

Oktay Emir

A multi-national satisfaction analysis: An application on tourists in Antalya

Abstract

There is no doubt that customer satisfaction is an integral part of services marketing and holds an important place in terms of providing higher profitability and repeat purchase behavior. Keeping this in mind, this study sets out to explore the satisfaction of tourists of different nationalities at five-star hotels in Antalya. A questionnaire was employed and administered to 2,907 visitors from Turkey, Germany, Russia, the Netherlands, Ukraine, and the United Kingdom to collect the data set. According to the results of statistical analyses, satisfaction varies with respect to nationalities, which is one of the expected results of this study. Based on the roots of variations, the study concludes with appropriate marketing and management implications for managers of five star hotels in Antalya.

Key words: tourist satisfaction; nationality; country-of-origin effects; Antalya; Turkey

Introduction

Since the early 1980s, Antalya has attracted attention from foreign and domestic tourists as one of the premier tourist destinations in Turkey. In response to the growing tourist industry, the number of tourism establishments operating in Antalya has increased. Hotels contribute considerably to the economy of the country at the local and national levels. For hotels to continue contributing to the national economy, they must know whether customers are satisfied with services. In hotel establishments that serve different nationalities, surveys of customer satisfaction provide a remarkable data source for improving management performance (Fontenot, Carson & Henke, 2005). In addition, knowing the difference in satisfaction levels for different nationalities toward the services offered will help hotel operators successfully serve to various markets and consumers. If customers are satisfied with a hotel's services, customers will become loyal to the establishment, providing invaluable positive word of mouth for the establishment (Kandampully & Suhartanto, 2000).

Establishments with a worry with the quality improvement pave the way for an increase of both customer satisfaction and loyalty, strengthening the brand value, enhancing destination publicity and marketing opportunities (Costa & Carvalho, 2011, p. 396). Thanks to the satisfied customers, establishments will gain advantages in hotel occupancy rates and the preferences of tourists over rivals. To serve this purpose, this study examined the satisfaction levels of tourists of six nationalities (German, Russian, Turkish, British, Ukrainian, and Dutch). The survey also analyzed the influence of the services, such as front office, employee, housekeeping, food and beverage (F&B), and customer relations, on satisfaction

Oktay Emir, PhD., Faculty of Business Administration, Department of Hospitality Management, Anadolu University, Eskişehir, Turkey; E-mail: oktayemir@anadolu.edu.tr

with the sum of services offered by hotels. Before moving on to the methodology of the research, the next section reviews the extant literature on tourist satisfaction.

Literature review

The hotel industry is one of the largest industries in a fast-developing sector of today's world economy (Severt, 2002). Service means meeting the demands and needs of customers correctly and at the right time (Hayes & Ninemeier, 2006). Goodwin, Squire and Chapman (2005) stated that the main purpose of hotel management is to meet customer expectations and enhance customer experience with the services offered. Hotel management should adopt a "customer-centered" philosophy to please customers. It is necessary for the hotel management to provide high quality service to the customers, by way of customer-centered marketing (Kotler, Bowen & Makens, 1998). Thus, management will more easily satisfy current customers, making them permanent customers (Vavra, 1997). The services and activities a hotel offers are only a part of quality service. Services offered by hotel management with the main concern of customer satisfaction might offer a variety of services and activities. Satisfaction or dissatisfaction with previous experience is important in that it may influence expectations for the next purchase and customer retention as well as motivating consideration of "brands"; which means that favorable perceptions and attitudes potentially matter (Azim, 2010, p. 112). Within this frame, customer satisfaction should be the main focus of hotel management, an idea put forward by related studies that connect satisfied customers with increased loyalty (Oliver, 1980; Fornell, 1992; Bigne, Sanchez & Sanchez, 2001; Petrick & Backman, 2002; Chen & Tsai, 2007; Chen, 2008).

Multiple theories and approaches have been used to measure customer satisfaction levels and to define satisfaction. According to the frequently used expectation-disapproval theory (Weber, 1997; Wong & Law, 2003; Ha & Jang, 2010) suggested by Lewin (1938), customer satisfaction forms as a result of comparisons between expectations and performance perceptions after consumption (Morrison, 1989; Zeithaml, Parasuraman & Berry, 1990; Kotler *et al.*, 1998; Parasuraman, 2004). According to this theory, customers compare their expectations with the performance they perceive (Lewin, 1938; Ha & Jang, 2010). If perceived performance (PP) is equal to or above expectations (E), then customer satisfaction (S) is the result (Pizam, Neumann & Reichel, 1978; Yüksel & Rimmington, 1998; Reisinger & Turner, 2003; Parasuraman, 2004; Poon & Low, 2005; Chen & Chen, 2010; Ha & Jang, 2010). But, if perceived performance falls below expectations, dissatisfaction (DS) will result.

