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Abstract: In general, perceived service quality seems to be positively related to customers’ likelihood of remaining a loyal customer and their attitudes toward the service provider (Anton, Camarero, & Carrero, 2007; Bell, Auh & Smalley, 2005; Aydin & Ozer, 2005). Suhartanto (2011) reported that there are numerous studies, mostly conducted in developed countries, which examined service quality as the determinant of customers’ brand loyalty in the hotel industry. This prompted the researchers to investigate empirically how and to what degree customers’ perceptions on service quality dimensions impact their hotel brand loyalty in developing country - India. Multiple regression analysis, on survey responses of the customers of 8 different four and five star hotels, reflected that customers’ perceptions on tangibles, empathy and reliability contributed to fostering their loyalty with hotel brands. Implications for practitioners and future researchers were discussed, too.
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I. Introduction

Berry (2000) claimed that branding is regarded as the cornerstone in 21st century while taking service marketing domain in to consideration. Today’s researchers declared the brand as the most influential character in services because of its innate distinctiveness like perish ability, inseparability, tangibility and heterogeneity (Kapferer, 2004). The emergence of brand equity raised its importance in researchers and brand manager equally (Keller, 2003) but it also had significant differences in the defining and measuring brand equity (Bailey and Ball, 2006; Keller and Lehmann, 2006).

The hotel industry, in particular, and all businesses whose service depend on building long term relationship need to concentrate on maintaining customer’s loyalty. To achieve a sustainable competitive advantage in the marketplace, one has to value the importance of building, using and maintaining brands. For this reason, academics and practitioners have studied the concept and measurement of brand equity for more than a decade (Kim, Kim & An, 2003). Prasad and Dev (2000) are of the opinion that branding is an effective method for hotels and hotel chains to identify and distinguish themselves from competitors in the mind of the customer. The hotel industry isn’t a new vertical for India by any measure. The 2011 World Economic forum’s Travel and Tourism Competitiveness Report (TTCR) ranked India 68 out of 124 countries to visit; which predicted a gloomy picture for hotels as well; which mainly depends on tourism in India. India has slipped 6 positions from position no. 62 in 2009.

Bailey and Ball (2006) defined hotel based brand equity as “the value that consumers and hotel property owners associate with a hotel brand and the impacts of these associations on their behavior”. Prasad and Dev (2000) and later on, Forgacs (2003) found that extensive strategies have been applied for the development and prolific growth of new branded hotels over the last five years, worldwide. This overabundance of hotel brands has given rise to severe confusion among customers according to the arguments of Gibson (2003), Olsen et al. (1998) and Kim et al. (2008). Now it clearly demanded efforts to enhance and enrich the specific knowledge related to hotel brand management, so that improved and better decision making related to marketing activities could be recognized and practiced to stand high in the crowd.

As suggested Al-Rousan, Ramzi & Mohamed (2010), the relationship at the level of dimensions has remained virtually unexplored. To add to the limited literature on hotel service industry, the present study intended to contribute to the literature of hotel brand equity, specifically, and service brand equity, generally. It also promises significant ‘go ahead’ for researchers to explore the effect of perceived service quality on brand loyalty. And due to the lack of empirical research in this particular domain (Cobb-Walgren et al., 1995; Prasad and Dev, 2000; Kim and Kim, 2005; Kayaman & Arasli, 2007), this study gains more importance. Besides, findings of the research would result in deeper and better understandings of the concept of hotels’ service quality and its subsequent effects on brand loyalty in theory especially in India.
Literature Review

Service quality was defined by Zeithaml (1988) as “the judgment of customers about the overall superiority of a product or service.” Gronroos (1988) posited that perceived quality is considered good when the experienced quality of customers meets the expected quality from the brand. The literature considers perceived service quality as a “core/primary” aspect across customer-based brand equity landmark frameworks (Farquhar, 1989; Keller, 1993; Aaker, 1996; Dyson et al., 1996). It provides customers with a reason to purchase and enhances customer value by equipping the brand with differentiation and prominent positioning among competitor’s brands.

