SATISFACTION AND LOYALTY AS INDICATORS OF THE QUALITY OF TOURISM PRODUCT ELEMENTS

Ivana Kostadinović[1], Sunčica Stanković[2*]

[1]University of Niš, Faculty of Economics, Niš, Serbia
[2]Center for strategic researching and national security – CESNA B,
Belgrade, Serbia

Abstract

The continuous expansion and diversification of tourism in recent decades have led to this branch of industry to become one of the largest and fastest growing in the world. Well-planned tourism generates benefits to destinations by increased revenue from tourism and employment. In this connection, the quality of tourism services, and this is the tourists' satisfaction with the quality of tourism services provided, as a precursor of loyalty, become crucial for the successful development of tourism. The subject of this research are satisfaction and loyalty as indicators of tourism product element quality. The aim of this study is to explore the connection between tourists' satisfaction with the quality of catering services, accommodation services, transportation services and in terms of the specific tourism event with their age structure and region they visited, as well as the connection between satisfaction of tourists with the quality of the elements of the tourist product and loyalty. In order to achieve this objective, the sample included 381 respondents. Answers that are relevant for the analysis yielded 357 respondents. For statistical analysis, multivariate analysis of variance and discriminant analysis were used. Research results indicated that there were significant statistical differences between the age structure and tourists' satisfaction, that these also corresponded to the region visited, and tourist loyalty depends on their satisfaction with the quality of elements of the tourist product.

Key words: tourism, tourism product, quality of tourism service, tourist satisfaction, tourist loyalty.

* Аутор за кореспонденцију: Сунчица Станковић, Центар за стратешка истраживања националне безбедности – ЦЕСНА Б, Војводе Влаховића 35ђ/1.2, 11000 Београд, Србија, suncicas@gmail.com

ЗАДОВОЉСТВО И ЛОЈАЛНОСТ КАО ПОКАЗАТЕЉИ КВАЛИТЕТА ЕЛЕМЕНАТА ТУРИСТИЧКОГ ПРОИЗВОДА

Апстракт

Континуирана експанзија и диверзификација туризма последњих деценија довели су до тога да ова привредна грана постане једна од највећих и најбрже растућих у свету. Добро испланирани туризам користи дестинацијама повећањем прихода од туризма и запосленошћу. С тим у вези, квалитет туристичких услуга, а самим тим и задовољство туриста квалитетом пружених туристичких услуга, као претходница лојалности – постају од кључног значаја за успешан развој туризма. Предмет овог истраживања су задовољство и лојалност као показатељи квалитета елемената туристичког производа. Циљ рада јесте испитивање повезаности задовољства туриста квалитетом угоститељских услуга, услуга смештаја, услуга превоза и пружања специфичног туристичког догађаја са њиховом старосном структуром и регионом који су посетили, као и повезаност између задовољства туриста квалитетом елемената туристичког производа и лојалности. Ради остварења овог циља, спроведено је истраживање које је обухватило 381 испитаника. Одговоре који су релевантни за анализу дало је 357 испитаника. За обраду података коришћене су мултиваријациона анализа варијансе и дискриминациона анализа. Резултати истраживања указују на то да постоје значајне статистичке разлике између задовољства и старосне структуре туриста, према региону који су посетили, као и да лојалност туриста зависи од њиховог задовољства квалитетом елемената туристичког производа.

Кључне речи: туризам, туристички производ, квалитет туристичке услуге, задовољство туриста, лојалност туриста.

INTRODUCTION

In modern conditions of the continual expansion and diversification of the tourism industry, but also the increased competitiveness within the global tourist market, the development of the quality of the tourist product, defined as ”satisfactory activity within the desired destination“ (Jefferson, & Lickorish, 1988), is becoming increasingly important (Țîțu et al., 2016). Numerous studies show that the perceived value, identified within the marketing literature in content of the foremost important measures for gaining a competitive advantage, a vital predictor and key determinant of customer satisfaction and loyalty (Petrick & Bakman, 2002; Parasuraman & Grewal, 2000; McDougall & Levesque, 2000). However, within the field of tourism, the intention to revisit a destination and the loyalty of tourists is commonly determined solely by measuring satisfaction and/or quality of services (Petrick & Bakman, 2002).

Parasuraman et al. (2005) define service quality as the degree and direction of the difference between consumer perceptions and expectations, while perceived quality, i.e. the difference between consumer expectations and perceptions, is defined as a measure of service quality.

Thus, service quality could be a construct that measures the difference between a consumer's expectations and perceptions (Hassan et al., 2013). Literature related to the quality of services within the field of tourism and recreation, dates from the early sixties of the last century (Baker & Crompton, 2000). Frochot (2004) believes that the character of tourism services, which is predicated on both the sale of consumer services and therefore the provision of services through which consumers can meet deep-rooted needs, makes their assessment reasonably complex. As the quality in general, and, also, the quality of services in tourism specifically, along with the satisfaction of tourists are complex multidimensional and dynamic concepts that are, further, jointly determined by individual characteristics and values of customers, situational and market forces (Zeithaml, 2000), deciding the determinants of consumer satisfaction (e.g. tourists) becomes an extremely difficult theoretical and empirical task (Fuchs, & Weiermair, 2003).

