



March 2019

How constraints on tourist complaints affect perceptions of justice and intentions of loyalty: Case of tourists from China visiting Turkey

Erdogan Ekiz

King Abdulaziz University, hekiz@kau.edu.sa

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarcommons.usf.edu/globe>



Part of the [Business Commons](#)

This Refereed Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Journal of Global Business Insights* by an authorized editor of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact scholarcommons@usf.edu.

Recommended Citation

Ekiz, E. (2019). How constraints on tourist complaints affect perceptions of justice and intentions of loyalty: Case of tourists from China visiting Turkey. *Journal of Global Business Insights*, 4(1), 1-17. doi:10.5038/2640-6489.4.1.1036

Corresponding Author

Erdogan Ekiz, King Abdulaziz University, Faculty of Tourism, Travel and Tourism Department, P.O. Box: 80200, Jeddah 21589, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

Revisions

Submission date: Oct. 7, 2018; 1st Revision: Nov. 20, 2018; 2nd Revision: Jan. 1, 2019; 3rd Revision: Mar. 20, 2019; Acceptance: Mar. 23, 2019

How Constraints on Tourist Complaints Affect Perceptions of Justice and Intentions of Loyalty: Case of Tourists from China Visiting Turkey

Erdogan H. Ekiz

Faculty of Tourism
King Abdulaziz University, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia
hekiz@kau.edu.sa

Abstract

Companies rarely enjoy hearing bad news, particularly when it comes from dissatisfied customers. Yet, in the face of continually growing competition and empowerment of customers, it is essential that companies learn of the problems that are causing their customers distress. In fact, companies never hear from most of the customers who simply go away unsatisfied, without voicing their complaints. The tourism and hospitality industries have a number of unique features that make them especially susceptible. Although several studies treat tourist complaints and general consumer complaints as the same, Ekiz (2011) reasoned that these unique features demand a new measurement scale, tourist complaint restraints (TCC scale). Thus, the aim of this study is to evaluate the effects of TCC on perceptions of justice (*justice perceptions* in the model) and commitment to loyalty (*loyalty intention*) among Chinese tourists in Istanbul, Turkey. To achieve this aim, 700 questionnaires in Mandarin were printed and distributed around Istanbul's historic tourist attractions as a form of purposive sampling. 597 questionnaires were found to be complete, giving a response rate of 85.3 percent. Structural Equation Modeling analyses indicated that the proposed seven-factor theoretical model fitted the data reasonably well. Results indicated that the majority of the hypothesized relationships were supported. In particular, *limited communication* on the *interactional justice* dimension, and *unfamiliarity* on the *procedural and distributive justice* dimension were found to be the most important constraints. *Distributive justice* was found to have the strongest effect on *loyalty*. The implications of these findings will be discussed.

Keywords: tourist complaining constraints, perceptions of justice, intentions of loyalty, Chinese tourists, Turkey

Introduction

Schoefer and Ennew (2004, p. 83) stressed that “eliminating service failure is utterly impossible, especially in the tourism industry where the involvement of a number of different parties in service delivery may increase the potential for failure”. Yet, several studies reported very low percentages of customer complaints (Hazée, Van Vaerenbergh, & Armirotto, 2017; Maheswaran & Shavitt, 2000; Tax & Chandrashekar, 1992). This raises the question, why do consumers not complain? So far, the high *cost* of complaining has been argued to be the leading reason. The cost may be the time required to complain, the financial cost of complaining, psychological outlay during

complaining, or any combination of these, and is likely to affect responses to service failure encounters (Park & Ha, 2016; Xu & Wu, 2018).

The reasons for not complaining are discussed at length by various scholars. These reasons include; amount of financial loss (Diener & Greysen, 1978), type of product (Day, 1984), industry (Gilly & Gelb, 1982), socio-demographic characteristics of dissatisfied consumers (Bourgeois & Barnes, 1979), and personal and psychological factors (Grönhaug & Zaltman, 1981). Also, more recently, some researchers turned their attention to cultural differences (Lee & Sparks, 2007; Weber, Sparks, & Hsu, 2017) and argued that consumers' cultural backgrounds might affect complaining behavior. All these researchers have provided significant insight into reasons why some unhappy customers do not complain. However, their results were inconsistent across industries, and some researchers concluded that complaining behavior might vary for some industries (Tribe, 2008). Furthermore, variations in individual cases made suggestions of implications almost impossible to fit all cases (Balaji, Khong, & Chong, 2016; Mousavi & Esfidani, 2013). In addition, the methodology used in earlier work was criticized (Halstead & Dröge, 1991). A specific limitation for the purposes of this study is that only a handful of these studies focus on tourist complaining (Ekiz, Au, & Hsu, 2012) in different cultural settings (Ekiz, 2011). A recurring conclusion in the relevant literature is *to call for further investigation* (Best & Andreasen, 1977; Moon & Han, 2018). Above mentioned issues created a gap in the understanding of tourism complaining constraints. Thus, in attempting to understand why tourists choose not to voice their dissatisfaction, the present study uses the TCC scale (Ekiz, 2011) with actual tourists, the absence of which was a limitation in the original study. The following section focuses on defining and justifying the factors Ekiz (2011) developed under the TCC scale. By using this framework, the present study aims to assess the effects of TCC on perceptions of justice and commitment to loyalty of Chinese tourists in Istanbul, Turkey.

Literature Review

No matter how hard they try, even the best service companies are not able to eliminate all mistakes and problems (Karatepe, & Ekiz, 2004). These mistakes, problems or service failures are performances that fall below customers' expectations (Hazée et al., 2017; Hoffman, Kelley, & Rotalsky, 1995). When this happens, a customer either complain or not, mostly latter is the common outcome. The majority of customer complaint research studied formal complaint actions or intentions as the major outcome of an unsatisfactory consumption (Bergel & Brock, 2018; Singh, 1990). However, Halstead and Dröge (1991) argued that restricting the definition of service failure to complaints directed at a seller or third party can be unnecessarily limiting. Therefore, customer complaint behavior (CCB) can be defined as "A set of multiple (behavioral and non-behavioral) responses, some or all of which are triggered by perceived dissatisfaction with a purchase episode" (Singh, 1988, p. 94).

Once services fail and complaints are made, complainers judge the outcome by using a justice balance in their minds. Austin (1979, p. 127) defined justice as "...the criterion against which the legitimacy of an act or a social program is judged...it refers to procedures governing human affairs, and/or claims". Building on a general meaning like this, Tax, Brown, and Chandrashekar (1998) proposed a concept of justice comprising three-dimensions; distributive/distributional justice (concerning decision outcomes), procedural justice (concerning decision-making processes) and interactional justice (concerning interpersonal behavior in enacting procedures and delivering outcomes). Only when consumers feel that recovery efforts are just (received a fair recovery), they can be loyal and their future business can be guaranteed. Oliver (1999, p. 34) defined loyalty as

“...a deeply held commitment to re-buy or re-patronize a preferred product/service consistently in the future, thereby causing repetitive same-brand or same brand-set purchasing, despite situational influences and marketing efforts having the potential to cause switching behavior”. Building a pool of loyal customers is a major challenge for all the businesses, yet there are additional issues when tourism services are considered (Finsterwalder & Tombs, 2018).

