INVESTIGATE CUSTOMER BEHAVIOR THROUGH EXCESSIVE SERVICE IN TANGIBLE FACILITIES AND EMPLOYEES RESPONSIVENESS

Hua-Hung (Robin) Weng
College of Management
Yuan Ze University
135 Yuan-Tung Road
Chung-Li, Taiwan
+886-3-4638800-2688
robinweng@saturn.yzu.edu.tw

Hui-Wen (Wendy) Wang
College of Management
Yuan Ze University
135 Yuan-Tung Road
Chung-Li, Taiwan
wendywang106@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Recently, service companies try to provide more service to satisfy their customers. However, providing excessive service will not always increase customer satisfaction. Focusing excessive service in tangible facilities and employee responsiveness, we design a 2x3 experiment with 2 service levels and 3 service categories to investigate the impacts on consumer behaviors. The results show higher customer satisfaction exists when companies provide adequate employee responsiveness, while the service levels related to tangible facilities do not have significant influence on customer behaviors. Based on service categories, companies can design a service procedure to meet customer needs and to save the cost simultaneously.

Key words: Excessive Service, SERVQUAL

INTRODUCTION

Service is the primary index of the world economy, especially for developed countries. The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development indicates that the value of GDP in service is more than 70% in most developed countries. According to the National Statistics, R.O.C. (Taiwan), the 2011 output value from service accounted for about 67.24% of Taiwan's GDP (National Statistics, 2011), which almost reached the level of developed countries. The proportion of employees in service was 58.63% in 2011, indicating that service plays an increasingly important role in the Taiwanese economy.

Customer satisfaction related to service quality is a key service issue and the primary factor for firms to gain a competitive advantage in the international market (Lovelock & Yip, 1996). In addition, customer satisfaction and perceived service quality help firms to improve their service delivery system (Bitner, 1990; Bolton & Drew, 1994). Generally, offering more services to customers can enhance their satisfaction and loyalty (Brady, Cronin, & Brand, 2002), although this depends on how well firms provide their basic service. For instance, an airline's basic service is to carry people from one place to another on time. However, if it only focuses on its facilities without paying attention to its flight schedule and route, its customers will have a lower level of satisfaction. Thus, this study aims to investigate the relationship between service levels (adequate service and excess service) and customer behavior (satisfaction, repurchase intentions and recommendation).

Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry (1988) created SERVQUAL (service quality), including five dimensions: tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance and empathy, for service firms to estimate whether or not they meet customers' needs and then improve their offerings. The last four dimensions focus on providing intangible service to customers through employees' performance. Sulek, Lind, and Marucheck (1995) indicate that a tangible design influences customer satisfaction, firm performance, and customers' purchase behavior.

Inconvenience and waiting generally have a negative influence on customer satisfaction (Berry, Seiders, & Grewal, 2002). To reduce inconvenience and utilize their resources more efficiently, firms need to develop a complete service design and emphasize its most important elements (Wakefield & Blodgett, 1999). Frontline employees are those who usually provide information for customers, but if customers are given too much information, they may become confused, and this will make them dissatisfied. Minimizing customers' inconvenience and resolving problems quickly are the key ways to increase customer loyalty (Dixon, Freeman, & Toman, 2010). Unfortunately, most firms do not realize this, but simply go on providing more services for customers, even though this costs them more.

Although tangible facilities influence consumer behavior (Sulek et al., 1995), little empirical research has addressed the physical environment of consumption, and the final use of some facilities is not fully understood (Bitner, 1992). Tangible dimensions in SERVQUAL include both facilities and employees' appearance. Shao, Baker, and Wagner (2004) indicate that employees who are appropriately dressed have a positive influence on customers' expectations of service quality and repurchase intentions. The other dimension, responsiveness, means that employees are willing to help customers quickly, and this also has an influence on customer satisfaction (Parasuraman, Zeithaml, & Berry, 1985a). Customers will feel more satisfied with satisfied employees because satisfied employees will transfer their positive responsiveness to customers during service delivery (Cohen & Areni, 1991; Dietz, Pugh, & Wiley, 2004; Pugh, 2001). However, some firms try to satisfy their customers to gain a competitive advantage, but ignore customers' demands (Dixon et al., 2010). Some services or products are useless to customers, and this is called over service (excessive service), which increases companies costs (Gia, 2008a, b).

