

Measuring service quality in the hotel industry: A study in a business hotel in Turkey

Atilla Akbaba*

*Akcakoca Turizm Isletmeciligi ve Otelcilik Yuksekokulu, Orhangazi Mah. Santral Cad. No. 66,
81650 Akcakoca, Duzce, Turkey*

Abstract

The role of service quality in the success of hotel businesses cannot be denied. It is vital for the hotel managers to have a good understanding on what exactly the customers want. Identifying the specific expectations of customers, the dimensions of the service quality, and their relative importance for customers for each specific segment of hotel industry would definitely help managers in the challenge of improving the service quality. The objectives of this study were to investigate the service quality expectations of business hotels' customers, examine whether the quality dimensions included in the SERVQUAL model apply in an international environment, search for any additional dimensions that should be included in the service quality construct, and measure the level of importance of each specific dimension for the customers of the business hotels. The findings of this study confirmed the five-dimensional structure of SERVQUAL; however, some of the dimensions found and their components were different from SERVQUAL. The five service quality dimensions identified in this study were named as “tangibles”, “adequacy in service supply”, “understanding and caring”, “assurance”, and “convenience”. The findings showed that business travelers had the highest expectations for the dimension of “convenience” followed by “assurance”, “tangibles”, adequacy in service supply”, and “understanding and caring”. The research findings also confirmed that, although the SERVQUAL scale was a very useful tool as a concept, it needed to be adapted for the specific service segments and for the cultural context within which it was used.

© 2005 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Keywords: SERVQUAL; Service quality; Hospitality industry; Business hotels

*Tel.: +90 380 611 2999x147, +90 380 611 51 11x147; fax: +90 380 611 32 66.

E-mail address: atillaakbaba@hotmail.com.

1. Introduction

From the review of literature on quality, it has been found that early research efforts concentrated on defining and measuring the quality in the manufacturing sector. Though systematic quality efforts started in the manufacturing sector in the 1920s, research in services started to grow in the late 1970s in several parts of the world (Gummesson, 1991). Since, especially in the industrialized nations, over the past three decades, the service sector has become the dominant element of the economy, and the studies revealed that service quality is a prerequisite for success and survival in today's competitive environment, the interest in service quality has increased noticeably (Ghobadian et al., 1994). Research shows that service quality leads to customer loyalty and attraction of new customers, positive word-of-mouth, employee satisfaction and commitment, enhanced corporate image, reduced costs, and increased business performance (Berry et al., 1989). The empirical analysis conducted by the Strategic Planning Institute has revealed the positive relationship between perceived quality and an organization's financial performance (Berry, 1991). The well-known Profit Impact of Marketing Strategy program of the institute has concluded that companies with perceived high-quality goods and services typically had higher market share, higher return on investment and asset turnover than companies with perceived low quality. This led to the conclusion that in the long term, the most important factor affecting business performance is the quality of goods and services offered by the organization, relative to its competitors (Juran and Gryna, 1993).

Despite the increasing importance of the service sector and of the significance of quality as a competitive factor, service quality concepts are not well developed (Ghobadian et al., 1994). Since service quality is an elusive concept, there is considerable debate in the relevant literature about how best to conceptualize this phenomenon. Though an all-embracing definition of service quality is not possible yet, definitions of service quality proposed by researchers revolve around the idea that it is the result of the comparison customers make between their expectations about a service and their perceptions of the way the service has been performed (Lewis and Booms, 1983; Grönroos, 1984; Parasuraman et al., 1985, 1988). This shared point brings about a broad consensus that service quality must be defined from the customer's perspective. Thus, a great majority of research focuses on the question of how service quality perceived by customers and how perceived service quality can be measured (Stauss and Weinlich, 1997).

Service quality cannot be objectively measured as can manufactured goods and therefore it remains a relatively elusive and abstract construct (Zeithaml et al., 1990). The evaluation of quality for services is more complex than for products because of their intrinsic nature of heterogeneity, inseparability of production and consumption, perishability and intangibility (Frochot and Hughes, 2000). These distinguishing characteristics of services make it difficult to define and measure service quality. In the hotel industry, other attributes, such as imprecise standards, short distribution channel, reliability and consistency, face to face interaction and information exchange, and fluctuating demand have been identified and further complicate the task of defining, delivering and measuring service quality. Moreover, demand for service in the hotel industry is generally clustered around peak periods of the day, week or year, such as check-in, check-out times or holiday season and these peak periods create an environment which makes it difficult to provide consistent service quality (Barrington and Olsen, 1987; Mei et al., 1999).

As competition is increasing and improving the quality of services offered is becoming more vital for the hotel industry, it is important to be able to define the service quality, identify the dimensions of the service quality and their relative importance for customers (Fick and Ritchie, 1991). Having knowledge about these areas could help managers in the challenge of improving the service quality in the hotel industry (Asubonteng et al., 1996).

2. Measuring service quality in the hotel industry

Available literature provides plenty of service quality measurement methods proposed by various researchers (Erto and Vanacore, 2002; Parasuraman et al., 1985; Philip and Hazlett, 1997; Cronin and Taylor, 1992; Franceschini and Rossetto, 1997; Teas, 1994; Schvaneveldt et al., 1991). These methods can be broadly categorized in two groups, as incident-based or attribute-based service quality measurement methods (Stauss and Weinlich, 1997). The incident-based methods utilize the incidents that customers experience in service contact situations. Attribute-based methods exist in a wide range of variants. Among these variants, the SERVQUAL instrument has attracted the greatest attention as a result of its claim of being able to measure the relevant dimensions of the perceived service quality, regardless of which service industry is being considered (Gilbert and Wong, 2002; Tsang and Qu, 2000; Brown and Swartz, 1989; Carman, 1990; Parasuraman et al., 1988, 1991, 1994a). The SERVQUAL instrument still continues to appeal to both academics and practitioners despite numerous criticisms pointed at the scale (Caruana et al., 2000).

In recent years, numerous studies have focused on service quality in the hotel industry (e.g., Juwaheer, 2004; Ekinici et al., 2003; Tsang and Qu, 2000; Mei et al., 1999). The outcomes of these studies have produced several contributions in relation to understanding the dimensional structure of service quality of hotels. At the same time, these studies have proved that there might have been different quality dimensions to deal with for the hotels that serve to different markets and thus fall into different segments of the hotel industry such as, resort hotels, motels, airport hotels, convention hotels, etc. which all have distinguishing characteristics. These studies have also shown that, in hotel setting, some of quality dimensions were different from the five dimensions described by the original SERVQUAL researchers. Akan (1995) prepared a questionnaire adapted from the SERVQUAL instrument and investigated the application of the SERVQUAL instrument in an international environment. The author aimed to examine the dimensions of the SERVQUAL and measure the level of importance of the dimensions for the users of Turkish four- and five-star hotels. The study identified seven dimensions, named as “courtesy and competence of the personnel”, “communication and transactions”, “tangibles”, “knowing and understanding the customer”, “accuracy and speed of service”, “solutions to problems”, and “accuracy of hotel reservations”. Among these, “courtesy and competence of hotel personnel” was the most important attribute influencing the perception of quality.

