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บทคัดย่อ
การรับรู้ของลูกค้าในเรื่องเวลาและความพยายามในการซื้อและบริโภคบริการนั้น เป็นสิ่งสำคัญของความสะดวกของการบริการและคุณภาพของการบริการ วัตถุประสงค์ของการศึกษาในครั้งนี้ 2 วัตถุประสงค์คือ เพื่อศึกษาผลของการเป็นตัวแปรแทรกของการรับรู้ในการควบคุมระหว่างมิติในการวัดความสะดวกในการบริการ (ความสะดวกในการเข้าถึง, ความสะดวกในการทำาธุรกรรม, และผลประโยชน์ที่ได้รับ) กับการรับรู้ในคุณค่าของลูกค้า และเพื่อศึกษาถึงความสัมพันธ์ของแต่ละมิติในการวัดของความสะดวกที่ส่งผลต่อการรับรู้ในคุณค่า

ผลการศึกษาจากนักท่องเที่ยวในธุรกิจการท่องเที่ยว เชียงใหม่ไนท์ซัฟารี (เชียงใหม่ไนท์ซัฟารี) จำนวน 391 คน พบว่าการรับรู้ในคุณค่ามีทั้งทางตรงและทางอ้อม (ผ่านการรับรู้ถึงการควบคุม) มีความสัมพันธ์กับการรับรู้ในคุณค่าทั้งทางตรงและทางอ้อม (ผ่านการรับรู้ถึงการควบคุม)

คำสำคัญ: ความสะดวกของการบริการ  ธุรกิจการท่องเที่ยว ประเมินการรับรู้  การรับรู้ในคุณค่า
Abstract

A consumer’s perception of the time and effort expended in purchasing and consuming a service is central to service convenience and therefore service quality. The purpose of this study was two-fold, first, to examine the extent to which perceived control mediated the relationship between the dimensions of service convenience (access, transaction, and benefit convenience) and consumer perceived value. The second objective was to examine the relative importance of each convenience dimension in impacting perceived value.

The results of this study, based on the responses obtained from 391 visitors to a high contact experiential service (Chiang Mai Night Safari), revealed that perceived control only partially mediates the relationship between the dimensions of service convenience and consumer perceived value.

Access and benefit convenience positively impacted perceived value, both indirectly (via perceived control) and directly. Transaction convenience had a direct, negative impact on perceived value.
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1. Introduction

Because of changing economic, socio-cultural, technological environments and demographic patterns (Berry, Seiders and Grewal, 2002; Brown, 1990; Brown and McEnally, 1992; Seiders, Voss, Godfrey and Grewal, 2006; Seiders, Voss, Godfrey and Grewal, 2007), customers are increasingly demanding services and products that require minimum time and effort to purchase, experience, and consume. Service convenience is the consumer's perception of the time and effort required to buy or utilize a service (Berry et al., 2002). For this reason, service convenience has become an interesting aspect within service marketing.

Service convenience influences both customers and service providers. Service providers seek to increase their profit by trying to meet the increasing demand of service convenience. In order to increase profits, there is often a need for service providers to include new value adding attributes. For example, service convenience within the banking industry indicated that location convenience was an important factor. This resulted in many banks opening branches in department stores, or offering self-service technology to entice their customers. Offering enhanced service convenience is one such value adding attribute that enables service firms to gain higher returns and a competitive advantage (Seiders, Berry and Gresham, 2000). It has been found that consumers are increasing their demand of service convenience for various reasons. Changing economic climates for instance, has led to an increase of women participating in paid work. Now, most of their time is spent at work and available time for family has decreased, reflecting the role of women in dual-wage families. As such, some working women will seek products and services which enable them to save time and effort. That is, the perceived benefits of convenience will highly influence working women to purchase a particular product or service.

Due to the nature of certain services, customers are required to be present for the service delivery process e.g. customers have to sit on the chair while hair stylists do their work. In high contact experiential services where customers not only have to visit the service site and be involved in the service delivery process, customers also have to remain there until the service is complete. The co-creation of value in a high contact experiential service between service providers and customers is unavoidable. Visitors to a safari theme park are co-creators of value by actively participating in some of the service delivery process, for example sightseeing animals in the trams, or sitting in the audience of a cabaret show. Service convenience helps visitors to a theme park participate in the service delivery process, for example the provision of a tram schedule for the park. Thus, a co-creation of value between service providers and visitors can occur during the service encounter, where the visitors will perceive the value of a theme park’s services. Service convenience also requires the customers to use non-monetary resources, time and effort. It is not possible for customers to increase some of these non-monetary resources,
such as time. Thus, when a customer’s time is limited, they will be careful in the way that they spend that resource. Customers who are able to choose the way in which they use their time can also be seen as having control over the way they spend their resource.

Previous investigations reveal that the influence of service convenience with service evaluation included factors such as service quality, customer satisfaction (Geissler, Rucks and Edison, 2006; Seiders et al., 2006; Vichet, 2007; Colwell, Aung, Kanetkar and Holden, 2008; Dai and Salam, 2010; Xie, Peng and Shen, 2010; Chang and Polonsky, 2012), perceived value (Dai and Salam, 2010; Chang, Chen, Hsu and Kuo, 2010), repurchase behavior (Butcher, Sparks and O’Callaghan, 2002; Seiders et al. 2007), and behavioral intention to purchase (Collier and Sherrell, 2010). Existing literature heavily focuses on conventional retailing (Seiders et al., 2007; Clulow and Reimers, 2009).

