ANALYZING THE CONCEPTUAL MODEL OF SERVICE QUALITY AND ITS RELATIONSHIP WITH GUESTS' SATISFACTION: A STUDY OF HOTELS IN ERBIL

Kofand Anwar, PhD

Chairman of Business Administration, Lebanese French University. Erbil, Kurdistan.

Govand.anwar@lfu.edu.krd

Abstract

Nowadays most industries used service quality in various field. All industries are implementing five service quality dimensions; these dimensions are tangible, assurance, reliability, responsiveness, and empathy. The main aim of this research is to investigate hotels' service quality and its affect on guests' satisfaction in Erbil. Moreover, to find which service quality dimension has more affect than the other quality dimensions. The researcher utilized a quantitative research method to measure the relationship between each service quality dimension on guests' satisfaction. A questionnaire was adapted and distributed on guests at hotels in Erbil. 111 questionnaires completed and received from hotel guests in Erbil. The findings showed that the responsive as service dimension had the highest value; on the other hand assurance as service dimension had the lowest value.

Keywords: Quality, Service Quality dimensions, Hotel Guests Satisfaction, Erbil

INTRODUCTION

In today's competitive business environment education sector is a vital, due to the fact is they considered as a necessary source for country's economics and income. Consequently, most of the countries are planning to attract local and international guests' attention to their destinations, as a consequence they will be able to develop and improve their nation's life. Guests satisfaction is extremely rely on hotel's building, guests' accommodation, guests' facilities and activities. In order to a hotels obtain and sustain competitive advantage, it is very essential to implement service quality dimensions effectively and efficiently to improve the current service at hotels, eventually results in students satisfaction. The service quality in hospitality sector is aimed to offer guests with high standard of accommodation atmosphere and almost all hotels are able to gain guests satisfaction through providing a high quality of services. In most cases, guests focus on the quality of service rather than concentrating on price. For that reason, it is essential that developing a certain level of quality that meets the needs of the guests and demonstrate this quality in practice. At the present time the guests became more complicated and more demanded, in addition it is essential to be familiar with guests location for example where they came from, what are guests expectation in order to choose the right strategies for enhancing hotels' service quality. Generally guests are much demanded, however when it comes to hospitality sectors the most significant aspect to be considerate is service quality that hotel provides to its guests. In view of the fact that service quality will result in guests' satisfaction, consequently executing an effective service quality will be required. Hospitality sector with poor service quality will result in guests' dissatisfaction. Many of hospitality sectors are searching and aiming to improve the quality of their systems in order to obtain and sustain competitive advantages. All service that provided by hospitality sectors will results in adding value to their guests as a result increase

2 Analyzing The Conceptual Model of Service Quality....

level of guests satisfaction. Currently, some of hospitality sectors are assigning a certain department to evaluate and ensure the implementation of service quality in order to confirm guests' satisfaction and additionally meet their needs and expectations. Furthermore, the key success of competitive market relies on providing a high quality of service which results in increasing the level of guests' satisfaction. Hence, guests' evaluation for the quality of services in hospitality sectors is very necessary in enhancing and growing the business. Hospitality sectors should provide competitive services to satisfy their students and build guests loyalty. Guests' satisfactions have numerous benefits, for instance building a positive association between hotel staff and guests which result in building and creating loyal guests. In this research, the researcher aimed to employ service quality dimensions as factors to assess guests' satisfaction in hotels in Erbil. Service quality has five dimensions; empathy, assurance, reliability, responsiveness and tangible. These five dimensions have a significant role in the guests' view of service quality. In this research the five dimensions of service quality are independent factors and guests' satisfaction is dependent factor.

Statement of the Problem

Guests are faced with service quality problems every day and in almost every service they purchase: in public transport, when it is crowded and you don't feel conformable to reach your destination; while making shopping, you may be offended on behavior of sales person; in the cafe/restaurant, you may not like how a waiter served you and so forth. We can continue identifying dissatisfaction at many service oriented originations.

Unfortunately, not always the quality service offered can meet the needs, requirements and expectations of the guests. This is the main reason of the selected topic the problem of insufficient levels of service quality based on the comments of different guests in hotels will be analyzed.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Research model

Figure 1- Research Model, by the author-2017

Research Hypotheses

H1: There is a positive and significant relationship between tangible dimensions with guests' satisfaction.

H2: There is a positive and significant relationship between reliability dimensions with guests' satisfaction.

H3: There is a positive and significant relationship between responsiveness dimensions with guests' satisfaction.

H4: There is a positive and significant relationship between assurance dimensions with guests' satisfaction.

