Service Quality of Troy: An Importance-satisfaction Analysis

Yurtseven, Huseyin Ridvan

Canakkale Onsekiz Mart University

10 October 2005

SERVICE QUALITY OF TROY: AN IMPORTANCE-SATISFACTION ANALYSIS

Huseyin Ridvan Yurtseven
Canakkale Onsekiz Mart University

The main purpose of this study was to measure Troy visitors' perceptions of service quality in terms of importance and satisfaction by visitor types. Troy visitors were categorized into four different types: the scholar, the general, the student, and the reluctant. The significant finding of this research has been that the importance service elements of the scholar visitors were perceived not to be present, while the majority of these elements were perceived to be present in Troy for the general, the student and the reluctant visitor. Perceptions of service quality by Troy visitors are not homogeneous. Consequently, specific and differentiated offers should be designed by the site organization for each type of visitor. The advantage of using importance-satisfaction analysis in this research is to underline the major service quality elements of heritage sites which are given high importance and perceived to be present by visitor types.

INTRODUCTION

Troy, in northwest Turkey at the entrance to the Dardanelles, is one of the oldest and most famous heritage sites. It had been thoroughly studied through two series of excavations by Heinrich Schliemann and Wilhelm Dorpfeld from 1871-1891 and by Carl W. Blegen (University of Cincinnati, Ohio) from 1932-1938. Troy lies at the crossing between the Orient and Southwest Europe, and between the Aegean and the Black Sea. Because of its nearly continuous occupation for more than 3000 years, this site is an important point of reference for the chronology of the ancient world from the early Bronze Age through to the Roman Empire. In 1988, after a hiatus of 50 years, the excavations at Troy were once again resumed under the Project Troia director Dr. Manfred Korfmann from the University of Tubingen & Canakkale Onsekiz Mart University, with the cooperation of Dr. Brian Rose from the University of Cincinnati.

Troy has been in the UNESCO-List of World Heritage since 1998. The purpose of this paper is to measure Troy visitors' perceptions of services in terms of importance and satisfaction by visitor types of heritage sites, and apply the results to the importance-satisfaction analysis to identify strengths and gaps in the service quality of Troy as a world heritage site.

SERVICE QUALITY OF HERITAGE SITES

Heritage sites have come to be described as the heritage industry (Goulding, 2000$_b$; Hewison, 1987). There are much critical analysis of the relationship between visitors and heritage sites. This relationship has been the source of a number of empirical studies (Brown, 1999; Catalca and Yurtseven, 2003; Gyimothy, 2000; Laws, 1998; Light, 1999) and theoretical developments (Goulding, 2000$_{a,b}$; Hannabuss, 1999; McKercher and Cros, 2003) that offer a variety of insights into the service quality of heritage sites. The heritage site management can have different emphases regarding service delivery depending on the prevailing management style. The two different styles evident in the study of Gilmore and Rentschler (2002) are custodial management and market-focused management. These styles present contemporary heritage site managers with a range of problems relating to conservation, as well as presentation and the management of visitors' satisfaction.

The multi-dimensional nature of services is well recognized in the services literature (Atilgan et al., 2003; Augustyn, 1998; Gummesson, 1994; Kandampully et al., 2001; Laws and Thornes, 1991; Li et al., 2003; Otto and Ritchie, 1996; Yurtseven, 2003). Service cannot be easily specified or presented before purchase. Both the visitor and service deliverer need to know what is on offer or what will be achieved as a result of receiving the service in order to understand the scope of the service package (Gilmore and Rentschler, 2002).

So what are the important service dimensions for heritage site management? The core elements of service delivery in a heritage site are: access to the site, help and knowledge, presentation of the site, tour design of the site, interpretation of the site, information signs and directions, printed information, cleanliness, security and protection, and the range of visitor services (ICOMOS, 1993). These dimensions of heritage site service delivery can be expanded and adapted to suit different heritage site service situations and contexts, depending on the nature and purpose of the heritage site. The design and management of the heritage site's total offering will depend upon the way it perceives its

62

strengths and weaknesses in relation to the threats and opportunities in the market and environment within which the heritage site competes (Gilmore and Rentschler, 2002). Heritage site management needs to focus attention on all dimensions encompassed in the overall offering of the heritage site service.

