



Karlstad Business School
Handelshögskolan vid Karlstads universitet

Carl Abrahamsson & Lucas Ritvala

The effects of customer moods on value co-creation practises

A study based on student's experiences from a
restaurant setting

Business Administration
Bachelor's Thesis
15 ECTS

Term: Fall 2018
Supervisor: Kaisa Koskela-Huotari

Abstract

In the service industry, value creation has emerged from being something where service providers are the sole creators of value, into something where customers are equal creators of value. Nowadays it is seen as value co-creation between the two parties. Authors Echeverri & Skålén (2011) identified five value co-creation practises in the public transportation industry between customer and supplier. The findings of Luong (2005) suggest that a service providers actions have an influence on the customers mood. No previous research has been conducted into how a customer's mood affects value co-creation, and more specifically the value co-creation practises identified. These identified practises in relation to customer mood were researched upon in a restaurant setting through a qualitative study with semi-structured interviews. The research was conducted with 10 different respondents and the purpose was to find out whether differences in customer moods affected the value being co-created between customer and supplier/service personnel. It was found out that customers in a positive mood, more easily ignored smaller service complications which made value co-creation opportunities harder to identify. Customers in a negative mood made it easier for service personnel to identify poorly performed touchpoints in the value co-creation practises between the supplier and customer due to a more reactive behaviour that indicated that they were dissatisfied. Further findings states that different value co-creation practises could produce more co-created value than others. This was found out when comparing the results of each practise and mood.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	6
1.1. Background	6
1.2. Purpose and research question	7
1.3. Scope and limitation	8
1.4. Disposition	8
2. Literature overview	10
2.1. Value co-creation and service-dominant logic	10
2.2. Practises within value co-creation	13
2.3. Service encounters and customer moods	15
3. Methodology	17
3.1. Research strategy	17
3.2. Selection of participants.....	18
3.3. Data collection	18
3.4. Implementation of interviews	19
3.5. Data analysis	19
3.6. Validity	20
3.7. Reliability.....	20
3.8. Ethical aspects.....	20
4. Findings.....	22
4.1. Greeting	22
4.2. Information sharing.....	22
4.3. Assistance/help	23
4.4. Charging.....	23
4.5. Service delivery	24
5. Discussion	25
5.1. Greeting	25
5.2. Information sharing.....	26
5.3. Assistance/help	27
5.4. Charging.....	28
5.5. Service delivery	29
6. Conclusions	31
6.1. Theoretical implications	31
6.2. Managerial implications	32
6.3. Limitations and further suggestions.....	32
Bibliography	34

Appendix 1: Interview guide and consent:.....	38
Appendix 2: Results for each practise and mood.....	39

1. Introduction

This chapter presents the background and purpose of the study. Furthermore, an overview of the thesis is given, and scope and limitation are discussed.

1.1. Background

Traditionally, the service providers have been seen as the sole creators of value in various industries, but due to switching roles, the customers role is equally important. The shift from goods-dominant logic to a service-dominant logic in the service industry creates new opportunities as well as challenges for many firms within the service industry (Vargo & Lusch 2004). Firms must be aware of this in the interaction and encounter process with the customer. There has been a great amount of research done into the topic of service-dominant logic and value co-creation, especially theoretical works defining the concepts in general, but also how the shift has happened. (Vargo & Lusch 2004; Payne et al. 2008; Prahalad & Ramaswamy 2004a).

Service-dominant logic puts the customer as a co-creator of value in the interaction process. This logic focuses on intangible resources, relationships and co-creation of value as the main aspect, compared to the more traditional logic, goods-dominant logic, that puts goods as the focus. An important aspect in service-dominant logic is the idea of value co-creation. Value co-creation as a concept puts the customer in an equal role as creator of value as the firm itself, in the value co-creation process. With this view, customers and suppliers create value together through customized solutions. (Payne et al. 2008; Prahalad & Ramaswamy 2004a)

Value co-creation is an important concept within many service industries, for example the restaurant industry. In a restaurant visit there are many touchpoints between customer and supplier where value can be co-created. This is because customers are crucial elements for a successful restaurant business, and they should be equal co-creators of value as the service personnel is. Because of this relatively new service dominant logic, researching customers role in the value co-creation is of importance, since the traditional role has always been that the service provider is the sole value creator.

Authors Echeverri & Skålén (2011) tackled the subject of value co-creation and identified five practises in relation to it in the service industry. These five practises further expand the idea of value creation as something that requires mutual collaboration from both parties, service provider and customer. These

practises were applied in the public transportation sector, but they could also be applied in different service sectors where the identified practises could fit in within that other sector. Another sector where these practises would fit in is within a restaurant visit.

Luong (2005) conducted a study on how customers feel before and after encounters with service providers. The article focused on customers moods prior to service encounter and mood change in relation to service assessment. The findings of Luong (2005) suggest that a service providers actions have an influence on the customers mood. On the other hand, no research has been made upon the customer mood and what role it places in the mutual value co-creation between a service provider and the customer itself. The mood of a customer, whether in neutral, positive or negative mood, could play a role in the amount of value being co-created together with the service provider. This will be researched upon within a restaurant visit with help of, and in relation to the five value co-creation practises as identified by Echeverri & Skålén (2011). The study will be conducted upon students and their experiences of a restaurant visit.

1.2. Purpose and research question

The aim of this paper is to identify how a customer's current mood affects the value being co-creaed in relation to the practises as identified by Echeverri & Skålén (2011), based on student's experiences from a restaurant setting. Different moods of a customer could affect the value co-creation and the total value being co-created within a restaurant visit. Positive mood of a customer could lead to one outcome whereas negative mood could lead to another. It is important to know this as a service provider to be able to in the future handle different types of customers and their different moods to be able co-create value together with them. The research question of this thesis is: How does a customer's current mood play a role in value co-creation practises? This will be researched upon in relation to a restaurant visit.

By identifying differences in customers mood in relation to value co-creation practises, the suppliers can take this into consideration in their service and perform the value co-creation practises in a more suitable way. For the firm, this can lead to increased revenue, returning customers, increased word-of-mouth, better understanding of customers emotions and improved quality of service. On the other hand, the customer feels validated if their feelings are being considered. They feel more valued and get improved and personalized service.

Furthermore, this study will evaluate the identified practises between a supplier and customer to understand what effects a customer's mood has on the value co-

creation practises. This will be studied by conducting semi-structured interviews with different participators to get expanded answers regarding customer moods in relation to value co-creation. The questions of the interviews will be outlined according to the practises by Echeverri & Skålén (2011) as scenarios in a restaurant setting based on a mood given to the participant. Given that both actor's value collaboration practises are already identified by Echeverri & Skålén (2011), it can be argued that differences in customers mood could be an important determinant for if the practise is successful on both parties. The results of this study should be able to contribute to how differences in customers moods affect value co-creation practises between supplier and customer in a restaurant setting.

1.3. Scope and limitation

Since the service industry is so diverse with thousands of different branches, a restaurant setting was chosen in order to limit the scope of the study. The study could have been conducted in other service settings too, but due to reasonable amounts of customer touchpoints during a restaurant encounter, this setting was appropriate for this study. The practises by Echeverri & Skålén (2011) are suitable to apply in this setting.

Due to mood being such a broad concept, the researchers have limited the study of mood into three different categories: neutral mood, negative mood and positive mood. By negative mood it is meant that the customer has a negative state of mind such as being angry, sad, stressed, irritated, frustrated or depressed for a longer period. By positive mood it is meant that the customer is happy, excited, joyful, calm, relaxed, peaceful etc and has been for a longer time (Tellegen 1985; Luong 2005). These states of mood can be further explained, but due to the nature of the study, the moods are limited to be neutral, positive or negative. The moods fit the aim of the research, as more detailed mood explanations would broaden the study.

Due to the difficulty to make a participant take on a certain mood, the respondents answers cannot be guaranteed to be fully reliable regarding answering the scenarios in a certain mood. The respondent's current mood when answering questions can be different from the mood asked to adopt during the different scenarios.

1.4. Disposition

The first chapter will present an introduction to the study and provides a background for the research. It also states the purpose with scope and limitations of the research. Second chapter will be an overview of literature and theory used in the study. Third chapter will explain choice of methodology and how empirical

data was collected. Fourth chapter will provide how the empirical research will be reported. Fifth chapter will review analysis and discussions of the research. Sixth chapter will present conclusions and suggestions for future research.

