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ABSTRACT

Determining Factors for the Success of Trade Show Websites

by

Jumyong Lee

Dr. Curtis Love, Examination Committee Chair
Associate Professor of Hotel Administration
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

The main purpose of this study is to evaluate appropriate quality factors of trade show websites as a marketing communication tool. These factors will be compared by measuring the impact on user satisfaction in the specific view of trade show attendees. This study also investigates what content items are effective in trade show websites.

An online survey was designed and distributed via email in March 2006. In total, 369 responses were collected from the attendees of the World Tea Expo. The data was analyzed using multiple regression analysis. The findings indicated that the four proposed website quality factors were significantly related to the overall user satisfaction. The data further indicated which content items were important to their satisfaction about the website.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Importance of the Study

As the worldwide convention industry continues to grow, both industry professionals and academics are focusing on marketing tools that can make a convention successful. The growth of the convention industry has been remarkable. According to the 2004 Meeting Market Report, the convention industry is one of the fastest growing segments of tourism and estimates that the US corporate, convention, and association meeting market segments spent US $44.7 billion in 2003. That figure was the largest dollar amount since this report started tracking the industry 30 years ago (Meetings and Conventions, 2004).

The 2004 Economic Impact Study, released by the Convention Industry Council (CIC), showed the current findings of the economic impact of the meetings, conventions, exhibitions, and incentive travel industry in the United States (Convention Industry Council, 2005). In this report, the meetings industry is the 29th largest contributor to the gross national product, generating $122.31 billion in total direct spending in 2004. The spending made the ripple effect on other industries of the local economy, supporting 1.7 million full-time equivalent (FTE) jobs in the United States along with the direct tax impact of $21.40 billion (Convention Industry Council, 2005).
Associations and other organizations can capitalize on the use of the Web in strategic marketing of their trade shows (Myung, Morrison, & Taylor, 2005). Trade shows are specifically designed to bring sellers and buyers together to conduct business. The economic potential for trade shows is enormous. Organizations use trade shows to generate company and brand awareness (Smith, 1998). The objective for any trade show is to attract qualified buyers who purchase products and services from the wholesalers and distributors which will ultimately be channeled to a select group of end users (Smith, 1998). Effective marketing communication should result in a positive effect on sales, either immediately or after some period of time. Consequently, the website of a trade show, a type of marketing communication tool, must have a relevant relationship to the end user which may enhance customer satisfaction and ultimately generate an increase in business (Smith, 1998).

Although there are numerous marketing tools in the trade show industry to communicate with customers, the trade shows websites play an important role in all business levels. Websites are particularly useful in information gathering (Palmer, 2002). Most people use the Internet when evaluating which conventions or trade shows they may attend. Also, meeting planners use the Web as a source for finding information about the selection of meeting facilities and destinations (Weber, 2001). In a survey conducted by Meetings and Conventions (2004), 92% of the meeting planners answered that their attendees could register on the website of the convention. This means that most of all attendees access the website to find convention information such as registration, transportation, lodging facilities, educational programs, and special events.
It is critical to understand that the quality of a website has a significant effect on user satisfaction from the perspective of communication effectiveness. For example, well-designed and navigable websites will make users feel more comfortable in trying to find the information that they are seeking. A poorly-designed website makes users confused and reluctant to return to the site. Whether users are attendees or exhibitors, if they find difficulty in searching for expected information on the website, their level of satisfaction about the trade show as a whole may decrease.

To prevent consumers from having an unsatisfactory website experience, constantly evaluating websites is critical. Morrison, Taylor, and Douglas (2004) mention that a lot of money has been spent on developing websites without thinking of their effectiveness to meet the specific goals of organizations. Website evaluation can produce continuous improvement and help to assess the performance of the website against competitors (Morrison et al., 2004). Numerous attempts to measure the success of tourism and hospitality websites have been conducted but the comprehensive criteria for evaluating the success of the websites are not yet established (Hong & Kim, 2004).

The unique nature of trade shows requires that the evaluation is different from that of hotel or restaurant websites. Although researchers suggest many different perspectives for evaluating the success of websites, this study will focus on the marketing communication perspective, because websites are tools of communication and an advertising medium, known as marketing channel (Berthon, Pitt, & Watson, 1996).
Problem Statement

In order to develop successful trade show websites, the show managers, who are in charge of maintaining the websites, need to understand what influences the attendees' satisfaction with the trade show. The answers to this question will lead a trade show website to be the most effective marketing tool.

Recent studies indicated that user satisfaction for hospitality websites (including travel agent websites) was evaluated by users in terms of website quality (Ha & Love, 2005; Jeong & Lambert, 2001). However, these previous studies defined similar constructs using different terminology and many of the determinants were used interchangeably without clear rationale. For example, there was confusion between the terms “utility” and “usability” among researchers who used these concepts in their studies. There were several confounding factors in these previous studies that were not discussed. Each study proposed its own framework but inadequately addressed the definition of constructs, omitting critical measurement items.

As pointed out by Mills and Morrison (2003), the development of quality determinants is not an easy task as websites can be used for multiple purposes. The founders of e-commerce market place theory, Dutta and Segev (1999), developed a theoretical process for e-market evolution based on informational, interactive, and transactional functions. A school of innovation adoption theory (Hanson, 2001) and communication theories (Contractor, 2002; Contractor & Bishop, 2000; Monge & Contractor, 2003; Yuan, Gretzel, & Fesenmaire, 2003) proposed similar evolutionary stages of technology adoption: substitution, enlargement, and reconfiguration. Their arguments described similar points: the preliminary stage is the substitution stage, in
which websites simply distribute information, replacing what published materials and traditional broadcast media did before. The second phase engages the user in two-way communication. As a website overcomes the limitations of traditional communication mediums, it becomes a selling agent for products and services enabling actual transactions to be completed in cyberspace in the reconfiguration stage. Payment can be made electronically with receipt or delivery arranged online.

When the organization and business entities develop their website, they should have already established the goal of how to utilize it. Different organizations will have different goals. For example, within hospitality and tourism organizations, hotels create websites to facilitate room sales whereas trade shows concentrate more on directing their attendees and exhibitors to the right resources. Therefore, applying identical website quality frameworks to the hotel, restaurant, and trade show segments may not be an effective way of assessing websites.

This study seeks a research model which could apply to trade show websites in general. The theoretical basis of this study is built from the Information Systems (IS) Success Model by DeLone and McLean (2003). They present three quality factors such as system quality, information quality, and service quality. These factors affect user satisfaction which can be a barometer of the successful website. In their model, they divide the success into the following two results: individual impact and organizational impact. The study found website-specific features on each quality factors and suggested an additional quality factor – relationship quality, described in Han (2006). This factor focuses on establishing a long-term relationship between a website and its users. This framework can be used to examine the determining factors of trade show websites in
terms of the successful marketing communication. The research questions for this study originated from the above statement and include:

1. What are the universal criteria for evaluating trade show websites?
2. What are the important content items of trade show websites to influence user satisfaction?
3. What are the determining factors for the success of trade show websites?
4. Which factor does influence the user satisfaction most?

Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of this study is to evaluate quality factors of trade show websites as a marketing communication tool. These factors will be compared by measuring the impact on the customers’ satisfaction in the specific view of trade show attendees. This study also investigates what content show managers and operators focus on to develop more effective trade show websites. To the end, the study examines the correlation between the quality factors and user satisfaction which leads to a successful website.

Definition of Key Terms

The following terms are defined as they are used in this research project. Definitions of terms are mainly from related literature. When the proper definition was not found, Cambridge Dictionaries Online website (http://dictionary.cambridge.org/) is used.
• **Trade show**: the gathering of large people to sell products or services as well as to generate company and brand awareness for the purpose of impersonal advertising (Smith, 1998, p.14).

• **Website quality**: a characteristic or feature of a set of pages of information on the Internet (Cambridge Dictionaries Online, 2005). Website quality in this study will be measured by using the concept of user satisfaction because a website is one of the marketing communication tools which should contribute to the increase of sales revenue, which can be achieved by consumers’ satisfaction (Smith, 1998). Although there are many categorizations for the factors which influence the quality of websites, this study will adopt four dimensions for categorizing numerous factors: system quality, information quality, service quality, and relationship quality.

• **System quality**: the desired characteristics of the information system itself which produces the information (DeLone & McLean, 1992, p.62). It can include all kinds of characteristics related to the technical matters such as the content of the data base, data currency, response time, system accuracy, turnaround time, system flexibility, and ease of use. DeLone and McLean (2004) also mentioned it in the application of e-commerce system as follows: usability, availability, reliability, adaptability, reliability, and response time.

• **Information quality**: the quality of the information that the system produces (DeLone & McLean, 1992, p.64). As websites have the nature of the communication channel to provide information, many researchers preferred to concentrate on the quality of information itself. It may be described as perceived
effectiveness (usefulness, or importance) of specific report items (Teo & Choo, 2001). In other words, it is related to how efficient the content of the website can be communicated to the users. Therefore, to measure the traditional management information system (MIS) success, many researchers listed the following measures: understandability, freedom from bias, completeness of information, timeliness of report, relevance to decision, comparability, quantitativeness, competitive intelligence (Mollar & Licker, 2001; Teo & Choo, 2001).

- **Service quality**: the overall support delivered by the service provider (DeLone & McLean, 2003, p.25). Ten years later when DeLone and McLean suggested their Information System (IS) Success Model in 1992, they updated their model by adding service quality as a dimension of IS success quality factors. The quality became more important than before because poor user support can be meant as same as lost customers and lost sales. Researchers who studied the service quality suggested five categories of tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy (Parasuraman, Zeithaml, & Berry, 1988). They presented SERVQUAL, a multiple-item scale for measuring service quality as an experimental tool.

