TOLEHO
Journal of Tourism, Leisure and Hospitality

ANADOLU UNIVERSITY
FACULTY OF TOURISM

AUGMENTED PRODUCT PERCEPTION AND ATTRIBUTION THEORY IN TOURISM[1]

Mehmet Şimşek[a,*], Göknil Nur Koçak[b]

[a]Department of Gastronomy and Culinary Arts, Giresun University, Giresun, Turkey.
  ORCID: 0000-0002-7558-5010   /   e-mail: mehmet.simsek@giresun.edu.tr
[b]Department of Recreation Management, Mersin University, Mersin, Turkey.
  ORCID: 0000-0002-1574-4403   /   e-mail: goknilkocak@mersin.edu.tr

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the functioning of augmented product perception and attribution theory in the tourism sector conceptually and operationally. The reason for this is that these two concepts, which are extremely important in terms of consumer behavior, have not been examined sufficiently. Since the research is essentially exploratory, it aims to test the factual relationships in theory and to examine and test the relationships in the model rather than generalize the findings. For this reason; it was preferred to collect data from different groups at different times via convenience sampling technique and high reliability and validity were obtained in each of field studies. The results indicated that augmented product perception was comprised of two dimensions as staff and atmosphere perceptions, and the impact of staff perception on attribution was found to be higher compared to the impact of atmosphere perception. In addition, it was found that the proposition put forward in the attribution theory cannot be generalized in tourism within the context of this study. The study revealed that consumers made external, permanent and controllable attributions.

1. Introduction

As long as we live, we examine events, facts, people and their behavior and create temporary and/or permanent mental perceptions about them. Although these perceptions that we have are shaped in harmony with each other, they also affect our attitudes and behavior towards events and people. For these reasons, it has been one of the most important areas of social psychology studies to investigate our behavior towards events, facts, and people. Some inferences drawn as a result of these studies have been tried to be explained by a theoretical approach called Attribution Theory (Gurses, 2008: p. 361).

Attribution theory has been the focus of marketing, especially since the early 1990s. This is because it is argued that marketing is to understand the attitudes and behaviors of people before, during and after purchasing a product and the reasons for these and to guide these attitudes and behaviors (Odabasi and Baris, 2003: p. 19; Yagci and Cabuk, 2014: p. 128). For this purpose, it is possible to come across studies examining the relationship between attribution theory and production, price, distribution, satisfaction and loyalty, which are important issues of marketing. Studies like Bitner, Booms and Mohr

(1994), Novlis and Simson (1997), Ellen, Mohr and Webb (2000), Fang, Evens and Landry (2005), Dutta, Bijwas and Grewald (2007) and Chung and Petrick (2012) can be given as an example to such studies.

Although not as widespread as marketing studies, there are also studies in the field of tourism that investigate the relationships between attribution theory and consumer behavior such as satisfaction, experience, loyalty and emotional reaction. Studies by Jackson, White and Schmierer (1996), Fucsh and Weiermaier (2004), Chan, McMohan, Cheing, Rosental and Bezyak (2005), Chung and Petrick (2012), and Browning, Fungso and Sparks (2013) can be given as examples to these kinds of studies.

As stated above, the relationships between attribution theory and consumer behavior have been the focus of interest in both marketing and tourism, especially since the 1990s. However, in the systematic literature review, it has been observed that the relationship between attribution theory and augmented product perception, which is important in terms of consumer behavior, or the way the attributions of tourism consumers for the augmented product are shaped has not received sufficient attention either in marketing or

tourism. However, as in the other service sectors, the environment in which the service is provided, the interaction between the service provider and the service receiver, and the interaction between the customers who receive the same service are essential in terms of service receivers in the tourism sector. It is argued that this interaction significantly affects the consumer's consumption, satisfaction, repurchase intention and trust in the business (Chaudhuri & Holbrook, 2001; Karatepe and Avci, 2002; Kim and Brown, 2012). For this reason, it is considered an important inadequacy not to know to what, to whom and at what level the consumer is making attributions during and after the service period.

Likewise, there is not a sufficient number of studies on how attribution theory works in the service sector where the service receiver/service provider/environment cannot be separated. According to the theory, for example, a student who passed an exam could say "I passed" by making an internal attribution while a student who failed could say "teacher failed me" by making an external attribution. However, attributions in the tourism sector, which is a service sector, may not be so simple. Due to the inseparability trait of the service in the tourism sector, external attribution may have its distinctions. Namely, does a consumer attribute his positive or negative perception of the augmented product during and/or at the end of the consumption process to the personal attitudes and/or behavior of the staff with whom he interacts, to the establishment or other customers? Or are these attributions at the same level? In addition, is the attribution of the consumer about augmented product perception temporary or permanent? Or is the attribution controllable or not?

According to attribution theory, the mental perceptions that people develop as a result of events, facts and behavior play a determining role in their subsequent behavior. Therefore, the fact that it is not known to whom, to what, in what way and at what level consumers make their attributions for the augmented product during the service procurement process means that the attitudes and behavior they will develop after these attributions are unknown, too. In this case, the promotion efforts that are still implemented and that will be implemented in the future towards creating a positive service perception among consumers lack sufficient support. Namely, the attitude and behavior that the tourism consumer will develop may differ depending on whether their judgments about the augmented product are internal or external during and after the consumption process. Promotion efforts to be developed against this situation should also differ. Similarly, the attitude and behavior of consumers towards the augmented product may be different depending on whether their judgments about the product are permanent or temporary or controllable or uncontrollable, and the promotion efforts to be developed for this situation are expected to be different. Otherwise,

it is believed that the success chance of a standard promotion effort to be developed for each situation will decrease.

From this point of view, the main purpose of this study is determined to be a conceptual and operational investigation of functioning of augmented product perception and attribution theory in the tourism sector. As a result of the study, the attribution attitudes of tourism consumers towards augmented product perception will be determined through the sample of a restaurant, and also the functioning of the attribution theory in the tourism sector will be detected. In this way, both the information gap about the theory regarding the inseparability will be filled, and inferences and suggestions will be presented to the researchers working in the field and the managers and practitioners who have developed promotion efforts to create a positive service perception in tourism.