Mei et al. (1999) examined the dimensions of service quality in the hotel industry in Australia. They used the SERVQUAL instrument as a foundation and developed a new scale called HOLSERV scale, a new instrument to measure service quality in the hotel industry. As the key findings of their study, the authors concluded that service quality was represented by three dimensions in the hotel industry, relating to “employees”, “tangibles” and “reliability”, and the best predictor of overall service quality was the dimension

referred to as “employees”. Saleh and Ryan (1992) conducted a study in the hotel industry and identified five dimensions of service quality. However, the dimensions they found were “conviviality”, “tangibles”, “reassurance”, “avoid sarcasm” and “empathy”, and they differed from those in SERVQUAL instrument. Their study also revealed that the “conviviality” dimension accounted for most of the variance. Knutson et al. (1990), using SERVQUAL as a foundation, developed LODGSERV, an instrument designed to measure service quality in the hotel industry. In their study, five service quality dimensions emerged, among them “reliability” ranked first in hierarchy of importance for evaluating the service quality, followed by “assurance”, “responsiveness”, “tangibles”, and “empathy”. Patton et al. (1994) translated LODGSERV into Japanese and Chinese and administered the instrument in Japan, Taiwan, Hong Kong, Australia and the UK. Their findings reflected that LODGSERV retains its reliability when administered in cultures outside the US. Oberoi and Hales (1990) developed a scale to measure service quality in conference hotels in UK. According to this study, perception of service quality was two-dimensional, and consisted of “tangibles” and “intangibles”. Ekinici et al. (1998) tested the SERVQUAL instrument in two seaside Turkish resorts. Their study did not confirm the dimensions in original SERVQUAL scale. The results of this study have also implied a two-dimensional structure, named as “tangibles” and “intangibles” for resort hotel setting. Webster and Hung (1994) developed an easy-to-use questionnaire for measuring service quality in hotel industry. The questionnaire was based on the SERVQUAL instrument. The authors field-tested the adapted instrument and concluded that their instrument was valid, reliable and practicable, and offer several advantages when compared with SERVQUAL. The adapted instrument consisted of eight dimensions: “tangibles”, “reliability”, “communication”, “responsiveness”, “security”, “understanding”, and “convenience”. Caruana et al. (2000) investigated the usefulness of the three-column format SERVQUAL instrument proposed by Parasuraman et al. in 1994. The findings indicated that the perception battery was the salient component, raising new concerns regarding the usefulness of the revised expectations scale in service quality measurement. The results of the study produced a three-dimensional structure: “reliability”, “tangibles”, while “responsiveness”, “assurance” and “empathy” melding into a single factor. Fick and Ritchie (1991) examined both the operation of the SERVQUAL scale and its management implications in four major sectors of the travel and tourism industry: airline, hotel, restaurant, and ski area services. They found that the most important expectations concerning service were “reliability” and “assurance” for all four sectors. The results of their research confirmed the five-dimensional structure and demonstrated the usefulness of the SERVQUAL instrument, but they also identified a number of concerns and shortcomings. The authors concluded that while the problems and limitations of the instrument did not invalidate its usefulness, care had to be taken in the interpretation of results derived from its extant formulation. They also concluded that SERVQUAL, and any adaptation of it, was most successful when comparing firms within a common service segment rather than across segments. Philip and Hazlett (1997) provided a review of the SERVQUAL instrument and explained the problematic areas associated with the instrument. The authors believed that its five dimensions did not adequately address some of the more critical issues associated with the assessment of individual services. Against this backdrop, they put forward their Pivotal–Core–Peripheral model (P–C–P model). The authors claimed that the P–C–P model provided a simple, yet highly effective,

general framework for assessing the service quality of any service sector. [Armstrong et al. \(1997\)](#), using the SERVQUAL instrument, examined the impact of “expectations” on service quality perceptions in the Hong Kong hotel industry which involved cross-cultural samples. They concluded that significant “expectations” differences exist between cultural groups and that “expectations” did not improve the validity of SERVQUAL. Their findings implied that for hotel services expectations of service differed from culture to culture.

The results of the previous studies found in relevant literature cited above indicated that caution must be taken in efforts for improving service quality in the hotel industry, since in hotel setting some of quality dimensions were different from the five dimensions described by the original SERVQUAL researchers, service quality dimensions differ from one segment of hotel industry to another, and for hotel services customer expectations of service differ from culture to culture.

The present study had four principal objectives, namely to:

- (1) investigate the service quality expectations of business hotels’ customers;
- (2) examine whether the quality dimensions included in the SERVQUAL model apply in an international environment;
- (3) search for any additional dimensions, identified by customers, that should be included in the service quality construct;
- (4) measure the level of importance of each specific dimension for the users of the business hotels’ services.

3. The SERVQUAL scale

The SERVQUAL scale is a survey instrument which claims to measure the service quality in any type of service organization on five dimensions which are *tangibles*, *reliability*, *assurance*, *responsiveness* and *empathy* ([Parasuraman et al., 1988](#)). The SERVQUAL scale was developed by [Parasuraman et al. in 1985](#), and refined in 1988, 1991 and 1994. Realizing the significance of service quality for survival and success of service companies and the need for a generic instrument which would be used to measure service quality across a broad range of service categories, [Parasuraman et al. \(1985\)](#) began a research program to develop such a tool. The research program began with a series of in-depth interviews conducted with executives from nationally recognized service firms in four selected service categories. The four service categories selected included appliance repair and maintenance, long distance telephone, retail banking, and credit cards. In conjunction with the executive interviews, the researchers conducted interviews with three customer focus groups for each of the selected service categories.

The exploratory study comprised of interviews and focus groups led [Parasuraman et al.](#) to make a definition of service quality as the discrepancy between customers’ expectations and perceptions and to identify 10 general dimensions that represent the evaluative criteria customers use to assess service quality. The researchers named these dimensions as “tangibles”, “reliability”, “responsiveness”, “competence”, “courtesy”, “credibility”, “security”, “convenience”, “communication” and “understanding the customer” ([Zeithaml et al., 1990](#)).

Using the conceptual definition of service quality and the 10 evaluative dimensions from the exploratory research as a base, Parasuraman et al. embarked on a quantitative research phase to develop an instrument for measuring customers' perceptions of service quality. The quantitative research phase involved customer surveys in five different service sectors: product repair and maintenance, retail banking, long-distance telephone, securities brokerage, and credit cards. In their 1988 work, the researchers describe the development of SERVQUAL instrument and the resultant structure of the instrument. After two stages of refinement, the initial instrument consisted of 97 items capturing the 10 dimensions refined and condensed to a purified instrument that consisted of 22 sets of expectation and perception measuring items and five dimensions. The resultant five dimensions and their definitions were:

- *Tangibles*: Physical facilities, equipment, and appearance of personnel.
- *Reliability*: Ability to perform the promised service dependably and accurately.
- *Responsiveness*: Willingness to help customers and provide prompt service.
- *Assurance*: Knowledge and courtesy of employees and their ability to inspire trust and confidence.
- *Empathy*: Caring, individualized attention the firm provides its customers.

This instrument consisted of two sections; an expectations section containing 22 statements to ascertain the general expectations of customers concerning a service, and a perceptions section containing a matching set of 22 statements to measure customers' assessments of a specific firm within the service category (Zeithaml et al., 1990). Statements in both sections used a seven-point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly Agree" (7) to "Strongly Disagree" (1), with no verbal labels for the intermediate scale points (i.e., 2 through 6) to measure the intended area.

