GADJAH MADA JOURNAL OF TOURISM STUDIES

VOLUME 3 NUMBER 2 OCTOBER 2020

Study of Tourist Satisfaction to Experience Quality of Visit to Budapest, Hungary, as Cultural Heritage Destination

Vincentius Bagas Adi Pratama

MSc in Tourism Management, Budapest Business School, Hungary

Email: vincentius.b.a.pratama@gmail.com

Abstract

The goal of this research is to determine the level of satisfaction of tourists who visited Budapest as a cultural heritage tourism destination in terms of experience quality, which includes interaction quality, physical environment quality, access quality, and outcome quality. In this study, the holiday satisfaction (HOLSAT) model is used to examine tourist satisfaction levels by comparing the mean of expectation and experience from each attribute. In total, 131 on-line questioners' responses from international tourists who visited Budapest between October 24 and November 17, 2019 were collected. The findings show that there are seven attributes indicating tourist satisfaction: staff knowledge, language competence, preservation, sign & information, ease of access, public transportation, and safety & security. Technology, traffic, and crowdedness are three indicators of tourist dissatisfaction. Furthermore, service, staff interaction, exhibition display, facilities, cleanliness, site accessibility, unpleasant behaviour of other visitors, and learning experience have a less significant difference between expectation and experience.

Keywords*: tourist satisfaction, Budapest, experience quality*

1. Introduction

Cultural tourism is an important component of Hungary's tourism industry (Smith & Puczko, 2012). Hungary's geographic location, which lacks mountains and coastline, has given rise to a distinct culture that has become one of the country's main hubs for tourism activities (Smith & Puczko, 2012). Furthermore, Hungary's cultural resources have received international recognition. Hungary has seven Cultural World Heritage Sites and one Natural World Heritage Site on its list (UNESCO, 2019). Because of this potential and resources, cultural tourism has become an essential component of the Hungarian tourism product (Hughes and Allen, 2005).

Budapest is the most well-known of Hungary's World Heritage Sites (Sziva & Bassa, 2017). This is due to Budapest's role as the capital city and international city, which has become Hungary's main gateway. Furthermore, when compared to other heritage sites or cities in Hungary, it has a strong international image (Sziva & Bassa, 2017; Smith & Puczko, 2012). Further to that, the image of Budapest as the country's main cultural destination, as evidenced by its selling propositions concentrated on the city's heritage area's urban landscape and architecture (Smith & Puczko, 2012).

Budapest's World Heritage Site area includes the Budapest Inner City District, the Danube Banks, the Buda Castle Quarter, and Andrássy Avenue (WHC, 2019). Since 1987, the heritage site area has been listed on the World Heritage List (WHC, 2019). The heritage site area is a hub of cultural interaction and historical events that are vital to the country and the region of Central Europe

(WHC, 2019). Furthermore, it contains relics from many historical periods of the city, which has been subjected to several devastation and revitalization phases, as well as unique and well-preserved structural characteristics of the former cities of Pest, Buda, and Obuda (WHC, 2019).

After the fall of the communist regime, the development of tourism in Budapest began, and it started to grow significantly after Hungary joined the European Union in 2004. (Kovacs, Wiessner, & Zischner, 2012; Pinke-Sziva et al., 2019). In addition, the rapid expansion of low-cost airlines has contributed to an increase in tourist arrivals in the city (Pinke-Sziva et al., 2019). The Inner-City District is one of the major areas that has undergone extensive transformation and development (Kovacs, Wiessner, & Zischner, 2012). The area has become a tourist attraction and a center for tourism-related services (Pinke-Sziva et al., 2019).

The increase in international tourist arrivals reflects the growth of tourism in Hungary and the importance of Budapest in Hungarian tourism. From 2013 to 2019, there has been an increase in international tourist arrivals, with 10,624,000 international tourists in 2013 increasing to 16,937,000 international tourists in 2019. (Hungarian Central Statistical Office, 2020). In terms of tourist distribution, it has been discovered that 35.7 percent of international tourists who visited Hungary in 2019 stayed in Budapest (Hungarian Central Statistical Office, 2020).

Because of the massive growth of the tourism industry, Budapest is under pressure from ongoing and future development projects (Smith & Puczko, 2012). There is concern that the city will face problems similar to those faced by major tourism destinations in Western Europe, such as overcrowding in the city center or old town and local resident resistance to tourism (Smith et al., 2017). Furthermore, there is evidence that tourists are becoming concerned about overcrowding in the city's tourism area (Pinke-Sziva et al., 2019).

With the pressures and challenges that cultural tourism destinations, particularly heritage sites, are facing, there is a growing concern about the quality and experience of tourists during their visit (Chen & Chen, 2010). There is a growing need for visitor-oriented development in the context of cultural and heritage tourism product development, with a greater emphasis on consumer preferences and the quality of tourist experience (Apostolakis & Jaffry, 2005). Furthermore, there are concerns about visitor management in cultural or heritage site management in order to balance the needs and requirements of visitors while also taking heritage sustainability into account (Daengbuppha, 2009). As a result, in order to comprehend the tourist experience, an evaluation of the tourism destination is required in order to identify future improvements (Russo, 2000; Chen and Chen, 2010).