The identification of the visitors' profile is an important factor for service quality management of heritage sites. Every site attracts particular types of visitors. They have different interests and motivations for visiting the site. The study of Goulding (2000$_b$) addressed the identification of three different visitor behavioral types: existential, aesthetic, and social visitors. The ICOMOS specialized committee (1993) categorized the visitors to heritage sites under the following headings:

- The Scholar Visitor: Some visitors come well prepared and familiar with the history of the site. For this visitor the primary responsibility is to make their visit as pleasant, easy and informative as possible.

- The General Visitor: Some visitors come to the site because they have heard little information about it. They seek a more comprehensive presentation of the site.

- Students: Depending on educational level, a separate interpretative program is required for them.

- The Reluctant Visitor: A major segment of the visitors come to the site as a part of a package tour. They are often more interested in services. They should be made to feel welcome and encouraged to experience the site.

It is the task of the site management to provide quality of service dimensions for each type of visitor. Visitors expect the service dimensions to fully satisfy their expectations.

Importance – satisfaction analysis

Service quality, helping an organization to differentiate itself from other organizations, is a critical determinant of competitiveness. A quality organization is focused on identifying and acting on the customer's needs and expectations. Quality is defined as satisfying the customer's requirements (Choi and Chu, 2000; Lee et al., 2004; Weiermair, 2000). In the case of the strategic approach, quality is used to differentiate the organization's service offering. The quality phenomenon is the source for strengthening and differentiating the offering and the organization from what is offered by the competitors (Davies et al., 1999; Ghobadian et al., 1994). Measuring service quality requires a clear understanding of

customers (Baker and Crompton, 2000; O'Neill et al., 1999; Pizam and Ellis, 1999).

Importance-satisfaction analysis entails the simultaneous consideration of visitors' assessment of the importance of salient attributes and their level of satisfaction with the service provided and the performance of the service providers. The method defines a two-dimensional grid with the horizontal axis indicating the visitors' perceptions of the service and service providers' performance on a given attribute. The vertical axis indicates the importance of the attribute to the visitor. The visitors' importance and satisfaction values are plotted on the grid, which is divided into four quadrants that are formed based on the mean scores of the importance and satisfaction attribute ratings. These values are then assessed according to their quadrant on the grid.

Each quadrant suggests a different strategy. Attributes that are rated high in importance and high in satisfaction suggest that the service provider keep up the good work and that continued resources should be directed toward these attributes. In contrast, attributes having a low importance rating and a low satisfaction rating suggest that investing scarce resources on these attributes may have little strategic advantage. Attributes that are rated high in importance and low in satisfaction are the attributes that an organization should pay particular attention to, investing the greatest amount of resources to improving the performance of these attributes. Lastly, attributes rated low in importance and high in satisfaction are attributes that an organization should continue to maintain but not necessarily allocate any additional resources (Almanza et al., 1994; Go and Zhang, 1997; Joppe et al., 2001; Ryan, 1995; Uysal et al., 1991).

The main purpose of importance-satisfaction analysis is to determine which attributes the visitors consider most important, to measure how well the heritage site performs in delivering these attributes, and to make recommendations to heritage site organizations about what they should concentrate upon and what strategies they should follow (Kozak and Nield, 1998). The importance-satisfaction analysis can be effectively used to point out a site's strengths and weaknesses. The use of this method has significant management implications for decision-makers at heritage sites.

METHODOLOGY

The focus of this research was to determine which of the elements of the Troy experience were important to visitors and to what degree the

services offered to them met their level of satisfaction. In this research, service quality and visitor satisfaction were examined at overall level. That's why, visitor satisfaction was related to visitors' attitude towards the site and results to quality of experience.

The research tool was a questionnaire consisting of three parts. The closed-ended questions in the first part determined the visitor types of Troy categorized by ICOMOS (1993). The second part included closed-ended personal questions that explored the profile of Troy visitors. In the third part of the questionnaire, respondents were asked to rate ten core elements of service delivery from their Troy experience on importance and satisfaction. A five-point scale ranging from very important (5) to very unimportant (1) was used to investigate the importance levels of each element. The satisfaction section of the questionnaire was also based on a five-point scale where 5 was very good, 3 was mediocre, and 1 was very bad. The questionnaire was translated from English into French, German, Italian, Japanese, and Turkish as these languages were most commonly used by visitors of Troy. The questionnaire was piloted in May 2005.

