

A Content Analysis About e-Complaints of the Hospitality Enterprises in Manavgat Regions

Manavgat Bölgesindeki Konaklama İletmelerine Yönelik e- İkayetlerin İçerik Analizi

E.Köksal SEZGİN¹

Seyran EFİLİTİ²

M.Bahadır KALIPÇI³

Seden ALGÜR⁴

ABSTRACT

There has been rapid improvements in communication technologies and in management of the customer complaints in an effective way. The consumers and enterprises which accommodate themselves with this situation are able to express themselves on online medium using the internet.

It is seen these comments which can be called e-complaints has become an important source of information for users who are about to take travel decisions. Primary purpose of this work is to evaluate with content analysis method total 1474 comments belonging to hotel enterprises which are found on the site of trip advisor and active in the region of Antalya Manavgat Turkey, according to site's own evaluation system under the titles of location hygiene service and sleep quality.it is also aimed that the mentioned complaints are understood and managed well the acquired finding's contribution to the application process has been discussed and suggestion have been given

Keywords: Customer Complaints, Customer Satisfaction, Hospitality Enterprises

ÖZET

İletişim Teknolojileri ve müşteri şikayetlerinin etkili bir şekilde yönetimi konusunda hızlı gelişmeler olmuştur. Bu durumdan yararlanmak isteyen tüketiciler ve işletmeler internet kullanımlarını arttırmaktadır. E-şikayetler olarak ifade edilebilen görüşlerin, seyahat kararı almak üzere olan kullanıcılar için önemli bir bilgi kaynağı haline geldiği görülmektedir. Bu çalışmanın birincil amacı; Tripadvisor sitesinde bulunan ve Antalya Manavgat bölgesinde faaliyet gösteren otel işletmelerine ait 1474 görüşün, Tripadvisor sitesinin lokasyon, hijyen, servis ve uyku kalitesi başlıkları altındaki kendi değerlendirme sistemine göre içerik analizini yapmaktır. Ayrıca belirtilen şikayetlerin anlaşılması ve yönetimi de amaçlanmıştır. Elde edilen bulgular bu doğrultuda değerlendirilmiş ve önerilerde bulunulmuştur.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Müşteri şikayetleri, Müşteri Memnuniyeti, Konaklama işletmeleri

¹ Ö.r.Gör., Akdeniz Üniversitesi, Manavgat MYO, ekoksalsezgin@akdeniz.edu.tr

² Ö.r.Gör., Akdeniz Üniversitesi, Manavgat MYO, seyranefiliti@yahoo.com

³ Ö.r.Gör., Akdeniz Üniversitesi, Manavgat MYO, bkalipci@akdeniz.edu.tr

⁴ Akdeniz Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler M.Y.O., Turizm ve Otel İşletmediliği Programı, sedenalgur@akdeniz.edu.tr

INTRODUCTION

It is very important for all service enterprises and especially hotels, to manage the customer complaints efficiently, improve the services and create the customer satisfaction in nowadays competition environment. To decrease the customer complaints or totally terminate them is possible to know the factors that create the dissatisfaction and have the educated staff who aware of the situation (Kotler and Armstrong, 2006).

Firstly, if the dissatisfied customers don't complain, the companies lose the chance to solve the problems and keep their customers. Secondly, reputation of the company which aims to the perfect services may be damaged. Thirdly, if the customer leaves the company without complain, then the company may be deprived of the valuable feedback about quality of its products and services (Ekiz and Köker: 2010).

Number of the web sites that the customer reviews and complaints about hotel enterprises can be shared on, increase rapidly and customers believe that their problems can be solved via these web sites. Consequently, complaint forums are getting more important for companies. Customers who get immediate and convincing replies against their complaints, commit to the companies. Customer complaints decrease the failure possibility of the organization's service preparation labours and prohibit the possible customer loss. Previous researches showed that at the end of recruitment labours on services, the customers who had complaint about the service were more satisfied than the customers who had no service failure before (Gilly and Hansen: 1992).

