The Relationship between Exhibitors' Show Performance and the Service Quality of Trade Shows: Research Based on International Trade Shows Held in Korea.

Namsu Kim,PhD

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is first to identify and then examine the relationship between the dimensions of a trade show's service quality and the dimensions of the exhibitors' show performance. This study is based on empirical research together with a literature review to discover service quality's effect on exhibitors' performance. A survey was conducted during an international trade show that was held in Korea where more than 100 businesses participated. The sample was selected from among the people who were in charge (e.g., managers) of their own private businesses. As a result, the study validated nine dimensions of a trade show's service quality: host and public relations, security, reputation and reliability, access, customer service, exhibition program, physical facilities, convenient facilities, and attendance cost. The study also identified five dimensions of the performance of participants: sales performance, information collection, networking, image building, and motivation. Overall, the empirical results of this study verified that a correlation exists between the performance of exhibitors and the service quality of trade shows.

Key Words: Trade Show, Exhibition, Service Quality, Exhibitors Show Performance

---

Namsu Kim PhD. is Research Professor at International Business Department, Dong Seo University, Busan, Korea (E-mail: nancy0013@pusan.ac.kr). Visiting Scholar at George Washington University, Washington DC.

INTRODUCTION

The trade show industry has tremendous potential and plays a significant role in the international trade and tourism industry. The trade show industry has an important impact on various related industries and promotes the nation as well. Many countries throughout the world benefit from trade shows in diverse fields such as politics, economics, and culture. Moreover, countries that do not participate in trade shows also benefit indirectly from the development of transportation and communication. Countries in the region of Southeast Asia, not to mention North America and other developed countries, are recognizing such facts and intensively promoting trade shows as a nation's strategic industry. Therefore, competition among different countries in the trade show industry is expected to increase (Dodds, 2003). Additionally, expenditures are on the rise for segments related to corporate and organization meetings as well as incentive travel due to the industry's growth rate of development at 9% since 1992 (Lee & Back, 2005). It is evident that the trade show industry has transformed into an international multi-billion dollar business as of 2004 (Hansen, 2004).

Meanwhile, the trade show industry has a major role in marketing. In general, companies have been focusing on marketing their message through advertisements and public relations, but attaining the key goal of communication effectively has been difficult. Trade shows are beneficial since they facilitate open communication, enabling companies and consumers to interact directly. Additionally, trade shows can be utilized as a marketing tactic to influence various groups of people, including existing customers, potential customers, buyers, and even shareholders. Although trade shows may not lead to direct sales conversions, they help to identify and build a network of buyer contacts.

Thus, trade shows are advantageous for developing and strengthening relationships through strategic networking in order to increase potential sales opportunities (Tanner, Chonko, and Ponzurick, 2001).

Trade show participation has increased globally due to such benefits. American companies invested approximately 14% of their marketing communication budget in attending trade shows, which took up the largest proportion after sales (Sind, 1996). European companies invested approximately 20% of their marketing communication budget in attending trade shows (Sandler, 1994). Moreover, it was estimated that there would be approximately 4,800 trade shows held with 112 million exhibitors and 1.5 million attendees for business purposes during 2000 and 2001 (Schwartz, 2001).

In China, the trade show industry demonstrates areas of potential. In 2001, the exhibition industry injected net 0.044% (4 billion RMB)[1] of GDP (8,900 billion RMB) into China's economy which would have accounted to 17.8 billion RMB in China (Kay, 2005).

The trade show industry in Korea started with the opening of the Convention and Exhibition Center (COEX) in 1979 and began to make headway upon completion of the Expo Park in Daejeon in 1993. Thereafter, Korea experienced rapid openings of exhibition venues throughout the country: Daejeon Exhibition Hall (1995), Seoul Yoido Exhibition Center (1996), Hakyeoul Exhibition Hall (1999), ASEM Exhibition Hall (2000), Busan Exhibition Convention Center (BEXCO)(2001), Taegu Exhibition Convention Center (EXCO)(2001), Jeju Exhibition Hall (2003), and Ilsan KINTEX Exhibition Hall (2005). Plans are being developed to open exhibition halls in cities such as Incheon, Goyang, Daejeon, and Woolsan.

[1] In 2001: 1 USD = 8.27 RMB

Accordingly, there has been rapid progress in the frequency of trade show openings following the increase of new exhibition halls: 68 trade shows in 1990, 79 trade shows in 1995, and an increase of up to 227 in 2000. As of 2003, there were approximately 300 trade shows held annually in Korea, reaching world-class level. Estimated expenditures related to the Korean domestic trade show industry were approximately 444 billion won (372 million USD), and it was estimated that the economic ripple effect reached 1.3 trillion won (1.09 billion USD) directly and indirectly.[2]

It is imperative to adapt to these new circumstances and insure that top exhibitors and companies continue to develop the trade show industry. Thus it is necessary to provide high quality service and satisfy the needs of participating companies and exhibitors. High quality service of trade shows can attract many customers and thus enhance the exhibitors' show performance. This has created substantial attention focused on research regarding the trade show industry, but mainly on the trade show participating companies' show performance in Western industrialized countries (Bonoma, 1983; Hansen, 1996, 2004; Kerin & Cron, 1987; Poorani, 1996; Shoham, 1992). There have been a limited number of studies that concentrate on service quality and there are only a few similar studies regarding contributing factors for trade show selection (Kijewski, Yoon, & Young, 1993; Shipley, Egan, & Wong, 1993). Replicating previous studies of different industries in order to examine the dimensions of a trade shows' service quality is insufficient. In fact, there are very few studies that attempt to determine the correlation between trade show service quality and exhibitors' show performance in the trade show industry.

