The Organisational Gap Model
for Hotel Management

Maja Uran

This paper describes the development of the organisational gap model
for hotel management. It descries a management measurement instru-
ment that helps to assess the 3 organizational service gaps that are pre-
conditions for delivering service quality (the positioning gap, specifi-
cation gap and evaluation gap). The described theoretical model was
constructed based upon the four organisational gaps of the Parasura-
man et al. service quality model, then redefined and reassessed. Data
were gathered on the sample of 500 questionnaires from the Slovenian
hotel industry and analysed with exploratory factor analysis and struc-
tural equation modelling. The results can be useful guidelines for hotel
management on how to improve the service delivery process.

Key Words: service quality model, organisational gaps, multivariate
analysis, hotel industry
JEL *Classification:* M1, L83

Introduction

The business environment in the hotel industry is highly competitive,
each hotel directly or indirectly competing with another hotel. The
highly competitive environment prompts hotel managers to meet their
customers' expectations as for as possible to enable the survival and suc-
cess of the business (Ivankovič 2005, 137). In order to create a sustainable
advantage, firms seek to develop core competencies: unique combina-
tion of processes, skills and/or assets (Kandampully 2007; Knowles 1999,
64). As competitors move more closely together in terms of product
quality, it is the service quality, developed by these core competencies,
which will be used more often to create a competitive distinctiveness
(Zeithaml, Parasurman, and Berry 1990, 149; Olsen, Ching-Yick Tse, and
West 1992, 163; Harrington and Lenehan 1998; Groenroos 1990; Johns
1999; Kandampully, Mok and Sparks, 2001; Uran, 2004; Uran et al., 2006;
Kandampully 2007). Service quality can be utilized in determining how
a business produces and delivers its products and services; in how it
manages its employees; and in how it builds a strong brand identity and

*Dr Maja Uran is an Assistant Professor at the University of Primorska,
Faculty of Tourism Studies Portorož, Slovenia.*

reputation. It is a process that includes both the responsiveness of the service and the consistency of the service delivery. Firms that learn how to match service quality as an operational approach with their competitive methods can create a formidable and sustainable competitive advantage.

The construct service quality has been the focus of many scholarly studies (Lehtinen and Lehtinen 1982; Lewis and Booms 1983; Parasuraman, Zeithaml and Berry 1985; Cronin and Taylor 1992; Teas 1993; Kandampully, Mok and Sparks, 2001; Uran, 2004; Uran et al., 2006; Kandampully 2007). There is a list, which covers the findings of international researchers regarding service quality and what characterises successful service companies:

- The managing director should be the leading practitioner of a professional and operative leadership. That means, among other things, creating and spreading a quality policy, developing challenging goals, plans and rituals, and dividing the responsibility in the organisation.
- Service quality has become a strategic area of development and an important part of the business plan and the vision of the company's development. It is also a central task for management at all levels.
- Successful service companies are characterised by a multiple focus. They manage to satisfy the needs and expectations of customers, co-workers and owners at the same time. They emphasise quality in results, processes and prerequisites for the service and how these interact. The customer orientation is especially important.
- Quality is considered as everyone's responsibility. Every co-worker has the knowledge, resources and authority to achieve high quality. The co-workers also control the quality of their own work.
- Service development and service construction, to build-in prerequisites for the right quality when developing new services is a key-issue.
- Emphasis on the development of quality in all processes in the organisation. The point is to prevent faults, not just to detect the ones already made.
- To develop service quality is regarded as maybe the most important measure to take in order to improve productivity and profitability.
- Emphasis on complaint management. Detecting customer dissatisfaction, learning to repair mistakes, compensate and explain the cause of the quality failure.

- Emphasis on the co-workers commitment to customer-perceived total quality.

- Increased emphasis on systematic measuring of the service quality. Measuring quality from the point of view of customers, co-workers and other interested parties.