Defining consumer satisfaction varies greatly looking at the context (Sánchez-Rebull, Rudchenko, & Martin, 2018). Satisfaction is defined as a mismatch between the perception of expectations before and also the perception of performance after consuming goods/services - if performance differs from expectations, dissatisfaction occurs (Chen & Chen, 2010; Oliver,1980). When it involves tourism, tourist satisfaction is primarily seen as a function of expectations before and the actual travel experience (Chen & Chen, 2010). Tourists, like other consumers, generally have initial expectations about the sort and quality of services that certain destinations offer (Akama & Kieti, 2003). The extent of tourist satisfaction is set by the extent to which their expectations are met. If the general performance, during or after the tour of the tourist destination, exceeds or meets the initial expectations, then the tourist is satisfied. However, in situations when the perception of tourists about the performance is below initial expectations, then the tourist could also be dissatisfied. So, when the experience in regard to expectations ends up in a sense of satisfaction (or dissatisfaction), the tourist is satisfied (or dissatisfied) (Chen & Chen, 2010; Reisinger & Turner, 2003). In this regard, tourist satisfaction is one of the most important sources of competitive advantage of the destination because the most significant goal of tourism actors is to assess both the adequacy and effectiveness of tourism products in terms of facilities and services that together result in an unforgettable experience for tourists (Bagri, & Kala, 2015b). Satisfaction affects the choice of tourist destination, as well as the decision of tourists to return to it (Bagri, & Kala, 2015a; Armario, 2008; Kozak & Rimington, 2000). For this reason, satisfaction is considered a central concept in tourism (Prayag, 2009; Chen & Tsai, 2007), and a key indicator of the performance of the tourism industry(Prebežac & Mikulić, 2008). Although earlier literature encompasses several different meanings of satisfaction, the most common forms are transient and cumulative satisfaction (Eid et al., 2019; Nam et al., 2011; Ekinci et al,, 2008;

Yoon & Uysal, 2005). Transient satisfaction involves behavior and actions that occur when there is an interaction with the services (Eid et al., 2019; Oliver, 1997), while cumulative satisfaction is considered to be the type of recent experience process that is consistent with all encounters with the same service provider (Eid et al., 2019; Nam et al., 2011; Ekinci et al., 2008).

Loyalty is an integral a part of business, however, relatively little is known about consumer loyalty. Riley et al. (2001) imply that loyalty is commonly seen as an attraction that is difficult to define considering the variety of roles that both previous attitudes and values and repeated behavior play. The efforts of experts to exactly define a loyal consumer have resulted in little progress in determining the factors that result in loyalty. So, although loyalty is taken into account as the "backbone of business," this construct has remained a mystery (Gremler & Brown, 1996). One of the attempts to define a loyal consumer is that it is someone who is curious about repurchasing from the identical supplier of products/services or spreading the word of mouth (Liu et al., 2013). Loyalty may be a consequence of satisfaction of service users (Vogt, 2011) and it is unthinkable for a tourist to go to a destination again if they are dissatisfied (Oppermann, 2000). Measuring the satisfaction of service users, ie consumers, shows how much their expectations are met by a given transaction. Measuring consumer loyalty shows how much the user of products/services is willing to repeat the purchase or give a positive recommendation (Sagib & Zapan, 2014). Gremler & Brown (1999) divided loyalty into three different categories: 1) behavioral loyalty (behavior that ends up in repeat purchases); 2) intentional loyalty (possible intention to shop for again) and emotional loyalty (when the consumer considers that the merchandise/service completely coincides along with his values, ideas and preferences). In conditions of growing competition, tourist loyalty is taken into account as a vital means of maintaining the benefits of a tourist destination. Loyal tourists contribute to the loyalty of the destination, but also to the tourist loyalty to the whole area (Xu & Wang, 2016).

Numerous researchers have researched the connection between quality, satisfaction and loyalty, with the results of many studies showing that there is a positive relationship between these constructs in tourism: tourist satisfaction influences their intention to recommend a destination (Abdalla et al., 2014); the low level of tourist satisfaction significantly reduces their intention to go to the destination again (Assaker et al., 2011); the level of satisfaction features a great influence on the intentions of tourists (Dayour & Adongo, 2015). However, these relations are not always positive, because there are tourists who reconsider the same destination, but there are also those who want to go to new ones, despite the very fact that they are satisfied (Fyall et al., 2003). Thus, as a result of the action of many factors, the connection between satisfaction and loyalty is quite complex and is not always proportional (Lepojević, & Đukić, 2018). The results of a study conducted by Faullant et al. (2008) show that the connection between

