旅 遊 管 理 研 究
第 七 卷　　第 二 期
民國九十六年十二月
頁 207~頁 225

Tourism Management Research
Vol. 7　No.2
December　2007
pp. 207 ~ 225

團體套裝旅遊服務品質重要因素之研究

Identification of Important Service Factors in Group Package Tours

林毓珊Yu-Shan Lin*

摘　要

本研究主要探討顧客如何評斷團體套裝旅遊(group package tour, GPT)之服務品質，及管理者如何用這些重要屬性區隔市場，並分析哪些屬性顯著影響顧客滿意度及再購意願。利用探索性和驗證性因素分析法確認 6 個因素 22 個屬性有最高的解釋變異量，此外，亦採用集群分析法將目前 GPT 市場區隔為「一般旅遊者」和「品質追求者」兩大族群，結果顯示兩群體在年齡、收入與旅遊經驗上有顯著不同；而有 4 個共通屬性將影響顧客之滿意度及再購意願，分別為「領隊有良好的溝通協調能力」、「旅館等級安排適當」、「領隊有良好的解說能力」及「對於未參加自費行程的團員有適當的安排」。透由本研究將使旅遊管理者更明確了解顧客，俾能設計出更符合顧客需求之產品，而本篇之研究方法亦可應用於不同的觀光產業中。

關鍵詞：服務品質、團體套裝旅遊、滿意度、再購意願、市場區隔

*中國文化大學國際企業管理研究所博士班博士候選人。
本研究曾發表於 2007 Advances in Tourism Marketing Conference, Spain，參酌主辦單位審查委員會及評論人之意見後，做部分修正，受惠於上述學者對於本研究所提供的寶貴意見。

ABSTRACT

This study evaluates how consumers assess service quality of group package tour (GPT) and how these important attributes segment GPT market. For data collection, responses of 833 tourists were used to assess the reliability and validity by exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis. Moreover, cluster analysis was applied and showed two distinct groups: "Easy traveler" and "Quality pursuing traveler". Empirical results demonstrated statistically significant difference between the two groups in terms of age, income, and travel experiences. "Satisfaction" and "Repurchase intention" were utilized as dependent variables for travel managers to further manage the tours. Four items are comparatively important including "The tour leader has an ability of coordination within group members," "The grade of hotel arrangement is appropriate," "The tour leader has a good presentation ability," and "Appropriate arrangements for those who did not participate in the optional tours." The authors believe the results of this study should be of value to both the travel related theories and managers in the relevant travel industries.

Keywords: *service quality, group package tour (GPT), satisfaction, and repurchase intention, market segmentation*

I. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, overseas travel in Asia is experiencing eye-catching growth. From around the world, the number of Asian tourists is increasing, such as Australia (Reisinger and Turner, 2002) and Guam (Iverson, 1997). Also, the growth in Asia's tourism population has also enhanced the attention of scholars and tourism operators on Asian tourists' travel behavior, especially the issues surrounding the travel behavior of group package tourists and tour leaders (e.g., Wong and Kwong, 2004; Yu, Weiler, and Ham, 2004; Lo and Lam, 2004; Wong and Lau, 2001; Quiroga, 1990; Wang, Hsieh, Yeh, and Tsai, 2004).

Group package tour (GPT) implies that the tourist pays a certain price to the tourist agency prior to the tour and the agency arranges all travel related services, including those provided by tour leaders and local guides (Sheldon and Mak, 1987; Morrison, 1989; Wang, Hsieh, and Huan, 2000). The tourism business in Asian countries is fiercely competitive, and travel products' service quality is one of the most important considerations when customers choose among GPTs (Heung and Chu, 2000; Wong and Kwong, 2004; Lo and Lam, 2004). The key to business success is intricately connected with whether businesses can provide the notions of high service quality (Berry, 1986; Boulding, Kalra, Staelin, and Zeithaml, 1993). Therefore, the travel industry's dedication to raising service quality is helpful toward sustaining existing customers and expanding new businesses.

Over the past two decades, the concept of service quality has been widely applied and explored by scholars. Among which, the most widely cited was the service quality scale (SERVQUAL) developed by Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry in 1988. SERVQUAL was applied to different industries but some scholars proposed that service quality scales should be modified according to industry differences (Dabholkar, Thorpe, and Rentz, 1996; Bowers, Swan, and Koehler, 1994).

Meanwhile, the discussion of service quality has become popular in the tourism business, such as the travel industry, restaurants, hotels, airlines, and travel locations (Bojanic and Rosen, 1994; Lee and Hing, 1995; Weiermair and Fuchs, 1999; Tsai, Ryan, and Lockyer, 2002; LeBlanc, 1992; Ryan and Cliff, 1997; Lam and Zhang, 1999; Bigné, Martínez, Miquel, and Andreu, 2003; Knutson, Stevens, Wullaert, 1991; Augustyn and Ho, 1998). However, the scale dimensionality of SERVQUAL appears to have a weak standing and the five dimensions are not as distinct and independent as one would wish (Llosa, Chandon and Orsingher, 1998). In addition, in Hudson, Hudson, and Miller's (2004) measurement of service quality in tour operation, they did not incorporate the attributes into the five original SERVQUAL dimensions.

