customers. If a participant was involved with a successful program or event and tells a friend, that friend will assume that same program will deliver at a similar level. Second, participant expectations vary based on individual characteristics and circumstances. This suggests that personal needs may influence their expectations to a certain degree. For example, participant number one may register for a fitness class for the cardiovascular benefits, while participant number two registers for the social benefits of being involved in a group activity. If the instructor is slow to get classes started because she enjoys chatting with the participants, participant number one will be more disappointed in the program than will participant number two. Third, past experiences play a key role in influencing a customer's expectations. If a customer has been involved with a program in the past and found it to be satisfactory, he/she will expect the same when he/she returns.

Rice (1990) in her article on how to deal with difficult customers, indicated how fast customer expectations can change. She said in the spring of 1990, Americans ranked the following quality components in this order; reliability, durability, easy maintenance, ease of use, a known or trusted brand name, and finally low price. That changed from five years earlier when customers thought a well-known brand name indicated quality, followed by workmanship and then price.

Oliver (1980) defines fulfillment as a function of an initial standard and some perceived discrepancy from an initial reference point. He sums it up by stating that post purchase satisfaction is a cognitive comparison between anticipated satisfaction and received satisfaction. According to Oliver (1980), satisfaction experiences influence future purchase intentions as well as post purchase attitudes.

Zeithaml, Parasuraman and Berry (1992) conducted a focus group study to identify the criteria used by customers in judging service quality. They identified five criteria: (1) Tangibles which include facilities, equipment, staff and promotions; (2) Reliability which is the ability to perform the promised service dependably and

accurately; (3) Responsiveness defined by the willingness to help customers and provide prompt service; (4) Assurance which is the courtesy, politeness, respect, consideration and friendliness of frontline staff and finally; (5) Empathy which is described as understanding the customer or making the effort to know customers and their needs.

They also indicated that these dimensions could be generalized across a wide range of services and were not necessarily independent of one another. Though the specific evaluative criteria may vary from service to service, the general dimensions underlying those criteria were covered by these five descriptors.

According to the number of studies conducted by Zeithaml, Parasuraman and Berry (1992) using the SERVQUAL research instrument, reliability has consistently been described as the most important dimension of service quality by customers. The fact that scored the least was tangibles. It is felt however, that tangibles may play a greater role in attracting potential customers.

During the early days of investigation, excellence could be theorized on palpable products (Lee & Hing, 1995). Although, many products centered around tourism & recreation are services of an unquantifiable nature. Bitner and Hubbert (1994) saw that an explanation of quality of service as being “the consumer’s overall impression of the relative inferiority/superiority of the organization and its services.” Crompton and Love (1995) took the view that service quality is a “quality of opportunity” in the area of tourism, as those individuals that provided a service within recreation had the ability to manipulate such service criteria. Because the service attributes are the output of a service provider, the quality of service performances is evaluated by tourists’ perceptions on the performance of the provider. Therefore, standards are clearly explained in terms of “excellence in performance.”

Crompton and MacKay (1989) have analysed importance of quality of service of recreational programs. They listed the programs under four varying kinds, based on high/low facility and staff intensives. It discovered crucial factors relevant to high quality outcome were the tangible elements such as the atmosphere of the facility and equipment in a low staff/high facility intensive activity. Conversely, in a high staff/low facility intensive activity, the tangibles were not necessarily important in

reaching opinions of high quality; in this climate, service providers' ability to perform their promised service accurately and dependably was an important service quality dimension.

In Hamilton, Crompton, and More's (1991) study, the researchers noted that parks are known for their inherent characteristics of being diverse and heterogeneous. Each park has a different atmosphere and setting with their own conditions such as location, natural resources, and visitors. Therefore, it is vital to begin a service quality investigation on the particular park that the respondents used. Lee (2005) also adopted this point in her festival study to discover that both festival and park visitation are abstract ideas, which could have been interpreted differently, and both are heterogeneous. In the event study, like parks and festivals, due to its heterogeneity and varied interpretations, it is also necessary to conduct a service quality study on a specific event rather than testing a standardized concept.

The revolutionary study of quality of service was instigated by Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry (1985, 1988) and it is their belief that service quality generally amounts to a customer's perceived quality. This is expressed as a consumer's opinion or outlook relevant to the whole package of a product or services excellence (Berry et al., 1988; Parasuraman et al., 1988; Zeithaml, 1988). But, Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry (1998) discovered that quality of service is immeasurably hard for one to classify due to vagaries of intangibility and construction. Because of the unquantifiable nature of quality of service, assessing it proves to be trickier than analysing excellence in other sectors (Zeithaml et al. 1990). Attempting to put this model into practice, Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry (1988) initialised a scale (SERVQUAL) by fostering a disconfirmation lattice:

$$Q \text{ (Perceived Quality)} = P \text{ (Perception of Service received)} - E \text{ (Visitors' expectations)}.$$

The idea posits, a consumer's idea of a service being given, far outweighs any expectation on their part and in fact the understanding as to the quality of the service goes up. As mentioned earlier, the SERVQUAL scale includes five dimensions of service quality, including: Tangibles, Reliability, Responsiveness, Assurance, and Empathy.

Although the SERVQUAL scale has been tested in many studies and industries (Brown et al., 1993), there have been condemnations mainly because of its "limited

applicability, inferior predictive validity, and the psychometric problems in using difference scores” (Baker & Crompton, 2000). A different approach to the SERVQUAL scale was created by Cronin and Taylor (1992), a performance based method - (SERVPERF). They doubted the SERVQUAL scale since it uses a gap model (measuring the difference between perceptions and expectations). They posited that measuring perception of the service performed itself would lead to far greater understandings of service quality. From recreation and tourism, to the fields of marketing, many investigators described comparable answers as a result of their empirical research: performance-based measures have higher predictive validity than measuring the discrepancy (Boulding et al., 1993; Childress & Crompton, 1997; Crompton & Love, 1995; Cronin & Taylor, 1992; Fick & Ritchie, 1991). A vast amount of printed literature regarding quality of service has substantiated the weight given to this construct. As an example, Baker and Crompton (2000) investigated, that when initialised amidst a celebration scenario, it was discovered that a remarkable quantity of excellence towards visitor fulfillment and behavioral intentions were noticed. Consequently, it was deduced that “enhanced performance quality leads to stronger positive behavioral intention” which backs the theoretical viewpoint. The investigation was seen as one of the pioneering studies to gauge connections between quality of performance and fulfillment in the tourism sector. Moreover, results found, that between estimations of fulfillment and foreseeable motive, quality was seen as the greatest gauge of fulfillment; second was participation, and third motivation (Lee and Beeler , 2009).

Cronin and Taylor (1992) reexamined SERVQUAL methodology for measuring service quality. The authors investigated the conceptualization and measurement of service quality and the relationships between service quality, consumer satisfaction, and purchase intentions. The authors' literature review suggested that the operationalization of service quality does not clearly demonstrate satisfaction and attitude. Further evidence of support for SERVQUAL has come from researchers other than the creators of the instrument. Swan, McCleary, and Asubonteng (1996) reviewed relevant literature and experimentation and concluded that the research on the SERVQUAL instrument was more than sufficient to convince them of its validity.

In summary, this section describes the development of conceptions of service

quality. A major advance occurred with the development of the model of service quality gaps, which conceives of service quality as the interaction of a number of perceptions and actions on the part of both provider and customer and that defines gaps that can lead to consumer dissatisfaction on five dimensions. This model has been expressed and measured by utilizing the SERVQUAL instrument. However, the complete model of service quality gaps is extremely complex; therefore, the present study utilized a simplified model, which for the first time applies this type of model to both the service provider and the customer perceptions of service quality.

### **2.5.1 The basic element of SERVQUAL**

The SERVQUAL instrument is a questionnaire which consists of two sections:

(1) An expectations section containing 22 statements to measure customers expectations service quality.

(2) A perceptions section containing a matching set of 22 statements to measure customers perceive service quality. Both sections are developed along ten quality dimensions in providing superior service quality. The key to delivering high-quality service is to balance customers' expectations and perceptions.

The basic element of SERVQUAL is an instrument for measuring service quality which builds on the conceptual definition of service quality and the ten evaluative dimensions (Parasuraman, et al, 1990a)

1. Tangible: Appearance of physical facilities, equipment, personnel, and communication.
2. Reliability: Ability to perform the promised service dependably and accurately.
3. Responsiveness: Willingness to help customers and provide prompt service.
4. Competence: Possession of the required skills and knowledge to perform the service.
5. Courtesy: Politeness, respect, consideration, and friendliness of contact personnel.
6. Credibility: Trustworthiness, believability, honesty of the service provider.
7. Security: Freedom from danger, risk, or doubt.
8. Access: Approachability and ease of contact.
9. Communication: Keeping customers informed in language they can understand and listening to them.
10. Understanding the Customer: Making the effort to know customers and their needs.



## Development of SERVQUAL

The SERVQUAL statements (in both the expectations and perceptions sections) are mapped from ten quality dimensions into the five dimensions in the following way, where the statement number correspond to the expectation and perception statements in the questionnaires.

Understanding successfully the degree to which excellence in service has been given, one must use SERVQUAL and compute the variation of grading consumers give to paired expectation/perception statements (Parasuraman, et al, 1990a). Major issues were identified in the design of the SERVQUAL instrument which are challenged in replication studies: reliability, face validity, discriminated validity, convergent validity, concurrent validity, and the usefulness of the expectation scores. The designers also concluded that replication studies provide support for the SERVQUAL's face validity. This refers to the extent to which the scale items are meaningful and appear to represent the construct being measured (Parasuraman, et al., 1991b).

### **2.5.2 Service quality factors**

Reeves and Bednar (1994) searched for a universal definition of quality and concluded that such a global definition does not exist. According to Reeves and Bednar, a definition of quality that emphasizes conformance to requirements is often relied upon and is relatively straightforward and easy because the process is readily translatable into operational criteria. However, a serious weakness is that the specific primary focus of the process is internal; it assumes that meeting specifications for a particular job (in this case, the provision of a service) guarantees high quality (Bristol City Council, 2005). The scenario described above is problematic because it assumes that what is specified is what the customer needs or wants. This idea has stimulated a variety of definitions of quality that emphasize customer satisfaction for example, "delighting the customer by fully meeting their needs and expectations".

Interest in quality originated with tangible quality dimensions associated with goods and production processes. Recently, the study of service quality, which is a composite of supply and demand factors attributed to intangible services, has become popular (Parasuraman et al., 1988). The Total Quality Management research stream best epitomizes the importance of quality to the value of products and services. Total Quality Management was pioneered by Feigenbaum (1951) and

Deming (1966) and was popularized by Crosby (1992). These older works are included in this literature review due to their impact on the arena. More recent works that describe the innovations in Total Quality Management include Evans and Lindsay (2002) ; Samson and Terziovski (1999).

The importance of service quality to American society is routinely captured by a variety of consumer sentiment indexes and broader measures of social well-being (Zagorski & McDonnell, 1995). Service quality resonates socially as a quality-of-life gauge (Lee & Sirgy, 2004) because the intangible and often intrinsic nature of services (Bebko, 2000; Wakearena & Blodgett, 1999) connotes a collective feeling (Johnson, 2000).

The relationship between service providers and customers also has been explored in the literature. The seminal work in this arena was by Solomon, Surprenant, Czepiel, and Gutman (1985). These authors suggested that interaction between service providers and consumers is crucial, if there is to be fulfilment with the service on a global level. Therefore, service quality is an important facet to assess from the perspective of both the provider and the customer.

Entertainment service quality and satisfaction research is quite recent. The development and recognition of formal management methods for entertainment services required a prolonged period before the artistic, performance, and theatrical production aspects could be effectively captured by business models. Within the services marketing literature, a wide assortment of entertainment services have been evaluated for quality and satisfaction, from theme parks, musical concerts, and shopping mall events to hospitality recreation activities and even emerging Web-based content and mobile device services.

Pertinent quality themes have emerged to guide the systematization of operations and organizations; for instance, the flow chart and the boundary less organization (Deming, 1986) are particularly applicable to service design and delivery. The focus on service quality stems from the improved approaches to operations management process, the use of information technology, and the increased efficiency and reduced defects attributable to production systems primarily developed for goods. However, similar quality benefits were transferred to service providers with the expansion of technology systems in transportation, financial, and communication markets (Evans & Lindsay, 2002).

Most important, service quality asserts the value of a systems perspective for

framing and formulating service design-and-delivery factors. Parasuraman et al. (1985) introduced this systems-framework view into the services marketing literature with a conceptual model of service quality. This conceptualization integrated separate service quality findings.

Among the salient service quality attributes identified are the four primary ways in which services differ from goods: intangibility, variability, simultaneity, and perishability (Lovelock, 1981). Because of the intangible properties of services, service quality is subjective and is based on customer expectations (Gronroos, 1982). A related finding described service quality as mediating customer expectations and service satisfaction (Smith & Houston, 1982).

The importance of a management-systems framing of service quality was captured by the first trichotomy of service design factors, specified as personnel, material, and facilities (Sasser, Olsen, & Wyckoff, 1978). This early trichotomy was later replicated with factors addressing the same essential functions. Eventually, the quality of service offerings was framed on a continuum comprising both tangible and intangible elements influencing providers' design execution and customers' delivery expectations (Zeithaml, 1991).

