

Exploring the forms of dysfunctional customer behaviour: A study of differences in servicescape and customer disaffection with service

Kate L. Daunt, *Cardiff Business School, UK*

Lloyd C. Harris, *Warwick Business School, UK*

Abstract Although wide agreement exists between scholars and marketing practitioners concerning the prevalence of dysfunctional customer behaviour, to date empirical research into this phenomenon is lacking. This article aims to identify empirically grounded categories of dysfunctional customer behaviours and examine the extent to which customers' perceptions of physical servicescape environments, social facets of servicescape, and customer disaffection with service differ for each category. Based on a quantitative sample of 380 consumer perpetrators, cluster analysis reveals three clusters of dysfunctional customer behaviour forms labelled 'petty norm infringements', 'felonious norm infringements', and 'belligerent norm infringements'. Subsequent variance analysis assesses the perceived differences between perceived physical servicescape, social servicescape, and customer disaffection for each identified form cluster. Specifically, the study findings reveal statistically significant differences between the forms of dysfunctional customer behaviour that are perpetrated across different service environments. The article concludes with a discussion of the implications of the study for theorists and practitioners.

Keywords dysfunctional customer behaviour; consumer deviance; servicescape; forms; dissatisfaction; inequity

Introduction

Appropriate servicescape design and frontline personnel behaviour are widely deemed as important facilitators in the achievement of organisational goals by marketing scholars. In particular, Bitner's (1992) seminal article maintains that different elements of physical servicescape design influence the behaviours of customers and employees. Building on this work, Harris and Ezeh (2008) include staff behaviour as a social facet of servicescape and argue an association between servicescape composition and customer loyalty. However, primarily, servicescape

research is based on the assumption that customers behave in a normative and functional manner during service exchange. This view contrasts with a growing body of practitioner- and theory-based literature that shows customers' routine activities in an alternate light.

Here, consumers are presented as not only the source of their own dissatisfaction and consequent service failures (Bitner, Booms, & Mohr, 1994), but also as the perpetrators of aggressive, rude, illegitimate, and illegal misdeeds (Grégoire, Tripp, & Legoux, 2009; Grove, Fisk, & John, 2004; Zourrig, Chebat, & Toffoli, 2009). Alarming, such customer misbehaviours are documented as occurring on an increasingly frequent basis, often resulting in grave consequences for employees, fellow customers, and organisations (see Harris & Reynolds, 2003). For example, the latest study of frontline workers published by USDAW (2009) in the United Kingdom indicates that 1 in 10 frontline workers have been subjected to physical assault whilst at work, while one in every three workers report that they have experienced verbal abuse and threatening behaviour from patrons during the past month. However, misbehaviours by consumers are not limited to single geographical or cultural context. For example, in the United States, CBS News (2007) reported an incident in which a customer shot an employee in a fast-food restaurant over a serving of chilli sauce, while Bamfield (2009) cites the rise of consumer thefts and thus organisational losses across multiple countries, including Brazil, China, Germany, Italy, Spain, Malaysia, Mexico, and Japan.

Sporadic insights from academic research reveal a plethora of individual forms of customer misbehaviours. These include: cheating (Wirtz & Kum, 2004), deshopping (King, Dennis, & Wright, 2008), grudgeholding (Aron, Judson, Aurand, & Gordon, 2007), illegitimate complaining (Reynolds & Harris, 2005), Internet deviance (Freestone & Mitchell, 2004), physical violence (McColl-Kennedy, Patterson, Smith, & Brady, 2009), sexual abuse (Yagil, 2008), shoplifting (Tonglet, 2002), vandalism (Fisher & Baron, 1982), and verbal abuse (Grandey, Dickter, & Sin, 2004). Typically, such studies investigate the mechanisms that underpin single forms or types of misbehaviour. Yet, to date, little research has examined diverse and varied types of deviance in a single study (Reynolds & Harris, 2009). Moreover, an understanding of how contextual factors such as physical and social servicescape design associate with perpetrated forms is lacking. This dearth of research has led Areni (2003) and Fisk et al. (2010) to call for studies to examine the link between servicescape design and the forms of misbehaviour performed within these environments.

The current study intends to contribute insights into these identified research gaps. First, this paper aims to make an empirical contribution through identifying multiple categories of types of dysfunctional customer behaviours. The vast majority of existing classifications and typologies of the different forms of customer deviance are typically anecdotally derived or formulated from the findings of small-scale qualitative research. However, the current study aims to provide a categorisation of customer misbehaviour using quantitative data of self-reported incidents of customer dysfunction. Second, in collecting and utilising empirical data, the current study aims to contribute empirical insights into customers' perceptions of physical servicescape environments, social facets of servicescape, and customer disaffection with relation to different forms of customer deviance. Thus the current study aims to utilise quantitative data to examine the associations between different categories of dysfunctional customer behaviour and the perceived servicescape environment in which such misbehaviours are perpetrated. Third, the current study aims to make

a theoretical contribution to existing literature on dysfunctional customer behaviour through the utilisation of a norms-based approach. In particular, this research intends to contribute to the growing number of studies that cite norm violation as the most appropriate mechanism for conceptualising and measuring incidents of dysfunctional customer behaviour (see Denegri-Knott, 2006; Fullerton & Punj, 2004; Reynolds & Harris, 2009; Yi & Gong, 2006).

The article begins by reviewing studies that forward classifications of the different forms of dysfunctional customer behaviour. Following conceptual development resulting in the forwarding of three hypotheses, the research design and methodology adopted is discussed. Subsequently, the findings of the study are presented. The article concludes with a discussion of the implications of the study for academics and theorists.

Forms of dysfunctional customer behaviour

For reasons of clarity, we adopt the term ‘dysfunctional’ customer behaviour in referring to behaviour by customers within the exchange setting that deliberately violates the generally accepted norms of conduct in such situations (Reynolds & Harris, 2009, p. 322). Additional terms that are used interchangeably within the literature include deviant customer behaviour (Mills, 1981), consumer misbehaviour (Fullerton & Punj, 2004), and jaycustomer behaviour (Lovelock, 2001). As a mechanism to increase academic and practitioner understanding of the varying guises and dynamics of dysfunctional customer behaviour, a small body of literature offers profiles and all-encompassing categorisations of deviant customer behaviours. Typically, such classifications offer profiles of the varying types of dysfunctional customer behaviour, focusing on how the forms vary in breadth, motive, and severity.

Categorising forms of norm-violation based on the stage of consumption in which they occur, Grove, Vitell, and Strutton (1989) theorise three categories of dysfunctional customer behaviour. First, misbehaviour for ‘acquisitive’ purposes includes shoplifting, pilfering, and illegal downloading. The second type, labelled ‘usage,’ encompasses deeds of product wastage and insurance fraud. Finally, ‘dispositional’ activities reflect unlawful littering and graffiti behaviours. Focusing on service-specific customer deviance, Lovelock (2001) offers what is perhaps the best-known classification of six jaycustomer behaviours. Derived from anecdotal evidence, the author distinguishes between thieves, rule breakers, belligerents, family feuders, deadbeats, and vandals. Harris and Reynolds (2004) recognise vandalistic behaviour as one of eight types of service dysfunctional customer behaviour. Utilising qualitative data from 106 interviews with a sample dominated by service workers, the authors categorise jaycustomer behaviours based on the perpetrators primary motivation (financial or non-financial) and level of behaviour visibility (covert or overt). Offering a broader classification of the different forms of customer dysfunction directed against organisations, Fullerton and Punj (2004) conceptualise 34 acts of ‘consumer misbehaviours’ into five broad categories. Identifying the targets of customer misconduct, the authors distinguish between consumer misbehaviour that is directed against organisational merchandise, employees, financial assets, property, and customers.