[2] In 2003: 1,191.6 KRW = 1 USD

It is important to explore the underlying concepts of the constantly developing and economically effective trade show industry. Therefore, the purpose of this paper is to discover the dimensions of a trade show's service quality and the dimensions of the exhibitor's show performance and determine if there is a correlation between the service quality and exhibitor show performance. The study is likely to provide some useful information and findings in regards to holding a successful trade show and developing the trade show industry.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Dimensions of a Trade Show's Service Quality

Quality and responsive service have been two important determinants in choosing exhibition sites (Baloglu & Love, 2001), but there has been an absence of research dedicated to learning the service needs of exhibition attendees. For exhibitors, a study conducted by Hultsman (2001) showed that they most valued booth location and quality of on-site and off-site services.

There has been considerable attention focused and much research done on service quality. Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry (1985, 1988) presented 10 dimensions of service quality that can be applied generally to the service industry. Through empirical research on four service fields, they derived an instrument called the SERVQUAL. It includes a pair of 22 statements that ranks the importance of customers' expectations and perceptions of five key dimensions (reliability, responsiveness, tangibles, assurance, and empathy). The result measures 10 dimensions of service quality: reliability,

responsiveness, competence, access, courtesy, communication, credibility, security, understanding, and tangibles.

Carman (1990) discovered some features about the service quality measurement standards through various experiments. The researcher utilized the 10 dimensions from the SERVQUAL introduced by Parasuraman et al. (1985) and investigated an automobile tire repair store, the employment office of a business school, and a clinic from a dental school. As a result, the key elements of service quality for the automobile tire repair store were identified as tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, security, and access. The elements of service quality for the employment office of a business school turned out to be tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, security, personal interest, access, and convenience. Lastly, the elements of service quality for the clinic from a dental school were tangibles, reliability, security, convenience, and cost.

Brady, Cronin, and Brand (2002) described the dimensions of service quality hierarchically. Service quality is composed of the three core qualities of interactivity, physical environment, and consequence. The interactive quality involves attitude, behavior, and profession. The physical environmental quality is comprised of ambient conditions, design, and social elements. Finally, the consequence quality involves waiting time, tangibles, and experience.

Shipley et al. (1993) conducted research on the selection criteria of major exhibitors through British engineering companies by comparing domestic and international trade shows and classified 16 variables. The most important variables that were considered in attending a trade show were visitor type, exhibition product type, estimated number of leads, estimated number of visitors, trade show attendance cost, and

estimated PR effect. On the other hand, the least important factors were frequency of exhibition, exhibition period, exhibition date, and organizers' reputation.

Kijewski et al. (1993) examined the primary factors for choosing a trade show amongst the Trade Show Bureau members. Consequently, factors such as attendance/lead performance, marketing synergy effect, exhibition environment, attendance costs, and staff capability were most crucial.

Kweon (2003) concluded that the following six discriminators were factors that affect the service quality of exhibitions: host and public relations, internal facilities of the exhibition hall, security and cleanliness, parking and convenient facilities, guidance and attendance cost, and surroundings and transportation convenience. From the study of the determinants of exhibition service quality as perceived by attendees, Jung (2005) analyzed the trade show service quality by categorizing 24 variables. Accordingly, booth management, registration, contents, exhibition and booth attractiveness, booth layout and function, and access were the decisive features for an exhibitions' service quality. Breiter and Milman (2006) that exhibitors most valued booth location and quality of on-site and off-site services. Through precedent research, Getz (2003) presented the following key destination attributes sought out by associations and meeting planners: accessibility, meeting venue supply, accommodations, amenities, desirable destination image, successful event hosting reputation, visitor safety and comfort, event support services, amount and local organizations and businesses capable of hosting/bidding on many types of events, and cost.

On the whole, the five key dimensions presented by Parasuraman et al. (1988) (reliability, responsiveness, tangibles, assurance, and empathy) were the most common service quality determinants among previous studies (cf. Parasuraman et al. 1985, 1988, Grönroos 1990, Carman 1990, Johnston, Parasuraman, Futrell, and Black 1990, and Brady et al. 2002). However, the cost factor inferred from Carman (1990) was not previously considered and was therefore grasped as the sixth service quality dimension. Furthermore, other dimensions were drawn from the argument that service quality should be evaluated by classifying the distinct characteristics inherent in each industry (Brady et al., 2002; Carman, 1990; Dabholkar, 1996; Pitt, Watson, & Kavan, 1995).