Service quality emerged as a primary determinant of customer satisfaction with services (McDougall & Levesque, 2000). However, because customers are a more accessible unit of measurement than intangible service processes, service satisfaction research rapidly expanded as a particular branch of the broader customer satisfaction literature. Ironically, customer satisfaction scholars purported to extend product quality measurement methods to customers. This constitutes a full-circle coupling of service quality with service satisfaction, reflecting customer satisfaction as an extension of product quality measurement. Services marketing scholars have established viable frameworks for measuring service quality. Lovelock and Yip (1996) highlighted three dominant factors for evaluating the design composition of services: people processing, possession processing, and mental stimulus processing. These service provider-oriented design considerations are reinforced by Dedek's (2003) contribution of three customer-oriented service delivery factors—customer-to-staff, customer-to-product/service, and customer-to-technology.

Dedek's focus on the interaction between service providers and customers places Lovelock and Yip's (1996) initial factors in the dynamic exchange context of the services marketing channel.

People factors pertain to the human element in services addressed by Lovelock and Yip (1996) as people processing and later classified by Dedeké (2003) as customer to staff. Product factors pertain to the tangible objects or devices that dominate Lovelock and Yip's (1996) possession processing as well as Dedeké's (2003) customer-to product/ service category. Also, digital processes are intended to capture the mental stimulus processing aspects identified by Lovelock and Yip (1996), because of the particular cognitive focus of digital information technology service platforms. Digital processes encompass Dedeké's (2003) customer-to-technology category because the dominant interactive technology platform is digital. This synthesized framework maintains the trichotomy anchors established four decades earlier by Sasser et al. (1978).

The people dimension mirrors personnel, product reflects material, and digital processes connote the primary modern facilities for service design and delivery.

To summarize, a strong focus on quality arose in industries concerned with the production of goods; however, a significant emphasis on quality has recently been applied to services. Because goods are different to services in a multitude of ways, it follows that the conception of service quality is somewhat distinct from that of product quality. In addition, recent marketplace changes, such as the expansion of retail service franchises and the explosion of online services, have altered customer expectations of quality. For example, services are expected to adhere to standards of consistency yet also are expected to be easily adapted to individual tastes.

### **2.5.3 Statistics and design aspects**

The SERVQUAL instrument is a quantitative survey tool. It relies on statistical analysis to provide the researcher with information. Smale (1996) states that there is a possibility that researchers overlook meaningful results which were ignored because they were not “statistically” significant, or place too much emphasis on results that exceed an arbitrary critical value (i.e.  $p < .05$ ). He writes that the testing of hypothesis assumes a fixed level of significance and largely ignores the size of effect and standard error issues. In addition, testing for significant difference does not address the practical significance of the results. The use of conventional significance levels leads to an either-or decision rather than a practical interpretation of the numbers.

Due to issues of the small sample size from both the managers and front line staff

groups, it is quite possible that the results were affected by extremes. Therefore, it is strongly recommended that practical differences be examined in addition to significant differences when administering the SERVQUAL instrument.

#### **2.5.4 Service quality and measurement**

In an attempt to reach the pinnacle of quality service, many investigators have begun developing the quest for excellence has caused a few investigators to commence development into explanations into quality of service; as such, to create models to measure said quality. Consensus by researchers rests largely on abstract dimensions in defining service quality, such as perception, expectation, and satisfaction. Quality of service can therefore be explained as the difference between the abstractions, thus requiring a means for measuring this difference. Although this will not define quality, it will determine its presence or no presence, irrespective of how one defines "*quality*" (Lewis, 1987).

Quality of service is often attributed as representing a kind of attitude. Similar to, but not an equal of, satisfaction; one that manifests itself as a companion to expectation and perception. Parasuraman et al. (1985) and other contemporaries have likened the differences between abstractions as "gaps" (Lewis, 1987).

A representation, constructed by Gronroos (1984) was set up to describe what he terms the missing service quality concept. This construct rests largely on the construct '*image*' which represents perceived service quality which thusly, symbolises a space connecting anticipated and service expectation.

Three distinct dimensions of service were classified by Nightingale (1986): services relevant to people, services relevant to product, and services relevant to information. The key characteristic in the hospitality industry is provision of services by the customer and that their involvement is absolute.

Satisfaction is determined by an impression formed by the customer, which is compared to expectation in his or her mind. Parasuraman et al. (1985) calls the differences in perception noted by Nightingale, '*service gaps*'. Since the delivery of high service quality produces measurable benefits in profits, cost savings, and market share, it is important to understand the nature of service quality and how it is achieved.

From the service gap theory, Parasuraman et al. (1986) developed SERVQUAL, a 31-item scale to measure generically the service quality construct (interaction

between perceptions and expectations) in service industries.

The service quality model of Parasuraman was extended to include aspects believed to alter the effectiveness and flow of the gap concept. These factors mainly involved communication and control processes, executed within establishments in order to effectively manage workers (Zeithaml, et. al., 1988).

There are inherent problems associated with strategies used by service providers that equate higher levels of service quality as a key to efforts to position effectively in the market place. In addition, up till now, the important relationship between quality of service, customer satisfaction, and one's buying behavior remains on the whole unfamiliar (Cronin & Taylor, 1992). How the quality of service construct could be measured and likewise, how service quality relates to customer fulfilment and purchase intentions are arguably the most important concerns of management.

Using Parasuraman's GAP THEORY, a number of methods and models were initialized to assess quality of service. Among the most notable models related to the hospitality industry are, LODGSERV, and a modified SERVQUAL.

LODGSERV is a 26 entry directory created to assess customer expectation for quality of service in the hotel industry. The index was developed from Parasuraman's 31- item SERVQUAL scale and was precisely personalised to the accommodation sector (Knutson, Stevens, Weillaert, Patton, Yokoyama, 1991).

Saleh and Ryan (1991,1992) analyzed customer satisfaction at a hotel by modifying the items previously developed by Parasuraman in developing the SERVQUAL model combined with Martins Customer-Service Assessment Scale (1986). A 33-item questionnaire was developed, using a five point system on the Likert scale.

SERVQUAL and LODGSERV, only measure the expectation side of the service quality issue. Until the perception side of the overall equation is measured, no assurance exists that the service being offered is the service the consumer perceives he will receive.

The 1980's most likely will be remembered as the decade American business awakened to the importance of consumer fulfilment. It is possible to define it as the level or amount which the service industry delivers products and services consistent with customer expectations. This of course is the same as the definition of service quality expressed in different terms (Cavallo and Perelmuth, 1989).

The current literature of the 1990's on quality of service expressed in terms as

customer satisfaction goes a step beyond SERVQUAL and LODGSERV, by introducing the importance of management to the expectation side of the service quality formula. The process for improving service quality has two critical aspects. First, a commitment by senior management to become actively involved in the setting of a customer agenda, as well as establishing policies and procedures that facilitate customers doing business with the organization. Second, to develop service professionalism through hiring, supervision, training programs and employee incentives, and development of service performance measurement based upon the positive aspects rather than the negative aspects (dissatisfaction) of the relationship (Cavallo & Perelmuth, 1989).

A process that provides a methodology for assessing, defining, and improving service quality is Total Service Quality. This management-driven service quality program encompasses the strong need and desire among executives of organizations to have a clear, logical, and compelling methodology for carrying out a service quality program (Albrecht, 1991).

Total Service Quality is a family of five interrelated menus that are critical to assessing, defining, and improving service quality. The sequence in which these methods are applied will depend on the situation that exists in the organization, the market and competitive situation, and the leadership style and attitudes of senior management.

The five interrelated menus are identified as: 1. Assessment, measurement and feedback. 2. Market and customer research. 3. Strategy formulation. 4. Education, training and communication. 5. Process improvement. These five components for total quality service work together to build service quality. Although a great deal has been published regarding the issue of quality of service, customer fulfilment, and measurement techniques for quality of service, most of this literature has been applied to the service industry generally.

There is a paucity of published articles relating specifically to the hospitality industry especially to specific areas within a hotel, such as front desk operations, gaming operations, or food and beverage operations (*Barrington & Olson, 1988*).

### **2.5.5 SERVQUAL instrument**

The SERVQUAL model comprises a list of 22 expectation questions and 22 perceptions questions and a section to ascertain customers' assessment of the

relative importance of the five dimensions. A seven point Likert scale ranging from 7 (strongly agree) to 1 (strongly disagree) accompany each statement. In addition, there is a section on customers' experience with and overall impression about the service and a section on demographics.

A benefit of SERVQUAL is its use in categorizing an organization's consumers into several perceived quality categories on the basis of their individual scores. These categories can then be analysed based on demographic, psychographic and/or other profiles; the relative importance of the five dimensions in influencing service quality perceptions or the reasons behind the perceptions identified.

There have been a number of past studies done in the arena of recreation and leisure using the SERVQUAL instrument to measure the quality of services. Wright et al. (1992) used the SERVQUAL instrument to identify the perceptions of customers of eight different recreation centers. The results indicated that the response time for facility and equipment repairs and keeping the equipment in good working order, had the most negative service quality gaps. Fick and Ritchie (1991) used the SERVQUAL instrument to compare four tourism related industries: airlines, hotels, restaurants, and ski areas. They found that the most important expectations in relation to service for airlines and hotels was the "reliability" dimension, ("assurance" was second). The most important expectation in relation to restaurants and ski areas was the "assurance" dimension ("reliability" was second). With regard to perception of performance they found "tangibles" to be the most highly rated dimension ("assurance" was second). They indicated that the scale was useful in identifying the relative importance of customer expectations of service quality.

Hartshorn (1990) utilized the SERVQUAL tool to determine how approximately 400 senior fitness managers in the voluntary, public and private sectors within the fitness industry of the eight-state Great Lakes region defined quality service. She discovered that service quality can be best measured by the participants' perception of the concept. In addition, her results also showed that the majority of the managers in the leisure fitness industry only conduct a minimal amount of program evaluation. In her study, "assurance" was identified as being a pattern primarily noteworthy, consistency was second.

Hamilton, Crompton and Moore (1988) did a study to determine which SERVQUAL dimensions were the most important with respect to parks. They found the tool was valid but suggested the "empathy" and "responsiveness" dimensions



could actually be merged together for their particular study. With respect to park services, the staff did not have direct contact with the users, the dimension “tangibles” received the highest ranking, “Reliability” ranked second, which was consistent with other studies supporting the high degree of importance of that dimension (MacKay & Crompton, 1988; Parasuraman et al., 1992).

## **2.6 Perceived Service Value and Quality**

There is some evidence to suggest that in the arena of marketing, perceived value of service is the best indicator of repeat custom (Cronin et al., 2000; Gale, 1994; Grewal et al.; 1998; Lee, 2005; Parasuraman, 1997). Likewise, certain academic literature on the subject points to the fact that for a business to attain a level of advantage amongst its competitors, it is crucial to have a transparent knowledge of the framework of perceived value. Zeithaml (1988), defines it as “the consumer’s overall assessment of the utility of a product based on perceptions of what is received and what is given”. In respect to this interpretation, value can be categorised in four ways: it can infer (1) low cost; (2) a consumers particular desire, if any, in a product; (3) what one gets for what one pays; or (4) the relationship between what a customer gives and what he/she receives. Simply put, perceived value of service is a compromise of perceptions between outlay and ownership.

A large number of investigations in this arena give credence to the idea that there is a relationship between value and quality on a perceptive level (Bolton & Drew, 1991; Zeithaml, 1988). These investigations point to the fact that purchase intentions are predominantly governed by ideas of quality and value perception. A proposal by Bolton and Drew (1991) posits that limited future plans were consistent with value of service perceptions. Certain investigative results proved, that particular value of service perceptions, have far better chances of predicting repeat purchasers than those governed by quality of service or satisfaction (Cronin et al., 2000; Lee, 2005; Oh, 2000). Furthermore, it has been postulated by Tam (2000) that a value of service is often inevitably connected to quality of service perceptions and satisfaction of the visitor.

An investigation was carried out by Lee (2005) at a celebration, to discern and identify the interrelation amongst three barometers of performance (quality of service perception, value of service perception, and fulfilment) to identify and

ascertain which one of them had the greatest ability to foresee purposes of behavior amongst visitors. The findings in the study show that value of service perceptions correlated more favorably with an intention than a quality of service perception or satisfaction. This proved beyond doubt, that value of service perception is the definite predictor of behavior intention. Additionally, the results pointed to the fact that satisfaction is highly depend on quality of perceived service.

Despite an enormous amount of investigative analysis on value of service, and even though its importance in its arena of service assessment, only a small amount of work has been even though a numerous research have been performed on service value, and despite the importance of its role as a form of evaluation of services, limited work has been carried out on the qualities of the model and how it influences a consumers behavior. (Nguyen & LeBlanc, 1998). Consequently, in order to achieve competitive headway in an industry of service, it is of crucial importance to analyse the upshot of awareness of value.

To put into practice and comprehend fully value of service perception, Petrick (2002) constructed an approach comprising five points to assess value of service perception. His discovery showed there was no tangible means to understand fully perceived value of service. Prior reports in this arena proposed that, a self-reported, measurement of one dimension was used to operationalise perceived value (Gale, 1994), but Petrick (2002) found that there was a problem with the one-dimensional scale used in these studies since the scale assumed that a meaning of value had been shared by consumers. The five factors Petrick (2002) had developed were interconnected, yet individual, composed of quality, emotional response, monetary price, behavioral price, and reputation. A study by Lee (2005) fostered Petrick's many faceted scale to analyse value of service perception against a celebration backdrop. It clearly presented the fact that value of service, when perceived, has a direct affect on the decision making process, and also concluding that intent, when attributed to behavior was interconnected too. As mentioned previously, certain investigations highlighted the significance of analysing value of service perceptions to better understand and foresee ones intent. In distinguishing the correlation amongst the ideas of the models, greater distinct parallels are noticed. Tallied with the thorough intelligence, noteworthy features can be appraised. As a result, managers or providers of service can forge greater strategies towards improving and establishing marketing ideas, which will increase the likelihood of a consumer

revisiting.