2. Conceptual Framework

2.1. Attribution Theory

People develop mental perceptions of events, facts, and behavior in order to survive and adapt to their environment. These perceptions have an important effect on their future behavior. These mental perceptions, called attribution, have been the subject of research since the 1950s. Heider (1958), who laid the foundations of the attribution theory, named the theory that he developed as a result of his studies on the subject Naive Psychology (Mizerski, Golden and Kernan 1979: p. 124). This is because Heider argues that people are social psychologists who develop causal theories of social behavior. According to Heider, people are naive psychologists because such theories have the same form as systematic-scientific social psychology theories (Hogg and Vaughan, 2005: p. 104).

Based on Heider's theory of attribution, Jones and Davis (1965) developed a theory they called Correspondent Inference. In this theory, they try to explain how people make attributions of other people's personality traits. In their study, Jones and Davis (1965) assumed that people are different from objects in terms of their intent and capacity, and therefore they seek both permanent and informative meaningful explanations regarding events, facts and behavior (Bilgin, 2006: p. 168).

Another study on attribution theory was carried out by Harold Kelley. Kelley (1967), in his study on attribution theory, analyzed the process of making internal and external attributions and proposed the Causal Attribution model. Kelley also shared Heider's view that people are rational beings and argued that as naive (inexperienced) scientists, people constantly test hypotheses about the behavior of others (Kagitcibasi, 1999: p. 231).

The foundations of the attribution theory were laid by Heider (1958) and it was developed by Jones and Davis (1965) and Kelley (1967) over time. The most comprehensive and most widely adopted form

of the theory in marketing literature was achieved by Weiner (1985) (Hogg and Vaughan, 2005: p. 111). In his theory, called Achievement Motivation, Weiner suggests that people attribute their success and failures mostly to internal or external causes and think that they will achieve the same results when they encounter the same situations in the future (Bilgin, 2006: p. 171). In addition, Weiner argues that three performance dimensions are taken into account in explaining individuals' successes or failures. These are locus, stability and controllability as described below (Hogg and Vaughan, 2005: p. 111).

Locus: Is the performance caused by the actor (internal) or by the situation (external)?

Stability: Is the internal and/or external cause permanent or temporary?

Controllability: Can the individual show the same performance for the same situation in the future?

Each of these three dimensions reveals one's attributions to success and/or failure. According to the theory, these dimensions indicate the predictions about how the attributions that will influence the future behaviors of people will be.

Weiner maintains that when behavior is controllable, people tend to make internal attributions, whether permanent or temporary. On the other hand, in cases where the behavior is uncontrollable, they tend to make external attribution, whether permanent or temporary (Weiner, 1985: p. 551; Tomlinson and Mayer, 2009: p. 98).

It is possible to list the basic propositions of the attribution theory developed by Weiner as follows:

- People make attributions on the causes of events, facts and behavior.
- These attributions are addressed in three dimensions as locus (internal / external), stability (permanent/temporary) and controllability (controllable/uncontrollable).
- People tend to attribute positive outputs to internal, controllable and permanent causes, and negative outputs to external, uncontrollable, and temporary causes (Hogg and Vaughan, 2005: p. 114).

2.2. Product Perception

Product is defined as "anything offered to the market for consumption, use, acquisition and attention in order to satisfy a demand or need" (Kotler et al., 2003: p. 302). A product that meets the perceptions and expectations of consumers is considered as a whole with its service bundle as well as its physical, functional, design and aesthetic qualities (Meydan Uygur, 2007: p. 233). From this point of view, tourism product is defined as a package that are made up of different goods and services such as accommodation, food and beverage, entertainment, transportation, shopping, and security that tourists use during their holidays or as the experiences they have (Kozak, 2006: p. 125; Meydan Uygur, 2007: p. 236).

As in other service sectors, products in tourism are described in four levels as a core product, facilitating product, supporting product and augmented product (Kotler et al., 2003: p. 302; Meydan Uygur, 2007: p. 240). While the core product here is defined as the main reason for being on the market, the facilitating product is described as products that facilitate the use of the core product. In terms of tourism, accommodation, food and beverages, and entertainment services offered by a hotel are considered as the core products. The facilitating products are defined as the geographical location of the area, size, view and physical assets of the hotel (Kozak, 2006: p. 135). The supporting product is defined as the products that add value to the core product. In terms of tourism, assistance services, and health and/or SPA services provided to its customers by a hotel are considered in this context (Kotler et al., 2003: p. 303).

The augmented product that constitutes the final ring of the components includes the atmosphere, which is the environment in which the service is provided, customer interaction with the service staff, the interaction between customers, and the participation of customers in the production process. In other words, while the core product, the facilitating product, and the supporting product indicate what the consumer is offered, the augmented product indicates how the consumer receives the product (Middleton and Clarke, 2001: p. 129; Kotler, et al., 2003: p. 306). In terms of service, the answer to the question of how can be associated with the environment in which the service is provided (atmosphere), the person who provides the service (service staff), and the positive and/or negative perception that occurs in consumers' minds regarding the attitudes and behavior of other customers receiving the same service (customer interaction).

3. Literature Review

Attribution theory, which has been in the interest of social psychology, sociology, psychology, and anthropology, which have been studying human behavior, since the 1950s, started to be used since 1970s when consumer behavior gained importance in marketing (Mizerski et al., 1979: p. 131). In order to determine how attribution theory is used in marketing studies, the journals that are at the top in the most-cited journals in the field (Steward and Lewis, 2010: p. 86) were superficially reviewed. Information about the articles obtained in the review is given in Table 1.

One of the remarkable points in the articles presented in Table 1 is that attribution theory is mainly addressed as a process or output in marketing studies. The fact that the theory is addressed in this way in the field of marketing is in line with the definition that people interpret events, facts and behavior and act in this direction. Another point that attracts attention is that the