New technologies are getting more important for managing and marketing of tourism destinations and organizations (Minghetti ve Buhalis, 2009). Especially, it effects deeply the distribution channels of tourism related information and people's travel purchasing and planning styles (Buhalis ve Law, 2008). According to the research of American Travel Industry Association, %64 of online travellers use search engines to plan their travel (TIA,2005). According to the research of Google, consumers make 12 online searches and visit 22 web sites before make travel decision (Taylor, 2009). Mouth to mouth marketing transferred to the electronic platform by using internet and internet based application all over the world (Kim, Leong ve Lee, 2010). Consumers use search engines and forum sites on siber environment to have information about products and services before making decision to purchase tourism products and trust the information about millions of user all over the world. These search engine results and especially reviews about companies, products and services on forum web sites effect directly preference of product. (Yaylı ve Bayram, 2010). The web sites about every single subject and product, which contain user reviews, were started to use by Amazon.com that put the customer reviews on their web sites in the beginning of 1995 (Yaylı ve Bayram, 2010). Therefore, the main purpose of this research is to analyze the content of user reviews about three, four and five star hotel in Antalya Manavgat area on Trip Advisor web site.

Methodology

The data that have been used in this research consist the reviews at www.tripadvisor.com between the dates May 15th-25th, 2011. The web site has both reviews about hotel enterprises and different applications regarding destinations and restaurants. The main reason to choose TripAdvisor is that the web site has the highest number of reviews on its area. The main purpose of TripAdvisor is to deliver unchanged and unshaped reviews and suggestions to other users. In this research, Antalya Manavgat has been chosen as research area and 29 hotels in this area have been selected to analyze. Six dimensions which consist the general evaluations and sub headlines have been analyzed. Besides, visit propose of review owners and with whom they visit were also evaluated. 21 hotels are 4 star, 5 hotels are 3 star and 3 hotels are 5 star on the web site. 1474 reviews about those hotels which were suitable to purpose of this research have been analyzed. Every single user's review has been evaluated under 6 main dimensions. Also, One Way Anova Test has been used to determine whether there was difference between the reviews and category of hotels on 0.05 significance level.

The Analysis of Research Data

According to Table 1, %86.3 of the reivews that have been analyzed belong to 4 star hotels, %8.2 of them belong to 3 star hotels and %5.5 of them belong to 5 star hotels.

Table 1: Findings About Participants

Category of the Hotels	f	%
Five Star	81	5,5
Four Star	1272	86,3
Three Star	121	8,2
Total	1474	100
Business Reviews	14	0,9
Couple Reviews	439	29,9
Family Reviews	713	48,4
Friend Reviews	269	18,2
Solo Travel Reviews	39	2,6
Total	1474	100

The other finding about participant is that %48.4 of them travel with their family, %29.9 of them travel as couples, %18.2 of them travel with their friends, %2.6 of them trvael alone and %0.9 travel for business. It can be told that most people who wrote review about hotels in Antalya Manavgat area, travel with their family.

Frequency and percentage findings about main dimensions of users reviews have been showed on Table 2. According to Table 2, %44 of users evaluate the hotel enterprises as *perfect* on value level, %22.9 of them evalute as *good*, %13.8 of them evaluate as

average, %10.2 evaluate as *bad* and %9.1 of them evaluate as *terrible*. The table also shows that %38.9 of the participants evaluate the rooms as *perfect*, %27.1 of them evaluate as *good*, %17.4 of them evaluate as *average*, %9.7 of them evaluate as *bad* and %7 of them evaluate as *terrible*.