In 1991, Parasuraman et al. published an article which described the recent amendments made to 1988 version of SERVQUAL scale (Parasuraman et al., 1991). In the 1988 SERVQUAL instrument, nine of the 22 items were negatively worded. The purpose was to keep respondents alert and to encourage them to read statements carefully. However, since many researchers have expressed concern over the negatively worded statements, Parasuraman et al. changed all these negative statements to a positive format.

The 1988 version had attempted to capture respondents' normative expectations. Recognizing the fact that the "should" terminology used in the expectation section might be contributing to unrealistically high expectation scores, Parasuraman et al. changed the wording of all expectation statements. For example, one expectation statement in the 1988 version read: "They should keep records accurately". The revised wording focused on what customers would expect from companies delivering excellent service. The sample statement was modified to read: "Excellent...companies will insist on error-free records". Detailed wording of many perception statements also modified. Two new statements, one each under "tangibles" and "assurance", were substituted for two original statements to more fully capture the dimensions. The tangible statement referred to the appearance of communication materials. The assurance statement referred to the knowledge of employees.

In 1988 version, all service quality dimensions were treated as equally important. This may be inappropriate as research has revealed that determinants of service quality differ in their importance to individual respondents and throughout different service environments.

For this reason, Parasuraman et al. refined the 1988 version and included an additional section to ascertain the relative importance of the five dimensions. In this section, respondents are given a total of 100 points to allocate across the five dimensions according to how important they consider each to be.

Notwithstanding the considerable refinement and modification that have been applied to the original SERVQUAL instrument, many researchers have kept expressing concern about the modified scale. Taking into consideration the criticisms, in 1994, Parasuraman et al. developed and investigated three alternative SERVQUAL formats, as one-column, two-column, and three-column format SERVQUAL. From their empirical research, the authors concluded that the three-column format questionnaire was the most useful one. Three-column format incorporated the reconceptualization of expectations into its two components and enabled the concurrent collection of desired expectations, minimum expectations, and performance data. Adjustments to the instrument also have been made to accommodate the elimination of one of the original statements thereby reducing the number of statements from 22 to 21 and a reordering of the sequence of some of the statements. The seven-point Likert scale of the 1988 SERVQUAL has also attracted criticism from many researchers. To respond to these criticisms, in 1994, Parasuraman et al. extended this scale to a nine-point scale (Parasuraman et al., 1994a, b).

SERVQUAL instrument has emerged as the most popular standardized questionnaire to measure service quality. The review of the relevant literature reveals that the SERVQUAL instrument continues to draw attention from both academics and practitioners (Mei et al., 1999). However, since its creation, the scale has been the object of various criticisms raised by a number of studies (e.g., Babakus and Boller, 1992; Carman, 1990; Cronin and Taylor, 1992, 1994; Teas, 1993, 1994). These theoretical and operational criticisms are listed below (Buttle, 1996):

(1) Theoretical:

- *Paradigmatic objections*: SERVQUAL is based on a disconfirmation paradigm rather than an attitudinal paradigm; and SERVQUAL fails to draw on established economic, statistical and psychological theory.
- *Gaps model*: there is little evidence that customers assess service quality in terms of P–E gaps.
- *Process orientation*: SERVQUAL focuses on the process of service delivery, not the outcomes of the service encounter.
- *Dimensionality*: SERVQUAL's five dimensions are not universal; the number of dimensions comprising service quality is contextualized; items do not always load on to the factors which one would expect a priori; and there is a high degree of intercorrelation between the five RATER (reliability, assurance, tangibles, empathy, and responsiveness) dimensions.

(2) Operational:

- *Expectations*: the term expectations is polysemic; consumers use standards other than expectations to evaluate service quality; and SERVQUAL fails to measure absolute service quality expectations.
- *Item composition*: four or five items cannot capture the variability within each service quality dimension.
- *Moments of truth (MOT)*: customer's assessments of service quality may vary from MOT to MOT.

- *Polarity*: the reversed polarity of items in the scale causes respondent error.
- *Scale points*: the seven-point Likert scale is flawed.
- *Two administrations*: two administrations of the instrument cause boredom and confusion.
- *Variance extracted*: the level of variance extracted is a measure of construct validity. The higher the variance extracted, the more valid is the measure. Generally, the modified scales tended to produce higher levels of variance extracted than original SERVQUAL did.

Despite the criticisms levelled at the scale, SERVQUAL is still regarded as a leading measure of service quality (Lam and Woo, 1997; Mittal and Lassar, 1996). For this reason, in this study the SERVQUAL instrument was used as a tool of analysis.

4. Methodology

A self-administered questionnaire, an adapted/modified version of SERVQUAL, was used in this study to analyze the service quality expectations and perceptions of the hotel's guests. The questionnaire divided into three parts, the first part was designed to measure the respondents' expectations and perceptions regarding quality of services offered by the hotel. The relevant literature, survey instruments developed by past studies, and information derived from experts (academia and industry) provided the basis for developing the first part of the questionnaire. After a review of the literature and interviews with experts, 29 service quality attributes were developed in the questionnaire. SERVQUAL instrument served as a foundation for development of questionnaire. Some attributes were reworded to make them more applicable to hotel setting and additional attributes were added to capture specific aspects of the hotel industry. The layout of the questionnaire was also altered from a two-set of questions format to a one-set of attributes format. The attributes were listed in the center column of the questionnaire and two five-point scales were placed on the left and right sides of the attributes column, the left side measuring the expectations and the right side measuring the perceptions. This layout deviates from the SERVQUAL instrument, but, it overcomes boredom and confusion caused by two administrations in SERVQUAL. Customers were asked to rate the attributes on a five-point scale, (1) indicating "very low" and (5) "very high". The five-point scale was also different from SERVQUAL which had seven-point scales. The second part of the questionnaire assessed respondents' perceptions of overall service quality on the same five-point scale. The respondents' assessment of overall service quality was measured using the following question: "Overall, how would you rate the quality of service you received in this hotel?" The third part of the questionnaire contained questions relating to socio-demographic data about the respondents.

A pilot test was undertaken to assess the reliability of the attributes, and to ensure that the wordings of the questionnaire were clear. Twenty questionnaires were completed by the guests in accompaniment of researcher. Some problems were identified with the wordings and implications of some questions, so some minor revisions were made to avoid confusion. Reliability analysis was also applied to test the internal consistency of each of the expectation and perception attributes. The results showed that the Cronbach's α coefficients for all the expectations and perception attributes, ranging from 0.9150 to 0.9486, were quite high, and they were internally consistent and reliable.

The study was conducted in a business hotel situated in a large city in the west coast of Turkey during 6 weeks in autumn of 2002. The target population of the survey was all business travelers who stayed in the business hotel selected for this study during the data collection period. A convenience sampling approach was employed and 250 questionnaires were distributed to the guests who inclined to take the questionnaires. Hotel guests who checked-out from the hotel and about to leave were approached and asked whether they would be willing to participate in the survey. The questionnaires were handed to the ones who were willing to fill out the questionnaires. The guests completed the questionnaires in accompaniment of researcher and the completed questionnaires were taken back by the researcher right after the completion of each questionnaire. By utilizing this method, a total of 250 questionnaires were attained. The sample size was chosen because the scale developers have used, and found reliable, similar sample sizes in previous studies (Stevens et al., 1995). Of these 250 questionnaires, 16 were not included in the analysis because of incompleteness, and 234 were usable for further analysis.

