



## Corporate Reputation in Tourism: Customer's Point of View

**Oleksandr P. Krupskiy\***

Oles Honchar Dnipro National University, 72 Gagarin Ave, Dnipro, Ukraine

**Maxym M. Kochevoi**

Odessa National Polytechnic University, 1, Shevchenko Avenue, Odessa, Ukraine

**Olha B. Kolomina**

Odessa National Polytechnic University, 1, Shevchenko Avenue, Odessa, Ukraine

**Iryna O. Steblianko**

Oles Honchar Dnipro National University, 72 Gagarin Ave, Dnipro, Ukraine

### Abstract

Modern tourism is an industry which role in ensuring the economic development of individual states and the world economy as a whole cannot be overestimated. The success of tourism and travel enterprises often depends on their corporate reputation. This article is devoted to the study of the elements and their connection with the peculiarities of different segments behavior. To assess the consumer's response to the corporative reputation the ranking methods were used in course of decrease of exponent importance; Likert five-grade scale. There were taken the constituent parts of corporate nature and the main elements of company reputation as the variables, which influence the consumer's decision on buying the service. Paper examines three issues: the possibility of a connection between the company's nature and corporative reputation elements; the factors affecting the purchase decision of tourism service; and the corporative reputation's place in the formation of consumer's behavior of the tourism company client. During the research there was found the connection between the company's nature and the corporate reputation elements, there were also found factors that effect the decision about buying the tourism product; the personal experience and the opinion of reference group turned out to be the most important. The essential influence of the corporate reputation on the client's behavior was found. Nevertheless, the obtained results differ for different groups, which were formed according to gender, age, income rate, belonging to a profession and the typical consumer behavior. The obtained results may be used by the companies of tourism and travel industry for identifying the target audience and for the development of the PR-campaigns.

**Keywords:** Consumer behavior; Corporate reputation; Tourism enterprise; Tourism; Hotels; Gender.

**JEL Classification:** D12, J6, L14, L83.



CC BY: [Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

### 1. Introduction

Nowadays, the tourism and travel industry (T&T) not only serves as a bridge that connects different cultures (civilizations), promotes socially responsible consumption and production, personal growth and tolerance of travelers, but also plays a key role in strengthening peace, social development, political, ecological, economic systems, which is especially important in conditions of slower recovery and differences between countries, which is aggravated during the globalization process (UNWTO, 2018; WEF, 2017; WTCFTRC, 2017).

It should be noted that the consequences of tourism can be ambiguous for the host part (UNCTAD, 2007). However, provided that the sector is under strict state control, the advantages become obvious and particularly noticeable in developing and least developed countries (Bogodistov *et al.*, 2017; Krupskiy *et al.*, 2017). Tourists' spending helps to fight poverty by 1) providing decent work, expanding opportunities for low-skilled personnel, youth, migrants, 2) eliminating gender discrimination, 3) promoting the prosperity of remote rural areas, 4) reviving national art, preserving ecology and cultural heritage endangered, 5) reducing the dependence of the economy on seasonality, 6) building a modern infrastructure, including transport, 7) rational use of natural resources; 8) disaster relief. The income received by the state catalyzes (multiply) the multiplier effect and generates economic benefits both nationally (Ashley *et al.*, 2007; Eusébio *et al.*, 2016; Mason, 2008; OECD, 2016; UNCTAD, 2010), and, ultimately, globally.

From this point of view, the value of the industry cannot be overestimated. Only in 2016, its direct contribution to world GDP amounted to 2.3 trillion dollars. (3.1% of global production), indirect - 7.6 trillion dollars. (7.1%). The industry provided the creation of 6 million jobs (23%), the operation of 109 million direct jobs (3.6%) and 292 million direct jobs (9.6%). The sector also played a significant role in exports - \$ 1401.5 billion. (6.6% of the total world index and about 30% of the service exports) and in attracting the flow of investments - 806 billion dollars. (4.4%); the latter, in turn, allowed acquiring and introducing new technologies, diversifying the product, establishing

a higher wage level compared to local enterprises, and contributing to the positive trend of the recreational sphere development.

Over the past six years, T&T has outpaced the growth rate of the economy as a whole (in particular, by 0.6% in 2016; neither political instability nor terrorist attacks significantly affected the index. However, despite the steady rise, the sector's opportunities are far from been exhausted. Experts predict that by 2027 over 380 million people will have worked in the tourism industry, the industry's share in GDP will grow up to 11.4%, in exports – up to 7.1%, tourism will have become a leader in growth rates, ahead of such sectors, like communications, financial and business services, production and retail trade (Bolwell and Weinz, 2008; ITB Berlin, 2019; WTTC, 2017).

Such success is a natural result of the efforts that companies make to provide transportation, accommodation, food and other services that help make the guest's vacation unforgettable. Given the limited material resources and the high level of competition in the industry, organizations are forced to concentrate on obtaining benefits from intangible assets. Some of these are corporate reputation (CR).

### 1.1. Theoretical Foundations of the Study: Corporate Reputation

Interest in the topic of corporate reputation attracted noticeable attention of practitioners of management and marketing in the 1960s. This interest was provoked by the substantial growth of corporations observed in that era. However, specialists had not done any serious analysis of CR until the end of the 1990s (Shamma, 2007).

This analysis, in particular, proved that corporate reputation is the key element of differentiation, since an organization that applies such a strategy needs to inform the public about what makes its offer better than those on the market Porter (1980), a strategic tool that can be used to develop and maintain relationships with consumers in order to create sustainable competitive advantage (Long-Tolbert, 2000).

It also confirmed the hypothesis that a good CR allows 1) to charge a higher price due to the perception of the goods as qualitative; 2) to attract and retain more qualified personnel, to motivate them, seeking to make the labor more productive; 3) increase sales; 4) to more effectively resist the pressure of competitors and negative changes in the external environment; 5) to conquer foreign markets; 6) to attract funds from investors; 7) to gain access to cheap resources; 8) seek growth in shareholder satisfaction and customer loyalty (Bondarenko, 2009a;2010; Feldman *et al.*, 2014; Helm, 2007; Rindova *et al.*, 2005). At the same time, damage to reputation can be more costly for a business than any other risk (Bondarenko, 2009b; Jackson, 2004).