satisfaction and loyalty does not seem linear, and that the causal link between these two constructions is not always clear. Based on the results of research on the quality of cruising tourism, conducted by Radić & Popesku (2018), satisfaction is positively related to the future behavior of the guest. The results of the research conducted by Lukić et al. (2020), on visitors from Serbia and abroad, show a higher degree of satisfaction with the atmosphere, safety during the stay within the destination and the relationship between visitors and the local community, in relation to tourist activities in the region, tourism product quality and social impact.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The subject of this research is satisfaction and loyalty as indicators of the tourism product elements quality. The aim of the research is to examine the connection between tourist satisfaction with the quality of tourism product elements (catering services, accommodation services, transport services and providing specific tourist event) with their age structure, and the region they visited, as well as the connection between tourist satisfaction with tourism service elements quality and loyalty. The target population consisted of tourists who visited Belgrade and the region of Southern and Eastern Serbia, regardless of marital status, length of stay and origin. The sampling method is convenient sampling, which is based on the selection of available population members (Fajgelj, 2005), and which, according to Mumuni and Mansour (2014), is widely used in research dealing with tourism. The conducted research included 381 respondents. Answers relevant to the analysis were given by 357 respondents, 175 (49.0%) of which are visitors to the Belgrade region, while 182 (51%) respondents are visitors to the region of Southern and Eastern Serbia. Most of respondents were men (55.2%), and most of respondents were within the age group "up to 24". According to the level of education, most respondents have completed secondary education (56.6%) (Table 1).

Table 1. Demographic structure of respondents (n = 357)

Total		n	%
Gender	Men	197	55.2
	Women	160	44.8
Region	Belgrade	175	49.0
	Southern and Eastern Serbia	182	51.0
Age	Up to 24	149	41.7
	25–39	72	20.2
	40–54	63	17.6
	55+	73	20.4
Education	Lower education	0	0.0
	Secondary education	202	56.6
	Higher education	155	43.4

Source: Author's calculation

Face-to-face techniques, a paper questionnaire and an electronic questionnaire were used to collect the data. The research, including the pilot test, was conducted in the period of February - April, 2019. The questionnaire is composed of three parts, with the questions in the first part related to the demographic characteristics of respondents. The second part contains questions related to respondents' satisfaction with the quality of the provided tourist services, while the third part refers to the respondents' intention to re-visit or recommend a destination they have visited. The list of elements of the tourist product was compiled from a review of the relevant literature (Bakić, 2002; Johann & Anastassova, 2014; Koutoulas, 2015). Respondents expressed the degree of their satisfaction on a 7 point Likert scale (1 – least; 7 – most).

In accordance with the subject and goal of the research, the following hypotheses were tested:

H_1: There is a significant statistical difference between the tourists' satisfaction with the quality of catering services, accommodation services, transport services, and the specific provided tourism event and tourist age structure, with respect to the region that have visited.

H_2: Tourists' satisfaction with the quality of catering services, accommodation services, transport services and the specific provided tourism event impacts their loyalty.

Testing hypothesis H_1 was conducted using multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) to explore the differences between age structure and region in relation to tourist satisfaction with the quality of: catering services, accommodation services, transportation services and the specific provided tourism event. To test hypothesis H_2, a discriminant analysis was applied, which classified the respondents into two groups "loyal" and "disloyal". The SPSS IBM Statistics Version 17 statistical package was used for data processing.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION OF ACHIEVED RESULTS

Testing the Hypothesis H_1

Factor multivariate analysis of variance was used to test hypothesis H_1, in order to investigate the differences between the age structure and the region in relation to tourist satisfaction. Satisfaction of tourists is expressed through four dependent variables: satisfaction with the catering services quality, satisfaction with the accommodation services quality, satisfaction with the quality of transport services (transfer to and within the destination) and satisfaction with the provided specific tourism event (entertainment, attractions, knowledge). The independent variables were the age structure of the tourists (up to 24, 25–39, 40–54, and 55 +) and the type of region (Belgrade and the region of Southern and Eastern Serbia) they visited. The

assumption of homogeneity of the matrices of variance and covariance was not violated because the value of Sig. Boxing index $= 0.002 > 0.001$.

        Descriptive measures (Table 2) indicate that, according to the age structure and region, the highest average value can be attributed to the visitors to the Belgrade region in the group "25 - 39", with the variable "satisfaction with the quality of the specific provided tourist event", while the largest standard deviation from the average value can be attributed to the visitors from the region of Southern and Eastern Serbia in the group "55 +" for the variable "satisfaction with the quality of the accommodation services."

Table 2. Descriptive statistics

	Age of tourists	Region	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Satisfaction with the quality of the catering services	Up to 24	Belgrade	4.67	.750	89
		Southern and Eastern Serbia	4.30	.619	60
	25-39	Belgrade	4.73	.837	41
		Southern and Eastern Serbia	4.19	.654	31
	40-54	Belgrade	4.12	.711	26
		Southern and Eastern Serbia	4.62	.639	37
	55 +	Belgrade	3.74	.653	19
		Southern and Eastern Serbia	4.39	.899	54
Satisfaction with the quality of the accommodation services	Up to 24	Belgrade	4.64	.757	89
		Southern and Eastern Serbia	4.17	.886	60
	25-39	Belgrade	4.29	.873	41
		Southern and Eastern Serbia	4.35	.661	31
	40-54	Belgrade	3.58	.703	26
		Southern and Eastern Serbia	3.92	.983	37
	55 +	Belgrade	3.53	.841	19
		Southern and Eastern Serbia	3.63	.996	54
Satisfaction with the quality of the transport services	Up to 24	Belgrade	4.48	.693	89
		Southern and Eastern Serbia	3.88	.691	60
	25-39	Belgrade	4.44	.673	41
		Southern and Eastern Serbia	4.10	.597	31
	40-54	Belgrade	3.92	.744	26
		Southern and Eastern Serbia	4.03	.799	37
	55 +	Belgrade	4.05	.621	19
		Southern and Eastern Serbia	4.37	.760	54
Satisfaction with the quality of the provided specific tourist event	Up to 24	Belgrade	4.80	.786	89
		Southern and Eastern Serbia	3.88	.715	60
	25-39	Belgrade	5.00	.671	41
		Southern and Eastern Serbia	3.65	.486	31
	40-54	Belgrade	4.38	.637	26
		Southern and Eastern Serbia	4.49	.692	37
	55 +	Belgrade	4.00	.745	19
		Southern and Eastern Serbia	4.15	.737	54