2. Literature overview

The following chapter focuses on the theoretical part of the study and presents the literature. The purpose of this section is to give a background of the concepts that are used in the study.

2.1. Value co-creation and service-dominant logic

In the emergent economy, leaders and companies need to focus on personal co-creation with customers which in the end creates truly unique value to each individual (Prahalad and Ramaswamy 2004a). Firms can no longer create the value only by themselves. The customers are now armed with new tools, and if dissatisfied, they can easily change supplier. The customers want to interact with the firm to co-create value together. (Prahalad and Ramaswamy 2004a). In today's economy there are two paradoxes; customers have more choice, yet it gives them less satisfaction and company management have more resources, yet it gives them less value. This forces companies to focus more into value co-creation and creating unique value. It begins by understanding that the consumer roles have changed from isolated to connected, unaware to aware and from passive to active. This change has been made by different factors such as better-informed customers, easier to network between customers, increased globalization and activism which enables people to speak out. All this leads to that companies can no longer only produce products since customers nowadays seek to influence the whole production system. The future of competition now lies in individual centred value co-creation. (Prahalad and Ramaswamy 2004a)

It is important to know the distinction of what co-creation is and what it is not. It is not the outsourcing of activities to customers and not a stage of scripting event delivered to the customer around the firm's offerings, but rather a personalized co-creation of value through sensitive and meaningful interactions with the customer. It is important to know that it is not the offering that is co-created with the customer, but rather the customer experience of creating unique value for each individual. (Prahalad and Ramaswamy 2004a)

Central to service dominant logic is the idea that customers become co-creators of value (Vargo & Lusch 2004). The previous goods dominant model was more focused on tangible value, transactions and embedded value. Over the past decades this old logic has emerged into a new logic which focuses on intangible resources, relationships and co-creation of value. The authors believe that this new perspective will form a new dominant logic, service dominant logic, which focuses on service provision rather than economic goods, which is essential for economic exchange (Vargo & Lusch 2004).

Over the recent decades, researchers have seen patterns moving the old dominant logic of good as central to value, towards a service dominant logic. Thomas Malthus (1798) described this by saying that with continuous geometric growth, the society would sooner or later run out of resources. With resources he means “natural” resources that humans use as a support. Resources are basically “stuff” that can be used for one's advantage. Over the past 50 years these resources have come not to be only “stuff” but more intangible and dynamic functions, thus, leading to resources not being static or fixed. This leads to a change in perspective and a new dominant logic. (Vargo & Lusch 2004).

The old dominant view, viewed in a traditional sense, the marketing mainly focused on goods and operand resources (Vargo & Lusch 2004). To describe the modern dominant logic one can say the following: The modern service dominant logic implies that marketing is a series of continuous social and economic processes focused in operand resources. With help of this, the firm is constantly trying to create value propositions that are better than its competitors. The firm knows whether they have a good or bad value proposition based on their financial performance. Firms can always be better at servicing customers and thereby improve financial performance, which leads to a continuous learning process for the firms (Vargo & Lusch 2004). The service dominant view could be stated as:

- Identify or develop core competencies that can lead to a competitive advantage for the firm.
- Find other entities that could benefit from the firm's competitive advantages, such as customers.
- Cultivate customized relationships to customers that enables a compelling value propositions to satisfy specific needs.
- Analyse marketplace feedback from customers to financial performance to learn how to create a better value proposition in order to improve firm performance.

(Vargo & Lusch 2004)

There are a couple of important implications that can be drawn from service dominant logic. Knowledge is the foundation of economic growth and competitive advantage. Knowledge can be said to be abstract and generalized and can be referred to as techniques (Mokyr 2002). These techniques are the main competences firms and entities use to gain a competitive advantage. The modern

dominant logic with major focuses on continuous processes, always makes the consumer a co-producer of value. Enterprises can only make value propositions. Earlier the value was seen in the goods, the modern logic implies that value is seen as value in use or value in exchange (Dixon 1990). (Vargo & Lusch 2004)

This new service dominant logic leads the firm to have better relationships with their customers through dialogue and interaction. Because of this, this explicitly puts the customer just as important as the company, as a co-creator of value in the interaction process (Payne et al. 2008). In this way, customers and suppliers can create value together through customized, co-created offerings. On the other hand, relatively little is known about how customers are engaged in the co-creation of value with the firms (Woodruff and Flint 2006). Vargo & Lusch (2004; 2006) describe service-dominant logic in 9 fundamental propositions (FPSs). To better understand the customer's role, focus can be put on FP nr 6: "The customer is always a co-creator of value; There is no value until an offering is used—experience and perception are essential to value determination". Traditionally producers produce goods and services and customers have been the buyers of these goods and services. Nowadays, customers can engage in dialogue with the producer in every stage of the production process. This should be an interactive process of where the customer and producer learn together (Ballantyne 2004). In this way, the supplier and the customer can create customized value through co-produced offerings. The co-creation process is essential for the firm to identify the customers point of view and identifying their needs and wants. Another argument (Holbrook 2006) is that customer value can be defined as 'interactive relativistic preference experience' which means that it is the experience that creates the value for the customer. The transformation of perspective between customers and suppliers can be described as customers going from 'passive audiences' to 'active players' (Prahalad and Ramaswamy 2000; Payne et al. 2008).

Payne et al. (2008) have identified three main components of value co-creation. The first component suggests that customers are active players who can co-develop and personalize their relationship with the suppliers. One key aspect for the customer to be able to co-create value is the amount of knowledge, skills and information that customers can obtain and use (Normann 2001). The supplier should aim to help customers improve their customer practices in order to create and build a more valuable role for themselves in the customer activities. The importance here is for the supplier to understand where their practices fit in within their customers overall activities. The degree of customer involvement helps to determine whether the relationship is on track or not. The second component suggests that creating value begins by understanding the value creating processes. This involves identifying co-creation opportunities, planning, testing, managing customer encounters, implement customer solutions so that in the end to find out

whether the firm is offering appropriate value propositions. The third component is the encounter process. This can be referred to as “touchpoints” or “contacts” and it can be on the initiative of either the company or the customer. Encounters can be seen as exchange practices where both parties exchange resources or collaborative activities where both parties jointly perform activities. (Payne et al. 2008)

Grönroos (2008b, 2011) states that provider service logic and customer service logic is different from one another. Customer service logic explains that the customer oversees the value creation process. Resources provided by a firm are combined with the customer's own resources in the value-creation processes and practises. This logic states that the customer is the only value creator, not the supplier/provider. If interaction between customer and supplier is established, and the firm has adopted both provider service logic and customer service logic, first then, is value co-created. If these interactions are interactive, both the customer and the provider are co-creating value. Both the firm and customer are actively participating in the value co-creation. Firms also need to find ways to establish interaction points and how to participate in the consumption process itself of the customer. (Saarijärvi et al. 2013)

To better understand practises within value-creation and value co-creation, the mechanism of “creation” itself must be defined. In order to realize value potential, different resources from different actors must be integrated. The mechanism behind creation is how the resources are integrated into value creation processes and then refined into value-in-use. They change the traditional roles of firms and customers in order to exploit resources in new ways. Mechanisms also shift the focus from money and goods to how additional resources can help other actors' value-creation processes. Co-production, co-development and co-design (Frow et al. 2010; Sheth & Uslay 2007) between firm and customer are examples of how a customer's resources help the value creation of a firm, it indicates that the customer is a co-creator of value. (Saarijärvi et al. 2013)

2.2. Practises within value co-creation

The underlying mechanism are explained to better understand so called practises in value co-creation. Practises have a common structure consisting of three parts according to Schau et al. (2009). First part is procedures which can be articulated in the form of principles, explicit rules, instructions and precepts. The second part consists of understandings which are skills and projects, knowledge of what to do and say and basic knowhow. Last part is engagements consisting of purposes and ends which only are emotionally charged if people are committed. Echeverri & Skålén (2011) name these parts as elements of practises to better understand how

different actors assess interaction value and then share the same agreement about it.