More recently research has begun to investigate areas of electronic retailing, such as in electronic mediated environments (Dai and Salam, 2010), online retailing (Jiang, Jiang and Liu, 2011; Jih, 2007), and in self-service technology (Collier and Sherrell, 2010). However, research into high contact experiential services, i.e. the service focus on the experience of customers more than the functional benefits (Voss and Zomerdijk, 2007), such as tourism destinations, theme parks, theatres and so on, is limited. High contact experiential services, for example, safari theme parks, are services where customers have to go to the park in order to participate in the service delivery process. Safari theme parks are tourist destinations where the management tries to provide a pleasant overall experience for visitors, not just provide a place that educates them about animal life. Therefore, the benefits from service convenience is to enhance a visitor’s ability to participate in the service delivery process which results in a pleasant experience and persuades them to join the co-creation of the value process as a co-creator.

For these reasons, we were interested in investigating the effects of service convenience in a high contact experiential service.

The purpose of this study was firstly to quantitatively examine the relative importance that the dimensions of service convenience had in impacting perceived value in a high contact experiential service. Secondly, to examine the mediation relationship of perceived control between service convenience and perceived value.

2. Theory

Service-dominant logic perspective (S-D) is conceptualized from a social and economic exchange phenomena. The central theme in S-D logic is that the customer and the firm jointly create, or co-create value (Vargo and Lusch, 2004, 2008). Some scholars call S-D logic a theory, but Vargo and Lusch (2008) believed that this perspective is a mindset and requires a theory of law-like generalization. The dominant logic is a shift from the exchange of tangible goods to the exchange of the intangible goods such as specialized...
skills and knowledge, and processes. It is the S-D logic that came to explain this shift (Vargo and Lusch, 2004, 2006, 2008; Vargo et al., 2008).

The S-D logic perspective defines services as the application of specialized competences (knowledge and skills) through deeds, processes, and performances for the benefit of another entity or the entity itself (Vargo and Lusch, 2004). S-D logic is concerned with the co-created value between a service firm and the customer, as well as the resources. “Value” in S-D logic is “value in use”, it is considered as an operand and an operant resource. An operand resource is an act or operation performed, such as goods (Vago and Lush, 2004). The operant resource is the basis of exchange in S-D logic where the resource acts upon the other resources. Customers are considered to be the operant resource as they co-create the value in a co-creation process (Vargo and Lusch, 2004; Vargo, 2008; Vargo et al., 2008).

The S-D logic perspective proposed ten foundation premises to explain value creation and the usage of resources. From the ten foundation premises of S-D logic, we were concerned with “which of the foundation premises should be used in the co-creation process experience of customers with the service providers” as firms operating within the tourism industry need the participation of visitors in all their processes. Service processes can only operate when that firm has visitors participating in the process, for example shows will only be successful if they have an audience. In order to investigate the involvement of visitors throughout this process, this study employed four premises of the S-D logic. The four premises were FP6, FP7, FP9, and FP10. FP6 is that ‘the customer is always a co-creator of value’. FP7 is that ‘the enterprise cannot deliver value, but only offer value propositions’. For FP9, ‘the value creation process requires the resources of all the parties concerned, besides requiring interaction with every party’. Finally, FP10 is that ‘value is always uniquely and phenomenologically determined by the beneficiary’ (Vargo and Lush, 2004, 2008).

The relationship between S-D logic with service convenience

Theme parks are commercially operated enterprises that offer rides, shows, merchandise, food services and other forms of entertainment in a themed environment (Milman, 2009). A safari theme park is simply a park with characteristics or themes of a safari which have been carried over into every aspect of the park. Thus, the park offers animal trips, shows, food services, and entertainment in a themed environment similar to a safari trip in Africa. The service process in a safari theme park requires visitor involvement in order to receive the service. The co-creation of value occurs when service firms and visitors bring their own resources together and integrate them in the processes of the service systems (Vargo and Lush, 2004, 2008; Vargo et al., 2008). Given that not all visitors may want to participate in all activities, they have the option to select those they are interested in. If theme parks give a value proposition to the particular processes where
visitors can determine the value and participate in them with their own resources, visitors will perceive a value of that service. Some of the processes that visitors participate in will give them the opportunity to increase their perceived value of that process whilst they participate in the consumption process.

Service convenience is a non-monetary resource that enables customers to perform in a way that requires minimum time and least amount of effort (Berry et al., 2002; Colwell et al., 2008). The perception that customers have of the time and effort required to receive a service is a factor that will help individuals decide whether or not they will become a customer of a particular firm or organization (Berry et al., 2002). As a customer’s resources are limited (e.g. time, and effort), they are careful in the way they spend them. Service firms that require customers to use low levels of their resources in order to receive benefits helps customers perceive a ‘value in use’ of that service as they interact in the co-creation of the value process. From the discussion above, we believe that service convenience not only gives the perception of value to customers, it also gives customers a sense of control over their resources. This evidence supports the idea that service convenience is a way to explain the service dominant logic within this research.

