



Bui, Hien ORCID logoORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3146-7098> and Robinson, Peter (2024) The asymmetric effect of all-inclusive holiday service quality attributes on tourist satisfaction. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 31 (3). pp. 714-735.

Downloaded from: <https://ray.yorks.ac.uk/id/eprint/9558/>

The version presented here may differ from the published version or version of record. If you intend to cite from the work you are advised to consult the publisher's version:  
<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/13567667241229447>

Research at York St John (RaY) is an institutional repository. It supports the principles of open access by making the research outputs of the University available in digital form. Copyright of the items stored in RaY reside with the authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may access full text items free of charge, and may download a copy for private study or non-commercial research. For further reuse terms, see licence terms governing individual outputs. [Institutional Repositories Policy Statement](#)

# RaY

Research at the University of York St John

For more information please contact RaY at  
[ray@yorks.ac.uk](mailto:ray@yorks.ac.uk)

# **EVALUATING THE ASYMMETRIC EFFECT OF ALL-INCLUSIVE HOLIDAY SERVICE QUALITY ATTRIBUTES ON TOURIST SATISFACTION**

## **Abstract**

All-inclusive holidays have regained popularity among budget-conscious holidaymakers amidst inflation and living cost crisis. Following the pandemic, tourists are now staying at the hotel more and venture out less, which further makes all-inclusive holidays more popular than ever. With the increasing popularity of all-inclusive holidays, knowledge expansion of this tourism segment is necessary. This study extends the under-developed all-inclusive holiday literature by exploring service quality attributes of all-inclusive holidays and evaluating their asymmetric effect on tourist satisfaction. Suggestions on prioritizing service quality attributes for improvement are expected to support industry practitioners in managing service quality and satisfaction strategically.

**Keywords: all-inclusive holidays, package tourism, asymmetric effect, service quality attributes, tourist satisfaction**

## **1. Introduction**

The tourism industry has been one of the most hard-hit by the Covid-19 pandemic as evidenced in the massive loss of \$935 billion in revenue within the first 10 months of 2020 alone (Madden, 2021). While the industry is on the road to recovery, it is currently facing the challenges of higher taxes, energy bills and living cost crisis. Travel industry research reveals that one in three holidaymakers will cut holiday spending in 2023 in the wake of soaring inflation and living costs (Topham, 2022). Though such challenges are likely to delay the industry recovery post-Covid 19, there is light at the end of the tunnel.

The living cost crisis has fueled the demand for all-inclusive holidays. Barrhead

Travel, a UK online travel agent revealed on the first Saturday of January 2023 that “all-inclusive holidays are the most type of holidays for summer 2023, accounting for more than 25% of bookings” (McConnell, 2023). EasyJet Holidays also reported that some 70% of their bookings are for all-inclusive holidays (Lancefield, 2022). The popularity of all-inclusive holidays can be ascribed to the fact that this travel model empowers tourists to better control the total cost of their holiday (Bui, 2022). As the name implies, an all-inclusive holiday (usually) includes everything from travel, accommodation, meals to entertainment bundled in a single pre-paid package (Bui, 2022). Holidaymakers can accordingly manage their budget and have no or few unexpected charges at check out. Indeed, 77% of holidaymakers believe that an all-inclusive holiday is the least stressful way to travel (Fox, 2022).

While regaining popularity is obviously beneficial to thriving all-inclusive tourism, it is challenging for this segment to retain customers. Staff deficiency (Bilgili et al., 2016), a lack of close supervision in service quality standards (Ozturk et al., 2019), and provision of low-quality food and beverage services to reduce costs (Okumus et al., 2020) have been ongoing issues in the management of all-inclusive holidays. Those service quality issues will adversely affect a healthy growth of all-inclusive holidays in the long run as service quality is a critical determinant of all-inclusive holiday choice (Cetinsoz and Artuger, 2014; Wong and Kwong, 2004), and of all-inclusive holiday satisfaction (Ozturk et al., 2019; Yolal et al., 2017). Therefore, research is needed to support all-inclusive holiday service providers in minimizing the satisfaction-hampering impact of such service quality issues while maximizing profitability.

To support industry practitioners in better managing the service quality of all-inclusive holidays without compromising financial yields, an examination of the asymmetric effect of service quality attributes on tourist satisfaction in this tourism segment is critical. According to the three-factor theory, attributes fall into either the basic factors, the

performance factors, or the excitement factors (Matzler and Sauerwein, 2002). The basic factors are composed of dissatisfaction-causing attributes on their absence without inducing satisfaction on their presence. The performance factors include attributes triggering dissatisfaction if not fulfilled and satisfaction if delivered. The excitement factors are characterized by attributes increasing customer satisfaction if delivered without causing dissatisfaction on their absence. Accordingly, different product or service attributes exert differential effects on the overall product or service satisfaction (Matzler and Sauerwein, 2002). Some product or service attributes only induce satisfaction while some others only trigger dissatisfaction (Fuller et al., 2006). Therefore, an understanding of the asymmetries between attribute performance and overall satisfaction is beneficial to the management in better decisions on product and/or service improvement (Fuller and Matzler, 2008). However, no research has attempted to examine the asymmetries between attribute performance and tourist satisfaction in all-inclusive holidays to date.

Given the paucity of all-inclusive knowledge, and the on-going issues and challenges in managing service quality, the research makes an original contribution by being the first to examine the asymmetric effect of service quality attributes on tourist satisfaction in all-inclusive holidays. The research aimed to (1) empirically identify service quality attributes of all-inclusive holidays and (2) evaluate the asymmetric effect of the attributes on tourist satisfaction. To that end, this study adopted the three-factor theory and a mixed methods approach. A netnographic study was first conducted to qualitatively identify service quality dimensions and attributes of all-inclusive holidays. An online survey was then launched to quantitatively validate the attributes and examine their asymmetric effect on tourist satisfaction by penalty-reward contrast analysis (PRCA), impact range performance analysis (IRPA) and impact asymmetry analysis (IAA).

## **2. Literature Review**

### **2.1. Asymmetric Effect of Attribute Performance on Customer Satisfaction**

Customer satisfaction is a vital ingredient for such key aspects of a business's success as favourable words of mouth (Luo and Homburg, 2007) and positive economic returns (Adinegara et al., 2017). In acknowledgment of customer satisfaction as the lifeblood of every business, the interdisciplinary literature has seen extensive scholarly approaches to theorize the concept such as the expectancy-disconfirmation (Oliver, 1977; Oliver, 1980), the comparison level (LaTour and Peat, 1979; Thibault and Kelly, 1959), and the value-percept disparity (Westbrook and Reilly, 1983). However, those theories commonly consider customer satisfaction as an outcome of a symmetric influence of attribute performance.

The expectancy-disconfirmation theory, for example, suggests that if attribute performance meets or exceeds customer expectations, customers will be satisfied. In contrast, if performance falls short of expectations, a negative disconfirmation will trigger customer dissatisfaction. Grounded on such 'traditional' view, many studies (Kartika et al., 2020; Qu and Ping, 1999; Rao and Sahu, 2013) have investigated the attribute performance and customer satisfaction in a symmetric manner. Qu and Ping (1999), for example, symmetrically assess the service performance of cruise travel on Hong Kong tourists. The scholars find that the high performance of food and beverage facilities and quality, and staff induces satisfaction while the low performance of attractiveness, variety and organization of entertainment, sport/fitness, shopping and childcare facilities, and seating space in food and beverage outlets triggers dissatisfaction among the travelers.

The symmetric assumption of attribute performance-satisfaction effect; however, has been challenged by the exploration of asymmetries. Many studies (Mersha and Adhlaka, 1992; Mikulic and Prebezac, 2008; Slevitch and Oh, 2010) indicate that the relationship between attribute performance and customer satisfaction is nonlinear or asymmetric. Mersha

and Adhlaka (1992), for example, find that staff indifference is ranked very high as an attribute of poor quality; however, staff enthusiasm or helpfulness is ranked low as an attribute of good quality. This indicates that the presence of staff enthusiasm/helpfulness (i.e., the absence of staff indifference) does not necessarily lead to or increase satisfaction. An investment in improving the staff enthusiasm/helpfulness is, accordingly, neither cost-effective nor efficient in increasing overall customer satisfaction for industry practitioners. The findings apparently challenge the ‘traditional’ view of symmetric performance-satisfaction relationship. An understanding of the asymmetric relationship between attribute performance and customer satisfaction is, therefore, of paramount importance in securing the profit-satisfaction link.

To facilitate the understanding of attribute performance and customer satisfaction, the three-factor theory of customer satisfaction was developed. The three-factor theory is rooted in Kano et al. (1984)’s theory of attractive quality which includes five factor categories of attractive, must-be, one-dimensional, indifferent, and reverse quality attributes (Fuller and Matzler, 2008). According to the theory, attractive quality attributes are satisfiers when they are present, without causing dissatisfaction on their absence. Must-be quality attributes are dissatisfiers when they are absent, without inducing satisfaction when they are present. Reverse quality attributes are, in contrast, either dissatisfiers when they are present or satisfiers when they are absent. One-dimensional quality attributes can be either satisfiers on their presence or dissatisfiers on their absence. Indifferent quality attributes are, in contrast, neither satisfiers nor dissatisfiers regardless of their presence and/or performance. Among those five factors, the attractive, must-be, and one-dimensional are more widely acknowledged and applied than the indifferent and reverse quality attributes. This can be ascribed to the disconfirmation of those attributes by some prior studies. Ting and Chen (2002), for example, find no reverse quality attributes in their study. In a similar vein, Tan

and Shen (2000) exclude indifferent and reverse factors due to their inapplicability to their research approach and to the fact that indifferent factors exert no impact on customer (dis)satisfaction. As a result, the three factors of attractive, must-be, and one-dimensional quality attributes are commonly highlighted as the most salient in the theory of attractive quality (Matzler et al., 1996; Shahin et al., 2013).

