

Organizational barriers to service quality failures: The case of hotel businesses**

Gülsüm Kasap*, Arif Nihat Samur, İbrahim Yılmaz

ABSTRACT

Keywords:

Service quality,
Service quality gap model,
Hotel businesses,
Organizational barriers,
Antalya.

The success of hotel businesses primarily hinges on delivering quality service, and achieving this is possible through the measurement of the provided quality. In the context of measuring service quality, the Service Quality Gap Model developed by Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry (1985) is commonly utilized. Subsequently, in 1988, Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry expanded this model and identified five fundamental gaps between customers' expectations and perceptions of service quality. The first four gaps are related to factors within the organization, while the fifth gap focuses on the disparity between customer expectations and perceptions and is a function of the first four gaps. In previous research, it has been observed that researchers often concentrate on the fifth gap, neglecting the viewpoints of the service providers. Within this context, the aim of this study is to investigate the underlying causes of the gap between customers' expectations and perceptions of service quality in the context of hotel businesses. The population of the study comprises managers and employees working in 4 and 5-star hotels in Antalya. Non-probability sampling, specifically convenience sampling, was used in the research. Data was collected from 217 managers and 217 employees using a questionnaire. Validity and reliability analyses were conducted in the data analysis process. The findings of the study indicate that the abundance of hierarchical levels between management and employees, perceived control issues, paperwork negatively impacting service quality, independent efforts in promotional activities, and making excessive promises to customers are significant factors affecting service quality.

Article History:

Submitted: 25.10.2023

Revised: 08.02.2024

Revised: 14.02.2024

Accepted: 29.04.2024

Published Online: 03.05.2024


1. Introduction


One of the most significant factors that differentiate a service business from others is its ability to produce and deliver services of higher quality than its competitors. Many service businesses gain a competitive advantage by providing distinct and expected levels of service quality, ensuring the sustainability of their profitability, and achieving a dominant position in the market (Karahan, 2000, pp. 113). One of the areas where services are intensively provided is undoubtedly hotel businesses. Service quality plays a crucial role in the success and continuity of hotel operations. Businesses that offer higher quality services tend to attract more customers and become more sought after, while those that fail to do so may face the risk of eventual obsolescence. However, consistently delivering the same standards of service to customers has become quite challenging. This is because customer desires and needs are constantly evolving, and customers increasingly expect higher levels of service quality. Businesses must continuously monitor changing


preferences and expectations and be able to respond quickly to customer needs (Göndelen, 2007, pp. 32). However, determining the quality of any service is much more complex and challenging than determining the quality of any product.

A review of the relevant literature reveals that various approaches and models are preferred for measuring service quality. Researchers have been known to employ different models to measure service quality, including Grönroos's service quality model (Grönroos, 1984; Kitapçı, Yıldırım, & Çömlek, 2011; Kozak & Aydın, 2018), the Kano model (Kano, 1984; Berger *et al.*, 1993; Matzler *et al.*, 1996; Matzler & Hinterhuber, 1998; Pawitra & Tan, 2003; Yun & Ree, 2006; Gregory & Parsa, 2013), the Servqual model (Parasuraman, Zeithaml, & Berry, 1988; Babakus & Mangold, 1992; Asubonteng *et al.*, 1996; Lam, 1997; Atılğan *et al.*, 2003; Eleren & Kılıç, 2007), and the Servperf model (Cronin & Taylor, 1994, pp. 131; Durvasula, 1999; Jain & Gupta, 2004; Öztürk & Kenzhebayeva, 2013). Despite numerous studies and

Corresponding Author

Gülsüm Kasap: Lecturer Dr., Isparta Uygulamalı Bilimler Üniversitesi, Isparta, Türkiye, Email: gulsumtabak@isparta.edu.tr, Orcid Id: 0000-0001-8735-348X 

Arif Nihat Samur: Lecturer Dr., Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli University, Nevşehir, Türkiye, Email: asamur@nevsehir.edu.tr, Orcid Id: 0000-0001-8081-5231 

İbrahim Yılmaz: Prof. Dr., Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli University, Nevşehir, Türkiye, Email: iyilmaz@nevsehir.edu.tr, Orcid Id: 0000-0003-1493-5379 

Research Paper



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution (CC-BY) 4.0 License

different approaches, it has been observed that the most widely used service quality measurement model is the “Extended Service Quality Gap Model” developed by Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry (1988). According to this model, there are five fundamental gaps between customer expectations and perceptions. The first four of these gaps pertain to the service-providing organization and can be controlled by organizations to some extent. The fifth gap is a function of these four gaps and is related to the customer using the service (Parasuraman, Zeithaml, & Berry, 1985, pp. 44; Dotchin & Oakland, 1994, pp. 33).

In the reviewed studies, there has generally been a focus on customer expectations and perceptions, while the viewpoints of service providers have not been adequately addressed or have been neglected (Marshall *et al.*, 1998; Mills & Ungson, 2001, pp. 252). Based on this, the current study examines the perspectives of managers and employees, and it centers on four underlying dimensions that contribute to the gap between customer expectations and perceptions. Consequently, this research aims to identify the barriers to the development of service quality in hotel businesses and shed light on factors that facilitate improved service delivery by these establishments. Furthermore, the limited number of studies conducted in the Turkish literature, as revealed during the literature review, underscores the significance of this research. Investigating this overlooked topic is expected to contribute to both the academic literature and the service industry in terms of enhancing service quality.

2. Literature

The development of technology, increasing levels of prosperity, growing wealth, women finding their place in the workforce, and rising expectations of individuals have contributed to the advancement of the service sector, making it a pervasive phenomenon in all aspects of life (Erkut, 1995, pp. 9; Özkul & Bozkurt, 2006, pp. 325). Generally, a service can be defined as “an activity or benefit provided by one person or organization that delivers utility and satisfaction when utilized, intangible in nature, and does not result in the ownership of any physical entity by the purchaser” (Kotler, 1982). Zeithaml and Bitner (2000, pp. 2), on the other hand, describe a service as “acts, processes, and performances.” The reason for the diverse definitions of services can be attributed to their inherent characteristics. It is possible to encapsulate the fundamental characteristics of services under the headings of intangibility, inseparability, perishability, heterogeneity, and lack of ownership (Parasuraman, Zeithaml, & Berry, 1985, pp. 41; Assael, 1993, pp. 368).

The quality of the service provided is of vital importance to the success of businesses. In its most general definition, service quality is “the ability of businesses to meet or exceed customer expectations. In other words, the difference between customer expectations and perceptions is defined as service quality” (Parasuraman, Zeithaml, & Berry, 1988). According to Edvardsson (1998, pp. 144),

service quality is the degree to which a business can identify customer needs and requirements. Ghobadian, Speller, and Jones (1994) approach service quality as the extent to which provided services meet customer expectations. Similarly, Kandampully (1998, pp. 433) defines it as “the comparison of customer expectations with the delivered service”. Another author who approaches the concept of service quality in a similar way is Grönroos. Grönroos suggests that service quality is based on the comparison between the quality customers expect from service providers and the quality of the service they receive (Grönroos, 1984). From the above-mentioned quality definitions, it can be concluded that the definition of this concept depends largely on customers, and the evaluation of a received service as high-quality is primarily influenced by the customer. However, each individual's expectations of service differ. Even if they receive the same service from the same person at the same time, their thoughts about this service may vary. In short, the most crucial factor determining service quality is what individuals expect and what they encounter. It is believed that the main reason why authors approach the concept in this way is this fact. Based on this, it is possible to approach service quality as “expected and perceived service quality” (Şarbak, 2009, pp. 32).

The Extended Service Quality Gap Model

The Servqual Model, developed by Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry (1988, 1991, 1994), was restructured with a focus on the factors contributing to unsuccessful service delivery or the root causes of service problems. They developed the model, referred to as the “Extended Service Quality Gap Model” (Sütütemiz, 2005, pp 29). In other words, they categorized the differences in service quality, defined as the “discrepancy between customer expectations and perceptions,” into five dimensions. The first four dimensions are related to the service-providing firm and encompass elements that the firm can control. The fifth dimension pertains to the customer who benefits from the service and is a function of the first four dimensions (Douglas & Connor, 2003, pp. 168).

Gap 1: The gap between customer expectations and management's perception of customer expectations.

Gap 2: The gap between management's perception of customer expectations and their translation into quality standards.

Gap 3: The gap between the specified service standards and the actual service delivered.

Gap 4: The gap between service delivery and external communication.

Gap 5: The gap between the service perceived by the customer and the service expected by the customer

The Barriers to Service Quality Improvement

The gaps between customer expectations and perceptions that indicate service quality and the factors hindering the delivery of quality service are explained as follows

• *Barrier 1 - The Gap Between Customer Expectations and Management's Perception of Customer Expectations*

One of the fundamental activities to compete and succeed in service businesses is to understand what customers expect from the businesses (Özkul, 2007, pp. 124). The primary reason for the emergence of this barrier is the accurate perception of customer expectations by the service-providing business (Parasuraman, Zeithaml, & Berry, 1990, pp. 52; Zikmund, Raymond, & Gilbert, 2003, pp. 156). According to Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry (1985), there are three conceptual factors that contribute to the emergence of this barrier. These factors can be listed as not giving enough importance to marketing research, lack of upward communication, and excessive hierarchical levels between management and employees. These elements are explained in detail below.