Tourist satisfaction is an important factor that can be used to evaluate the performance of tourism destinations (Salleh et al., 2013). Tourist satisfaction could be used as an indicator instrument to learn how tourists rate their experiences in tourism destinations (Valle et al., 2006). Furthermore, it can be used to evaluate elements of a tourism destination that should be improved based on tourist feedback (Valle et al., 2006).

Several previous studies have focused on tourist satisfaction in heritage sites. However, there have been few studies on tourist satisfaction with regard to experience quality in cultural heritage sites (Mehmood, Liang, & Gu, 2018). Furthermore, in most leisure experience studies, there is a lack of analysis complexity regarding visitor experience during their visit (Daenbupha, 2009).

The purpose of this study is to assess the level of satisfaction of tourists who visited Budapest as a cultural heritage tourism destination. The purpose of this study is to determine the level of satisfaction of tourists who visit Budapest in terms of experience quality, which includes interaction quality, physical environment quality, access quality, and outcome quality. Furthermore, this research attempts to identify elements of tourism destinations that have been able to satisfy or dissatisfy tourists, as the basis for improving tourism products in Budapest, particularly those related to cultural tourism and heritage tourism.

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1 Experience Quality

In the context of the tourism industry, experience quality could be defined as the psychological outcome of tourist participation in tourism activities (Chen & Chen, 2010; Wu & Li, 2014).

Furthermore, experience quality can be defined as tourist perception as a result of tourist judgment of the superiority or excellence of their experience (Wu & Li, 2014). This also includes the tourist's perception of the service quality that they encounter during their visit, as well as how the tourist reacts to the service interaction (Parasuraman et al., 1995; Walls et al., 2011).

This factor is critical in understanding how tourists perceive and associate their visit to the heritage site (Wu & Li, 2014; Chen & Chen, 2010). Furthermore, evaluation of experience quality is required to determine which attributes of a tourism destination need to be improved in order to satisfy tourists. As a result, in order to assess the complexity of experience quality, a measurement model capable of measuring tourist perceptions of experience quality must be flexible and capable of assessing its multidimensional factors (Wu et al., 2014).The assessment of experience quality could be focused on its sub-dimensions, which include interaction quality, physical environment quality, outcome quality, and access quality (Herzig, 2017).

Interaction quality is a dimension of experience quality that includes the behavior, expertise, and attitude of tourism destination staff (Brady & Cronin, 2001). This dimension focused on the quality of service provided to tourists (Wu et al., 2014; Wu & Li, 2014). Furthermore, it refers to the role of interpersonal interaction between service provider staff and tourists during the service delivery process (Jin, Lee, & Lee, 2012). (Lee & Bang, 2017). Interaction between staff and tourists is an important factor in tourist service evaluation (Clemes et al., 2009). Furthermore, it is an important factor influencing tourist perception and satisfaction with tourism destinations (Aida et al., 2012). Furthermore, it was suggested that the quality of interaction has a positive influence on tourist satisfaction (Hussain & Ekiz, 2009).

When evaluating interaction quality, the focus should be on the most important aspects of it. Climes et al. (2009) Interaction quality is divided into five sub-dimensions: interaction, problem-solving, expertise, attitude, and behavior (Wu et al., 2014; Brady & Cronin, 2001). As a result, the purpose of this study would be to evaluate this sub-dimension of interaction quality.

Another dimension of experience quality is physical environment quality (Clemes et al., 2009). This dimension emphasized the quality of the environment and the surrounding area in which the service is provided. (2018, Ramli et al.) Furthermore, it can be referred to as tourist quality evaluation of physical facilities and the environment (Jin et al., 2012)

Physical environment quality is an important factor for tourism destinations because it can serve as the foundation for developing competitive advantages by improving physical facility quality, making tourists feel more at ease during their visit to the area (Baker, 1986). This dimension focuses on how the tourism destination's facilities can ensure the quality of service delivery (Wu et al., 2014). This dimension is related to social and physical setting elements such as building condition, design, accessibility, space, and cleanliness (Turley & Millman, 2000). Aesthetic, equipment, layout, design, social factor, environment, ambiance, and cleanliness are some of the sub-dimensions of physical environment quality (Aida, et al, 2012; Safri et al., 2016; Brady & Cronin, 2001).

Access quality is another dimension of experience quality. The ease and time required by people to reach their desired destination can be defined as access quality (Wu & Cheng, 2013; Wu et al., 2014). In the tourism context, this dimension refers to the ease with which tourists can move around and reach various locations within the tourism destination in a short period of time (Wu & Cheng, 2013). It could also refer to the quality of tourist flow in the tourism destination (Eichhorn and Buhalis, 2011). One of the most important issues in the supply side of tourism destinations is access quality (Eichhorn and Buhalis, 2011). It is also suggested that the following sub-dimensions of access quality be considered: accessible attractions, accessible transportation, and accessible lodging facilities (Eichhorn and Buhalis, 2011). It also includes other sub-dimensions such as parking, airport access, and public transportation (Abdali et al., 2016). As a result, the focus of this study was on the traffic situation, the accessibility of tourist attractions, and the state of public transportation,

Outcome quality is a dimension of experience quality that connects or relates the consumer's perception of the outcome or result of their interaction with the service provider (Jin

et al., 2012). Furthermore, this dimension could be defined as the outcome of the consumer's interaction with the service provider and service performance (Aida et al., 2012). Furthermore, it could be defined as a tourist's evaluation of the final product or service that they received (Ramli et al., 2018). Outcome quality plays an important role in determining overall service quality because it reflects tourists' perceptions of their overall experience (Hossain & Kim, 2019). As a result, the quality of the outcome plays a significant role in influencing tourist satisfaction (Hussain & Ekiz, 2009). Furthermore, in terms of tourist satisfaction, the quality of the outcome has a direct positive influence on it (Hussain & Ekiz, 2009; Chen & Kao, 2009).