Corresponding to classifications of customer misbehaviour forwarded by scholars, typologies of customers behaving badly are also highlighted within the practitioner-oriented literature. Typically, such typologies offer profiles of dysfunctional customer behaviours within individual contexts. For example, Berry and Seiders (2008) propose five anecdotally derived categories of 'unfair' service customers, while Zemke and Anderson (1990) describe five personifications of the 'customer from hell' that include 'freeloading Freda' and 'bad-mouth Betty'. Theorising categories of 'customers from hell' within retail contexts, Belding (2000) offers a typology comprising nine forms. Akin to Zemke and Anderson's (1990) categorisation, Belding (2000) provides humorous descriptions of each deviant type, including 'time vampires' who loiter in the store after closing and 'wishy-washy Wendys' who engross frontline workers' time because of their inability to make a decision. However, while both academic- and practitioner-based categorisations offer rich and insightful descriptions of the different forms of dysfunctional customer behaviour, such classifications are bounded by limitations. Overwhelmingly, such categorisations are anecdotally derived or originate from small samples of qualitative data. In this sense, large-scale quantitative data that reflect the customer's own interpretation of events is lacking.

To summarise, research on the associations between servicescape design and consumer behaviour typically assumes rationality and functionality. This literature contrasts with a growing number of studies that identify and classify numerous types of dysfunctional customer behaviour. However, to date, such categorisations are restricted by their reliance on anecdotal or qualitative data. In addition, understanding of how such classifications of misbehaviours associate with firms' servicescape and situational variables is limited. Thus our attention now turns to literature that offers insight into these associations.

The links between context and dysfunctional behaviour form

While servicescape research typically focuses on investigating the relationship between servicescape design and functional customer behaviours (e.g. Bitner, 1992). A small body of literature offers insight into the dynamics between different forms of dysfunctional customer behaviour and environmental contexts. This research is best divided into three categories. First are studies that examine the association between individual facets of physical servicescape design (layout and design, atmospherics, and exterior environments) and individual forms of customer misbehaviour. Second is research that identifies a link between social facets of the servicescape (fellow customers, perceptions of service employees, and outlet vulnerability) and single varieties of customer deviance. Third is literature that highlights the relationship between customers' disaffection with service (dissatisfaction and inequity) and separate types of customer misdemeanours. Each will now be discussed in turn.

Physical servicescape variables

Layout and design variables centre on the space and architectural arrangement of servicescapes (Turley & Milliman, 2000). To date, studies analysing the role of layout and design variables primarily focus on normative consumer behaviours (see Lin, 2004; Wakefield & Blodgett, 1999; Yildirim & Akalin-Baskaya, 2007). With

reference to deviance, Jones and Groenenboom (2002) advocate that the physical layout and design of buildings may affect the magnitude and frequency of deviant behaviour perpetrated against and within such firms. This is reflected in the findings of McGrath and Gouling (1996) who verify the relationship between uncomfortable and overly formal waiting-area design and episodes of verbal and physical abuse. Abusive behaviour is also the focus of Macintyre and Homel's (1997) study, which reveals a link between high levels of design-induced crowding and incidents of aggressive behaviour. Specifically, the authors reveal inappropriately designed venues that foster cramped and uncomfortable levels of patron density represent environmental stressors, which may trigger responsive violent behaviours of varying intensities. Further empirical support for the association between organisational layout and design and customer deviance is forwarded by Nicholls (2005, p. 236), who draws on previous research to highlight a link between tension-inducing red interiors with reflective surfaces and incidents of physical violence within public bars. In doing so, the author emphasises the value of interior designs that promote tranquillity and negate environmental stress and aggression.

Akin to studies on layout and design variables, research into the relationship between atmospherics and deviant behaviour overwhelmingly focus on aggressive forms of misbehaviour. Atmospheric or ambient conditions affect the five senses and include the background characteristics of temperature, music, air quality, and cleanliness (Bitner, 1992). Bell and Baron (1981), Parker and Tavassoli (2000), and Rose and Neidermeyer (1999) individually forward evidence of an association between high ambient temperatures and episodes of consumer aggression. That is, hot ambient temperatures induce negative emotions (e.g. distress), cognitions (e.g. hostile attitudes), and physiological states (e.g. increased heart rate) that manifest in violent behaviours. In addition to the effect of temperature, Macintyre and Homel (1997) cite the presence of adversely loud music as an environmental stressor and thus a contributory factor to incidents of customer aggression. Moreover, Donnerstein and Wilson (1976) and Konecni (1975) both forward evidence of a link between stress-inducing loud environments and disruptive conduct. Areni (2003) concurs and also notes of an association between the genre of music broadcast and incidents of anti-social behaviour. Specifically, the author draws on research from clinical psychology, which indicates that heavy metal music is linked with aggressive behaviours, while classical music is found to soothe disorderly and hostile customers. Theorising the effect of multiple atmospheric variables, Grove et al. (2004) assert the role that room temperature, noise levels, and cleanliness play in 'triggering' incidents of customer rage. Cleanliness is also highlighted by Homel and Clark (1994) who argue that environments that are perceived to be unclean, when combined with other displeasing design factors such as poor ventilation, endure a higher rate of responsive patron misbehaviour than atmospheres that are characterised by superior physical design.

In addition to the internal design of servicescapes, the exterior environment of firms is recognised as associating with various forms of misbehaviour. The perceived 'exterior environment' signifies customers' interpretation of physical exterior organisational features such as the building's architecture, entrances, and the surrounding location (see Turley & Milliman, 2001). Environmental psychologists widely argue that the cues and signals derived from the physical design of outlets affect the cognitions, emotions, and behaviours of individuals within their locality (see Allen & Greenberger, 1978; Hopkins, 2002). This assertion is illustrated by

Mills and Bonoma (1979) who maintain that the physical facets of outlets, including exterior size, design, and structure, convey differing degrees of power. This leads Mills and Bonoma (1979) to hypothesise that firms with divergent levels of power emanation will experience differing forms of dysfunctional customer behaviour. A comparable conceptualisation is offered by Wilson and Kelling's (1982) 'broken window' theory, which argues that establishments that reside in vicinities that exhibit signs of physical neglect and disrepair act as a signal to encourage vandalistic and other deviant behaviours. In this regard, vandalised and damaged exterior environments indicate a breakdown of social norm enforcement and conformity and thus signify a general acceptance and/or disregard for non-normative behaviours (Wilson & Kelling, 1982). Fisher and Baron (1982) concur and argue that buildings that appear run down and damaged may inadvertently encourage different forms of vandalistic behaviours. This leads to:

H_{1a-c}: The perpetrators of different types of dysfunctional customer behaviours will perceive significant differences in the service outlet's (a) layout and designs, (b) atmospherics, and (c) exterior environments.

Social servicescape variables

Research that acknowledges an association between servicescape design and customer dysfunction is not limited to physical design variables. Rather, this relationship is also recognised to extend to human facets of the physical environment. Here, a small number of studies note the importance of the congruence and compatibility between the perceived attitudes and behaviours of fellow customers within the service setting, that is, the extent to which patrons within the service environment behave in a manner that is deemed appropriate by other customers present (see Grove & Fisk, 1997; Martin, 1996). Interestingly, Lewis and Clacher's (2001) findings show that incidents of customer misbehaviour are frequently driven, in part, by disagreeable interactions with fellow patrons. Grove et al. (2004) theoretically corroborate this argument and maintain that the norm-violating behaviours of other customers (e.g. passing wind and queue cutting) may incite different forms of dysfunctional customer behaviour by means of defensive response mechanisms. Empirical support for this association is also offered by the 'domino effect' revealed by Harris and Reynolds (2003). Specifically, the authors uncover evidence that shows customers replicating the dysfunctional activities of fellow patrons motivated by financial and non-financial gain. In this sense, witnessing the deviant acts of other customers may generate copycat misbehaviours, as customers learn successfully how to misbehave for personal gain.