The earliest investigator to take advantage of a Customer Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction template to explain service quality satisfaction and performance of service was Gronroos (1983b). Gronroos (1982) believed there were two kinds of quality service: technical and functional. Quality of a technical nature relates to consequence, or put simply, what the service gave to the individual, and is assessed in the same way as one would measure quality of product. Quality of a functional nature governs the way a service is delivered. Utilising the quality of service template set up by Gronroos, the results of functional and technical quality may not be satisfactory enough to establish what, if anything is discerned by the consumer. This is because, when combined, functional and technical qualities, comprise a construct of an image. Gronroos posits that an image is a factor in quality dimension that perhaps could influence beliefs, and could also affect the quality of service perception, dependent of course, on the amount of functional or technical quality present (Gronroos, 1984).

Expanding on Gronroos's work, later research and developments, initiated by Parasuraman, et al (1985), further refined the concept of perceived service quality. They constructed a quality of service template, founded on inconsistencies in a consumers presupposition and his or her perception. Features effecting supposed service comprise: chains of communication that are transferred by word-of-mouth, previous observations, or recognised wants. They comprise ten common measurements and standards that an individual might utilise in gauging quality of service. These factors are as follows: reliability, reaction, competence, access, courtesy, communication, credibility, security, understanding/knowing the customer, and tangibles (Berry, et al., 1985). The relative importance of the ten determinations depends upon the service feature, consumer experiences and the amount of cognitive processing (Parasuraman, et al., 1985).

Assessing such quality of service must have a sequence of events like to touchable product fulfilment (Berry, et al, 1985), where fulfilment arises when the conclusion of service outstripped opening presuppositions. Fulfilment of service, therefore, tends to accurately reflect a belief or worldwide perception (Bolton & Drew, 1991a). Clarification in differences among quality of service presuppositions, fulfilment and belief, was carried out by Oliver (1981). It was posited by him that fulfilment can be defined as buying determined, yet viewpoint can be not as much about location,

rather can be classified as “the consumer’s relatively enduring affective orientation for a product or process”.

A lot of early investigations have analysed quality of service presuppositions, the contrasting aspects of assumption and quality of service presupposition, prioritising the “Gap 5” within the service template, as seen underneath: An investigation analysed by Douglas (1993) pertained to members’ perceptions of service quality at the Nellis Air Force base, Officer’s Open Mess. The Officers’ club members were surveyed using the SERVQUAL instrument and expectations were compared to achieve a SERVQUAL score for five areas of quality of service. The results showed that club member perceived that the Officers’ Club was providing less than average service quality. The difference was perceived by the active duty members to be greater than that of the other club members. Both groups of members rated the tangible dimension as exceeding their expectations, but the rated reliability dimension as having the greatest anomaly linking assumption and presupposition in quality of service. In another research project, Francoise (1993) studied the quality of interlibrary borrowing services around two viewpoints: The library viewpoint centered on individual turnover and the time it took to complete a task, and the individual’s viewpoint focused on assumption that a belief is wrong. He analysed anticipation and quality of service expectations using the SERVQUAL questionnaire, developed in the marketing management sector to assess quality of service, from a customer perspective. Quality of service rated higher on participant expectation than was the individual’s belief of the service value given. This study also found a perception of service quality; Perception (P) can be explained thusly, an individual’s outlook regarding obtained service (Parasuraman, et al., 1985).

Trusting a template Bayesian in its construct, Boulding et.al. (1996) produced a blueprint for analysing behavior in quality of service beliefs. It was concluded that previous presuppositions of what should occur at point of service are measureable against ideas of quality of service. Crucially an individual’s general expectation of quality is molded by the foundations of said quality scales, this then leads to an ability by which one can foresee an individual’s behavior intention. These analyses point to the fact that two differing components of anticipation are juxtaposed to quality of service presupposition.

## **2.7 Quality of Service and Customer Fulfillment**

A theory posited by Minazzi (2008), is one where an individual's fulfillment can be attributed to the direct contrast of an individual's presumptions and an individual's perceived notions. Put simply, an individual's fulfillment is the contrast of anticipated service quality and the individuals encounter post transaction. Many factors affect an individuals fulfillment in this way. Whether the service was reliable, how responsive was the service given, guarantee, plus other variables including cost and unique circumstances relating to the individual. These can all happen when service is given. (Bateson, Hoffman. 2000)

There can be no question, that quality of service plays a crucial role in an individual's overall fulfillment. However, it is of the belief of Erto and Vanacore (2002) that an individual has a working part to play in the provision of service. Equally, said individual can be viewed as a client of a particular system and by being the judge of receipt of service given. It is vital, and of the utmost importance to those professionals working in the hotel sector, to assess, foresees and predicts a client's beliefs and needs. And having recognised them, to transpose them effectively to fluid operational systems.

Gerson (1993) stated that an individual's expectation or belief is fundamental to a business's ability to maintain standards. What an individual inherits is thusly categorised and identified as excellence while it is impractical to have mastery over the entire service chain, prerequisites for a positive end product are very important. If excellence is continually improving, an individual's loyalty will remain steadfast as will his or her fulfillment (Erto and Vanacore 2002).

It is often the case that a business' profile can act like a netting, so that should a business make some minor errors, the individual will find it is not a problem to disregard or turn a blind eye to them; therefore not tarnishing the overall image of the business in the eyes of the individual.

Gummesson and Gronroos (1988 a,b, 1991) coined the phrase - relation quality - which posits that the hotel is one unique system. The hotel system is large. One where the departmental areas influence and collaborate with each other. Furthermore it is possible for these departments to be offered for sale independently from one another. A hotels reputability is like a tower of cards - should one card (department) falter, the whole tower comes crashing down and with it the reputation of the hotel.

Branding is key to maintaining a business' reputability and is interpreted as name = expectation of excellence (Aaker and Keller, 1990). From a business viewpoint, a company name or brand is explained thusly: "... *perceptions of an organization reflected in the associations held in consumer memory*" (Keller, 1993). Repeat consumers, are seen as being faithful to the business. Previous expectations that have been met, encourage consumers to buy again. They believe a company is more trustworthy in this respect. It is much easier for a company to foresee future incomes, if a business has a loyal base of consumers. Marketing strategy becomes less important and also, the consumer remains less malleable to strategies of other businesses.

Reichheld (1996) posits four distinct advantages of the faithful consumer:

- It is inexpensive to provide for faithful consumers
- Faithful consumers do not worry about price
- Faithful consumers devote more time to the business
- Word of mouth is increased as consumers relay positives to their contemporaries

Selling a service is not what a company does. Rather it offers opportunities for service. If a service is seen by the consumer as having value and excellence, it can only be favorable. Of course, this must occur with profitability in mind. As well as creating favorable impressions on the consumer and a decent level of fulfillment amongst a company's employees.

An intrinsic notion within the arena of marketing is satisfaction, according to (Oliver, 1999; Yi, 1990); attaining such fulfillment among consumers equates to absolute success within all organisations (Park et al., 2005). It has been claimed by Oliver (1980) that in organisational marketing, priority should be placed in making sure the consumer is fulfilled. As fulfillment correlates to consumer spending, as well as to the after sales experience or 'post purchase phenomena'. These after sales experiences can be identified as; a consumers repeat buying behavior, acquisition reproduction, favourable recommendations to contemporaries, brand fidelity, plus an altering of outlook can all be regarded as post-purchase phenomena.

Literature has provided four distinct ways in which satisfaction can be conceptualized: appraisal satisfaction (Bultena & Klessig 1969; LaPage, 1983), need satisfaction (Francken, 1982; Stankey, 1972), transaction-specific satisfaction (Cronin & Taylor, 1992) and cumulative satisfaction (John & Fornell, 1991). The first two items listed above were conceptualized based upon situations where

satisfaction might or might not be related to needs or motives. The remaining conceptualizations of satisfaction were distinguished by the perception of evaluation in whether a product or a service is to be evaluated at a certain point in time or as a total experience, which has been found to have a direct effect on future behaviors.

Amid the differing interpretations of fulfillment, there is one broadly utilised in analyses of tourism and leisure, posited by Bultena and Klessig (1969). They explained fulfillment as “a function of the degree of congruency between expectation and the perceived reality of experiences”. This implies the rate of consumer fulfillment would be decided on an individual’s perception, and how it equates to the individuals prediction of the service. This idea is known as appraisal satisfaction. Crompton and Love (1995) conceived the amount of fulfillment as an indicator of tourist product. Investigators posited that fulfillment is swayed by an individuals’ psychological circumstances on a social level, and factors including temperament and outlook, and requirements of uncontrollable mediums, for instance weather and socio influences; lead to an altering by the service provider.

A further idea along the lines of consumer contentment is need satisfaction. The meaning holds the opinion that fulfilment is inextricably linked to a consumers ambition. A few investigators have interpreted that as being contentedness is because of meeting certain requirements; a consumers wants, motivations, and rationale (Francken, 1982; Stankey, 1972).

Transaction-specific fulfillment analysed in the nineties by Cronin and Taylor (1992). In their investigation, asserted that consumer fulfillment was gauged by whether a consumer was particularly pleased with his or her merchandise or service at a particular moment in time: transient satisfaction.

A large number of investigations have discovered numerous correlations relationships connecting consumer fulfillment and quality of service. Certain investigators researchers suggest an informal connection joining the factors; perceived quality of service naturally ties to consumer fulfillment (Cronin & Taylor, 1992; Parasuraman et al., 1988). Others believe and have contemplated the idea that consumer fulfilment is in a way, the forefather to quality of service (Bitner, 1990; Oliver, 1980). Nevertheless, certain investigations looking into fulfilment and perceived quality of service did not discover a connection (Churcill & Supernant, 1982; Fornell, 1992). Because the connection between quality of service and consumer fulfillment is ongoing and remains questionable, despite the large number

of investigations; analysing the connection between the two in the arena of this study is valid.

Perceived value of service is one other fluctuating factor that investigators heed when analyzing consumer fulfillment. The arena of service marketing is one where a connection linking value of service and fulfillment has been discussed (McDougall & Levesque, 2000). Bagozzi (1992) noted that cognitive reactions have priority, not emotional ones; value of service is appraised as a consumers cognitive reaction to an event given by a service; fulfillment of one's satisfaction, a reaction on an emotional level (Cronin et al., 2000). Furthermore, Oh (1999) states that value of service go hand in hand with fulfillment. Petrick and Backman's (2002) investigation opposes this idea. They believe that a fulfilled consumer might have a high value of service perception, but this fulfillment could be merely some kind of halo effect on the value itself.



### **3. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND HYPOTHESIS**

#### **3.1 Statement of the Problem**

Tourism is big business. It is one of the world's largest industries and in many regions the single largest source of investment and employment. The World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) claims that tourism is currently the world's largest industry with 9% GDP direct, indirect and included impact.

Istanbul is one of the most important tourism spots not only in Turkey but also in the world. There are thousands of hotels and other tourist-oriented industries in the city, catering to both vacationers and visiting professionals. On the other hand, Barcelona is the 10<sup>th</sup> most-visited city in the world and the third most visited in Europe after London and Paris, with several million tourists every year. Barcelona as famous a tourist destination, with several leisure areas is the one of the best beaches in the world, moderate climate, historical monuments, including eight UNESCO , many well quality hotels as well as tourist infrastructure.

After studying some research works which were conducted relating to theories and models of the tourism industry, service quality and tourist satisfaction, this study deals with perceived value towards several dimensions of quality of tourism attractions and infrastructures in the touristic cities. Finally, the study assesses the perceived values regarding attraction and infrastructure in Barcelona and Istanbul based on SERVQUAL dimension.

#### **3.2 Significance of the Study**

This study empirically assesses the service quality of tourism industry in Barcelona and Istanbul. First, it provides testing the multi-dimensional of service quality to measure and compare the tourist satisfaction. Second, it provides additional evidence as the association between heritage tourism quality and tourist satisfaction thereof. Finally, it extends the literature of management of heritage tourism.

Therefore, the present study would be a guide for authorities as a bridge between service quality of infrastructure in tourism and tourist satisfaction in Barcelona and Istanbul. Furthermore there is little or no empirical research to guide authorities to adequately address the challenges and opportunities. The information provided in the study would be useful to the Spanish as well as Turkish private, public sectors to enhance their market share and increase the number of high net worth customers in the tourist competitive market. The tourism authorities could also use this information to formulate future plans, competitive strategy and improve tourism services quality.

### **3.3 Scope of Study**

The scope of the study involves determination of level of tourist satisfaction in Barcelona and Istanbul. The study focuses on five dimensions of service quality based on SERVQUAL model. These dimensions is included Reliability, Assurance, Tangible, Empathy and Responsiveness

The main aim of the research is to assess and compare the tourist satisfaction between two cities with help of dimensions of SERVQUAL model.

### **3.4 Objective of the Study**

The study is designed to conduct with the following few special objectives:

- 1- To assess the difference between tourists satisfaction in Istanbul and Barcelona.
- 2- To determine most influential dimension on tourist satisfaction in Istanbul and Barcelona.

### **3.5 Hypothesis**

Based on conceptual foundations, the following null hypotheses are explored:

**H<sub>01</sub>:** There is no positive and significant correlation between service quality dimensions and overall tourist's satisfaction.

**H<sub>01a</sub>:** There is no positive and significant correlation between Tangibility dimension and overall tourist's satisfaction.

