



# Evaluation of Guest Satisfaction about Hospitality Services: A Case of Accommodation Units in Nainital, Uttarakhand

S. K. Gupta\*, Neha Sharma\*\*

**Abstract** *Nainital, renowned as the Lake District of Uttarakhand, is a popular hill station in North India since the time of Britishers which attracts a large number of tourists, domestic as well as international, every year. In order to meet the need of overnight visitors, Nainital houses a plethora of accommodation units of all kinds, ranging from the budget to star category properties, as per the demand of the visitors. Satisfied and repeat customers play a key role in the success of any business. The present study was initiated with the primary purpose to evaluate customer satisfaction about the various products and services offered by the accommodation units in Nainital. The study also attempts to identify any significant broad category of determining factors of customer satisfaction specific to the accommodation industry at Nainital. Primary data, on various service attributes related to hospitality industry that can influence customer satisfaction, were collected from 200 tourists visited the study area for varied reasons through structured questionnaires by applying random sampling methods in order to achieve the framed objectives of the study. The results provide some insights on how customers rate the service quality and also highlight the broad factors determining the customer towards hospitality industry in Nainital. Thus, the result can be used as a guide for hotel managers to improve the essential quality attributes and enhance service quality as well as business performance.*

**Keywords:** *Customer Satisfaction, Service Quality, Hotels, Nainital*

## INTRODUCTION

The world hotel industry has moved to a new phase in this era of economic development. Today's hoteliers have accepted that they can retain more profit through existing customer rather than to catch the attention from new customer (Garrido-Moreno and Padilla-Meléndez, 2011; Wang, 2007) and it overloads five times as much to magnetize new customers than keeping present ones (Ko et al., 2008; Abraham and Taylor, 1999). As a result, management of the hotels should focus that their employees shall always please the customers, because they are always right. In addition, the hotels can increase satisfaction level of the customer by adapting new and innovative technology. These days, technology is touching new heights every day and can afford businesses with systems that can maintain the interaction between the customer and the hotels. After this, the

organization can forward this information to the staff. Thus customer relationship management (CRM) has gain impetus in the hotel business field and it is an important concern for hotel managers. Today, hotel managers have to raise profits with restricted resources. Hence, to outstand the competitors, there should be enhancement in customer service (Daghfous and Barkhi, 2009). Altogether for gaining the competitive advantage from the market the managers commonly use two different strategies (Kandampully and Suhartanto, 2000). These two strategies are "low-cost leadership through price discounting, and mounting customer loyalty by providing incomparable benefits to customers" (Kandampully and Suhartanto, 2000). The business philosophy which tends to the customer satisfaction is to create the value for customer, predicting and supervising their expectation and representing ability and responsibility to satisfy their needs. Quality of service and customer satisfaction is critical factors for accomplishment of every business (Gronoos,

\* Dean School of Management and Professor, CMTHS, HNB Garhwal University, Srinagar Garhwal, Uttarakhand, India.  
Email: gupta.sk21@gmail.com; sk\_gupta21@yahoo.com

\*\* Research Scholar, CMTHS, HNB Garhwal University, Srinagar Garhwal, Uttarakhand, India.  
Email: Mail: tourism.neha@gmail.com

1990; Parasuraman et al., 1988). As Valdani (2009) spotted out: organization stay alive because they have a customer to dish up. Customer satisfaction is surely lies on delivering high quality service which is the key to survive in sustainable business (Shemwell et al, 1998). To fight the battle for the competitive advantage and customer retention hoteliers must focus on two key factors i.e service quality and customer satisfaction. In assortment to reach customer satisfaction, it is important to continuously observe customers' needs and to be able to satisfy them. Venture which are able to rapidly understand and satisfy customers' needs, make greater profits than those which fall short to understand and satisfy them (Barsky & Nash, 2003). In the view of the fact that the price of drawing attention in new customer is higher than the price of keeping the existing ones. This is particularly true in the hotel industry. The dominating ingredient in the service industries are perceived value, service quality and customer satisfaction (Brady et al., 2001). In common, the value as perceived by customers was based on the price (Zeithaml, 1988). In contrast, Oh (1999) found that lofty pricing in isolation adversely affected customer perceptions of value, which also weakened customer satisfaction and intentions to repurchase and to recommend the hotel to their family, friends or relatives. However, Oh (1999) noted that the relationship between perceived value, service quality and customer satisfaction in the hotel industry should be further investigated.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