Fellow customers represent one element of the social facet of servicescapes. A second aspect concerns customers' perceptions of employee service. This denotes customers' evaluations of individual employees' ability and perceived willingness to perform and deliver service in a manner that fulfils their requirements and needs (see Olsen & Johnson, 2003). The attitudes and behaviours of frontline service workers are widely recognised as important to our understanding of normative customer cognitions, emotions, and behaviours (Bove, Pervan, Beatty, & Shiu, 2009; Heskett, Sasser, & Schlesinger, 1997). The sentiment of this argument is also mirrored in literature that examines dysfunctional customer behaviour. Here, the manners and activities of front-line service employees are argued to cultivate and/or exacerbate

customer misbehaviour. In this regard, customers react and strike back against the negative and undesirable behaviours of the front-line workers with whom they interact. Unresponsive, rude, and inappropriate employee behaviours may trigger different types of misbehaviours or intensify the severity of the misdemeanour performed. This is demonstrated by Fullerton and Punj (1993) who theorise that the attitudes and conducts of front-line workers are an important determinant in episodes of customer dysfunction. Specifically, the authors suggest that employees who are viewed as impolite, tardy, unhelpful, and ignorant can intensify customers' propensity towards deviance. Empirical evidence to support this association is offered by Keeffe, Russell-Bennett, and Tombs (2008) who, in the context of service failure, reveal a link between substandard employee attitudes and behaviours and 13 forms of retaliatory acts by customers, including physical violence. Specifically, the authors find that customers are more likely to misbehave against an organisation if they perceive that the employee has failed to offer appropriate levels of service recovery and accept blame for the service failure. Consequently, customers retaliate against the employee who has wronged them. Harris and Reynolds (2004), Lewis and Clacher (2001), and McGrath and Goulding (1996) also offer support for this association.

The third social facet of the social servicescape denotes customers' perceptions of outlet vulnerability. In particular, perceived outlet vulnerability denotes customers' perceptions of the ease at which they can misbehave within or against an individual service outlet. This construct inherently encapsulates customers' perceptions of fellow patrons, front-line employees, and managers' tolerance and susceptibility to deviant consumer behaviours (see Harris & Reynolds, 2004). In this sense, other people present within the servicescape environment serve as an inhibitor or enabler of misbehaviour. Hence, highly vulnerable outlets are deemed so because they have few perceived impediments, that is, the outlet is perceived to have low levels of security, shows leniency to norm-breaking behaviour, and/or is unlikely to confront or apprehend the misbehaving individual. Therefore, the perceived opportunity to misbehave is high, while the perceived cost of the behaviour is low (Reynolds & Harris, 2005).

Perceived opportunity is core to evaluations of outlet vulnerability (see Fullerton & Punj, 1993). The concept of opportunity is embedded within routine activity theory (Cohen & Felson, 1979), which conceptualises dysfunctional behaviour in terms of a convergence of circumstances and individuals within outlets that create an opportunity within which to commit a misdemeanour. This notion is further explored by Fullerton and Punj (1993) who highlight the importance of perceived opportunities derived from a perceived lack of physical security and deterrence methods in fostering incidents of aberrant customer behaviour. Thus highly vulnerable outlets are perceived to have high levels of opportunity in which to commit misdemeanours without consequence. Tonglet (2002) also highlights the role of perceived opportunity in episodes of shoplifting behaviours. This link is also reflected in Lawrence's (2004) findings of retail crime wherein organisations are argued to emit social cues or signals that denote the vulnerability of the outlet and thus opportunities to misbehave. Also within a retail context, King and Dennis (2006) suggest that the perceived ease of the misbehaviour and thus outlet vulnerability is a significant factor in driving acts of customer deshopping. Correspondingly, Groff (2008) notes the role of perceived opportunity in addition to the physical and spatial aspects of environments in theorising the drivers of criminal behaviours.

H_{2a-c}: The perpetrators of different types of dysfunctional customer behaviours will perceive significant differences in the service outlet's (a) fellow customers, (b) employee service, and (c) outlet vulnerability.

Disaffection with service

We utilise the term disaffection with service to refer to customers' negative cognitive-emotive evaluations of a service provision. Customers' negative evaluations relating to an exchange encounter are key associates of acts of dysfunctional customer behaviour (Reynolds & Harris, 2009). Specifically, extant literature identifies the constructs of dissatisfaction and inequity as worthy of investigation (see Fisk et al., 2010). Customer dissatisfaction denotes negative disconfirmation of expectations pertaining to service received (see Oliver, 1980). It differs from perceptions of employee service in that the evaluation is reflective of the service outlet as a whole rather than an individual employee's performance. Within the field of marketing, customer dissatisfaction is increasingly documented to associate with dysfunctional customer behaviour (see Fisk et al., 2010; Harris & Reynolds, 2004). The dynamics of this argument is explained by Mills (1981) who forwards what is widely considered as the first explicit empirical link between customer dissatisfaction and deviant customer behaviour. Focusing on retail establishments, Mills (1981) finds that the level of customer dissatisfaction experienced with an outlet directly correlates with the frequency of fraudulent customer behaviours committed within or against the same store. In accord, Huefner et al. (2002) argue that retaliatory customer behaviour is a conventional response to experienced dissatisfaction. In accordance, Bechwati and Morin (2003) offer empirical evidence of an association between customer dissatisfaction and revengeful behaviours. Customer dissatisfaction is also linked to a wider variety of forms of customer misbehaviour, including cheating behaviour (Wirtz & Kum, 2004) and student misbehaviour (Yi & Gong, 2008).

Together with the concept of consumer dissatisfaction, perceived inequity is frequently linked with different forms of customer misbehaviour within marketing literature (see K.L. Reynolds & Harris, 2009). Akin with customer dissatisfaction, inequity judgements reflect customers' negative cognitive-emotive evaluations of a service provision at the level of the outlet. Specifically, equity evaluations refer to the extent that customers believe they have been treated in a fair and just manner during their encounter with the service outlet (see Huefner & Hunt, 2000; Oliver & Swan, 1989). Indeed, Huefner and Hunt (2000) deem inequity as core in their definition of retaliatory consumer behaviours wherein 'behaviour [is] done with the intention to get even, making it an equity issue' (p. 63). A review of extant literature reveals that customer inequity associates with numerous individual forms of dysfunctional customer behaviour. For example, Cox, Cox, and Moschis (1990), Turner and Cashdan (1988), and Wilkes (1978) individually explain acts of consumer theft as a means for the perpetrator to restore a perceived equity imbalance. Offering complementary evidence, Yi and Gong (2006) cite perceived injustice as a key to understanding different rude and disruptive customer behaviours, while Keeffe et al. (2008) reveal inequity to associate with various acts of customer trashing, theft, vandalism, and abusive behaviour. This leads to:

H_{3a-b}: The perpetrators of different types of dysfunctional customer behaviours will experience significantly different levels of (a) dissatisfaction and (b) inequity.

Method

The hospitality industry, characterised by qualities including extended opening hours and personal contact, lends itself to the study of dysfunction (Harris & Ogbonna, 2006; USDAW, 2009). More specifically, incidents of misbehaviour by consumers within bars, hotels, and restaurants have been reported as endemic (Fullerton & Punj, 2004; Reynolds & Harris, 2005) and thus represent an insightful area of enquiry.

A total of 1300 customers were approached in a public space (e.g. shopping malls) and asked a screening question (a) to ascertain their suitability and (b) so that the researcher could provide confidentiality assurances. Informants who were aged 18 years or more and had knowingly misbehaved within a bar, hotel, or restaurant during the past three months were deemed eligible to participate in the study. In this sense, informants admitted that they had behaved in a manner that they believed the organisation would not endorse. Of the customers approached, 696 declined to participate and 220 indicated that they had misbehaved in the past but not within a hospitality-based outlet, or had misbehaved in a services setting but not in the role as a customer. Consequently, 384 questionnaires were completed (four of which were incomplete and removed from the sample). This yielded a response rate of nearly 30%. Although informants were asked to recall an incident that had occurred within the past three months, 78% of recorded episodes had taken place within the previous six weeks. Of the respondents, 53.9% were female, the median age was 51, and the largest group comprised respondents who earned between \$40,000 and \$60,000 annually.

