

9th International Strategic Management Conference

Architectural innovations are competitive advantage for hotels in tourism industry?: What customers, managers and employees think about it?

Hulusi Doğan^a, Oğuz Nebioğlu^b, Oğuzhan Aydın^c, İlknur Doğan^d a*

^{a,c,d}Adnan Menderes University, 09800 Turkey

^bAkdeniz University, 07400 Turkey

Abstract

This study aims to find an answer for the question that is whether architectural innovations are supplying an advantage for hotels in tourism sector. So, the study focuses on measuring and comparing the perceptions of tourists, managers and employees about architectural design advantage of tourism hotels. And Granada, a five-stars and 12-months servicing hotel in Alanya destination, was selected as a research hotel because of its interesting and modern architectural design. Also, satisfaction level of tourists and employees from Granada's ship design and decorative (interior) design was examined in the study. At the end of the survey completed in December 2012, a total of 297 completed questionnaires were returned, 200 (20.3 percent response rate) from 771 customers (tourists) staying at the hotel, and 97 (32.3 percent response rate) from 300 hotel staffs. Research results indicate that customers, employees and managers believe that architectural innovations are advantage in competition for hotels in tourism industry. According to the research results, both customers and staffs are very satisfied from Granada's ship (external) and decorative (interior) design. Furthermore, T-Test results do show that there are statistical differences between the evaluations of hotel staffs and customers with some research items.

Keywords: Architectural innovations, Tourism industry, Alanya

© 2013 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd.

Selection and peer-review under responsibility of the International Strategic Management Conference.

1. Introduction

Innovation has become one of the most important issues for all organizations to acquire new technological capabilities and explore new business process for staying profitable in the long run. Because living in an environment characterized by rapid change, variety of customer requirements and severe competition force the organizations to create innovation that is able to meet customer requirements and introduce new products or processes (Vanhaverbeke and Peeters, 2005). In other words, organizations are more competitive with innovation in today's cutthroat competition environment (De Jong and Vermuelen, 2006). Innovation is not only strategic for organizations but also

* Corresponding author. Tel. + 90-256-347-7013 fax. +90-256-347-7016

Email address: hdogan@adu.edu.tr

has a key role in developing the economy, in composing industrial competitiveness, in improving the standard of living, and in creating a better quality of life (Gopalakrishnan and Damanpour, 1997; Ar and Baki, 2010). So that innovation is a consistent process. And this process helps the countries to boost their productivity and sustainable growth (Şener et al., 2010; OECD, 2008). In other words, innovation is an important competition tool for all companies, industries and countries since it increases efficiency and profitability, and helps to enter new markets and/or enlarge the current market (Karatepe et al., 2010). Accordingly, all tourism firms and agents are motivated predominantly by economic driving forces to introduce or imitate new products/services and production processes (Hjalager, 1997). Tourists meet interesting innovation patterns in hotels parking lots, security systems, staffs costumes, eco-foods, energy saving equipments etc. Innovation wind dominating sectors is also changing the exterior and interior faces of the hotels. While hotels are turning into ship, plane, fish, ball, castle, or jail designs, innovations in decorative designs are changing the atmosphere of lobbies, rooms, bathrooms, restaurants, and meeting rooms. At this point, finding answers for some questions creates a great interest. What do customers, managers and employees think about architectural innovations for hotels? Are architectural innovations advantage for hotels in competition? Innovations in architectural designs are required? Architectural innovations have an influence on customers buying decisions? Originality in architectural design creates attractiveness? In this context, this study focuses on the innovations in tourism industry and mainly examines how architectural innovations in hotels have an influence on customers, employees, and managers. Firstly, the study examines the literature with innovation and tourism. And then, the survey results conducted on hotel staffs and customers to understand perceptions with architectural innovations and satisfaction from hotel exterior and interior design are presented.

2. Literature Review

Innovation is generally understood as the successful introduction of a new thing or method; embodiment, combination, or synthesis of knowledge in original, relevant, valued new products, processes, or services (Luecke and Katz, 2003). And also innovation is simply defined as the process of transforming a creative idea to a marketable product (Duygulu, 2007). A long-definition describes the innovation as the doors opening to both global and international competitive advantage through: providing the marketplace with new or unique products/services; creating entry barriers that provide the necessary resources to develop innovation through learning; and creating new values that reshape the rules of competitive environment (Llorens et al., 2005). As an interesting definition, Finland's Old Prime Minister Esko Aho, describes innovation by comparing it to R&D with the words "R&D is transforming money to information, and innovation is transforming information to money" (Yetiş, 2009; Karatepe et al., 2010). Adding new ones to these definitions is possible in the literature, but the common belief with innovation is its strategic role in success and sustainable competitive advantage of all organizations and countries. In other words, all types of innovation are very important for all companies and countries. For example, World Economic Forum (WEF) defines the most developed countries as the ones whose economies are driven by innovation (Arslan, 2009). And Barack Obama confirms the strategic value of innovation with "the capital of 21st century" statement in his speech (Karatepe et al., 2010). In the literature and organizational context, innovation may be linked to performance and growth through improvements in efficiency, productivity, quality, competitive positioning, market share, etc. All organizations can innovate, including for example hospitals, universities, and local governments (Zehir, et al., 2010).