In the hotel industry, products are produced and consumed simultaneously, while in other industries production and consumption are separated in time and space. For this reason, a high quality standard is hard to achieve. Another issue is direct contact between employees and consumers, which inevitably leads to errors that can easily contribute to the possible collapse of the system. If it is accepted that these errors are inevitable, then the goal is to minimize them. The battle for quality determines the path that everyone in the tourist industry needs to follow. Using a quality system, hotel managers try to eliminate errors and improve the guest's perception of quality issues. The usual perception is that a good quality hotel is one with five stars, but nowadays it is defined differently. Quality is not defined by category, but by the capability to deliver products and services that have district characteristics, and are designed in a way to please the guests and fulfil their needs (Groenroos 1990).

Since 1985, most of the debate has centred around the conceptualization and measurement of service quality based on the gap theory stream of research (Parasuraman, Zeithaml and Berry 1985; Zeithaml, Berry and Parasuraman 1988; Zeithaml, Parasuraman and Berry 1990; Zeithaml, Berry and Parasuraman 1993; Kandampully, Mok and Sparks, 2001; Uran, 2004; Uran et al., 2006; Kandampully 2007). It is evident from the literature that most of the empirical work had been focussed on the gap 5 perception-minus-expectations framework as operationalized by Parasuraman, Berry and Zeithaml (1985).

However, the management of service quality concerns wider issues of organizational structure, philosophy and culture that can also influence service delivery and ultimately customer perceptions of service quality (Bowen and Schneider 1988; Groenroos 1990; Heskett 1987; Kandampully, Mok and Sparks, 2001; Uran, 2004; Uran et al., 2006; Kandampully 2007). The discrepancy between expectations and perceptions is reported to be caused by a series of organizational behavioural factors.

A model known as the 'gaps model' or 'service quality model' has been developed to identify problems in service delivery (Zeithaml, Parasura-

man, and Berry 1990), which defines quality service through customer satisfaction. The idea is to identify problems and mistakes through recognizing gaps in the model and trying to avoid them. Hotel management can influence service delivery by narrowing organizational gaps and by improving service quality and customer satisfaction. The service quality model assumes that the difference between the service that the customers expect and the service they actually get is due to organizational gaps (Zeithaml, Parasuraman, and Berry 1990; Candido and Morris 2000; McCarthy and Keefe 1999). These gaps can be split into (Uran 2003):

- positional gap
- specification gap
- service execution gap
- communication gap
- evaluation gap

Studying the models shows that the model of Zeithaml, Berry and Parasuraman (1990) gives the best insight into the organisation and its methodological and conceptual factors, as well as the correlation with gaps in quality service. Using the four gaps of the basic quality service model, it is possible to explain inconsistencies in delivering the expected quality of the service. By consulting the literature and conducting a preliminary quality study of organisational gaps, the author discovered some weaknesses in the widely used Zeithaml, Berry and Parasuraman model and the need to extend it using theoretical support from the model by Candid and Morris (2000). This particular model identifies 14 gaps in quality service. Even though this author believes that the aforementioned gaps could be downsized into the model presented by Zeithaml, Parasuraman, and Berry (1990), some elements of the gaps were presented more accurately and extensively.

The extended service quality model (Zeithaml, Berry and Parasuraman 1988; 1990) was the framework used for developing the organisational gap model for hotel management. The original and extended model of Parasuraman, Parasuraman, and Berry (1988; 1990) model has 4 organisational gaps with 16 dimensions consisting of 50 elements. Derived from Zeithaml, Berry and Parasuraman's (1990) extended service quality model, and based upon an in-depth review of over 300 literature units (Uran 2003) on service quality management and existing service quality models, we are able to develop the model. The theoretical model comprises 26 dimensions with more than 100 elements stemming from

the 5 organisational gaps. The focus of this paper is on the three gaps specifically aimed at hotel management rather than personnel, namely the positioning gap, the specification gap and the evaluation gap. More specifically, the goal of this paper is to test the validity of an instrument designed to assess these service gaps in the Slovenian Hotel Industry.