In fact, incorporating service quality theory into travel products is difficult. Past literature on service quality only saw a part of the service process (Swan and Bowers, 1998) but travel is a process enriched with interpersonal interactions. Not only the travel experiences would influence satisfaction and service quality, the interaction between group members and tour leaders/local guides would also affect satisfaction. Also, GPT service emphasizes on totality, long processes, and rich details. It requires the input of many people in different industries such as hotel, airline, restaurant, and transportation to complete the task. An error in any section of the trip is enough to break the tour.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

(I) Service quality measurement

Review the literatures about service quality, there are three kinds of assessment scales for measuring in the past-SERVQUAL by Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry (1988), SERVPERF by Cronin and Taylor (1992), and Non-Difference by Brown et al. (1993). The argument of performance-based and perceptions-minus-expectations measure of service quality has been last for two decades. Researches support that difference scores should be avoided and conclude that there are serious problems in conceptualizing service quality as a difference score (Peter, Churchill, and Brown, 1992; Babakus and Boller, 1992; Babakus and Mangold, 1992). However, the contributions made by PZB to figure out the five

dimension of service quality have been widely applied in plenty of service industries (LeBlanc, 1992; Ryan and Cliff, 1997; Lam and Zhang, 1999; Bigné, Martínez, Miquel, and Andreu, 2003; Knutson, Stevens, Wullaert, 1991; Augustyn and Ho, 1998). Moreover, Su (1995) compared the differences among SERVQUAL, SERVPERF and Non-Difference scales. The results showed that SERVPERF had higher reliability and validity. As a result, this study adopts the views of Cronin and Taylor (1994) to assess service quality with customers' actual recognition.

(Ⅱ) Assessment of customer satisfaction

The last decades have spawned a number of studies on customer satisfaction. A key motivation for the growing emphasis on customer satisfaction is that highly satisfied customers can lead to a stronger competitive position resulting in higher market share and profit (Fornell, 1992). Customer satisfaction is also generally assumed to be a significant determine of repeat sales, positive word-of-mouth, and customer loyalty (Homburg and Rudolph, 2001). The customer satisfaction can influence significantly on operation performance of enterprise. With proper assessment tools, we can precisely assess customer satisfaction of the provided products or service.

When measuring the satisfaction, there are generally two methods: (1) single item: having single item to assess the overall satisfaction. According to Day (1997), which support the overall satisfaction results after customer experience a product or service; and (2) multiple items: measuring individual satisfaction of products with general scale and summing up for the overall satisfaction. We agree with the views of Day (1997) to take customers' satisfaction as an overall concept and such variable will be used to assess customer satisfaction in this study.

(Ⅲ) Assessment of repurchase intention

Marketing managers routinely use purchase intentions to predict sales. When managers and academic researchers rely on purchase intentions, they hope, and implicitly assume, that these measures will be predictive of subsequent purchases. This notion is a cornerstone of many theoretical models of consumer behavior. Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) wrote, "If one wants to know whether or not an individual will perform a given behavior, the simplest and probably the most efficient thing one can do is to ask the individual whether he intends to perform that behavior. Intentions constitute a willful state of choice where one makes a self-implicated statement as to a future course of action. Warshaw (1980) notes that most formal consumer behavior models show intent as being an intervening variable between attitude and choice behavior, implying that intentions outperform beliefs or other cognitive measures as behavioral correlates. For measuring the repurchase intention, intention to

recommend to others and further buying are suggested by previous studies (Homburg and Rudolph, 2001; P. Z. B., 1991; Sweeney and Soutar, 2001).

III. RESEARCH PROBLEM

In order to conquer the measurement problems associated with GPT service quality, Wang, Hsieh, Chou, and Lin (2007) developed an instrument called GPTCCC (customer comment card for GPT). They were the first to develop and empirically validate an instrument (scale) which measures the group package tour service by six factors including hotel, transportation, shopping arrangement, optional tour, tour leader, and local guide. However, little attention has been paid to the development of informative and straightforward perspective that help managers understand what GPT tourists regard as the components of a satisfactory service experience. How these elements can be better managed to improve satisfaction and repeat businesses have received inadequate attention.

Several marketing studies have demonstrated that tourist market is not homogeneous (Pizam and Milman, 1993). Customer needs are diverse, and it is obvious that they can no longer be satisfied through a mass marketing and management approach (Dibb, 1998). The diversity in customer needs requires hospitality and tourism managers to identify groups of customers with homogeneous characteristics and behaviors, and try to adjust their product offer as much as possible to the unique needs and desires of the target markets (Kara and Kaynak, 1997).

Customizing products according to consumer needs and improving on the areas that tourists consider important are beneficial toward product development and design. According to the investigation of this study, ten of Taiwan's major travel agencies launched a total of 1,810 GPT products between September and October of 2006. This statistic highlights the wide assortment of travel product categories. From the managers' standpoint, to identify where the customers are and what they want is vital. Only effective market segregation can ensure the more effective utilization of marketing resources. When carried out properly, segmentation can actually enhance sales and profits.

