

## University of Groningen

### Public service guarantees

Thomassen, Jean Pierre Robert

**IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.**

*Document Version*

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

*Publication date:*

2018

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*

Thomassen, J. P. R. (2018). Public service guarantees: Exploring the design and implementation of service guarantees in public settings. [Groningen]: University of Groningen, SOM research school.

**Copyright**

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

**Take-down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

## Appendix I - Service guarantee definitions

In this appendix to section 1.1. an overview of 20 service guarantee definitions used in literature is presented in alphabetical order of the (first) author. Since the term ‘service charter’ is often used in public management literature, three definitions (1, 17 and 18) use this term.

1. Charters are, essentially, a formal contract between the public service provider and their customers (Aldridge and Rowley, 1998 p. 27).
2. A service guarantee promises the customer that if the service delivery system does not meet certain performance standards, the customer is entitled to an economic and/or noneconomic payout (Baker and Collier, 2005 p. 197).
3. A service guarantee is a formal commitment by a service provider designed to reduce a customers’ loss in the event of a service failure (Berman and Mathur, 2014 p. 108).
4. A service guarantee is a tool to systematize and formalise the recovery process (Björlin Lidén and Skålen, 2003 p. 37).
5. Service guarantees are a formalised recovery technique that is used for dealing with service failures and learning from the experience (Björlin Lidén and Sandén, 2004 p. 2).
6. A service guarantee is a tangible manifestation of the reliability of the service (Boshoff, 2002 p. 292).
7. A service guarantee can be represented as a promise to the customer and is often advertised as such (Callan and Moore, 1998 p. 60; Kashyap, 2001 p. 1).
8. A service guarantee is a kind of warranty that promises a particular level of service to a customer and compensation if that level of service is not achieved (Chen *et al.*, 2009 p. 584).
9. Service guarantees, in essence, are “a policy, expressed or implied, advertised or unadvertised, that commits the operation to making its guests happy” (Evans *et al.*, 1996 p. 57, Kashyap, 2001 p. 1).
10. A service guarantee is an explicit commitment to the customer concerning all or part of the service process, generally including compensation for the customer if the commitment is not honoured (Fabien, 2005 p. 33).
11. Dienstleistungsgarantien können als Versprechen eines Anbieters definiert werden, dass dieser die Voraussetzungen zur Erbringung einer bestimmten Leistung besitzt oder eine bestimmte Leistung oder einzelne Leistungsbestandteile in der vom Kunden gewünschten Qualität liefert (Fliess and Hogreve, 2007 p. 238; Hogreve and Sichtmann, 2009 p. 347).

12. A guarantee is simply a statement explaining the service customers can expect (the promise) and what the company will do if it fails to deliver (the payout) (Hart *et al.*, 1992 p. 20; McDougall *et al.*, 1998 p. 278; Levy, 1999 p. 4; Kashyap, 2001 p. 1; McQuilken and Robertson, 2011 p. 953).
13. A service guarantee is a set of two promises. The first is a promise to provide a certain level of service. The second is a promise to compensate the customer in a particular way if the first promise is not met (Hays and Hill, 2006 p. 754).
14. A service guarantee is an explicit promise on the part of the service provider to satisfy customers in the performance of a service (Hocutt and Bowers, 2005 p. 8).
15. A service guarantee is an explicit promise made by the service provider to (a) deliver a certain level of service to satisfy the customer and (b) remunerate the customer if the service is not sufficiently delivered (Hogreve and Gremler, 2009 p. 324; Van Vaerenbergh *et al.*, 2014 p. 45).
16. Service guarantees are written promises of service performance declared through advertising and company literature, making offers of compensation if promises are not honoured (McColl and Mattsson, 2011 p. 451).
17. Service charters are in essence a quality assurance strategy that offers a type of consumer guarantee (McGuire, 2002 p. 494).
18. Service charters list the rights that citizens can expect from public institutions and introduce – especially in European continental countries – the notion of putting citizens or users first (Torres, 2006 p. 159).
19. A service guarantee is an extension of a product warranty, but in a service setting (Wong *et al.*, 2009).
20. Service guarantees are formal promises made to customers about the service they will receive (Zeithaml and Bitner, 1996 p. 458; McCollough and Gremler, 2004 p. 58; McCollough, 2010 p. 28).