3. Literature Review

This section provides a summary of the literature related to service convenience, perceived control and perceived value. It also serves to introduce the relationship with service convenience and our hypotheses.

**Service Convenience**

Brown (1990) defined convenience as a reduction in the amount of a consumer’s time and/or energy required to acquire, use, and dispose of a product or service relative to the time and energy required by other offerings in the same class as that product/service. Berry et al. (2002) referred to service convenience as the consumers’ time and effort perceptions related to the buying or using of a service. Farquhar and Rowley (2009) proposed that the convenience of a service was a judgment made by consumers according to their sense of control over the management, utilization, and conversion of the time and effort involved in achieving their goals associated with the access to and use of that service. From the various definitions above, we suggest that service convenience not only the reduction of time and effort required, but also the sense of control over that a consumer has over their time and effort.

Service convenience is a multidimensional construct (Brown, 1990; Brown and McEnally, 1992; Berry et al., 2002; Seiders et al., 2007; Colwell et al., 2008; Farquhar and Rowley, 2009). Brown (1990) proposed five dimensions that customers used to measure the convenience of a service: time, place, acquisition, use, and execution. The first four dimensions were based on the economic utility theory. For the fifth dimension-
execution, a customer is able to choose how much mental or physical effort he or she wished to expend in obtaining and using a particular service. Berry et al. (2002) identified five dimensions to measure service convenience: decision, access, transaction, benefit, and post-benefit conveniences. Decision convenience is the time and effort spent in deciding how to obtain a service. Access convenience is the perceived time and effort expended in initiating the service delivery. Transaction convenience is defined as the expenditure of time and effort in effecting a transaction. Benefit convenience is defined as the perceived time and effort that a customer is required to expend in order to experience the service’s core benefits. Post-benefit convenience is defined as the perceived time and effort expenditure when reinitiating contact with a firm after the benefit stage of the service. Several researchers investigated these five dimensions (Seiders et al., 2006, 2007; Colwell et al., 2008; Chang et al., 2012) and confirmed that they capture the service convenience construct well.

The systematic development of the service convenience scale was done by Seiders et al. (2007) and Colwell et al. (2008), who utilized the five dimensions of service convenience: decision, access, transaction, benefit, and post-benefit convenience (Berry et al., 2002). Seiders et al. (2007) developed their scale using subjects in a retailing context, reporting seventeen items which was termed “SERVCON”. Colwell et al. (2008) validated the scale using university student subjects in the context of cellular telephone and internet usage. Colwell et al. (2008) also reported seventeen items, however, in terms of reliability, the Cronbach’s alpha of Colwell et al. (2008) was lower than the “SERVCON” scale.

Due to the nature of service convenience, in that it varies according to its specific context (Colwell et al., 2008), several researchers have investigated which dimensions of convenience provide the most appropriate meaning for their study. There is evidence from previous studies that researchers have modified the dimensions of convenience for their specific contexts. Additional dimensions of service convenience were shown in several researches (Moeller et al., 2009; Dai and Salam, 2010; Hon, 2010; Jiang et al., 2011). For example, the research conducted by Dai and Salam (2010), investigated the relationship of service convenience and the service consumption experience in an electronic mediated environment. They found that the original dimensions did not adequately capture all the service convenience in their context because ‘search convenience’ was left out. Therefore, they proposed six dimensions; decision, access, transaction, benefit, post-benefit, and search convenience. In contrast, Geissler et al. (2006) ran focus groups with visitors to an art museum. They found that only three dimensions were associated with their context; decision, access, and transaction convenience. However, it has been found that even though there may be similar contexts, such as in the retail context, the dimensions used to measure service convenience are not always consistent. Thus, determining the critical dimensions for a high contact experiential service
is an interesting area to investigate.

Most literature reviews in the area of service convenience heavily concentrate on conventional retailing. Conventional retailing has been widely tested in the USA and Australia (Clulow and Reimers, 2009; Seiders et al., 2007). Recent investigations have turned to online retailing (Jih, 2007; Jiang et al., 2011), electronic-mediated environments (Dai and Salam, 2010), and self-service technology (Collier and Sherrrell, 2010). Even though there have been qualitative investigations into service convenience in experiential service at an art museum, there has not yet been any quantitative investigations into experiential service, such as tourism destinations, theme parks, and the theatre. A safari theme park is a high contact experiential service in which visitors visit the service facility in person and are actively involved with the service organization and its personnel throughout the service delivery process (Lovelock, Patterson, and Walker, 2007). As such, this particular context became of particular interest to us.

In this research, we defined (1) decision convenience as the time and effort required to make decisions on how to obtain a service, (2) access convenience as the perceived time and effort expended to initiate the service delivery, (3) transaction convenience as the expenditure of time and effort to effect a transaction, (4) benefit convenience as the customer’s perceived time and effort expenditures to experience the service’s core benefit (Berry et al., 2002).