**H<sub>01b</sub>:** There is no positive and significant correlation between Reliability dimension and overall tourist's satisfaction.

**H<sub>01c</sub>:** There is no positive and significant correlation between Assurance dimension and overall tourist's satisfaction.

**H<sub>01d</sub>:** There is no positive and significant correlation between Responsiveness dimension and overall tourist's satisfaction.

**H<sub>01e</sub>:** There is no positive and significant correlation between Empathy dimension and overall tourist's satisfaction.

**H<sub>02</sub>:** There is no difference between overall satisfaction of tourist in Barcelona and Istanbul.

**H<sub>03</sub>:** There is no difference between service quality dimensions from tourist point of view in Barcelona and Istanbul.

## **4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND FINDING**

### **4.1 Methodology**

The design specifies the methods, tools and techniques used in this comparative study. The present study is a conclusive research and the descriptive case study approaches is considered for analyzing the SERQUAL dimensions. It is designed to identify differences in perceived service quality toward service dimensions namely: reliability, assurance, tangible, empathy and responsiveness (Zeithaml, et al, 1996). The research focuses SERVQUAL model which involves assessment of five different dimensions of service quality.

### **4.2 Sample design**

The sample population for this research comprised of tourists who visited Barcelona and Istanbul at different places that are frequently visited in year of 2015-2016. Distributions of questionnaires were carried out through using electronic questionnaire as well as face to face interview. Respondents were approached and informed about the purpose of the survey in advance before they were given the questionnaire.

Respondents under the age of 18 are excluded. Personal observations revealed that tourists who is age 18 or older visit cultural/heritage destinations either individually or with their friends or families as groups. The sample size of each city is 50.

#### **4.2.1 The instrument**

The data collection instrument consisted of a two part self-administered questionnaire. The first section of the questionnaire measures the tourist' perception of service quality. Respondents will be asked to indicate the level of perceptions based on a Likert scale from one (very poor) to five (excellent). The second part of the questionnaire is designed to capture the demographic and traveling characteristics of respondents. SPSS 18 software for windows will be employed in

order to access the particular results required for the scale measurement. Descriptive analysis such as means, standard deviation and frequencies and t-test, correlation and multiple regression analysis will be performed.

#### 4.2.2 Data analysis

The study has assessed the tourists' satisfaction with the help of statistical tools such as factor analysis, correlation and regression analysis.

#### 4.2.3 Description of the measurement instrument

Based on the review of literatures, a questionnaire including 24 items was developed and eight dimensions emerged as key for delivering optimum e-service quality and tourist satisfaction. Thus, the various dimensions of tourist satisfaction in terms of '*Tangibility*', '*Reliability*', '*Assurance*', '*Responsiveness*' and '*Empathy*' were focused upon.

Cronbach' Alpha Test was applied for reliability Test, the dimensions and their Cronbach's Alpha are mentioned in Table 4-1.

**Table 4-1:** Cronbach's Alpha Scores of Satisfaction variables

<b>Dimension</b>	<b>Cronbach's Alpha (<math>\alpha</math> -score)( <math>\alpha &gt; 0.70</math>)</b>	<b>Number of Items</b>
Tangibility	0.89	8
Reliability	0.75	5
Responsiveness	0.76	2
Assurance	0.82	4
Empathy	0.79	5

With respect to Table 4-1, the  $\alpha$ -scores of selected dimensions are above 0.70, which indicates that these are reliable for the research.

Consequently, with respect to the analysis of data, the five quality dimensions should include the following variables: '*Tangibility*', '*Reliability*', '*Responsiveness*',

'Assurance' and 'Empathy'. Table 4-2 shows the following questions, which are suggested to create the respective dimensions.

**Table 4-2:** Labels for the created dimensions of tourist satisfaction

<b>Position number of the question in the questionnaire</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>New dimension label</b>
Q1	The appearance of heritage places.	<b>Tangibility</b>
Q3	The value and price of goods and services.	
Q4	Quality and taste of food and beverages.	
Q5	Accommodation quality.	
Q6	Cleanliness of the materials associated with the public services.	
Q9	Availability of shopping facilities.	
Q10	Availability of facilities and services.	
Q17	Neat appearance of tourist staff.	
Q7	Availability of daily tour services to other destinations and attractions.	<b>Reliability</b>
Q8	Availability of local transport services.	
Q11	Availability of accurate and reliable information.	
Q13	Professionalism level of staff.	
Q19	Punctuality of the staff for giving the service	
Q12	Availability of staff to provide service.	<b>Responsiveness</b>
Q20	Staff's willingness to respond and help.	
Q2	Level of security and safety of the destination.	<b>Assurance</b>
Q16	Knowledge level of staff to answer my questions.	
Q21	Level of English language of people.	
Q15	Consistently of staff courtesy to meet my needs.	
Q22	Friendliness of local people.	<b>Empathy</b>
Q23	Convenience level of contact with staff.	
Q24	Understand of the tourist authorities about my needs.	
Q14	Special attention given by staff.	
Q18	Friendliness and courtesy of staff.	

## 4.2.4 Statistical Analysis

### 4.2.4.1 Demographic analysis

The demographic items were intended to gather general information about the subjects. These demographic variables of tourists (including the respondent's gender, age, education level, occupational level, travel rate), were not hypothesized to have relationships with the variables. These variables were mainly gathered to describe the sample. Tables 4-3 and 4-4 show frequency distribution of the demographic variables of total tourists in Barcelona and Istanbul.

**Table 4-3:** Demographic data of tourist in Istanbul

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Demographic Characteristics</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Gender</b>	Male	26	52%
	Female	24	48%
<b>Age</b>	Less than 25	12	24%
	25-35	15	30%
	35-45	8	16%
	45-55	9	18%
	Above 55	6	12%
<b>Education level</b>	High school	6	12%
	Graduation	26	52%
	Post graduation	15	30%
	Doctorates	2	4%
<b>Occupation level</b>	Professional	4	8%
	Salaried	15	30%
	Business	10	20%
	Others	17	34%
<b>Travel rate per month</b>	1-2 times	27	54%
	3-5 times	18	36%
	6-12 times	2	4%
	Above 12	3	6%

**Table 4-4:** Demographic data of tourist in Barcelona

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Demographic Characteristics</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Gender</b>	Male	29	58%
	Female	21	42%
<b>Age</b>	Less than 25	10	20%
	25-35	17	34%
	35-45	12	24%
	45-55	8	16%
	Above 55	3	6%
<b>Education level</b>	High school	3	6%
	Graduation	16	32%
	Post graduation	22	44%
	Doctorates	9	18%
<b>Occupation level</b>	Professional	5	10%
	Salaried	19	38%
	Business	13	26%
	Others	4	8%
<b>Travel rate per month</b>	1-2 times	17	34%
	3-5 times	22	44%
	6-12 times	9	18%
	12 above	2	4%

From the Tables4-3 and 4-4 stated the gender distribution of the respondents was quite even, with 48% and 42% female respondents in Istanbul and Barcelona respectively, and 52% male respondents in Istanbul and 58% male respondents in Barcelona .

In case of Age, the dominant age group of the respondents was 25 to 35 years 30% and 34% in Istanbul and Barcelona respectively , followed by less than 25 years 24% in Istanbul and 20% in Barcelona, 35 to 45 years 16% and 24% in Istanbul and Barcelona respectively, and 45 to 55 18% in Istanbul and 16% in Barcelona, whereas above 55 years made up the smallest group, representing 12% and 6% of the respondents in Istanbul and Barcelona respectively.

In terms of the level of education, Tables reports almost 52% of the respondents had a university level education inIstanbul,44% of the respondents had a post graduate education in Barcelona.



In case of respondents' occupation, the result shows the most often mentioned occupations were followed by Others (34%) , Salaried (30%) , Business (20%) and Professional (8%) in Istanbul. Whereas , the most often mentioned occupations were 'Salaried' (38%) and 'Business' (26%), 'Professional' (10%) and 'Others' (8%) in Barcelona.

Finally, In case of travel rate frequency, the result show that almost 54% of the respondents in Istanbul travel 1 to 2 times per year, while 44% of the respondents in Barcelona travel 3 to 5 times per year. Further 36% travel 3-5 times per year, 6% travel above 12 times per year and 4% travel 6-12 times in Istanbul. Moreover 34% the respondents in Barcelona travel 1-2 times per year, 18% travel 6-12 times and only 4% travel above 12 times.

#### **4.2.5 Statistical analysis of tourist satisfaction**

To evaluate and composition of tourist satisfaction towards services qualities dimensions, statistical tools such as correlation, stepwise multiple regressions and t-test analysis were applied to test the null hypothesis.

Thus, the following null hypothesis is developed and tested to verify the research problem and draw the conclusion.

**H<sub>01</sub>:** There is no positive and significant correlation between service quality dimensions and overall tourist's satisfaction.

**H<sub>01a</sub>:** There is no positive and significant correlation between Tangibility dimension and overall tourist's satisfaction.

**H<sub>01b</sub>:** There is no positive and significant correlation between Reliability dimension and overall tourist's satisfaction.

**H<sub>01c</sub>:** here is no positive and significant correlation between Assurance dimension and overall tourist's satisfaction.

**H<sub>01d</sub>:** There is no positive and significant correlation between Responsiveness dimension and overall tourist's satisfaction.

**H<sub>01e</sub>:** There is no positive and significant correlation between Empathy dimension and overall tourist's satisfaction.

**H<sub>02</sub>:** There is difference between overall satisfaction of tourist in Barcelona and Istanbul.

**H<sub>03</sub>:** There is difference between service quality dimensions from tourist point of view in Barcelona and Istanbul.

Furthermore, stepwise multiple regression analysis was applied to predict the overall tourist satisfaction. It includes regression models in which the choice of predictive variables is carried out by an automatic procedure (Draper & Smith, 1981). The stepwise regression algorithm was terminated when an incoming variable was no longer significant at the 0.10 level. Each variable has been entered into sequence and its value assessed. If adding the variable contributes to the model then it is retained, but all other variables in the model are then re-tested to observe if they are still contributing to the achievement of the model. If they no longer contribute significantly then they are eliminated.

#### **4.2.5.1 Correlation analysis**

The Pearson Correlation was applied to measure the correlation between ‘Overall Satisfaction’ as the dependent and service quality dimensions as the independent variables.

The Pearson Correlation was applied to measure the correlation between ‘Overall Satisfaction’ as the dependent and service quality dimensions as the independent variables (Tangibility, Reliability, Responsiveness, Assurance and Empathy). The correlations between overall satisfaction were positive and were significant at the 0.01 and 0.05 levels. Table 4-5 , 4-6, 4-7 and 4-8 state the results.

**Table 4-5:** Correlation analysis of satisfaction variables of tourists at Barcelona

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Tangibility</b>	<b>Reliability</b>	<b>Assurance</b>	<b>Responsiveness</b>	<b>Empathy</b>	<b>Overall Satisfaction</b>
<b>Tangibility</b>	1.00	0.466**	0.240	0.397**	0.357*	<b>0.382**</b>
<b>Reliability</b>		1.00	0.575**	0.504**	0.583**	<b>0.520**</b>
<b>Assurance</b>			1.00	0.545**	0.662**	<b>0.763**</b>
<b>Responsiveness</b>				1.00	0.400**	<b>0.349*</b>
<b>Empathy</b>					1.00	<b>0.517**</b>
<b>Overall Satisfaction</b>						<b>1.00</b>

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

\* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**Table 4-6:** Correlation analysis of satisfaction variables of tourists at Istanbul

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Tangibility</b>	<b>Reliability</b>	<b>Assurance</b>	<b>Responsiveness</b>	<b>Empathy</b>	<b>Overall Satisfaction</b>
<b>Tangibility</b>	1.00	0.800**	0.646**	0.779**	0.676**	<b>0.730**</b>
<b>Reliability</b>		1.00	0.694**	0.908**	0.637**	<b>0.806**</b>
<b>Assurance</b>			1.00	0.931**	0.844**	<b>0.742**</b>
<b>Responsiveness</b>				1.00	0.812**	<b>0.851**</b>
<b>Empathy</b>					1.00	<b>0.729**</b>
<b>Overall Satisfaction</b>						<b>1.00</b>

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

\* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**Table 4-7:** Correlations between touristic service quality dimensions and overall tourists' satisfaction in Barcelona

<b>Variable</b>		<b>Overall Satisfaction</b>	<b>Result</b>
<b>Tangibility</b>	<b>Pearson Correlation</b>	0.382**	<b>H<sub>01a</sub> is Rejected</b>
	<b>Significant Level</b>	0.006	
<b>Reliability</b>	<b>Pearson Correlation</b>	0.520**	<b>H<sub>01b</sub> is Rejected</b>
	<b>Significant Level</b>	0.000	
<b>Assurance</b>	<b>Pearson Correlation</b>	0.763**	<b>H<sub>01c</sub> is Rejected</b>
	<b>Significant Level</b>	0.000	
<b>Responsiveness</b>	<b>Pearson Correlation</b>	0.349*	<b>H<sub>01d</sub> is Rejected</b>
	<b>Significant Level</b>	0.013	
<b>Empathy</b>	<b>Pearson Correlation</b>	0.517**	<b>H<sub>01e</sub> is Rejected</b>
	<b>Significant Level</b>	0.000	

**Table 4-8:** Correlations between touristic service quality dimensions and overall tourists' satisfaction in Istanbul

<b>Variable</b>		<b>Overall Satisfaction</b>	<b>Result</b>
<b>Tangibility</b>	<b>Pearson Correlation</b>	0.730**	<b>H<sub>01a</sub> is Rejected</b>
	<b>Significant Level</b>	0.000	
<b>Reliability</b>	<b>Pearson Correlation</b>	0.806**	<b>H<sub>01b</sub> is Rejected</b>
	<b>Significant Level</b>	0.000	
<b>Assurance</b>	<b>Pearson Correlation</b>	0.742**	<b>H<sub>01c</sub> is Rejected</b>
	<b>Significant Level</b>	0.000	
<b>Responsiveness</b>	<b>Pearson Correlation</b>	0.851**	<b>H<sub>01d</sub> is Rejected</b>
	<b>Significant Level</b>	0.000	
<b>Empathy</b>	<b>Pearson Correlation</b>	0.729**	<b>H<sub>01e</sub> is Rejected</b>
	<b>Significant Level</b>	0.000	

#### 4.2.5.2 Interpretation of hypothesis

Table 4-7 reports there are positive correlations between ‘Overall Satisfaction’ and ‘Tangibility’ ( $r=0.382$ ), ‘Reliability’ ( $r=0.520$ ), ‘Assurance’ ( $r=0.763$ ), ‘Responsiveness’ ( $r=0.349$ ) and ‘Empathy’ ( $r=0.517$ ). Consequently, the finding supports to reject the  $H_{01}$  hypothesis and it can be concluded that all dimensions could contribute to increase the tourist satisfaction in Barcelona.