- **Relationship quality**: the measurement of the relational behaviors in building and maintaining long-term relations (Crosby, Evans, & Cowles, 1990). As the marketing trend makes an emphasis on the continuous relationship between both business partners such as buyers and sellers, the quality of relationship has been accepted for the success of marketing strategy. The craze of Customer Relationship Management (CRM) during past several years can be the good example in this trend. The concept of service quality consists of both a

---
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transactional nature – it can be described as impersonal, discrete, episodic exchange – and relational nature – close, enduring, interdependent associations (Crosby et al., 1990). This study separates the latter nature from the service quality. Accordingly, the relationship quality will be defined as the measurement of the relational behaviors such as cooperative intentions, contact intensity, and mutual disclosure in building and maintaining long-term relations while the service quality will focus on the short-term and direct sales (Crosby et al., 1990). To assess the degree of relationship quality, some researchers developed the RELQUAL scale which reflected 1) the amount of information sharing, 2) communication quality of the relationship, 3) long-term relationship orientation, and 4) satisfaction with relationship (Lages, Lages, & Lages, 2004).

In this study, the aforementioned four dimensions are composed of the independent variables to the dependent variable, user satisfaction. These variables will be explained more in detail in the literature review chapter.
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The objective of this literature review is to better understand website evaluation, website quality factors, and the importance of appropriate content items of the trade show websites. This review will first describe studies on website evaluation in hospitality websites, followed by website quality factors studies. The main content items in trade show websites will be suggested by comparing other types of websites in the trade show industry. Finally, a framework will be developed on what elements of a trade show website can be applied to measure the quality of the websites.

Website Evaluation

Importance of Website Evaluation

With the advent of the Information Age, websites are widely used for information seeking and as an electronic commerce tool. It is no exaggeration to say that markets, industries, and businesses are dramatically being transformed by the Internet. Accordingly, many researchers have claimed the importance of a website when conducting business. Chen and Yen (2004) stated that many marketers regarded a website as the fourth marketing channel because of its potential to attract, engage, and involve visitors. They estimated that the number of online users all over the world would
be more than 760 million by the end of the year 2005. Online businesses are increasing and websites are the most effective way to gain access to new customers and reinforce the portfolio of the service being offered to existing customers (Chiu, Hsieh, & Kao, 2005).

While millions of dollars were spent on website development, website performance and evaluation were often neglected. Little thought of how to evaluate the effectiveness in fulfilling specific organizational goals was given (Morrison, Taylor, & Douglas, 2004). Accordingly, experts have emphasized the importance of website evaluation. For example, Tierney (2000) mentions that the evaluation of website effectiveness is necessary because of significant costs for setup, advertising, and maintenance.

Hong and Kim (2004) suggested three requirements for website usability evaluation criteria. First, the criteria have to have strong theoretical foundations to be comprehensive for the purpose of not missing any important aspects of the usability of websites. Second, empirical validation is needed to be in accordance with the intention of measurement and reliability of results. Third, the criteria can be applied to different types of websites even though the effectiveness of specific evaluation criteria may be considerably different according to the types of websites. These requirements cast light on the study for making a step towards setting up the objective of the study.

Website Evaluation Studies in Hospitality Industry

Numerous studies have been carried out to assess the quality factors of websites in the tourism and hospitality industry. However, most of the studies dealt with tourism bureau websites which were relatively well-developed. Morrison et al.'s study (2004) is
a good example of content analysis for hospitality and tourism websites. They summarize website evaluation studies in tabular form on the basis of the following factors: approach and authors, industry sector focus and geographic area, method, and evaluators/evaluations. Morrison et al. provide the basic theoretical foundations for this study, but more detailed factors derived from our literature review are used for the framework of this study, as shown in Table 1.

Despite various attempts in evaluating website quality factors, most of the studies do not provide universal criteria to evaluate the website quality factors. Even though Morrison et al. (2004) provided a general framework in the name of critical success factors (CSFs), groups of customers were not included in their experimental tool, the Balanced Scorecard (BSC) approach. As Chiu et al. (2005) stated in their study, the quality of a website should be assessed by its customers, especially for measuring user satisfaction.

While many valuable frameworks for the evaluation of website quality were found in the studies of hospitality areas, more universal criteria are needed for measuring the website quality factors. Therefore, the website quality model proposed in a previous study (Han, 2006) was adopted in this study, which was established on the basis of DeLone and McLean IS Success Model (2004) by adding the new quality factor – relationship quality. While Han’s model can provide a universal criteria for evaluating websites, this study provides an opportunity to apply his general model to websites in a specific industry i.e. trade shows.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors (Year)</th>
<th>Quality measurement</th>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Limitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mills &amp; Morrisson (2003)</td>
<td>- Clarity</td>
<td>- Expected quality</td>
<td>Self administered</td>
<td>- Low response rate (4.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Completeness</td>
<td>- Expected value</td>
<td>online survey</td>
<td>- No follow up, 71% female respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Ease of use</td>
<td>- Purchase attraction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feng, Morrison, &amp; Ismail (2003)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Effective as a destination marketing tool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim, Morrison, &amp; Mills (2003)</td>
<td>Four perspectives</td>
<td>Effectiveness of convention centers websites as a</td>
<td>BSC Approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for CSFs</td>
<td>communication medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So &amp; Morrison (2003)</td>
<td>Four perspectives</td>
<td>The improvement status of the websites</td>
<td>Modified BSC</td>
<td>- Measuring intangible outcomes (CSFs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Technical</td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation by online</td>
<td>- Subjective conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td>outsourced company</td>
<td>- Not control other variables such as cultural differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Internal</td>
<td></td>
<td>(technical perspective)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Customer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuan, Gretzel, &amp; Fesenmaier (2003)</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Extent</td>
<td>Stage1: telephone</td>
<td>- Discontinuation of technical evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>interview</td>
<td>- Short period time (1 year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stage2: mail survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrison, Taylor, &amp; Douglas (2004)</td>
<td>CSFs (critical</td>
<td>Effectiveness of hospitality and tourism websites</td>
<td>Modified BSC (balanced</td>
<td>No unified evaluation procedure (no single measure, or perspective)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>success factors),</td>
<td></td>
<td>scorecard approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by four perspectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Technical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Internal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Customer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Destination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ha &amp; Love (2005)</td>
<td>- Information</td>
<td>Effectiveness of content and design of CVB websites</td>
<td>- Email survey to</td>
<td>- Self-administered study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>quality</td>
<td></td>
<td>PCMA &amp; MPI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Ease of use</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Using EFA, CFA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Business processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and Interactivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tourism Bureau Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors (Year)</th>
<th>Site content</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Limitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Web page design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Marketing information</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Not control other variables such as cultural differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Technical quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feng, Morrison, &amp; Ismail (2003)</td>
<td>- Marketing strategy</td>
<td>Modified balanced scorecard</td>
<td>- Measuring intangible outcomes (CSFs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Web page design</td>
<td>(BSC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Marketing information</td>
<td>ANOVA (Data analysis)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Technical quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So &amp; Morrison (2003)</td>
<td>Four perspectives</td>
<td>The improvement status of</td>
<td>- Discontinuation of technical evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Technical</td>
<td>the websites</td>
<td>- Short period time (1 year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Internal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Customer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ha &amp; Love (2005)</td>
<td>- Information quality</td>
<td>Effectiveness of content</td>
<td>- Nature and size of sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Ease of use</td>
<td>and design of CVB websites</td>
<td>- Self-reported questionnaire (hidden bias &amp; undiscovered variation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Business processes and Interactivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
### Other sectors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liu (2003)</td>
<td>- Active control - Two-way communication - Synchronicity</td>
<td>Questionnaire survey to undergraduate student</td>
<td>Only student participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen &amp; Yen</td>
<td>- Reciprocal - Playfulness - Choice - Connectedness - Information</td>
<td>Interactivity</td>
<td>- Only homepages were considered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2004)</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Descriptive statistics - ANOVA - Survey</td>
<td>- Simple counting mechanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong &amp; Kim</td>
<td>- Users' goals - User's activity - Robustness - Utility - Aesthetic</td>
<td>- User satisfaction - Loyalty</td>
<td>Self-selection data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2004)</td>
<td>appeal</td>
<td>- Online survey - Multi-Dimensional Scaling (MDS) analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiu, Hsieh,</td>
<td>- Connectivity, - Information quality - Interactivity,</td>
<td>Customer’s behavioral intention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; Kao (2005)</td>
<td>- Playfulness - Learning</td>
<td>Field Survey</td>
<td>External validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hassan &amp; Li</td>
<td>- Usability (consistency, screen appearance, content, accessibility,</td>
<td>Website effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2005)</td>
<td>navigation, media use, interactivity)</td>
<td>- Content analysis - Expert review</td>
<td>- Only tested on political website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Only deal with objective web criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Only deal with usability content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>usefulness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: based on Morrison, Taylor, & Douglas, 2004)

### Factors of Website Success

*Modified Factors for the Study*

Huizingh (2002) evaluated the performance of websites in terms of the number of visitors and the managerial satisfaction with the website. The results showed that both performance indicators referred to different dimensions of website performance and that they were influenced by different antecedents. The results also indicated that the performance of websites was really influenced by most antecedents identified in literature. Multivariate analyses indicated that customization of the website was an important determinant of both web performance indicators.
Many other researchers have identified the factors of website success. For example, Palmer (2002) considered frequency of use, user satisfaction, and intent to return as all elements of website success. Liu and Arnett (2000) claimed that information and service quality, system use, playfulness, and system design are significantly related to website success.

However, out of many studies, DeLone & McLean Information Systems Success Model is accepted as one of the most comprehensive frameworks for measuring the performance of information systems. DeLone and McLean (2003) created a more elaborate model than the one they had presented under the name of DeLone & McLean Information Systems Success Model (D & M IS Success Model) in 1992. While the original model provided only two constructs – system quality and information quality – as the independent variables in their six interrelated dimensions of information systems success, the updated model included the addition of service quality for the purpose of reflecting the significance of service in successful business. Therefore, the upgraded model has three independent variables such as system quality, information quality, and service quality. The updated D & M IS Success Model is shown in Figure 1.

