



# The relationship between demographic and tripographic factors and customers' expectation, perception and service quality: A case of star rated hotel guests in Ethiopia

Dr Orthodox Tefera\*  
Graduate School of Business and Leadership  
University of KwaZulu-Natal  
South Africa  
[Orthodox.tefera@gmail.com](mailto:Orthodox.tefera@gmail.com)

and

Professor Stephen Migiro  
Graduate School of Business and Leadership  
University of KwaZulu-Natal  
South Africa

Corresponding author\*

## Abstract

The hospitality industry in general and hotels in particular attend to diverse guests and their expectations. The effective and efficient meeting of the expectation of all hotel guests, given their different profiles, is a challenge to the sector, This study aims to address this very issue by trying to find out the relationship between the demographic and tripographic attributes and the customers expectation, perception and service quality of hotel guests who stayed in star rated hotels in Ethiopia. HOTSPER, the modified version of SERVQUAL and SERVPER, instrument which utilizes the gap analysis techniques was used. A total of 1200 questionnaires distributed to 40 hotels out of which 415 hotel guests responded, by completing the questionnaires. The result of inferential statistical techniques reveals significant relationship between employment type and customer perception and expectation while the other three demographics variables (age, gender and marital status) showed no significant relationships. From the tripographic variables, there were significant relationships between two attributes and the customers' expectation and perception. Furthermore, there was a relationship between customers' preference for a chain or independent hotels and service quality provision. Hotel managers in Ethiopia need to look at the importance of segmentation of guest based on their demographics and tripographic factors in order to provide personalized service to their valued guests. The result of the study has also an implication on service marketers as profiling their customers can enable them to design a targeted marketing strategy.

**Key Words:** Tripographic, customer expectation, perception, segmentation, service quality, Ethiopia

## Introduction

The hotel industry in Ethiopia has been growing at a higher pace over the past several years. In the last decade, on an average eleven hotels were opening every year in the country and in the next ten years, the number is anticipated to increase to eighteen new hotels per annum (Hailesilasse, 2013). The growth, however, is marred by the delivery of poor quality of service in



the majority of the hotels (Kifle, 2012). Addressing these quality issues requires addressing customers' varying needs from one segment of the population to another, primarily because consumers are presumed to perceive service quality differently (Ganesan-Lim et al., 2008). Kotler et al. (2010), stated that "in general, customers compare the perceived service with the expected service, and service quality is positive when the perceived service experience exceeds the expected service, and negative when perceived service fell short of the expected service". In order to determine the customers' service expectations, hotel customers must first be identified (Hoyer and MacInnis, 2010). Hotel marketers need to study their customers from many angles and perspectives because without sound knowledge of these attributes and guidelines, they may run into the risk of making wrong decisions (Grazhdani and Merollari, 2015). The objective of this study therefore is to investigate if there are relationships between the demographic and tripographic attributes of the customers and their expectation, perception and service quality of hotel guests who stayed in star rated hotels in Ethiopia. There are abundant researches on customer expectations, customer perception and service quality in the service industry including the hotel sector. However, limited research exists on the relationship between customer expectation, perception and service quality and the demographic and tripographic characteristics of hotel guests in the context of Ethiopian hotel industry.

## Literature review

### Concept of demography, tripography and service

Demography, according to Yeoman et al. (2010), is a classification of people mostly used by marketers to analyse and segment markets. The approach used by many marketers or consumer behaviour researchers to segment their markets is grouping consumers according to the demographic variables. Furthermore, traditionally, marketers use demographic analysis to segment their markets so that they can generate reliable and valid characteristics of their target markets (Yeoman et al., 2010). Hotel operators implement demographic profiles in order to enhance their knowledge or understanding of customers' demographic differences with regards to service expectation, perception and service quality (Tsiotsou and Vasioti, 2006). It is, therefore, imperative for the hospitality industry's survival that management in the hotel industry know the effect of their customers demographics on the entire service marketing variables (Yeoman et al., 2010). There have been many studies with regards to demographic profiles and its effect or relationship with different variables. The results of most of these studies however have been inconsistent (Kniatt, 1995; Tsiotsou and Vasioti, 2006; Sasikala, 2013; Serin et al., 2013). In most of the studies, sex age, income, education and occupation are the most widely used variables representing demographics (Lee et al., 2012). In this study the classification of respondents' demographic variable is based on age, gender, marital status as well as their employment status (Table 1). The other method used to classify customers by the hospitality industry, including travel and tourism is called tripography.

According to Yangjin (2015), tripography is a word used to describe what is traditionally used to explain travel or trip characteristics. These characteristics however are expressed with different connotations reflecting the many attributes and dimensions. The tripographic attributes, in this study, are the travel-related behavioural characteristics, such as the length of stay of the current visit, source of information regarding the rating of the hotel, preference for hotels star ratings, preference for types of hotels (chain versus independent), source of information on hotels for the current visit, the purpose of their stay and hotel method of payment of bills. The tripographic attributes used in this study together with their different group dimensions are shown on Table 4.



The concept “service” had been defined by many disciplines such as; economics, marketing, human resource, operations and organizational development (Tefera and Govender, 2016). Haksever (2000:126) defined a service as “an economic activity that produces time, place, form, or psychological utilities”. He further explained service from the point of view of its advantage to customers as saving their time and providing convenient outlets, information and “psychological refreshment”. From the point of view of operational management, “service was viewed as a process where input was processed to output”. Service, as explained by Lovelock and Wirtz (2004:246) is “an act or performance offered by one party to another with the process that may be tied to a physical product with the performance being transitory as well as intangible in nature, and does not normally result in ownership of any of the factors of production”. The aforementioned authors further depicted service “as an economic activity that creates value and provides benefits to customers at specific times and places by bringing about a desired change in, or on behalf of, recipients of the service”.

Furthermore, services were differentiated from goods through the assessment of the applicability of the “four unique characteristics of services” (Narangajavana, 2007). These characteristics were “intangibility, inseparability, heterogeneity, and perishability” (Parasuraman et al., 1994b). Based on Zeithaml et al. (1985), Wirtz (2012:347) defined *intangibility* as “a distinguishing characteristic of services that makes them unable to be touched or sensed in the same manner as physical goods”; *inseparability* as “a distinguishing characteristic of services that reflects the interconnection among the service provider, the customer involved in receiving the service, and other customer’s sharing the service experience”; *heterogeneity* as “distinguishing characteristic of services that reflects the variation in consistency from one service transaction to the next” and *perishability* as “a distinguishing characteristic of services in that they cannot be saved, their unused capacity cannot be reserved, and they cannot be inventoried”.