## Appendix II. Vignettes for manipulations of dependent variables

This appendix to Chapter 3 gives an overview of the vignettes used in the two experiments.

Sector	Vignettes
Municipality (study 1)	'In a month your driving license is expired. You have been at the municipality office to apply for a new one (costs approximately 40 euro). After a couple of days you receive a message that it is ready for pickup and you go to the municipality office.'
Visa governmental organisation (study 2)	'In a month you have to be in another country for which a travel visa is required which costs you approximately 40 dollar. You have ordered it by internet. After a couple of days you receive a message that it is ready for pickup at the office (about 20 minutes drive from home) and you go to the office.'
Internet store (study 1 and 2)	'You have made an online order on the web shop of the only store that offers this product (costs approximately 40 euro/dollar). It is a gift for a friends' birthday next month. You have indicated that you want to collect the parcel at a pick up point. After a couple of days you receive a message that it is ready for pickup and you go to the pick up point (study 2: about 20 minutes drive from home).'
All scenarios	Followed by.... 'Now you are at the desk, and the employee informs you that the driving license/package/visa (dependent on study and scenario) is not there. The employee checks the system and informs you that it is still on its way. It will be available tomorrow'. Only in the four 'compensation promised' scenarios a service guarantee with an explicit compensation was visible behind the desk: ' <i>We keep our promises, if not, you'll get a gift voucher worth 5 euro/dollar</i> '. Only in the four 'compensation offered' scenarios the customer received proactively a gift voucher. The scenario ends with the customer leaving the hypothetical building. Participants then answer a number of questions related to the dependent variables.

## Appendix III. Scales for dependent variables

This appendix to Chapter 3 gives an overview of the dependent variables used.

<b>Severity of failure</b>	(1) How would you rate the importance of the service failure? (1=unimportant 7= extremely important)
<b>Distributive justice</b> (study 1 $\alpha = 0.76$ ; study 2 $\alpha = 0.91$ )	(1) The compensation for the inconvenience is fair (2) I did <u>not</u> receive what I deserve (R) (3) The outcome I received was <u>not</u> fair (R) (1=strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree)
<b>Procedural justice</b> (study 1 $\alpha = 0.88$ ; study 2 $\alpha = 0.89$ )	(1) The organisation used a good procedure to solve my problem (2) If I was an employee of that organisation, I would have acted similarly (3) I felt taken seriously (1=strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree)
<b>Negative emotions</b> (study 1 $\alpha = 0.90$ ; study 2 $\alpha = 0.95$ )	(1) How annoyed would you be? (2) How irritated would you be? (1=not at all, 7=extremely so)
<b>Post-recovery satisfaction</b> (study 1 $\alpha = 0.75$ ; study 2 $\alpha = 0.94$ )	(1) Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied did this experience make you feel? (1=very dissatisfied, 7=very satisfied) (2) How well did this service experience meet your needs? (1=not at all, 7=absolutely yes) (3) Overall, I am very satisfied with this experience. (1=strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree)
<b>Realism of scenario</b>	(1) To what extent do you think this was a realistic situation? (1=not at all realistic, 7=very realistic)

## Appendix IV. Scales and items used in three experiments

This appendix to Chapter 4 gives an overview of the scales/dependent variables used in the experiments 1 and 2A&B.