Customer satisfaction is an important topic for both researchers and managers because a high level of customer satisfaction leads to an increase in repeat patronage among current customers and aids customer recruitment by enhancing an organization's market reputation (Yüksel and Yüksel, 2002). Proper customer satisfaction research is likely to produce information on service attributes that are considered important by customers, the relative importance of the attributes in customer decision making and how well an organization is currently meeting its customer needs.

To date, there have been limited studies on service quality evaluation variables and their effect on satisfaction and repurchase intention. Majority of past studies on GPT service quality focused in discussing service attributes. However, managers are interested in the attributes that significantly influences tourists' satisfaction and repurchase intention. These issues are profoundly linked to marketing and questions that managers are urgently seeking answers.

Despite the importance of GPT service in the tourism industry, there is a lack of empirical support regarding its effectiveness. For this reason, this study applied GPTCCC with the purposes of: (1) understand how GPT tourists assess service quality; (2) segment group package tourists in Taiwan; and (3) further analyze what service attributes in GPTCCC would significantly influence satisfaction and repurchase intention.

IV. METHODOLOGY

(I) Measures

The questionnaire consisted of three parts. In the first part, respondents were required to rate the performance of 22 items in the 6 dimensions. A 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 7 (Strongly agree) was used. In the second part, to evaluate overall satisfaction and repurchase intention, additional questions derived from literature were added. One item (Overall evaluation: I am satisfied with my recent GPT) was included to measure the overall satisfaction (Homburg and Rudolph, 2001; Sweeney and Soutar, 2001; Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry, 1991). Moreover, as suggested by prior studies Geva and Goldman (1991), Sweeney and Soutar (2001), Dabholkar, Thorpe, and Rentz (1996), and P.Z.B. (1988), two items were measured for repurchase intention: (1) intention to recommend the travel agent to others and (2) intention to purchase future tours from the same travel agent. In the third part, several questions were incorporated to capture respondents' demographic attributes and travel behaviors such as departure date, travel agency, destination, frequency of GPT travels, as well as dissatisfied GPT experiences.

(Ⅱ) Data Collection

The complete data was gathered over a period of 3 months (from 2003 Jan. to Mar.). Adults aged 18 and above, spanning major cities of Taiwan, including the capital Taipei as well as eastern, western, southern, and northern cities were solicited to give responses. According to client lists gathered from major travel agencies (mainly from Zion International Co., LTD and Lion travel service Co., LTD), respondents were screened to ensure they had GPT experiences. Two thousand and six hundred questionnaires were sent out by mail; 833 were found useable for analysis (response rate was 32%). Results showed that among the 833 usable samples, 68 percent were female and 32 percent male. Most

respondents were between 21-40 years old (56.9 percent) and 38 percent of respondents were college graduates. Although this study did not apply nonresponse bias test, the some of characteristics of the sample correspond to the characteristics of GPT tourist in Taiwan, for example, nearly 60% of GPT tourists are females (Tourism Bureau, 2006).

V. RESULTS

(I) Factor Analysis of GPTCCC

Exploratory factor analysis with varimax rotation was conducted to create correlated variable composites from the original 22 attributes and identify a smaller set of dimensions, or factors, which explained most of the variances between the attributes. The factors were retained if they had eigenvalues greater than or equal to 1.0 and items were retained only if the factor loading greater than 0.6. The eigenvalues suggested that the six-factor solution with 22 items explained 80.63% of the overall variance was appropriate.

After having assessed the individual factors, a confirmatory factor analysis using maximum likelihood estimation was then applied in the second step. The results were summarized in Table 1, together with some additional information on reliability and validity. Although the chi-square value was significant (741.04 with 203 df, $p<0.001$), other goodness-of-fit measures indicated a good overall fit of the six-factor model to the data: GFI=0.93, AGFI=0.91, SRMR=0.035, RMSEA=0.056, NFI=0.98, NNFI=0.99, RFI=0.98, and CFI=0.99. In summary, these criteria seem to suggest that the model fits the data adequately.

Table 1. Results of Exploratory and Confirmatory Factor Analysis (N=833)

Factor	Items	Factor Lading	Variance (%)	Construct Reliability	Average Variance Extracted	Coefficient Alpha
●Hotel Sector			**14.7**	**0.91**	**0.76**	**0.90**
H1	The grade of hotel arrangement is appropriate.	0.77				
H2	The hotels were comfortable.	0.87				
H3	The hotels have a sanitary environment.	0.85				
H4	The facilities of the hotel are good.	0.83				
●Transportation Sector			**7.89**	**0.90**	**0.79**	**0.85**
R1	The bus is clean and tidy.	0.89				
R2	Safety of the bus is reliable.	0.91				
●Shopping Arrangement Sector			**14.56**	**0.91**	**0.76**	**0.91**
S1	Frequency of shopping is appropriate.	0.82				
S2	Shopping stores fit in with the needs of group members.	0.84				
S3	Shopping stores have good reputation.	0.77				
S4	Duration in shopping stores is appropriate.	0.83				
●Optional Tour Sector			**13.80**	**0.89**	**0.67**	**0.85**
O1	Provided detailed descriptions of the contents of optional tours.	0.71				
O2	The price of optional tours is reasonable.	0.82				
O3	The optional tours are safe.	0.79				
O4	Appropriate arrangements were made for those who did not participate in the optional tours.	0.81				
●Tour Leader Sector			**22.19**	**0.95**	**0.79**	**0.96**
T1	The tour leader has good presentation ability.	0.81				
T2	The tour leader has a sense of responsibility.	0.84				
T3	The tour leader shows friendliness.	0.80				
T4	The tour leader has an interpretive ability.	0.85				
T5	The tour leader has a professional ability.	0.86				
T6	The tour leader has the ability coordinate between group members.	0.81				
●Local Guide Sector			**7.40**	**0.82**	**0.78**	**0.97**
L1	Local guide has a professional ability.	0.85				
L2	Local guide is skillful in group leading.	0.80	Total=80.6			