Reisinger et al. (2001:10) explained the three stages of service evaluation: “pre-consumption, consumption, and post-consumption”. In the “pre-consumption stage”, a choice between different options will be made by consumers; however decisions will rarely be based on information about service attributes. Following this, consumers will start to weigh up their expectation with that of the actual experience in the “consumption stage and post consumption stage”. Consumers will then evaluate the service process as a whole in their own capacity, even though service provision consist of many other interactions (Rauch et al., 2015). Due to this fact services in the hotel industry differs from services in other industries such as retail, banking, telecom, etc.

### **Service in the Hotel Industry**

A hotel service involves high interaction among people as it involves visits by guests who come to stay or seek services at the hotel (Chase and Dasu, 2001). The guests utilize the hotel infrastructure and actively engage with employees during their stay. Reisinger et al. (2001) observed “the hotel as being part of the hospitality industry and described it as the provision of accommodation and catering (food and beverage) services for guests that included both tourists and local residents”. The aforementioned also stated “the importance of the quality of hospitality services, asserting that staffs need to treat guests with empathy, kindness, and friendliness, and be concerned about their well-being and satisfaction”. Furthermore, Reisinger et al. (2001) indicated that services in the hospitality and tourism industry are a mixture of products and services and hence are not totally tangible or intangible. According to Reisinger et al. (2001) the degree of intangibility is seen in most services, and customers cannot utilize them before the purchase or store or save them for future use (Olivier (2010). This means that both the service provider and customers need to be present as the “services are produced and consumed at the



same time”, and depending on the mood of the customers or the employees, services can be different at different times (Hoyer and MacInnis, 2010). The characteristics of service in the hospitality industry has created a challenge, and according to Metters et al. (2006), makes the evaluation of the service and its quality by customers very difficult.

## Expected Services

Expectation<sup>1</sup> is “an anticipation of future consequences based on prior experience and other sources of information” (Hoyer and MacInnis, 2010: :367). These researchers also described expectations as a comparative referent for performance since “performance alone is an unreferenced concept, and meaning is attached only when performance can be compared to some standard”. In fact, whatever “can be used in satisfaction assessments, can become channelled into expectations when the product or service is purchased” (Hoyer and MacInnis, 2010). The pioneers, in service marketing, Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry (1994), define expectation as the desire or need of consumers, and the consumers’ understanding of service quality as arising from the difference between their expectations and their real experience. It is often “difficult to evaluate a service in advance of the purchase by customers”; however, they set some expectations of the product they are anticipating to purchase (Cant and Edris, 2012). These same customers, will look for those products that they anticipate will satisfy their needs (Bagozzi and Ruvio, 2011).

Lovelock and Wirtz (2004: 265) indicated that customers compare what they are experiencing against what they expected to experience, if it costs them resources “such as money, time and opportunity in terms of obtaining alternative goods and services”. Customers’ expectation differs from one service industry to another with regards to quality service provision. A service provided by a lawyer and a medical practitioner varies, even though they both deliver professional services. The lawyer provides legal advice to his clients while a medical practitioner deals with the health matter and hence the experience and expectation of both services are very different (Lovelock and Wirtz, 2004). According to Cant and Edris (2012), “expectations are also likely to vary in relation to different service providers in the same industry and guests may expect a luxury product and service from a five star hotel as opposed to four star and less. If this expectation is not met, guests will undoubtedly be very dissatisfied”. In the hotel industry, when guests evaluate service quality for booking purposes, they tend to use “hotel ratings”, customer reviews and other internal standards, prior to reserving a hotel (Zeithaml et al., 1993).

Customer expectations tend to change through time, and according to Nowlis (2015) they are “influenced by both the hotel-controlled factors, such as advertising, pricing, new technologies, and service innovation, as well as social trends, advocacy by consumer organizations, increased access to information through the media and the internet and the demographic and tripographic factors of the customers”. When customers book a hotel based on its ratings, they have a certain expectation of the level of service that the hotel is likely to provide (Zeithaml et al., 2009). If the hotel service meets their expectations, consumers will be happy and satisfied. “Service quality is concerned with a broader understanding of service expectations, where respondents are looking for what they expect from a service provider” (Motwani and Shrimali, 2013). Beard (2013) views customer service expectation as a belief about service delivery that serves as a standard or reference against which performance is judged. Knowing what the hotel customers expect as a result of the hotel’s rating, is the first and most crucial step in delivering

---

<sup>1</sup> Expectation in this study refers to customer service expectation



quality service, and misjudging what customers expect can mean losing customers to competitors (Kim-Soon et al., 2014). This means that any difference between customers' expectations and their experiences impacts on service quality which eventually affects customers' satisfaction (Po-Hsuan et al., 2014; Kim-Soon et al., 2014; Wael Hassan, 2013; Al-Ababneh, 2013; Razi et al., 2012; Mohajerani and Miremadi, 2012; AbuKhalifeh and Som, 2012). Hotel guests are currently better informed and often check prices and compare their services with at least ten hotels on the website before they make a decision (Matzler and Wiaguny, 2005 ; Mitchell and Papavassiliou, 1999; Minazzi, 2010)

Consumers' expectations as reiterated by Hawkins and Mothersbaugh, (2010), "are the result of learning from experience and can be formed very quickly and once set up, can wield enormous influence and become difficult to change. The expectation of hotel guests is different for higher star rated hotels as compared to the lower ones when it comes to service quality (Tefera and Govender, 2015). However, the expectation could differ based on the demographic or tripographic profiles of the customers (Ranjbarian et al., 2012; Sasikala, 2013) or their explicit knowledge of what is required to have the designated hotel rating they chose to stay in.

### **Perceived Service**

Perceived service is the perception of customers about the actual service being experienced. Customers can come up with different perceptions for the same product and service (Kotler et al., 2010). Zeithaml et al. (2009:77) stated that the "entire discussion on quality and satisfaction is based on the customer's perceived service, not some predetermined objective criteria of what the service is or should be". Customers may have "single, transaction-specific encounters as well as overall perceptions of a company based on all their experiences" (Olsen and Johnson, 2003). Furthermore, Wu et al. (2014) indicated that perceptions are more complementary than competing and hence understanding perceptions at the transaction-specific stage is vital for diagnosing service issues and making quick changes, while cumulative experience evaluations are better predictors of overall customer satisfaction and loyalty towards hotels. Yein Ping et al. (2012) showed that perceived service quality of customers depends on how satisfied they are with their overall experience. Thus, perceptions need to be considered relative to expectations so that management could immediately address issues if it is short of expectations.

Customers' source of expectations are constructed from many factors, events and experiences including "past experiences, word-of-mouth, advertising, hotel ratings, e-WoM etc.", however it is the actual service experienced at the time of their stay that determines the "customer's perception of service quality" (Tung Lai, 2004).