There are several ways to assess the quality of service and customer satisfaction through subjective (or soft) measures of quality, which focusing on perceptions and attitudes of the customer, rather than more concrete objective criteria (Hayes, 1997). Customer satisfaction is an emotional concept that involves the feeling of wellbeing and pleasure that results from obtaining what one hopes for and expects from an appealing product and or service (WTO, 1985). According to Vavra (1997), customer satisfaction can also be defined as, "a satisfaction that based on an outcome or process". Customer satisfaction is the leading criterion for determining the quality that is actually delivered and is essential for corporate survival.

Service quality, Customer Satisfaction and Behavioral Intentions are interrelated (Berry and Parasuraman, 1991; Gale, 1992 and Zeithaml et al., 1996). Numerous studies have established that service quality has directly influenced behavioral intentions through customer satisfaction (Woodside, Frey & Daly, 1989; Bagozzi, 1992; Anderson & Sullivan, 1993; Gotlieb, Grewal & Brown, 1994; Choi & Chu, 2001; Tian-Cole, Crompton & Willson, 2002; Chen, 2007; Chen, Chen & Hsieh, 2007; Kuo, Wu & Deng, 2009; He & Song, 2009). Hu et al (2009) defined customer

satisfaction as a cognitive or affective reaction that emerges in response to a single or prolonged set of service encounters.

Many studies have supported the view that customer satisfaction gives success to the organization and is liable for the profit (Bell & Zemke, 1988; Bitner, 1990; Heskett, Jones, Loveman, Sasser, & Schlesinger, 1994; Brown, Fisk, & Bitner, 1994; Hocutt, Chakraborty, & Mowen, 1997; Gilbert and Horsnell, 1998). Several researchers has showed customer satisfaction as customer's emotional reactions to the experience of a product and service (Oliver, 1981; Cadotte, Woodruff & Jenkins, 1987; Spreng & Mackoy, 1996; Gunderson, Heide, & Olsson, 1996 ).

In marketing theory and practice customer satisfaction plays an important role and it is one of factor for foundation of service marketing (Fujimura, 1992). Kondou (1999) has established a correlation between response and experience of the guest. Further according to Wang, Chen, & Zhao (2007) the service industry badly requires the attention on customer satisfaction and try to achieve more customer satisfaction on higher levels. However, most of the organization has focused on a customer satisfaction (Jones & Sasser, 1995). In tourism and hospitality industry like hotel, tourism and aviation organization try to satisfy customer on a priority basis (Barsky & Labagh, 1992; Leblanc, 1992; Legoheral, 1998; Pizam & Ellis, 1999). Lam and Zang (1999) considered customer's needs and wants in hospitality industry as service attributes which helps to fill the gap of customer satisfaction. Alternatively, Lam & Zang (1999) demonstrated his view in respect of marketing that once customer's demand is satisfied, organization can achieve customer satisfaction. According to Juwaheer (2004) customer satisfaction is positive mouth publicity for the hotel industry.

Success of the accommodation sector is primarily based on the revisit of the customer, which can be done by word-of-mouth publicity and with satisfied customers. A customer who receives what he or she expects in a hotel stay is most likely to be satisfied (Bowen and Shoemaker, 1998-1999). In this competitive world, hotel industry is facing problem related to amenities, services offered and price (Chaisawat, 1998). In hotel business it is mandatory to understand the factors related to customer satisfaction (Poon & Low, 2005). The relationship between profits, customer satisfaction and employees satisfaction of service profit chain was analyzed buy different researchers (Heskett et al., 1994; Loveman, 1998; Rucci et al., 1998 and Hallowell et al., 2000). According to service profit chain if the companies provides better internal service quality to their employees, and treat them as a customer, in revert they achieve higher employees satisfaction and by doing so productivity can be obtained from the organization. Ultimately, customer satisfaction and customer loyalty influence revenue growth and profits through increasing the volume of purchases and market share.