In case of sub-hypotheses  $H_{01a}$ ,  $H_{01b}$ ,  $H_{01c}$ ,  $H_{01d}$  and  $H_{01e}$ , it can be concluded that “Tangibility”, “Reliability”, “Assurance”, “Responsiveness”, and “Empathy” have significant and positive correlation with “Overall satisfaction” with 0.382 ( $p=0.006$ ),

0.520 ( $p=0.000$ ), 0.763 ( $p=0.000$ ), 0.349 ( $p=0.013$ ) and 0.517 ( $p=0.000$ ). So, the hypotheses  $H_{01a}$ ,  $H_{01b}$ ,  $H_{01c}$ ,  $H_{01d}$  and  $H_{01e}$  are rejected.

In case of Istanbul, Table 4-8 reports there are positive correlations between ‘Overall Satisfaction’ and ‘Tangibility’ ( $r=0.730$ ), ‘Reliability’ ( $r=0.806$ ), ‘Assurance’ ( $r=0.742$ ), ‘Responsiveness’ ( $r=0.851$ ) and ‘Empathy’ ( $r=0.729$ ). Consequently, the finding supports to reject the  $H_{01}$  hypothesis and it can be concluded that all dimensions could contribute to increase the tourist satisfaction in Istanbul.

In case of sub-hypotheses  $H_{01a}$ ,  $H_{01b}$ ,  $H_{01c}$ ,  $H_{01d}$  and  $H_{01e}$ , it can be concluded that “Tangibility”, “Reliability”, “Assurance”, “Responsiveness” and “Empathy” have significant and positive correlation with “Overall satisfaction” with 0.730 ( $p=0.000$ ), 0.806 ( $p=0.000$ ), 0.742 ( $p=0.000$ ), 0.851 ( $p=0.000$ ) and 0.729 ( $p=0.000$ ). So, the hypotheses  $H_{01a}$ ,  $H_{01b}$ ,  $H_{01c}$ ,  $H_{01d}$  and  $H_{01e}$  are rejected.

#### **4.2.5.3 Regression analysis**

After correlation analysis, ‘Overall Satisfaction’ variable as a dependent variable was considered for stepwise regression analysis.

Further, based on Table 4-9 the related variables of service were entered into the regression equation to predict the ‘Overall satisfaction’. Table 4-9 reports that two out of five key dimensions contributed to increase the tourist satisfaction; therefore, In Model 1, ‘Assurance’ as the other independent variable was added into the model, the variable significantly explains 58.20 % of the total variance and in Model 2 “Tangibility” and “Assurance” variables significantly explain 61.6 % of the total variance. It significantly contributed to increase the explanation of the total variance by 0.034.

**Table 4-9:** Regression model summary of satisfaction variables in Barcelona

Model	Variable	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	F Change	Sig. F Change
1	Assurance	0.763 <sub>a</sub>	0.582	0.569	0.5985	<b>0.582</b>	23.867	0.000
2	Tangibility	0.785 <sub>b</sub>	<b>0.616</b>	0.601	0.5753	<b>0.034</b>	4.952	0.031

Dependent Variable: Tourist satisfaction

a: Predictors: (Constant), Assurance

b: Predictors: (Constant), Tangibility, Assurance

Overall, the R-square (0.616) in Table 4-9, exposes that the model can predict the tourist satisfaction factor by almost 61.6%, correctly. In other words, it can be mentioned that tourist in Barcelona could be satisfied up to 61.6% through ‘Assurance’ and ‘Tangibility’ dimensions. Consequently, the findings of the study show that 38.4 % (100%-61.6%) of improving factors are unaccounted and unexplained for recognition of tourist satisfaction dimensions in Barcelona.

In case of Istanbul also the related variables of service were entered into the regression equation to predict the ‘Overall satisfaction’. Table 4-10 reports that one out of five key dimensions contributed to increase the tourist satisfaction; therefore, in Model 1 “Responsiveness” variable significantly explains 72.3% of the total variance.

**Table 4-10:** Regression model summary of satisfaction variables in Istanbul

Model	Variable	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	F Change	Sig. F Change
1	Responsiveness	0.851 <sup>a</sup>	<b>0.723</b>	0.718	0.40163	0.723	125.583	0.000

Dependent Variable: Tourist satisfaction

a: Predictors: (Constant), Responsiveness

Overall, the R-square (0.723) in Table 4-10, exposes that the model can predict the tourist satisfaction factor by almost 72.3%, correctly. In other words, it can be mentioned that tourist in Istanbul could be satisfied up to 72.3% through ‘Responsiveness’ dimension. Consequently, the findings of the study show that 27.7 % (100%-72.3%) of improving factors are unaccounted and unexplained for recognition of tourist satisfaction dimensions in Istanbul.

#### 4.2.5.4 Comparison of service quality dimensions

Table 4-11 reports descriptive statistic of SERVQUAL dimensions of Barcelona and Istanbul. In addition, it reports that in Barcelona the average rating significantly is higher than the average rating in “Assurance dimension”(p<0.05) and there are no significant difference between two cities in case of other SERVQUAL dimensions. The overall satisfaction of tourists in Barcelona also is higher than Istanbul city.

Therefore, based on findings, it can be stated that the results reject H<sub>02</sub> and accept H<sub>03</sub> hypotheses.

**Table 4-11:** Descriptive Statistics on tourists’ Perception of Service Quality in Barcelona and Istanbul (N=100)

Dimension	Barcelona (N=50)		Istanbul (N=50)		Difference	t	Sig. (2tailed)	Results
	Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D				
Tangibility	3.97	0.3518	3.91	0.4705	0.06	0.764	0.449	p>0.05
Reliability	3.96	0.5248	3.84	0.5722	0.12	1.068	0.291	p>0.05
Assurance	<b>3.55</b>	<b>0.6253</b>	<b>3.30</b>	<b>0.6546</b>	<b>0.25</b>	<b>2.091</b>	<b>0.042</b>	<b>p&lt;0.05</b>
Responsiveness	3.72	0.8091	3.57	0.5646	0.15	1.209	0.232	p>0.05
Empathy	3.71	0.5686	3.54	0.6442	0.17	1.382	0.173	p>0.05
<b>Overall Satisfaction</b>	<b>4.06</b>	<b>0.7117</b>	<b>3.80</b>	<b>0.7559</b>	<b>0.26</b>	<b>1.827</b>	<b>0.035</b>	<b>Reject</b>



## **5. CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY AND DIRECTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH**

At the final stage of data analysis, the study compares SERVQUAL dimensions in Barcelona and Istanbul cities. Table 4-11 states there are difference between the cities and it can be concluded the result reject hypotheses  $H_{02}$  and accept  $H_{03}$ .

Totally, it states tourists in Barcelona were more satisfied than tourists in Istanbul in “Assurance”, “Empathy” and “ Responsiveness” dimensions.

Additionally, With respect to regression analysis, Table 4-9 shows that in Barcelona, “Assurance” and “Tangibility” dimensions could contribute to increase tourist’s satisfaction. In other word, the variables such as “The appearance of heritage places”, “Food and accommodation quality”, “Cleanness and availability of facilities”, “Level of security and safety” and “Level of English language of people” could play an important role for satisfying the tourist in Barcelona. Whereas in Istanbul, tourist satisfaction mostly was effected by “Responsiveness” attribute. In other word, the variables such as “Availability of staff to provide service” and “Staff’s willingness to respond and help” could play a significant role for satisfying the tourist in Istanbul.

Additionally both cities have significant different in perception of “Assurance” variable. For example in some variables such as “Knowledge of staff”, “Level of safety and security”, and “Level of English language of people” Barcelona is better than Istanbul. Indeed to enhance “Assurance” factor, Tourist Authority of Istanbul need to remove the insecurity issues such as pick pocketing in metro stations and crowed places. In addition, it is suggested to manager of touristic places such as hotels and heritage places and museum to focus on improving the level of English languages of staff in order to making efficient communication with tourists.

In addition, concerning Table 4-9 and 4-10 the mentioned factors contribute 61.6% and 72.3% to improvement of quality of touristic service quality in Barcelona and

Istanbul; it means that 38.4% and 27.7% of improving factors are unaccounted and unexplained for recognition of tourist satisfaction dimensions in the cities. So, conducting a survey by Tourist Authorities are needed to know about tourist's expectation level towards other services quality dimensions by giving tourists the opportunity to talk about both their positive as well as negative experiences in Barcelona and Istanbul cities and establish a proper feedback system to evaluate the tourist's expectation and perception. Additionally, conducting training course for employees is suggested in order to improve the quality of personal attention to tourists and other factors that are required for the provision of a high level of service quality. The allocation of financial resources for the human resource applications will equip employees with a better understanding of excellent.



## REFERENCE

- Aaker, D. A. & Keller, K. L.** (1990). Consumer Evaluations of Brand Extensions, *Journal of Marketing*, 54(1),27-41.
- Albrecht, K.** (1991), Total Quality Service, Executive Excellence, pp. 18-19.
- Allen, J.** (2000). Event planning: The ultimate guide to successful meetings, corporate events, fundraising galas, conferences, conventions, incentives and other special events, Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Andreoli, T.** (1996). Hassle-free service key to repeat biz. *Discount Store News*, 35 (9),pp.62-66.
- Babakus, E. & Boiler, G.W.** (1992). An empirical assessment to the SERVQUAL scale,*Journal of Business Research*, 24, pp.253-268.
- Backman, S.J., & Veldkamp, C.** (1995). Examination of the relationship between service quality and user loyalty, *Journal of Parks and Recreation Administration*, 13, pp.29-41.
- Bagozzi, R.P.** (1992). The Self Regulation of Attitudes, Intentions, and Behavior, *Social Psychology Quarterly* ,55,pp.178-204
- Baker, D. A., & Crompton, J. L.** (2000). Quality, satisfaction, and behavioral intentions, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27, pp785-804.
- Barrington, Melvin N., Olsen, Michael D.** (1988).An Evaluation of Service Complexity Measures of Front Office Employees in the Hotel/Motel Industry, *Hospitality Research Journal*, 12(2),pp 149-162.
- Bateson, J. E. G.** (1979). Why we need services marketing. In O. C. Ferrell, S. W. Brown,& C. W. Lamb, Jr. (Eds.), Conceptual and theoretical developments in marketing, Chicago: *American Marketing Association*, pp.131-146.
- Bateson, J.E.** (1985). Perceived control and the service encounter, In J.A. Czepiel,M.R. Lolomon, & C.F. Suprenant (Eds.), *The service encounter* London,Lexington Books, pp.67-82.
- Bateson E.G., Hoffman K.D.** (1999). *Managing Service Marketing*, Boston, Dryden Press.
- Bebko, C. P.** (2000). Service intangibility and its impact on consumer expectations of service quality, *Journal of Services Marketing*, 14(1), pp.9-26.

- Beech, J., & Chadwick, S. (Eds.).** (2004). The business of sport management[Electronic version], Retrieved August 14, 2006, from <http://www.booksites.net/download/chadwickbeech/Glossary.htm>
- Berelson, Bernard P., and Steiner, Gary, A.** (1964). Human Behavior: An Inventory of Scientific Findings. Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., New York.
- Berry, L.** (1980). Services marketing is different, *Business*, 30(May-June), pp.24-29.
- Berry, L. L., Zeithaml, V. A. & Parasuraman, A.** (1985). Quality Counts in Service, Too. *Business Horizons*, 28, pp. 44-52.
- Berry, L. L., Zeithaml, V. A., & Parasuraman, A.** (1990). Delivering quality service: Balancing customer perceptions and expectations, New York, The Free Press.
- Bitner, M. J., Booms, B.H., & Tetreault, M.S.** (1990). The service encounter, Diagnosing favourable and unfavourable incidents, *Journal of Marketing*, 54, pp. 71-84.
- Bitner, M. J., & Hubbert, A. R.** (1994). Encounter satisfaction versus overall satisfaction versus quality, In: R. T. Rust & R. Oliver (Eds). *Service Quality: New Directions in Theory and Practice*, Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications ,pp.72-93,
- Bolton, R.N. & Drew, J.H.** (1991). A Multistage Model of Customers, Assessments of Service Quality and Value, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 17(3), pp.375-384.
- Bolton, R. N., & Drew, J. H.** (1991a). A Longitudinal Analysis of the Impact of Service Changes on Customer Attitudes, *Journal of Marketing*, 55 (61), pp.1-9.
- Bolton, R. N., & Lemon, K. N.** (1999). A dynamic model of customers' usage of services: Usage as an antecedent and consequence of satisfaction, *Journal of Marketing Research*, 36(2), 171.
- Boulding, W., Kalra, A., Staelin, R., & Zeithaml, V.** (1993). A dynamic process model of service quality: From expectations to behavioral intentions, *Journal of Marketing Research*, 30(February), pp. 7-27.
- Brace, I.** (2004). Questionnaire Design: How to Plan, Structure, and Write Survey Material for Effective Market Research. London: Kogan Page, Limited, 7, pp.118.
- Bright, A.D.** (1994). Information campaigns that enlighten and influence the Public, *Parks and Recreation*, 29, pp. 48-54.