In the current study, the performance only approach, which directly measures performance criteria, provides another test of customer satisfaction (Choi & Chu, 2001; Heo, Jogaratnam & Buchanan, 2004; Juwaheer, 2004; Poon & Low, 2005). Yüksel and Yüksel (2001) argued that components of the expectancy-disconfirmation theory cause errors in studies. Additionally, previous researchers (Crompton & Love, 1995) have proven that testing satisfaction levels with the performance only approach provides more reliability and validity than does the expectancy-disconfirmation theory. The performance only approach holds that the expectations customers have before service delivery can be shaped by internal or external factors during or after use. Thus, instead of customer expectations and perceived performance, perceived performance is adequate in measuring customer satisfaction.

A few studies have analyzed the satisfaction levels of customers of different nationalities with the services they receive (Akama & Kieti, 2003; Valle, Silva, Mendes & Guerreiro, 2006; Yu & Goulden, 2006). Kozak (2001) stated that hotel establishments entertain customers from different cultures and nationalities; thus, it is not enough to measure the satisfaction levels of only one group of customers. It is necessary to make comparisons to better understand the F&B consumption of customers from different cultures and nationalities. For example, a study carried out in Taiwan by Wong and Law (2003) examined the expectation and satisfaction levels of customers from different nationalities based on shopping choices and the results indicated great significance of the expectation levels in different nationalities.

It would be incorrect to only give importance to one customer group when customer satisfaction research has shown that tourism centers attract tourists from multiple nationalities and cultures (Kozak, 2003). For example, according to a study carried out among British and German tourists by Witt (1980), British tourists perceive vacation in foreign countries as a luxury, whereas German tourists view them as a necessity (Kozak, 2003). According to the survey results from Min, Min and Chung (2002), there is a relationship between customer nationality and purpose of travel. For instance, Japanese customers generally stay in hotel establishments during vacation, and similarly American customers, too, generally stay in hotel establishments for business purposes. For this reason, hotel establishments must keep in mind the demands of both Japanese and American customers. Hotel establishments should offer variety services to better suit the different nationalities of guests.

Pizam and Ellis (1999) mention the importance of measuring customer satisfaction based on local cultural habits and psychological factors and also argue that language differences affect customer satisfaction. According to Hofstede (2001), the cultural values of countries are unique features that make a nation different from others. These features are influenced by beliefs about family, school, politics, government, religion, and science. For example, even if the social and economic characteristics of the Japanese and Korean communities parallel each other, these two countries have developed unique norms and values (Hofstede, 2001). Because culture influences how people perceive their experiences, hotel establishments must measure the satisfaction levels of customers of different cultures to identify which factors are effective in creating satisfaction for each nationality.

Cultural and social features impact the expectations and satisfaction of hotel guests (Pizam & Jeong, 1996; Gursoy & Umbreit, 2004). How needs are met is also a defining feature of a given culture. For this reason, hotel establishments that meet the specific needs and goods/services expectations of their customers have a higher chance of expanding in financial terms. The customer culture targeted by hotel establishments will affect the cost, distribution, and efforts toward the variety of goods and services marketed by the hotel. Accordingly, customers compare the extent hotel establishments meet, or fail to meet the expectations and satisfaction by their cultural values. For example, research has shown that customers from England are more tolerant than are those from the United States of low quality products due to characteristics unique to their nationalities and to the perceptions of quality that stem from the standards of living in their countries (Voss, Roth, Rosenzweig, Blackmon & Chase, 2004). Hence, cultural differences are influential in shaping customer behaviors and satisfaction levels. What's more, Christou and Saveriades (2010, p. 95) argue that conversations between the ethnographer and the participants make it possible for the researcher to investigate the important aspects of the tourist satisfaction process, or more specifically the tourist needs and expectations.

This study, along with similar studies, sets out to examine the satisfaction levels of tourists from different nationalities, focusing on the satisfaction of various interests 'e.g., destination, dining, festivals, and shopping'. Few studies have detailed the satisfaction levels of tourists with hotel services according to tourist nationality. The latest research regarding destinations has shown that tourist satisfaction levels generally differ according to nationality, emphasizing the importance of anticipating the expectation and satisfaction criteria for tourists of different nationalities. The aim of this study is to determine whether there are meaningful differences in the satisfaction levels of customers of six different nationalities in service delivery. The results of the survey will reveal whether there are significant differences in the levels and criteria of satisfaction among customers of different nationalities.

Method

A questionnaire was used as the data collection method. The researcher prepared the questionnaire by adopting scales and items from the related literature (Pizam & Ellis, 1999; Tsang & Qu, 2000; Juwaheer & Ross, 2003; Matzler, Renzl & Rothenberger, 2006), taking the opinions of the experts into account. The scale consisted of eight sub-services and 36 items (four items each for front office, housekeeping, F&B, and employees; and four questions each for physical facilities, hygiene and health, customer relations, and other services). Each item in the scale was graded with a 5 point Likert Scale (within the range of 1= not satisfied at all, to 5= 'highly satisfied').