## OBJECTIVES

To analyze the level of guest satisfaction towards various aspects of hospitality services / products.

To find out the influence of guest satisfaction level on their intensity to revisit the hotel property.

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The goal of the present research is to understand the profile of customers / visitors and their level of satisfaction towards the various products and service attributes of the hospitality industry at Nainital. The study further investigates the factors largely influencing the customer satisfaction for probing their contribution in formulating the intension to revisit. The present research is descriptive in nature and follows survey method with the help of structured questionnaires from a sample of 200 overnight tourists from varied demographic background. The study investigate the satisfaction of customer based on the mean scores of their responses on 25 service attributes identified for the current study on a 5 point Likert scale ranging from very dissatisfied to fully satisfied. Principle component analysis with Varimax rotation was used a tool for dimension reduction in order to find few broad and meaningful factors of customer satisfaction. Multiple regression analysis was performed for understanding the contribution of each factor in determining their intention to revisit the accommodation units in study area.

## FINDINGS

The present study is focused on to understand the factors influencing the satisfaction level of the tourists staying at the accommodation units in Nainital. Responses on visitor satisfaction about various aspects of hospitality product were collected from 200 respondents belonging to various demographic segments with the help of personally administered structured questionnaires. Demographic profile of the respondents is presented in the following Table: 1.

**Table 1: Demographic Profile of Respondents (N=200)**

Demographic Variable	Frequency	Percentage
Age		
0-20	11	5.5
20-40	154	77.0
40-60	30	15.0
60-80	5	2.5
Gender		
Male	140	70.0

Demographic Variable	Frequency	Percentage
Female	60	30.0
<b>Marital Status</b>		
Single	93	46.5
Married	107	53.5
<b>Educational Qualification</b>		
Secondary	2	1.0
Higher secondary	11	5.5
Graduate	66	33.0
Post graduate	118	59.0
Any other	3	1.5
<b>Occupation</b>		
Self employed	67	33.5
Professional	80	40.0
Retired	4	2.0
Student	34	17.0
Other	15	7.5
<b>Monthly Income</b>		
Up to Rs. 20000/-	64	32.0
Rs. 20000/- to Rs. 40000/-	70	35.0
Rs. 40000/- to Rs. 60000/-	33	16.5
Rs. 60000/-to Rs. 80000/-	11	5.5
Rs. 80000/-to Rs. 100000/-	8	4.0
Above Rs.100000	14	7.0

Source: Primary Data.

Data from above table reveals that a single largest group of the respondents (77%) was from the age group between 20 to 40 years followed by 30% from the age group between 40 to 60 years, 5.5% were from the age group of up to 20 years and remaining 2.5% were from the age group of above 60 years. Out of total 200 respondents, 70% were male and 30% were female. As far as the marital status of tourists' sample is concerned, majority of the respondents (53.5%) were married whereas the remaining (46.5%) were single. In case of the educational level, more than half of the respondents (59%) were post graduate followed by 33% graduate and merely 1% were from higher secondary whereas, 1.5% were from the educational level 'other' including illiterates. In case of the distribution of the sample on the basis of the occupation of the respondents 40% of the respondents were professionals closely followed by 33.5% self-employed, 17% students, 7.5% from other professions including housewives and 2% retired. Perusal of the data reveals that 35% of all the respondents were having their monthly income between Rs. 20000/- to Rs. 40000/-, followed by 32% with income up to Rs. 20000/- per month, 16.5% with an income between Rs. 40000/- to Rs. 60000/- per month, 5.5% between Rs. 60000/- to Rs. 80000/- and 4% between

Rs. 80000/- to Rs. 100000/- per month while 7% were having their monthly income Above Rs. 100000/-.