Table 1. Marketing Literature on Attribution Theory

Author(s) and Year	Variables associated with Attribution Theory
Bitner, 1990	Satisfaction, quality perception, behavioral intention
Badovick, 1990	Effort, stability, expectation, self-blame, regret, satisfaction
Jonston and Kim 1994	Sales effort, performance, expectation
Bitner, Booms and Mohr, 1994	Consumer Satisfaction
Green and Krieger, 1995	Brand preference, purchasing tendency, pricing
Nowlis and Simonson, 1997	Pricing, distribution, consumer choice
Weiner, 2000	Satisfaction, consumer behavior
Janiszewski and Meyvis, 2001	Brand, processing fluency, repetition frequency
Herpen and Pieters, 2002	Product variety, product management, product choice
Tsiros, Mittal and Ross, 2004	Responsibility, stability, customer satisfaction
Miller and Khan, 2005	Colour, flavour (feature), consumer choice
Sinha et al.2005	Loyalty, consumer choice, product management, diversification
Fang et al., 2005	Sales control, capability, performance, satisfaction
Khan and Dhar, 2006	Consumer choice
Janakiraman, Meyer and Morales, 2006	Customer experience, spending tendency
Dutta et al., 2007	Pricing, repurchase intention
Pham at al., 2010	Personal awareness, satisfaction
Troye and Supphellen, 2012	Co-production, personal production, personal integration
Bower and Maxham, 2012	Product returns, customer perception, regret, spending intention
Habel et al., 2016	Benefit, price increase, price justice, loyalty
Guha et al., 2018	Price, perceived value, buying tendency
Leung, Paolacci and Puntoni, 2018	Identity, willingness to borrow

variables associated with attribution are dependent variables such as satisfaction, loyalty, purchase intent, consumer choice, spending tendency, and repurchase intention. This indicates that consumers make positive and/or negative attributions mainly based on events, facts and behavior, and as a result, they exhibit an attitude and/or behavior. From this point of view, it can be suggested that attribution theory is extremely important in terms of marketing, especially consumer behavior.

No studies have been found in the comprehensive review of the literature on the use of the augmented product perception and the attribution theory in tourism research. Based on this result, this time a comprehensive review was carried out for the use of the attribution theory in tourism research. Details of the studies found as a result of the comprehensive review are presented in Table 2. The first point that draws attention in the studies the details of which are presented in Table 2 is that attribution theory in the studies in the field of tourism, in parallel with the marketing studies, is associated with dependent variables such as experience (Jackson, White and Schmierer, 1996; Jackson, 2019), satisfaction (Tsang, Prideaux and Lee, 2015; Choi and Cai, 2016), trust and revisit intention (Su, Lian and Huang, 2020) and satisfaction (Fuchs and Weiermaır, 2004) and loyalty (Choi and Cai, 2016). Based on this result, it can be put forward that attribution theory is important in the field of tourism as it is in the field of marketing.

The second remarkable point is that although attribution theory is frequently examined with variables such as satisfaction, loyalty, experience, service quality perception and trust, which are among consumer behavior, the issue of how the attribution attitudes are shaped towards the augmented product perception, which is important in terms of consumer behavior, has not received sufficient attention.

The third noticeable point in the table is that attribution theory is not addressed with all its dimensions, so there is no certain conclusion about how attribution theory works in the tourism sector (People tend to attribute positive outcomes to internal, controllable and permanent causes, and negative outcomes to external, uncontrollable, temporary causes). Based on these facts, it becomes more evident that it is important to conceptually and operationally examine how the augmented product perception and the attribution theory work in the tourism sector.

4. Methodology

4.1. Research Model

This is a review study, and in the study, the cross-sectional survey model is used to determine the dimensions of the augmented product perception and the dimensions of attribution theory and the relational survey model is used to examine the relationship between the augmented product

Table 2. Tourism Literature on Attribution Theory

Author (s) Year	Sample	Data collection method	Findings on attribution theory	Limitations
Jackson, White and Schmierer, 1996	Tourists	Questionnaire	- Internal and permanent attribution is made towards positive experience, - External and permanent attribution is made towards negative experience.	Controllability dimension wasn't examined.
Fuchs and Weiermaır, 2004	Tourism communities	Questionnaire	- Destination attributes affect tourist satisfaction; Tourists make external attributions towards satisfaction.	Only locus dimension was examined.
Chung and Petrick, 2012	Airline passengers	Literature review and Questionnaire	- There is a positive relationship between causality and price fairness, - There is a positive relationship between controllability and price fairness, -There is a positive relationship between stability and price fairness.	Only controllability and stability dimensions were examined.
Browning, FungSo and Sparks, 2013	Tourists	Scenario and Questionnaire	-Tourists make controllable attributions for service quality.	Only controllability dimension was examined.
Tsang, Prideaux and Lee, 2015	Theme park visitors	Literature review and Questionnaire	-There is a positive relationship between satisfaction and stability, -There is a positive relationship between satisfaction and controllability.	Only controllability and stability dimensions were examined.
Choi and Cai, 2016	University students	Questionnaire	-External attribution is made for loyalty and satisfaction, -Permanent attribution is made for loyalty and satisfaction.	Only The locus and stability dimensions were examined.
Jackson 2019	Tourists	Questionnaire	-Internal and permanent attribution is made towards positive experience, -External and temporary attribution is made for a negative experience.	Only The locus and stability dimensions were examined.
Su, Lian and Huang, 2020	Tourists	Literature review and Questionnaire	-Internal attribution is made for destination trust and revisit intention.	Only The locus dimension was examined.

perception and the dimensions of the attribution theory (Karasar, 2003: p. 81).

As independent variables in the relationships examined in the studies in the literature listed above, perceptions about experience (Jackson, White and Schmierer, 1996; Jackson, 2019) quality of service (Browning, FungSo and Sparks, 2013) and/or destination trust (Su, Lian and Huang, 2020) are taken into account. In this study, the independent variable was determined to be the product perception, in parallel with the literature. While considering the product perception, the augmented product dimension, which is one of the sub-dimensions of the product, was taken into consideration, and other dimensions (core/ main product, facilitator product and supporting product) were excluded. This is because these dimensions reveal what the consumer receives, while the augmented product dimension indicates how the consumer receives the product (Middleton and Clarke, 2001: p. 129; Kotler, et al., 2003: p. 306).

When considered in terms of service, the components of the augmented product include the environment in which the service is provided, the interaction with the staff providing the service, the attitudes and behavior of other customers receiving the same service and the participation of the customers in the process (Kotler, et al., 2003: p. 306).

The customer participation was not included in the model because the attribution for the customer participation in the process would be internal and the internal attribution, one of the attribution dimensions, was excluded from this study.

When the model is examined, it is seen that it coincides with the decision-making process advocated in the Cognitive man model in terms of consumer behavior (Khan, 2006: p. 130). In addition, the model is also in line with the perception process, which is among consumer behavior (Koc, 2008: p. 75). This is because the consumer behavior process consists of input, process and output stages, and the consumer is exposed to some stimuli during the input stage, pays attention to these stimuli and comments on them during the process stage, and acts in line with these comments during the output stage (Koc, 2008: p. 75).

