



# How face-to-face feedback influences guest outcome evaluation of co-production: Changing or shaping guest experiences?



May Irene Furenes\*, Torvald Øgaard, Olga Gjerald

The Norwegian School of Hotel Management, University of Stavanger, Norway

## ARTICLE INFO

### Article history:

Received 22 August 2016

Received in revised form 8 November 2016

Accepted 21 November 2016

Available online xxxx

### Keywords:

Co-production

Face-to-face feedback

Consumer outcome evaluation

Self-presentation

Experiments

## ABSTRACT

Recent studies of the co-production process have indicated that written feedback influences consumer satisfaction with their own self-production. This study investigated whether the use of more direct face-to-face feedback might further increase guest satisfaction with own self-production when involved in food and drink preparation activities. Two experiments were conducted to compare two different types of verbal feedback. One was relatively neutral while the second one was more enthusiastic. The latter was more significantly appreciated, and it reinforced the attractiveness of verbal over written feedback. The experiments were designed based on the self-presentation theory. The ways in which respondents in two experiments presented themselves is also discussed.

© 2016 Published by Elsevier Ltd.

## 1. Introduction

Guests' experiences with hospitality and tourism services are considered of major importance for the competitive advantage of this industry (Blazquez-Resino, Molina, & Esteban-Talaya, 2013; Sørensen & Jensen, 2015; Žabkar, Brenčič, & Dmitrović, 2010). Service marketing research indicates that guests' active involvement with products and services offered by the company influences service experience (Mathis, Kim, Uysal, Sirgy, & Prebensen, 2016; Mossberg, 2007; Prebensen & Foss, 2011). Typical examples of service offerings in which guests' are actively involved includes cooking classes, skiing courses, rafting and the like. Since guests' service experiences are considered important for the hospitality and tourism industry, studies should examine the ways in which service providers can influence consumers' engagement in co-production to achieve valuable experiences for guests (Chathoth et al., 2016; Stokburger-Sauer et al., 2016).

Recent studies of the co-production process indicate that written feedback influences customers' satisfaction with their own self-design (Franke, Keinz, & Schreier, 2008; Hildebrand, Häubl, Herrmann, & Landwehr, 2013). Feedback refers to a message expressed by external agents that provides information about certain aspects of one's task performance (Kluger & DeNisi, 1996). Because the hospitality and tourism is a high contact industry (Grissmann & Stokburger-Sauer, 2012), verbal feedback seems to be more relevant compared to written feedback.

Therefore, a direct feedback, such as face-to-face, could possibly influence guests' service experiences when they are involved in task performance (Chathoth et al., 2016; Homburg, Koschate, & Hoyer, 2006).

This study investigates whether the use of oral face-to-face feedback may increase guests' satisfaction and their enjoyment when they are involved in food and drink preparation activities. We conducted two experiments to test the effect of face-to-face feedback on enjoyment and satisfaction. The first experiment compared face-to-face feedback with no feedback. The second experiment compared two types of face-to-face feedback, one neutral and one more enthusiastic, with written feedback as well as the nature of the oral message. The more enthusiastic face-to-face feedback was valued more, and it strengthened the attractiveness of verbal over written feedback. We designed both experiments following the self-presentation theory.

This study sought to contribute to the existing knowledge of how service managers can add more value to guest service experiences through direct face-to-face feedback. The paper also sought to address the call for more experimental research on guest behaviour in hospitality and tourism literature (Cohen, Prayag, & Moital, 2013; Larsen, 2007; Ritchie & Hudson, 2009; Ritchie, Tung, & Ritchie, 2011; Uriely, 2005).

## 2. Theoretical background and hypothesis development

### 2.1. Psychological responses to face-to-face feedback

Previous research on peoples' responses to feedback has pointed out that feedback seems to influence people's evaluation of themselves

\* Corresponding author at: University of Stavanger, 4036 Stavanger, Norway.  
E-mail address: [may.i.furenes@uis.no](mailto:may.i.furenes@uis.no) (M.I. Furenes).

(Archibald & Cohen, 1971; Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Kluger & DeNisi, 1996; Leary & Kowalski, 1990). It also suggested that the presence of others increases peoples' self-awareness (Banaji & Prentice, 1994; Baumeister, 1982; Leary & Kowalski, 1990). Furthermore, research on co-production suggests that consumers' active participation seems to create a link between these consumers' self-awareness and the outcome (Troye & Supphellen, 2012). When guests are involved in co-production, feedback in the form of oral comments from service employees may influence guests' evaluation of the outcome based on how they want to present themselves. We will therefore draw on the self-presentation theory to account for such effects (e.g., Baumeister, 1982; Baumeister & Tice, 1986; Leary & Kowalski, 1990; Schlenker, Forsyth, Leary, & Miller, 1980).

Self-presentation refers to the way in which people control the impression that they are making on others (Baumeister, 1982; Baumeister & Tice, 1986). People engage in self-presentation for two reasons, (1) because they want others to think favourably about them and (2) because they want to present their public self in line with their ideal self (Baumeister, 1982). Both of these motivations may yield different outcomes, depending on the value of the material or social outcome (Leary & Kowalski, 1990). Drawing on the self-presentation theory, we developed hypotheses to test the respondents' responses to face-to-face feedback and its relation to satisfaction and enjoyment in the process.