The main purpose of the present research is to study the factors influencing the satisfaction level of the tourists staying at the accommodation units in Nainital. The respondents were asked to rate their satisfaction level corresponding to total 25 service attributes based on a 5-point Likert scale. The results were interpreted using mean score of each attribute based on the thumb rule where mean score < 1.5 denotes fully dissatisfied, mean score >1.5 and < 2.5 denotes dissatisfied, mean score >2.5 and <3.5 indicates neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, mean score >3.5 and <4.5 denotes satisfied and mean score >4.5 denotes fully satisfied respondents. The results are displayed in the following Table: 2. Data from the table suggests that majority of the respondents were found satisfied regarding the service attributes including most of the reservation process, availability of getting reservation

during peak season, hotel location is accessible, check in / out efficiency, reservation handling, television facility and decoration of the public and private spaces in the hotel (mean score ranges between >3.5 and < 4.5) while most of them were found neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (mean score ranges between >2.5 and < 3.5). However, perusal of the distribution of the responses suggests that a single largest group of the respondents were found dissatisfied about service attributes like tariff during peak season, parking facilities during peak season, courtesy and efficiency of the staff, cleanliness of the room, guest supplies and amenities, overall courtesy and friendliness, general condition of room, room temperature, restaurant, quality of services, quality and variety of food and value for money. The reason for the differences can be attributed to the larger value of standard deviation for these service attributes which is due to the distribution of the responses throughout the scale.

**Table 2: Satisfaction of the Respondents about Various Service Attributes**

S. No.	Service attributes	Fully Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither	Satisfied	Fully Satisfied	Mean (SD)
	Most of the reservation	15 (7.5)	15 (7.5)	31 (15.5)	115 (57.5)	24 (12.0)	3.59 1.04
	Availability of getting reservation during peak season	11 (5.5)	22 (11.0)	31 (15.5)	93 (46.5)	43 (21.5)	3.67 1.09
	Tariff during peak season	27 (13.5)	88 (44.0)	38 (19.0)	33 (16.5)	14 (7.0)	2.59 1.12
	Parking facilities during peak season	25 (12.5)	99 (49.5)	21 (10.5)	37 (18.5)	18 (9.0)	2.62 1.18
	Hotel location is accessible	4 (2.0)	19 (9.5)	25 (12.5)	120 (60.0)	32 (16.0)	3.78 0.89
	Safety and security in hotel	10 (5.0)	29 (14.5)	82 (41.0)	44 (22.0)	35 (17.5)	3.32 1.07
	Check in /out efficiency	16 (8.0)	14 (7.0)	34 (17.0)	109 (54.5)	27 (13.5)	3.58 1.06
	Reservation handling	7 (3.5)	22 (11.0)	32 (16.0)	105 (52.5)	34 (17.0)	3.68 0.99
	Bell staff efficiency	8 (4.0)	21 (10.5)	95 (47.5)	44 (22.0)	32 (16.0)	3.35 1.00
	Courtesy and efficiency	36 (18.0)	56 (28.0)	43 (21.5)	30 (15.0)	35 (17.5)	2.86 1.35
	Cleanliness of room first entering	11 (5.5)	59 (29.5)	63 (31.5)	42 (21.0)	25 (12.5)	3.05 1.10
	Cleanliness and service during your stay	31 (15.5)	42 (21.0)	61 (30.5)	38 (19.0)	28 (14.0)	2.95 1.25
	Guest supplies and amenities	1 (0.5)	47 (23.5)	86 (43.0)	35 (17.5)	31 (15.5)	3.24 0.99