Before completing the survey instrument, using a form of critical incident technique, respondents were required to recall and describe a single incident of dysfunctional behaviour that they had undertaken. This enabled us to gain a better understanding of the episode and to record the both form and severity of the behaviour. This first stage of data collection assists in memory stimulation, helps respondents complete the questionnaire in a more focused frame of mind (Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003), and engenders trust. Thereafter, respondents individually completed a structured questionnaire that focused on the single incident.

Measure development

Of the scales used within the current study, seven originated from existing measures, while two physical servicescape measures (layout and design and the exterior environment) were newly created as part of a wider study. We followed standard psychometric development procedures (Gerbing & Anderson, 1988). To detail, in order to determine the underlying facets for each construct, we conducted an extensive review of extant literature. Next, in-depth interviews with 12 consumers, eight frontline employees, three service managers, and four scholars revealed potential indicators for each measure. To assess the integrity of each newly created measure, we utilised the Q-sort method, a manual factor sorting technique. Here, a group of 21 consumers, employees, and academicians performed three sorting rounds. During the three rounds, judges independently sorted cards labelled with individual item wording into construct categories. Feedback was also obtained from the judges regarding item wording and ambiguity. To evaluate the initial reliability and validity of each newly created construct, the Cohen's (1960) kappa and Moore and Benbasat's (1991) hit ratio were calculated. To detail, at .81 at the end of the third

round, the kappa coefficient indicates a good percentage of joint agreement between the judges in the sorting process, while a hit ratio of 88% indicates a high degree of inter-judge agreement in placing items on the correct target constructs. In order to assess the entire research instrument format, we conducted two pilot tests. The first ($n = 50$) specifically focused on the elicitation of sensitive information from the participants. The second pilot test employed a sample of 60 consumers to trial the revised measures. Subsequent analysis of construct reliability and validity showed that all measures met standard benchmark criteria.

Measures of constructs

All measures (with the exception of form of misbehaviour) employed a seven-point Likert-type scale. Physical servicescape was gauged using three individual measures. Because of the lack of applicable existing scales, two physical servicescape related measures were newly developed using the above detailed scale development procedures. These processes resulted in the forwarding of a five-item scale to reflect the layout and design of the servicescape and a five-item scale to gauge the exterior servicescape environment. D'Astous's (2000) classification of irritating ambient variables was drawn on to derive a four-item measure of servicescape atmospherics.

Three separate measures were utilised to assess the social facets of servicescape. Derived from Grove and Fisk's (1997) and Martin's (1996) conceptualisations and the above detailed scale development procedures, a six-item scale was used to gauge the behaviour of fellow customers. Perception of employee service was operationalised using Olsen and Johnson's (2003) measure, while outlet vulnerability was derived from D'Astous and Levesque's (2003) measure of store personality.

Two individual measures were employed to assess customer disaffection with service. Dissatisfaction was measured using a four-item scale derived from Bloemer and Oderkerken-Schröder (2002) and Pizam and Ellis (1999). We used Oliver and Swan's (1989) four-item scale of fairness to measure perceptions of inequity during service. Finally, owing to the self-report and sensitive nature of our research focus, we felt it pertinent to assess the effect of social desirability bias on the constructs and relationships of interest. Consequently, four items from Reynolds (1982) were utilised. Appendix A details these measures.

In order to measure the form of dysfunctional customer behaviour, respondents were first required to indicate, from a predetermined list of behaviours, which form best described the misbehaviour that they had perpetrated. The list (see Appendix B) was generated from existing literature and typologies and in-depth interviews with customers, employees, service managers, and scholars (see above). Second, the researcher recorded their own interpretation of the form of behaviour performed. Subsequent analysis revealed a strong correlation between these two measures ($p < .01$), indicating a high degree of consistency in terms of perceptions of behavioural form between respondents and the researcher evaluations.

Scale assessment

Consistent with good practice, prior to performing confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), we purified our measures using exploratory factor analysis with varimax rotation. We retained items that exhibited statistically significant loadings on their expected factors, with high item-to-total correlations. Next, we used CFA to assess

our measurement model. The CFA included the full measurement properties of all three measures of physical servicescape, three measures of social servicescape, and two measures of customer disaffection with service. The resulting model yielded a very good parsimonious, incremental, and absolute fit to the data, producing chi-square values of 1296.516, degrees of freedom values of 743, a Marsh and Hocevar (1985) chi-square–degrees of freedom ratio of 1.7, a comparative fit index (CFI) of .99, a non-normed fit index (NNFI) of .97, and a root-mean-squared error of approximation (RMSEA) of .04. In support of convergent validity, for both models each item had a factor loading in excess of .50 and proved significantly related to its underlying factor (t -value > 5.15).

The reliability of the measures employed was examined through CFA and the calculation of Cronbach alpha coefficients (Cronbach, 1951), composite reliabilities, and average variance extracted (AVE). Cronbach coefficient alpha estimates of internal consistency ranged from .91 (atmospherics) to .96 (dissatisfaction) and are well above the threshold criterion of .70 (Nunnally, 1978). Composite reliabilities ranged from .84 (outlet vulnerability) to .92 (perceptions of employee service), well above the minimum level of .60 recommended by Bagozzi and Yi (1988) and the .70 desirable threshold of Garver and Mentzer (1999). Finally, each AVE exceeded Fornell and Larcker's (1981) suggested minimum value of .50.

Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson, and Tatham (2006) argue that construct validity (convergent and discriminant validity) should ideally be gauged using a variety of tests and approaches. As previously mentioned, the measurement instrument was extensively pretested in an effort to improve content validity. Subsequently, to assess the validation of index operationalisation, items in each scale were correlated to the whole scale (see Nunnally, 1978). This analysis indicates that each item is significantly correlated to the scale in the expected direction (see Cook & Campbell, 1979) and provides an indication of convergent validity. Addition support for convergent validity emerged on the scrutiny of the AVEs, all of which had a loading in excess of .50 and was significantly related to its underlying factor (see Fornell & Larcker, 1981). Discriminant validity was gauged via the test recommended by Fornell and Larcker (1981). This test recommends comparing the AVEs to the variance shared (that is the squared phi correlation) between the construct and other constructs in the model. The application of this method reveals that, in each case, the square of the parameter estimates between two constructs is less than the AVE, supporting discriminant validity (see Appendix C). Finally, owing to the sensitive nature of our research focus, it was felt pertinent to test for the possible effects of social desirability bias on the data. Following the procedures recommended by Podsakoff et al. (2003), the social desirability measure (see earlier) was introduced at CFA stage of analysis. Two versions of the measurement model (one containing method effects, the other assuming no method effects) were compared using a chi-square difference test. The results reveal there are no statistically significant method effects due to social desirability bias in the data.