Based on their research, Echeverri & Skålén (2011) have identified five practises within value co-creation. The first identified practise is informing; the customer and supplier/seller engage in information sharing between each other about problems related to the service in question. Second identified practise is greeting; in what way will the customer or supplier/seller greet the other one. This can occur both as non-verbal communication or verbal communication depending on circumstance. Third identified practise is the delivering of the service in question; what is offered. Both actors are involved in the interaction for value creation, since, delivering is traditionally defined as being only done by the supplier. Fourth identified practise is charging; this includes the paying, checking and issuing of the service. Usually both customer and provider are co-creators since charging requires engagement from both parties. Last identified practise is helping; either the provider or customer can provide assistance to one another in an interaction. This is also not only limited to one actor, both are required to create value in a given situation. (Echeverri & Skålén 2011)

For these five practises, Echeverri & Skålén (2011) describe scenarios in which a practise is used to better articulate if it leads to either co-creation or co-destruction of value. Their scenarios illustrate the interaction between a bus driver and a passenger. One example is a scenario where the bus driver is informing an irritated passenger about why the bus is late. The passenger and driver have different mindsets when the conversation starts but, in the end, value is created due to establishing a common ground on the reason for why the bus is late. The timetable for the bus has estimated schedule times, which the passenger is informed about by the driver because he initially did not know. Co-destruction on the other hand occurs in this scenario when either actor, for example, withholds information from the other or both actors disagree with each other on the matter. (Echeverri & Skålén 2011)

As previously mentioned, Echeverri & Skålén (2011) five identified practises possibly leads to both value co-creation and value co-destruction as these dimensions appear in their studied scenarios. To clarify: the elements of procedures, engagements and understandings making up the practises leads to the co-destruction and co-creation. Echeverri & Skålén (2011) conclude that value co-creation is the outcome when customers and service providers agree on the elements that inform a specific interaction, i.e. elements of practises are congruent. Value co-destruction on the other hand occurs when they do not agree on which elements inform a specific interaction, i.e. elements of practises are incongruent.

Echeverri & Skålén (2011) further explain how interactive value formation, known as value co-creation and co-destruction, takes place based on how providers and customers make use of incongruent or congruent elements of practises. More traditional ways of value formation are the exchanged-based view which measures value in terms of money (Alderson 1957; Bagozzi 1975; Hunt 1976), and the interaction-based view which measures value from the customer's perspective and value is seen subjectively (Holbrook 2006; Prahalad & Ramaswamy 2004b; Ramirez 1999; Vargo & Lusch 2004). Echeverri & Skålén (2011) expand the view of value as something that requires assessments from both provider and customer. Value can be better understood in terms of congruence and incongruence between possible configuration of practises and the elements connected to practises. Customers and providers extract these in order to interpret actions by other actors and to act on them.

2.3. Service encounters and customer moods

Value co-creation takes place during so called service encounters. Shostack (1985) defines service encounter as a period during which a consumer directly interacts with a service. This definition bounds all aspects of a service firm's activities that the consumer/customer possibly interacts with. These include tangible elements of the firm, e.g. the personnel and physical facilities, during a given period. (Mattila et al. 2002)

Previous research by Price et al. (1995) into the subject of service encounters, proposes that there are three basic dimensions of service encounter. These dimensions are the following: emotional content, temporal duration of the encounter itself and the distance itself between the customer and service provider. They found out that a tour guides performance greatly influenced the customers emotional responses, which in turn affected the encounter-level satisfaction. Mattila et al. (2002) then further expanded into this subject by studying a customer's mood and emotional display in service interactions displayed by public encounter, low emotional content and short duration. These are so called boundary-closed encounters.

Mattila et al. (2002) findings state that a customer's mood and display of feelings measured directly after a service encounter and during the interaction, go hand in hand with the customers own assessment of a service encounter. Their results match up with previous research (Gardner 1985) about the likelihood of mood effects in service encounters. The findings of Mattila et al. (2002) reveal that emotional responses influences the customers own encounter-level assessments in brief and ordinary encounters, as previously studied encounters have been more

focused on employees and professional/entertainment services (Johnson and Zinkhan 1991; Price et al. 1995). Customers response set based on the impact of emotions was not only limited to transaction-specific evaluations. A customer's assessment of an organization was highly influenced by the customer's own emotional state. This means that if a customer is in a positive mood, the assessment usually is more favourable and vice versa (Mano & Oliver 1993). Further findings stated by Mattila et al. (2002), are that observations of a customer's displayed emotions such as smiling, eye contact and thanking behaviour are important aspects to use when determining a customer's assessment of a service providers performance. Menon et al. (2000) recommend that a customer's satisfaction is enhanced by the way of how a salesperson reacts to a customer's emotions during an encounter. The service delivery provided by frontline employees during encounters can be customized by already detecting a customer's feelings and emotions during a "moment of truth". (Mattila et al. 2002)

Luong (2005) conducted a study on how customers feel before and after encounters with service providers. Mood is defined as subjective feeling states which are long lived, do not have specifiable causes and are broader than emotions. Emotions on the other hand are more specific states such as fear and joy (Diener et al. 1985; Gardner 1985; George & Brief 1992; Lee & Allen 2002). Mood comprises two independent dimensions which are negative and positive mood. High positive mood refers to pleasurable engagement and low positive mood to sadness and laziness. Vice versa, high negative mood refers to a feeling of nervousness and distress, while low negative mood refers to relaxation and calmness (Tellegen 1985). Positive and negative moods are easily influenced by external factors, vary between individuals and are ever changing over time. (Luong 2005)

The findings of Luong (2005) suggest that a service providers actions have an influence on the customer's mood. When a customer gets friendly service, the mood of a customer is likely to change from negative to positive or vice versa in a different scenario. As Luong (2005) studied mood prior to encounter, this mood displayed can change during the service encounter itself. The service provider affects this mood based on how the provider acts during the service (Luong 2005) As value co-creation happens during a service encounter, the findings of Luong (2005) are relevant to this study.

3. Methodology

The following chapter describes how the research was conducted and why choice of method was used to explain the research question.

3.1. Research strategy

There are different types of methods to conduct research and the two most common are qualitative and quantitative studies. The fundamental differences between the two are that quantitative research puts the results in numbers whereas qualitative research puts it into words (Halfpenny 1979; Bryman 1988a; Hammersley 1992b). Because of the purpose of this study, to see how customer mood affects value co-creation practises within service, the chosen method is a qualitative method. This is because qualitative methods tend to be less structured (Halfpenny 1979; Bryman 1988a; Hammersley 1992b), which allows room for interpretation of the data which fits this research. Data gathered from participants is unstructured to freely allow interpretation of the participants statements in order to draw conclusions.

In this study, qualitative research will be conducted in the form of semi-structured interviews. Semi-structured interviews give the respondent freedom to outline the answers in their own way to a question/scenario in relation to a mood (Bryman & Bell 2014). This is necessary for this study to make it possible to draw conclusions later in the discussion and conclusion. If the researcher wants to gain a correct insight of how respondents experience their reality in a given social context, in this case their mood in a restaurant setting, semi-structured interviews are appropriate (Bryman & Bell 2014). With semi-structured interviews, the researcher has a list of themes being touched upon, but it can also touch other important aspects if appropriate. This means that the respondents can provide new and unexpected information or perspectives outside of the original question. (Bryman & Bell 2014).

Observational research was also a possible considered method. This method could suit this study well, because observation allows the researcher to outline different behaviours of observed individuals in a given context (Bryman & Bell 2014). Due to a limited amount of time and the scope of this research, observational research was left out as a method.

3.2. Selection of participants

To be able to see how customer moods affect value co-creation in a restaurant visit, semi-structured interviews were conducted with assumed restaurant visitors. These interviews were conducted with past and current visitors of a restaurant. These interviews were all conducted at Karlstad University and random students were asked to participate in semi-structured interviews. The reason for why the university area and random students were chosen, was due to the researchers spending a lot of time at the university so it was a convenient way of conducting interviews. Also, since there was limited time to conduct the study, students were easier to access to conduct interviews with. The interviews were held with both male and female students at the university. Another reason for why students were chosen, was due to all of them being in the same occupation.

3.3. Data collection

There are two types of data that can be used for a study; primary and secondary data. Primary data was gathered to answer the current study's purpose while secondary data was already collected from previous studies (Saunders et al. 2009).