The service quality dimensions can be taken from the studies of Shipley et al. (1993), Kijewski et al. (1993), and Kweon (2003). Overall, the dimensions for service quality can be implied for the most part from Kweon (2003) as host and public relations, internal facilities of the exhibition hall, security and cleanliness, parking and convenient facilities, guidance and attendance cost, and surroundings and transportation convenience. In addition, cost, reputation, and access addressed by Shipley et al. (1993), and customer service and exhibition program mentioned by Kijewski et al. (1993) should be considered. Namely, service quality dimensions can be summarized into 10 factors—host and public relations, security, guidance, attendance cost, reputation, access, internal facilities, customer service, exhibition program, and convenient facilities—according to previous studies.

This study classified internal facilities as a type of physical facilities, integrated reputation, and reliability together. In summary, the findings from the literature review suggest host and public relations, security, reputation and reliability, access, customer

service, trade exhibition program, physical facilities, convenient facilities, and attendance cost as the nine service quality dimensions, which led to the following hypothesis:

H1: Trade show service quality consists of the following nine dimensions: (1) host and public relations, (2) security, (3) reputation and reliability, (4) access, (5) customer service, (6) exhibition program, (7) physical facilities, (8) convenient facilities, and (9) attendance cost.

The Dimensions of the Exhibitors' Show Performance

Bonama (1983) provided two perspectives on the reasons why companies attend a trade show for both existing and potential customers. From the selling standpoint, variables such as clientele assurance and new market development, access to key decision makers, information dispersal regarding the product and service, actual product sales, and the opportunity to service customers were addressed. From the communication standpoint, variables such as maintaining the company's image for customers, competitors, and the media, information collection about competitors and the market, the opportunity to boost employee morale, and the chance to test new products were addressed.

Shoham (1992) discussed the sales and non-sales goals from the exhibitors' viewpoint, explained the decision-making steps from the buyers' perspective in a trade show, and depicted selling and non-selling activities. According to Shoham, selling activities can be divided into categories of selling activities: selling activities aimed at existing customers, selling activities aimed at new customers, and finally selling activities aimed at existing and new customers. In contrast, non-selling activities can be divided into information gathering, enhancing and maintaining employee morale, enhancing and

maintaining corporate image, producing new product ideas, managing suppliers' relationships, and maintaining strategic alliances.

Hansen (1996) argues that trade shows are utilized effectively for small firms or new firms that are trying to get out into the market as a device to contact key decision makers or confront prospective customers. Such firms believe that trade shows are an event where they can sell their products and services or conclude deals. Hansen distinguished between trade show performance from a seller's and a non-seller's perspective. Developing new products and evaluations, selling at the trade show, testing new products, establishing new markets, and establishing new clientele are activities suggested from a seller's point of view. Alternatively, information gathering, image building, and networking are activities suggested from a non-seller's point of view.

Shipley et al. (1993) analyzed the importance level of attending international and domestic trade shows through British engineering companies. The reasons for attending a trade show were divided into 13 categories, and the study indicated that short-term sales at the trade show had a relatively low importance level, and long-term selling and non-selling purposes had a higher priority. In other words, new customer contact, corporate image building, customer relationships, promoting sales of existing products, and introduction of new products were some important reasons why companies attended a trade show; actual sales at the trade show or contact with new manufacturers were some reasons that were shown to be less important.

Michael and Jonathan (1999) described the four objectives of attending a trade show among the exhibitors from a British trade show, GLEE (International Garden and Leisure Exhibition). Improving customer relationships, generating sales, and introducing

new products were the main purposes of attending a trade show, whereas enhancing media relations, finding new employees/distributors/vendors, and doing market research were of lesser importance. Sales was addressed as the second most important motivation in this study because many retailers attend such trade shows related to the gardening industry in order to acquire goods in stock. Such results were slightly different from the study of Shipley et al. (1993).

Smith, Hama, and Smith (2003) investigated the exhibitors' show performance among Japanese companies at the NAHB IBS (National Association of Home Builders International Builders' Show). Results suggest that managing suppliers, understanding the products and industry trends, analyzing sales trends, and educating employees were the four dimensions of show performance.

For Chinese exporting firms participating in international trade shows, Fu, Yang, & Qi (2007) analyzed trade show performance according to 8 categories: acquire customers, collect orders, seek customers' opinion for product improvement, speak with existent customers, conduct a competitor analysis, explore industry and technology trends, find distributors, boost company reputation.

In general, previous studies saw trade show performance from a selling and non-selling perspective (Bonoma, 1983; Fu, Yang, & Qi, 2007; Hansen, 1996, 2004; Kerin & Cron, 1987; Shoham, 1992). The non-selling point of view can be classified into information collection activity, image building activity, and networking (Hansen, 2004). Maintaining employee morale, brought up by Bonoma (1983) and Shoham (1992), can be reclassified as a motivation activity. New product testing, from Bonoma (1983), was classified as a sales activity in the studies of Kerin and Cron (1987) and Hansen (2004).