This study aims to investigate the impact of excessive tangible and responsiveness service levels on customer behavior, including satisfaction, repurchase intentions, and

recommendation. The following are the research questions of this study:

1. Can providing excessive tangible services (e.g., facilities, employees' uniform) enhance customer satisfaction?

2. Can providing excessive responsiveness enhance customer satisfaction?

3. Will the above situations change depending on different service categories?

LITERATURE REVIEW

SERVICE CATEGORIES

Intangible, inseparability, heterogeneity, and perishability are the four characteristics used to distinguish service from goods (Sasser, Olsen, & Wyckoff, 1978). However, they are not used to separate service types. Therefore, Lovelock (1983) proposes a new method to classify service instead of industry types, and this method is considered to have greatly developed service management. The author uses 2 factors, namely, recipient and service delivery, to categorize service. While recipient refers to people and physical goods, service delivery is divided into tangible (i.e., act tangible during service delivery) actions and intangible (i.e., act intangible during service delivery) actions. These two factors create four categories, which managers can use to determine their position, as well as observing other companies in the same category and establishing some competitive strategies (Lovelock, 1983).

Zeithaml, Berry, and Parasuraman (1993) indicate that using operations to categorize service is another way to distinguish goods from service, and further, make a strategic decision. Lovelock and Yip (1996) then suggest a similar foundation for service categories, because classifying service by industry boundaries may be biased. The biggest differences between services are in the operational processes, from input to output, and these processes have a significant influence on strategy. Therefore, by examining the operational processes of

service, Lovelock and Yip (1996) divided it into three categories, based on whether or not customers need to physically participate during service delivery and the nature of the process, tangible or intangible (e.g., tangible action: hair cutting, intangible action: bank accounting).

First category is people-processing service.   In this category, customers need to participate in the service process, and then they need to take time to wait for the output, such as health care, hair-cutting, food service, etc. Customers need to attend the service system, either by them going to the service organization or the facilities being brought to them. On the other hand, during service delivery, firms need to provide equipment and a building in an existing location to reach their customers.

Second category is possession-processing service. While objects should be involved in the service process, customers' participation is minimal. Usually, customers need to explain what they want and then pay for it to complete the consumption. In terms of services such as car repair, freight transport, laundry, etc., customers simply leave the relevant objects with these service organizations and do not need to participate in the service process. On the other hand, during service delivery, firms need to provide a location for customers to repeat-consume.

The third category is information-based service. This category includes service for customers' minds or intangible assets, such as banking, education, insurance. Customers' level of participation in the service process is minimal. However, depending on their characteristics, some customers are used to participating in the service process; for example, watching movies with many people in the theater feels different from watching them at home. This relates to the view of Lovelock (1983), that customer satisfaction is influenced by employees, facilities and other customers in the same service organizations. Lovelock and Yip (1996) also argue that people-process services are high contact and possession-process services are low contact.

SERVQAUL

Service quality is customers' assessment of their expectation before purchase and their perceived service after purchase (Gronroos, 1982). Lehtinen and Lehtinen (1982) also indicate that service quality can be created when suppliers interact with customers. Moreover, Kotler, Bowen, and Makens (2009) indicate that a service or product should fit customers' needs, and improve their satisfaction through quality. SERVQUAL is a widely-used framework (Parasuraman et al., 1988) to estimate service quality, which includes customers' perception of firms' tangibles, reliability, assurance, empathy, and responsiveness. It can also be sued to forecast customers' response, especially their loyalty (Parasuraman & Grewal, 2000) and satisfaction (Cronin Jr, Brady, & Hult, 2000; Cronin Jr & Taylor, 1992; Parasuraman, Zeithaml, & Berry, 1985b).

Having identified the factors which influence customers' expectation, Parasuraman, Berry, and Zeithaml (1991) developed the SERVQUAL scale, which includes 22 items connected to customers' perception and expectation in five dimensions: tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance and empathy (Parasuraman et al., 1988).This scale seeks to evaluate the gap between customers' expectations before purchase and their perceived service after purchase. Customers' delight can be seen as being a positive emotion, which is in excess of their expectation (Robbins, Decenzo, & Coulter, 2011). If the service perception is more than the tolerance zone and exceeds customers' expectation, it will result in customer loyalty (Füller & Matzler, 2008). However, not all products or service will delight all customers (Berman, 2005; Robbins, DeCenzo, & Coulter, 2010); therefore, firms need to carefully evaluate which factor will influence customers' behavior.

Bolton and Drew (1994) also argue that SERVQUAL, as a framework, can characterize customers' expectations before purchase, and compare the perceived service to evaluate whether or not the service quality matches their expectation (Parasuraman et al., 1988).

Shemwell (1998) indicates that high quality service is the key to lead to satisfied customers and keep competitive advantage. Cronin Jr et al. (2000) indicate that a strong correlation exists between great service quality with high customer value and satisfaction. In a global economy, quality is the key to a successful process to gain a competitive advantage, and how customers evaluate service quality through service delivery is also important for firms (Zindersin, Maric, & Grubor, 2009). Besides, Othman and Owen (2001a) indicate that SERVQAUL is a popular tool to estimate service quality, managed and measured by technology.

