

The Effects of Public Transport Performance on Destination Satisfaction

Ass. Prof. Dr. Gökçe Yüksek^a,
Res. Asst. İbrahim Taner Akkoç^b
Ramazan Ufuk Bayer^{c*}

^aAnadolu University, Faculty of Tourism, Yunusemre Campus 26470, Eskisehir-Turkey

^bAnadolu University, Open Education Faculty, Yunusemre Campus 26470, Eskisehir-Turkey

^cAnadolu University, Faculty of Business Administration, Yunusemre Campus 26470,
Eskisehir-Turkey

r.ufukbayer@gmail.com

Corresponding Author*

Abstract

Public transport has become an important component of urban tourism. In this context, one of the purposes of this study is to investigate public transport performance in the Turkish city of Eskişehir and the other purpose is to determine overall destination satisfaction of tourists who came to Eskişehir. The relationship between public transport performance and overall destination satisfaction of tourists was also examined. Within the framework of these goals, from November 2015 through April 2016, a total of 259 surveys were conducted through face to face interviews from tourists who are about to leave from bus/train stations in Eskişehir. Explanatory factor analysis was conducted to reduce the number of items occurring in the scales. To examine the impacts of public transport performance on tourists' overall destination satisfaction, regression analysis was used from methods of multivariate data analysis. According to the research findings, public transport performance can be analyzed in five headings as; "ease of use", "physical condition", "infrastructure", "staff", and "timing". However, the findings of this research indicated that tourists' overall destination satisfaction can be examined in one dimension as; "destination satisfaction". According to the results of regression analysis performed, "destination satisfaction" is affected by infrastructure, ease of use, timing and physical condition, respectively. Based on the research results, recommendations for future studies and tourism practitioners are suggested.

Keywords: Public Transport, Destination Satisfaction, Urban Tourism, Eskişehir

Introduction

Fierce competition is observed in tourism as in all sectors. Destination managers strive to attract more tourists, so for destinations to be successful in such a competitive environment, it is important to accurately understand the factors affecting destination preferences. While Hall (2000) defines destination generally as geographical areas such as countries, cities, or towns, Van Raiji (1986) defines it as a product composed of natural elements such as climate, vegetation, beaches, mountains, and historic-cultural structures and human-made artificial elements such as hotels, package tours, recreational activities and transportation services (as cited in Hsu, Tsai, & Wu, 2009). Accessibility is one of the important factors forming destination. The fact that transportation assumes an important position is discussed in destination definitions. Local transportation, which is one of the attractiveness factors, is known to have an effect towards the general satisfaction level of tourists (Ladki, Shatila, & Ismail, 2014).

Setting off with the purpose of travelling, visitors allowed road systems, organized freight shipment and passenger transportation, and the sea travel and accommodation sector in the

Mediterranean to be developed (Prideaux, 2000). According to data from the World Tourism Organization (WTO), while tourist mobility in 1950 equalled 25 million, a new record was set as of the end of 2014 with more than 1.1 billion tourists. The number is estimated to reach to 1.8 billion tourists in 2030 (WTO, 2015). The role of transportation in the development of travelling to the present can be considered quite important. The role of the transportation system in terms of tourism is the relationship between terminals, roads, and transportation types for visitors intending to reach destination and the operation of this relation and even the provision of transportation services in destinations (Prideaux, 2000).

Mill and Morrison (1992) stated that tourist destinations are composed of elements such as attractions, facilities, infrastructure, transportation, and hospitality. In addition, while there is not an absolute alignment of characteristics contributing to destination attractiveness, Kozak and Rimmington (1998) have determined five categories as attractiveness, facility and services, infrastructure, hospitality, and price based upon the studies conducted previously and evaluated the prices of transportation out of the scope of this list. Starting from this point of view, transportation can be said to have an important effect on destination choice of tourists and their tourism experience in the destination.