Results

The next phase of analysis was designed to identify and establish groups of similarly misbehaving customers. To achieve this aim, we adopted Ward's (1963) hierarchical clustering routine, as Wishart (1987) contends that this approach consistently generates compact spherical clusters more effectively than other

methods. Consequently, we utilised the standard ‘cluster’ analysis technique in SPSS and clustered customers’ responses to the survey based on the form of misbehaviour committed according to the interpretation of the respondent and the researcher (see earlier). Previous research has contended that the maximum number of specified clusters in any analysis is determined by $n = 30$, where n is the number of cases (see Lehmann, 1979). In the current study, this suggests that a maximum limit of 12 clusters could be accepted. Consequently, 12 through to 2 cluster solutions were calculated. Given the volume of potential solutions, considerable attention was devoted to evaluating these analyses. The cluster solutions with eight or more cluster defied logical interpretation, while the solutions with seven, six, five, and four increasingly divided a single cluster into smaller groups without immediately clear distinctions. Accordingly, this process led to the conclusion that the three-cluster solution offered the clearest interpretation. Analysis of the three-cluster solution revealed that the cluster means of *each* measure of misbehaviour form (used as cluster criteria) was significantly different using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). Consequently, the three-cluster solution was accepted. In order to establish whether the three clusters differed in respect to demographic differences, the demographic characteristics of the three groups was compared and no significant differences uncovered.

An examination of the three-cluster solution according to the criteria of clustering (the two measures of misbehaviour form) led to the labelling of the clusters as petty norm infringements, felonious norm infringements, and belligerent norm infringements. The descriptive statistics of the two-cluster criteria for each of the three-cluster solutions is presented below (see Table 1).

The cluster labelled petty norm infringements ($n = 126$) exhibit very low levels norm infringements typically cantered on misbehaviours such as failing to tell an employee of a mistake in their favour or making complaints without genuine cause. In contrast, the second cluster, labelled felonious norm infringements ($n = 179$), encompass incidents where, typically, the behaviour of customers involves non-violent criminal acts such as failures to pay for services, theft, or rudeness to service employees. Finally, belligerent norm infringements ($n = 75$) include the most severe acts of customer misbehaviour such as intentional damage and infringements of the personal space and well-being of service workers.

A key objective of this study is to describe the distinguishing characteristics of the service contexts and dynamics in which different types of customer misbehaviour occur. Consequently, for each cluster, the descriptive statistics of the measures of physical servicescape, social servicescape, and disaffection with service were calculated (see Table 2). These statistics indicate a number of differences between

Table 1 Descriptive statistics of cluster criteria.

	Cluster one: Petty norm infringements	Cluster two: Felonious norm infringements	Cluster three: Belligerent norm infringements	Global mean
Respondents’ mean score	1.39	4.08	6.63	3.70
Researcher’s mean score	1.42	3.97	6.41	3.61

Table 2 Descriptive statistics of factor characteristics.

	Petty norm infringements	Felonious norm infringements	Belligerent norm infringements	Global mean	Standard deviation
<i>Physical servicescape</i>					
Layout and design	3.53	3.81	4.85	3.92	1.71
Atmospherics	3.61	4.05	5.09	4.11	1.90
Exterior environment	3.03	3.23	4.74	3.46	1.86
<i>Social servicescape</i>					
Fellow customers	2.79	3.72	4.27	3.52	1.98
Employee service	2.63	3.37	4.47	3.34	1.86
Outlet vulnerability	4.52	4.36	3.62	4.27	1.71
<i>Customer disaffection</i>					
Inequity	2.60	3.15	4.40	3.21	1.74
Dissatisfaction	2.53	3.42	4.37	3.31	2.03

the service context and dynamics of each of the three clusters. Incidents of petty norm infringements occur in service contexts that are markedly below the global mean, suggesting that such episodes take place in more appealing servicescapes. Interestingly, occurrences of petty norm infringements appear to arise where dissatisfaction and inequity are low but the outlet is viewed as vulnerable. In contrast, incidents of felonious norm infringements emerge in servicescapes and involve customer disaffection that is broadly similar to the global mean. This appears appreciably different from incidents of belligerent norm infringements, which appear to occur in servicescapes perceived as insalubrious and where customers perceive high levels of inequity in exchange and are very dissatisfied regardless of perceived outlet vulnerability.

Analysis of differences between clusters

A multivariate analysis of variance found significant overall differences between the petty norm infringements, felonious norm infringements, and belligerent norm infringements clusters at the .001 level of significance.

A second phase of variance analysis was conducted in order to establish the extent to which the servicescape and customer disaffection characteristics of the three clusters were significantly different (see Table 3). Table 3 presents the results of this analysis, which found that all six of the servicescape characteristics and both of the customer disaffection measures were significantly different across the three-cluster solution. These results denote that, in broad terms, the physical and social servicescape and the customer disaffection characteristics of the petty norm infringements, felonious norm infringements, and belligerent norm infringements clusters are significantly different.

The third phase of variance analysis was conducted to ensure that the analysis of cluster variance across individual measures conducted earlier (see Table 3) was a true representation of differences between the three clusters and not an artefact of differences between two of the three clusters. In order to avoid an overestimation of statistical significance, a multivariate analysis of variance using joint multivariate Bonferroni 95% confidence intervals was calculated (see Table 4). This procedure reveals significant differences between one of the social servicescape characteristics

Table 3 Analysis of variance across individual factors.

	<i>F</i> -value	Significance of <i>F</i>
<i>Physical servicescape</i>		
Layout and design	16.073	.000
Atmospherics	15.710	.000
Exterior environment	25.223	.000
<i>Social servicescape</i>		
Fellow customers	16.048	.000
Employee service	25.794	.000
Outlet vulnerability	7.290	.001
<i>Customer disaffection</i>		
Inequity	29.208	.000
Dissatisfaction	22.019	.000

Table 4 Analysis of variance between each cluster for each factor solution.

	Groups with non-significant differences	Groups with significant differences
<i>Physical servicescape</i>		
Layout and design	1–2	1–3, 2–3
Atmospherics	1–2	1–3, 2–3
Exterior environment	1–2	1–3, 2–3
<i>Social servicescape</i>		
Fellow customers	2–3	1–2, 1–3
Employee service		All
Outlet vulnerability	1–2	1–3, 2–3
<i>Customer disaffection</i>		
Inequity		All
Dissatisfaction		All

1 = petty norm infringements, 2 = felonious norm infringements, and 3 = belligerent norm infringements.

(perception of employee service) and both features of customer disaffection (inequity and dissatisfaction) for all combinations of clusters. However, for three physical servicescape features (layout and design, atmospherics, and perceptions of the exterior) and one social servicescape characteristic (outlet vulnerability), differences were *not* significant between petty and felonious norm infringements. Similarly, in the case of perceptions of fellow customers, differences between felonious and belligerent norm infringements were found not to be significant.

H_{1a-c} argues that different forms of customer misbehaviour are (respectively) distinguished by perceived differences in (a) layout and design, (b) atmospherics, and (c) exterior environment variables. H_{2a-c} claims that perpetrators perceptions of (a) fellow customers, (b) employee service, and (c) perceived outlet vulnerability are differ significantly for different types of misbehaviours. The analysis of variance across clusters reveals that of the 18 possible differences across clusters, 13 differences are statistically significant, indicating broad support for H_{1a-c} and H_{2a-c} and the suggestion that varying types of customer behaviour are associated with different servicescape characteristics. However, in the case of H_{1a} (layout and design), H_{1b} (atmospherics), H_{1c} (the exterior environment), H_{2a} (perceptions of fellow customers), and H_{2c} (outlet vulnerability), one of the three possible differences between clusters is found to be non-significant. Accordingly, H_{1a-c}, H_{2a}, and H_{2c} are only partially supported. In contrast, H_{2b} is supported in full through the finding of significant differences in employee service across all clusters.

H_{3a-b} argues that customers responsible for different types of dysfunctional behaviours will experience differing levels of (a) inequity and (b) dissatisfaction. H_{3a-b} are fully supported through the finding that perceptions of inequity and dissatisfaction vary across all clusters.