*Insufficiency in Marketing Research: Marketing research involves gathering detailed data about the characteristics, needs, and desires of consumer and organizational markets (Bowie & Buttle, 2011, pp. 45). Business managers who do not prioritize marketing research find it quite challenging to perceive customer expectations accurately. Analyzing customer priorities accurately allows for the efficient allocation of resources to the relevant areas. Additionally, the dynamic nature of customer expectations and their tendency to change necessitate that research be conducted at specific intervals and continuously updated (Zeithaml & Bitner, 2000, pp. 110).

*Lack of Upward Communication: Due to the excessive workload and responsibilities of individuals at the management level, it is not feasible to know the expectations of each individual customer. It can be argued that employees who have continuous interaction with customers have much more information about customer needs and expectations compared to those at the management level. Therefore, it largely depends on managers reaching out to employees who have direct contact with customers to acquire accurate information about customer expectations (Yılmaz, 2013, pp. 121).

*Excessive Number of Management Levels: The excessive number of management levels between front-line employees in direct contact with customers and the upper management can lead to inadequate communication, data and time loss, and misinterpretation of information (Oğuz, 2010, pp. 62). This is because having a high number of management levels delays communication between the two sides, and front-line employees struggle to convey crucial customer expectations and information to upper-level managers. In summary, as the number of individuals between managers and front-line employees increases, it becomes more challenging for information to reach managers accurately.

• *Barrier 2 - Discrepancy between Management's Perception of Customer Expectations and Their Conversion into Quality Standards*

In service businesses, accurately identifying customer expectations is not always sufficient to compete with competitors and deliver high-quality services. It is essential to put into practice the information obtained through proper market research (Zeithaml & Bitner, 1996, pp. 41). In other words, businesses that overcome the first barrier, that is, understanding what customers truly want, but cannot translate customer expectations into service quality standards, will still face challenges in delivering quality (Öztürk, 2017, pp. 190). Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry (1990, pp. 72) have identified four factors that contribute to the second gap. These factors are as follows:

*Lack of Management's Desire to Improve Service Quality: Business managers may not always view service quality as a significant strategy (Karatepe, 1997, pp. 97). For example, in a hotel business, market research might reveal that customers prefer to check in online and avoid waiting at the front desk. However, the hotel manager, even after learning this information, may choose to allocate the budget for an automation system to a different department and neglect the importance of meeting customer expectations.

*Failure to Set Objectives: Another phenomenon that constitutes the second obstacle is not being able to set a specific goal. Setting the right goal and making efforts to achieve these goals will positively affect quality service, individual success and organizational performance. In addition, goal setting will also help the general control of the business (Yılmaz, 2013, pp. 122). However, business managers are not always willing to set service quality targets. This situation causes one of the factors that prevent the development of service quality.

*Lack of Task Standardization: Lack of task standardization is a type of behavior within the second obstacle that causes disruption of service quality. The fact that the human factor plays an important role in service delivery prevents it from being the same at different times and in different places. It is quite common for the quality and form of service to vary from day to day and from customer to customer (Zeithaml & Bitner, 2000). In order to overcome this deficiency, it is recommended that businesses actively use automation systems, have sufficient technological tools and equipment, and conduct incomplete employee performance evaluations.

*Lack of Feasibility Perception: The degree to which business managers believe they can meet customer expectations is the feasibility perception. Reasons for this lack of confidence may include businesses not having the necessary capabilities to meet customer expectations, failing to meet expectations without affecting financial performance, and employees lacking the required qualifications (Çiftçi, 2006, pp. 39). The higher the feasibility perception, the greater the commitment of

management to improving service quality, and the rate of action in this regard will be influenced accordingly. The most important factors influencing this perception are the capacity and economic competence of the business (Güzel, 2006, pp. 107).

• *Barrier 3 - Discrepancy Between Defined Service Standards and Actual Service Delivered*

Discrepancy Between Defined Service Standards and Actual Service Delivered, also known as service performance, is primarily caused by the inability to deliver services at the desired level despite correctly identified customer expectations and standards (Parasuraman, Zeithaml, & Berry, 1988: 36). In other words, this barrier arises from the difference between the characteristics of the service as presented and the service as it should be delivered. This discrepancy is often encountered in industries that require close interaction with customers (Özkul, 2007, pp. 137). To minimize this barrier, it is crucial to fully support the established standards in every aspect. For example, in a lodging establishment with a large number of rooms, a standard may be set for each room to be cleaned within an average of 12 minutes. However, if the required number of skilled employees or necessary technology to clean the rooms within the defined time is not provided, it becomes impossible to clean the rooms according to the established standards. In short, the defined standards need to be supported by the system, infrastructure, and employees. According to the research conducted by Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry (1988), the obstacles leading to the third gap are detailed below.

* *Lack of Teamwork*: Due to factors such as increasing competition, technological advancements, continuous changes in customer needs, and rising expectations, individual decisions made within businesses may prove to be insufficient. Therefore, in order to gain a competitive advantage, develop employee skills and creativity, and harness their potential, it is essential to form teams consisting of individuals with diverse characteristics and utilize these teams effectively (İlhan & İnce, 2015, pp. 128). Teamwork encourages employees to perceive themselves as valuable members of the organization and motivates them to work together within a shared purpose (Gordon, 1998, pp. 41).

* *Employee-Job Mismatch*: In businesses, the effective execution of various activities that differ from each other relies on the presence of individuals with diverse skills and personality traits. This situation necessitates the employment of qualified, skilled, and job-appropriate individuals within businesses. To achieve harmony between the employee and the job, it is necessary for both the individual's abilities and personality structure to be suitable for the job (Alpugan *et al.*, 1987). Particularly in the tourism sector, where the human element holds special importance, employee-job fit is crucial. This is because customers come into direct contact with the respective employee the moment they enter tourism establishments,

and their initial perceptions about the business are shaped accordingly.

* *Technology-Job Mismatch*: One of the reasons for the gap between the defined features of a service and the service actually delivered is the technological tools and equipment that employees use in performing their tasks (Çiftçi, 2006, pp. 40). For instance, in a lodging establishment, it is essential to provide the appropriate tools and technology for a housekeeping staff member to clean a room within a specified time frame. When the technology used is suitable for the job and helps reduce the workload of the employee, several positive outcomes can be expected. Employee performance will improve, workflow will remain consistent, the perception that employees can perform their tasks will change, the time required to complete the job will decrease, and as a result, both customer and employee expectations will be met (Yıldız, 2009, pp. 18).

* *Perceived Lack of Control*: Perceived control can be defined as an individual's response to whether they can control the environment during work or under stress (Yumuşak, 2006, pp. 64). Not granting sufficient initiative to the individuals providing the service when meeting customer requests and making them dependent on obtaining approvals from other individuals and departments can lead to employees experiencing stress and elongating the problem-solving process (Sevimli, 2006, pp. 28).

* *Lack of Control Monitoring Systems*: Control monitoring system refers to the efforts made to determine an individual's level of success and efficiency in any subject. Establishing an effective control system has become crucial in the service sector, which is based on the human element (Benligiray, 1999, pp. 30). The data obtained from the assessment will facilitate the achievement of the company's objectives. Moreover, establishing an effective control monitoring system will determine the return on investment in employees. The data obtained from the evaluation are used in determining training needs, salary increases, selecting employees for rewards, promotion decisions, identifying employees' weaknesses, and revealing existing and potential future problems (Örücü & Köseoğlu, 2003, pp. 27).

* *Role Conflict*: Role conflict defined as a situation where an individual who needs to perform one or more roles simultaneously finds it difficult or impossible to do so due to conflicting roles between different people or roles assigned to the individual (Gökçe & Şahin, 2003, pp. 146). For example, a hotel establishment may expect its front desk employee to complete the check-in process within a specified minute and handle more customers. However, customers may expect the employee to display more friendliness. This situation may cause the employee to be caught in the middle and experience role conflict.

* Role Ambiguity: Role ambiguity is defined as the situation where an employee's job responsibilities and expectations are unclear or not well-defined (Kim *et al.*, 1996, pp. 951). Role ambiguity can be attributed to the failure of management to provide clear and specific information to employees regarding job descriptions, company policies, and performance evaluations, as well as inadequate knowledge among employees about products and services and a lack of training in effective communication with customers (Oğuz, 2010, pp. 64).

• *Barrier 4- Discrepancy Between Service Delivery and External Communication*

In the service sector, many of the products customers intend to purchase have abstract characteristics, and therefore, the marketing of these products requires the use of tangible information (Yıldrgan & Zengin, 2014, pp. 69). In other words, customers need some clues to form opinions about the tourism products they intend to purchase. The most prominent of these clues are media tools such as television, radio, websites, advertisements, and more. These factors, which influence customer expectations, shape consumers' thoughts about the service (Parasuraman, Zeithaml, & Berry, 1985, pp. 45). Coordinating between the operational staff and marketing departments when providing information to customers about the hotel will reduce the gap between the service promised by businesses and the service actually delivered (Korkmaz, 2006, pp. 55). Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry (1994) have identified two significant factors that create this gap.

* Lack of Horizontal Communication: Horizontal communication is a type of communication that occurs between employees and departments with equal authority levels (Karatepe, 1997, pp. 103). The main purpose of establishing a horizontal communication system in businesses is to coordinate employees and departments within the framework of the company's goals (Bell & Smith, 1999, pp. 36). In the service sector, one example of horizontal communication is between the sales and marketing department and employees who have face-to-face communication with customers. In this communication, employees who interact with customers provide information to the sales and marketing department about what promises should be made in the promotion of the business. This prevents the sales and marketing department from making promises that exceed what the business can actually deliver (Yılmaz, 2013, pp. 127). For example, if a hotel's sales and marketing department makes an announcement on the official website that "your pets are welcome" without obtaining the necessary information from the receptionist, and customers choose the hotel with this expectation, the negative response they encounter will adversely affect customers' perception of quality.