2.2 Tourist Satisfaction

Tourist satisfaction defined as the overall pleasure felt by tourists from the result of tourist expectations, desires, and needs fulfilment (Helier et al., 2003). In addition, it could be referred as tourists feeling in regard to their experience (Hussain & Ekiz, 2009). Further, it is also suggested that tourist satisfaction is influenced by tourist expectation, which could affect their perceived experience (Hussain & Ekiz, 2009). Tourist satisfaction also can be seen as a relation and comparison between tourist pre-travel expectation and their post-travel experience (Chen & Chen, 2010) (Aliman et al., 2016) Therefore, tourist satisfaction also could be defined as tourist perceived product's performance relative to their expectations (Kotler et al., 2017). Moreover, it could refer to tourist evaluation toward the service that they receive compared to their expectation of service (Lopez et al., 2018). Tourist satisfaction is an important evaluation for tourism destination development. It is because it has influence on the marketing of tourism destination that also influences tourist choice, tourist decision for consumption, and decision for return visit (Kozak & Rimmington, 2000)

There are several methods and tools to evaluate tourist satisfaction. One of the methods is by comparing tourist expectations and tourist experiences (Omar et al., 2015). One of the tools that could be used to evaluate tourist satisfaction through comparison of expectation and experience is HOLSAT Model (Truong and Foster, 2006). HOLSAT is considered as a measurement model for tourist satisfaction that flexible and could be adapted to specific characteristics and conditions of a tourism destination (Truong & Foster, 2006; Tribe & Snaith, 1998).

There are several features of HOLSAT that differentiate and make it better tools to measure tourist satisfaction. One of the key features that differentiate HOLSAT with other tourist satisfaction measurement model is its flexibility (Slack, 2019). It does not require a fixed setlist of attributes and give opportunities to analyse wide ranges of destination attributes (Slack, 2019). This provides the opportunity to evaluate tourist satisfaction of specific features of the destination (Meimand et al., 2013). In addition, other key feature of HOLSAT is its analysis that compares and based on two-phase of travel, which are: pre-travel expectation and post-travel experience (Meimand et al., 2013). This feature differentiates it with other measurement models such as: SERVQUAL, SERVPERF that only focused on quality or performance of service (Truong & Foster, 2006). This provides a better understanding of tourist expectations and experience toward tourism destinations (Meimand et al., 2013). Moreover, it also analyse both positive and negative attribute tourism destination (Meimand et al., 2013) (Truong & Foster, 2006). This gives the opportunity to get an overview of tourist perception to positive or negative aspects of tourism destination (Meimand et al., 2013; Truong & Foster, 2006).

Analysis of tourist satisfaction with HOLSAT model is based on the comparison of the mean of expectation and mean of experience from each attribute of tourism destination (Truong & Gebbie, 2007). The level of tourist satisfaction or tourist dissatisfaction is demonstrated by the difference between the mean of experience and the mean of expectation (Truong & Foster, 2006).

3. Research Methodology

3.1 Data Collection

This research is focus to understand the satisfaction level of international tourists toward their visit to Budapest as a cultural heritage tourism destination. The target population for this research is international tourists that have visited Budapest in the period between October 2018 to November 2019. The

primary data for this research is collected through online questionnaire, with non-probability sampling method. The online questionnaire is created through Google Form. The online questionnaire is posted in travel and tourism-related groups on Facebook, as well as through shared online survey links that were sent to selected respondents. The online was collected from 24 October 2019 to 17 November 2019. In total, there are 131 questionnaires response that collected from the research and analysed to evaluate their satisfaction of visit to Budapest.

The online questionnaire for this research consists of three main parts. The first part consists of questions related to visitor profile and travel characteristics. The second part is the evaluation of tourist expectations before their visit toward elements of cultural heritage sites in Budapest. The third part is the evaluation of tourist experiences after their visit toward element s of cultural heritage sites in Budapest. In the second and third parts, tourist was asked to rate their expectation and experience toward each statement by matching with five options: strongly disagree, agree, neutral, agree, and strongly agree.

In order to evaluate tourist experiential quality toward heritage sites in Budapest, there four dimensions that become the focus of the research, with total of 18 attributes that analysed. Those are interaction quality, physical environment quality, outcome quality, and access quality. For interaction quality, there are four attributes that are analysed. It consists of three positive attributes, which are: service, staff knowledge, and interaction, as well as one negative attribute, which is: language. For physical environment quality, there are six attributes that are analysed. It consists of five positive attributes, which are: exhibition display, technology, facilities, cleanliness, and preservation, as well as one negative attribute, which is: sign and information. For access quality, there are four attributes that are analysed. It consists of three positive attributes, which are: site accessibility, easiness to reach, and public transportation, as well as one negative attribute, which is: traffic. For outcome quality, there are four attributes that are analysed. It consists of two positive attributes, which are: learning experience, and safety, as well as two negative attributes, which are: crowdedness, and behaviour of other tourists.