4.2. Research Questions and Hypotheses

The main purpose of this study is to examine the functioning of the augmented product perception and the attribution theory in the tourism sector. With this aim in mind, the following two main research questions are posed in order to question the relationships between the dependent and independent variables that are the subject of the study:

RQ1: How many dimensions is the augmented product perception divided into?

RQ2: How many dimensions is the attribution attitudes towards the augmented product divided into?

The research questions listed above will contribute to the determination of the relationships between the variables examined in the study. The hypotheses developed based on the research questions are described below.

As emphasized in the literature review section, there are no studies that investigate the relationship between the dimensions of the augmented product perception and the attribution theory. However, as discussed in the introduction part of the research, it is argued that people create mental perceptions about events, facts and behavior and that these perceptions have a significant impact on their future behavior (Gürses, 2008: p. 361).

On the other hand, as discussed in the conceptual framework section of the research, when considered in terms of service, the augmented product perception indicating how the consumer receives the product is associated with the positive and/or negative perception that occurs in the consumers' mind regarding the environment in which the service is provided, the service provider and the attitudes and behaviors of other customers receiving the same service. (Middleton and Clarke, 2001: p. 129; Kotler, et al., 2003: p. 306). Based on this idea, there may be a positive relationship between the dimensions of the augmented product perception and the dimensions of the attribution theory. In addition, considering that attribution is the mental perception that people create for events, facts and behavior, there may be a cause and effect relationship between the augmented product dimensions and the dimensions of the

attribution theory. The hypotheses were created to examine these relationships are presented below;

H1: Atmosphere perception has a positive impact on stability.

H2: Staff perception has a positive impact on stability.

H3: Customer interaction has a positive impact on stability.

H4: Atmosphere perception has a positive impact on controllability.

H5: Staff perception has a positive impact on controllability.

H6: Customer interaction has a positive impact on controllability.

4.3. Data Collection Method and Tool

In order to collect the research data, a questionnaire was used as a data collection tool. The reasons for using a questionnaire include the fact that it provides the opportunity to collect a great number of data from a large number of participants easily and economically in a short time, and that uniformity is achieved by asking the same questions to all participants. In addition, a questionnaire was used because privacy guarantee is convincing, it can be digitized, the results can be compared with other studies conducted on the subject, and it allows for generalization (Karasar, 2003: p. 182).

Scale items created through the adaptation of the scales used in the literature were arranged according to the 5-point Likert type scale consisting of five response categories as "1. strongly disagree, 2. disagree, 3. partially agree, 4. agree, and 5. strongly agree" (Babbie, 1989: p. 153) and two different scales were developed. In order to ensure that the attitudes to be measured respond to the extremes, the response category named 3. partially agree was

Table 3. The Scales Used and the Scale Items

	Adapted version of the scale items	Resources
The augmented product perception scale	I enjoyed being in the same environment with other customers around.	Added by the researcher
	I felt uneasy due to some customers.	
	I liked the atmosphere of this restaurant.	Cronin and Taylor, 1992
	The system was functioning properly in the restaurant.	
	The attitude of the restaurant staff was good.	
	The staff was concerned.	
	I felt good at this restaurant.	Kim et al., 2013
	I waited unnecessarily to order.	
	It took unnecessarily long for the meal to be delivered.	
The attribution theory scale	Restaurant management is responsible for the current atmosphere in this restaurant.	Tsiros et al., 2004
	The atmosphere of this restaurant will always remain the same.	
	Restaurant management is responsible for the customers' disturbing behavior.	
	The customer profile of this restaurant will always remain the same.	
	Restaurant management is responsible for the staff's attitude to the custom-ers.	
	The attitude of the staff to the customers will always remain the same.	

used instead of the response category named 3. undecided (Erkus, 2014: p. 79). The scales are given below with their reasons and development process, and the scales are presented as the augmented product perception scale and the attribution theory scale, respectively.

In the literature review conducted during the development of the augmented product perception scale, it was found that product perception was widely measured as the perception of service quality, and SERVQUAL and SERVPERF scales were also widely used in this measurement process (Cronin and Taylor, 1994; Parasuraman, Zeithaml and Berry, 1994; Khan, 2003; Saez, Fuentes and Montes, 2007; Kim, Blancher Desarbo and Fong, 2013). When the scales were examined, it was observed that the items of the augmented product scale for the dimensions of atmosphere and interaction with the staff were parallel to each other in both scales, and that the scale items for the dimension of customer interaction were not used in both scales, though. Based on this finding, as revealed in Table 3, the scale items for the dimensions of atmosphere and interaction with the staff were developed by using the relevant scales, and the scale items for the dimension of customer interaction were added by the researcher.

During the development of the attribution theory scale, the scale structures of the studies investigating the attribution attitudes especially towards consumer behavior in the field of marketing and tourism were examined. As a result of the examination, it was determined that Bower and Maxham (2012) used scale items only for the dimension of locus and that Jonston and Kim (1994) and Tsiros et al. (2004) included scale items only for the locus and stability dimensions. Based on this finding, the items of the attribution theory scale developed using the related studies are arranged as in Table 3.

4.4. Sampling and Data Collection Process

Since the research is essentially an exploratory research, it aims to test the factual relationships in theory and to examine and test the relationships in the model rather than generalize the findings (Yıldırım & Simsek, 2000: p. 64). For this reason, it was preferred to collect data from different groups (heterogeneous) at different times via convenience sampling technique (Erkus, 2009: p. 97).

In the first two of the studies (First Field Study (FS1) and Second Field Study (FS2)), it was aimed to establish a scale item pool and to test reliability and validity. In the last two studies (Third Field Study (FS3) and Fourth Field Study (FS4)), research questions and hypotheses were examined based on the data obtained from the scales consisting of the items whose reliability and validity were tested.

The first field study, which was conducted to create the scale item pool and to test the reliability and validity of the scale, was applied to the customers of a luxury restaurant operating in Mersin during the service procurement process, and a total of 160 participants (n) were reached. The second field study, which was also carried out for the same purpose, was applied to the customers of a restaurant operating in Mersin University right after the first field study, and a total of 171 participants were reached. The purpose of using the survey, in the same way, was to determine whether the problematic items observed in the scale item pool at the end of the first field study resulted from the scale item structure or the differences between participants.