Table 2: Findings About Users Reviews

	5		4		3		2		1		Mean	Std.Dev
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
Value	648	44,0	338	22,9	203	13,8	151	10,2	134	9,1	3,82	1,33
Rooms	573	38,9	399	27,1	256	17,4	143	9,7	103	7,0	3,81	1,24
Locations	533	36,2	351	23,8	302	20,5	175	11,9	113	7,7	3,68	1,27
Cleanliness	784	53,2	282	19,1	170	11,5	137	9,3	101	6,9	3,92	1,35
Service	741	50,3	289	19,6	171	11,6	135	9,2	138	9,4	4,02	1,27
Sleep Q.	614	41,7	357	24,2	254	17,2	135	9,2	114	7,7	3,82	1,27
General	724	49,1	458	31,1	164	11,1	69	4,7	59	4,0	4,16	1,05

(5: Perfect, 4: Good, 3: Average, 2: Bad, 1:Terrible)

As it can be seen on Table 2, %36.2 of the users evaluate the location of the hotel as *perfect*, %23.8 of them evaluate as *good*, %20.5 of them evaluate as *average*, %11.9 of them evaluate as *bad* and %7.7 of them evaluate as *terrible*.

%53.2 of the users evaluate the cleanliness of the hotel as *perfect*, %19.1 of the evaluate as *good*, %11.5 of them evaluate as *average*, %9.3 of them evaluate as *bad* and %3.92 evaluate as *terrible*.

%50.3 of the users evaluate the service of the hotel as *perfect*, %19.6 of them evaluate as *good*, %11.6 of them evaluate as *average*, %9.2 of them evaluate as *bad* and %9.4 of them evaluate as *terrible*.

%41.7 of the users evaluate the sleep quality of the hotels as *perfect*, %24.2 of them evaluate as *good*, %17.2 of them evaluate as *average*, %9.2 of them evaluate as *bad* and %7.7 of them evaluate as *terrible*.

In addition to 6 dimensions of the research, the other criterion to evaluate the hotels is *general evaluation*. This general evaluation is not related the other 6 dimensions and was specified by the users. According to Table 2, %49.1 of the users evaluate the hotels generally as *perfect*, %31.1 of them evaluate as *good*, %11.1 of them evaluate as *average*, %4.7 of them evaluate as *bad* and %4 of them evaluate as *terrible*.

Table 3: User Reviews Regarding Hotel Category

		Five Star	Four Star	Three Star
Value	n	81	1272	121
	mean	3,88	3,82	3,74
	S.D.	1,35	1,33	1,28
	F	2443,546		
	p	0,000		
Rooms	n	81	1272	121
	mean	3,88	3,77	4,17
	S.D.	1,20	1,25	1,06
	F	2548,758		
	p	0,000		
Locations	n	81	1272	121
	mean	3,56	3,62	4,42
	S.D.	1,35	1,26	1,14
	F	3453,068		
	p	0,000		
Cleanliness	n	81	1272	121
	mean	4,08	3,90	4,38
	S.D.	1,15	1,38	1,08
	F	2573,068		
	p	0,000		
Service	n	81	1272	121
	mean	3,80	3,88	4,38
	S.D.	1,42	1,36	1,05
	F	2383,762		
	p	0,000		
Sleep Quality	n	81	1272	121
	mean	3,80	3,77	4,39
	S.D.	1,30	1,28	1,00
	F	2537,231		
	p	0,000		

(5: Perfect, 4: Good, 3: Average, 2: Bad, 1:Terrible)

On Table 3, it was investigated whether statistically relationship existed between sub dimensions of user reviews and category of hotels. According to the analysis, F was found as 2443.546 and p found as 0.000 on $\alpha=0,05$ between Value and Hotel Category. As Mean was found as 3.88 for five star hotels, it can be said that perception about value at for five star hotels was higher.

As F was found as 2548.758 and p was found as 0.000 on $\alpha=0,05$, there was significant difference between Rooms and Hotel Category. As Mean was found as 4.17 for three star hotels, it can be said that perception about rooms at three star hotels was higher.