Besides, Davidoff (1994) emphasizes the importance of quality, and provides three "laws of service." These are: "Satisfaction equals perception minus expectation (Davidoff, 1994, p. 31)"; "First impressions are the most important (Davidoff, 1994, p. 35)"; "A service-oriented attitude alone will not achieve good service (Davidoff, p. 35)". The second and third laws emphasize that the physical facilities and employees' responses play an important role in service organizations. This could relate to the dimensions of SERVQUAL: tangibles and responsiveness, which also emphasize the importance of facilities and employees' responsiveness. Davidoff (1994) also indicates that customers prefer a hassle-free service, but when they interact with employees, they may have to wait and this may cause them to feel impatient or frustrated. Based on the research previously indicated, there is a relationship between employee responsiveness and tangible facilities. For instance, when customers go to a hair salon, and employees chat with them when customers are trying to read a magazine, this situation will have an effect on customers' behavior.

PHENOMENON OF OVER SERVICE

Usually, providing more service to customers will enhance their satisfaction (Brady et al., 2002). However, Gia (2008a, b) indicates that some functions of service and products are useless after customers have purchased them. The author regards this surplus service as being

over service, which may also increase companies' costs. Therefore, Gia (2008a, b) provides the following three characteristics of over service:

1. The product or service is too complex for customers to understand and use;

2. Customers think the function of the product or service is useless or worthless;

3. The service or product is not innovative enough for the firm to make a good profit.

Gia (2008a, b) also indicates that not all customers can create value and profit for companies, and in a worst-case scenario, they may destroy them. Moreover, if companies provide excess service to customers, the operational cost may larger than the value customers contribute.

It usually takes time to see the output of service, and some products cannot be stored to be used another time. For instance, an empty seat on an airplane cannot be stored until another time, and this reflects one of the characteristics of service, namely, perishability. Therefore, utilizing resources and increasing productivity is really an important issue, which can be resolved by creating a balanced relationship between demand and supply. Sasser (1976) indicates that excess capacity is a big issue to which companies need to pay attention.

On the other hand, according to Dixon et al. (2010), customer loyalty depends on how well the company provides its basic service. For instance, customers' major demand in transportation is to transfer them from one place to another. Yet, most companies ignore this and waste a great deal of investment on other facilities rather than paying attention to the route and schedule, so that they lose customers. Sasser et al. (1978) believe that service performance must meet customers' expectation, and then firms will have achieved effective service. Besides, Dixon et al. (2010) maintain that, even if firms provide service which exceeds customers' expectation, this does not change or increase customer loyalty. This can relate to Gossen's First Law, diminishing marginal utility, which proposes that customers' utility will decrease when they consume one more service or product (Berman, 2005).

Customers will feel dissatisfied in a situation of receiving excessive service and lower their repurchase intentions; moreover, this could result in negative word of mouth (Fong, 2011). Thus, firms should provide their core service, with an emphasis on what customers really want, rather than simply providing more and more service.

CUSTOMER BEHAVIOR

Satisfaction is what customers expect before making a purchase and it needs to be realized or exceeded (Peter & Olson, 2009); it is also the output of service quality (Cronin & Taylor, 1992; Cronin Jr et al., 2000; Parasuraman et al., 1985b). According to Taylor and Baker (1994), customer satisfaction can influence the repurchase intentions and service quality. Firms can sustain their competitive advantage by providing high quality service which will produce satisfied customers (Shemwell, 1998), lower their demand for flexible prices and transaction costs, keep loyal customers (Rust & Oliver, 1993), and gain market share and profit (R.T.Rust, A.J.Zahorik, & T.L.Keiningham, 1995).

The new principles of service marketing is to clearly understand the relationship between customer behavior and service quality, which has a positive influence on customer satisfaction and repurchase intentions (Taylor & Baker, 1994). Inconvenience and having to wait during service delivery have a powerful influence on customer satisfaction (Berry et al., 2002). Moreover, employees, layout of facilities, as well as other customers' behavior and characteristics will also influence customer satisfaction (Lovelock & Wirtz, 2010).

Generally, customer satisfaction reflects service quality and value, and this leads to customer loyalty and profitability (Heskett, 1994).Gronroos (2000) observes that achieving customer satisfaction by providing high quality service is the only way to gain customer loyalty, and customer loyalty can influence firms' revenue and profit. Hence, customer's loyalty can be seen to be an important measure to predict market share (Pugh et al., 2002).