* Tendency to Make Excessive Promises: In the service sector, as competition among companies increases and services diversify, businesses may be tempted to make

promises they cannot keep in order to compete with their rivals and retain existing and potential customers. For example, if a small hotel has very small rooms but, in order to compete with its rivals, it portrays its rooms as very large through clever camera angles in brochures or advertisements, it demonstrates a tendency to make excessive promises (Devebakan & Aksaraylı, 2003, pp. 42). Anything shown beyond the capacity of the business will raise customer expectations, and unattainable customer expectations can lead to customer dissatisfaction, a decrease in perceived quality, and damage to the business's image (Yılmaz, 2007, pp. 56). To reduce the hindrance to service quality, businesses should communicate the service they can realistically and qualitatively provide to customers and avoid making promises of services that cannot be delivered (Zeithaml & Bitner, 2000, pp. 488).

3. Method

In the competitive environment of the hotel industry, where businesses aim to stand out, it is essential for all managers and employees to maintain service quality at the highest level to meet customer expectations (Yeşilyurt, 2011, pp. 110). Service quality measurement studies have been conducted in both the tourism sector and other sectors, utilizing various measurement models. Among these models, the Servqual model developed by Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry (1985, 1991, 1994) and its scale have been widely used. However, in the majority of these studies, efforts were mainly focused on measuring the gap between customer expectations and perceptions (Üner *et al.*, 1998, pp. 454). In other words, these studies predominantly concentrated on customer expectations and overlooked the underlying factors (Barrier 1, Barrier 2, Barrier 3, Barrier 4) that could hinder service quality. In the present study, four fundamental barriers that stand before service quality were examined in the context of hotel businesses. These barriers arise from the misperception of customer expectations by the business, inappropriate service quality standards, the inability of the business to deliver services in line with correctly defined service standards, and the disparity between the services promised by the business and the services actually provided (Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry, 1985; Uyguç, 1998). In line with this perspective, the aim of this study is to investigate the barriers briefly mentioned above, which can lead to service quality deficiencies.

The population of this research consists of the managers and employees of 4 and 5-star hotel businesses located in Antalya. The reason for choosing this population is due to the high level of organization opportunities in terms of their management and organizational structures (Kingir, 2006, pp. 467). According to the data from the Ministry of Culture and Tourism, there were 534, 4 and 5-star hotel businesses in Antalya in the year 2021 (ktb.gov.tr, 2021). Within the scope of the study, it was deemed appropriate to collect data from one manager and one employee from

each hotel business. The sample size that can best represent the population, considering a 90% confidence level and a sampling error $\neq 0.05$, is sufficient to have 217 managers and 217 employees (Karagöz, 2019, pp. 264). In the implementation process of the research, a total of 434 individuals were reached, and it was deemed appropriate to subject the collected data to analysis.

In this research, the questionnaire form directed towards managers and employees in hotel businesses was created using the study of Parasuraman *et al.*(1991). The factors considered differently in this study were noticed to be potential obstacles to improving service quality, and they have been named as such in our study. According to the scale developed by Parasuraman *et al.*(1991), two obstacles related to managers and two obstacles related to employees were identified. All the statements included in the research were translated into Turkish with the consultation of an academic expert who specializes in the field and provides education in a foreign language. Furthermore, attention was paid to language compatibility, and the statements were translated back into English for rechecking. A 5-point Likert scale was preferred in the scale where organizational obstacles causing service quality deficiencies were tried to be determined based on the views of managers and employees. Each statement in the scale corresponds to the values of “Strongly Disagree” (1), “Disagree” (2), “Neither Agree nor Disagree” (3), “Agree” (4), “Strongly Agree” (5). Information about the sub-dimensions and how many statements each sub-dimension consists of is provided in Table 1.

4. Findings

The correct interpretation of research results highly depends on how the data obtained in the scope of the study will be analyzed and which analysis techniques will be used. The results of this research were uploaded to

statistical software, and appropriate analysis techniques were employed to analyze the data. Primarily, skewness and kurtosis coefficients for the dimensions and sub-dimensions were examined to evaluate whether the data set meets the normality assumption. As a result of the analysis, it was determined that the obtained results had appropriate skewness and kurtosis values, and the data distribution met the normality assumption.

Research Validity and Reliability Assessment

In this study, “Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA)” and “Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA)” were conducted to test the validity. In exploratory factor analysis, the process of finding factors is carried out based on the relationships between the dimensions. Exploratory factor analysis is a method used to test the construct validity of newly created scales and aims to reach fewer unobservable factors based on the observed variables in the scale. Confirmatory factor analysis, on the other hand, is conducted to test whether the scales previously discovered and combined under fewer factors are similar in the sample in which the research is conducted (Meydan & Şeşen, 2015).

Factor Analysis Results for the Barrier 1 Scale

In order to measure hotel managers' perception of customer expectations, a 9-item scale was used to measure the sub-dimensions of marketing research orientation, upward communication and number of management levels. As a result of the EFA, it was determined that the KMO sampling adequacy value was .83 and the sample size was sufficient for factor analysis. The fact that Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant ($p < .001$) indicates that the correlation relationships between the items are suitable for factor analysis. As a result of the EFA analysis, a two-factor result was obtained. Considering the scree plot and the variances explained by the factors, it was predicted that the two-factor structure was appropriate, but the item should be removed. In this context, the statement on the

Table 1. Dimensions and Numbers of Expressions

		Sub-dimension	Numbers of Expressions
Manager	Barrier 1	Marketing Research Orientation (MRO)	4
		Upward Communication (UC)	4
		Level of Management (LOM)	1
	Barrier 2	Management Commitment to Service Quality (MCSQ)	4
		Goal-Setting (GS)	2
		Task Standardization (TS)	2
Employee		Perception of Feasibility (POF)	3
		Teamwork (TEAM)	5
	Barrier 3	Employee-Job Fit (EFIT)	2
		Technology-Job Fit (TFIT)	1
		Perceived Control (PC)	4
	Barrier 4	Supervisory Control Systems (SCS)	3
		Role Conflict (RC)	4
		Role Ambiguity (RA)	5
		Horizontal Communication (HC)	4
		Propensity to Overpromise (PTO)	2

Source: Authors' own elaboration.

number of management levels was removed from the scale since it was included under another dimension. As a result, it was determined that the first factor explained 58.639% variance, the second factor explained 23.369% variance, and the factors explained 82.008% of the total variance. EFA results are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Exploratory Factor Analysis Results for Barrier 1 Scale

Madde	1	2
MRO 1	0.975	
MRO 2	0.952	
MRO 3	0.904	
MRO 4	0.902	
UC 2		0.900
UC 3		0.852
UC 1		0.845
UC 4		0.805
Core Values	4.691	1.875
Percentage of Variance Explained %	58.639	23.369
Percentage of Total Explained Variance %		82.008
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin		0.830
Bartlett Test of Sphericity		.000

Source: Authors' own elaboration.

The multi-factor structure of the scale of customer expectations and managers' perception of customer expectations, which consists of two sub-dimensions and a total of 8 items, was tested through Confirmatory Factor Analysis using statistical software. As a result of CFA, the relationships between the dimensions were found to be statistically significant. After the CFA analysis, the model fit indices were checked and Modification Indices (MI) values were examined in order to bring the fit index values to a more appropriate level. In this context, covariances were drawn between the error terms e1-e2 under the same factor. According to CFA, as a result of the structural equation model, it was determined that the 8 items and 2 sub-dimensions that make up the scale of customer expectations and managers' perception of customer expectations are related to the scale structure. According to the CFA results, the fit index values show that the two-factor model is compatible and acceptable with the data ($\chi^2/sd=4.276$ NFI=0.937, NNFI(TLI)=0.917, IFI=0.957, CFI=0.947, RMSEA=0.093, GFI=0.906, AGFI=0.805)

Factor Analysis Results for the Barrier 2 Scale

An 11-item scale was developed to measure the perception of customer expectations by hotel managers and their ability to transform them into quality standards. The scale included sub-dimensions related to management's commitment to service quality, goal setting, task standardization, and feasibility perception. As a result of the Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA), it was determined that the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) sample adequacy value was 0.791, indicating that the sample size was sufficient for factor analysis. The significance of the Bartlett's sphericity test ($p < 0.001$) suggests that the correlation relationships between the items are suitable for factor analysis. In the EFA analysis, a three-factor solution

was obtained. Considering the scree plot and the variance explained by the factors, a three-factor structure was found to be suitable, but some items needed to be removed. In this context, 2 items were removed because they loaded onto a different dimension than expected. According to the results, the first factor explained 47.709% of the variance, the second factor explained 15.893%, and the third factor explained 11.164%, with the total variance explained by the factors being 74.766%. The EFA results are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Exploratory Factor Analysis Results for Barrier 2 Scale

Items	1	2	3
MCSQ 4	0.917		
MCSQ 1	0.735		
MCSQ 2	0.697		
MCSQ 3	0.760		
TS 1		0.939	
TS 2		0.913	
POF 3			0.883
POF 2			0.856
POF 1			0.815
Core Values	4.294	1.430	1.005
Percentage of Variance Explained %	47.709	15.893	11.164
Percentage of Total Explained Variance %		74.766	
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin		0.791	
Bartlett Test of Sphericity		0.000	

Source: Authors' own elaboration.