(II) Clusters Procedure Results

One of the most common multivariate analysis techniques used to analyze complex arrays of data is cluster analysis. Cluster analysis is used to classify respondents into mutually exclusive groups. This method performs such that individual entities within each cluster are more similar to each other than they are to other groups, creating a situation of homogeneity with clusters and heterogeneity between clusters (Hair et al., 1992). This study applied 22 items as segmentation variables rather than 6 outline factors. That is because using 22 items to demonstrate cluster analysis will provide information that is more detailed to readers than just six factors identified. For travel managers, they can have clearer picture to understand what items discriminate clusters by order.

A two-stage cluster approach was adopted as suggested by Punj and Stewart (1983). First, the Ward's minimum variance method was applied to choose an appropriate number of clusters as well as to acquire the means. In addition, Hair et al. (1992) recommended using a priori criteria, practical judgment, common sense, and theoretical foundations for choosing the number of clusters. The final number of clusters was based on the following criteria: (1) Identified clusters have high within-cluster similarity and low between-cluster similarity. (2) The identified segments were large enough to be managerially useful. (3) The identified segments were stable. (4) The identified segments were interpretable.

Secondly, K-means clustering was used to cluster respondents into groups. By calculating the squared Euclidean distance, which was based on the mean distance of the cluster groups from the center of the cluster, clusters that were derived from the data analysis exhibited similar levels of homogeneity. As a result, a two-cluster solution appeared to provide the most distinctive and to be the optimal solution. The first and second cluster accounted for 37.1% and 62.9% of the respondents, respectively (Table 4).

To delineate the differences in GPTCCC items between the two clusters, means and standard deviation for each cluster were calculated (Table 2). These descriptive statistics provides summary information about the importance of each of the service evaluations for the members of GPT tourists of each cluster. For each of the evaluations, the mean scores of Cluster I were consistently lower than those of Cluster II. Based on the agreement allotted on each item to each cluster, Cluster I was labeled "Easy traveler" and Cluster II "Quality pursuing traveler."

Table 2. Service Quality Evaluations for Group Package Tours for Two Cluster Groups

Service Quality Evaluative Items (performance)	Cluster I (n=309) Easy traveler		Cluster II (n=524) Quality traveler		
	Mean	(std)	Mean	(std)	F
1. The grade of hotel arrangement is appropriate.	4.50 [a]	(1.3)	5.75 [a]	(1.0)	251.4*
2. The hotels are comfortable.	4.63	(1.2)	5.92	(1.0)	262.3*
3. The hotels have a sanitary environment.	4.78	(1.3)	6.01	(0.9)	245.1*
4. The facilities of the hotel are good.	4.40	(1.3)	5.67	(1.1)	216.3*
5. The bus is clean and tidy.	4.38	(1.2)	5.70	(1.1)	251.4*
6. Safety of the bus is reliable.	4.39	(1.2)	5.70	(1.0)	281.5*
7. Frequency of shopping is appropriate.	3.49	(1.3)	4.95	(1.3)	312.8*
8. Shopping stores fit in with the needs of group members.	3.26	(1.4)	4.77	(1.3)	304.0*
9. Shopping stores have good reputation.	3.60	(1.2)	4.92	(1.1)	309.7*
10. Duration in shopping stores is appropriate.	3.18	(1.3)	4.70	(1.3)	339.2*
11. Provided detailed descriptions of the contents of optional tours.	4.07	(1.4)	5.44	(1.1)	290.2*
12. The price of optional tours is reasonable.	3.68	(1.3)	5.16	(1.1)	322.3*
13. The optional tours are safe.	3.98	(1.3)	5.34	(1.1)	266.4*
14. Appropriate arrangements for those who did not participate in the optional tours.	3.53	(1.3)	5.02	(1.2)	269.7*
15. The tour leader has a good presentation ability.	3.73	(1.4)	5.85	(1.0)	603.0*
16. The tour leader has a sense of responsibility.	3.80	(1.4)	5.93	(1.0)	630.6*
17. The tour leader shows friendliness.	4.00	(1.3)	5.90	(1.0)	490.0*
18. The tour leader has an interpretive ability.	3.56	(1.3)	5.77	(1.1)	607.0*
19. The tour leader has a professional ability.	3.55	(1.4)	5.78	(1.0)	630.9*
20. The tour leader has the ability coordinate between group members.	3.75	(1.3)	5.86	(1.0)	622.8*
21. Local guide has a professional ability.	4.73	(1.3)	5.81	(0.9)	180.6*
22. Local guide is skillful in group leading.	4.18	(1.4)	5.61	(1.1)	250.0*

[a] 1=strongly disagree and 7=strongly agree.