The population of the research was visitors to Troy in August 2005. As the sample of the research, 384 visitors of Troy were drawn from this population by using the formula of sample size ($n = t^2pq / d^2$; α=0.05, t=1.96, p=0.50, q=0.50, d=0.05). Using an on-site intercept methodology procedure, visitors of Troy were approached while exiting the site and were asked to complete the self-administrated questionnaire. If visitors agreed to participate, they were invited to Troy Cafe. Each visitor was given a copy of the questionnaire in his/her own language or another language in which he/she was proficient. The research was conducted when the 384 questionnaires replying to all of the questions were collected.

The questionnaire was collated and analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) program. Differences between the visitor types' importance and satisfaction perceptions of ten elements were investigated by using ANOVA and Scheffe tests.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

Visitor profile

The demographic characteristics of the sample are outlined in Table 1. The majority of the visitors (66.4%) were from European countries.

17.4% resided in Australia and New Zealand. 8.6% of the respondents reported that they lived in American countries. There were more male visitors (58.3%) than female visitors (41.7%). 37.5% were married or in a common law relationship. The level of education is skewed toward the high end of the continuum, with 68.0% reporting having graduated from college/university or higher. The age of the visitors was widely distributed across all age categories. The level of annual household income was less widely distributed. Almost three-quarters (71.8%) reported an annual household income of €49.999 or less.

Table 1. Profile of Troy visitors

Component	N	%
Country of residence		
Europe	255	66.4
(Turkey 31.5%, United Kingdom 8.6%, Germany 8.6%, Italy 3.9%, Greece 2.9%, others 10.9%)		
Australia and New Zealand	67	17.4
(Australia 11.9%, New Zealand 5.5%)		
America	33	8.6
(USA 5.2%, Canada 2.3%, others 1.1%)		
Asia	28	7.3
(Japan 6.3%, others 1.0%)		
Africa	1	0.3
(Tunisia 0.3%)		
Sex		
Male	224	58.3
Female	160	41.7
Marital status		
Married/common law	144	37.5
Single/separated/widowed/divorced	240	62.5
Level of education		
High school or less	48	12.5
Some college or university	75	19.5
Graduated from college/university	193	50.3
Master/doctorate	68	17.7
Age		
18-29	185	48.2
30-39	99	25.8
40-49	48	12.5
50-59	34	8.8
60 and older	18	4.7
Annual household income		
Less than €25.000	163	42.4
€25.000-€49.999	113	29.4
€50.000-€74.999	64	16.7
€75.000-€99.999	23	6.0
€100.000 and higher	21	5.5

Importance – satisfaction analysis

The average importance of the core elements of service delivery in heritage sites and the average level of satisfaction with these elements of the Troy experience were calculated for all visitors. The placement of each element on an importance-satisfaction scale was accomplished by using the means of importance and performance as the coordinates. Once these calculations had been performed, they were plotted on a two-dimensional grid (Joppe et al., 2001; Kozak and Nield, 1998; Pizam and Ellis, 1999; Ryan, 1995). Each element on the grid can then be analyzed by locating the appropriate quadrant in which it falls. Elements in Grid I are rated very important, and the level of satisfaction is above average. Elements in Grid II are rated very important, but the level of satisfaction is rated below average. Elements in Grid III are considered less important, and satisfaction level is below average. Elements in Grid IV are rated above average on satisfaction, but are rated below average on importance.

Table 2. Means of importance and satisfaction for all visitors of Troy (n=384)

Service Elements	Mean of Importance	Mean of Satisfaction	Grid
Access to the site	3.96	3.88	IV
Help and knowledge	4.12	3.76	I
Presentation of the site	4.27	3.72	I
Tour design of the site	4.24	3.75	I
Interpretation of the site	4.35	3.70	I
Information signs and directions	4.29	3.59	II
Printed information	4.04	3.31	III
Cleanliness	3.93	3.94	IV
Security and protection	3.84	3.68	IV
The range of visitor services	4.05	3.30	III

