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Abstract

During the past ten years self-service technologies (SSTs) have attracted research attention especially in the banking, retail and airline sectors. The infusion of technology in the service encounter has been identified as being advantageous to both the service provider and the consumer, provided that SSTs gain adoption among consumers. In light of the importance of consumer participation in SSTs, this paper reviews the state of the SST adoption literature in an attempt to identify the most important influencing factors. Seven factors emerged as the ones of key research interest in the literature and they are discussed in more detail. These include risk, trust, perceived ease of use, perceived usefulness, technology readiness, preference for personal contact and demographic variables.
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

Self-service technologies (SSTs) are attracting research attention in services marketing and management (Curran and Meuter, 2005; Bitner, Ostrom and Meuter, 2002) because when they are implemented successfully, they have proven to offer efficient and effective service standards without any traditional employee involvement. Some SST examples include the ATM, e-commerce websites such as Amazon.com and the online booking engines on airline websites.

The aim of this paper is to present the factors affecting consumer adoption and usage of SSTs. A literature review of seven adoption factors and two adoption models identifies some key gaps which may be used as directions for further research into SST adoption.

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

The term ‘self-service technologies’ was first used by Meuter, Ostrom, Roundtree and Bitner (2000, p.50) who defined them as ‘technological interfaces that enable customers to produce a service independent of direct service employee involvement’. This term and definition gained wide acceptance in subsequent research by other authors (e.g. Dean, 2008; Beatson, Lee and Coote, 2007; Curran and Meuter, 2005).

2.1 Classifications of SSTs

The growing research into SSTs brought the need for the development of a classification system. Meuter et al. (2000) made one of the initial attempts to devise a classification of SSTs. Their classification divides SSTs along two dimensions: interface (telephone/interactive voice response; online/internet; interactive kiosks; video/CD) and purpose (customer service, transactions, self-help). The need for a classification of SSTs by interface and purpose was further confirmed when Walker and Johnson (2006) and Curran and Meuter (2005) tested
adoption factor models across different SSTs and reported that the influence of the tested adoption factors varied by SST type.

Similarly to Meuter et al. (2000), Castro, Atkinson and Ezell (2010) classified the existing SSTs based on interface. Their classification recognizes four broad groups based on the type of the self-service technology channel: 1) electronic kiosks, 2) internet applications, 3) mobile devices and 4) phone applications. Please refer to Table 2.1 below for examples of SSTs as developed by Castro et al. (2010).

Table 2.1 Commonly Used SSTs (2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Electronic Kiosks</strong></th>
<th><strong>Internet Applications</strong></th>
<th><strong>Mobile Devices</strong></th>
<th><strong>Phone Applications</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Banking ATM</td>
<td>Online health</td>
<td>Smart phones</td>
<td>Dual tone multi frequency (DTMF) – use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-service gasoline stations</td>
<td>Online banking</td>
<td>Mobile payments</td>
<td>phone buttons to navigate a services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-pay parking, tolls</td>
<td>E-learning</td>
<td>Smart cards</td>
<td>menu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food ordering kiosks</td>
<td>Professional services</td>
<td></td>
<td>Interactive voice response (IVR) – speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport kiosks</td>
<td>Retail e-commerce</td>
<td></td>
<td>recognition technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vending machines</td>
<td>Customer service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self checkout</td>
<td>Online customization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail kiosks</td>
<td>Access to government services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resource kiosks</td>
<td>Ticketing and reservation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo printing kiosks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal kiosks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic voting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health kiosks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information kiosks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is evident from comparing the Meuter et al. (2000) and Castro et al. (2010) classifications by SST interface that some changes have occurred. The mobile devices section is not present in Meuter et al.’s (2000) classification, due to the lack of availability of smart phones and mobile internet access not existing in consumer markets at the time. Smart phones are presently used for commercial and financial transactions, online reservations, airline check-in and boarding and mobile banking (Castro et al., 2010).