It should be noted that the point of view of theorists and business practitioners on the role of corporate reputation is the same. This, however, cannot be said about the interpretation of the very concept of CR. For example, Long-Tolbert (2000) understands corporate reputation as a general assessment of the company's past, current, and projected company actions, as well as the implications of these actions for consumers and other interested parties. Weigelt and Camerer (1988), insist that CR is a reflection of a firm's actions that give signals to interested parties about its "true" attributes. Sandberg (2002), suggests by reputation to understand the public perception of how a firm will behave in each specific situation Brown *et al.* (2006) with colleagues - associations arising from outsiders about the enterprise; Gotsi and Wilson (2001) is a kind of consensus between the vision of external and internal shareholders. Feldman *et al.* (2014), believe that reputation can be viewed as a general perception or assessment of the actions and attributes of an organization by participants in the production process.

In this paper, under the corporate reputation, the author understands the consumer's perception of the travel company's activities and nature, which helps to predict its future behavior and, on this basis, make a decision about purchasing a service.

## 2. Method

### 2.1. Participants and Sample

There were 325 people invited to participate in the survey; provided answers to questions - 264 (98 men, 166 women), which amounted to 81.23% of the planned value. The questionnaire was freely available on the Internet for 1 month (see Appendix A); it received 72 responses (27.3%). 51 completed forms were sent by e-mail (19.3%); the remaining 141 (53.4%) questionnaires were filled in during a personal interview.

Table 1 and Table 2 presents the distribution of respondents (based on the principles of Philip Kotler's marketing segmentation (Wrenn *et al.*, 2009).

**Table-1.** Distribution of men by age, marital status, place of residence, profession, income level, and consumer behavior.

Age											
18-25 (M1)		26-40 (M2)			41-60 (M3)			60 and older (M4)			
18	18.4%	42	43%	29	29.6%	9	9%				
Marital status											
single					married						
without children (M5)		with 1-2 children (M6)		3 or more children (M7)		without children (M8)		with 1-2 children (M9)		3 or more children (M10)*	
21	21.4%	2	2%	—	—	18	18.4%	46	46.9%	11	11.3%
* Minor children living and/or traveling with their parents were taken into account											
Region											
Developed country (M11)					Developing (M12)						
16		16.3			82			83.7			
Place of residence (residence with the number of inhabitants)											
Less than 50000 (M13)		50000-100000 (M14)		100000-500000 (M15)		500000-1000000 (M16)		1000000-4000000 (M17)		Over 4000000 (M18)	
4	4.1%	8	8.2%	16	16.3%	29	29.6%	26	26.5%	15	15.3%
Income											
below average for the country of residence (M19)				average (M20)				above average (M21)*			
7		7.1%		64		65.3%		27		27.6%	
* estimated opinion of the respondent											
Profession											
statesmen (M23)		Private sector									
		managers (M22)		specialists (M24)		technical staff (M25)		unemployed (M26)		retired (M27)	
32	32.7%	23	23.5%	16	16.3%	7	7.1%	3	3.1%	17	17.3%
Religion											
Christian (M28)		Jewish (M29)		Muslim (M30)		Hindu (M31)		—— (M32)			
44	44.9%	8	8.2%	12	12.2%	1	1%	33	33.7%		
Lifestyle											
achievers (M33)		strivers (M34)		innovators(M35)		thinkers (M36)		believers (M37)			
26	26.5%	5	5.1%	32	32.7%	15	15.3%	20	20.4%		

**Table-2.** Distribution of women by age, marital status, place of residence, profession, income level, and consumer behavior.

Age											
18-25 (F1)		26-40 (F2)			41-60 (F3)			60 and older (F4)			
39	23.5%	61	36.8%	48	28.9%	18	10.8%				
Marital status											
single					married						
without children (M5)		with 1-2 children (M6)		3 or more children (M7)		without children (M8)		with 1-2 children (M9)		3 or more children (M10)*	
19	11.4%	27	16.3%	6	3.6%	31	18.7%	71	42.8%	12	7.2%
* Minor children living and/or traveling with their parents were taken into account											
Region											
Developed country (F11)					Developing (F12)						
46		27.7			120			72.3			
Place of residence (residence with the number of inhabitants)											
Less than 50000 (F13)		50000-100000 (F14)		100000-500000 (F15)		500000-1000000 (F16)		1000000-4000000 (F17)		Over 4000000 (F18)	
12	7.2%	21	12.7%	29	17.5%	48	28.9%	26	15.7%	30	18%
Income											
below average for the country of residence (M19)				average (M20)				above average (M21)*			
42		25.3%		93		56%		31		18.7%	
* personal opinion of the respondent											
Profession											
statesmen (F23)		Private sector									
		managers (F22)		specialists (F24)		technical staff (M25)		unemployed (M26)		retired (M27)	
55	33%	34	20.5%	30	18.1%	21	12.7%	6	3.6%	20	12.1%
Religion											
Christian (M28)		Jewish (M29)		Muslim (M30)		Hindu (M31)		—— (F32)			
73	44%	28	16.9%	35	21.1%	1	0.6%	29	17.4%		
Lifestyle											
achievers (F33)		strivers (F34)		innovators (F35)		thinkers (F36)		believers (F37)			
35	21.1%	31	18.7%	22	13.3%	37	22.3%	41	24.6%		

### 3. Men's Characteristics

#### 3.1. Age

All the respondents were divided into 4 categories by age: 18–25 years old (18 people, 18.4%); 26–40 (42, 43%, respectively); 41–60 (29; 29.6%); 60 and older (9; 9%).

The situation within the groups was significantly different. For example, among young people, the group of students who were unmarried, had no children, permanently residing in a developing country, and referred to themselves as Christians and innovators (8 people, 44.4%) turned out to be the largest group among young people. In the M2 category, the leader in terms of size was a group that responded to the following characteristics: 1) married men with 1–2 children, 2) employed in the private sector of the economy, 3) having a profession that requires higher education, 4) defined their income as an average, 5) Christians, 6) living in a developing country, 7) “thinkers” - 12 people (28.6%) Members of the “team” M3 also showed similar behavior. The difference was only for one attribute: “winners” described themselves as “achievers” (7 people, 24.1%).

#### 3.2. Family

For the analysis, the men who took part in the survey were divided into two categories: single (23 people, 23.5%) and having a family (75 people, 76.5%; no widowers among the respondents were found). The most representative was the group of married men with one or two children (46 people, 46.9%); The second place in terms of the number of participants was taken by the category of bachelors without children (21 men, 21.4%). The number of married people without children was 18 people (18.4%), having many children - 11 (11.3%). Two of their respondents (2%) raised one child each. Single fathers were not identified during the survey.

#### 3.3. Region

According to the results of the survey, the overwhelming majority of the men who answered the questions live on the territory of the former USSR (78 people, 79.6%). In addition to them, in the M12 category were 4 citizens of China (students who were educated in Ukraine; 4.1%). Developed countries were represented by 16 respondents (16.3%). Of these men, 2 reside in the Netherlands (2%), 3 in Austria (3.1%), 1 in North America (1%), 10 in Germany (10.2%).