The salient three-factor structure of attractive, must-be, and one-dimensional quality attributes in Kano et al. (1984)'s model has been tailored and further explored. Matzler and Sauerwein (2002), for example, propose basic factors (i.e., must-be attributes), performance factors (one-dimensional attributes), and excitement factors (i.e., attractive attributes). This approach has typically been adopted and adapted (Albayrak, 2018; Fuller and Matzler, 2008, Mikulic and Prebezac, 2008). Fuller and Matzler (2008), for example, refer to basic factors, performance factors, and excitement factors as dissatisfiers, hybrids, and satisfiers respectively. Mikulic and Prebezac (2008) similarly refer to performance factors as hybrids and notably further subdivide basic factors into dissatisfiers and frustrators, and excitement factors into satisfiers and delighters. Dissatisfiers, frustrators, hybrids, satisfiers, and delighters are demonstrated based on the studies by Mikulic and Prebezac (2008) and Fuller and Matzler (2008) as follows.

*Dissatisfiers and frustrators (i.e., extreme dissatisfiers) are basic factors which are minimum requirements taken for granted by customers. If they are absent or their performance is poor, customers are dissatisfied. However, if they are present or their performance is high, customers are not necessarily satisfied. Dissatisfiers and frustrators, accordingly, relate to overall customer satisfaction in a negative asymmetry.*

*Hybrids are performance factors which connect with overall customer satisfaction in a positive and symmetric relationship. They are usually expected by customers, and*

*trigger (dis)satisfaction if they are (not) fulfilled.*

*Satisfiers and delighters (i.e., extreme satisfiers) are excitement factors which exhibit a positive asymmetric relationship with overall customer satisfaction. They are attractive attributes that customers do not usually expect in advance and induce satisfaction if delivered but do not cause dissatisfaction if absent.*

Mikulic and Prebezac (2008)'s attribute classification approach has been widely adopted by tourism and hospitality studies (Coghlan, 2012, Pratt et al., 2020). Consistent with such previous studies, the current research adopts Mikulic and Prebezac (2008)'s approach to evaluate the asymmetric effect of all-inclusive holiday service quality attributes on tourist satisfaction by identifying dissatisfiers, frustrators, hybrids, satisfiers, and delighters.

## **2.2. Service Quality Attributes in the Context of All-inclusive Holidays**

To accurately articulate the service quality attributes in the context of all-inclusive holidays, it is critical to reflect on the all-inclusive concept, and typical services of this tourism segment. Morrison (1989, p. 260) defines the all-inclusive concept in tourism as “a generic term for packages that include all or nearly all the elements that travellers require for their trips, including airfare, lodging, ground transportation, meals, recreation and entertainment, taxes, and gratuities”. The definition indicates that the all-inclusive concept represents package tourism and points to such typical services of all-inclusive holidays as transport, accommodation, meals, and entertainment. Some studies on Asian tourism markets such as Mainland China, Hong Kong, and Taiwan (for example, Chen et al., 2019; McKercher and Wong, 2013) commonly refer to the all-inclusive concept as escorted outbound multi-destination package tours which essentially include such services as tour guiding, and attractions. However, several others (for example, Aguilo and Rossello, 2012; Jayawardena, 2002; Oviedo-Garcia et al., 2019) consistently claim that the all-inclusive



mechanism encourages people to spend most of their time within the accommodation premises to get the money worth out of the holiday. This highlights the importance of lodging-related service quality attributes on customer satisfaction with all-inclusive holidays and suggests that such services as attractions, and tour guiding/escort services are not typically included in an all-inclusive package.

In the light of the all-inclusive concept, and the importance of lodging-relevant service quality attributes in customer satisfaction with all-inclusive holidays, the literature review on the service quality attributes in the context of lodging and package tours were reviewed (Table 1). The review shows that in the lodging context, previous studies commonly shed light on service attributes relevant to staff, food and beverage, physical environment, room, leisure facilities (Alexandris et al., 2006; Amin et al., 2013; Juwaheer, 2004; Wu and Ko, 2013). In the package tours context, service attributes related to hotel/accommodation, transportation, tour guide/leader, shopping arrangements, attractions, leisure activities, food and beverage/catering services were featured (Caber and Albayrak, 2018; Chan et al., 2015; Chen et al., 2018; Jin et al., 2014; Lin and Kuo, 2019; Wang et al., 2000; Wang et al., 2007; Wang et al., 2013). Such service attributes uncovered by previous relevant studies formed, to some extent, the basis for the identification of service quality attributes of all-inclusive holidays by the current research.

**[Insert Table 1 here]**

### **3. Study 1: Exploring All-inclusive Holiday Service Quality**

#### **3.1. Data Collection**

To examine the asymmetric effect of service quality attributes on tourist satisfaction in all-inclusive holidays, the service quality attributes must be identified. However, no prior studies have empirically explored the all-inclusive holiday service quality

attributes. Therefore, a qualitative approach of netnography was first conducted to empirically explore the service quality attributes of all-inclusive holidays. Netnography was employed as it grants the researcher access to online customer posts on public forums or websites (Nelson and Otnes, 2005). Accordingly, TripAdvisor, the largest global online travel community (Mate et al., 2019), was employed as the data collection platform. The employment of TripAdvisor was premised on its merit as a valid and credible source of data for tourism and hospitality research (Stoleriu et al., 2019).

To collect relevant reviews, the key word *all-inclusive* was inputted in the search field on TripAdvisor homepage. Three criteria were also applied to collect relevant reviews. First, only reviews in English were included to ensure the comprehension of the content by the researchers. Second, only reviews posted within 6 months from the date of stay were collected to minimize the memory effect. Third, reviews must be between 2021 and 2022 for a contemporary picture of all-inclusive service quality. 250 valid TripAdvisor reviews on all-inclusive holidays were collected in February 2022. The collected reviews were analyzed by two experienced researchers with the assistance of the qualitative data analysis tool of NVivo.

### **3.2. Results of Study 1**

The analysis revealed twenty-five service quality attributes of all-inclusive holidays which were categorized into seven categories, including staff, physical environment, food and beverage, room, transport, entertainment, and value-added services. An inter-coder reliability check was conducted in SPSS to measure the level of (dis)agreement between the coders. The resulting Kappa coefficient of 0.71 ( $p < .001$ ) indicated a statistically significant intercoder reliability. The results of dimensions and (sub)attributes (Table 2) importantly drove the development of the survey questionnaire in Study 2.

[Insert Table 2 here]

#### **4. Study 2: Evaluating Asymmetric Effect of All-inclusive Holiday Service Quality Attributes on Tourist Satisfaction**

##### **4.1. Questionnaire Development**

The set of all-inclusive holiday service quality attributes were initially generated from the results of Study 1 (Table 2). The results of Study 1 were compared with the measurements by relevant previous studies on the service quality in the contexts of lodging and package tours (Table 1) to better decide on the inclusion of measurement items. 91 items were generated and evaluated on relevance and applicability by a panel of six academics from Sheffield Hallam University, University of Surrey, The Ohio State University, Hong Kong Baptist University, Fernando Pessoa University and Edith Cowan University. 66 measurement items were retained for the main survey. Two attention checks were added to the questionnaire to retain more credible responses (Kung et al., 2018; Ladini, 2022). One instructional manipulation check (“All meals were served a la carte (please tick 1-strongly disagree)”) was included in the measurement scale of food and beverage. One nonsensical measurement item (“I was seated next to the pilot during the flight to the destination”) was added to the measurement scale of transport.

The questionnaire was structured into three main sections. Section 1 included general and relevant multiple-choice questions about the most recent all-inclusive holidays. Section 2 was composed of eight seven-point Likert scales in which respondents were asked to rate the performance of staff, physical environment, food and beverage, room, entertainment, transport, value-added services attributes, overall service quality, and overall satisfaction. The questionnaire was concluded with the demographic questions in Section 3.

## **4.2. Data Collection**

The survey was distributed on the online panel platform of Prolific as its participant recruitment, and obligations are transparent (Palan and Schitter, 2018). Prolific provides a higher quality of respondents' comprehension, attention, and honesty than MTurk (Eyal et al., 2021). Such online panels as Prolific are more efficient in recruiting knowledgeable and viewpoint-oriented samples than face-to-face surveys (Duffy et al., 2005).

A total of 650 valid responses were obtained in March 2022 from those who have been on an all-inclusive holiday entirely organized by a tour operator between 2020 and 2022 and passed the attention checks. An exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was conducted to examine the dimensionality of all-inclusive holiday service quality. Penalty-reward contrast analysis, impact range performance analysis and impact asymmetry analysis were then conducted to evaluate the asymmetric effect of all-inclusive holiday service quality attributes on tourist satisfaction.

## **4.3. Results of Study 2**

### **4.3.1. Survey Participants**

A slightly larger proportion of female respondents (52.9%) participated in the survey compared to their male counterparts (47.1%) (Table 3). The participants of both genders were overwhelmingly Caucasian/white, accounting for 64.2%. In terms of age, 68% of those aged between 25 and 44 made up more than half of the survey population, in which those aged between 25 and 34 and between 34 and 44 occupied 35.5% and 32.5% respectively. Many respondents are married, accounting for 35.8%.

Popular destinations for all-inclusive holidays were also uncovered. Although no destination emerged as an overwhelmingly popular all-inclusive holiday spot, the Canary Islands and Greece appeared more attractive to the respondents than the other places as

14.6% and 11.5% of participants reported that their most recent all-inclusive holiday was in those two destinations respectively. Noticeably, nearly half of the respondents (49.5%) spent 7 days or less in such destinations, and only 7.2% reported that their most recent all-inclusive holiday was 15 days or more.

**[Insert Table 3 here]**

#### **4.3.2. Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA)**

EFA should be performed to minimize the effect of multicollinearity and inter-variable correlations when conducting impact range performance analysis and impact asymmetry analysis in the subsequent stages (Back, 2012). Therefore, EFA was performed using principal components extraction with direct oblimin rotation. As shown in Table 4, the EFA revealed fifty-five items under nine factors (staff, arrival & departure personal touch, transport, food and beverage, entertainment, room, physical environment, location, Covid-19 services) were retained. The nine factors explained 70.25% of the variance and showed good reliability as evidenced in the Cronbach's alpha coefficient exceeding the threshold of 0.7 (DeVaus, 2002).