Cunningham, Young and Gerlach (2008) offer a different perspective by researching how consumers view SSTs. Consumers classed SSTs along two main dimensions, customized-standardized and separable-inseparable from the core service. For example, airline reservations are viewed as highly customized and separable from the main service, while ATMs are standardized and inseparable from the service (Cunningham et al., 2008).

Meuter et al.’s (2000) classification and the more up-to-date classification by Castro et al. (2010) contribute towards a general overview of the existing SSTs. Even so, Cunningham et al. (2008) suggested that there is no widely established SST classification which is still a research gap.

2.2 Advantages and Disadvantages of SSTs

Some of the main advantages of SSTs as identified by consumers relate to a ‘better than the alternative’ theme including: ease of use; avoid service personnel; saved time; saved money; time and place convenience (Meuter et al., 2000, p.56). Dabholkar, Bobbitt and Lee (2003) propose that customers also enjoy the SST interaction. Further more, SSTs can improve service quality perceptions, offer flexibility and customize services to individual consumer needs (Bitner, Brown and Meuter, 2000). On the negative side, consumers reject SSTs because of ‘technology failure’, ‘process failure’, ‘poor design’ and ‘customer-driven failure’ (Meuter et al., 2000, p.56). Even people who have favorable attitudes towards technology may avoid SSTs because they can not replace the personal interaction (Dabholkar et al., 2003; Lee and Allaway,
SSTs also require higher levels of consumer participation and responsibility, so they are perceived as riskier than personal services (Lee and Allaway, 2002).

The main benefits to service providers from successfully implementing SSTs are: operational cost reduction; increasing customer satisfaction and loyalty; and accessing new markets (Bitner et al., 2002). SSTs allow staff to be relieved from routine duties and concentrate on aspects of the service delivery where personal touch is more valuable (Lee and Allaway, 2002). The limitations of SSTs from a service provider perspective are related to investment expenses, and staff and consumer training (Bitner et al., 2002; Lee and Allaway, 2002). If the service technology does not gain adoption with consumers, the company may face increased expenses because it needs to keep the operational staff, as well as pay for the new technology (Lee and Allaway, 2002).

It is obvious that SSTs offer plenty of benefits, but Anitsal and Schumann (2007) question if those are shared fairly between service providers and consumers. During SST encounters, consumers are active participants in the service delivery, and as such, service providers need to be familiar with the consumer perspective (Anitsal and Schumann, 2007). If consumers perceive that their input in the service production is higher than the output that they receive as benefits or rewards, they are unlikely to adopt the SST (Anitsal and Schumann, 2007).

### 2.3 SST Adoption Factors

The successful implementation of SSTs is dependent on wide consumer adoption in order to justify the investment cost (Lee and Allaway, 2002). A review of the SST literature, by the authors, from the past ten years identified over sixty peer-reviewed publications relating to research into SST adoption factors. This review produced over twenty different SST adoption factors and this paper suggests that there is no evidence of a widely agreed model of SST adoption. For the purposes of this paper, the authors examine seven key factors, namely perceived risk, trust, perceived ease of use, perceived usefulness, technology readiness, preference for personal contact and demographic variables. Those factors were chosen because of their frequent inclusion in SST adoption research and will be reviewed below.
2.3.1 Perceived Risk

The risk variable is examined mainly in the e-commerce literature in connection with the buying process (Cunningham, Gerlach, Harper and Young, 2005; Cunningham, Gerlach and Harper, 2004; Forsythe and Shi, 2003; Cases, 2002). The risks involved in internet shopping were researched in varying shopping contexts: shopping for clothes (Cases, 2002), airplane tickets (Kim, Qu and Kim, 2009; Cunningham et al., 2004) and Internet shopping in general (Forsythe and Shi 2003; Lieberman and Stashevsky, 2002).

Kim et al. (2009) studied the perceived risk and risk reduction in purchasing air-tickets online. They included risk dimension variables including performance risk, security risk, financial risk, physical risk, psychological risk and time risk. Kim et al. (2009) concluded that security risk was of primary importance. This finding is similar to previous research which found that payment and privacy security appeared as major risk factors in internet shopping settings (Forsythe and Shi, 2003; Cases, 2002; Lieberman and Stashevsky, 2002).