Implications

The aim of this research was to examine the association between contextual service factors, including disaffection with service, physical servicescape, and the social

facets of service and the forms of dysfunctional customer behaviour perpetrated within these environments. In offering empirical insights into these issues, we offer a number of implications for theorists and practitioners. First, by gathering data that detail actual incidents of dysfunctional customer behaviour, the current study makes an empirical contribution. While past research offers fascinating, often anecdotal, conceptualisations of the numerous types of customer dysfunction, using cluster analysis the current study reveals three data-derived categories of customer misbehaviour. Consequently, the current research provides the empirical grounding for subsequent studies to explore a wide variety of drivers and consequences of the three identified categories of dysfunctional customer behaviour.

The current research offers a second empirical contribution because of our analysis, which assesses the association between facets of the physical and social servicescape and customer disaffection and the type of customer misbehaviour committed. Specifically, we find that there are significant differences between the forms of customer misbehaviours that are perpetrated across different service environments. For example, our findings show that there are statistically significant differences between the levels of dissatisfaction *and* inequity experienced by the perpetrators of petty, felonious, and belligerent types of misbehaviour. Thus the current study forwards empirical evidence of the link between service design and customer disaffection and the categories of deviance that are committed under such conditions. Consequently, our findings tentatively suggest that certain service conditions may predict particular forms of customer misbehaviour.

Third, our study offers a theoretical contribution in uncovering evidence that suggests that dysfunctional customer behaviour is strongly influenced by contextual factors. That is, much previous research has focused the importance of individual factors, such as the personality traits and lifestyle characteristics of offenders (Agnew, Brezina, Wright, & Cullen, 2002; Rayburn & Rayburn, 1996). Typically, studies from this perspective argue that occurrences of deviant behaviour are activated by personal and internal characteristics and are therefore inherent to some individuals regardless of environmental surroundings (see Carrasco, Barker, Tremblay, & Vitaro, 2006; Caspi et al., 1994). While we do not contest this perspective, our findings indicate that the degree of norm-breaking performed is influenced by the context in which it occurs. Hence, although tempered by our non-causal approach, we argue that potentially controllable organisational conditions may trigger different forms of deviance.

Fourth, we make a contribution to dysfunctional customer behaviour theory through the identification of different forms of misbehaviour according to norm violation. In line with theorists who champion the study of deviant customer behaviour from a norms-based perspective (see Denegri-Knott, 2006; Fullerton & Punj, 2004), our findings reflect this approach. Indeed, our findings suggest that the issue of norm violation is inherent to the definition and classification of different types of dysfunctional customer behaviour. That is, the degree of norm violation may be more important to understanding the mechanisms of deviance performed rather than the individual form itself. Our study reveals three categories of dysfunctional customer behaviour based on the severity of norm infringement that had occurred. Each category reflects multiple types of misbehaviour. We find that the form of misbehaviour, defined by the degree of norm violation, associates with the environment within which the misbehaviour occurred. Therefore, adoption of a norms-based approach may offer theorists and researchers a more useful tool when

simultaneously examining multiple types of customer misdeeds. In this sense, our research aids the holistic study of dysfunctional customer behaviour.

The study findings raise a number of implications for service practitioners. In particular, our findings suggest that different norm-violating forms of dysfunctional customer behaviour are characterised by differences in service contextual factors. This finding is important for service managers because it indicates that incidents of dysfunctional customer behaviour may be managed, in part, through the manipulation and control of service design and associated processes. In particular, our findings relating to the physical servicescape, social servicescape, and customer disaffection warrant further discussion. First, our findings imply an association between physical aspects of servicescape design, including the exterior environment, the layout and design of the outlet, and the outlet's atmospheric variables and the form of misdeed performed. These findings suggest that through the blueprinting and control of servicescape variables that promote ease of patron movement, suitable crowd density, good air quality, and cleanliness, service outlet managers might be able to lessen and negate incidents of norm-breaking patron behaviour.

Second, this study indicates that the social facets of the servicescape are associated with the perpetration of different forms of dysfunctional customer behaviour. Here, guided by existing scholarly prescriptions, managers should work towards ensuring that customer contact workers are motivated and skilled in their roles. Furthermore, the social facets of servicescape might be manipulated to decrease customers' perceptions of outlet vulnerability. This could be achieved through the physical provision of security in the form of electronic surveillance and visible personnel. Employees might also be trained in appropriate policies and procedures for actively dealing with misbehaving customers. Additionally, episodes of dysfunctional customer behaviour may be managed through the consideration of customer compatibility management. Specifically, service managers should target compatible market segments. For example, a bar might pursue groups of customers who share similar tastes in music type and volume, interior design, and who desire comparable levels of patron interaction. Based on the suggestion that congruence and order characterise groups of compatible individuals (see Nicholls, 2005), attracting attuned customers may reduce the level of discord between customers within the servicescape setting.

Third, the current study reveals the importance to service managers of managing customers' expectations and perceptions of service. The findings identify an association between customer disaffection (dissatisfaction and inequity) and different forms of norm-violating behaviour. In doing so, the current study suggests that through the formulation and scrutiny of service provision, feedback and complaint strategies, and customer service activities, service practitioners can proactively manage customers' inequity and dissatisfaction evaluations. Therefore, although the study's findings are not casual, it can be inferred that practitioners are far from defenceless in the management of episodes of dysfunctional customer behaviours.

The findings and contributions of our study are bounded by limitations that, in turn, highlight potentially fruitful avenues for further research. First, the current study relies on retrospective data, which may be flawed by recall biases. In particular, we assume that informants report self-perpetuated incidents of dysfunctional behaviour in a correct and truthful manner. We also suppose that informants accurately recall their behaviours and situational factors without reinterpreting such events. In order to avoid the potential for such bias, future research might

wish to examine the relationship between servicescape design and the forms of misbehaviour performed using experimental design. If ethical constraints concerning the inducement of customer deviance could be overcome, researchers might wish to manipulate the different facets of the servicescape and measure the corresponding levels of norm-violating behaviours that result. Second, the industrial context of the study limits its generalisability. While we assert the hospitality industry as appropriate setting, its characteristics in terms of employee–customer contact and customer–environment contact are not universal. Consequently, the forms of misbehaviour assessed may not be evident in all organisational contexts. Therefore, future research should examine norm-violating behaviours in alternative service and non-service contexts. Third, the current study centres on analysing the variances between clusters of dysfunctional customer behaviours according to organisationally derived variables. Future research might also consider the effects of personality variables and servicescape variables as representing moderators when modelling dysfunctional customer behaviours dynamics.

References

- Agnew, R., Brezina, T., Wright, J.P., & Cullen, F.T. (2002). Strain, personality traits, and delinquency: Extending general strain theory. *Criminology*, 40(1), 43–72.
- Allen, V.L., & Greenberger, D. B. (1978). An aesthetic theory of vandalism. *Crime and Delinquency*, 24, 309–332.
- Areni, C.S. (2003). Exploring manager's implicit theories of atmospheric music: Comparing academic analysis to industry insight. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 17(2), 161–184.
- Aron, D., Judson, K., Aurand, T., & Gordon, G. (2007). Consumer grudgeholding: Does age make a difference. *Mid-American Journal of Business*, 22(1), 45–58.
- Bagozzi, R.P., & Yi, Y. (1988). On the evaluation of structural equation models. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 14(1), 33–46.
- Bamfield, J. (2009). *Global retail theft barometer*. Centre for Retail Research, Nottingham, UK. Retrieved November 5, 2009, from <http://www.retailresearch.org/home/index.php>
- Bechwati, N.N., & Morrin, M. (2003). Outraged consumers: Getting even at the expense of getting a good deal. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 13(4), 440–453.
- Belding, S. (2000). *Dealing with the customer from hell: A survival guide*. New York; Stoddart.
- Bell, P.A., & Baron, R.A. (1981). Ambient temperature and human violence. In P.F. Brain & D. Benton (Eds.), *Multidisciplinary approaches to aggression research*. (pp. 421–430). Oxford: Elsevier.
- Berry, L.L., & Seiders, K. (2008). Serving unfair customers. *Business Horizons*, 51, 29–37.
- Bitner, M.J. (1992). Servicescapes: The impact of physical surroundings on customers and employees. *Journal of Marketing*, 56(2) 57–71.
- Bitner, M.J., Booms, B.H., & Mohr, L.A. (1994). Critical service encounters: The employee's viewpoint. *Journal of Marketing*, 58, 95–106.
- Bloemer, J., & Odekerken-Schröder, G. (2002). Store satisfaction and store loyalty explained by customer- and store-related factors. *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, 15, 68–80.
- Bove, L.L., Pervan, S.J., Beatty, S.E., & Shiu, E. (2009). Service worker role in encouraging customer organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Business Research*, 62, 698–705.
- Carrasco, M., Barker, E.D., Tremblay, R.E., & Vitaro, F. (2006). Eysenck's personality dimensions as predictors of male adolescent trajectories of physical aggression, theft and vandalism. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 41, 1309–1320.
- Caspi, A., Moffitt, T.E., Silva, P.A., Stouthamer-Loeber, M., Krueger, R.F., & Schmutte, P.S. (1994). Are some people crime-prone? Replications of the personality–crime relationship across countries, genders, races, and methods. *Criminology*, 32(2), 163–196.