Tourism literature in general, and tourist behavior research, in particular, has become a compelling mixture of issues by using theories originating from other areas of study, such as, anthropology, psychology, sociology, and marketing. In particular, marketing literature has been heavily relied upon regarding consumer behavior in the explanation of tourist behavior (Mousavi & Esfidani, 2013; Ozdemir & Yolal, 2016; Tribe, 2008). Huang (2007, p. 247) noted that “...although some scholars align tourist behavior with consumer behavior or confine the former to the broad scope of inquiry to the latter, it is obvious that tourist behavior differs from other types of consumer behavior...”. Although consumer behavior studies have enhanced our understanding of tourist behavior to a large extent, there has been comparatively fewer studies conducted on tourists’ purchasing behavior (Cohen, Prayag, & Moital, 2014) and even fewer on tourist complaining behavior (Ekiz et al., 2012; Hui, Ho, & Wan, 2011). Thus, below section defines and presents the framework of tourist complaint constraints (TCC) by Ekiz (2011).

Limited Time

Morello (2004) proposed that two types of time exist: objective time or *clock time*; personal time or mental time, in which people base their understanding of time on subjective measurement norms drawn from their experience or preferences. During holidays, where time commitments tend to be flexible, other than the pre-determined start and finish of the holiday, people are likely to lose track of time (van der Knaap, 1997). However, Swanson and Kelly (2001) noted that time restrictions are particularly influential in service industries. Time availability has been linked to the propensity to complain (Morel, Poiesz, & Wilke, 1997), choice of channels (Kotler, Bowen, & Makens, 2010) and perceptions of justice (Woehler, 2004). By definition, a tourist has limited time available to spend at a destination. Thus, limited time may affect tourists’ complaining behavior in the sense that they may simply not have time to complain. Indeed, Cohen (2004) proposed that limitations on time negatively affect their overall holiday satisfaction. Similarly, Cohen-Hattab and Kerber (2004) urged that having limited time negatively affects activities that tourists participate in, places they visit and even their overall holiday satisfaction. Yuksel and Yuksel (2008) noted that within the limited time spent in a destination, tourists tend to choose the easiest activities to experience a local culture and to utilize their limited time effectively. McKercher (1998) investigated the effect of market access on destination choice and found that travelers with limited time will tend to (i) drive directly to the destination, (ii) select the more proximate of destinations, and (iii) seek destinations with very strong market access. These findings imply that limited time is a noteworthy issue affecting tourist decisions. Morley (1990) emphasized that time restrictions during the holiday experience may affect tourists’ complaining behavior. Ekiz and Au (2009) suggested a possible relationship between time limitation and justice perceptions among tourists. Based on this discussion, we propose the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1. Limited time, as a constraint on complaining behavior, negatively affects tourists’ (a) interactional justice perceptions, (b) procedural justice perceptions and (c) distributive justice perceptions.

Unfamiliarity

Day and Landon (1976, p. 264) argued that "...the less knowledgeable [familiar in this case] consumer will be less able to judge product performance and evaluate the goods and services as he consumes...also he will be unfamiliar with procedures for seeking redress and in registering complaints". In the context of tourism, Wickens (2002) described familiarity as one's knowledge of the customs, norms and practices of other social groups. He argued that when a consumer is not familiar with the purchased service, s/he is less likely to be able to evaluate its performance (Zeithaml, Bitner, & Gremler, 2006) and will be less likely to be familiar with the procedures for seeking redress and registering complaints (Reisinger & Turner, 2003). Morel et al. (1997) found that complaint behavior is associated with familiarity. Given that tourists are mostly unfamiliar with complaining procedures (Stauss & Seidel, 2004), do not know where and how to complain (Yuksel & Yuksel, 2008) and are not sure when to expect redress and in what form (Voorhees, Brady, & Horowitz, 2006), their complaining behavior is likely to be negatively affected (Ekiz and Au, 2009). This discussion leads to the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 2a. Unfamiliarity, as a constraint on complaining behavior, negatively affects tourists' (a) interactional justice perceptions, (b) procedural justice perceptions and (c) distributive justice perceptions.

Limited Communication

Communication is integral to human nature and crucially important to people's everyday social interaction. Being able to communicate increases the individual's ability to cope with uncertainty (such as a failed service), especially during inter-cultural encounters (Kim & Gudykunst, 1988). Cohen (1992) claimed that limited communication makes any significant social exchange between tourists and hosts impossible. This includes interactions around provision of services and rectifying failed services (Finsterwalder & Tombs, 2018). Consequently, when something goes wrong in a service situation, creating a need for the tourist and host to communicate to report their dissatisfaction through a complaint complaining or to respond effectively to remedy the problem, communication becomes even more important (Cohen, 1992; Nam, Baker, Ahmad, & Goo, 2018). Therefore, not having the ability to communicate with the host when there is a need to convey a dissatisfying experience, creates a natural barrier (Oz, Ihtiyar, Ahmad, & Ali, 2016; Pearce, 1982). For these reasons, this study suggests that the more tourists consider limited communication as a constraint, the more they will be demanding the service provider should go the extra mile and provide an interactive, *by-the-book*, fair redress. In line with this discussion, we propose the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 3a. Limited communication, as a constraint on complaining behavior, negatively affects tourists' (a) interactional justice perceptions, (b) procedural justice perceptions and (c) distributive justice perceptions.

Limited Involvement

According to Mittal and Lee (1989), involvement occurs when customers spend additional mental and physical energy to engage with the given service. Involvement plays a key role in explaining consumer behavior and has been shown to be significantly related to the extent of the decision-making process (Cohen et al., 2014; Mittal & Lee, 1989), product evaluation (Lovelock, 2000) and perception building about products and/or services (Cai, Feng, & Breiter, 2004). When consumers

have limited involvement, they tend to lower their interaction with the company (Park, 1996) and are more tolerant when faced with problems (Josiam, Kinley, & Kim, 2005). They also tend to perceive recovery efforts differently (Harrison, 2018; Havitz & Dimanche, 1999). In that respect, the present study argues that limited involvement creates low numbers of complaints, hence should be considered a constraint that can affect tourists' complaining behavior. This study also argues that the more tourists perceive limited involvement as a constraint, the more they will demand a personalized recovery action accompanied by fair and appropriate compensation from the service provider. Further to the above discussion, we propose the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 4a. Limited involvement, as a constraint on complaining behavior, negatively affects tourists' (a) interactional justice perceptions, (b) procedural justice perceptions and (c) distributive justice perceptions.