As F was found as 3453.068 and p was found as 0.000 on $\alpha=0,05$, there was significant difference between Location and Hotel Category. As Mean was found as 4.42 for three star hotels, it can be said that perception about rooms at three star hotels was higher.

As F was found as 2573.068 and p was found as 0.000 on $\alpha=0,05$, there was significant difference between Cleanliness and Hotel Category. As Mean was found as 4.38 for three star hotels, it can be said that perception about rooms at three star hotels was higher.

As F was found as 2383.762 and p was found as 0.000 on $\alpha=0,05$, there was significant difference between Service and Hotel Category. As Mean was found as 4.38 for three star hotels, it can be said that perception about rooms at three star hotels was higher.

As F was found as 2537.231 and p was found as 0.000 on $\alpha=0,05$, there was significant difference between Sleep Quality and Hotel Category. As Mean was found as 4.39 for three star hotels, it can be said that perception about rooms at three star hotels was higher.

CONCLUSION and SUGGESTIONS

Developing the internet network rapidly causes that the communication between the people transfer onto this network. People intent to search and read user reviews before making purchase decision for a product or service. Therefore the aim of this research was to investigate the reviews of the people who accommodated at hotels in Antalya Manavgat area by determining perceive of the potential consumers.

According to the results, most of the hotel enterprises which are %86.3 were four star hotels. It was because the number of four stars hotels are more than the other categories. It was found that %48.4 of people travelled with their families and only %0.9 of them travelled on business purpose. The reviews of the customers were analyzed under six main criterias. According to this analysis, the most *perfect* voted criteria was Cleanliness with %53.2. Service was on second place with %50.3, Value was on third place with %44, Sleep Quality was on fourth place with %41.7, Rooms was on fifth place with %38.9 and Location was on sixth place with %36.2.

Even there were negative reviews during the analysis, hotel enterprises have had generally positive image on TripAdvisor. Companies may be one step forward in the market by doing everything correctly and without huge promotion and marketing budgets as the consumers also share their positive opinions when they were satisfied and not only negative reviews when they were unsatisfied. Companies should consider the negative reviews and provide the necessary improvement.

This research was made only on reviews for hotel enterprises in Antalya Manavgat area. In the future another research is planned which will comprise the whole country and may be significant for general country image.

REFERENCES

- BUHALIS, D.**, ve Law, R. (2008). Progress in information technology and tourism management: 20 years on and 10 years after the internet the state of eTourism research. *Tourism Management*, 29(4), 609-623.
- EK Z E.**, Köker N. E. (2010). ikâyetin Kısıtlayıcı Faktörleri: Turistlerin Belirgin ikâyet Etme Davranı ları *Journal Of Yasar University* 2010 17(5) 2859 2873
- GILY, M.C.** and Hansen R. W. (1992). Consumer Coplaint Handling as a Strategic Marketing Tool. *The Journal of Product and Brand Management*. ! (3). 5-16
- KIM, W.**, Jeong, O.R. ve Lee, S.W. (2010). On Social Web Sites, *Information Systems*. 35(2), 215-236.
- KOTLER, P.**,Armstrong, G. (2006). *Principles of marketing* (11th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc.
- MINGHETT, V.**, ve Buhalis D. (2009). Digital Divide in Tourism. *Journal of Travel Research*. 1-15.
- TIA.** (2005). *Traveler's use of the internet*. Washington. DC: Travel Industry Association of America.
- YAYLI, A.**, ve Bayram, M. (2010). Otel letmelerine li kin Sosyal A lardaki Kullanıcı Yorumlarının De erlendirilmesi. 11. Ulusal Turizm Kongresi. 2-5 Aralık. Ku adası,Aydın.
- YAYLI, A.**, ve Bayram, M. (2010). E-Tüketici Yorumları: Antalya Restoranları Üzerine Bir De erlendirme. 4. Ulusal Gastronomi Sempozyumu&Sanatsal Etkinlikler. 16-17 Nisan, Antalya