3.2 Data Analysis

In this research, tourist satisfaction is evaluated based on the comparison of the mean of expectation and the mean of experience of each attribute. In the analysis process paired t-test is performed to analyse the difference of mean between expectation and experience from each attribute. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) is used in the analysis of tourist satisfaction.

The respondent response towards expectations and experiences of each attribute is collected in the form of five points Likert scale. Respondents responses are transformed into number as the following: strongly disagree = 1, agree = 2, neutral = 3, agree = 4, and strongly agree = 5. These numerical responses of each attribute, then calculated to measure the mean of expectation and the mean of experience from each attribute. A paired t-test was then conducted to measure the difference between expectation and experience from each attribute. In addition, the paired t-test also could show the level of significance that indicates the level of significant difference between the mean of expectation and the mean of experience.

Further, as the Holiday satisfaction (HOLSAT) model measures both positive and negative attributes, the interpretation of the mean comparison should consider the type of the attribute. For positive attributes, tourist satisfaction is indicated if the mean of experience is higher than the mean of expectation (Truong & Gebbie, 2007). If the mean of experience is lower than the mean of expectation, it indicates tourist dissatisfaction toward the attribute (Truong & Gebbie, 2007). In reverse, for the negative attribute if the mean of experience is lower than the mean of expectation it indicates tourist satisfaction (Truong & Gebbie, 2007). If the mean of experience is higher than the mean of expectation it indicates tourist dissatisfaction toward the attribute (Truong & Gebbie, 2007).

Moreover, the level of significance could indicate the significance of satisfaction/ dissatisfaction of an attribute. If the level of significance is lower than 0.001 it indicates that the attribute has significant satisfaction or dissatisfaction level (Truong & Foster, 2006). If the level of significance higher than 0.001 it indicates

there is a less significant difference between the mean of expectation and the mean of experience, which indicates there is less significant satisfaction/ dissatisfaction toward the attribute (Truong & Foster, 2006)

4. Research Findings and Discussion

4.1 Respondent Profile and Characteristics

Table 1. Respondent Profile

Gender		
Gender	Number of Respondent	Percentage
Female	69	52.7%
Male	62	47.3%
Age		
Age	Number of Respondents	Percentage
18-24	38	29%
25-34	52	39.7%
35-44	28	21.4%
45-54	10	7.6%
Above 54	3	2.3%
Region of Origin		
Region	Number of Respondent	Percentage
Europe	62	47,33%
Africa	12	9,16%
Asia	36	27,48%
Australia & New Zealand	7	5,34%
South America	5	3,82%
North America	9	6,87%

From the total of 131 respondents for this research, it could be classified into several groups based on its profile and characteristics. More than half of the respondents are female, which are consists of 52.7% of total respondents, while male respondents share 47.3% of the total respondents. In terms of age, the majority of respondents come from the age range between 18 to 34 years old range. Most of the respondents come 25 to 34 years old age range that represents 39.7% of the total respondents. Most respondents come from Europe that consists of 47.33% of the total respondent, followed with respondents from Asia that consists of 27.48% of the total respondent.

Moreover, respondent characteristics also could be described by its length of stay and its average daily expenses. Most of the respondents, which are consist of 54.96% of total respondents stayed between two to three days when they visit Budapest. In addition, there are 23.66% of respondents that stay between four to seven days during their visit to Budapest. Furthermore, most of the respondents on average spent daily between 25 to 50 Euros, which consists of 37.4% of total respondents. There are also 35.88% of respondents that on average spent between 51 to 75 Euros.

Table 2. Respondent Characteristics

Length of Stay		
Length of Stay	Number of Respondent	Percentage
1 day	24	18.32%
2-3 days	72	54.96%
4-7 days	31	23.66%
More than 7 days	4	3.05%
Average Daily Expenses		
Average Daily Expenses	Number of Respondent	Percentage
Below 25 Euros	14	10.69%
25 – 50 Euros	49	37.40%
51 – 75 Euros	47	35.88%
76 - 100 Euros	12	9.16%
More than 100 Euros	9	6.87%

4.2 Tourist Satisfaction to Experience Quality

This section provides analysis of tourist satisfaction of experience quality based on the mean comparison of respondent experience and expectation. This section gives an overview of the comparison between the mean of experience and mean of expectation from each attribute, and determine whether there is less significant difference, satisfaction, or dissatisfaction.

Based on the mean comparison of experience and expectation from four attributes of interaction quality, two attributes indicate tourist satisfaction. Those attributes are staff knowledge and language competence. In addition, two attributes have a less significant difference between expectation and experience. Those attributes are service and staff interaction.

As a positive attribute tourist satisfaction to staff knowledge could be observed as the mean of the experience, which is 4.21, is higher than the mean of its expectation, which 3.89. There is also a significant difference between the mean of the expectation and experience, with a significance level lower than 0.001. This indicates that tourists perceived that the knowledge of the staff in cultural heritage sites in Budapest is exceeding their expectations, able to satisfy them.