Positive Holiday Mood

Currie (1997, p. 884) suggested "...tourists' behavior often differs from those in the home environment...individuals remove themselves from their day-to-day environment and place themselves within a tourism environment..." where they behave differently. This difference could possibly be explained by their unique psychology, which is typified by their changed social role and the fact that they are only temporary residents of the travel destination (Casidy & Shin, 2015; Hosany & Gilbert, 2010). A review of tourism literature revealed that most tourists are determined to have a positive (Finsterwalder & Tombs, 2018; Liljander & Mattsson, 2002) and hassle-free (Wood & House, 1991) experience. Similarly, it has been noted that tourists tend to stay positive (McIntosh, Goeldner, & Ritchie, 2006), playful, relaxed and unconstrained by the rules of their home country (Yagi & Pearce, 2007) and be tolerant of service failures (Chang, Tsai, Wong, Wang, & Cho, 2015; White, 2005). In other words, if tourists face a problem, they may be more forgiving (Ekiz & Au, 2009), evaluate the encounter positively (Casidy & Shin, 2015; Hoffman et al., 1995; Park & Ha, 2016) and may not complain or be more constructive even if they do complain. This discussion therefore calls for the consideration of a positive holiday mood as a possible constraint on tourists' complaining behavior. Following from the above discussion, we propose the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 5a. Being in a positive holiday mood, as a constraint on complaining behavior, negatively affects tourists' (a) interactional justice perceptions, (b) procedural justice perceptions and (c) distributive justice perceptions.

Effects of Justice Perceptions on Loyalty Intention

Relationships between justice and post-recovery behavior have been investigated extensively within consumer complaining behavior literature (Lee, 2018). With few exceptions, all researchers agree that customers expect to, first, receive fair service and, if something goes wrong, for their problems to be solved in a fair manner (Berry, Parasuraman, & Zeithaml, 1994; Tax et al., 1998; Zemke & Anderson, 2007). Customers who perceive that they have received a fair solution may consequently feel satisfied, increase their re-patronage and engage in positive WOM (Gursoy, Ekiz, & Chi, 2006; Harrison, 2018).

A review of the literature on consumer complaining behavior (CCB) shows that justice perception significantly influences the customer's satisfaction with a procedure for handling complaints and increases re-purchase intentions and actual re-purchase, and decreases negative WOM behaviors

(Gilly & Gelb, 1982; Lovelock, 2000; Mattila, 2001). It is commonly argued that justice perceptions has significant direct and indirect effects on recovery satisfaction, loyalty to the company and repurchase intentions. Tax et al. (1998) gave an extensive review of justice literature, concluding that the three dimensions of justice (distributive, procedural and interactional) have a significant influence on complainants' post-recovery behaviors, particularly their intention of loyalty to the company. These findings are supported by many complainant satisfaction scholars, (Bergel & Brock, 2018; Gursoy, Ekiz, & Chi, 2007; Wirtz & Mattila, 2004) and word-of-mouth communication (Kau & Loh, 2006; Yoda & Kumakura, 2007). Based on this significant evidence within CCB literature, this study assesses the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 6. Interactional justice perception positively relates to tourists' loyalty intention.

Hypothesis 7. Procedural justice perception positively relates to tourists' loyalty intention.

Hypothesis 8. Distributive justice perception positively relates to tourists' loyalty intention.

Methods

The current study employs the TCC scale developed by Ekiz (2011) in order to implement the model shown in Figure 1. Additionally, it borrows Gursoy et al.'s (2007) justice constructs and Davidow's (2003a) loyalty construct. The questionnaire items were first written in English and then translated into Mandarin, following the back-translation technique (McGorry, 2000). The survey elicited responses on a 5-point scale ranging from 5 = *strongly agree* to 1 = *strongly disagree* (Likert, 1932). Results of a pilot study, conducted on 70 respondents, suggest that no items in the questionnaire significantly need to be changed or modified.

The sample for this study comprised tourists from Mainland China who visited Istanbul hotels between June and August 2016. A purposive sampling approach was undertaken for data collection. Screening questions, i.e. country of origin and whether they had had an unsatisfactory experience from their hotels during the current trip, were asked to ensure the respondents were eligible to take part in the research (Ekiz, 2011). The research team distributed the questionnaires to the respondents in Istanbul's historic tourist attractions and requested them to fill out the questionnaires in their own time. 700 questionnaires were distributed, with a total of 597 usable returns, giving a response rate of 85.3 percent.

Findings

The overwhelming majority of the respondents (87.1%) were living in Mainland China; the remainder came from Hong Kong (SAR) and from other countries, including the USA and UK. Slightly more than half of the respondents (54.2%) were men. Just over fifty-three percent were aged between 28 and 47. Half of the respondents (50.2 %) had college education. Additionally, the majority reported the purpose of their visit as vacation (76.7%) and this was their first trip to Turkey (74.4%). Finally, sixty-one percent of the respondents reported an annual income in the range of 40.000 to 60.000 USD.

Any test utilizing SEM analysis should first confirm the distributional characteristics of the data at hand via normality test (van de Vijver & Tanzer, 2004). Thus, in order to perform tests of normality based on the skewness and kurtosis of the observed variables PRELIS 2.70 was used (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1996). Overall, the results revealed a slight kurtosis and skewness for most

of the observed variables. To be more specific, the univariate skewness and kurtosis values were -1.236 and -1.481 respectively and relative multivariate kurtosis value was 1.803. None of these absolute values of skewness exceeded 2.00, while the absolute values of kurtosis did not exceed 3.00, indicating the data did not appear to deviate *extremely* from a normal distribution (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994).




Figure 1: Hypothetical model of the study

In evaluating the instrument's psychometric properties, issues of reliability, dimensionality, convergent and discriminant validity are investigated. Results of exploratory factor analysis (EFA) indicated a very good fit, so confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was employed on collected data ($n = 597$) as recommended by research methodology literature (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988). The LISREL 9.10 package by Jöreskog & Sörbom (1996) was used to apply the maximum likelihood method of estimation, using the covariance matrix as input data. Corrected item-total correlations were calculated at 0.32 or greater, supporting the convergent validity of the scale (Churchill, 1979; Kelloway, 1998). The reliability coefficient for each study variable was also computed. At the aggregate level, an overall Alpha coefficient score of 0.805 was calculated, with reliability

coefficient scores for the nine factors ranging from 0.748 to 0.863; see Table 1. These findings show that the cut-off value of 0.70, as recommended by Nunnally (1978), is exceeded for each coefficient, as was also found in Ekiz’s previous study (Ekiz, 2011).