This study consists of primary data. The primary data for this study was collected by interviewing students at Karlstad University. This data was collected by semi-structured interviews which allowed the respondents to give a broad view of opinions in different scenarios compared to for e.g. yes/no questions. The interviews were held orally with given instructions to the participants that gave room for interpretation of the answers. The interviews were conducted with ten different people. The same core questions were given to all the ten people about the five practises as identified by Echeverri & Skålén (2011) but with different given moods. First, a core question in relation to each practise was asked when the respondent was in a neutral mood. Afterwards, the respondent was asked to take on a negative mood and then a positive mood to answer the same core question. In this way the respondents took on different moods when answering the same core question, and then in regards of the answers of the core question, follow up questions were asked in accordance to different moods. The follow up questions were not the same in every case but were customized to tackle the answers from the core-questions (Bryman & Bell 2014). In this way, the answers could be compared, and differences could be drawn regarding value co-creation regarding different moods of the customer. The five questions were outlined in an open-ended way which gave the respondent the need to expand the answers.

3.4. Implementation of interviews

The interviews were conducted at Karlstad University to students in the library and in the university area. Rooms were booked for the three occasions the interviews were held so that the interviews could be conducted privately and without outside noise and disturbance. The interviews were conducted to 10 students in total, 5 men and 5 women. This was on purpose to keep the same number of interviews to each gender. The interviews were conducted mainly on the afternoons because the researchers believed that it was easier to find respondents in the university areas later during the day than earlier. This was because earlier in the day students are more focused in their work and what they are there for compared to later in the afternoon where more breaks can be taken and the focus decreases. All the interviews ranged from 9-18 minutes in time, the majority took between 10-15 minutes. The questions were outlined according to the 5 practises as identified by (Echeverri & Skálén 2011) but in a restaurant setting. Every practise had one core question that was asked three times according to neutral, positive and negative mood. All in all, 14 core questions because the last practise only had 2 core questions and not 3. Depending on the answers of the core questions, follow up questions were asked. These follow up questions ranged from different topics depending on the first answer given and was conducted by the interviewees own understanding of what was relevant. The interviewees tried to create a calm environment so that the respondents could answer sincerely, this is also believed to have been the case. In some cases, to give the potential respondents an incentive to participate in the interview, a free coffee was offered but only one person accepted a free coffee and the rest did it voluntarily and without a reward.

3.5. Data analysis

All the interviews were transcribed from recordings to words in a written document. After the transcriptions were done, each interview was easier to oversee and deconstruct into smaller parts. To make the interviews easier to analyse, key points were taken out from the answers provided by respondents. The key points were what the respondent had to say to each question regarding mood and practise. The key points from every interview were then categorized into respective practise and mood. Based on the mood and practise the key points belonged to, all key points within the same category were summarized into one single entity. Each practise then got three summaries based on the moods researched. The exception was practise 5 which is service delivery; this practise only got two summaries. E.g. practise 1 has three summaries consisting of neutral, negative and positive mood. Further findings are presented in **Appendix 2**.

3.6. Validity

The questionnaire in this study was formulated according to the five value co-creation practises by Echeverri & Skálén (2011). Since these practises have already been identified in an earlier study, they formed the basis for this study to fulfil the validity criterion. This research tested the already identified practises in a new setting to study another phenomenon, in this case moods.

3.7. Reliability

Reliability deals with the question of whether a study's results are repeatable. Commonly used to see if measures in business and management are consistent. (Bryman & Bell 2014). Although reliability and validity are distinguishable concepts, they are still related to each other because validity presumes reliability. This means that if the measure is not reliable it is not valid. (Bryman & Bell 2014)

The questionnaire formulated was tested and reformulated two times prior to conducting the interviews with respondents. During the first trial run of an interview, the test respondent got confused about answering the questions regarding different moods. This was because mood was given to the respondent before a set of questions which lead to the respondent not knowing or remembering which mood they were supposed to take on, for example, in the later questions. The questions had to be changed so that mood was given before every core question and practise, and the follow-up questions dealt with that given mood. During the second trial run, mood was clearly given before the core questions and it was clear that the follow-up questions belonged to that mood. This ensured more accurate and varied answers from the test respondent as the respondents were now aware of the mood they were supposed to adapt and to which question.

Since the answers differed between all the respondents, the answers were comparable and provided the researcher with various data to analyse. The follow-up questions differentiated between respondents, since they were formulated according to each respondent's answer and mood. The result was that each respondent gave unique answers. Also, a difference in answers between scenarios given in negative compared to positive mood were visible in the results. This indicates that each respondent was able to adapt a given mood successfully.

3.8. Ethical aspects

There are several ethical issues that can occur when conducting business research. It is important that the researcher is informed about the issues, and that the

respondents are informed about all aspects as well to ensure ethical consideration when conducting interviews (Bryman & Bell 2014).

Before every interview, each respondent had been informed about every aspect of the study in order to ensure “informed consent” of the respondent. Respondents were asked if they consent to the interview being recorded. The respondents were informed about the nature and purpose of the study, and what part the respondents played in it. They were also informed that the recorded interview was only accessible by the researchers, and that every participant was anonymous in order to ensure no harm or risks to the respondent based on their answers (Bryman & Bell 2014). The respondent was told that they could cancel the interview at any time if they felt like doing it, and that the recorded interviews were going to be deleted when the study was completed.

4. Findings

The following chapter presents the findings from the qualitative research conducted.

The purpose of this section is to present the findings and differences in customer moods in relation to value co-creation practises (Echeverri & Skålén 2011) in a restaurant setting. The information in this section will serve as a basis for the analysis in the discussion part. The quotes in this section have been directly translated from Swedish, since the interviews were conducted in Swedish. For more detailed findings, see **Appendix 2**.

4.1. Greeting

No matter the mood, it was found out that all the restaurant visitors had expected to be greeted by staff. If the customer was in a neutral or positive mood, they tended to wait longer for service personnel to show them a table. One of the positive customers said: *“If the restaurant is fully booked, I want the personal to show me an empty table to avoid conflict.”* Almost half of the customers in a negative mood would just have left the restaurant if they were not greeted. The same tendency was in the neutral mood customers while positive had been more patient with waiting.

If the restaurant was a finer restaurant, neutral mood customers expected a proper greeting. Negative mood customers also tend to voice their displeasure with the service. One customer said: *“... greeting can sometimes be a little bit inconvenient to criticize so I would maybe have written an angry email afterwards”*. Another customer would have left a comment at the restaurant. In general, positive customers had been more patient and accepting of the situation.

4.2. Information sharing

Everyone in a neutral mood expected staff to come with a menu to the table and if they were asked to order at the bar, most of them would have been willing to do so. However, all the customers in a negative mood would have felt neglected if asked to order at the bar, and they had different reasons for it. One customer said: *“...I might have complained a little bit to the company I was there with, like Swedish complaining.”* (See **Appendix 2** for further reasons listed).

Customers in positive mood on the other hand, would not have minded ordering at the bar, and here again, would be more accepting of the circumstances. The only

concern positive mood customers had, was that if the restaurant was a finer one, they would have concerns and confusion about ordering at the bar.

4.3. Assistance/help

All the customers in neutral mood expected help from staff if complications occurred or if assistance was needed. If the staff couldn't provide help, all the negative mood customers would have questioned the staff about why they could not provide assistance. On the other hand, positive mood customers would not have questioned unhelpful staff, once again indicating a more accepting attitude. Positive mood customers would have tried to solve a minor problem by themselves, whereas neutral mood customers would have thought it was poor service if assistance was not provided. In one case, the neutral mood customer would even have gone and talk to the manager if assistance was not provided. Another customer said: *“Depending on how bad the overall service was, I would have thought that I'm not coming back here.”*

Among the negative mood customers, there were different ways they would have displayed their displeasure, e.g. leave the restaurant even though food was already ordered. (See **Appendix 2** for more negative mood customer responses).

4.4. Charging

All the neutral mood customers had expected the bill to come to the table after finishing their meal, but on the other hand they would not be concerned about paying at the bar. Some of them also wanted the service personnel to ask them if everything was okay before conducting the payment. They also wanted to be given different payment options such as card or cash. One said: *“... the personnel should ask how I want to pay...”*.