- *Grid I: High Importance-High Satisfaction, Grid II: High Importance-Low Satisfaction, Grid III: Low Importance-Low Satisfaction, Grid IV: Low Importance-High Satisfaction.*
- *The grand mean for importance (X=4.10, SD=0.17) and the grand mean for satisfaction (X=3.66, SD=0.21).*

Table 2 shows the overall ratings of all visitors' perceptions of Troy. Help and knowledge, presentation of the site, tour design of the site, and interpretation of the site are located in Grid I (High Importance-High Satisfaction). Information signs and directions were considered above average for importance, but below average for satisfaction (Grid II: High

Importance-Low Satisfaction). Printed information and the range of visitor services were rated below average for both importance and satisfaction (Grid III: Low Importance-Low Satisfaction). Troy visitors perceived access to the site, cleanliness, and security and protection higher than average on satisfaction, but below average on importance (Grid IV: Low Importance-High Satisfaction).

Importance-satisfaction means were calculated for each of four visitor types: the scholar, the general, the student, and the reluctant. Table 3 and Table 4 summarize these means. The importance-satisfaction grid positions for each sample were based on the importance and satisfaction grand means for each visitor type. The importance-satisfaction grids for visitor types are represented in Table 5.

Table 3. Comparison of importance means for visitor types of Troy

Service Elements	The Scholar (n=104)	The General (n=215)	The Student (n=27)	The Reluctant (n=38)	ANOVA Sig.
Access to the site	3.81	3.98	4.14	4.18	0.220
Help and knowledge	4.09	4.11	4.00	4.34	0.584
Presentation of the site	4.37	4.18	4.48	4.31	0.159
Tour design of the site	4.26	4.22	4.14	4.31	0.853
Interpretation of the site	4.32	4.37	4.29	4.31	0.908
Information signs and directions	4.33	4.30	4.07	4.28	0.563
Printed information	4.11	4.03	3.85	4.02	0.690
Cleanliness	3.91	3.91	4.00	4.10	0.705
Security and protection	3.77	3.89	3.70	3.78	0.705
The range of visitor services	4.02	4.09	3.66	4.23	0.144

- *The importance meaning is based on a five-point scale where 5 is very important and 1 is very unimportant.*

The scholars rated presentation of the site, tour design of the site, interpretation of the site, information signs and directions, and printed information as above average for importance, but below average for satisfaction (Grid II: High Importance-Low Satisfaction). These visitors perceived help and knowledge, security and protection, and the range of visitor services as below average for both importance and satisfaction (Grid III: Low Importance-Low Satisfaction). Access to the site and cleanliness were considered above average for satisfaction, but below average for importance (Grid IV: Low Importance-High Satisfaction).

Table 4. Comparison of satisfaction means for visitor types of Troy

Service Elements	The Scholar (n=104)	The General (n=215)	The Student (n=27)	The Reluctant (n=38)	ANOVA Sig.
Access to the site	3.70	3.94	3.74	4.13	0.027*
Help and knowledge	3.46	3.85	3.66	4.15	0.001*
Presentation of the site	3.64	3.74	3.66	3.89	0.552
Tour design of the site	3.65	3.79	3.62	3.86	0.471
Interpretation of the site	3.59	3.73	3.66	3.86	0.422
Information signs and directions	3.53	3.61	3.51	3.71	0.726
Printed information	3.16	3.34	3.29	3.52	0.265
Cleanliness	3.85	3.97	3.85	4.07	0.489
Security and protection	3.57	3.72	3.40	3.94	0.085
The range of visitor services	3.30	3.30	2.92	3.57	0.095

- *Satisfaction scores show meaning of visitors' perceptions of satisfaction based on a five-point scale where 5 is very good and 1 is very bad.*
- *(*) Significant at < 0.05*

Table 5. Comparison grids of visitors' perceptions of Troy by visitor types

Service Elements	The Scholar (n=104)	The General (n=215)	The Student (n=27)	The Reluctant (n=38)
Access to the site	IV	IV	I	I
Help and knowledge	III	I	IV	I
Presentation of the site	II	I	I	I
Tour design of the site	II	I	II	I
Interpretation of the site	II	I	I	I
Information signs and directions	II	II	III	I
Printed information	II	III	III	III
Cleanliness	IV	IV	IV	I
Security and protection	III	IV	III	IV
The range of visitor services	III	III	III	II