**[Insert Table 4 here]**

#### **4.3.3. Asymmetric Effect of All-inclusive Holiday Service Quality Attributes on Tourist Satisfaction and Discussion**

In the first step, penalty-reward contrast analysis (PRCA) was performed using dummy variables and multiple regressions. The first set of dummy variables was created by coding the lowest performance attributes as 1 and the others as 0. The second set of dummy variables was generated by coding the highest performance attributes 1 and the others as 0. The two sets of dummy variables (i.e., the independent variables) were then regressed on overall satisfaction (i.e., the dependent variable). Regression coefficients for the first set and

the second set of dummy variables were penalty indices (PI) and reward indices (RI) respectively.

In the second step, impact range performance analysis (IRPA) was performed. The absolute values of PI and RI were totalled to arrive at the impact range (IR) of an attribute on tourist satisfaction. Their satisfaction-generating potential (SGP) and dissatisfaction-generating potential (DGP) were subsequently calculated by dividing their RI and PI by their IR respectively.

In the third step, impact asymmetry analysis (IAA) was conducted. The DGP of attributes was subtracted from their SGP to derive impact asymmetry indices (IA). Based on the obtained IA indices, service quality attributes were classified into five categories, namely Frustrators ( $IA < -0.4$ ), Dissatisfiers ( $-0.1 > IA \geq -0.4$ ), Hybrids ( $0.1 \geq IR \geq -0.1$ ), Satisfiers ( $0.4 \geq IA > 0.1$ ), Delighters ( $IA > 0.4$ ) (Mikulic and Prebezac, 2008). Briefly, the following equations were applied.

$$IR = |RI| + |PI|$$

$$SGP = |RI| / IR$$

$$DGP = |PI| / IR$$

$$IA = SGP - DGP$$

Findings (Table 5) illuminated asymmetries in the effect of service quality attributes on tourist satisfaction. In the dimension of staff, all staff conduct- and problem solving-related attributes were characterized by negative asymmetries as they were either classified as frustrators or dissatisfiers. Staff expertise-related attributes had notably both symmetric and asymmetric effects on tourist satisfaction. Symmetric effect was evidenced in the hybrid attribute of *service efficiency*. Asymmetric effect was shown in the classification of *service knowledge* and *extra cost clarification* as frustrators and satisfiers respectively. Accordingly, it is prominent that while most staff attributes exhibited negative asymmetries, the attribute

*extra cost clarification* showcased positive effects on satisfaction. The negative effects of the staff conduct-, problem solving- and expertise-relevant dissatisfiers and frustrators signified the need to maintain their performance at standardized levels to prevent dissatisfaction. The positive effects of *extra cost clarification* confirmed the significance of cost transparency in satisfaction posited by previous studies in the tourism industry in general (Mattila and Choi, 2005) and in the bundled vacation packages in specific (Tanford et al., 2010).

Symmetric and asymmetric effects on tourist satisfaction with all-inclusive holidays were similarly found in the dimension of Covid-19 services. Symmetric effect was displayed in hybrid attribute of *Covid tests*. Asymmetric effect was attested in the findings of the satisfier *Covid procedures*, and the delighter *Covid supplies*. The positive effects of Covid-19 services on satisfaction highlighted the importance of health and safety measures which significantly influence the post-covid recovery of the hospitality industry (Jimenez-Medina et al., 2022). Therefore, health and safety measures should not only be a contemporary response to any particular pandemic but a strategic move for hotels to satisfy and delight customers and to build a positive and resilient brand image in the long run.

In the dimension of arrival & departure personal touch, *on-arrival offerings* (satisfier), and *luggage assistance*, and *post-checkout service allowance* (delighters) indicated positive asymmetries while the frustrators *late checkout facilities* and *post-checkout buggy service* illuminated negative asymmetries. While previous studies (Padma and Ahn, 2020) merely focused on check-in and check-out as on-arrival and departure services, the current research covered a more comprehensive range of critical services on arrival and departure. The positive and negative effects of those services on satisfaction emphasized the important role of personal touch in tourist experience. Although the convenience and efficiency of self-check-in kiosks and non-contact services in the tourism industry are acknowledged (Moon et

al., 2021), the current study posits that arrival and departure personal touch is necessary to create travellers' memorable first and last impressions.

The attributes in the dimension of location exhibited both positive and negative asymmetries as evidenced in the findings of the satisfier *central area accessibility*, and the frustrator *convenient location*. This showed that while the attribute of *convenient location* is taken for granted, the other attribute of *central area accessibility* is unexpected and highly appreciated by customers if the service is offered. The findings on the asymmetric effects of location on all-inclusive holiday satisfaction emphasized the importance of location in this tourism segment. It is worthwhile for those who create and sell all-inclusive holiday packages to reconsider the role of their all-inclusive hotel/resort partners' location. This is premised on the previous research findings that all-inclusive holiday organizers tend to downplay the location of all-inclusive resorts (Wall-Reinius et al., 2019).

In the dimension of transport, flight efficiency and transfer efficiency attributes fell into either positive or negative asymmetries. While *seats* (delighter), *flight punctuality* (delighter), and *airport check-in* (delighter) exerted positive asymmetric effect on satisfaction; *legroom* (dissatisfier), *flight schedule* (dissatisfier), *on-board services* (frustrator), *luggage handling* (frustrator) showed negative asymmetries. The findings of both positive and negative effects of transport attributes in all-inclusive holiday satisfaction offered a valuable insight to the management of this tourism segment, especially to tour operators. Transport services can be out of direct control by all-inclusive holiday tour operators as they may outsource transportation services to third-party providers and may arrange, for example, shuttle services, for transfers between the airport and the accommodation. However, in light of the current research's findings on the importance of transport service quality in overall tourist satisfaction with all-inclusive holidays, tour operators must be alert to the critical role of cooperating with reliable transport providers for



well-organized transport services if transport is included in a prepaid all-inclusive holiday package.

In the dimension of room, *comfort* showcased positive effect on satisfaction as shown in the identification of *decoration* (i.e., visual comfort) and *temperature* (i.e., thermal comfort) as delighters and satisfiers respectively. In contrast, *size* was reflective of negative asymmetries, except for *bathroom size* which was found to be a delighter. The other attributes of *cleanliness* (frustrator) and *bedding quality* (frustrator) also fell into negative asymmetries. Compared to Ozturk et al. (2019)'s all-inclusive holiday study in which only room cleanliness was covered, the current research offered a more holistic insight into important room attributes that were found to be influential to overall satisfaction positively and negatively. Moreover, the findings of positive asymmetries of the attributes could support the management in their service quality improvement. Accordingly, such negative attributes as cleanliness and bedding quality need more attention, especially when their performance falls low, than such positive attributes as decoration or temperature.

In the dimension of food and beverage, all attributes were identified as either frustrators or dissatisfiers. This indicated that food and beverage-related attributes were all strongly associated with negative asymmetries. Similarly, all attributes (either dissatisfiers or frustrators) in the dimension of entertainment and in the dimension of physical environment had negative asymmetric effect on tourist satisfaction. The sole negative asymmetries of food and beverage, and entertainment services reflected that those services are considered fundamental requirements by tourists. This can be attributed to the fact that "all the package tours presented to the market are very similar. Itineraries offered by travel agencies possess high degrees of similarity with reference to entertainment and food" (Wong and Kwong, 2004, p. 582). As those services are basic components of different types of holiday packages,

it is critical for all-inclusive holiday service providers to maintain a satisfactory level of quality and quantity to prevent dissatisfaction.

**[Insert Table 5 here]**

## **5. Conclusion and Implications**

### **5.1. Conclusion**

Service quality and tourist satisfaction have generally been well-researched. However, knowledge about those important research arenas in the particular context of all-inclusive tourism is sparse. To extend and advance knowledge of service quality and satisfaction in this tourism segment, the current research was conducted to evaluate the asymmetric effect of all-inclusive holiday service quality attributes on satisfaction.

By applying the three-factor theory of customer satisfaction, the service quality attributes were classified into basic factors (i.e., factors with negative asymmetries), performance factors (i.e., factors with symmetries), and excitement factors (i.e., factors with positive asymmetries). The three-factor theory was further extended to five categories of frustrators and dissatisfiers (basic factors), hybrids (performance factors), and satisfiers and delighters (excitement factors) to better delineate the asymmetric effect of service quality attributes on tourist satisfaction in all-inclusive holidays.

The illuminated asymmetric effect of the all-inclusive holiday service quality attributes on satisfaction by the current research challenges the traditional view of linear effects by previous studies on all-inclusive holidays (Ozdemir et al., 2012; Ozturk et al., 2019). The findings also lends empirical support to the asymmetric relationships between attribute-level performance and satisfaction claimed by prior academics (Anderson and Sullivan, 1993; Oliva et al., 1992).

This study was aimed at further developing knowledge of all-inclusive tourism and supporting industry practitioners in improving the segment's service quality and satisfaction without compromising profitability. To that end, the theoretical and practical implications are discussed below.

## **5.2. Theoretical Implications**

The service quality of all-inclusive holidays remains untapped. Service quality has simply identified as one of the selection criteria for all-inclusive holidays among tourists (for example, Cetinsoz and Artuger, 2014; Wong and Kwong, 2004), and a determinant of tourist satisfaction with all-inclusive resorts (for example, Ozturk et al., 2019; Yolal et al., 2017). No studies have focused on exploring the service quality dimensions and attributes of all-inclusive holidays. The current study filled the knowledge gap through a netnographic approach. Seven service quality dimensions and twenty-five attributes were identified, including staff (expertise, conduct, problem-solving, communication, availability), physical environment (ambient conditions, public area cleanliness, design), food and beverage (labelling, hygiene, variety, sensory appeal), room (maintenance, size, comfort, amenities), entertainment (availability of activities, leisure facilities quality, attractiveness of activities), transport (flight efficiency, transfer efficiency), and value-added services (on-arrival personal touch, covid-19 services, location, (post)check-out support).