Turkish, German, Russian, Dutch, Ukrainian, and British customers took part in the study because those were the most frequent visitors to Antalya based on 2008 and 2009 data (2009, only the first five months). The study was conducted between June 2009 and August. By taking the language competencies of the tourists into account, the questionnaires were translated into four different languages through professional interpreters; Turkish, English, Russian and German. Respondents were given language options for completing the questionnaire. The researcher chose Antalya because it is the most popular destination for domestic and foreign tourists in Turkey. Table 1 shows the visitor statistics for the first five months of 2009. According to the statistics in Table 1, 72.19% of tourists visiting Antalya in the first five months of 2009 belonged to the nationalities used for the survey.

Table 1
Number of tourists visiting Antalya according to nationality, 2009

Nationality	January	February	March	April	May	Total	Rates
German	51,902	72,432	112,163	156,079	244,920	637,496	32.51
Russian	6,970	6,825	7,432	45,914	291,553	358,694	18.29
Dutch	3,399	5,971	9,547	58,509	55,708	133,134	6.79
Turkish	17,147	18,362	25,862	27,299	37,402	126,072	6.43
British	3,451	6,277	11,267	22,877	36,293	80,165	4.09
Ukrainian	1,180	1,178	1,181	18,031	58,552	80,122	4.09
Others	23,122	36,785	69,225	151,099	265,136	545,367	27.81
Overall total	107,171	147,830	236,677	479,808	989,564	1,961,050	100.0

Source: Antalya Culture and Tourism Ministry (2009) Tourist Statistics.

Due to limitations of cost, distance, and time, a stratified sampling method was used instead of examining all the nationalities. According to the stratified sampling method, the minimum sampling from the tourists of each nationality (stratum) was calculated using the $n = \sigma^2 \cdot Z_{\alpha}^2 / H^2$ formula suggested for quantitative surveys and infinite populations ($N > 10.000$) (Özdamar, 2002). A preliminary study covered 100 tourists with a standard deviation value of $\sigma = 0.8$, standard error value $H = 0.10$ and Z value $z_{0,05} = 2.58$, at $\alpha = 0.01$ significance level. The Calculated minimum sampling range for each nationality was found out to be 426. In order to increase the reliability of the questionnaire, for each nationality 600 questionnaires were implemented. However, due to errors in coding or incomplete coding, some of the questionnaires were not used in data analysis. Respondents were selected while they were waiting to return to the destination airport, and each the respondents were asked to complete the questionnaire in person. Table 2 shows the number of questionnaires analyzed.

Table 2
Tourist sampling according to nationality

Nationality	n	%
German	502	17.3
Russian	489	16.8
Dutch	449	15.4
Turkish	562	19.3
British	433	14.9
Ukrainian	472	16.3
Total	2,907	100.0

Arithmetical means and standard deviations were calculated to describe the satisfaction levels of the customers of each nationality. Additionally, the differences in customer satisfaction between each nationality were tested with one-way ANOVA. Then, Tukey test was used for pair comparison among group means. After Pearson Correlation coefficients and Cronbach's Alpha coefficients were calculated for the correlation of the relationship between customer satisfaction and hotel services, confirmatory factor analysis were implemented to the scale.

Findings

Table 3 shows the confirmatory factor and reliability analysis results. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) shows the sampling adequacy ($KMO = 0.957$), and Bartlett's test, on the other hand, shows that the sampling is fit for the factor analysis ($\text{Chi-Square} = 32672, 66; p = 0.000$). The confirmatory factor analysis in Table 3 shows that all factors explain 78.15% of the total variance. Cronbach Alpha values showing the reliability coefficients related to each factor are between 0.72 and 0.81. The reliability coefficient above 0.70 is considered to be consistent in studies in the social sciences; therefore the values above indicate that the scale is reliable.

The ANOVA results for dependent/repeated measures in Table 3 show that the satisfaction levels of customers are significantly different for each of hotel services ($p < 0.001$). According to arithmetic mean values for each sub-service, customer satisfaction reaches its highest value in the front office ($\bar{X} = 4.17$) and other ($\bar{X} = 4.11$) services and its lowest value in the employee ($\bar{X} = 3.91$) and health/hygiene ($\bar{X} = 3.90$).