H5: There is a positive and significant relationship between empathy dimensions with guests' satisfaction.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Guests Satisfaction

According to (Haemoon & Kawon, 2017), the term satisfaction is a person's feeling of gratification consequence from comparing certain service or product or even transition perceived outcome or performance in terms of the expectation". It has been proven that when the service quality meets guests' expectation and need, hence the guests will become satisfied with provided service quality. However, in the hospitality sector to meet guests' expectations is not easy task. In many industries speed has become the most valued and the new competitive advantage. Speed is shortening the product life cycle from years to weeks. In hospitality sector, guests are expecting speed to meet their expectations and needs. Guests who are able to fulfill are going to win, those who can't, will be passed by (Juan, et al., 2017). Recently many academicians and scholars are debating the topic of satisfaction. At the present time, guests' satisfaction significantly is taking into consideration from hospitality sectors. Results from guests' dissatisfaction, will cause in poor image of hotel, therefore lack of recommendation from experienced guests and current guests to others and they might switch hotel to other. All the things which the hotel does in order to increase service quality can be counted as a zero if the guests left the hotel without being satisfied. Nowadays, fulfilling guests' requests remains the greatest challenge (Raditha, 2017).

Service Quality

The process of quality considers one of the essential characteristics in service quality. For that reason, organization which provides service does not have any product; however they do have interactive processes. Services are invisible; consequently it is complicated for the organization to evaluate and measure it (Appaw-Agbola & Dehlor, 2011). There are numerous significant service quality definitions, developed by different academic scholars. According to (Blesic, et al., 2013), Service quality is a divergence amongst guests' expectation of the service provider and their evaluation of the services. A further definition has been developed by (Chikwendu, et al., 2012) stated that service quality is a dissimilarity amongst guests' expectation for service implementation before the service encounter and their observations of the rendered services. Puja & Yukti, (2011), defined service quality as a specific assessment and consideration made by guests among the expected service quality and actually provided services. Quality is a bit more complicated to distinguish than guests' satisfaction and pleasure, due to of the different statements, developed by various scholars. Quality is concentrated to guests' observation and assessment, therefore quality is characterized as whatever the purchaser perceives as a quality (Sivesan, 2013). According to (Yadav & Dabhade, 2013) there are two main factors, which influence the perception of guests, such as expectations and quality standards. Expectations means what is actually the students supposed to get from the service

provider. As delivering of services in the hospitality sectors consistently compromises human beings, it should focus on the administrative staff, and particularly on the cooperation between the administrators, guests and providers (Abukhalifeh & Mat, 2012).

Service Quality Dimensions

Currently, almost all service providers have taken into their consideration that service quality is a significant aspect should be concerned; through clarification of various meanings of service quality it can be observed that there is a positive and significant association between service providers and guests' satisfaction (Anand & Selvaraj, 2012). Many previous researches have been studied to reveal dimensions of service quality that most fundamentally participate to fundamental quality appraisals in the service encirclement. Service quality is vital in light of the fact that it will assist to evaluate, to monitor and afterward improve guests' service quality (Campos & Marodin, 2012). According to Parasuraman et al., (1985), developed ten service quality dimensions, which were determined by). These dimensions fit as a service quality field from which these items were obtain for the SERVQUAL model (Forozia, et al., 2013). Later, after refinement, above mentioned dimensions were revised and five dimensions (three original and two combined), Parasuraman, et al., (1988) were developed in order to evaluate service quality (Kamau & Waudo, 2012): (1) Tangibles, (2) Reliability, (3) Responsiveness, (4) Assurance, and (5) Empathy.

- **Tangible dimension** is defined "as the physical appearance, equipment, personnel, and communication materials" Physical appearance is the appearance of the personnel, exterior of the equipment, the look of building and renovation (Kangogo, et al., 2013). Tangibles dimensions refer to physical version of image of the services that students, will utilize to evaluate the quality.
- **Reliability dimension** depicts whether education sectors follow confirmed promises and how precious it is in the implementation process. Reliability dimension reflects the education sectors' capability to execute service accurately and dependably ". It compromises "doing it right the first time" and as for the students it is one of the most significant dimension Berry and Parasuraman, (1991) as cited in (Landrum, et al., 2009). Furthermore, reliability demonstrates that the education sectors convey on its guarantees regarding the attendance, examinations, pricing policies, and provided service. Students prefer to join a university that keep their guarantees concerning the service outcomes (Kangogo, et al., 2013).
- **Responsiveness dimension** –"being willing to help" -refers to the university's readiness of prompt service. It is significant to respond to all guests needs and expectation, otherwise the guests demand and needs will become a complaint towards the university's service quality. University's ability to confirm that they are providing with a service on time is a basic part of service quality for major students.
- **Assurance dimension** is conveyed to students by the duration of time they require to wait for the response of their inquiries. Standards for promptness that indicates requirements in the university's internal policy might be dissimilar to what the students require or expect. Assurance refers "the knowledge and courtesy of employees and their ability to inspire trust and confidence". This dimension is especially critical for services that guests see as high hazard or for the services where the outcome seems uncertain for the students. Assurance and empathy comprise originally developed seven dimensions, which are communication, security, credibility, competence, understanding/knowing students, courtesies, and access (Kangogo, et al., 2013).