In customer-based brand equity (CBBE) model, perceived quality is considered as the primary facet (Dyson et al., 1996).

Many researchers conceptualized various dimensions of perceived service quality like, landmark study of Knutson et al. (1990), Oberoi and Hales (1990) work in UK based hotel settings, Getty and Thompson (1994) study on Spanish hotel industry, SERVPERF model developed by Cronin and Taylor (1992), Ekinci (1998) work in hotel industry of Turkey, Wilkins et al. (2007) work on hotel service industry, “HOLSERV” scale of Mei et al. (1999) in the hotel industry of Australia, studies ranging from supermarkets to travel agencies and from information services to hotel industries (Bigné et al., 2003; Akhaba, 2006; Landrum et al., 2007; Roses et al., 2009), five service quality dimensions in the hospitality industry by Saleh and Ryan (1991), six dimensions developed by Khan (2003) in ecotourism industry, “lodging quality index” by Getty and Getty (2003) in USA hospitality market, nine dimensional scale by Juwaeer (2004) developed in the Mauritian hotel industry and then a five-dimensional scale by Albacete-Saes et al. (2007) in rural accommodation industry. The most famous model of service quality was proposed by Parasuraman et al. (1985, 1988). It had five dimensions and can be explained as:

1st - Reliability: “the degree to which a promised service is performed dependably and accurately”.
2nd - Responsiveness: “the degree to which service providers are willing to help customers and provide prompt service”.
3rd - Assurance: “the extent to which service providers are knowledgeable, courteous, and able to inspire trust and confidence”.
4th - Empathy: “the degree to which the customers are offered caring and individualized attention”.
5th - Tangibles: “the degree to which physical facilities, equipment, and appearance of personnel are adequate”.

The perception of customers about quality was predicted to be linked with their loyalty with brand because favorable perception about the brand quality leads to more and more brand loyal customers. That’s why Bolton and Drew (1991) suggested “service quality has significant effects on
customer loyalty”. In general, perceived service quality seems to be positively related to customers’ likelihood of remaining a loyal customer and their attitudes toward the service provider i.e. brand loyalty (Anton, Camarero, & Carrero, 2007; Bell, Auh & Smalley, 2005; Aydin & Ozer, 2005). Among others, Jones et al. (2002) found a significant relationship between perceived quality and customer loyalty. To report the direct relation between perceived service quality and brand loyalty, existence of a significant and positive relationship between the perceptions of customers related to service quality and their intentions to buy and, subsequently, willingness to recommend the company (positive word of mouth) is very much evident in various studies (Parasuraman et al., 1988; 1991). Conflicting findings regarding the relationships between service quality and brand loyalty are also found in empirical studies in the hotel context. Kandampully and Hu (2007) and Kim et al. (2008) did not find a significant relationship between service quality and brand loyalty. Lai et al. (2009) found indirect relationships between service quality and brand loyalty through perceived value. Kayaman and Arasli (2007) reported that only tangible and responsiveness dimension has significant effect on brand loyalty. Others report indirect relationship between service quality and brand loyalty through perceived value and customer satisfaction (Chitty et al., 2007). Suhartanto (2011) reported that there are a number of studies examining service quality as the determinant of brand loyalty in the hotel industry, mostly conducted in developed countries. Some of these studies are bivariate studies in that they examine brand loyalty with service quality (Alexandris et al., 2002; Juwaeheer, 2004). Cretu and Brodie (2007), Michell et al., (2001) and Jones et al., (2002) also found significant and positive association among perceived service quality with brand loyalty. So, Study Hypothesis: Hotel customers’ perceptions regarding SERVQUAL dimensions (assurance, tangibles, reliability, responsiveness and empathy) will have differential positive impact on their brand loyalty

II. Research Methods

Data was collected from multiple cities of Goa and Kerala who used services of eight renowned four and five stars hotel operating in India. Survey questionnaires were personally administered during Nov-December, 2011 – the peak season in the area. After multiple follow-ups, 190 questionnaires were successfully retrieved. The SERVQUAL items in the questionnaire were adapted from the pioneering study conducted by Parasuraman et al’s (1988) having five dimensions namely, tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance and empathy. Kim and Kim (2005) scales were used for measuring brand loyalty (6-items). The 5-point Likert scale was used to measure five dimensions of service quality and customer loyalty where “1 = strongly disagree” and “5 = strongly agree”. Stepwise regression analysis was employed to test the research hypothesis.