Table 3

Factor analysis and comparison of customer satisfaction with hotel services

Factors	Factor load	Eigen value	Variance (%)	Cumulative variance (%)	α	\bar{X}	s.d.	F	p
Front office	Fast and error-free check-in / check-out procedures 0.423	10.39	33.52	33.52	0.79	4.17a	0.57	126.78	0.000*
	Warm and sincere welcoming 0.532								
	Error-free customer bills and records 0.515								
	Allocation of rooms according to customers' requests 0.536								
	Attempt to find out possible particular needs of customers when taking a reservation 0.516								
Food and beverage	Quality food and beverage provision 0.512	6.22	20.06	53.58	0.72	4.04b	0.64	126.78	0.000*
	Inclusion of dietary and vegetarian food and beverage in menus 0.553								
	Consideration of nationality of customers in food and beverage menus 0.541								
	Good service employee knowledge on food and beverages and its contents 0.495								
	Cleanliness of utensils used in restaurants and bars 0.576								
Housekeeping	Availability of equipments 0.513	1.70	5.48	59.06	0.74	4.07b	0.63	126.78	0.000*
	Readiness of rooms on time as promised 0.502								
	Daily room cleaning and bed linen change 0.523								
	Provision of laundry and dry-cleaning services to customers 0.586								
	Furnishing in rooms which meet customers' needs 0.559								
Employees	Clean and neat appearance of employees 0.576	1.51	4.87	63.93	0.81	3.91c	0.78	126.78	0.000*
	Instilling a confidence in the guests by employees 0.618								
	Consistent and continuously courteous and respectful treatment of customers 0.601								
	Ability of employees to understand customers' feelings when serving 0.589								
	At least one foreign language speaking ability of employees 0.611								
Customer relations	Getting what customers' pay for (value for money) 0.683	1.21	3.90	67.83	0.72	3.97bc	0.79	126.78	0.000*
	Provision of atmosphere for customers to express their wishes and complaints 0.658								
	Resolution of complaints and compensation of the inconveniences caused 0.613								
	Service delivery at a satisfactory level 0.664								
Health and hygiene	Clean and well-maintained common areas 0.628	1.14	3.68	71.41	0.73	3.90c	0.82	126.78	0.000*
	Physical Quality 0.617								
	Cleanliness of the Saunas and Hamams 0.615								
	Maintenance and cleanliness of the pools 0.652								
Physical facilities	Visually appealing interior and exterior physical appearance and furnishings 0.622	1.08	3.48	74.89	0.76	3.93c	0.78	126.78	0.000*
	Sufficient fire precautions 0.631								
	Sufficient health and safety precautions 0.528								
	Adequate and well-placed signposting at the hotel 0.628								
Others	Availability of sports and entertainment facilities for children and adults 0.718	1.01	3.26	78.15	0.73	4.11a	0.73	126.78	0.000*
	Provision of adequate animation activities at the hotel 0.619								
	Correct and on time service at the first time 0.515								
	Service delivery at a satisfactory level 0.623								

* $p < 0.001$ \bar{X} : mean ^{a,b,c}: the difference between the means including different letters in the same column is significant

Table 4 shows that there is a statistically significant relationship between the nationalities of tourists and all of the services offered in five star hotels. The arithmetic mean values related to each sub-service for customers of different nationalities show that, for the overall services of the hotel, the groups with the highest levels of satisfaction are Turkish ($\bar{x}=4.21$) and German ($\bar{x}=4.20$) customers. The groups with the lowest levels of satisfaction are Dutch ($\bar{x}=3.82$) and Ukrainian ($\bar{x}=3.80$).

Table 4
Comparison of customer satisfaction with hotel services according to nationality

Services	Nationality		Turkish		German		Russian		Dutch		Ukrainian		British		p
	\bar{X}	s.d.	\bar{X}	s.d.	\bar{X}	s.d.	\bar{X}	s.d.	\bar{X}	s.d.	\bar{X}	s.d.	\bar{X}	s.d.	
Front office	4.35a	0.56	4.27a	0.65	4.18ab	0.49	4.06c	0.58	4.03c	0.53	4.08c	0.50	0.000*		
Housekeeping	4.23a	0.56	4.20a	0.65	4.11ab	0.49	3.97c	0.58	3.93c	0.53	4.02c	0.50	0.000*		
Food and beverage	4.18a	0.70	4.18a	0.70	4.12ae	0.57	3.89c	0.60	3.81d	0.59	3.99e	0.58	0.000*		
Employee	4.19a	0.71	4.24a	0.69	3.95b	0.56	3.68c	0.57	3.67c	0.55	3.69c	0.55	0.000*		
Physical facilities	4.13a	0.78	4.14a	0.67	4.03b	0.75	3.70c	0.74	3.68c	0.64	3.80d	0.82	0.000*		
Health and hygiene	4.08a	0.75	4.15b	0.69	4.04a	0.70	3.66c	0.86	3.63c	0.75	3.78d	0.84	0.000*		
Customer relations	4.21a	0.75	4.15ab	0.72	4.09b	0.70	3.73c	0.81	3.70c	0.69	3.88d	0.83	0.000*		
Others	4.30a	0.68	4.23ab	0.71	4.22b	0.64	3.88c	0.81	3.93c	0.66	4.02d	0.76	0.000*		
Overall	4.21a	0.57	4.20a	0.55	4.10b	0.49	3.82c	0.57	3.80c	0.48	3.91d	0.56	0.000*		
P	0.000***		0.000***		0.000***		0.000***		0.000***		0.000***		0.000***		