### **Service Quality**

Service quality is defined by Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry (1985, 1988) as "the overall evaluation of a specific service firm that results from comparing that firm's performance with the customers' general expectations of how firms in that industry should perform". Service quality is "the gap between customers' expectations about a service and their perceptions of the way the service was delivered" (Parasuraman et al., 1994a: :93; Zeithaml et al., 2009). A poor quality of service is an indication of customer dissatisfaction, who may not return to the establishment in the future and even move their business dealings to other places (Christopher et al., 2005). According to Wu et al. (2014), both perception and expectations need to be measured in order to evaluate service quality.





Mauri et al. (2013:141) also defined service quality as “a multidimensional concept, assessed and perceived by consumers, according to a set of essential parts, grouped into five categories, namely: tangible, reliability, responsiveness, assurance and empathy.”

Rauch et al. (2015) indicated that the concept of service quality was initially used in the marketing framework by making customers the focal point following a growing concern in quality assurance. Furthermore, through investigation of the development of service quality assessment, Gronroos (2007) stated that the confirmation/disconfirmation concept of service quality forms the basis for its development. The confirmation and disconfirmation concept is explained in relation to comparison of the customers’ perceived (experience) and their expectations of the service. Therefore, in this regard, service quality in the hotel industry will be discussed in the next section.

### **Service Quality in the Hotel Industry**

Consumers use service quality in their judgement of superiority and excellence service provided to them by service providers. In the hospitality industry, “service quality” is extremely important, and the survival of the industry depends on the delivery of quality services to their customers. According to Briggs et al. (2007), the determinants of service quality vary in relation to the size of the hotel. Differences were found in the ratings of several operational factors by customers (personal service, friendliness, standard and tangibles), with the exception of value for money based on the size of the hotel service (Kim et al., 2013). Boon-Liat and Md. Zabid Abdul (2013) stated that as a result of guests’ experience of the attitudes and certain feelings in the hotel, service quality perceptions are formed. The hotel sector need to acknowledge the evaluation of customers perceived service quality and level of satisfaction as a strategy to enhance their profitability (Claver et al., 2006; Tam, 2004). The hotel industry is a highly competitive sector and faces a lot of rivalry and hence, it becomes “imperative for hotel operators to constantly assess and look for ways to improve the quality of their services” (Su and Sun, 2007). According to Wuest (2001), “the strategies for impacting service quality in tourism, hospitality, and leisure businesses need to include, improving the convenience amenities to guests; enhancing the image of the service provider; ensuring customer security; generating traffic linking to profits, saving costs, having a higher market share; establishing a competitive edge, and increasing customer demand”.

Regardless of their size, hotels recognize the advantage of offering high quality of service. According to Callan and Fearon (2010), a third of UK hotels which are “country-based” check their service quality using certain service standards. Additionally, Narangajavana (2007), recommended that hotel managers measure service quality in order to help them “anticipate customers’ expectations and understand their perceptions”. Research results show that during assessment of the best practice of service quality, only few hotels in the US paid attention to the subject however, these hotels did very well on selected service issues (Enz and Siguaw, 2000). According to Enz and Siguaw (2000:23) the list of issues pertaining to service delivery being addressed by the US hospitality industry were: “creating a service culture; building an empowered service-delivery system; facilitating a customer listening orientation; and developing responsive service guarantees”

From the studies and investigations stated above, it is safe to state the extreme importance of service quality in the hotel industry, and it can be concluded that the survival of the industry depends on the delivery of quality service to the satisfaction of their customers. Any study that focuses on service quality and the factors that affect it is very important for the hospitality industry and its customers because all hotels seek to gain a competitive advantage and strive to obtain repeat business and good word-of-mouth publicity.



## **Relationship between customers' tripographic and demographic factors and service expectation, service perception and service quality**

Traditionally demographic and tripographic analysis were made for market segmentation to allow marketers develop different promotional strategies (Kniatt, 1995; Tsiotsou and Vasioti, 2006; Correia et al., 2008; Ganesan-Lim et al., 2008). For the aforementioned, it was considered to be easier to measure demographic and tripographic variables. The other more complex variables, like life style trends and preference or other behavioural measures, are more complex for marketers and policy makers to establish valid and reliable information in relation to their target market. Furthermore, the development of marketing strategies need the thorough understanding of all factors that influence customers' expectation, perception and service quality in order to create satisfied and loyal customers (Rubenstein et al., 2016)

According to (Grazhdani and Merollari, 2015), demographic attributes reveal different customers' demographic characteristics with different perceptions of service quality. The aforementioned, also found out that gender, age and income were significantly related to expectation of service quality in service sectors. It is thus imperative to have demographic information of respondents for targeting and segmentation (Sasikala, 2013). It is equally valuable to understand the effect of pertinent tripographic and demographic attributes such as age, gender and income on customer perception of service quality (Grazhdani and Merollari, 2015).

Many recent studies found out that expectations of a hotel service by customers be likely to be strongly affected by some of the demographic and tripographic attributes of guests (Darar and Ismail, 2016; Sasikala, 2013; Serin et al., 2013). Based on the above findings by researchers, this study would like to focus on the following research questions:

- Which demographic and tripographic attributes of the respondents' subgroups are significantly different from each other on service expectations, service perceptions and service quality of star rated hotel guests in Ethiopia?
- What is the magnitude of their differences?

### **Data Analysis**

The data that was collected using questionnaires survey was based on HOTSPERF (the modified version of the SERVQUAL). Guests were also asked to fill demographic and tripographic related questions at the beginning of the survey.

A pilot test using 120 respondents from four hotels was conducted. The main issue raised by the respondents was the number of questions in the questionnaire. That was similar to Cronin and Taylor (1994) criticism of the SERVQUAL instrument. The data was analysed using Stata Version 13 and SPSS Version 24. Statistical analyses were performed for each of the four demographic and five tripographic variables. For demographic and tripographic variables with more than two subgroups (e.g., age) and which were non-homogenous, a non-parametric test was used (Kruskal-Wallis H) while for each demographic variable with two subgroups (gender), an independent sample t test (Mann-Whitney) was performed. ANOVA and Welch Kruskal-Wallis test were used to test the difference in service expectations, perceptions and service quality among the different groups tripographic attributes.



## Findings

Thirty one of the 40 hotels returned completed questionnaires, ranging from four to thirty participants per hotel. Four hundred twenty seven questionnaires were returned accounting to 35.58% of response rate. Due to missing data twelve questionnaires were excluded. Only 415 (34.59) responses were analysed. According to Saunders et al. (2012), 34.6% of responses deemed to be adequate for statistical analysis.

## Validity

Confirmatory Factor Analysis using maximum likelihood estimation was conducted to validate the 25 service attributes of the HOTSPERF (Tefera and Govender, 2016) instrument. The result confirmed “a good fit” of the 25 service expectation and perception attributes onto the HOTSPERF model instrument.