As the world's largest industry, innovation has also become critical for creating and sustaining competitive advantage in tourism industry (Erdil and Kalkan, 2010; Chen et al., 2009; Cook et al., 2007; Otto and Ritchie, 1996). In this dynamic sector, highly exposed to global competition, tourism firms need to innovate to survive, because otherwise their offerings are likely to become obsolete and have no demand. Also tourism is identified as one of the most promising sectors of growth for the world economy. It means that tourism firms need to be more innovative in the future (Sundbo et al., 2007; Meneses and Teixeira, 2009).

However, research on the innovation in tourism has been limited, Hjalager (1997) made a great contribution to this field presenting innovation patterns in sustainable tourism. Hjalager found necessary to sub-divide the innovations into the following types: product innovations, classical process innovations, process innovations in information handling, management innovations and institutional innovations. In Hjalager's study, the emphasis were placed on innovations connected to the issue of environmental sustainability. For example, nature tourism products, development of supplementary natural resources, green establishments and product developments limiting tourism volumes were examined under product innovations title (Hjalager, 1997). Also Aldebert et al. (2011) used three types of innovation in tourism: product innovation (defined as the introduction of a good or service that is new or significantly improved with respect to its characteristics or intended use), process innovation (implementation of a new or significantly

improved production or delivery method) and marketing innovation (implementation of a new marketing method involving significant changes to product design or packaging, product placement, product promotion or pricing).

As with many other products, hotel products have become more segmented by market and there has been the recent rise of the “hotel design” (Ransley and Ingram; 2001). Innovations in design have changed the exterior and interior faces of the hotels (Durna and Babur, 2011). Interesting hotels in ship, plane, fish, ball, castle, or jail designs have appeared in different tourism destinations of the world. And many hoteliers and hotel designers agree that “good” design can affect the bottom line for hotels and it is very important: as important as their level of service and personality (Callan and Fearon, 1997; Furness, 1993; Ransley and Ingram; 2001). Also, findings in “psychology” science confirm hoteliers and hotel designers; psychologists have determined that the physical environment has an effect on human behavior and this branch of psychology has become known as environmental psychology (Countryman and Jang, 2006). Using the premise of environmental psychology, Kotler (1973) determined that physical environment influenced the behavior of individuals in consumer settings, while Bitner (1992) used the term servicescape to describe the physical environment in which services take place. In a study conducted by Dube et al. (2000) about the top ten attributes driving the hotel purchase decision, respondents ranked physical aspects and room design of the hotel as the third and fourth determinants of their purchase decision. Countryman and Jang (2006) found that colour, lighting and style were three atmospheric elements having a significant impact on customers’ overall impression of a hotel lobby. And colour was the most significant of these three atmospheric elements. On the other hand, Ransley and Ingram (2001) pointed out that design can create an atmosphere in the public areas of the hotel that makes it attractive to visit, including bedrooms, restaurants, lobbies, lounges, bars and shops. They believed that both interior and exterior design were able to add or detract from the property’s attractiveness. Good design can affect “soft” factors including image, style, comfort, marketing and ambience as well as harder and more tangible factors such as operational efficiency, cost, safety, cleanliness and maintenance, ergonomics, noise and space allocation (Ransley and Ingram, 2001). Furthermore, Ransley and Ingram (2001), presented the financial benefit or detriment of good hotel design (Table I). Similarly, Siguwaw and Enz (1999), after examining some of the best practices in the hotel industry, indicated that the architectural style of a hotel did have an impact on the profitability and success of the hotel. They believed that hotels with unique architectural approaches and designs were able to increase the average daily rate and increase occupancy.

Table 1. The effects of design on the hotel product

Effective design	Hotel product	Ineffective design
Increased sales	Revenue	Lower sales
Greater efficiency	(Costs)	Poor efficiency
Higher	Gross operating profit	Lower
Reduced	(Capital spend)	Increased
High	Net profit	Low

Source: Ransley and Ingram (2001), 80.

Hassanien (2006) states that innovation and renovation in hotel design are essential for the success of hotel operations. According to Hassanien, first two, of 8 reasons forcing hotels for renovation are to keep up with the competition and to maintain or increase market share by satisfying current or potential customers. In addition, some studies reported that architectural innovations help firms gain competitive advantage and have a positive effect on profitability (Thorpe et al., 2009; Ransley and Ingram, 2001; Katsigris and Thomas, 1999; Callan and Fearon, 1997). Thus, in this study we aim to find what customers, managers and employees think about hotel design. Do they believe that architectural innovations (designs) are competitive advantage for hotels in tourism industry? In this context, the hypotheses of the study are:

H1: There are significant differences between the evaluations of hotel staffs and customers with “competitive advantage of architectural innovations (designs) for hotels in tourism industry”

H2: There are significant differences between the satisfaction levels of hotel staffs and customers with Granada (survey) Hotel design.