Meanwhile, as a negative attribute satisfaction toward language competence could be observed as the mean of its experience, which is 2.86, is lower than the mean of the expectation, which is 3.31. There is also a significant difference between the mean of the expectation and experience, with a significance level lower than 0.001. This indicates that tourists slightly expect that they encounter language barriers, while in their experience the language barrier it less than what they expected. This could indicate that the language competence of staff is good enough and able to satisfy tourists.

Meanwhile for service and staff interaction attributes there are less significant between experience and expectation. This indicated through those attributes level of significance that higher than 0.001. This demonstrates that there is a less significant difference between tourist expectation and their experience related to the service and staff interaction attributes.

From six attributes of physical environment quality, two attributes indicates tourist satisfaction. Those attributes are preservation and sign & information. There is one attribute that shows tourist dissatisfaction, this attribute is technology. In addition, three attributes have a less significant difference between expectation and experience. Those attributes are exhibition display, facilities, and cleanliness.

As a positive attribute tourist satisfaction to the preservation of heritage site could be observed as the mean of the experience, which is 4.50, is higher than the mean of its expectation, which is 4.14. There is also a significant difference between the mean of the expectation and experience, with a significance level lower than 0.001. This indicates that tourists perceived that preservation of heritage

Table 3. Mean Comparison of Interaction Quality

Attributes	Type	Expectation		Experience		Experience - Expectation	Significant t	Result
		Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation			
Good service	Positive attribute	4.11	0.55	4.22	0.65	0.11	0.136	Not significant
Good staff knowledge	Positive attribute	3.89	0.68	4.21	0.68	0.32	0.000	Satisfaction
Good staff interaction	Positive attribute	3.85	0.85	3.93	0.88	0.08	0.397	Not significant
Language barrier	Negative attribute	3.31	1.01	2.84	1.04	-0.44	0.000	Satisfaction

Table 4. Mean Comparison of Physical Environment Quality

Attributes	Type	Expectation		Experience		Experience – Expectation	Significant t	Result
		Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation			
Interesting exhibition display	Positive attribute	4.08	0.53	3.92	0.72	-0.17	0.032	Not significant
Technology to provide information	Positive attribute	3.95	0.65	3.47	0.84	-0.48	0.000	Dissatisfaction
Well maintained facilities	Positive attribute	4.05	0.53	4.15	0.67	0.09	0.217	Not significant
Clean condition	Positive attribute	4.12	0.56	4.31	0.62	0.18	0.005	Not significant
Well preserved heritage site	Positive attribute	4.14	0.58	4.50	0.59	0.37	0.000	Satisfaction
Difficulties to find sign and information	Negative attribute	2.79	0.93	2.36	0.95	-0.43	0.000	Satisfaction

Table 5. Mean Comparison of Access Quality

Attributes	Type	Expectation		Experience		Experience - Expectation	Significant t	Result
		Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation			
Heritage site accessibility	Positive attribute	4.16	0.65	4.03	0.75	-0.13	0.107	Not significant
Easy to reach	Positive attribute	4.02	0.71	4.50	0.59	0.48	0.000	Satisfaction
Good public transportation	Positive attribute	4.08	0.68	4.55	0.61	0.47	0.000	Satisfaction
Crowded traffic	Negative attribute	2.84	0.95	3.25	1.07	0.41	0.000	Dissatisfaction

sites in Budapest is in good condition and exceeding their expectations, able to satisfy them. In addition, there is tourist satisfaction toward sign and information attributes. It could be observed as the mean of its experience, which is 2.36, is lower than the mean of the expectation, which is 2.79. There is also a significant difference between the mean of the expectation and experience, with significance level lower than 0.001. This indicates that signs and information in Budapest are easy to find and in better condition than they expected.

It is also observed that tourists are dissatisfied with the availability of technology to provide information on the heritage sites in Budapest. As a positive attribute tourist dissatisfaction to technology attribute could be observed as the mean of the experience, which is 3.47, is lower than the mean of its expectation, which is 3.95. There is also a significant difference between the mean of the expectation and experience, with a significance level lower than 0.001. This could indicate that tourists expect there is a technology that helps to provide information in the heritage sites, however, their experience does not exceed their expectations.

Furthermore, for exhibition display, facilities, and cleanliness attributes, there are less significant between experience and expectation. This indicated through those attributes level of significance that

higher than 0.001. This demonstrates that there is a less significant difference between tourist expectation and their experience related to the exhibition display, facilities, and cleanliness attributes.

From four attributes of access quality, two attributes indicate tourist satisfaction. Those attributes are easiness to reach and public transportation. There is one attribute that shows tourist dissatisfaction, this attribute is traffic. In addition, there is one attribute that has a less significant difference between expectation and experience. This attribute is site accessibility.

As positive attributes, tourist satisfaction to easiness to reach and public transportation could be observed as the mean of the experience that higher than the mean of expectation. There are also significant differences between the mean of the expectation and experience, with a significance level lower than 0.001 for both attributes. For easiness to reach it has mean of experience of 4.50, that higher than its mean of expectation, which is 4.02. This indicates that heritage sites in Budapest are easier to reach than expected by tourists. Moreover, for the public transportation attribute, it has mean of experience of 4.55 that higher than its mean of expectation, which is 4.08. This could indicate that tourists perceived the quality of public transport is good, better than their expectation and they are satisfied with it.

