

TRENDOVI U TURIZMU / TRENDS IM TOURISMUS / TRENDS IN TOURISM

Assistant Professor DAMIJAN MUMEL, Ph.D.
Faculty of Economics and Business, University of Maribor, Slovenia
Ekonomsko-poslovni fakultet, Sveučilište Maribor, Slovenija

UDC 658.8:061.4
Received: 06.02.2001
Preliminary reports

FACTORS OF QUALITY OF THE EXHIBITION STAND - DEVELOPING A NEW YARDSTICK

This paper presents a piece of research with two main goals: (1) to find out essential factors of quality of the exhibition stand and (2) to devise a measuring instrument for measuring the quality of exhibition stands, both from the non-professional attendee's point of view.

To reach both goals, first, fourteen dimensions of quality of exhibition stands were identified. These dimensions were taken as the basis for the composition of the first version of the measuring instrument concerning the quality of the exhibition stands (MIMQES-1). When MIMQES-1 was tested the congruity of assessors was also examined.

On the basis of the analysis of MIMQES-1 the second version of MIMQES (MIMQES-2) was formed and the preparation procedure for assessors was changed and improved. The results of MIMQES-2 analysis show a better factor structure as well as a better congruity of assessors, which was probably the result of a change in qualification of assessors.

Key words: exhibitions, trade show, quality, exhibition stand.

1. INTRODUCTION

The success of any organisation (profit oriented or non-profit oriented) depends on a variety of factors. Over some of them an organisation can have control, while others are hard to control, at least in a short time span and without co-operation of other organisations.

One of the key factors, which is basically under organisational control and is closely related to the success of the organisation, is the image of organisation (Assael, 1995). The organisation can build and shape its image through many different activities. One of powerful tools is its corporate promotion. The organisation can promote itself in two basic ways:

- a) indirect promotion: through messages in mass media (TV spots, newspaper or radio advertisement, sponsorship ...), where organisation representatives are not directly (physically) present and where direct feedback of information isn't possible, and
- b) direct promotion: through presence on different exhibitions, competitions, expositions and similar events, where the representatives of the organisations are directly/physically present and where direct information feedback is possible.

Kerin and Cron (1987) in their investigation found out, that managers in many organisations view exhibitions as an opportunity to enhance the company image.

In this paper, the centre of our interest is directed to exhibitions, one of the tools of direct presentation of an organisation.

Trade shows as an important direct promotion tool

Trade shows are marketing events which bring together, in a single location, a group of suppliers who set up physical exhibits of their products and services from a given industry or discipline (Black, 1986).

The fact that 70% of enterprises in Slovenia sell their products and services to other enterprises and only 30% of enterprises sell directly to end consumers is very important (Fahy et al, 1997). Advertising is therefore not so important as it is usually considered. Therefore other communication tools, as for instance personal selling or trade show exhibitions, have a more important role for the majority of enterprises.

How important role is played by trade shows in marketing communication mix is visible from the fact that companies in the USA spend in 1988 more than \$9 billion annually on trade shows. This is a huge rate of increase when comparing with \$7 billion in 1982. In exchange, trade shows generate over \$70 billion annually in sales (The Trade Show Bureau, 1993).

Trade shows in USA are in the second place to personal selling and ahead of print advertising and direct mail accounted for 22-25% of typical USA business market promotional budget (Herbig, O'Hara, Palumbo, 1994).

Europe plays an important role in trade show business. Industry observers estimate that 60% of the world's major trade shows are located in Europe (Cech, 1990) and that the unification in EU was expected to further stimulate this development (AUMA, 1991).

Some differences exist between the United States and the United Kingdom. European shows attract more chief executive officers and senior executives (Friedlander, 1992), who are more likely to come to the show with a single objective in mind and often make their buying decisions at the show (Dykeman, 1979). In the U.S.

pre-show promotional activities are usually aimed at generating initial interest while in Europe they are often used to set formal appointments. Differences tend to exist also in the field of promotional activities and booth characteristics (Dykeman, 1979; Tanner, 1995).