The hospitality industry faces with different difficulties than organizations which produce products due to the dissimilar nature of service in comparison with a product. In service industry there is a greater probability to fail, rather than in product sales. For instance, if a guest purchases a demolished mobile phone, it can be replaced, but if an employee of the hotel didn't provide with a proper service, the consequences might be definitive. Therefore, services don't have replaceable factor, in the same way as the majority of the items that don't fulfill customers' needs. According to (Yousapronpaiboon, 2014), there are following key characteristics of services "intangibility, inseparability, variability or heterogeneity and perishability".

- ***Intangibility***

Opposite to tangible goods, guests can't actually see or test the service before they consume it. The purchaser is not able to see the features of the service product; he or she consumes it (Kotler, 2006). This is one of the biggest problems to the hospitality industry, in light of the fact that they should prove that the service they are offering is worth to be purchased. Accommodation in a hotel can't assess ahead of time, but a guest already has some programmed desires on which the gratification level is actually based on.

- ***Inseparability***

Inseparability occurs when production and consumption of the service is happening at the same time, while tangible products following already tasted road from manufacture, through storage to the final purchase. For example in hotels, a buyer ought to be available during the actual service, he should be in the room in order to get his or her service; it is impossible to pack a room and other hotel facilities and send to the customer, in service industries, the customer have to be present in the place, in order to receive a service.

- ***Variability or heterogeneity***

This means is that there cannot be two different hotels, providing similar services. The quality of service can be a differently provided by the same employee, working in a different company. It is obvious, that even identical products can be different from each other. The variability is very common among services.

- ***Perishability***

Perishability means that "services cannot be saved, stored, resold or returned" (Kotler, 2006). It is a big disadvantage, that when the demand is high, hotels cannot sell more rooms, than they have in their inventory. And same they cannot keep rooms to sell them tomorrow, because tomorrow is another day and another let's say 200 rooms according to the budget should be sold. Service quality has been the point of impressive concern via specialists lately. By taking a look at different meanings of service quality it can be seen that it is an aftereffect of the correlation which clients makes between their desires and what they really get from the related service supplier (Parasuraman, et al., 1985).

Various studies have been carried out in order to reveal dimensions of service quality that most essentially contribute to fundamental quality appraisals in the service encirclement. Distinguishing proof of the determinants of service quality is crucial in light of the fact that it will help to measure, to control and afterward enhance client's apparent service quality.

There are ten service quality dimensions, which were determined by Parasuraman et al. (1985). These dimensions fit as a service quality field from which these items were obtain for the SERVQUAL model (Parasuraman, et al., 1985). The dimensions are as follow:

6 *Analyzing The Conceptual Model of Service Quality....*

- Reliability is a companies' ability to perform assured service and honor its promises. It signifies that the service supplier provides service right the first time;
- Responsiveness refer to willingness of employees to assist guests and provide prompt service;
- Competence involve employees' knowledge and measure of required skills;
- Access is a scope to which employees are approachable;
- Courtesy includes employees' relation towards the customer (notably, respect, politeness, friendliness);
- Communication means proper delivery of the information to the customer;
- Credibility involves honesty and trust of the service supplier;
- Security means providing freedom from danger or doubt;
- Understanding/Knowledge means to apply an effort to understand the guest's needs (for example to learn guest's specific requirements);
- Tangible includes physical appearance.

Later, after refinement, above mentioned dimensions were revised and five dimensions (three original and two combined) (Parasuraman, et al., 1988) were developed in order to evaluate service quality:

- Tangibles
- Reliability
- Responsiveness
- Assurance
- Empathy

Tangibles are defined "as the appearance of physical facilities, equipment, personnel, and communication materials" (Alonso-Almeida, et al., 2015), Physical appearance is the appearance of the equipment, appearance of the personnel, the look of building and renovation. Tangibility refers to the cleanness of the rooms, restaurants and other areas, the clean and proper uniform, used by the employees, usage of disposable gloves and etc. (Parasuraman, et al., 1988). Tangibles, amongst all other five dimensions, think over the most significant element for the guest. It give physical representation of pictures of the services that clients, especially new clients, will use to assess the quality. In spite of the fact that tangibles are frequently utilized by service providers to reinforce their reputation, give congruity, and sign quality to client, most organizations unite together tangibles with other in order to establish a service quality technique for the company (Boulter, 2013).