Jones and Sasser (1995) provide three ways to evaluate customer loyalty, the first of

which is repurchase intentions, which means asking whether or not customers will come back to the store for a particular service. The second is based on frequency and the last time the customer received a particular service and volume. The third is to use word of mouth and recommendations from customers to promote the service. However, customer loyalty may depend on how well firms provide their basic service rather than simply delighting customers, but most firms rarely understand this and waste investment and increase costs (Dixon et al., 2010).Mohsan, Nawaz, Khan, Shaukat, and Aslam (2011) contend that over-emphasizing the service and leading customers to expect more than the firm can deliver turns satisfied customers into dissatisfied ones. This demonstrates that firms should focus on their core operation to satisfy their customers; hence the following hypotheses are established.

H1: Service Categories moderate the relationship between Service Level and Customer Behavior.

H2: Service Levels of Responsiveness and Tangible have an interactive effect on Customer Behavior.

H3: Tangible in adequate service levels leads to more positive Customer Behavior than Tangible in an over service level.

H4: Responsiveness in adequate service levels leads to more positive Customer Behavior than Responsiveness in an over service level.

METHODOLOGY

The study will be designed as three service types, namely, hair salons, laundries and theaters, and employees' responsiveness and tangible facilities will be divided into two service levels, adequate service or excessive service. Finally, whether or not this will influence customer behavior will be assessed.

The first step will design the scenarios for the questionnaire. The second will be to use a pre-test to ensure that the scenario designs are significantly different. The third step will be to distribute the questionnaires to respondents, and then collect the data they provide, while the final step will be to analyze the collected data.

A scenario design is widely used to enable the respondents to understand the questionnaire. A scenario-based role-playing experiment (SBRP experiment) is a descriptive vignette which covers the whole information in the essay (Alexander & Becker, 1978). According to Anderson and Sullivan (1993), an SBRP experiment is like a "framed field experiment" and a "situational experiment" (Bendoly, Donohue, & Schultz, 2006). Overall, in an SBRP experiment, the context is changed in various versions to describe the vignettes, and it is highly connected to the research purpose (Rungtusanatham, Wallin, & Eckerd, 2011).The most important thing is that each vignette should be properly explained and written, so that the responses can be usefully related to the statistical analysis (R.T.Rust et al., 1995).

Based on the research framework, two primary factors, tangible and responsiveness with 2 service levels and 3 levels in service categories, will be designed into nine different scenarios, which are listed in Table 1. A1 represents a hair salon, and tangible and responsiveness will both be designed as an adequate service level. A2 represents a hair salon, with an excessive service level of tangible and responsiveness, and so on.

Table 1: The Nine Types of Scenario Design in Service

Service levels	Tangible	Responsiveness	Hair salon	Laundry	Theater
Adequate service/	Adequate	Adequate	A1	B1	C1
Excessive service	Excessive	Adequate	A2	B2	C2
	Adequate	Excessive	A3	B3	C3

A pilot-test is done to certify that the vignettes in the scenario design and the versions are realistic, trustworthy and fascinating, and the most important aspect is that the vignettes should certainly lead people to make the appropriate responses (Rungtusanatham et al., 2011). After pilot-test, laundry scenario is found inappropriate; thus, only 2 categories are kept for primary research.

Questionnaires are the most important tool, which are widely used, and they can also measure respondents past experience, attitude and personal features (Hu, 2009). This study developed eight types of questionnaires; four for hair salons and four for theaters. Each questionnaire included two dimensions of SERVQUAL, namely, tangible and responsiveness, and both factors had 2 service levels, adequate service and over service.

The same price was set at the beginning of the questionnaires to ensure that the respondents had their own expectation within this price. Eight questions were asked including the two dimensions of responsiveness and tangible from SERVQUAL to evaluate customers' expectations (Parasuraman et al., 1988). Parasuraman et al. (1991) argue that SERVQUAL could be modified depending on different situations. Besides, Cronbach's alpha is a coefficient which is widely used to evaluate the reliability between customer satisfaction and service quality (Cronbach, 1951). In these questionnaires, Cronbach's alpha showed that responsiveness from SERVQUAL with a negative description was lower than with a positive

description. Based on this reason, PZB then modified the SERVQUAL scale from a negative description to a positive description (Parasuraman et al., 1991). Hence, these questionnaires also used a positive description of responsiveness.

The respondents were asked to score their answers based on a 5-point Likert scale, where strongly disagree=1, disagree=2, neither agree nor disagree=3, agree=4 and strongly agree=5 (Likert, 1932). The second part was the scenario in each service category, including a description of both tangible facilities and employee responsiveness with two levels of service levels, namely, adequate and over service.

RESEARCH RESULTS

This study analyzes primary factors, responsiveness and tangible (independent variables) whether they have significant influence on customer behaviors (dependent variables) in different service levels. Also, whether the relationship between responsiveness and tangible (independent variables) and customer behaviors (dependent variables) modified by service categories (moderating variable) is analyzed. After using MONOVA SPSS 17.0, it could be found the interactive effect on tangible*types* responsiveness. Thus, separate these two types, hair salons and theaters, then do MONOVA SPSS again.