In spite of fact that many of marketing managers believe that trade shows are an important component of business practice, there are some who point out that the question of effectiveness of trade shows remains unanswered (Skolnik, 1987). Trade shows have received little attention in the academic marketing literature and there have been especially few reports on the relationship between what a firm does in connection with trade shows and what the effects are (Dekimpe et al, 1997).

Cons of the trade show exhibitions

One of the reasons, which should make us think, is the cost of exhibition space, which is typically 15% of a company's total trade show budget. Other common negatives associated with trade shows are: (1) trade shows take salespeople away from their territories, (2) large shows are sometimes cluttered, crowded, and confusing, (3) labour problems and unions occasionally "flare up", and (4) there sometimes are and excessive number of sightseers at these events (Herbig, O'Hara, Palumbo, 1994).

Some other problems associated with trade shows include:

- too often a substantial number of corporate marketing executives perceive trade shows as a non-selling activity, or as a social affair for those employees that attend (Skolnik, 1987),
- only 56% of firms participating in trade shows set specific objectives before participating in a given show, 56% of exhibitors do not train the people staffing their trade show booths, and 78% of participants do not promote their exhibit prior to the show (Donath, 1980),
- Tanner and Chonko (1995) report that managers predominantly staff the staffing of stands with salespeople, even though there is evidence suggesting that visitors do not like this.

Possible benefits of the trade show exhibitions

Exhibitors have several objectives for participating in a trade show: generating high-quality leads, promoting corporate image or maintaining contact with current and prospective customers, and many have multiple objectives (Dekimpe et al, 1997). Some other specific goals, which organisations try to reach through participation on exhibitions include:

- to present (present, new, planned) of products and/or services to potential customers,
- acquaintance with competitors (competitive organisations) and their offers,
- acquaintance with potential partners,

- to re-establish direct contacts with customers who thus have an opportunity to transmit their experience, proposals etc. directly to the representatives of various organisations.

Benefits of exhibitions are:

- exhibitions play a key role in business-to-business marketing, because of the possibility of a direct contact between buyers and sellers (time and geographical barriers),
- exhibitions are organised on a neutral territory for both sellers and buyers, therefore both are more relaxed,
- meetings with partners is a tool of relationship marketing,
- almost everyone who visits an exhibition is interested in the industry,
- visitors visit exhibitions in the information gathering stage of their decision process,
- exhibitions are a PR tool.

Mee (1988) found that buyers attended trade shows to (1) find solutions to known problems, (2) decide on or finalise vendor selection for post-show purchases, (3) identify new methods, (4) meet with technical experts, and (5) assess technical directions. Attendees typically spend 7.8 hours viewing exhibits over 2-day period and stop at an average of 21 booths during this time (Herbig, O'Hara, Palumbo, 1994).

Regardless of the specific goal of the organisation, the general goal is always to build up communication between an organisation and its environment.

Shipley, Egan and Wong (1993) identified 13 reasons for exhibiting. Seven of them were directly related to selling and six were related to non-selling activities. The reason of "enhancing company image" was on a second place among both US and overseas respondents.

Similarly, Kerin and Cron (1987) found that non-selling activities are by some exhibitors considered to be more important than selling activities. Many organisations view exhibitions as an opportunity to enhance the company image. This aim has the highest mean score.

An excellent exhibition stand of an organisation present at an exhibition is an essential factor of a successful participation. That is why the exhibition stand could be one of the important tools for shaping the organisation's image.

If in the communication process an organisation represents one side and the exhibition (exhibition stands) visitors the other side, then the scope of this paper is to point to the role of a visitor in this communication process.

Exhibition stand as “a product of a company”

The exhibition stand, which is prepared by the organisation, can be seen as a product of the company. If we use marketing reasoning (or logic of thinking) then we have to consider the visitor's (customer's) point of view and ask ourselves the following questions:

- Which customer's (visitor's) needs does the product (the exhibition stand) satisfy?
- Which desires/wants do the customer (visitor) have about the product (exhibition stand)?
- How should the product (exhibition stand) look like in order to satisfy the customer's (visitor's) needs in the best possible way?

On the other hand, it must be clear what are the organisational goals at the exhibition. As a result, the organisation can shape the exhibition stand both on the basis of the organisation's purpose related to the exhibition and according to the customer's needs/wants.