**Perceived Control**

The need for control over a situation is a major force that drives human behavior (Bateson, 1985). Humans have a need for control over a variety of behaviors, such as playing games, studying to achieve a desired grade, gambling, watching television, and doing leisure activities (Ajzen, 1991; Ajzen and Driver, 1992). Perceived control is defined as the belief in one’s ability to perform the course of action required to manage a situation (Bandura, 1997).

The perception of convenience from a service gives customers a sense of control over the situation of consumption. Perceived control may not seem real for customers when they have relatively little information about the behavior, when requirements or available resources have changed, or when new and unfamiliar elements have entered the situation (Ajzen, 1991; Ajzen and Driver, 1992). Thus, information is an important part of the decision making process and perceived control. Service providers who provide enough information can help customers make their decision easily. The information that customers receive helps them to perceive decision convenience, which in turn helps them to behave appropriately. In the context of a safari theme park, an operand resource, such as maps, brochure of the trams service and show schedules, price lists, and clear signage within the park can help customers perceive control of their situation through the information they provide.
Previous investigations did not make any link between service convenience and perceived control. Direct links always linked service convenience and customer valuation of a service (service quality, service fairness, customer satisfaction, loyalty), (Geissler et al., 2006; Seiders et al., 2006; Vichet, 2007; Colwell et al., 2008; Dai and Salam, 2010; Xie, Peng and Shen, 2010; Chang and Polonsky, 2012). Research into the area of service convenience showed evidence of associations with perceived value (Dai and Salam, 2010; Chang et al., 2010), repurchase behavior (Butcher et al., 2002; Seiders et al., 2007), and behavioral intention to purchase (Collier and Sherrell, 2010). Surprisingly, there was no evidence of a relationship between service convenience and perceived control. Therefore, this research aimed to try and find the link between these two constructs. Literature revealed that service convenience and perceived control were linked by resources and the opportunities of customers. The resources and opportunities available to a person enables them to achieve or perform a behavior (Ajzen, 1991). The perception of resources and opportunities, such as perception about time, money, skill, and the cooperation of others, can generate a perception of control that the customers have over the situation (Ajzen, 1985). Studies have shown that service convenience is the time and effort that customers have to expend when they want to change from ordinary people to a customer of a service firm (Berry et al., 2002). Thus, time and effort are the non-monetary resources that can make customers perceive control of their situation. Therefore, we propose that the relationship between service convenience and perceived control is as follows:

**H1. Service Convenience (H1a — Decision convenience, H1b — Access convenience, H1c — Transaction convenience, H1d — Benefit convenience) will have a positive relationship with perceived control.**

**Perceived Value**

Previously, research into service marketing widely investigated areas of customer satisfaction and service quality. At present, literature in service marketing has concentrated more on perceived value. Dodds and Monroe (1985) reported that the most important factor in the buying decision process is perceived value. Moreover, marketing managers have employed perceived value as a way to explain repeat purchase behavior, brand loyalty, and relationship commitment (Patterson and Spreng, 1997). Perceived value is defined as the consumer’s overall assessment of the utility of a product based on perceptions of what is received and what is given (Zeithaml, 1988).

Value is the term used to describe a trade-off of equivalents to compensation, or the balance between benefits and sacrifices (Gil, Berenguer and Cervera, 2008). The most basic approach to a two-way definition of value is a ratio, or a trade-off between quality and price (Monroe, 1991). The ratio between quality and price is called value for money. The perceived value for services however, is more complex than a simple trade-off
between quality and price (Bolton and James, 1991). Some researchers believe that value is not only between benefits and sacrifices, but also the trade-off between give and get (Zeithaml, 1988). Service convenience has been defined as the time and effort that customers have to pay when they want to change from ordinary people to a customer of service firms (Berry et al., 2002). For this reason, customers will be concerned about what they “give” when they buy and consume some services. The work of Dai and Salam (2010), and Chang et al. (2010), found that there was a direct relationship between service convenience and perceived value. Therefore, we propose that the relationship between service convenience and perceived value, as follows:

\(H2.\) Service Convenience \((H2a — Decision convenience, H2b — Access convenience, H2c — Transaction convenience, H2d — Benefit convenience)\) will have a positive relationship with perceived value.

In general, customers’ have a need for control over their situation, even if they are just playing a game, studying for a desired grade, or watching television (Ajzen, 1991). As such we see that customers even desire to have control over their leisure activities. In high contact experiential contexts, time and effort are the non-monetary resources that can make customers perceive that they have control over their trip. The perception of control over their resources, enables customers to perceive the level of “give” in order to receive some service which is what makes the value of service. The discussion above made us believe that service convenience has both a direct and indirect relationship to perceived value. The positive path between the service convenience dimensions and the perceived value was investigated in \(H2a–H2d\). Therefore, a mediation approach was proposed for this high contact experiential context in order to explain the link between the service convenience dimensions, perceived control, and perceived value. Thus, we hypothesize:

\(H3.\) Perceived control mediates the relationship between service convenience and perceived value.

---

Figure 1. Conceptual model.
4. Methodology

Data Collection

The largest safari theme park in Thailand, the Chiang Mai Night Safari (CNS), was selected as the site for testing our hypotheses. Permission was granted from the director of the CNS, who provided us with a research area at the exit of the park. The collection period was during February and March, 2013. A total of 391 questionnaires were completed and used to test the model.