THE POSITIONING GAP

The hotel management perceptions of guest expectations with regard to the desired quality of a hotel service may not be in sync with real customer expectations. Zeithaml et al. (1988) suggest that the size of the positioning gap in any service firm is a function of marketing research orientation, upward communication, and levels of managers. Candido and Morris (2000) stated that the gap is defined as a management lack of understanding of customer's expectations and perception of the service. It is motivated both by lack of initiatives to listen to the customer and by the lack of correct understanding when these initiatives are taken. The authors suggested that the gap could be further enlarged to include a lack of understanding of other external information, namely a service positioning gap or service quality strategy. The service quality strategy identifies the organization's competitive scope and its concepts of quality, through a selection of, and positioning on, the fundamental quality dimensions it wants to compete with. The service quality strategy is a set of guidelines that provides orientation for everyone in the organization. Similar dimensions to this gap are noted by McCarty and Keefe (1999), who acknowledge that the gap can be caused by a lack of consumer orientation, management commitment to service quality, service quality leadership and mission/vision clarity.

The size of the positioning gap in any hotel is proposed to be a function of: marketing research orientation, customer orientation, service quality improvement leadership, management's commitment to service quality and concepts of quality. Table 1 provides an overview of each of the above factors.

THE SPECIFICATION GAP

Gap 2, the so-called management perception-service quality specification gap, occurs when hotel management correctly perceives guest expectations, but is unable to translate this information into clear specifications. Garvin (1988) and Zeithaml, Parasuraman, and Berry (1988; 1990) suggest that four factors may account for this discrepancy, includ-

TABLE 1   Factors of the positioning gap

Dimension	Elements
1. Marketing research orientation	1. Amount of marketing research 2. Usage of marketing research 3. Collecting information on guest's satisfaction 4. Collecting information on guest's expectations 5. Extent of direct interaction between managers and customers
2. Customer orientation	6. Tendency to service quality 7. Willingness to change
3. Management's commitment to service quality	8. Service quality responsibility 9. Motivating for service quality 10. Responsibility for innovation and improvement 11. Priorities 12. Resource commitment to quality 13. Existence of internal quality programs
4. Service quality improvement leadership	14. Designing the operations according to customer's expectations 15. Discrepancy between expected and perceived service 16. Understanding the working conditions 17. Openness to change 18. Communication 19. Helping employees 20. Decision making style 21. Spreading the mission/vision 22. Understanding the mission/vision 23. Resources commitment to mission/vision
5. Concepts of quality (−)	24. Service quality as a business goal 25. Employee delegation 26. Service quality awareness 27. Adequacy of service quality concepts 28. Meaning of service quality dimensions 29. Goal setting 30. System of preventing service defects 31. Effectiveness of service quality concepts

ing: management commitment to service quality, existence of goal setting, task standardization and perception of feasibility. Specifications, along the service quality dimensions, are useful to define what quality is. Frequently, organizations do not possess any kind of formal specification, which results in aggravated service variability and lower quality (Zemke and Schaaf 1989). Specifications are required to guide personnel in their activities. Specifications are also required as a means of

comparison for effective quality evaluation. Candido and Morris (2000) assert that this gap exists because of a lack of analysis, design and definition of service quality specifications, or when specifications exist because of an inconsistency between those specifications and the strategy content or the perceptions that management held of customers' expectations. Several more factors can create this gap, including: short-term profit orientation (Zeithaml, Parasuraman, and Berry 1988; 1990), internal communication-levels of management (Zeithaml, Parasuraman, and Berry 1988; 1990; Groenroos 1990; Candido and Morris 2000), poor service design, and absence of customer-driven standards.

The size of the specification gap in any hotel is proposed to be a function of: designing specifications, task standardisation, perception of feasibility, levels of management, HRM and integration/coordination. Table 2 provides an overview of each of the above factors.

THE EVALUATION GAP

The perception gap and its instrument (SERVQUAL) are the only service quality evaluation in the model. It is necessary to gain some information about service quality before the so-called moment of truth or service consumption. After assessing the model, the need for inclusion of the evaluation gap became clear. The thesis was confirmed as well by the Candido and Morris (2000) gap charting efforts. They found it necessary to have the means of comparison for effective quality evaluation. These facts are supported McCarthy and Keefe (1999), and others. The size of the evaluation gap in any hotel is proposed to be a function of:

1. measuring performances
2. feedback

Table 3 provides an overview of each of the above factors.

