

**An Assessment of Moment of Truth Service Encounter:
The Case of Momona Hotel**

Abraham Tadesse, St. Mary's University

Abstract

This paper aimed to assess the moment of truth service encounter of Momona Hotel. The sample used in this paper was based on the recommendations of (Malhotra, 2006). 150 questionnaires were distributed; 141 of them were properly filled and returned. The data that are collected from 141 guests of the Hotel show that the majority were male, between the age group 20-26, and with education level of MA and above. Concerning customer selection, convenience sampling approach was used. Interview was used to collect qualitative data from the Marketing Management. Descriptive design was used because the general objective of this paper was to assess the moment of truth service encounter of Momona Hotel. As it is discovered in the research finding, the moment of truth customer experience in the Hotel service delivery is undesirable. Most of the respondents have a negative perspective towards service encounter. This shows that the interactivity between the customer and the Hotel is at stake. Service is all about how you deliver it properly and how the employees understand the service and deliver the expected service. With this perspective, the majority of the respondents are not quite satisfied with the service interaction process from the Hotel because of several reasons. Although the majority of the respondents feel that the interaction during, before and after the service is quite unpleasant, the second majority feel that they get the interaction process pleasant.

Introduction

Services are everywhere we turn; be it travel to an exotic tourism destination, a visit to the doctor, a church service, a trip to the bank, a meeting with an insurance agent, a meal at our favorite restaurant, or a day at school (Hoffman & Bateson, 2008). Service has become very important in our current economy because service denominates the global economy further; most jobs are generated by service and understanding service offers personal competitive advantage (Wirtz & Lovelock, 2018).

Service has a great richness and diversity of meaning. It could be argued also as an implicit recognition of the distinctiveness of service (Mudie & Pirrie, 2006). According to Kotler & Keller, Marketing Management, (2016), service is any act or performance that one party can offer to another that is essentially intangible and does not result in ownership of anything. Most services are characterized by an encounter between a service provider and a customer. This interaction, which defines the quality of the service in the mind of the customer, is called a 'moment of truth'. The often-brief encounter is a moment in time when the customer is evaluating the service and forming an opinion of its quality (Micheal, 2015).

The service encounter has become a major theme in the last decade in determining customer satisfaction and its impact on service quality (Stewart & Bowden, 2003). Service encounter is defined as the dyadic interaction between a customer and service provider Suprenant &

Solomon, (1997), or more broadly as a period of time during which a consumer directly interacts with the service (Shostack, 1985).

In the study of Rahman,(2013), the service encounter practice of Marriot International Hotel shows that most customers are satisfied with the factor of recovery and adaptability but dissatisfied in the sector of spontaneity and coping. Hotel owners should overcome those shortcomings as soon as possible to stay in the competitive market. The study was developed keeping in mind the hotel industry and, therefore, care should be taken in using it in any other service sector. Another empirical study done by Alexandros,(2001) shows the internal service encounter in international hotels.

The basic finding was that the factors influencing the internal service encounters in a hotel are professionalism, dependability, conscientiousness of the internal suppliers, their communication skills and consideration they show to their internal customers.

According to Carlzon,(2017) a customer comes into contact with the service organization when her/his body, mind, assets, or information is processed. This is generally known as a service encounter. Whether or not the customer is satisfied with the service experience depends on the outcome of the service encounter. A service encounter involves not only the customer and service employees, but also other customers, the service delivery system and physical evidence. Goffman,(1983) points out the importance of ceremonials and rites that shape the encounter's dynamic. Therefore, there are six dimension of service encounter, two based on customers' perspective, interactivity and rituality. To avoid global evaluation, it has been broken into several sub-dimensions inspired by the works of (Gumperz, 1989). Interactivity encompasses responsiveness, listening, ability to explain, understanding, personalization, and psychological proximity. Rituality includes courtesy of each individual and confidence, security, attitudes of receptionist, waiting time, and perceived competence of contact personnel. On the other hand, from employees' perspective, effectiveness, materiality, accessibility and agent satisfaction are the requirements.

Statement of the Problem

The service logic is changing the course of marketing research by emphasizing the role of co-creation in services. Central to the idea of co- creation is the service encounter, yet research on co- creation has mostly been unilateral so far, placing too much emphasis on the customer's perspective of value creation and ignoring the interactive nature of co- creation (Neghina & Caniels, 2012). The importance of quality has prompted researchers and marketers of services to study new concepts and approaches to service marketing. The emphasis has been on the social psychology perspective and the focus was on the nature of the interaction between the customer and service personnel during the service delivery, namely, the service encounter (Krishna, 1998).One of the unique characteristics of services is the active participation of the customer in the service production process.

Every moment of truth involves an interaction between a customer and a service provider; each has a role to play in an environment staged by the service organization (Goffman , 1983). Customer perceptions of service encounters are important elements of perceptions of quality,

customer satisfaction, and service loyalty (Bitner & Hubbert, 1997). Evaluation of a service encounter depends on several factors, including the attitudes of frontline staff and the behavior of customers.

A key aspect of the service encounter is the communication that occurs and encompasses both verbal and non-verbal aspects. The service encounter is also subject to failure, and negative experiences are likely to result in negative outcomes such as customer dissatisfaction, the loss of customers and negative word of mouth communication. Managers need to be proactive to optimize the service encounter. Actions can include selecting appropriate service-oriented staff, providing regular training on the service encounter, ensuring that staffs are empowered to deal with issues arising in the service encounter and monitoring the effectiveness of service delivery at the frontline (Shostack, 1985).

Based on the preliminary investigation, the student researcher has found problems regarding the service encounters of Momona Hotel. Regardless of the Hotel being a 4- star and known, it fails on selecting the appropriate service-oriented staff which can provide and deliver the service as per the customers' expectations; the staff members are not qualified and professional. Furthermore, the staff is very laid back and do not pay attention to local guests; they serve foreign guests more efficiently than local guests. This shows that the Hotel does not empower the employees to deal with the issue arising in the service encounter. If any service provider fails to empower its employees or does not know how to recruit employees, then it is considered like a car without wheels (Mudie & Pirrie, 2006). Additionally, the Hotel does not have a specific culture; the Hotel is unable to put, in the minds of customers, the ordinary and standard waiting time, and the attitude of receptionist. This might affect the employee's confidence in delivering the expected service. Following the points mentioned above this paper further clarified and identified problems in the Hotel with respect to the service encounter dimensions.

Research Questions

1. What is the overall ritual with respect to courtesy and confidence of each individual, waiting time, and perceived competence of contact personnel of Monona Hotel regarding service encounter?
2. What effort has been made to improve the service encounter in terms of interactivity and ritual of Momona Hotel?
3. What are the challenges that the Hotel faces while interacting with customers?