Although this model is one of the most elaborate models in Management Information Systems area, the application to the trade show website success needs some modification. First, this study focuses on user satisfaction which can be related to an overall trade show success beyond just its website success. Consequently, user satisfaction is the only dependent variable that shows the correlation with the aforementioned quality factors – independent variables.
Moreover, the relatively recent advent of the relationship marketing paradigm in modern marketing stimulates active debate on the increasing importance of the concept (Berry, 1995). While "transactional" marketing focuses on attracting and satisfying new customers, relationship marketing makes an emphasis on building relationships with clients in the long-term basis. In other words, the goal is to establish, develop, and maintain a meaningful relationship with any kind of customers (Bennette & Barkensjo, 2005). A website is regarded as an important marketing communication tool for trade shows, thus building the long-term relationship is more important than the transaction in the websites. Therefore, the relationship quality is added as the fourth independent variable to see the correlation with the user satisfaction (Han, 2006). Accordingly, the revised framework is used in the study as shown in Figure 2. The dotted box indicates the scope on which this study concentrated for the purpose of measuring the correlation between the variables.
According to this model, the explanation regarding these four quality factors - system, information, service, and relationship will be presented in the following sections.

**System Quality**

Since DeLone and Mclean (1992) introduce Shannon and Weaver’s study, which mentions that information systems success can be measured at diverse levels such as the technical level, the semantic level, and the effectiveness level, this categorization has been the basis of following studies. They define the technical level as “the accuracy and efficiency of the system which produces the information”, the semantic level as “the success of the information in conveying the intended meaning”, and the effectiveness level as “the effect of the information on the receiver” (DeLone & McLean, 1992, p.61).
In consideration of the nature of websites, any valuable content is useless if users feel inconvenienced when they access the website. For example, users cannot be satisfied with a server problem that makes them wait a long time when they navigate webpages on the website to search for information. Therefore, the technical matters may be accepted as important factors to measure user satisfaction.

Many researchers mention numerous items of system quality, but it is hard to conclude what is the standard categorization. DeLone and McLean (2004) presented system quality measures as follows: usability (or ease of use), download time, system responsiveness (or response time), dependability (or reliability), usefulness (or functionality), interactivity, and so on. In this study, the most tangible factors were selected for measuring the satisfaction levels of the factors. Therefore, the questions about the dependability of system, response time, downtime, and missing links were chosen by the factor analysis from Han's study (2006).

**Information Quality**

Ducoffe (1996) defines information quality as the ability to inform the consumers about product choices, and provides the factors of relevant product information, timely information, up-to-date product information, immediate access to information, convenient source of product information, and complete product information to measure the dimension of information quality. DeLone and McLean (2004) add three factors – dynamic content, content personalization, and variety of information to the existing information quality factors that they presented for the traditional MIS success measures as follows: accuracy, relevance, understandability, completeness, currency, and competitive intelligence.
The information quality dimension in this study indicates the online customer’s relative perception about the excellence of information offered by the trade show websites (DeLone & McLean, 2003). That is, the information quality dimension evaluates whether the trade show websites provide clear information about the identity and location of the exhibitors, products offered, business policy (or show rule), conference (or seminar) information.

In order to measure the perception of attendees, five sub-dimensions are selected from Han’s study (2006). These are understandability, readability, usefulness, clarity, and relevance of information.

**Service Quality**

Since any type of website in the business area is forced to have a role of not only “information provider” but also “service provider”, most websites seek out profitable ways to make themselves different from other sites and gain a competitive edge by increasing relative service quality. Accordingly, a website providing higher quality of service may get more visitors and higher return on investment and, in the end, can obtain long-term profitability (Ghobadian, Speller, & Jones, 1994).

Consequently, it is important that practitioners and academics understand what service quality consists of, its definition, and how service quality can be accurately measured. There have been various definitions of service quality. Ghobadian et al. (1994) suggest five categories as the classification of service quality such as “1) quality as innate excellence, 2) quality as the units of goodness packed into a product or service, 3) quality as conformance to requirement, 4) quality as satisfying consumer’s requirement, and 5) quality as meeting the customer’s requirements in terms of quality,
price, and availability” (pp. 47-49). Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry (1988) define service quality as the degree and direction caused by the comparison between consumer expectation and actual satisfaction of service performance. They also explain the concept of consumer expectation from the service quality perspective as: “desires or wants of consumers, what they feel a service provider should offer rather than would offer” (Parasuraman et al., p.17).

Out of numerous definitions of service quality, the transactional nature of the quality is focused in this study because the quality should be related to the satisfaction of website customers. According to Parasuraman et al. (1988), perceived service quality is universal judgment or attitude about the pre-eminence of the service while satisfaction is related to a specific transaction. Consequently, the range of service quality in this study is restricted to the area of short-term transactions which is related to direct sales. The long-term relationship between the website and its visitors – usually attendees of a trade show will be mentioned in the relationship quality.

**Relationship Quality**

Due to the Internet technology, network-based relations through websites can serve relationship marketing goals. The concept of relationship marketing is quite different from the transaction-based approach (so-called “4 Ps” marketing mix). According to Boone and Kurtz (1999), it is clearly compared with the transaction marketing, as shown in the Table 2.

Transaction-based marketing involves buyer and seller exchanges characterized by limited communication and few continuing relationships between two of them (Boone & Kurtz, 1999). The focus of the marketing is mainly attracting a buyer to make a
purchase based on reasons such as low price, convenience, packaging, or similar inducements. The current shift of marketing for many organizations is to focus on a new approach to creating long-term relationship with customers.

Table 2

Comparing Transaction-based and Relationship Marketing Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Transaction marketing</th>
<th>Relationship marketing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time orientation</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational goal</td>
<td>Make the sale</td>
<td>Emphasis on retaining customer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer service priority</td>
<td>Relatively low</td>
<td>Key component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer contact</td>
<td>Low to moderate</td>
<td>Frequent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of customer commitment</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basis for seller-customer interactions</td>
<td>Conflict manipulation</td>
<td>Co-operation: trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of quality</td>
<td>Primarily from production</td>
<td>Company-wide commitment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Boone & Kurtz, 1999, p.335)

This trend is noteworthy in website marketing. For example, online book stores like Amazon.com use book reviews in cyber space for communication among users. Websites provide a lot of benefits for their users without regard to the direct sales. These benefits create a new level of social interaction between users and the websites. The interaction forms trust that ultimately contributes to sales in the long-term basis. Trust reflects the extent of one party’s (usually customers’) confidence that it can rely on the other’s truthfulness (Boone & Kurtz, 1999). Even though it can be claimed that “relationship quality” is only a sub-category of “service quality,” the changes in the role
of websites over the decade argue for a separate variable – the “relationship quality”
dimension.

Crosby, Evans, and Cowles (1990) indicate that high relationship quality means
the customer’s reliance on the salesperson’s integrity and confidence in the salesperson’s
upcoming performance owing to the consistent satisfaction of the previous performance.
They suggest two dimensions of the relationship quality as follows: “1) trust in the
salesperson and 2) satisfaction with salesperson” (Crosby et al., 1990, p.70). However, it
is too broad and focused on the relationship between buyer and seller in the traditional
sales area, but the principle that the relationship quality can be achieved through the
salesperson’s ability to lessen the uncertainty perceived by customers. Therefore, the
following factors are selected as the elements of the relationship quality in a website
through the result of factor analysis in Han’s study (2006) and discussions: 1) feeling of
safety by protecting against identity theft, 2) comfortable cyber place to meet other users,
3) perception that a website provides trust, 4) relief from the danger of transaction
security, 5) feeling that a website meets specific user needs, and 6) existence of adequate
contact information.

Main Content Items in Trade Show Websites

Ha and Love (2005) introduced 22 content items of convention and visitors
bureaus (CVBs) website based on a content analysis of the top 10 convention cities. The
items can be classified into four groups as follows: 1) general information
(accommodation information, hotel and meeting facilities information, information for
convention attendees, press release, recreation activities information, safety and security
information), 2) CVB information (general information of CVB service, area map, 
convention calendar, convention hot dates, virtual tour of convention facilities, 
convention vendor information), 3) destination information (attraction information, 
description of destination, destination statistics shopping information, transportation 
information, virtual tour of the city, and weather information), and 4) online 
communication (convention service request form, online brochure, online Request for 
Proposal).

Myung, Morrison, and Taylor (2005) also present the major 21 categories for the 
Convention and Exhibition (CE) center websites. They are divided into two dimensions 
as CE center information and general mix information. Each dimension has 11 items and 
10 items separately for the comparison between the Convention and Tourism Bureau 
(CVB) websites and Convention and Exhibition (CE) center websites.

As this study concentrates on trade show websites from the user – especially 
attendee – perspective, it is not appropriate that these lists are applied directly to the trade 
show websites. Despite the limitation of application, these two lists highlight the 
important information categories in the convention industry. The benchmarking of the 
content items will establish the foundation of main content items in trade show website 
for the purpose of measuring the correlation between the items and user satisfaction.
Table 3

Main Content Items in CE Centre Websites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>CE Center Information</th>
<th>General Mix Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Items</td>
<td>Sales and services for meeting planners</td>
<td>Lodging/ accommodation facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Online form for request for proposal (RFP)</td>
<td>Restaurant/ foodservice facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CE center facilities</td>
<td>Shopping facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Room capacities/ configurations of the facilities</td>
<td>Entertainment/ nightlife facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical facilities in the CE center</td>
<td>Transportation facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjacent car parking facilities</td>
<td>Maps/ directions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Food and beverage (catering) services</td>
<td>Destination’s attractions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disabled visitors to the CE centre</td>
<td>Festivals or events in the destination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CE’s calendar or schedule of upcoming events</td>
<td>Suggested tour itineraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CE contacts for sales/ marketing</td>
<td>Travel tips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facility documents be downloaded from the site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Myung, Morrison, & Taylor, 2005, p.55)

A Framework for Measuring Quality of Trade Show Websites

As stated previously, the research framework in this study is established on the basis of the DeLone and McLean model (2004) and Han (2006). From the classification of the quality types, the elements (or characteristics) of a trade show website are shown in Table 4.