Methodology

Based on the literature above, an instrument was designed to assess organisational gaps in the Slovenian hotel industry. Antončič (2000) stresses the importance of validation of the constructs that have an American basis, in Slovenian contexts. This is why reason we approached the qualitative analysis of theoretical concepts by employing 15 experts from the Slovenian hotel industry. The results of qualitative analysis provided the basis for the final operationalisation of the measurement instruments. This analysis also pointed out that the theoretical concept

TABLE 2   Factors of the specification gap

Dimensions	Elements
1. Designing specifications	1. Existence of formal specifications
	2. Specifications as a business efficiency measure
	3. Service specifications design precision
	4. Having enough information for specification design
	5. Consistency between specification and business strategy and consumer expectations
	6. Service specification directed towards low cost
2. Task standardisation	7. Usage of automatization
	8. Necessity of investment in quality systems
	9. Operations procedures
	10. Amount of resources
3. Perception of feasibility	11. Cost perceptions
	12. Total service fit to consumers' expectations
	13. Perception of service quality
4. Levels of management	14. Number of layers
	15. Flattening and inverting the hierarchical pyramid
	16. Getting information from employees
	17. Means of communication
	18. Joint problem solving and decision making
5. Integration/coordination	19. Cooperation between managers
	20. Control/supervision
	21. Compatibility
	22. Lack of coordination
	23. Connection between subjects in the organisation
	24. Education and joint projects
	25. Cooperation with other organizations
6. HRM	26. Selection
	27. Level of autonomy
	28. Confidence
	29. Meaning of education
	30. Delegation
	31. Helping employees
	32. Perceptions of management style

cannot be tested directly, but should be divided into two models. First, the service quality model for the hotel management with the following gaps: positioning gap, specification gap and evaluation gap. Here a 7-point Likert scale was used. And the second, a model for the contact personnel with the service delivery gap and the communication gap, or a 5-point Likert scale. This paper presents only the first model. The sample, data collection and data analysis method were chosen.

TABLE 3 Factors of the evaluation gap

Dimensions	Elements
1. Measuring performances	1. Benchmarking measures
	2. Responsibility
	3. Self-evaluation
	4. Service quality perception
	5. Progress
2. Feedback	6. Time needed for collecting information
	7. Spreading information about efficiency

SAMPLE

Data were collected by using the mail survey administered in Slovenia: 38 hotel companies were included, comprising 95% of all employees in the Slovenian Hotel Industry. Altogether, 500 questionnaires for hotel managers were sent, for all the levels of management, while 100 questionnaries were addressed directly to the general managers. Some 33.6% of the sample returned usable questionnaires.

DATA ANALYSIS

The gathered data were then analysed with the chosen statistical methods as suggested by Zeithaml, Berry, and Parasuraman (1988). For exploring the gap structures the exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was used with the support of SPSS software. To confirm the gap structures the structural equation modelling (SEM) was employed with the support of EQS software. Each gap was explored individually by EFA until the appropriate structure was reached. This phase resulted in the integrated organisational gap construct that was then tested with the SEM.

Results

The results are divided into 3 parts. First, the results of EFA are presented. Special attention is dedicated to the convergent and dicriminant validity of the construct. Second, the confirmation process of the constructs is presented. Finally, the end result of the organisational gap assessment for Slovenian hotel management is presented.

EXPLORATORY FACTOR ANALYSIS

All the elements defined in theory for every identified gap were used (positioning gap with 6 dimensions and 31 elements, specification gap with 6 dimensions and 32 elements, and evaluation gap with 7 elements) for

conducting EFA by using the overall sample (163 cases). Before the analysis, all measurement items were examined for normality. No significant departures from normality were found. The existence of sufficient correlations is a more critical issue. The appropriateness of factor analysis was determined by examining the correlation matrix of gap items. The matrix had a sufficient number for justified usage of EFA. The Bartlett test of sphericity, which statistically tests the presence of correlations among underlying variables, showed that the correlation matrix had significant correlations (significant at 0.05 for all items as well as retained items). The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was 0.749 for retained items, which suggests medium adequacy.

The number of factors to be extracted was determined *a priori* on the basis of the number of dimensions. The construct had 13 dimensions. Because the gap dimensions were identified according to the different gap models (never empirically tested), we assumed that the initial number of the factors would be lower. The number of factors was then determined by using the latent root, percentage of variance and scree test critea. The scree plot of initial run indicated that 2 to 8 factors may be an appropriate number, whereas the latent root criterion indicated 5 factors (eigenvalue above 1). The percentage of variance with the final number of items for 2 factors was 47.447% to 69.583% for the 5-factor solution.