Tangible and responsiveness are found to have interactive effect in different service types. Tangible and responsiveness did have influence on customer behavior when they are in different service categories. Therefore, Hypothesis 1 is supported. However, the interactive effect between tangible and responsiveness, which did not have significant difference in theaters but it partly influence in hair salons. Then Hypothesis 2 is weakly supported.

In theater, it could be found there was no significant interactive effect between tangible and responsiveness with customer behavior. Thus, it can continue to analyze the primary factors, tangible and responsiveness. It could be found that tangible did not have significant

influence on customer behavior; it couldn't continue do analyze which service level is better. Then Hypothesis 3 is not supported.

However, the other factor, responsiveness, it did have influence on customer satisfaction partly recommendation and repurchase intentions. In theater, responsiveness with adequate service level all have higher customer satisfaction, repurchase intension and recommendation than with over service level. Therefore, Hypothesis 4 is supported.

There was interactive effect between tangible and responsiveness on customer repurchase intension and recommendation, then it could indicate customer behavior are not consistent. In hair salon, it found that customers with adequate tangible tended to have much satisfaction, repurchase intension and recommendation when responsiveness also in adequate service level. When responsiveness in over service level, customer with excessive tangible facilities had much satisfaction, repurchase intension and recommendation. Base on the results that could weakly support Hypothesis 3.

The other factor, responsiveness, it also had influence on customer behavior in hair salons when tangible in adequate service levels and partly influence on customer satisfaction when tangible in over service levels.

Then checked the mean, it found no matter tangible in adequate service level or over service level, customer tended to have more satisfaction, repurchase intentions, and recommendation when responsiveness in adequate service level. Therefore, Hypothesis 4 is supported.

DISCUSSION

The study finds that there is an interactive relationship between tangible facilities and employees' responsiveness at different service levels, and this further influences customer behavior. In addition, this relationship is modified by service categories. While this

interactive relationship does not have a huge influence on customers' behavior in theaters, it does in hair salons. The reason for this may be that service encounters and tangible service can be clearly separated in theaters. Customers can use the facilities without encountering employees; thus, the chances to interact with employees are minimal. However, customers simultaneously use facilities and interact with employees more often in hair salons, and this situation has some influence on customers' behavior.

The other reason is that, in theaters, customers' main requirement is to watch the movie; therefore, they spend little time interacting with employees. In hair salons, customers' main requirement is to get a new hair style or other service, so they have more opportunities to interact with employees. These are the reasons why service categories modify the relationship between responsiveness and tangible, and further influence customer behavior, and these results can also relate to previous research. Chase (1978) indicates that high-contact service is more uncertain and difficult to control than low-contact service, and this will even influence customer satisfaction. Theater is seen as being a low-contact service category, based on the perspective of Lovelock and Yip (1996).

It is shown that employees with adequate responsiveness can increase customers' satisfaction, repurchase intentions and recommendation more than employees with excessive responsiveness in both hair salons and theaters. It can be seen from these results that, if service employees provide too much responsiveness, it tends to have a negative influence on customers' behavior. This also relates to research by Pugh et al. (2002), who found that the closer employees are to customers, the more information they can share with them and this will influence customer satisfaction. However, the author also indicated that firms need to offer the basic service customers want rather than providing too much information. Furthermore, Dixon et al. (2010) indicate that customer loyalty is based on how firms provide their basic service. Customers' main requirement in theaters is to watch movies, and their

main requirement in hair salons is to get a new hairdo. These are the basic services customers really want, and firms need to realize this and care more about it.

In theaters, tangible, which includes facilities and employees' appearance, does not have a significant influence on customer behavior, but it does in hair salons. This is because Taiwanese theaters are usually located inside department stores, so customers spend less time waiting in theaters, but go shopping instead. In hair salons, customers need to spend time waiting for the output and then completing the consumption. Based on the opinion of Bolton and Drew (1994), the longer customers stay in service organizations, the more opportunity they have to evaluate the environment and facilities. Customers spend much more time in hair salons than they do in theaters, so they have more opportunity to use the facilities and further evaluate them. The other reason is that customers usually believe that, if the store provides many high quality facilities, it will make them feel that it is worth paying a reasonable price. This may be the reason why tangible facilities only have a weak influence on customers' behavior in hair salons.

CONCLUSIONS

This study has demonstrated that tangible facilities and employee's responsiveness have an influence on customers' behavior, and they are also modified according to service categories. However, customers' behavior will not be significantly different in low-contact service categories. According to previous studies, the time customers spend in service facilities is one of the factors which influence their behavior (Chase, 1978). The respondents in this study also indicated that the information employees provide should fit their needs. Therefore, firms need to rethink their core service and decide what basic service customers really want, instead of providing service which annoys customers or is not useful to them.