H3: There are significant differences between the evaluations of hotel customer (German and Russian) groups with “competitive advantage of architectural innovations (designs) for hotels in tourism industry”

H4: There are significant differences between the satisfaction levels of customer (German and Russian) groups with Granada Hotel design.

H5: There are significant differences between the evaluations of hotel managers and employees with “competitive advantage of architectural innovations (designs) for hotels in tourism industry”

H6: There are significant differences between the satisfaction levels of hotel managers and employees with Granada Hotel design.

3. Methodology

In this study, data were collected through a questionnaire designed by the authors. Demographic survey part of the questionnaire is composed of 6 variables. And 10 variables exist on the second part of the questionnaire to measure the perceptions of hotel staffs and customers (tourists) about whether architectural innovations are supplying advantage for hotels in tourism sector. The instrument consisted of these 10 items answered on a five-point Likert with anchors strongly agree (= 5) and strongly disagree (=1). And 8 variables exist on the third part of the questionnaire to measure the satisfaction level of hotel staffs and customers (tourists) for architectural (external and internal) design of Granada Hotel. The instrument consisted of these 8 items answered on a five-point Likert with anchors very high (= 5) and very low (=1). SPSS pc + version 20.0 was used for statistical analysis in the study. Differences in the responses between the groups were tested by T-Test Analysis.

4. Findings

4.1 Findings For Tourism of Alanya, and Granada Hotel

Granada Hotel is located in Alanya that is a resort in Antalya, and it's situated in the 135 km east coast of Antalya Gulf on the Anatolian Peninsula which is sharing the Mediterranean Sea coastline. The Mediterranean region is one of the most important tourist destinations in the world, constituting one-third of all international tourist movements (Montanari, 1995). Although, Alanya met with tourism in the late 1950s (Aktas, et al., 2009), it has become one of the most important tourism destinations of Turkey with its 6-7 % share in total, approximately 158.000 beds in 678 hotels in 2010 and annual tourism receipts exceeding \$1 billion (Dogan et al., 2010; Aktas, et al., 2009; ERACCI, 2011). According to Alanya Chamber of Commerce and Industry, the largest five groups visiting Alanya are Germans, Russians, the Dutch, Ukrainians and the British. And there has been a steady increase in the number of Russians and the British visiting Alanya for last five years [19].



Fig. 1. (a) Exterior (ship) design of Granada Hotel; (b) back part of Granada's ship design

Granada Hotel was determined as a survey unit because of its interesting ship design (Fig. 1) as well as its successes. Granada Hotel began to serve in 2010 and was included in “the best resort hotels list of tophotels.ru” and “Turkey's best hotels list of Holidaycheck” in 2012 (Report of tophotelsru, 2012). As seen from Figure 2, Granada Hotel has also a different interior design. Granada has 1200 bed-capacity and 600 rooms. There are 2 big balls and 3 meeting rooms. And Granada has 7 a la carte restaurants and employs 300 persons. Germans and Russians are the largest two customer groups of this five-star and 12-months servicing hotel.



Fig. 2. (a) Interior design (entrance) of Granada Hotel; (b) a picture from the lobbies of Granada Hotel.

4.2. Findings For Demographics

As seen from Table 2, a total of 200 completed questionnaires were returned (25.9 percent response rate) from 771 customers (tourist) staying at Granada Hotel in December, 2012. And demographic statistics of hotel customers (tourists) were presented in Table 2. As can be seen from this table, the majority of hotel customers were German (64.7%); and 35.3% were Russian. 56.9 percent of the customers were male and 43.1 percent were female. And 65.2 percent of the customers were married, 34.3 percent were single. Customers were categorized by age: 18-25 years (27.0%), 26-35 years (16.0%), 36-45 years (12.0%), 46-55 years (18.0%) and 56 years and over (27.0). Also as presented in Table 2, the majority (62.5%) of the customers (tourists) held university degrees, 30.2 percent high school degrees, and 7.3 percent elementary school degrees.