## 2.2. Face-to-face feedback and outcome evaluation

Consumers' self-involvement in the co-production process has been suggested to influence consumer outcome evaluation in general (Troye & Supphellen, 2012). According to the self-presentation theory (Baumeister, 1982), people are concerned about their public self-image when they are involved in social interactions. People's motive to impress others seems to be influenced by how their public self-image is presented in such interactions (Leary & Kowalski, 1990).

Usually, people want to present a positive self-image when they interact with others (Baumeister, 1982). To present a positive self-image, people normally seek positive feedback and avoid negative feedback (e.g., Ilgen, Fisher, & Taylor, 1979; Van Dijk & Kluger, 2011; Zhou, 1998). Therefore, people's motive to control the impression that they are making on others seems to depend on whether they perceive the feedback as positive or negative (Dolcos, LaBar, & Cabeza, 2004; Swann, Hixon, Stein-Seroussi, & Gilbert, 1990).

In a recent study, Holroyd, Hajcak, and Larsen (2006) found that neutral feedback was viewed as negative. Giving people a negative feedback can possibly create a cognitive dissonance between "*the ideal self*" and "*the real self*" (Baumeister, 1982). For example, a mid-scale feedback on their own work or creations can be a stimulus that produces a conflict between "*the ideal self*" and the "*real self*". If people hope for positive but receive negative information, they may need to control the impression they are making on others. For example, if the feedback is negative, people may distance themselves from the product to protect a positive self-image. Therefore, negative feedback could have a negative effect on satisfaction with the product. For that reason, we suggest that:

**H1.** People receiving a mid-scale face-to-face feedback on task performance will be less satisfied with the outcome compared to those who do not receive performance feedback.

Literature on co-production indicates that consumer values the enjoyment derived from the co-production process (Dahl & Moreau, 2007; Franke & Schreier, 2010; Stokburger-Sauer et al., 2016). Enjoyment refers to the psychological benefits (e.g., fun, enjoyment) derived from consumer participation in the co-production process (Yim, Chan, & Lam, 2012). Given that people enjoy the interaction derived from their participation, then participation in the co-production process may be

more valuable compared to a neutral feedback as for example a mid-scale message. We therefore assume that a mid-scale, face-to-face feedback on their self-made product may not affect the person's pleasure in the co-production process.

**H2.** People who receive a mid-scale, face-to-face feedback and those who do not receive feedback will not differ in process enjoyment.

## 2.3. The direct and moderating effects of effort

Effort that consumers invested in task performance is considered to influence these consumers' experiences (Atakan, Bagozzi, & Yoon, 2014a, 2014b; Dellaert & Stremersch, 2005; Franke & Schreier, 2010; Huffman & Kahn, 1998; Troye & Supphellen, 2012). For example, Troye and Supphellen (2012) found that consumers who spent high level of effort valued the outcome more positively compared to those who spent less effort in task performance. Effort involves different levels of time and mental energy that the consumers spend on task performance (Bendapudi & Leone, 2003; Buechel & Janiszewski, 2014; Dellaert & Stremersch, 2005). However, the outcome of performance will more likely become a part of a person if that person puts more effort into task performance (Troye & Supphellen, 2012). Therefore, we hypothesized that:

**H3a.** Effort has a positive effect on outcome evaluation.

If it is important to present an ideal self-image, then mid-scale face-to-face feedback is likely to have a stronger influence on those who exert greater effort compared to those who exert less effort. Therefore, we suggest that the more effort individual consumers put into task performance, the greater degree of self-affirmation they may expect to receive from the expert provides. In short, we hypothesized that:

**H3b.** Effort moderates the relationship between a mid-scale face-to-face feedback and outcome evaluation.

To test the hypothesized relationships, we conducted two experiments. In the following sections, we report the results from both experimental tests of the effect of face-to-face feedback on outcome evaluation.

## 3. Experiment 1

In Experiment 1, we manipulated face-to-face feedback to test the effect of a mid-scale face-to-face feedback on process enjoyment and satisfaction with the outcome. We also manipulated effort.

### 3.1. Participants, design, and measurement

#### 3.1.1. Participants

Overall, 134 people attending a regional food festival (Gladmat) participated in the experiment. In the experiment, 35% (47) were male, 57% (76) were female, and 8% (11) did not report their gender. Participants' ages ranged from 10 to 88 years ( $M = 39.8$ ). We recruited all participants from the festival by handing out flyers and oral invitations.

#### 3.1.2. Design

We used a  $2 \times 2$  (mid-scale, face-to-face feedback/control  $\times$  effort high/low) between-subjects factorial design. Upon entering the experiment, we randomly assigned all participants to one of these four conditions. Participants were told to mix a juice of their own taste. One of the experimenters followed the participants into a booth prepared with five different flavours of juice. As a cover story, we told the participants to mix a new flavour of juice that could be launched on the market. We manipulated the level of effort

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/5108804>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/5108804>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)