- CBS News (2007). Hot sauce triggers fast-food shooting. Retrieved November 5, 2009, from <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2007/05/30/national/main2867606.shtml>
- Cohen, J. (1960). A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 10(1), 37–46.
- Cohen, L.E., & Felson, M. (1979). Social change and crime rate trends: A routine activity approach. *American Sociological Review*, 44, 588–608.
- Cook, T.D., & Campbell, D.T. (1979). *Quasi-experimentation: Design and analysis issues for field settings*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Cox, D., Cox, A.D., & Moschis, G.P. (1990). When consumer behavior goes bad: An investigation of adolescent shoplifting. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 17, 149–159.
- Cronbach, L.J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, 16, 297–334.
- D'Astous, A. (2000). Irritating aspects of the shopping environment. *Journal of Business Research*, 49, 149–156.
- D'Astous, A., & Levesque, M. (2003). A scale for measuring store personality. *Psychology and Marketing*, 20(5), 455–469.
- Denegri-Knott, J. (2006). Consumers behaving badly: Deviation or innovation? Power struggles on the web. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 5, 82–94.
- Donnerstein, E., & Wilson, D.W. (1976). Effects of noise and perceived control on ongoing and subsequent behaviour. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 34, 774–781.
- Fisher, J.D., & Baron, R.M. (1982). An equity-based model of vandalism. *Population and Environment*, 5(3), 182–200.
- Fisk, R., Grove, S., Harris, L.C., Keeffe, D., Daunt, K.L., Russell-Bennett, R., & Wirtz, J. (2010). Customers behaving badly: A state of the art review, research agenda and implications for practitioners. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 24(6), 417–429.
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D.F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18, 39–50.
- Freestone, O., & Mitchell, V.W. (2004). Generation Y attitudes towards e-ethics and Internet-related misbehaviours. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 54, 121–128.
- Fullerton, R.A., & Punj, G. (1993). Choosing to misbehave: A structural model of aberrant consumer behavior. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 20, 570–574.
- Fullerton, R.A., & Punj, G. (2004). Repercussions of promoting an ideology of consumption: Consumer misbehavior. *Journal of Business Research*, 57(11), 1239–1249.
- Funches, V., Markley, M., & Davis, L. (2009). Reprisal, retribution and requital: Investigating customer retaliation. *Journal of Business Research*, 62, 231–238.
- Garver, M.S., & Mentzer, J.T. (1999). Logistics research methods: Employing structural equation modeling to test for construct validity. *Journal of Business Logistics*, 20(1), 33–57.
- Gerbing, D.W., & Anderson, J.C. (1988). An updated paradigm for scale development incorporating unidimensionality and its assessment. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 25, 186–192.
- Grandey, A.A., Dickter, D.N., & Sin, H.-P. (2004). The customer is *not* always right: Customer aggression and emotion regulation of service employees. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25, 397–418.
- Grégoire, Y., Tripp, T.M., & Legoux, R. (2009). When customer love turns into lasting hate: The effects of relationship strength and time on customer revenge and avoidance. *Journal of Marketing*, 73(6), 18.
- Groff, E.R. (2008). Adding temporal and spatial aspects of routine activities: A further test of routine activity theory. *Security Journal*, 21, 95–116.
- Grove, S.J., & Fisk, R.P. (1997). The impact of other customers on service experiences: A critical incident examination of 'getting along'. *Journal of Retailing*, 73(1), 63–85.
- Grove, S.J., Vitell, S.J., & Strutton, D. (1989). Non-normative consumer behavior and the techniques of neutralization. *Proceedings of the Winter Educators Conference* (pp. 131–135). USA: Marketing Association.

- Grove, S.J., Fisk, R.P., & John, J. (2004). Surviving in the age of rage. *Marketing Management*, 13(2), 41–46.
- Hair, J.F., Black, W.C., Babin, B.J., Anderson, R.E., & Tatham, R.L. (2006). *Multivariate data analysis* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Harris, L.C., & Ezech, C. (2008). Servicescape and loyalty intentions: An empirical investigation. *European Journal of Marketing*, 42(3/4), 390–422.
- Harris, L.C., & Ogbonna, E. (2006). Service sabotage: A study of antecedents and consequences. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 34(4), 543–558.
- Harris, L.C., & Reynolds, K.L. (2003). The consequences of dysfunctional customer behavior. *Journal of Service Research*, 6(2), 144–161.
- Harris, L.C., & Reynolds, K.L. (2004). Jaycustomer behavior: An exploration into the types and motives in the hospitality industry. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 18(5), 339–357.
- Heskett, J.L., Sasser, W.E., Jr., & Schlesinger, L.A. (1997). *The service profit chain: How leading companies link profit and growth to loyalty, satisfaction and value*. New York: Free Press.
- Homel, R., & Clark, J. (1994). The prediction and prevention of violence in pubs and clubs. In R.V. Clarke (Ed.), *Crime prevention studies* (Vol. 3). New York: Criminal Justice Press.
- Hopkins, M. (2002). Crimes against businesses: The way forward for future research. *British Journal of Criminology*, 42, 782–797.
- Huefner, J.C., & Hunt, H.K. (2000). Consumer retaliation as a response to dissatisfaction. *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, 13, 61–82.
- Huefner, J.C., Perry, B.L., Payne, C.R., Otto, S.D., Huff, S.C., Swenson, M.J., & Hunt, H.K. (2002). Consumer retaliation: Confirmation and extension. *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, 15, 114–127.
- Jones, P., & Groenenboom, K. (2002). Crime in London hotels. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 4(1), 21–35.
- Keeffe, D.A., Russell-Bennett, R., & Tombs, A. (2008). Customer retaliation at the employee–customer interface. *Journal of Management and Organization*, 14(4), 438–450.
- King, T., & Dennis, C. (2006). Unethical consumers: Deshopping behaviour using qualitative analysis of theory of planned behaviour and accompanied (de)shopping. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, 9(3), 282–296.
- King, T., Dennis, C., & Wright, L.T. (2008). Myopia, customer returns and the theory of planned behaviour. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 24(1/2), 185.
- Konecni, V.J. (1975). The mediation of aggressive behaviour: Arousal level versus anger and cognitive labeling. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 32, 706–712.
- Lawrence, G. (2004). Designing out crime: The retail perspective. *International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management*, 32(12), 572–576.
- Lehmann, D.R. (1979). *Marketing research and analysis*. Homewood, IL: Irwin.
- Lewis, B.R., & Clacher, E. (2001). Service failure and recovery in UK theme parks: The employees' perspective. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 13(4), 166–175.
- Lin, I.Y. (2004). Evaluating a servicescape: The effect of cognition and emotion. *Hospitality Management*, 23, 163–178.
- Lovelock, C. (2001). *Services marketing: People, technology, strategy* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Macintyre, S., & Homel, R. (1997). Danger on the Dance Floor: A Study of Interior Design, Crowding and Aggression in Nightclubs. In R. Homel (Ed.), *Policing for prevention: Reducing crime, public intoxication and injury* Crime Prevention Studies Vol. 7, (pp. 92–113). Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press.
- Marsh, H.W., & Hocevar, D. (1985). Applications of confirmatory factor analysis to the study of self-concept: First- and higher-order factor models and their invariance across groups. *Psychological Bulletin*, 97, 562–582.