- *Grid I: High Importance-High Satisfaction, Grid II: High Importance-Low Satisfaction, Grid III: Low Importance-Low Satisfaction, Grid IV: Low Importance-High Satisfaction.*
- *The grand mean for importance (X=4.10, SD=0.17) and the grand mean for satisfaction (X=3.66, SD=0.21).*

The generals rated help and knowledge, presentation of the site, tour design of the site, and interpretation of the site as above average for both

importance and satisfaction (Grid I: High Importance-High Satisfaction). The general visitors rated information signs and directions as above average for importance, but below average for satisfaction (Grid II: High Importance-Low Satisfaction). Printed information and the range of visitor services were regarded as below average for both importance and satisfaction (Grid III: Low Importance-Low Satisfaction). Access to the site, cleanliness, and security and protection were considered to be above average for satisfaction, but below average for importance (Grid IV: Low Importance-High Satisfaction).

The students rated access to the site, presentation of the site, and interpretation of the site as above average for both importance and satisfaction (Grid I: High Importance-High Satisfaction). The tour design of the site was rated above average for importance, but below average for satisfaction (Grid II: High Importance-Low Satisfaction). Information signs and directions, printed information, security and protection, and the range of visitor services were attributes that the students rated below average for both importance and satisfaction (Grid III: Low Importance-Low Satisfaction). The students rated help and knowledge, and cleanliness as above average for satisfaction, but below average for importance (Grid IV: Low Importance-High Satisfaction).

The reluctant visitors rated access to the site, help and knowledge, presentation of the site, tour design of the site, interpretation of the site, information signs and directions, and cleanliness as above average for both importance and satisfaction (Grid I: High Importance-High Satisfaction). The range of visitor services was rated above average for importance, but below average for satisfaction (Grid II: High Importance-Low Satisfaction). The reluctant visitors perceived printed information as below average for both importance and satisfaction (Grid III: Low Importance-Low Satisfaction). Security and protection was considered as above average for satisfaction, but below average for importance (Grid IV: Low Importance-High Satisfaction).

The quadrant locations are not the same for the ten attributes. Presentation of the site and interpretation of the site are in Grid I (High Importance-High Satisfaction), and printed information is in Grid III (Low Importance-Low Satisfaction) for the general, the student, and the reluctant. The range of visitor services is in Grid III (Low Importance-Low Satisfaction), and cleanliness is in Grid IV (Low Importance-High Satisfaction) for the scholar, the general, and the student.

DISCUSSION

One-way ANOVA tests were used to analyze importance and satisfaction means of service elements for visitor types to Troy. The purpose of the one-way ANOVA test is to determine whether the four means differ significantly from each other. There were no statistically significant differences between the importance means of visitor types to Troy. The same service elements were rated as equally important. In order of importance, these are: presentation of the site, interpretation of the site, and tour design of the site. Except for access to the site and help and knowledge, there are no considerable differences based on satisfaction means of visitor types. Scheffe tests indicated significant differences in these two service elements between the scholar visitors and the reluctant visitors.

Important service elements for all visitors of Troy are: interpretation of the site, information signs and directions, presentation of the site, tour design of the site, and help and knowledge. Except for information signs and directions, all visitors were satisfied with their Troy experience. Regarding all the visitors to Troy, importance service elements were perceived to be present at Troy as a heritage site.

The scholar visitors were the most unsatisfied with the service elements of Troy. Their importance ratings of presentation of the site, information signs and directions, interpretation of the site, tour design of the site, and printed information did not exceed their expectations. In other words, important service elements of the scholar visitors were not perceived to be present at the site. Regarding the importance and satisfaction ratings on service elements of Troy, there are considerable resemblances between the general visitor and all visitors. The student visitors seemed to be impressed by access to the site, presentation of the site, and interpretation of the site, but not by the tour design of the site. The reluctant visitors were the most satisfied with their Troy experience. All of the service elements deemed important (access to the site, help and knowledge, presentation of the site, tour design of the site, interpretation of the site, information signs and directions, and cleanliness) exceeded their expectations, except for the range of visitor services.