Avgoustis and Achanca (2002) emphasized that local transportation services are one of the primary factors considered while selecting destinations (Thompson & Schofield, 2007). Visitors arriving in tourism destinations are also in need of transportation in those locations and a few of them make use of services to rent private cars. This makes local transportation systems such as the metro, tramways, and buses that tourists need in big cities quite important (Albalade & Bel, 2010). Taking this into consideration, it can be asserted that it not only affects the choices of destination, but also shapes the experience of visitors coming to the destination. According to data from the World Tourism Organization (WTO), local transportation is also included in the expenses made by tourists in destinations where international tourism revenues are acquired (WTO, 2014). Local transportation is considered to be a tourism product contributing to a destination (as cited by Le- Klähn, et al., 2013 in Duval, 2007).

Cities intending to benefit from the tourism industry obtain a competition advantage by allowing touristic products and services to be provided in a quality manner and strengthen their positions (Suh & Gartner, 2004). According to Kozak and Rimmington (1999), characteristics of a destination contribute to the competitiveness of that destination. Additionally, these characteristics are the factors affecting the satisfaction and dissatisfaction of tourists throughout their visits (Corte et al., 2015). Tourism activities of a city are composed of a series of products and combination of services which form the visitors' experience as a whole, and transportation is among them (Thompson & Schofield, 2007). Vetter (1985) indicates that the type of transportation to reach a destination play a role in increasement of the general satisfaction level of tourists (Corte, et al., 2015).

One of the factors bringing success in terms of destination marketing activities is the satisfaction of tourists which affects the destination choice and decision of revisiting (Dmitrovic, et al., 2009). Undoubtedly, satisfaction of tourists has an important role in planning the marketable tourism assets and services (Yoon & Uysal, 2005). Measuring the satisfaction of tourists through the local transportation services is a fundamental issue in transportation researches and application (Le-Klähn, 2014). Some studies in recent years state the use of transportation services in a destination affects the visitors' satisfaction and tourists' experience in general. Thompson and Schofield (2007) indicate that the usability and perceived quality of the local transportation system in a tourist destination affects the satisfaction levels of tourists, their intention to revisit, and visitors' experiences. From this point of view, it can be asserted it is quite important that general satisfaction levels of visitors using local transportation services in a destination are met in accordance with their

expectations because touristic destinations providing local transportation services properly will take a serious competition superiority due to the success they will acquire.

Literature Review

Some research examining the transportation issue in tourism in some ways (e.g., economic, sustainability, attractiveness) are available. Albalade and Bel (2009) analysed the effect of tourism over the local transportation demand and its presentation. Results of the research for 45 destinations in Europe show that tourism creates a demand-increasing effect on the local transportation; however, there is not any supply to meet the demand. This affects the quality of local transportation reversely both for tourists and local people. In other words, insufficient local transportation supply may create reverse effects on the destination satisfaction of tourists. Lumdson, Downward, and Rhoden (2006) researched the sustainability of local transportation, and how individuals visiting destinations in England will be encouraged to use public transport vehicles. In studies conducted regarding local transportation, it is observed that issues such as motivations, perceptions, and preferences of users are more concentrated. In the extant literature, research regarding the motivation and demotivation of local people and individuals visiting destinations to use local transport vehicles (Susilo, Joewono, & Santosa, 2009; Antoniou & Tyrinopoulos, 2013; Le-Klähn, Gerike, & Hall, 2014a) are available. Recently, it is observed that the perceptions and preferences of tourists about the local transportation types (Hergesell & Dickinger, 2013; Le-Klähn, Roosen, Gerike, & Hall, 2015; Loo, Corcoran, Babiano, & Zahnow, 2015) are mentioned in studies. Chang and Lai (2009) analysed the attractiveness of the local transportation in Taipei, Taiwan for domestic tourists and concluded that the most important factors for domestic tourists to prefer local transportation are 'safety and reliability', 'ticket price', and 'short waiting time'.