Taken as a whole, the findings from the literature review suggest the dimensions of a trade show performance as sales, information collection, image building, networking, and motivation. Therefore, the following hypothesis is advanced:

H2: Exhibitor trade show performance consists of the following five dimensions: (1) sales performance, (2) information collection, (3) image building, (4) networking, (5) motivation.

The Relationship Between Service Quality and Show Performance

From a business point of view, performance measurement has many implications. Numerous studies have attempted to learn the determinants that have an effect on performance measurement of businesses and criteria for relationships. According to Carol and Solomon (1987), service personalization is multidimensional and does not necessarily result in higher customer satisfaction. Firms that provide exceptional service are more likely to enhance their market share, better their reputation, experience high premium cost, and therefore increase profit by generating higher revenue (Phillips, Chang, & Buzzel, 1983). Other studies verified that an increase in customer loyalty brought about by customer satisfaction can bring a significant increase in profitability (Anderson, Fornell, & Lehmann, 1994).

In addition, an increase in customer satisfaction through the improvement of service quality can boost a company's reputation. Popularity can provide a superior image for a company, and customers are more likely to take a risk in purchasing a new product from a company with a high-standard image. Additionally, popularity can form and maintain a relationship with suppliers, distributors, and potential associates. It also

has a halo effect and can protect a company from temporary environmental impacts. All in all, customer service is a crucial asset for businesses.

As mentioned in the introduction, there were a limited number of previous studies that attempted to discover the relationship between trade show service quality and exhibitors' show performance. However, numerous studies emphasized the fact that a company's service quality has an impact on its business performance. In other words, the service quality of a company can be a competitive advantage in improving and sustaining customer satisfaction, which will bring growth in the long run.

It can be concluded that buyers or attendees are present at trade shows because they might be interested in the products or information, but exhibitors or participating businesses are influenced by the service provided by the trade show sponsor or promoter. Likewise, the perception of service quality of the trade show attendees can be influenced not only by the exhibitors but also by the service quality provided by the trade show itself. Hence, the findings of the literature review suggest a positive relationship between a trade show's service quality and the exhibitor's performance in sales, networking, and image building. Therefore the following hypothesis is advanced:

H3: There is a positive relationship between the exhibitors' show performance and the service quality of trade shows.

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Data Collection

This study selected its sample from among the people who were in charge of the exhibiting companies during trade shows held in Seoul at COEX and in Busan at BEXCO. The sample population consisted of international trade shows where more than 100 companies attended as exhibitors. Such trade shows were the International Factory Automation System, Nano Korea, Franchise Expo, and Comtex Korea held at Seoul, COEX and ITU Busan held at Busan, BEXCO, held during the year 2004.

The sampling procedure used convenience sampling. However, the study used the following methods to supplement the disadvantages of convenience sampling: (1) the study verified the list of the trade show exhibitors, (2) the researcher attended the trade shows personally, (3) the study selected every fifth company by booth arrangement order, and (4) the questionnaires were distributed to the people in charge of their companies. Prior to data collection, the researcher explained the purpose of the study and obtained permission. A self-administered survey method was used to collect data.

Adjustment and Measurement of Variables

Trade Show Service Quality

The concept of service quality is abstract and difficult to define. The definition of service quality varies according to the viewpoints or approach. The literature describes service quality in different ways, such as the overall impression of consumers of the relative inferiority or superiority of the organization and the service (Bitner & Hubbert, 1994), consumers' evaluation about the overall superiority or excellence of the service

(Zeithaml, 1988), the customers' perception through comparison of the expectations and perceptions of the service (Grönroos, 1984), and the customers' attitudes about the superiority or excellence of the service, which is different from its objective quality (Parasuraman et al., 1985).

This study attempted to determine the relationship between the service quality of a trade show and the exhibitors' show performance. In accordance with its purpose and approach, this study has defined trade show service quality as the exhibitors' degree of satisfaction about the service quality that a trade show provides. The study examined the service quality attributes in other industries as well as the trade show industry to identify variables that could represent trade show service quality. Subsequently, trade show service quality could be determined by measuring the exhibitors' degree of satisfaction about the nine variables, which are host and public relations, security, reputation and reliability, access, customer service, trade show contents, equipment, convenience facilities, and attendance cost. A Likert scale ranging from 1 (*Extremely Dissatisfied*) to 7 (*Extremely Satisfied*) was used.

Exhibitors' Show Performance

Performance has been a popular topic but has not been clearly defined. Kotler (1984) described measuring performance as a necessary activity to improve performance. Kaplan and Norton (1992) studied the dimensions of performance indexes. They reported that performance indexes should include the customers' viewpoint, the financial viewpoint, the viewpoint of internal operation, and the viewpoint of innovation and research.

Based on Kotler's (1984) study, this study tried to measure the exhibitors' show performance on the customers' side from the trade show viewpoint; in other words, the exhibitors' viewpoint. However, the financial viewpoint has been excluded when measuring exhibitors' show performance in this study. The previous research excluded the financial viewpoint and divided the exhibitors' show performance into sales performance and nonsales performance. According to Hansen (1996), nonsales performance could be classified as collecting information, creating image, and networking. Bonoma (1983) and Shoham (1992) suggested that nonsales performance was maintaining employee morale and encouragement that could be redefined as motivation. Supported by Kerin and Cron (1987) and Hansen (1996) who classified a new product test (Bonoma, 1983) as sales performance in their research, this study included a new product test in sales performance. Accordingly, this study adopted five factors to measure the exhibitors' show performance: sales performance, information collection, image building, networking, and motivation. In a nutshell, the exhibitors' show performance was identified thorough their achievement on these five factors.