General Objective

The general objective of the study is to assess the moment of truth service encounter in Momona Hotel.

Specific Objectives

1. To assess the overall ritual with respect to courtesy of each individual and confidence, waiting time, and perceived competence of contact personnel of Monona Hotel regarding service encounter
2. To analyze the efforts that have been made to improve the service encounters in terms of interactivity and rituality of Momona Hotel.

3. To investigate the challenges that the Hotel faces while interacting with customers.

Significant of the Study

The researcher believes that the study will have several contributions. Primary, it will help Momona Hotel to improve their service encounter experience on guests. Moreover, this study will give hints and information to other related providers. In addition, it creates good opportunity for the student researcher to get more practical knowledge about the area of service encounter and moment of truth. It also helps to learn the practical research process and techniques. Lastly, this research paper can be used as reference material to future researchers who will conduct study on related study.

Delimitation of the Study

In terms of unit of study, this research exclusively is narrow to the extent that it took only the face-to-face encounter into consideration. In terms of time frame, the study covered the time from 2020-2022. The participants of this study were guests of Momona Hotel, and marketing department.

Methodology

Research Design

According to Cooper & Schindler, (2014), a descriptive research method is describing characteristics of objects, people, group, or organizations. It tries to discover answers to the questions who, what, when, where, and sometimes how. This study is descriptive because the study emphasizes on and explains the actual situation.

Population, Sample Size and Sampling Technique

In order to gather appropriate information relevant to this study, which is specifically concerned with the assessment of moment of service encounter at Momona Hotel, the population for this study was customers and the marketing department of Momona Hotel. With reference to (Malhotra, 2006), a sample size of 150 respondents was considered to represent the guest of the Hotel; however, out of the 150 questionnaires only 141 were filled properly. Non-probability sampling approach through convenience sampling technique to survey customers available in a certain specific time and place was used because the sample frame of Momona could not be obtained, and because of this reference cannot be made for probability sampling approach. Besides, another reason for using non probability sampling approach is because it is very wide to cover the whole population.

Source of Data Collection

This paper has used two types of data: primary and secondary sources. The primary sources include gathering data from the questioners and replies from the interview of marketing department of Momona Hotel, while the secondary sources are obtained from magazines, newspapers, books, online sources, reports, and company reports.

Method of Data Collection

The data for this study was collected through questionnaire and interview. The researcher applied structured questionnaire designed for selected customers. The questionnaire was prepared under 5-point Likert scale. For the data that was collated from the Head of the marketing department, interview questions were prepared. In addition, to make the customers take their time in filling the questionnaire and feel confident in providing the necessary information, the questionnaires were distributed through the waiters to fill it while they are taking the service.

Method of Data Analysis

Quantitative and qualitative data analysis techniques were used in this study. Quantitative data analysis technique, specifically descriptive data analysis technique which includes using tables, charts and figures was used. Then to summarize the findings, percentages was computed to get the total picture of the data that was collected from sample respondents. The qualitative data was collected through interview narrated qualitatively.

Organization of the Study

This study consists of four chapters. The 1st chapter deals with the introduction which consist the background information, statement of the problem, research questions, objectives, significance, scope, and definition of terms. The 2nd chapter is about review of related literature. The 3rd chapter consists of data presentation, analysis and interpretation. The 4th chapter provides summary, conclusion, and recommendation.

Data presentation, Analysis and Interpretation

This chapter deals with the presentation, analysis and interpretation of data gathered from customers and the head of marketing of Momona Hotel. It tries to assess the brand association from the customers’ perspective, and head of marketing.

Various questions related to brand association were posed to inquire answers from respondents. 150 representative questionnaires were prepared and distributed to the respondents, but only 141 (94%) questionnaires were filled and returned. So, the analysis is presented based on the response gathered from customers of Momona hotel and summarized by using descriptive statistics method, where by the raw data is computed in percentage and presented followed by detailed explanation and interpretation of the data that is made to show implication of the major finding.

Table 1: General characteristics analysis

No	Variable		Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Gender	Male	109	77.30%
		Female	32	22.69%
		Total	141	100%
2	Age	18-27	97	68.79%
		28-37	32	22.69%
		38-47	6	4.25%
		Above 48	6	4.25%
		Total	141	100%

3	Educational Background	10th completed	32	22.69%
		12th completed	67	47.51%
		Certificate	11	7.8%
		Diploma	18	12.76%
		1st degree	9	6.38%
		MA and above	4	2.83%
		Total	141	100%

Source: Own survey (2022)

From the general characteristics of respondents in Item 1 related to gender, the survey shows that male respondents account for 109 (77.30%) out of 141 and 32 (22.69%) of the respondents were female. From this we can conclude that the majority of respondents for this study were male which might also indicate the majority of customers of Momona Hotel were male. Regarding Item 2 concerning age, 97 (68.79%) were between the age of 20-26 which makes them the largest respondents to report on this study; 32 (22.69%) of respondent were in the age category of 27-34; 35-41 of ages; and above 47 accounts to 6 (4.5%) and 6 (4.5%), respectively. This also implies that the customers of Momona encompasses the younger generation.

Concerning the educational background, the least majority of respondents have MA/MSc and above, accounting to 4 (2.83%) from the total of 141 respondent; the next least majority were first degree holders encompassing 9 (6.38%); 11(7.8%) have certificates; 18(12.76%) have diploma; 32(22.69%) completed 10th grade; and the majority encompassing 67(47.51%) completed 12th grade.

Table 2: Responsiveness variable

NO	Responsiveness	Description	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1.	Employees of the Hotel genuinely wished to help you.	Strongly disagree	59	41.84%
		Disagree	15	10.63%
		Neutral	30	21.3%
		Agree	26	18.43%
		Strongly agree	11	7.8%
		Total	141	100%
2.	Employees of the Hotel give you enough time for the encounter.	Strongly disagree	63	44.68%
		Disagree	41	29.1%
		Neutral	11	7.8%
		Agree	19	13.47%
		Strongly agree	7	4.96%
		Total	141	100%
3.	Employees of the Hotel tell you exactly when the service will be performed	Strongly disagree	11	7.8%
		Disagree	7	4.96%
		Neutral	5	3.54%
		Agree	75	53.19%
		Strongly agree	43	30.49%
		Total	141	100%
4.	Employees of the Hotel give you prompt service	Strongly disagree	44	31.20%
		Disagree	42	29.78%
		Neutral	24	17.02%
		Agree	15	10.63%

		Strongly agree	16	11.34%
		Total	141	100%
5.	Employees of the Hotel are never too busy to respond to your request.	Strongly disagree	50	35.46%
		Disagree	46	32.62%
		Neutral	20	14.18%
		Agree	17	12.05%
		Strongly agree	8	5.67%
		Total	141	100%
6.	You can contact the employees of the Hotel easily.	Strongly disagree	14	9.92%
		Disagree	25	17.73%
		Neutral	18	12.76%
		Agree	43	30.49%
		Strongly agree	41	29.07%
		Total	141	100%
7.	Employees of the Hotel are overworked to the extent that they don't respond to you.	Strongly disagree	46	32.62%
		Disagree	42	29.78%
		Neutral	27	19.14%
		Agree	11	7.8%
		Strongly agree	15	10.63%
		Total	141	100%

Source: Own survey (2022)

According to Table 2, to the item, “Employees of the hotel genuinely wished to help you,” the majority encompassing 59(41.84%) strongly disagreed, 15(10.63%) disagreed, 30(21.3%) were neutral, 26(18.43%) agreed and 11(7.8%) strongly agreed. This implies that from the given data employees of Momona Hotel are not genuinely helpful.