In the literature, research in relation to the positioning of local transportation also draws attention. Gimeno and Vila (2007) created perception maps in five different local transportation services in terms of satisfaction and innovation. Additionally, Kinsella and Caulfield (2011) studied how the local transportation in Dublin was perceived by both the local people and visitors in the context of importance-performance and concluded that the factors to which visitors attach importance the most are "information and "reliability". They also concluded that visitors need sources through which they can acquire information especially before and during their visits. In addition, Le-Klähn et. al. (2015) published a synopsis by editing studies in the tourism literature performed after 2000.

Research about the subject is not only restricted to unidimensional studies. Lai and Chen (2011) included passengers' interest in the local transportation in their other studies other than the service quality thought to be relevant to behavioural intention, perceived value, and their satisfaction levels. Data collected from individuals using the local transportation in Koahsiung, Taiwan is subject to analysis. The relationship between structural equation modelling (SEM) and variables was analysed. It was concluded that the relationship between all of the variables was statistically meaningful.

Additionally, Parahoo, Harvey, and Raid (2014) examined the relationship between the service quality, reputation and consumers' satisfaction within the context of local transportation. It was observed that the reputation was effective to create value and values were effective on the satisfaction and the reputation indirectly affect the satisfaction. The conclusion that the service quality did not have any effects on the value led to the interpretation that the service quality created an asymmetrical effect.

In the extant literature, research in which the local transportation issue was handled with its different sides in a comprehensive way are also available. One side of the local transportation issue required to be evaluated is satisfaction. Local transportation is

developed by considering only the needs of local people (Orbasli & Shaw, 2004); however, local transportation is not only used by local people, it is also used by the visitors in destinations. Castillo and Benitez (2012) examined the factors which affect the satisfaction of the local people using buses in Bilbao. A total of 35 criteria regarding the local transportation were grouped under eight factors; connectivity, accessibility, information, time satisfaction, user attendance, comfort, security/safety, and environmental impact. The most effective five factors causing satisfaction in terms of local transportation are line reliability, bus stop location adequacy, bus illumination, punctuality, and connections.

Le-Klähn et. al. (2014b) examined the factors allowing people visiting Munich, Germany and using the local transportation to be satisfied about the local transportation. The criteria determined as a result of the factor analysis performed were grouped into four factors; traveling comfort, service quality, accessibility, and additional features. The most important six factors allowing visitors to be satisfied about the local transportation include information, ticket price, service frequency, space on the vehicle, cleanliness of the vehicle, and ease of use. The relationship of the local transportation with the destination satisfaction is subject to research because the satisfaction in the local transportation in destinations is known to have a possible effect on the destination satisfaction. Avgoustis and Achanca (2002) evaluated 14 factors affecting the destination satisfaction and concluded that the local transportation is the fourth most important criterion of all criteria. Thompson and Schofield (2007) evaluated the performance components of the local transportation from the perspective of international visitors and examined the effect of this evaluation on the general destination satisfaction.

According to the results from the factor analysis performed with the data acquired from the international visitors in Manchester, England, local transportation performance aspects are “the ease of use”, “efficiency and safety”, and “good parking”. Subsequently, the perceived local transportation performance is observed to have a slight effect on the destination satisfaction. The most effective factor of all criteria related to the local transportation performance was determined to be “the ease of use”. Since the study of Le-Klähn et. al. (2014b), Thompson and Schofield (2007) reflected the insights of only international tourists and questioned the relationship between the destination satisfaction and the local transportation satisfaction in general without setting forth the sub-aspects; it attracts notice to the development requirement.