Table 2. Demographics findings for hotel customers and staffs

Demographics findings for hotel customers			Demographics findings for hotel customers		
Nationality	Frequency	Percent	Marital Status	Frequency	Percent
German	132	64.7%	Married	130	65.2%
Russian	72	35.3%	Single	68	34.3%
Age	Frequency	Percent	Education	Frequency	Percent
18-25	54	27.0%	Elementary	14	7.3%
26-35	32	16.0%	High school	58	30.2%
36-45	24	12.0%	University	120	62.5%
46-55	36	18.0%	Gender	Frequency	Percent
56 and over	54	27.0%	Female	88	43.1%
			Male	116	56.9%
Demographics findings for hotel staffs			Demographics findings for hotel staffs		
Gender	Frequency	Percent	Marital Status	Frequency	Percent
Female	27	27.8%	Married	55	59.1%
Male	70	72.2%	Single	38	40.9%
Age	Frequency	Percent	Vocational experience	Frequency	Percent
18-25	26	27.1%	1-5 years	4	4.2%
26-35	46	47.9%	6-10 years	18	18.9%
36-45	20	20.8%	11-15 years	22	23.2%
46-55	4	4.2%	16-20 years	18	18.9%
56 and over	-	-	21 years and over	32	33.7%
Education	Frequency	Percent	Vocational Status	Frequency	Percent
Elementary	28	29.8%	Manager (white collar)	34	35.1%
High school	46	48.9%	Employee (blue collar)	63	64.9%
University	20	21.3%			

On the other hand, also as seen from Table 2, a total of 97 completed questionnaires were returned (32.3 percent response rate) from 300 employees of Granada hotel. The findings seen from Table 2 indicate that 72.2 percent were male and 27.8 percent were female. And 59.1 percent of the hotel staffs were married, 40.9 percent were single. Hotel staffs were categorized by age: 18-25 years (27.1%), 26-35 years (47.9%), 36-45 years (20.8%), 46-55 years (4.2%) and 56 years and over (0%). Vocational experience was also assessed using categorical brackets; 4.2 percent of the hotel staffs indicated they were between the experience of one to five; 18.9 percent indicated they were six to ten; 23.2 percent were eleven to fifteen; 18.9 percent were sixteen to twenty and 33.7 percent (majority) of the respondents were twenty-one and over. Managers were also categorized by managerial experience: 1-5 years (15.8%), 6-10 years (33.7%), 11-15 years (22.1%), 16-20 years (26.3%) and 21 years and over (0.0%). And about the half (48.9%) of the hotel staffs held high school degrees, 29.8 percent elementary school degrees, and 21.3 percent university degrees. Additionally, respondents were categorized by vocational status; manager (35.1%), and employee/blue collar (64.9%).

4.3. The Results of Factor Analysis

18 items of the questionnaire were included in a factor analysis. At the end of the factor analysis, items of the questionnaire were collected in two factor groups which were labeled as: “competitive advantage of architectural innovations for hotels” and “satisfaction with architectural design of Granada Hotel”.

Table 3. Factor loadings and reliability (Cronbach Alpha) values of research items

VARIABLES AND FACTOR GROUPS	F1	F2	Alpha	Mean	St. Dev.
Competitive advantage of architectural innovations for hotels			0.932	4.105	0.772
Exterior design is important for hotels	0.669			4.122	1.005
Originality in exterior design is important for hotels	0.792			4.030	0.949
Originality in exterior design creates attractiveness for hotels	0.791			4.061	1.015
Originality in exterior design is an advantage in competition for hotels	0.811			4.142	0.987
Innovations in exterior design are required	0.784			3.891	1.054
Exterior design has an effect in buying decisions of hotel customers	0.689			4.092	0.980
Originality in decorative (interior) design is important for hotels	0.768			4.235	0.950
Originality in decorative (interior) design creates attractiveness for hotels	0.791			4.177	0.944
Innovations in decorative (interior) design are required for hotels	0.796			4.015	0.997
Originality in decorative design is an advantage in competition for hotels	0.809			4.122	0.931
Satisfaction with architectural design of Granada Hotel			0.918	4.253	0.590
Originality of Granada's exterior design		0.656		4.278	0.647
Attractiveness of Granada's exterior design		0.772		4.285	0.664
Satisfaction with Granada's exterior design		0.802		4.297	0.741
Advantage level of Granada's exterior design in competition		0.795		4.229	0.793
Originality of Granada's decorative (interior) design		0.748		4.215	0.721
Attractiveness of Granada's decorative (interior) design		0.851		4.229	0.718
Satisfaction with Granada's decorative (interior) design		0.856		4.275	0.761
Advantage level of Granada's (decorative) interior design in competition		0.767		4.220	0.835
Variance explanation ratios	45.458	18.485			
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy			0.898		
Total variance explained: 63.943					
Extraction method: Principal Component Analysis					
Rotation method: Varimax with Kaiser normalization					

The results (presented in Table 3) of the factor analysis show that our factor groups were rather reliable and consistent. Because alpha coefficients of two factor groups, namely “architectural innovations are advantage for hotels” and “satisfaction with architectural design of Granada Hotel” were very high; 0.932 and 0.918. On the other

hand, research results indicate that hotel customers and employees think that architectural innovations are advantage in competition for hotels (with a mean of 4.105) and they are very satisfied with Granada's architectural design (with a mean of 4.253).