Dependent variable	Used in experiment	Items
Corporate image	1	(a) Negative - positive (b) Unfavourable - favourable (c) Bad - Good (d) Dislike - Like (7 point scale)
Credibility	1	(a) I have sincere doubts about the ability of the Internet store/visa governmental organisation to keep its promises (R) (b) There would be no risk in dealing with this Internet store /visa governmental organisation (c) I would feel very confident in dealing with this Internet store/visa governmental organisation (d) I am confident in the ability of this Internet store/visa governmental organisation to perform as promised (1=strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree), scales are separately presented for both sectors
WOM-intent	1	(a) I would say positive things about this Internet store/visa governmental organisation to other people (b) If someone talks negatively about this Internet store/visa governmental organisation I would argue against it (1=most unlikely, 7=most likely), scales are separately presented for both sectors
CSR-image	1	(a) This Internet store/visa governmental organisation is a social responsible organisation (b) This Internet store/visa governmental organisation is concerned about the well-being of society (c) I think this Internet store /visa governmental organisation has legitimate interest in improving society (d) Contributing to society appears important to this Internet store/visa governmental organisation (1=strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree), scales are separately presented for both sectors
Severity of service failure	2A&B	(a) How would you rate the importance of the service failure? (1=unimportant, 7= extremely important)
Distributive justice	2A&B	(a) The compensation for the inconvenience is fair (b) I did not receive what I deserve (R) (c) The outcome I received was not fair (R) (1=strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree)
Procedural justice	2A&B	(a) The organisation used a good procedure to solve my problem (b) If I was an employee of that organisation, I would have acted similarly (c) I felt taken seriously (1=strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree)
Post-recovery satisfaction	2A&B	(a) Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied did this experience make you feel? (1=very dissatisfied, 7=very satisfied) (b) How well did this service experience meet your needs? (1=not at all, 7=absolutely yes) (c) Overall, I am very satisfied with this experience. (1=strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree)
Realism of the scenario	1, 2A&B	(a) To what extent do you think this was a realistic situation? (1=not at all realistic, 7=very realistic)

## Appendix V. Main and interaction effects of three experiments

This appendix to Chapter 4 gives an overview of the main and interaction effects of the experiments 1 and 2A&B.

### Experiment 1. Signalling Effects – US-citizens

Dependent variable		Main/interaction effect
Corporate image	compensation	<b><math>F(3,595) = 4.78, p = .003</math></b>
	sector	$F(1,595) = 0.83, p = .363$
	compensation x sector	$F(3,595) = 0.82, p = .484$
Credibility	compensation	<b><math>F(3,595) = 6.28, p = .000</math></b>
	sector	$F(1,595) = 0.04, p = .843$
	compensation x sector	$F(3,595) = 1.86, p = .136$
WOM-intent	compensation	<b><math>F(3,595) = 7.06, p = .000</math></b>
	sector	$F(1,595) = 2.80, p = .095$
	compensation x sector	$F(3,595) = 0.03, p = .991$
CSR-image	compensation	<b><math>F(3,595) = 15.13, p = .000</math></b>
	sector	<b><math>F(1,595) = 6.21, p = .013</math></b>
	compensation x sector	$F(3,595) = 0.84, p = .474$

### Justice Effects: Experiment 2A– Dutch students & Experiment 2B – mainly US-citizens

Dependent variable		Main/interaction effect	
		Experiment 2A	Experiment 2B
Distributive justice	compensation	<b><math>F(2,142) = 13.10, p = .000</math></b>	<b><math>F(3,588) = 38.02, p = .000</math></b>
	sector	$F(1,142) = 2.57, p = .111$	$F(1,588) = 3.79, p = .187$
	compensation x sector	$F(2,142) = 0.82, p = .445$	$F(3,588) = 1.53, p = .205$
Procedural justice	compensation	<b><math>F(2,142) = 9.41, p = .000</math></b>	<b><math>F(3,588) = 46.62, p = .000</math></b>
	sector	$F(1,142) = 1.48, p = .226$	$F(1,588) = 2.06, p = .152$
	compensation x sector	$F(2,142) = 0.85, p = .431$	$F(3,588) = 2.54, p = .056$
Post-recovery satisfaction	compensation	<b><math>F(2,142) = 3.09, p = .049</math></b>	<b><math>F(3,588) = 36.71, p = .000</math></b>
	sector	$F(1,142) = 0.29, p = .591$	$F(1,588) = 1.24, p = .266$
	compensation x sector	$F(2,142) = 0.86, p = .425$	$F(3,588) = 0.73, p = .534$

## Appendix VI. Summary of Ms and SDs for the dependent variables

This appendix to Chapter 4 gives an overview of the Ms and SDs for the dependent variables of the experiments 1 and 2A&B.