Ladki et. al. (2014) examined the effect of the local transportation in Lebanon on the general destination satisfaction of visitors and six aspects, ‘safety and efficiency’ ‘ease of use’ ‘cleanliness’ ‘price value’ ‘reachable attractions’ and ‘difficult to reach’, were acquired in relation to the local transportation performance. It was concluded the performance of the local transportation had an effect on the general destination satisfaction. It was observed that the local transportation in Lebanon affected the destination satisfaction of visitors reversely in terms of ‘safety and efficiency of transport mode’ ‘ease of use of transportation’ and ‘ease of access to attractions’. Additionally, it was concluded that there was no relation between “the price of value” factor and the general destination satisfaction.

Methodology

The aim of this study is to measure the effect of the public transportation on the satisfaction of visitors. The complementarity and causation relation model was used in the study. While the goal was to acquire information in relation to the demographic characteristics of participants, the relationship between variables was attempted with the causation relation model. The local transportation is within the authority and responsibility of the Metropolis Municipality in Eskişehir where the study was conducted. Five different transportation means, bus, tramway, minibus, taxi and shared-taxi, are used in Eskişehir for urban transportation. Lines and routes were integrated together for tramway and bus services to maintain the integrity in the public transportation services.

The population of the study was composed of domestic visitors using the public transportation vehicles in Eskişehir. The exemplification method was used since a complete calculation was not possible to be performed in terms of costs and time and the convenience sampling method, which is one of the non-probable exemplification methods, was preferred. Data was collected through a questionnaire form and the expressions in the questionnaire were adapted from the studies in the literature. Data related to the studies from which those expressions were acquired is available in the Table 1.

Table 1. Summary of the Expressions Edited from Studies

Satisfaction with Public Transport Service			
Authors (Publication Year)	Items		Journal
Le-Klahn, et. al. (2014)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accessibility • Convenience • Ease of use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Network connection • Punctually • Service Frequency 	Journal of Public Transportation
Ladki, et. al. (2014)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety • Efficiency • Ease of use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information • Cleanliness 	Journal of Tourism Challenges and Trends
Mokonyama and Venter (2013)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information • Service Frequency 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff respect • Temperature 	Research in Transportation Economics
Antoniou and Tyrinopoulos (2013)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Availability • Bus shelters • Cleanliness • Comfort • Frequency 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information • Network Coverage • Route • Safety • Waiting time 	International Journal of Transportation
Castillo and Benitez (2012)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accessibility • Cleanliness • Comfort • Information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Occupancy • Safety • Staff Kindness • Temperature 	Social and Behavioral Sciences
Wang and Hsu (2010)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Courteous and polite staff • Knowledgeable and skillful 		Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing
Destination Satisfaction			
Authors (Publication Year)	Items		Journal
Yuksel et. al. (2010)	The first 3 items adapted		Tourism Management
Wang and Hsu (2010)	The last item adapted		Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing

Questionnaires were used via the face-to-face method throughout the data collection process. The data collection was initiated on November 27, 2015 and ended on April 16, 2016. Analyses in relation to the research were carried out based on 259 observations in

total and collected from visitors to Eskişehir and about to leave the destination. The data collection was performed by researchers carrying out the study.

The SPSS program was used to analyze the data. Primarily, the explanatory factor analysis was applied for the data in relation to the local transportation and general destination satisfaction. And finally, the stepwise regression analysis was applied with the purpose of setting forth the destination satisfaction of the local transportation. The main aim of this research is investigating the prediction ability of the destination's local transport performance on the tourists' destination satisfaction. In this research, the stepwise regression analysis is preferred because there is not any theoretical background about the predictors of the destination satisfaction in terms of local transport. It is known that independent variables are entered into the model based on mathematical calculations or statistical criteria within the stepwise regression (Field, 2009: 212; Pallant, 2010: 150; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013: 138). In this manner, which location transportation aspect/aspects create(s) a meaningful effect on the destination satisfaction can more easily be understood.

Findings

Demographic Characteristics of Sample

Around half of the respondents (53.3%) were male. Findings shows that the 67% of respondents had a bachelor's or higher degree. The majority of respondents (24.3%) were retired, followed by officer (20.1%), student (15.8%), worker (12%), director (8.1%), employer (6.6%), others (5.5%), unemployed (3.9%). Mean age of respondents were 37 and the findings indicate that respondents earn 5,000 TL averagely.