The majority of important service elements of the general, the student and the reluctant visitors were perceived to be present in Troy. The site management should keep up the good work and continue to direct resources toward these service elements (Ryan, 1995). Important service elements of the scholar visitors were perceived not to be present in Troy. The site management should concentrate their resources on these (Ryan,

1995). They should pay particular attention to improving the satisfaction of presentation of the site, tour design of the site, interpretation of the site, information signs and directions, printed information, and the range of visitor services in Troy for service quality. Despite the fact that the service quality is not solely a determinant for visiting heritage sites, visitors would be seriously dissatisfied with poor service quality. Therefore, the service standard of heritage sites may not be a primary source of satisfaction but can be a major cause of dissatisfaction (Kozak and Nield, 1998).

CONCLUSION

Visitor types of heritage sites and understanding their characteristics are important for management strategies. Site organizations monitor visitors' perceptions to identify strengths and gaps in service quality. In today's heritage industry, one of the most important goals of site organizations is retaining and satisfying current and past visitors. This goal can be achieved by visitor oriented organizations. These organizations focus on the importance of specific visitor types and then work hard to maximize satisfaction with the service being offered.

The main purpose of this study was to measure Troy visitors' perceptions of service quality in terms of importance and satisfaction by visitor types. Troy visitors were categorized into four different types: the scholar, the general, the student, and the reluctant. The significant finding of this research was that the important service elements of the scholar visitors were perceived not to be present, but the majority of these elements for the general, the student and the reluctant visitor were perceived to be present in Troy. Perceptions of service quality by Troy visitors are not homogeneous. Consequently, specific and differentiated offers should be designed by the site organization for each type of visitor. The use of importance-satisfaction analysis in this research has the advantage of underlining the major service quality elements of heritage sites which are given high importance and perceived to be present by visitor types.

Importance-satisfaction analysis provides understanding of how the visitor types define service quality, and how service elements may aid the development of visitors' satisfaction. This research supports former studies on service quality of heritage sites (Brown, 1999; Catalca and Yurtseven, 2003; Goulding, 2000$_{a,b}$; Gyimothy, 2000; Hannabuss, 1999; Laws, 1998; Light, 1999; McKercher and Cros, 2003) and importance-

satisfaction analysis (Almanza et al., 1994; Go and Zhang, 1997; Joppe et al., 2001; Kozak and Nield, 1998; Ryan, 1995; Uysal et al., 1991; Yurtseven, 2003). The major limitation of this research was the small sample size. It was applied only to visitor types of Troy. It should be repeated at other heritage sites. The results present important data about the service quality at Troy as a case concerning world heritage sites.

REFERENCES

Almanza, B.A., Jaffe, W., Lin, L. (1994). Use of the Service Attribute Matrix to Measure Consumer Satisfaction. *Hospitality Research Journal*, Vol.17, No.2, pp.63-75.

Atilgan, E., Akinci, S., Aksoy, S. (2003). Mapping service quality in the tourism industry. *Managing Service Quality*, Vol.13, No.5, pp.412-422.

Augustyn, M.M. (1998). The road to quality enhancement in tourism. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol.10, No.4, pp.145-158.

Baker, D.A., Crompton, J.L. (2000). Quality, satisfaction and behavioral intentions. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol.27, No.3, pp.785-804.

Brown, T.J. (1999). Antecedents of culturally significant tourist behavior. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol.26, No.3, pp.676-700.

Catalca, H., Yurtseven, H.R. (2003). Understanding New Anzacs: A Managerial Perspective. *Anatolia: An International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research*, Vol.14, No.2, pp.127-141.

Choi, T.Y., Chu, R. (2000). Levels of satisfaction among Asian and Western travelers. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, Vol.17, No.2, pp.116-132.

Davies, B., Baron, S., Gear, T., Read, M. (1999). Measuring and managing service quality. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, Vol.17, No.1, pp.33-40.

Ghobadian, A., Speller, S., Jones, M. (1994). Service Quality Concepts and Models. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, Vol.11, No.9, pp.43-66.

Gilmore, A., Rentschler, R. (2002). Changes in museum management: A custodial or marketing emphasis. *The Journal of Management Development*, Vol.21, No.10, pp.745-760.

Go, F., Zhang, W. (1997). Applying Importance-Performance Analysis to Beijing as an International Meeting Destination. *Journal of Travel Research*, Spring, pp.42-49.