Research Method

This study was a mixed method research comprising of three phases: qualitative, pretest, and main study.

Stage I: Qualitative study was used to examine the conceptual model for content validity and to find out whether there were other constructs or dimensions of constructs that should be included in the model. Twelve in-depth interviews, one focus group and observation were used to gather the qualitative data. All activities were conducted in the city of Chiang Mai. The qualitative study used at the beginning of the research process enabled us to better understand the dimensions of the ‘service convenience construct’ in a safari theme park setting, and helped us to determine if other relevant constructs should also be included in the model. All interviews and the focus group were recorded then transcribed into words for interpretation. This stage resulted in the development of the questionnaire and supported the face validity of the model specification.

Stage II: Pretest Stage. Following the qualitative study, a questionnaire was developed. The original questionnaire was constructed in English; then translated into Thai by a translator who also holds a doctoral degree of philosophy in applied linguistics. The Thai version was then translated back into English, after that, the author then compared the translated version with the original version. In this phase, the researchers cross-checked the items with a native English speaker and any problematic items were eliminated. The first draft of the questionnaire was administered to three lecturers who hold doctoral degrees in marketing, and four Ph.D. students for face validity. Ambiguous items and items not relevant to service convenience were removed. After this refinement, double pretests were employed with 86 visitors to the park. Results from the double pretests enabled us to fine-tune the final questionnaire.

Stage III: Main Study. The fine-tuned questionnaire was distributed to the CNS visitors. Quota sampling was employed, previous research done by CNS over several years enabled us estimate the quota of sampling. We estimated the quota of first-time visitors and the repeat visitors as 52 and 48 percent, respectively. Self-administered questionnaires were distributed at the exit, hand bags were provided as a souvenir for all visitors who completed the questionnaire. Our respondents totaled 391 visitors who yielded the results for our analysis.
Measurements

The measurement of decision, access, and transaction convenience were modified from Berry et al. (2002) and Seiders et al. (2007). Benefit convenience was modified from Berry et al. (2002), Geissler and Rucks (2011), and Liu et al. (2010). The measurement of perceived control was modified from Hui and Bateson (1991). Service convenience and perceived control scales were measured with a five-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). To capture perceived value, we modified the seven-point Likert scale of Sweeney and Soutar (2001), as ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). The final section was designed to collect demographic information, such as gender, age, and two questions regarding the reasons for their trip and their experience of the trip.

Data Analysis

The analysis in the qualitative stage was content analysis, all interviews including the focus group were recorded and then transcribed for interpretation. After being transcribed, answers were tallied in the areas of service convenience which enable us to identify and develop important themes, and then extract the service convenience meaning from text. The results from the content analysis allowed us to develop the questionnaire for our pretest stage. Outlier and extreme values were checked before the beginning of the analysis. The descriptive analysis was conducted via SPSS 17.0. The factor analysis was conducted to examine the underlying dimensions which may have had to be reduced, separated, and summarized in a set of factors representing the latent construct. We conducted the exploratory factor analysis (EFA) using the principle component method with varimax rotation and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). We also employed the structural equation modeling (SEM) to test the model with the AMOS version 6.00.

5. Results

Descriptive Analysis

Of the 391 respondents, 58.8 percent were female and 41.2 percent were male. A total of 35.8 percent of the respondents were aged between 26 and 35 years. The majority of the visitors pointed out that they had come away in order to spend time with the family (29.4 percent). Finally, the percentage of the first-time visitors and repeat visitors were 48.8 percent and 51.2 percent, respectively. (See Table I.)

Factor Analysis

After analyzing the profile of the respondents, we conducted the exploratory factor analysis to screen the items of service convenience measurement. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) value from the exploratory factor analysis showed the suitability of our data reach as excellent data, with a factor analysis at 0.91 (Kaiser and Rice, 1974). Bartlett’s test of sphericity also showed a significant statistic.
(p<0.01). The data was rotated using varimax rotation. Three factors which exceeded the eigenvalue explain 60 percent of the variance. The results revealed that “decision convenience” and “access convenience” were collapsed into one dimension. As a result, this study defines this dimension as “access convenience”. Thus, from the exploratory factor analysis results, this study included three dimensions of service convenience: access, transaction, and benefit convenience which were to be investigated in the model.

Table I. Profile of Respondents (n = 391)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profile</th>
<th>Frequency (s)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>58.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-25 Y</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35 Y</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45 Y</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55 Y</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 Y up</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reason for this trip</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broaden their world and educate children</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spend time with family</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spend time relaxing on our trip today</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertain myself and group member</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recommended as a place to visit</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Type of visitor** |   |   |
| First-time visitor | 191 | 48.8 |
| Repeated visitor   | 200 | 51.2 |
Reliability and Validity

Reliability analysis

For the evaluation of the reliability of the scale, the Cronbach’s alpha was used. The Cronbach’s alpha of each factor exceeded 0.7 as recommended by Nunnally (1978), ranging between 0.78-0.88. Moreover, for the evaluation of the reliability of the construct, the composite reliability was used. Composite reliability of the service convenience dimensions exceeded 0.7 as suggested by Hair, Black, Babin and Anderson, (2010), ranging between 0.85-0.94. This is evidence that the service convenience measurement has a high reliability.