Reliability depicts whether a service supplier follows assured promises and how precious it is in the actions. The significant importance lies in fulfilling promptly the customer's requests (Cronin & Taylor, 1992). According to (Parasuraman, et al., 1988) reliability "reflects the service provider's ability to perform service dependably and accurately". It includes "doing it right the first time" and as for the customer it is one of the most significant dimension (Berry and Parasuraman, 1991 as cited in (Kim, et al., 2012). In detail, reliability implies that the organization conveys on its guarantees - guarantees about conveyance, service supply, issue determination and pricing policy.

Responsiveness – "being willing to help" - refers to the organization's readiness to settle happened issues and availability to provide fast service (Parasuraman, et al., 1988). It is important to respond to all customer requests, otherwise the request can turn into a complaint. Service suppliers' capability to ensure that they are providing with a service on time is a basic

part of service quality for major customers. This dimension underscores mindfulness and immediacy in managing customers' appeals, questions, complaints and other issues (Tari, et al., 2014). Responsiveness is conveyed to clients by the length of time they need to wait for the reply for inquiries. Responsiveness likewise catches the idea of adaptability and capability to redo the service to client needs. Standards for promptness that indicates requirements in the internal policy of the company might be dissimilar to what the guests require or expect. Front-line staffs, in hotels they are receptions, waitress, hostess, guest relation, have to be very well trained as well as should be responsive towards customers.

Assurance indicates "the knowledge and courtesy of employees and their ability to inspire trust and confidence" (Parasuraman, et al., 1988). It is important for the hotel to prove that it's trustable and worth the money, the customer is paying. The guest should feel safe when he or she consumes different services from a hotel and would like to feel secure during his stay (Ahmad, et al., et al., 2014). Also based on the study of (AbuKhalifeh & Mat, 2012), guests should feel safe in all financial transactions, therefore employees should be trustworthy. This dimension is especially critical for services that guests see as high hazard or for the services where the outcome seems uncertain for the customer.

Empathy depicts proper communication skills and job knowledge while offering related services. It is ability to good communication, customer understanding and individualized attention given to a guest by the employee, as has been discussed in the study of (Haemoun & Kawon, 2017). The entity of empathy is imparting through customized service that shows that clients are unique and uncommon and that their need are caught on. It is very important to the hotel's guest to feel that their needs are understood by the hotel. They appreciate when a front-line staff calls them by name, this in turn build up relationship between customer and an employee.

Assurance and empathy comprise originally developed seven dimensions, which are communication, security, credibility, competence, understanding/knowning customers, courtesy, and access (Parasuraman, et al., 1988).

Above mentioned dimensions depict how customers sort out data about service quality in their opinions. Sometimes clients will utilize each of the five dimensions to focus on service quality recognitions, but sometimes they will use just part of them.

GAP Analysis

Service quality is the differences between expected and perceived performance. It is easier to measure the quality of goods, due to their tangibility, notably defects can be seen on the product. But service quality is intangible and evasive; hence it is difficult to measure it (Parasuraman, et al., 1985). Ten service quality dimensions were developed by Parasuraman (1985), and based on these discoveries they have created a service quality model which eventually focused around GAP dissection. The model is illustrated in Figure-2-

The GAP has been recognized in the quality literature for some time. "GAP refers to the differences between desired levels of performance and actual levels of performance" (Parasuraman, et al., 1985). "In services this is the difference between the expected and the actual level of service provided" (Juan, et al., 2017). Gaps are significant in the following aspects; once a gap is distinguished, corrective actions and process improvement should take place. The process in identifying and correcting these gaps is called gap analysis.

GAP 1: The Knowledge of GAP is the dissimilarity between guest's expectation and perceptions of management of these expectations (Lack of knowledge of guests' expectations).

When this GAP is large, service providers are likely producing excellent service that nobody wants (Parasuraman, et al., 1985).

Figure 2-GAP 1- Adopted from (Parasuraman, et al., 1985).

In order to truly improve customer service the clear understanding of customers wants should be identified. The SERVQUAL instrument can be used in order to help in this understanding.

GAP 2: The Standards GAP is the dissimilarity among what company's management perceives and service quality specifications (Improper standards of service quality) (Parasuraman, et al., 1985).

Figure 3-GAP 2- Adopted from (Parasuraman, et al., 1985).

After managers reveals the guests' needs a system will be acquired to help provide the customer with his or her wants.

GAP 3: The Delivery GAP is the dissimilarity between service quality details and actual rendered service (Service performance GAP) (Parasuraman, et al., 1985).

Figure 4-Gap-3-Adopted from (Parasuraman, et al., 1985).

The establishing of service quality doesn't mean that it will be perfectly delivered. If there is no proper established training program for the personnel and communication system is not well organized the quality of services can be brought down.

GAP 4: The Communications GAP is the dissimilarity between delivery of the service and the communications to the guests about its delivery (If the promises match the actual delivery) (Parasuraman, et al., 1985).