III. Results and Discussion

The demographic statistics of four and five star hotel customers indicated that 149 (78%) male customers participated in this study besides 41 (22%) females. Sixty four percent respondents earned Master degrees whereas only 36% were undergraduates. Thirty percent were employed by private organizations, 15 percent were businessmen and only 6 percent were from government sectors. The descriptive statistics such as mean, standard deviation and inter correlations of all study variables are presented in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Descriptive Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X1 = Brand Loyalty, X2 = Tangibles, X3 = Reliability, X4 = Responsiveness, X5 = Assurance, X6 = Empathy, *Significant at 0.001 level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table # 2 displays the results of stepwise regression analysis in which customers' perceptions on dimensions of service quality such as tangibles, empathy, reliability, assurance, and responsiveness were regressed on brand loyalty. The results indicated that overall about 40% variance (adjusted $R^2=0.40$) was explained by the perceptions regarding SERVQUAL dimensions like “reliability”, “tangibles” and “empathy”. Brand reliability perceptions alone explained 27% variability ($R^2$ change=.27) whereas tangibles and empathy perceptions accounted for only 11% ($R^2$ change=.11) and about 3% ($R^2$ change=.03) variance in brand loyalty respectively. However, customers' perceptions on “responsiveness” and “empathy” did not influence their loyalty with hotel brand.

ANOVA results (Table 3) are indicative of predictive strength ($F_{3,163} = 38.578, p < .001$) of the empirical model suggesting its appropriateness for explaining variance in brand loyalty.

IV. Conclusion and Recommendations

The main aim of this research was to determine differential impact of customers' perceptions regarding SERVQUAL dimensions on their hotel brand loyalty. Based on study findings, it can be concluded that customers’ perceptions regarding hotel brand quality dimensions such as “tangibles”, “reliability” and “empathy” contributed to build their brand loyalty. Interestingly, favorable perceptions on hotel tangibles predicted relatively stronger brand loyalty than did reliability and empathy.
perceptions. Today, competition is a primary challenge in the hospitality industry and the solution lies not only in increasing market share, and then preserving it accordingly, but also keeping them intact with the brand. As discussed earlier, in highly competitive war-field, a brand loyal customer profile is critical for a hotel brand. Our study recommends a stronger role of service quality and one of the strategies to create such a loyal customer profile is to develop a unique ambiance, an exclusive tangibilized atmosphere and a service delivery ensuring empathy and reliability. The staff’s politeness, responsiveness, timely service and empathy plays a strong positive role in instigating a sense of belongingness in the customers; which means a strong brand loyalty because employee’s behavior and attitude shape customers’ overall perceptions about the brand.

This study also has several limitations. Firstly, this study targeted only four/five-star hotels. So the results cannot be generalized on the entire hotel industry. Secondly, conducting this research by using probability sampling method will compensate the limitation of non probability sampling method used in this study. In spite of a lot of literature on brand equity, it has been difficult to offer a full description of the nature of the hotel brand equity construct. To the best knowledge of the researchers, this research examined the impact of only two dimensions of brand equity for hotels. Still, there may be some other dimensions that have not been identified in the conceptual framework of this study. There is a dire need to extend this study to the categories in chain restaurant, cafe and motel settings.

References

[23]. Gibson, A. (2003). The International Hospitality Industry Structure, Characteristics and


[50]. World Economic Forum, Travel and Tourism Competitiveness Report (2011.)