Very few studies (Centisoz and Artuger, 2014; Wong and Kwong, 2004; Yolal et al., 2017) have, to some extent, covered all-inclusive holiday service quality. Those studies; however, were conducted in a piecemeal manner, covering either all-inclusive travel agencies' service quality or all-inclusive resorts' service quality. More specifically, scholars (Centisoz and Artuger, 2014; Wong and Kwong, 2014) merely point to service quality of travel agencies as an antecedent of all-inclusive tour selection. The service quality of travel

agencies who provide all-inclusive tours was not explored and/or measured. Yolal et al. (2017) better measured the service quality of all-inclusive resorts; however, the adoption of SERVQUAL exposes certain shortcomings as its dimensions are not generic for universal across-discipline application (Amin et al., 2013). The scholars also grounded the generation of measurement items in each dimension on Parasuraman et al. (1991)'s scale rather than on the all-inclusive tourist perspective. Therefore, the study's generated knowledge of all-inclusive resorts service quality is distanced from what contemporary tourists perceive.

The foregoing shortcomings in the extant all-inclusive tourism service quality have been addressed by the current study. By covering both services by hoteliers (Staff, Physical environment, Food and beverage, Room, Entertainment, Value-added services) and tour operators (Transport, Value-added services), this study creates a more holistic picture of all-inclusive holiday service quality. Compared to Yolal et al. (2017)'s study in which the service quality of all-inclusive resorts was measured by SERVQUAL, the service quality dimensions and attributes identified the current study are more germane to all-inclusive holidays as they were identified and refined from the customer perspective. As such, the current study not only adds new knowledge to the extant service quality literature and to the current scholarship on all-inclusive tourism, but also creates fundamentals for future studies if testing the relationship between service quality of all-inclusive tourism and, for example, tourist loyalty or behavioural intentions is of interest.

Very few previous studies (Ozdemir et al., 2012; Ozturk et al., 2019) have studied satisfaction in all-inclusive holidays. Such studies mainly focused on satisfying attributes. Hybrid and dissatisfying attributes have been overlooked. Moreover, satisfaction-influencing attributes in all-inclusive holidays have merely been adopted from the literature. The application of those attributes to studying all-inclusive tourists is therefore questionable. Such drawbacks of previous studies have been addressed by the current research through an

empirical identification of not only satisfying attributes but also hybrids and dissatisfying ones. The identification of satisfiers, delighters, hybrids, dissatisfiers, and frustrators by the current study provides a more comprehensive picture of tourist satisfaction in all-inclusive holidays. The extant literature on tourist satisfaction in all-inclusive holidays is accordingly advanced.

The asymmetric effect of service quality attributes on tourist satisfaction with all inclusive holidays has not been evaluated by any previous studies. By filling the gap, the research revisits the conventional linear approach to the effect of service quality on satisfaction by the extant all-inclusive holiday literature (for example, Ozturk et al., 2019; Yolal et al., 2017) and advances knowledge on the effect of service quality attributes on satisfaction the context of all-inclusive holidays.

This study contributes to the discourse on analytical approaches to the asymmetric effect of attributes on satisfaction and to the prioritization of attributes. To evaluate the asymmetric effect of attributes on satisfaction, previous studies have applied the critical incident technique (Holloway and Beatty, 2008), the analysis of complaints and compliments (Friman and Edvardsson, 2003), the importance grid (Smith and Costello, 2009). To suggest the priorities of attributes for improvement, the extant literature has seen the adoption of the importance-performance analysis (Lai and Hitchcock, 2015) and the analytic hierarchy process (Zhou et al., 2015). Instead of taking two different approaches, this study lends support to the applicability and effectiveness of the penalty-reward contrast analysis, impact range performance analysis, and impact asymmetry analysis in studying the asymmetric effect of (service) attributes on satisfaction and prioritizing the attributes by future service studies in their attempts to advance service quality and satisfaction knowledge in different industries.

### 5.3. Practical Implications

The identification of satisfiers, delighters, hybrids, dissatisfiers, and frustrators offered industry practitioners a better understanding of the non-linear effect of all-inclusive holiday service quality attributes on tourist satisfaction. The understanding that not every service is critical to tourist satisfaction even in case of improved performance will support industry practitioners in a better decision on their investment. For instance, the dissatisfiers *food variety, range of drinks, presentation, freshness, and tableware cleanliness* performed above average. There would be no need to put extra effort in improving their performance. If the performance decreases and improvement is needed, the high impact *food variety*, and *range of drinks* should be given a higher priority than the medium impact *tableware cleanliness* and the low impact *presentation* and *freshness*.

The study found that the service quality attributes in the dimensions of staff, physical environment, food and beverage, room and entertainment primarily displayed negative asymmetric effects on tourist satisfaction as evidenced in the overwhelming number of dissatisfiers and frustrators (Table 5). This indicates the attributes in those service dimensions are generally taken for granted by customers. Customers are dissatisfied if the performance of dissatisfiers, and frustrators is low. Immediate attention is therefore needed by the management. In light of the findings, the poorly performed dissatisfiers (*effective solutions to problems, food taste, daily food diversification, tableware cleanliness, entertainment availability, operating time, entertainment volume*) and frustrators (*music, entertainment activity diversification, and attractiveness*) all need to be improved.

The study also found that transport-relevant and value-added services-relevant attributes fundamentally showcased positive asymmetries as manifested in 9 out of 13 satisfiers and delighters (Table 5). Customers are likely to be satisfied with the attributes in these service dimensions even if the performance of those satisfiers and delighters are poor.

Resources should be allocated to improve the dissatisfiers (*flight schedule, airplane legroom*) and frustrators (*on-board services, late checkout facilities, post-checkout buggy service*).

Generally, industry practitioners are recommended to manage the frustrators, dissatisfiers, and hybrids in each service dimension attentively for the success of all-inclusive holidays because dissatisfaction is triggered on their poor performance (Fuller and Matzler, 2008). The service quality attributes in the dimensions of staff, physical environment, food and beverage, room, and entertainment should be paid more attention than those related to transport and value-added services. If the performance of the frustrators, dissatisfiers and hybrids is in line with standard levels, resources could be allocated to the satisfiers and delighters to delight customers.

## **6. Limitation and Suggestions for Future Studies**

Certain limitations must be acknowledged as an essential part of any research endeavour to open opportunities for future studies. First, the identification of service quality attributes of all-inclusive holidays was grounded on TripAdvisor reviews. The generalization of the qualitative findings by this study is limited to the online communities. This is also the limitation associated with the Prolific-based survey. Future research should include offline population or both online and offline populations, which potentially reveal a more comprehensive picture of attribute asymmetries. Findings comparison and contrast between this study and future research can be conducted to contribute more interesting insights to the literature and provide diverse implications for industry practitioners.

Second, service quality attributes of all-inclusive holidays were identified from the customer perspective only. The exclusion of such other stakeholders as hoteliers, and tour operators may have omitted valuable insights into the service quality attributes of all-inclusive holidays. Future studies are encouraged to include a more diverse range of participants when revisiting the asymmetric effect of service quality attributes on tourist

satisfaction in all-inclusive holidays after a few years to keep up with the dynamics of service quality attributes (Falk et al., 2010; Nilsson-Witell and Fundin, 2005).

The study took Covid-19 service attributes into account to reflect the contemporary service landscape. In the next few years, those attributes are potentially inapplicable. A re-evaluation of the asymmetric effect of service quality attributes on tourist satisfaction with all-inclusive holidays in a few years will importantly keep both academics and practitioners updated on the dynamic pace of change in the role of service quality attributes in tourist satisfaction. Furthermore, transportation can be external to all-inclusive holiday tour operators if they need to outsource flight and transfer services to a third party provider due to, for example, resources constraints. While tour operators might not have direct control over transport quality, transport attributes were found to have both positive and negative effects on overall satisfaction with all-inclusive holidays. Therefore, it is worthwhile for future studies to further investigate the impact of transport services on satisfaction in all-inclusive holidays to better understand the role of this component. If the impact of transport service in all-inclusive holidays is further delineated, tour operators can be better supported in their holiday package design and/or transport services arrangement.



## References

- Adinegara GNJ, Suprpti NWS, Yasa NNK, et al. (2017) Antecedents and consequences of tourist satisfaction: A literature review. *ASEAN Marketing Journal* 9(1): 40–53.
- Aguilo E, Rossello J (2012) The new all-inclusive board formula in mature destinations – from motivation to satisfaction. *Tourism Economics* 18(5): 1117–1123.
- Akan P (1995) Dimensions of service quality: a study in Istanbul. *Managing Service Quality* 5(6): 39–43.
- Albayrak T (2018) Classifying daily tour service attributes by three-factor theory of customer satisfaction. *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality & Tourism* 19(1): 112–125.
- Alexandris K, Kouthouris C, Meligdis A (2006) Increasing customers' loyalty in a skiing resort: the contribution of place attachment and service quality. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management* 18(5): 414–425.
- Ali F, Hussain K, Konar R, et al. (2017) The effect of technical and functional quality on guests' perceived hotel service quality and satisfaction: a SEM-PLS analysis. *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality & Tourism* 18(3): 354–378.
- Amin M, Yahya Z, Ismayatim WFA, et al. (2013) Service quality dimension and customer satisfaction: an empirical study in the Malaysian hotel industry. *Services Marketing Quarterly* 34(2): 115–125.
- Anderson EW, Sullivan AW (1993) The antecedents and consequences of customer satisfaction for firms. *Marketing Science* 12(2): 125–143.
- Back KJ (2012) Impact-range performance analysis and asymmetry analysis for improving quality of Korean food attributes. *International Journal of Hospitality Management* 31(2): 535–543.
- Bilgili B, Ozkul E, Candan B (2016) An outlook on “all inclusive” system as a product diversification strategy in terms of consumer attitudes. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 235: 493–504.
- Bui HT (2022) All-inclusive value. In: Buhalis D (ed) *Encyclopedia of Tourism Management and Marketing*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing, 133–136.
- Caber M, Albayrak T (2018) Assessing daily tour service quality: a proposal for a DAILYSERV scale. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management* 7: 18–25.
- Cetinsoz BC, Artuger S (2014) International tourists' selection criteria for choosing all-inclusive package tours: an application in Istanbul. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences* 4(9): 369–384.