Risk associated with the travel and tourism sector is further intensified by the specific characteristics of the tourism product (Kim et al., 2009). Kim et al. (2009) summarize four characteristics of the tourism product which contribute to its relatively higher perceived riskiness in comparison to other products: 1) intangibility, 2) the product is purchased before experience, 3) variations in performance due to dependence on situational variables like weather, performance of the different components of the package and other tourists and 4) perishability, as the product quality is largely dependent on fluctuations in demand.

Recent studies on risk identify as a common weakness the usage of non-generalisable student samples and single measures (Kim et al., 2009; Cunningham et al., 2005). Cases (2002) studied risk within a very specific research context, i.e. clothes shopping online, which she recognized as a shortcoming of the research.

2.3.2 Trust
Bitner et al. (2000) recognize that the infusion of technologies in service encounters may not be welcomed by consumers, regardless of the obvious benefits. They propose two main concerns to the adoption of SSTs by customers: the preferences of some customers for interpersonal encounters during service, and the issues of privacy and confidentiality. Meuter et al. (2000) also suggest that developing trust in a non-employee atmosphere could be an avenue for further research in the area of SSTs. The importance of gaining consumers’ trust is further emphasized by findings from research which suggest that trust is a direct antecedent of behavioural intentions in electronic environments (Yousafzai, Pallister and Foxhall, 2009; McKnight, Choudhury and Kacmar, 2002).

The trust construct is regarded in the literature as hard to measure as a one-dimensional phenomenon (McKnight et al., 2002). McKnight et al. (2002) tested a model examining how personal disposition to trust and institution-based trust in the internet affected consumer’s trusting beliefs and trusting intentions. The findings from statistical analysis identified a relationship between disposition to trust and trusting beliefs and trusting beliefs and trusting intentions (McKnight et al., 2002). None of the paths from institution-based trust to the other variables were supported. This finding was not expected and it was interpreted as a shortcoming of the definition of institution-based trust as a general belief in the internet rather than a specific website context (McKnight et al., 2002). Institution-based trust therefore needs further research attention (McKnight et al., 2002). The authors suggest that the model could be tested in the e-vendor context and examined for changes beyond the initial trust and moving into on-going commercial relationships.

Connolly and Bannister (2008) tested the factors influencing trust in internet shopping in Ireland. They employed, as a measurement instrument, the conceptual model developed by Cheung and Lee (2000). Cheung and Lee’s (2000) model hypothesizes that there are two groups of variables which determine consumers’ trust in internet shopping namely, trustworthiness of the internet vendor, and external environment and those are mediated by the personal propensity to trust. Their empirical testing of the model argues that external environment factors have a very weak influence on consumer trust and that the moderating effect of propensity to trust is non-existent.
In an Irish context, the trustworthiness of the Internet vendor, combined with previous experience (which is part of the propensity to trust variable) were the two direct antecedents of trust while higher technical awareness led to the perception of higher trustworthiness of the Internet vendor. Connolly and Bannister (2008) concluded that the difference in findings of the two studies indicates that the Cheung and Lee (2000) model is not culture independent, and they call for further research into global factors influencing consumer trust in Internet shopping.

The latest trend in consumer trust research is a shifting towards exploring trust in virtual communities and social networks, as the new (Rayport, 2009; Wu and Tsang, 2008). Wu and Tsang (2008) adapted the McKnight et al. (2002) trust building model to measure trust in virtual communities. The outcomes of their research support the hypothesis that trust in websites has a behavioural influence on the intention of members to visit them.