However, tangible factors do not have strong influence on customer behavior in both

service categories. The respondents reported that they feel that high-quality tangible service is worth paying for, and they do not feel that it is over-service. The other reason is that customers will not use all the facilities, and they can ignore those they think are not useful. Besides, the basic factor of the three-factor theory (Füller & Matzler, 2008) which discusses what influences customer satisfaction, is that firms need to provide basic service or facilities, but exceeding their service level will not necessarily increase customer satisfaction. This can also relate to Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory, which states that the facilities firms provide are hygiene factors, which is a basic service and does not have much influence on customer behavior. This can explain why providing excessive tangible service will not have much influence on customers' behavior.

CONTRIBUTIONS AND LIMITATIONS

This study contributes to both academic and practical areas. In the academic area, it shows that more service is not always better, but can even cause customer dissatisfaction. To satisfy customers and keep their loyalty, previous research indicates that firms should provide high quality service. However, this does not always have huge impacts on customer satisfaction, repurchase intention, and recommendation, further to increase companies' costs. The study indicates that providing a basic service which customers really want is more important than merely providing high quality over-service.

In practice, this study could encourage firms to rethink their service categories, and decide what kind of basic service customers want and they can provide. This would avoid investing capital which will not increase customer satisfaction, keep their loyalty, and worst of all, waste firms' capacity. Firms need to know what information customers really want, so that they can train employees to have the appropriate responsiveness. Besides, firms should know what elements customers really want and whether they are meeting their needs or not (Fitzsimmons & Fitzsimmons, 2006; Sasser et al., 1978; Wakefield & Blodgett, 1999), so that

they can utilize their resources more efficiently and increase their productivity.

Most of the respondents in this student were college students, some of whom may have had the same experience of consumption. Therefore, the results may have some homogeneity without any huge differences, which is not good for generalization. Future researchers may want to include more professionals as samples to increase the variation and enhance the chance to generalize this study. They may also like to use other stores to survey, since one of the stores in this study, laundries, are not common service facilities in today's daily life, so customers do not visit them very often. Since the respondents did not have much experience of laundries, this topic was deleted from the survey. Finally, the research was not complete since it did not include three service categories.

Future research could extend the range for a more generalized concept and use psychology combined with customer behavior, which are based on human characteristics to make a much more in-depth evaluation of why customers feel this emotion and decision during service delivery. Other dimensions from SERVQUAL could also be used to design scenarios and analyze customers' behavior.

REFERENCE

Alexander, C. S., & Becker, H. J. 1978. The Use of Vignettes in Survey Research. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 42(1): 93.

Anderson, E. W., & Sullivan, M. W. 1993. The Antecedents and Consequences of Customer Satisfaction for Firms. *Marketing Science*, 12(2): 125-143.

Bendoly, E., Donohue, K., & Schultz, K. L. 2006. Behavior in operations management: Assessing recent findings and revisiting old assumptions. *Journal of operations management*, 24(6): 737-752.

Berman, B. 2005. How to delight your customers. *California Management Review*, 48(1): 129-151.

Berry, L. L., Seiders, K., & Grewal, D. 2002. Understanding Service Convenience. *The Journal of Marketing*, 66(3): 1-17.

Bitner, M. J. 1990. Evaluating Service Encounters: The Effects of Physical Surroundings and Employee Responses. *Journal of Marketing*, 54(2): 69-82.

Bitner, M. J. 1992. Servicescapes: The Impact of Physical Surroundings on Customers and Employees. *Journal of Marketing*, 56(2): 57-71.

Bolton, R. N., & Drew, J. H. 1994. *Linking Customer Satisfaction To Service Operations and Outcomes*.

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

Chase, R. B. 1978. Where does the customer fit in a service operation? *Harvard business review*, 56(6): 137-142.

Cohen, J. B., & Areni, C. S. 1991. *Affect and Consumer Behavior.* In T. S. Robertson & H. H. Kassarjian (Eds.) *Handbook of Consumer Behavior*: Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Cronbach, L. 1951. Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, 16(3): 297-334.

Cronin, J. J., Jr., & Taylor, S. A. 1992. Measuring Service Quality: A Reexamination and Extension. *The Journal of Marketing*, 56(3): 55-68.

Cronin Jr, J. J., Brady, M. K., & Hult, G. T. M. 2000. Assessing the effects of quality, value, and customer satisfaction on consumer behavioral intentions in service environments. *Journal of Retailing*, 76(2): 193-218.

Cronin Jr, J. J., & Taylor, S. A. 1992. Measuring Service Quality: A Reexamination and Extension. *Journal of Marketing*, 56(3): 55-68.

Davidoff, D. M. 1994. *Contact : customer service in the hospitality and tourism industry.* New York, NY: Prentice Hall;1 edition.