4.4. Research Findings

T-test results, seen from Table 4, indicate that there are significant differences between the evaluations of hotel staffs and tourists with three out of ten determinative variables for competitive advantage of architectural innovations for hotels. These variables are; "exterior design is important for hotels" with a mean of 4.268 by hotel staffs and 3.979 by hotel tourists; "originality in exterior design is important for hotels" with a mean of 4.123 by hotel staffs, compared to 3.939 by hotel tourists; "originality in exterior design is an advantage in competition for hotels" with a mean of 4.239 by hotel staffs and 4.050 by hotel tourists. Additionally, t-test results indicate that there is a significant difference between the evaluations of hotel staffs and tourist with "competitive advantage of architectural innovations for hotels" with a mean of 4.236 by hotel staffs and 3.977 by hotel tourists. According to the research values seen from Table 5, hotel staffs and tourists believe that architectural innovation (design) is important in competition for hotels in tourism industry. Also they agree that innovations in architectural (exterior and interior) design are required and a strategic advantage in competition for hotels. Furthermore, they believe that exterior design has an influence on buying decisions of hotel customers. As a result, H1 hypotheses defined as "there are significant differences between the evaluations of hotel staffs and customers with "competitive advantage of architectural innovations (designs) for hotels in tourism industry" was accepted ($0.001 < 0.05$).

Table 4. Comparison of Hotel (Granada) Staffs and Tourists Evaluations for Research Items: T-Test Results (1=very low, 5=very high)

FACTOR GROUPS	Hotel Staffs			Hotel Tourists			F	Sig.
	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.		
Competitive advantage of architectural innovations for hotels	88	4.236	0.939	180	3.977	0.539	10.865	0.001*
Exterior design is important for hotels	97	4.268	1.141	198	3.979	0.832	11.361	0.001*
Originality in exterior design is important for hotels	97	4.123	1.111	198	3.939	0.753	8.105	0.005*
Originality in exterior design creates attractiveness for hotels	96	4.135	1.120	200	3.990	0.904	2.296	0.131
Originality in exterior design is an advantage in competition for hotels	96	4.239	1.140	200	4.050	0.808	9.057	0.003*
Innovations in exterior design are required for hotels	95	4.073	1.178	198	3.717	0.892	1.510	0.221
Exterior design has an effect in buying decisions of hotel customers	97	4.247	1.041	196	3.938	0.894	1.540	0.216
Originality in decorative (interior) design is important for hotels	96	4.302	1.077	198	4.171	0.808	2.660	0.105
Originality in decorative (interior) design creates attractiveness for hotels	97	4.206	1.069	200	4.150	0.808	1.761	0.186
Innovations in decorative (interior) design are required for hotels	95	4.221	1.083	200	3.820	0.868	1.249	0.265
Originality in decorative design is an advantage in competition for hotels	93	4.268	0.990	190	3.978	0.850	2.311	0.130
Satisfaction with architectural design of Granada Hotel	94	4.228	0.638	194	4.220	0.540	2.251	0.135
Originality of Granada's exterior design	93	4.371	0.666	190	4.185	0.617	3.727	0.055
Attractiveness of Granada's exterior design	97	4.340	0.659	198	4.232	0.667	0.316	0.575
Satisfaction with Granada's exterior design	96	4.354	0.807	198	4.242	0.671	1.733	0.190
Advantage level of Granada's exterior design in competition	97	4.319	0.797	198	4.141	0.782	0.315	0.576
Originality of Granada's decorative (interior) design	96	4.177	0.739	198	4.252	0.704	0.022	0.883
Attractiveness of Granada's decorative (interior) design	97	4.237	0.787	198	4.222	0.647	2.520	0.114
Satisfaction with Granada's decorative (interior) design	97	4.268	0.784	198	4.282	0.742	0.039	0.844
Advantage level of Granada's (decorative) interior design in competition	96	4.270	0.839	198	4.171	0.833	0.000	0.990

$p < 0.05$

T-test results, seen from Table 4, also indicate that hotel staffs and tourists are highly satisfied with architectural design of Granada Hotel. And no significant differences between the satisfactions of hotel staffs and tourists with 8 determinative variables are found. According to the research results (table 5), both hotel staffs and tourists believe that originality and attractiveness of Granada's architectural (interior and exterior) design is high. As a result, H2

hypotheses defined as “there are significant differences between the satisfaction levels of hotel staffs and customers with Granada Hotel design” was rejected ($0.135 > 0.05$).