The variables were developed based on the literature of Bonoma (1983), Kerin and Cron (1987), Shoham (1992), and Hansen (2004). A Likert scale ranging from 1 (*Extremely Dissatisfied*) to 7 (*Extremely Satisfied*) was used.

RESULTS

Sample Profile

Exhibitors' Demographic and Behavior Profile

A total of 263 questionnaires were coded. Table 1 describes the demographic profiles.

Table 1

Gender, Age and Attending Frequency

Variables		*N*	%
Gender			
	Male	159	60.5%
	Female	104	39.5%
Total		263	100.0%
Age			
	20-29	72	27.4%
	30-39	138	52.5%
	40-49	26	9.9%
	Over 50	27	10.3%
Total		263	100.0%
Attendance Frequency			
	1-4 times	116	44.1%
	5-9 times	62	23.6%
	10-19 times	29	11.0%
	20-29 times	41	15.6%
	over 30 times	15	5.7%
Total		263	100.0%

Information Collecting Channels of the Exhibitors

The information collecting channels of the exhibitors are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Information Collecting Channels

Ranking	Channels	N	%
1	Brochures from the host	97	36.9%
2	Internet	53	20.2%
3	Other exhibitors	41	15.6%
4	Direct Mail	15	5.7%
5	Others	14	5.3%
6	Newspaper	10	3.8%
7	Phone	8	3.0%
8	TV	5	1.9%
9	Radio	3	1.1%
10	Magazines	3	1.1%
N/A	Missing	14	5.3%
	Total	263	100.0%

Exhibitors' Marketing Expenses

The exhibitors' marketing expenses are presented in Table 3.

Table 3

Exhibitors' Marketing Expenses

Ranking	Marketing Expenses	N	%
1	Trade Shows	96	36.5%
2	PR	82	31.2%
3	Sales	32	12.2%
4	Advertising	15	5.7%
5	Mailing	10	3.8%
6	Others	6	2.3%
7	Telemarketing	5	1.9%
N/A	Missing	17	6.5%
	Total	263	100.0%

Factor Analysis Results for Trade Show Service Quality

Factor analysis was used to identify variables representing trade show service quality (H1). The KMO (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy) value supports the reliability as .922. Bartlett's test of sphericity represents the overall significance of all correlations within a correlation matrix. The probability associated with the Bartlett test was less than 0.0005. The statistical results provide good support for using factor analysis and show that there is a subset of components in each factor.

Factor analysis conducted with 44 attributes produced nine factors with Eigen values greater than one. The results show that nine factors explained 72.48% of the total variance. Cronbach's alpha coefficient was used to measure the reliability. The Cronbach's alpha values of all factors were above .8420. The higher values, from 0 to 1, indicate stronger internal consistency.

Consequently, the results support H1, which is "The trade show service quality is composed of (1) host and public relations, (2) security, (3) reputation and reliability, (4) access, (5) customer service, (6) exhibition program, (7) physical facilities, (8) convenient facilities, and (9) attendance cost." Table 4 presents the factor analysis results and the reliability of the trade show service quality variables.

Table 4

Factor Analysis Results and Reliability of the Variables for Trade Show Service Quality

Factor	Variables	Factor Loadings	Eigen value	Variance
Customer Service (Cronbach's α = .9196)	Reliable and consistent service	0.760	17.363	9.732
	Kindness of the hosting staff	0.748		
	Reasonable number of employees for the trade show operation	0.720		
	Staff knowledge about the show	0.717		
	Prompt Service	0.653		
Physical Facilities (Cronbach's α = .8637)	Size of the exhibition hall	0.737	3.376	9.21
	Temperature of the exhibition hall	0.729		
	Exterior of the exhibition hall	0.684		
	Interior decoration	0.682		
	Sound system of the exhibition hall	0.597		
	Cleanliness of the exhibition hall	0.590		
	Communication system of the exhibition hall	0.501		
Guidance & Convenient Facilities (Cronbach's α = .8637)	Restrooms	0.732	2.284	8.617
	Resting area and convenient facilities	0.689		
	Service for the handicapped and the senior	0.678		
	The booth map	0.625		
	Guidance facilities and signage	0.595		
	Availability of pamphlets and brochures	0.588		
Exhibition programs (Cronbach's α = .8941)	Entertainment of the trade show	0.763	2.024	8.539
	Opening, closing and other special events	0.732		
	Accuracy of the show schedule notice	0.677		
	Educational functions of the trade show	0.654		
	The consistency of the schedule and actual running of the show	0.616		
Reliability (Cronbach's α = .8815)	Reliability of the exhibition	0.801	1.626	8.333
	Popularity of the exhibitors	0.773		
	Reputation of the host	0.743		
	Reputation of the exhibition	0.645		
	Reliability and trust toward the host	0.587		