#### 3.4. Place of Residence (City Size)

The analysis of the collected data showed that the proportion of people living in cities with a population of 500,000 to 1,000,000 and from 1,000,000 to 4,000,000 differs slightly (M16 - 29, 29.6%; M17 - 26, 26.5%). 15 people (15.3%) recognized themselves as residents of the megalopolis. In the settlements, with the number of inhabitants less than 100,000, 12 respondents live permanently (12.3%).

#### 3.5. Income

During the distribution of respondents by income level, the scale was not used for one reason: in developing countries, official statistics do not reflect the real situation with household income. Therefore, the analysis was based on the respondent's subjective perception of his own financial situation. Based on the answers, it can be concluded that the overwhelming number of respondents refer themselves to the middle class (64 people, 65.3%). Seven men (7.1%) rate their income as too low (5– of them are students, 2 are single fathers. Single pensioners did not fall into this category since all the respondents turned out to be working people.

#### 3.6. Profession

In accordance with their position, the answers of the respondents were as follows: the majority build a career in the public sector (32 people, 32.7%); 23 people (23.5%) work as managers, including top managers (5%); the number of specialists (16; 16.3%) is almost equal to the number of pensioners (17, 17.3%); seven (7.1%) are engaged in technical support of the production process. The rest said that they were in a state of transition to a new job, and at the same time, they identified themselves with the category of persons with average income (2 respondents) and above average (1). Of those surveyed in the tourism sector, 26 people are involved (26.3%).

#### 3.7. Religion

Among people who are convinced that they belong to a particular denomination, 44 (44.9%) people consider themselves to be Christian, 12 (12.2%) - Muslim; 8 people (8.2%) were Jewish, 1 was Hindu. The rest with confession is undecided (20 people, 20.4%) or are convinced atheists (13 people, 13.3%)

#### 3.8. Lifestyle

Taking into account the characteristics provided by the respondents based on the classification of the lifestyles of Philip Kotler (Wrenn *et al.*, 2009), the "ranking places" were distributed as follows: 1) "innovators" - 32 people, 32.7%; 2) "achievers" - 26, 26.5%; 3) "believers" - 20, 20.4%; 4) "thinkers" - 15, 15.3%; 5) "strivers" - 5, 5.1%. The last one included 1 single student from category M1 and four married childless men (M2).

## 4. Women's Characteristics

### 4.1. Age

In general, the results of segmentation by age of women (table 2) do not fundamentally differ from those obtained for men: the majority of respondents fell into the category of 26-40 years old (61 respondents, 36.8%); in the second place was the group of 41-60 years (48, 28.9%); young people were ranked third in the ranking (39.23.5%) and elderly people ranked fourth (18, 10.8%).

The situation was similar within the age-related gender categories. Taking into account all the signs, the group of unmarried girls without children was the greatest, citizens of developing countries who consider themselves Christians (25, 64.1%); However, the consumer behavior of young women was significantly different from male peers (the first (the former) mostly turned out to be "believers" (29%) and "strivers" (37%). In the category "26-40", a group of individuals won, meeting the following criteria: 1) married women with 1-2 children, 2) employed in the public sector, 3) having a profession that requires higher education, 4) who determine their income as an average, 5) Christians, 6) living in a developing country (37 people, 60.7%); while 12% considered themselves "achievers", 18% - "thinkers", 38.5 - "believers".

### 4.2. Family

Among those who took part in polls, unmarried women made up 52 (31.3%), married and 114 (68.7%). The most numerous category was F9 (71 women, 42.8%). As the index declined, the remaining groups ranked as follows: F8 (31, 18.7%), F6 (27, 16.3%), F5 (19, 11.4%), F10 (12, 7.2%).

### 4.3. Region

The survey showed that the largest is the proportion of women living in the former Soviet republics (123 people, 74.1%). The rest were distributed as follows: 11 citizens of China (6.6%), 5 - of Africa (3%; all are students who received education in Ukraine). Of the representatives of countries with developed economies, 4 live in Spain (2.4%), 2 - in the Netherlands (1.2%), 3 - in Austria (1.8%), 5 - in North America (3.1%), 13 - in Germany (7.8%).

### 4.4. Residence (City Size)

As in the case of men, the majority of female respondents live in cities with a population of 500,000 to 1,000,000 and from 1,000,000 to 4,000,000 (F15 - 29, 17.5%; F16 - 48, 28.9%). 26 women (15.7%) live in large cities (F17); in small (F13 + F14) - 33 persons (19.9%), in megalopolises - 30 (18%).

### 4.5. Income

Analysis of the personal data confirmed that the overwhelming majority of women consider themselves to be representatives of the middle class (93 people, 56%); 42 (25.3%) respondents are incomes that are not sufficient (18 of them (10.8%) are students, 13 (7.8%) are women with the highest education, children raising themselves, 11 (6.6%) are people with a low level of qualifications. An interesting fact is that gender categories, the unemployed (all married) considered their income to be average, and this paradox can be explained both by the presence of unofficial income and the high earnings of their spouses.

### 4.6. Profession

When asked about the workplace, women answered as follows: 55 people are employed in the public sector (33%); of the remaining 34 respondents (20.5%) work as managers, all are middle managers, 30 (18.1%) are specialists. 21 women (12.7%) are engaged in technical support of the production process, 6 (3.6%) are frictional unemployed and 20 (12.1%) are pensioners (of which 50% continue to work). Of those surveyed in the tourism sector, 54 people are involved (32.5%).

### 4.7. Religion

As for religion, 73 women (44%) profess Christianity, 28 (16.9%) - Judaism, 35 (21.1%), 1 (0.6%) - Hinduism and 29 (17.4%) are not interested in matters of faith.

### 4.8. Life style

According to the classification already mentioned above (Wrenn *et al.*, 2009), the "rating" of consumer behavior of the respondents is as follows: "believers" - 41 women (24.6%); "strivers" - 31 (18.7%); "Thinkers" - 37 (22.3%); "Achievers" - 35 (21.1%); "Innovators" - 22 (13.3%). An interesting fact was that the latter were distributed very evenly between age categories: F1 - 6, F2 - 6, F3 - 5, F4 - 5.

## 4.9. Research Design and Data Collection

### 4.9.1. Assessments and Measures

To assess the consumer's reaction to corporate reputation, ranking methods were used as the importance of the indicator decreases; A five-point Likert scale (the opinions of the participants varied as follows: 1 — the factor does not affect, 2 — insignificantly affects; 3 — any effect is not noticeable; 4 — there is little influence; 5 — the effect is significant).