Table 5. Comparison of Tourist Evaluations for Research Items: T-Test Results (1=very low, 5=very high)

FACTOR GROUPS	German			Russian			F	Sig.
	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.		
Competitive advantage of architectural innovations for hotels	114	3.993	0.580	60	3.920	0.593	0.311	0.578
Exterior design is important for hotels	128	3.906	0.920	64	4.062	0.618	1.156	0.285
Originality in exterior design is important for hotels	128	3.984	0.745	64	3.843	0.766	0.478	0.491
Originality in exterior design creates attractiveness for hotels	130	3.984	0.926	64	3.968	0.860	0.376	0.541
Originality in exterior design is an advantage in competition for hotels	130	4.046	0.908	64	4.031	0.594	6.602	0.012*
Innovations in exterior design are required for hotels	128	3.656	0.912	64	3.750	0.842	0.498	0.482
Exterior design has an effect in buying decisions of hotel customers	126	4.000	0.915	64	3.843	0.883	0.040	0.843
Originality in decorative (interior) design is important for hotels	128	4.234	0.791	64	4.031	0.860	0.004	0.951
Originality in decorative (interior) design creates attractiveness for hotels	130	4.215	0.780	64	4.000	0.879	0.318	0.574
Innovations in decorative (interior) design are required for hotels	130	3.784	0.926	64	3.843	0.766	2.467	0.120
Originality in decorative design is an advantage in competition for hotels	124	4.000	0.868	60	3.933	0.827	0.107	0.744
Satisfaction with architectural design of Granada Hotel	130	4.201	0.567	58	4.258	0.497	0.044	0.834
Originality of Granada's exterior design	130	4.215	0.672	58	4.139	0.515	5.726	0.019*
Attractiveness of Granada's exterior design	130	4.292	0.654	62	4.096	0.700	0.268	0.606
Satisfaction with Granada's exterior design	130	4.230	0.701	62	4.290	0.588	1.354	0.248
Advantage level of Granada's exterior design in competition	130	4.092	0.823	62	4.290	0.692	0.033	0.857
Originality of Granada's decorative (interior) design	130	4.246	0.729	62	4.225	0.668	0.112	0.738
Attractiveness of Granada's decorative (interior) design	130	4.230	0.655	62	4.225	0.616	0.333	0.566
Satisfaction with Granada's decorative (interior) design	130	4.276	0.739	62	4.258	0.773	0.318	0.574
Advantage level of Granada's (decorative) interior design in competition	130	4.030	0.918	62	4.419	0.564	3.333	0.071

p<0.05

T-test results, seen from Table 5, indicate that there is a significant difference between the evaluations of tourist (German and Russian) groups with only one of 10 determinative variables; “Originality in exterior design is an advantage in competition for hotels” with a mean of 4.046 by German tourists and 4.031 by Russian tourists. As a result, H3 hypotheses defined as “there are significant differences between the evaluations of hotel customer (German and Russian) groups with competitive advantage of architectural innovations (designs) for hotels in tourism industry” was rejected ($0.578 > 0.05$). On the other hand, German tourists are more satisfied than Russian tourists with one variable of architectural design of Granada Hotel (Table 5); “originality of Granada's exterior design” with a mean of 4.215 by German tourists, as opposed to 4.132 by Russian tourists. According to the research results (Table 5), German and Russian tourists are satisfied with architectural (exterior and interior) design of Granada Hotel. As a result, H4 hypotheses defined as “there are significant differences between the satisfaction levels of customer (German and Russian) groups with Granada Hotel design” was rejected ($0.834 > 0.05$).

Table 6. Comparison of Hotel Staffs Evaluations for Research Items: T-Test Results (1=very low, 5=very high)

FACTOR GROUPS	White Collar			Blue Collar			F	Sig.
	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.		
Competitive advantage of architectural innovations for hotels	30	4.386	0.840	55	4.190	0.973	0.458	0.500
Exterior design is important for hotels	34	4.235	1.280	59	4.339	1.010	1.629	0.205
Originality in exterior design is important for hotels	34	4.147	1.131	59	4.152	1.111	0.026	0.873
Originality in exterior design creates attractiveness for hotels	33	4.272	1.068	59	4.067	1.172	0.052	0.821
Originality in exterior design is an advantage in competition for hotels	34	4.382	1.155	58	4.172	1.141	0.002	0.962

Innovations in exterior design are required for hotels	33	4.030	1.310	58	4.155	1.072	0.797	0.374
Exterior design has an effect in buying decisions of hotel customers	34	4.352	0.949	59	4.220	1.035	0.013	0.908
Originality in decorative (interior) design is important for hotels	33	4.484	1.003	59	4.237	1.056	0.052	0.820
Originality in decorative (interior) design creates attractiveness for hotels	34	4.323	1.006	59	4.186	1.058	0.000	0.996
Innovations in decorative (interior) design are required for hotels	34	4.294	1.142	57	4.193	1.076	0.021	0.885
Originality in decorative design is an advantage in competition for hotels	33	4.424	0.612	57	4.190	0.705	0.028	0.868
Satisfaction with architectural design of Granada Hotel	34	4.393	0.548	56	4.267	0.628	0.514	0.475
<i>Originality of Granada's exterior design</i>	34	4.441	0.612	59	4.322	0.705	0.307	0.581
Attractiveness of Granada's exterior design	34	4.441	0.612	59	4.322	0.680	0.388	0.535
Satisfaction with Granada's exterior design	34	4.470	0.563	58	4.344	0.828	3.168	0.078
Advantage level of Granada's exterior design in competition	34	4.382	0.696	59	4.339	0.756	0.717	0.399
Originality of Granada's decorative (interior) design	34	4.264	0.790	58	4.139	0.712	1.341	0.250
Attractiveness of Granada's decorative (interior) design	34	4.382	0.652	59	4.203	0.760	0.233	0.631
Satisfaction with Granada's decorative (interior) design	34	4.352	0.645	59	4.271	0.761	1.797	0.183
Advantage level of Granada's (decorative) interior design in competition	34	4.411	0.656	58	4.258	0.849	1.258	0.265