S. No.	Service attributes	Fully Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neither	Satisfied	Fully Satisfied	Mean (SD)
	Overall courtesy and friendliness	25 (12.5)	53 (26.5)	55 (27.5)	36 (18.0)	31 (15.5)	2.97 1.25
	General condition of room	9 (4.5)	102 (51.0)	30 (15.0)	25 (12.5)	34 (17.0)	2.86 1.21
	Room Temperature	3 (1.5)	71 (35.5)	34 (17.0)	64 (32.0)	28 (14.0)	3.21 1.12
	Plumbing	12 (6.0)	47 (23.5)	83 (41.5)	41 (20.5)	17 (8.5)	3.02 1.01
	TV	6 (3.0)	19 (9.5)	33 (16.5)	111 (55.5)	31 (15.5)	3.71 0.94
	Décor	6 (3.0)	11 (5.5)	41 (20.5)	111 (55.5)	31 (15.5)	3.75 0.88
	Restaurant	22 (11.0)	63 (31.5)	59 (29.0)	43 (21.5)	13 (6.5)	2.81 1.09
	Quality of service	26 (13.0)	78 (39.0)	59 (29.5)	16 (8.0)	21 (11.5)	2.64 1.13
	Quality of food	40 (20.0)	90 (45.0)	37 (18.5)	17 (8.5)	16 (8.0)	2.39 1.13
	Variety	26 (13.0)	48 (24.0)	69 (34.5)	41 (20.5)	16 (8.0)	2.86 1.12
	Value for price	38 (19.0)	65 (32.5)	57 (28.5)	27 (13.5)	13 (6.5)	2.56 1.13
	Prompt service	15 (7.5)	29 (14.5)	107 (53.5)	28 (14.0)	21 (10.5)	3.05 1.00

Source: Primary Data.

Further, in order to evaluate the underlying dimensions of customer satisfaction regarding accommodation units in Nainital based on the views of respondents, principal component analysis with varimax rotation was conducted using all the 25 service attributes identified for present study. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin statistics of 0.860 and Bartlett's test of Sphericity statistics of 2716.34, shown in the Table: 3, indicated that the data were suitable for conducting factor analysis.

**Table 3: KMO and Bartlett's Test**

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.860
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	2716.349
	df	300
	Sig.	.000

As shown in Table: 4, principal component analysis yielded a seven factor solution based on the minimum Eigen value of one. These factors cumulatively explained 67.06% of the total variance in the data set. The first factor was labeled as 'front office & accessibility' consists of six items including most of the reservation process, availability of reservation during peak season, hotel location, check in / out efficiency, reservation handling and bell staff efficiency. With an Eigen Value of 7.98 this factor accounted for 31.92 per cent of total variance. The relatively large proportion of variance explained by this factor suggests that items under the factor 'front office & accessibility' are highly influential dimension for shaping the satisfaction of customer towards the hotel units.

**Table 4: Factor Analysis**

ITEMS	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7	Alpha
Most of the reservation	<b>.836</b>	.123	.078	.124	.158	.113	.076	.922
Availability of reservation during peak season	<b>.829</b>	-.062	-.026	.101	.188	.044	.064	
Hotel location is accessible	<b>.782</b>	.164	.116	-.011	.206	.051	-.076	
Check in /out efficiency	<b>.858</b>	.207	.000	.065	.077	.117	.006	
Reservation handling	<b>.818</b>	.199	-.062	.091	.029	.073	.053	
Bell staff efficiency	<b>.615</b>	.433	.055	.098	.042	.098	-.106	
Guest supplies and amenities	.380	<b>.507</b>	.257	-.098	.211	-.108	-.213	.724
General condition of room	.253	<b>.772</b>	.022	.049	.031	.068	.083	
Room temperature	.357	<b>.666</b>	.224	-.015	-.088	-.074	.128	
Tv	.092	<b>.722</b>	.001	.207	.066	.155	.057	
Decor	.118	<b>.762</b>	.050	.186	.106	.068	-.064	
Plumbing	.383	<b>.402</b>	.394	.115	.132	.229	-.136	
Restaurant	-.120	.214	<b>.722</b>	.190	.061	.078	-.212	.743
Quality of food	-.126	.113	<b>.687</b>	-.138	.115	.269	.244	
Variety	.222	-.012	<b>.848</b>	.118	-.013	-.090	.035	
Prompt service	.535	.241	-.124	<b>.576</b>	.105	.115	.179	.648
Courtesy and efficiency	.069	.284	-.180	<b>.429</b>	.124	.380	-.327	
Overall courtesy and friendliness	.095	.102	-.026	<b>.770</b>	.143	.054	.020	
Parking facilities during peak season	.201	.067	.134	.281	<b>.567</b>	.124	-.054	.625
Safety and security in hotel	.417	.305	.122	-.048	<b>.469</b>	-.103	-.116	
Cleanliness of room first entering	.339	-.475	.024	.143	.136	<b>.575</b>	-.014	.589
Cleanliness and service during your stay	.271	.109	.177	-.093	-.066	<b>.787</b>	.092	
Value for price	.030	.089	.090	.070	.101	.056	<b>.886</b>	
Quality of service	.276	-.179	.215	.059	-.053	-.159	<b>.679</b>	
Eigen value	7.98	2.26	1.86	1.32	1.16	1.11	1.04	
% of Variance	31.92	9.06	7.45	5.30	4.67	4.46	4.18	
Cumulative %	31.92	40.98	48.44	53.74	58.41	62.87	67.06	
Factor Level	Front office & accessibility	Ambience and amenities	Quality of food and service	Courtesy and efficiency	Safety and security	Cleanliness	value for money & Quality service	