- Bristol City Council.** (2005). Promoting a credible, competitive and confident social economy: Research report into quality systems and the social economy, Bristol, England.
- Bultena, Gordon L., & Klessig, Lowell L.**(1969). Satisfaction in camping: A conceptualization and guide to social research, *Journal of Leisure Research*, 1(4), pp.348-354.
- Brown, T. J., Churchill, G. A., & Peter, J. P. (1993).** Improving the measurement of service quality, *Journal of Retailing*, 69(1),pp. 127-147.
- Brown, S. W., & Bond, E. U., III.** (1995).The internal market/external market framework and service quality: Toward theory in services marketing, *Journal of Marketing Management*, 11(1-3),pp. 25-39.
- Buttle, F.** (1996).SERVQUAL: Review, critique, research agenda. *European Journal of Marketing*, 30(1), pp.8-32.
- Campbell, John D.** (1967).Studies in Attitude Formation, in Carolyn W. Sherif and Muzafer Sherif, eds., Attitude, Eao-Involvement and Change. John Wiley and Sons, Inc., pp. 153-169.
- Cateora, R. P.** (1990). International Marketing, Home wood, IL: Richard D. Irwin, pp.410-12.
- Carman, J. M.** (1990). Consumer Perceptions of Service Quality: An Assessment of the SERVQUAL Dimensions. *Journal of Retailing*, 66(11),pp. 33-55.
- Carman, M. J. and Langerd, E.** (1980). Growth Strategies of Service Firms, *Strategic Management Journal*, 1 (January March),pp. 7-22.
- Cavallo, G.O. & Perelmuth, J.** (1989). Building Customer Satisfaction, Strategically, Bottomline, pp. 29-33.
- Chen, C. and Chen, F.** (2010). Experience quality, perceived value, satisfaction and behavioral intentions for heritage tourists. *Tourism Management*, 31,pp. 29–35.
- Childress, R. D., & Crompton, J. L.** (1997). A comparison of alternative direct and discrepancy approaches to measuring quality of performance at a festival, *Journal of Travel Research*, 36(Fall), pp.43-57.
- Clemmer, J.** (1992). Firing on all cylinders. Toronto, ON: Macmillan Canada.
- Crandall R.** (2010). Why measure customer satisfaction. Web pages. Visited on 24.10.2010 <[www.hostedsurvey.com/article-measure-survey.html](http://www.hostedsurvey.com/article-measure-survey.html)>
- Crompton, J. L., & Love, L. L.** (1995). The predictive validity of alternative approaches of evaluating quality of a festival, *Journal of Travel Research*, 34, pp.11-24.

- Cronin, J. J., Brady, M. K., & Hult, G. T.** (2000). Assessing the Effects of Quality, Value, and Customer Satisfaction on Consumer Behavioral Intentions in Service Environments, *Journal of Retailing*, 76(2), pp.193–218.
- Cronin, J. J., Brady, M. K., & Hult, G. T.** (2000). Assessing the Effects of Quality, Value, and customer Satisfaction on Consumer Behavioral Intentions in Service Environments. *Journal of Retailing*, 76(2),pp. 193–218
- Cronin, J. Joseph, & Taylor, Steven A.** (1992). Measuring Service Quality: A Re-examination and Extension, *Journal of Marketing*, 56(3), pp. 55-68.
- Crosby, P-B.** (1979). *Quality was free: The art o f making quality certain.* Scarborough, ON: The New American Library.
- Dabholkar, P. A., Shepherd, C. D., & Thorpe, D. I.** (2000).A comprehensive framework for service quality: An investigation of critical conceptual and measurement issues through a longitudinal study. *Journal of Retailing*, 76(2), 139-173.
- Davis, Keith.**(1977).*Human Behavior at Work.* 5th ed., McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Dean, E.B.** (1998).Total quality control: From the perspective of competitive advantage. (On-line). Available: <http://akao.larc.nasa.gov/dfc/tqc.html>
- Dedeke, A.** (2003). Service quality: A fulfilment-oriented and interactions-centered approach. *Managing Service Quality*, 13(4),pp. 276-289.
- Deming, W. E.** (1966). *Some theory of sampling.* Mineola, NY: Dover Publications.
- Deming, W. E.** (1986). *Out of the crisis.* Cambridge: MA: MIT Center for Advanced Educational Services.
- Donnelly, & W. George (Eds.).** *Marketing of services Chicago,* American Marketing Association, pp. 5-9.
- Douglas, C. B.** (1993). Members' Perception of Service Quality at the Nellis Air Force Base Officers' Open Mess (Nevada). Las Vegas: University of Nevada, Department of Business Administration.
- Draper, N.R. & Smith, H.** (1981). *Applied regression analysis.* (2nd Ed.) New York: Wiley
- Erramilli, M. K.** (1990). Entry Mode Choice in Service Industries, *InternationalMarketing Review*, 7(5), pp.50-62.

- Erto, P. & Vanacore, A.** (2002). A probabilistic Approach to measure Hotel Service Quality, *Total Quality Management*, 13(2), pp. 165-174.
- Evans, J.R., & Lindsay, W.M.** (2002). *The management and control of quality*. Cincinnati, Ohio: South-Western.
- Feigenbaum, A. V.** (1951). *Quality control: Principles, practice, and administration*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Fick, G. R., & Ritchie, J. R.** (1991). Measuring service quality in the travel and tourism industry. *Journal of Travel Research*, 30(Fall), pp.2-9.
- Fisk, R. P., Brown, S. W., & Bitner, M. J.** (1993). Tracking the evolution of the service marketing literature. *Journal of Retailing*, 69(1), pp. 61-103
- Fornell, C.** (1992). A National Customer Satisfaction Barometer: The Swedish Experience. *Journal of Marketing*, 56 (January), pp.1-18.
- Forsberg, K.** (1999). The quality management principles. (On-line). Available: <<http://qmp.wineasy.se/about.html>>
- Francken, Robert E.** (1982). *Human Motivation*. Monterey, CA: Brooks-Cole.
- Francoise, H.** (1993). *The Quality of Interlibrary Borrowing Services in Large Urban Public Libraries in Canada*, University of Toronto.
- Gagliano, K. B. & Hathcote, J.** (1994). Customer expectations and perceptions of service quality in retail apparel specialty stores, *Journal of Services Marketing*, 8(11), pp. 60-69.
- Galbraith, J.** (2000). Review of 20th century management theories. (On-line). Available: <[www.jagatgcc.com/HistMgt.htm](http://www.jagatgcc.com/HistMgt.htm)>
- Gale, Bradley T.** (1994). *Managing Customer Value: Creating Quality and Service that Customers Can See*. New York: The Free Press.
- Gallup Organization, Inc.** (1988). Consumers' perceptions concerning the quality of American products and services, Survey conducted for the American Society for Quality Control: ASQC Publication No. T711
- Gerson, R. F.** (1993). *Measuring Customer Satisfaction: A Guide to Managing Quality Service*, 4th edition. Menlo Park, California: Crisp Publications, pp. 5-12.
- Godfrey, A.B. & Krammerer, E.G.** (1993). Service quality versus manufacturing quality: Five myths exploded. In E.E. Scheuing and W.F. Christopher (Ed.), *The service quality handbook* pp. 3-16. New York, NY: American Management Association.

- Godbey, G.** (1989). The future of leisure services: Thriving on change, State College, PA: Venture.
- Gordon, H.G., & McDougall, T.L.** (2000). Customer satisfaction with services: Putting perceived value into the equation, *Journal of Services Marketing*, 14(5), pp. 392-410.
- Green, L.** (1999). TOM FAQ's (On-line). Available: <[http://www.skyenet.net/~leg/tqmodel/tqmf\\_aq.htm](http://www.skyenet.net/~leg/tqmodel/tqmf_aq.htm)>
- Grewal, Dhruv., Monroe, Kent B., & Krishnan, R. Monroe.** (1998). The Effect of Price- Comparison Advertising on Buyers' Perception of Acquisition Value, Transaction Value, and Behavioral Intentions, *Journal of Marketing*, 62(April), pp.46-59.
- Gronroos, C.** (1982). Strategic management and marketing in the service sector, Helsingfors, Finland: Swedish School of Economics.
- Gronroos, C.** (1983b). Innovative Marketing Strategies and Organizational structures for Service Firms, *Emerging Perspectives on Services Marketing*, Chicago: American Marketing Association, pp.9-21.
- Gronroos, C.** (1984). A service quality model and its marketing implications, *European Journal of Marketing*, 18(4), pp.36-44.
- Grover, V., Cheon, M.J., & Teng, J.T.C.** (1996). The effect of service quality and partnership on the outsourcing of information systems functions, *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 12(4), pp.89-116.
- Gummesson, E. & Gronroos, C.** (1988). Quality of services: lessons from the product sector. In C. Suprenant (Ed.), *Add Value to Your Service*. Chicago, IL: American Marketing Association.
- Gunther, J. & Hawkins, F.** (1996). Total quality management in human service organizations (On-line). Available <<http://www.henderson-assoc.com>>
- Gursoy, D., Kim, K., & Uysal, M.** (2004). Perceived impacts of festivals and special events by organizers: An extension and validation. *Tourism Management*, 25(2), 171-181.
- Hamilton, J.A., Crompton, L.C., & T.A. Moore.** (1988). Identifying the dimensions of service quality in a park context. As cited in D.A. Baker, *Exploring service quality expectation differentials using a triatic service encounter model: A case study*, Unpublished masters thesis, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.
- Hamilton, J.A., J.L. Crompton, J.L., and T.A. Moore.** (1991). Identifying the Dimensions of Service Quality in a Park Context,



*Journal of Environment Management*, 32, pp. 211 – 220.

- Hartshorn, C. S.** (1990). Service quality as perceived by public, private and voluntary leisure fitness industry. Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University.
- Hayes, Bob E.** (2008). *Measuring Customers Satisfaction: Survey design, Use and Statistical Analysis Methods*. Third Edition. USA: Quality Press
- Hernon, P., Nitecki, D. A., & Altman, E.** (1999). Service quality and customer satisfaction: an assessment and future directions. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 25(1), pp.9-17.
- Heskett, James L.** (1986). *Managing in the Service Economy*, Harvard Business School Press, Boston, Massachusetts.
- Hollinshead, K.** (1993). Encounters in Tourism. VNR's Encyclopedia of Hospitality and Tourism, pp.636-651.
- Howard, D.R., & Crompton, J.L.** (1984). Who are the consumers of public park and recreation services?, *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 2(3), pp.33-48.
- Huang, H., C. Chiu, and C. Kuo.** (2006). Exploring Customer Satisfaction, Trust and Destination Loyalty in Tourism. *The Journal of American Academy of Business*, 1 (10), pp.156-159.
- Haung, F., & Su, L.** (2010). A Study on the relationships of service fairness, quality, value, satisfaction, and loyalty among rural tourists. Paper presented at the 7th International Conference on Service Systems and Service Management, Tokyo.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/icsssm.2010.5530137>
- Jamieson, L.M. & Wolter, S.A.** (1999). Management - What is it? In B. van derSmisssen, M. Moiseichik, V. J. Hartenburg and L.F. Twardzek (Ed.), *Management of parks and recreation agencies*. Ashburn, VA. National Recreation and Parks Association.
- Jeffres, L. W., & Dobos, J.** (1993). Perceptions of leisure opportunities and the quality of life in a metropolitan area. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 25(2), pp. 203.
- Jones, M. A., Mothersbaugh, D. L., & Beatty, S. E.** (2002). Why customers stay: Measuring the underlying dimensions of services switching costs and managing their differential strategic outcomes. *Journal of Business Research*, 55(6), pp.441-450.
- Johnson, M. D.** (2000). Deep Blue: The evolution and future of national customer satisfaction index models, Retrieved February 24, 2007, from [http://deepblue.lib.umich.edu/handle/2027.42/35761?mode=simple&submit\\_simple+item+record](http://deepblue.lib.umich.edu/handle/2027.42/35761?mode=simple&submit_simple+item+record)

- Johnson, Michael D. & Fornell, Claes.** (1991), A Framework for Comparing Customer Satisfaction Across Individuals and Product Categories, *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 12 (2),pp. 267–86.
- Johnson, R. L., Tsiros, M., & Lancioni, R. A.** (1995). Measuring service quality: A systems approach. *The Journal of Services Marketing*, 9(5), pp.6-19.
- Kandampully, J.** (2002). *Services management: The new paradigm in hospitality*. Frenchs Forest NSW: Pearson Education Australia.
- Kandampully, J., Mok, C, & Sparks, B.** (2001). *Service quality management inhospitality, tourism, and leisure*. Binghamton, NY: The Haworth Press.
- Kar, E. V. D., Eldin, A. A., & Wang, Y.** (2004). A user centric design approach formobile information and entertainment services (MIES) implemented on a UMTStestbed, Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Mobile Business.
- Kasamson, P.** (1995). The relationship between consumers, perceptions o f productattributes and their willingness to purchase foreign consumer electrical appliances:A comparison o f United States and Thai consumers, DBA, Dissertation, UnitedStates International University.
- Keller, K. L.** (1993). Conceptualizing, Measuring, and Managing Customer-Based Brand Equity. *Journal of Marketing*, 57(1),pp. 1-22.
- Klassen, K. J., Russell, R. M., & Chrisman, J. J.** (1998). Efficiency and productivity measures for high contact services,*The Services Industries Journal*, 18(4), pp.1-18.
- Knutson, B., Stevens, P., Weillaert, C., Patton, M., and Yokoyama, F.** (1991), LODGESERV: A Service Quality Index for the Lodging Industry, *Hospitality Research Journal*, 14 (2), pp. 277-284.
- Kraus, R.G. & Bates, B.** (1975). Recreation leadership and supervision: guidelinesfor professional development, Philadelphia, PA: W.B. Saunders Co.
- Kraus, R.G., & Curtis, J.E.** (1986). Creative management in recreation, parks andleisure services. Toronto, ON: College Publishing.
- LaPage, W.F.** (1983). Recreation Resource Management for Visitor Satisfaction, *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 1(2), April, pp.279-285.
- Leadership factor Ltd.** (2010). Customer satisfaction measurement, <<http://www.chemuturi.com/Measuring%20Customer%20Satisfaction-CMK.pdf>>
- Lee, J. & Beeler, C.** (2009). An investigation of predictors of satisfaction and future intention: links to motivation, involvement, and service

quality in a local festival,*Event Management*, 13, pp.17-29.