The presence of an organisation on the exhibition can be characterised as successful only when it has reached the goals of the organisation and satisfied the needs and wants of visitors.

Problem and purpose of research

Blythe (2000) states, that the area of exhibitions is “... considerably under-researched by academics, and much of the existing research has been conducted by parties with vested interests who may or may not be entirely unbiased in their findings”.

The reasons for such a situation may lie in the (Blythe, 2000):

- difficulties of obtaining a definitive answer as to whether exhibitions are really an effective way to promote,
- difficulty of reconciling the aims of exhibitors with the aim of visitors,
- entrenched attitudes on the part of exhibitors, non-exhibitors and exhibition managers,
- the split between activities that directly relate to personal selling and activities that relate to other marketing functions as public relations, promotion, new product launches and marketing research.

An organisation, which wants to be successfully presented on the exhibition must know the essential factors, which make the exhibitors or their stands attractive and make a good impression on visitors. This was the main problem of our research. The aim of our research was to provide answers to two basic questions:

1. Which are the essential factors of quality of the exhibitions stand from the non-professional attendee's point of view? and
2. How to measure it?

The answer to those two questions is highly important for any exhibitor: when the benefits gained from participation on an exhibition are lower than costs of the participation, used financial resources can be valued as a slip investment. If we don't take into consideration essential factors, which have impact on the perception of the quality of the exhibition stand, from the visitor's point of view, it is very likely that the investment (participation on exhibition) will not cover the costs, let alone yield a profit.

An additional problem lies in the fact that the benefits of the participation on an exhibition are hard to measure. Results are seen later except in the case of a selling exhibition.

In a situation when we do not have financial or some other efficiency index, the satisfaction of visitors with the exhibition stand can be one of the available indicators of success. If we measure visitor's satisfaction, the results represent valuable information for the organisation, especially when the costs of participation on the exhibition are well argued.

Many organisations in Slovenia are still not realising the importance of quality of the presentations on the exhibitions. The evidence are the exhibition stands which in many cases more repel the visitors than attract them. Reasons for such a situation are certainly several, and one among them is (as the author believes) that organisations do not know the characteristics, which influence the quality of the exhibition stands in the eye of visitors.

In a broader sense one could say that the presentation of the organisation on the exhibition should be of the highest possible quality. But when we try to define what is meant by this and how the organisation could reach this goal, we find ourselves in difficulties.

It is obvious that there is no single recipe. In addition, recipes kill originality. But it is nevertheless reasonable to try to find out some characteristics which influence the perception of quality of an exhibition stand.

2. RESEARCH

Basic purpose of our research was to prepare a measuring instrument/tool concerning the quality of the exhibition stands (*MIMQES*) from the *non-professional attendee's* point of view. To undertake this task, it was necessary to find out which are the main factors of quality of exhibition stands from the customer's (visitor's) point of view. In this stage of our research it was too early to think about the assessment of individual exhibition stands (rank of exhibitors upon the *MIMQES-1* results, profile of individual exhibitors, strengths and weakness of stands...). The main question was: is *MIMQES-1* suitable for the assessment and classification of exhibitors?

Main factors of quality of the exhibition stands from the non-professional attendee's point of view

Respondents in the first part of the study were 17 male and 18 female students of marketing at the Faculty of Economics, University of Maribor, Slovenia.

To find out factors of quality of the exhibition stands we used brain storming. The work was implemented in three stages. First, we introduced the problem to the group. Second, producing and gathering ideas through the session, and third, evaluating the ideas and finding the best solutions. Students were divided in three groups. In each group the moderator introduced a problem, motivated the students and led the discussion.

The result of the group's work was analysed and led to 14 isolated dimensions with which it was possible to assess the quality of the exhibition stand. We classified them in four categories:

1. *appearance of the exhibition stand* (lighting, easy overview, variety, originality),
2. *staff* (staff appearance, relation to customer, knowledge about the product/service),
3. *advertising material* (quantity, diversity, design, information capacity),
4. *"summary"* (synergy of all components, general impression, size of the exhibition stand in square metres).

Working out MIMQES-1

In the next stage we looked for an appropriate approach for measuring the above dimensions for measuring the quality of the exhibition stand. Seven stage Likert type scale (3 and -3 as extremes) was chosen, as it offered enough discrimination.