* *P* value is significant at the 0.000 level.

The main use of discriminant analysis is to predict group membership from a set of predictors. Discriminant function analysis consists of finding a transform which gives the maximum ratio of difference between a pair of group multivariate means to the multivariate variance within the two groups. Accordingly, SPSS stepwise discriminant analysis was used to identify and delineate the GPTCCC items that most effectively discriminate between Cluster I and II. Table 3 illustrates the results of the summary statistics using 22 GPTCCC items as predictors. It indicated that 12 items were significant ($p < .05$). The variables which differentiated the clusters the most were “The tour leader has a professional ability”. The discriminant analysis seems to suggest that major dissimilarities between the two clusters are focus on the Tour Leader (5/12), Shopping (2/12), and Optional Tour (2/12) factors. Overall, 96.9% of the group cases were correctly classified.

Before exploring the profile of the two clusters based on demographic variables, it is possible to outline a profile of the Easy and Quality Pursuing Traveler by describing them in terms of service quality evaluations. In deed, the investigation of the result to the

discriminant analysis and the examination of the differences of mean scores between the two cluster groups provide information that helps to describe the two groups.

Table 3. Summary Statistics of Discriminant Analysis Using Service Quality Evaluation Items as Predictors

Service Quality Evaluation Items (performance)	Wiiks's Lambda	Significance	Discriminating Ranking
1.The tour leader has a professional ability (Tour Leader).	.542	.000	1.
2.The hotels have a sanitary environment (Hotel).	.470	.000	2.
3.Duration in shopping stores is appropriate (Shopping).	.423	.000	3.
4.The tour leader has an ability of coordination within group members (Tour Leader).	.393	.000	4.
5.The price of optional tours is reasonable (Optional Tour).	.377	.000	5.
6.The bus is clean and tidy (Transportation).	.366	.000	6.
7.The tour leader shows friendliness (Tour Leader).	.359	.000	7.
8.Local guide is skillful group leading (Local guide).	.353	.000	8.
9.Shopping stores fit in with the needs of group members (Shopping).	.350	.000	9.
10.The tour leader has a good presentation ability (Tour Leader).	.346	.000	10.
11.Appropriate arrangements for those who did not participate in the optional tours (Optional tour).	.344	.000	11.
12.The tour leader has an interpretive ability (Tour Leader).	.342	.000	12.

Note: Eigenvalue=1.921; canonical correlation=.811; Wilks' lambda=.4798; df=12; significance level=.000.

A series of cross-tabulation were performed to provide a complete demographic profile for each of the two clusters. Chi-square statistical analysis was then used to determine whether significant demographic differences existed between the two clusters. The results of this analysis revealed that age, income and travel experiences differed significantly between Cluster I and II. As shown in Table 3, "Easy Traveler" (Cluster 1) consisted of 46% of travelers younger than 30 years of age and their personal income per month was under NT$20,000 (44%). In fact, thirty-five percent of them were students and their frequency of travel experience was less then 3 times (66%). 57% of them had travel experiences in Southeast Asia, such as Thailand, Malaysia or Indonesia. In "Quality pursuing traveler" (Cluster 2), forty six percent of travelers were aged between 31-39 years old and 27% of respondents were older than 40. In addition, 56% of them had personal income per month of between NT$40,000 and NT$80,000 and 16% were higher than NT$80,000. Among them, forty three percent had traveled GPT more than 3 times and 53% had traveled to Europe and America.

Table 4. Summary Profile of the Clusters

Cluster	Demographic Characteristics and Travel Behaviors
Cluster I "Easy Traveler" *n*=309 37.3%	46% younger than 30 45% male, 55% female 44% personal income per month under NT$ 20,000, 33% between NT$40,000 and NT$ 60,000 66% travel experiences are less than 3 times 35% occupations were student, 34% business 44% education level is college and above 38% travel destinations are China, Hong Kong, and Macao 57% travel destinations are Southeast Asia, such as Thailand, Malaysia or Indonesia 54% respondents perceived the measurement of service quality to be an important part of the GPT
Cluster II "Quality Pursuing Traveler" n=524 62.9%	46% 31-39 years old, 27% older than 40 44% male, 56% female 56% personal income per month between NT$40,000 and NT$ 80,000, 16% higher than NT$ 80,000 30% occupations were business, 27% technical workers, 13% work for government 48% education level is college and above 43% travel experiences are more than 3 times 41% travel destinations are Northeast Asia 53% travel destinations are Europe and America 85% respondents perceived the measurement of service quality to be an important part of the GPT

(Ⅲ) Connection to Overall Satisfaction and Repurchase Intention

A series of stepwise regression analyses were the performed to predict overall satisfaction by the six factors. The results were presented in Table 5. Beta weights for individual factor scores showed that all of the factors were significant predictor variables in the regression model. The regression equation characteristics of overall satisfaction ($p \leqq .000$) indicated an R^2 of 0.51, which suggest that the resulting dimensions are, in fact, highly related to consumers' perceived satisfaction.