Security (Cronbach's α = .9091)	Safety system for the fire alarm	0.736	1.556	7.729
	Security for theft of the exhibition items	0.708		
	Safety of the facilities such as booths or other equipment	0.692		
	Controlling the order at the show room	0.657		
Host and Public Relations (Cronbach's α = .8777)	Trade show PR by the host	0.802	1.406	7.096
	Activities to host exhibitors	0.763		
	Activities to invite visitors	0.737		
	Managing website	0.482		
Attendance Cost (Cronbach's α = .9061)	Booth rental cost	0.834	1.24	7.052
	Booth setting cost	0.782		
	The reasonable price for participation	0.737		
Access (Cronbach's α = .8420)	Availability of accommodations and restaurants	0.803	1.018	6.177
	Location & Easy to find/access	0.733		
	Convenient public transportation	0.532		
	Convenient parking	0.475		
	Easy access to the inside and outside	0.455		

Note. KMO = .922. $p < .0005$. Varimax rotation with Kaiser Normalization was used.

Factor Analysis Results for the Exhibitors' Show Performance

Factor analysis was used to identify variables to measure the exhibitors' Show Performance (H2). The KMO value supports the reliability as .937. The Bartlett test value was 8308.9, and the probability associated with the Bartlett test was less than 0.0005. The statistical results provide good support for using factor analysis. Factor analysis was conducted with 38 attributes and produced five factors with Eigenvalues greater than one. The five factors explained 66.04% of the total variance. The Cronbach's alpha values of all factors were above .8786.

Consequently, the results support H2, which is "The exhibitors' show performance is composed of (1) sales performance, (2) information collection, (3) image

building, (4) networking, and (5) motivation." Table 5 presents the factor analysis results and the reliability of the exhibitors' show performance variables.

Table 5

Factor Analysis Results and the Reliability of the Exhibitors' Show Performance Variables

Factor	Variables	Factor Loadings	Eigen value	Variance
Image Building (Cronbach's α = .9301)	Chance to expose the firm to customers	0.771	17.563	46.219
	Chance to inform customers of the products	0.744		
	Enhancement of the firm's image and products in the market	0.722		
	Chance to test the firm's image	0.703		
	Distribution of the materials concerning business and products	0.699		
	Projecting a good image of the firm	0.675		
	Taking a dominant position over competitors who didn't participate	0.629		
	Benchmark the position in the market	0.595		
	Benchmark the position of competitors in the market	0.572		
	Chance of publicity through media	0.526		
Information Collection (Cronbach's α = .9242)	Evaluation of the exhibited products	0.743	2.245	5.908
	Collecting information on competitors' products, their price and strategies	0.74		
	Establish new distribution channels	0.737		
	Understanding customers' dissatisfaction	0.687		
	Clarification of customers' desires or preferences	0.656		
	Collecting information about the market	0.655		
	Getting ideas for a new product	0.639		
	Collecting information about related products	0.613		

Sales Performance (Cronbach's α = .9044)	Obtaining loyal customers through special offers	0.798	1.89	4.974
	Supporting sales of related products by attending the exhibition	0.697		
	Making new contracts during the exhibition	0.693		
	Creating a chance to enter a new market	0.675		
	Increase of sales through the exhibition	0.673		
	Chance to test new products	0.594		
	Identify a new market	0.534		
Networking (Cronbach's α = .9028)	Networking with existing customers	0.727	1.773	4.666
	Networking and improving relationships with suppliers	0.714		
	Meeting with decision-makers directly	0.708		
	Searching for cooperation with competitors	0.645		
	Networking with potential customers	0.644		
	Affecting the decision process and for the customers	0.607		
	Face-to-face communication with potential new customers	0.455		
Motivation (Cronbach's α = .8786)	Motivating employees (out of routines)	0.807	1.626	4.278
	Motivating employees through meetings with customers on site	0.757		
	Chance to enhance sales power of the employees	0.72		
	Helpful to recruit new employees	0.592		
	Motivating customers' purchasing desire	0.54		
	Helpful to educate employees	0.538		

Note. KMO = .937. $p < .0005$. Varimax rotation with Kaiser Normalization was used.

Canonical Correlation Analysis Results for

Trade Show Service Quality and Exhibitors' Show Performance

Canonical correlation analysis was used to identify the relationship between trade show service quality and exhibitors' show performance. The canonical correlation analysis could explain the relationship between two sets of multiple variables, and this study used nine factors for the trade show service quality and five factors for exhibitors' show performance.

The results produced two significant canonical functions. Table 6 presents the results of the canonical correlation analysis between trade show service quality and exhibitors' show performance. Values in parentheses are standardized canonical correlation coefficients with canonical cross loadings greater than .30.