Davis, L. L., & Lennon, S. J. 1988. SOCIAL COGNITION AND THE STUDY OF CLOTHING AND HUMAN BEHAVIOR. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, 16(2): 175-186.

Dietz, J., Pugh, S. D., & Wiley, J. W. 2004. SERVICE CLIMATE EFFECTS ON CUSTOMER ATTITUDES: AN EXAMINATION OF BOUNDARY CONDITIONS. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47(1): 81-92.

Dixon, M., Freeman, K., & Toman, N. 2010. STOP Trying to Delight Your Customers. *Harvard Business Review*, 88(7/8): 116-122.

Doyle, R. 1998. Looking good: Working in work wear. *Air Conditioning Heating & Refrigeration News*, 205(7): 49.

Füller, J., & Matzler, K. 2008. Customer delight and market segmentation: An application of the three-factor theory of customer satisfaction on life style groups. *Tourism*

Management, 29(1): 116-126.

Fitzsimmons, J. A., & Fitzsimmons, M. J. 2006. *Service management: operations, strategy, and information technology*: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.

Gay, L. R. 1996. *Educational research: competencies for analysis and application*. New York: Macmillan.

Grandey, A. A., Geoldberg, L. S., & Pugh Douglas, S. 2011. EMPLOYEE SATISFACTION, RESPONSIVENESS, AND CUSTOMER SATISFACTION: LINKAGES AND BOUNDARY CONDITIONS. *Academy of Management Annual Meeting Proceedings*: 1-6.

Gronroos, C. 1982. *Strategic Management and Marketing in the Service Sector*: Swedish School of Economics and Business Administration, Helsingfors, Finland.

Gronroos, C. 2000. *Service Management and Marketing: a customer Relationship Management Approach. England*: England: John Wiley & Sons, ltd. .

Heskett, J. L. 1994. Putting the service-profit chain to work. *Harvard Business Review*, 72(2): 164.

Howard, J. A., & Sheth, J. N. 1969. *The theory of buyer behavior*: Wiley.

Hui, M. K., & Bateson, J. E. G. 1991. Perceived Control and the Effects of Crowding and Consumer Choice on the Service Experience. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 18(2): 174-184.

Iwaarden, J. v., Wiele, T. v. d., Ball, L., & Millen, R. 2003. Applying SERVQUAL to Web sites: an exploratory study. *international Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, 20: 919 - 935.

Jones, T. O., & Sasser, W. E. 1995. Why satisfied customers defect. *Harvard business review*, 73: 88-88.

Kotler, P., Bowen, J. T., & Makens, J. C. 2009. *Marketing for Hospitality and Tourism*: Prentice Hall.

Lehtinen, U., & Lehtinen, J. R. 1982. *Service Quality: A Study of Quality Dimensions*: Service Management Institute, Finland OY. .

Likert, R. 1932. A technique for the measurement of attitudes. *Archives of Psychology*, 22(140): 1-55.

Lovelock, C. H. 1983. Classifying Services to Gain Strategic Marketing Insights. *The Journal of Marketing*, 47(3): 9-20.

Lovelock, C. H., & Wirtz, J. 2010. *Services Marketing, People, technology, Strategy*: Prentice Hall.

Lovelock, C. H., & Yip, G. S. 1996. Developing global strategies for service businesses. *California Management Review*, 38(2): 64-64.

Lovelock, C. H., & Young, R. F. 1979. Look to consumers to increase productivity. *Harvard Business Review*, 57(3): 168-178.

Mohsan, F., Nawaz, M. M., Khan, M. S., Shaukat, Z., & Aslam, N. 2011. Impact of Customer Satisfaction on Customer Loyalty and Intentions to Switch: Evidence from Banking Sector of Pakistan. *International Journal of Business & Social Science*, 2(16): 263-270.

National Statistics, R. O. C. 2011. Gross Domestic Product by Kind of Activity（Percentage Distribution at Current Prices ）. In S. A. o. N. A. L. U. o. May-2012) (Ed.). National Statistics, R.O.C.(Taiwan): National Statistics, R.O.C.(Taiwan).

Norton, S. D., & Franz, T. M. 2004. Methodological Issues in Research on Business Casual Dress. *Journal of American Academy of Business, Cambridge*, 5(1/2): 130-137.

Othman, A., & Owen, L. 2001a. Adopting and Measuring Customer Service Quality (SQ) in Islamic. *International Journal of Islamic Financial Services Marketing Quarterly*.

Parasuraman, A., Berry, L. L., & Zeithaml, V. A. 1991. Refinement and Reassessment of the SERVQUAL Scale. *Journal of Retailing*, 67(4): 420.