Because these elements are from the various literatures regardless of the trade show industry, some elements may not be appropriate for measuring the trade show website quality. Therefore, some characteristics are not included in the questionnaire through the factor analysis of a pretest and discussion with experts in the trade show industry.
Table 4

Website Characteristics Identified for Each Quality Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Types</th>
<th>Website Characteristics</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>System Quality</td>
<td>Usability, ease of use</td>
<td>Spiller &amp; Lohse (1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Download time</td>
<td>Spiller &amp; Lohse (1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>System responsiveness</td>
<td>Molla &amp; Licker (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dependability, reliability</td>
<td>Liu &amp; Arnett (2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Usefulness</td>
<td>Palmer (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interactivity</td>
<td>Palmer (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Quality</td>
<td>Accuracy, clarity</td>
<td>Molla &amp; Licker (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>Molla &amp; Licker (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understandability</td>
<td>Molla &amp; Licker (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completeness</td>
<td>Palmer (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Currency</td>
<td>Molla &amp; Licker (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Competitive intelligence</td>
<td>Teo &amp; Choo (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dynamic content</td>
<td>Parsons et al. (1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content personalization</td>
<td>Molla &amp; Licker (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variety of information</td>
<td>Palmer (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Quality</td>
<td>Tangibles</td>
<td>Parasuraman et al. (1988)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assurance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Quality</td>
<td>Interaction intensity</td>
<td>Crosby et al. (1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agent disclosure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Customer disclosure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cooperative intentions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfaction with salesperson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trust in salesperson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anticipation of future interaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion

This chapter examined relevant literature in website evaluation criteria, and success factors of quality that help in creating efficient trade show websites were also...
discussed. The categorization examples of website menus in the convention industry are presented to explain appropriate content items for trade show websites. Based on the literature reviewed in this chapter, four dimensions of website quality factors are developed as follows: system quality, information quality, service quality, and relationship quality.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter presents the procedures and methodology used to construct the study. The chapter is divided into the following sections: a) Introduction, b) Research Hypotheses, c) Population and Sample, d) Research Design, e) Survey Instrument, f) Data Collection, g) Data Analysis, and h) Conclusion.

The purpose of this research was to survey trade show attendees who use the websites in their business and rate their satisfaction regarding specific factors of the websites. A researcher-designed survey was posted on Zoomerang (www.zoomerang.com), an online survey website. An email invitation letter was sent to the attendees of a specific trade show -- World Tea Expo, which was held in Las Vegas on March 27-29, 2006. The letter contained a hyperlink to the survey instrument for online completion and submission. A follow-up letter was sent a week later to express thanks to respondents, request non-respondents to participate in the survey, and notice that the survey was closing shortly.

Research Hypotheses

The survey was divided into two parts. In Part I (Question 1) of the survey, the satisfaction of the quality factors, derived from the previous literature, on the World Tea
Expo website was asked to see if correlations exist between each quality factor and the overall satisfaction of the website. Then, in Part II (Question 2), the content items of the website were tested to find out if the satisfaction of the items were related to the overall satisfaction of the website. To measure the correlation with the previous two questions, the overall satisfaction of the website was tested in the form of four different statements. Therefore, the following hypotheses were established to test the relationships.

H1: System quality factors will have a positive effect on the overall satisfaction of the website.

H2: Information quality factors will have a positive effect on the overall satisfaction of the website.

H3: Service quality factors will have a positive effect on the overall satisfaction of the website.

H4: Relationship quality factors will have a positive effect on the overall satisfaction of the website.

H5: There is a positive relationship between the satisfaction of website content items and the overall satisfaction of the website.

Multiple regression analysis identified which quality factor influenced the overall satisfaction most and which content items were most correlated to the overall satisfaction.

Population and Sample

Population

The population of this study was composed of expected attendees of the World Tea Expo. The World Tea Expo was held on March 27-29, 2006 in Las Vegas. Show
management expected that the number of their attendees would be approximately 2,500. The population was chosen because the World Tea Expo could be considered as a typical medium-sized trade show in Las Vegas (Las Vegas Leisure Guide, 2005).

Sample

This survey used nonprobability sampling. To protect privacy of World Tea Expo attendees, the emailing list was not provided to the authors directly. Show management sent the invitation email and reminder email to the attendees. Because the survey was performed before the opening of the trade show, the sample of the study was restricted to the attendees who already pre-registered online.

Like other Internet surveys, the survey was conducted with volunteer respondents who received the invitation email from the show management and visited the online survey website. Thus, it was a convenience sample and respondents may not be representative due to self-selection bias. Despite this limitation, this type of sampling method was effective because the target population was defined as users to a particular website – World Tea Expo website. Zikmund (2003) mentions that “evaluation and analysis of visitors’ perceptions and experience of the website would be a typical survey objective with this type of sample” (p.395). The proposed sample size was a minimum of 250 usable surveys and the survey was closed once achieved.

Research Design

Variables Studied

The four quality factors of the website (in Part I) were independent variables. From Han’s study (2006) performed for checking the validity of the characteristics of
website, these 19 sub-questions were selected: four questions for system quality factor, five questions for information quality factor, four questions for service quality factor, and six questions for relationship quality factor.

The main content items of trade show websites (in Part II) were categorized according to the search of top four trade show websites in Las Vegas. These are SEMA (Specialty Equipment Manufacturer Association: www.semashow.com), CES (Consumer Electronics Show: www.cesweb.org), MAGIC (Man’s Apparel Guild in California: www.magiconline.com), and WOC (World of Concrete Exposition: www.worldofconcrete.com) on the basis of the number of attendees (over 80,000 persons).

World Tea Expo management accepted the proposal of this study and permitted the survey to their attendees. The categories to be used in Question 2 were selected by the discussion with the management as follows: conference information, general information, exhibitor list, product search, online registration, resource center, show management information, and sponsor’s links.

To measure the overall satisfaction, four different sub-questions were adopted from the questionnaire of QuadGem Inc. website evaluation report (SurveySite Inc., 2000). For the multiple regression analysis, the average ratings of the four statements were used as the measurement of the dependent variable in this study.

At the World Tea Expo management’s request, an open-ended question was added to the questionnaire for obtaining additional comments or suggestions. The results were content analyzed.
Survey Instrument

The survey instrument was posted on the Worldwide Web. The online survey software, zPro was used as the template of Web survey. This survey instrument was based on Han’s Study (2006) and revised through the discussion with the professors at UNLV’s William F. Harrah College of Hotel Administration. The draft questionnaire was also revised from comments made in a meeting with World Tea Expo management.

The final form of the survey had a total of 37 questions within nine major questions. Question 1 had 19 sub-questions, Question 2 had eight sub-questions, and Question 3 had four sub-questions whereas other questions had only one sub-question each. Most of the questions were composed of multiple-choice type questions except for one open-ended. All questions in Question 1, 2, and 3 were answered on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from “Highly Dissatisfied” to “Highly Satisfied” (Question 1 and 2) and “Strongly Disagree” to “Strongly Agree” (Question 3). Question 4 had a textbox that allowed the respondent to share any additional comments, although it was not mandatory.

Once the survey was activated, the invitation email was sent by the show management to the registered attendees for the purpose of soliciting their participation in the survey. The email invitation letter contained a hyperlink, which took the respondents directly to the survey on their computer. The subjects completed the survey online, clicked the submit button, and the response was stored electronically on Zoomerang. The Zoomerang system allowed results to be viewed in real-time.

To increase the response rate, show management offered an incentive to the respondents. The incentive offer was inserted into the Web greeting page and thank you page as well as into the invitation email as follows: “Participation in our research also
entitles you to enter a drawing for a total value of over $500 package pass including exhibit hall entrance and complete conference in 2007.”

Data Collection

Data was compiled from the launch (March 14, 2006) to closing (March 22, 2006). As stated in the instrument cover letter – Web greeting page, participation was voluntary and respondents were encouraged to complete by March 22, 2006 by the notice of closing in the follow-up email.

In total, 1,126 email invitation letters were sent to all of the registered attendees and the follow-up letters were sent to encourage the attendees to respond a week later. Five-hundred-ninety-nine attendees visited the survey questionnaire page and 369 attendees among them completed the survey. However, it is hard to conclude that exactly 569 attendees visited the survey website because each visit would be counted separately if an attendee visited the survey site several times without completing the survey. Thus, the response rate of the survey was 32.8% (369/1126).

Data Analysis

The data analysis was mainly conducted by the Statistical Packages for Social Sciences® (version 13.0) except for the qualitative analysis of the open-ended question. The multiple choice responses were compiled into an Excel table provided by Zoomerang. That table was used to input the SPSS for statistical analysis.
The first part of data analysis dealt with a profile of respondents based on the background information in the end of the survey. Descriptive statistics were run to describe sample characteristics and demographic profile.

Second, data of the first question (Question 1) and the third question were used for multiple regression analysis to test the hypotheses that the quality factors have positive effect on the overall satisfaction of the website. Moreover, the most influential factor to the user satisfaction was suggested by the comparison of the figure of correlation.

The third part of the data analysis involved the main content items of trade show website. In this part, the multiple regression analysis was also performed to see how the satisfaction of particular contents affects the overall satisfaction of the website.

Finally, a qualitative analysis was performed to interpret the customers’ opinions about their experience which the questionnaire didn’t cover. As a content analysis, the responses to the open-ended question were grouped according to the general nature of the responses and frequencies of those described responses were counted (see Appendix C).

Conclusion

This chapter described the research hypotheses, sampling, survey design and instrument, data collection administration, and data analysis. The findings from the survey are presented in Chapter IV. Then, the discussion, managerial implications and recommendations are mentioned in Chapter V.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

This chapter presents the findings from the analysis of data collected in this study. The data was analyzed to identify whether the quality factors affect the satisfaction level of a trade show website by using multiple regression models. In other words, the data was analyzed to determine if there were correlations between the satisfaction of particular quality factors and overall satisfaction. The ranks of the factors were indicated in terms of the contribution to the overall user satisfaction. With the same analysis tool, the impact of content items of the website on the overall satisfaction was measured.