In the same table, to the item, “Employees of the hotel give you enough time for the encounter,” majority of the respondents encompassing 63(44.68%) strongly disagreed, 41(29.1%) disagreed, 11(7.8%) were neutral, 19(13.47%) agreed and 7(4.96%) strongly agreed to the statement. We can deduct from this data that employees of Momona Hotel do not give customers enough time for the encounter.

In the same table, for item 3, “Employees of the hotel tell you exactly when the service will be performed,” 11(7.8%) strongly disagreed, 7(4.96%) disagreed, 5(3.54%) were neutral, majority encompassing 75(53.19%) agreed and the remaining 43(30.49%) strongly agreed. We can imply from the given data that the employees of the hotel tell you when the service will be performed.

For item 4 in the same table, “Employees of the hotel give you prompt service,” majority encompassing 44(31.20%) strongly disagreed, 42(29.78%) disagreed, 24(17.02%) were neutral, 15(10.63%) agreed, and the remaining 16(11.34%) strongly agreed. From this data it can be inferred that the employees of the hotel do not give customers prompt service.

Item 5 in table 2 states, “Employees of the hotel are never too busy to respond to your request.” The majority encompassing 50(35.46%) strongly disagreed, 46(32.62%) disagreed, neutral encompassing 20(14.18%), 17(12.05%) agreed, 8(5.67%) strongly agreed to the statement. From the given data we can deduce that the employees are too busy to respond to customers need.

Item 6 in table 2 states, “You can contact the employee of the hotel easily.” 14(9.92%) strongly disagreed, 25(17.73%) disagreed, neutral encompassing 18(12.76%), majority 43(30.49%) agreed, 41(29.07%) strongly agreed to the statement. Form the given data we can imply that customers can contact the employees easily.

In the same table in item 7states, “Employees of the hotel are overworked to the extent they don’t respond to you.” The majority of respondents, encompassing 46(32.62%) strongly disagreed, 42(29.78%) disagreed, 27(19.14%) were neutral, 11(7.8%) agreed and 15(10.63%) strongly agreed to the statement. We can learn from this data that employees of Momona Hotel are not overworked to respond to customers.

Table 3: Listening Variables

NO	Listening	Description	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1.	Employees of the Hotel listened to you carefully	Strongly disagree	58	41.13%
		Disagree	16	11.34%
		Neutral	35	24.82%
		Agree	21	14.89%
		Strongly agree	11	7.8%
		Total	141	100%
2.	Employees of the Hotel understood properly what you wanted	Strongly disagree	63	44.68%
		Disagree	38	26.95%
		Neutral	14	9.92%
		Agree	15	10.63%
		Strongly agree	11	7.8%
		Total	141	100%
3.	We wasted some time because of misunderstanding	Strongly disagree	51	36.41%
		Disagree	56	39.71%
		Neutral	7	4.96%
		Agree	12	8.51%
		Strongly agree	15	10.63%
		Total	141	100%
4.	The service encounter lasted (took) too long.	Strongly disagree	11	7.8%
		Disagree	35	24.82%
		Neutral	24	17.02%
		Agree	66	46.80%
		Strongly agree	5	3.54%
		Total	141	100%
5.	Employees of the Hotel usually do not listen to the local customers	Strongly disagree	41	29.07%
		Disagree	48	34.04%
		Neutral	19	13.47%
		Agree	23	16.31%
		Strongly agree	10	7.09%
		Total	141	100%

Source: Own survey (2022)

In Table 3, item number 1 states, “Employees of the hotel carefully listened to you.” To this item, majority encompassing 58(41.13%) strongly disagreed, 16(11.34%) disagreed, 35(24.82%) were neutral, 21(14.89%) agreed and 11(7.8%) strongly agreed. This implies that from the given data employees do not carefully listen to customers

In the same table, item 2 states, “Employees of the hotel understood properly what you wanted.” The majority of the respondents encompassing 63(44.68%) strongly disagreed to the statement, 38(26.95%) disagreed, 14(9.92%) were neutral, 15(10.63%) agreed and 11(7.8%) strongly agreed to the statement. We can imply that the employees do not properly understand the wants of customers.

In the same table, item 3 states that some time is wasted because of misunderstanding. 51(36.41%) strongly disagreed, 56(39.71%) disagreed, 7(4.96%) were neutral, 12(8.51%) agreed and the remaining 15(10.63%) strongly agreed. We can imply from the given data that customers do not waste time because of misunderstanding.

Item 4 in table 3 states that the service encounters lasted (take) too long. 11(7.8%) strongly disagreed, 35(24.82%) disagreed, 24(17.02%) were neutral, the majority encompassing 66(46.8%) agreed and the remaining 5(3.54%) strongly agreed to this statement. From this data we can infer that the service encounter takes too long.

Item 5 in table 3 states that employees of the hotel usually do not listen to the local customer. 10(7.09%) strongly disagreed, 48(34.04%) disagreed, 19(13.47%) were neutral, 23(16.31%) agreed, and the majority 41(29.07%) strongly agreed. Form the given data we can say that employees of the hotel do not usually listen to local customers.