Source: Author's calculation in SPSS

Table 3 shows the multivariate tests. Statistical significance for all independent variables is p = 0.000 < 0.05 in relation to tourist satisfaction, so that the null hypothesis of no differences between satisfaction and age of tourists, considering the region they visited, is rejected.

The preliminary examination examined the assumptions about normality, linearity, univariate and multivariate atypical points, homogeneity of matrices of variance-covariance and multicollinearity, with no serious violation of the assumptions (Green & Salking, 2014; Pallant, 2007). There were significant statistical differences between the age structure of tourists and the type of region they visited in relation to the combination of dependent variables. There was a statistically significant difference in tourist satisfaction according to: age structure, $F_{(12, 915)} = 6.236$, $p = 0.0001 < 0.05$; Wilks' Lambda = 0.812; partial eta squared = 0.067 (medium impact) (Cohen, 1988, 284–287); the region they visited, $F_{(4, 364)} = 14.617$, $p = 0.0001 < 0.05$; Wilks' Lambda = 0.855; partial eta squared = 0.145 (large impact); age structure and the region visited, $F_{(12, 915)} = 6.206$, $p = 0.0001 < 0.05$; Wilks' Lambda = 0.813; partial eta squared = 0.067 (medium impact).

Table 3. Multivariate tests

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Age of tourists	Pillai's Trace	.196	6.094	12.000	1044.000	.0001	.065
	Wilks' Lambda	.812	6.263	12.000	915.000	.0001	.067
	Hotelling's Trace	.222	6.381	12.000	1034.000	.0001	.069
	Roy's Largest Root	.161	14.050	4.000	348.000	.0001	.139
Region	Pillai's Trace	.145	14.617	4.000	346.000	.0001	.145
	Wilks' Lambda	.855	14.617	4.000	346.000	.0001	.145
	Hotelling's Trace	.169	14.617	4.000	346.000	.0001	.145
	Roy's Largest Root	.169	14.617	4.000	346.000	.0001	.145
Age of tourists * Region	Pillai's Trace	.193	5.994	12.000	1044.000	.0001	.064
	Wilks' Lambda	.813	6.206	12.000	915.000	.0001	.067
	Hotelling's Trace	.222	6.372	12.000	1034.000	.0001	.069
	Roy's Largest Root	.179	15.555	4.000	348.000	.0001	.152

Source: Author's calculation in SPSS

By separately considering the results of the dependent variables (Table 4), after Bonferroni correction alpha level is 0.013, the differences between the age structure and the satisfaction of tourists with the quality of the catering services, $F_{(3, 349)} = 4.733$, $p = 0.003$; partial eta squared = 0.039, and accommodation services $F_{(3, 349)} = 18.137$, $p = 0.0001$; partial eta squared = 0.135. Statistical significance of differences was achieved between the regions visited by tourists and their satisfaction with the quality of the provided specific tourist event $F_{(1, 349)} = 36.584$, $p = 0.0001$; partial eta squared = 0.095. Statistical significance of differences was achieved between the age structure of tourists, according to the region they visited and

satisfaction with the quality of the catering services, F (3, 349) = 11,932, p = 0.0001; partial eta squared = 0.093; accommodation service F (3, 349) = 4.152, p = 0.007; partial eta squared = 0.034; transport services, F (3, 349) = 7.353, p = 0.0001; partial eta squared = 0.059, and the specific provided tourist event F (3, 349) = 19.088, p = 0.0001; partial eta squared = 0.141.

Table 4. Tests of between-subjects effects

Source	Dependent variable	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Age of tourists	Satisfaction with the quality of the catering services	3	2.589	4.733	.003	.039
	Satisfaction with the quality of the accommodation services	3	13.140	18.137	.0001	.135
	Satisfaction with the quality of the transport services	3	1.039	2.090	.101	.018
	Satisfaction with the quality of the provided specific tourist event	3	1.412	2.803	.040	.024
Region	Satisfaction with the quality of the catering services	1	.274	.500	.480	.001
	Satisfaction with the quality of the accommodation services	1	.005	.007	.933	.0001
	Satisfaction with the quality of the transport services	1	1.224	2.462	.118	.007
	Satisfaction with the quality of the provided specific tourist event	1	18.434	36.584	.0001	.095
Age of tourists * Region	Satisfaction with the quality of the catering services	3	6.527	11.932	.0001	.093
	Satisfaction with the quality of the accommodation services	3	3.008	4.152	.007	.034
	Satisfaction with the quality of the transport services	3	3.657	7.353	.0001	,059
	Satisfaction with the quality of the provided specific tourist event	3	9.618	19.088	.0001	,141

Source: Author's calculation in SPSS

Therefore, it can be concluded that hypothesis H_1 is accepted, i.e. that There is a significant statistical difference between tourists' satisfaction with the quality of catering services, accommodation services, transport services, and the specific provided tourism event and tourist age structure, with respect to the region visited.