As variables were considered 1) components of a corporate nature (agreeableness, Agr; competence, Com; enterprise, Ent; Chic; ruthlessness, Rut; machismo, Mac; informality, Inf; Davies and Chun (2003) the main elements of the company's reputation that have a positive and negative impact (Table 3) on the decision to purchase a service (Long-Tolbert, 2000; Shamma, 2007).

**Table-3.** Distribution of Corporate Reputation Attributes, Causes Consumer Certain Associations

Positive	
Social corporate responsibility (SCR)	P1
Social utility	P2
Business acumen	P3
Emotional binding by the client	P4
Mission and vision	P5
Effective management	P6
A well-considered personnel policy	P7
Openness to communication, organization of feedback with clients and employees	P8
Providing personalization services	P9
Ready for change, commitment to new technologies	P10
Good financial results	P11
High standards of service and quality of the products	P12
Good value for money	P13
There is an attractive loyalty program	P14
Negative	
Inability (unwillingness) of the company to develop	N1
Low quality of purchased service	N2
Ignoring the claims of the tourist	N3
Unqualified staff	N4
Distributing empty promises	N5
Inconsistency of advertising statements to reality	N6
Harm to the environment (cultural heritage) arising from the activities of the company	N7

## 5. Results

In order to determine the sensitivity of the consumer to the components of corporate reputation, the following hypotheses were put forward:

*Hypothesis 1. There is a link between the nature of the company and elements of corporate reputation.*

Results of regression between elements of corporate character and reputation are presented Table 4

**Table-4.** Regression Results Between Components of a Corporate Nature And Reputation (R<sup>2</sup>)

	P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	P6	P7	P8	P9	P10	P11	P12	P13	P14
Agr	0.66	0.81	0.54**	0.79*	0.34	0.52**	0.57	0.69	0.73*	0.32	0.61*	0.57	0.68*	0.73**
Com	0.44**	0.39	0.81**	0.58	0.42**	0.76*	0.78	0.73*	0.69*	0.84	0.79	0.71**	0.68	0.76*
Ent	0.29	0.67*	0.43*	0.73**	0.47	0.53	0.41**	0.69	0.58	0.79	0.45**	0.36	0.62**	0.26*
Chic	0.84**	0.73	0.54	0.33	0.69**	0.81*	0.85**	0.71*	0.89*	0.67**	0.77	0.92**	0.4	0.75
Rut	-0.21*	-0.03*	0.51	-0.16*	-0.18	0.29**	-0.31*	-0.24	-0.05	0.33	0.41	0.17	0.38*	-0.09*
Mac	0.19	0.53*	0.43**	0.53	0.49*	0.45	0.38	0.69**	0.71*	0.8*	0.65**	0.58*	0.73	0.52
Inf	-0.18	0.29	0.17*	0.36*	0.23**	0.35	-0.03	0.47	0.26**	0.44	0.2	0.29*	0.68*	0.26**
	N1		N2		N3		N4		N5		N6		N7	
Agr	0.03**		-0.6		-0.34*		0.1		0.22**		0.16		-0.29*	
Com	-0.27		-0.31**		-0.08*		-0.17**		-0.25**		0.08*		-0.16*	
Ent	-0.41		0.2*		0.11		0.27		0.31*		0.42		0.45	
Chic	0.33**		-0.46		-0.32*		-0.25**		-0.18		-0.24**		-0.51**	
Rut	0.34**		0.29*		0.68		0.43		0.52		0.61		0.31	
Mac	-0.1*		-0.03		0.15**		0.27*		-0.06		-0.12**		0.36**	
Inf	0.19		0.27**		0.21		0.33*		0.3*		0.26		0.31	

ρ-value < 0.10 \* ρ-value < 0.05 \*\* ρ-value < 0.01

The analysis of table 4 confirmed the presence of a connection in the consumer's view between the organization's character and the individual components of its reputation. A consistently high value of the correlation coefficient R<sup>2</sup> was observed for the category “chic”. At the consumer, it was, first of all, associated with five-star hotels (83%). The level of services provided by them was perceived as high (R<sup>2</sup> = 0.92, ρ-value <0.01) even by those survey participants who never stayed at such institutions (38% of them were in the sample). The relationship with “personalization of the service” (R<sup>2</sup> = 0.89, ρ-value <0.05), “well-thought-out personnel policy” (R<sup>2</sup> = 0.85, ρ-value <0.01), “management efficiency” (R<sup>2</sup> = 0.81, ρ- Value <0.05). The loyalty program was appreciated only by frequent visitors to the hotel chains: 6 men (4 –M9 + M16 + M22, three of them are residents of developed countries; 2 –M8 + M15 + M24, developing country residents employed in the IT sector) and 9 women (mostly from F9 + F15). Of the total number of 12 people (80%) attributed themselves to the group of participants with incomes

above the average; 10 (66.7%) - to “thinkers” and “believers” ( $R^2 = 0.83$ ,  $\rho$ -value  $<0.01$ ). Those employed in tourism showed a result higher than the average in terms of “reasonable personnel policy” ( $R^2 = 0.94$ ,  $\rho$ -value  $<0.05$ ) and “inconsistency of advertising statements with reality” ( $R^2 = 0.86$ ,  $\rho$ -value  $<0.1$ ).

According to the company's “character traits,” the value of the  $R^2$  coefficient turned out to be not so high and close in value. The respondents reacted negatively to the “ruthlessness” (a significant positive relationship was observed only with the probability of “ignoring the tourist's claims” ( $R^2 = 0.68$ ,  $\rho$ -value  $<0.1$ ) and “N6” ( $R^2 = 0.61$ ,  $\rho$ -value  $<0.1$ ). Paradoxically, for “rough” companies ( $R^2 = 0.34$ ,  $\rho$ -value  $<0.05$ ), the ability to improve was considered at the same level as for “chic” ( $R^2 = 0.33$ ,  $\rho$ -value  $<0.05$ ). Participants explained that this situation is the unwillingness to develop in the first and the traditional way of life - in the latter.