For traffic attribute, it is observed that tourists are dissatisfied with crowded traffic in Budapest. As a negative attribute tourist dissatisfaction to technology attribute could be observed as the mean of the experience, which is 3.25, is higher than the mean of its expectation, which is 2.84. There is also a significant difference between the mean of the expectation and experience, with a significance level lower than 0.001. This could indicate that tourists dissatisfied with the attribute as they experience more crowded traffic than they expected

In addition, for site accessibility attribute, there is a less significant between experience and expectation. This indicated through the attribute level of significance that higher than 0.001. This demonstrates that there is a less significant difference between tourist expectation and their experience related site accessibility in Budapest.

From four attributes of outcome quality, one attributes indicate tourist satisfaction, which is the safety and security attribute. There is one attribute that shows tourist dissatisfaction, which is the crowdedness attribute. In addition, two attributes have less significant difference between expectation and experience, those attributes are: learning experience and behaviour of other tourists.

As a positive attribute tourist satisfaction to safety and security attribute could be observed as the mean of the experience, which is 4.17, is higher than the mean of its expectation, which is 3.82. There is also a significant difference between the mean of the expectation and experience, with a significance level lower than 0.001. This indicates

Table 6. Mean Comparison of Outcome Quality

Attributes	Type	Expectation		Experience		Experience – Expectation	Significant t	Result
		Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation			
Safety and security	Positive attribute	3.82	0.68	4.17	0.66	0.35	0.000	Satisfaction
Valuable learning experience	Positive attribute	4.06	0.52	4.25	0.62	0.19	0.007	Not significant
Crowdedness	Negative attribute	2.94	1.07	3.47	1.05	0.53	0.000	Dissatisfaction
Unpleasant behaviour of other tourists	Negative attribute	2.36	0.83	2.29	0.91	-0.07	0.508	Not significant

that tourists perceived Budapest as a safe and secure destination. In addition, it indicates the perceived experience of tourists regarding safety and security exceeds their expectations before the visit.

As a negative attribute tourist dissatisfaction to crowdedness attribute could be observed as the mean of the experience, which is 3.47, is higher than the mean of its expectation, which is 2.94. There is also a significant difference between the mean of the expectation and experience, with a significance level lower than 0.001. This could indicate that tourists perceived and dissatisfied with the more crowded situations in Budapest that they experience compared to their expectations before.

Moreover, for learning experience, and other tourist's behaviour attributes, there are less significant between experience and expectation. This indicated through those attributes level of significance that higher than 0.001. This demonstrates that there is a less significant difference between tourist expectation and their experience related to the learning experience, and other tourist's behaviour attributes, that are perceived by tourists.

5. Conclusions

Based on tourism satisfaction analysis, it gives overviews of tourist satisfaction to attributes of experiential quality. From a total of 18 attributes, tourists are satisfied with seven attributes. In addition, tourists are dissatisfied with three attributes. Meanwhile, eight attributes indicate that there is a less significant difference between expectation and experience for each attribute.

For interaction quality, there are two attributes indicate tourist satisfaction, those are staff knowledge and language competence. In addition, two attributes have less significant differences between expectation and experience, those are service and staff interaction.

For physical environment quality, two attributes indicate tourist satisfaction, those are preservation and sign & information. There is one attribute of physical environment quality that indicates tourist dissatisfaction, this attribute is technology. In addition, three attributes of physical environment quality have less significant differences between expectation and experience, those attributes are exhibition display, facilities, and cleanliness.

For access quality, two attributes indicate tourists' satisfaction, those are easiness to reach and public transportation. There is one attribute of access quality that shows tourist dissatisfaction, this attribute is traffic. Moreover, there is one attribute of access quality that shows a less significant difference between expectation and experience, this attribute is site accessibility.

For outcome quality there is one attribute that indicates tourist satisfaction, this attribute is safety & security. There is one attribute of outcome quality that indicates dissatisfaction, this attribute is crowdedness. In addition, two attributes have less significant differences between expectation and experience; those attributes are the learning experience and the behaviour of other tourists.

In general, it is observed that tourists are satisfied with the attributes of Budapest as a cultural heritage tourism destination. However, there are some dissatisfactions with attributes and less significant performance of attributes. Therefore, based on the analysis, some recommendations are suggested for the future development of Budapest as a tourism destination. The first suggestion is the improvement of service in the heritage sites, particularly regarding the interaction between staff and tourists. The second recommendation is the use of technology needs to be enhanced to provide information for tourists. Further, it also needs improvement in terms of visitor management to manage visitor flow and traffic in the area surrounding tourist attractions and cultural heritage sites.

There are several limitations that exist and limit the generalisation of the analysis result of this research. This limitation emerges as the implication of limited research period, sampling method, and data collection methods. This makes this research only represent results based on the collected response during the research period. In addition, the author also does not have full control over the respondent's responses to the questionnaire. This makes the result might not able to collect recent experiences of tourists who visited Budapest, as there are possibilities of issues or distortion of memories of tourists related to their expectations before the visit and experience after their visit.

For this reason, there are some suggestions for future research to develop better research in analyzing tourist satisfaction in Budapest as a cultural heritage destination. First, future research could be focused on a specific target group, with a larger sample size to provide that could better represent the analysis of satisfaction from specific tourist segments. Moreover, for future research, it also could put focus to measure how information sources could influence tourist expectations and experience. In addition, content analysis could be used as a secondary research approach to analyze promotional material, could be used as a basis to understand tourist expectations of a destination before their visit.