Figure 5-Gap-4-Adopted from (Parasuraman, et al., 1985).

GAP 5: The Overall GAP is the dissimilarity between customers' expectations and perceived services. This GAP is important and depends on the directions on above mentioned four gaps, which associate with the delivery of service (Raditha, 2017).

Figure 6-Gap-5- Adopted from (Parasuraman, et al., 1985).

Organizations influence guest's expectations of services through 'word of mouth' and through other types of social media such as promotions or advertising. Therefore, there could be a contrast between what clients hear you say and you are going to convey as a service supplier. If this GAP will not be followed in a proper way, it can awake a negative client's perception of service quality.

Customer (Guest)

Figure 8-Gap-6- Adopted from (Parasuraman, et al., 1985).

GAP model is one of the most useful contributions to service literature. Gaps in communication and understanding between workers and guests have an earnest negative effect on the impression of service quality, due to service being intangible (Foster, 2007).

All above mentioned GAPs demonstrate dissimilarity between perceptions that can have a harmful consequence on service quality. GAP 1, GAP 2, GAP 3, GAP 4 operates as a path in which service will be provided, while GAP 5 belongs to the guest. Later, The GAP 5 is the GAP that the SERVQUAL instrument influence

SERVQUAL and SERVPERF Models

There have been several endeavors, which were made by different researchers, to identify variables that measure service quality, amid which the most used is SERVQUAL and SERVPERF (Yadav & Dabhade, 2013). An important SERVQUAL tool was developed by Zeithaml, Parasuraman and Berry in the mid-1980s, in order to evaluate quality in the service industry and developed from the GAP model. These researchers developed this survey instrument for accessing quality along the five service quality dimensions discussed in detail in paragraph 1.3.

The SERVQUAL questionnaires have been used by different companies and it is a ready-made approach that is appropriate to be used in various service situations. SERVQUAL signify service quality as dissimilarity between the expected services by a customer and guest's perception of the received services (Anand, & Selvaraj, 2012). This model evaluates the GAP between guest's expectations and what the customer got in the reality. The SERVQUAL tool reside the most entire endeavor to hypothesize and evaluate service quality. Parasuraman et al. (1985) has stated that this model is more applicable while it's utilized with other related services quality models.

The SERVQUAL scale is a primary tool in service marketing literature for accessing quality. This tool has been extensively utilized by researchers and industry leaders in order to access guest appreciation of service quality for a discrepancy of services (Forozia, et al., 2013). According to Parasuraman et al., (1988) firstly developed SERVQUAL model included two parts that aimed to evaluate:

- 1) Guests' expectations for different characteristics of service quality;
- 2) Guests' perceptions of the rendered services (Parasuraman, et al., 1985). In brief, the SERVQUAL tool is based on GAP theory which has been unfolded by Parasuraman et al. (1985).

Talking about SERVPERF according to Kangogo , et al., (2013), it is the performance element of the service quality scale, which is measures in the same way as SERVQUAL, using five service quality dimensions: "Tangibles, Reliability, Responsiveness, Assurance and Empathy" (Parasuraman, et al., 1988). They were among the scientists who leveled maximum attack on SERVQUAL model (Alonso-Almeida, et al., 2015). It has been mentioned that to measure service quality the evaluation of perceived performance was enough and no need to evaluate the expectations. Cronin & Taylor (1992) assert that SERVPERF has greater hypothesis power and it measures exhibit convergent and distinct lawfulness. Questions that make up the SERVPERF scale could cover most of the wide domain of service quality (Kim, et al., 2012).

Nowadays a competitive advantage can be earned by the organization by enhancing the service quality. Conceptual models in service quality empower management to identify problems related to quality. The prevention of occurred problems empowers the probability of improving company's profit, efficiency and general performance (Forozia, et al., 2013).

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this research is to determine service quality perceptions of guests and investigate the impact of service quality on service guests' satisfaction in hotels in Erbil. A

quantitative method used in order to analyse data gathered by the researcher. The survey has been distributed to and collected from hotel guests by the reception Manager.

Design of the Study

The researcher used questionnaire in order to be able to analyse the current study. The questionnaire was divided into two sections, the first section consisted of demographic questions; starting with respondent's gender, marital status, level of education, visit per year and the travel purpose. The second part of questionnaire was regarding five service quality dimensions as independent factors and guest satisfaction as dependent factor

Instrumentation

As it has been mentioned earlier that there are several methods to measure service quality, but there are two which are considered as a main and which were used the most: SERVQUAL and SERVPERF. Both of the models measure five dimensions, namely: tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, empathy, and assurance. However, the former model helps to measure guests' expectation and service quality perception, whereas the latter, measure service quality perception only. Different researchers proposing various ideas regarding both methods, as there are many uncertainty in using both expectation and perception measurements, and a continued support enhanced by Cronin & Taylor (1992), SERVPERF method has been chosen for the present study. The questionnaire structured in the form of multiple choice questions were designed by the researcher. The participants were asked to mark each item on five point scales ranging from definitely agree to do not agree at all. This research instruments were validated by earlier researchers to be appropriate for measuring perceived performance of the hotel that guests stayed in (Mey Pei, et al., 2006).