Source: Primary Data. Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis with Varimax Rotation

Second factor was leveled as ‘ambience and amenities’ also included six items related to guest supplies and amenities, general condition of room, room temperature, television facility, décor and plumbing shared 9.06% of total variance with an Eigen value of 2.26 denotes that it is a significant factor of customer satisfaction but the items has a moderate influence on the overall satisfaction. The third factor, labeled as ‘quality of food and service’ with the Eigen value of 1.86 shares 7.45 % of the total variance comprises of three items related to restaurant, quality and variety of food. This factor also shows a moderate but significant influence on the customer satisfaction. The fourth factor, labeled as ‘courtesy

and efficiency’ included three items namely- prompt service, courtesy and efficiency and overall courtesy and friendliness of the staff having an Eigen value of 1.32 with a 5.30% of total variance of is also significant in determining the customer satisfaction though at a moderate extent. ‘Safety and security’ was the label given to the fifth factor which consists of two items including parking facilities and safety and security in hotel with 4.67% of total variance and an Eigen value 1.16. Again, this factor is a significant component of the customer satisfaction but the small individual Eigen values of the items suggest that this factor influences the satisfaction level at a moderate extent. The

sixth factor was labeled as 'cleanliness' included two items namely-cleanliness of room at first entering and cleanliness and service during stay. With an Eigen value 1.11 and 4.46% of total variance this factor also has a moderate influence on customer satisfaction however the 'cleanliness and service during stay' with individual factor loading of 0.787 is a significant contributor of overall satisfaction. The last factor was labeled as 'value for money and quality service' explained 4.18% of total variance in the data with an Eigen value of 1.04 suggests that it also has moderate influence on the customer satisfaction but the significant values of factor loadings for individual items suggest that both value for money and quality of service are the significant component of the customer satisfaction for the accommodation units in Nainital.

Further, these seven factors obtained from principal component analysis were tested for reliability through Cronbach's Alpha coefficients. The coefficients ranged from a high (0.922) to a low (0.589) which indicate that the items displayed a moderate correlation with their factor groupings and may be regarded as internally consistent and stable.

Intension to revisit any destination or accommodation unit is dependent on the satisfaction level of the visitor on various service attributes. In order to identify that which factor related to satisfaction of the guests is most important towards the intention to revisit, a multiple regression analysis was performed and the results are exhibited in the following Table 5.