- Lee, D. J., & Sirgy, M. J.** (2004). Quality-of-life (QOL) marketing: Proposed antecedents and consequences,*Journal of Macromarketing*, 24, pp.44-58.
- Lee, S.** (2005). A conceptual Model of the Roles of Price, Quality, and intermediary Constructs in Determining Behavioral Intention to Visit a Festival, Texas A&M University: College Station, Texas.
- Lewis, Robert C.** (1987). The Measurement of Gaps in the Quality of Hotel Services, *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 6(2), pp. 83-88.
- Lovelock, C.** (1981). Why marketing management needs to be different for services. In J. Donnelly, & W. George (Eds.), *Marketing of services*, Chicago: American Marketing Association, pp. 5-9.
- Lovelock, C., & Gummesson, E.** (2004). Whither services marketing: In search of a new paradigm and fresh perspectives,*Journal of Service Research*, 7(1), pp.20-41.
- Lovelock, C. H., & Yip, G. S.** (1996). Developing global strategies for services Businesses,*California Management Review*, 38(2), pp.64-86.
- Le'vy, J.** (1997). Organizational determinants of customer satisfaction in the service, The influence of market orientation and human resource factors.
- MacKay, K. J., & Crompton, J. L.** (1988). A conceptual model of consumer evaluation of recreation service quality,*Leisure Studies*, 7, pp.41-49.
- MacKay, K.J., & Crompton, J.L.** (1990). Measuring the quality of recreation Services, *Journal of Parks and Recreation Administration*, 8, pp.47-56.
- Malika, R.** (1995). The impact of culture on the overseas operations of United States multinationals in the United Kingdom and Thailand foreign direct investment, PhD Dissertation, Indiana University.
- McDougall, Gordon H.G., & Snetsinger, Douglas W.** (1990). The Intangibility of Service: Measurement and Competitive Perspective, *The Journal of Service Marketing*, 4(4), pp. 27-40.
- Minazzi, R.** (2008). Customer satisfaction survey in the hospitality industry: comparison of international hotel chains questionnaires, Milano, Università IULM.
- Minor, M. S., Wagner, T., Brewerton, F. J., & Hausman, A.** (2004). Rock on, A elementary model of customer satisfaction with

musical performances, *The Journal of Services Marketing*, 75(1), pp.7-18.

- Mueller, G.L. & Bedwell, D.E.** (1993). Customer service and service quality, In E.E. Scheuing and W.F. Christopher (Ed.), *The service quality handbook*, New York, NY: American Management Association, pp. 3-16.
- Nightingale, M.** (1986). Defining Quality for a Quality Assurance Program a Study of Perceptions, *Service Industry Journal*, 5, pp. 9-22.
- Nitech, D.A.** (1997). SERVQUAL: Measuring service quality in academic Libraries, (On-line) Available: <<http://www.arl.org/newsltr/191/servqual.html>>
- Nguyen, Stéphanie & Leblanc, Thierry.** (1998). The mediating role of corporate image on customers' retention decisions: an investigation in financial services, *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 16(2), pp. 52-65.
- Nyeck, S., Morales, M., Ladhari, R., & Pons, F.** (2002). 10 years of service quality measurement: reviewing the use of the SERVQUAL instrument. <<http://www.esan.edu.pe/paginas/pdf/NyeckMorales.pdf>>
- Oh, Haemoon.** (2000). Diners perception of quality, value, and satisfaction: A practical viewpoint. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 41(3), pp. 58-66.
- Oliver, R.L.** (1980). A cognitive model of the antecedents and consequences of satisfaction decisions, *Journal of Marketing Research*, 17, pp.460-469.
- Oliver, R. L.** (1999). Whence Customer Loyalty?, *Journal of Marketing*, 63, pp.33-44.
- Oliver, R. L. Tam, J. L. M.** (2000). The Effects of Service Quality, Perceived Value and Customer Satisfaction on Behavioral Intentions. *Journal of Hospitality and Leisure Marketing*, 6(4), pp.31-43.
- O'Marrow, G.S. & Carter, M.J.** (1997). Effective management in therapeutic recreation service. State College, Pen: Venture Publishing.
- O'Sullivan, E.L. & Spangler, K J.** (1998). Experience Marketing: Strategies for the new millennium. State College, Pen: Venture Publishing.
- Parasuraman, A.** (1997). Reflections on Gaining Competitive Advantage Through Customer Value, *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 25(Spring), pp.154-161.

- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V.A. and Berry, L.L.** (1985). A Conceptual Model of Service Quality and Its Implication for Future Research, *Journal of Marketing*, 49, pp.41-50.
- Parasuraman, A., Berry, L. L., & Zeithaml, V. A.** (1988). SERVQUAL: A multiple-itemscale for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality, *Journal of Retailing*, 64, pp. 2-AQ.
- Parasuraman, A., Berry, L. L., & Zeithamal, V. A.**(1991a). Understanding customer Expectations of Service, *Sloan Management Review*, 32 (3), pp. 39-48.
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L.** (1994). Reassessment of expectations as a comparison standard in measuring service quality: Implications for further research, *Journal of Marketing*, 58(1), pp.111-124.
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V.A., & Malhotra, A.** (2002). Service quality delivery through web sites: A critical review of extant knowledge, *Greenvale*, 30(4), pp.362-375.
- Park, J. W., Robertson, R., & Wu, C. L.** (2006). Modelling the impact of airline service quality and marketing variables on passengers' future behavioural intentions, *Transportation Planning and Technology*, 29(5), pp. 359-381.
- Petrick, J. F.** (2002). Development of a Multi-Dimensional Scale for Measuring the Perceived value of a Service, *Journal of Leisure Research*, 34(2), pp.119-134.
- Petrick, J. F., & Backman, S. J.** (2002). An Examination of the Determinants of Golf Travelers' Satisfaction, *Journal of Travel Research*, 40 (3), pp. 252-258.
- Pitt, L.F., Watson, R.T., & Kavan, C.B.** (1995). Service quality: A measure of information systems effectiveness. *MIS Quarterly*, 19(2), pp.173-178.
- Pizam, A. & Ellis, T.** (1999). Customer Satisfaction and its Measurement in Hospitality Enterprises, *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 11(7), pp. 326-339.
- Raab, G., Ahami R., Gargeya V., & Goddard G.** (2008). Customer relationship management: a global perspective. USA: Gower Publishing Limited.
- Reardon, James, R., Erramilli, M Krishna, Dsouza, and Derrick.** (1996). International expansion of service firms. *Journal of Professional Services Marketing*. 15(1), pp.31-46.
- Reeves, C. A., & Bednar, D. A.** (1994). Defining quality: Alternatives and implications, *Academy of Management Review*, 19(3), 419-445.

- Reichheld, F. F.** (1996). Learning from customer defections. *Harvard Business Review*, 74(2),pp. 56-69.
- Reid, R. Dan, & Sandler, Melvin.** (1992). The Use of Technology to Improve Service Quality, *The Cornell H.R.A. Quarterly*, 33(3), pp. 68-73.
- Rice, F.** (1990). How to deal with tough customers, *Fortune*, December 3. pp.39-40.
- Richards, G. (ed.)** .(2001). *Cultural Attractions and European Tourism*,Wallingford: CABI.
- Richard, M. D. & Allaway, A. W.** (1993). Service quality attributes and choice behavior,*Journal of Service Marketing*,7(1),pp. 59-68.
- Ritchie, J.R.B.** (1991). Measuring service quality in the travel and tourism industry,*Journal of Travel Research*, 30(2),pp. 2-9.
- Rouffaer, Bruno,** (1991), In Search of Service: The 'G.O.S.'Mode 1, *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 10(4), pp.313-321.
- Sadeh, E., L. Mousavi, M. Garkaz, and S. Sadeh.** (2011). The structural model of e-service quality, e- customer satisfaction, trust, customer perceived value and e-loyalty, *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*, 5(3), pp. 532-538.
- Saleh, F. & Ryan, C.** (1991), Analyzing Service Quality in the Hospitality Industry using the SERVQUAL Model, *Service Industries Journal*, 11(3), pp. 324-345.
- Samson, D., & Terziovski, M.** (1999). The relationship between total qualitymanagement practices and operational performance, *Journal of OperationsManagement*, 77(4),pp. 393-409.
- Sasser, W. E., Olsen, R. P., & Wyckoff, D. D.** (1978). *Management of service operations*.Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Schneider, B.** (1990). Alternative strategies for creating service-orientedOrganizations, In D.E. Bowen, R. B. Chase, T.G. Cumming and Associates (Eds), *ServiceManagement Effectiveness* ,San Francisco: Jossey Bass, Inc. pp. 126-151.
- Shahin, A.** (2004). SERVQUAL and model of service quality gaps: A framework fordetermining and prioritizing critical factors in delivering quality services,Paper presented at the 4th International Conference on Quality Management, RetrievedJuly 31, 2007, from <<http://www.qmconf.com/Docs/0077.pdf>>

- Shames, Germaine w., and Glover, W. Gerald.** (1989).World Class Service. Intercultural Press, Inc., Yarmouth, Maine.
- Sharma, D. D. & Johanson, J.** (1987). Technical Consultancy inInternationalization, *International Marketing Review*, 4 (Winter), pp.20-9.
- Silberberg, T.** (1995). Cultural tourism and business opportunities for museums and heritage sites,*Tourism Management*, 16(5),pp. 361-365.
- Simon and Homburg (eds).**(1998). Customer satisfaction,Wiesbaden, pp. 33-55.
- Simpson, M. C., JR.** (1995). International service variants, A study of airline passengerexpectations and perceptions of service Quality, DBA,Dissertation, Golden GateUniversity.
- Sit, J., & Merrilees, B.** (2005). Understanding satisfaction formation of shopping mallentertainment seekers: A conceptual model. In S. Purchase (Ed.), *Australian andNew Zealand Marketing Academy Conference Proceedings 2005: Broadening theBoundaries*, Perth: Australia: University of Western Australia, pp. 106-114
- Sit, J., Merrilees, B., & Birch, D.** (2003). Entertainment-seeking shopping centre patrons:The missing segments. *International Journal of Retail & DistributionManagement*, 31(2),pp. 80-94.
- Smale, B.J.A.** (1996). The improbability o f less than .05 probability: Overrelianceon statistical testing in leisure research. Unpublished Paper Presentation,University of Waterloo, Ontario, Canada.
- Smith, Don J., & Umbreit, W. Terry,** (1991), Using Drama as an Instructional Technique to Help Students Measure and Evaluate Service Quality, *Hospitality Research Journal*, 14( 2), pp. 505-513.
- Smith, R. A., & Houston, M. J.** (1982). Script-based evaluations of satisfaction withServices, In L. Beny, G. Shostack, & G. Upah (Eds.), *Emerging Perspectives onServices Marketing* (Chicago): American Marketing, pp. 59-62.
- Solomon, M.R., Surprenant, C, Czepiel, J.A., & Gutman, E.G.** (1985). A role theoryperspective on dyadic interactions: The service encounter,*Journal of Marketing*,49(1),pp. 99-111.
- Song, H.,Veen R., Li G., and Chen J.** (2011) .The Hong Kong tourist satisfaction Index. *Annals of Tourism Research*, x(x): xxx-xxx.
- Stankey, George H.** (1972). A strategy for the definition and management of wilderness quality, in John V. Krutilla (ed.) *Natural Environments: Studies in Theoretical and Applied*

Analysis. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Press.  
pp.88-114

- Svensson, G.** (2003). A generic conceptual framework of interactive service quality, *Managing Service Quality*, 13(4), pp267-275.
- Swan, J.E., McCleary, K.J., & Asubonteng, P.** (1996) .SERVQUAL revisited: A criticalreview of service quality, *Journal of Services Marketing*, 10(6), pp. 62-81.
- Tansik, D.A.** (1990). Managing human resources issues for high contact servicePersonnel, In D. E. Bowen, R. B. Chase, T. G. Cummings, and Associates (Eds.), *Service management effectiveness fop*, San Fransico: Jossey Bass, Inc,pp.152-171
- Tian-Cole, S. & Crompton, J. L.** (2003). A conceptualization of the relationships between service quality and visitor satisfaction, and their links to destination selection. *Leisure Studies*, 22, pp.65-80.
- Tian-Cole, S., Crompton, J. L. & Willson, V. L.** (2002). An empirical investigation of the relationships between service quality, satisfaction and behavioral intentions among visitors to a wildlife refuge. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 34, pp.1-24.
- Van Iwaarden, J., & Van Der Wiele, T.** (2003). A study on the applicability ofSERVQUAL dimensions of web sites. ERIM Report Series Reference No. ERS-2002-61-ORG.
- U.S. Census Bureau.** (2007). North American Industry Classification System: UnitedStates, Washington, DC.
- Wakefield, K. L., & Blodgett, J. G.** (1999). Customer response to intangible and tangibleservice factors, *Psychology and Marketing*, 16(1),pp.51-68.
- Webster, C.** (1989). Can Consumers be Segmented on The Basis of Their Service QualityExpectations, *Journalof Services Marketing*, 3(2). pp.35-53.
- Webster, C.** (1991). Influences upon Consumer Expectations of Services, *Journal of Service Marketing*, 5(1), pp.5-17.
- Wren, D.** (1972). The evolution o f management thought. New York: RonaldPress.
- Woodside, A. G., Frey, L. L., Daly, R. T.** (1989). Linking quality customer satisfactionand behavioral intention,*Journal Health Care Mark*, 9(4), pp.5-17.
- Wright, B.A., Duray, N. & Goodale, T.L.** (1992). Assessing perceptions ofrecreation centre service quality: An application o f recent advancements in service qualityresearch,



*Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 10 (3), pp.33-47.