*p<0.001 \bar{X} :mean ^{a,b,c,d,e}:The difference between the means including different letters in the same row is significant

The mean values showed that the Dutch, Ukrainian, and British customers have the lowest satisfaction levels for the sub-services. The Turkish and German customers have the highest satisfaction levels for the front office, housekeeping and employee services (Table 4). In terms of F&B, physical facilities, health/hygiene, customer relations, and other services, the Dutch and Ukrainian customers have the lowest satisfaction levels, and the Turkish and German customers have the highest satisfaction levels. For these services, the satisfaction levels of the British tourists are higher than the Dutch and Ukrainian tourists and lower than the German, Turkish, and Russian tourists (Table 4). These findings suggest significant differences in the satisfaction levels of tourists from different nationalities in the services offered by hotels.

Table 4 reports that, the front office is the most satisfying sub-service for tourists of all nationalities. The services with the lowest satisfaction levels are health/hygiene for Turkish ($\bar{x}=4.08$), Dutch ($\bar{x}=3.66$) and Ukrainian ($\bar{x}=3.63$) tourists and physical facilities for Germans ($\bar{x}=4.14$). The employee services show the lowest satisfaction levels for Russian ($\bar{x}=3.95$) and British ($\bar{x}=3.69$) tourists.

As the statistics in Table 4 show, hotel managements can take all these differences among nationalities into consideration, and keeping these differences in mind, they can reorganize the services offered and come into terms with the expectations of different nationalities. In other words, they can bring the expected service of customers together with the services offered. Thus, the perceived service by the customer should meet their expectations and this will lead to the repeat visit intentions.

According to the matrix in Table 5, all of the Pearson Correlation coefficients are significant among the services offered in five star hotels ($p < 0.001$). The correlation coefficients reveal that the services of physical facilities, health/hygiene, and customer relations have the highest correlation with the satisfaction levels of customers with regard to the overall service quality of the hotel. Coefficients among services show that the highest correlation levels are between F&B, front office, housekeeping, employee and customer relations, physical facilities, and health/hygiene, respectively.

Table 5
Correlation matrix among hotel services in terms of customer satisfaction*

Services	Front office	Housekeeping	Food and beverage	Employee	Physical facilities	Health/hygiene	Customer relations	Other	Overall
	r	r	r	r	r	r	r	r	r
Front office	-								
Housekeeping	0.573	-							
Food and beverage	0.590	0.623	-						
Employee	0.484	0.472	0.552	-					
Physical facilities	0.507	0.527	0.550	0.548	-				
Health/hygiene	0.488	0.497	0.549	0.579	0.701	-			
Customer relations	0.513	0.506	0.534	0.574	0.688	0.675	-		
Other	0.522	0.530	0.565	0.570	0.657	0.621	0.646	-	
Overall	0.719	0.734	0.773	0.766	0.833	0.826	0.826	0.815	-

* $p < 0.001$

Conclusion

According to results of the current study, there are significant differences in the hotel services among the nationalities of tourists coming to Antalya. Turkish and German customers exhibit the highest satisfaction levels, and Dutch and Ukrainian customers have the lowest levels of satisfaction related to the overall services of the hotels. While the overall service in hotels was fifth among seven factors influencing overall customer satisfaction in a similar study by Choi and Chu (2001), this survey shows differences according to the nationality of customers. These differences may arise from the different expectations of different cultures. Also, Turkish and German tourists are more familiar with Turkish hotel standards than are Dutch and Ukrainian tourists. In studies carried out by Matzler *et al.* (2006) and Pizam and Jeong (1996), familiarity with a foreign culture and cultural similarities/differences strongly influences satisfaction levels regarding services.

According to the evaluation of services, the Turkish and German customers exhibit the highest satisfaction levels, and the Dutch, Ukrainian, and British customers have the lowest levels of satisfaction in the front office, housekeeping, and employee services. In F&B, physical facilities, health/hygiene, customer relations, and other services, the Turkish and German customers have the highest satisfaction levels,

and the Dutch and Ukrainian customers have the lowest satisfaction levels. In a survey of customer satisfaction in Malaysian hotels by Poon and Low (2005), out of twelve service factors, the F&B factor was the second most important factor, following price, in the overall satisfaction of Asian visitors and the third most important factor for Western visitors. According to this survey, F&B is the second most important factor in overall satisfaction, following front office service, for the British, Dutch, and Ukrainian customers, the fourth most important factor for the German and Russian customers, and the third most important factor for the Turkish customers.