## Reliability

Both the service expectation and perception measurement instrument scales showed internal consistency of .952 and .957 respectively (Nunnally (1978). Accordingly, the Cronbach Alpha results of the service quality dimensions were considered to be both consistent and stable

## Demographic profiling

As shown on Table 1, the majority (65.5%) of the respondents was male while the rest (34.5%) were female. Almost 62 % of respondents were under the age of 40 with the highest response (31.6%) obtained from guests between the ages of 20 and 29. With regards to the marital status, nearly all (90%) of the participants were either single (34.9%) or married (54.7%) and 91% of the respondents are employed including those that were self-employed.

**Table 1: Demographic Attributes of Respondents**

Demographic variables		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Gender	Male	272	65.5	65.5	65.5
	Female	143	34.5	34.5	100.0
	Total	415	100.0	100.0	
Age	20-29	131	31.6	31.6	31.6
	30-39	124	29.9	29.9	61.4
	40-49	96	23.1	23.1	84.6
	50-59	52	12.5	12.5	97.1
	60+	12	2.9	2.9	100.0
	Total	415	100.0	100.0	
Marital status	Single	145	34.9	34.9	34.9
	Married	227	54.7	54.7	89.6
	In Partnership	17	4.1	4.1	93.7
	Divorced	24	5.8	5.8	99.5
	Widowed	2	0.5	0.5	100.0
	Total	415	100.0	100.0	





Employment status	Employed	274	66.0	66.0	66.0
	Self employed	106	25.5	25.5	91.6
	Retired & Semi-retired	20	4.8	4.8	96.4
	Others	15	3.6	3.6	100.0
	Total	415	100.0	100.0	

Source: primary data

### Relationships between guests demographic and service expectations, service perception and service quality

Respondents' service expectation, perception and overall service quality perceptions were tested from a gender perspective using the Mann-Whitney U Test. The test result (Table 2) revealed that the z value for the expectation, perception and overall service quality were .868, .930 and .163 respectively. This was an indication that the probability value (p) was not less than .05. Hence, there was no significant difference in the service expectations, perception and overall service quality between the male and female respondents.

**Table 2: Mann-Whitney test on Expectation, perception and service Quality based on respondents' gender**

	Expectation	Perception	Service Quality
Mann-Whitney U	19254.500	19345.500	17832.000
Wilcoxon W	29550.500	56473.500	54960.000
Z	-.167	-.088	-1.394
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.868	.930	.163

a. Grouping Variable: Gender

**Source:** Primary data

The difference in service expectations, perceptions and service quality among the different groups including those of age, marital status and employment were tested using the Kruskal-Wallis test, and the result is shown in Table 3. It is evident (Table 3) that there was no statistically significant difference ( $p > .05$ ) in the mean scores of the expectations, perceptions and overall service quality across the age and marital status groups of respondents (for age, expectation  $p = .144$ , perception  $p = .288$  and service quality  $p = .217$  and for marital status, expectation  $p = .069$ , perception  $p = .359$  and service quality  $p = .259$ ).

There was statistically significant difference ( $p < .05$ ) in the mean scores of the expectations across the four employment groups (Gp1,  $n = 274$ : employed, Gp2,  $n = 106$ : self-employed, Gp3  $n = 20$ : retired and semi-retired, Gp4,  $n = 15$ : others),  $X^2(3, n = 415) = 11.466, p = .009$ . The "others" group recorded the highest median score ( $Md = 4.0370$ ) as compared to "employed" ( $Md = 3.8148$ ), "self-employed" ( $Md = 3.7963$ ) and "retired and semi-retired" ( $Md = 3.111$ ). Despite reaching statistical significance, the actual difference in the mean score between the groups was very small. The effect size calculated ( $r = 0.0004$ ) and the median difference of the group renders the difference insignificant.

Furthermore, there were statistically significant differences ( $p < .05$ ) in the mean scores of the perception across the four employment groups (Gp1,  $n = 274$ : employed, Gp2,  $n = 106$ : self-employed, Gp3  $n = 20$ : retired and semi-retired, Gp4,  $n = 15$ : others),  $X^2(3, n = 415) = 9.421, p$



= .024. The “others” group recorded the highest median score (Md = 4.1111) as compared to “employed” (Md = 3.9074), “self-employed” (Md = 3.8148) and “retired and semi-retired” (Md = 3.2593). The effect size calculated ( $r = 0.46$ ) and the median difference of the group was an indication of a moderate difference.

There was no statistically significant difference ( $p > .05$ ) in the mean scores of the service quality across the employment type groups of respondents ( $p = 0.964$ ). This indicates that there is no association between service quality and employment type.

**Table 3: Kruskal Wallis test on Expectation, Perception and Service Quality based on age, marital status and employment type**

Categories	Expectation			Variables Perception			Service Quality			Test
	Chi-Square	df	Asymp. Sig.	Chi-Square	df	Asymp. Sig.	Chi-Square	df	Asymp. Sig.	
Age	6.852	4	0.144	4.996	4	0.288	5.769	4	0.217	Kruskal Wallis Test
Marital status	8.711	4	0.069	4.364	4	0.359	5.292	4	0.259	Kruskal Wallis Test
Employment	<b>11.466</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0.009</b>	<b>9.421</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0.024*</b>	0.278	3	0.964	Kruskal Wallis Test

Source: Primary data

### Tripographic profiling

With regard to the tripographic attributes (Table 4) most of the participants (67.5%) stayed in the hotel for less than six days.

The majority (78.8%) of them got information on the rating of the hotel from online sources (the hotels’ websites (36%), online travel agents sites (25%) and online guest comments (18%).

With the exception of 14 of the 415 participants who stated their wish to stay in one or two star hotels, the remaining participants (92%) stated their preference for three to five star rated hotels.

Forty five percent of the participants stated that they preferred to stay in an independent hotel while 30% preferred to stay in chain operated hotels with the remaining 25% indicating no particular preference.

The source of information about the hotels in those particular visits came from online travel agents (23.4%), WoM (15.7%), their own previous experience (14.7%), travel agents (14.2%), social media (10.8%) while the remaining (21.2%) came from traditional information sources like brochures, guide book, newspaper, magazines, direct mail, TV and radio.

Among the participants, business and meeting travellers accounted for 71% while the leisure and meeting travellers made up 29%.