### Experiment 1. Signalling Effects – US-citizens

Dependent variable	Compensation	Customers' evaluations					
		total (N = 603)		internet store (N = 293)		travel visa (N = 310)	
		M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Corporate image	no compensation (NC)	5.41	1.06	5.28	.96	5.56	1.15
	gift voucher (GV)	5.76	.90	5.82	.80	5.72	.97
	fixed cause (FC)	5.73	1.09	5.71	1.24	5.75	.96
	cause of customers' choice (CCC)	5.86	1.14	5.81	1.03	5.91	1.26
Credibility	no compensation (NC)	4.52	.95	4.42	.81	4.63	1.09
	gift voucher (GV)	4.93	.99	5.09	.83	4.80	1.09
	fixed cause (FC)	4.99	1.11	4.91	1.15	5.06	1.09
	cause of customers' choice (CCC)	4.96	1.18	5.02	1.12	4.89	1.26
WOM-intent	No compensation (NC)	4.09	1.26	3.99	1.16	4.21	1.36
	gift voucher (GV)	4.67	1.24	4.56	1.18	4.75	1.28
	fixed cause (FC)	4.67	1.35	4.61	1.37	4.73	1.33
	cause of customers' choice (CCC)	4.71	1.41	4.61	1.41	4.81	1.42
CSR-image	no compensation (NC)	4.62	1.14	4.41	1.14	4.86	1.11
	gift voucher (GV)	4.95	1.13	4.82	1.03	5.05	1.20
	fixed cause (FC)	5.37	1.11	5.25	1.15	5.47	1.08
	cause of customers' choice (CCC)	5.40	1.20	5.38	1.10	5.41	1.30

### Experiment 2A. Justice Effects – Dutch students

Dependent variable	Compensation	Customers' evaluations					
		total (N = 148)		internet store (N = 76)		municipality (N = 72)	
		M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Distributive justice	gift voucher (GV)	4.31	1.28	4.63	1.27	4.16	1.28
	fixed cause (FC)	3.08	1.32	3.07	1.21	3.10	1.45
	cause of customers' choice (CCC)	3.40	1.28	3.61	1.07	2.99	1.58
Procedural justice	gift voucher (GV)	5.14	1.44	5.54	1.20	4.94	1.53
	fixed cause (FC)	3.91	1.42	3.84	1.23	3.99	1.63
	cause of customers' choice (CCC)	4.43	1.54	4.58	1.36	4.12	1.86
Post-recovery satisfaction	gift voucher (GV)	3.25	1.39	3.38	1.45	3.19	1.37
	fixed cause (FC)	2.60	1.18	2.48	.86	2.74	1.46
	cause of customers' choice (CCC)	2.96	1.28	3.10	1.19	2.67	1.44

### Experiment 2B. Justice Effects – mainly US-citizens

Dependent variable	Compensation	Customers' evaluations					
		Total (N=596)		Internet store (N=298)		Travel visa (N=298)	
		M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Distributive justice	no compensation (NC)	2.13	1.17	2.05	1.22	2.21	1.21
	gift voucher (GV)	3.88	1.57	4.01	1.48	3.77	1.64
	fixed cause (FC)	3.25	1.50	3.01	1.54	3.47	1.44
	cause of customers' choice (CCC)	3.47	1.62	3.35	1.59	3.61	1.65
Procedural justice	no compensation (NC)	2.85	1.36	2.75	1.35	2.95	1.36
	gift voucher (GV)	4.75	1.41	4.93	1.33	4.59	1.47
	fixed cause (FC)	3.91	1.55	3.65	1.64	4.17	1.42
	cause of customers' choice (CCC)	4.17	1.37	4.03	1.38	4.32	1.35
Post-recovery satisfaction	no compensation (NC)	1.77	1.01	1.74	1.05	1.81	.98
	gift voucher (GV)	3.54	1.66	3.61	1.63	3.49	1.70
	fixed cause (FC)	2.85	1.61	2.67	1.70	3.03	1.51
	cause of customers' choice (CCC)	3.02	1.56	2.91	1.54	3.14	1.59