If the customers in a negative mood were asked to pay at the bar, most of them were okay with this. Some of them actually preferred to pay at the bar since they wanted to leave the restaurant quickly due to their negative mood. As one customer said: *“... then I would not have to talk to the service personnel as many times, since it is only one point of contact...”*. Even though the negative mood customers did not mind paying at the bar, some of them would still have questioned the fact that they had to do so, all of them with different reasons (see **Appendix 2**).

The positive mood customers had no problem with paying at the bar, but one customer preferred to pay at the table.

4.5. Service delivery

All negative mood customers would more easily react to minor service complications which would affect their overall review of the restaurant experience. One negative mood customer also thought that negative mood affects the assessment of a restaurant visit but also highlighted that what actually happens during the service encounter affects their review. Another negative said: “... *I would have associated the restaurant with something negative if the experience was bad...*”

All the positive mood customers said that a positive mood positively influences their review of the visit. All of them also said that they would have been more forgiving about small service complications, indicating once again that positive mood makes them more accepting and forgiving. One customer said: “... *sometimes I have been on a very positive mood but then a not-so happy seeming waiter has come to take orders. So that destroys the experience a bit.*”

5. Discussion

The following chapter focuses on analysing and comparing the results presented in Table 1 in relation to the literature presented in the study. Each identified value co-creation practise is analysed individually in relation to mood.

5.1. Greeting

The first of the five practises as identified by Echeverri & Skålén (2011) is the greeting phase. The results of this practise show a difference in when a customer enters a restaurant depending on if they are in a neutral mood or negative. Mano & Oliver (1993) states that mood plays a key role in the customers assessment of a particular firm or organization. Customers who are in a neutral mood are more likely to be patient to wait for service personnel to approach them whereas customers with a negative mood are less likely to be patient about waiting to be greeted and are likely to go get a table themselves. The difference in the way the customer acts is partly because of their mood and because the fact that service personnel are not greeting them straight away. Earlier findings suggest that customer satisfaction is enhanced by the way of how a salesperson reacts to the customers emotions during the first encounter (Mattila et al. 2002). The greeting could be customized by the service personnel by detecting customer moods as soon as they walk into the restaurant to co-create value from the first encounter (Mattila et al. 2002; Prahalad & Ramaswamy 2004a).

The positive mood respondents would in general be even more patient if not greeted straight away. The results indicate that they tend to wait until staff arrives to greet them, or they would approach staff to ask for an available table or just pick one for themselves. Positive mood customers are easier to handle since they in this case take initiative themselves to get seated and value co-creation (Prahalad and Ramaswamy 2004a) can start from the moment the service personnel come to the table. On the other hand, already negative mood customers might get even less satisfied if not greeted properly, when this could have been prevented by an approaching service person who took their moods into consideration at the greeting (Mattila et al. 2002). This is also something that goes hand in hand with the findings of Luong (2005) who states that a service providers actions have an influence on the customers mood. The mutual value co-creation between customer and provider can be enhanced with a proper greeting when customer enters a restaurant regardless of mood. (Prahalad and Ramaswamy 2004a)

5.2. Information sharing

The second practise as identified by Echeverri & Skålén (2011), is information sharing. The results show that all respondents want the staff to come to the table with a menu when in a neutral mood. This indicates that there has to be interaction established between the staff and customers if value co-creation is to be successful in the practise of information sharing (Saarijärvi et al. 2013). In the case of neutral mood and the staff does not come to the table with a menu, the customer can be seen as the sole creator of value as the customer takes own initiative to get a menu and starts ordering without the help from staff. This shows that the firm is possibly stuck in a customer service logic where the customer is the sole creator of value (Grönroos 2008). Half of the customers want to take their time before ordering and half of them are willing to go to the bar to order if asked to. The amount of information and knowledge a customer can obtain, and use helps their own role in the co-creation of value (Normann 2001). This points out that the staff should provide the customers with enough information needed in the restaurant to improve their own role in the customers own activities. If the staff informs the neutral mood customers about going to the bar to order, value can possibly be co-created between the parties.

When in a negative mood, none of the respondents would prefer going up to the bar to order. On the other hand, when in a positive mood, no one minded going up to the bar to order. This once again highlights that the customer is more likely to engage as a co-creator of value together with the staff when on a better mood. The customers want to interact with the firm in order to co-create value together (Prahalad and Ramaswamy 2004a).

In a negative mood, the customer is less willing to engage in value co-creation as they don't want to go up to the bar to order. This points more to the direction of value co-destruction, which means that either one or both parties clash in information sharing (Echeverri & Skålén 2011). Different reasons behind why value co-destruction can occur in the case of ordering at the bar, lies on both parties. The customers have reasons such as higher expectations of the restaurant, being very hungry and thinking that there is bad communication of routines from the staff to customers. Only one respondent would be understanding if they saw that the staff was busy. A few respondents would have doubted why they must order at the bar if it was a finer restaurant, but they would have done it anyway. All this indicates that proper communication by staff is required to provide enough information to customers in order to establish co-value creation instead of destruction (Echeverri & Skålén 2011)

5.3. Assistance/help

The third practise as identified by Echeverri & Skålén (2011) is assistance/help. The results show that all the respondents expected assistance from service personnel on questions they have regardless of mood. If in a negative mood and the service personnel was unable to help, all respondents would question the staff. Here, neither provider service logic or customer service logic are applied (Saarijärvi et al. 2013) which in turn does not lead to value co-creation (Prahalad and Ramaswamy 2004a). The interaction between the customer and provider needs to be interactive to allow co-creation of value which in the above case it is not. Firms needs to establish interaction points in the customers consumption process to be able to co-create value (Saarijärvi et al. 2013). The above example is a clear example of where these interaction points are not established since the customer doesn't get the help asked for. This leads to lost value co-creation opportunities. If the service was considered bad due to unhelpfulness during negative mood, various actions by the respondents were stated. For example, one respondent would have left, and another would have expressed their dissatisfaction after service. Customers are now armed with more tools and can easily change supplier if dissatisfied (Prahalad and Ramaswamy 2004a). As in this case, a customer wants to interact with the service provider to co-create value, and if not, they are likely to change provider (Prahalad and Ramaswamy 2004a). This leads to lost value co-creation opportunities.

On the other hand, almost all respondents in a positive mood had let the staff's unhelpfulness slip by as they would have had more comprehension for it. When in a positive mood, various reasons explained why the respondent would not be bothered by the staff's unhelpfulness, for example, enjoying the company they were there with. Also, when being in a positive mood, the more likely it was that the respondent would try to solve the problem themselves. One respondent stated that if in positive mood, how they would react depended on the size of the problem. These reasons further highlight that when customers are in a good mood, mistakes or bad performed value co-creation practises by service personnel are more easily ignored. This does not go hand in hand with the idea that more dialogue and interaction between provider and customer create better relationships (Payne et al. 2008). The above case of non-helpfulness is ignored by the customer because he/she is in a positive mood, on the other hand it could have been an opportunity for value co-creation (Prahalad and Ramaswamy 2004a). There is a possibility that value co-creation opportunities get lost because people in a positive mood are more likely to accept poorer service practises.

5.4. Charging

The fourth practise as identified by Echeverri & Skålén (2011) is charging. The result show that every respondent wanted the service personnel to come to the table with the bill when in neutral mood. Furthermore, when in neutral mood, respondents had different preferences such as; expected bill to the table if she had gotten table service the entire dinner, pay at the bar if he was with a bigger company of friends, didn't want question regarding tip, don't want the service personnel to push for the payment or being able to have multiple payment options. Since this indicates that customers usually have different preferences for handling the payment, staff could possibly engage in dialogue with customers in earlier stages of the production process to ensure value co-creation (Ballantyne 2004). This means that staff could ask customers when they have finished the meal about what payment methods, they prefer to create customized payment solutions as co-produced offerings (Ballantyne 2004). The staff would then have identified the customers point of view, and their needs and wants regarding payment (Payne et al. 2008). The satisfaction of a customer can be further enhanced if the mood of the customer is also identified by staff (Menon et al. 2000)

When in negative mood seven respondents wanted to pay at the bar and which three of the respondents wanted to leave the restaurant as soon as possible if in a negative mood. One did not want the service personnel to stress her to go to the bar to pay and one wanted to know why payment couldn't be conducted at the table when the rest of the service was conducted at the table. In the two later cases, customer satisfaction could be enhanced by a more customized service regarding the mood of the customer (Menon et al. 2000).