Table 4: Understanding variables

NO	Understanding	Description	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1.	Employees of the Hotel explain to you how he/she understands your problem.	Strongly disagree	71	50.35%
		Disagree	22	15.6%
		Neutral	11	7.8%
		Agree	20	14.18%
		Strongly agree	17	12.05%
		Total	141	100%
2.	The employee gives very few explanations.	Strongly disagree	31	21.98%
		Disagree	38	26.95%
		Neutral	47	33.3%
		Agree	14	9.92%
		Strongly agree	11	7.8%
		Total	141	100%
3.	The employee asks a question irrelevant to your problem.	Strongly disagree	56	39.71%
		Disagree	53	37.58%
		Neutral	17	12.05%
		Agree	8	5.67%
		Strongly agree	7	4.96%
		Total	141	100%
4.	The employee checked you understand what he said.	Strongly disagree	64	45.39%
		Disagree	46	32.62%
		Neutral	19	13.47%
		Agree	7	4.96%
		Strongly agree	5	3.54%
		Total	141	100%
5.	You understand the usefulness of his question.	Strongly disagree	24	17.02%
		Disagree	39	27.65%

Proceedings of the 16th National Student Research Forum, September 1, 2022

		Neutral	48	34.04%
		Agree	19	13.47%
		Strongly agree	11	7.80%
		Total	141	100%
6.	The employee took pain to satisfy your exigencies (demand).	Strongly disagree	59	41.84%
		Disagree	15	10.63%
		Neutral	30	21.3%
		Agree	26	18.43%
		Strongly agree	11	7.8%
		Total	141	100%

Source: Own survey (2022)

In Table 4, item number 1 states, “Employees of the hotel explain to you how he/she understands your problem,” to which the majority encompassing 71(50.35%) strongly disagreed, 22(15.6%) disagreed, 11(7.8%) were neutral, 20(14.18%) agreed and 17(12.05%) strongly agreed. This implies that the problems are not explained with understanding.

In the same table item 2 states that the employee gives very few explanations. 31(21.98%) strongly disagreed to the statement, 38(26.95%) disagreed, majority encompassing 47(33.3%) were neutral, 14(9.92%) agreed and 11(7.8%) strongly agreed to the statement. We can imply that respondents were unsure of the given statement.

In the same table, item 3 state that the employee asks a question irrelevant to your problem. The majority encompassing 56(39.71%) strongly disagreed, 53(37.58%) disagreed, 17(12.05%) were neutral, 8(5.67%) agreed and the remaining 7(4.96%) strongly agreed to the statement. We can imply from the given data that employees do not ask irrelevant questions.

Item 4 in the same table states that the employee checked you understand what he said. The majority encompassing 64(45.39%) strongly disagreed, 46(32.62%) disagreed, 19(13.47%) were neutral, 7(4.96%) agreed and the remaining 5(3.54%) strongly agreed. From this data we can deduce that employees do not check that.

Item 3.3.3 in table 4 states, “You understand the usefulness of his question,” to which 24(17.02%) strongly disagreed, 39(27.65%) disagreed, majority encompassing 48(34.04%) were neutral, 19(13.47%) agreed, and 11(7.80%) strongly agreed. Form the given data we can say customers were not sure of the posed statement.

Item 6 in the same table states, “The employee took pain to satisfy your exigencies (demand),” to which 59(41.84%) strongly disagreed, 15(10.63%) disagreed, 30(21.3%) were neutral, 26(18.43%) agreed and 11(7.8%) strongly agreed. This implies that from the given data employees do not satisfy customers’ demand.

Table 5: Personalization Variables

NO	Personalization	Description	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1.	Employees of the Hotel seemed interested in your case.	Strongly disagree	63	44.68%
		Disagree	38	26.95%
		Neutral	14	9.92%
		Agree	15	10.63%
		Strongly agree	11	7.8%
		Total	141	100%
2.	The employee has studied your profile before the encounter.	Strongly disagree	63	44.68%
		Disagree	41	29.1%
		Neutral	11	7.8%
		Agree	19	13.47%
		Strongly agree	7	4.96%
		Total	141	100%
3.	The employee approaches you as per your mood.	Strongly disagree	51	36.41%
		Disagree	56	39.71%
		Neutral	7	4.96%
		Agree	12	8.51%
		Strongly agree	15	10.63%
		Total	141	100%
4.	The Hotel service is flexible to different need of customers.	Strongly disagree	16	11.34%
		Disagree	42	29.78%
		Neutral	24	17.02%
		Agree	15	10.63%
		Strongly agree	44	31.20%
		Total	141	100%
5.	The employees of the Hotel are friendly.	Strongly disagree	5	3.54%
		Disagree	46	32.62%
		Neutral	19	13.47%
		Agree	7	4.96%
		Strongly agree	64	45.39%
		Total	141	100%

Source: Own survey (2022)

According to Table 5 regarding the dimension of personalization, item 1 states, “Employees of the hotel seemed interested in your case,” to which the majority of respondents encompassing 63(44.68%) strongly disagreed to the statement, 38(26.95%) disagreed, 14(9.92%) were neutral, 15(10.63%) agreed and 11(7.8%) strongly agreed. We can imply that employees do not seem interested in the case of customers.

In the same table item 2 states that the employee has studied your profile before the encounter. The majority of respondents encompassing 63(44.68%) strongly disagreed, 41(29.1%) disagreed, 11(7.8%) were neutral, 19(13.47%) agreed and 7(4.96%) strongly agreed to the statement. We can deduct from this data that the hotel does not study the profiles of its prospective customers.

In the same table, item 3 states, “The employee approaches you as per your mood,” to which 51 (36.41%) strongly disagreed, majority encompassing 56(39.71%) disagreed, 7(4.96%) were

neutral, 12(8.51%) agreed and the remaining 15(10.63%) strongly agreed. We can imply from the given data that employees do not approach customers as per their mood.

Item 4 in the same table states that the hotel service is flexible to different need of customers. 16 (11.34%) strongly disagreed, 42(29.78%) disagreed, 24(17.02%) were neutral, 15(10.63%) agreed and the majority encompassing 44(31.20%) strongly agreed to this statement. From this data we can deduce that the hotel is flexible to customers’ needs.

Item 5 in the same table states that the employees of the hotel are friendly to which 5(3.54%) strongly disagreed, 46(32.62%) disagreed, 19(13.47%) were neutral, 7(4.96%) agreed and majority of 64 (45.39%) strongly agreed. From this data we can deduce that employees of the hotel are friendly.

Table 6: Psychological Proximity

NO	Psychological Proximity	Description	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1.	The employees welcomed you warmly.	Strongly disagree	11	7.8%
		Disagree	38	26.95%
		Neutral	14	9.92%
		Agree	15	10.63%
		Strongly agree	63	44.68%
		Total	141	100%
2.	The employees are open to be your friend.	Strongly disagree	51	36.41%
		Disagree	56	39.71%
		Neutral	7	4.96%
		Agree	12	8.51%
		Strongly agree	15	10.63%
		Total	141	100%
3.	It’s always intimidating to be perceived as a local customer at the hotel.	Strongly disagree	41	29.07%
		Disagree	48	34.04%
		Neutral	19	13.47%
		Agree	23	16.31%
		Strongly agree	10	7.09%
		Total	141	100%

Source: Own survey (2022)

In Table 6, item 1 it states that the employee welcomed warmly. 11(7.8%) strongly disagreed to the statement, 38(26.95%) disagreed, 14(9.92%) were neutral, 15(10.63%) agreed and majority encompassing 63(44.68%) strongly agreed to the statement. We can imply that employees are welcoming.