p<0.05

T-test results, seen from Table 6, indicate there is no significant difference between the evaluations of hotel managers and employees with 10 determinative variables for “competitive advantage of architectural innovations for hotels”. As a result, H5 hypotheses defined as “there are significant differences between the evaluations of hotel managers and employees with competitive advantage of architectural innovations (designs) for hotels in tourism industry” was rejected ($0.500 > 0.05$). According to t-test results, both hotel managers (with a mean of 4.393) and employees (with a mean of 4.267) are satisfied with architectural design of Granada Hotel and no significant difference between their satisfaction levels. And finally, H6 hypotheses defined as “there are significant differences between the satisfaction levels of hotel managers and employees with Granada Hotel design” was rejected ($0.475 > 0.05$)

5. Conclusion

This study has attempted to determine what customers, managers and employees think about architectural innovations of hotels in tourism industry. Research results indicate that these three groups believe that architectural innovations can be a competitive advantage for hotels in tourism industry. They all agree that innovations in architectural (exterior and interior) design are required and supply a strategic advantage for hotels in competition. Furthermore, they believe that originality in exterior design has an influence on buying decisions of hotel customers. For example, they are very satisfied with the original (ship) design of Granada Hotel. Also they believe that architectural (interior and exterior) design of Granada creates an attractiveness and advantage for itself in competition. These findings confirm Ransley and Ingram's (2001) study stating that good design can lead to increased sales, greater efficiency, reduced staffing levels and higher gross operating profit. Also our research results are similar to the findings of Mateljic (2010). Because Mateljic (2010) states that increase in quality of hotel design is attracting guests and bringing added value for its owners.

On the other hand, this research is not free from limitations. One limitation was found in the narrow scope of this research. The study included the customers, managers and employees of only one five-star hotel. Thus, future researches would hopefully include other five-star hotels located in other destinations for confirming the results. Second limitation was found in the classification of hotel. This research primarily focused on a five-star hotel, which is one classification of hotel. Other classifications of hotels such as three, four-star or boutique hotels might be interesting for further researches.

References

- Aktaş, A., Çevirgen, A., and Tokar, B. (2009), Assessing holiday satisfaction of German and Russian tourists visting Alanya, Tourism and Hospitality Management, 15 (1), pp. 1-12.
- Aldebert, B., Dang, R.J. and Longhi, C. (2011), Innovation in the tourism industry: The case of Tourism, Tourism Management, 32, pp. 1204-1213.
- Ar, İ.M. and Baki, B. (2010), Measuring the innovation performance of Turkish science&technology parks: An application of data envelopment analysis, The Proceedings of 6th International Strategic Management Conference, St. Petersburg-Russia, pp. 657-664.