Sample Size

The sampling technique will be random sampling method, where almost all guests in hotels in Erbil will have equal chances of being selected for the sample. The researcher gathered 125 questionnaires but 14 questionnaires were invalid and 111 questionnaires were properly completed.

FINDINGS

Data were collected with a questionnaire and has been analyzed. According to the respondents' profile, descriptive statistics of frequencies and percentages were calculated and analyzed. Besides that, mean and standard deviation for each question has been calculated. Additionally regression and correlation analysis were carried out.

Table 1-Demographic Analysis

Items		Frequency	Percent
Gender	Male	71	64.0
	Female	40	36.0
Age	20 – 25	2	1.8
	26 – 30	3	2.7
	31 – 35	6	5.4
	36 – 40	24	21.6
	41 – 45	42	37.8
	46 and above	34	30.6
Marital status	Married	52	46.8
	Single	47	42.3

	Divorced	12	10.8
Education	High School	2	1.8
	Diploma	18	16.2
	Bachelor	47	42.3
	Master	23	20.7
	PhD	15	13.5
	Other	6	5.4
Frequency of visit	1-2	14	12.6
	3-4	16	14.4
	5-6	40	36.0
	7-8	34	36.6
Purpose of the travel	Business	95	85.6
	Leisure	16	14.4

Sources: Compiled Primary data, 2017

Table 1 illustrates participants' gender in this study. According to statistical results 71 participants were male and 40 participants were female. This indicates that majority of the responders from the hotel guests were male. As for participants' age which have been involved in this study: 2 participants fall under group of age 20-25 years old, 3 participants fall under group of 26-30 years old, 6 participants fall under group of 31-35 years old, 24 participants fall under group of 36-40 years old, 42 participants fall under group of 41-45 years old and 34 participants fall under group of 46 years old and above. This indicates that majority of participants fall under group of 41-45 years old which means that most of participants were mature and reliable to fulfill the questionnaire. As for participants' marital status: 52 participants were married, 47 participants were single and 12 participants were divorced. As for participants' level of education: 2 participants had obtained high school, 18 participants had obtained diploma, 47 participants had obtain bachelor degree, 23 participants had obtained master degree, 15 participants had obtained PhD degree and 6 participants responded as other level of education. As for the rate of visitors to hotel per year: 14 participants rated as 1-2 times per year, 16 participants rated as 3-4 times per year, 40 participants rated as 5-6 times per year, 34 participants rated as 7-8 times per year and 7 participants rated as more than 8 times per year. This indicates that the hotel has approximately 81 regular guests per year. As for the purpose of hotel guests: 95 participants' purpose were business travel and 16 participants' purpose were leisure reason. This means that the majority of participants (guests) purpose was business travel.

Table 2-Reliability analysis

Variables	Cronbach's Alpha	N of items
Tangible	.747	8
Reliability	.839	7
Responsiveness	.807	9
Assurance	.730	8
Empathy	.799	8

Sources: Compiled Primary data, 2017

As seen in table 2, the reliability analysis for five independent factors and a dependent factor; however it was found that the value of Alpha for tangible as service quality dimension = .747 which is more than .6, the result revealed that tangible dimension is reliable to measure guest satisfaction in Hotels, the value of Alpha for reliability as service quality dimension = .839

which is more than .6, the result revealed that reliability dimension is reliable to measure guest satisfaction in Hotels, the value of Alpha for responsiveness as service quality dimension = .807 which is more than .6, the result revealed that responsiveness dimension is reliable to measure guest satisfaction in Hotels, the value of Alpha for assurance as service quality dimension = .730 which is more than .6, the result revealed that assurance dimension is reliable to measure guest satisfaction in Hotels and the value of Alpha for empathy as service quality dimension = .799 which is more than .6, the result revealed that empathy dimension is reliable to measure guest satisfaction in Hotels.

Table 3-Correlations Analysis

		Correlations					
		Tangib le	Reliabi lity	Respo nsive ness	Assur ance	Empa thy	Guests' Satisfac tion
Tangible	Pearson Correlation	1					
	Sig. (2-tailed)						
	N	111					
Reliability	Pearson Correlation	.662**	1				
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000					
	N	111	111				
Responsiveness	Pearson Correlation	.954**	.613**	1			
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000				
	N	111	111	111			
Assurance	Pearson Correlation	.965**	.670**	.890**	1		
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000			
	N	111	111	111	111		
Empathy	Pearson Correlation	.563**	.918**	.590**	.527**	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000		
	N	111	111	111	111	111	
Guests' Satisfaction	Pearson Correlation	.915**	.769**	.938**	.885**	.764**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	
	N	111	111	111	111	111	111
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).							