Testing the Hypothesis H_2

Discriminant analysis was used to classify respondents into "loyal" and "disloyal" groups. The value of Sig. Boxing index M = 0.003 > 0.001, so that the assumption of homogeneity of the covariance matrices is not violated.

Table 5 shows group statistics. Based on the results, it can be seen that the average values of the groups and "loyal" and "disloyal" are the highest for the variable "satisfaction with the quality of the catering services", while the largest standard deviation from the average value in the group "disloyal" for the variable "satisfaction with the quality of the accommodation services."

Table 5. Group statistics

Loyalty		Mean	Std. Deviation	Valid N (listwise)	
				Unweighted	Weighted
Loyal	Satisfaction with the quality of the catering services	4.54	.747	299	299.000
	Satisfaction with the quality of the accommodation services	4.21	.911	299	299.000
	Satisfaction with the quality of the transport services	4.32	.674	299	299.000
	Satisfaction with the quality of the provided specific tourist event	4.51	.761	299	299.000
Disloyal	Satisfaction with the quality of the catering services	3.91	.732	58	58.000
	Satisfaction with the quality of the accommodation services	3.74	.947	58	58.000
	Satisfaction with the quality of the transport services	3.67	.825	58	58.000
	Satisfaction with the quality of the provided specific tourist event	3.62	.768	58	58.000

Source: Author's calculation in SPSS

The total indicator of Wilk's Lambda shows that the discriminant function, determined by the χ^2 test, is statistically significant, χ^2 (df = 4) = 72.394, p <0.001, the value of Sig. = 0.000, shows that the null hypothesis is rejected and that the application of discriminant analysis makes sense. The eigenvalue shows a canonical correlation of 0.431. By squaring the canonical correlation, a value of 0.1858 was obtained, i.e. 18.58% of the variance of the dependent variable (loyal and disloyal) was explained on the basis of four independent variables (satisfaction with the quality of the catering services, satisfaction with the quality of the accommodation services, satisfaction with the quality of the transport services, and satisfaction with the quality of the specific provided tourist event). The variable "satisfaction with the quality of the provided specific tourist event" has the strongest (discriminatory load = 0.903), and the variable "satisfaction with the accommodation services quality" the weakest impact (discriminatory load = 0.394) on the separation of respondents into two groups. By separately considering the results of independent variables using Wilk's Lambda indicator and univariate indicator F, it was concluded that all independent variables reach statistical significance for classifying respondents into two groups: satisfaction with the

quality of the catering services $F (1, 355) = 34.179$, $p = 0.0001 < 0,05$; satisfaction with the quality of the accommodation services $F (1, 355) = 12.554$, $p = 0.0001 < 0,05$; satisfaction with the quality of the transport services $F (1, 355) = 41.72$, $p = 0.0001 < 0.05$); satisfaction with the quality of the provided specific tourist event $F (1, 355) = 65.840$, $p = 0.0001 < 0.05$ (Table 6).

Table 6. Diagnostic of discriminant analysis

Predictor variables	Discriminatory load	Mean group value Loyal	Disloyal	Wilk's Lambda	F	Sig.
Satisfaction with the quality of the catering services	.650	4.54	3.91	.912	34.179	.0001
Satisfaction with the quality of the accommodation services	.394	4.21	3.74	.966	12.554	.0001
Satisfaction with the quality of the transport services	.718	4.32	3.67	.895	41.712	.0001
Satisfaction with the quality of the provided specific tourist event	.903	4.51	3.62	.844	65.840	.0001
Total indicator of Wilk's Lambda				.815	Chi-square: 72.394	.0001
Eigenvalue				.228		
Canonical Correlation				.431		

Source: Author's calculation in SPSS

The results of the classification (Table 7) show that 73.1% of cases are correctly classified. The classification of results shows that 72.9% were correctly classified for the group "loyal", and 74.1% were correctly classified for the group "disloyal". Based on the value of the indicator Q ($Q = 76.20 > 6.63$), the accuracy of the prediction is higher than the classification accuracy based on randomness at a statistically significant level ($p < 0.01$).

Table 7. Classification results

		Loyalty	Predicted group affiliation Loyal	Disloyal	Total
Original data	Number of cases	Loyal	218	81	299
		Disloyal	15	43	58
	%	Loyal	72.9	27.1	100.0
		Disloyal	25.9	74.1	100.0
a. 73.1% of original grouped cases correctly classified.					

Source: Author's calculation in SPSS

Having in mind the above, it can be concluded that hypothesis H_2 is accepted, i.e. that tourists' satisfaction with the quality of catering services, accommodation services, transport services and the specific provided tourism event impacts their loyalty.

CONCLUSION

This research is focused on examining the relationship between tourist satisfaction with the tourism product elements quality and the age structure of respondents according to the region they visited, as well as examining the relationship between tourist satisfaction with tourism product elements quality and tourist loyalty. Understanding the tourism product is a prerequisite for efficient destination marketing, but also for the phenomenon of tourism in general.