References

Abdali, T., Abdali, A. and Heidary, A. (2016) Sport tourism loyalty revisited: An overview. *International Academic Journal of Business Management*, Vol. 3:2 (43-50)

Aida Azlina Mansor, Rahayu Hasanordin, Muhammad Hafiz Abd Rashid, and Wan Edura Wan Rashid, (2012) Hierarchical Service Quality Model towards Student Satisfaction, *International Journal of Innovation, Management and Technology* vol. 3, no. 6, pp. 803-807,

Aliman, N. K., Hashim, S. M., Wahid, S. D., & Harudin, S. (2016). Tourists' Satisfaction with a Destination: An Investigation on Visitors to Langkawi Island. *International Journal of Marketing Studies,* 8(3), 173.

Apostolakis, A., Jaffry, S. (2005). " choice modelling application for Greek heritage attractions. *Journal of Travel Research*, 43(3), 309-318.

Baker,J. (1986). The Role of the Environment in Marketing Sciences: The Consumer Perspective, In: J. A. Cepeil, et al., Eds., *The Services Challenge: Integrating for Competitive Advantage*, (pp. 79-84) AMA, Chicago

Brady, M. K. and Cronin, J. J., (2001), Some new thoughts on conceptualizing perceived service quality: A hierarchical approach. *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 65, No. 3, pp. 34-49.

Chen, C. F., & Chen, F. S. (2010). Experience Quality, Perceived Value, Satisfaction and Behavioral Intentions for Heritage Tourists. *Tourism Management*, 31, 29-35.

Chen, Ching-Fu & Kao, Ya-Ling. (2010). Relationships between process quality, outcome quality, satisfaction, and behavioural intentions for online travel agencies – evidence from Taiwan. *Service Industries Journal* - SERV IND J. 30. 2081-2092.

Clemes, Michael. Wu, Hung-Che. Hu, Baiding. & Gan, Christopher. (2009). An empirical study of behavioral intentions in the Taiwan hotel industry. *Innovative Marketing*. 5. 30-50.

Daengbuppha, Jaruwa., (2009). Modelling Visitor Experience: A Case Study from World Heritage Sites, Thailand. *PhD. Thesis*. Bournemouth University.

Eichhorn, V. and Buhalis, D. (2011). Accessibility – A Key Objective for the TourismIndustry. In Buhalis, D. & Darcy, S. (Eds.) *Accessible Tourism: Concepts and Issues*, (pp. 46-61). Bristol: Channel View Publications.

Hellier, Phillip K., Geursen, Gus M., Carr, Rodney A. and Rickard, John A. (2003). Customer repurchase intention: a general structural equation model, *European Journal of Marketing*, vol. 37, no. 11, pp. 1762-1800.

Herzig, Philip J.C.,(2017). Visitor Satisfaction of UNESCO World Heritage Sites: The Case of the Oasis of Bahla and Land of Frankincense in the Sultanante of Oman. *Master Thesis*. Faculty of Economics University of Ljubljana.

Hossain, M.A.; Kim, M. (2018). Does Multidimensional Service Quality Generate Sustainable Use Intention for Facebook?. *Sustainability*, 10, 2283.

Hughes, H. Allen, D. (2005). Cultural tourism in Central and Eastern Europe: the views of 'induced image formation agents. *Tourism Management* 26 (2005) 173–183

Hungarian Central Statistical Office.(2020) The number of inbound trips to Hungary and the related expenditures (2009–).
https://www.ksh.hu/docs/eng/xstadat/xstadat_annual/i_ogt002b.html Accessed 08th December 2020 at 15:10

Hungarian Central Statistical Office.(2019) Tourist arrivals and tourism nights at commercial accommodation establishments by tourism region.
https://www.ksh.hu/docs/eng/xstadat/xstadat_annual/i_oga018.html Accessed 08th December 2020 at 15:25

Hussain, Kashif & Ekiz, Erdogan. (2009). Perceptions of service quality through interaction, physical environment and outcome qualities of hotel services. *Journal of Hospitality Application & Research*. 4. 26-40.

Jin, Naehyun Paul., Lee, Hyuckgi., Lee, Sangmook. (2012). Event Quality, Perceived Value, Destination Image, and Behavioral Intention of Sports Events: The Case of the IAAF World

Championship, Daegu, 2011. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*. 18. 1-16.

Kotler, Philip., Bowen, John, T., Makens, James, C., Baloglu , Seyhmus. (2017). *Marketing for Hospitality and Tourism*. Pearson

Kovács, Z., Wiessner, R., & Zischner, R. (2013). Urban Renewal in the Inner City of Budapest: Gentrification from a Postsocialist Perspective. *Urban Studies*, 50(1), 22-38

Kozak, M., & Rimmington, M. (2000). Tourist satisfaction with Mallorca, Spain, as an off-season holiday destination. *Journal of Travel Research*, 38(3), 260-269.

Lee, Cindy & Bang, Hyejin. (2017). Interaction Quality on Satisfaction: Season Ticket Holders' Perspective. Journal *of Physical Education and Sports Management. 4*.