The questionnaire was finalized by removing the same problematic scale items determined in the first and second field studies, and the third and fourth field study data were collected via this questionnaire. The third field study was applied to the customers of a luxury restaurant operating in Antalya during the service procurement process and a total of 176 participants were reached. The fourth field study, which was the last stage of the process, was applied to the customers of a restaurant operating in a region which had a large number of university students and faculty members during the service procurement process and a total of 168 participants were reached. The main purpose of the third and fourth field studies was to test research questions and research hypotheses. Thus, the reliability and consistency of the findings would be tested as well.

As is noted in the studies, the data of the research were collected from 675 restaurant customers in different places at different times. The purpose of collecting data from restaurant customers is the assumption that the augmented product perception is more pronounced in restaurants compared to accommodation establishments or tours. The reason for this is that since there are multiple departments in accommodation establishments, it is believed to be difficult to determine for which department and/or for which employee in which department the perception is. Similarly, it can be assumed that the product perception of a tourist on a tour differs because the tourist encounters independent and different service environments, service types and service staff during the tour.

5. Data Analysis and Findings

During data analysis, firstly, missing and/or sloppily filled questionnaires were eliminated, and the remaining survey data were transferred to the computer environment. Mean and standard deviation values were checked to examine the accuracy of all field study data. As a result of the elimination and analyses, a total of 142 survey data were included in the analysis of the first field study, 157 in the analysis of the second field study, 164 in the analysis of the third field study and 157 in the analysis of the fourth field study.

At first, reliability and validity analyses were performed on all field study data in order to test the reliability and validity of the study. Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was used for reliability (Kalaycı, 2010: p. 405), and for validity analysis, expert opinion was

Table 4. Reliability and Validity Results of the Augmented Product Perception Scale

Augmented Product Perception Scale (6 items)	F. Loadings				Variance (%)				Eigenvalue				Cronbach's Alfa			
Factor 1: Staff Perception	FS1*	FS2*	FS3*	FS4*	FS1	FS2	FS3	FS4	FS1	FS2	FS3	FS4	FS1	FS2	FS3	FS4
The system was functioning properly in the restaurant.	0.792	0.864	0.615	0.772												
The attitude of the restaurant staff was good.	0.912	0.904	0.892	0.903	53.7	56.0	46.4	53.0	3.22	3.36	2.78	3.18	0.840	0.894	0.762	0.838
The staff was concerned.	0.817	0.896	0.849	0.873												
Factor 2: Atmosphere Perception																
I enjoyed being in the same environment with other customers around.	0.763	0.774	0.790	0.830												
I liked the atmosphere of this restaurant.	0.820	0.810	0.742	0.790	18.5	20.0	19.5	21.3	1.11	1.20	1.11	1.28	0.729	0.712	0.640	0.737
I felt good at this restaurant.	0.778	0.755	0.647	0.673												

Values for the Overall Scale	FS1	FS2	FS3	FS4
KMO (%)	0.737	0.753	0.737	0.748
Total variance	72.297	76.140	66.061	74.423
Bartlett Test	X²: 359.553 s.d.: 15 p<0.001	X²: 509.091 s.d.: 15 p<0.001	X²: 279.985 s.d.: 15 p<0.001	X²: 424.723 s.d.: 15 p<0.001
Cronbach's Alpha for Overall Scale	0.819	0.822	0.754	0.805
Overall Mean	4.208	4.107	3.881	4.309

FS1*: Field study1   FS2*: Field study2   FS3*: Field study3   FS4*: Field study4

sought to ensure scope validity, and explanatory factor analysis was used to ensure construct validity (Erkuş, 2009: p. 135). During the explanatory factor analysis, the three items on the product perception scale were found to be problematic in the first and second field study data and excluded from the analysis, and the analysis was continued with the remaining items on the scale.

Although the data of the study were obtained at different times and in different places, the results of the four different field studies are presented in the same table for each scale in order to show the parallelism of the analysis results with each other (Tables 4 and 5).

Reliability and validity analysis results for the augmented product perception are illustrated in Table 4. In the analysis results presented as five columns, the first column contains the factor structures formed as a result of the analysis. As can be seen in the column, in four of the field studies

Table 5. Reliability and Validity Results of the Attribution Theory Scale

Attribution Theory Scale (6 Items)	F. Loadings				Variance (%)				Eigenvalue				Cronbach's Alfa			
Factor 1 Stability	FS1*	FS2*	FS3*	FS4*	FS1	FS2	FS3	FS4	FS1	FS2	FS3	FS4	FS1	FS2	FS3	FS4
The atmosphere of this restaurant will always remain the same.	0.881	0.883	0.822	0.870												
The customer profile of this restaurant will always remain the same.	0.894	0.846	0.860	0.914	51.9	49.2	42.3	53.0	3.11	2.95	2.53	3.80	0.903	0.856	0.747	0.889
The attitude of the staff to the customers will always remain the same.	0.879	0.864	0.718	0.862												
Factor 2 Controllability																
Restaurant management is responsible for the current atmosphere in this restaurant.	0.794	0.808	0.775	0.800												
Restaurant management is responsible for the customer profile.	0.465	0.683	0.690	0.745	17.0	21.5	22.4	20.6	1.02	1.29	1.34	1.23	0.521	0.669	0.671	0.719
Restaurant management is responsible for the staff's attitude to the customers.	0.817	0.850	0.825	0.808												

Values for the Overall Scale	Field study 1	Field study 2	Field study 3	Field study 4
KMO	0.795	0.732	0.727	0.785
Total variance (%)	69.008	70.815	64.774	73.659
Bartlett Test	X²: 347.279 s.d.: 15 p<0.001	X²: 348.713 s.d.: 15 p<0.001	X²: 222.691 s.d.: 15 p<0.001	X²: 404.927 s.d.: 15 p<0.001
Cronbach's Alpha for Overall Scale	0.798	0.776	0.726	0.818
Overall Mean	3.842	3.818	3.832	3.910

FS1*: Field study1   FS2*: Field study2   FS3*: Field study3   FS4*: Field study4

(FS1, FS2, FS3, FS4), the augmented product perception scale consists of two factors as staff perception and atmosphere perception. In addition, when the values for the overall scale are examined, it is seen that the two factors explain the augmented product perception between 66% and 76%, and that the KMO values are between 0.737 and 0.753.

In addition, the fact that the participants regard customer interaction as part of the environment is considered as an important output. In the next three columns of the table, factor loading values, explained variance ratio and eigenvalues are presented, respectively. Both the values in these three columns and the reliability coefficients in the last column are parallel to each other, as in the other analysis results.