2.3.3 Perceived Ease of Use and Perceived Usefulness

Davis, Bagozzi and Warshaw (1989) introduced the two variables of perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use in a conceptual model called the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM). Davis (1989) justified the choice of perceived ease of use and perceived usefulness as key determinants of technology adoption behavior, based on a literature review of multiple disciplines dealing with behavior and innovation adoption. Perceived ease of use is introduced in the information systems literature by Davis (1989, p.320) and defined as ‘the degree to which a person believes that using a particular system would be free of effort’. He further defined perceived usefulness as ‘the degree to which a person believes that using a particular system would enhance his or her job performance’ (p.320). TAM and its application in SST adoption literature will be discussed in Section 2.5.1.

2.3.4 Technology Readiness

Technology readiness (TR) is defined by Parasuraman (2000, p.308) as ‘people’s propensity to embrace and use new technologies for accomplishing goals in home life and at work’. Parasuraman (2000) based the components of TR on the notion that people harbor positive and
negative feelings towards technology, as identified by Mick and Fournier (1998). Mick and Fournier (1998) listed eight technology paradoxes with which consumers have to cope: control/chaos, freedom/enslavement, new/obsolete, competence/incompetence, efficiency/inefficiency, fulfills/creates needs, assimilation/isolation and engaging/disengaging. Parasuraman (2000) identified four groups of beliefs which impact on the technological readiness of individuals. He contends that *optimism* and *innovativeness* are contributors to TR whilst *discomfort* and *insecurity* are inhibitors to TR.

Parasuraman (2000) points to the need to investigate the antecedents and consequences of TR in a model where TR is the core construct. This research avenue was followed by Lin and Hsieh (2005) who empirically tested how TR influenced satisfaction and behavioural intentions. Their research found that TR had an influence on how consumers perceived the quality of SST interactions and determined their intentions to use them. Furthermore, another study by Zhu, Nakata, Sivakumar and Grewal (2007) empirically tested the influence of TR on the effectiveness of technology interfaces and found that the level of TR influenced the cognitive processing of interface design features. Therefore TR is a critical factor as it is directly related to perceptions of service quality (Zeithaml, Parasuraman and Malhotra, 2002).

Chiu, Fang and Tseng (2010) and Liljander, Gillberg, Gummerus and Riel (2006) challenge the importance of TR in explaining SST adoption behavior. In their study, Liljander et al. (2006) suggested that TR of adopters and non-adopters of self-service check-in did not differ significantly while other factors such as efficiency of service, control, perceived benefits, preference for personal contact and convenience emerged as stronger predictors. Liljander et al.’s (2006) research did not confirm the central role of TR as an adoption factor which contrasts with the findings of Lin and Hsieh (2005) and Parasuraman (2000). This difference in findings was attributed to the TR measurements which may need to be adapted for the specific research contexts (Chiu et al., 2010; Liljander et al. 2006).

### 2.3.5 Preference for Personal Contact
A common construct included in research models regarding SST adoption is the preference for personal contact (Lee, Cho, Xu and Fairhurst, 2010; Walker and Johnson, 2006; Curran and Meuter, 2005; Meuter, Bitner, Ostrom and Brown, 2005; Dabholkar et al., 2003). This construct is researched in more detail by Simon and Usunier (2007). Their research concluded that a cognitive style (rational/experiential) had the strongest influence on the preference for the personal contact construct. This fact confirms the view of Dabholkar and Bagozzi (2002) that personal traits are the basis of forming consumer attitudes and behavioural intentions. Lee et al. (2010) confirmed the effect of consumer personality traits, such as the need for interaction, on the intention to use SSTs but their results also proved that age is an antecedent to the preference for the personal contact construct. Preference for personal contact grew stronger with age (Lee et al., 2010; Simon and Usunier, 2007). Walker and Johnson (2006) reported that 35% of the respondents to their survey preferred personal contact and 65% preferred it on some occasions, including when they had a specific issue which needed prompt resolution, or when they wanted to make a complaint. Consumers develop negative attitudes towards a service provider if they are left with only an SST option and expect to have personal backup if something goes wrong (Reinders, Dabholkar and Frambach, 2008).