Table 1. Results of the Confirmatory Factor Analysis

Factors and items	CSL		Measurement error		R ²	α
	λ _i	t	E _i	t		
<i>Unfamiliarity (FAM)</i>						.863
* As a tourist, I feel safer expressing my complaints, if I am in a familiar destination.	.82	12.44	1.01	10.05	.46	
* When faced with a problem during my holiday, I will be more likely to complain if I know how my complaint will be handled.	.80	11.30	1.19	14.88	.52	
* Having knowledge about the destination makes me more confident in conveying my unsatisfactory experience(s).	.75	14.31	1.12	18.61	.52	
<i>Limited Time (TIME)</i>						.807
* If I have a limited amount of time to explain my case to the service provider, I will usually prefer not to complain.	.89	15.67	1.33	14.73	.55	
* I think finding the right contact person to voice dissatisfaction takes a lot of time. For this reason, I usually choose not to complain during my vacation.	.84	13.11	1.78	16.33	.51	
* If I feel that resolving the problem will take a long time, I will sometimes choose not to complain.	.81	12.43	1.46	14.59	.48	
<i>Positive Holiday Mood (HOLI)</i>						.831
* During my holiday, I usually forgive service providers when they fail.	.82	13.66	1.81	15.80	.53	
* I consider myself very forgiving throughout my holiday.	.84	14.27	1.30	16.01	.56	
* Most of the time, I choose not to complain when I am on holiday.	.79	10.24	1.52	13.47	.44	
<i>Limited Involvement (INVO)</i>						.825
* The more money I spend on my vacation, the more likely I am to complain when an issue arises.	.84	14.35	1.84	13.47	.58	
* If I spend a lot of effort in planning my holiday, I am more likely to complain if anything goes wrong.	.80	11.07	1.17	15.23	.55	
* I tend to complain more if I am highly involved in my vacation planning.	.77	10.86	1.06	10.78	.43	
<i>Limited Communication (COMM)</i>						.798
* It becomes frustrating if the employee(s) cannot understand me while I am complaining.	.88	16.53	1.44	15.93	.57	
* I feel more confident in expressing my concerns if the employee(s) can speak my language.	.83	13.71	1.15	14.84	.49	
<i>Procedural Justice (PROJUST)</i>						.774
* I felt that hotel policies allowed for flexibility in taking care of my complaint.	.90	15.81	1.38	15.22	.59	
* I believe that the university guidelines for listening to and to handling complaints are fair.	.87	14.02	1.24	12.49	.53	
* I felt that the guidelines, used by the hotel to process my complaint, were fair.	.81	10.63	1.12	11.16	.50	
<i>Distributive Justice (DISTJUST)</i>						.751
* I am pretty happy with what the hotel gave me.	.89	17.71	1.73	18.46	.57	
* I think that the result I got from the hotel was appropriate.	.85	14.34	1.66	15.69	.53	
* I thought that the hotel solution was definitely acceptable.	.80	10.85	1.20	12.30	.50	
<i>Interactional Justice (INTJUST)</i>						.748
* I felt like the representative really cared about me.	.90	18.55	1.77	16.57	.56	
* I felt that the concern shown by the representative was sincere.	.84	14.97	1.52	15.39	.53	
* I felt that the representative was very courteous.	.81	12.51	1.28	14.20	.49	
<i>Loyalty (LOYAL)</i>						.842
* I will recommend this hotel to someone who seeks my advice.	.94	16.05	1.86	18.81	.58	
* I will say positive things about this hotel to other people.	.91	15.92	1.64	17.84	.51	
* I will encourage my friends and relatives to stay in this hotel.	.88	13.87	1.42	14.27	.50	
* I am more likely to patronize this hotel in the future.	.83	12.76	1.15	17.80	.48	
* I will consider this hotel as my first choice to buy accommodation services.	.81	10.58	1.04	17.80	.45	
Fit indices						
χ ² / df					= 2.75	
GFI (goodness of fit index)					= .95	
AGFI (adjusted goodness of fit index)					= .94	
CFI (comparative fit index)					= .91	
NNFI (non-normed fit index)					= .90	
RMSEA (root mean square error of approximation)					= .035	
RMR (root mean square residual)					= .077	

Notes: CSL = completely standardized loadings, Overall Cronbach’s α = .805, All loadings are significant at p < .01.

According to the results of the completely standardized factor loadings (CSL), there was no item with a CSL score lower than the recommended 0.40 cut-off value (Nunnally, 1978). Table 1 shows the measurement error, t-values and coefficient of determination (R^2) scores. Millan and Esteban (2004) reported R^2 scores as a relative measure of fit for each structural equation. Moreover, Hair, Money, Samouel, and Page (2007) recommended the deletion of items whose R^2 scores are lower than 0.40. Since all the values are above 0.40 there was no need to omit any items from the analysis.

Initially, results of the CFA indicated a reasonable fit of the nine-factor model to the data based on a number of fit statistics (such as; $\chi^2/df = 2.75$, GFI = .95, AGFI = .94, CFI = .91, NNFI = .90, RMSEA = .035 and RMR = .077). Although χ^2/df value is one of the most important fit indices, there is no consensus on the acceptable level. For instance, Byrne (1998) argued that the value should be low and supported a rather conservative *less-than-two criterion*, whereas Nunnally and Bernstein (1994) noted that any value between 2 and 5 is an acceptable level. Thus, 2.75 is considered an indication of a good fit. This therefore, allows us to conclude that the study model with nine constructs and 28-items is appropriate to describe the collected data and serves as a well-fitting scale for this study (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1996; Kelloway, 1998).

In order to evaluate discriminant validity, Pearson product-moment correlations were calculated. To do this, composite scores were calculated for each factor by averaging item scores for that factor. The highest correlation occurred between *distributive justice* and *loyalty* factors (0.54), and the lowest was found between *positive holiday mood* and *distributive justice* (0.12). Bauer, Falk and Hammerschmidt (2006) highlighted the need for utilizing rather conservative Fornell/Larcker tests while assessing the discriminant validity of newly developed or comparatively new scales. The average variance extracted estimate (AVE) was calculated to explain the overall amount of variance in the indicators accounted for by the respective construct (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). Values equal to or greater than 0.45 are viewed as reasonable (Netemeyer, Bearden, & Sharma, 2003), thus the overall 0.59 is acceptable. For the measurement model, the AVE for all nine factors ranged from 0.46 to 0.63, exceeding the threshold level of 0.45 (Fornell & Larcker, 1981).

Construct validity is evaluated through tests of convergent validity and discriminant validity (Schwab, 1980). Convergent validity demonstrates whether items are able to measure the construct that they are supposed to and can be assessed from the t-value of each indicator (Hair et al., 2007). Table 1 shows that all indicators of the scale have a significant t-value at the level of 0.01 (± 1.96), and 28 indicators of completely standardized factor loadings range between 0.75 and 0.95. Based on these estimates, the convergent validity of the measurement scale was established (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). Overall, these results indicated a good fit of data, with each indicator showing convergent and discriminant validity and reliability within its respective construct. This therefore provided additional support for the structural integrity of the study model (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988; Bauer et al., 2006).

The hypothesized relationships were tested using path analysis (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1996). The empirical results demonstrate that 16 out of 18 hypothesized relationships were supported, the exceptions being hypotheses 3c and 4b. Consistent with Ekiz (2011) and Ekiz *et al.* (2012) the TCC dimensions were found to be negatively related to the underlying justice dimensions. Thus, the hypotheses 1 to 5a, b and c are accepted. Moreover, three justice perceptions had a strongly significant effect on loyalty so hypotheses 6, 7 and 8 are accepted as well. A careful examination of Table 2 reveals that TCC dimensions jointly explain 49.1%, 44.0% and 41.5% of the variance in interactional, procedural and distributive justice, respectively. Moreover, justice dimensions collectively explained 60.4% of the variance in loyalty.