Mehmood, S.; Liang, C.; Gu, D., (2018). Heritage Image and Attitudes toward a Heritage Site: Do They Really Mediate the Relationship between User-Generated Content and Travel Intentions toward a Heritage Site? *Sustainability 20*18, 10, 4403

Meimand, S.E. & Khalifah, Zainab & Hakemi, H.G.. (2013). Expectation and experience gap for japanese travelers visiting malaysian homestay, utilizing holiday satisfaction model. *Indian Journal of Science and Technology*. 6. 5593-5599.

Omar, Shida Irwana & Mohamad, Diana & Rozelee, Saliza & Mohamed, Badaruddin. (2015). Holiday satisfaction in Penang, Malaysia: A quantitative perspective analysis of international and domestic tourists. *Geografia Online Malaysia Journal of Society and Space.*

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

Pinke-Sziva, I., Smith, M. K, Olt, G. and Berezvai, Z. (2019) Overtourism and the night-time economy: a case study of Budapest*, International Journal of Tourism Cities*

Ramli, N., Ghani, W. S. W. A., Ma'mor, H., & Rashid, N. M. (2018). The Impacts of Perceived Service Quality on Attendees' Satisfaction. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 8(11), 2066–2074.

Russo, Antonio Paolo, (2000). *"The "Vicious Circle" Of Tourism Development In Heritage Destinations,* ERSA conference papers, European Regional Science Association.

Safri, Safwana & Mohi, Zurinawati & Sumarjan, Norzuwana. (2016). "Patrons' satisfaction towards Kopitiam's physical environment quality in Malacca". Heritage, Culture and Society: Research agenda and best practices in the hospitality and tourism industry - *Proceedings of the 3rd International Hospitality and Tourism Conference, IHTC 2016 and 2nd International Seminar on Tourism*, ISOT 2016

Salleh, Munir., Omar, Khatijah., Yaakop, Azizul Yadi., and Mahmmod, Ahmad Ramli. (2013). Tourist satisfaction in Malaysia*. International journal of business and social Science*, 4(5), May 2013

Slack, N.J. (2019) HOLSAT Evaluation of International Tourist's Expectations and Experiences of Fiji as a Holiday Destination. *Theoretical Economics Letters* , 9, 2418-2435

Smith, Melanie Kay. Egedi, Tamás. Csizmady, Adrienne. Jancsik, András and Michalkó, Gábor. (2017). Non-planning and tourism consumption in Budapest's inner city. *Tourism Geographies*, 20 (3). pp. 524-548

Smith, Melanie & Puczko, Laszlo. (2012). Budapest: From socialist heritage to cultural capital?. *Current Issues in Tourism*. 15. 107-119.

Sziva, I., & Bassa, L. (2017). World Heritage Sites through the Eyes of New Tourists – Who Cares about World Heritage Brand in Budapest?. *Almatourism - Journal of Tourism, Culture and Territorial Development*, 8(7), 255-268.

Tribe, John. and Snaith, Tin. (1998). From SERVQUAL to HOLSAT: Holiday satisfaction in Varadero, Cuba. *Tourism management*, 19(I), 25-34

Truong, Truy-Huong. and Foster, David. (2006). Using HOLSAT to evaluate tourist satisfaction at destinations: The case of Australian holidaymakers in Vietnam". *Tourism Management* 27, 2006. Elsevier

Truong, Thuy-Huong. and Gebbie, Peter John. (2007). Market segmentation of Australian tourists in Vietnam: An application of the HOLSAT model". Tourism *management in the 21st century*. Chang, Peter R. (Ed). New York: Nova Science Publishers, Inc.

Turley, L. W., & Milliman, R. E. (2000). Atmospheric effects on shopping behavior: A review of the experimental evidence. *Journal of Business Research*, 49, 193–211

UNESCO.(2019). "Hungary:Description-Properties inscribed on the World Heritage List":UNSECO-World Heritage Centre. http://whc.unesco.org/en/statesparties/HU Accessed 21th October 2019 at 16:20

Valle, Patricia Oom do., Silva, J. A., Mendes, J., and Guerreiro, M. (2006). Tourist satisfaction and destination loyalty intention: A structural and categorical analysis. *Int. Journal of Business*

Science and Applied Management, 1(1), 2006

Walls, Andrew , Okumus, Fevzi , Wang (Raymond) , Youcheng and Kwun, David Joon-Wuk. (2011) 'Understanding the Consumer Experience: An Exploratory Study of Luxury Hotels', *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 20: 2, 166 — 197

World Heritage Council-UNSECO, International Council on Monuments and Sites. (WHC). (2019). Budapest, including the Banks of the Danube, the Buda Castle Quarter and Andrássy Avenue (Hungary) Reactive Monitoring Mission https://whc.unesco.org/document/175254 Accessed 20th October 2019 at 20:15

Wu, Hung-Che & Cheng, Ching-Chan. (2013). A hierarchical model of service quality in the airline industry. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*. 20. 13–22.

Wu, Hung-Che., and Li, Tao., (2014) A Study of Experiential Quality, Perceived Value, Heritage Image Behavioral Intentions for Heritage Tourists *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research,* 2014, 1– 41

Wu, Hung-Che & Li, M.-Y & Li, Tao. (2014). A Study of Experiential Quality, Experiential Value, Experiential Satisfaction, Theme Park Image, and Revisit Intention. Journal *of Hospitality & Tourism Research*. 2014. 1-48