The profile of the subjects is described first. Then, the overall results of multiple linear regression models are discussed. Furthermore, the results of analysis of variance (ANOVA) and an independent-samples t-test are discussed to see the significant difference between groups of each attribute of the subjects. Next, the results of regression models between two different gender groups are discussed. Finally, a content analysis is used to examine the answers to the open-ended question.

Profile of the Subjects

The population for this study includes attendees of the World Tea Expo who visited the trade show website. There were 599 attendees who visited the web
questionnaire page and 369 respondents completed the survey during the online survey period. Thus, from the 1,126 invitation emails sent, the response rate was 32.8%.

Approximately 88% of attendees who participated in this study have used the Internet for more than 5 years. Among these participants, 46.6% (172 respondents) answered that they have used the Internet for 5-10 years and 41.5% (153 respondents) have experience with the Internet for more than 10 years (see Table 5).

With regard to the average use of the Internet in hours for business purposes per week, 26.6% of the respondents are using the Internet at least half of their business hours for their average working hours per week are usually 40 hours. As shown in Table 6, 15.2% of the respondents use the Internet for 15-20 hours per week, 16.3% use it for 10-15 hours per week, 26.0% use it for 5-10 hours per week, and 14.6% use it for 1-5 hours. Only 1.4% of them seldom use the Internet (less than an hour per week).

Participants in this study reported a variety of access patterns to the website. Approximately 30% of respondents visited the website at least once a week while cumulatively 75% came to the site at least once a month. Approximately 25% of respondents visited less than once a month including first time visitors (see Table 7).

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience with the Internet</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than a year</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year to 5 years</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years to 10 years</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10 years</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 6

*Average Hours of Using the Internet for Business Purposes in a Week*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How many hours</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than an hour</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 5 hours</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 10 hours</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 15 hours</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 20 hours</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20 hours</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>369</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7

*Frequency of Access to World Tea Expo Website*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least once a day</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-6 times per week</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once or twice a week</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 times per month</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once or twice a month</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less often than once a month</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is my first time</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>369</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The age of the respondents was divided into five different groups: 3.5% were included in the range of 21 to 25 years old, 15.4% were 26 to 35 years old, 32.5% were 36 to 45 years old, 30.1% were 46 to 55 years old, and 18.4% were over 55 years old (see Table 8). The sample was composed of 284 (77%) females and 85 (23%) males as depicted in Table 9.
Table 8

**Age of Respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21–25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26–35</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36–45</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46–55</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 55</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9

**Gender of Respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>77.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of the Data

**Reliability and Validity Tests**

The reliability in this study was measured by the reliability analysis on SPSS 13.0. Cronbach’s alpha was computed to assess the reliabilities of the factors which were composed of combined characteristics (Norusis, 2004). The Cronbach’s alpha index, the coefficient of reliability, ranges from 0 to 1. A higher alpha value means a higher internal consistency, which means the measurement has homogeneity among the combined answers of the questions (Zikmund, 2003). The results in Table 10 show that the reliability alpha values, ranging from 0.891 for Relationship Quality Factor to 0.929 for Information Quality Factor, are acceptable because the generally agreed lower limit of the
alpha value is 0.80 in most social science applications (UCLA Academic Technology Services, 2005). All the variables had acceptable alpha values, which were, in fact, excellent values very close to 1 (see Table 10).

Face (content) validity means the subjective agreement that a scale logically appears to adequately measure what it purports to measure (Zikmund, 2003). The factor’s content validity was established through the painstaking process of developing the questionnaire and theoretical support from the review of the related literature.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>No. of Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>System Quality Factor</td>
<td>.893</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>.669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Quality Factor</td>
<td>.929</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>.665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Quality Factor</td>
<td>.914</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>.731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Quality Factor</td>
<td>.891</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>.681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Overall) Satisfaction</td>
<td>.939</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>.755</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Preliminary Steps for Multiple Regression Analysis

The correlation between a dependent variable and an independent variable can be proved by simple linear regression analysis. In most real-life situations, however, it is next to impossible that only one independent variable is enough to predict the values of a dependent variable (Norusis, 2004). The dependent variable of this study, user satisfaction of a trade show website, is also affected by its various elements. Therefore, a multiple linear regression analysis was performed to test the hypotheses of this study.
This statistical technique explains two main requisites about the distribution of each variable and the association between the variables (Norusis, 2004).

Before the multiple linear regression analysis was performed, individual composite variables were made for each quality factor category. The items of each category were computed and transformed into a single variable by the SPSS program. As mentioned in the previous chapter, the independent variables of this study in Part I consisted of four quality factors: system quality, information quality, service quality, and relationship quality. That is, the responses of dependability, response time, downtime, and missing links were combined into one separate variable as system quality. Understandability, readability, usefulness, clarity, and relevance of information were combined into an individual variable as information quality. The responses about appealing visual, neat structure, generating user confidence, and prompt service were combined into a separate variable as service quality. Finally, the measurements of safe feeling, comfortable place to meet other users, a feeling of trust, a feeling of transaction security, and adequate contact information were combined into one separate variable as relationship quality.

There are some assumptions that the data should satisfy when the regression analysis is performed: linearity, normality, independence of observations, constant variance, and multicollinearity (Norusis, 2004). All data were examined for outliers, and scatter plots were reviewed for nonlinear distributions and relationships. Linearity was confirmed by producing all partial plots. Histograms and normal probability plots were checked for normal distribution in each performance as well. The independence assumption was tested to make sure that there was no relationship between the
observations in the different groups and between the observations within the same group. The Durbin-Watson test was checked in each case for the independence of observations. This statistic, ranging from 0 to 4, should be close to 2 if there is no correlation between adjacent observations. Because most of the observed values are close to 2 (between 1.5 and 2.5 as a rule of thumb), there is no significant violation of this assumption (Norušis, 2004). The constant variance was verified by plotting studentized residuals against the predicted values since there was no pattern in the data points (Norušis, 2004). Finally, analysis of variance inflation factors (VIF) and the value of tolerance (the reciprocal of VIF) were tested for a linear combination among independent variables, so-called multicollinearity (Berenson, Levine, & Krehbiel, 2004). In conclusion, all the assumptions for the regression analysis were checked and none of them were violated.

Hypotheses Testing for Website Quality Factors

The first four hypotheses were built to examine the effect of the website quality factors on user satisfaction of a trade show website. Multiple linear regression analysis was run with overall satisfaction as the dependent variable and the four composite independent variables, which was created by combining the items into each quality factor. Based on regression of quality factors versus user satisfaction, the following hypotheses are supported:

H1: System quality factors will have a positive effect on the overall satisfaction of the website.

H2: Information quality factors will have a positive effect on the overall satisfaction of the website.
H3: Service quality factors will have a positive effect on the overall satisfaction of the website.

H4: Relationship quality factors will have a positive effect on the overall satisfaction of the website.

Table 11
Descriptive Statistics for Regression of Website Quality Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>4.2445</td>
<td>.75490</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Quality</td>
<td>4.2729</td>
<td>.66867</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Quality</td>
<td>4.3537</td>
<td>.66527</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Quality</td>
<td>4.1703</td>
<td>.73107</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Quality</td>
<td>3.8734</td>
<td>.68147</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12
Regression Analysis of Website Quality Factors (N=229, Stepwise Method)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Durbin-Watson</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F Statistics</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.754(a)</td>
<td>.569</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>299.992</td>
<td>.000(a)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.787(b)</td>
<td>.620</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>184.055</td>
<td>.000(b)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.798(c)</td>
<td>.636</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>131.052</td>
<td>.000(c)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.804(d)</td>
<td>.646</td>
<td>2.056</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>102.368</td>
<td>.000(d)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Dependent Variable - Satisfaction, *p< .05.

a) Predictors: (Constant), InfoQual,
b) Predictors: (Constant), InfoQual, ServQual,
c) Predictors: (Constant), InfoQual, ServQual, RelQual
d) Predictors: (Constant), InfoQual, ServQual, RelQual, SysQual
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Table 13

Regression Coefficients of Website Quality Factors (N=229)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InfoQual</td>
<td>.381</td>
<td>.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ServQual</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RelQual</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SysQual</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>.078</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p<.05.

As can be seen in Table 12, these four quality factors are the predictors of the regression model. This means that all quality factors have the relationship with the dependent variable, the overall satisfaction of users. According to Model 4, the absolute value of the correlation coefficient (R) between the website quality factors and user satisfaction is 0.804. From this regression model, 64.6% of variability in observed user satisfaction (R²) is explained by these quality factors. The results indicate that the model was significant (p< 0.05). Thus, these four hypotheses support the conclusion that there is a positive relation between website quality factors and user satisfaction.

Table 13 shows that the result of each of the factors is related to user satisfaction respectively. Therefore, information quality is the most powerful predictor of this model (p< 0.05, \( \beta = .336, t = 4.613 \)) while other factors also turn out to be significant. In other words, information quality has more effect on overall user satisfaction than other qualities when a unit of change occurs in a quality factor without any change of other factors.
Hypotheses Testing for Website Content Items

The last hypothesis is the relationship between the satisfaction of website content items and overall user satisfaction of a trade show website. In Question 2, eight categories of content items were asked to measure the level of satisfaction, and these eight sub-questions turned into the independent variables. Based on the regression of content items versus user satisfaction, the following hypothesis is supported:

H5: There is a positive relationship between the satisfaction of website content items and the overall satisfaction of the website.