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences version 11.0 was used to analyze the data. Descriptive statistics analysis was used to measure guests' expectation and perception scores. Paired *t*-test was carried out to test the significant difference between the two means of expectations and perceptions. To explore the dimensionality of the 29-attribute scale, a factor analysis was performed. Validity and reliability of the adapted/modified scale were established. Validity tests how well an instrument that is developed measures the particular concept it is supposed to measure. Reliability of a scale on the other hand indicates the stability and consistency with which the instrument measures the concept and helps to assess the goodness of a measure (Sekaran, 2000). To have an idea on the internal consistency among the items and on the convergent validity of the overall scale, a reliability analysis was employed. Within-scale factor analyses were used to ensure that all indicators in the scale measure the same construct. This process is known as construct validity (Flynn et al., 1995). To test the internal consistency of each factor, a reliability analysis was employed. Based on the new factors derived from the factor analysis, a multiple regression analysis was used to identify the relative importance of the factors in predicting the overall customer satisfaction with the service quality provided by the particular business hotel.

5. Findings and discussion

Table 1 shows the demographics of the respondents. As can be seen from Table 1, the gender distribution was 24.8% female, 75.2% male. The highest proportion of the respondents (39.3%) fell into the 25–34 year age group, followed by the 35–44 year age group (25.2%). The majority of respondents were married (69.6%). A variety of occupations were reported by the respondents. The highest frequencies were self-employed (31.5%), followed by executives/managers (15%), and others (15%). Of 35 respondents who marked "Other" choice, 18 were soccer players, six were engineers, two were computer specialists, and two were unemployed. The question on the educational level of guests showed that 58.5% of the respondents had a university, college or graduate education. Regarding the respondents' frequency of stay at hotels, a major part of the respondents reported that they stayed at hotels five times or more a year (46.2%).

Descriptive statistical methods were used to research guests' expectations and perceptions. The means, standard deviations, and the difference scores were computed

Table 1
Profile of respondents ($n = 234$)

Variables		Frequency (s)	Percentage of total (%)
Gender	Male	176	75.2
	Female	58	24.8
Age	18–24	29	12.4
	25–34	92	39.3
	35–44	59	25.2
	45–54	34	14.5
	55–64	15	6.4
	65 and over	5	2.1
Marital status	Married	163	69.6
	Single	64	27.4
	Other	7	3.0
Occupation	Executive/manager	35	15.0
	Self-employed	73	31.2
	White collar	33	14.1
	Blue collar	19	8.1
	Retired	13	5.6
	Housewife	16	6.8
	Student	10	4.3
	Others	35	15.0
Education	No school education	1	0.4
	Elementary school	16	6.8
	Junior high school	13	5.6
	High school	67	28.6
	Junior college	15	6.4
	Bachelor's degree	83	35.5
	Master's degree	31	13.2
	Doctorate degree	8	3.4
Frequency of stay at hotels	Less than once a year	26	11.1
	Once a year	15	6.4
	Twice a year	29	12.4
	Three times a year	27	11.5
	Four times a year	29	12.4
	Five times or more a year	108	46.2

for each attribute. The means were computed by adding up the scores allocated by respondents for each attribute and dividing the total value by the number of respondents. The gap scores (PM-EM) for each attribute was calculated by subtracting the expectation means from the perception means. Positive scores show better than expected service while negative scores show poor quality. A zero score implies that quality is satisfactory. Paired *t*-test was carried out to test the significant difference between the means of expectations and perceptions. The paired-samples *t*-tests between the respective expectation means and perception means of all the 29 attributes showed that they were significantly different

Table 2

Values for each attribute obtained through analysis ($n = 234$)

Attributes	Expectations means (SD)	Perceptions means (SD)	(PM–EM)	<i>t</i> -value
The hotel has visually appealing buildings and facilities	4.22 (0.61)	3.51 (0.75)	–0.71	12.69
The service units of the hotel have adequate capacity (<i>dining rooms, meeting rooms, swimming pools, business center facilities, etc.</i>)	4.40 (0.70)	3.50 (0.81)	–0.90	13.57
The hotel has modern-looking equipment (<i>air conditioner, furniture, elevator, communication devices, etc.</i>)	4.35 (0.73)	3.37 (0.90)	–0.98	14.10
The atmosphere and equipment are comfortable and appropriate for purpose of stay (<i>beds, chairs, rooms, etc. comfortable, clean, and tranquil</i>)	4.57 (0.63)	3.59 (0.89)	–0.98	15.23
The equipment of the hotel works properly without causing breakdowns	4.51 (0.57)	3.58 (1.01)	–0.93	12.66
Materials associated with the services are adequate and sufficient (<i>soap, shampoo, towel, etc.</i>)	4.45 (0.67)	3.88 (1.02)	–0.57	7.97
Food and beverages served are hygienic, adequate, and sufficient	4.67 (0.57)	4.01 (0.80)	–0.66	11.37
Employees of the hotel appear neat and tidy (<i>as uniforms and personal grooming</i>)	4.41 (0.62)	3.82 (0.76)	–0.59	10.81
The hotel provides the services as they were promised	4.51 (0.64)	3.96 (0.88)	–0.55	9.44
The hotel performs the services right the first time	4.34 (0.64)	3.81 (0.85)	–0.53	8.65
Employees provide prompt service	4.41 (0.62)	3.76 (0.90)	–0.65	10.77
The hotel provides the services at the time it promises to do so	4.44 (0.67)	3.82 (0.86)	–0.62	9.81
Employees are always willing to serve customers	4.34 (0.68)	3.74 (0.85)	–0.60	9.61
Employees are always available when needed	4.41 (0.67)	3.60 (0.97)	–0.81	11.45
The hotel keeps accurate records (<i>reservations, guest records, bills, orders, etc.</i>)	4.52 (0.71)	4.09 (0.87)	–0.43	6.56
The hotel resolves guest complaints and compensates for the inconveniences guests suffer	4.61 (0.61)	3.91 (0.89)	–0.70	11.37
The hotel provides flexibility in services according to guest demands	4.21 (0.70)	3.71 (0.83)	–0.50	8.76
The hotel serves consistent services (<i>providing the same services and associated materials every time</i>)	4.32 (0.70)	3.75 (0.83)	–0.57	10.25
Employees have knowledge to provide information and assistance to guests in areas they would require (<i>shopping, museums, places of interest, etc.</i>)	4.11 (0.83)	3.47 (1.02)	–0.64	9.38
Employees always treat guests in a friendly manner	4.34 (0.75)	3.97 (0.84)	–0.37	5.67
Employees of the hotel understand the specific needs of guests	4.29 (0.74)	3.61 (0.93)	–0.68	10.04

Table 2 (continued)

Attributes	Expectations means (SD)	Perceptions means (SD)	(PM–EM)	<i>t</i> -value
The hotel is also convenient for disabled guests (<i>necessary arrangements made for the disabled</i>)	4.29 (0.78)	3.03 (1.16)	–1.26	13.99
Employees give guests individualized attention that makes them feel special	3.82 (1.06)	3.25 (1.02)	–0.57	7.49
The hotel and its facilities have operating hours convenient to all their guests	4.37 (0.85)	3.98 (0.86)	–0.38	6.46
The hotel provides its guests a safe and secure place	4.66 (0.62)	3.85 (0.88)	–0.81	13.21
Employees instill confidence in guests	4.55 (0.65)	3.87 (0.85)	–0.68	11.54
Employees have in-depth occupational knowledge (<i>professional skills, foreign language, communication skills, etc.</i>)	4.56 (0.66)	3.69 (0.82)	–0.87	13.41
It is easy to access to the hotel (<i>transportation, loading and unloading area, car parking area, etc.</i>)	4.54 (0.65)	3.82 (1.01)	–0.72	10.02
Getting information about the facilities and services of the hotel is easy (<i>reaching information via phone, internet, etc., direction signs, etc.</i>)	4.48 (0.69)	3.86 (0.92)	–0.62	9.57

Note: SD represents standard deviation; PM represents perception mean; EM represents expectation mean.