Explanatory Factor Analysis Results for Public Transport

Explanatory factor analysis was conducted to reduce the number of public transport attributes (22 items). Two items, "Public transport staff kindness" and "Physical state of public transport vehicles", were deleted due to their low correlations (<0.3) with other items in the scale. Then with the 20 items, explanatory factor analysis was performed using the Orthogonal (Varimax) rotation method and Principal Components Analysis as the method of extraction. As seen in Table 1, a total of 20 public transport attributes from the factor analysis resulted in five factors, and these factors explained 62.80% of the variance. In terms of value, the explained variance these factors can be listed as: 1) *Ease to Use* 2) *Physical Condition* 3) *Infrastructure* 4) *Staff* 5) *Timing*.

Factor 1 ($\alpha=0,828$) explains 14.74 % of the variance and loads on four variables. Factor 2 ($\alpha=0,726$) explains 12.87 % of the variance and loads on five variables. Factor 3 ($\alpha=0.70$) explains 12.59 % of the variance and loads on five variables. Factor 4 ($\alpha=0.76$) explains 11.63 % of the variance and loads on five variables. Last, Factor 5 ($\alpha=0.76$) explains 10.94 % of the variance and loads on five variables. The overall significance of the correlation matrix was 0.000 with a Bartlett test of sphericity value of 2228.549. It showed that the data matrix had sufficient correlation to the factor analysis. With the value of 0.787, The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin overall measure of sampling adequacy was significant.

Table 2. Dimensions of public transport performance

Dimensions and Items	Factor loading	Eigen value	Variance %	Mean
Ease of Use ($\alpha=0,828$)		2.950	14.749	4.14
Public transport in Eskişehir is a fast way to travel	.936			
I am able to find the information needed to make journeys by public transport	.920			
It is easy to use public transport in Eskişehir	.845			
Public transport technologically supported	.462			
Physical Condition ($\alpha=0,726$)		2.575	12.877	3.13
Public transport vehicles are clean	.701			
Crowded public transport vehicles	.690			
Public transport vehicles in Eskişehir are safe	.672			
Public transport temperature adequacy	.663			
Public transport comfort	.521			
Infrastructure ($\alpha=0,701$)		2.520	12.599	4.48
Public transport in Eskişehir is very accessible	.778			
Adequate number of bus/train stops in Eskişehir	.776			
Train/bus stops are conveniently located	.722			
Train/bus stops shelters (comfort, cleanness, protection from weather conditions)	.598			
Accessibility of the public transport network in Eskişehir	.440			
Staff ($\alpha=0,763$)		2.327	11.635	2.93
Public transport staff helpful	.836			
Public transport staff respectful	.815			
Public transport staff knowledgeable and skillful	.592			
Timing ($\alpha=0,769$)		2.189	10.945	3.00
It is easy to buy the ticket for your journey	.853			
Punctually of public transport in Eskişehir	.818			
Service frequency in Eskişehir	.676			
Total Variance			62.805	

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy: 0,787

Bartlett's test of sphericity/ Ci-square value: 2228,549, sd: 190, p:0,000

Explanatory Factor Analysis Results for Destination Satisfaction

For four items, explanatory factor analysis was performed using the Orthogonal (Varimax) rotation method and Principal Components Analysis as the method of extraction. As seen in Table 2, this single-factor structure measured *Destination Satisfaction* ($\alpha=0,884$) which consists of four items that explain about visitors' satisfaction with the overall destination. This produced single factor which explained 74.289% of the variance in the data set.