- Chan A, Hsu CHC, Baum T (2015) The impact of tour service performance on tourist satisfaction and behavioral intentions: a study of Chinese tourists in Hong Kong. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing* 32(1/2): 18–33.
- Chang HS (2009) Taiwanese Tourists' perceptions of service quality on outbound guided package tours: a qualitative examination of the SERVQUAL dimensions. *Journal of Vacation Marketing* 15(2): 165–178.
- Chen H, Weiler B, Young M (2018) Examining service shortfalls: a case study of Chinese group package tours to Australia. *Journal of Vacation Marketing* 24(4): 371–386.
- Chen N, Masiero L, Hsu CHC (2019) Chinese Outbound tourist preferences for all-inclusive group package tours: a latent class choice model. *Journal of Travel Research* 58(6): 916–931.
- Coghlan A (2012) Facilitating reef tourism management through an innovative importance-performance analysis method. *Tourism Management* 33(4): 767–775.
- DeVaus D (2002) *Surveys in Social Research*, 5th ed. Australia: Routledge.
- Duffy B, Smith K, Terhanian G, et al. (2005) Comparing data from online and face-to-face surveys. *International Journal of Market Research* 47(6): 615–639.
- Eyal P, David R, Andrew G, et al. (2021) Data quality of platforms and panels for online behavioral research. *Behavior Research Methods* 54: 1643–1662.
- Falk T, Hammerschmidt M, Schepers JJ (2010) The service quality-satisfaction link revisited: exploring asymmetries and dynamics. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing* 38(3): 288–302.
- Fox JT (2022) All-inclusive hotels become more exclusive for customers, developers. *Hospitality Insight*. <https://www.hospitalityinvestor.com/sectors/why-all-inclusives-are-hit>.
- Friman M, Edvardsson B (2003) A content analysis of complaints and compliments. *Managing Service Quality* 13(1): 20–26.
- Fuller J, Matzler K (2008) Customer delight and market segmentation: an application of the three-factor theory of customer satisfaction on life style groups. *Tourism Management* 29(1): 116–126.
- Fuller J, Matzler K, Faullant R (2006) Asymmetric effects in customer satisfaction. *Annals of Tourism Research* 33(4): 1159–1163.
- Getty JM, Getty RL (2003) Lodging quality index (LQI): assessing customers' perceptions of quality delivery. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management* 15(2): 94–104.
- He Y, Song H (2009) A mediation model of tourists' repurchase intentions for packaged tour services. *Journal of Travel Research* 47(3): 317–331.

- Holloway BB, Beatty SE (2008) Satisfiers and dissatisfiers in the online environment: a critical incident assessment. *Journal of Service Research* 10(4): 347–364.
- Jayawardena C (2002) Mastering Caribbean tourism. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management* 14(2): 88–93.
- Jimenez-Medina P, Navarro-Azonrin JM, Cubillas-Para C, et al. (2022) What safety and security measures really matter in the post-COVID recovery of the hospitality industry? An analysis of the visitor's intention to return in Spain. *Tourism and Hospitality* 3(3): 606–617.
- Jin T, Lin VS, Hung K (2014) China's generation Y's expectation on outbound group package tour. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research* 19(6): 617–644.
- Juwaheer TD (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.
- Kano N, Seraku N, Takahashi F, et al. (1984) Attractive quality and must-be quality. *Hinshitsu - The Journal of the Japanese Society for Quality Control* 14(2): 147–156.
- Kartika H, Kholil M, Bakti CS (2020) Service quality and customer satisfaction in furniture sector installation services. *Journal of Industrial Engineering & Management Research* 1(2): 103–111.
- Kung FYH, Kwok N, Brown DJ (2018) Are attention check questions a threat to scale validity? *Applied Psychology* 67(2): 264–283.
- Ladini R (2022) Assessing general attentiveness to online panel surveys: the use of instructional manipulation checks. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 25(2): 233–246.
- Lai IKW, Hitchcock M (2015) Importance-performance analysis in tourism: a framework for researchers. *Tourism Management* 48: 242–267.
- Lancefield N (2022) Spike in all-inclusive holidays as families seek break from money worries. *The Independent*.
- LaTour SA, Peat NC (1979) Conceptual and methodological issues in consumer satisfaction research. In: Wilkie WL, Abor A (ed) *Advances in Consumer Research*. Michigan, USA: Association for Consumer Research, 6, 431–437.
- Lin CL, Kuo CL (2019) A service position model of package tour services based on the hybrid MCDM approach. *Current Issues in Tourism* 22(20): 2478–2510.
- Lin CT, Lee C, Chen WY (2009) Using fuzzy analytic hierarchy process to evaluate service performance of a travel intermediary. *The Service Industries Journal* 29(3): 281–296. [Crossref](#).
- Luo X, Homburg C (2007) Neglected outcomes of customer satisfaction. *Journal of Marketing* 71(2): 133–149.

- Madden D (2021) The Covid-19 pandemic has cost the global tourism industry \$935 billion. *Forbes*.
- Mate MJ, Trupp A, Pratt S (2019) Managing negative online accommodation reviews: evidence from the Cook Islands. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing* 36(5): 627–644.
- Mattila AS, Choi S (2005) The impact of hotel pricing policies on perceived fairness and satisfaction with the reservation process. *Journal of Hospitality & Leisure Marketing* 13(1): 25–39.
- Matzler K, Hinterhuber HH, Bailom F, et al. (1996) How to delight your customers. *Journal of Product & Brand Management* 5(2): 6–18.
- Matzler K, Sauerwein E (2002) The factor structure of customer satisfaction: an empirical test of the importance grid and the penalty-reward-contrast analysis. *International Journal of Service Industry Management* 13(4): 314–332.
- McConnell I (2023) Barrhead travel sees ‘stampede’ with all-inclusive holidays in demand. *The Herald*.
- McKercher B, Wong CUI (2013) Web markers for various tour products – the case of Hong Kong. *Tourism Management Perspectives* 8: 126–130.
- Mersha T, Adhlaka V (1992) Attributes of service quality: the consumer’s perspective. *International Journal of Service Industry Management* 3(3): 65–85.
- Mikulic J, Prebezac D (2008) Prioritizing improvement of service attributes using impact range-performance analysis and impact-asymmetry analysis. *Managing Service Quality* 18(6): 559–576.
- Moon HG, Lho HL, Han H (2021) Self-check-in kiosk quality and airline non-contact service maximization: how to win air traveler satisfaction and loyalty in the post-pandemic world. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing* 38(4): 383–398.
- Morrison MA (1989) *Hospitality and travel marketing*. New York: Delmar Publishers.
- Nelson MR, Otnes CC (2005) Exploring cross-cultural ambivalence: a netnography of intercultural wedding message boards. *Journal of Business Research* 58(1): 89–95.
- Nilsson-Witell L, Fundin A (2005) Dynamics of service attributes: a test of Kano's theory of attractive quality. *International Journal of Service Industry Management* 16(2): 152–168.
- Okumus B, Taheri B, Giritlioglu I, et al. (2020) Tackling food waste in all-inclusive resort hotels. *International Journal of Hospitality Management* 88: 1–10.
- Oliva TA, Oliver RL, MacMillan IC (1992) A catastrophe model for developing service satisfaction strategies. *Journal of Marketing* 56(3): 83–95.
- Oliver RL (1977) Effect of expectation and disconfirmation on postexposure product evaluations: an alternative interpretation. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 62(4): 480–486.

- Oliver RL (1980) A cognitive model of the antecedents and consequences of satisfaction decisions. *Journal of Marketing Research* 17(4): 460–469.
- Oviedo-Garcia MA, Gonzalez-Rodriguez MR, Vega-Vazquez M (2018) Does sun-and-sea all-inclusive tourism contribute to poverty alleviation and/or income inequality reduction? The case of the Dominican Republic. *Journal of Travel Research* 58(6): 995–1013.
- Ozdemir B, Cizel B, Cizel RB (2012) Satisfaction with all-inclusive tourism resorts: the effects of satisfaction with destination and destination loyalty. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration* 13(2): 109–130.
- Ozturk Y, San RA, Okumus F, et al. (2019) Travel motivations of Iranian tourists to Turkey and their satisfaction level with all-inclusive package tours. *Journal of Vacation Marketing* 25(1): 25–36.
- Padma P, Ahn J (2020) Guest satisfaction & dissatisfaction in luxury hotels: an application of big data. *International Journal of Hospitality Management* 84: 102318.
- Palan S, Schitter C (2018) Prolific – a subject pool for online experiments. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Finance* 17: 22–27.
- Parasuraman A, Berry LL, Zeithaml VA (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* 30(3): 335–364.
- Pratt S, Suntikul W, Agyeiwaah E (2020) Determining the attributes of gastronomic tourism experience: applying impact-range performance and asymmetry analyses. *International Journal of Tourism Research* 22(5): 564–581.
- Qu H, Ping EWY (1999) A service performance model of Hong Kong cruise travelers' motivation factors and satisfaction. *Tourism Management* 20(2): 237–244.
- Ramsaran-Fowdar RR (2007) Developing a service quality questionnaire for the hotel industry in Mauritius. *Journal of Vacation Marketing* 13(1): 19–27.
- Rao PS, Sahu PC (2013) Impact of service quality on customer satisfaction in hotel industry. *Journal of Humanities and Social Science* 18(5): 39–44.
- Salazar A, Costa J, Rita P (2010) A service quality evaluation scale for the hospitality sector: dimensions, attributes and behavioural intentions. *Worldwide Hospitality and Tourism Themes* 2(4): 383–397.
- Shahin A, Pourhamidi M, Antony J, et al. (2013) Typology of Kano models: a critical review of literature and proposition of a revised model. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management* 30(3): 341–358.