($t < 0.01$). Table 2 shows the means, standard deviations, difference scores, and *t*-values obtained through the evaluation of data.

A factor analysis was performed to reduce the 29 service attributes to a meaningful, interpretable, and manageable set of factors. The 29 service attributes in relation to their gap scores (perceptions minus expectations) were factor analyzed. The principal component analysis and Varimax rotation method were used in the factor analysis to summarize the information contained in the original 29 attributes measuring the service quality into smaller sets of newly correlated composite dimensions and apply the derived dimension score in subsequent multiple regression analysis. A principle component analysis transforms all the variables into a set of composite variables that are not correlated to one another (Sekaran, 2000). Only factors with eigen value equal to or greater than one were considered significant, and chosen for interpretation. A variable with factor loading equals to or greater than 0.4 was considered significant and included in the analysis. The factor analysis and associated statistics are presented in Table 3. The results of factor analysis reveal that, in this study, five factors emerged as dimensions of service quality. These five dimensions, with 25 attributes from the original 29 attributes, explained 56.8% of the total variance. The five dimensions were named: “tangibles”, “adequacy in service supply”, “understanding and caring”, “assurance”, and “convenience”. The reliability test conducted for each factor indicated that the reliability coefficients for the five factors ranged from 0.7091 to 0.8572, which exceeded the recommended significant level of 0.70 (Sekaran, 2000). Therefore, good internal consistency among the attributes within each dimension was found.

Table 3
Results of factor analysis ($n = 234$)

Attributes	Factor loading	Reli. coeff.	Eigen-value	% of var.	Cum. var. %	Composite reli. coeff.	Factor
The equipment of the hotel works properly	0.706	0.9272	10.412	35.902	35.902	0.8516	1. Tangibles
Atmosphere and equipment comfortable and appropriate	0.683	0.9276					
Modern looking equipment	0.674	0.9275					
Materials associated with the services are adequate and sufficient	0.665	0.9287					
Adequate capacity	0.644	0.9287					
Food and beverages served	0.580	0.9282	1.841	6.347	42.249	0.8572	2.Adequacy in service supply
Providing prompt service	0.747	0.9275					
Providing the services at promised times	0.720	0.9268					
Performing the services right the first time	0.660	0.9277					
Providing the services as they were promised	0.536	0.9281					
Employees are always available when needed	0.527	0.9280					
Consistency in services	0.517	0.9279					
Employees are always willing to serve	0.517	0.9286					
Treating guests in a friendly manner	0.746	0.9292	1.591	5.486	47.735	0.7919	3.Understanding and caring
Flexibility in services	0.696	0.9292					
Understanding the specific needs of guests	0.640	0.9276					
Individualized attention	0.606	0.9294					
Providing assistance in other required areas	0.460	0.9287					
Convenient operating hours	0.741	0.9291	1.380	4.758	52.493	0.8009	4.Assurance
Providing a safe and secure place	0.725	0.9273					
Instilling confidence in guests	0.630	0.9277					
Occupational knowledge of employees	0.518	0.9282					
Ease of access to the hotel	0.805	0.9306	1.235	4.258	56.751	0.7091	5.Convenience
Reaching information	0.641	0.9277					
Resolving guest complaints	0.473	0.9274					

Table 4
Reliability and validity

Factors	Reliability (Cronbach alpha)	Validity (items loading range)	Expectation		Perception		Diff. scores	
			Means	SD	Means	SD	Means	SD
Tangibles	0.8516	0.630–0.762	4.497	0.487	3.658	0.692	−0.838	0.784
Adequacy in service supply	0.8572	0.592–0.779	4.399	0.460	3.780	0.672	−0.619	0.695
Understanding and caring	0.7919	0.580–0.764	4.159	0.550	3.608	0.708	−0.551	0.758
Assurance	0.8009	0.630–0.869	4.539	0.562	3.852	0.647	−0.687	0.743
Convenience	0.7091	0.590–0.784	4.547	0.511	3.777	0.764	−0.680	0.806

Note: SD represents standard deviation; diff. scores represent difference scores and computed as perception mean–expectation mean.

Fornell and Larcker (1981) suggests that “variance extracted” should be employed as a measure of construct validity. The higher the variance extracted, the more valid is the measure. The percentage of variance extracted produced by the present study is in line with the values produced by Parasuraman et al.’s (1988, 1991) works and other researchers’ works conducted in hotel sector. Parasuraman et al. (1988) reported that the percentage of variance extracted by the five RATER factors in the bank, credit card, repair and maintenance, and long-distance telephone samples were 56.0%, 57.5%, 61.6%, and 56.2%, respectively. In their 1991 study, Parasuraman et al. report variance explained in a telephone company, insurance company 1, insurance company 2, bank 1, bank 2, and the combined sample at 67.2%, 68.3%, 70.9%, 71.6%, 66.9%, and 67.9%, respectively. Saleh and Ryan’s (1992) modified replication in the hotel sector reports 78.6%. Mei et al.’s (1999) study in the hotel sector in Australia reports 67.7%. Ekinci et al.’s (2003) modified SERVQUAL instrument in Cretan accommodations reports 73.7%. Juwaheer’s (2004) study in hotels of Mauritius reports 61.8%. The variance extracted values produced by this study and other hotel sector studies do not support the criticism levelled at the SERVQUAL scale that the modified scales tended to produce higher levels of variance extracted, and thus, the validity of the SERVQUAL scale is poor (Buttle, 1996).

The reliability coefficient was calculated to test the internal consistency of the items. Cronbach’s α is a reliability coefficient that indicates how well the items in a set are positively correlated to one another. The closer Cronbach’s α is to 1, the higher the internal consistency reliability (Sekaran, 2000). Table 3 shows the reliability coefficients obtained through the evaluation of data. As Table 3 shows, the reliability coefficients are higher than 0.7 and range from 0.9268 to 0.9306. The α value for the total scale was also high (0.9309). The high α values indicate good internal consistency among the items, and the high α value for the overall scale indicates that the convergent validity of the questionnaire met (Parasuraman et al., 1991). For determining the validity of the measurement instrument it is not sufficient to compute the Cronbach α . Some complementary analyses need to be carried out. To investigate the construct validity of the questionnaire, within-scale factor analyses were performed. Table 4 shows the ranges of within-scale factor loading. The face and content validity of the scale was established by conducting pilot

Table 5
Results of regression analysis, overall service quality against the five service quality factors ($n = 234$)

Independent variables	Standardized coefficients Beta	<i>t</i> -values	Significance
(Constant)		116.870	0.00*
F1: Tangibles	0.387	7.794	0.00*
F2: Adequacy in service supply	0.153	2.836	0.00*
F3: Understanding and caring	0.225	4.666	0.00*
F4: Assurance	0.140	2.798	0.00*
F5: Convenience	0.125	2.599	0.01*

$R^2 = 0.702$.

$F = 107.658$.

Significant $F = 0.000$.

Dependent variable: Overall service quality.