This survey observed that the most consistently satisfactory service among all the tourist nationalities is the front office. In a study by Barsky and Labagh (1992), it was pointed out that while the attitudes of employees produced the highest satisfaction level, the front office produced the sixth highest satisfaction level among nine factors. In this study, the Turkish, Dutch and Ukrainian customers report the lowest satisfaction for health/hygiene; the Germans report the lowest satisfaction for physical facilities; and the Russian and British tourists report the lowest satisfaction for employee services. For this study, satisfaction with customer relations in this survey is generally the fourth or fifth priority among eight factors, and the health/hygiene factor is the sixth or eighth most important priority. Additionally, the Turkish, German, and Russian tourists report much more satisfaction than do the Ukrainian, Dutch, and British tourists in this survey, which may result from the German and Russian tourists visiting Turkey frequently and from being more familiar with Turkish hotel standards. Previous studies (Shin & Elliott, 2001; Bhanugopan, 2004; Juwaheer, 2007; Yuan, Wu, Jianren, Goh & Stout, 2008; Okello & Yerian, 2009) have shown that knowing a different culture shapes expectations and the satisfaction with services offered in the hotels of that country. If destinations are well managed and tourists are knowledgeable and aware, these elements complement the natural attributes and contribute to satisfaction (Marzuki, Hussin, Mohamed, Othman, Ghapar & Som, 2011, p. 283). In the same time, it may also be that familiarity with a culture shapes expectations and the perception of satisfaction with services.

This survey shows that physical facilities, health/hygiene, and customer relations are the most highly correlated with overall satisfaction with the hotel. A study by Min *et al.* (2002) reached similar conclusions. According to the findings of Min *et al.*, cleaning, health/hygiene, approach to customers, and kindness/respect were among the most important factors for customer satisfaction. In a similar manner, a study by Juwaheer (2004) found that the most influential factors for the satisfaction of hotel customers were attractiveness of hotel rooms, decoration, appearance and attitude of employees, reliability, environmental elements around the hotel, and F&B. Additionally, the highest correlation coefficients were between customer satisfaction and front office and housekeeping, F&B, employee and customer relations, physical facilities and health/hygiene.

This study examined the hotel services most important for the satisfaction of customers of different nationalities. Measuring customer satisfaction by taking the variables of nationality, gender, and culture into consideration will make remarkable contributions to public sector managers and to the literature. Considering the results of the related literature about the remarkable influence of cultural differences on the attitudes of tourists in their purchase (Kozak *et al.*, 2003; Yoo, Mckercher & Mena, 2004; Gürsoy & Umbreit, 2004; Maoz, 2007) and consumption habits (Andriotis, Agiomirgianakis & Mihiotis, 2007), hotel managements should analyze the consumption habits of customers of different nationalities to develop more attractive and successful service strategies. In addition, hotel establishments should

constantly seek customer feedback to meet the needs and demands of a constantly changing customer base. The experiences of tourists are enriched by not only the tangible but intangible heritage of the destinations as well. The local services offered and people are attractive to international tourists. Hence, it must be stated that tourist motives and experiences are interconnected (Chheang, 2011, p. 238)

Besides, a more comprehensive study covering the demographic factors as well as nationalities more than 6 and in different cities or region will undoubtedly reveal much more useful insights for hoteliers and professionals. What's more, the study was conducted in high season and implemented over the participants who were there for vacation. Other studies may focus on those for business or culture tourism in different seasons as well, and the results could be compared.

The most important of all, considering the developments such as the ease of getting visa and the integration of countries through union (e.g. European Union), a much more comprehensive study covering the different continent will attract a wider range of researchers and hoteliers.