Table 14

Descriptive Statistics for Regression of Website Content Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>4.3161</td>
<td>.76380</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Info</td>
<td>4.2097</td>
<td>.84258</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Info</td>
<td>4.2161</td>
<td>.83321</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibitor List</td>
<td>4.1645</td>
<td>.88242</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Search</td>
<td>3.8258</td>
<td>.96976</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Registration</td>
<td>4.3548</td>
<td>.81445</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Center</td>
<td>4.1161</td>
<td>.85108</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Show Management Info</td>
<td>4.0548</td>
<td>.84392</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsors’ Links</td>
<td>3.9452</td>
<td>.88874</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As can be seen in Table 15, only four content items such as General Information, Resource Center, Exhibitor List, and Online Registration are significant in this regression model. In other words, the rest of the four items – Conference Information, Product Search, Show Management Information, and Sponsors’ Links – have no significant effect on the dependent variable, the overall satisfaction of users, in this model. According to
Model 4 in Table 14, the absolute value of the correlation coefficient (R) between the website quality factors and user satisfaction is 0.792. From this regression model, 62.8% of variability in observed user satisfaction ($R^2$) is explained by these content items. The results indicate that the model was significant (p< 0.05). Thus, this hypothesis supports the idea that there is a positive relation between the satisfaction of particular content items and overall user satisfaction.

Table 16 shows the results of each content item, which turned out to be significant and related to user satisfaction separately. In accordance with the results in Table 16, general information is the most important content of the website to predict the overall satisfaction of the website (p< 0.05, $\beta = .362$, $t = 6.728$). For example, content items such as hotel and travel information, event schedule, and show rules were positively related to attendees' satisfaction. In addition, the information in Resource Center (World Tea News, Tea Education, etc.), the exhibitors search menu, and the registration on the website were also critical elements influencing on the satisfaction of attendees who visited the website. On the contrary, the excluded four variables – conference information, product search, show management information, and sponsors' links – turned out to have an insignificant effect on their overall satisfaction. This might mean that there is no significant difference even if the satisfaction level of these contents increased.

**Gender Difference**

As mentioned in the first part of this chapter, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) and independent-samples $t$ test were performed to see whether there are significant differences in the results between groups on the basis of the profile of respondents. ANOVA was used to test the null hypothesis that the average user
satisfaction is the same for respondents in four categories of the Internet experience year, six categories of weekly hours to use the Internet for business, seven categories of the frequency to access the website, and five categories of age (Norusis, 2004). For comparing mean values of the two gender groups, an independent-samples \( t \) test was conducted.

In conclusion, only gender showed a significant difference in the independent-samples \( t \) test while the others in ANOVA tests turned out to be insignificant in terms of the difference of their mean values among groups. As shown in Table 18, the result of independent-samples \( t \) test about gender showed that there is significant variability between the groups.

**Table 17**

*Group Statistics of Independent-Samples t Test: Gender (N=369)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>4.4155</td>
<td>.72106</td>
<td>.04280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>3.9706</td>
<td>.72108</td>
<td>.07821</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 18**

*Independent-Samples t Test: Gender (N=369)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Std. Error Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.990</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.44490</td>
<td>.08917</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *\( p<.05 \).*
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To see how the results of the regression model are different between men and women, two separate regression analyses were performed by using the function of 'Select Cases' in SPSS. That is, the first analysis used only female samples and the other analysis used only male samples to see the differences from the result of whole samples.

Table 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Significant Factors</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Durbin-Watson</th>
<th>Beta ($\beta$)</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female (N=173)</td>
<td>InfoQual</td>
<td>.762</td>
<td>.581</td>
<td>.446</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SysQual</td>
<td>.785</td>
<td>.616</td>
<td>.243</td>
<td>.002*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RelQual</td>
<td>.795</td>
<td>.631</td>
<td>1.972</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>.010*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male (N=56)</td>
<td>ServQual</td>
<td>.755</td>
<td>.570</td>
<td>.488</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RelQual</td>
<td>.790</td>
<td>.625</td>
<td>1.986</td>
<td>.354</td>
<td>.008*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Dependent Variable - Satisfaction, *$p<.05$.

As shown in Table 19, a distinctive feature was found in comparison of website quality factors between women and men. When the female sample only was selected for the regression analysis, three factors – information quality, system quality, and relationship quality – were statistically significant in terms of satisfaction of the female group. Accordingly, service quality factors cannot affect their satisfaction level significantly. On the contrary, only two factors turned out to be significant for male attendees. This means that the satisfaction level of male respondents was more related to service quality and relationship quality than information quality and system quality.

Table 20 shows which content items were important to each gender. While the female group appeared to have the same pattern as the entire sample, the male group showed quite different content items as predictors of the regression model. As for male
respondents, online registration was the most influential item for their satisfaction level whereas it was the fourth item in the female group. Furthermore, show management information, which was excluded in the regression model of the entire sample, ranked as the second predictor of the regression model while general information, the first predictor in both entire and female samples, was found as the third predictor.

Table 20

Comparison of Website Content Items between Genders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Significant Items</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Durbin-Watson</th>
<th>Beta (β)</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>General Info</td>
<td>.744</td>
<td>.554</td>
<td>.398</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=239)</td>
<td>Resource Center</td>
<td>.777</td>
<td>.604</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exhibitor List</td>
<td>.792</td>
<td>.627</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.002*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Online Registration</td>
<td>.800</td>
<td>.639</td>
<td>1.808</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.005*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Online Registration</td>
<td>.639</td>
<td>.408</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>.047*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=71)</td>
<td>Show Management Info</td>
<td>.697</td>
<td>.486</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>.008*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Info</td>
<td>.721</td>
<td>.521</td>
<td>2.668</td>
<td>.263</td>
<td>.033*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Dependent Variable - Satisfaction, *p < .05.

The differences between the two gender groups found in this regression model are discussed in the next chapter. The meaning of this disparity between men and women may have practical applications to the industry despite some limitations which are mentioned in Chapter 5.

Content Analysis for an Open-ended Question

This survey used an open-ended question at the end in order to collect the diverse opinions of attendees. It provides valuable insights to the World Tea Expo management and can provide guidance for website designing for other trade shows.
The open-ended question was not mandatory and 107 participants responded out of the submitted 369 online questionnaires. The question was “Please list any additional comments or suggestions about your experience with the World Tea Expo website.” Answers can be classified by three major categories: 1) praise, 2) comments on specific items of the website, and 3) suggestions to the show management (see Appendix C).

First, 29 respondents expressed their satisfaction with the website, mentioning just words of praise. In particular, their compliments were focused on the following aspects such as excellent responsiveness, useful information, user friendliness, frequent updates, and visual attractiveness.

The second category included comments about a) navigation, b) additional material, c) content usefulness, d) registration, and e) communication. Navigation received a mix of both positive and negative comments. While some respondents positively commented on the easiness of navigation, other respondents described excessive scrolling, difficulty in locating information, and inconvenient movement in conference registration form. More photos of products and more information (e.g. traveler’ guides) were requested. Content usefulness also had both pros and cons. Pricing and auction were the main negative items concerning content usefulness. Technical problems were claimed in registration, whereas regular newsletter emails turned out to be helpful.

The suggestion responses were roughly composed of these three issues: a) attendance, b) education, and c) schedule. Some respondents suggested that attendance should be free and open to the public, while some requested more information about past shows. The improvement of description, price, and bio of speakers in the conference
were suggested by some respondents. Finally, some attendees suggested improving the quality of the PDF of the schedule.

Conclusion

This chapter presented an analysis of the collected data and described key findings of the results. The profiles of respondents were presented first. The hypotheses about website quality factors were tested and all of them turned out to have significant effects on user satisfaction in the regression analysis. Moreover, four content items on the website showed a significant relationship with the overall satisfaction, while the others were excluded in the regression model because of insignificant correlation.

In the tests for checking the statistical difference among demographic groups, only gender showed the significant variability. Consequently, the different results of separate regression model analysis were presented and remarkable distinctions between the female and male groups were found.

Lastly, attendees’ additional opinions were categorized to see what comments and suggestions were frequent in the answers of an open-ended question.
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents discussion of major findings derived from the analysis of the data collected. Also, implications for management are discussed. Finally, the limitations of this study and recommendations for future research are discussed.

Discussion of the Findings

Empirical results from this study provided valuable findings for website quality factors and user satisfactions in the trade show industry. In addition, the relationship between the satisfaction of particular content items and overall satisfaction was also empirically validated.

The results supported all five hypotheses that were developed in this study. The first four hypotheses were concerned with determining whether the website quality factors have an impact on overall satisfaction of attendees who visit the trade show website. This study validated a model of website quality by finding a new quality factor – relationship quality. This provides trade show management with practical criteria when they initiate, evaluate, and maintain their websites. Considering the increasing importance of the website as a strategic marketing tool, it is needless to say that measuring customers’ satisfaction is critical to the success of business.
Moreover, the study provides the result that quality factors have a different level of influence on the user satisfaction. As the standardized coefficients (β) can be the measure of the relative importance of the variables (Norusis, 2004), the information quality can be considered the most powerful predictor of the user satisfaction in the regression model. Therefore, an attempt to increase the quality of information is a more effective way to increase overall satisfaction level than improvement of any other quality factor in Figure 3.
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Figure 3. Website quality factor scale – regression standardized coefficients.

This study also tested the correlation between content items of the website and attendees’ satisfaction through the regression model. However, only four content categories among the presented eight categories turned out to be significant statistically. These are general information, resource center, exhibitor list, and online registration. As
the stepwise variable selection method was used in the regression model, the order of the
selected items can be interpreted as the order of the influential power for the dependent
variable. These observed significant levels are not likely to be accurate from a strict
statistical perspective, because they depend on both the number of variables and the
correlations of the independent variables (Norusis, 2004). Nevertheless, the result of this
regression model can be regarded as valid because the multicollinearity of the data was
already diagnosed and any of the tolerances for each of the independent variables in the
model were greater than 0.1 (see Table 21), which means that the independent variables
are not highly related (Norusis, 2004).