Three-to-eight factor solutions were tested. In the end, the solution with highest number of items and lowest number of the factors was chosen, as suggested by Hair et al. (1998). The majority of the items were excluded because of low communalities or factor loadings. Some were excluded because they were loaded on the wrong dimensions, or else on two dimensions. The retained solution had 4 factors with 18 items (eigenvalue 1.280, percentage of variance 63.478%). The communalities of retained items were above 0.400 (with the exception of items P15 and P20). The retained 4 dimensions, with 18 items of organisational gap for hotel management, are presented in table 4.

The factors were named: marketing research orientation (F1), service quality improvement leadership (F2), designing specifications (F3) and measuring results (F4). All dimensions have theoretical support and present key factors of the organisational gap for hotel management.

CONFIRMATORY FACTOR ANALYSIS

A confirmatory factor analysis was conducted in order to validate the findings of EFA and to examine the convergence of the organisational

TABLE 4 Factor loadings of the organisational gap for hotel management

		NKV-F1	NKV-F2	NKV-F3	NKV-F4
Marketing research orientation (NKV-F1)					
P3	Collecting information on guest's satisfaction	1.031			
P1	Amount of marketing research	0.608			
Service quality improvement leadership (NKV-F2)					
S28	Confidence		0.861		
P9	Motivating for service quality		0.723		
S29	Meaning of education		0.704		
S20	Control/supervision		0.668		
S31	Helping employees		0.661		
S24	Education and joint projects		0.656		
S27	Level of autonomy		0.635		
P20	Decision making style		0.632		
S17	Means of communication		0.521		
P28	Meaning of service quality dimensions		0.410		
P15	Discrepancy between expected and perceived service		0.322		
Designing specifications (NKV-F3)					
S2	Specifications as a business efficiency measure			0.788	
S3	Service specifications design precision			0.635	
Measuring results (NKV-F4)					
E2	Responsibility				0.712
E7	Spreading information about efficiency				0.657
E5	Progress				0.626

gap for hotel management dimensions. The methodology suggested by Antončič (2000) was used and five model fit indices were calculated: NFI (normed fit index), NNFI (non-normed fit index), CFI (comparative fit index), SRMR (standardized root-mean-square residual) and RMSEA (root-mean-square error of approximation).

Two samples were used, one for analysis the other for validation. Confirmatory factor analysis confirmed the above findings on the construct of dimensionality. All items had positive, high and significant coefficients. No items were found to differ between the samples in terms of

TABLE 5 The organisational gap for hotel management dimension's scale convergence

Dimensions	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Marketing research orientation	2	0.780	0.608	1.031	*	*	*	*	*
Designing specifications	2	0.765	0.635	0.788	*	*	*	*	*
Measuring results	3	0.705	0.633	0.765	1.000	*	*	*	*
Service quality leadership	11	0.883	0.322	0.861	0.937	0.850	0.950	0.050	0.143
Mean		0.783	0.550	0.861					
Total	18 (8)	0.798	0.322	1.031	0.904	0.930	0.960	0.050	0.060

NOTES Column headings are as follows: (1) no. of variants, (2) Cronbach Alpha, (3) Interval stand. loadings min., (4) Loadings max. Index: (5) NFI, (6) NNFI, (7) CFI (8) SRMR, (9) RMSEA.

coefficients and errors. Statistical information on each dimension's internal consistency (Cronbach alpha reliability statistic) and convergence (model goodness-of-fit indices) based on overall sample ($N = 163$) is indicated in table 5.

The marketing research orientation scale showed very good reliability (Cronbach alpha 0.780) and convergence in terms of coefficients (all were positive, high and significant). Model fit indices were not calculated, due to the low number of items (less than 3). The designing specification scale showed very good reliability (Cronbach alpha 0.765) and convergence in terms of coefficients (all were positive, high and significant). Model fit indices were not calculated, due to the low number of items (less than 3). The measuring results scale showed good reliability (Cronbach alpha 0.705) and convergence in terms of coefficients (all were positive, high and significant). Only NFI was calculated and it demostrated good convergence in terms of the goodness-of-fit indice. The service quality improvement leadership scale showed very good reliability (Cronbach alpha 0.883) and convergence in terms of coefficients (all were positive, high and significant) and some of the goodness-of-fit indices (NFI and CFI over 0.90, NNFI is above, but still good, SRMR is 0.05, as recommended, critical is just THE RMSEA value). Overall, the dimensions' scale showed good reliability and good convergence in terms of coefficients, and moderately good convergence in terms of model fit indices.