The results of the reliability and validity analysis for the attribution theory scale are illustrated in Table 5. The data in the table are arranged in a way that the data of the four different field studies are included in the same table as in Table 4. As pointed out, the attribution theory scale consists of two factors as stability and controllability in all four field studies. Another noteworthy situation is that both the reliability and validity analysis results are within acceptable values and the results of the four different field studies are parallel to each other.

Considering the results of the four field studies given above for the two scales, it is noteworthy that both the reliability and validity results are parallel to each other. It can be argued that this contributes significantly to the generalizability of the findings within the scope of this study. In addition, according to the results of the factor analysis, the two main research questions of the research are answered, too. Accordingly, it was determined that the augmented product perception scale was divided into two dimensions as staff perception and atmosphere perception. Hypotheses (H3 and H6) suggested for customer interaction were eliminated due to the fact that the scale items for customer interaction included in the augmented product perception scale were in the dimension of atmosphere perception. In addition, it was found that the attribution theory scale was divided into two dimensions as stability and controllability within the scope of this study.

After the reliability and validity analysis of the study, regression analysis was performed for the data of the third and fourth field studies. The purpose of this analysis is to test the linear relationship between the variables (H1, H2, H4, H5). The simple linear regression analysis results are demonstrated in Table 6.

The results of the simple linear regression analysis conducted to test the linear relationship between the variables are presented in Table 6. As can be seen in the table, the results of the analysis performed on the data of the third and fourth field studies are given in summary and in the same table.

The first point that draws attention in the table is that all the hypotheses proposed were supported in the analysis of the results of both field studies. Another noteworthy situation is that the effect of staff perception on the attribution theory was higher than the atmosphere perception.

6. Conclusion and Recommendation

As revealed in the conceptual framework section of the study, augmented product consists of atmosphere that is the environment in which the service is provided, customer interaction with service staff, interaction between customers and participation of customers in the production process. In this study, attribution attitudes of the restaurant customers towards the perception of augmented products were examined, and it was determined that product perception was observed in two dimensions as staff perception and atmosphere perception. Since no findings have been obtained in the literature review about how many dimensions the augmented product perception is divided into, this finding is believed to be important for researchers and will be taken into consideration in future research. This is because it is believed that since the study was carried out on a restaurant having inseparability trait, it can give an important perspective to the studies to be conducted on samples such as accommodation, transportation, entertainment, shopping, health, etc., which are other tourism products with the same trait.

In the research questions and hypotheses section of the study, it is stated that there is no research investigating the direct relationship between the augmented product perception and the dimensions of the attribution theory in the literature, but people make attributions in line with the mental perceptions they create towards events, facts and behavior; and from this point of view it is argued that there may be a relationship between the augmented product perception and the dimensions of the attribution

Table 6. Simple Linear Regression Analysis Results Performed on the Data of the Third and Fourth Field Studies

Hypothesis	Beta		ΔR2		Significance of the model (p)		Support	
	FS3*	FS4*	FS3	FS4	FS3	FS4	FS3	FS4
H1: Atmosphere Perception → Stability	0.367	0.359	0.136	0.129	p<.01	p<.01	Supported	Supported
H2: Staff Perception → Stability	0.430	0.348	0.185	0.121	p<.01	p<.01	Supported	Supported
H4: Atmosphere Perception → Controllability	0.164	0.279	0.027	0.078	p<.05	p<.01	Supported	Supported
H5: Staff Perception → Controllability	0.237	0.381	0.056	0.145	p<.01	p<.01	Supported	Supported

FS3*: Field Study3   FS4*: Field Study4

theory. In the present study, conducted on a restaurant sample, the existence of the relationship and the finding that the impact of staff perception is higher than atmosphere perception is presented in the analysis and findings section. The fact that the relationship between the dimensions of the augmented product perception and the dimensions of the attribution theory is presented as is believed to offer a perspective to the researchers who are planning to study on consumer behavior and the dimensions of the attribution theory.

In the conceptual framework section, it is stated that Weiner's success motivation theory, which is taken into consideration in the study, addresses attribution with the dimensions of locus, stability and controllability, and in the studies carried out in this context, generally internal, controllable and permanent attributions are made for positive outputs, and external, temporary and uncontrollable attributions are made for negative outputs. However, in the tourism sector, which is a service sector, the attributions may not be as simple and may have their distinctions due to the inseparability of the service.

As can be seen in the analysis and findings section of the study, the mean of the restaurant customers both for the augmented product perceptions and the attribution attitudes in the four different field studies is 4 and/or close to 4, and this result corresponds to the "Agree" category of the five response categories in the scale. Based on this finding, it can be argued that restaurant customers make external, controllable and permanent attributions for positive augmented product perceptions within the scope of this study. This finding does not coincide with the results of studies based on Weiner's theory. This difference may result from the nature of the tourism product or the fact that the theory is not addressed with all dimensions in the field of marketing and tourism, as in this study. It is believed that this situation revealed by the study may be a guide for researchers in paving the way for different studies in this field.

As revealed in the analysis and findings section of the study, it was found that the perceptions of consumers towards the augmented product were composed of two dimensions as staff perception and atmosphere perception. It was also found that staff perception and atmosphere perception had a positive effect on attribution attitudes, and the effect of staff perception was higher than atmosphere perception. As reported in the method section of the study, it is stated that the consumer behavior process consists of input, process and output stages, the consumer is exposed to some stimuli during the input stage, pays attention to these stimuli and comment on them during the process stage, and acts in line with these comments during the output stage. When the stages of consumer behavior process are evaluated in terms of research variables, it is noticeable that they overlap each other, that is the consumer creates a perception towards the staff and the atmosphere during the input stage, makes attributions for the

perceptions during the process stage, and develops a positive and/or negative behavior in line with these attributions.

The findings of the research reported above are believed to play a significant role in providing information and guidance to the practitioners who are thinking about planning promotion activities aimed at improving customers' positive service perceptions towards the establishment. Based on the findings, it can be argued that the practitioners who are planning to positively affect the attitudes and behaviors of customers towards the establishment should first plan to positively affect their perceptions towards the staff and the atmosphere. In addition, considering the findings within the scope of the study, it can be put forward that it will be more effective to concentrate more on the staff perception compared to the atmosphere perception, because the impact of the staff perception on the attribution theory is greater than the impact of the atmosphere perception.