If we go back to discrepancies, then they were especially significant in the column “emotional binding by the client”. The most prone to re-staying in one place were women, whose profile is described by such characteristics: F2 + F9 / F10 + F14 / F15 + F20 (the combination of parameters gave a slight deviation of  $R^2$  from 0.81 to 0.83; in this case, the choice was determined, first of all, the impression of children and the conditions created for them). The least loyal were young people of both sexes without children (for men,  $R^2$  was = 0.29, women - 0.24,  $\rho$ -value  $<0.1$ ). At the same time, M5, who are fond of extreme types of tourism, highly appreciated “machismo” ( $R^2 = 0.76$ ,  $\rho$ -value  $<0.05$ , 0.23 higher than the average), and F5 preferred “informality”, which they perceived as the possibility of inexpensive cognitive trips abroad (0.55,  $\rho$ -value  $<0.1$ , + 0.19). Also interesting in this column was the opinion of the tourism industry staff. So, if the organization where it works, has signs of “ruthlessness”, P4 sharply decreased (to  $R^2 = -0.33$ ,  $\rho$ -value  $<0.05$  compared to the average for all participants  $R^2 = -0.18$ ,  $\rho$ -value  $<0.01$ ) ; if the nature of the company describes “agreeableness”, then the degree of attachment increases significantly ( $R^2 = 0.93$ ,  $\rho$ -value  $<0.1$ , + 0.19).

*Hypothesis 2. The decision to purchase tourism services have a significant impact: 2a. personal experience*

*2b. "Word of mouth" (word of a mouth)*

*2c. Media*

Data presented in Table 5.

**Table-5.** Intangible Determinants of Consumer Choice ( $R^2$ )

	Men	Women
Personal experience	0.57**	0.76
Opinion of the reference group (friends, colleagues, parents, spouse, other relatives)	0.43	0.55*
Informational or promotional articles in the media or on Internet	0.37	0.42
$\rho$ -value $< 0.10$ * $\rho$ -value $< 0.05$ ** $\rho$ -value $< 0.01$		

The figures reflected in the table confirm the existence of a positive relationship between the company's reputation, on the one hand, and making choices based on previous experience or information obtained from different sources - on the other. In all cases, the correlations for men were lower (personal experience -  $R^2 = 0.57$ ,  $\rho$ -value  $<0.01$ ; opinion of relatives -  $R^2 = 0.43$ ,  $\rho$ -value  $<0.1$ , media -  $R^2 = 0.37$ ,  $\rho$ -value  $<0.1$ ); for women, the corresponding coefficients were  $R^2 = 0.76$ ,  $\rho$ -value  $<0.1$ ,  $R^2 = 0.55$ ,  $\rho$ -value  $<0.05$ ,  $R^2 = 0.42$ ,  $\rho$ -value  $<0.1$ .

Within each group, the distribution was not so uniform. Women who have minor children (F9 and F10;  $R^2 = 0.83$ ,  $\rho$ -value  $<0.01$ ) were more focused on personal experience, regardless of income level, age, and place of residence. Fathers and mothers of adult children are not willing to strongly trust their choice ( $R^2 = 0.24$ ,  $\rho$ -value  $<0.1$ ). Young people of both sexes (income level - M19, M20, F19, F20; marital status is single) gave preference to peer advice ( $R^2 = 0.65$ ,  $\rho$ -value  $<0.05$ ), emphasizing the viewpoint of parents as not very popular ( $R^2 = 0.16$ ,  $\rho$ -value  $<0.01$ ). Some new high-income women ( $R^2 = 0.68$ ,  $\rho$ -value  $<0.1$ ) and men (M5 + M21;  $R^2 = 0.57$ ,  $\rho$ -value  $<0.1$ ) listened to friends when selecting a new place to travel. For married women without children, the spouse's opinion often becomes decisive ( $R^2 = 0.71$ ,  $\rho$ -value  $<0.01$ ); married men (M8) are less inclined to listen to their wives ( $R^2 = 0.31$ ,  $\rho$ -value  $<0.05$ ).

But the credibility of advertising placed in the media was insignificant. The youth practically ignores it ( $R^2 = 0.14$ ,  $\rho$ -value  $<0.1$ ); older people (caught in the category of “thinkers” and “believers”) are perceived only as food for thought (food for thought) ( $R^2 = 0.47$ ,  $\rho$ -value  $<0.1$ ): it does not speed up the purchase itself, but makes it necessary to seek feedback from tourists and experts on the Internet, seek advice from friends. Only 9% of the participants admitted that they were ready to go on the road, seeing a profitable offer in an advertisement; all of these people had a different demographic profile, but a similar style of buying behavior (“innovators”).

*Hypothesis 3. Corporate reputation plays an important role in determining the consumer behavior of a tourist.*

Data presented in Table 6.

Table-6. Intangible Determinants of Consumer Choice ( $R^2$ )

		Men	Women
Positive features			
Social corporate responsibility	P1	0.42	0.37
Social utility	P2	0.67*	0.61
Business acumen	P3	0.55	0.43**
Emotional binding by the client	P4	0.67	0.75
Mission and Vision	P5	0.31**	0.26
Effective management	P6	0.49	0.42
A well-considered personnel policy	P7	0.68	0.75*
Openness to communication, organization of feedback with customers and employees	P8	0.57**	0.63
Providing personalization of the service	P9	0.55**	0.76
Ready for change, commitment to new technologies	P10	0.64	0.61*
Good financial results	P11	0.47*	0.32
High standards of service and quality of the products offered	P12	0.71*	0.82
Good value for money	P13	0.84	0.78**
There is an attractive loyalty program	P14	0.73	0.65
Negative			
Inability (unwillingness) of a company to develop	N1	0.03	0.18**
Low quality of the purchased service	N2	-0.15	-0.38
Ignoring the claims of the tourist	N3	-0.24**	-0.41
Low-skilled staff	N4	-0.36**	-0.49
Distributing empty promises	N5	0.11	-0.26
Inconsistency of advertising statements to reality	N6	-0.05	-0.21*
arm to the environment (cultural heritage) arising from the activities of the company	N7	0.1	0.22*
$\rho$ -value < 0.10 * $\rho$ -value < 0.05 ** $\rho$ -value < 0.01			

As the analysis showed, for those living in the former USSR, social corporate responsibility cannot be considered a key determinant of choosing a tourist destination (11% of respondents have never heard of such a term). Citizens of developed countries showed greater awareness: of these, 12 people (19 %) stated that during trips they stopped only in green hotels. The youth of the post-Soviet states showed greater awareness regarding hard currency, but insufficient income did not allow them to choose destinations that meet the requirements of socially responsible tourism.

“Social utility” was most associated with consumers in obtaining satisfaction from travel; some men (48%) and women (43%) hoped not only to relax during the trip, but also to gain new experiences, enrich their knowledge, and make useful contacts. The value of the correlation coefficient significantly exceeded the average figure for young single people ( $R^2 = 0.75$ ,  $\rho$ -value < 0.1 for guys and  $R^2 = 0.72$ ,  $\rho$ -value < 0.1 for girls). Among middle-aged people (M2, F2), the highest growth was shown by tourism workers (which is associated with study tours, which contribute to sales growth:  $R^2 = 0.78$ ,  $\rho$ -value < 0.01 (M) and  $R^2 = 0.8$ ,  $\rho$ -value < 0.1 (F)). A similar reaction was demonstrated by top and middle managers ( $R^2 = 0.75$ ,  $\rho$ -value < 0.1 and  $R^2 = 0.71$ ,  $\rho$ -value < 0.1).