Test of MIMQES-1

The first trial of MIMQES-1 was held on the exhibition "Energetika 98", in Maribor. This was an 5 days international trade show with exhibitors from Slovenia, Italy, Austria, Croatia, Hungary, Germany and Denmark. The subject of trade was to exhibit and sell the products in the field of heating technology. The attendees was professionals as well as non-professionals. There were 157 exhibitors.

Procedure

Assessors of the exhibition stands were 17 students of the Faculty of Business and Economics in Maribor. The objects of assessing were eight exhibition stands randomly selected from the list of exhibitors. The assessors got the list of exhibitors and

MIMQES-1. Factors that could bias assessment of exhibition stands are: (a) group impact on assessing (if all assessors start at the same stand and at the same time), (b) the presence of all seventeen assessors at the same time in one exhibition stand could disturb the exhibitor or their staff, (c) first impression bias - if all assessors start at the same exhibition stand. To avoid these potential problems we placed two assessors in each exhibition stand at the beginning of the assessment (in last group there were three assessors).

Results

Factorisation of MIMQES-1¹

Through factorisation of MIMQES-1 four factors were extracted. We named them:

- 1st factor - appearance of the exhibition stand,
- 2nd factor - advertising material,
- 3rd factor - staff,
- 4th factor - lighting and size.

Dimensions with ponder found only in one factor:

- easy overview, variety, originality, synergy of all components and general impression have ponders in first factor;
- quantity and diversity of advertising material have ponders in second factor;
- relation to customer and knowledge about the product have ponders in third factor;
- lighting and staff appearance have ponders in fourth factor.

Dimensions with ponders found in two or more factors:

- staff appearance with highest ponder in fourth factor and lower ponders (.38, .31 in 0.38) in other three factors;
- design and information capacity of advertising material with ponders in first and second factor (higher ponders in first factor);
- size of the exhibition stand with ponder in first and fourth factor;
- "summary" dimensions synergy of all components and general impression, could be expected to have ponders in all four factors. It has actually high ponders on first factor and low ponders in second and third factors. The dimension total sum of gathered results have ponders in three factors.

On the basis of the results the following activities were made:

1. Instructions to assessors were given about what to assess in staff appearance (assessing only dress, hairstyle, and face).

¹ In all factor analyses the method of principal components and varimax rotation was used. The results are presented in appendix 1.

2. Design of the advertising material and information capacity of advertising material both have similar factor structure. The purpose of advertising material could have a different aim (for instance stimulation of emotional response) and not only mediation of information about the product. For this reason we abandoned the dimension information capacity of advertising material.
3. Dimensions synergy of all components and general impression have similar factor structure and similar content. Therefore we abandoned dimension synergy of all components, and kept the dimension general impression, for which we assumed that it was understandable for the assessors.
4. Change of outward form of MIMQES-1: (a) adding + sign to numbers, and (b) change the "design of advertising material" to "appearance of the advertising material".

Due to the fact that MIMQES-1 was used for the first time the results of factorisation were satisfactory. Factor structure of MIMQES-1 is congruent with aprioristic structure in spite of the fact that assessors were inexperienced.

Factorisation of assessors in MIMQES-1

As the result of factor analysis of assessors, we get factors which can be interpreted as groups of similar assessors. If we presume that we have a good measuring instrument and that we have skilled assessors who know exactly what and how to assess then we can expect that assessors would be congruent among themselves.

If, as in our case, assessors assess the same characteristic of the exhibition stand in different stands, then the correlation between their evaluations (marks) should be positive. Rigorousness of assessors is not important, if an assessor is constantly rigorous or constantly gentle. Except when the assessor is so extreme in his/her assessment that he/she uses only two values (-3 and -2 for instance). Consequently, the variability is too low. In an ideal situation the result of factor analysis will be only one factor, mainly because of the congruency between all assessors.

In the procedure of factor analysis, seventeen assessors were classified in five groups (factors). Each among seventeen assessors was only in one group taking into account only ponders higher than 0.50.