Table 2. Results of the Path Analysis

	Standard Parameter Estimates (ML)	T-values
I. Impact on interactional justice		
H1a: FAMI → INTJUST	0.51	10.94
H2a: TIME → INTJUST	0.50	9.17
H3a: HOLI → INTJUST	0.53	13.10
H4a: INVO → INTJUST	0.46	6.85
H5a: COMM → INTJUST	0.60	14.04
<i>Explained variance (R²) = 0.491</i>		
II. Impact on procedural justice		
H1b: FAMI → PROJUST	0.59	13.46
H2b: TIME → PROJUST	0.55	10.54
H3b: HOLI → PROJUST	0.39	5.12
H4b: INVO → PROJUST	0.23	1.88*
H5b: COMM → PROJUST	0.57	11.83
<i>Explained variance (R²) = 0.440</i>		
III. Impact on distributive justice		
H1c: FAMI → DISTJUST	0.56	11.77
H2c: TIME → DISTJUST	0.54	9.18
H3c: HOLI → DISTJUST	0.24	1.92*
H4c: INVO → DISTJUST	0.38	4.62
H5c: COMM → DISTJUST	0.47	7.19
<i>Explained variance (R²) = 0.415</i>		
IV. Impact on loyalty		
H6: INTJUST → LOYAL	0.65	19.14
H7: PROJUST → LOYAL	0.61	14.38
H8: DISTJUST → LOYAL	0.71	24.42
<i>Explained variance (R²) = 0.604</i>		

Notes: * indicates that the related hypothesis is not supported by the data

Discussion and Conclusions

“Tourism is considered to be a complex and multi-faceted industry that depends heavily on human involvement” (Ekiz, 2011, p. 286). This increases the likelihood of the tourist experiencing problems during their holiday experiences (Finsterwalder & Tombs, 2018; Oz et al., 2016; Witt & Moutinho, 1994). Thus, eliminating service failure is impossible within the tourism industry (Xu & Wu, 2018), so it is crucial for companies in the tourism industry to learn the factors that prevent tourists from voicing their complaints (Ekiz, 2011). Therefore, this research aims to examine the effects of tourist complaint constraints on justice perceptions and loyalty intentions of Chinese tourists in Istanbul, Turkey. To do so, this paper replicates Ekiz et al.’s (2012) methodology. It is argued in this study that the unique characteristics of tourism add more constraints to those already discussed within CCB literature, including the cost of complaining, the negative attitude towards complaining, the significance of problems, and the unwelcoming attitude of the company toward complaints (Ekiz & Au, 2011).

The evaluation of the results provided evidence that all TCC dimensions had significant negative relationships with justice perceptions, apart from the relationship between the *limited involvement and procedural justice* and *holiday mood and distributive justice* perceptions. More specifically, the results gave significant empirical evidence of the relationship between *limited time* and *justice perceptions*. This result indicates that respondents demand fair compensation, particularly when feeling they have limited time. Being already in a restrained condition makes them more demanding; in other words, makes them expect a fair recovery (Chan, Lee Ada, & Elise, 2016;

Ekiz, 2010). This result indicates that tourists expect hotels to recover the failure particularly when time is an issue for them.

As for unfamiliarity, the results indicate significant empirical evidence for the relationship between *unfamiliarity* and *justice perceptions*. This means, the more tourists regard unfamiliarity as a constraint the more they demand the hotel should have pre-established guidelines that regulate recovery efforts and secondly, they expect the hotel representative to follow those guidelines (Kelley, Hoffman, & Davis, 1993; Lee, 2018). This result indicates that hotel guests rely on hotel guidelines and try to compensate for their lack of knowledge and/or experience by demanding that the hotel should set and follow standard and appropriate procedures.

Results revealed significant empirical evidence for the relationship between *limited communication* and *justice perceptions*. Thus, tourists expect the hotel representative to go the extra mile, spend considerable effort to find a way of communication and be very courteous (Ekiz, 2009). This result indicated that hotel guests, who have difficulties in communicating their problems, expect the hotel to tear down the communication barriers and provide a fair service.

As for limited involvement, the results give partial empirical evidence for the relationship between *limited involvement* and *justice perceptions*, except procedural justice. This indicates that tourists demand fair compensation, even if they are not highly involved in planning their holidays. In other words, having limited involvement does not make them less demanding in asking for fair compensation (Ekiz, 2010). Even though the hypothesized relationship between limited involvement and procedural justice was not statistically significant (H4b), still tourists demand a fair treatment.

As for the last TCC dimension, results related to holiday mood provided partial empirical evidence. More precisely, the relationships between positive holiday mood and interactional procedural justice were significant, while distributive justice was below the recommended cut-off value (H3c). The more tourists are in positive holiday mood, the more they demand interactive and personal recovery action from the company. In other words, they expect the hotel representative to be very courteous and spend considerable effort to find a fix for any problem that may have occurred (Ekiz & Au, 2009).

Finally, results of the analyses provided significant empirical evidence to support the overall relationship between justice perceptions and loyalty intentions. The evidence supports the expectation that when faced with a service failure, tourists demand a fair recovery to keep them loyal to the company. This result aligns with the findings of several scholars within the reviewed justice literature (Chang et al., 2015; Choi & Choi, 2014; Gursoy, McCleary, & Lepsito, 2007). In more detail, the link between distributive justice and loyalty intention appears to be the strongest. It indicates that fair compensation of what has been lost during the failure is the most important expectation of hotel guests. This result is consistent with those of Teo and Lim (2001) and Tax et al. (1998), who reported distributive justice-related issues such as compensation, as the most important justice dimension affecting post-recovery intentions. Distributive justice is followed by interactional and procedural justice, which shows that guests want hotels to recover their service failures not only by providing full compensation (Chebat & Slusarczyk, 2005), but also by following established procedures in a respectful, sincere and empathetic manner (Choi & Choi, 2014; de Ruyter & Wetzels, 2000).

Practical Implications

There are a number of managerial and theoretical implications from this study. First, Chinese tourists are increasingly important to the Turkish economy; thus, Turkish tourism officials, like those in other destinations, need to understand patterns of Chinese tourists' behavior in order to gain a greater share of the tourism market (Chan, et al., 2016; Li, 2016; Moon & Han, 2018). In practical terms, understanding constraints which limit tourist complaints implies several actions. Because of the barrier created by limited communication, managers and officials in the tourist industry should make greater efforts to hire speakers of Chinese and possibly provide Chinese language training. In this way, the communication skills of frontline employees will be improved, and this, in turn, will encourage Chinese tourists to discuss their complaints. It would also be helpful for tourism officials to make detailed information available to make Chinese tourists familiar with appropriate procedures; informing tourists of how and where to voice their discontent will encourage them to make their feelings known. Although managers cannot extend the time their guests are able to stay in their holiday destination, it is important for them to devise ways to deal effectively with complaints in the time which is available. To extend this time, managers could possibly use the internet to extend their guest relations services beyond the holiday itself, to reduce the effects of time constraints. They should also ensure that their guests are aware of the hotel's system for handling complaints and that this system works efficiently; such an assurance would encourage guests to report problems that otherwise would not be reported.