2.3.6 Demographic Variables

Some of the most common demographic variables researched in relation to SSTs include age, gender, education and income, since they offer effective grounds for traditional marketing segmentation (Lee et al., 2010; Nilsson, 2007; Chang and Samuel, 2004; Wu, 2003). Demographics have been examined as direct antecedents of usage (Nilsson 2007; Chang and Samuel, 2004), as influencing beliefs and attitudes (Elliott and Hall, 2005; Wu, 2003) or as indicators of personality traits (Lee et al., 2010). Dabholkar and Bagozzi (2002) expressed a view that demographic factors are not of interest in understanding consumer behaviour towards SSTs but research has produced varying results which will be discussed below.

A comparative research of Estonian and Swedish customers’ use of online banking undertaken by Nilsson (2007) found that demographic profiles of consumers in Western markets were more
diverse than in developing Eastern markets. The typical user of online banking in Estonia emerged as a young, well-educated male with a high income, while in Sweden no sizable differences in usage were identified across age, gender, education and income groups. In another study, Taiwanese men in the age group 36-40 showed better attitudes towards online shopping (Wu, 2003).

Some authors have concluded that age starts to matter less with experience and wider dissemination of technology in one’s everyday social and business life (Nilsson, 2007; Dabholkar et al., 2003; Dabholkar and Bagozzi, 2002), while other studies confirm differences associated with age (Lee et al., 2010; Dean, 2008; Simon and Usunier, 2007; Chang and Samuel, 2004).

Dabholkar et al. (2003) found that shopper age had little influence on adoption of self-scanning in grocery shops. In contrast, a study specifically of the age variable by Dean (2008) found that there are differences in the adoption of SSTs between the different age groups. Dean divided his sample into three age groups: 18-28; 29-48 and 49+. The study concluded that increasing age has a negative effect on three variables: preferences for SST to human contact; confidence to use SSTs; and belief in the benefits of using technology.

The interaction between demographics (e.g. age, gender, education and income) and personality traits (e.g. technology anxiety, need for interaction and technology innovativeness) and their effect on intentions to use SSTs was researched by Lee et al. (2010). Their findings show that consumer demographics influenced SST usage intentions through the mediating effect of personality traits (Lee et al., 2010). For example, men exhibited a greater level of technology innovativeness and less technology anxiety; older people needed more personal contact, showed more technology anxiety and less technology innovativeness; while consumers with higher income were less anxious about technology. The education construct is the only one which did not affect any of the tested personality traits (Lee et al., 2010).
The varying results of the SST research into demographics may be explained to some extent by the cross-cultural differences (Nilsson, 2007) or the changing influence of different demographic features over time based on changes in society (Chang and Samuel, 2004).

2.4 Adoption models

SST adoption has been researched by organizing various factors in testable conceptual models (Baron, Patterson and Harris, 2006). In this paper, two models will be presented, i.e. the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) and the Bitner et al. (2002) SST Adoption Model.

2.4.1 Technology Acceptance Model

One of the most influential adoption models in the SST literature is the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) by Davis, Bagozzi and Warshaw (1989), which is illustrated in Figure 2.1 below. The model was originally developed to predict technology systems usage in the workplace. TAM proposes that the beliefs of perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use are fundamental in forming an attitude towards an information system, which in turn forms a behavioral intention, followed by actual system use (Davis et al., 1989). Other factors such as demographics, personal traits and technology attributes are to be included in a group of external variables which affect attitudes only through the mediating TAM variables of perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use (Davis et al., 1989).

TAM has been researched in different technology contexts and its extensive testing to date has proven that it is a scientifically robust model (Gefen, Karahanna and Straub, 2003). The adaptability of TAM to different contexts was a justification to adapt it for SST research (Gefen et al., 2003). Findings show that the proposition of TAM which states that technology system
usage is predicted by perceived ease of use and perceived usefulness, could not explain fully SST adoption (Curran and Meuter, 2005; Gefen et al., 2003).