7. Limitation and Future Research

As highlighted in the introduction section of the study, the study examines the attribution attitudes of consumers towards the augmented product perception through a restaurant sample. In the study, the augmented product dimension, one of the product dimensions, was taken into account because it explains how consumers receive the product, and other dimensions related to the product were excluded. In addition, while atmosphere, interaction with the staff, and the interaction between customers were taken into consideration in the study, the dimension of the customers' participation in the process is excluded from the scope of the study since it may not be possible to manipulate a process that develops in line with the involvement of consumers themselves and therefore no inference can be made in this sense. Based on this, it is suggested that perceptions about the other dimensions of the product and the attribution attitudes towards these perceptions can be investigated in future research.

In order to collect the data of the research, four different field studies were conducted at different times and in different places. Throughout this process, local participants were contacted. For this reason, the findings revealed in the analysis and findings section are for local participants and exclude foreign participants. Based on this, it is suggested that future studies can also be conducted for foreign tourists in order to reveal and compare product perceptions and the attribution attitudes of consumers from different cultures.

Since the study was conducted on a restaurant sample, other areas that constituted the tourism product (accommodation, entertainment, shopping, health, transportation, etc.) were excluded. For this reason, the augmented product perceptions for these areas and the attribution attitudes towards these perceptions are out of the scope of this research. Conducting future studies on the other elements of

tourism products and even including other service sectors in the scope of these studies may contribute to the generalizability of the findings of the present study.

References

Babbie, E. (1989). *The practice of social research* (Fifth Ed.). California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Badovick, G.J. (1990). Emotional reactions and salesperson motivation: an attributional approach following inadequate sales performance. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 18-2, 123-130.

Bilgin, N. (2006). *Sosyal psikolojiye giriş* [Introduction to social psychology]. İzmir: Ege Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayınları 48.

Bitner, M.J. (1990). Evaluating service encounters: the effects of physical surroundings and employee responses. *Journal of Marketing*, 54, 69-82.

Bitner, M.J., Booms, B.H., and Mohr, L.A. (1994). Critical service encounters: The employee's viewpoint. *Journal of Marketing*, 58, 95-106.

Browning, V., FungSo, K.K., and Sparks, B. (2013). The influence of online reviews on consumers' attributions of service quality and control for service standards in hotels. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 30, 23-40.

Bower, A.B., and Maxham III, J.G. (2012). Return shipping policies of online retailers: normative assumptions and the long-term consequences of fee and free returns. *Journal of Marketing*, 76, 110-124.

Chan, F., Mcmahon, B.T., Cheing, G., Rosenthal, D.A., and Bezyak, J. (2005). Drivers of workplace discrimination against people with disabilities: the utility of attribution theory. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 25, 77-88.

Chaudhuri, A., and Holbrook, M.B. (2001). The chain effects from brand trust and brand affect to brand performance: The Role of Brand Loyalty. *Journal of Marketing*, 65(4), 81-93.

Choi, S., and Cai, L.A. (2016). Tourist Causal Attribution: Does Loyalty Matter? *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 33, 1337–1347

Chung, J.Y., and Petrick, J.F. (2012). Price fairness of airline ancillary fees: an attributional approach. *Journal of Travel Research*, 52(2), 168-181.

Cronin, J.J., and Taylor, S.A. (1992). Measuring service quality: a reexamination and extension. *Journal of Marketing*, 56, 55-68.

Cronin, J.J., and Taylor, S.A. (1994). Servperf versus servqual: reconciling performance-based and perceptions-minus-expectations measurement of service quality. *Journal of Marketing*, 58, 125-131.

Dutta, S., Bijwas, A., and Grewal, D. (2007). Low price signal default: an empirical investigation of its consequences. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 35, 76-88.

Ellen, P.S., Mohr, L.A., and Webb, D.J. (2000). Charitable programs and the retailer: do they mix? *Journal of Retailing*, 76(3), 393-406.

Erkuş, A. (2014). *Psikolojide ölçme ve ölçek geliştirme—1 temel kavramlar ve işlemler* [Measurement and scale development in psychology - 1 basic concepts and operations] (2nd Ed.). Ankara: Pegem Yayınları.

Erkuş, A. (2009). *Davranış bilimleri için bilimsel araştırma süreci* [Scientific research process for behavioral sciences] (2nd Ed.). Ankara: Seçkin Yayınları.

Fang, E., Evens, K.R., and Landry, T.D. (2005). Control systems' effect on attributional processes and sales outcomes: a cybernetic information-processing perspective. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 33 (4), 553-574.

Fuchs, M., and Weiermair, K. (2004). Destination benchmarking: an indicator-system's potential for exploring guest satisfaction. *Journal of Travel Research*, 42, 212-225.

Green, P.E., and Krieger, A.M. (1995). Attribute importance weights modification in assessing a brand's competitive potential. *Marketing Science*, 14(3), 253-270.

Guha, A., Biswas, A., Grewal, D., Bhowmmick, S., and Nordfalt, J. (2018). An Empirical Analysis of the Joint Effects of Shoppers' Goals and Attribute Display on Shoppers' Evaluations. *Journal of Marketing*, 82, 142-156

Gürses, İ. (2008). *Yükleme teorisi ve din ilişkisi üzerine bir değerlendirme* [An evaluation of attribution theory and the relationship between religion]. Uludağ Üniversitesi İlâhiyat Fakültesi Dergisi, 17(2), 359-377.

Habel, J., Schons, L.M., Alavi, S., and Wieseke, J. (2016). Warm Glow or Extra Charge? The Ambivalent Effect of Corporate Social Responsibility Activities on Customers' Perceived Price Fairness. *Journal of Marketing*. 80, 84-105.

Herpen, E.V., and Pieters, R. (2002). The variety of an assortment: an extension to the attribute-based approach. *Marketing Science*, 21(3), 331-341.

Hogg, M.A., and Vaughan, G.M. (2005). Sosyal psikoloji [Social psychology] (4th Ed.) (Trans. İ. Yıldız and A. Gelmez, 1st Ed.). Ankara: Ütopya Yayınları.

Jackson, M. (2019). Utilizing attribution theory to develop new insights into tourism experiences. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 38, 176–183.

Jacson, M.S., White, G.N., and Schmierer, C.M. (1996). Tourism experiences within an attributional framework. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 23(4), 798-810.