In the same table, item 2 state that the employees are open to be your friend. 51(36.41%) strongly disagreed, majority encompassing 56(39.71%) disagreed, 7(4.96%) were neutral, 12(8.51%) agreed and the remaining 15(10.63%) strongly agreed to the statement. We can imply from the given data that the employees are not open toward guests to be friends. Item 3 in Table 6 states, “It’s always intimidating to be perceived as a local customer at the hotel.” 41(29.07%) strongly disagreed, 23(16.31%) disagreed, 19(13.47%) were neutral, 48 (34.04%)

agreed, and 10(7.09%) strongly agreed to the statement. From the given data we can say that it is intimidating to be perceived as a local customer at the hotel.

Table 7: Courtesy Variables

NO	Personalization	Description	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1.	The employees are polite.	Strongly disagree	5	3.54%
		Disagree	46	32.62%
		Neutral	19	13.47%
		Agree	7	4.96%
		Strongly agree	64	45.39%
		Total	141	100%
2.	The employees of the Hotel don't check you very often.	Strongly disagree	11	7.8%
		Disagree	38	26.95%
		Neutral	14	9.92%
		Agree	15	10.63%
		Strongly agree	63	44.68%
		Total	141	100%
3.	The employees treat you with humor.	Strongly disagree	14	9.92%
		Disagree	22	15.6%
		Neutral	15	10.3%
		Agree	46	32.62%
		Strongly agree	44	31.2%
		Total	141	100%
4.	Employees of the Hotel have good manner.	Strongly disagree	16	11.34%
		Disagree	42	29.78%
		Neutral	24	17.02%
		Agree	15	10.63%
		Strongly agree	44	31.20%
		Total	141	100%

Source: Own survey (2022)

In Table 7, item 1 states that the employees are polite. 5(3.54%) strongly disagreed, 46(32.62%) disagreed, 19(13.47%) were neutral, 7(4.96%) agreed and the remaining majority of 64 (45.39%) strongly agreed to this statement. From this data, we can infer that employees of the hotel are polite. In the same table, item 2 states, “Employees of the Hotel don’t check you very often,” to which 11(7.8%) strongly disagreed, 38(26.95%) disagreed, 14(9.92%) were neutral, 15(10.63%) agreed and the majority, 63(44.68%) strongly agreed. We can imply that employees of the Hotel do not often check on customers.

In the same table, item 3 states, “The employees treat you with humor,” to which 14(9.92%) strongly disagreed to the statement, 22(15.6%) disagreed, 15(10.3%) were neutral, majority of 46(32.2%) agreed and 44(31.2%) strongly agreed to the statement. We can imply that the employees treat customers with humor.

Item 4 in the same table says employees of the hotel have good manner. 16 (11.34%) strongly disagreed, 42(29.78%) disagreed, 24(17.02%) were neutral, 15(10.63%) agreed and the majority encompassing 44(31.20%) strongly agreed to the statement. From this data we can deduce that the hotel employees have good manners.

Table 8: Confidence Variables

NO	Confidence	Description	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1.	I trust the service provided by Momona Hotel	Strongly disagree	56	39.71%
		Disagree	53	37.58%
		Neutral	17	12.05%
		Agree	8	5.67%
		Strongly agree	7	4.96%
		Total	141	100%
2.	The employees seemed happy to deliver the service	Strongly disagree	64	45.39%
		Disagree	46	32.62%
		Neutral	19	13.47%
		Agree	7	4.96%
		Strongly agree	5	3.54%
		Total	141	100%
3.	The employees are honest.	Strongly disagree	24	17.02%
		Disagree	39	27.65%
		Neutral	48	34.04%
		Agree	19	13.47%
		Strongly agree	11	7.80%
		Total	141	100%
4.	You will consider employees advice as reliable.	Strongly disagree	59	41.84%
		Disagree	15	10.63%
		Neutral	30	21.3%
		Agree	26	18.43%
		Strongly agree	11	7.8%
		Total	141	100%

Source: Own survey (2022)

With relation to confidence variable, item 1 in table 8 states, “I trust the service provided by Momona Hotel.” The majority consisting 56(39.71%) strongly disagreed, 53(37.58%) disagreed, 17(12.05%) were neutral, 8(5.67%) agreed and the remaining 7(4.96%) strongly agreed to the statement. We can imply from this data that customers do not trust the service provided by the Hotel.

Item 2 in the same table states, “The employees seemed happy to deliver the service,” to which 64 (45.39%) strongly disagreed, 46(32.62%) disagreed, 19(13.47%) were neutral, 7(4.96%) agreed and the remaining 5(3.54%) strongly agreed. From this data we can deduce that employees are not happy in delivering the service.

Item 3 in table 8 states that the employees are honest. 24(17.02%) strongly disagreed, 39(27.65%) disagreed, majority encompassing 48(34.04%) were neutral, 19(13.47%) agreed, and 11(7.80%) strongly agreed to the statement. Form the given data we can say customers are not sure if the employees are honest or not.

Item 4 in the same table states, “You will consider employees’ advice as reliable.” 59(41.84%) strongly disagreed, 15(10.63%) disagreed, 30(21.3%) were neutral, 26(18.43%) agreed and 11(7.8%) strongly agreed. This implies that from the given data customers do not consider employees’ advice as reliable.

Table 9: Security variables

NO	Security	Description	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1.	The Hotel doesn't share your privacy to anyone.	Strongly disagree	7	4.96%
		Disagree	41	29.1%
		Neutral	11	7.8%
		Agree	19	13.47%
		Strongly agree	63	44.68%
		Total	141	100%
2.	The Hotel has reliable security that protects you from crimes.	Strongly disagree	11	7.8%
		Disagree	7	4.96%
		Neutral	5	3.54%
		Agree	75	53.19%
		Strongly agree	43	30.49%
		Total	141	100%
3.	The Hotel has a secure room key system.	Strongly disagree	16	11.34%
		Disagree	42	29.78%
		Neutral	24	17.02%
		Agree	15	10.63%
		Strongly agree	44	31.20%
		Total	141	100%
4.	The Hotel's Wi-Fi password is protected.	Strongly disagree	8	5.67%
		Disagree	46	32.62%
		Neutral	20	14.18%
		Agree	17	12.05%
		Strongly agree	50	35.46%
		Total	141	100%
5.	There is a smoke detector in the Hotel	Strongly disagree	14	9.92%
		Disagree	25	17.73%
		Neutral	18	12.76%
		Agree	43	30.49%
		Strongly agree	41	29.07%
		Total	141	100%
6.	The Hotel protects your personal property during your stay in the hotel.	Strongly disagree	16	11.34%
		Disagree	42	29.78%
		Neutral	24	17.02%
		Agree	15	10.63%
		Strongly agree	44	31.20%
		Total	141	100%

Source: Own survey (2022)

In table 9, in relation to security dimension, item 1, states, "The hotel doesn't share your privacy to anyone." 7(4.96%) strongly disagreed to the statement, 41(29.1%) disagreed, 11(7.8%) were neutral, 19(13.47%) agreed and the majority, 63 (44.68%) strongly agreed to the statement. We can deduct from this data that the hotel protects residents' privacy.