**Table 4: Tripographic Attributes of Respondents**

Tripographic Variables		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Length of stay this visit	1-3 days	173	41.7	41.7	41.7
	4-6 days	107	25.8	25.8	67.5
	7-9 days	80	19.3	19.3	86.7
	10+ days	55	13.3	13.3	100.0
	Total	415	100.0	100.0	
Source of information on the hotel rating	Hotel's own website	149	35.9	35.9	35.9
	Online guest comments	75	18.1	18.1	54.0
	Online travel agents website	103	24.8	24.8	78.8
	Official hotel rating directory	53	12.8	12.8	91.6
	More than one source	32	7.7	7.7	99.3
	Others	3	0.7	0.7	100.0
	Total	415	100.0	100.0	
Staying preference of rated hotels	1 Star	7	1.7	1.7	1.7
	2 Stars	17	4.1	4.1	5.8
	3 Stars	110	26.5	26.5	32.3
	4 Stars	168	40.5	40.5	72.8
	5 Stars	113	27.2	27.2	100.0
	Total	415	100.0	100.0	
Staying preference (chain or independent hotels)	Independent	188	45.3	45.3	45.3
	Chain	122	29.4	29.4	74.7
	No preference	105	25.3	25.3	100.0
	Total	415	100.0	100.0	
Source of information on the hotel	Brochures	17	4.1	4.1	4.1
	Guide book	10	2.4	2.4	6.5
	Newspaper/magazine advert	5	1.2	1.2	7.7
	Direct mail/email	12	2.9	2.9	10.6
	TV	7	1.7	1.7	12.3
	Radio	2	0.5	0.5	12.8
	Travel agent	59	14.2	14.2	27.0
	Family and friends (WOM)	65	15.7	15.7	42.7
	Own last experience	61	14.7	14.7	57.3
	Social media (online guest	45	10.8	10.8	68.2
	Online travel agents website	97	23.4	23.4	91.6
	Others	35	8.4	8.4	100.0
	Total	415	100.0	100.0	
Purpose of stay	Leisure	114	27.5	27.5	27.5
	Business	180	43.4	43.4	70.8
	Meeting/conference	114	27.5	27.5	98.3
	Others	7	1.7	1.7	100.0
	Total	415	100.0	100.0	
Method of payment of hotel bill	Self	190	45.8	45.8	45.8
	Company	164	39.5	39.5	85.3
	Sponsors	50	12.0	12.0	97.3
	Complimentary	7	1.7	1.7	99.0
	Others	4	1.0	1.0	100.0
	Total	415	100.0	100.0	

Source: primary data



## Relationships between guests Tripographic and service expectations, service perception and service quality

The difference in service expectations, perceptions and service quality among the different groups of tripographic attributes were tested using ANOVA and Welch test, and the result is presented in Table 5.

**Table 5: ANOVA and Welch results on Expectation, Perception and Service Quality based on tripographic of Respondents**

Tripographic attributes	Expectation			Variables Perception			Service Quality			Test
	F	df	Sig	F	df	Sig	F	df	F	
Length of stay this visit	.737	3	0.531	1.031	3	0.379	.493	3	0.688	ANOVA
Source of information on the hotel rating	1.293	5	.266	1.200	5	.308	2.354	5	0.40	ANOVA
Staying preference of rated hotels	<b>5.766</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>6.512</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0.000</b>	0.195	4	0.941	ANOVA
Staying preference (chain or independent)	0.295	2	.745	.836	2	0.434	<b>4.938</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0.008</b>	ANOVA/Welch
Source of information on the hotel	<b>3.231</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>0.006</b>	2.076	11	0.059	1.252	11	0.298	Welch
Purpose of stay	.376	3	.770	.117	3	0.950	1.036	3	.376	ANOVA
Method of payment of hotel bill	1.472	4	.210	0.313	4	0.869	1.793	4	.129	ANOVA/Welch

Source: Primary data

The test revealed that there was no significant difference at the  $p > .05$  level in service expectation, service perception and service quality scores for “length of stay of this visit”, “source of hotel rating information”, “purpose of stay” and “hotel bill payment “ tripographic attributes. The result also revealed that there was no significant difference at the  $P > .05$  level in service expectation and service perception for “staying preference in chain or independent hotels” tripographic attribute. Furthermore, there was no significant difference at the  $p > .05$  level in service quality and “staying preference of rated hotels” and “source of information during this visit” tripographic attributes.

In some of the tripographic attributes however the result revealed significant differences. First, there was statistical significant difference at the  $p < .05$  level in service perception for “staying preference of rated hotels” tripographic attribute. The effect size, calculated using eta squared, was .15 indicating a small difference in the mean score between the groups. The post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey test indicated that mean score for group 3 star ( $M = 3.4906$ ,  $SD = .77266$ ) was significantly different from 4 star group ( $M = 3.7828$ ,  $SD = .71407$ ) and 5 star group ( $M = 3.9879$ ,  $SD = .88987$ ). Secondly, there was statistical significant difference at the  $p < .05$  level in service expectation for “staying preference of rated hotels” tripographic attribute. The effect size, calculated using eta squared, was .17 indicating a small difference in the mean score between the groups. The post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey test indicated that mean score for group 3 star ( $M = 3.4175$ ,  $SD = .78849$ ) was significantly different from 4 star group ( $M = 3.7044$ ,  $SD = .79852$ ) and 5 star group ( $M = 3.9079$ ,  $SD = .82692$ ). Thirdly, there



was statistical significant difference at the  $p < .05$  level in service perception for “source of hotel information this visit” tripographic attribute. The effect size, calculated using eta squared, was .15 indicating a small difference in the mean score between the groups. The post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey test indicated that the mean scores for all groups were not significantly different from each other. Fourthly, there was statistical significant difference at the  $p < .05$  level in service expectation for “source of hotel information for this visit” tripographic attribute. The effect size, calculated using eta squared, was .23 indicating a small difference in the mean score between the groups. The post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey test indicated that mean score for group “others” ( $M = 3.9619$ ,  $SD = .58681$ ) was significantly different from “Brochure” group ( $M = 3.1612$ ,  $SD = .76555$ ) and “own last experience” group ( $M = 3.3449$ ,  $SD = .97278$ ). Furthermore, the post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey test indicated that the mean score for group “own last experience” group ( $M = 3.3449$ ,  $SD = .97278$ ) was significantly different from “travel agents” group ( $M = 3.8380$ ,  $SD = .63898$ ) and “own last experience. However, the mean scores for service expectations which were greater than four were recorded from customers who got their source of information from guide books (4.1259), radio (4.1111) and direct mail/email (4.0741) Finally, there was statistical significant difference at the  $p < .05$  level in service quality for “staying preference in either chain or independent hotel” tripographic attribute. This was the only tripographic attribute that showed a significant difference at the  $P < .05$  level in service quality. In this case, the post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey test indicated that the mean score for group “chain” ( $M = -.0156$ ,  $SD = .45278$ ) was significantly different from “independent” group ( $M = .1421$ ,  $SD = .40899$ ).