Following this, this study also submitted 22 items to regression analyses for further understanding the significant predictor items. Beta weights for individual item scores revealed that when all items were regressed together on overall satisfaction, 8 out of 22 items were significant in the regression, the weight in ranking included "The tour leader has an ability of coordination within group members," "Duration in shopping stores is

appropriate," "The hotels have a comfortable staying environment," "Local guide is skillful in group leading," "The grade of hotel arrangement is appropriate," " Safety of the bus is reliable," "The tour leader has a good presentation ability," and "Appropriate arrangements for those who did not participate in optional tours."

Table 5. Regression of six factors vs. overall satisfaction

Dependent	Independent Factor	R	R square	F change	Sig. F change	BETA	T	Sig.
Overall Satisfaction	Hotel					.403	16.64	.000
	Transportation					.348	14.35	.000
	Shopping					.300	12.38	.000
	Optional Tour					.270	11.15	.000
	Tour Leader					.216	8.91	.000
	Local Guide					.144	5.95	.000
		0.72	0.51	145.87	.000			

This study also applied discriminant analysis from repurchase intention. First of all, we summed up the scores of two measurements of repurchase intention (the calculated scores are from 2 to 14), then, divided it into two groups (group 1 $\leqq$7, represented have no intention to repurchase; group 2 > 7, represented have repurchase intention) as dependent variable. The reason applied discriminant analysis here is because it's more comprehensible to practical and travel managers can easily recognize what items would make or break the business. Both the six factors and 22 items were submitted to discriminant analysis as independence variables respectively. The result shows that the six factors were all significant predictor variables in the discriminant model. For extra considerate of discriminating items, a stepwise method was used to select 22 items of better discriminate. Then, general linear discriminant analysis was adopted to derive the discriminant function. As a test of equality of group covariance matrices, Box's M (Box's M= 77.41, F=5.113, and P=.000) indicated that the covariance was equal. After calculation, one discriminant function reached significance; Wilks' lambda value was 0.63 ($p \leqq 0.000$), and 81.3% of the original grouped cases were correctly classified. Five out of 22 items were found to be significant in discriminant analysis (table 6); the weight in ranking included "The tour leader has an ability of coordination within group members," "The grade of hotel arrangement is appropriate," "Shopping stores fit in with the needs of group members," "Appropriate arrangements for those who did not participate in the optional tours", and "The tour leader has a good presentation ability."

Table 6. Discriminant analyses of 22 items vs. repurchase intention

Dependent	Independent items	Wilks' lambda	Sig.
Repurchase intention	The tour leader has an ability of coordination within group members	.65	.000
	The grade of hotel arrangement is appropriate	.67	.000
	Shopping stores fit in with the needs of group members	.65	.000
	Appropriate arrangements for those who did not participate in the optional tours	.64	.000
	The tour leader has a good presentation ability	.64	.000

VI. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The travel industry is a unique service industry that heavily relies on the delivery of high quality service (Ap and Wong, 2001). Service quality is gradually seen as the key factor in raising service product differentiation and establishing competitive advantage (Hudson, Hudson, and Miller, 2004). Service managers are bestowed the mission of satisfying customers but their understanding of the methods to enhance customer satisfaction during the service delivery process is limited (Yuksel and Rimmington, 1998). From the customers' perspective, this study measures the affecting factors of satisfaction in GPT service. Also, from the travel managers' standpoint, the article offers insights on market segmentation as well as the service segments influencing "satisfaction" and "repurchase intention."

From the research results, we discovered that 6 items were on the tour leader factor and the interpretability reached 22.19%. This indicated that tour leader serves a very important role in overall GPT service quality. That is, the performance of the tour guide is key to service quality. This finding conforms to the results of past literature that highlight the significance of the tour guide (Geva and Goldman, 1991; Wang, et al., 2000; Mossberg, 1995; Agrusa, 1994)

"Shopping" and "optional tour" factors made up a large proportion of the scale and the interpretability reached 14.56% and 13.80% respectively. In the past, the travel operators did not provide transparent detail of travel products. For example, using low price strategy to attract the consumers buying travel products, then forces them to purchase optional tours or increases the duration of time in shopping store. This often causes the customers the feeling of cheat. However, as customers' travel experience is becoming gradually mature and they have attained more understanding of travel operators' GPT patterns, service performance in "shopping" and "optional tour" has become important factors. To effectively enhance service quality, travel operators must delve further in these areas, such as arranging for appropriate duration in shopping stores and giving detailed introductions of optional tours.

In terms of Taiwan's GPT market segregation, empirical results found that a majority

of GPT tourists (62.9%) put in a great deal of respect on travel quality. Members of this group are older, and have more travel experiences and belong to the higher-income bracket. Also, over half has previous travel experience in Europe and the US. In terms of service quality, which focus on meeting customers' needs and requirements and how well the service delivered matches customers' expectation. Past travel experiences would increase the expectation. Therefore, this study reasons that Taiwan's GPT market is approaching maturity and customers are more sophisticated and are more capable of traveling farther. In addition, although it is a popular trend in Taiwan to use simple itinerary (e.g. ticket + hotel + city tour) in GPTs, these programs still have room for development in terms of providing premium quality and good tour services. We recommend travel operators to customize product designs tailor-made to different customer attributes. In light of the increasing transparency of GPT products as well as customers' elevated sophistication and fastidiousness, we suggest managers to boost the practicality of service quality since they can only enhance satisfaction by exceeding customers' expectation.