Table 6

Canonical Correlation Analysis Results

Factors	Standardized Canonical correlation coefficients		Canonical cross loading	
	1	2	1	2
Trade Show Service Quality				
Customer Service	(-.278)	-.236	-0.606	-.078
Physical Facilities	(-.056)	.133	-0.479	-.012
Guidance & Convenient Facilities	(-.100)	-.443	-0.564	-.099
Exhibition Program	(-.363)	-.496	-0.629	-.073
Reliability	(-.195)	.951	-0.543	.167
Security	(-.184)	-.423	-0.449	-.009
Host and Public Relations	(-.264)	.361	-0.533	.084
Attendance Cost	(-.153)	-.223	-0.483	-.006
Access	(-.040)	.561	-0.481	.091
Redundancy Coefficient	0.284	0.007		
Exhibitors' Show Performance				
Image Building	(-.378)	1.516	-0.899	.432
Information Collection	(-.112)	-0.499	-0.818	-0.245

Sales Performance	(-.314)	-0.494	-0.855	-0.262
Networking	(-.271)	-0.463	-0.854	-0.183
Motivation	(-.090)	-0.176	-0.773	-0.049
Redundancy Coefficient	0.397	0.008		

	Canonical Function 1	Canonical Function 2
Canonical Correlation Coefficients	0.75	0.346
Wilks' Lambda	0.341	0.779
Chi-SQ	273.849	63.51
Degree of Freedom	45	32
P Value	0	0.001

Note. A canonical correlation analysis routine in the SPSS for Windows Version 6.0 was used for the analysis. Values in parentheses are the standardized canonical correlation coefficients with canonical cross loadings greater than .30.

The results support H3, which means, all the trade show service quality factors and all exhibitors' show performance factors have a statistically significant relationship. Among the factors representing trade show service quality, exhibition program was the most important factor rated for the exhibitors' show performance, followed by customer service, host and public promotions, reliability, security, attendance cost, guidance and convenience facilities, physical facilities, and access. On the other hand, among the factors comprising exhibitors' show performance, image building was the factor most related to trade show service quality, followed by sales performance, networking, information collection, and motivation.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Discussion of Results

With their economical and cultural impact, trade shows and exhibitors are increasing all over the world. As a result, trade shows need to attract more exhibitors and attendees to survive and advance in the competitive environment. Providing high quality service and increasing the satisfaction of exhibitors and attendees can be one of the solutions. Also, trade shows have to support the exhibitors' show performance through improving their service quality to keep them as customers.

This study attempted to identify the factors of trade show service quality and exhibitors' show performance and find the relationships between each set of variables. This study generated nine factors for trade show quality: host and public relations, security, reputation and reliability, access, customer service, exhibition program, physical facilities, convenience facilities, and attendance cost. This study had a different approach from the previous research about trade show service quality, which was to sample the exhibitors, not the visitors (Jung, 2005; Kijewski et al., 1993; Kweon, 2003). The results are inconsistent with Kijewski et al.'s (1999) study, because Kijewski et al. examined the determinants of attending a trade show and they did not focus on service quality factors. The exhibitors' performance factors were sales performance, information collection, networking, image building, and motivation. Hansen's (2004) study supports the consistent results, producing similar factors.

The results have shown that all the factors representing the trade show service quality and all the factors for exhibitors' show performance have a

significant relationship. Among the factors representing trade show service quality, exhibition program was rated the most important factor for exhibitors' show performance, followed by customer service, host and public promotions, reliability, security, attendance cost, guidance and convenience facilities, physical facilities, and access. On the other hand, among the factors comprising exhibitors' show performance, image building was the factor most related to trade show service quality, followed by sales performance, networking, information collection, and motivation. As supported by the results of this study, the show hosts or organizers have to try to improve the service quality and support the exhibitors' show performance.

Limitations

There are limitations in this study. First, because there was a limited amount of literature about trade show service quality, this study had to use literature from other industries to develop the attributes representing trade show service quality. Future research should be followed in order to support and improve the adequacy and reliability of this study. Second, it is hard to generalize the results, because the samples were collected from only two convention centers; one in Seoul, Korea (COEX) and the other in Busan, Korea (BEXCO). Future study should expand the variables relating to trade show service quality and exhibitors' show performance to accommodate a flexible environment.

References

Anderson, E. W., Fornell, C., & Lehmann, D. R. (1994). Customer satisfaction, market share and profitability: Findings from Sweden. *Journal of Marketing, 58*(3), 53-66.

Baloglu, S., & Love, K. (2001). Association meeting planners' perceptions of five major convention cities: Results of the pre-test. *Journal of Convention and Exhibition Management*, 3(1), 21–30.

Bitner, J. J., & Hubbert, A. R. (1994). *Service quality: New direction in theory and practice.* Thousands Oaks, CA Sage.

Bonoma, T. V. (1983). Get more out of your trade shows. *Harvard Business Review, 61*(Jan.-Feb.), 75-83.

Brady, M. K., Cronin, J. J., & Brand, R. R. (2002). Performance-only measurement of service quality: A replication and extension. *Journal of Business Research, 55*(1), 17-31.

Breiter, D., & Milman, A. (2006). Attendees' needs and service priorities in a large convention center: Application of the importance–performance theory. *Tourism Management*, 27, 1364–1370.