Sources: *Compiled Primary data, 2017*

As it was found the correlation analysis between each independent factor and dependent factor (as seen in table 3). The results revealed that the Pearson correlation between guest satisfaction and tangible dimension of service quality = .915** , as it can be concluded that there is a positive and strong relationship between guest satisfaction as dependent factor and tangible dimension as independent factor, since the value = .915** is higher than 0.01, the Pearson correlation between guest satisfaction and reliability dimension of service quality = .769** , as it

can be concluded that there is a positive and strong relationship between guest satisfaction as dependent factor and reliability dimension as independent factor, since the value = .769** is higher than 0.01, the Pearson correlation between guest satisfaction and responsiveness dimension of service quality = .938**, as it can be concluded that there is a positive and strong relationship between guest satisfaction as dependent factor and responsiveness dimension as independent factor, since the value = .938** is higher than 0.01, the Pearson correlation between guest satisfaction and assurance dimension of service quality = .885**, as it can be concluded that there is a positive and strong relationship between guest satisfaction as dependent factor and assurance dimension as independent factor, since the value = .885** is higher than 0.01, and the Pearson correlation between guest satisfaction and empathy dimension of service quality = .764**, as it can be concluded that there is a positive and strong relationship between guest satisfaction as dependent factor and empathy dimension as independent factor, since the value = .764** is higher than 0.01.

Table 4-Multiple Regression Analysis

Coefficients						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.380	.110		3.458	.000
	Tangible	.529	.056	.502	9.455	.000
	Reliability	.426	.052	.370	8.208	.000
	Responsiveness	.548	.034	.573	6.028	.000
	Assurance	.375	.029	.475	2.922	.000
	Empathy	.385	.023	.468	6.449	.000
R Square		.964				
F		2728.138				
a. Dependent Variable: Guest Satisfaction						

Sources: Compiled Primary data, 2017

The researcher implemented multiple regression analysis to measure guests' satisfaction based on each service quality dimensions. According to the conceptual framework and five research hypotheses which developed by the author, the multiple regression analysis was applied to measure each research hypothesis. The findings revealed that; as for tangible dimension it was found that there is a positive and significant relationship between tangible as service quality dimension and guests' satisfaction, as it can be seen that the value of B for tangible dimension is .529 which is higher than .005 with P-value =.000 this indicates that the first research hypothesis is supported, as for reliability dimension it was found that there is a positive and significant relationship between reliability as service quality dimension and guests' satisfaction, as it can be seen that the value of B for reliability dimension is .426 which is higher than .005 with P-value =.000 this indicates that the second research hypothesis is supported, as for responsiveness dimension it was found that there is a positive and significant relationship between responsiveness as service quality dimension and guests' satisfaction, as it can be seen that the value of B for responsiveness dimension is .548 which is higher than .005 with P-value =.000 this indicates that the third research hypothesis is supported, as for assurance dimension it was found that there is a positive and significant relationship between assurance as service quality dimension and guests' satisfaction, as it can be seen that the value of B for assurance dimension is .375 which is higher than .005 with P-value =.000 this indicates that the fourth research

hypothesis is supported and as for empathy dimension it was found that there is a positive and significant relationship between empathy as service quality dimension and guests' satisfaction, as it can be seen that the value of B for empathy dimension is .385 which is higher than .005 with P-value =.000 this indicates that the fifth research hypothesis is supported. The value of R square = .802 this indicates that 80% of total variance has been explained, moreover, the F value for independent variables =90.296, since $(90.296 > 1)$ this indicates there is a significant relation with service quality dimensions and customer satisfaction.

CONCLUSION

In today's competitive environment, service sectors have been developing rapidly, at the same time as consumers' high quality service demand service is increasing. In order to hotels be able to compete in such competitive business environment, it requires to assess guests' perception and expectations towards provided service. The research objective was to investigate the relationship between service quality dimensions with guests satisfaction in hotels in Erbil. In this study, the researcher adopted the SERVQUAL instrument (Parasuraman, 1985), to prepare a survey by utilizing five service dimensions. The survey designed to find out the level of guests' perception and expectation towards the hotels' service quality. The findings showed that the responsive as service dimension had the highest value; on the other hand assurance as service dimension had the lowest value.