The literature review and primary data collection both find that customers' responses tend to be related to their level of involvement. This means that their decision to make a complaint or accept the situation depends on how strongly involved they feel. This indicates that managers should pay attention to making guests feel more engaged in their holidays by providing greater interaction and constant feedback. For example, Wirtz and Mattila (2004) emphasized that considerable sums of public money are expended on engaging guests in designing services and recovering them. A final suggestion for managers is that they should proactively identify potential problems, regardless of any holiday mood which may leave them disinclined to protest: silence does not always imply contentment. For this reason, managers should endeavor to make it as easy as possible to register a complaint without spoiling the guests' holiday moods. Taken as a whole, awareness of these constraints will assist managers in minimizing the effect of service breakdowns and adapting their companies' processes for managing complaints without discouraging guests from expressing their grievances. This is consistent with the findings of a number of other researchers who emphasized that research into tourist behavior (Ozdemir & Yolal, 2016), especially complaint behavior, should form a key component of service companies' strategic and operational plans, for these plans to achieve success. Reducing the constraints will bring the companies a little closer to correcting the problem and, therefore, keeping their guests, avoiding negative word-of-mouth and cutting customer turnover (Kotler et al., 2010; Tax et al., 1998).

Theoretical Implications

In terms of theoretical implications, this paper most important contribution is its evidence that that tourist complaints are different from general customer complaints (Ekiz & Au, 2009; Yagi & Pearce, 2007). In addition, the use of the scale developed by Ekiz (2011) to measure TCC fills a gap which has hitherto existed; this tailor-made scale is specific to the tourism industry and its applicability is demonstrated in this paper. This study fulfills Ekiz's wish that his 2011 study should be replicated with genuine tourists, rather than the graduate students used in his 2011

research and other studies (Ekiz, 2011); the current study targeted Chinese tourists visiting Istanbul, Turkey.

Limitations

Interpretation of this study should bear in mind several limitations. First, it concentrated on development of the TCC scale, without considering possible causal relationships between dimensions of TCC and other constructs. Therefore, constructs such as organizational responses (Gursoy et al., 2007), perceptions of justice (Chebat & Slusarczyk, 2005), overall satisfaction (Zeithaml et al., 2006), intention to repurchase (Davidow, 2003b), and word-of-mouth intention (Swanson & Kelly, 2001) could lead to further insights. A second limitation is the dependence on purposive sampling. Probabilistic sampling would lead to greater confidence in the generalizability of the results. Finally, it would be helpful to assess the extent of generalizability of the TCC scale by carrying out similar studies in other contexts and with larger samples.

References

- Anderson, J. C. & Gerbing, D. W. (1988). Structural equation modeling in practice: A review and recommended two-step approach. *Psychological Bulletin*, 103(3), 411-423.
- Austin, W. (1979). Justice, freedom, and self-interest in intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Warchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations!* (pp. 20-37). Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Balaji, M., Khong, K. W., & Chong, A. Y. L. (2016). Determinants of negative word-of-mouth communication using social networking sites. *Information & Management*, 53(4), 528-540.
- Bauer, H. H., Falk, T., & Hammerschmidt, M. (2006). eTransQual: A transaction process-based approach for capturing service quality in online shopping. *Journal of Business Research*, 59(4), 866-875.
- Bergel, M., & Brock, C. (2018). The impact of switching costs on customer complaint behavior and service recovery evaluation. *Journal of Service Theory and Practice*, 28(4), 458-483.
- Berry, L. L., Parasuraman, A., & Zeithaml, V. A. (1994). Improved service quality in America: lessons learned. *Academy of Management Executive*, 8(2), 32-52.
- Best, A., & Andreasen, A. R. (1977). Consumer response to unsatisfactory purchases: A survey of perceiving defects, voicing complaints, and obtaining redress. *Law and Society*, 11(4), 701-742.
- Bourgeois, J. C., & Barnes, J. G. (1979). Viability and profile of the consumerist segment. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 5(4), 217-228.
- Byrne, B. M. (1998). *Structural equation modelling with LISREL, PRELIS, and SIMPLIS: Basic concepts, applications, and programming*. New Jersey, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cai, L. A., Feng, R., & Breiter, D. (2004). Tourist purchase decision involvement and information preferences. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 10(2), 138-148.
- Casidy, R., & Shin, H. (2015). The effects of harm directions and service recovery strategies on customer forgiveness and negative word-of-mouth intentions. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 27(1), 103-112.
- Chan, G. S. H., Lee Ada, L. Y., & Elise, W. M. L. (2016). Phenomenological study of complaint behavior toward fashion chain stores: a case study in Hong Kong. *Journal of Tourism and Hospitality*, 5(252), 269-2167.
- Chang, H. H., Tsai, Y. C., Wong, K. H., Wang, J. W., & Cho, F. J. (2015). The effects of response strategies and severity of failure on consumer attribution with regard to negative word-of-mouth. *Decision Support Systems*, 71(1), 48-61.
- Chebat, J. C., & Slusarczyk, W. (2005). How emotions mediate the effects of perceived justice on loyalty in service recovery situations: An empirical study. *Journal of Business Research*, 58(5), 664-673.
- Choi, B., & Choi, B. J. (2014). The effects of perceived service recovery justice on customer affection, loyalty, and word-of-mouth. *European Journal of Marketing*, 48(1/2), 108-131.
- Churchill, G. A. Jr. (1979). A paradigm for developing better measures of marketing constructs. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 16(1), 64-73.
- Cohen, D. (1992). *Body language in relationships*. London, UK: Sheldon.
- Cohen, E. (2004). *Contemporary tourism: Diversity and change*. Wagon Lane, UK: Emerald.
- Cohen, S. A., Prayag, G., & Moital, M. (2014). Consumer behaviour in tourism: Concepts, influences and opportunities. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 17(10), 872-909.