Both gender groups did not show a strong reaction either to the “mission” or to the “business acumen” or to the “effective management” (1 participant wrote that he was interested not in slogans or efforts, but in their result). But the “emotional binding of customers” ( $R^2 = 0.67$ ,  $\rho$ -value < 0.1 and  $R^2 = 0.75$ ,  $\rho$ -value < 0.1) showed a significant connection, since it served as a positive signal for other service purchasers.

A well-considered personnel policy was highly appreciated by both men and women. The correlation coefficient was higher for experienced travelers with a high level of income ( $R^2 = 0.79$ ,  $\rho$ -value < 0.05 (M) and  $R^2 = 0.83$ ,  $\rho$ -value < 0.01 (F)). But the leaders in the P7 category were employees of the hospitality industry (1 person indicated that high professional standards make him feel significant, inspire not only to work with full dedication, but also to have fun in one of the hotels of the chain).

“A good price-quality ratio” can certainly be considered the most important guideline when making choices in a competitive environment ( $R^2 = 0.84$ ,  $\rho$ -value < 0.1 (M) and  $R^2 = 0.78$ ,  $\rho$ -value < 0.01 (F)). For residents of developing countries, the relationship was even more significant ( $R^2 = 0.91$ ,  $\rho$ -value < 0.05 for men and  $R^2 = 0.86$ ,  $\rho$ -value < 0.1 for women).

It should also be noted that religious affiliation has not had a significant impact on consumer preferences. The exception was left by orthodox Jews (12 women, 5 men), for whom “personalization of the service” ( $R^2 = 0.97$ ,  $\rho$ -value < 0.1) proved to be an extremely important characteristic. The refusal to visit places that do not meet certain characteristics is associated with the need to observe strict rules related to eating habits and family traditions. For the same reason, this category is characterized by reliance on the recommendations of the reference group during the initial visit to the recreation center ( $R^2 = 0.93$ ,  $\rho$ -value < 0.01).

As for the negative perceptions of the consumer about the company's reputation, for all the components, the connection revealed an insignificant. In general, the reaction of women was more obvious, due to their natural emotionality. The largest deviation of indicators was observed in a group of elderly tourists of both sexes. For



example, in the case of N3 in men,  $R^2$  was -0.35,  $\rho$ -value <0.1; for women -  $R^2$  = -0.52,  $\rho$ -value <0.1. The same trend occurred with the rest of the group.

## 6. Summary and Conclusion

During the study, the reaction of the tourist to the company's reputation was put forward and received answers to three hypotheses. First, the existence of a relationship of different levels of significance between individual components of a corporate nature and CR (hypothesis 1) was confirmed. Secondly, it was proved that for both men and women, personal experience plays the most important role in shaping the mind of the consumer an idea of the strengths and weaknesses of the enterprise; the opinion of the reference group is also significant; trust in mass media can be considered relative (hypothesis 2). In the case of hypothesis 3, the assumption put forward was also confirmed: representatives of both sexes prefer the product of the company, whose reputation meets certain reliability criteria. In all three cases, there were significant differences in the perception of individual groups, which were distributed on the basis of gender, age, income, professional affiliation, and typical consumer behavior.

According to the author, the most impressive was the following result: if the consumed service met or exceeded expectations, 43% of the participants strongly recommended the destination to their loved ones; of the respondents 1) 61% (mostly young people) shared their experience in social networks; 2) 36% made a second trip; 22% returned more than 3 times. If the impressions left were negative, the corresponding messages on the Internet were spread by 72% of tourists; 3% applied for moral and material damages.

Thus, it can be argued that the study is of an applied marketing nature. Its results can and should be used by enterprises of the tourism and hospitality industry in identifying the target audience and developing a PR company that would not only correspond to reality but takes into account the peculiarities of perception of certain consumers' categories.

Thus, it is possible to claim that undertaken research has applied marketing character. Its results can be and must be used by the enterprises of travel and tourism industry at the exposure of target audience and development of PR Company that would not only be true but also take into account the features of perception of separate consumer categories.

## References

- Ashley, C., Brine, P. O., Letir, A. and Wilde, H. (2007). *The role of the tourism sector in expanding economic opportunity corporate social responsibility initiative report no. 23*. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard: Cambridge, MA.
- Bogodistov, Y., Presse, A., Krupskiy, O. P. and Sardak, S. (2017). Gendering dynamic capabilities in micro firms. *Revista de Administração de Empresas*, 57(3): 273-82. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/s0034-759020170308>
- Bolwell, D. and Weinz, W. (2008). Reducing poverty through tourism. Available: [http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed\\_dialogue/---sector/documents/publication/wcms\\_162268.pdf](http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_dialogue/---sector/documents/publication/wcms_162268.pdf)
- Bondarenko, L. V. (2009a). Organizational-economic bases of ensuring competitiveness of recreational-tourist services. *Terra Economicus*, 7(2-3): 137-40.
- Bondarenko, L. V. (2009b). Study of directions of stabilization of selected sectors of the sphere of services. *Terra Economicus*, 7(4-2): 130-32.
- Bondarenko, L. V. (2010). Formation market environment in selected service sectors. *Terra Economicus*, 8(3-2): 93-98.
- Brown, T. J., Dacin, P. A., Pratt, M. G. and Whetten, D. A. (2006). Identity, intended image, construed image, and reputation: An interdisciplinary framework and suggested terminology. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 34(2): 99-106.
- Davies, G. and Chun, R. (2003). The Use of Metaphor in the Exploration of the Brand Concept. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 19(1): 45-71.
- Eusébio, C., Carneiro, M. J., Kastenholz, E. and Alvelos, H. (2016). The impact of social tourism for seniors on the economic development of tourism destinations. *European Journal of Tourism Research*, 12: 5-24. Available: <https://web.b.ebscohost.com/abstract?direct=true&profile=ehost&scope=site&authtype=crawler&jrnl=19947658&AN=113503539&h=vUBa0EQpUHH62KQvh8ceOZ8ZO%2fmiUyUwBbD3SGxL73wXaBeY3Om17H11s1XxAV0AsAssxBW%2bq2CRocNohIa13g%3d%3d&crl=c&resultNs=AdminWebAuth&resultLoc al=ErrCrlNotAuth&crlhashurl=login.aspx%3fdirect%3dtrue%26profile%3dehost%26scope%3dsite%26aut htype%3dcrawler%26jrnl%3d19947658%26AN%3d113503539>
- Feldman, P. M., Bahamonde, R. A. and Velasquez Bellido, I. (2014). A new approach for measuring corporate reputation. *Revista de Administração de Empresas*, 54(1): 53-66. Available: <http://doi.org/10.1590/s0034-759020140102>
- Gotsi, M. and Wilson, A. M. (2001). Corporate reputation: seeking a definition. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, 6(1): 24-30. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/13563280110381189>
- Helm, S. (2007). The role of corporate reputation in determining investor satisfaction and loyalty. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 10(1): 22-37. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.crr.1550036>