References

- Akama, J. S. & Kieti, D. M. (2003). Measuring tourist satisfaction with Kenya's wildlife safari: a case study of Tsavo west national park. *Tourism Management*, 24, 73-81.
- Andriotis, K., Agiomirgianakis, G. & Mihiotis, A. (2007). Tourist vacation preferences: the case of mass tourists to Crete. *Tourism Analysis*, 12(1/2), 51-63.
- Azim, T. S. A. (2010). Evaluating the Relationship between the Socio-Demographic Variables, Travel Experience and the Probability to Return to Destination the Case of French Tourists in Egypt. *Tourismos: An International Multidisciplinary Journal of Tourism*, 5(1), 111-129.
- Barsky, J. D. & Labagh, R. (1992). A strategy for customer satisfaction. *The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 33(5), 32-40.
- Bhanugopan, R. (2004). Perceptions on quality customer service in the hospitality industry in Papua New Guinea: an evaluation. *Asia Pacific J. Tourism Research*, 9(2), 177-187.
- Bigne, J., Sanchez, M. I. & Sanchez, J. (2001). Tourism image, evaluation variables and after-purchase behavior: inter relationships. *Tourism Management*, 22(6), 607-616.
- Chen, C. F. & Tsai, D. C. (2007). How destination image, evaluative factors affect behavioral intentions? *Tourism Management*, 28, 1115-1122.
- Chen, C. F. (2008). Investigating structural relationships between service quality, perceived value, satisfaction and behavioral intentions for air passengers: evidence from Taiwan. *Transportation Research*, 42(4), 709-717.
- Chen, C. F. & Chen, F. S. (2010). Experience quality, perceived value, satisfaction and behavioral intentions for heritage tourists. *Tourism Management*, 31, 29-35.
- Chheang, V. (2011). Angkor Heritage Tourism and Tourist Perceptions, *Tourismos: an International Multidisciplinary Journal of Tourism*, 6(2), 213-240.
- Choi, T. Y. & Chu, R. (2001). Determinants of hotel guests' satisfaction, repeat patronage in the Hong Kong hotel industry. *Hospitality Management*, 20, 277-297.
- Christou, P. & Saveriades, A. (2010). The Use of Ethnography to Explore Tourist Satisfaction Antecedents. *Tourismos: An International Multidisciplinary Journal of Tourism*, 5(1), 89-100.

- Costa, M. T. G. & Carvalho, L. M. C. (2011). The Sustainability of Tourism Supply Chain: A Case Study Research. *Tourismos: an International Multidisciplinary Journal of Tourism*, 6(2), 393-404.
- Crompton, J. L. & Love, L. L. (1995). The predictive value of alternative approaches to evaluating quality of a festival. *Journal of Travel Research*, 34(1), 11-24.
- Fontenot, G., Carson, K. & Henke, L. (2005). Take action on customer satisfaction. *Quality Progress*, 38(7), 40-47.
- Fornell, C. (1992). A national customer satisfaction barometer: the Swedish experience. *J. Marketing*, 55, 1-21.
- Goodwin, C., Squire, A. & Chapman, E. (2005). *The Hospitality The hospitality supervisor's survival kit*. New Jersey: Upper Saddle River.
- Gursoy, D. & Umbreit, T. W. (2004). Tourist information search behavior: cross-cultural comparison of European Union Member States. *Int. J. Hospitality Management*, 23(1), 55-70.
- Ha, J. & Jang, S. (2010). Perceived values, satisfaction and behavioral intentions: the role of familiarity in Korean restaurants. *Int. J. Hospitality Management*, 29(1), 2-13.
- Hayes, D. K. & Ninemeier, J. D. (2006). *Foundation of lodging management*. New Jersey: Upper Saddle River.
- Heo, J. K., Jogaratnam, G. & Buchanan, P. (2004). Customer-focused adaptation in New York City hotels: exploring the perceptions of Japanese and Korean travelers. *Hospitality Management*, 23, 39-53.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Cultural consequences: comparing values behaviors institutions, organizations across nations*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Juwaheer, T. D. & Ross, D. L. (2003). A study of hotel guest perceptions in Mauritius. *Int. J. Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 15(2), 105-115.
- 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.
- Juwaheer, T. D. (2007). Using service quality expectations as a criterion to segment international tourists in the hospitality industry. *J. Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 21(2), 1-18.
- Kandampully, J. & Suhartanto, D. (2000). Customer loyalty in the hotel industry: the role of customer satisfaction image. *Int. J. Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 12(6), 346-351.
- Kotler, P., Bowen, J. T. & Makens, J. C. (1998). *Marketing for hospitality and Tourism* (2nd ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River.
- Kozak, M. (2001). Comparative assessment of tourist satisfaction with destinations across two nationalities. *Tourism Management*, 22, 391-401.
- Kozak, M. (2003). Measuring tourist satisfaction with multiple destinations attributes. *Tourism Analysis*, 7, 229-240.
- Kozak, M., Bigné, E., González, A. & Andreu, L. (2003). Cross-cultural behavior research in tourism: a case study on destination image. *Tourism Analysis*, 8(2-4), 253-257.
- Lewin, K. (1938). *The Conceptual representation, measurement of psychological forces*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Maoz, D. (2007). Backpackers motivations the role of culture and nationality. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 34(1), 122-140.
- Marzuki, A., Hussin, A. A., Mohamed, B., Othman, A. G., Ghapar, A. & Som, A. P. M. (2011). Assessment of Nature-Based Tourism in South Kelantan, Malaysia. *Tourismos: An International Multidisciplinary Journal of Tourism*, (1), 281-295.
- Matzler, K., Renzl, B. & Rothenberger, S. (2006). Measuring the relative importance of service dimensions in the formation of price satisfaction, service satisfaction: a case study in the hotel industry. *Scandinavian J. Hospitality and Tourism*, 6(3), 179-196.
- Min, H., Min, H. & Chung, K. (2002). Dynamic benchmarking of hotel service quality. *J. Services Marketing*, 16(4), 302-321.