- Cohen-Hattab, K., & Kerber, J. (2004). Literature, cultural identity and the limits of authenticity: A composite approach. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 6(2), 57-73.
- Currie, R. R. (1997). A pleasure-tourism behaviors framework. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24(4), 884-897.
- Davidow, M. (2003a). Have you heard the word? The effect of word of mouth on perceived justice, satisfaction and repurchase intentions following complaint handling. *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, 16(2), 67-80.
- Davidow, M. (2003b). Organizational responses to customer complaints: What works and what doesn't, *Journal of Service Research*, 5(3), 225-250.
- Day, R. L. (1984). Modeling choices among alternative responses to dissatisfaction. In T. C. Kinnear (Eds.), *Advances in Consumer Research 11* (pp. 496-499). Ann Arbor, MI: Association for Consumer Research.
- Day, R. L., & Landon, E. L. Jr. (1976). Collecting comprehensive consumer complaint data by survey research. In B. B. Anderson (Eds.), *Advances in consumer research 3* (pp. 263-268). Ann Arbor, MI: Association for Consumer Research.
- de Ruyter, K., & Wetzels, M. G. M. (2000). Customer equity considerations in service recovery: a cross-industry perspective. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 11(1), 91-108.
- Diener, B. J., & Greyser, S. A. (1978). Consumer views of redress need. *Journal of Marketing*, 42(4), 21-27.
- Ekiz, H. E., & Au, N. (2009, May). *Constraining factors to complaint: The particular complaining behavior of the tourists*. Paper presented at the APac-CHRIE Conference, Singapore.
- Ekiz, H. E. (2009). Factors influencing organizational responses to guest complaints: cases of Hong Kong and Northern Cyprus. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing and Management*, 18(6), 539-573.
- Ekiz, H. E. (2010). Obstaculas al reclamo: El compartamiento particular de los turistas ante los reclamos [Obstacles to the claim: The particular behavior of tourists before the claims]. *Estudios y Perspectivas en Turismo*, 19(1), 18-44.
- Ekiz, H. E. (2011). *Effects of tourist complaining constraints on justice perceptions and loyalty: Using culture and magnitude as moderators* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://ira.lib.polyu.edu.hk/handle/10397/5438>
- Ekiz, H. E., & Au, N. (2011). Comparing Chinese and American attitude towards complaining. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 23(3), 327-343.
- Ekiz, H. E., Au, N. & Hsu, C. H. C. (2012). Development of a tourist complaining constraints (TCC) measurement scale. *Scandinavian Journal Hospitality and Tourism*, 12(4), 373-399.
- Finsterwalder, J., & Tombs, A. (2018). Services marketing and customer experience in a post-disciplinary era, *Journal of Service Theory and Practice*, 28(4), 406-409.
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18(1), 39-50.
- Gilly, M. C., & Gelb, B. D. (1982). Post-purchase consumer processes and the complaining consumer. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 9(3), 323-328.
- Grønhaug, K., & Zaltman, G. (1981). Complainers and noncomplainers revisited: Another look at the data. In K. B. Monroe (Eds.), *Advances in consumer research 8* (pp. 83-87). Ann Arbor, MI: Association for Consumer Research.
- Gursoy, D., Ekiz, H. E., & Chi, C. G. (2006). Impacts of organizational responses on complainants' justice perceptions and post-purchase behaviors in North Cyprus hotel industry: International tourist perspective. *Proceedings of 2006 Annual I-CHRIE Conference*, 141-146.
- Gursoy, D., Ekiz, H.E., & Chi, C.G. (2007). Impacts of organizational responses on complainants' justice perceptions and post-purchase behaviors, *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality and Tourism*, 8(1), 1-25.
- Gursoy, D., McCleary, K.W., & Lepsito, L.R. (2007). Propensity to complain: Effects of personality and behavioral factors. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*, 31(3), 358-386.
- Hair, J. F. Jr., Money, A. H., Samouel, P., & Page, M. (2007). *Research methods of business*. West Sussex, UK: Wiley.
- Halstead, D., & Dröge, C. (1991). Consumer attitudes toward complaining and the prediction of multiple complaint responses. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 18(1), 210-216.
- Harrison, J. (2018). An examination of the nature of service recovery within the airline industry and its impact on customer loyalty. *Journal of Promotional Communications*, 6(2), 148-160.
- Havitz, M. E., & Dimanche, F. (1999). Leisure involvement revisited: Drive properties and paradoxes. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 31(2), 122-149.
- Hazée, S., Van Vaerenbergh, Y., & Armirotto, V. (2017). Co-creating service recovery after service failure: The role of brand equity. *Journal of Business Research*, 74(1), 101-109.

- Hoffman, K. D., Kelley, S. W., & Rotalsky, H. M. (1995). Tracking service failures and employee recovery efforts. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 9(2), 49-61.
- Hosany, S., & Gilbert, D. (2010). Measuring tourists' emotional experiences toward hedonic holiday destinations. *Journal of Travel Research*, 49(4), 513-526.
- Huang, S. H. (2007). *The effects of motivation, past experience, perceived constraint, and attitude on tourist revisit intention* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://ira.lib.polyu.edu.hk/handle/10397/2260>
- Hui, M. K., Ho, C. K. Y., & Wan, L. C. (2011). Prior relationships and consumer responses to service failures: A cross-cultural study. *Journal of International Marketing*, 19(1), 59-81.
- Jöreskog, K. G., & Sörbom, D. (1996). *LISREL 8: User's reference guide*. Lincolnwood, IL: Scientific Software International.
- Josiam, B. M., Kinley, T. R., & Kim, Y. K. (2005). Involvement and the tourist shopper: Using the involvement construct to segment the American tourist shopper at the mall. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 11(2), 135-154.
- Karatepe, O. M., & Ekiz, H. E. (2004). The effects of organizational responses to complaint on satisfaction and loyalty: A study of hotel guests in Northern Cyprus. *Managing Service Quality*, 14(6), 476-486.
- Kau, A. K., & Loh, E. W. Y. (2006). The effects of service recovery on consumer satisfaction: A comparison between complainants and non-complainants. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 20(2), 101-111.
- Kelley, S., Hoffman, K., & Davis, M. (1993). A typology retail failures and recoveries. *Journal of Retailing*, 69(4), 429-452.
- Kelloway, E. K. (1998). *Using LISREL for structural equation modeling*. London, UK: Sage.
- Kim, Y. Y., & Gudykunst, W. B. (1988). *Theories of intercultural communication*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Kotler, P., Bowen, J., & Makens, J. (2010). *Marketing for hospitality and tourism* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall International.
- Lee, S. H. (2018). Guest preferences for service recovery procedures: Conjoint analysis. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Insights*, 1(3), 276-288.
- Lee, Y. L., & Sparks, B. (2007). Appraising tourism and hospitality service failure events: A Chinese perspective. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*, 31(4), 504-529.
- Li, X. (2016). *Chinese outbound tourism 2.0*. Ontario, Canada: Apple Academic.
- Likert, R. (1932). A technique for the measurement of attitudes. In R. S. Woodworth (Eds.), *Archives of psychology: Vol. 22* (pp. 5-55). New York, NY: New York University.
- Liljander, V., & Mattsson, J. (2002). Impact of customer preconsumption mood on the evaluation of employee behavior in service encounters. *Psychology and Marketing*, 19(10), 837-860.
- Lovelock, C. H. (2000). *Services marketing: People, technology, strategy* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Maheswaran, D., & Shavitt, S. (2000). Issues and new directions in global consumer psychology. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 9(2), 59-66.
- Mattila, A. S. (2001). The effectiveness of service recovery in a multi-industry setting. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 15(7), 583-596.
- McGorry, S. Y. (2000). Measurement in a cross-cultural environment: Survey translation issues. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, 3(2), 74-81.
- McIntosh, R. W., Goeldner, C. R. & Ritchie, J. R. B. (2006). *Tourism principles, practices, philosophies* (10th ed.). New York, NY: Wiley.
- McKercher, B. (1998). The effect of market access on destination choice. *Journal of Travel Research*, 37(1), 39-47.
- Millan, A., & Esteban, A. (2004). Development of a multiple-item scale for measuring customer satisfaction in travel agencies services. *Tourism Management*, 25(5), 533-546.
- Mittal, B., & Lee, M. S. (1989). A causal model of consumer involvement. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 10(3), 363-389.
- Moon, H., & Han, H. (2018). Destination attributes influencing Chinese travelers' perceptions of experience quality and intentions for island tourism: A case of Jeju Island. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 28(1), 71-82.
- Morel, K. P. N., Poiesz, T. B. C., & Wilke, H. A. M. (1997). Motivation, capacity, and opportunity to complain: Towards a comprehensive model of consumer complaint behavior. In M. J. Houston (Eds.), *Advances in consumer research 24* (pp. 464-469). Ann Arbor, MI: Association for Consumer Research.
- Morello, G. (2004). Spacing and timing in leisure activities. In K. Weiermair & C. Mathies (Eds.), *The Tourism and leisure industry - shaping the future* (69-82). New, York, NY: Haworth Hospitality.
- Morley, C. L. (1990). What is tourism? Definitions, concepts and characteristics. *The Journal of Tourism Studies*, 1(1), 3-8.
- Mousavi, M., & Esfidani, M. R. (2013). A comprehensive model of customers' complaint behavior. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 3(5), 548-569.