The results of the research showed that satisfaction with the quality of tourist services largely depends on the age structure and region visited by tourists, with the greatest statistical significance of the difference observed between satisfaction and region. By separately considering the results of the dependent variables, the differences between the age structure and the tourists' satisfaction with the accommodation services quality reached the greatest statistical significance. The age structure of tourists, according to the type of region they visited, has the greatest impact on satisfaction with the specific provided tourist event quality, and the smallest on satisfaction with the accommodation services quality.

Also, the obtained results showed that the satisfaction of tourists with the quality of the elements of tourist services has impact on their loyalty. By dividing the respondents into two groups (loyal and disloyal), it was determined that "satisfaction with the quality of the provided tourist event" has the strongest influence on the separation between the groups.

The limitations of the conducted research are, first of all, reflected in the limitedness of the sample only for visitors to Belgrade and the region of Southern and Eastern Serbia, while there is no data on other regions in Serbia the tourists visited. In addition, since this is a convenient sample, the generalization of the results is very limited. Also, one of the limitations of the research is that it is an *ad hoc* research, i.e. the research that was conducted in one period of time, so that the degree of connection between the quality of the elements of the tourist product, satisfaction and loyalty cannot be accepted with certainty.

This research included respondents who visited Belgrade and the region of Southern and Eastern Serbia. In that sense, future research could be extended to visitors from other regions in Serbia. In addition, future research may address the relationship between tourist satisfaction with the quality of elements of a tourist product with their origin and length of stay

in a particular region or destination. Having in mind the importance of the quality of the elements of the tourist product, as well as the satisfaction of tourists, on the formation of the base of loyal tourists, in order to better understand the relationship between the quality of the elements of the tourist product and satisfaction and loyalty of tourists, further research is needed which should be conducted on a more representative sample.

In practical terms, the results of this research indicate that improving the quality of the elements of the tourist product (service), leads to a higher level of satisfaction, and thus to the loyalty of tourists, which, as a final result, increases the base of loyal tourists. Considering that tourism has become one of the largest and fastest growing industries in the world that generates benefits for destinations, the quality of tourist services, and thus the satisfaction of tourists with the quality of tourist services, as a precursor to loyalty, become crucial for successful tourism development. In this regard, the need to increase research on improving the quality of the elements of the tourist product, as well as on the satisfaction and loyalty of tourists, is one of the key implications of this research.

REFERENCES

Abdalla, M.M., Ribas, J.R., da Costa Vieira, P.R. (2014). The antecedents of word of mouth intentions about a Brazilian tourist destination. *Tourism & Management Studies*, 10 (1), 104–111.

Akama, S. J., & Kieti, M. D. (2003). Measuring tourist satisfaction with Kenya's wildlife safari: a casestudy of Tsavo West National Park. *Tourism Management*, 24. 73–81. doi: 10.1016/s0261-5177(02)00044-4

Assaker, G., Vinzi, V.E., & O'Connor, P. (2011) Examining the effect of novelty seeking, satisfaction, and destination image on tourists' return pattern: A two factor, non-linear latent growth model. *Tourism Management*, 32 (4), 890–901. doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2010.08.004

Armario, E. M. (2008). Tourist satisfaction: an analysis of its antecedents in *Asociación   Española de Dirección y Economía de la Empresa International Conference*, Spain, 2008, 367-382.

Baker, D.A., & Crompton, J.L. (2000). Quality, satisfaction and behavioral intentions. *Annals   of   Tourism   Research*,   27,   785-804.   doi: 10.1016/S0160-7383(99)00108-5

Bagri, C. S., & Kala, D. (2015a). Tourists' satisfaction at Trijuginarayan, India: an importance-performance analysis. *An International Journal of Akdeniz University Tourism Faculty*, 3 (2), 89-115.

Bagri, C. S., & Kala, D. (2015b). Tourists' satisfaction at Trijuginarayan: an emerging spiritual and adventure tourist destination in Garhwal Himalaya India. *Turizam*, 19 (4), 165–182. doi: 10.18421/TRZ19.04-03

Bakić, O. (2002). *Marketing menadžment turističke destinacije*. Ekonomski fakultet, Beograd

Chen, C.F., & Chen, F.S. (2010). Experience quality, perceived value, satisfaction and behavioral intentions for heritage tourists, *Tourism management*, 31 (1), 29-35. doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2009.02.008

Chen, C., & Tsai, D. (2007). How destination image and evaluative factors affect behavioral intentions?. *Tourism Management*, 28, 1115–1122. doi: 10.16/j.tourman.2006.07.007

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral science*. Hillsdale, NY: LawrenceErlbaum Associates.

Dayour, F., & Adongo, C.A. (2015). Why they go there: International tourists' motivations and revisit intention to Northern Ghana. *American Journal of Tourism Management* , 4 (1), 7–17. doi: 10.5923/j.tourism.20150401.02

Eid, R., El-Kassrawy, A. Y., & Agag, G. (2019). IntegratIng destInatIon attrIbutes, polItIcal (In)stabIlIty, destInatIon Image, tourIst satIsfactIon, and IntentIon to recommend: A study of UAE. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, XX (X), 1 –28. doi: 10.1177/109634801983775020191

Ekinci, Y., Dawes, P., & Massey, G. (2008). An extended model of the antecedents and consequences of consumer satisfaction for hospitality services. *European Journal of Marketing*, 42 (1/2), 35-68. doi: 10.1108/03090560810840907

Fajgelj, S (2005). Metode istraživanja ponašanja, drugo dopunjeno izdanje. Beograd: Centar za primenjenu psihologiju.

