

國立嘉義大學100學年度

觀光休閒管理研究所博士班考試試題

科目：觀光休閒遊憩文獻評論

一、請閱讀以下文章，並回答問題：

Nowaczek, A. & Smale, B. (2010). Exploring the predisposition of travellers to qualify as ecotourists: The Ecotourist Predisposition Scale, *Journal of Ecotourism*, 9(1), 45-61.

※請以中文作答

1. 本文（第1段）所歸納的 **ecotourists** 研究類型包括那些取向？（10%）
2. 續1，上述研究取向在當今的研究中出現什麼 **knowledge gap**？（10%）
3. 本文（第3段）如何去評論 **ecotourists** 的相關研究？（10%）
4. 請指出本研究的「研究問題」與「研究目的」為何？（10%）
5. 請指出本文的「預期貢獻」為何？（10%）

Studies of ecotourists typically have identified them based on the destinations they go to (e.g. National Parks), the behaviours in which they engage (e.g. wildlife viewing), the tours that they take (e.g. safaris), or in a very few cases, self-identification by the travelers themselves (Ballantine & Eagles, 1994; Fennell, 1999; Saleh & Karwacki, 1996; Wight, 1996, 2001). On very few occasions and only recently, studies have begun to identify ecotourists based on their psycho-social personal make-up (Lemelin & Smale, 2007) of more stable and deeply ingrained character traits responsible for directing visitor motivations and behaviours (Ajzen, 1991; Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975; Lewis & Haviland-Jones, 2000). This approach is an extension of the earlier studies, which reported on visitor motivations and perceptions (Blamey, 1997; Weaver, 1999; Woods & Moscardo, 1998). However, the way in which ecotourists have been typically identified in the bulk of the literature is limited by relying too heavily on superficial markers of behaviour, destination, and/or circumstance. All of these are indicators of possible ecotourists, at least superficially, yet they do not guarantee these travellers indeed are ecotourists. Simply visiting ecotourism sites or engaging in behaviours typically associated with ecotourism, such as wildlife viewing, does not make someone an ecotourist. Instead, getting at a traveller's potential to be an ecotourist based on his or her predisposition would be a more conceptually consistent way of defining an ecotourist.

What characteristics, then, really constitute an ecotourist; that is, who is seeking an

ecotourism experience? Making the distinction is particularly important because tourists typically participate in various activities offering a range of experiences that they may find attractive to pursue, regardless of personal characteristics (Weaver, 2001). When identifying and profiling ecotourists, we cannot presume a priori that their activities and destinations also define their travel expectations and experiences. Rather, they have certain characteristics and attributes-attitudes, values, beliefs, motives, commitments, needs, desires, and interests-that might predispose them to visit ecotourism destinations and engage in ecotourism-related activities. Hence, these characteristics and attributes may in large degree be responsible for shaping the travellers' nature-related interests. In some cases, their predisposition might also shape their commitment to protecting and preserving these interests, whether the protection of environments, the conservation of native species, the support of research, or the desire to volunteer.

Therefore, to identify the ecotourists our focus should place more emphasis on their psycho-social make-up as opposed to relying solely on their chosen destination or activities, or their participation in what ecotour operators present as ecotourism experiences (Lai & Shafer, 2005). Demographic profiles of tourists and especially ecotourists are not terribly compelling when many different tourism sectors typically generate very similar profiles. Indeed, a number of studies in both North America and Australia suggest that the profile of potential ecotourists tends to be broader than the profile of, by definition, actual ecotourists (Wight, 2001). However, which among the host of psychological concepts best define an ecotourist is far from established (Blamey & Braithwaite, 1997) and their measurement remains problematic (Pizam & Calantone, 1987). While several earlier tourism studies did address psychological concepts, such as Plog's (1994) attention to personality characteristics or Pearce's (1991) focus on the nature of travel motivations for a particular experience, "a personality type approach is likely to be more useful if the purpose is to generalise across time and/or predict tourism-related forms of behavior" (Blamey & Braithwaite, 1997, p.31).