In the same table, item 2 states that the Hotel has reliable security that protects from crimes. From the survey result, 11(7.8%) strongly disagreed, 7(4.96%) disagreed, 5(3.54%) were neutral, majority encompassing 75(53.19%) agreed and the remaining 43(30.49%) strongly agreed. We can imply from the given data that the Hotel has reliable security.

Item 3 in the same table states that the Hotel has a secured room key system. 16(11.34%) strongly disagreed, 42(29.78%) disagreed, 24(17.02%) were neutral, 15(10.63%) agreed and the remaining 44(31.20%) strongly agreed. From this data, it can be deduced that the employees of the room's security are dependable.

Item 4 in table 9 states that the hotel Wi-Fi password is protected. 8(5.67%) strongly disagreed, 46(32.62%) disagreed, neutral encompassing 20(14.18%), 17(12.05%) agreed, majority of 50 (35.46%) strongly agreed. Form the given data we can deduce that the Wi-Fi is protected.

Item 5 in table 9 states that there is a smoke detector in the hotel. 14(9.92%) strongly disagreed, 25(17.73%) disagreed, 18(12.76%) were neutral, 43(30.49%) agreed, and 41(29.07%) strongly agreed. Form the given data we can deduce that there is no fear of fire hazard in the Hotel.

In the same table, item 6 it states, "The hotel protects your personal property during your stay in the Hotel." 16 (11.34%) strongly disagreed, 42(29.78%) disagreed, 24(17.02%) were neutral, 15(10.63%) agreed and the majority encompassing 44(31.20%) strongly agreed. From this data we can deduce that the hotel protects customers' personal property.

Table 10: Welcome variables

NO	Welcoming	Description	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1.	The reception personnel are very responsive.	Strongly disagree	11	7.8%
		Disagree	38	26.95%
		Neutral	14	9.92%
		Agree	15	10.63%
		Strongly agree	63	44.68%
		Total	141	100%
2.	The reception personnel are efficient	Strongly disagree	31	21.98%
		Disagree	38	26.95%
		Neutral	47	33.3%
		Agree	14	9.92%
		Strongly agree	11	7.8%
		Total	141	100%
3.	The reception personnel do not care about customers.	Strongly disagree	56	39.71%
		Disagree	53	37.58%
		Neutral	17	12.05%
		Agree	8	5.67%
		Strongly agree	7	4.96%
		Total	141	100%
4.	The reception personnel are friendly.	Strongly disagree	14	9.92%
		Disagree	25	17.73%
		Neutral	18	12.76%
		Agree	43	30.49%
		Strongly agree	41	29.07%
		Total	141	100%
5.	The reception personnel are polite.	Strongly disagree	5	3.54%
		Disagree	46	32.62%
		Neutral	19	13.47%
		Agree	7	4.96%
		Strongly agree	64	45.39%
		Total	141	100%

Source: Own survey (2022)

In table 10, in relation to welcome dimension, item 1 states that the receptionist personnel are very responsive. 11(7.8%) strongly disagreed, 38(26.95%) disagreed, 14(9.92%) were neutral, 15(10.63%) agreed and the majority, 63(44.68%) strongly agreed to the statement. We can imply that employees in the reception are responsive.

In the same table, item 2 it states that the reception personnel are efficient. 31(21.98%) strongly disagreed, 38(26.95%) disagreed, 47(33.3%) were neutral, 14(9.92%) agreed and 11(7.8%) strongly agreed to the statement. We can imply that respondents were unsure if the receptionists are efficient or not.

In the same table, item 3 states that the reception personnel do not care about customer. 56(39.71%) strongly disagreed, 53(37.58%) disagreed, 17(12.05%) were neutral, 8(5.67%) agreed and the remaining 7(4.96%) strongly agreed. We can imply from the given data that the receptionists care about the customers. Item 4 in table 3.3.9 states that reception personnel are friendly, to which 14(9.92%) strongly disagreed, 25(17.73%) disagreed, 18(12.76%) were neutral, 43(30.49%) agreed, and 41(29.07%) strongly agreed. Form the given data we can infer that the employees of the Hotel are friendly.

Item 5 states that the reception personnel are polite, to which 5(3.54%) strongly disagreed, 46(32.62%) disagreed, 19(13.47%) were neutral, 7(4.96%) agreed and the remaining majority of 64 (45.39%) strongly agreed. From this data we can deduce that the receptionists of the Hotel are polite.

Table 11: Waiting time variable

NO	Waiting time	Description	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1.	The employees are polite.	Strongly disagree	5	3.54%
		Disagree	46	32.62%
		Neutral	19	13.47%
		Agree	7	4.96%
		Strongly agree	64	45.39%
		Total	141	100%
2.	The waiting time is too long.	Strongly disagree	11	7.8%
		Disagree	38	26.95%
		Neutral	14	9.92%
		Agree	15	10.63%
		Strongly agree	63	44.68%
		Total	141	100%
3.	You could check the waiting time left at any time.	Strongly disagree	14	9.92%
		Disagree	22	15.6%
		Neutral	15	10.3%
		Agree	46	32.62%
		Strongly agree	44	31.2%
		Total	141	100%
4.	The Hotel knows your time of arrival and serve you fast.	Strongly disagree	16	11.34%
		Disagree	42	29.78%
		Neutral	24	17.02%
		Agree	15	10.63%
		Strongly agree	44	31.20%
		Total	141	100%

Source: Own survey (2022)

In table 11, with regards to waiting time variable, item 1 states that the waiting room is comfortable. 5(3.54%) strongly disagreed, 46(32.62%) disagreed, 19(13.47%) were neutral, 7(4.96%) agreed and the remaining majority of 64 (45.39%) strongly agreed. From this data we can deduce that the waiting room is comfortable.

In the same table, item 2 states that the waiting time is too long. 11(7.8%) strongly disagreed, 38(26.95%) disagreed, 14(9.92%) were neutral, 15(10.63%) agreed and majority of 63(44.68%) strongly agreed to the statement. We can suggest that the waiting time of the Hotel is too long.