Carman, J. M. (1990). Consumer perceptions of service quality: An assessment of the SERVQUAL dimension. *Journal of Retailing, 66*(1), 33-55.

Carol, F. S., & Solomon, M. R. (1987). Predictability and personalization in the service encounter. *Journal of Marketing, 51*(2), 86-96.

Dabholkar, P. A. (1996). Consumer evaluation of new technology-based self service options: An investigation of alternative models of service quality. *International Journal of Research in Marketing, 13*(1), 29-51.

Dodds, A. (2003). Blame it on IT: Technology shows drag down an otherwise encouraging fourth quarter. *Tradeshow Week*, February 10, 2003.

Fu, H., Yang, G., & Qi, Y. (2007). Factors affecting trade show effectiveness for Chinese small and medium-sized exporters, *International Management Review*; 3(3).

Getz, D. (2003). Bidding on events: Identifying event selection criteria and critical Success Factors. *Journal of Convention & Exhibition Management*, 5(2), 1-24.

Grönroos, C. (1984). A service quality model and its marketing implication. *European Journal of Marketing, 18*(4), 36-44.

Grönroos, C. (1990). *Service management and marketing: Managing the moments of truth in service competition.* Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Hansen, K. (1996). The dual motives of participants at international trade shows. *International Marketing Review, 13*(2), 39-53.

Hansen, K. (2004). Measuring performance at trade shows: Scale development and validation. *Journal of Business Research, 57,* 1-13.

Hultsman, W. (2001). From the eyes of the exhibitors: Characteristics that make exhibitions a success for all stakeholders. *Journal of Convention and Exhibition Management*, 3(3), 27–44.

Johnston, M. W., Parasuraman, A., Futrell, C. M., & Black, W. C. (1990). Longitudinal assessment of the impact of selected organizational influences on salespeople's

organizational commitment during early employment. *Journal of Marketing Research, 27*(3), 333-344.

Jung, M. (2005). Determinants of exhibition service quality as perceived by attendees. *Journal of Convention & Event Tourism, 7*(3/4), 85-98.

Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (1992). The balanced scorecard: Measures that drive performance. *Harvard Business Review, 70*(1), 71-79.

Kay, Andrew L. K.(2005). China's convention and exhibition center boom. *Journal of Convention & Event Tourism*, 7(1), 5-22.

Kerin, R. A., & Cron, W. L. (1987). Assessing trade show functions and performance: An exploratory study. *Journal of Marketing, 51*(3), 87-94.

Kijewski, V., Yoon, E., & Young, G. (1993). How exhibitors select trade shows. *Industrial Marketing Management, 22*(November), 287-298.

Kotler, P. (1984). Marketing management: Analysis, planning, and control (5th ed.), Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Kweon, C. H. (2003). *Impacts of international exhibition services organizer's perception and participant's satisfaction.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Sejong University, Seoul.

Lee, M. J., Back, K. J. (2005). A review of convention and meeting management research 1990-2003: Identification of statistical methods and subject areas, *Journal of Convention & Event Tourism*, 7(2), 1-20.

Michael, M., & Jonathan, L. (1999). Are trade exhibitions used effectively as promotional tools? *Proceedings of PCMA Annual Meeting*, 96-117.

Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1985). A conceptual model of service quality and its implications for future research. *Journal of Marketing, 49*(3), 41-50.

Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1988). SERVQUAL: A multiple-item scale for measuring consumer perception of service quality. *Journal of Retailing, 64*(1), 12-40.

Phillips, L. W., Chang, D. R., & Buzzell, R. D. (1983). Product quality, cost position and business performance: A test of some key hypotheses. *Journal of Marketing, 47*(2), 26-43.

Pitt, L. F., Watson, R. T., & Kavan, C. B. (1995). Service quality: A measure of information system effectiveness. *MIS Quarterly, 19*(2), 173-187.

Poorani, A. A. (1996). Trade-show management: Budgeting and planning for a successful event. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly, 37*(August), 77-84.

Sandler G. (1994). Fair dealing. *Journal of European Business, 4*(March/April), 46-49.

Schwartz, M. (2001). Shows exhibit staying power. *Business to Business, 86*(5), 1-23.

Shipley, D., Egan, C., & Wong, K. S., (1993). Dimension of trade show exhibiting management. *Journal of Marketing Management, 9,* 55-63.

Shoham, A. (1992). Selecting and evaluating trade shows. *Industrial Marketing Management, 21*(4), 335-341.

Sind, S (1996). More evidence of the power of exhibitions. *Advertising Age's Business Marketing, 81*(3), B-2.

Smith, T. M., Hama, K., & Smith, P. M. (2003). The effect of successful trade show attendance on future show interest: Exploring Japanese attendee perspectives of domestic and offshore international events. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing, 18*(4/5), 403-418.

Tanner, John F., Chonko, Lawrence B., & Ponzurick, Thomas V. (2001). A learning model of trade show attendance. *Journal of Convention & Exhibition Management*, 3(3), 3-26.

Zeithaml, V. A. (1988). Consumer perceptions of price, quality and value: A means-end model and synthesis of evidence. *Journal of Marketing, 52*(2), 2-22.