Four assessors have ponders in the first factor and four in the fifth factor. Three assessors have ponders in the second, three in the third and three in the fourth factor. Factors are very similar regarding the number of assessors and the explained variance (between 15% in the first factor, 13% in the fifth factor and 12% in the second, third and fourth factor).

We could not be satisfied with the results. The number of factors (or groups of assessors with similar assessment criteria) was really too high. This shows us that assessors were either not congruent or not congruent enough.

There are at least two possible reasons for this: (1) the assessors were not skilled enough, and (2) the measuring instrument was not precise enough when determining measuring dimensions (each group of assessors understands it differently). It follows that we should (a) train the assessors and (b) improve the measuring instrument (MIMQES-1). The conclusions of the analysis of assessors are similar to those of the analysis of MIMQES-1. Based on factor analysis of MIMQES-1 and factor analysis of assessors, MIMQES-2 was devised.

Test of MIMQES-2

The trial of MIMQES-2 was held at a same trade show as MIMQES-1, but one year later. The number of exhibitors grew up to 165. All other circumstances and conditions was identical.

Procedure

Exhibition stands were assessed by 17 students of the Faculty of Business and Economics in Maribor. Assessors were not the same than those for testing the MIMQES-1. The objects of assessment were eight exhibition stands randomly selected from the list of exhibitors at the exhibition. The assessors got the list of exhibitors and MIMQES-2. The procedure of assessing was the same as in the MIMQES-1. The difference in procedure was in pre-assessment activities. This time the assessors were skilled. The instructor explained MIMQES-2, its specific dimensions and assessing rules.

Results

Factorisation of MIMQES-2

Table 1: Twelve dimensions of MIMQES-2

1	lighting of the exhibition stand
2	the exhibition stand easy overview
3	variety of the exhibition stand
4	originality of the exhibition stand
5	staff appearance
6	staff relation to customer
7	staff knowledge about product/service
8	quantity of the advertising material
9	diversity of advertising material
10	appearance of the advertising material
11	general impression
12	size of the exhibition stand in m ²

Table 2: Eigenvalues of MIMQES-2

	Eigenvalue	% total Variance	Cumul. Eigenval	Cumul. %
1	5.342	44.52	5.342	44.52
2	1.924	16.03	7.266	60.55
3	1.262	10.52	8.528	71.07

Table 3: Communalities of MIMQES-2 and factor structure of MIMQES-2

	From 1 Factor	From 2 Factors	From 3 Factors		F 1	F 2	F 3
Staff appearance	.674	.774	.794		.821	.316	.143
Staff relation to customer	.805	.811	.849		.897	.079	.194
Staff knowledge about product/service	.772	.775	.830		.878	-.061	.233
Lighting of the exhibition stand	.059	.580	.601		.243	.722	.145
The exhibition stand easy overview	.002	.688	.696		-.046	.828	.086
Variety of the exhibition stand	.029	.382	.386		.170	.594	.061
Originality of the exhibition stand	.022	.686	.738		.147	.815	.228
Size of the exhibition stand in m ²	.001	.327	.386		-.036	.571	.242
Quantity of the advertising material	.038	.062	.820		.195	.154	.871
Diversity of advertising material	.075	.102	.867		.274	.165	.874
Appearance of the advertising material	.032	.121	.758		.179	.298	.799
general impression	.338	.609	.805		.582	.520	.443
			Expl.Var		2.847	3.070	2.612
			Prp.Totl		.237	.256	.218

With factorisation we extracted three factors: factor 1 - staff, factor 2 - exhibition stand, factor 3 - promotional material.

All dimensions (variables) have loadings only in one factor (Table 10). Loadings are high (over 0.70). The only exception is the dimension general impression with loadings in all three factors, which is not bad. This dimension was mentioned as the general dimension with the purpose to provide a possibility for a general assessment. On the basis of these results we can say that factor structure is congruent with theoretical (a priori) structure.

MIMQES-2 has a very clear factor structure. Perhaps it would be adequate to exclude the dimension "size of the exhibition stand" which is a very objective dimension and also has a very low explained variance (39%, Table 9).