The multi-dimensional structure of the scale measuring the perception of customer expectations by management and their transformation into quality standards, consisting of three sub-dimensions and a total of 9 items, was tested using Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) through a statistical program. As a result of CFA, the relationships between the dimensions were found to be statistically significant. After the CFA analysis, the model fit indices were checked and Modification Indices (MI) values were examined in order to bring the fit index values to a more appropriate level. In this context, covariances were drawn between the error terms e3-e4 under the same factor. According to CFA, the results of the structural equation model revealed that 9 items and 3 sub-dimensions of the scale of management's perception of customer expectations and their transformation into quality standards are related to the scale structure. According to the CFA results, the fit index values show that the three-factor model is compatible and acceptable with the data ($\chi^2/sd=2.639$ NFI=0.941, NNFI(TLI)=0.951, IFI=0.963, CFI=0.962, RMSEA=0.087, GFI=0.942, AGFI=0.887).

Factor Analysis Results for the Barrier 3 Scale

A 24-item scale was developed to measure the difference between defined service standards and the actual service delivered. As a result of the Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA), it was determined that the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) sample adequacy value was 0.788, indicating that

Table 4. Exploratory Factor Analysis Results for Barrier 3 Scale

Items	1	2	3	4	5
TEAM 2	0.853				
TEAM 4	0.828				
TEAM 1	0.764				
TEAM 3	0.816				
TEAM 5	0.607				
RA 4		0.832			
RA 5		0.656			
RA 1		0.648			
RA 2		0.604			
RC 2			0.763		
RC 1			0.725		
RC 3			0.680		
RC 4			0.686		
PC 1				0.722	
PC 4				0.682	
PC 3				0.681	
EFIT 1					0.498
EFIT 2					0.558
Core Values	4.883	1.842	1.793	1.617	1.026
Percentage of Variance Explained %	27.128	10.233	9.963	8.986	5.703
Percentage of Total Explained Variance %		62.013			
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin		0.788			
Bartlett Test of Sphericity		0.000			

Source: Authors' own elaboration.

the sample size was sufficient for factor analysis. The significance of the Bartlett's sphericity test ($p < 0.001$) suggests that the correlation relationships between the items are suitable for factor analysis. In the EFA analysis, a five-factor solution was obtained. Considering the scree plot and the variance explained by the factors, a five-factor structure was found to be suitable, but some items needed to be removed. In this context, 6 items were removed, with 3 items loading onto a different dimension than expected, and 3 items showing a tendency for cross-loading. After the revised EFA, it was observed that the 18-item scale had a three-factor structure. According to the results, the first factor explained 27.128% of the variance, the second factor explained 10.233%, the third factor explained 9.963%, the fourth factor explained 8.986%, and the fifth factor explained 5.703%, with the total variance explained by the factors being 62.013%. The EFA results are presented in Table 4.

The multifactor structure of the scale of the difference between specified service standards and actual service provided, which consists of five sub-dimensions and a total of 18 items, was tested with CFA using statistical software. As a result of CFA, the relationships between the dimensions were found to be statistically significant. After the CFA analysis, the model fit indices were checked and Modification Indices (MI) values were examined in order to bring the values to a more appropriate level. In this

context, covariances were drawn between the error terms e3-e4 under the same factor. According to CFA, it was determined that 18 statements and 5 sub-dimensions constituting the scale of the difference between service standards and the actual service provided, which were determined as a result of the structural equation model, were related to the scale structure. According to the CFA results, the fit index values show that the three-factor model is compatible and acceptable with the data ($\chi^2/sd=2,244$, $NFI=0,937$, $NNFI(TLI)=0,920$, $IFI=0,908$, $CFI=0,915$, $RMSEA=0,076$, $GFI=0,891$, $AGFI=0,938$)

Factor Analysis Results for the Barrier 4 Scale

A 6-item scale was developed to measure the difference between service delivery and external communication, focusing on upward communication and a tendency to make excessive promises. As a result of the Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA), it was determined that the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) sample adequacy value was 0.751, indicating that the sample size was sufficient for factor analysis. The significance of the Bartlett's sphericity test ($p < 0.001$) suggests that the correlation relationships between the items are suitable for factor analysis. In the EFA analysis, a two-factor solution was obtained. Considering the scree plot and the variance explained by the factors, a two-factor structure with 6 items was found to be suitable. According to the results, the first factor explained 53.085% of the variance, while the second factor explained

27.265%, with the total variance explained by the factors being 80.351%. The EFA results are presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Exploratory Factor Analysis Results for Barrier 4 Scale

Items	1	2
HC 3	0.962	
HC 4	0.960	
HC 1	0.930	
HC 2	0.760	
PTO 1		0.915
PTO 2		0.914
Core Values	3.185	1.654
Percentage of Variance Explained %	53.085	27.265
Percentage of Total Explained Variance %		80.351
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin		0.751
Bartlett Test of Sphericity		0.000

Source: Authors' own elaboration.

The multi-factor structure of the scale measuring the difference between service delivery and external communication, consisting of two sub-dimensions and a total of 6 items, was tested using Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) through a statistical program. As a result of CFA, the relationships between the dimensions were found to be statistically significant. After the CFA analysis, the model fit indices were checked and the Modification Indices (MI) values were examined in order to bring the fit index values to a more appropriate level. As a result of the examination, it was not deemed necessary to make any changes in the MI values. According to CFA, as a result of the structural equation model, it was determined that 6 items and 2 sub-dimensions constituting the difference between service delivery and external communication scale were related to the scale structure. According to the CFA results, the fit index values show that the proposed three-factor model is compatible with the data and acceptable. These results indicate that the theoretical structure proposed for the scale of management's perception of customer expectations and their transformation into quality standards is confirmed ($\chi^2/sd=1.100$ NFI=0.991, NNFI(TLI)=0.979, IFI=0.925, CFI=0.999, RMSEA=0.022, GFI=0.987, AGFI=0.966).

Determination of Research Reliability

Reliability “refers to whether the result does not change when the measurement tool is repeatedly applied on the same sample”. Various approaches are used to measure the reliability of a scale. The most frequently used approach is internal consistency analysis. Alpha coefficient, also known as Cronbach's alpha, is used to measure internal consistency (Altunışık *et al.*, 2012). In this model developed by Cronbach, Cronbach's alpha coefficient takes a value between 0-1. Since the internal consistency value between the items in the scale is higher than the acceptable

value of 0.60, it can be said that the reliability levels of the scales used as data collection tools in the research are high.

Table 6. Reliability Coefficients of the Scales

Dimensions	Cronbach's Alpha
Barriers 1	0.896
Marketing Research Orientation	0.955
Upward Communication	0.886
Barriers 2	0.857
Management Commitment to Service Quality	0.805
Task Standardization	0.860
Perception of Feasibility	0.853
Barriers 3	0.768
Teamwork	0.877
Employee-Job Fit	0.727
Perceived Control	0.646
Role Conflict	0.658
Role Ambiguity	0.673
Barriers 4	0.784
Horizontal Communication	0.898
Propensity to Overpromise	0.804

Source: Authors' own elaboration.

Findings Regarding the Demographic Characteristics of the Participants

When examining the distribution of managers who participated in the research based on gender, it is observed that out of 217 managers, 115 (53%) were female, and 102 (47%) were male. Looking at the distribution of managers by age, a significant portion falls within the 36-45 age group with 95 individuals (43.8%). Additionally, 72 participants (33.2%) were between the ages of 26-35, 40 participants (18.4%) were between 40-55, 7 participants (3.2%) were 56 years and older, and 3 participants (1.4%) were 25 years or younger. The research found that 137 managers (63.1%) were married, while 80 (39.9%) were single. Furthermore, a significant number of managers had completed a bachelor's degree (158 participants, 72.8%). However, 31 participants (14.3%) had completed an associate degree, 17 participants (7.8%) had a postgraduate degree, and 11 participants (5.1%) were high school graduates. Notably, there were no participants at the managerial level with education levels limited to primary or middle school. In terms of income, the majority of participating managers had a monthly income of 9001 TL or more (107 participants, 49.3%). Additionally, 94 participants (43.3%) had an income ranging from 6001-9000 TL, 13 participants (6%) had an income between 4001-6000 TL, and 3 participants (1.4%) had an income of 4000 TL or less. Regarding job positions, most participating managers held the position of a general manager (36 participants, 16.6%). Additionally, 33 participants (15.2%) were in front office roles, 29 participants (13.4%) were in customer relations, 23

participants (10.6%) worked in food and beverage services, 22 participants (10.1%) were in public relations, 12 participants (5.5%) were in the kitchen, 7 participants (3.2%) worked in security, 9 participants (4.1%) were in roles related to accounting, sales and marketing, and entertainment animation, and 4 participants (2.3%) worked in health club-Spa departments. As for years of work experience, 97 participants (44.7%) had 6-10 years of experience, 72 participants (33.2%) had 1-5 years, 23 participants (10.6%) had 11-15 years, 17 participants (7.8%) had over 15 years of experience, and 8 participants (3.7%) had less than 1 year of experience.