Validity analysis

The results from an exploratory factor analysis revealed three dimensions of service convenience. We confirmed the items in the construct again with confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). The results from CFA posited that the measurement items fit with the model. All indicator factor loadings were significant ($t$-values between 9.70 and 20.46). An acceptable factor loading level value is more than 0.5. Many of our items exceed 0.7 showing them to be good indicators (Hair, et al., 2010). In particular, transaction convenience showed very good indicators with factor loadings higher than 0.8 for every item. Our model demonstrated a good fit (RMSEA=0.048), with an overall $\chi^2/df.=1.92$ ($p<.01$). The fit indices showed the goodness-of-fit to be above threshold levels (CFI=0.96, GFI=0.91, TLI=0.95, RMR=0.026). Moreover, composite reliability was tested as evidence for convergent validity. The acceptable level of CR value as suggested by Hair et al. (2010) was 0.7. Three dimensions of service convenience showed high internal consistency with the CR value ranging above the suggested the level between 0.85 - 0.94. (See Table II.)

Table II. Item Descriptions of Service Convenience Construct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Lambda Loading</th>
<th>Construct Reliability</th>
<th>Average Variance Extracted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access Convenience ($\alpha = .84$)</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can easily determine prior to travel whether Chiang Mai Night Safari will offer what I need.</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciding to take a trip at Chiang Mai Night Safari is quick and easy.</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can quickly find information before I take a trip to decide if Chiang Mai Night Safari has what I am looking for.</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to get to Chiang Mai Night Safari quickly and easily.</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiang Mai Night Safari offers convenient parking.</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiang Mai Night Safari is in a convenient location.</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night Safari offers convenient opening hours.</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table II. Item Descriptions of Service Convenience Construct (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Lambda Loading</th>
<th>Construct Reliability</th>
<th>Average Variance Extracted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transaction Convenience ( (\alpha = .88) )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night Safari makes it easy for me to buy an entry ticket.</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to complete my purchase quickly at Night Safari.</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It takes little time to pay for my purchase at Night Safari.</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefit Convenience ( (\alpha = .78) )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The exhibition and display of animals are easily viewed.</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is easy for me to receive help from the Night Safari staff.</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage and directions are clear and easy to follow.</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilets in Night Safari can be found easily.</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discriminant validity was tested by examining the average variance extracted (AVE.) and testing for common method bias. The correlation matrix in Table III, demonstrates that the square root of AVE. of each construct was higher than the correlation between it and the other constructs in the model. Moreover, discriminant validity also showed with common method bias. The common method bias is an issue when the same source is relied upon for measures of both independent and dependent variables. If the common method variance was a major problem, our model would lack discriminant validity. We employed Harman’s single-factor test (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee and Podsakoff, 2003) to investigate the self-rating of CNS visitors. The results found that it was not a major factor in the model. In addition, the largest unrotated factor accounted only 36.5 percent of the variance. Therefore, we concluded that common method bias was not a problem.

In summary, the measurement of service convenience with the three dimensions had high reliability and high construct validity.

Table III. Correlation Matrix of Constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Perceived Value</th>
<th>Perceived Control</th>
<th>Access Convenience</th>
<th>Transaction Convenience</th>
<th>Benefit Convenience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Value</td>
<td>.872</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Control</td>
<td>.413</td>
<td>.877</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Convenience</td>
<td>.511</td>
<td>.381</td>
<td>.748</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transaction Convenience</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>.560</td>
<td>.911</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit Convenience</td>
<td>.528</td>
<td>.382</td>
<td>.585</td>
<td>.502</td>
<td>.768</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All the correlations are significant at \( p<0.001 \); the square root of the AVE is displayed in the diagonal.
Inferential Statistics

Based on the factor analysis results, decision and access convenience were collapsed into one dimension which we defined as an access convenience. As a result, this study overlooked the testing of hypotheses $H1a$ and $H2a$. As such, we investigated only the hypotheses of $H1b$, $c$, and $d$, and $H2b$, $c$, and $d$. We studied the hypothesized model of service convenience, perceived control and perceived value via structural equation modeling (SEM). The results showed that three dimensions of service convenience explained 23 percent of the variance of perceived control. The findings indicated that access convenience and benefit convenience had a positive relationship with perceived control as hypothesized ($t$ value=2.04, $p$=.04, and $t$ value=3.05, $p$=.00, respectively). Therefore, $H1b$ and $H1d$ were supported. Interestingly, benefit convenience was found to have the strongest impact on perceived control ($\beta = .36$, $p<.01$), while access convenience was $\beta = .22$ ($p<.01$).