Faullant, R., Matzler, K., & Füller, J. (2008). The impact of satisfaction and image on loyalty: The case of Alpine ski resorts. Managing Service Quality, 18, (2), 163-178. doi: 10.1108/09604520810859210

Frochot, I. (2004). An investigation into the influence of the benefits sough by visitors on their quality evaluation of historic houses' service provision. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 10 (3), 223-237. doi: 10.1177/1356766670401000303

Fuchs, M., & Weiermair, K. (2003). New perspectives of satisfaction research in tourism destinations. *Tourism Review*, 58 (3), 6-14. doi: 10.1108/eb058411

Fyall, A., Callod, C., & Edwards B. (2003). Relationship marketing: The challenge for destinations. *Annals of Tourism*, 30 (3), 644-659. doi: 10.1016/S0160-7383(03)00046-X

Green, M., & Salking, N. (2014). *Using SPSS for windows and Macintosh: Analyzing and under-standing data*. New York, NY: Pearson Education.

Gremler, D. D., & Brown, W. S. (1996). Service loyalty: Its nature, importance, and implications in Edvardsson, B. et al. (Eds) *Advancing service quality: A global perspective*. International Service Quality Association, 171-180.

Hassan, M., Hassan, S., Nawaz, S. M., & Aksel, I. (2013). Measuring customer satisfaction and loyalty through service fairness, service quality and price fairness perception: an empirical study of pakistan mobile telecommunication sector. *Science International (Lahore)*, 25(4), 971-980.

Jefferson, A., & Lickorish, L. (1988). *Marketing Tourism*. Harlow: Longman.

Johann, M., & Anastassova, L. (2014). The perception of tourism product quality and tourist satisfaction: the case of Polish tourists visiting Bulgar. *European Journal of Tourism Research*, 8(8), 99-114.

Koutoulas, D. (2015). Understanding the tourism product. *Interim symposium of the Research Committee on International Tourism (RC 50) of the International Sociological Association (ISA)*, on the topic: UNDERSTANDING TOURISM - THEORETICAL ADVANCES 14-16 May 2004, University of the Aegean, Mytilini, Greece. Doi: 10.13140/RG.2.1.2250.4806

Kozak, M., & Rimmington, M. (2000). Tourist satisfaction with Mallorca, Spain, as an off-season holiday destination. *Journal of Travel Research*, 38(3), 260-269. doi: 10.1177/004728750003800308

Lepojević,V., & Đukić, S. (2018). Factors affecting customer loyalty in the business market - an empirical study in the Republic of Serbia. *FACTA UNIVERSITATIS*,

Series: Economics and Organization, 15 (3), pp. 245 - 256 Doi: 10.22190/ FUEO1803245L

Liu, S., Law, R., Rong, J., Li, G., & Hall, J. (2013). Analyzing changes in hotel customers' expectations by trip mode. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 34 (1), 359–371. doi: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2012.11.011

Lukić, D., Stanković, S., Petrović, M.D., Radovanović, M.M., & Vuković, D. (2020). How can small-scale events contribute to the tourism progress of an undeveloped border area? Lesson from Eastern Serbia. *GeoJournal of Tourism and Geosites*, 30(2spl), 905–912. doi:10.30892/gtg.302spl17-521

McDougall, G. H. G., & Levesque, T. (2000). Customer satisfaction with services: Putting perceived value into the equation. *Journal of Services Marketing* 14(5), 392-410. doi: 10.1108/08876040010340937

Mumuni, A., & Mansour, M. (2014). Activity-based segmentation of the outbound leisure tourism market of Saudi Arabia. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 20(3), 239-252. doi: 10.1177/1356766714522258

Nam, J., Ekinci, Y., & Whyatt, G. (2011). Brand equity, brand loyalty and consumer satisfaction. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 38 (3), 1009-1030. doi: 10.1016/j.annals.2011.01.015

Oliver, R. (1980). A cognitive model of the antecedents and consequences of satisfaction decisions. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 17, 460–469. doi: 10.2307/3150499

Oliver, R. L. (1997). *Satisfaction: A behavioral perspective on the consumer*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill

Oppermann, M. (2000). Tourism destination loyalty. *Journal of Travel Research*, 39 (1), 78-84. doi: 10.1177/004728750003900110

Pallant, J. (2007). *SPSS survival manual—A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS for windows* (3rd ed.). Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V., & Berry, L.L. (1985). A conceptual model of service quality and its implications for future research, *Journal of Marketing*, 49 (4), 41-50. doi: 10.2307/1251430

Parasuraman, A., & Grewal, D. (2000). The impact of technology on the quality-value-loyalty chain: A research agenda. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 28 (1), 168-170. doi: 10.1177/0092070300281015

Petrick, J.F., & Backman, S.J. (2002). An examination of the construct of perceived value for the prediction of golf travelers' intentions to revisit. *Journal of Travel Research*, 41 (1), 38-45. doi: 10.117/004728750204100106

Prayag, G. (2009). Tourist's evaluation of destination image, satisfaction and future behavioural intentions – The case of Mauritius. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 26, 836-853. doi: 10.1080/10548400903358729

Prebežac, D., & Mikulić, J. (2008). Imidž destinacije i ključni čimbenici percipirane atraktivnosti destinacije. [Destination image and key drivers of perceived destination attractiveness]. *Tržište*, 20 (2), 163–178.