Gefen et al. (2003) found empirical evidence that, in an online shopping context, trust was significantly related to usage, independent of the TAM variables. Similarly, Curran and Meuter (2005) found that the adoption of online banking was more influenced by consumers’ perceptions of risk, than by their perceptions of its usefulness or ease of use. Baron et al. (2006) offered a qualitative approach to analyzing TAM and the issue of explaining and predicting technology adoption. The authors recognized the predominantly quantitative and rational approaches into researching technology adoption in consumer markets. Baron et al. (2006) concluded that quantitative model verifications based on TAM have been exhausted. Baron et al.
(2006) suggested that there is still room for more research into adoption as TAM fails to explain situations where SSTs are deeply influenced by social context and consumer co-creation of value. Baron et al. (2006) chose to employ consumer diary writing as a research instrument in the context of mobile text messaging. The study revealed that technology paradoxes and coping strategies (from Mick and Fournier, 1998), as well as consumer co-creating of value and embracement of text messaging services, provided new nuances to consumer technology-based service adoption.

### 2.4.2 Bitner, Brown and Meuter (2002) SST Adoption Model

SST adoption is recognized as a consumer decision process by Bitner et al. (2002) who proposed a conceptual model comprising of six stages namely, awareness, investigation, evaluation, trial, repeated use and commitment. Please refer to their model in Figure 2.2. Their model was developed on the basis of qualitative in-depth interviews with consumers and the integration of theory. Bitner et al. (2002) conducted 22 in-depth interviews with customers of a healthcare company which was in the process of trying to implement a voice response ordering system for prescription refills (Bitner et al., 2002). The results confirmed that awareness of the SST was an initial stage of the adoption process, after that the consumer collected additional information about it and evaluated the advantages and drawbacks of the offered new SST over the traditional method of service delivery. If the evaluation was positive, the customer was likely to try the SST. The outcome of the trial would then determine if the usage was repeated (Bitner et al., 2002).

![Figure 2.2 Model of SST Adoption](image-url)
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Meuter et al. (2005) determined that the trial stage of the Bitner et al. (2002) adoption model deserved most attention as it is crucial for adoption. A set of factors predicting trial was derived from previous adoption literature. Those antecedents included - innovation characteristics (compatibility, relative advantage, complexity, observability, triability and perceived risk), and individual differences (inertia, technology anxiety, need for interaction, previous experience, age, gender, education and income). The set of predictors was hypothesized to be mediated by the consumer readiness construct which is conceptualized as role clarity, motivation and ability (Meuter et al., 2005).

Meuter et al.’s (2005) research confirmed that the dimensions of the readiness construct mediated the set of individual differences and innovation characteristics tested. Role clarity and extrinsic motivation emerged as the consumer readiness factors which mediated the largest amount of antecedent predictors. They suggest further research regarding the exploration of the other steps of the adoption process from awareness to commitment, as well as in-depth research of the most influential mediator of role clarity.

3.0 CONCLUSION

This paper provided an overview of the relatively new area of SSTs, concentrating on consumer adoption. This area of research has been attracting attention as there are obvious advantages that
SSTs offer to both consumers and service providers, whilst certain drawbacks are to be taken into consideration.

The review of the key SST adoption factors and models to date revealed a number of gaps which call for further research. SST adoption has been researched predominantly at a ‘trial’ level, i.e. Stage 4 of Bitner et al.’s six stage process. There are three stages preceding trial (awareness, information search and evaluation) and no factors have been identified which may improve awareness of SSTs or influence towards a better evaluation. Similarly, beyond the trial stage, research has been interested mainly in satisfaction outcomes but has not investigated other factors contributing to repeated usage (Beatson et al., 2007).

The strategic importance of understanding SST adoption factors is essential in service industries, especially if large investments are involved (Anitsal and Schumann, 2007). Some SSTs do not gain adoption because service providers do not take into consideration that a high level of consumer participation is involved, and sometimes the consumer is not rewarded for his input (Anitsal and Schumann, 2007). Therefore, an understanding of the consumer perspective is of importance in terms of awareness, adoption, repeated usage and commitment to SSTs.
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