## Discussion of the Findings

The results presented in this study reveal some interesting and important insights into the role of demographics on service marketing variables. There were no statistically significant differences in the scores of the service quality across gender, age, marital status as well as the type of employment someone has. This indicates that there were almost no differences in consumer service quality perceptions between different demographic groupings. This said however mixed findings have been reported by some studies conducted in the past. To cite some examples Arif et al. (2014) indicated that the age groups had significant differences on perception of service quality, Rubenstein et al. (2016) found significant relationship between gender and service quality dimensions, Kim et al. (2004) and Serenko et al. (2006) showed that demographic variables created differences in the service perception and customers’ satisfaction and retention. Cetin and Dincer (2014) however, found that similar to the finding of this study, none of the demographic factors groups (age, gender, marital status, education, nationality and income) showed significant differences on scores of expectation and perception by hotel customers. Furthermore, in their study of bank customers, Mirzagoli and Memarian (2015) found out that wages and conditions of employment, occupation, gender, education, marital status, had no impact on customers’ satisfaction based on their perceived service quality.

There were statistically significant differences in the mean scores of customers’ service expectations and service perceptions across the four kinds of employment status groups. The remaining three demographic attributes’ groups (gender, age and marital status) showed no significant difference to both customer expectations and perceptions. When it comes to expectations however, the mean difference between the different types of employment groups was insignificant. Only the mean difference between the different types of employment showed a moderate difference among customers’ perceptions. The highest median score regarding employment came from “others” employment group followed by “employed” and “self-employed”. The lowest median score came from “retired and semi-retired” employment type. From the outset of this result, it may feel safer to assume that respondents who are employed





by a third party are from a younger age group and the Kruskal-Wallis test revealed insignificant mean differences. Confirming this further is the fact that, customers' service perception score was tested among the four age groups and the result showed no significant differences. Following this, it is safer to assume that the difference in the mean score of the employed and retired and semi-retired did not originate from the participants' ages. Some other factor must be responsible for the difference. Contrary to the above, the study conducted by Tsiotsou and Vasioti (2006) reported that employment and family status had no effect on customers' service expectation, perception and satisfaction while education and age showed significant differences in the mean scores of customers satisfaction.

With tripographic attributes, there were no statistically significant differences in the scores of the service expectation; perception and quality in relation to the length of stay, source of information regarding the hotel, purpose of the visit and the method of payment of the hotel bill. In addition to this, there were no statistically significant differences in the scores of the service expectation and service perception across all tripographic attributes except for preference for rated hotels and source of information on the hotel. Kattara et al. (2015), in their study of employees' behaviour on customers' service quality perception and overall service quality, also found no significant difference in service expectation, perception and satisfaction in length of stay of customers.

There were statistically significant differences in the mean scores of customers' service expectations and service perception across the five staying preference (hotels' ratings) groups. The mean score of the customers who preferred to stay in the three star hotels is different from those who wanted to stay in four and five star hotels. The highest mean score of service expectation and service perception came from customers who preferred to stay in five star hotels followed by four and three star rated ones. For both service expectation and perception, there was a small difference in the mean score between customers' staying preferences. This indicates that hotel customers who preferred to stay in higher star rated hotels have different service expectations and service perception to those who preferred to stay in lower rated hotels. The higher the hotel's rating, the higher the expectation for more tangible and intangible products by the guests. It is imperative therefore for hotels to review their ratings according to international standards and adjust it accordingly. Failing to do so may lead to inability to meet their customers expectation creating a negative service quality leading to dissatisfied customers (Souca, 2011).

Furthermore, there was a statistically significant difference in the mean score of customers' service expectation across the twelve sources of "hotel information for this visit" tripographic attribute groups. The post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey test indicated that the mean score for customers in the group "others" was significantly different from "Brochure" and "own last experience" groups. In addition to this, the mean score for the group "own last experience" was significantly different from the "travel agents" group. The highest mean of service expectation came from customers' who got their booking information from traditional sources labelled as "guidebook", "radio", "direct mail/email", "others" and "travel agents". This is a surprising result as it is unclear how the source of information from traditional and online sources has affected customers' expectations.

Finally, statistical differences were observed in the mean scores of customers' service quality across the three staying preference tripographic attribute groups. Staying preference of customers was the only tripographic attribute that showed a significant difference in the mean scores of service quality. The mean score for the group of chain hotels was significantly different from those which were in the independent group. The mean score for the chain hotels group was also negative indicating that the participants who preferred to stay in such hotels have



marginally negative service quality resulting from unmet expectation leading to their dissatisfaction. Participants who stayed in independent hotels showed a marginally positive service quality and thus higher satisfaction with the services of those hotels.

## **Conclusions and Recommendations**

In this study, the inability to find differences in expectation, perceptions and service quality among customers who differ in age gender and marital status has implications for the kind of hospitality shown to hotel customers by hotel employees and their managers. Dividing customers based on their age group, their gender or marital status may not yield any advantage in the way they are approached as hotel guests. Instead of labelling customers using these demographic attributes, hotel managers and employees need to treat their customers individually by attending to their individual needs and striving to meet or even exceed their expectation. The result of this study needs to be looked at as small snapshots of the experience of hotel customers in Ethiopia in that particular period. This result doesn't undermine the importance of having demographic information on hotel customers as it provides a clear picture of customers that visit the hotel which in turn could enable managers to gain advantage over their competitors.

Hotel managers and service marketers should continuously strive to identify demographic attributes that may have an effect on service expectation, perception and service quality so that they can use it to target consumers with the same characteristics in their promotions and advertisements in order to maximise their sales and profits. Information on the type of employment on the other hand, though it made up only 4.8% of the respondents, showed differences in expectation and perception. The retired and semi-retired group showed the least mean score for both expectation and perception as compared to employed or self-employed groups in employment type demography. This result implies that retired and semi-retired hotel customers need to get appropriate and targeted attention by hotel managers and their employees. Hotel managers need not only warrant that this group gets appropriate and customised service, but rather ensure that they get the highest standard of service so that they are likely to return to a property.

With regards to the tripographic attributes, the only attribute that showed significant difference in service quality scores is "staying preference in either chain or independence hotel". Chain hotels have a marginally negative service quality, emanating from the unmet expectation, may lead to customers' dissatisfaction, while participants who stayed in the independent hotels showed a marginally positive service quality which may lead to their satisfaction. It is imperative for the management of chain hotels to exceed their customers' expectations. Guests arrive with certain expectations created from past experience in similarly branded hotels. The hotel management together with the employees need to meet or exceed customers' expectations to create a positive service quality perception of their hotel.

One of the ways to achieving this is for the hotel management to develop training programmes for both the managers and the employees on the importance of customer service with all its implications. It is further recommended that hotel management understand the effects of the quality of service of employees on customers and service delivery in general, and devise ways and strategies that ultimately promote and enhance the overall experience of customers. Furthermore, the result revealed that the higher the hotel rating, the more the customers service expectation making it imperative for hotels to review their ratings so that it is adjusted according to international standards. Finally, the results showed a significant difference in customers'



service expectation across the “source of hotel information this visit” tripographic attribute. Even though almost half of the respondents obtained information on the hotels from online sources the highest expectation score was recorded from the customers who were informed through traditional sources. This tripographic attribute has an implication on service marketers as it will assist them in determining the sources of information used by most of their customers and their service expectations which in turn will help them achieve maximum market share in comparison to their competitors.