The organisational gaps for hotel management dimensions were tested for convergent and discriminant validity together in the organisational gap for the hotel management construct structural model, where di-

TABLE 6   The organisational gap for hotel management construct convergent and discriminant validity

Dimensions	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Marketing research orientation (OTR)	0.696	0.540	0.446	1	0.191	0.252	0.397
Designing specifications (OS)	0.679	0.493	0.409	0.191	1	0.323	0.439
Measuring results (MR)	0.656	0.449	0.356	0.252	0.323	1	0.291
Service quality leadership (VIZ)	0.746	0.685	0.665	0.397	0.439	0.291	1

NOTES   Fit index: NFI = 0.904, NNFI = 0.930, CFI = 0.960, SRMR = 0.050, RMSEA = 0.060. Models: (1) composite reliability, (2) variance extracted, (3) variance shared. Correlations: (4) OTR, (5) OS, (6) MR, (7) VIZ.

mensions were modeled as first order latent constructs and correlated with each other. The model showed reasonably good fit: NFI 0.904, NNFI 0.930, CFI 0.960, with the exception of SRMR 0.050 and RMSEA 0.060, all coefficients were found to be positive, high and significant (between 0.507 and 0.862). These results were very similar across different control groups: size of the company, random split. The model reliability, variance statistics and inter-dimension correlations are indicated in table 6.

Two dimensions demonstrated good composite reliability – at or over the threshold of 0.700 (Hair et al. 1998), two were just a little below. Variance extracted was found to be somewhat below the threshold of 0.500 for 2 dimensions. Correlations among the dimensions were all significant and ranged from 0.191 in 0.439, demonstrating convergence, but not redundancy, of the dimensions. Overall, the model's fit indices, composite realiability, variance extracted, and correlations indicate moderately good convergent validity. There is also evidence of discriminant validity, because correlations are not too high (not over 0.70) and even more importantly, because the variance extracted for each dimension is higher than the variance shared with other dimensions.

Multidimensionality of the organisational gap for hotel management construct was also tested by comparing the relative contributions of two models. The first is the model that includes only one common organisational gap first order factor (the one common factor model) and is based on the assumption of unidimensionality of the organisational gap concept. The second is the dimensions-only model that is based on the assumption of non-unidimensionality of the organisational gap concept. These 2 models are nested in the model with both dimensions and the common factor, a method that allows for comparison of the models. The comparison is shown in table 7.

TABLE 7   The dimensions-only vs. the one common factor model

Dimensions	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
M1: One common factor model	145.956	20	0.448	0.254	0.467	0.150	0.197
M2: Dimensions-only model	25.516	16	0.904	0.930	0.960	0.053	0.061
M3: Model with both factor and dim.	14.491	11	0.945	0.962	0.985	0.048	0.045
M1–M3: Contribution of dimensions	131.465	4	0.901	0.820			
M2–M3: Contrib. of the common factor	11.025	5	0.432	0.174			

NOTES   Column headings are as follows: (1) χ^2 (all Chi-squares significant at 0.001), (2) *df*, (3) NFI, (4) NNFI, (5) CFI, (6) SRMR, (7) RMSEA.

The one common factor model indicated overall poor fit and low fit relative to the dimensions-only model in all goodness-of-fit indices. Model fit indices of the dimensions-only model and model with both the dimensions and the common factor are similar. The contributions of the 2 models are shown in the last 2 rows in table 4. Both Chi-square differnces are significant, indicating that both models may contribute to explanatory power. However the NFI and NNFI for two models' differences demonstrate that the contribution of dimensions seems to be quite substantial (NFI 0.901; NNFI 0.820), whereas the contribution of the overall factor seems to be rather minimal (NFI 0.432; NNFI 0.174). Overall, the one common factor model seems to be inferior to the dimensions-only model. This can be considered a strong indication of multidimensionality of the organisational gap for the hotel management construct. Hence, the organisational gap for the hotel management construct developed in this study can be seen as a good measure of the organisational gap for hotel management that captures both dimensionality as well as the overall shared characteristics of the organisational gap for hotel managers. It presents all the necessary evidence for the existence of convergent and discriminant validity of the construct. The organisational gap model for hotel management has 4 dimensions with 18 elements.