- Wyckoff, D. D.** (1984). New Tools for Achieving Service Quality, *The Cornell hotel and restaurant administration quarterly*, 25 (3), pp. 78-82.
- Xia, W., Z. Jie, G. Chaolin, and Z. Feng,** (2009). Examining Antecedents and Consequences of Tourist Satisfaction: A Structural Modeling Approach. *Tsinghua Science And Technology*, 14 (3), pp. 397-406.
- Yi, Y.** (1990). A critical review of consumer satisfaction, *Review of Marketing*, pp.68–123.
- Yoon, Y., & Uysal, M.** (2005). An examination of the effects of motivation and satisfaction on destination loyalty: a structural model, *Tourism Management*, 26, pp.45-56.
- Yun, L. L. & Hing, N.** (1995). Measuring quality in restaurant operations: An application of the SERVQUAL instrument, *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 14(3/4), pp.293-310.
- Zagorski, K., & McDonnell, J. S.** (1995). Consumer confidence indexes as social indicators, *Social Indicators Research*, 36(3), pp. 227-246.
- Zeithaml, V. A.** (1988). Consumer perceptions of price, quality and value: a means-end model and synthesis of evidence, *Journal of Marketing*, 52(July), pp.2-22.
- Zeithaml and Bitner,** (1996), *Service Marketing*, McGraw-Hill Publication.
- Zeithaml, V. A., & Bitner, M. J.** (2003). *Services marketing: Integrating customer focus across the firm* (3rd ed.), New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Zeithaml, V. A., Berry, L. L. & Parasuraman, A.** (1991), The Nature and Determinants of Customer Expectations of Service, Marketing Science Institute, working paper No. 91-113, Cambridge, MA: Marketing Science Institute.
- Zeithaml, V. A., Parasuraman, A. & Berry, L. L.** (1990). Delivering quality service: Balancing customer perceptions and expectations. New York: The Free Press.
- Zeithaml, V., Parasuraman, A., & Berry, L.** (1992). Delivering quality service: Balancing customer perceptions and expectations, Toronto, ON. Maxwell Macmillan Canada.

## APPENDICES

### APPENDIX A: Questionnaire

Please indicate the expectation and satisfaction regarding touristic service quality

No. of Item	Assessment Items	Very poor	Poor	Average	Good	Excellent
1	The appearance of heritage places					
2	Level of security and safety of the destination.					
3	The value and price of goods and services					
4	Quality and taste of food and beverages					
5	Accommodation quality					
6	Cleanliness of the materials associated with the public services					
7	Availability of daily tour services to other destinations and attractions					
8	Availability of local transport services					
9	Availability of shopping facilities					
10	Availability of facilities and services.					

11	Availability of accurate and reliable information					
12	Availability of staff to provide service					
13	Professionalism level of staff					
14	Special attention given by staff.					
15	Consistently of staff courtesy to meet my needs.					
16	Knowledge level of staff to answer my questions.					
17	Neat appearance of tourist staff					
18	Friendliness and courtesy of staff.					
19	Punctuality of the staff for giving the service.					
20	Staff's willingness to respond and help.					
21	Level of English language of people.					
22	Friendliness of local people.					
23	Convenience level of contact with staff.					
24	Understand of the tourist authorities about my needs.					
25	<b>Overall, I am satisfied with touristic service quality in my destination</b>					

**Tell us something about yourself.**

Please tick the appropriate:

**1. Gender:** Male  Female

**2. Age:**

Less than 25  25 to 35  35 to 45   
45 to 55  Above 55

**3. Education:** Below Graduation  Graduation   
Post graduation  Professional  Others

**4. Occupation:**

Professional  Salaried   
Business  Student  Other: please specify .....

**5. On average, how often do you travel for sightseeing?**

1-2 times  3-5 times  6-12 times  12+

**6. Please give suggestion to improve tourism service quality in Barcelona.**

-----  
-----  
-----

-----  
-----

**Thank you for your time!**





T.C.  
İSTANBUL AYDIN ÜNİVERSİTESİ REKTÖRLÜĞÜ  
Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Müdürlüğü

Sayı : 88083623-044-5479  
Konu : Azadeh TAGHINIA HEJABI Etik Kurul  
Onay hk.

29/08/2016

Sayın Azadeh TAGHINIA HEJABI

Enstitümüz Y1312.130005 numaralı İşletme Ana Bilim Dalı İşletme Yönetimi(İngilizce) Tezli Yüksek Lisans programı öğrencilerinden Azadeh TAGHINIA HEJABI'nin "EVALUATION OF SERVICE QUALITY OF TOURISM INDUSTRY BASED ON SERVQUAL MODEL: A COMPERATIVE STUDY BETWEEN ISTANBUL AND BARCELONA" adlı tez çalışması gereği "Tourist Satisfaction in Barcelona and İstanbul" ile ilgili anketi 15.08.2016 tarih ve 2016/14 İstanbul Aydın Üniversitesi Etik Komisyon Kararı ile etik olarak uygun olduğuna karar verilmiştir.

Bilgilerinize rica ederim.

Prof. Dr. Özer KANBULOĞLU  
Müdür V.

Evrakı Doğrulamak İçin : <https://evrakdogrula.aydin.edu.tr/enVision.Dogrula/BelgeDogrulama.aspx?V=BENUK587>

Adres:Beşyol Mah. İnönü Cad. No:38 Sefaköy , 34295 Küçükçekmece / İSTANBUL  
Telefon:444 1 428  
Elektronik Ağ:http://www.aydin.edu.tr/

Bilgi için: Canan TOPDEMİR  
Unvanı: Enstitü Sekreteri





## **RESUME**

### **AZADEH TAGHINIA HEJABI**

Atakoy, 2 Kisim,H4 block, Kat 4, Daire 7, Bakirkoy,Istanbul, Turkey.

Mob:+90 5374394092

Email: [azadeh.taghinia@gmail.com](mailto:azadeh.taghinia@gmail.com)

#### ***Personal:***

Date of birth: 19/09/1979

Place of birth : Tehran-Iran

Sexual status : Female

Marital status : Married

#### ***Work experiences:***

2012-Now

Simpleks Co, Vice President ,Istanbul, Turkey

1, August – 12, August ,2016

Lecturer, Istanbul Aydin University –Summer School, Istanbul, Turkey

15, January – 31, January, 2016

Lecturer, Istanbul Aydin University –Winter School, Istanbul, Turkey

2001-2005

SEA Project expert, Iranian Department of Environment ,Tehran –Iran

#### ***Virtual work :***

05 April 2002–25 June 2005

Environmental research scientist, Arzyaban Mohit Consulting engineers of Environment), Tehran (Iran)

- *Carrying out environmental impact assessment for a wide range of development projects.*
- *studying and analyzing pollution , atmospheric condition, demographic characteristics, ecology , mineral, soil and water samples.*
- *collect data, assist in project planning.*
- *participate in meetings, take part in coordination and planning of public awareness activities*

***Education:***

2013-2016	Master of Business administration(MBA) ,Istanbul Aydin University, Istanbul, Turkey
2009-2011	PhD Department of Earth Science Studies, Mysore University, Mysore , India.
2004 – 2006	Master of Environmental Science in Environmental Science Department , Mysore university, Mysore , India.
1998 – 2002	Bachelors of Science in Natural Resources Engineering – environmental science Azad Islamic University Tehran, I.R, Iran.

***Research experiences:***

Bachelor thesis: “Environmental Assessment of Resalat Highway on Inhabitants of Shahrake-Jandarmeri”

Master thesis: “Studies on Analysis of Heavy Metal in Agricultural Soils and their Uptake by Plants in Nagarathalli Village of Mysore District.

Master thesis: “Evaluation of Service Quality of Tourism Industry Based on SERVQUAL Model–A Comparative Study between Istanbul and Barcelona”



Ph.D thesis: “Geochemistry , Heavy Metal Pollution And Environmental Impact of Kabini River Sediments Using GIS, Nanjangud, Karnataka

***Publish Paper:***

- 2009 Survey of trace metal contaminations in sediments of Kabini river in the Nanjangud industrial area, Mysore district. International journal on all aspect of environment nature environment and pollution technology , 8(1):49-52
- 2009 Heavy metal contamination of soils and vegetation in the Nagarthalli, Mysore District, Karnataka, India, Environmental Geochemistryjournal. 12(1&2):1-4
- 2010 Heavy Metal Pollution in Kabini River Sediments International Journal of Environmental Research .4(4):629-636. **(ISI: Impact factor 1.818)**
- 2011 Heavy metal pollution in water and sediments in the Kabini river, Karnataka, India. Environmental monitoring and assessment (Springer), DOI:10.1007/s 10661-010-1854-0 **(ISI: Impact factor 1.59)**
- 2011 Characteristic Levels of Heavy Metals in Sediments of the Kabini River in Karnataka, India., Environmental Geochemistry (ISSN 0972-0383),14(1): 11-16.
- 2013 Heavy metals partitioning in sediments of the Kabini River in South India. Environmental monitoring and assessment (Springer), 185(2),1273-1283  
DOI 10.1007/s10661-012-2631-z **(ISI: Impact factor 1.59)**
- 2014 Transferring of Hg Concentration from Ambient Air to Rain Water and Surface Soil in an Industrial urban Area , International Journal of Environmental Research , 8(2):479-482. **(ISI: Impact factor 1.818)**

- 2014 New Method for Sulfur Components Removal from Sour gas Through Application of Zinc and Iron Oxides Nan particles, International Journal of Environmental Research,.8(2):273-278.(ISI: Impact factor 1.818)
- 2016 Istanbul or Barcelona? A Comparative Study on Tourism Service Quality, Business Management and Consumer Studies-An International Journal, ISSN 2415-0347 (Online), ISSN 2414-2808 (Print) ,1(3):133-146

***Presented Paper:***

- 2009 Challenges & opportunities of natural resource management for the 21<sup>st</sup> century, 31<sup>st</sup> international conference on environment, agriculture & food security in India.
- 2011 National seminar on recent advances in mineral sciences and their applications and golden jubilee celebrations of mineralogical society of India

***Certificate course:***

- 2001 ISO 1400 Standard Workshops, DQS Germaney-Tehran-Iran
- 2008 Environmental Management , Karnataka Open University, Mysore,India
- 2011 Research Methodology, Mysore University, India
- 2011 SPSS-Mysore University, India
- 2011 Geographical Information System(GIS), Mysore University, India

***Certificates:***

- 1997 Air Pollution Conference & Workshops, Tehran, Iran.
- 2000 Environmental Impact Assessment Workshop, Environmental Protection ,Research Center, Pardisan Park, Tehran, Iran.

- 2002 Improvement method of environment impact of mining.
- 2005 Environmental Pollution And Management Future Challenge.
- 2006 Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA).
- 2008 Natural resource management: challenge and opportunities for 21st century.
- 2009 38th national seminar on crystallography. Mysore, India.
- 2009 Two day national workshop on rooftop rainwater harvesting and groundwater recharge , Mysore, India.
- 2009 National workshop on applied geochemistry in mineral exploration (mineral ,water and fuels):current and future trends, Mysore, India.
- 2009 National conference on current trends in environmental science and sustainable development. Mysore, India.
- 2009 Special lecture series in geology and environmental science. Mysore, India.

***Computer skills:***

Windows XP , Word , Excell , Power point (Office), Photoshop , SPSS, Geographical Information System(GIS).

***Languages:***

Persian: Mother tongue

English: Fluently

Turkish:Intermediate (B2)

Spanish Elementary(A2)

Germany: Deutsch als Fremdsprache/Sprachniveau (B1)

***Communication skills:***

Carrying out research work has improved my communication skills, my leadership skills and my ability to lead and supervise subordinates effectively.