ITB Berlin (2019). World travel trends report 2017/2018. Available: [https://www.itb-berlin.com/media/itb/itb\\_dl\\_all/itb\\_presse\\_all/ITB\\_WTTR\\_A4\\_2018\\_interaktiv.pdf](https://www.itb-berlin.com/media/itb/itb_dl_all/itb_presse_all/ITB_WTTR_A4_2018_interaktiv.pdf)

Jackson, K. T. (2004). *Building reputational capital: Strategies for integrity and fair play that improve the bottom line*. Oxford University Press: Oxford.

Krupskiy, O. P., Stukalo, N. V., Krasnikova, N. A. and Falko, Y. A. (2017). Franchising model for expansion of the international travel business. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 15(4): 230-42.

Long-Tolbert, S. J. (2000). *A conceptual framework and empirical tests of the antecedents and consequences of corporate reputation: a study of consumer markets*. Doctoral dissertation. The Ohio State University.

Mason, P. (2008). *Tourism impacts, planning and management*. Elsevier: Burlington.

OECD (2016). *OECD tourism trends and policies 2016*. OECD Publishing: Paris.

Porter, M. E. (1980). *Competitive strategy: Techniques for analyzing industries and competitors*. The Free Press: New York.

Rindova, V. P., Williamson, I. O., Pelkova, A. P. and Sever, J. M. (2005). Being good or being known: An empirical examination of the dimensions, antecedents, and consequences of organizational reputation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(6): 1033-49. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/amj.2005.19573108>

Sandberg, K. (2002). Kicking the tires of corporate reputation. *Harvard Management Communication Letter*, 5: 3-4.

Shamma, H. M. (2007). *A stakeholder perspective for examining corporate reputation: An empirical study of the US wireless telecommunications industry*. Doctoral dissertation. George Washington University.

UNCTAD (2007). *FDI in tourism: The development dimension*. United Nations publication: New York; Geneva.

UNCTAD (2010). The contribution of tourism to trade and development. Note by the UNCTAD secretariat. Available: [http://unctad.org/en/Docs/cid8\\_en.pdf](http://unctad.org/en/Docs/cid8_en.pdf)

UNWTO (2018). UNWTO Annual Report 2017. Available: [http://tourlib.net/wto/WTO\\_annual\\_report\\_2017.pdf](http://tourlib.net/wto/WTO_annual_report_2017.pdf)

WEF (2017). *The travel & tourism competitiveness report 2017. Paving the way for a more sustainable and inclusive future. Insight report*. World Economic Forum: Geneva.

Weigelt, K. and Camerer, C. (1988). Reputation and corporate strategy: A review of recent theory and applications. *Strategic Management Journal*, 9(5): 443-54.

Wrenn, B., Kotler, P. and Shaw, N. (2009). *Building strong congregations: Attracting, serving and developing your membership*. Autumn House Publishing: Hagerstown, MD.

WTCFTRC (2017). Report on World tourism economy trends 2017. *Chinese Academy of Social Sciences*: Available: <http://www.wtcf.org.cn/uploadfile/2017/0224/20170224012636257.pdf>

WTTC (2017). *Travel and tourism global economic impact and issues 2017. The authority on world travel and tourism*. United Kingdom.

**Appendix A: Questionnaire**

<b>Gender</b>					
<input type="radio"/> Men			<input type="radio"/> women		
<b>Age</b>					
<input type="radio"/> 18-25		<input type="radio"/> 26-40		<input type="radio"/> 41-60	
<input type="radio"/> 60 and older					
<b>Marital status</b>					
<i>single (unmarried)</i>			<i>Married</i>		
<input type="radio"/> without children	<input type="radio"/> 1-2 children	<input type="radio"/> 3 and more children	<input type="radio"/> without children	<input type="radio"/> 1-2 children	<input type="radio"/> 3 and more children *
<b>Children age</b>					
<input type="radio"/> younger child			<input type="radio"/> senior		
* Minor children living and traveling with their parents were taken into account					
<b>Country of residence</b>					
<b>Place of residence (residence with a number of inhabitants)</b>					
<input type="radio"/> less than 50000	<input type="radio"/> 50000-100000	<input type="radio"/> 100000-500000	<input type="radio"/> 500000-1000000	<input type="radio"/> 1000000-4000000	<input type="radio"/> over 4000000
<b>Income</b>					
<input type="radio"/> below average for the country of residence			<input type="radio"/> average		<input type="radio"/> above the average*
* estimated opinion of the respondent					
<b>Profession</b>					
<input type="radio"/> managers	<input type="radio"/> statesmen	<input type="radio"/> specialists	<input type="radio"/> technical staff	<input type="radio"/> unemployed	<input type="radio"/> retired
<b>sector of employment</b>					
<input type="radio"/> tourism			<input type="radio"/> other _____		
<b>Religion</b>					
<input type="radio"/> Christianity	<input type="radio"/> Judaism	<input type="radio"/> Islam	<input type="radio"/> Hinduism	<input type="radio"/> _____	
<b>What traits are inherent in your character and behavior</b>					
<input type="radio"/> High level of responsibility and self-esteem; propensity for diversity and choice of high-tech niche products emphasizing individuality; active consumer of travel services					

- The main motivator is ideals; a mature personality that values order, knowledge, education, and responsibility; when making decisions based on a large amount of information, open to the adoption of new ideas; a conservative and practical consumer who is looking for functionality in a product
- Reliance on ideals; a conservative type, which has strong convictions, traditional approaches, unshakable moral principles; lifestyle revolving around family, work and a narrow circle of loved ones; preference is given to familiar products of a regular supplier
- Goals make you keep moving forward; commitment to both work and family is significant; great attention is paid to maintaining the image, credibility, and preservation of the status quo; there is a choice between predictability and stability, on the one hand, and risk, on the other; active consumer behavior in the market
- The main incentive is success and achievement; not the last role is played by the opinion and approval of the environment, the opportunity to have fun in the “fashionable get-together”; acquisitions differ in style, but rarely in good quality because of the limited budget of the owner; purchases are frequent and impulsive