This study has some limitations. The main limitation lies in the omission of some demographic attributes such as education, income and geographic origin of hotel guests. The use of more demographic variables could give more insight into the other variables affecting customers' expectation and perception. The interaction of demographic and tripographic variables was not tested in this study and this may pave the way for further research. In future, a larger sample size and a more longitudinal study may contribute to the generalizability of the results. Further research may also assess or investigate the effect of both demographic and tripographic characteristics on customers satisfaction and loyalty among hotel guests.

## References

- AbuKhalifeh, A.N. & Som, A.P.M. (2012). Service Quality Management in Hotel Industry: A Conceptual Framework for Food and Beverage Departments. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 7: 135-141.
- Al-Ababneh M. (2013). Service Quality and its Impact on Tourist Satisfaction. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research In Business*, 4: 164-177.
- Arif M, Zakuan N, Rahman S, Abdullah, T. & Fadzil, N. (2014). The effect of demographics on customer satisfaction amongst Malaysia Hajj Pilgrims: survey result. *Applied Mechanics and Materials*, 660: 1000-1004.
- Asubonteng, P., McCleary, K.J. & Swan, J.E. (1996). SERVQUAL revisited: a critical review of service quality. *The Journal of Services Marketing*, 10: 62-81.
- Bagozzi, R.P. & Ruivo, A.A. (2011). International Encyclopedia of Marketing. Consumer Behavior. United Kingdom: John Wiley and Sons Ltd.
- Beard, R. (2013). The Secrets To High Customer Satisfaction. Client Heartbeat.
- Boon-Liat C & Md. Zabid Abdul R. (2013). Service Quality and the Mediating Effect of Corporate Image on the Relationship between Customer Satisfaction and Customer Loyalty in the Malaysian Hotel Industry. *Gadjah Mada International Journal of Business*, 15: 99-112.
- Briggs, S., Sutherland, J. & Drummond, S. (2007). Are hotels serving quality? An exploratory study of service quality in the Scottish hotel sector. *Tourism Management* 28: 1006-1019.
- Callan, R., & Fearon R. (2010). Town House Hotels: An Emerging Sector. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 9: 168-175.
- Cant, M.C.P. & Erdis, C.M. (2012). Incorporating Customer Service Expectations In The Restaurant Industry: The Guide To Survival. *Journal of Applied Business Research*, 28: 931-941.
- CETIN, G. & DINCER, F.I. (2014). Electronic word of mouth among hotel guests: Demographic and tripographic factors. *Journal of Knowledge Economy & Knowledge Management*, 9: 35-41.



- Chase RB & Dasu S. (2001). Want to Perfect Your Company's Service? Use Behavioural Science. *Harvard Business Review* 79: 79-84.
- Christopher L, Jochen W, & Hean TK. (2005). *Service Marketing in Asia*, New Delhi: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Claver E, José Tarí J & Pereira J. (2006). Does quality impact on hotel performance? *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 18: 350-358.
- Correia A, Moital M, & Da Costa CF. (2008). The determinants of gastronomic tourists' satisfaction: a second-order factor analysis. *Journal of foodservice*, 19: 164-176.
- Cronin JJ & Taylor SA. (1994). SERVPERF versus SERVQUAL; Reconciling performance-based and. *Journal of Marketing*, 58: 125.
- Darar SES & Ismail HN. (2016). Tripographic assessment of VFR travel in context of Malaysian domestic travellers. *Planning Malaysia Journal*, 14: 87 - 98.
- Enz CA & Siguaw JA. (2000). Best practices in service quality. *The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 41: 20-29.
- Ganesan-Lim C, Russell-Bennett R and Dagger T. (2008). The impact of service contact type and demographic characteristics on service quality perceptions. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 22: 550-561.
- Grazhdani S & Merollari K. (2015). The Influence of Demographic Factor on Customer Service Quality Perception. *European Journal of Economics and Business Studies*, 2: 155-167.
- Gronroos C. (2007). *Service Management and Marketing: Customer Management in Service competition*, England: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Gupta M & Gupta D. (2011). *Research methodology*. New Delhi: PHI Learning Private Limited.
- Hailesilasse A. (2013). Ethiopia: New Hotel Star Rating to Raise Bar High. *Addis Fortune*.
- Haksever C. (2000). *Service management and operations*, New York: Pearson College Division.
- Hawkins DI & Mothersbaugh DL. (2010). *Consumer Behavior*, New York: McGraw-Hill Irwin.
- Hoyer WD & MacInnis DJ. (2010). *Consumer Behavior*, China: Cengage Learning
- Kattara HS, Weheba D & Ahmed O. (2015). The impact of employees' behavior on customers service quality perceptions and overall satisfaction. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure* 4.
- Kifle E. (2012). More hotels, not enough professionals. *Capital*. Addis Ababa.
- Kim-Soon N, Rahman A & Visvalingam L. (2014). SERVQUAL: Can It Be Used to Differentiate Guest's Perception of Service Quality of 3 Star from a 4 Star Hotel. *International Business Research*, 7: 37-47.
- Kim B, Park M & Jeong DTe. (2004). The effects of customer satisfaction and switching barrier on customer loyalty in Korean mobile telecommunication service. *Telecommunication Policy*, 28: 145-159.
- Kim S-H, Holland S & Han H-S. (2013). A Structural Model for Examining how Destination Image, Perceived Value, and Service Quality Affect Destination Loyalty: a Case Study of Orlando. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 15: 313-328.
- Kniatt NL. (1995). The effect of demographics on customer expectations. *Business Administration*. University of North Texas, 65.