Parasuraman, A., & Grewal, D. 2000. The Impact of Technology on the Quality-Value-Loyalty Chain: A Research Agenda. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 28(1): 168-174.

Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. 1985a. A Conceptual Model of Service Quality and Its Implications for Future Research. *Journal of Marketing*, 49(4): 41-50.

Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. 1985b. Problems and Strategies in Services Marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 49(2): 33-46.

Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. 1988. SERVQUAL: A Multiple-Item Scale for Measuring Consumer Perceptions of Service Quality. *Journal of Retailing*, 64(1): 12-40.

Peter, J. P., & Olson, J. C. 2009. *Consumer behavior and marketing strategy*: McGraw-Hill College.

Pugh, S. D. 2001. Service with a Smile: Emotional Contagion in the Service Encounter. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 44(5): 1018-1027.

Pugh, S. D., Dietz, J., Wiley, J. W., & Brooks, S. M. 2002. Driving service effectiveness through employee-customer linkages. *Academy of Management Executive*, 16(4): 73-84.

Robbins, S. P., DeCenzo, D. A., & Coulter, M. 2010. *Fundamentals of Management: Essential Concepts and Applications*: Prentice Hall.

Robbins, S. P., Decenzo, D. A., & Coulter, M. 2011. *Fundamentals of Management*: Perason

Rungtusanatham, M., Wallin, C., & Eckerd, S. 2011. THE VIGNETTE IN A SCENARIO-BASED ROLE-PLAYING EXPERIMENT Vignette in an SBRP Experiment. *The journal of supply chain management*, 47(3): 9-16.

Rust, R. T., & Oliver, R. L. 1993 *Service Quality: New Directions in Theory and Practice*: SAGE Publications, Inc

Rust, R. T., Zahorik, A. J., & Keiningham, T. L. 1995. Return on quality (ROQ): Making service quality financially accountable. *The Journal of Marketing*: 58-70.

Ruth, J. A., Brunel, F. F., & Otnes, C. C. 2002. Linking Thoughts to Feelings: Investigating Cognitive Appraisals and Consumption Emotions in a Mixed-Emotions Context. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 30(1): 44-58.

Sasser, W. E. 1976. Match supply and demand in service industries. *Harvard Business Review*, 54(6): 133-140.

Sasser, W. E., Olsen, R. P., & Wyckoff, D. D. 1978. *Management of service operations: text, cases, and readings*: Allyn and Bacon.

Seiders, K., Voss, G. B., Grewal, D., & Godfrey, A. L. 2005. Do Satisfied Customers Buy More? Examining Moderating Influences in a Retailing Context. *Journal of Marketing*, 69(4): 26-43.

Shao, C. Y., Baker, J. A., & Wagner, J. 2004. The effects of appropriateness of service contact personnel dress on customer expectations of service quality and purchase intention: The moderating influences of involvement and gender. *Journal of Business Research*, 57(10): 1164-1176.

Shemwell, D. J. 1998. Customer-service provider relationships: an empirical test of a model of service quality, satisfaction and relationship-oriented outcomes. *International journal of service industry management*, 9(2): 155-168.

Sudman, S. 1976. *Applied sampling*. 明尼蘇達大學: Academic Press.

Sulek, J. M., Lind, M. R., & Marucheck, A. S. 1995. The Impact of a Customer Service Intervention and Facility Design on Firm Performance. *Management Science*, 41(11):

1763-1773.

Taylor, S. A., & Baker, T. L. 1994. An assessment of the relationship between service quality and customer satisfaction in the formation of consumers' purchase intentions. *Journal of retailing*, 70(2): 163-178.

Wakefield, K. L., & Blodgett, J. G. 1999. Customer Response to Intangible and Tangible Service Factors. *Psychology & Marketing*, 16(1): 51-68.

Zeithaml, V. A., Berry, L. L., & Parasuraman, A. 1993. The nature and determinants of customer expectations of service. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 21(1): 1-12.

Zeithaml, V. A., Berry, L. L., & Parasuraman, A. 1996. The Behavioral Consequences of Service Quality. *Journal of Marketing*, 60(2): 31-46.

Zeithaml, V. A., Parasuraman, A., & Berry, L. L. 1990. *Delivering quality service: Balancing customer perceptions and expectations*: Free Pr.

Zindersin, R. K., Maric, D., & Grubor, A. 2009. CONSUMER EVALUATION OF THE SERVICE QUALITY. *POTROŠAČKO VREDNOVANJE KVALITETA USLUGA.*, 47(4): 169-185.

(Chinese Reference)

Hu. 2009. *Enterprise Research Method: The Application of Qualitative and Quantitative Skills.*

Fong. 2011. *The Exploratory Research of Excessive Service.*

Gia. 2008a. *The Brand Rule.*

Gia. 2008b. *Marketing Safety・Safety Marketing.*