Factorisation of assessors on MIMQES-2

Table 4: Eigenvalues of assessors in MIMQES-2

	Eigenvalue	% total Variance	Cumul. Eigenval	Cumul. %
1	11.433	67.25	11.433	67.25
2	3.135	18.44	14.568	85.70

Table 5: Communalities of assessors in MIMQES-2 and factor structure of assessors in MIMQES-2

Assessor	From 1 Factor	From 2 Factors	Assessor	Factor 1	Factor 2
1	.002	.773	4	.953	.116
2	.001	.800	5	.968	.061
3	.003	.805	6	.967	.045
4	.908	.921	7	.962	.032
5	.937	.941	8	.954	.020
6	.935	.937	10	.953	-.013
7	.926	.927	11	.969	.031
8	.909	.910	12	.947	.002
9	.002	.781	13	.813	.042
10	.907	.907	14	.790	.137
11	.939	.940	15	.979	.019
12	.898	.898	16	.931	.078
13	.660	.662	17	.941	.071
14	.624	.643	1	.046	.878
15	.959	.960	2	.038	.893
16	.867	.873	3	.057	.896
17	.886	.891	9	.046	.882
			Expl.Var	11.365	3.204
			Prp.Totl	.669	.188

The result of factorisation of assessors with MIMQES-2 comprises of only two factors - groups of similar assessors, which is much better than with MIMQES-1, where five factors were extracted.

In the first factor thirteen assessors have pondered, and in second factor four assessors do. Such a situation is very satisfactory and shows that the majority of assessors have identical assessment criteria. We assumed that this was, on the one hand, the result of improvements of MIMQES-1 and, on the other hand, of good prepare group of assessors.

The reliability of MIMQES-2 was also computed. Cronbach alpha .878 and average inter-item correlation of .421 show a high reliability of the instrument.

The additional question "What in your opinion is the most important when participating in the exhibition trade show?" was put to all eight directors of the exhibition stands included in our research. Seven of them put the product on the first place, while eight mentioned as the most important the size of the exhibition stand.

3. CONCLUSION

The main purpose of our presented research was (1) to find out the most significant factors of quality of exhibition stands, (2) to produce a measuring instrument concerning the quality of exhibition stands, (3) to present the congruity of assessors ("quality" of assessment) and (4) to present the course of the research. In our opinion, all purposes of our research were reached.

On the basis of the results gathered by brain storming we isolated fourteen dimensions which we assumed to represent the quality of exhibition stands from the non-professional attendee's point of view. Out of these fourteen components we produced a measuring instrument concerning the quality of exhibition stands (MIMQES-1). Factor analysis was used to check both the factor structure of MIMQES-1 and the congruity of assessors. The results were not satisfactory.

On the basis of the results of the MIMQES-1 analysis, the MIMQES-2 was devised. Before we tested MIMQES-2 we had also organised training for assessors. The results of analysis of MIMQES-2 were much better than those of the first version. With factor analysis three factors were extracted: (a) staff, (b) exhibition stand and (c) promotional material. The reliability of MIMQES-2 (Cronbach alpha .878) is also high enough to say that the developed instrument is reliable.

Better results were achieved also with regard to assessors. Instead of five groups of similar assessors in first testing, only two groups of assessors were detected in second testing. Second group was only one third of the size of the first group. This means that assessors were very congruent and that the training procedure was successful.

We realise that the development of MIMQES is not finished. It represents only a good starting point for further development. In further research we should establish if it would be useful to add new criteria of quality of exhibition stand and to examine the reliability also with test-retest method. In the consequent research it would probably be reasonable to exclude variable "size of the exhibition stand in m²", of the assessing list although the size is a highly important criterion. In addition, it would also be useful, if other researchers used MIMQES in other countries and exhibitions in order to verify the applicability of the instrument.

In further research it would also be of interest to compare the most important dimensions for professionals and non-professional visitors of trade shows as well as compare the assessment of same exhibition stand by the group of professional and a group of non-professional assessors.