Independent variables: Five service quality factors.

*Significant at $p < 0.05$ level.

studies. The attributes of the scale were pre-tested by selected experts (academia and industry), and hotel guests, for wording, layout, and comprehension. Necessary changes were made based on the recommendations after these reviews, before it was considered ready to be administered to the final sample.

Based on the results of factor analysis, factor 1 (tangibles) appears to be particularly important contributor to service quality evaluation in the business hotel setting. As seen in Table 3, factor 1 accounted for 35.902% of the total variance. Also, factor 1 contains six of the 25 attributes from the scale. A regression analysis was used to further investigate the relative importance of the five service factors in predicting overall quality. Table 5 shows the results of regression analysis in which the five service quality factors used as independent variables and overall service quality measure as dependent variable. According to the results of regression analysis shown in Table 5, the five service quality factors together explained 70% of the variance in the evaluation of overall service quality, which was significant as indicated by the F -value. The significance values of all five factors were less than the significant level of 0.05. The results indicated that the regression model was statistically significant and that the five service quality factors positively affected the respondents' overall evaluation of service quality. An examination of t -values for the five factors indicated that the most important factor in predicting guests' overall service quality evaluation was "tangibles", followed by "understanding and caring". It appears that a business hotel should make more efforts to improve its service quality along these two critical factors.

One of the major criticisms SERVQUAL has been received from researchers is about the dimensionality of service quality. The most serious criticisms are concerned with the number of dimensions, and their stability from context to context (Buttle, 1996). Despite Parasuraman et al.'s (1988, 1991) claim that their five service quality dimensions are generic, it is generally agreed by the researchers that this is not the case, and that the number and definition of the dimensions varies depending on the context (e.g., Bouman and van der Wiele, 1992; Finn and Lamb, 1991). When SERVQUAL has been employed in modified forms for different service fields, researchers identified varying numbers and contents of dimensions according to the service sector under investigation (Buttle, 1996).

Parallel to these claims, numerous studies have been conducted on service quality in the hotel industry as well (e.g., Saleh and Ryan, 1992; Fick and Ritchie, 1991; Tsang and Qu, 2000; Mei et al., 1999). These studies have produced several contributions in relation to understanding the dimensional structure of service quality of hotels. However, when these studies were analyzed, it is observed that, the researchers took the hotel industry as a whole and did not consider the different hotel segments incorporated under the industry such as, resort hotels, motels, airport hotels, convention hotels, etc. which all have distinguishing characteristics (Akan, 1995; Mei et al., 1999; Saleh and Ryan, 1992; Knutson et al., 1990). There are only a few studies which took into consideration this point and focused solely on a specific segment of the hotel industry. Only studies found in literature specifying the hotel segment are Oberoi and Hales's (1990) study on conference hotels in UK, and Ekinci et al.'s (1998) study on resort hotels.

This study was conducted in the business hotel sector and identified five service quality dimensions guests use to assess service quality of the business hotels. The findings confirmed the five-dimensional structure of SERVQUAL, but some of the dimensions found and the components of these dimensions differed from that of SERVQUAL. These findings support the claim that, the number of service quality dimensions is dependent on the particular service being offered and different measures should be developed for different service contexts (Babakus and Boller, 1992; Carman, 1990).

The studies conducted in the hotel sector produce different outcomes with regard to the hierarchy of dimensions in contributing to overall evaluation of service quality. Akan (1995) reports "courtesy and competence of hotel personnel", Mei et al. (1999) report "employees", Saleh and Ryan (1992) report "conviviality", Knutson et al. (1990) report "reliability", and Ekinci et al. (2003) report "intangibles" as the most important dimensions influencing the perception of quality in the hotel sector. In this study, "tangibles" was the most important factor in predicting guests' service quality evaluation. This appeared to be a different result from that of Parasuraman et al.'s (1988) study, in which "reliability" was the best predictor. This finding was also different from the findings of other studies conducted in the hotel sector cited above and in the literature review part of this paper. This finding suggests that for the guests of hotels, purpose of stay may be an important determining element when evaluating the quality of hotels.

Some researchers also address concern about the layout and administration of SERVQUAL. Carman (1990) comments on the timing of the two administrations. Buttle (1996) contends that two administrations of the instrument cause boredom and confusion. Bouman and van der Wiele (1992) also suggest that respondents appear to be bored, and sometimes confused by the two administration of SERVQUAL. This study utilized a one-column customized format of SERVQUAL instrument. The one-column format scale has overcome some problems associated with operationalizing the SERVQUAL instrument. The modified scale is a shorter, more user-friendly version of SERVQUAL, and provides valid and reliable results.

6. Conclusion

Identifying accurately the specific expectations of customers, the dimensions of the service quality around which customers make their quality evaluations, and their relative importance for customers carries vital importance in quality improvement efforts (Asubonteng et al., 1996). Having knowledge about these areas would definitely help

managers in the challenge of improving the service quality in the hotel industry. From this point of view, obtaining specific knowledge about these areas for the hotel segments that show differences with regard to the clientele they serve, the services they offer, and the cultural context from which the hotel generates its customers would create more satisfying outcomes in quality efforts.

This study has contributed to the theoretical and methodological advancement of service quality and hotel industry literature by analyzing some pivotal service quality issues in a specific class of accommodation. This study identified five service quality dimensions that represent the evaluative criteria customers use to assess service quality of the business hotels named as “tangibles”, “adequacy in service supply”, “understanding and caring”, “assurance”, and “convenience”. The findings of this study indicated that the most important factor in predicting business travelers’ overall service quality evaluation was “tangibles”, followed by “understanding and caring”, “adequacy in service supply”, “assurance”, and “convenience” respectively. Although the findings of this study confirmed the five-dimensional structure of SERVQUAL, some of the dimensions found and the components of these dimensions differed from that of SERVQUAL. It was also noticeable that “convenience” has emerged as a completely new dimension. The findings of this study suggest that among the five dimensions of service quality, “tangibles” has emerged as the best predictor of overall service quality. These findings support the claim that, although the SERVQUAL scale is a very useful tool as a concept, it needs to be adapted for the specific service environments and for the cultural context. Along with the important findings obtained by this study, the adapted/modified questionnaire itself is also an important contribution of this study. The questionnaire developed through this study is suitable for use by managers in the business hotels, so that they can confidently identify the action needed areas of services and design service strategies that create satisfied guests.

Investigating the service quality expectations of business hotels’ customers was also among objectives of this study. The findings revealed that business travelers had the highest expectations for the dimension of “convenience” followed by “assurance”, “tangibles”, adequacy in service supply”, and “understanding and caring,” respectively. When analyzed at attributes level, “food and beverages served” attribute received the highest expectation mean score, followed by “providing a safe and secure place” and “resolving guest complaints” respectively. “Individualized attention” attribute received the least expectation mean score. A detailed analysis of expectation, perception and gap mean scores of the attributes could help hotel managers in detecting the weak points of services and designing the services to meet or exceed guests’ expectations.