Table 3. Dimension of destination satisfaction

Dimension and Items	Factor loading	Eigen value	Variance %	Mean
Destination Satisfaction ($\alpha=0,884$)		2.972	74.289	4.00
I believe I did the right thing when I choose to make me holiday in Eskişehir	.888			
Overall, I am satisfied with decision to make my holiday in Eskişehir	.869			
This tourism experience in Eskişehir was exactly what I expected	.854			
I am happy about my decision to stay in Eskişehir	.835			

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy: 0,830
 Bartlett's test of sphericity/ Ci-square value: 556,057, sd: 6, p:0.000

Regression Analysis Results

In order to apply stepwise regression analysis, there are some assumptions that should be checked. First, the normality of the variables was tested based on their skewness and kurtosis values and the the data can be accepted as normally distributed with the significance level of 95%, according to Tabachnick and Fidell (2013), because all the variables' skewness and kurtosis values are in the ideal range (-2 and +2). Second, the variance inflation factor ($VIF > 0,1$) and tolerance values (less than 10) which take part in Table 4 shows there is no multicollinearity problem. Third, homoscedasticity was controlled by the Durbin-Watson test (Table 5) and the test score is 1,138 which between 1-3 that revealed the residuals are uncorrelated or independent. Ultimately, the assumptions (normality, multicollinearity, homoscedasticity or independence of residual) of the stepwise regression analysis were all met.

Table 4. Local Transport Predictors of the Destination Satisfaction

Model Variables	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients β	<i>t</i>	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
	<i>B</i>	Std. error				Tolerance	VIF
(Constant)	.679	.333		2.039	.042		
Infrastructure	.256	.082	.199	3.111	.002***	.734	1.363
Ease of use	.267	.073	.221	3.641	.000***	.808	1.238
Timing	.155	.060	.158	2.586	.010**	.797	1.255
Physical Condition	.156	.061	.148	2.570	.011**	.896	1.116

*** Significant at 0.01 level (two-tailed)

** Significant at 0.05 level (two-tailed)

* Significant at 0.10 level (two-tailed)

There are four independent variables related with local transport which significantly effects on the destination satisfactions. These are infrastructure (std. coefficient $\beta = .199$, $p < .005$), ease of use (std. coefficient $\beta = .221$, $p < .001$), timing (std. coefficient $\beta = .158$, $p < .01$), and

physical condition (std. coefficient $\beta = .148$, $p < .01$). The standardized coefficient β values of four independent variables related with local transport which significantly predict the destination satisfaction are positive and that means there is positive correlation between the dependent and independent variables.

Table 5. Model Summary

Model	R	R ²	Adj. R ²	Std. error of the estimates	Collinearity statistics					Durbin-Watson
					R ² change	F change	df1	df2	Sig. F change	
1	.378 ^a	.143	.139	.98036	.143	42.757	1	257	.000	
2	.432 ^b	.186	.180	.95693	.044	13.742	1	256	.000	
3	.470 ^c	.221	.212	.93795	.035	11.465	1	255	.001	
4	.491 ^d	.241	.229	.92781	.020	6.604	1	254	.011	1.138

^aPredictors: (Constant), infrastructure

^bPredictors: (Constant), infrastructure, ease of use

^cPredictors: (Constant), infrastructure, ease of use, timing

^dPredictors: (Constant), infrastructure, ease of use, timing, physical condition

^eDependent variable: destination satisfaction

Stepwise regression analysis revealed the best equation with four independent variables out of five. Four independent variable related with the local transport performance are retained in the model because they significantly contribute to the model's prediction ability. From Table 5 the correlation between infrastructure of the local transport and destination satisfaction is 0.378 and 14.30% of the destination satisfaction can be explained by first independent variable-infrastructure. Then, another dimension of the local transport-ease of use is included in the model and the total of amount explained variance has been changed approximately 4.4% ($F_{\text{change}} = 13.742$, $p < .001$).