- Slevitch L, Oh H (2010) Asymmetric relationship between attribute performance and customer satisfaction: a new perspective. *International Journal of Hospitality Management* 29(4): 559–569.
- Smith S, Costello C (2009) Culinary tourism: satisfaction with a culinary event utilizing importance-performance grid analysis. *Journal of Vacation Marketing* 15(2): 99–110.
- Stoleriu OM, Brochado A, Rusu A, et al. (2019) Analyses of visitors' experiences in a natural world heritage site based on TripAdvisor reviews. *Visitor Studies* 22(2): 192–212.
- Tan KC, Shen XX (2000) Integrating Kano's model in the planning matrix of quality function deployment. *Total Quality Management* 11(8): 1141–1151.
- Tanford S, Erdem M, Baloglu S (2011) Price transparency of bundled vacation packages. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research* 35(2): 213–234.
- Thibault JW, Kelly HH (1959) *The social psychology of groups*. London: Wiley.
- Ting SC, Chen CN (2002) The asymmetrical and non-linear effects of store quality attributes on customer satisfaction. *Total Quality Management* 13(4): 547–569.
- Topham G (2022) Travel industry research suggests people will seek all-inclusive and cheaper packages due to fears over inflation and weak pound. *The Guardian*.
- Wall-Reinius S, Ioannides D, Zampoukos K (2019) Does geography matter in all-inclusive resort tourism? Marketing approaches of Scandinavian tour operators. *Tourism Geographies* 21(5): 766–784.
- Wang K, Hsieh AT, Chou SH, et al. (2007) GPTCCC: an instrument for measuring group package tour service. *Tourism Management* 28(2): 361–376.
- Wang KC, Hsieh AT, Huan TC (2000) Critical service features in group package tour: an exploratory research. *Tourism Management* 21(2): 177–189.
- Wang KC, Ma AP, Hsu MT, et al. (2013) Seniors' perceptions of service features on outbound group package tours. *Journal of Business Research* 66(8): 1021–1027.
- Westbrook RA, Reilly MD (1983) Value – percept disparity: An alternative to the disconfirmation of expectations theory of consumer satisfaction. In: Bagozzi RP, Tybout AM, Abor A (ed) *Advances in Consumer Research*. MI: Association for Consumer Research, 10, 256–261.
- Wong CS, Kwong WY (2004) Outbound tourists' selection criteria for choosing all-inclusive package tours. *Tourism Management* 25(5): 581–592.
- Wu HC, Ko YJ (2013) Assessment of service quality in the hotel industry. *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality & Tourism* 14(3): 218–244.

- Yolal M, Chi CGQ, Pesamaa O (2017) Examine destination loyalty of first-time and repeat visitors at all-inclusive resorts. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management* 29(7): 1834–1853.
- Zhou Y, Maumbe K, Deng J, et al. (2015) Resource-based destination competitiveness evaluation using a hybrid analytic hierarchy process (AHP): The case study of West Virginia. *Tourism Management Perspectives* 15: 72–80.

## List of Tables

**Table 1. Service Quality Attributes in the Context of Lodging and Package Tours**

<b>LODGING CONTEXT</b>			
<b>Author(s) (Year)</b>	<b>Research site</b>	<b>Research methods</b>	<b>(Sub)attributes</b>
Akan (1995)	Turkey	Survey questionnaire	Courtesy & competence of the personnel, communication & transaction, tangibles, knowing & understanding the customer, accuracy & speed of service, solutions to problems, and accuracy of hotel reservations
Getty & Getty (2003)	USA	Mixed methods: interview and survey questionnaire	Tangibility, reliability, responsiveness, confidence, and communication
Juwaheer (2004)	Mauritius	Survey questionnaire	Reliability, assurance, extra room amenities, staff communication & additional amenities sought, room attractiveness & décor, empathy, staff outlook & accuracy, food & service-related factors, and hotel surrounding & environment
Alexandris et al. (2006)	Greece	Survey questionnaire	Interaction quality (behaviour, attitudes, expertise), physical environment quality (design, ambient conditions, social), and outcome quality (physical outcomes, social outcomes, psychological outcomes)
Ramsaran-Fowdar (2007)	Mauritius	Interview	Tangibility, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, empathy, core hotel benefits, hotel technologies
Salazar et al. (2010)	Portugal	Mixed methods: survey questionnaire and interview	Room, feelings, restaurant service, tangibles, and reception
Amin et al. (2013)	Malaysia	Survey questionnaire	Hotel ambience & staff courtesy, food and beverage products, staff performance & knowledge, reservation services, overall financial value
Wu & Ko (2013)	Taiwan	Mixed methods: focus group discussion and survey questionnaire	Interactive quality (conduct, expertise, problem solving), environment quality (atmosphere, room quality, facility, design, location), outcome quality (sociability, valence, waiting time)
Ali et al. (2017)	Malaysia	Survey questionnaire	Functional quality (tangibility, reliability, responsiveness, confidence, communications)



and technical quality (sociability, valence, waiting time)

### PACKAGE TOURS CONTEXT

Wang et al. (2000)	Taiwan	Open-ended questionnaire	Pre-tour briefing, airport/plane, hotel, restaurant, coach, scenic-spot, shopping, optional tour, others (tips, medical care, punctuality)
Wang et al. (2007)	Taiwan	Mixed methods: interview and survey questionnaire	Hotel, transportation, shopping arrangement, optional tour, tour leader, and local guide
Chang (2009)	Taiwan	Observation and interview	Tangibility, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, empathy, communication, and sociability
He and Song (2009)	Hong Kong	Questionnaire survey	Customization, reliability, overall performance
Lin et al. (2009)	Taiwan	Interview	Pre-tour information, hotel, restaurant, scenic spot, coach, and driver
Wang et al. (2013)	Mainland China and Taiwan	Mixed methods: interview and survey questionnaire	Taiwanese sample: Tour leader and tour guide, restaurant, hotel, coach, scenic spot, Chinese sample: Pre-tour briefing, restaurant, and optional tour
Jin et al. (2014)	China	Survey questionnaire	Group leader/local guide(s), optional tour and shopping arrangement, safety, cleanliness and comfortableness, accommodation, activities, and shopping length and frequency
Chan et al. (2015)	Hong Kong	Mixed methods: Group discussion and survey questionnaire	Transportation, accommodation, food, leisure activities, shopping, tour guiding service
Caber and Albayrak (2018)	Turkey	Mixed methods: focus group discussion and survey questionnaire	Transportation, tour guide, food and beverage facility, shopping facility, stopover facility, and museums and sites.
Chen et al. (2018)	Australia	Survey questionnaire	Attractions, Tour leader, food and accommodation, shopping, optional tour
Lin and Kuo (2019)_	Taiwan	Survey questionnaire	Traffic and transport services, lodging services, itinerary planning, catering services, travel promotion

**Table 2. Results of Study 1: All-inclusive Holiday Service Quality Dimensions and (Sub)attributes**

<b>Dimensions &amp; attributes (frequency)</b>	<b>Sub-attributes (Excerpts)</b>
<b><u>Staff (318)</u></b>	
Expertise (22)	Quick service ("the waiters who helped us were so efficient and quick thinking, no lengthy waiting to be served")
	Consistent and accurate information provision ("staff at the bar are also inconsistent about what your all-inclusive can get you")
Conduct (145)	Willingness to help ("They really didn't want to help and it felt like too much hassle for them to bother")
	Friendliness ("everyone was friendly and made us feel welcome")
	Politeness ("staff were very nice and polite")
	Attentiveness ("staff are wonderful and are clearly all run off their feet, but still made time to chat and make sure our toddler was ok")
	Guest respect ("we felt as though we weren't wanted there and treated like rubbish")
Availability (52)	Sufficiency of hotel staff ("check-in was slow and tedious, not enough staff to register the arrivals")
	Accessibility to the hotel management ("I asked for a manager but 'not now, not available until tomorrow'")
Problem-solving (65)	Sincere interest in dealing with complaints ("the staff generally didn't care at the management level about any issue we raised")
	Taking quick actions / solutions ("Jet2 representative, Isabel, very good and sorted our damaged suitcase out quickly")
Communication (34)	Good language skills ("staff were friendly but some struggled with understanding English")
	Keeping customers well-informed "there was almost no verbal information given to us on arrival"
<b><u>Physical environment (189)</u></b>	
Ambient conditions (95)	Scent ("it happens that is what it smelt like there was a bad drain smell it that area of the hotel")
	Noise ("On arrival we were worried that it was a bit big and noisy")