The research shows that out of the employees who participated, 83% (32.2%) are female, and 134% (61.8%) are male. The majority of employees are in the 26-35 age range (n=82; 37.8%). Additionally, 29.5% (n=64) of the employees participating in the study are between 36-45 years old, 21.7% (n=47) are 25 years and younger, 9.2% (n=20) are between 46-55 years old, and 1.8% (n=4) are 56 years and older. Based on the research results, it can be said that the working age of the employees participating in the study is predominantly in the middle-aged range. Furthermore, out of the employees participating in the research, 120 (55.3%) are married, and 97 (44.7%) are single. Moreover, the majority of employees have received a bachelor's degree (n=93; 42.9%). Additionally, 25.8% (n=56) have completed high school, 23% (n=50) have completed an associate degree, 6.9% (n=15) have completed middle school, and 1.4% (n=3) are elementary schoolgraduates. In terms of monthly income, most of the employees participating in the research have an income in the range of 4001-6000 TL (n=106, 48.8%). In addition, 87 individuals (40.1%) have an income between 6001-9000 TL, 18 individuals (8.3%) have an income of 4000 TL or less, and 6 individuals (6%) have an income of 9001 and above. Regarding the departments where the employees participating in the research work, 20.3% (n=44) work in the front office, 17.1% (n=37) in food and beverage service, 12.9% (n=28) in the kitchen, 11.1% (n=24) in housekeeping, 9.7% (n=21) in public relations, 6.5% (n=14) in human resources and customer relations, 3.7% (n=8) in the health club and spa, 2.8% (n=6) in technical and accounting, 2.3% (n=5) in security, 1.8% (n=4) in sales and marketing, 1.4% (n=3) in procurement, and entertainment and animation departments. From the employees who participated in the research, 46.1% (n=100) have worked in the tourism sector for 1-5 years, 37.3% (n=81) have worked for 6-10 years, 12.9% (n=28) have worked for less than 1 year, 2.3% (n=5) have worked for 11-15 years, and 1.4% (n=3) have worked for 15 years or more in the tourism industry.

Descriptive Statistics for Dimensions

The arithmetic mean and standard deviation values for the dimensions Barrier 1, Barrier 2, Barrier 3, and Barrier 4 have been determined, and interpretations based on these values are provided. When the overall scale of customer

expectations and managers' perception of customer expectations is analyzed, high averages are observed (Barrier 1). When the overall scale average (G.M=3.62) is examined, it is determined that the statement "Our employees who are in constant communication with the customer are also in constant communication with the management" under the marketing research orientation dimension has the highest average, while the lowest average is the statement "We usually ask for suggestions about customer service from the employees who are in direct communication with the customer" under the same dimension. In addition, it can be said that the dimension averages are listed as marketing research orientation (G.M=3.85), upward communication (G.M=3,55) and number of management levels (G.M=3,05).

Table 7. Arithmetic Mean and Standard Deviation Values for Barrier 1 Dimension

	General Mean	SD
Marketing Research Orientation	3.85	0.88
We regularly collect information about the needs of our customers.	3.78	0.98
We regularly use marketing research information that is collected about our customers.	3.76	0.80
We regularly collect information about the service quality expectations of our customers.	3.91	1.10
The managers in our company regularly interact with customers.	3.95	0.78
Upward Communication	3.55	0.92
The customer-contact personnel in our company frequently communicate with management.	4.01	1.09
Managers in our company usually seek suggestions about serving the customer from contact personnel.	3.01	1.01
The managers in our company frequently have face-to-face interactions with customer-contact personnel.	3.51	0.75
The primary means of communication in our company between contact personnel and upper level managers is through memos.	3.68	0.99
Level of Management	3.05	1.08
Our company has too many levels of management between contact personnel and top management.	3.05	1.08
Scale Mean	3.62	0.95

Source: Authors' own elaboration.

When looking at the overall scale of the scale measuring the perception of customer expectations by the management and their transformation into quality standards (Barrier 2), high means were observed (GM=3.76). In general, hotel managers seem to have a very positive approach to the conversion of defined service quality into standards. They stated that as an establishment, they are dependent on service quality, have specific objectives, and possess the necessary capacity (GM=3.76). Among the statements, the one with the highest mean is the statement "Our hotel has the necessary capacity to meet customer requirements," which is under the feasibility sub-dimension. On the other hand, the statement with the lowest mean is the one under the same sub-dimension,

stating “If we really try to provide the level of service our customers want, it will not affect our costs” (GM=3.55). Additionally, dimension means are ranked as perception of feasibility (GM=3.84), goal setting (GM=3.78), task standardization (GM=3.72), and management commitment to service quality (GM=3.71).

Table 8. Arithmetic Mean and Standard Deviation Values for Barrier 2 Dimension

	General Mean	SD
Management Commitment to Service Quality	3.71	0.87
Our company does not commit the necessary resources for service quality.	3.78	1.06
Our company has internal programs for improving the quality of service to customers.	3.90	1.03
In our company, managers who improve quality of service are more likely to be rewarded than other managers.	3.61	1.08
Our company emphasizes selling serving customers as much as or more than it emphasizes selling	3.58	0.84
Goal Setting	3.71	1.14
Our company has a formal process for setting quality of service goals for employees.	3.78	0.91
In our company, we try to set specific quality of service goals.	3.85	0.96
Task Standardization	3.71	1.02
Our company effectively uses automation to achieve consistency in serving customers.	3.72	0.94
Programs are in place in our company to improve operating procedures so as to provide consistent service.	3.74	1.00
Perception of Feasibility	4.08	1.02
Our company has the necessary capabilities to meet customer requirements for service.	3.84	0.94
If we gave our customers the level of service they really want, we wouldn't go broke.	3.55	0.70
Our company has the operating systems to deliver the level of service customers demand.	3.90	1.03
Scale Mean	3.71	0.87

Source: Authors' own elaboration.

When examining the responses related to the teamwork dimension of the scale measuring the difference between defined service standards and actual service provided (Barrier 3) high means are observed (GM=3.36). In general, employees contribute to teamwork, and the presence of necessary technological infrastructure and the employment of qualified personnel in the establishment can be mentioned. Furthermore, employees have expressed that they know what is taken into account when evaluating their performance and do not experience role ambiguity. However, employees feel that they do not have sufficient control over their work, and administrative tasks and the increased emphasis on sales put pressure on employees. Among the statements, the one with the highest mean is the statement “I can adapt to changes that affect my work” under the role ambiguity sub-dimension (GM=3.78), while the statement with the lowest mean is the one stating “I feel completely free to meet our customers' needs while doing my job,” under the perceived control sub-dimension (GM=2.95). Additionally, dimension means are ranked as teamwork (GM=3.65), technology-job fit (GM=3.59), employee-job fit (GM=3.58), role ambiguity (GM=3.33),

perceived control (GM=3.30), control control systems (GM=3.28), and role conflict (GM=3.15).

Table 9. Arithmetic Mean and Standard Deviation Values for Barrier 3 Dimension

	General Mean	SD
Teamwork	3.65	0.98
I feel that I am part of a team in my branch or organizational unit.	3.40	0.79
Everyone in my branch or organizational unit contributes to a team effort in servicing customers.	3.61	0.77
I feel a sense of responsibility to help my fellow employees do their jobs well.	3.65	0.69
My fellow employees and I cooperate more often than we compete.	3.48	0.50
I feel that I am an important member of this company	3.63	1.00
Employee-Job Fit	3.58	0.70
I feel comfortable in my job in the sense that I am able to perform the job well.	3.84	0.81
My company hires people who are qualified to do their jobs.	3.32	0.73
Technology-Job Fit	3.59	1.05
My company gives me the tools and equipment that I need to perform my job well. .	3.59	1.05
Perceived Control	3.30	0.72
I spend a lot of time in my job trying to resolve problems over which I have little control.	3.36	0.78
I have the freedom in my job to truly satisfy my customers' needs.	2.95	0.65
I sometimes feel a lack of control over my job because too many customers demand service at the same time	3.42	0.63
One of my frustrations on the job is that I sometimes have to depend on other employees in serving my customers.	3.47	0.96
Supervisory Control Systems	3.28	0.87
My supervisor's appraisal of my job performance includes how well I interact with customers.	3.37	1.04
In our company, making a special effort to serve customers well result in more pay or recognition	3.11	0.93
In our company, employees who do the best job serving their customers are more likely to be rewarded than other employees.	3.35	0.88
Role Conflict	3.15	0.94
The amount of paperwork in my job makes it hard for me to effectively serve my customers.	3.49	1.02
Our company places so much emphasis on selling to customers that it is difficult to serve customers properly.	3.01	0.87
What my customers want me to do and what management wants me to do are usually the same thing.	3.12	0.65
My company and I have the same ideas about how my job should be performed.	3.00	0.60
Role Ambiguity	3.33	0.76
I receive a sufficient amount of information from management concerning what I am supposed to do in my job.	3.41	0.69
I often feel that I do not understand the services offered by my company.	3.18	0.83
I am able to keep up with changes in my company that affect my job. .	3.78	0.91
I feel that I have not been well trained by the company in how to interact effectively with customers	3.12	0.80
I am not sure what aspects of my job my supervisor will stress most in evaluating my performance.	3.16	0.75
Scale Mean	3.36	0.53

Source: Authors' own elaboration.

When looking at the scale measuring the difference between service delivery and external communication as a whole (Barrier 4), low means are encountered (GM=2.84). Therefore, it can be inferred that internal communication within the organization is not at a sufficient level. In particular, employees are not informed about the decisions made within the framework of promotional activities, and their opinions are not taken into account. This situation is believed to put pressure on employees. Among the statements, the one with the highest mean is the statement

“Our competitors make promises they cannot keep in order to gain new customers” under the tendency to make excessive promises sub-dimension (GM=3.63), while the statement with the lowest mean is the one stating “The company's customer service policies are also compatible with other departments serving customers” under the horizontal communication sub-dimension (GM=2.53). In addition, dimension means are ranked as the tendency to make excessive promises (GM=3.51) and horizontal communication (GM=2.59).