The third independent variable-timing creates an additional 3.5% variance ($F_{\text{change}} = 11.465$, $p < .01$) and three independent variables together explain 21.2% of the variation in the destination satisfaction. The best model is confronted in the fourth step through the inclusion of physical condition variable into the model. According to Table 5, four independent variables (dimensions of the local transport) predict 24.10% of the variation in the destination satisfaction. The model may not be regarded as a good model statistically because it explains less than 30% of the variance in the dependent variable. In fact, local transport performance of the destination is approximately one quarter of the destination satisfaction and this is a quite considerable amount.

Conclusion and Discussion

While Eskişehir displays its best performance in terms of the local transportation in the infrastructure aspect, the lowest performance was displayed in the staff aspect. These results show parallelism with the results of the study of Castillo and Benitez (2012). However, it was observed they do not coincide with the results of the study of Le-Klähn et. al. (2014b), in which it can be understood that features such as quality and comfort affect the satisfaction of visitors in terms of the local transportation. This difference can be revealed due to the fact that Munich is a more developed city than Eskişehir. Reviewing the general destination satisfaction of visitors to Eskişehir, it can be declared that the city is in a good state in terms of the mean (\bar{x} line: 3,94).

The primary aim of this study is to compare the performance of the local transportation to the destination satisfaction. Looking at the subject from this point of view, it was concluded that only one (staff) of the five aspects of the local transportation did not create any meaningful effect on destination satisfaction. According to the model formed by the local transportation aspects creating meaningful effects on the destination satisfaction, a total of 22,90% of the variance is on the local transportation destination satisfaction. Comparing this result to the results of the studies in the literature, while Thompson and Schofield (2007) concluded that the local transportation performance had a slight effect on the destination satisfaction, Ladki et. al. (2014) concluded that the local transportation performance is effective in terms of the general destination satisfaction.

Within this content, the results of the study are similar to the results of the study performed by Ladki et. al (2014). Analysing the effect of the local transportation aspects on the destination satisfaction individually, while infrastructure has an explanatory power of 14.30%; the explanatory power of other transportation aspects was determined to be the following: 4.40% for the ease of use, 3.50% for timing, and 2.00% for the physical condition. Comparing them from this perspective, while the aspect standing out in the study of Thompson and Schofield (2007) is “the ease of use” in terms of the destination satisfaction, the aspect standing out in the study of Ladki et. al. (2014) is “the safety and efficiency”.

Results of this study indicate that the local transportation has a significant effect on the destination satisfaction. Therefore, destination management organizations or decision-makers in relation to destinations need to pay more attention to accommodate the satisfaction of destination visitors subject to the local transportation. It is especially important to consider the fact that the aspects of infrastructure and ease of use of the local transportation create a significant effect on the general destination satisfaction. Researchers interested in this subject may test if they can achieve the similar results by carrying out studies in different destinations. Additionally, only the perspectives of domestic visitors were taken into account. In future studies, perspectives of domestic and foreign visitors may be examined together and compared. Studies may also be designed by considering that there may be other factors affecting the destination satisfaction.

References

- Albalate, D. & Bel, G. (2009). Tourism and Urban Public Transport: Holding Demand Pressure Under Supply Constraints. *Tourism Management*, 1-9.
- Antoniou, C. & Tyrinopoulos, Y. (2013). Factors Affecting Public Transport Use in Touristic Areas. *International Journal of Transportation*. 1 (1), 91-112.
- Avgoustis, S.H. & Achanca, F. (2002). Designing a Sustainable City Tourism Development Model Using an Importance Performance (IP) Analysis. In K. Wöber (ed.), *City Tourism 2002* (pp. 39-149). Vienna: Springer.
- Castillo, J. M. D. & Benitez, F. G. (2012). A Methodology for Modeling and Identifying Users Satisfaction Issues in Public Transport Systems based on Users Surveys. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 54, 1104-1114.
- Chang, H. H. & Lai, T. Y. (2009). The Taipei MRT (Mass Rapid Transit) Tourism Attraction Analysis from the Inbound Tourists' Perspectives. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 26 (5-6), 445-461.
- Gimeno, C. & Vila, N. (2007). Competitive Group Analysis of Public Transport Services. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 21 (1), 13-29.