REFERENCES

1. Assael, H. (1995). Consumer behaviour and marketing action, Boston: PWS-Kent Publishing.
2. AUMA. (1992). Das Messewesen im E.G. Binnenmarkt. Bergisch Gladbach: Joh. Heider Verlag.
3. Black, R. (1986). The trade show industry: management and marketing career opportunities. Massachusetts, East Orleans: Trade Show Bureau.
4. Blythe, J. (2000). Marketing Communications. Harlow: Pearson Education
5. Cech, J. (1990). Beursspecial 90. Belgian Business Magazine, (September), 39-45.
6. Dekimpe, M., Francois, P., Gopalakrishna, S., Lilien, G.L. and Van den Bulte C. (1997). Generalizing about trade show effectiveness: a cross-national comparison. Journal of Marketing, 61, 55-64.
7. Donath, B. (1980). Show and sell by the numbers. Industrial Marketing, March, 70,75.
8. Dykeman, J. (1979). Business shows sure are different across the pond. Modern Office Procedures 24, 41-45.
9. Fahy, J., Snoj, B., Mumel, D., Gabrijan, V., Irsic, M. (1997). The effect of privatisation and foreign direct investment on the marketing of enterprises in Slovenia. In: The effect of privatisation and foreign direct investment on the marketing of enterprises in Central and Eastern Europe : ACE Project No. 94-0766-R : final report. [Birmingham: Aston University], pp. 199-237.
10. Friedlander, P. (1992). Flexing the marketing muscle of european trade shows. Journal of European Business, 3, 10-14.
11. Herbig, P., O'Hara, B. and Palumbo, F. (1994). Measuring trade show effectiveness: an effective exercise?. Industrial Marketing Management 23, 165-170.
12. Kerin, R.A., and Cron, W.L. (1987). Assessing trade show functions and performance: an exploratory study. Journal of Marketing, 51, 87-94.
13. Mee, W.W. (1988). Trade shows: this marketing medium means business. Association Management 40, 50-55.
14. Shipley, D., Egan, C., and Wong, K.S. (1993). Dimensions of trade show exhibiting management. Journal of Marketing Management, 9, 55-63.
15. Skolnik, R. (1987). Getting the brass to take trade shows seriously. Sales and Marketing Management 139, 99-102.
16. Tanner, J.F. (1995). Curriculum guide to trade show marketing. Bethesda: Center for Exhibition Industry Research.
17. Tanner, J.F. and Chonko, L.B. (1995). Trade show objectives, management and staffing practices. Industrial Marketing Management, 24, 7-64.
18. Trade Show Bureau (1993). The Power of Trade Shows, 2.

Appendix 1: Factorisation of MIMQES-2

Table 1-1: Fifteen dimensions of MIMQES-1.

1	lighting
2	easy overview
3	variety
4	originality
5	staff appearance
6	relation to customer
7	knowledge about product
8	quantity of advertising material
9	diversity of advertising material
10	design of advertising material
11	information capacity of advertising material
12	synergy of all components
13	general impression
14	size of the exhibition stand v square meters (m ²)
15	total sum

Table 1-2: Eigenvalues of MIMQES-1

	Eigenvalue	% total Variance	Cumul. Eigenval	Cumul. %
1	7.022	46.81	7.02	46.81
2	1.716	11.44	8.74	58.25
3	1.394	9.29	10.13	67.55
4	1.184	7.89	11.32	75.44

Table 1-3: Communalities of MIMQES-1

	From 1 Factor	From 2 Factors	From 3 Factors	From 4 Factors
lighting	.000	.026	.039	.709
easy overview	.522	.522	.554	.681
variety	.603	.637	.638	.649
originality	.781	.783	.789	.797
staff appearance	.146	.246	.393	.623
relation to customer	.039	.044	.850	.854
knowledge about product	.013	.051	.823	.823
quantity of advertising material	.020	.835	.857	.861
diversity of advertising material	.028	.876	.885	.893
design of advertising material	.339	.530	.550	.612
Information capacity of advertising material	.335	.556	.567	.617
synergy of all components	.526	.674	.766	.766
general impression	.540	.665	.793	.797
size of exhibition stand in m ²	.163	.199	.273	.638
total sum	.488	.744	.937	.996

Table 1-4: Factor structure of MIMQES-1 (ponders above .40 are in bold)