Effective tourism marketing requires that managers understand not only what they should do in a GPT service process but also how tourists can be satisfied and make repurchasing decisions. Studies on the relationship between GPT tourists' satisfaction and repurchased intention are very limited; to our knowledge, this study represents the first study that undertakes an analysis on both dimensions. Four evaluation items are both significant in the analysis of regression and discriminant model, including "The tour leader has an ability of coordination within group members," "The grade of hotel arrangement is appropriate," "The tour leader has a good presentation ability," and "Appropriate arrangements for those who did not participate in the optional tours." The above items provided the practical managers clear directions to work towards.

REFERENCES

1. Agrusa, J. Group tours in Hawaii. Annals of Tourism Research, 21(1), 1994, pp.146-147.
2. Ap, J. & Wong, K. Case study on tour guiding: Professionalism, issues and problems. Tourism Management, 22(5), 2001, pp.551-563.
3. Augustyn, M. & Ho, S. K. Service quality and tourism. Journal of Travel Research, 37(1), 1998, pp.71-75.
4. Babakus, E. & Boller, G. W. An Empirical Assessment of the SERVQUAL scale. Journal of Business Research, 24(3), 1992 , pp.253-268.
5. Babakus, E. & Mangold, W. G. Adapting the SERVQUAL scale to hospital services:

An empirical investigation. Health Service Research, 26(6), 1992, pp.767-780.

6. Berry, L. L. Retail businesses are service businesses. Journal of Retailing, 62(1), 1986, pp.3-6.
7. Bigné, J. E., Martínez, C., Miquel, M. J., & Andreu, L. SERVQUAL reliability and validity in travel agencies. Annals of Tourism Research, 30(1), 2003, pp.258-262.
8. Bojanic, D. C. & Rosen, D. L. Measuring service quality in restaurants: An application of the SERVQUAL instrument. Hospitality Research Journal, 18(1), 1994 , pp.3-14.
9. Boulding, W., Kalra, A., Staelin, R., & Zeithaml, V. A. A dynamic process model of service quality: From expectations to behavioral intentions. Journal of Marketing Research, 30(1), 1993, pp.7-27.
10. Bowers, M. R., Swan, J. E., & Koehler, W. F. What attributes determine quality and satisfaction with health care delivery? Health Care Management Review, 19(4), 1994, pp.49-55.
11. Churchill, G. A., Jr. A paradigm for developing better measures of marketing constructs. Journal of Marketing Research, 16(1), 1979, pp. 64-73.
12. Dabholkar, P. D., Thorpe, D. I., & Rentz, J. O. A measure of service quality for retail stores: Scale development and validation. Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 24(1), 1996, pp.3-16.
13. Day, R. L. Extending the concept of consumer satisfaction. Atlanta: Association for Consumer Research, 4(2), 1997, pp. 149-154.
14. Dibb, S. Market segmentation: Strategies for success. Marketing Intelligence and Planning, 16(7), 1998, pp.394-406.
15. Fishbein, M. & Ajzen, I. Belief, attitude, intention, and behavior. Addison–Wesley, Reading, MA, 1975.
16. Fornell, C. A national customer satisfaction barometer: the Sweden experience. Journal of Marketing, 56(1), 1992, pp. 6-21.
17. Geva, A. & Goldman, A. Satisfaction measurement in guided tours. Annals of Tourism Research, 18(2), 1991, pp. 177-185.
18. Hair, J. F., Jr., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. Multivariate data analysis with readings (3 rd ed.). New York: Macmillan, 1992.
19. Heeler, R. M. & Ray, M. L. Measure validation in marketing. Journal of Marketing Research, 9(4), 1972, pp.361-370.
20. Heung, V. C. S. & Chu, R. Important factors affecting Hong Kong consumers' choice of a travel agency for all-inclusive package tours. Journal of Travel Research, 39(1), 2000, pp.52-59.