Hergesell, A. & Dickinger, A. (2013). Environmentally Friendly Holiday Transport Mode Choices Among Students: The Role of Price, Time and Convenience. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 21(4), 596-613.

Field, A. P. (2009). *Discovering Statistics Using SPSS* (3rd Ed.). London: Sage.

Kinsella, J. & Caulfield, B. (2011). An Examination of the Quality and Ease-of-use of Public Transport in Dublin from a Newcomer's Perspective. *Journal of Public Transportation*, 14(1), 69-81.

Ladki, S. Shatilla, F. & Ismail, S. (2014). The Effect of Lebanese Public Transport on Visitor's Satisfaction. *Journal of Tourism Challenges and Trends*, 7(2), 87-96.

Lai, W. T. & Chen, C. F. (2011). Behavioral Intentions of Public Transit Passengers-The Roles of Service Quality, Perceived Value, Satisfaction and Involvement. *Transport Policy*, 18, 318-325.

Le-Klähn, D. T. (2013). Measuring Tourists' Satisfaction with Public Transport in Munich, Germany. *International Journal of Business Tourism and Applied Sciences*, 1(1), 75-83.

Le-Klähn, D. T. & Hall, C. M. (2015). Tourist Use of Public Transport at Destinations-A Review. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 18(8), 785-803.

Le-Klähn, D. T., Gerike, R. & Hall, C. M. (2014a). Visitor Users vs. Non-users of Public Transport: The Case of Munich, Germany. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 3(3), 152-161.

Le-Klähn, D. T., Hall, C. M. & Gerike, R. (2014b). Analysis of Visitor Satisfaction with Public Transport in Munich. *Journal of Public Transportation*, 17(3), 68-85.

Le-Klähn, D. T., Roosen, J., Gerike, R., & Hall, C. M. (2015). Factors Affecting Tourists' Public Transport Use and Areas Visited at Destinations. *Tourism Geographies*, 1-19.

Loo, L. Y. L., Corcoran, J., Mateo-Babiano, D. & Zahnow, R. (2015). Transport Mode Choice in South East Asia. Investigating The Relationship Between Transport Users' Perception and Travel Behaviour in Johor Bahru, Malaysia. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 46, 99-111.

Lumsdon, L., Downward, P. & Rhoden, S. (2006). Transport for Tourism: Can Public Transport Encourage a Modal Shift in the Day Visitor Market? *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 14 (2), 139-156.

Mokonyama, M. & Venter, C. (2013). Incorporation of Customer Satisfaction in Public Transport Contracts - A Preliminary Analysis. *Research in Transportation Economics*, 39 (1), 58-66.

Orbasli, A. & Shaw, S. (2004). Transport and Visitors in Historic Cities. In L.M. Lumsdon and S.J. Page (Eds.), *Tourism and Transport: Issues and Agendas for the New Millennium*, Amsterdam: Elsevier, 93-104.

Parahoo, S. K., Harvey, H. L. & Radi, G. Y. A. (2014). Satisfaction of Tourists with Public Transport: An Empirical Inves Investigation in Dubai. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 31 (8), 1004-1017.

Pallant, J. (2010). *SPSS Survival Manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using the SPSS Program*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Susilo, Y. O., Joewono, T. B. & Santosa, W. (2010) An exploration of public transport users' attitudes and preferences towards various policies in Indonesia. *The Journal of the Eastern Asia Society for Transportation Studies*, 8, 1230-1244.

Tabachnick, B. G. & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using Multivariate Statistics* (6th Ed.). Boston: Pearson.

Thompson, K., & Schofield, P. (2007). An Investigation of the Relationship between Public Transport Performance and Destination Satisfaction. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 15, 136-144.