THE ORGANISATIONAL GAP MODEL FOR HOTEL MANAGEMENT IN SLOVENIA

The redefined organisational gap model for hotel management was tested in the Slovenian hotel industry in order to assess the size of organisational gaps in Slovenian hotels. The results are presented in table 8.

According to the result of the research, the biggest problem of the Slovenian hotel industry is the lack of dedication of the hotel managers to define hotel service specifications (mean 3. 90). On the other hand, this

TABLE 8 The organisational gap of Slovenian hotel management (163 cases)

Elements/dimensions	Min	Max	Mean
P3 Collecting information on guest's satisfaction	2	7	5.47
P1 Amount of marketing research	3	7	5.19
Marketing research orientation			5.33
P20 Decision making style	2	7	5.06
P9 Motivating for service quality	2	7	4.93
P15 Discrepancy between expected and perceived service	3	7	5.69
S28 Confidence	2	7	5.73
S20 Control/supervision	2	7	5.65
S31 Helping employees	2	7	6.02
S24 Education and joint projects	3	7	5.10
S29 Meaning of education	4	7	6.31
S17 Means of communication	2	7	5.55
S27 Level of autonomy	2	7	5.72
P28 Meaning of service quality dimensions	3	7	6.33
Service quality improvement leadership			5.64
S3 Service specifications design precision	1	7	3.48
S2 Specifications as a business efficiency measure	1	7	4.33
Designing specifications			3.90
E2 Responsibility	1	7	5.47
E5 Progress	1	7	4.43
E7 Spreading information about efficiency	3	7	5.50
Measuring results			5.13

is the area that can be addressed and developed to increase service quality. Still, the general assessment of the organisational gap of hotel management (average value 5.00) is that, although the managers understand the meaning of conducting marketing research, of service specification, of performance measurement and of implementation of service quality systems, it is nevertheless a rare practice in Slovenian hotel industry for various reasons.

Conclusion

The extended service quality model was the framework for assessing organisational gaps. The original and extended Parasuraman's et al. model has 4 organisational gaps with 16 dimensions with 50 elements. Due to

the reason that the model was not tested in the tourism or hotel industry, or explored and confirmed with appropriate statistical methods, we decided to redefine and reassess the model. Based on the in-depth review of over 300 literature units on service quality management and identification of the existing service quality models, we were able to construct the concept of the service quality gaps.

Because in the original model service quality is evaluated through gap 5 or the perception gap, we found it necessary to add the fifth gap in the service quality model- evaluation gap. It is essential to have supervision and control – or better to say assessment – of the service delivery before the consumption of the services. The service quality gap theoretical concept consists of 5 gaps (positioning, specification, service delivery, communication and evaluation) that have 26 dimensions with more than 100 elements. The focus of this paper is on the three gaps specifically aimed at hotel management rather than personnel, namely the positioning gap, the specification gap and the evaluation gap. To overcome the weaknesses of prior researches, a complex research was undertaken to identify the representative structure and dimensions.

Authors (Parasuraman et al.) of the extended service quality model suggest that the model should be tested with the appropriate multivariate statistical methods such as factor analysis. Measures of the theoretical construct affecting each gap can be viewed as an indicator of that gap. Therefore, it is possible to recast the conceptual model in the form of a structural equations model. The model was tested by collecting data on the indicators of gaps through questionnaires and by analyzing data with exploratory factory analysis, and then confirming the structure of the constructs with structural equation modelling.

The results of this study suggest that the assessment tested here is both valid and reliable. Clearly, although further testing is required, the findings are nevertheless encouraging. In the Slovenian context, some dilemmas were revealed. The Slovenian hotel managers should put more effort into obtaining the right information about their guests and planning the effective service quality systems. In order to fully use service quality as a competitive advantage, service positioning, specification and evaluation must be further explored.