	<p><i>Music</i>  <i>("lack of ambience at the pool, no music at all not even in the background")</i></p>
	<p><i>Light</i>  <i>("the whole hotel lacks ambience for goodness's sake, dim the lights in the entertainment area at least!!!")</i></p>
Public area cleanliness (56)	<p><i>Hygiene</i>  <i>("cleaning around the main areas bad with rubbish cigarette butt's and sick all over the floor in the front of the entrance to the breakfast hall")</i></p>
Design (38)	<p><i>Décor</i>  <i>("The hotel looked fairly new, and we were impressed by the décor, colours used, tiling, and all seating")</i></p> <p><i>Refurbishment</i>  <i>("the hotel has obviously had a decent refurb in recent years and it's looking so much better")</i></p> <p><i>Signage</i>  <i>("Signs are not very clear, and you are never sure if you are going the right way")</i></p> <p><i>Layout</i>  <i>("the dining room itself is well appointed and has great views of the grounds and the sea")</i></p>
<b>Food and beverage (296)</b>	
Labelling (48)	<p><i>Labelling on the menu</i>  <i>("Making clear which cocktails are included on all-inclusive would be helpful on the menu")</i></p> <p><i>Labelling of food being served</i>  <i>("often dishes had no labels at all")</i></p> <p><i>Allergens labelling</i>  <i>("Very few of the dishes had any allergens listed, so I had to ask every meal if there was anything GF")</i></p>
Hygiene (89)	<p><i>Tableware cleanliness</i>  <i>("dirty glasses (18 to be precise) smeg and lipstick, rings of dirt all around them! Vile! During a pandemic yes mental")</i></p> <p><i>Staff's hygiene practices</i>  <i>("we also noticed this lady replenishing food items for example bread rolls without using the tongs provided or gloves")</i></p> <p><i>Availability of sanitizing facilities near food and drink stations</i>  <i>("No hand sanitising stations near the food stations")</i></p>
Variety (102)	<p><i>Wide range of foods and drinks</i>  <i>("the food was spot on with plenty of choice")</i></p> <p><i>Regular diversification of the menu</i>  <i>("the food at the all-inclusive was ok for the first couple of days but then even that went downhill, same food nearly every day")</i></p>
Sensory appeal (57)	<p><i>Taste</i>  <i>("5 taster dishes were all very yummy")</i></p> <p><i>Visual appeal</i></p>

	<p>("We went for the tasting menu in the sky bar and this was all so good, great flavours and well presented")</p> <p>Temperature ("food was constantly cold or lukewarm. Hot food out of the ovens was mixed with the cold food on the side")</p>
<b>Room (336)</b>	
Maintenance (98)	<p>Cleanliness ("our family room was spotlessly clean and was cleaned throughout the holiday by the hotel team.")</p> <p>Room equipment functionality ("balcony door wouldn't lock, caterpillar shape black thing on the ceiling, toilet wouldn't flush, no water pressure in the shower")</p>
Size (79)	Spaciousness of room/bathroom/bed ("the room a double was very spacious...could have easily fitted the whole family in there")
Comfort (104)	<p>Thermal comfort (room temperature) ("the AC was stuck at the coldest temperature, so we could either have the room freezing cold or boiling hot")</p> <p>Bedding comfort ("the bed was massive and very comfortable")</p> <p>Visual comfort (room decoration) ("we had a wonderful 2-bedroom, 3 bathroom duplex apartment that was beautifully decorated")</p> <p>Acoustic comfort (Quietness) ("we're fit enough for the steep ramps whilst appreciative of the usual quietness of our room")</p>
Amenities (55)	<p>Availability of amenities ("the room was well-equipped with a fridge, hairdryer, beach towels, televisions, and plenty of lighting")</p> <p>Daily stocking-up ("our minibar is supposed to be stocked daily... we drank our drinks on the first day and have not had a refill since")</p>
<b>Entertainment (155)</b>	
Leisure facilities quality (81)	<p>Sufficiency ("This area is a real cause for concern. I counted exactly 57 sunbeds around the pool area (sad I know). This caused absolute chaos")</p> <p>Cleanliness ("the sunbeds were dirty and don't look like they have been cleaned for months.")</p> <p>Proper functionality ("the pool showers were not working for half the holiday..")</p>
Availability activities (45)	Variety of entertainment activities ("we couldn't thank enough for all the activities and fun, from raffle shooting, archery, French bowls, football, pool, darts, table tennis")
Attractiveness of activities (29)	<p>Unusual and fun activities ("the entertainment was appalling unless you wanted to know how to tie up balloons")</p> <p>Performance language flexibility</p>

	<p>(“entertainment was all in Spanish (I know we are in Spain). They know English people are staying there, so wouldn’t hurt for a bit of English entertainment”)</p> <p>Appropriate entertainment volume          (“the volume of the entertainment was not just uncomfortable and difficult, but it meant that customers and the lovely staff had to shout at each other to be heard”)</p>
<b>Transport (72)</b>	
Flight efficiency (49)	Airport check-in service (“We flew with Jet2.com and all went well, very quick check-in at East Midlands airport”)
	Aircraft features (“Flight all fine with decent legroom”)
	In-flight staff performance (“Jet2 cabin crew were excellent on both outbound & return flights”)
	Punctuality (“We arrived fairly late on Saturday evening due to our Jet2 flight being 3 hours late”)
Transfer efficiency (23)	Luggage handling performance (“Someone due on our transfer, their baggage never came around on the belt, so that held things up”)
	Transfer duration (“I was expecting a lengthy transfer time from the airport- this took two hours as we had multiple drop-offs on the way and we were the last drop. The transfer took as long as the flight!”)
	Coach driver performance (“the drivers were all very friendly, especially the oldest one”)
<b>Value-added services (191)</b>	
On-arrival personal touch (56)	Warm greetings (“Upon arrival at 11pm we were greeted a grumpy and useless chap..”)
	On-arrival transfer-to-the room assistance (“Upon arrival, approx. 7pm Saturday evening, we were left to walk this with our baggage, elderly gentleman and 3 kids. No assistance was offered with help to the room”)
	On-arrival welcome offerings (“We got sandwiches and water upon arrival which was a nice touch as arrived after the all-inclusive ended at 11 pm”)
(Post) check-out support (34)	Granting same service allowance (“Our flight home was in the evening so being allowed to keep our all-inclusive bands was a nice touch, allowing us to have lunch and drinks after check out”)
	<i>Facilities for late check-out</i> (“Would probably use the hotel again but would be aware of the lack of facilities for a late checkout and the lack of support offered by reception staff”)
	Buggy service at checkout (“the buggy service on check out was a nice touch”)
Location (21)	Convenience for transport, attraction exploration, etc.

	(“hotel was in an excellent location, about 5-minute walk to a very nice beach”)
Covid-19 services (80)	Available Covid tests (“We booked return Covid tests at reception and that was seamless and only 30 euros per person”)
	Well-established Covid procedures and facilities (“The procedures in place for Covid 19 can’t be faulted. Temperature checked on arrival, security give you the guidelines on face coverings when you arrive. Hand sanitizers outside each restaurant, the lifts, bars, etc.”)

**Table 3. Profile of Participants**

<b>Profile categories</b>		<b>Frequency (N)</b>	<b>Percentage (%)</b>
<b>Gender</b>	Male	306	47.1
	Female	344	52.9
<b>Age</b>	Between 18 and 24	67	10.3
	Between 25 and 34	231	35.5
	Between 35 and 44	211	32.5
	Between 45 and 54	96	14.8
	Between 55 and above	45	6.9
<b>Ethnic origin</b>	Caucasian/white	417	64.2
	Asian	81	12.5
	African	48	7.4
	Hispanic/Latino	37	5.6
	Mixed	44	6.8
	Other(s)	23	3.5
<b>Marital status</b>	Single	199	30.6
	Married	233	35.8
	Divorced	38	5.8
	Separated	26	4.0
	In a domestic partnership	129	19.9
	Widowed	11	1.7
	Other(s)	14	2.2
<b>Destination visited</b>	The Caribbean	40	6.2
	Mexico	46	7.1
	Dubai	30	4.6
	Balearic Islands	37	5.7
	Canary Islands	95	14.6
	Mainland Spain	51	7.8
	Mauritius	19	2.9
	Zanzibar	14	2.2
	Greece	75	11.5
	Turkey	42	6.5
	Jamaica	18	2.8
	Cyprus	25	3.8
	Egypt	27	4.2
	Portugal	38	5.8
	Tunisia	14	2.2
	Morocco	22	3.4
	Other(s)	57	8.7
<b>Duration</b>	7 days or less	322	49.5
	8 days to 10 days	187	28.8
	11 days to 14 days	94	14.5
	15 days or more	47	7.2

**Table 4. Results of EFA (N=650)**

Measurement instrument	Factor loading	Cronbach's alpha
<b>Factor 1. Staff (eigen value: 21.19, % variance explained: 41.84)</b>		<b>0.97</b>
Service knowledge of staff was good.	0.78	
Staff could answer my questions accurately.	0.78	
Waiting time to be served by staff was short.	0.70	
Staff were willing to help me when I needed.	0.80	
Staff showed respectful attitudes to me.	0.74	
Staff were friendly to me.	0.72	
Staff were attentive to my needs.	0.85	
Staff's interest in solving my problems was sincere.	0.81	
Speed of response by staff to my problems was acceptable.	0.83	
Staff's solutions to my problems were effective.	0.79	
Staff clearly informed me about the extra cost of a service not included in my package.	0.64	
Staff provided me with sufficient information about services at check-in.	0.72	
<b>Factor 2. Arrival &amp; departure personal touch (eigenvalue: 3.93, % variance explained: 5.83)</b>		<b>0.78</b>
A snack/drink was offered on arrival as a welcome gesture.	0.68	
Assistance with luggage transferred to the room was provided on arrival.	0.70	
On departure date, I still could fully access all-inclusive services after check-out.	0.72	
Facilities for late check-out were available.	0.69	
Buggy service was provided at check-out.	0.58	
<b>Factor 3. Transport (eigenvalue: 3.15, % variance explained: 4.67)</b>		<b>0.93</b>
Flight schedule was convenient.	0.78	
Legroom of my seat during flight to destination was appropriate.	0.86	
My seat during flight to destination was comfortable.	0.85	
On-board services during flight to destination were good.	0.71	
Punctuality of flight to destination was on-time.	0.64	
Check-in at destination airport was quick.	0.72	
Handling luggage at drop-off points during transfer to destination was quick.	0.68	
<b>Factor 4. Food and beverage (eigenvalue: 2.69, % variance explained: 3.58)</b>		<b>0.95</b>
Variety of foods was acceptable.	0.68	
Foods were diversified daily.	0.69	
Range of drinks was diverse.	0.67	
Foods were tasty.	0.63	
Presentation of foods was attractive.	0.61	
Temperature of foods was appropriate.	0.72	
Freshness of foods was satisfactory.	0.70	
Food trays at serving sections were properly covered.	0.53	
Tableware was clean.	0.65	