- Nam, K., Baker, J., Ahmad, N., & Goo, J. (2018). Dissatisfaction, disconfirmation, and distrust: an empirical examination of value co-destruction through negative electronic word-of-mouth (Ewom). *Information Systems Frontiers*, 1-18.
- Netemeyer, R. G., Bearden, W. O., & Sharma, S. (2003). *Scaling procedures: Issues and applications*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Nunnally, J. C. Jr. (1978). *Psychometric theory*, New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Nunnally, J. C. Jr., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Oliver, R. L. (1999). Whence customer loyalty. *Journal of Marketing*, 63(4), 33-44.
- Oz, S. N., Ihtiyar, A., Ahmad, F. S., & Ali, F. (2016). A conceptual framework to explain the impact of visitors' previous experiences on customer satisfaction. *International Interdisciplinary Business-Economics Advancement Journal*, 1(1), 38-49.
- Ozdemir, C., & Yolal, M. (2016). Cross-cultural tourist behavior: An examination of tourists' behavior in guided tours. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 17(3) 314-324.
- Park, J., & Ha, S. (2016). Co-creation of service recovery: Utilitarian and hedonic value and post-recovery responses. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 28, 310-316.
- Park, S. H. (1996). Relationships between involvement and attitudinal loyalty constructs in adult fitness programs. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 28(4), 233-250.
- Pearce, P. L. (1982). Tourists and their hosts: Some social and psychological effects of inter-cultural contact. In S. Bochner (Eds.), *Cultures in contact: Studies in cross-cultural interaction* (pp. 199-221). Oxford, UK: Pergamon.
- Reisinger, Y., & Turner, L. W. (2003). *Cross-cultural behaviour in tourism: Concepts and analysis*. Oxford, UK: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Schoefer, K., & Ennew, C. (2004). Customer evaluations of tour operators' responses to their complaints. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 17(1), 83-92.
- Schwab, D. P. (1980). Construct validity in organization behavior. In B.M. Staw & L.L. Cummings (Eds.). *Research in organizational behavior Volume 2* (pp. 3-43). Greenwich, CT: JAI.
- Singh, J. (1988). Consumer complaint intentions and behavior: Definitional and taxonomical issues. *Journal of Marketing*, 52(1), 93-107.
- Singh, J. (1990). A typology of consumer dissatisfaction response styles. *Journal of Retailing*, 66(1), 57-99.
- Stauss, B., & Seidel, W. (2004). *Complaint management: The heart of CRM*. Miamisburg, OH: Thomson Business and Professional.
- Swanson, S. R., & Kelly, S. W. (2001). Service recovery attributions and word-of-mouth intentions. *European Journal of Marketing*, 35(1/2), 194-211.
- Tax, S. S., & Chandrashekar, M. (1992). Consumer decision making following a failed service encounter: A pilot study. *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, 5(1), 55-68.
- Tax, S. S., Brown, S. W., & Chandrashekar, M. (1998). Customer evaluation of service complaint experiences: Implication and relationship marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 62(2), 60-76.
- Teo, T. S. H., & Lim, V. K. G. (2001). The effects of perceived justice on satisfaction and behavioral intentions: the case of computer purchase. *International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management*, 29(2), 109-124.
- Tribe, J. (2008). Tourism: A critical business. *Journal of Travel Research*, 46(3), 245-255.
- van de Vijver, F. J. R., & Tanzer, N. K. (2004). Bias and equivalence in cross-cultural assessment: An overview. *Revue Europeenne de Psychologie Appliquee*, 54(2), 119-135.
- van der Knaap, W. (1997). *The tourist's drives - GIS oriented methods for analysing tourist recreation complexes*. (Master thesis). Retrieved from <http://edepot.wur.nl/206775>
- Voorhees, C. M., Brady, M. K., & Horowitz, D. M. (2006). A voice from the silent masses: An exploratory and comparative analysis of noncomplainers. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 34(4), 514-527.
- Weber, K., Sparks, B., & Hsu, C. H.C. (2017). Moving beyond the western versus Asian culture distinction: an investigation of acculturation effects. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 29(6), 1703-1723.
- White, C. J. (2005). Culture, emotions and behavioural intentions: Implications for tourism research and practice. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 8(6), 510-531.
- Wickens, E. (2002). The sacred and the profane - a tourist typology. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(3), 834-851.
- Wirtz, J., & Mattila, A. S. (2004). Consumer responses to compensation, speed of recovery and apology after a service failure. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 15(2), 150-166.
- Witt, S. F., & Moutinho, L. (1994). *Tourism marketing and management handbook* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Prentice Hall.

- Woehler, K. (2004). The rediscovery of slowness, or leisure time as one's own and as self-aggrandizement? In K. Weiermair & C. Mathies (Eds.), *The Tourism and Leisure Industry - Shaping the future* (pp. 83-92). New York, NY: Haworth Hospitality.
- Wood, K., & House, S. (1991). *The good tourist: A worldwide guide for the green traveller*. London, UK: Mandarin.
- Xu, Q., & Wu, K. (2018). Service failure, psychological contract violation and formation of customer relationship crisis - an empirical research of the OCT Theme Park. *Journal of Service Science and Management*, 11(5), 466-478.
- Yagi, C., & Pearce, P. L. (2007). The influence of appearance and the number of people viewed on tourists' preferences for seeing other tourists, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 15(1), 28-43.
- Yoda, T., & Kumakura, T. (2007). Effect of unfairness on customer satisfaction: new insights into customer retention. *Innovative Marketing*, 3(1), 44-55.
- Yuksel, A., & Yuksel, F. (2008). Tourist satisfaction: Definitional and relational issues. In A. Yuksel (Eds.), *Tourist Satisfaction and Complaining Behavior: Measurement and management issues in the tourism and hospitality industry* (pp. 43-72). New York, NY: Nova.
- Zeithaml, V. A., Bitner, M. J., & Gremler, D. D. (2006). *Services marketing: Integrating customer focus across the firm* (4th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Zemke, R., & Anderson, K. (2007). *Delivering knock your socks off service* (4th ed.), New York, NY: American Marketing Association.