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
lighting	.000	.161	-.116	.818
Easy overview	.722	.001	.179	.356
variety	.777	.185	.010	.108
originality	.884	-.048	.078	.091
Staff appearance	.382	.316	.383	.480
Relation to customer	.199	.064	.898	.063
knowledge about product	.116	.193	.879	-.009
Quantity of advertising material	.141	.903	.147	.066
Diversity of advertising material	.168	.921	.097	.090
design of advertising material	.582	.438	.139	.250
Information capacity of advertising material	.578	.470	.107	-.223
synergy of all components	.725	.384	.303	.021
General impression	.735	.354	.357	.067
size of exhibition stand in m ²	.404	-.190	.272	.604
total sum	.699	.506	.439	.242
Expl.Var	4.543	2.845	2.325	1.603
Prp.Totl	.303	.190	.155	.107

Appendix 2: Factorisation of assessors in MIMQES-1

Table 2-1: Eigenvalues of assessors in MIMQES-1

	Eigenvalue	% total Variance	Cumul. %
1	3.76	22.11	22.11
2	2.56	15.04	37.15
3	2.07	12.16	49.30
4	1.34	7.86	57.17
5	1.19	7.01	64.18

Table 2-2: Factors of assessors in MIMQES-1

Assessor	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5
5	.762	-.083	-.011	-.029	.115
6	.848	.080	-.088	.049	.088
7	.608	-.179	.347	.452	.137
8	.694	.025	-.080	-.096	.393
13	-.150	.623	-.180	.295	.038
9	.170	.750	.216	-.014	-.041
10	-.067	.776	.103	.161	.061
1	-.062	-.002	.763	-.231	.234
2	.083	-.015	.891	-.041	.004
16	-.136	.289	.544	.151	-.004
3	.013	.270	-.092	.821	.085
4	-.091	.232	-.072	.775	-.049
12	.366	-.185	.106	.508	.360
11	.393	.126	.031	-.195	.586
14	.203	-.000	.329	.068	.657
15	.114	-.259	.156	.101	.791
17	.073	.259	-.160	.140	.660
Expl.Var	2.592	1.995	2.080	2.014	2.230
Prp.Totl	.153	.117	.122	.118	.132

Appendix 3: MIMQES 2

Instruction: In each of the following six categories circle the number which you believe to best reflect the quality of the exhibition stand

Exhibition stand: _____ assessor nr.: _____

	Very Bad			Medium			Very good
Lighting of the exhibition stand	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
The exhibition stand easy overview	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Variety of the exhibition stand	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Originality of the exhibition stand	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3

	Not presentable			Looking good enough			More than suitable
Staff appearance	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3

	Very bad			Medium			Very good
Staff relation to customer	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3

	Very bad			Medium			Very good
Staff knowledge about product/service	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3

	Nothing			Medium			Large quantity
Quantity of the advertising material	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3

	Very poor diversity			Medium			Very wide diversity
Diversity of the advertising material	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3

	Poorly designed			Medium			Very well designed
Appearance of the advertising material	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3

	Very Poor			Medium			Very good
General impression	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3

size of the exhibition stand (in m²): _____

Sažetak

**ČIMBENICI KVALITETE IZLOŽBENOG PROSTORA
- RAZVOJ NOVOG MJERILA**

Ovaj rad prezentira dio istraživanja sa dva glavna cilja: (1) pronaći bitne čimbenike kvalitete izložbenog prostora i (2) stvoriti instrument mjerenja za određivanje kvalitete izložbenog prostora, oba sa ne profesionalne točke gledišta posjetioca.

Da bi postigli oba cilja, prvo je utvrđeno četrnaest dimanzija kvalitete izložbenog prostora. Te dimenzije bile su temeljem stvaranja prve verzije mjernih instrumenata u svezi kvalitete izložbenih prostora (MIMQES-1). Kada je isproban MIMQES-1 također je ispitana i sukladnost procjenitelja.

Temeljem analize MIMQES-1 druge verzije MIMQES stvorena je (MIMQES-2), te je postupak pripreme procjenitelja izmjenjen i poboljšan. Rezultati MIMQES-2 analize pokazuju kako bolju strukturu čimbenika tako i bolju sukladnost procjenitelja, što je najvjerojatnije bio rezultat promjene u određivanju procjenitelja.

Ključne riječi: izložba, sajam, kvaliteta, izložbeni štand.