Radić, A., & Popesku, J. (2018). Quality of cruise experience: Antecedents and consequences. *TEME*, XLII (2), 523-539. Doi: 10.22190/TEME1802523R

Reisinger, Y., & Turner, L. W. (2003). *Cross-cultural behaviour in tourism: Conceptsand analysis*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Riley, M., Niininem, O., Szivas, E. E., & Willis T. (2001). The case for process approaches in loyalty research in tourism. *The International Journal of Tourism Research*, 3(1), 23-32. doi: 10.1002/1522-1970(200101/02)3:1<23: :aid-jtr290>3.0.co;2-m

Sagib, G. K., & Zapna, B. (2014). Bangladeshi mobile banking service quality and customer satisfaction and loyalty. Management & Marketing. Challenges for the Knowledge Society, 9 (3), 331 – 346.

Sánchez-Rebull, M.-V., Rudchenko, V., & Martín, J.-C. (2018). The antecedents and consequences of customer satisfaction in tourism: a systematic literature review. *Tourism and Hospitality Management*, 24, (1), 151-183. doi: 10. 20867/thm.24.1.3

Țîțu, A. M., Răulea, S. A., & Țîțu, S. (2016). Measuring service quality in tourism industry. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 221, 294 – 301. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.05.118

Vogt, C.A. (2011). Customer relationship management in tourism: Management needs and research applications. *Journal of Travel Research*, 50, (4), 356–364. doi: 10.1177/0047287510368140

Zeithaml, A. V. (2000). Service quality, profitability and the economic worth of customers: What we know and what we need to learn. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 28 (1), 67-85. doi: 10.1177/0092070300281007

Yoon, Y., & Uysal, M. (2005). An examination of the effects of motivation and satisfac-tion on destination loyalty: A structural model. *Tourism Management*, 26 (1), 45-56. doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2003.08.016

ЗАДОВОЉСТВО И ЛОЈАЛНОСТ КАО ПОКАЗАТЕЉИ КВАЛИТЕТА ЕЛЕМЕНАТА ТУРИСТИЧКОГ ПРОИЗВОДА

Ивана Костадиновић[1], Сунчица Станковић[2]
[1]Универзитет у Нишу, Економски факултет, Ниш, Република Србија
[2]Центар за стратешка истраживања националне безбедности – ЦЕСНА Б, Београд, Србија

Резиме

У савременим условима континуиране експанзије и диверзификације туристичке индустрије, као и повећане конкуренције на глобалном туристичком тржишту, развијање квалитета туристичког производа постаје све значајније. С тим у вези, квалитет туристичких услуга, а самим тим и задовољство туриста квалитетом пружених туристичких услуга, као претходница лојалности – постају од кључног значаја за успешан развој туризма.

Предмет овог истраживања су задовољство и лојалност као показатељи квалитета елемената туристичког производа. Циљ рада је испитивање повезаности сатисфакције туриста квалитетом угоститељских услуга, услуга смештаја, услуга превоза и пружања специфичног туристичког догађаја са њиховом старосном структуром и регионом који су посетили, као и повезаност између задовољства туриста квалитетом елемената туристичког производа и лојалности.

У складу са предметом и циљем истраживања, постављене су следеће хипотезе: Х1: Постоје значајне статистичке разлике између задовољства туриста квалитетом угоститељских услуга, услуга смештаја, услуга превоза и пружених специфичних туристичких догађаја и старосне структуре туриста, с обзиром на регион који су посетили. Х2: Задовољство туриста квалитетом угоститељских услуга, услуга смешта-

ја, услуга превоза и пруженог специфичниог туристичког догађаја утиче на њихову лојалност.

Тестирање хипотезе X1 спроведено је применом мултиваријационе анализе варијансе (МАНОВА) како би се истражиле разлике између старосне структуре и региона у односу на задовољство туриста квалитетом угоститељских услуга, услуга смештаја, услуга превоза и пружањем специфичног туристичког догађаја. За тестирање хипотезе X2 примењена је дискриминациона анализа, којом су испитаници класификовани у две групе: „лојални" и „нелојални".

Резултати истраживања указују на то да постоје значајне статистичке разлике између задовољства и старосне структуре туриста, према региону који су посетили, као и да лојалност туриста зависи од њиховог задовољства квалитетом елемената туристичког производа.

У практичном смислу резултати ове студије упућују на то да унапређење квалитета елемената туристичког производа (услуге) доводи до већег нивоа задовољства, а самим тим и до лојалности туриста. Што се недостатака овог истраживања тиче, они се, пре свега, огледају у ограничености узорка само на посетиоце Београдског региона, те региона Јужне Србије и Источне Србије.