Table 10. Arithmetic Mean and Standard Deviation Values for Barrier 4 Dimension

	General Mean	SD
Horizontal Communication	2.59	0.95
Intense competition is creating more pressure inside this company to generate new business.	2.64	0.89
I am usually aware in advance of the promises made in the company's advertising campaigns.	2.63	1.02
Employees like me interact with operations people to discuss the level of service the company can deliver to customers.	2.57	0.95
The company's policies on serving customers are consistent in the different offices that service customers.	2.53	1.11
Propensity to Overpromise	3.51	0.98
Intense competition is creating more pressure inside this company to generate new business.	3.40	0.70
Our key competitors make promises they cannot possibly keep in an effort to gain new customers.	3.63	0.55
Scale Mean	2.84	0.86

Source: Authors' own elaboration.

Conclusion and Finding

Providing quality service to customers is crucial for the success of tourism enterprises, which are fundamental components of the service sector. Service quality entails responding to the changing needs of customers as quickly as possible and is central to customer satisfaction (Akbaba & Kılınc, 2001, pp. 163). Because the viability of hotel businesses, which are service enterprises, largely depends on their success in satisfying customers. Businesses that achieve customer satisfaction and offer services of higher quality than expected attract more customers and become more visited establishments, while those that fail to do so may face the risk of eventual extinction (Kandampully & Suhartanto, 2000, pp. 346). One way to enhance service quality is to gather the perspectives of employees and managers involved in service delivery. In this context, identifying the reasons and underlying causes of organizational barriers that contribute to service quality deficiencies has constituted the purpose of the research. The research was confined to managers and employees working in 4 and 5-star hotels operating in Antalya. Time and financial constraints of the study led to its limitation to hotels in Antalya. The scale used in the research aimed to uncover four underlying factors contributing to service quality deficiencies through a survey conducted between June and September 2021. The identified factors and the limited timeframe are considered constraints of the research. The analyses conducted and the results obtained are specific to hotel businesses operating in this region.

The first theoretical contribution of this study is to provide support for the reliability and validity of the scale developed by Parasuraman *et al.* (1991), which was used in the research. Furthermore, in the context of this study, there is no general consensus in the literature regarding which statements are covered by the dimensions and sub-dimensions addressed. Exploratory factor analysis revealed that the scale referred to as Barrier1 has a two-factor structure, and it was deemed appropriate to remove the sub-dimension of management level, which consists of a single statement. This result is parallel to the study by Mount (1997b). It is believed that the reason for this result is the fact that the sub-dimension of management level consists of a single statement. It is recommended to add different statements that can measure the same phenomenon under the sub-dimension of management level.

The scale referred to as Barrier 2 was found to be suitable for a three-factor structure. However, it was deemed necessary to remove the statements “Our hotel follows a formal process in setting service quality goals for employees” and “Our hotel tries to set specific goals for service quality” from the sub-dimension of goal setting.

The scale referred to as Barrier 3 was found to be suitable for a five-factor structure, and it was deemed necessary to remove certain statements from the scale. The Barrier 3 scale, with its redefined factors, differs slightly from the factor analysis results of Mount (1997a), where the technology-job fit sub-dimension is combined with the control control systems sub-dimension. Additionally, within the team collaboration sub-dimension, two statements were combined into one statement, which sets the Barrier 3 factor analysis results apart from Mount's study.

On the other hand, the scale referred to as Barrier 4 was found to be suitable for a two-factor structure without the need to remove any statement. This differs from Mount's (1997a) study, where a two-item structure measuring the tendency to overpromise was removed from the scale based on respondents' concerns about clarity.

After conducting exploratory factor analysis, confirmatory factor analysis was performed on the obtained scale statements, and it was determined that the dimensions and sub-dimensions that make up the Barrier 1, Barrier 2, Barrier 3, and Barrier 4 scales were related to the scale structure. Fit index values indicated that the model was consistent with the data and acceptable.

When examining the arithmetic mean and standard deviation values for the dimensions of Barrier 1, Barrier 2, Barrier 3, and Barrier 4, it can be said that generally high averages were encountered. For Barrier 1, it is noteworthy that the dimension with the highest average is market research focus, and the statement with the highest average is “Our employees who are in constant communication with customers are also in constant communication with

management". In general, it can be concluded that hotel managers collect data to understand customer expectations and are in constant interaction with employees. Additionally, they mentioned that there is a high number of hierarchical levels between top management and employees who have direct contact with customers. It is considered unfavorable that the response to this statement is high because having a high number of hierarchical levels between top management and employees can lead to time delays in problem-solving.

For Barrier 2, high averages were again observed. Among the sub-dimensions, the feasibility perception had the highest average. The statement "Our hotel has the necessary capacity to meet customer requirements" was the statement with the highest average among all dimensions. In short, for Barrier 2, it was concluded that management is oriented toward service quality, acts according to specific objectives, and has the necessary automation, programs, capacity, and systems for standardization. This attitude may be due to various reasons such as a sense of ownership and control, a sense of responsibility, motivation, and persuasiveness on employees.

In Barrier 3, the sub-dimension with the highest average was team collaboration. The statement "I feel good because I think I do the given tasks well" had the highest average, while the statement "I feel completely free to meet the needs of our customers while doing my job" had the lowest average among the statements. The high average of the sub-dimension perceived control indicates that employees are having difficulties in terms of control mechanisms in their work. This sense of control in the workplace can generally be thought of as an employee's ability to manage, make decisions, and influence. A high perception of control in the workplace can often increase employee job satisfaction, while a lack of control can lead to negative outcomes such as stress, burnout, and low motivation. Perceived control in the workplace can affect employees' overall happiness, motivation, and job performance. Therefore, employers are recommended to develop methods and policies to allow employees to have more control over their work. Additionally, listening to employees' opinions, encouraging their participation, and strengthening communication can also positively influence the sense of control.

Furthermore, the statement "Paperwork at work puts pressure on me to provide effective service to our customers" within the role conflict sub-dimension indicates that paperwork in businesses may cause disruptions in service quality. This situation can lead to both disruptions in business processes and problems in customer service delivery. To address this issue, it is recommended that businesses increase the use of technology, identify and prioritize essential paperwork, and work collaboratively.

Finally, for Barrier 4, the sub-dimensions of horizontal communication and a tendency to overpromise were

examined, and it was found that the sub-dimension of horizontal communication had a lower average compared to other sub-dimensions. Especially, the statements "The advertising managers consult employees about the realism of the promises made in our hotel's advertising campaigns" and "We usually find out in advance about the promises made in our hotel's advertising campaigns" were noteworthy. It can be concluded that employees are not actively involved in promotional activities and are not informed about the promises made. Similar results were found in the study conducted by Cankat (1996). In this study, it was determined that there were deficiencies in horizontal communication. Additionally, it was observed that hotel businesses tend to make excessive promises to attract new customers, and this situation creates pressure within the company. These results are similar to the findings in Walker, Fleischman, and Johnson's (2012) study. In the related study, it was also found that the statements in external communication and a tendency to overpromise differed on average from the others.

Practical Implication

*The first factor that can be recommended to businesses to close or minimize the first gap, which we call Barrier 1 and which causes service quality problems, is to take into account the wants, needs and expectations of customers. Collecting information about customers' expectations and renewing it at regular intervals will be of great benefit to businesses. In addition, management's communication with customers is limited. The people who will help the management in data collection are the employees who can constantly communicate with the customers. Hotel management should not interrupt communication with these employees, ask for suggestions from these people if necessary and diversify the ways of communication. In other words, it is recommended that the ways in which employees and managers communicate should be both face-to-face and through written statements. In addition, an important factor that enterprises should pay attention to is the high number of levels between the employees and senior management. Businesses should take the necessary precautions in this regard and, if necessary, reduce the number of employees between them and senior management.

*In order for the management to perceive customer expectations and transform them into quality standards, which we call barrier 2, to be eliminated, it must believe that providing quality service will actually provide positive returns for the business. In addition to this, enterprises should provide the necessary resources and programs to employees and managers in order to ensure service quality, and managers who attach importance to service quality should be encouraged. In addition to all these, they should make specific and clear decisions on how to ensure service quality and implement the necessary automation and procedures so that the employee who will do this can

provide it in the same way, regardless of which department or hotel chain.

*In order to reduce the difference between the set service standards, which we call Barrier 3, and the actual service provided, the standards set in the Barrier 2 dimension must comply with the decisions taken during the delivery of the service to customers. For this, the focus should be on the employees, who are also referred to as internal customers. It should be ensured that the employee working in the business firstly sees himself/herself as a part of the business, cooperates with other employees and sees himself/herself as a team with all his/her colleagues. In addition, when the employee encounters any problem, flexibility and authority should be given to solve the problem quickly. Thus, both the employee will be satisfied because he/she can do his/her job and the customer will be satisfied because the problem is solved quickly. Other measures that the business should take in order to close this gap are that there should not be any contradiction or uncertainty about the work to be done by the employee. Because it is not possible for people who do not know exactly how to do their job or who are in between exactly which job to do to provide a correct service quality.

*In order to reduce the 4th barrier that causes incompatibility between customers' expectations and perceptions of service quality, it should be ensured that the promises made in promotion activities are fulfilled. Customers may be influenced by the promotion activities and enter into expectations. Failure to meet these expectations may result in customer loss in itself. The people responsible for promoting the business should benefit from the opinions and suggestions of the people who will do these jobs while planning the promotion activities. In addition, in order to close this gap, the features that the hotel business does not have should not be presented, so the employee should not be subjected to excessive pressure.