While many studies have identified ecotourists in different ways, including typologies that point to specific attributes, most of these approaches have been guided by the assumption that their samples already comprised ecotourists. This still leaves the question unanswered: what really defines an ecotourist? Answering this question and then developing a means to assess whether individuals possess the dispositional view of ecotourists lies at the core of this study. It is the underlying make-up of the person that predisposes him or her to fit' the comprehensive definition of ecotourism or, in other words, possesses the critical characteristics. Therefore, is to avoid the conventional approach of developing profiles based on tourists *in situ* and rather, to focus on describing the psychological predispositions of potential travellers to qualify as ecotourists based on a foundational, conceptual definition of ecotourism. Further, this definition of ecotourism leads to the means to assess individual predispositions for ecotourism and, thus, to the development of the Ecotourist Predisposition Scale (EPS).

二、請閱讀以下文章，並回答問題：

Lin, J.S & Hsieh, P. L. (2011) Assessing the Self-service Technology Encounters: Development and Validation of SSTQUAL Scale, *Journal of Retailing* (in press)

※請以中文作答

1. 何謂 Self-service Technology？對企業有何好處？（10%）
2. 本文所謂的 research gap 所指為何？（10%）
3. 請就服務品質評估觀點，區隔旅館業與本文所指行業之差異性。（10%）
4. 請定義本文之研究類型？（10%）
5. 請指出本文之可能貢獻為何？（10%）

Consumers' experiences with service firms range from full service delivered by service personnel to self-service co-produced by customers. Rising labor costs have encouraged companies to explore more self-service options that allow customers to perform services for themselves. Information technology advancement has further enhanced self-service delivery and revolutionized the service landscape, allowing companies to use a variety of self-service technologies (SSTs) that increase customer participation. From bank transactions to supermarket self-check outs, service providers are now employing a wide range of SSTs that engage customers in service co-production electronically in lieu of interaction with service employees.

SSTs are “technological interfaces that enable customers to produce a service independent of direct service employee involvement” (Meuter et al. 2000, p. 50). The types of SSTs currently employed by firms include kiosks, Internet, interactive voice response, and mobile services (Castro, Atkinson, and Ezell 2010; Meuter et al. 2000; NCR 2008, 2009). As consumers have grown more comfortable using technology in recent years, the demand for SSTs has risen tremendously (NCR 2009). Prior research indicates that, through customer involvement in service co-production, SSTs can lower labor costs, enhance efficiency, improve productivity, and increase corporate performance (Bitner, Zeithaml, and Gremler 2010; Dabholkar 1996). Customers enjoy services with increased independence and freedom from time/space constraints through more channels (Meuter et al. 2000; Oliver, Livermore, and Farag 2009). Within the context of technological innovation, such customer co-production and value co-creation through SSTs are expected to become a key criterion for long-term business success (Bolton, Grewal, and Levy 2007).

With the growth of multi-channel marketing (Grewal and Levy 2009), companies are providing a combination of SST channels for seamless customer service delivery (NCR 2008, 2009; Retail Merchandiser 2009). For example, airline customers can

reserve and pay for tickets online, check-in through the Internet or mobile phones, pick up boarding passes at airport kiosks, and receive flight updates on mobile devices. Banks offer services through Internet, interactive phone systems, ATMs, and mobile channels. Healthcare providers enable patients to schedule appointments and fill out paper work online, check in and validate insurance information via portable tablets in the doctor's office, and receive information via mobile devices. Consumers have valued the ability of service providers to offer multiple SST channels for anywhere/anytime convenience (NCR 2008). Nevertheless, existing technology-based service quality measurement research is limited solely to the Internet. Instruments that systematically measure service quality of SSTs as a whole still remain underdeveloped (Verhoef et al. 2009). As the integrated SSTs differ in the mode of communication from traditional human-interaction-based and virtual-Internet-based services (Hoffman 2003; Murphy 2008; Sousa and Voss 2006), a strong need, therefore, exists for both researchers and practitioners to examine customer expectations of SST service quality in the emerging context. This study aims to fill this important research gap by developing a psychometrically sound instrument, SSTQUAL, for customer technology interaction based service quality measurement across contexts. To enhance generalizability, we further replicated the scale across industries and consumer traits.

In the remainder of this paper, we first discuss theoretical background of technology-based service quality. Second, we present a qualitative investigation that produces an initial pool of scale items. Third, the scale is refined through substantive and empirical considerations, increasing confidence in the factor structure. Fourth, we present various reliability and validity tests as well as replications across industries and consumer traits with new samples. This article concludes with a discussion of the implications and applications of the scale.