- Kotler P, Bowen J & Makens J. (2010). *Marketing for hospitality and tourism*, Boston: Pearson.
- Lee SH, Bai B & Murphy K. (2012). The Role Demographics Have on Customer Involvement in Obtaining a Hotel Discount and Implications for Hotel Revenue Management Strategy. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 21: 569-588.
- Lovelock CH & Wirtz J. (2004). *Services Marketing, U.S.A.*: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Matzler K & Wiaguny M. (2005 ). Consequences of Customer Confusion in Online Hotel Booking, in A.J. Frew (ed) *Information and Communication Technologies in Tourism. International Conference*, Innsbruck. Austria, New York and Vienna: Springer, 306-316.
- Mauri AG, Minazzi R & Muccio S. (2013). A Review of Literature on the Gaps Model on Service Quality: A 3-Decades Period: 1985-2013. *International Business Research*, 6: 134-144.
- Metters R, King-Metters K, & Pullman M. (2006). *Successful Service Operations Management*, USA: South-Western.
- Minazzi R. (2010). *Hotel Classification Systems: A Comparison of International Case Studies*. Available at: [https://www.academia.edu/1922797/Hotel\\_Classification\\_Systems\\_A\\_Comparison\\_of\\_International\\_Case\\_Studies](https://www.academia.edu/1922797/Hotel_Classification_Systems_A_Comparison_of_International_Case_Studies).
- Mirzagoli M & Memarian E. (2015). The effects of demographic factors on customer satisfaction from ATM. *Science Journal (CSJ)*, 36.
- Mitchell VW & Papavassiliou V. (1999). Marketing causes and implications of consumer confusion. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 8: 319-342.
- Mohajerani P & Miremadi A. (2012). Customer Satisfaction Modeling in Hotel Industry: A Case Study of Kish Island in Iran. *International Journal of Marketing Studies*, 4: 134-152.
- Motwani D & Shrimali D. (2013). Customer Expectation and Perception in Hotels: An empirical study. *Intercontinental journal of marketing research review*, 1.
- Narangajavana Y. (2007). *The Relationship of the Hotel Rating System and Service Quality: A Case Study of the the "Thailand Hotels Standard" Graduate College Oklahoma State University*.
- Nowlis M. (2005). *Hotel classifications vs. customer expectations*. Available at: <http://tourismintelligence.ca/2005/01/13/hotel-classifications-vs-customer-expectations/>.
- Nunnally J. (1978). *Psychometric Theory*, New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Olivier RL. (2010). *Satisfaction: A Behavioural Perspective on Consumer*, New York: M.E. Sharpe, Armonk.
- Olsen LL & Johnson MD. (2003). Service Equity, Satisfaction, and Loyalty: From Transaction-Specific to Cumulative Evaluations. *Journal of Service Research*, 7: 53 - 64.
- Parasuraman A, Berry LL & Zeithaml VA. (1994a). Reassessment of expectations as a comparison standard in measuring service quality: Implications for further research. *Journal of Marketing*, 58: 111.
- Parasuraman A, Zeithaml VA & Berry LL. (1994b). Alternative scales for measuring service quality: A comparative assessment based on psychometric and diagnostic criteria. *Journal of Retailing*, 70: 201-230.
- Po-Hsuan W, Ching-Yuan H & Cheng-Kai C. (2014). Service Expectation, Perceived Service Quality, and Customer Satisfaction in Food and Beverage Industry. *International Journal of Organizational Innovation*, 7: 171-180.





- Ranjbarian B, Sanayei A. & Kaboli MR. (2012). An Analysis of Brand Image, Perceived Quality, Customer Satisfaction and Re-purchase Intention in Iranian Department Stores. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 7: 40-48.
- Rauch DA, Collins MD & Nale RD.. (2015). Measuring service quality in mid-scale hotels. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 27: 87-106.
- Razi MA, Siddiquei AN & Awan HM. (2012). Relationship Between Service Quality, Perceived Value, Satisfaction and Revisit Intention in Hotel Industry. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research In Business*, 4: 788-805.
- Reisinger Y, Kandampully J & Mok C. (2001). Concepts of tourism, hospitality, and leisure services. *Service quality management in hospitality, tourism, and leisure*, 1-14.
- Rubenstein CL, Duff J, & Prilleltensky I.. (2016). Demographic Group Differences in Domain-Specific Well-Being. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 44: 499-515.
- Sasikala D. (2013). Impact of demographics on service quality. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing & Management Review*, 2: 103-116.
- Saunders M, Lewis P & Thornhill A. (2012). *Research Methods for Business Students* England: Prentice Hall.
- Serenko A, Turel O & Yol S. (2006). Moderating Roles of user demographics in the American customer satisfaction model within the context of mobile service. *Journal of Information Technology Management*, 17: 20-32.
- Serin E, Balkan O & Doğan H. (2013). The effect of demographic factors on perceived. *International Journal of Information Technology and Business Management*, 22.
- Souca ML. (2011). SERVQUAL - Thirty years of research on service quality with implications for customer satisfaction. *Cluj-Napoca: Babes Bolyai University*, 420-429.
- Su C-S & Sun L-H. (2007). Taiwan's Hotel Rating System: A Service Quality Perspective. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 48: 392-401,358.
- Tam JLM. (2004). Customer Satisfaction, Service Quality and Perceived Value: An Integrative Model. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 20: 897-917.
- Tefera O & Govender K. (2015). Hotel Grading, Service Quality, Satisfaction and Loyalty – Proposing a Theoretical Model and Relationship. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, 4.
- Tefera O & Govender K. (2016). From SERVQUAL to HOTSPERF: Towards the Development and Validation of an alternate Hotel Service Quality Measurement Instrument. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, 5.
- Tsiotsou R & Vasioti E. (2006). Using Demographics and Leisure Activities to Predict Satisfaction with Tourism Services in Greece. *Journal of Hospitality & Leisure Marketing*, 14: 69-82.
- Tung Lai L. (2004). Service Quality and Perceived Value's Impact on Satisfaction, Intention and Usage of Short Message Service (SMS). *Information Systems Frontiers*, 6: 353-368.
- Wael Hassan E-G. (2013). Developing and Validating a Hospitality Service Quality Scale in Saudi Arabia (HOSP-SQ): A Structural Equation Model. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 4.
- Wirtz J. (2012). *Essentials of Services Marketing*, Singapore: Pearson Education South Asia



Wu P-H, Huang C-Y & Chou C-K. (2014). Service Expectation, Perceived Service Quality, and Customer Satisfaction in Food and Beverage Industry. *International Journal of Organizational Innovation*, 7: 171-180.

Wuest BS. (2001). Service quality concepts and dimensions pertinent to tourism, hospitality, and leisure services. *Service quality management in hospitality, tourism, and leisure*, 51-66.

Xie G, Qiu P & Chen Y. (2007). Expectation and Satisfaction of Rural Tourism: a case Study of Hainan, China. *Ecological Economy*, 3: 405-416.

Yangjin H. (2015). Visiting friends and relatives (VFR) versus non-VFR: a comparative study of Chinese origin market to Thailand.

Yein Ping CT, Suki NM & Suki NM. (2012). Service Quality Dimension on Customer Satisfaction towards E-Banking Interdisciplinary. *Journal of Contemporary Research In Business*, 4: 741-751.

Yeoman I, Hsu C & Smith K. (2010). *Tourism and Demography*. Good Fellow Publishers.

Zeithaml V, Bitner MJ & Gremler D. (2009). *Service Marketing: Integrated Customer Focus Across the Firm*, New York: McGraw-Hill.

Zeithaml VA, Berry LL & Parasuraman A. (1993). The Nature and Determinants of Customer Expectations of Services. *Journal of Academy of Marketing Science*, 21: 1-12.