The relationship between the service convenience dimensions and perceived value were investigated in hypotheses $2b-2d$. The results indicated that access convenience and benefit convenience had a positive relationship with perceived value as hypothesized ($t$ value=3.39, $p$=.00, and $t$ value=5.85, $p$=.00, respectively). However, transaction convenience shows a significant but negative relationship with perceived value at $p=.00$. As such, we concluded that $H2c$ was not supported, however, $H2b$ and $H2d$ were supported. Interestingly, the strongest predictor of convenience to perceived value was benefit convenience ($\beta=.65$). It should be noted that ‘benefit convenience’ is the strongest predictor of service convenience to predict both perceived control and perceived value. The results are provided in Table IV.

Mediation Tests

Hypothesis 3 makes precise predictions regarding mediation, in that the effects of the service convenience dimensions and perceived value were implied to be completely mediated by the perceived control. To demonstrate that perceived control completely mediates the effects of service convenience, it is necessary to show that the direct relationship of service convenience to perceived value was not significant when the mediator-perceived control was added to the model (Baron and Kenny, 1986). This approach has been used in examining mediating variables in several past service studies (Patterson and Spreng, 1997; La, Patterson and Styles, 2009; Chang and Polonsky, 2012).

Following the Baron and Kenny (1986) procedure, we investigated four equations to determine whether there were direct effects of the service convenience dimensions to perceived value or indirect effects through perceived control. The first equation represents the direct effect between the service convenience dimensions and mediating variable (perceived control). The second equation represents the effect between the mediating variable (perceived control) and the dependent variable (perceived value). The third equation represents the direct effect between the service convenience dimensions and the mediating variable (perceived control). The fourth equation represents the indirect effect through the mediating variable (perceived control).
convenience dimensions and the dependent variable (perceived value). Finally, the fourth equation represents the effect between service convenience dimensions and the dependent variable (perceived value), and the effect of mediating variable (perceived control) to dependent variable (perceived value) in the same equation.

If perceived control completely mediated the relationship between service convenience and perceived value, the direct path to perceived value in Eq.4 should not be significant. If service convenience dimensions remain significant, but their effect is reduced, they are partially mediated (Baron and Kenny, 1986; Holmbeck, 1997). The statistically significant results from Eq.1 and Eq.2 suggested that there was a mediated association between service convenience and perceived value through perceived control. To further indicate the type of mediated association, investigations need to be examined from Eq.3 and Eq.4.

The beta coefficient for access convenience dropped from $\beta=0.33$ in Eq.3 to $\beta=0.29$ in Eq.4, transaction convenience dropped from $\beta=-0.36$ in Eq.3 to $\beta=-0.35$ in Eq.4, and benefit convenience dropped from $\beta=0.65$ in Eq.3 to $\beta=0.61$ in Eq.4. Moreover, the beta coefficient of perceived control dropped from $\beta=0.47$ in Eq.2 to $\beta=0.25$ in Eq.4. The results from Eq.4 indicated that service convenience remains a significant predictor of perceived value even when perceived control is introduced into the model, but the effect of the relationship was reduced. This is evidence to support the partial mediation of perceived control between the service convenience dimensions and perceived value. Therefore, H3 was partially supported. The results of four equations are provide in Table IV.

Table IV. Structural model results of $H3$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equation</th>
<th>Independent Variable $\rightarrow$ Dependent Variable</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equation 1</td>
<td>Access Convenience $\rightarrow$ Perceived Control</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>H1b: Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transaction Convenience $\rightarrow$ Perceived Control</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-1.32</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>H1c: Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benefit Convenience $\rightarrow$ Perceived Control</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>H1d: Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R$^2$=.23, $\chi^2=245.375$, df=129, p&lt;.000, CFI=.96, GFI=.93, TLI=.96, PGFI=.70, RMR=.03, RMSEA=.048</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equation 2</td>
<td>Perceived Control $\rightarrow$ Perceived Value</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R$^2$=.22, $\chi^2=75.549$, df=33, p&lt;.000, CFI=.98, GFI=.96, TLI=.97, PGFI=.58, RMR=.03, RMSEA=.057</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equation 3</td>
<td>Access Convenience $\rightarrow$ Perceived Value</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>H2b: Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transaction Convenience $\rightarrow$ Perceived Value</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>-4.87</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>H2c: Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benefit Convenience $\rightarrow$ Perceived Value</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>H2d: Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R$^2$=.53, $\chi^2=373.281$, df=164, p&lt;.000, CFI=.95, GFI=.91, TLI=.94, PGFI=.71, RMR=.02, RMSEA=.057</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equation 4</td>
<td>Access Convenience $\rightarrow$ Perceived Value</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>H3: Partial Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transaction Convenience $\rightarrow$ Perceived Value</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>-4.78</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benefit Convenience $\rightarrow$ Perceived Value</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perceived Control $\rightarrow$ Perceived Value</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R$^2$=.55, $\chi^2=462.753$, df=185, p&lt;.000, CFI=.93, TLI=.92, PGFI=.72, RMR=.10, RMSEA=.062</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Discussion and Conclusion

This research contributes to the current service convenience literature in the area of high contact experiential services. From our conceptual model of the link between three constructs, our results support the model and generally confirm the six hypotheses.

Customers spend their resources, such as time, money, and effort, in order to receive a service (Zeithaml, 1988). In high contact experiential services, customers have to come and remain during the service delivery process in order to receive the service experience. So the service is often ‘manufactured’ and delivered over a lengthy period of time. Therefore, service convenience and the service experience are inextricably linked for such types of services (Dai and Salam, 2010). For these reasons, it was of interest to investigate service convenience in the context of a high contact experiential service.