<b>Factor 5. Entertainment (eigenvalue: 2.03, % variance explained: 3.06)</b>		<b>0.94</b>
Range of entertainment activities was diverse.	0.85	
Availability of entertainment activities throughout the day was good.	0.89	
Operating hours of entertainment activities were appropriate.	0.74	
Entertainment activities were fun.	0.86	
Volume of entertainment activities was appropriate.	0.75	
<b>Factor 6. Room (eigenvalue: 1.83, % variance explained: 3.54)</b>		<b>0.93</b>
My room was clean.	0.57	
My room was spacious.	0.74	
My bed was large.	0.86	
Bathroom in my room was big.	0.72	
Room decoration was pleasant.	0.78	
Temperature of my room was comfortable.	0.53	
Quality of bedding (e.g., pillows, blankets) was good.	0.74	
<b>Factor 7. Physical environment (eigenvalue: 1.28, % variance explained: 3.92)</b>		<b>0.89</b>
Noise level was acceptable.	0.67	
Music was pleasing.	0.58	
Lighting was appropriate.	0.58	
Directional signs were helpful.	0.56	
Layout in the hotel's public areas made facilities more convenient.	0.55	
<b>Factor 8. Location (eigenvalue: 1.15, % variance explained: 1.56)</b>		<b>0.88</b>
Access from the hotel to central/scenic places (e.g., shopping centres/beaches) by walking was easy.	0.76	
Location of the hotel was convenient for transportation, attractions exploration, etc.	0.78	
<b>Factor 9. Covid-19 services (eigenvalue: 1.03, % variance explained: 2.25)</b>		<b>0.73</b>
Covid tests for home return were available at the hotel.	0.58	
Covid procedures (e.g., temperature check, mask requirement) were good.	0.69	
Covid supplies (e.g., masks, hand sanitising) were available at no cost at the hotel.	0.82	

**Table 5. Results of PRCA, IRPA, and IAA**

Service quality attributes	RI	PI	IR	SGP	DGP	IA	APS	Attribute classification
<b>Staff</b>								
Staff were attentive to my needs.	0.029	-0.335	0.364	0.08	0.92	-0.84	5.44	Frustrator
Speed of response by staff to my problems was acceptable.	0.033	0.179	0.212	0.16	0.84	-0.68	5.58	Frustrator
Staff were willing to help me when I needed.	0.114	-0.426	0.540	0.21	0.79	-0.58	5.91	Frustrator
Staff's interest in solving my problems was sincere.	0.004	-0.063	0.067	0.06	0.94	-0.88	5.55	Frustrator
Staff showed respectful attitudes to me.	0.021	-0.044	0.065	0.32	0.68	-0.36	5.92	Dissatisfier
Staff were friendly to me.	0.061	0.123	0.184	0.33	0.67	-0.34	5.67	Dissatisfier
Staff's solutions to my problems were effective.	0.053	-0.124	0.177	0.30	0.70	-0.40	5.13	Dissatisfier
Waiting time to be served by staff was short.	0.062	-0.068	0.130	0.48	0.52	-0.04	5.26	Hybrid
Staff could answer my questions accurately.	0.019	-0.290	0.309	0.06	0.94	-0.88	5.57	Frustrator
Service knowledge of staff was good.	0.021	0.500	0.521	0.04	0.96	-0.92	5.56	Frustrator
Staff provided me with sufficient information about services at check-in.	0.014	0.617	0.631	0.02	0.98	-0.96	5.58	Frustrator
Staff clearly informed me about the extra cost of a service not included in my package.	0.071	-0.053	0.124	0.57	0.43	0.14	5.76	Satisfier
<b>Transport</b>								
My seat during flight to destination was comfortable.	0.057	0.005	0.062	0.92	0.08	0.84	4.65	Delighter

Legroom of my seat during flight to destination was appropriate.	0.012	-0.027	0.039	0.31	0.69	-0.38	5.25	Dissatisfier
Flight schedule was convenient.	0.065	-0.127	0.192	0.34	0.66	-0.32	4.99	Dissatisfier
Check-in at destination airport was quick.	0.089	0.021	0.110	0.81	0.19	0.62	5.56	Delighter
On-board services during flight to destination were good.	0.002	0.111	0.113	0.02	0.98	-0.96	4.83	Frustrator
Handling luggage at drop-off points during transfer to destination was quick.	0.029	-0.182	0.211	0.14	0.86	-0.72	5.36	Frustrator
Punctuality of flight to destination was on-time.	0.079	-0.025	0.104	0.76	0.24	0.52	4.92	Delighter
<b>Food and beverage</b>								
Foods were diversified daily.	0.085	-0.600	0.685	0.12	0.88	-0.76	5.21	Frustrator
Foods were tasty.	0.058	-0.126	0.184	0.32	0.68	-0.36	4.66	Dissatisfier
Variety of foods was acceptable.	0.099	-0.221	0.320	0.31	0.69	-0.38	5.54	Dissatisfier
Presentation of foods was attractive.	0.008	-0.017	0.025	0.32	0.68	-0.36	5.66	Dissatisfier
Temperature of foods was appropriate.	0.038	-0.103	0.141	0.27	0.73	-0.46	5.62	Frustrator
Freshness of foods was satisfactory.	0.042	-0.077	0.119	0.35	0.65	-0.30	5.58	Dissatisfier
Tableware was clean.	0.040	0.090	0.130	0.31	0.69	-0.38	5.82	Dissatisfier
Range of drinks was diverse.	0.087	-0.203	0.290	0.30	0.70	-0.40	5.41	Dissatisfier
Food trays at serving sections were properly covered.	0.017	0.043	0.060	0.28	0.72	-0.44	5.25	Frustrator
<b>Entertainment</b>								
Entertainment activities were fun.	0.063	-0.356	0.419	0.15	0.85	-0.70	4.99	Frustrator
Availability of entertainment activities throughout the day was good.	0.034	-0.080	0.114	0.30	0.70	-0.40	4.86	Dissatisfier
Range of entertainment activities was diverse.	0.025	0.183	0.208	0.12	0.88	-0.76	4.82	Frustrator

Operating hours of entertainment activities were appropriate.	0.106	0.146	0.252	0.42	0.58	-0.16	5.19	Dissatisfier
Volume of entertainment activities was appropriate.	0.044	0.066	0.110	0.40	0.60	-0.20	5.06	Dissatisfier
<b>Room</b>								
My bed was large.	0.023	-0.135	0.158	0.15	0.85	-0.70	5.54	Frustrator
My room was spacious.	0.032	-0.086	0.118	0.27	0.73	-0.46	5.47	Frustrator
Quality of bedding (e.g., pillows, blankets) was good.	0.043	-0.124	0.167	0.26	0.74	-0.48	5.53	Frustrator
Room decoration was pleasant.	0.148	-0.036	0.184	0.80	0.20	0.60	4.93	Delighter
Bathroom in my room was big.	0.035	-0.007	0.042	0.83	0.17	0.66	5.48	Delighter
My room was clean.	0.001	0.003	0.004	0.25	0.75	-0.50	5.84	Frustrator
Temperature of my room was comfortable.	0.078	0.058	0.136	0.57	0.43	0.14	5.02	Satisfier
<b>Physical environment</b>								
Noise level was acceptable.	0.053	0.161	0.214	0.25	0.75	-0.50	5.51	Frustrator
Lighting was appropriate.	0.020	-0.346	0.366	0.55	0.95	-0.40	5.73	Dissatisfier
Music was pleasing.	0.043	0.111	0.154	0.28	0.72	-0.44	5.18	Frustrator
Layout in the hotel's public areas made facilities more convenient.	0.060	-0.138	0.198	0.30	0.70	-0.40	5.60	Dissatisfier
Directional signs were helpful.	0.036	0.087	0.123	0.29	0.71	-0.42	5.55	Frustrator
<b>Arrival &amp; departure personal touch</b>								
On departure date, I still could fully access all-inclusive services after check-out.	0.043	0.015	0.058	0.74	0.26	0.48	4.86	Delighter
Assistance with luggage transferred to the room was provided on arrival.	0.055	0.018	0.073	0.75	0.25	0.50	4.58	Delighter

A snack/drink was offered on arrival as a welcome gesture.	0.050	-0.034	0.084	0.60	0.40	0.20	4.01	Satisfier
Facilities for late check-out were available.	0.002	-0.039	0.041	0.05	0.95	-0.90	5.04	Frustrator
Buggy service was provided at check-out.	0.015	-0.066	0.081	0.19	0.81	-0.62	3.83	Frustrator

#### Location

Location of the hotel was convenient for transportation, attractions exploration, etc.	0.060	-0.155	0.215	0.28	0.72	-0.44	5.34	Frustrator
Access from the hotel to central/scenic places (e.g., shopping centres/beaches) by walking was easy.	0.054	-0.038	0.092	0.59	0.41	0.18	5.46	Satisfier

#### Covid-19 services

Covid supplies (e.g., masks, hand sanitising) were available at no cost at the hotel.	0.054	-0.015	0.069	0.78	0.22	0.56	4.26	Delighter
Covid procedures (e.g., temperature check, mask requirement) were good.	0.045	0.025	0.070	0.64	0.36	0.28	5.30	Satisfier
Covid tests for home return were available at the hotel.	0.069	-0.058	0.127	0.54	0.46	0.08	5.51	Hybrid

**Notes:** RI = Reward Index, PI = Penalty Index, IR = Impact Range, SGP = Satisfaction Generating Potential, DGP = Dissatisfaction Generating Potential, IA = Impact Asymmetry, APS = Attribute Performance Score

Low impact ( $IR < 0.125$ ), Medium impact ( $0.125 \leq IR \leq 0.225$ ), High impact ( $IR > 0.225$ )

Frustrators ( $IA < -0.4$ ), Dissatisfiers ( $-0.1 > IA \geq -0.4$ ), Hybrids ( $0.1 \geq IR \geq -0.1$ ), Satisfiers ( $0.4 \geq IA > 0.1$ ), Delighters ( $IA > 0.4$ )