REFERENCES

- AbuKhalifeh, A. N., & Mat, S. A. (2012). Service Quality Management in Hospital Industry: A Conceptual Framework for Food and Beverage Departments. *International Journal of Busienss and Management*, 7(1), 135-141
- Ahmad, F. S., Ihtiyar, A., & Omar, R. (2014). A Comparative Study on Service Quality in the Grocery Retailing: Evidence from Malaysia and Turkey. *Procedia-Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 109(1), 763-767.
- Alonso-Almeida M., Bagur, L., & Llach J. (2015). The adoption of quality management practices and their impact on business performance in small service companies: the case of Spanish travel agencies. *Journal of Service Business*, 9, 57–75
- Anand,V. and Selvaraj, M.(2012). The Impact of Service Quality on Customer Satisfaction and Loyalty in Indian Banking Sector: An Empirical Study through SERVPERF. *International Journal of Business and Management research*, 2 (2), 151- 163
- Appaw-Agbola, E. T., & Dehlor, S. A. (2011). Service Quality in Ghana's Hospitality Industry: A Perspective from Tourists and Hospital Managers in the Volta Region. *World Review of Business Research*, 1(5), 110-125.
- Blesic, I., Tesanovic, D., & Psodorov, D. (2013). Consumer satisfaction and quality management in the hospitality industry in South-East Europe. *African Journal of Business Management*, 5(4), 1388-1396.
- Boulter, L., Bendell, T., & Dahlgaard, J. (2013). Total quality beyond North America. A comparative analysis of the performance of European Excellence Award winners. *International Journal of Operation and Production Management*, 33, 197–215
- Campos, F.D. and Marodin, G.T.(2012). Perceptions of Quality and expectations of Hotel service. *Journal of Operations and Supply Chain Management* 5 (1), pp 82 – 99
- Chikwendu, D., Ejem, E., & Ezenwa, A. (2012). Evaluation of service quality of Nigerian airline using servqual model. *Journal of Hospitality management and hospitality*, 3(6), 117-125.
- Forozia, A., Zadeh, M.S. and Gilani, M.H. (2013). Customer Satisfaction in Hospitality Industry: Middle East Tourists at 3star Hotels in Malaysia. *Research Journal of Applied Sciences, Engineering and Technology* 5(17): 4329-4335

- Haemoun O., Kawon K., (2017) "Customer satisfaction, service quality, and customer value: years 2000-2015", *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*,29(1),2-29, 4
- Juan José Tarí, J.J., Pereira-Moliner, J., Pertusa-Ortega, E., López-Gamero, D.M., & Molina-Azorin, F.J.(2017). Does quality management improve performance or vice versa? Evidence from the hotel industry. *International Journal of Service Business*, 11(1), 23-43.
- Kamau, s.w. and Waudu, J.(2012). Hospitality industry employer's expectation of employees' competences in Nairobi Hotels. *Journal of Hospitality Management and Tourism*, 3(4), 55-63
- Kangogo , E., Dr. Musiega , & Dr. Manyasi, J. (2013). Effect of Customer satisfaction on Performance of teh Hotel Industry in the Western Tourism Circuit of Kenya. *European Journal of Business Management* , 5 (14),pp. 87-100
- Kim D-Y, Kumar V, Kumar U (2012) Relationship between quality management practices and innovation. *Journal of Operation Management*, 30,295–315
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithamal, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1985). A conceptual model of service quality and its implications for the future research . *Journal of Marketing*, 49(4), 41-50.
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithamel, V., & Berry. (1988). SERVQUAL: A multiple-Item scale for measuring guest perceptions of service quality. *Journal of retailling*, 64(1), 12-40.
- Puja, K., & Yukti, A. (2011). Relationship between service quality and brand loyalty in restaurants: A cross cultural study. *International Journal of engineering and Management science*, 2(4), 205-215.
- Raditha, H., Michael, D., & David, D. (2017). "The impact of service quality, customer engagement and selected marketing constructs on airline passenger loyalty", *International Journal of Quality and Service Sciences*, 9,(1),21-40
- Sivesan, S. (2013). Factor Analysis of Service Quality in University Libraries in Sri Lanka – An Application of Servqual Model. *Industrial Engineering Letters*,3(5), 40-50.
- Tarí JJ, Heras-Saizarbitoria I, Dick G (2014) Internal and external drivers for quality certification in the service industry: do they have different impacts on success? *Journal of Service Business*,8,337–354
- Vilakazi, A. and Govender, K. (2014). Exploring public bus service quality in South Africa : a structural equation modelling approach. *Journal of Transport and Supply Chain Management*, 8(1), 1-10
- Yadav, R. K., & Dabhade, N. (2013). Impact of Service Quality on guest Satisfaction of Mobile Users- A case study of Airtel. *International Journal of Innovative Research and Studies*,2(5), 139-163.
- Yousapronpaiboon, K.(2014).SERVQUAL: Measuring higher education service quality in Thailand. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 116, 1088 – 1095