Recommendations for Future Research

*In future studies, it is thought that examining service quality on managers and employees by using deeper and different measurement tools to improve service quality will contribute to related to the literature

*The scale used in this research can also be used to identify service quality barriers in other regions. It is also recommended to be applied to people working in other tourism businesses such as motels, pensions, holiday villages, boutique hotels, city hotels, etc. In addition to all these, data were collected from several different hotel establishments in the study. Research can be conducted on the basis of a single business by using the scale developed in the research.

*The research examined considered the organizational barriers that cause service quality disruptions as a whole and did not measure any effect of these barriers on service quality. Researchers who will conduct studies on service

quality in the future will gain a different perspective on the subject by taking opinions from both customers, managers and employees within the same business.

*The effects of 4 different dimensions and sub-dimensions that cause service quality disruptions on customer satisfaction, customer loyalty and repurchase intention can be examined.

*In future research, it can be investigated whether the factors that hinder service quality have any effect on each other. For example, if the teamwork dimension has any effect on perceived control or role conflict, it is suggested to reveal this.

*In order to identify service quality impediments in more detail, it would be useful to conduct applications in different sectors in order to prove the accuracy of the scale used.

References

- Akbaba, A., & Kılınç, İ. (2001). Hizmet kalitesi ve turizm işletmelerinde Servqual uygulamaları. *Anatolia Turizm Araştırmaları Dergisi* 12: 162-168.
- Alpugan, O., Demir, M. H., Oktav, M., & Üner, N. (1987). İşletme Ekonomisi ve Yönetimi (Beta Basım Yayın Dağıtım, İstanbul)
- Altunışık, R., Coşkun, R., Bayraktaroğlu, S., & Yıldırım, E. (2012). *Sosyal Bilimlerde Araştırma Yöntemleri SPSS Uygulamalı* (Sakarya Yayıncılık, Sakarya).
- Assael, H. (1993). Marketing (The Dryden Pres, Orlando. U.S.A).
- Asubonteng, P., McCleary, K. J., & Swan, J. E. (1996). SERVQUAL revisited: A critical review of service quality. *Journal of Services marketing* 10(6): 62-81.
- Atılğan, E., Akıncı, S., & Aksoy, Ş. (2003). Mapping service quality. *Managing Service Quality* 13(5): 412-422
- Babakus, E., & Mangold, W. G. (1992) Adapting the SERVQUAL scale to hospital services: an empirical investigation. *Health Services Research* 26(6): 767-786
- Bell, A. H., & Smith, D. M. (1999). Management Communication (John Wiley & Sons, Inc, New York)
- Benligiray, S. (1999). İnsan Kaynakları Açısından Otellerde Performans Yönetimi (Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları, Eskişehir)
- Berger, C., Blauth, R., Bolster, C., Burchill, G., DuMouchel, W., Pouliot, F., Richter, R., Rubinoff, A., Shen, D., Timko, M., & Walden, D. (1993). Kano's Methods for Understanding Customer Defined Quality. *The Center for Quality Management Journal* 2(2): 3-36.
- Bowie, D., & Buttle, F. (2011). Hospitality marketing: Principles and practice (Butterworth-Heinemann Publication, USA)
- Cankat, Y. (1996). Measurement of Service Quality of Bilkent Computer Center Through Servqual. Doktora Tezi, Bilkent Üniversitesi, İşletme Fakültesi, İşletme Yönetimi Ana Bilim Dalı, Ankara.
- Çiftçi, G. A. (2006). Hizmet kalitesi ve bankacılık sektöründe hizmet kalitesi ölçümüne yönelik bir uygulama. Yüksek

- Lisans Tezi, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İşletme Ana Bilim Dalı, İzmir.
- Cronin, J. J., & Taylor, S. A. (1994). Servperf versus servqual: Reconciling performance-based ve perceptions minus-expectations measurement of service quality. *Journal of Marketing* 58(1): 125-131.
- Devebakan, N., & Aksaraylı, M. (2003). Sağlık işletmelerinde algılanan hizmet kalitesinin ölçümünde Servqual skorlarının kullanımı ve özel Altınordu hastanesi uygulaması. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi* 1: 38-54.
- Dotchin, J. A., & Oakland, J. S. (1994). Total quality management in services part 2: Service quality. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management* 11(3): 27-42.
- Douglas, L., & Connor, R. (2003). Attitudes to service quality-the expectation gap. *Nutrition & Food Science*, 33(4): 165-172.
- Durvasula, S. (1999). Testing the SERVQUAL scale in the business-to-business sector: The case of ocean freight shipping service. *The Journal Of Services Marketing* 13(2): 132-150
- Edvardsson, B. (1998). Service quality improvement. *Managing Service Quality: An International Journal*, 8(2): 142-149.
- Eleren, A., & Kılıç, B. (2007). Turizm sektöründe SERVQUAL analizi ile hizmet kalitesinin ölçülmesi ve bir termal otelde uygulama. *Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 9(1): 235-263.
- Erkut, H. (1995). Hizmet Yönetimi (Interbank Yayınları, İstanbul).
- Ghobadian, A., Speller, S., & Jones, M. (1994). Service quality: Concepts and models. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management* 11(9): 43-66.
- Gökçe, O., & Şahin, A. (2003). Yönetimde rol kavramı ve yönetsel roller. *Selçuk Üniversitesi İktisadi İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Sosyal ve Ekonomik Araştırmalar Dergisi* 6: 133-156.
- Göndelen, D. (2007). Öğretmenevlerinde hizmet kalitesi, müşteri tatmininin ölçülmesi uygulaması ve müşteri tatmini artırmaya yönelik bir eğitim modeli. Doktora Tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Turizm İşletmeciliği Eğitimi Ana Bilim Dalı, Ankara
- Gordon, T. (1998). Katılımcı Yönetimin Temeli (Sistem, İstanbul)
- Gregory, A. M., & Parsa, H. G. (2013). Kano's model: an integrative review of theory and applications to the field of hospitality and tourism. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management* 22(1): 25-46
- Grönross, C. (1984). A service quality model and its marketing implications. *European Journal of Marketing* 18(4): 35-49
- Güzel, N. G. (2006). Yükseköğretimde turizm eğitimi ve hizmet kalitesi. Doktora Tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Turizm İşletmeciliği Eğitimi Ana Bilim Dalı Ankara
- İlhan, A., & İnce, E. (2015). Takım Çalışması ve Takım Etkinliğini Belirleyen Faktörlerin Ölçülmesi: Gaziantep Üniversitesinde Bir Uygulama. *Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi* 5(1): 127-152.
- Jain, S. K., & Gupta, G. (2004). Measuring service quality: Servqual vs. Servperf scales. *Vikalpa* 29 (2): 25-37.
- Kandampully, J. (1998). Service quality to service loyalty: A relationship which goes beyond customer services. *Total Quality Management* 9(6): 431-444
- Kandampully, J., & Suhartanto, D. (2000). Customer loyalty in the hotel industry: The role of customer satisfaction and image. *International Journal Of Contemporary Hospitality Management* 12(6): 346-351.
- Kano, N. (1984). Attractive quality and must-be quality. *Journal of the Japanese society for quality control* 31(4): 147-156.
- Karagöz, Y. (2019). SPSS ve AMOS Uygulamalı Nitel-Nicel-Karma Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemleri ve Yayın Etiği (Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık, Ankara)
- Karahan, K. (2000). Hizmet Pazarlaması (Beta Basım A.Ş., İstanbul)
- Karatepe, O. (1997). Bir hizmet kalitesi modeli yardımıyla hizmet kalitesi oluşumuna yönelik kavramsal bir inceleme. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi İktisadi İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi* 15(2):85-111
- Kim, S., Price, J. L., Mueller, C. W., & Watson, T. W. (1996). The determinants of career intent among physicians at a US. *Air Force Hospital Human Relations* 49(7): 947-976.
- Kıngır, S. (2006). Bir Hizmet İşletmesi Olarak Beş Yıldızlı Otel İşletmelerindeki Yönetsel Sorunlar. Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi 1 (1): 458-481
- Kitapçı, H., Yıldırım, A., & Çömlek, O. (2011). Grönross Modeline Göre Bankacılıkta Hizmet Kalitesinin Müşteri Memnuniyeti, Sadakati ve Davranışsal Niyete Etkisi. *Balıkesir Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 14(26), 177-196.
- Korkmaz, E. (2006). Otel işletmelerinin yiyecek-içecek hizmetlerinde dış kaynak kullanımı (Outsourcing): Hizmet kalitesine yönelik yönetici ve müşteri algılamalarının Antalya örneği ile değerlendirilmesi. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Anadolu Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Turizm İşletmeciliği ve Otelcilik Ana Bilim Dalı, Eskişehir
- Kotler, P. (1982). Marketing for Nonprofit organizations (Prentice Hall, Inc., New Jersey).
- Kozak, M. A., & Aydın, B. (2018). Grönross hizmet kalitesi modeli: Otelcilik alanyazını üzerinden bir değerlendirme. *Anatolia: Turizm Araştırmaları Dergisi* 29(2): 175-184.
- ktb.gov.tr. (2021). Antalya'da bulunan 4 ve 5 yıldızlı otel sayısı. <https://yigm.ktb.gov.tr/TR-9579/turizm-tesisleri.html>
- Lam, S. S. (1997). SERVQUAL: A tool for measuring patients' opinions of hospital service quality in Hong Kong. *Total Quality Management* 8(4): 145-152.

