

2013

## Understanding Customer Actions during Self-service Technology Failures in Multichannel Service Environments

Jennifer Lawlor

*Technological University Dublin, [jennifer.lawlor@tudublin.ie](mailto:jennifer.lawlor@tudublin.ie)*

Petranka Kelly

*Technological University Dublin, [petranka15@gmail.com](mailto:petranka15@gmail.com)*

Michael Mulvey

*Technological University Dublin*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://arrow.tudublin.ie/tfschmtcon>



Part of the [Business Administration, Management, and Operations Commons](#), [Technology and Innovation Commons](#), and the [Tourism and Travel Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Kelly, P., Lawlor, J. and Mulvey, M. (2013) Understanding Customer Actions During Self-service Technology Failures in Multichannel Service Environments. *Tourism and Travel Research Association (TTRA) Conference, Europe Chapter, Dublin, April 17-19, 2013*, DOI: 10.21427/D7DN3M

This Conference Paper is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Tourism & Hospitality Management at ARROW@TU Dublin. It has been accepted for inclusion in Conference papers by an authorized administrator of ARROW@TU Dublin. For more information, please contact [arrow.admin@tudublin.ie](mailto:arrow.admin@tudublin.ie), [aisling.coyne@tudublin.ie](mailto:aisling.coyne@tudublin.ie), [vera.kilshaw@tudublin.ie](mailto:vera.kilshaw@tudublin.ie).

To be cited as:

**Kelly, P., Lawlor, J. and Mulvey, M. (2013) *Understanding Customer Actions During Self-service Technology Failures in Multichannel Service Environments*, Tourism and Travel Research Association (TTRA) Conference, Europe Chapter, Dublin, April 17-19.**

## **Understanding Customer Actions during Self-service Technology Failures in Multichannel Service Environments**

### Authors:

**Petranka Kelly** (corresponding author), PhD Student  
Dublin Institute of Technology, Sackville Place, Dublin 1, Ireland.  
Tel: +353 1 402 7550  
Email: [petranka.kelly@mydit.ie](mailto:petranka.kelly@mydit.ie)

**Dr Jennifer Lawlor**  
Dublin Institute of Technology, Dublin, Ireland.  
Tel: +353 1 402 7569  
Email: [jennifer.lawlor@dit.ie](mailto:jennifer.lawlor@dit.ie)

**Dr Michael Mulvey**  
Dublin Institute of Technology, Dublin, Ireland.  
Tel: +353 1 402 3417/8  
Email: [michael.mulvey@dit.ie](mailto:michael.mulvey@dit.ie)

### Keywords:

self-service technologies (SSTs); service recovery; service failure; customer role; customer management; services marketing

Contemporary customers are now being offered multiple channels of access to service companies, via the traditional service encounter, through the use of self-service technologies (SSTs) and technology facilitated employee encounters (Neslin and Shankar 2009). The tourism services industry is changing with the introduction of newer SSTs and their rapid adoption by customers. Examples of SSTs include hotel reservation websites, kiosk technologies at airports and mobile telephone service applications. SSTs may provide tourism service companies with opportunities for cost savings and broadening of the customer base, while customers appreciate the improved service in terms of convenience, efficiency, customer control, and cheaper price. The minimal or no interaction with company employees characteristic of SST encounters still poses a threat to their successful implementation, because it makes monitoring and recovery of service failures difficult (Dabholkar and Spaid 2012; Forbes 2008).

Research suggests that SST service failures are not being dealt with to the satisfaction of customers, which presents a threat to building lasting customer relationships (Forbes 2008; Forbes, Kelley, and Hoffman 2005). Furthermore, the recognised active role of the customer as a producer during SST encounters has received limited research in the situation of service recovery (Dong, Evans, and Zou 2008). The research attention has focused on the responses of service providers during SST failure/recovery episodes (e.g. Dabholkar and Spaid 2012; Mattilla, Cho, and Ro 2011), while overlooking the customer role (Dong et al. 2008). Based on the service-dominant logic in services marketing (Vargo and Lusch 2004), this paper contributes towards exploring customer actions during SST failure/recovery situations. The objective of this paper is to explore the factors affecting customer actions during SST failure/recovery episodes.

The research method employed to gather customer experiences of various SST failures was short qualitative interviews with 133 passengers at an international airport. This method of data collection was suggested as appropriate for gaining of a broad perspective on the main themes in an area of research where there is relatively little prior knowledge (Carson, Gilmore, Gronhaug, and Perry 2001). With a view to avoiding any preconceptions, the research included a broad sample in terms of ages, gender and education. Furthermore, the inclusion of a broad sample of participants was intended for gaining various customer perspectives. The limitations of this research method constitute the insufficient depth in questioning during the short interviews. The aim of this research was to gain initial understanding of customer behaviour during SST failures and should be followed by a more comprehensive data collection instrument, such as in-depth interviews or focus groups.

The interpretive analysis revealed numerous SST service recovery situations, namely when customers took no action, tried to recover the service, demanded a self-service option for service recovery, sought assistance from a company employee, abandoned the SST of the service company, alerted the company of service faults or interacted with other customers in recovering the service. These customer actions are discussed in terms of affecting factors. Some of the factors, which may determine customer actions during SST service failure episodes, include the ability of the SST to fix itself, customer experience with SSTs, the cost and ease of contacting a customer service representative, the presence of knowledgeable fellow customers, switching barriers and time pressure.

The findings from this research have implications for both academic knowledge and practice. The understanding of customer actions during SST failure/recovery episodes contributes towards the debate on efficient and effective SST service recovery. The outcomes from this research may assist services providers, customers, marketers, managers and policy

makers in ensuring higher consumer adoption and usage of SSTs in the tourism industry, and the wider services sector. The managerial implications are in the areas of optimal customer relationship management, improved customer experiences with SSTs and reduction of company operational costs. The paper concludes with the limitations of the research and suggestions for further research.

## **References**

Carson, David, Audrey Gilmore, Chad Perry, and Kjell Gronhaug, *Qualitative Marketing Research*. London: Sage, 2001.

Dabholkar, Pratibha and Brian Spaid “Service Failure and Recovery in Using Technology-Based Self-Service: Effects on User Attributions and Satisfaction.” *The Service Industries Journal* 32/9 (2012): 1415-32.

Dong, Beibei, Kenneth Evans, and Shaoming Zou “The Effects of Customer Participation in Co-created Service Recovery.” *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 36 (2008): 123-37.

Forbes, Lukas “When Something Goes Wrong and No One is Around: Non-Internet Self-Service Technology Failure and Recovery.” *Journal of Services Marketing* 22/4 (2008): 316-27.

Forbes, Lukas, Scott Kelley, and Douglas Hoffman “Typologies of E-commerce Retail Failures and Recovery Strategies.” *Journal of Services Marketing* 19/5 (2005): 280-92.

Mattila, Anna, Wonae Cho, and Heejung Ro “The Role of Self-Service Technologies in Restoring Justice.” *Journal of Business Research* 64 (2011): 348-55.

Neslin, Scott and Venkatesh Shankar “Key Issues in Multichannel Customer Management: Current Knowledge and Future Direction.” *Journal of Interactive Marketing* 23 (2009): 70-81.

Vargo, Stephen and Robert Lusch “Evolving to a New Dominant Logic for Marketing.” *Journal of Marketing* 68 (2004): 1-17.