Since the payment process requires both parties' engagement in order to establish successful value co-creation (Echeverri & Skålén 2011), staff should once again try creating customized payment solutions as co-produced offerings with customers as in the case of neutral mood (Payne et al. 2008). The customer can then possibly provide staff with information that considers their mood. This could turn out to be successful value co-creation if the customer is in a negative mood. In positive mood everyone was fine with paying at the bar except for one who preferred to do so at the table. Due to most positive mood respondents not minding in what way payment is conducted, value is possibly co-created no matter what is done by staff so a co-produced offering is not possibly necessary in this case.

5.5. Service delivery

The fifth practise as identified by Echeverri & Skálén (2011) is service delivery. No questions regarding neutral mood was asked in this practise. When in negative mood, all respondents said that they will more easily react to minor service complications than when in a positive mood. This is something that strengthens Mattila et al. (2002) findings that a customer's assessment of a firm is highly influenced by customer moods. When in a positive mood, customers are less likely to react to minor complications.

One person might have left the restaurant if experiencing service compilation and in a negative mood, here value co-creation opportunities are lost since the mood of the customer is affected negatively by the service personnel's lack of service (Luong 2005). Another respondent said that a minor service complication can always be recovered by the personnel. The second of the three components of value co-creation as identified by Payne et al. (2008) begins by understanding the value creating processes. To be able to recover from a minor service complication companies need to identify co-creation opportunities effectively and implement customer solutions so that in the end, the firm is offering appropriate value propositions. By identifying customer solutions, a minor service complication can be dealt with in a positive way that enables value co-creation (Prahalad & Ramaswamy 2004a). Whereas if the minor service complication is dealt with poorly or the firm does not have a customer solution to it, the potential of the customer leaving the restaurant is possible, which in the end leads to lost value co-creation opportunities. (Payne et al. 2008)

Another person said that the importance of the evaluation of a restaurant visit is not the current mood, but what happens during the service encounter. This further implicates (Prahalad & Ramaswamy 2004a) that it is not the offering that is co-created with the customer, but rather the customer experience and personalized co-creation of value through sensitive and meaningful interaction.

Every respondent said that positive mood affects the overall service experience positively and that they are more forgiving for minor service complications. One respondent said that if in a positive mood, her expectation of the service personnel is lowered. The moods of customers are affected negatively when bigger service problems occur. The research done by Price et al. (1995) found that a tour guides performance heavily affects the customers own emotional responses which then influence their own satisfaction of the service encounter. This contradicts with the findings that a customer's positive mood in a restaurant is influenced by minor service mistakes, this is because the customer who is in a positive mood is not greatly affected by minor service complications. On the other hand, if a customer is in a negative mood, they are more bothered by service complications which

matches the findings by Price et al. (1995). A positive mood customer is less likely to be influenced by smaller service complications, while negative mood customers are more likely to be influenced by external factors or smaller complications.

6. Conclusions

The following chapter presents conclusions and limitations of the study and possible suggestions for further research.

6.1. Theoretical implications

As the aim of this paper was to identify how a customer's current mood affects the value co-creation practises as identified by Echeverri & Skålén (2011). In order to answer the research question, following conclusions have been made.

Based on the assumption that the service personnel of a restaurant conduct themselves in a reasonable manner and with a willingness to help, different moods of the customers play a role in the mutual value co-creation practises. Customers with a positive/neutral mood are more likely to engage in value co-creation practises with the service personnel than customers with a negative mood. Positive mood customers more easily see through and ignore minor service complications than negative mood customers. This could indicate that positive mood customers co-create more value with the service personnel than negative mood customers. On the other hand, this does not have to be true. Negative mood customers have a more critical perspective on the service practises and are less patient with poorly conducted practises. If the two moods are compared, negative and positive, negative mood customer are more likely to identify weaknesses in the value co-creation practises as identified by Echeverri & Skålén (2011) in a restaurant setting, compared to positive mood customers who tend to just see through these weaknesses or ignore them. Therefore, it is hard to say that positive mood customers co-create more value than negative mood customers.

Positive mood customers are more likely to be more satisfied after the restaurant visit because of their positive mood, but, on the other hand, this does not have to be an indicator that the mutual value co-creation practises taking place during the visit, were more successful. It just shows that their overall mood made them more acceptable and receptive of the service practises of the restaurant. Negative mood customers are more likely to leave the restaurant disappointed after the same treatment. This correlates with previous research that negative mood leads to a poorer review of the service.

Further conclusions that can be made is that every single practise as identified by Echeverri & Skålén (2011) does not play the same important role in the mutual value co-creation in a restaurant setting. For example, the greeting practise tended to be more critical in relation to customer moods than for example the charging practise. If the service personnel did not put effort into value co-creation in the

greeting practice, it could lead to customers leaving the restaurant if not presented with a proper greeting. If on the other hand in a positive mood, customers were more likely to take a seat themselves or ask for service personnel more patiently. This practise in relation to mood and value co-creation, can play a big difference in the overall visit and is critical. The charging practise on the other hand turned out to be not as critical. In this practise customers were more okay, regardless of mood, with different scenarios and value was more easily co-created whether the customer was in neutral, positive or in negative mood. In the assistance/help practise as identified by Echeverri & Skålén (2011), the biggest difference in value co-creation regarding mood, could be identified.

6.2. Managerial implications

There are certain aspects to consider from a managerial perspective regarding value co-creation practises (Echeverri & Skålén, 2011) in relation to mood within a restaurant setting. What can be said is that customers in a negative mood, give the service personnel more opportunities to co-create value than positive ones. This is because it is easier to identify poorly performed value co-creation touchpoints in a service practise when the customer is in a negative mood. It is possibly up to the service personnel of the restaurant to identify these poorly performed value co-creation touchpoints and play their part in the mutual value co-creation processes between the customers and the service provider to be able to co-create value successfully. Therefore, when customer is in a negative mood, it is important for service personnel to identify this, and act on it.

The first practise of greeting is of high importance from a managerial perspective. This is because greeting is the first phase where customers encountered service personnel and their mood played a role in whether they would stay or possibly just leave the restaurant. If the customer chooses to leave the restaurant it is not even possible for the service provider/restaurant to be able to co-create value in later practises since the customer is already gone. Therefore, the greeting practise should be taken seriously from a managerial perspective.

6.3. Limitations and further suggestions

The limitations of this study could be the number of interviews conducted. A larger number of interviews could increase the variety of responses and thereby increase the reliability of the study. Another limitation is that the respondents are all students at a university. Since students are usually younger people, there is a possibility that they have a more tolerant attitude towards mediocre/bad service, compared to an older demographic group. Older people, for example, might be

employed and have a higher income which in turn could mean a different attitude towards service and it is a possibility that they have higher expectations of service quality at a restaurant. This means that different results could possibly be produced from another demographic group. Also, since the study chose a restaurant setting, the results gathered from this setting does not necessarily work or represent similar practises within another service industry or branch.

Future research can be conducted into value co-creation and the practises (Echeverri & Skålén 2011) related to it in other service settings outside of a restaurant. With help of the findings of this study; that it is easier to identify poorly performed value co-creation touchpoints when the customer is in a negative mood, future research could analyse these poorly performed value co-creation touchpoints and find ways to fix or prevent them. Since customer mood in relation to value co-creation practises is a new research area, a similar study could be conducted on a larger scale. This can be done to further investigate the findings of this study, preferably in a different service industry so that comparisons can be drawn between the same concepts but within different industries.

Bibliography

Alderson, W. (1957). *Marketing Behaviour and Executive Action: A Functionalist Approach to Marketing Theory*. Homewood, IL: Irwin.

Bagozzi, R.P. (1975). Marketing as Exchange, *Journal of Marketing* 39(October), 32–9.