Table 21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multicollinearity Diagnostics: Website Content Items (N=310)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unstandardized Coefficients</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibitor List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Registration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After the tests for between-groups variability, gender was the only demographic
attribute which showed significant difference between groups. Consequently, two
separate regression analyses were performed to see whether the result of the female group
differs from that of the male group. Interestingly, considerable dissimilarities were found
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in the contrast between men and women. First, male attendees turned out to be affected by service quality and relationship quality, while female attendees were affected in the following order: Information quality, system quality, and relationship quality. Second, the female group showed the same pattern as the entire sample but the male group had considerably different results in the regression analysis of website content items. Online registration was selected as the most powerful predictor and show management information, which was excluded in the regression model of entire sample, was ranked as the second predictor. It is hard to interpret the result accurately but it can be inferred that male attendees might be more sensitive about the service (online registration) and relationship (show management information) than information itself on which female attendees concentrate when connecting with these two results.

Implications for Management

The findings of this research study would be beneficial to trade show managers. The results of this study revealed that website quality factors and content items do affect attendees positively. Consequently, the managers who want to initiate and maintain their websites are able to possess the empirically validated evaluation criteria. Based on the criteria, they can concentrate their efforts effectively to develop productive content items for improving users' satisfaction. Since most trade shows have limited resources to operate their website in terms of time and money, the results of the study can contribute to the effective use of the limited resources by focusing on the determining factors for a successful website.
Furthermore, different strategies can be established on the basis of the gender difference found in this study. In other words, the audience of a trade show may impact the organization of the website. For example, the trade show whose attendees are mainly male like SEMA (Specialty Equipment Manufacturer Association) show should emphasize the quality of elements related to service, such as online registration. On the contrary, if the majority of attendees are women like World Tea Expo, the show management should seek to make the website more informative. Although all factors on a website can affect the satisfaction of visitors, this separate strategy can save time and money to increase the level of satisfaction under limited resources.

There is no doubt that the Internet is one of the most powerful marketing tools in the trade show industry. Accordingly, the satisfaction with the quality of websites may be associated with the successful operation of the trade show. As most attendees are real customers – usually retailers in a particular industry and most are repeat attendees, the website can be an effective market place and serve to extend the life of the show in a virtual environment. If more attendees are satisfied with the website, the sales revenue potential for both the physical trade show and the website may be increased.

Limitations of the Study

The interpretations of the results of the study were limited. First, there may be a limitation in generalizing the results to all trade show websites globally, because the subjects of this study were selected from only one trade show – World Tea Expo. The unique nature of this trade show makes it evident that the findings may not be generalizable to other different types of trade shows. For example, the attendees of the
World Tea Expo are heavily Asian in which is atypical from the other types of trade shows. The expo is also a hybrid in nature as it is both a consumer show and an industry trade show. The characteristics of attendees are varied according to the type of a trade show. The respondents in this study were limited to the attendees in the tea industry. This limits the application of the findings of this study to general trade show websites.

Second, the results may have a limitation in generalizing the results to different groups of people because the proportion of gender in the sample was not balanced. The proportion of female respondents amounted to 77%, which may be different from general proportion between genders in trade shows. Therefore, this sample may not represent all trade show attendees.

Third, the Internet survey has bigger possibility to have nonresponse error even though the response rate of this survey was relatively high. Approximately 67% attendees who received the invitation email didn’t respond to the survey. Consequently, this could bring about the self-selection bias, “the problem frequently seen in a self-administered questionnaire” (Zikmund, 2003, p. 178). The incentive in the survey also might promote the self-selection bias. The incentive may cause the acquiescence bias and extremity bias in case of the indifferent respondents who are only interested in the drawing of a free pass package. In addition, auspices bias might happen because this survey used the UNLV logo and World Tea Expo logo to show their sponsorship of the study. These systematic (nonsampling) errors possibly influenced the result of the study (Zikmund, 2003).
Recommendations for Future Research

In order to validate the results of this study, a nationally representative group of trade show website users should be included in future research. If this study is performed with representative samples from various types of trade shows, it would assist in establishing the external generalizability or applicability of the results. It doesn’t imply only a bigger sample size but more general samples which have similar demographic and behavioral characteristics to the population – all attendees of trade shows. Diverse samples from different kinds of trade shows could also resolve the imbalanced gender problem.

For obtaining survey efficiency, this study focused on the attendees’ satisfaction. There is another important user group who uses trade show websites – namely, exhibitors. The exhibitors are the essential clients for a trade show because the trade show cannot be operated without them. Therefore, the future study should include the exhibitors in the sample. It would be interesting to compare the differences between attendees and exhibitors in a future study.

In this study, there were some findings about the significant quality factors to affect user satisfaction and the different results between gender groups. However, clear explanations of the findings were not made although the inferences were made. Additional studies might provide more conclusive results. Finally, qualitative research involving case study experiences of various users from different trade show websites could be conducted to achieve more insight and information while this study tried in Question 4, the only open-ended question.
## Determining Factors for the Success of Trade Show Websites

**[Part I]**
Following is a list of terms that is concerned with the various features of a typical trade show website. For each characteristic listed, please consider your satisfaction towards the item, and rank it from one to five on the scale provided next to the item. A “1” will refer to the characteristic listed as having HIGH DISSATISFACTION to you, while a “5” will indicate that the characteristic listed has HIGH SATISFACTION to you as a visitor to that website.

How would you rate your level of SATISFACTION with the following factors of the World Tea Expo website (www.worldteaexpo.com)? (If you want to see the website, click the link above)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>N.A.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dependability of system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response time of system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website experiences little downtime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website has few missing links</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understandability of information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readability of information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness of information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance of information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website is visually appealing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website is neat and well-structured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website generates user confidence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website provides prompt service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website provides safe feeling by protecting against identity theft</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website provides comfortable place to meet other users</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website provides a feeling of trust</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website provides a feeling of transaction security</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website covers various specific user needs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website provides adequate contact information</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on your experience with the World Tea Expo website (www.worldteaexpo.com), how would you rate each area in terms of how SATISFACTORY it is to you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conference Information (e.g. Schedule, Pricing, Speaker Bios)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Information (e.g. Event Schedule, Hotel &amp; Travel, Show Rules, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibitor List</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Search</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Registration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Center (e.g. World Tea News, Tea Education, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Show Management Information (e.g. Company Info, Contact Us, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, how would you rate the following statements about your satisfaction with the World Tea Expo website?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strongly disagree</strong></td>
<td><strong>Somewhat disagree</strong></td>
<td><strong>Neither agree nor disagree</strong></td>
<td><strong>Somewhat agree</strong></td>
<td><strong>Strongly agree</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoyed visiting the website.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The website met my expectations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I left the website with information I was seeking.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would recommend the website to my colleagues.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please list any additional comments or suggestions about your experience with the World Tea Expo website:


BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Approximately how long have you used the Internet?

- Less than a year
- 1 to 5 years
- 5 to 10 years
- More than 10 years
6. How many hours do you use the Internet per week for business?

- Less than an hour
- 1 to 5 hours
- 5 to 10 hours
- 10 to 15 hours
- 15 to 20 hours
- More than 20 hours

7. How often do you access the World Tea Expo website?

- At least once a day
- 3-6 times per week
- Once or twice a week
- 3-5 times per month
- Once or twice a month
- Less often than once a month
- This is my first time
What is your age?
- Under 25
- 26-35
- 36-45
- 46-55
- 56 and older

What is your gender?
- Female
- Male

Thank you for your participation.
APPENDIX B

MESSAGES TO PARTICIPANTS

Web Greeting Page/ Thank You Page
Dear World Tea Expo Attendee

I am a graduate student in the Hotel College at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. I am studying the determining factors for the success of trade show websites. This study is the culmination of my Master of Science degree. Your participation would be valuable to my study.

This questionnaire will only take approximately 10 minutes of your time. Your participation in the study is voluntary. Consent for use of your response is implied when you submit your survey. This survey is anonymous. You may refuse or stop participating at any time during the research. You will not be able to withdraw from this study once you have submitted the questionnaire, as we will be unable to identify which questionnaire is yours. All records will be stored in a secured server at UNLV for at least 3 years after completion of the study. After the storage time, the information will be destroyed. If you would like a copy of the results, please provide an e-mail address as directed.

PARTICIPATION IN OUR RESEARCH ALSO ENTITLES YOU TO ENTER A DRAWING FOR A TOTAL VALUE OF OVER $500 PACKAGE PASS INCLUDING “EXHIBIT HALL ENTRANCE AND COMPLETE CONFERENCE IN 2007.” Just send us your contact information at the THANK YOU PAGE at the end of this survey.

For questions regarding the rights of research subjects, any complaints or comments regarding the manner in which the study is being conducted you may contact the UNLV Office for the Protection of Research Subjects at (702) 895-2794.

If you have any questions you can feel free to contact the Principal Investigator—Dr. Curtis Love (702) 895-3334 or student investigator—Jumyong (Stephen) Lee (702) 403-7147.

Thank you for your time and consideration. Your participation is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Jumyong (Stephen) Lee
Master of Science Candidate
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
leej64@unlv.nevada.edu

Curtis Love, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
curtis.love@unlv.edu

START SURVEY!
THANK YOU FOR TAKING OUR SURVEY!
As a sign of thanks for your participation, World Tea Expo management will randomly select one respondent to win a FREE PACKAGE PASS (over $500 total value) including “EXHIBIT HALL ENTRANCE AND COMPLETE CONFERENCE IN 2007.”

Please send your contact information (name, email address, phone number) to survey@worldteaexpo.com to participate in the drawing. The drawing will be held no earlier than April 3rd and no later than May 30th. The winner will be contacted by email.

Your survey response is separate from this entry to the drawing. Therefore, your confidentiality will be maintained even if you send us the contact information.