In designing this study, efforts were made to minimize its limitations, but some still need to be addressed. Because of the difficulties in establishing contact with the study sample before their arrival to the hotel, administration of questionnaire did not follow a before-and-after approach, i.e., the study has measured expectations and perceptions of respondents at the same time. According to Carman (1990), expectation and perception measures cannot both be administered at the same time. Future studies should try to utilize two-phase approach to collect the data from the guests, administering the expectation section in advance of their stay and then perception section following their stay. Another limitation is that the questionnaire used in this study did not include enough general questions, which allowed respondents to summarize their overall experience. The questionnaire included only one question to measure overall service quality perceptions of respondents. To have a better idea about the validity of the questionnaire, additional

questions measuring customer satisfaction and behavioral intentions could have been included. Future studies should consider this point and include such questions as dependent variables. The sample of respondents in this study was dominated by male (75.2%) and married (69.7%) guests. So respondent bias due to demographic differences could have been created. Finally, the results of this study may not have been representative of the whole population, due to the fact that a convenience sampling method was used to collect the data. This study was conducted for only one business hotel. To be able to generalize the findings for this specific hotel segment, a study that would include more business hotels in a variety of regional settings could be conducted. Future studies could enlarge the scope of the study by covering more hotels to generate segment-specific data. Future research could also be extended to other classes of accommodation, such as caravan parks, bed and breakfast motels, resorts, etc. In addition, since this study was conducted solely in Turkey, future research may also look at whether the findings of this research differ by countries.

Appendix A. Questionnaire used for the study

Dear guest,

This questionnaire aims to collect data that will be used in quality development efforts. The questionnaire measures your expectations from a business hotel and your perceptions shaped during your stay in this particular hotel. Instructions to fill out the questionnaire are given at the top of each part. Thank you very much for your cooperation (see [Table A1](#)).

Table A1

Part 1: Center column contains some attributes that customers would expect from a business hotel. There are two scales on each side of this column, the one on the left measures your expectations and the one on the right measures your perceptions. Please read each attribute first and then circle the numbers in both scales that indicate your judgments. The corresponding values for the numbers are shown at the top of both scales.

When evaluating the service quality of a hotel, how important are the attributes given in the center column for you?					List of attributes	If you evaluated the hotel of which you are customer, how would you rate the hotel for the attributes given in the center column?				
Very low	Low	Moderate	High	Very high		Very low	Low	Moderate	High	Very high
1	2	3	4	5	The hotel has visually appealing buildings and facilities	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	The service units of the hotel have adequate capacity (dining rooms, meeting rooms, swimming pools, business center facilities, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	The hotel has modern-looking equipment (air	1	2	3	4	5

Table A1 (continued)

When evaluating the service quality of a hotel, how important are the attributes given in the center column for you?						If you evaluated the hotel of which you are customer, how would you rate the hotel for the attributes given in the center column?				
Very low	Low	Moderate	High	Very high	List of attributes	Very low	Low	Moderate	High	Very high
					conditioner, furniture, elevator, communication devices, etc.)					
1	2	3	4	5	The atmosphere and equipment are comfortable and appropriate for purpose of stay (<i>beds, chairs, rooms, etc. comfortable, clean, and tranquil</i>)	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	The equipment of the hotel works properly without causing breakdowns	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	Materials associated with the services are adequate and sufficient (<i>soap, shampoo, towel, etc.</i>)	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	Food and beverages served are hygienic, adequate, and sufficient	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	Employees of the hotel appear neat and tidy (<i>as uniforms and personal grooming</i>)	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	The hotel provides the services as they were promised	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	The hotel performs the services right the first time	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	Employees provide prompt service	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	The hotel provides the services at the time it promises to do so	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	Employees are always willing to serve customers	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	Employees are always available when needed	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	The hotel keeps accurate records (reservations, guest records, bills, orders, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	The hotel resolves guest complaints and compensate for the inconveniences guests go through	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	The hotel provides flexibility in services according to guest demands	1	2	3	4	5

Table A1 (continued)

When evaluating the service quality of a hotel, how important are the attributes given in the center column for you?						If you evaluated the hotel of which you are customer, how would you rate the hotel for the attributes given in the center column?				
Very low	Low	Moderate	High	Very high	List of attributes	Very low	Low	Moderate	High	Very high
1	2	3	4	5	The hotel provides consistent services (providing the same services and associated materials every time)	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	Employees have knowledge to provide information and assistance to guests in areas they would require (<i>shopping, museums, places of interest, etc.</i>)	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	Employees always treat guests in a friendly manner	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	Employees of the hotel understand the specific needs of guests	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	The hotel is also convenient for disabled guests (<i>necessary arrangements made for the disabled</i>)	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	Employees give guests individualized attention that makes them feel special	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	The hotel and its facilities have operating hours convenient to all their guests	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	The hotel provides its guests a safe and secure place	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	Employees instill confidence in guests	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	Employees have in-depth occupational knowledge (professional skills, foreign language, communication skills, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	It is easy to access to the hotel (transportation, loading and unloading area, car parking area, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	Getting information about the facilities and services of the hotel is easy (<i>reaching information via phone, internet, etc., direction signs, etc.</i>)	1	2	3	4	5

Table A1 (continued)

Part 2: This part measures your assessment of overall service quality about the hotel. Please read the question and circle the number in the scale that indicates your judgment.

	Very low	Low	Moderate	High	Very high
Overall, how would you rate the quality of service you received in this hotel?	1	2	3	4	5

Part 3: Please tick the appropriate box below.

1. You are:					
☐ Male	☐ Female				
2. Your age falls into following groups of:					
☐ 18–24	☐ 25–34	☐ 35–44	☐ 45–54	☐ 55–64	☐ 65 or above
3. Your marital status:					
☐ Married	☐ Single	☐ Other. (please indicate)			
4. Your occupation:					
☐ Executive/manager	☐ Self-employed	☐ White collar	☐ Blue collar		
☐ Student	☐ Retired	☐ Housewife	☐ Other. (please indicate)		
5. The level of education you received:					
☐ No school education	☐ Elementary school	☐ Junior high school	☐ High school		
☐ Junior college	☐ Bachelor's degree	☐ Master's degree	☐ Doctorate degree		
6. Your frequency of stay at hotels:					
☐ Less than once a year	☐ Once a year	☐ Twice a year			
☐ Three times a year	☐ Four times a year	☐ Five times or more a year			

References

Akan, P., 1995. Dimensions of service quality: a study in Istanbul. *Managing Service Quality* 5 (6), 39–43.

Armstrong, R.W., Mok, C., Go, F.M., Chan, A., 1997. The importance of cross-cultural expectations in the measurement of service quality perceptions in the hotel industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management* 16 (2), 181–190.

Asubonteng, P., McCleary, K.J., Swan, J.E., 1996. Servqual revisited: a critical review of service quality. *The Journal of Services Marketing* 10 (6), 62–81.

Babakus, E., Boller, G.W., 1992. An empirical assessment of the SERVQUAL scale. *Journal of Business Research* 24 (3), 253–268.

Barrington, M.N., Olsen, M.D., 1987. Concept of service in the hospitality industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management* 6 (3), 131–138.

Berry, T.H., 1991. *Managing the Total Quality Transformation*. McGraw-Hill, New York, NY.

Berry, L.L., Bennet, D.R., Brown, C.W., 1989. *Service Quality: A Profit Strategy for Financial Institutions*. Dow–Jones–Irwin, Homewood, IL.