**Arrange the components of the nature of the organization as their importance diminishes in your presentation (7 is the least significant factor) determined by such parameters:**

1) Agreeableness; implies openness, empathy, support, honesty, trustful relations, and social responsibility;	<input type="radio"/>
2) Competence; describes integrity, reliability, a sense of security combined with a focus on results and a technocratic approach to leadership (Leading Technocracy);	_____
3) Enterprise; it is distinguished by innovation, readiness for renewal, perception of fashion trends, courage and fantasy of decisions;	<input type="radio"/>
4) Chic; remembered by elegance, emphasizes prestige, style, elitism, and exclusivity;	_____
5) ruthlessness (Ruthlessness); concentrates on internal needs, authoritarianism, control, aggression;	-
6) machismo; inherent in organizations that emphasize Masculine (Masculine), rigidity (tough), force (Rugged);	<input type="radio"/>
7) Informality; promotes simplicity and ease of communication and business management.	_____
	<input type="radio"/>
	_____
	-

**Match style with the type of tourist organization. Multiple choice possible**

1) pliability	A) Luxury 5 stars hotels	E) transport company
2) competence	B) Hostels	F) companies selling extreme services
3) enterprise	C) Travel agencies and tour operators	G) camping
4) chic	D) Rental of private housing in resort areas	H) catering
5) ruthlessness		I) tour desk
6) machismo		
7) informality		

1 \_\_\_\_\_ 2 \_\_\_\_\_ 3 \_\_\_\_\_ 4 \_\_\_\_\_  
 5 \_\_\_\_\_ 6 \_\_\_\_\_ 7 \_\_\_\_\_

**Indicate how, in your opinion, these parameters affect the company's reputation**

<i>Pliability</i>				
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5*
<i>Competence</i>				
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5*
<i>Enterprise</i>				
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5*
<i>Chic</i>				
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5*
<i>Ruthlessness</i>				
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5*
<i>Machismo</i>				
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5*
<i>Informality</i>				
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5*
*1 – does not affect	2 – insignificantly affect	3 – any effect is imperceptible	4 – slightly effects	5 – effect is significant

**Rank the values of corporate reputation in descending order (1 is the most important component)**

Nature of organization	<input type="radio"/> _____
Social corporate responsibility (caring for the environment, disaster relief, promoting the development of local communities, etc.)	<input type="radio"/> _____
Social utility is the company's ability to help clients fulfill important life goals and improve their quality of life	<input type="radio"/> _____
Business acumen	<input type="radio"/> _____

Emotional binding by the client					<input type="radio"/> _____
Mission and vision					<input type="radio"/> _____
Effective management					<input type="radio"/> _____
A well-considered personnel policy: hiring, retaining, developing personnel; providing conditions for decent work; help in solving problems; thought out motivation system					
Openness to communication, organization of feedback with customers and employees					<input type="radio"/> _____
Providing service personalization					
Readiness for change, commitment to new technologies					<input type="radio"/> _____
Good financial results					
High standards of service and quality of the products offered					<input type="radio"/> _____
Good value for money					
There is an attractive loyalty program					<input type="radio"/> _____
<hr/>					
<b>Additional parameters not mentioned in questionnaire</b>					
<b>Rate the importance of each component on a 5-point scale</b>					
<i>Nature of organization</i>					
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5*	
<i>Social Corporate Responsibility</i>					
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5*	
<i>Social utility</i>					
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5*	
<i>Business acumen</i>					
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5*	
<i>Emotional binding by the client</i>					
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5*	
<i>Mission and Vision</i>					
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5*	
<i>Effective management</i>					
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5*	
<i>Thoughtful personnel policy</i>					
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5*	
<i>Openness to communication, organization of feedback with customers and employees</i>					
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5*	
<i>Providing service personalization</i>					
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5*	
<i>Readiness for change, commitment to new technologies</i>					
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5*	
<i>Good financial results</i>					
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5*	
<i>High standards of service and quality of the products offered</i>					
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5*	
<i>Good value for money</i>					
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5*	
<i>There is an attractive loyalty program</i>					
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5*	
*1 – does not affect	2 – insignificantly affect	3 – any effect is imperceptible	4 – slightly effects	5 – the effect is significant	
<b>Arrange in descending order of reliable sources of information that help to make decisions about corporate reputation (1 is the most important component)</b>					
<i>Personal opinion</i>					
<i>The opinion of the referential group:</i>					
• friends					<input type="radio"/> _____
• parents					<input type="radio"/> _____
• spouse					<input type="radio"/> _____
• colleagues					<input type="radio"/> _____
• adult children					<input type="radio"/> _____
• other relatives					<input type="radio"/> _____
<i>Informational or promotional articles in the media or on the Internet</i>					
<input type="radio"/> _____					
<b>Arrange in descending order of likelihood factors that can lead to switching to a competitor's product/service (1 is the most important component)</b>					
<i>Unwillingness of the company to develop</i>					
					<input type="radio"/> _____
<i>Low quality of the purchased service</i>					
					<input type="radio"/> _____

<i>Ignoring tourists' complaints</i>					<input type="radio"/> _____
<i>Ignoring the claims of the tourist</i>					<input type="radio"/> _____
<i>Low-skilled staff</i>					<input type="radio"/> _____
<i>Distributing empty promises</i>					<input type="radio"/> _____
<i>Inconsistency of advertising statements to reality</i>					<input type="radio"/> _____
<i>Harm to the environment (cultural heritage) arising from the company's activities</i>					<input type="radio"/> _____
<b>Rate these factors on a 5-point scale</b>					
<i>Unwillingness of the company to develop</i>					
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5*	
<i>Low quality of the purchased service</i>					
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5*	
<i>Ignoring the claims of the tourist</i>					
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5*	
<i>Low-skilled staff</i>					
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5*	
<i>Distributing empty promises</i>					
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5*	
<i>Inconsistency of advertising statements to reality</i>					
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5*	
<i>Harm to the environment (cultural heritage) arising from the company's activities</i>					
<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5*	
*1 – does not affect	2 – insignificantly affect	3 – any effect is imperceptible	4 – slightly effects	5 – the effect is significant	
<b>Describe the situation that left a positive impression and helped to decide on a repeat visit</b>					
<b>Describe your reaction if:</b>					
<b>Reality exceeded expectations</b>					
<b>You did not enjoy the rest at all</b>					
<b>How many times have you taken the same route?</b>					
<b>Additional information, unforeseen questionnaire, but fundamentally important for the respondent</b>					