- Arslan, K. (2009), Değişimin kilometre taşları: tasarım, Ar-Ge ve inovasyon, *Çerçeve Dergisi*, 17(52), pp. 128-133.
- Bitner, M.J. (1992), Sericescapes: the impact of the physical environment surround customers and employees”, *Journal of Marketing*, 54(2), pp. 57-71.
- Callan, R.J. and Fearon, R. (1997), Town house hotels - an emerging sector, *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 9(4), pp. 168-175.
- Chen, Y.G., Chen, J.C. and Lee, C.S. (2009), In-depth tourism’s influences on service innovation, *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 3(4), pp. 326-336.
- Cook, R.A., yale, L.J. and Maraqua, J.J. (2007), *Tourism: The Business of Travel*, 3rd ed., Prentice-hall, Upper saddle River, NJ.
- Countryman, C.C. and Jang, S. (2006), The effects of atmospheric elements on customer impression: the case of hotel lobbies, *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 18(7), pp. 534-545.
- De Jong, J.P.J. and Vermuelen, P.A.M (2006), Determinants of product innovation in small firms: A comparison across industries, *International Small Business Journal*, 24(6), pp. 587-609.
- Dogan, H., Barutcu, S. and Unguren, E. (2010), Russian and German tourist potential and satisfaction in sustainable competitive advantage of Alanya Destination, *The Proceedings of 6th International Strategic Management Conference*, St. Petersburg-Russia, pp. 997-1006.
- Dube, L., Enz, C.A., Reneghan, L.M. and Singuaw, J.A. (2000), Managing for excellence, *The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 41(5), pp. 30-39.
- Durna, U. and Babur, S. (2011), Otel işletmelerinde yenilik uygulamaları, *Uluslararası Alanya İşletme Fakültesi Dergisi*, 3(1), pp. 74-97.
- Duygulu, E. (2007), İşletmelerde yaratıcılık yenilikçilik girişimcilik, Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İzmir.
- Erdil, O. and Kalkan, A. (2010), The impacts of globalization on service quality and innovation of firms in tourism sector in Antalya, *The Proceedings of 6th International Strategic Management Conference*, St. Petersburg-Russia, pp. 973-989.
- ERACCI, Economics Report of Alanya Chamber of Commerce and Industry, (2011), Alanya.
- Furness, J. (1993), Does design pay?, *FX Best Business Magazine*, January, pp. 101-105.
- Gopalakrishnan, S. and Damanpour, F. (1997), A review economics of innovation research in sociology and technology management, *Omega*, 25(1), pp. 15-28.
- Hassanien, A. (2006), Exploring hotel renovation in large hotels: a multiple case study, *Structural Survey*, 24(1), pp. 41-64.
- Hjalager, A. M. (1997), Innovation patters in sustainable tourism, *Tourism Management*, 18(1), pp. 35-41.
- Karatepe, S., Omay, R. E. and Gökçe, S. G. (2010), A study on the relationship between innovation performance and competitiveness ranking of some countries in the global economic crisis period, *Proceedings of 6th International Strategic Management Conference*, St. Petersburg-Russia, pp. 665-674.
- Katsigris, C. And Thomas, C. (1999), *Design and Equipment for Restaurants and Foodservice*, John Wiley & Sons, New York, NY.
- Kotler, P. (1973), Atmospherics as a marketing tool, *Journal of Retailing*, 49(4), pp. 48-64.
- Llorens, M. F. J., Moreno, A. R. and Morales, V. G. (2005), Influence of leadership and teamwork cohesion on organizational learning, innovation and performance: An empirical examination, *Technovation*, 25, pp. 1159-1172.
- Luecke, R. And Katz, R. (2003), *Managing Creativity and Innovation*, Harvard Business School Press.
- Mateljić, S.R. (2010), Promotion and design in the hotel industry, *Tourism and Hospitality Management Conference Proceedings*, pp. 1203-1214.
- Menesses, O.A.M. and Teixeira, A.A.C. (2009), The innovative behaviour of tourism firms, *Economics and Management Research Projects*, 1(1), pp. 25-35.
- Montanari, A., (1995), The Mediterranean region: Europe's summer leisure space. In: Montanari, A., Williams, A.M. (Eds.), *European Tourism: Regions, Spaces and Restructuring*. Wiley, New York, pp.41-65.
- OECD (2008), *OECD Science, Technology and Industry Outlook 2008*, OECD Publishing, France.
- Otto, J.E. and Ritchie, J.R.B. (1996), The service experience in tourism, *Tourism Management*, 17(3), pp. 165-174.
- Rasnley, J. and Ingram, H. (2001), What is “good” hotel design, *Facilities*, 1(2), pp. 79-86.
- Report of tophotelsru, (2012) <http://www.turizmguancel.com/haber/iste-top-hotelsruda-ilk-100e-giren-turk-otelleri-h11441.html> (accessed on 01.08.2013).
- Siguaw, J.A. and Enz, C.A. (1999), Best practices in hotel architecture, *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 40(5), pp. 44-49.
- Sundbo, J., Orfila-Sintes, F. and Sorensen, F. (2007), The innovative behavior of tourism firms-Comparative studies of Denmark and Spain, *Research Policy*, 36, pp. 88-106.
- Şener, S. Savrul, M. and Köse, C. (2010), The role of innovation for reducing the effects of the crises, *The Proceedings of 6th International Strategic Management Conference*, St. Petersburg-Russia, pp. 647-655.
- Thorpe, D., Ryan, N. and Charles, M.B. (2009), Innovation and small residential builders: an Australian study, *Construction Innovation*, 9(2), pp. 184-200.
- Vanhaverbeke, W. and Peeters, N. (2005), Embracing innovation as strategy: corporate venturing, competence building and corporate strategy making, *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 14(3), pp. 246-257.
- Yetiş, N. (2009), TÜBİTAK Ar-Ge ve Yenilik, *Çerçeve Dergisi*, 17(52), pp. 28-35.
- Zehir, C., Altındag, E. and Acar, A. Z. (2010), Learning, entrepreneurship and innovation orientations in Turkish family-owned firms, *The Proceedings of 6th International Strategic Management Conference*, St. Petersburg-Russia, pp. 623-631.