- Marshall, G. W., Baker, J., & Finn, D. W. (1998). Exploring internal customer service quality. *Journal Of Business & Industrial Marketing* 13(4/5): 381-92.
- Matzler, K., & Hinterhuber, H. H. (1998). How to Make Product Development Projects More Successful By Integrating Kano's Model of Customer Satisfaction into Quality Function Deployment. *Technovation* 18(1): 25-38.
- Matzler, K., Hinterhuber, H. H., Bailom, F., & Sauerwein, E. (1996). How to Delight Your Customers. *Journal of Product and Brand Management* 5(2):6-18.
- Meydan, C. H., & Şeşen, H. (2015). Yapısal Eşitlik Modellemesi AMOS Uygulamaları (Detay Yayıncılık, Ankara).
- Mills, P. K., & Ungson, G. R. (2001). Internal market structures substitutes for hierarchies, *Journal Of Service Research*. 3(3): 252-64
- Mount, D. J. (1997a). A factor analysis of internal service constructs in the lodging industry: The employee factors. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research* 21(1): 193-210.
- Mount, D. J. (1997b). A factor analysis of internal service constructs in the lodging industry: The management factors. *Journal of International Hospitality, Leisure & Tourism Management* 1(2): 45-65.
- Oğuz, D. (2010). Hizmet kalitesi ve bankacılık sektöründe hizmet kalitesinin Servqual yöntemiyle ölçümüne yönelik bir uygulama. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İşletme Ana Bilim Dalı, Ankara.
- Örücü, E., & Köseoğlu, M. A. (2003). İşletmelerde İşgören Performansını Değerlendirme (Gazi Kitabevi, Ankara)
- Özkuş, E. (2007). Servqual Kavramsal Çerçevesinde Turizm İşletmelerinde Hizmet Kalitesinin Geliştirilmesi (İçinde) Sevkinaz Gümüşoğlu, İge Pınar, Perran Akan ve Atilla Akbaba (Ed.) Hizmet Kalitesi: Kavramlar, Yaklaşımlar ve Uygulamalar (Detay Yayıncılık, Ankara).
- Özkuş, E., & Bozkurt, M. (2006). Hizmet işletmelerinde müşteri memnuniyeti ve müşteri şikayetleri yönetimi hakkında teorik bir değerlendirme. *EKEV Akademi Dergisi* 10 (29): 323-336.
- Öztürk, A. S. (2017). Hizmet Pazarlaması: Kuram, Uygulama ve Örnekler (Ekin Yayınevi, Bursa).
- Öztürk, Y., & Kenzhebayeva, A. (2013). Turizm sektöründe hizmet kalitesi: Türkiye ve Kazakistan'daki termal otel işletmelerinde karşılaştırılmalı bir araştırma. *Journal of Tourism and Gastronomy Studies* 1(4): 35-46.
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, A. V., & Berry, L. L. (1985). A conceptual model of service quality and its implications for future research *Journal of Marketing* 49(1): 41-50.
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, A. V., & Berry, L. L. (1988). *Servqual: A multiple- item scale for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality. Journal of Retailing* 64(1), 12-37.
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, A. V., & Berry, L. L. (1990). *Delivering Service Quality: Balancing Customer Perceptions and Expectations* (The Free Press, New York)
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, A. V., & Berry, L. L. (1991). Understanding customer expectations of service. *Sloan Management Review* 32(3): 39-48
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, A. V., & Berry, L. L. (1994). Reassessment of expectations as a comparison standard in measuring service quality: implications for further research. *Journal of marketing* 58(1): 111-124
- Pawitra, T. A., & Tan, K. C. (2003). Tourist satisfaction in Singapore – a perspective from Indonesian tourists. *Managing Service Quality*, 13(5):399 411
- Şarbak, M. (2009). Sağlık müdürlüklerinde hizmet kalitesinin ölçümü: İzmir il Sağlık Müdürlüğü'nde uygulama. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İşletme Anabilim Dalı, İzmir
- Sevimli, S. (2006). Hizmet sektöründe kalite ve hizmet kalitesi ölçümü üzerine bir uygulama. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İşletme Ana Bilim Dalı, İzmir.
- Sütütemiz, N. (2005). Müşteri sadakati belirleyicileri ve modellerinin karşılaştırılması: Bankacılık ve sağlık sektöründe bir araştırma. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Sakarya Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İşletme Ana Bilim Dalı, Sakarya.
- Üner, M., Karatepe, O., & Halıcı, A. (1998). Bir hizmet kalitesi modeli yardımıyla hizmet kalitesi, iş tatmini ve örgütsel bağlılık kavramlarının yapılandırılmasına yönelik bir deneme. 6. Ulusal İşletmecilik Kongresi, 470-481.
- Uyguç, N. (1998). Hizmet Sektöründe Kalite Yönetimi Stratejik Bir Yaklaşım (Dokuz Eylül Yayınları, İzmir).
- Walker, K. B., Fleischman, G. M., & Johnson, E. N. (2012). Measuring management accounting service quality. *Management Accounting Quarterly* 13(3): 15-27
- Yeşilyurt, C. (2011). Otel işletmelerinin yiyecek içecek bölümlerinde hizmet kalitesinin ölçülmesi: Adıyaman ilinde bir araştırma. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Turizm İşletmeciliği Ana Bilim Dalı, İzmir.
- Yıldırğan, R., & Zengin, B. (2014). Turizm ürünlerinin pazarlanmasında fiziksel kanıt stratejileri. *Bilgi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi* (2): 69-83.
- Yıldız, G. (2009). Hizmet sektöründe Servqual ölçeği ile toplam hizmet kalitesinin ölçümü ve Emniyet Genel Müdürlüğünde bir uygulama. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Dumlupınar Üniversitesi, Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Endüstri Mühendisliği Anabilim Dalı, Kütahya
- Yılmaz, İ. (2007). Otel işletmelerinde hizmet kalitesinin müşteriler ve yöneticiler açısından ölçülmesi: İzmir örneği. Doktora Tezi, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Turizm İşletmeciliği Ana Bilim Dalı, İzmir.
- Yılmaz, İ. (2013). Hizmet kalitesine ilişkin beklenti ve algılar arasındaki farkın nedenleri. *Verimlilik Dergisi* 2: 117-135.
- Yumuşak, N. U. (2006). Hizmet kalitesinin ölçümü ve hizmet kalitesini etkileyen faktörler: Uşak ticaret ve sanayi odası uygulaması. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Dokuz Eylül

- Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İşletme Ana Bilim Dalı, İzmir
- Zeithaml, A. V., & Bitner, M. J. (1996). *Services Marketing* (The McGraw-Hill Companies Inc., New York).
- Yun, H. C., & Ree, S. B. (2006). A study on the family restaurant customers' needs by Kano model & potential customer satisfaction improvement index: Based on female customers. *Journal of Korean Institute of Industrial Engineers* 32(2): 153-162
- Zeithaml, A. V., & Bitner, M. J. (2000). *Service Marketing* (McGraw Hill, New York)
- Zikmund, W. G., Raymond, M. J. R., & Gilbert, F. W. (2003). *Customer Relationship Management: Integrating Marketing Strategy and Information Technology* (John Willey & Sons, Inc. New Jersey)

INFO PAGE

Organizational barriers to service quality failures: The case of hotel businesses

Abstract

The success of hotel businesses primarily hinges on delivering quality service, and achieving this is possible through the measurement of the provided quality. In the context of measuring service quality, the Service Quality Gap Model developed by Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry (1985) is commonly utilized. Subsequently, in 1988, Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry expanded this model and identified five fundamental gaps between customers' expectations and perceptions of service quality. The first four gaps are related to factors within the organization, while the fifth gap focuses on the disparity between customer expectations and perceptions and is a function of the first four gaps. In previous research, it has been observed that researchers often concentrate on the fifth gap, neglecting the viewpoints of the service providers. Within this context, the aim of this study is to investigate the underlying causes of the gap between customers' expectations and perceptions of service quality in the context of hotel businesses. The population of the study comprises managers and employees working in 4 and 5-star hotels in Antalya. Non-probability sampling, specifically convenience sampling, was used in the research. Data was collected from 217 managers and 217 employees using a questionnaire. Validity and reliability analyses were conducted in the data analysis process. The findings of the study indicate that the abundance of hierarchical levels between management and employees, perceived control issues, paperwork negatively impacting service quality, independent efforts in promotional activities, and making excessive promises to customers are significant factors affecting service quality.

Keywords: Service quality, Service quality gap model, Hotel businesses, Organizational barriers, Antalya.

Authors

Full Name	Author contribution roles	Contribution rate
Gölsüm Kasap:	Conceptualism, Methodology, Software, Validation, Formal Analysis, Investigation	35%
Arif Nihat Samur:	Resources, Data Curation, Writing - Original Draft, Visualization	30%
İbrahim Yılmaz:	Writing - Review & Editing, Supervision, Project administration, Funding acquisition	30%

Author statement: Author(s) declare(s) that All procedures performed in studies involving human participants were in accordance with the ethical standards of the institutional and/or national research committee and with the 1964 Helsinki declaration and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards. **Declaration of Conflicting Interests:** The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article

Ethics Committee Statement: Ethics committee report is available for this research and it has been documented to the journal

Ethics committee: Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli University Ethics Committee

Date of ethics committee decision: 44230

Ethics committee decision number: 210000285