Ballantyne, D. (2004). Dialogue and its role in the development of relationship specific knowledge. *Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing*, 19(2), 114–123

Bryman, A. (1974). *Quantity and Quality in social research*. London: Routledge. Svensk utgåva (1997): *Kvantitet och kvalitet i samhällsvetenskaplig forskning*. Övers. B. Nilsson. Lund: Studentlitteratur

Bryman, A & Bell, E. (2014). *Företagsekonomiska forskningsmetoder*. Stockholm: Liber, Upplaga 2.2

Dixon, D. F. (1990) Marketing as Production: The Development of a Concept," *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 18 (Fall), 337-43.

Echeverri, P. and Skålén, P. (2011). Co-creation and co-destruction: A practice-theory based study of interactive value formation. *Marketing theory*, 11(3), 351-373.

Gardner, P. (1985). Mood States and Consumer Behavior: A Critical Review, *Journal of Consumer Research*, 12, 281-300.

George, J. M. and A. P. Brief (1992). Feeling Good–Doing Good: A Conceptual Analysis of the Mood at Work-Organizational Spontaneity Relationship, *Psychological Bulletin*, 112, 310-29.

Grönroos, C. (2008b). Service logic revisited: who creates value? And who co-creates?, *European Business Review*, Vol. 4, 298-314.

Grönroos, C. (2011). Value co-creation in service logic: a critical analysis, *Marketing Theory*, Vol. 11 No. 3, 279-301

Halfpenny, P. (1979). The analysis of qualitative data. *Sociological Review*, 27, 799-825.

- Hammersley, M (1992). Deconstructing the qualitative-quantitative divide. I:M. Hammersley (red.), *What's wrong with ethnography?* London: Routledge
- Holbrook, M. B. (1996). Customer value—A framework for analysis and research. In K. P. Corfman & J. G. Lynch Jr. (Eds.), *Advances in consumer research*, vol. 23 (138–142). Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research.
- Holbrook, M.B. (2006). ‘ROSEPEKICECIVECI versus CCV: The Resource-operant, Skills-exchanging, Performance-experiencing, Knowledge-informed, Competence-enacting, Co-producer-involved, Value-emerging, Customer-interactive View of Marketing versus the Concept of Customer Value: “I Can Get It for You Wholesale”’, in R. F. Lusch and S. L. Vargo (eds) *The Service-Dominant Logic of Marketing: Dialog, Debate and Directions*, 208–23. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.
- Hunt, S.D. (1976). The Nature and Scope of Marketing, *Journal of Marketing* 40(3), 17–28.
- Johnson, E. & G. Zinkhan (1991), Emotional Responses to a Professional Service Encounter, *Journal of Services Marketing*, 5 (2), 5-15.
- Lee, K. & N. J. Allen (2002), Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Workplace Deviance: The Role of Affect and Cognitions, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 131-42
- Luong, A., 2005. Affective service display and customer mood. *Journal of Service Research*, 8(2), 117-130.
- Malthus, T. (1798). *An Essay on the Principle of Population*. London: Printed for J. Johnson, in St. Paul's Church-Yard.
- Mano, H. & R. Oliver (1993). “Assessing the Dimensionality and Structure of the Consumption Experience: Evaluation, Feeling and Satisfaction,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 20, 451-66.
- Menon, K. & Dube, L. (2000). Ensuring Greater Satisfaction by Engineering Salesperson Response to Customer Emotions, *Journal of Retailing*, 76 (3), 285-307.
- Mokyr, J. (2002). *The Gifts of Athena: Historical Origins of the Knowledge Economy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Normann, R. (2001). *Reframing business: When the map changes the landscape*. Chichester, England: Wiley
- Payne, A.F., Storbacka, K. & Frow, P. (2008). Managing the co-creation of value. *Journal of the academy of marketing science*, 36(1), pp. 83-96.
- Prahalad, C.K. & Ramaswamy, V. (2000). Co-opting customer competence. *Harvard Business Review*, 78, 79–90, (January).
- Prahalad, C.K. & Ramaswamy, V. (2004a). Co-creating unique value with customers. *Strategy & leadership*, 32(3), 4-9.
- Prahalad, C.K. & Ramaswamy, V. (2004b). *The Future of Competition: Co-creating Unique Value with Customers*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Price, L., E. Arnould, & Deibler, S. (1995). Consumers' Emotional Responses to Service Encounters, *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 6 (3), 34-63., and Patrick Tierney (1995), Going to Extremes: Managing Service Encounters and Assessing Provider Performance, *Journal of Marketing*, 59 (April), 83-97
- Ramirez, R. (1999). Value Co-production: Intellectual Origins and Implications for Practice and Research, *Strategic Management Journal* 20(4), 49–65.
- Saarijärvi, H., Kannan, P.K. & Kuusela, H. (2013). Value co-creation: theoretical approaches and practical implications. *European Business Review*, 25(1), 6-19.
- Schau, H.J., Albert M.M., Jr & Arnould, E.J. (2009). How Brand Community Practices Create Value, *Journal of Marketing* 73(5), 30–51.
- Shostack, L. (1977). Breaking Free from Product Marketing, *Journal of Marketing*, 41, 73-80.
- Tellegen, A. (1985). Structures of Mood and Personality and Their Relevance to Assessing Anxiety, with an Emphasis on Self-Report, in *Anxiety and the Anxiety Disorders*, A. H. Tuma & J. D. Maser, eds. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 681-706.
- Vargo, S.L. & Lusch, R.F. (2004). Evolving to a New Dominant Logic for Marketing, *Journal of Marketing* 68(1), 1–17.

Vargo, S.L., & Lusch, R.F. (2006). Service-dominant logic: What it is, what it is not, what it might be. In R. F. Lusch & S. L. Vargo (Eds.), *The service dominant logic of marketing: Dialog, debate and directions* (43–56). Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

Appendix 1: Interview guide and consent:

Målet med denna intervju är att utvärdera värdeskapande aktiviteter i relation till kundens humör inom ett restaurangbesök. Vi är intresserade av dina svar och vi kommer att använda dem till att jämföra med andra respondenternas svar. Din medverkan är naturligtvis frivillig och du kan avbryta intervjun när som helst. Inga personuppgifter kommer att samlas in men intervjun kommer att ljudinspelas. När vi publicerar vår studie kommer inga ljudinspelningar att publiceras utan dem är endast till för oss som forskare och i vår utvärdering i resultat delen. Ljudinspelningarna kommer att raderas efter studiens publicering. Har vi ditt medgivande att ljudinspela dig till denna intervju?

Instruktioner:

Du är på väg till en restaurang med dina vänner en vardagskväll.

Du kommer att presenteras med scenarier/frågor som vi vill att du ska svara på. Försök beskriva så noggrant som möjligt.

1. Välkomnande

I detta scenario går du in i restaurangen. Du stiger in på en restaurang, vad förväntar du dig att ska hända? Beskriv så noga som möjligt.

Följdfråga: Om du var på dåligt humör, hade du förväntat något annat i samma situation?

Följdfråga: Om du var på väldigt bra humör, hade du förväntat något annat i samma situation?

2. Informationsdelning

Du har satt dig med ditt sällskap vid ert bord. Vad förväntar du dig ska hända härnäst?

Beskriv så noga som möjligt.

Följdfråga: Om du var på dåligt humör, hade du förväntat dig något annat?

Följdfråga: Om du var på väldigt bra humör, hade du förväntat dig något annat?

3. Assistans och hjälp

Du sitter vid bordet och behöver assistans av personalen. Vad förväntar du dig ska hända härnäst? Beskriv så noga som möjligt.

Följdfråga: Om du var på dåligt humör, hade du förväntat dig något annat?

Följdfråga: Om du var på väldigt bra humör, hade du förväntat dig något annat?

4. Betalning av tjänsten

Efter att ha avslutat din måltid, är det dags för betalning. Vad förväntar du dig att ska hända härnäst? Beskriv så noga så möjligt.

Följdfråga: Om du var på dåligt humör, hade du förväntat dig något annat?

Följdfråga: Om du var på väldigt bra humör, hade du förväntat dig något annat?

5. Service leverans

Restaurangbesöket är över. Hur skulle du säga att ditt bra/dåliga humör påverkar din bedömning av restaurangbesöket?

Följdfrågor baserat på respondentens svar.