- Morrison, M. A. (1989). *Hospitality, travel marketing*. Albany NY: Delmar Publishers Inc.
- Okello, M. M. & Yerian, S. (2009). Tourist satisfaction in relation to attractions, implications for conservation in the protected areas of the Northern circuit Tanzania. *J. Sustainable Tourism*, 17(5), 605-625.
- Oliver, R. (1980). A cognitive model of the antecedents, consequences of satisfaction decisions. *J. Marketing Research*, 17, 460-469.
- Özdamar, K. (2002). *Paket programlar ile istatistiksel veri analizi: çok değişkenli analizler-2*, 4. Baskı. Kaan Kitabevi. Eskişehir.
- Parasuraman, A. (2004). Assessing, improving service performance for maximum impact: insights from a two-decade-long research. *J. Performance Measurement Metrics*, 5(2), 45-52.
- Petrick, J. F. & Backman, S. J. (2002). An examination of the construct of perceived value for the prediction of golf travelers' intentions to revisit. *J. Travel Research*, 41(1), 38-45.
- Pizam, A., Neumann, Y. & Reichel, A. (1978). Dimensions of tourism satisfaction with a destination area. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 5, 314-322.
- Pizam, A. & Jeong, G. H. (1996). Cross-cultural tourist behavior: perceptions of Korean tour-guides. *Tourism Management*, 17(4), 277-286.
- Pizam, A. & Ellis, T. (1999). Customer satisfaction, its measurement in hospitality enterprises. *International J. Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 11(7), 326-339.
- Poon, W. C. & Low, K. L. T. (2005). Are travelers satisfied with Malaysian hotels? *Int. J. Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 17(3), 217-227.
- Reisinger, Y. & Turner, L. W. (1997). Cross-cultural differences in tourism: Indonesian tourists in Australia. *Tourism Management*, 18(3), 139-147.
- Severt, D. E. (2002). *The customer's path to loyalty: a partial test of the relationships of prior experience, justice and customer satisfaction* (Unpublished PhD Thesis). Blacksburg, Virginia: Virginia Polytechnic Institute, State University.
- Shin, D. & Elliott, K. M. (2001). Measuring customers' overall satisfaction, *Service Marketing Quarterly*, 22(1), 3-19.
- Tsang, N. & Qu, H. (2000). Service quality in china's hotel industry: a perspective from tourists and hotel managers. *Int. J. Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 12(5), 316-326.
- Vavra, T. G. (1997). *Improving your measurement of customer satisfaction: a guide to creating, conducting, analyzing and reporting customer satisfaction measurement programs*. ASQ Quality Press.
- Valle, O. D. P., Silva, J. A., Mendes, J. & Guerreiro, M. (2006). Tourist satisfaction, destination loyalty intention: a structural categorical analysis. *Int. J. Business Science, Applied Management*, 1(1), 25-44.
- Voss, C. A., Roth, A. V., Rosenzweig, E. D., Blackmon, K. & Chase, R. B. (2004). A tale of two countries conservatism, service quality and feedback on customer satisfaction. *J. Service Research*, 6(3), 212-230.
- Weber, K. (1997). Assessment of tourist satisfaction using the expectancy disconfirmation theory: a study of German travel market in Australia. *Pacific Tourism Review*, 1, 35-45.
- Witt, S. F. (1980). An econometric comparison of UK and German foreign holiday behavior. *Managerial, Decision Economics*, 1(3), 123-131.
- Wong, J. & Law, R. (2003). Difference in satisfaction levels: a study of tourists in Hong Kong. *Tourism Management*, 24, 401-410.
- Yoo, J. J. E., Mckercher, B. & Mena, M. (2004). A cross-cultural comparison of trip characteristics: international visitors to Hong Kong from Mainland China and USA. *J. Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 16(1), 63-75.
- Yu, L. & Goulden, M. (2006). A comparative Analysis of international tourists' satisfaction in Mongolia. *Tourism Management*, 27, 1331-1342.

- Yuan, J. J., Wu, C. K., Jianren, Z., Goh, B. K. & Stout, B. L. (2008). Chinese tourist satisfaction with Yunnan province China. *J. Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 16(1), 181-202.
- Yüksel, A. & Rimmington, M. (1998). Customer–satisfaction measurement. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 39, 60-70.
- Yüksel, A. & Yüksel, F. (2001). The expectancy–disconfirmation paradigm: a critique. *J. Hospitality and Tourism Research*, 25(2), 107-131.
- Zeithaml, V. A., Parasuraman, A. & Berry, L. L. (1990). *Delivering quality service: balancing customer perceptions and expectation*. Washington: Free Press.

Submitted: 09/04/2013

Accepted: 11/18/2013