In the same table, item 3 states, “You could check the waiting time left at any time.” 14(9.92%) strongly disagreed, 22(15.6%) disagreed, 15(10.3%) were neutral, 46(32.2%) agreed and 44(31.2%) strongly agreed to the statement. We can safely say that you can check the waiting time left at any time.

Item 4 in the same table says, “The Hotel knows your time of arrival and serve you fast,” to which 16 (11.34%) strongly disagreed, 42(29.78%) disagreed, 24(17.02%) were neutral, 15(10.63%) agreed and the majority 44(31.20%) strongly agreed. From this data we can deduce that the Hotel knows time of arrival and serves fast.

Table 12: Perceived competence

NO	Perceived competence	Description	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1.	The employee mastered the service you asked for	Strongly disagree	71	50.35%
		Disagree	22	15.6%
		Neutral	11	7.8%
		Agree	20	14.18%
		Strongly agree	17	12.05%
		Total	141	100%
2.	The employees seemed competent.	Strongly disagree	31	21.98%
		Disagree	38	26.95%
		Neutral	47	33.3%
		Agree	14	9.92%
		Strongly agree	11	7.8%
		Total	141	100%
3.	The employees give you good advice.	Strongly disagree	56	39.71%
		Disagree	53	37.58%
		Neutral	17	12.05%
		Agree	8	5.67%
		Strongly agree	7	4.96%
		Total	141	100%

Source: Own survey (2022)

In relation to table 12 regarding perceived competent variable, item 1 states, “The employee mastered the service you asked for,” to which the majority, 71(50.35%) strongly disagreed, 22(15.6%) disagreed, 11(7.8%) were neutral, 20(14.18%) agreed and 17(12.05%) strongly agreed. This implies that the employees did not master certain services.

In the same table, item 2 states that the employee seemed competent, to which 31(21.98%) strongly disagreed, 38(26.95%) disagreed, the majority, 47(33.3%) were neutral, 14(9.92%) agreed and 11(7.8%) strongly agreed to the statement. We can imply that respondents were unsure if the employees were competent or not.

In the same table, item 3 states that the employee gives good advice. The majority, 56(39.71%) strongly disagreed, 53(37.58%) disagreed, 17(12.05%) were neutral, 8(5.67%) agreed and the remaining 7(4.96%) strongly agreed.

We can imply from the given data that employees do not give good or relevant advice.

Table 13: Mean Result of the survey

INTERACTIVITY				
Dimension/Scales	D	N	A	Total
1. Responsiveness	51.16%	13.67%	35.15%	100%
2. listening	59.14%	14.04%	27.23%	100%
3. Understanding	61.22%	20.33%	18.43%	100%
4. Personalization	59.71%	10.63%	29.64%	100%
5. Psychological proximity	57.91%	9.45%	32.62%	100%
RITUALITY				
1. Courtesy	34.39%	12.76%	52.83%	100%
2. Confidence	63.12%	20.21%	16.67%	100%
3. Security	32.5%	12.05%	55.43%	100%
4. Welcome	44.96%	16.31%	38.72%	100%
5. Waiting time	34.39%	12.76%	52.83%	100%
6. Perceived competent	64.06%	17.73%	18.20%	100%

Source: Own survey (2022)

Interview Analysis

An interview was held with the manager of Momona Hotel. The manager mentioned that there are different kinds of encounter. The majority of our guests are satisfied with the service we provide though there are some difficulties we face during encounter; however, we always try to fix it immediately, and mostly we don't get negative reaction from our gusts.

For the question: "What effort has been made to improve the service encounter in terms of interactivity and ritual of your hotel? the manager responded that they always sought to deliver the expected service, and to do that, they always make sure the hotel is clean. They also try to shorten the process for guests to book their room. In addition to that we try to minimalize the waiting time of guests. "What are the challenges that the hotel face while interacting with customers?"

The manager said that the hotel has been providing the service for years and they think they know what the customers need and want; however, he admitted that sometimes the employees fail to deliver the service because they serve different kinds of people. Sometime employees don't know how to handle the situation; however, we always compensate the failed service as fast as possible.

For the question, "What kind of incentive does the hotel provide for the employee? the manager said that at the end of the month they reward the best employee to their good performance, and gave them a certificate and a badge with "the bast waiter", "the best receptionist" etc... of the month inscribed on it.

The study focused on the assessment of moment of truth service encounter in Momona Hotel. Based on the analysis the following summary, conclusion and recommendation are made

Summary of Major Findings

Based on the analysis of data, the following findings are given:

Interactivity

- On the variable under responsiveness, the majority of respondents (about 51%.) disagreed implying that employees of the Hotel are not responsive.
- About 59 % of the respondents disagreed to the variable of listening showing that the employees are not fully prepared to listen to the guests.
- About 59 % of the respondents think the service they receive is ordinary, i.e., it is not tailored according to each individual.
- The findings also indicated that from the total respondents, 50% of them usually look for their peer's advice when they buy products.
- The research finding indicated that the majority (57 %) of respondents disagreed to the variable of psychological proximity.

Rituality

- Under the variable of courtesy, the majority respondent (about 52 %) agreed that the employees show courtesy to the gusts.
- Regarding the confidence variable majority of respondent (about 63 %) reported that the employees do not have confidence while delivering the service.
- About 55 % agreed that the Hotel's security is good.
- The majority of respondents claimed that the employees are not welcoming to the customers.
- The majority of the respondents agreed that the hotel service waiting time is almost accurate.
- The majority of respondents said they always consider the price of the product before they buy products from the super market
- The majority of respondent (about 64%) reported that the employees are not competent for the position to deliver the service.

Conclusion

On the basis of data gathered to assess moment of truth service encounter in Momona Hotel, the following conclusion is drowned:

It is discovered in the research finding that the moment of truth customer experience in the Hotel service delivery is undesirable. Most of the respondents have a negative perspective towards the service encounter. This shows that the interactivity between the customer and the Hotel is at stake. Service is all about how the employees understands the service and deliver the expected service. With this perspective, the majority of the respondents are not quite satisfied with the service interaction process from the Hotel because of many reasons. Although majority of the respondents feel that the interaction during, before and after the service is quite unpleasant, the next majority feel they get the interaction process pleasant.

On the other hand, expected (ritual) service of the Hotel has had variety of outcomes based on the research finding. The study indicates that majority of the respondents have a positive attitude on the courtesy of the employees, the accurate waiting time, and they believe that the Hotel has good security. However, the majority responded that the confidence of the employees while delivering the service, the hospitality on the faces of the employees, and the employees' competence on their position has been rated negatively. As result of the study shows, Momona Hotel customers' experience on moment of truth is unsatisfactory.