Appendix 2: Results for each practise and mood

	Neutral	Negative	Positive
Greeting	<p>Ten out of the ten respondents expect to be welcomed as they step into the restaurant and to be informed about table seating. Five out of the ten respondents would look up staff regarding table placement if no one was there to greet them. Four of the ten respondents, on the other hand, would just have chosen a table. Three out of the ten respondents might have gone out of the restaurant if they were not accommodated within the first moments in the restaurant. However, two of the ten respondents had patiently waited if they really wanted to eat at the restaurant. Two out of the ten respondents said that the greeting depended on the restaurant; a finer restaurant must have a proper greeting.</p>	<p>Four out of the ten respondents had just taken a seat somewhere if they were not greeted by staff. Two out of the ten respondents would have been willing to further wait for service staff to come greet them. Four out of the ten respondents had left if they did not receive a greeting when they came in. Of these four respondents, one respondent had mailed the restaurant afterwards saying that it is not sustainable service while another respondent had mumbled a bad comment at the restaurant before they went out. Another one of these four respondents might have chosen another restaurant nearby</p>	<p>Four out of the ten respondents would just go and sit down. Another four out of the ten respondents would be patient with waiting for staff and not see it as a major problem. Three out of the ten respondents had themselves asked for a table placement. One out of the ten respondents had thought that mood did not affect action, they had acted in the same way regardless of mood.</p>

	Neutral	Negative	Positive
Information sharing	<p>All ten out of the total respondents expect the staff to come up with a menu as they sat down at the table. Five out of the ten respondents want to take a good time reading the menu before ordering. One out of these five respondents would have wanted a recommendation regarding the menu while another one out of these five respondents did not want any recommendations. Six out of the ten respondents were willing to go to the bar and make an order if service staff do not come with a menu to the table or they fail to get a hold of service personnel. One out of the ten respondents thought that the staff must give a better overall impression in order to even have to go to the bar and order. Another respondent out of the ten respondents thought it was bad service if you had to order food at the bar.</p>	<p>Ten out of the ten respondents had been neglected to go to the bar. However, it was different depending on the situation, for example, one out of the ten respondents would not have appreciated it if it was a nicer restaurant which had led to higher expectations than having to go to the bar. Another one out of the ten respondents thought that if they were hungry, they would not have preferred to order at the bar. One out of the ten respondents thought that the restaurant should better communicate how the layout in the restaurant is regarding table service etc. Similarly, another one out of the ten respondents had wondered why they had not been informed earlier about the setup in the restaurant. Another one out of the ten respondents were understanding about if the staff had been fully busy and wanted the company to order at the bar while the same respondent thought it would have been unpleasant if the staff was not busy. One out of ten respondents had thought for themselves that it was hard to go forward, but still did it if they were asked to do so.</p>	<p>Ten out of the ten respondents did not mind going to the bar and order if they were in a good mood. Three out of the ten respondents had wondered about the arrangement to have to order at the bar if it was a nicer restaurant. One out of the ten respondents had thought the same no matter what mood.</p>

	Neutral	Negative	Positive
Help/ Assistance	<p>Ten out of the ten respondents expected assistance or help by service personnel if complications occurred. In the case of minor problems, eight out of the ten respondents thought that it was poor service if they did not get help because they believe it is the service staff's job to help. One out of these eight respondents had summoned the manager if staff did not want or could not help with a small matter. Another one of these eight respondents had thought that I will not come back to the restaurant if I cannot get help/assistance for a small problem. Two out of the ten respondents had not been bothered so much if help was not offered but had instead tried to do something about it for themselves, depending on whether the staff were busy/stressed. Another two out of the ten respondents expected that if you summon personnel, you should get their attention.</p>	<p>Ten out of the ten respondents had questioned the staff about not being able to get help with a small problem, of which four of these ten respondents thought that this indicated poor service. One out of the ten respondents had reacted differently based on the staff's actions, attitude and willingness to help. Another one of the ten respondents might have left the restaurant even though they had already ordered food, if the staff did not want to help with a small problem. One out of the ten respondents would not have said anything at the time and instead tried to solve the problem themselves, but later when the visit was over, they would have expressed their opinion about the dissatisfaction. One of the ten respondents had been bothered but would not make it a big deal and instead tried to accept it. That respondent did not want to turn a small problem into something bigger.</p>	<p>Nine out of the ten respondents had not questioned the unhelpful staff but tended to accept it more easily. They would have had more indulgence for small things. One out of the ten respondents had strongly questioned the unhelpful staff and would not accept it that easily. The respondents who had accepted it stated different reasons why they accepted it. For example, they would have solved the problem themselves or if they had a good company and a nice time, they would just ignore the problem, or alternatively, they would see that the staff were stressed and would then have more tendency to overlook. One out of the ten respondents stated that if there were problems with the food that could not be solved by the staff, such as raw chicken, then the person would have left the restaurant without paying.</p>

	Neutral	Negative	Positive
Charging	<p>Ten out of the ten respondents had expected the payment process to be started after finishing the meal. These ten respondents preferred the service personal to come to the table with the bill to conduct the payment but on the other hand they would not have minded going to the bar to pay. One out of the ten respondents expected the bill to the table if they had gotten table service throughout the entire dinner. Another one out of the ten respondents said that if they were in a bigger company, it would have been easier to go to the bar to pay because it is easier to split the bill there compared to at the table. Two out of the ten respondents wanted the service personal to ask if the dinner was okay and if everything was fine before starting the payment process. Another one of the ten respondents didn't want the service personal to ask about tips at the payment process. Three out of the ten respondents said they did not want the service personal to be too pushy and force the payment process. One of these three respondent said that they do not want to feel forced out of the restaurant by the service personal and that it is rude to do so. Three out of the ten respondents wanted it to be possible to pay with multiple payment methods such as card or cash whatever one prefers.</p>	<p>Seven out of the ten respondents said it was okay to go to the bar to make the payment. Three out of the ten respondents preferred paying at the bar because they just wanted to leave the restaurant as quick as possible if they were in a bad mood. One out of the ten respondents said it is not weird to go to the bar and that it can be easier for the service personal to conduct the payment in this way. Another one out of the ten respondents said they do not like the service personal to stress them to go pay at the bar because that makes them feel thrown out of the restaurant. One out of the ten respondents thought it was bad service if they must go to the bar to make the payment and they would also argue and ask for an answer to why they had to do so. Another one out of the ten respondents would have questioned the fact that they get table service the entire dinner, but then on the other hand must go to the bar to make the payment. This would have led to less tips or eventually no tips at all.</p>	<p>Ten out of the ten respondents thought that it is ok to go to the bar to make the payment. One out of the ten respondents said that they are going to leave the restaurant anyway so why not stand up and go to the bar on their way out. One out of the ten respondents on the other hand said that they prefer the bill to the table.</p>

	Neutral	Negative	Positive
Service delivery	No neutral mood in this scenario.	<p>Ten out of the ten respondents said that they more easily react to minor service problems which will reduce the overall experience and the overall review of the restaurant. One out of the ten respondents said they would not have gone back to the same restaurant if there were many complications during the dinner.</p> <p>Another one out of the ten respondents said that if a fail point occurred during the dinner, then it is up to the service personal to fix these problems to make the overall experience good and memorable. Another one out of the ten respondents said that if they were not happy with the visit, they would have possibly contacted the restaurant via email to tell them about the things they didn't like.</p> <p>One out of the ten respondents thought that it was easy to tell the difference in the overall review when it comes to different moods, but also highlighted the importance of what happens during the service encounter. One out of the ten respondents did not enjoy waiting too long for the food which they said can affect the overall review of the restaurant visit.</p>	<p>Ten out of the ten respondents said that a good mood gives a better overall review of the restaurant visit. Ten out of the ten respondents also said that having a good mood makes them more forgiving regarding minor complications or smaller problems during the restaurant visit. One out of the ten respondents said that in the end, the food is the most important factor to review a restaurant visit and that the service personal plays a minor role in it. Another one out of the ten respondents said that if they are in a good mood, they would not have the same expectations of the service personnel.</p> <p>Another respondent out of the ten said that the mood of the service personnel also plays a key role in the overall review. One out of the ten respondents said that the company they are with at the restaurant plays a key role in the overall review. One out of the ten respondent said that the mood of the visitors is affected negatively by bigger service problems.</p>