21. Homburg, C. & Rudolph, B. Customer satisfaction in industrial markets: Dimensional and multiple role issues. Journal of Business Research, 52(1), 2001, pp. 15-33.
22. Hudson, S., Hudson, P., & Miller, G. A. The measurement of service quality in the tour operating sector: A methodological comparison. Journal of Travel Research, 42(3), 2004, pp. 305-312.
23. Iverson, T. J. Decision time: A comparison of Korean and Japanese travelers. International Journal of Hospitality Management, 16(2), 1997, pp. 209-219.
24. Kara, A., Kaynak, E. & Kucukemiroglu, O. Marketing strategies for fast-food restaurants: A customer view. British Food Journal, 99(9), 1997, pp. 318-324.
25. Knutson, B., Stevens, P., Wullaert, C., Patton, M., & Yokoyama, F. LODGSERV: A service quality index for lodging industry. Hospitality Research Journal, 14(2), 1991, pp.277-284.
26. Lam, T. & Zhang, H. Q. Service quality of travel agents: The case of travel agents in Hong Kong. Tourism Management, 20(3), 1999, pp. 341-349.
27. LeBlanc, G. Factors affecting customer evaluation of service quality in travel agencies: An investigation of customer perceptions. Journal of Travel Research, 30(4), 1992, pp.10-16.
28. Lee, Y. L. & Hing, N. Measuring quality in restaurant operations: An application of the SERVQUAL instrument. International Journal of Hospitality Management, 14(3/4), 1995, pp. 293-310.
29. Llosa, S., Chandon, J. L. & Orsingher, C. An empirical study of SERVQUAL's dimensionality. Services Industries Journal, 18(2), 1998, pp. 16-44.
30. Lo, A. & Lam, T. Long-haul and short-haul outbound all-inclusive package tours. Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research, 9(2), 2004, pp.161-176.
31. Morrison, M. A. Hospitality and travel marketing. Albany, New York: Delmar Publishers, 1989.
32. Oliver, R. Measurement and evaluation of satisfaction process in retail settings. Journal of Retailing, 57(3), 1981, pp.25-48.
33. Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. SERVQUAL: A multiple-item scale for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality. Journal of Retailing, 64(1), 1988, pp.12-37.
34. Peter, J. P., Churchill, Jr. G. A., & Brown, T. J. Caution in the use of difference scores as marketing constructs. A. C. Nielsen working paper #91-2, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI,1992.
35. Pizan, A & Milman, A. Predicting satisfaction among first-time visitors to a destination

by using the expectancy disconfirmation theory. International Journal of Hospitality Management, 12, 1993, pp.197-209.

36. Punj, G. & Stewart, D. W. Cluster analysis in marketing research: Review and suggestions for application. Journal of Marketing Research, 20(2), 1983 pp.134-148.
37. Quiroga, I. Characteristics of package tours in Europe. Annals of Tourism Research, 17(2), 1990, pp.185-207.
38. Reisinger, Y. & Turner, L. W. Cultural differences between Asian tourist markets and Australian hosts, Part 1. Journal of Travel Research, 40(3), 2002, pp. 295-319.
39. Ryan, C. & Cliff, A. Do travel agencies measure up to customer expectation? An empirical investigation of travel agencies' service quality as measured by SERVQUAL. Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing, 6(2), 1997, pp. 1-29.
40. Sheldon, P. J. & Mak, J. The demand for package tours: A mode choice model. Journal of Travel Research, 25(3), 1987, pp. 13-17.
41. Swan, J. E. & Bowers, M. R. Service quality and satisfaction: The process of people doing things together. Journal of Service Marketing, 12(1), 1998, pp. 59-72.
42. Sweeney, J. C. & Soutar, G. N. Consumer perceived value: The development of a multiple item scale. Journal of Retailing, 77(2), 2001, pp. 203-220.
43. Tourism Bureau. 2005 annual survey reports on R. O. C. outbound travelers. Taipei: Tourism Bureau, 2006.
44. Tsai, M., Ryan, C. & Lockyer, T. Culture and evaluation of service quality-A study of the service quality gaps in a Taiwanese setting. In C.-C. Lu, K. Chon, H.-Q. Zhang, & Y.-J. Xie (Eds.), Proceeding of the 8th Annual Conference Asia Pacific Tourism Association (pp. 754-763). Dalian, China: Dongbei University of Finance & Economics, 2002.
45. Wang, K.-C., Hsieh, A.-T., & Huan, T.-C. Critical service features in group package tour: An exploratory research. Tourism Management, 21(2), 2000, pp. 177-189.
46. Wang, K.-C., Hsieh, A.-T., Chou, S.-H., & Lin, Y.-S. GPTCCC: An instrument for measuring group package tour service. Tourism Management, 28(2), 2007, pp. 361-376.
47. Wang, K.-C., Hsieh, A.-T., Yeh, Y.-C., & Tsai, C.-W. Who is the decision maker: The parents or child in group package tour? Tourism Management, 25(2), 2004, pp. 183-194.
48. Warshaw, P. R. Predicting purchase and other behaviors from general and contextually specific intentions, Journal of Marketing Research, 17(1), 1980, pp. 26-33.
49. Weiermair, K. & Fuchs, M. Measuring tourist judgment on service quality. Annals of

Tourism Research, 26(4),1999 , pp.1004-1021.

50. Wong, C. K. S. & Kwong, W. Y. Y. Outbound tourists' selection criteria for choosing all-inclusive package tours. Tourism Management, 25(5), 2004, pp. 581-592.
51. Wong, S. & Lau, E. Understanding the behavior of Hong Kong Chinese tourists on group tour packages. Journal of Travel Research, 40(1), 2001, pp. 57-67.
52. Yu, X., Weiler, B. & Ham, S. Cultural mediation in guided tour experiences: A case study of Australian guides of Chinese tour groups. In G. R. Jennings (Ed.), Annual Conference Proceeding of Research and Academic Papers Vol.16 (pp. 83-95). St Clair Shores, Michigan: International Society of Travel and Tourism Educators, 2004.
53. Yuksel, A. & Rimmington, M. Customer-satisfaction measurement. Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly, 39(6), 1998, pp. 60-71.