Thanks again for your help.
APPENDIX C

ANSWERS FOR AN OPEN-ENDED QUESTION
A Content Analysis for an Open-ended Question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category (frequency)</th>
<th>Answer Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Praise (29)</td>
<td>1, 3, 7, 12, 14, 19, 25, 28, 31, 34, 36, 38, 43, 45, 51, 61, 62, 70, 73, 80, 83, 93, 94, 96, 97, 98, 101, 102, 103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Comments on specific items of the website (66)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) navigation (15)</td>
<td>Positive (5): 2, 16, 17, 44, 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative (10): 11, 18, 23, 24, 35, 40, 53, 57, 69, 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) additional material (5)</td>
<td>5, 35, 37, 56, 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) content usefulness (31)</td>
<td>Positive (9): 6, 13, 14, 15, 21, 59, 72, 78, 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative (23): 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, 27, 29, 32, 35, 39, 40, 47, 52, 63, 64, 67, 68, 71, 79, 91, 99, 100, 104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) registration (10)</td>
<td>8, 30, 54, 74, 75, 84, 87, 90, 97, 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) communication (5)</td>
<td>48, 81, 89, 91, 106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Suggestions to the show management (15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) attendance (2)</td>
<td>50, 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) education (10)</td>
<td>26, 33, 41, 42, 46, 60, 76, 77, 82, 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) schedule (3)</td>
<td>23, 37, 95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cf. some answers were duplicated and some answers were missing.
4. Please list any additional comments or suggestions about your experience with the World Tea Expo website:

1. You did a good job relatively.
2. Add links to exhibitors web sites
3. Great work.
4. N/A
5. Could you have a photo section where you can see prior events, saw it somewhere but unsure where.
6. Some of the content could have been better written/structured for the web (i.e., shorter, bulleted, not so many long pages, use of links)
7. Great job, excellent responsiveness.
8. Promotion of the conference should be begin only after the speakers and exhibitors have been finalized. This means the World Tea Expo should have an earlier cut off date for exhibitors and commitment date for speakers. The earliest registrants are uncertain as to what and who will be presenting.
9. Na
10. I guess my 3s mean that I really have no opinion because I haven't used the website for those purposes.
11. Site requires a lot of scrolling to see all the information
12. I think it is a FINE functioning website.
13. Been once and headed back again to the Expo! The website helps me keep abreast with what's happening with this organization during the year. Keep up the good work.
14. I found what I was looking for, and am hopeful that the networking gained at the expo will be fruitful!
15. Found it very informative and clearly defined
16. The website is a great resource. I found exactly what I needed in a short amount of time.
17. The site was very easy to navigate through. I especially liked the link to the exhibition floor plan where you can click on the booth and you'll get the vendor info with their link.
18. I had difficulty in locating the information and pricing on the auction for this show.
19. Site not very personalized. Gives good basic information.
20. ADD MORE INFORMATION FOR OUTSIDE TRAVELLERS.
21. I like the updates.
22 Too much information stuffed into a screen. I much prefer receiving something in the mail that I my peruse at my leisure, rather than sitting infront of a computer!

23 I remember thinking that some of the navigation seemed a little laborious rather than obvious. And the pricing structure and information was not clearly outlined on the website, but required reading the extremely small print on the PDF application form.

24 I have found that the website at times is difficult to navigate for the specific information I am seeking. It has improved that in the last couple of months. Sometimes I don't know which link has the information I am seeking in regards to conference information and specifics.

25 Great website. Highly satisfied with the site.

26 My suggestion would be that each session be available during another time slot thus enabling each participant the opportunity to take it at another time because of a conflict. I am a little disappointed that I missed out on attending at least 3 other ones because of the lack of availability. Suggestions on attire would be helpful for 1st time participants.

27 Pricing structure was hard to understand w/ first read through. I thought the site could have been structured better.

28 I look at it almost every day to see if there is any more info added that may help me learn more about tea and also to find new vendors.

29 Sometimes the website seems to lag in its' currency of information.

30 Previous attendees should have an express way of registering each year.

31 I have recommended the World Tea Expo to others as a resource for information gathering for new tea businesses. I have searched their site and found several companies I am interested in doing business with attending the World Tea Expo in Las Vegas which I am attending and look forward to seeing first hand vendor’s products.

32 I wanted, and looked for more information on both of the tea ceremonies but couldn't find any on the site. i guess I'll find out more when I get there.

33 Make schedulinfg of classes clearer and easier to register for.

34 I check the website frequently for updates or to recheck information previously viewed. The site is well-structured, visually appealing and offers the information and links I need. I have never felt the need to call The World Tea Expo for clarification.

35 The web site could offer better links for additional resources. The Exhibit hall area on the website is very small and could be improved upon. A little more 'Salesmanship' for the actual purpose of the website would be
welcomed, i.e. additional photo's of past years trade shows. Since I we are first time attendees, we were looking for more in the way of photos, exhibits, resources, etc.

36 In general it allowed me to do what I wanted to do...register. It was informative and pleasing

37 The PDF of the Schedule at a Glance is too small and on my computer I cannot enlarge it. This may be too much, although I love the vendor list, it would be GREAT if you clicked on the vendor and could get a visual of some samples of that vendor's goods.

38 good job, i got all the info about the convention that i need and bought tickets online. good website.

39 Pricing was not clear -

40 I could not locate the actual address of the Conference only a reference to the hotel.

41 The website design is fine but the scheduling of classes and tea education is not well thought out for people to get us much education as they can.

42 Should look into reducing cost per conference topic or provide discount for multiple conferences topic registered. Perhaps a 3-4 tier price structure

43 Outstanding

44 I have been visiting the web site for a couple of months now, and its content has remained consistent, up to date, and easy to navigate. Great job!

45 Very easy to use

46 Descriptions of lectures need to be much more complete and accurate. At the last two Expos I felt that I had been mislead by the website, and that I had wasted my time and money on several lectures which were not relevant to me. This year I will waste less because I am buying far fewer lectures.

47 The home page is a little busy and could be better organized.

48 Their followup with past attendees is very helpful. I appreciate their reminders via the internet.

49 This is my first year attending the Expo and visiting the website.

50 It would be exceptionally helpful to list how many attendees & exhibitors were present for each of the years the Expo has been in existence - this would be a partial guage to show us, those involved in the industry, how much growth there is.

51 Helpful staff; knowledgable; nice to work with.

52 Would like to see more local items, places to visit etc. Also, would like to
see more spotlight pieces.

53 Once registered for the conference I was unable to go back into the site to register for further sessions independently.

54 I could not register online. I had to do it by phone. I thought it would be better to do it on line. Thanks

55 easy to navigate

56 Satisfied with website. more pictures on products. more info on wholesalers.

57 Prefer to be able to change dates of visit online rather than having to fax requests to hotel.

58 none

59 The map helped me decide which vendors I want to see first and communicate with.

60 I was surprised to find out that classes were $50 each. For some reason I thought they were $50 for the entire package. I'm not sure why that wasn't clear, but you might want to find a way to make that really clear in the future. Very satisfied with everything else.

61 Great website!

62 Excellent site, user friendly site.

63 It needs to be about more than just the annual expo. The expo should be central, or course, but industry info should be prioritized and categorized.

64 More info in clear terms for the newbie.

65 This is our first Tea Expo, and we're extremely excited to attend.

66 attendance for exhibit hall only should be free and open to public.

67 map and exhibitor info lacking

68 I would like to see more networking through the web-site, particularly for new upstart businesses.

69 It could be easier to navigate through. I still have a hard time knowing exactly all that is happening at the expo.

70 Easy to use web site. The print-out for the exhibitors did not show all numbered spaces just part of them.

71 They should list The Tea House Times along with the other publications :-)

72 I have found new info on trade shows and other companies using the links on the home page.

73 This is my first time in general looks very good

74 I'm pretty sure that I have not received written confirmation regarding my registration. I assume that this is because I'm outside of the US. But
confirmation by mail would have

As a member of the press, it was not clear that attendees must register for each event so when I noticed that events were sold out, I panicked. Maybe there should be more info for the press regarding access to events, exhibitors, speakers, etc.

One thing that would be very helpful is a little more insight about the seminars offered - other than a basic one-line description, they were rather vague. As my company gave me a budget on what I could spend for seminars, that information is very important so I can decide what is relevant to my goal of attending the World Tea Expo.

I could not register for classes on line

It is a wonderful website full of good information.

SPECIFIC PRODUCTS NOT LISTED

I'm new in the tea industry, but it seems to be a great site!

I find the weekly emails very useful and well written.

Price of class was not clear

We look forward to many years attending the World Tea Expo.

I had a little bit of trouble with the on-line registration process

I would like to see the bio of each seminar speaker located with the seminar schedule.

I loved the schedule of the exhibition. and fast response redarding to my questions about the exhibits. Very impressive.

When registering- at the end the option to edit information was not given, the form had to be quit and re-entered in full.

none

Responses to questions were promptly made by staff.

You should make it much easier for couples to sign up.....was a little confusing. p.s Your javascript survey form is OUTSTANDING!

More information the better, please keep updating! Love it!

Maybe a better view of the ones and their products. It seemed a little confusing to me.

Good Job, very useful to the tea indust.

I'm in the event business as well as tea business and this was one of the best sites I've seen in a long time. Well done!

the pdf schedule was hard to manage when signing up for sessions.

I have found the entire interaction has been projected very professional and well room. Even if the time difference a callback to a question is prompt and professional. Looking forward to the Expo!
97 It lacked a little on signing up as a vendor could have used more clarity in information with contact names and pricing. I am not saying it didn't exist the information could have been better.

98 Additional hotel and travel information would have been helpful at the beginning. It was slow to browse the various speakers. Could have been much more efficient.

99 I am confused about this email in general... has the World Tea Expo for next year changed to June in Atlanta? Will there still be one in Vegas in March? That is the only reason I rated some of the questions lower, as I couldn't find further info on the website.

100 Information about the tea auction was very unclear.

101 I am satisfied with it.

102 Great website - user friendly and informative

103 pleased

104 Make sure all links work according to the published timetable.

105 It would not let you proceed if there was certain information not given. Example...phone number, a friend of mine who wanted to attend doesn't have a phone...it made it difficult to register

106 We do appreciate the World Tea Expo & their efforts to let people get more info. I am currently conducting mini-seminars and would like to get more info on competitive pricing for products and stores in specific locations i.e. Laguna Beach, CA; West Hollywood, CA; Denver, CO; Seattle, WA; Silverlake, CA; Las Vegas, NV, etc.

107 when I went to take this survey, I was warned about safety.
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