Janakiraman, N., Meyer, R.J., and Morales, A.C. (2006). Spillover effects: how consumers respond to unexpected changes in price and quality. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 33, 361-369.

Janiszewski, C., and Meyvis, T. (2001). Effects of brand logo complexity, repetition and spacing on processing fluency and judgment. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 28, 18-32.

Johnston, W.J., and Kim, K. (1994). Performance, attribution, and expectancy linkages in personal selling. *Journal of Marketing*, 58, 68-81.

Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (1999). *Sosyal psikolojiye giriş* [Introduction to social psychology] (10th Ed.). İstanbul: Evrim Yayınevi.

Kalaycı, Ş. (2010). Spss uygulamalı çok değişkenli istatistik teknikleri [Multivariate statistical techniques with spss application] (5th Ed.). Ankara: Asil Yayın Dağıtım.

Karasar, N. (2003). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi* [Scientific Research Method] (12th Ed.). Ankara: Nobel Yayınevi.

Karatepe, O.M., and Avcı, T. (2002). Measuring service quality in the hotel industry: evidences from Northern Cyprus. *Anatolia: An International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 13(1), 19 -32.

Khan, M. (2003). Ecoserv ecotourists' quality expectations.

Annals of Tourism Research, 30(1), 109-124.

Khan, M. (2006). *Behaviour and advertising management*. New Delhi: New Age International Limited Publishers.

Khan, U., and Dhar, R. (2006). Licensing effect in consumer choice. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 43, 259-266.

Kim, A.K., and Brown, G. (2012). Understanding the relationships between perceived travel experiences, overall satisfaction, and destination loyalty. *Anatolia : An International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 23(3), 328-347.

Kim, S., Blanchard, S.J., Desarbo, W.S., and Fong, D.K.H. (2013). Implementing managerial constraints in model-based segmentation: Extensions of Kim, Fong, and Desarbo (2012) with an application to heterogeneous perceptions of service quality. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 50, 664-673.

Koç, E. (2008). *Tüketici davranışı ve pazarlama stratejileri; global ve yerel yaklaşım* [Consumer behavior and marketing strategies: global and local approach] (2nd Ed.). Ankara: Seçkin yayınları.

Kotler, P., Bowen, J., and Makens, J. (2003). *Marketing for hospitality and tourism* (3rd Ed.). New York: Prentice Hall.

Kozak, N. (2006). *Turizm Pazarlaması* [Tourism Marketing] (1st Ed.). Ankara: Detay yayıncılık.

Leug, E., Paolacci, G., and Puntoni, S. (2018). Man Versus Machine: Resisting Automation in Identity-Based Consumer Behavior. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 55(6), 818-831.

Middleton, V.T.C., and Clarke, J. (2001). *Marketing in travel and tourism* (Third Edition). Great Britain: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Miller, E.G., and Khan, B.G. (2005). Shades of meaning: the effect of color and flavor names on consumer choice. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 32, 86-92.

Mizerski, R.W., Golden, L.L., and Kernan, J.B. (1979). The attribution process in consumer decision making. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 6, 123-140.

Nowlis, S.M., and Simonson, I. (1997). Attribute-task compatibility as a determinant of consumer preference reversals. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 34, 205-218.

Odabaşı, Y., Barış, G. (2002). *Tüketici davranışı* [Consumer behavior] (1st Ed). İstanbul: Mediacat Akademi.

Parasuraman, V. A., Zeithaml, V.A., and Berry, L.L. (1994). Reassessment of expectations as a comparison standard in measuring service quality: implications for further research. *Journal of Marketing*, 58, 111-124.

Pham, M.T., Goukens, C., Lehmann, D.R., and Stuart, C.A. (2010). Shaping customer satisfaction through self-awareness cues. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 47, 920–932.

Saez, C.A.A., Fuentes, M.M.F., and Montes, F.J.L. (2007). Service quality measurement in rural accommodation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 34(1), 45–65.

Sinha, A., Inman, J.J., Wang, Y., and Park, J. (2005). Attribute drivers: a factor analytic choice map approach for understanding choices among Skus. *Marketing Science*, 24(3), 351-359.

Steward, M.D., and Levis, B.R. (2010). A comprehensive analysis of marketing journal rankings. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 32(1), 75-92.

Su, L., Lian, Q., and Huang, Y. (2020). How do tourists'

attribution of destination social responsibility motives impact trust and intention to visit? The moderating role of destination reputation. *Tourism Management*, 77, 1-13.

Tomlinson, E.C., and Mayer, R.C. (2009). The role of causal attribution dimensions in trust repair. *Academy of Management Review*, 34(1), 85-104.

Troye, S.V., and Supphellen, M. (2012). consumer participation in coproduction: "I made it myself" effects on consumers' sensory perceptions and evaluations of outcome and input product. *Journal of Marketing*, 76, 33-46.

Tsang, N.K.F., and Prideaux, B., Lee, L. (2015). Attribution of Inappropriate Visitor Behavior in a Theme Park Setting – A Conceptual Model. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 33, 1088-1105.

Tsiros, M., Mittal, V., and Ross, W.T. (2004). The role of attributions in customer satisfaction: a reexamination. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 31(2), 476-483.

Meydan Uygur, S. (2007). *Turizm pazarlaması* [Tourism marketing] (1st Ed.). Ankara: Nobel Yayınları.

Weiner, B. (1985). An attributional theory of achievement motivation and emotion. *Psychological Review*, 92(4), 548-573.

Weiner, B. (2000). Attributional thoughts about consumer behavior. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 27, 382-387.

Yağcı, M.İ., and Çabuk, S. (2014). *Pazarlama teorileri* (Marketing theories). İstanbul: MediaCat Kitapları.

Yıldırım, A., and Şimşek, H. (2000). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri* [Qualitative Research Methods in Social Sciences] (2nd Ed.). Ankara: Seçkin Yayınları.

Mehmet Şimşek is an assistant professor at Univesity of Giresun, Turkey. He holds a PhD in Tourism Management from University of Mersin, Turkey. His research interests are consumer behavior, tourism marketing, image perception, consumer trust.

ORCID: 0000-0002-7558-5010

Göknil Nur Koçak is a professor at Univesity of Mersin, Turkey. She holds a PhD in Tourism Management from Dokuz Eylül University, Turkey. Her research interests are consumer satisfaction, value perception and consumer trust.

ORCID: 0000-0002-1574-4403