References

Antončič, B. 2000. *Intrapreneurship: Construct refinement and integrative model development.* PhD. diss., Case Western University.

Bowen, D. E., and B. Schneider. 1988. Services marketing and management: implications for organisational behaviour. In *Research in organizational behaviour,* ed. B. M. Staw, and L. L. Cummings. Greenwich, CT: JAI.

Candido, C. J. F., and D. S. Morris. 2000. Charting service quality gaps. *Total Quality Management* 11 (4–6): 463–72.

Cronin, J. J., and S. A. Taylor. 1992. Measuring service quality: a re-examination and extension. *Journal of Marketing* 56 (3): 55–8.

Garvin, D. A. 1988. *Managing service quality, the strategic and the competitive edge.* New York: The Free Press.

Groenroos, C. 1990. *Service management and marketing: Managing the moments of truth in service competition.* Lexington, MA: Lexington Books; New York: Free Press.

Hair, J. F., R. E. Anderson, R. L. Tatham, and W. C. Black. 1998. *Multivariate data analysis with readings.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Harrington, D., and T. Lenehan. 1998. *Managing quality in tourism.* Dublin: Oak Tree.

Ivankovič, G. 2005. Decision-making information for different levels and hotel performance. *Economic and Business Review* 7 (2): 137–56.

Heskett, J. L. 1987. Lessons in the service sector. *Harvard Business Review* 87 (2): 118–26.

Johns, N. 1999. Quality management. In *The handbook of contemporary hospitality management research,* ed. B. Brotherton, 333–50. Chichester: Wiley.

Kandampully, J. 2007. Services management: The new paradigm in hospitality. *Upper Saddle River,* NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Kandampully, J., C. Mok, and Sparks, B., eds. 2001. *Service quality management in hospitality, tourism and leisure.* Binghamton: Haworth.

Knowles, T. 1999. *Corporate strategy for hospitality.* Harlow: Longman.

Lehtinen, U., and J. R. Lehtinen. 1982. Service quality: a study of quality dimensions. Unpublished working paper, Service Management Institute, Helsinki.

Lewis, R. C., and B. H. Booms. 1983. The marketing aspects of service quality. In *Emerging perspectives on services marketing,* ed. L. L. Berry, G. Shostack, and G. Upah, 99–107. Chicago: AMA.

McCarthy, P. M., and T. J. Keefe. 1999. A measure of staff perceptions of quality. *Journal of Quality Management* 4 (2): 185–207.

Olsen, M. D, E. Ching-Yick Tse, and J. J. West. 1992. *Strategic management in the hospitality industry.* New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Parasuraman, A., V. A. Zeithaml, and L. L. Berry. 1985. A conceptual model of service quality and its implications for future research. *Journal of Marketing* 49 (4): 41–50

Teas, R. K. 1993. Expectations, performance evaluation and consumers; perceptions of quality. *Journal of Marketing* 57 (4): 18–34.

Uran, M. 2003. Kakovost storitev kot strategija diferenciacije za ustavrjanje konkurenčne prednosti slovenskega hotelirstva. phd. diss, University of Ljubljana.

Uran, M. 2004. *Zagotavljanje kakovosti storitev v hotelskih podjetih.* Koper: Društvo za akademske in aplikativne raziskave.

Uran, M., M. R. Testa, K. Sievers, D. Conti, Z. Batagelj, J. Jerman, and D. Radić. 2006. *Slovenian hotel quality system.* Ljubljana: Ministrstvo za gospodarstvo.

Zeithaml, V. A, L. L. Berry, and A. Parasuraman. 1988. Communication and control processes in the delivery of service quality. *Journal of Marketing* 52:34–48.

Zeithaml, V. A., A. Parasuraman, and L. L. Berry. 1990. *Delivering quality service balancing customer perceptions and expectations.* New York: Free Press.

Zeithaml, V. A, L. L. Berry, and A. Parasuraman. 1993. The nature and determinants of customer expectations of service. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 21 (1): 1–12.

Zemke, R., and D. Schaaf. 1989. *The service edge: 101 companies that profit from customer care.* New York: Nal Books.