According to the literature reviews, service convenience measurements should be modified specifically for specific contexts. This study firstly provided an insight into the quantitative measurement of a high contact experiential service by three factors: access convenience, transaction convenience, and benefit convenience. Our findings supported the idea that dimensions of service convenience were not the same for every context. Our findings indicated three dimensions of service convenience (access convenience, transaction convenience, and benefit convenience) for the high contact experiential services-theme park. Previous qualitative study in experiential services found that there were three dimensions of service convenience too, however the dimensions were not the same. Dimensions previously identified were decision convenience, access convenience, and transaction convenience (Geissler et al., 2006). Geissler et al. (2006) did their qualitative study in an art museum context where the entrance fee was low, in comparison to our theme park context, the entrance fee was quite high. Therefore, visitors of the theme park were concerned about the benefits of service that they were to receive if they bought the ticket to go inside the park. Our findings indicated that benefit convenience was the strongest predictor of service convenience in high contact experiential services. For example, the effect of benefit convenience to perceived value ($\beta=.65$), and perceived control ($\beta=.35$). This is evidence to support the idea that benefit convenience is a necessary dimension in high contact experiential services.

Previous research indicated the existence of an association between service convenience and perceived value. Our results confirmed this association and was consistent with Dai and Salam (2010) and Chang et al. (2010). However, this study firstly showed that there was a separate direct effect of the service convenience dimensions on perceived value. The effects of each dimension of service convenience pinpointed the benefits that visitors to the theme park were most concerned when making judgements of value received. For
example, when access convenience was compared with benefit convenience, it was revealed that visitors were concerned with the core benefit of the service more than benefit from the access.

Finally, our findings supported the partial mediation of perceived control between the service convenience dimensions and perceived value. This means that visitors do not intend to completely control the situation, but they want to know about the situation, where they are and what they should do. This is not surprising as generally, customers seek to have some degree of control over their situation, especially over their resources. Customers tried to perceive how much time and effort they had to “give” to consume that service, and whether or not they could control their non-monetary resources to perform the behavior in that situation, each of which affects perceived value.

There are some limitations that need to be noted. This research concentrates only on the effect of service convenience on perceived value. High contact experiential services have service environments that surround the customers while they consume that service which also effects the consumption experience. Thus, other environmental or situational factors also need to be investigated. Moreover, benefit convenience of customers plays a crucial role in predicting perceived value and perceived control. If some service organizations in a high contact experiential context provide additional services which increase benefits to their customers, that organization will influence the customers’ perceived value from during their consumption experience. Therefore, additional services which make customers perceive higher levels of convenience need to be investigated in future research.

7. Managerial Implications

This study aimed to offer managerial contributions and insights of service convenience in high contact experiential services. In Thailand, high contact experiential services are predominantly found in the tourism industry. Theme parks, which are part of the tourism industry, offer their service experience throughout the entire service delivery process. Our findings give several ideas to help develop the tourism industry in Thailand. Even though, our study was conducted in a theme park context, there are other high contact experiential services who have offerings similar to that of a theme park, such as a zoo, water park, or an amusement park. For example some large zoos offered trips on trams to see animals, various shows, souvenirs, and food services inside the zoo. Other high contact experiential services can also apply our findings to their services.

Our results revealed that benefit convenience was considered to be an essential aspect of convenience in theme parks. The top two benefit conveniences of theme parks were the helpfulness of staff, and clear signage and directions within the park. These conveniences suggest that management can increase their service quality and value-for-money offering to customers through making certain that staff are helpful as well as
ensuring clear signage within the park. This is especially important when the service involved is a high contact one, with interactions between staff and customers occurring over the entire consumption process. Despite having various service delivery processes within the theme park, for example, sightseeing in the tram in a restricted zone, walking around in the designated zones to see the animals, watching cabaret and fountain shows, or eating food at restaurants, visitors are required to interact with the theme park staff at each area. The presence of the staff in each service area enables visitors to perceive convenience as staff are readily available to ask if information or help is required. One key success factor of theme parks is that they operate on large grounds. However, due to the large area of the land, visitors can easily get lost or become disoriented (Geissler and Rucks, 2011). Hence, clear signage and directions will go a long way in helping to complete the visitors’ need and quest for convenience experience in the theme park service.

Managers who clearly understand the need for service convenience in their contexts, and provide the right aspects of convenience for the customer, will enable their organizations to have higher returns and competitive advantage (Seiders et al., 2000). Additionally they will ensure repurchase behavior of their customers (Seiders et al., 2007), higher customer satisfaction (Colwell et al., 2008; Dai and Salam, 2010; Xie et al., 2010; Chen et al., 2011), behavioral intention to purchase (Collier and Sherrell, 2010), higher perception of service quality (Vichet, 2007), and share of wallet and visit (Moeller et al., 2009).

References:


Phungbangruay, Patterson, Kimpakorn and Tantiprapa/The Influence of Service Convenience in Predicting Customer Value …