Recommendations

Based on the conclusion drawn above, the following recommendations were forwarded to improve the experience of customers on service encounter. Employees' understanding of the service has a great role in increasing the satisfaction of the customer by elevating the perceived service with respect to the expected service. Before hiring employees, the Hotel should test them if they are fit to the service delivery, or equip them with the information needed to deliver the expected service and to be competent enough for the service. Apart from the design, furniture, good security, and many more, the employees' competence is very crucial. If employees have good understanding of the service, they can be confident to deliver the expected service.

In addition to that, employees should get different incentives while working in the Hotel. They should feel that the Hotel is their second home. Just only assigning a supervisor is not advisable. In order for the employees to be responsive to listen to the customers and to deliver the service as per the customers' need, they should be treated well.

References

- Alexandros, P. (2001). Internal service encounters in hotels: an empirical study. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 13(6).
- Bateson, H. K. (2010). *Service Marketing Concepts, Strategies, & Cases* (4th edition ed.). Natrop Boulevard, Mason, USA: Cengage Learning.
- Birks, N. M. (2006). *Marketing Research: An Applied Approach*. Harlow: Pearson Ltd.
- Bitner, M., & Hubbert, A. (1997). *Encounter Satisfaction versus overall satisfaction versus quality: The Customers Voice*. Sage Publication .
- bitner, v. a. (2003). *service marketing integrating customer focus across firm*. new delhi: tata McGraw.
- Carlzon, J. (2017). *THE NATURE OF SERVICES AND SERVICE ENCOUNTERS*. In *Service and Operations Management*.
- Chandon, J. L., Leo, P. Y., & Philippe, J. (1997). Service encounter dimensions – a dyadic perspective: measuring the dimensions of service encounters as perceived by cus- tomers and personnel. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 8(1).

- Cooper, D. R., & Schindler, P. S. (2014). *Business Research Method* (12th Edition ed.). New York, USA: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
- Czepiel, J. A. (1985). *The Service Encounter: Managing Employee/Customer Interaction in Service Businesses*. In J. A. Czepiel, *Service encounters: an overview*. Lexington Books: Lexington, MA.
- Goffman, E. (1983). *The interaction order*. American Sociological Association, 48.
- Gronroos, C. (2015). *Service Management and Marketing: Managing the Service Profit Logic* (4th Edition ed.). Chichester, West Sussex, UK: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Gronroos, C. (2015). *Service Management and Marketing: Managing the Service Profit Logic* (4th Edition ed.). Chichester, West Sussex, UK: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Gumperz, J. (1989). *Engager la conversation: introduction à la sociolinguistique interactionnelle*. Paris: Editions de Minuit.
- Hansen, D. E., & Danaher, P. J. (1999). Inconsistent performance during the service encounter: what's a good start worth? *Journal of Service Research*, 1(3).
- Hoffman, D. K., & Bateson, J. E. (2008). *Service Marketing: Concept, Strategies & Cases* (4th ed.). Mason, USA: South-Western Cengage Learning.
- Keller, K. L., & Swaminathan, V. (2020). *Brand Management: Building Measuring, and Managing Brand Equity*. United States of America: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Kotler. (2005). *Principle of Marketing* (4th European Edition ed.). Harlow, Edinburgh Gate, England: Pearson.
- Kotler, P., & Keller, K. L. (2016). *Marketing Management* (15th ed.). South Asia: Pearson Indian Education Service Pvt. Ltd.
- Kotler, P., Haider, D., & Rein, I. (1993). *Marketing Places Attracting Investment*, in: *Industry, and Tourism to Cities, States and Nations*. New York: The Free Press/Macmillan.
- Krishna, G. (1998). *Managing Service Quality By Managing The Service Encounter: The Effects of Organizational Socialization Strategies*. Thesis Presented for the Degree of DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY, University of Cape Town, Department of Marketing.
- Lovelock, J. W. (2016). *Service Marketing: People, Technology, Strategy* (7th edition ed.). (S. Yagan, Ed.) New Jersey, One Lake Street, Upper Saddle River, United States of America: Pearson Education Inc.
- Malhotra. (2006). *Basic Marketing Research* (2nd ed.). Pearson.
- Micheal. (2015). *Managing the services encounter: the moment of truth*. Most services are characterized by an encounter between a service provider and a customer. This interaction, which defines the quality of the service in the mind of the customer, is called a 'moment of truth'. The often brief encounter is a moment in time, 12.

- Mudie, P. a. (2006). *Service Marketing Management* (3rd edition ed.). Burlington, USA: Elsevier Ltd.
- Mudie, P., & Pirrie, A. (2006). *Service Marketing Management* (3rd ed.). Great Britain: Elsevier Ltd.
- Neghina, C., & Caniels, M. (2012). *Co-Creation Dimentions in service Encounter: A dyadic Perspective*. PhD Thesis , Open University, the Netherlands.
- Parasuraman A., V. A. (1991). Refinement and Reassessment of the SERVQUAL Scale. *Journal of Retailing*, 67(4).
- Rahman, T. M. (2013). ANALYSIS OF SERVICE ENCOUNTER: CUSTOMER'S VIEWPOINT REGARDING HOTEL SERVICES IN COX'S BAZAR CITY, BANGLADESH. *International Journal of Business and General Management (IJBGM)*, 2(2).
- Rathmell, J. M. (1966). What Is Ment By Service. *Journal of Marketing*, 30.
- Shostack. (1985). *The Service Encounter: Managing Employee/Customer Interaction in Service Businesses*. Lexington, MA, Lexington.
- Shostack. (1992). *The Service Encounter: Managing Employee/Customer Interaction in Service Businesses*. In J. S. Czepiel, *Planning the service encounter*. Lexington Books.
- Stewart, & Bowden. (2003). *Piecing Together Service Quality: A Framework for Robust Service, Production and Operations Management* (Vol. 12).
- Suprenant, C., & Solomon, M. (1997). Predictability and Personalization in the Service Encounter. *Journal of Marketing*, 51.
- Valarie A. Zeithaml, L. L. (1988). Communication and Control Processes in the Delivery of Service Quality. *Journal of Marketing*, 52(2).
- Valarie, A. Z. (2017). *Service Marketing: Integrating Customer Focus Across the Firm* (7th Edition ed.). New York, USA: McGraw-Hill Education.
- Wirtz, J. c. (1988). *Essentials of Service Marketing* (3rd Edition ed.). Harlow, Edinburgh Gate, England : Pearson Education Limited.
- Wirtz, J., & Lovelock, C. (2018). *Essentials of Service Marketing* (3rd ed.). Harlow, England: Pearson.