**Table 5: Regression Results for Intension to Revisit**

Multiple R	.542				
Multiple R <sup>2</sup>	.518				
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	.502				
Std. Error of the Estimate	.49074				
Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)					
Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	35.016	7	5.002	6.084	.000
Residual	157.859	192	.822		
Variables in the equation					
Independent Variables	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	3.425	.034		53.419	.000
Cleanliness	.366	.034	.372	5.700	.000
value for money & Quality service	.276	.034	.357	-1.176	.000
Quality of food and service	.239	.034	.340	-.611	.000
Front office & accessibility	.171	.034	.268	.153	.031
Courtesy and efficiency	.164	.034	.246	2.557	.000
Ambience and amenities	.126	.034	.214	-.317	.000
Safety and security	.121	.034	.185	-1.294	.001

Source: Primary Data. Dependent variable: Intention to revisit

The results of multiple regression analysis depicted in above table suggest that intention to revisit is dependent on the factors influencing the customer satisfaction regarding the accommodation units in Nainital. Further, the examination of the table reveals that seven independent variables were included and the t-value for all the variable is significant at 1% level of significance except the independent variable 'front office and accessibility' which is significant at 0.05% level of significance indicating that all the seven variables are important predictors of the intention to revisit with regards to the accommodation units in Nainital. Result of ANOVA shows that the F-value of 6.084 is also significant which means that the regression as a whole is very significant.

In addition, the value of multiple R square (51.8%) and adjusted R square (50%) these seven factors influencing the customer satisfaction together contribute for more than 50% in the intention to revisit accommodation units in Nainital.

The table: 5 above also shows the relative contribution of each factor influencing the satisfaction in determining the intention to revisit in terms of standardized beta. The most important predictor of intention to revisit is 'Cleanliness' (beta=.372) closely followed by 'value for money & Quality service' (beta=.357) and 'quality of food and service'

(beta=.340). Hence, it can be concluded that the intention to revisit accommodation units in Nainital is dependent on the factors influencing the customers' satisfaction level.

## CONCLUSION

The study was successful in identifying the important factors influencing the customer's satisfaction. The results of data analysis suggest that the most appropriate market segment visiting Nainital is youth between 20-40 years of age, like to travel with their family members, educated (post graduates), professionals and, however, belongs to income group between Rs. 20000/- to Rs. 40000/- per month. In case of the customer satisfaction recorded about 25 service attributes, the results of the study report that the customers are not satisfied about service attributes like tariff and parking facilities during peak season, courtesy and efficiency of the staff, cleanliness of the room, guest supplies and amenities, overall courtesy and friendliness, general condition of room, room temperature, restaurant, quality of services, quality and variety of food and value for money which need to be improved in order to foster the customer satisfaction. Seven broad factors determining and influencing the customer satisfaction about accommodation units in Nainital were identified. These factors are: cleanliness, value for money and quality service, quality of food and service, front office and accessibility, courtesy and efficiency, ambience and amenities, and safety and security. Of these cleanliness, value for money and quality service, quality of food and service contribute highly in determining the customer satisfaction. The study also concludes that the intention to revisit the accommodation unit is dependent on the overall satisfaction level of customers.