Goulding, C. (2000$_a$). The museum environment and the visitor experience. *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol.34, No.3/4, pp.261-278.

Goulding, C. (2000$_b$). The commodification of the past, postmodern pastiche, and the search for authentic experiences at contemporary heritage attractions. *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol.34, No.7, pp.835-853.

73

Gummesson, E. (1994). Service Management: An Evaluation and the Future. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, Vol.5, No.1, pp.77-96.

Gyimothy, S. (2000). Odysseys: analysing service journeys from customer's perspective. *Managing Service Quality*, Vol.10, No.6, pp.389-396.

Hannabuss, S. (1999). Postmodernism and the heritage experience. *Library Management*, Vol.20, No.5, pp.295-303.

Hewison, R. (1987). *The Heritage Industry: Britain in a Climate of Decline*. London, Matheun.

ICOMOS, (1993). *Tourism at World Heritage Cultural Sites: The Site Manager's Handbook*. Sri Lanka, ICOMOS International Specialized Committee on Cultural Tourism.

Joppe, M., Martin, D.W., Waalen, J. (2001). Toronto's Image As a Destination: A Comparative Importance-Satisfaction Analysis by Origin of Visitor. *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol.39, No.3, pp.252-260.

Kandampully, J., Mok, C., Sparks, B. (2001). *Service quality management in hospitality, tourism and leisure*. Binghamton, NY., The Haworth Press.

Kozak, M., Nield, K. (1998). Importance-Performance Analysis and Cultural Perspectives in Romanian Black Sea Resorts. *Anatolia: An International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research*, Vol.9, No.2, pp.99-116.

Laws, E. (1998). Conceptualizing visitor satisfaction management in heritage settings: an exploratory blueprinting analysis of Leeds Castle, Kent. *Tourism Management*, Vol.19, No.6, pp.545-554.

Laws, E., Thornes, S. (1991). *Tourism marketing: Service and quality management perspectives*. London, Travel and Tourism Research Ltd.

Lee, C., Lee, Y., Wicks, B.E. (2004). Segmentation of festival motivation by nationality and satisfaction. *Tourism Management*, Vol.25, No.1, pp.61-70.

Li, Y.N., Tan, K.C., Xie, M. (2003). Managing service quality: applying utility theory in the prioritization of service attributes. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, Vol.20, No.4, pp.417-435.

Light, D. (1999). Characteristics of the audience for events at a heritage. *Tourism Management*, Vol.17, No.3, pp.183-190.

McKercher, B., Cros, H. (2003). *Cultural Tourism: The Partnership between Tourism and Cultural Heritage Management*. Binghamton, NY., Haworth Hospitality Press.

O'Neill, M., Getz, D., Carlsen, J. (1999). Evaluation of service quality at events: the 1998 Coca-Cola Masters Surfing event at Margaret River, Western Australia. *Managing Service Quality*, Vol.9, No.3, pp.158-166.

Otto, J.E., Ritchie, J.R.B. (1996). The service experience in tourism. *Tourism Management*, Vol.17, No.3, pp.165-174.

Pizam, A., Ellis, T. (1999). Customer satisfaction and its measurement in hospitality enterprises. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol.11, No.7, pp.326-339.

Ryan, C. (1995). *Researching Tourist Satisfaction*. London, Routledge.

Uysal, M., Howard, G., Jamrozy, U. (1991). An Application of Importance-Performance Analysis to a Ski Resort: A Case Study in North Carolina. *Visions in Leisure and Business*, Spring, pp.16-25.

Weiermair, K. (2000). Tourists' perceptions towards and satisfaction with service quality in the cross-cultural service encounter: implications for hospitality and tourism management. *Managing Service Quality*, Vol.10, No.6, pp.397-409.

Yurtseven, H. R. (2003). Experiencing cultural tourism products and its impact on perceived service quality: research on the Barba Yorgo customers. *Journal of Marmara University- Economical and Administrative Sciences Faculty*, Vol.18, No.1, pp.229-243.

Huseyin Ridvan Yurtseven (ryurtseven@comu.edu.tr) is the director of Gokceada Vocational College and Associate Professor in the Department of Tourism Management, Canakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Canakkale, Turkey.

76