- Bouman, M., Wiele, T.V.D., 1992. Measuring service quality in the car service industry: building and testing an instrument. *International Journal of Service Industry Management* 3 (4), 4–16.
- Brown, S.W., Swartz, T.A., 1989. Gap analysis of professional service quality. *Journal of Marketing* 53 (April), 92–98.
- Buttle, F., 1996. SERVQUAL: review, critique, research agenda. *European Journal of Marketing* 30 (1), 8–32.
- Carman, J.M., 1990. Consumer perceptions of service quality: an assessment of the SERVQUAL dimensions. *Journal of Retailing* 66 (1), 33–55.
- Caruana, A., Ewing, M.T., Ramaseshan, B., 2000. Assessment of the three-column format SERVQUAL: an experimental approach. *Journal of Business Research* 49 (1), 57–65.
- Cronin, J.J., Taylor, S.A., 1992. Measuring service quality: a reexamination and extension. *Journal of Marketing* 56 (3), 55–68.
- Cronin, J.J., Taylor, S.A., 1994. SERVPERF versus SERVQUAL: reconciling performance-based and perceptions-minus-expectations measurements of service quality. *Journal of Marketing* 58 (1), 125–131.
- Ekinci, Y., Riley, M., Fife-Schaw, C., 1998. Which school of thought? The dimensions of resort hotel quality. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management* 10 (2), 63–67.
- Ekinci, Y., Prokopaki, P., Cobanoglu, C., 2003. Service quality in Cretan accommodations: marketing strategies for the UK holiday market. *International Journal of Hospitality Management* 22 (2003), 47–66.
- Erto, P., Vanacore, A., 2002. A probabilistic approach to measure hotel service quality. *Total Quality Management* 13 (2), 165–174.
- Fick, G.R., Ritchie, J.R., 1991. Measuring service quality in the travel and tourism industry. *Journal of Travel Research* 30 (2), 2–9.
- Finn, D.W., Lamb, C.W., 1991. An evaluation of the SERVQUAL scale in a retailing setting. *Advances in Consumer Research* 18 (4), 483–490.
- Flynn, B.B., Schroeder, R., Sakakibara, S., 1995. Determinants of quality performance in high- and low-quality plants. *Quality Management Journal* 2 (2), 8–25.
- Fornell, C., Larcker, D.F., 1981. Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research* 18 (2), 39–50.
- Franceschini, F., Rossetto, S., 1997. Design for quality: selecting products' technical features. *Quality Engineering* 9 (4), 681–688.
- Frochot, I., Hughes, H., 2000. Histoqual: the development of a historic houses assessment scale. *Tourism Management* 21 (2000), 157–167.
- Ghobadian, A., Speller, S., Jones, M., 1994. Service quality: concepts and models. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management* 11 (9), 43–66.
- Gilbert, D., Wong, R.K.C., 2002. Passenger expectations and airline services: a Hong Kong based study. *Tourism Management* 24 (2003), 519–532.
- Grönroos, C., 1984. A service quality model and its marketing implications. *European Journal of Marketing* 18 (4), 36–44.
- Gummesson, E., 1991. Service quality: a holistic view. In: Brown, S.W., Gummesson, E., Edvardsson, B., Gustavson, B. (Eds.), *Service Quality*. Lexington Books, Lexington, MA, pp. 3–22.
- Juran, J.M., Gryna, F.M., 1993. *Quality Planning and Analysis from Product Development through Use*. McGraw-Hill, Inc., New York, NY.
- Juwaheer, T.D., 2004. Exploring international tourists' perceptions of hotel operations by using a modified SERVQUAL approach: a case study of Mauritius. *Managing Service Quality* 14 (5), 350–364.
- Knutson, B., Stevens, P., Wullaert, C., Patton, M., Yokoyama, F., 1990. LODGSERV: a service quality index for the lodging industry. *Hospitality Research Journal* 14 (2), 227–284.
- Lam, S.S.K., Woo, K.S., 1997. Measuring service quality: a test-retest reliability investigation of SERVQUAL. *Journal of the Market Research Society* 39 (2), 381–396.
- Lewis, R.C., Booms, B.H., 1983. The marketing aspects of service quality. In: Berry, L.L., Shostack, G., Upah, G. (Eds.), *Emerging Perspectives in Service Marketing*. American Marketing Association, Chicago, pp. 99–107.
- Mei, A.W.O., Dean, A.M., White, C.J., 1999. Analyzing service quality in the hospitality industry. *Managing Service Quality* 9 (2), 136–143.
- Mittal, B., Lassar, W.M., 1996. The role of personalization in service encounters. *Journal of Retailing* 72 (1), 95–109.

- Oberoi, U., Hales, C., 1990. Assessing the quality of conference hotel service product: towards an empirical based model. *The Service Industries Journal* 10 (4), 700–721.
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V.A., Berry, L.L., 1985. A conceptual model of service quality and its implications for future research. *Journal of Marketing* 49 (4), 41–50.
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V.A., Berry, L.L., 1988. SERVQUAL: a multiple-item scale for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality. *Journal of Retailing* 64 (1), 12–40.
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V.A., Berry, L.L., 1991. Refinement and reassessment of the SERVQUAL scale. *Journal of Retailing* 67 (4), 420–450.
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V.A., Berry, L.L., 1994a. Alternative scales for measuring service quality: a comparative assessment based on psychometric and diagnostic criteria. *Journal of Retailing* 70 (3), 201–230.
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V.A., Berry, L.L., 1994b. Reassessment of expectations as a comparison standard in measuring service quality: implications for further research. *Journal of Marketing* 58 (1), 111–124.
- Patton, M., Stevens, P., Knutson, B., 1994. Internationalizing LODGSERV as a measurement tool: a pilot study. *Journal of Hospitality and Leisure Marketing* 2 (2), 39–55.
- Philip, G., Hazlett, S., 1997. The measurement of service quality: a new P–C–P attributes model. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management* 14 (3), 260–286.
- Saleh, F., Ryan, C., 1992. Analyzing service quality in the hospitality industry using the SERVQUAL model. *The Service Industries Journal* 11 (3), 324–343.
- Schvaneveldt, S.J., Enkawa, T., Miyakawa, M., 1991. Consumer evaluation perspectives of service quality: evaluation factors and two-way model of quality. *Total Quality Management* 2 (2), 149–161.
- Sekaran, U., 2000. *Research Methods for Business: A Skill-building Approach*. Wiley, New York, NY.
- Stauss, B., Weinlich, B., 1997. Process-oriented measurement of service quality: applying the sequential incident technique. *European Journal of Marketing* 31 (1), 33–55.
- Stevens, P., Knutson, B., Patton, M., 1995. Dineserv: a tool for measuring service quality in restaurants. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly* 36 (2), 56–60.
- Teas, R.K., 1993. Expectations, performance evaluation and consumer's perception of quality. *Journal of Marketing* 57 (4), 18–34.
- Teas, R.K., 1994. Expectations as a comparison standard in measuring service quality: an assessment of a reassessment. *Journal of Marketing* 58 (1), 132–139.
- Tsang, N., Qu, H., 2000. Service quality in China's hotel industry: a perspective from tourists and hotel managers. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management* 12 (5), 316–326.
- Webster, C., Hung, L., 1994. Measuring service quality and promoting decentring. *The TQM Magazine* 6 (5), 50–55.
- Zeithaml, V.A., Parasuraman, A., Berry, L.L., 1990. *Delivering Quality Service: Balancing Customer Perceptions and Expectations*. The Free Press, New York, NY.

Atilla Akbaba is an Assistant Professor in the School of Hospitality Management at Abant İzzet Baysal University (Akcakoca, Turkey). He teaches hospitality- and tourism-related courses. His areas of specialization include service quality, organizational culture, and management of tourism businesses.