## REFERENCES

- Abraham, P., & Taylor, E. (1999). Customer satisfaction and its measurement in hospitality enterprises. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 11(7), 326-339.
- Anderson, E. W., & Sullivan, M. (1993). The antecedents and consequences of customer satisfaction. *Marketing Science*, 12(Spring), 125-143.
- Barsky J., & Nash, L. (2003). Customer satisfaction: Applying concepts to industry-wide measures. *The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 44(4), 173-183.
- Barsky, J. D., & Huxley, S. J. (1992). A customer-survey tool: Using the quality sample. *The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 33(6), 18-25.
- Barsky, J. D., & Labagh, R. (1992). A strategy for customer satisfaction. *The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 35(3), 32-40.
- Bell, C. R., & Zemke, R. (1988). Do service procedures tie employee's hands? *Personal Journal*, September.
- Bowen, J. T., & Chen, S. L. (2001). The relationship between customer loyalty and customer satisfaction. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 13(5), 213-217.
- Brady, M. K., & Cronin, J. J. Jr. (2001). Some new thoughts on conceptualizing perceived service quality: A hierarchical approach. *Journal of Marketing*, 65(3), 34-50.
- Cadotte, E. R., Woodruff, R. B., & Jenkins, R. L. (1987). Expectations and norms in models of consumer satisfaction. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 24(3), 305-314.
- Choi, T. Y., & Chu, R. (2001). Determinants of hotel guests' satisfaction and repeat patronage in the Hong Kong hotel industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 20, 277-297.
- Daghfous, A., & Barkhi, R. (2009). The strategic management of information technology in UAE hotels: An exploratory study of TQM, SCM, and CRM implementations. *Technovation*, 29(9), 588-595. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2009.05.007>
- Gotlieb, J. B., Grewal, D., & Brown, S. W. (1994). Consumer satisfaction and perceived quality: Complementary or divergent constructs? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79(6), 875-885.
- Gronroos, C. (1984). *Strategic management and marketing in the service sector*. Chartwell-Bratt, London
- Gundersen, M. G., Heide, M., & Olsson, U. H. (1996). Hotel guest satisfaction among business traveler's: What are the important factors? *The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 37(2), 72-81
- Heskett, J. L., Jones, T. O., Loveman, G. W., Sasser, W. E. Jr., & Schlesinger, L. A. (1994). Putting the Service-Profit Chain to Work. *Harvard Business Review*, 72(2), 164-174.
- Hu, H. H. S., Kandampully, J., & Juwaheer, T. (2009). Relationships and impacts of service quality, perceived value, customer satisfaction, and image: an empirical study. *The Service Industries Journal*, 29(2), 111-125.
- Jones, T. O., & Sasser, W. E. Jr. (1995). Why satisfied customers defect? *Harvard Business Review*, 88-99.
- Juwaheer, T. D. (2004). Exploring international tourists' perceptions of hotel operations by using a modified SERVQUAL approach - A case study of Mauritius. *Managing Service Quality*, 14(5), 350-364.
- Kandampully, J., & Suhartanto, D. (2000). Customer loyalty in the hotel industry: The role of customer satisfaction and image. *Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 12(6), 346-351.
- KO, E., Sook, H. K., Myungsoo, K. J., & Young, W. (2008). Organizational characteristics and the CRM adoption process. *Journal of Business Research*, 61, 65-74.

- Lam, T., & Zhang, H. (1999). Service quality of travel agents: the case of travel agents in Hong Kong. *Tourism Management*, 20, 341-349.
- Oh, H. (1999). Service quality, customer satisfaction, and customer value: A holistic perspective. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 18(1), 67-82.
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1988). SERVQUAL: A Multiple-Item Scale for Measuring Consumer Perceptions of Service Quality. *Journal of Retailing*, 64(1), 12-40.
- Parasuraman, B., & Zeithaml, V. A. (1991). Perceived service quality as a customer-based performance measure: An empirical examination of organizational barriers using an extended service quality model. *Human Resource Management*, 335-64.
- Parasuraman, B., & Zeithaml, V. A. (1991). Understanding Customer Expectations of Service. *Sloan Management Review*, 39-48.
- Poon, W., & Low, K. L. (2005). Are travelers satisfied with Malaysian hotels? *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 17(3), 217-227.
- Shemwell, D. J., Yavas, U., & Bilgin, Z. (1998). Customer service provider relationship: An empirical test of a model of service quality, satisfaction and relationship-oriented outcome. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 9, 155-68.
- Valdani, E. (2009). *Cliente & Service Management*. Egea, Milan.
- Vavra, T. G. (1997). Improving your measurement of customer satisfaction: A guide to creating, conducting, analyzing, and reporting customer satisfaction measurement programs, *American Society for Quality*, p.42.
- Wang, M. Y. (2007). Introducing CRM into an academic library. *Library Management*, 28(6), 281-291.
- Woodside, A. G., Frey, L. L., & Daly, R. T. (1989). Linking service quality, customer satisfaction, and behavioral intention. *Journal of Health Care Marketing*, 9, 5-17