- Martin, C.L. (1996). Consumer-to-consumer relationships: Satisfaction with other consumers' public behavior. *The Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 30, 1.
- McColl-Kennedy, J.R., Patterson, P.G., Smith, A.K., & Brady, M.K. (2009). Customer rage episodes: Emotions, expression and behaviors. *Journal of Retailing*, 85(2), 222–237.
- McGrath, H., & Goulding, A. (1996). Part of the job: Violence in public libraries. *New Library World*, 97(1127), 4–13.
- Mills, M.K. (1981). Deviance and dissatisfaction: An exploration study. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 8, 682–686.
- Mills, M.K., & Bonoma, T.V. (1979). Deviant consumer behavior: A different view. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 6, 347–352.
- Moore, G.C., & Benbasat, I. (1991). Development of an instrument to measure the perceptions of adopting information technology innovation. *Information Systems Research*, 2(2), 192–222.
- Nicholls, R. (2005). *Interactions between service customers: Managing on-site customer-to-customer interactions for service advantage*. Poznań, Poland: Poznań University of Economics Publishing House.
- Nunnally, J.C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Oliver, R.L. (1980). A cognitive model of the antecedents and consequences of satisfaction. *Journal of Marketing*, 17, 460–469.
- Oliver, R.L., & Swan, J.E. (1989). Consumer perceptions of interpersonal equity and satisfaction in transactions: A field survey approach. *Journal of Marketing*, 53, 21–35.
- Olsen, L.L., & Johnson, M.D. (2003). Service equity, satisfaction and loyalty: From transaction-specific evaluations. *Journal of Service Research*, 5(3), 184–195.
- Parker, P.M., & Tavassoli, N.T. (2000). Homeostasis and consumer behavior across cultures. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 17, 33–53.
- Pizam, A., & Ellis, T. (1999). Customer satisfaction and its measurement in hospitality enterprises. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 11(7), 326–339.
- Podsakoff, P.M., Mackenzie, S.B., Lee, J.-Y., & Podsakoff, N.P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879–903.
- Rayburn, J.M., & Rayburn, L.G. (1996). Relationship between Machiavellianism and type A personality and ethical-orientation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 15, 1209–1219.
- Reynolds, K.L., & Harris, L.C. (2005). When service failure is not service failure: An exploration of the types and motives of 'illegitimate' customer complaining. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 19(5), 321–335.
- Reynolds, K.L., & Harris, L.C. (2009). Dysfunctional customer behavior severity: An empirical examination. *Journal of Retailing*, 85(3), 321–335.
- Reynolds, W.M. (1982). Development of reliable and valid short forms of the Marlowe–Crowne social desirability scale. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 38, 119–125.
- Rose, R.L., & Neidermeyer, M. (1999). From rudeness to roadrage: The antecedents and consequences of consumer aggression. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 26, 12–17.
- Tonglet, M. (2002). Consumer misbehaviour: An exploratory study of shoplifting. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 1(4), 336–354.
- Turley, L.W., & Milliman, R.E. (2000). Atmospheric effects on shopping behavior: A review of the experimental. *Journal of Business Research*, 49, 193–211.
- Turner, C.B., & Cashdan, S. (1988). Perception of college students' motives for shoplifting. *Psychological Reports*, 62, 855–862.
- USDAW (2009). *Freedom from Fear Survey*. September 2009.
- Wakefield, K.R., & Blodgett, J.G. (1999). Customer response to intangible and tangible service factors. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 16(1), 51–68.
- Ward, J.H., Jr. (1963). Hierarchical grouping to optimise an objective function. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 58, 236–244.

- Wilkes, R.E. (1978). Fraudulent behavior by consumers. *Journal of Marketing*, 42(4), 67–75.
- Wilson, J.Q., & Kelling, G. (1982). Broken windows: The police and neighbourhood safety. *Atlantic Monthly*, March, 29–38.
- Wirtz, J., & Kum, D. (2004). Consumer cheating on service guarantees. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 32(2), 112–126.
- Wishart, D. (1987). *Clusters*. St. Andrews, UK: University of St. Andrews.
- Yagil, D. (2008). When the customer is wrong: A review of research on aggression and sexual harassment in service encounters. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 13, 141–152.
- Yi, Y., & Gong, T. (2006). The antecedents and consequences of service customer citizenship and badness behavior. *Seoul Journal of Business*, 12(2), 145–176.
- Yi, Y., & Gong, T. (2008). The effects of customer justice perception and effect on customer citizenship behavior and customer dysfunctional behavior. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 37(7), 767–783.
- Yildirim, K., & Akalin-Baskaya, A. (2007). Perceived crowding in a café/restaurant with different seating densities. *Building and Environment*, 42, 3410–3417.
- Zemke, R., & Anderson, K. (1990). Customers from hell. *Training*, 27(2), 25–33.
- Zourrig, H., Chebat, J.C., & Toffoli, R. (2009). Consumer revenge behavior: A cross-cultural perspective. *Journal of Business Research*, 62, 995–1001.

Appendix A. Construct and measurement items

Layout and design^a ($\alpha = .91$, CR = .85, AVE = .55)

1. The interior of the outlet was designed to my taste (reverse scored)
2. It was very crowded inside of the outlet
3. The interior design of the outlet was unpleasant.
4. It was very cramped inside of the outlet
5. It was easy to move around the outlet (reverse scored)

Atmospherics^a ($\alpha = .91$, CR = .84, AVE = .57)

1. The temperature inside of the outlet was pleasant (reverse scored)
2. The music inside of the outlet was too loud
3. The air quality inside of the outlet was poor
4. The outlet was very clean (reverse scored)

Exterior environment^a ($\alpha = .94$, CR = .89, AVE = .62)

1. The exterior of the outlet was unappealing
2. The outlet was located in a nice area (reverse scored)
3. The outside of the outlet did not look well maintained
4. The exterior of the outlet looked run down
5. The exterior of the outlet looked attractive (reverse scored)

Fellow customers^a ($\alpha = .94$, CR = .90, AVE = .60)

1. Fellow customers behaved in a pleasant manner (reverse scored)
2. Fellow customers behaved in a way that I was not expecting
3. I enjoyed being around the other customers in the outlet (reverse scored)
4. Fellow customers conducted themselves in a manner that I did not find appropriate
5. Fellow customers behaved in a way that I found to be unpleasant
6. Fellow customers behaved in a way that I did not agree with

Perception of employee service^a ($\alpha = .96$, CR = .92, AVE = .65)

1. I was very dissatisfied with the way that the employee treated me
2. The employee gave me no reason to trust them
3. I was very dissatisfied with the employee's ability to satisfy my needs
4. I was very dissatisfied with the employee's ability to help me
5. The employee appeared to be very unenthusiastic
6. The employee behaved in a manner that I found unacceptable

Outlet vulnerability^a ($\alpha = .91$, CR = .84, AVE = .57)

1. Overall, I think that this outlet is gullible
2. Overall, I think that this outlet is lenient when dealing with customers
3. Overall, I think that this outlet is easy to fool
4. Overall, I do not think that this outlet is very security conscious

Inequity^a ($\alpha = .92$, CR = .85, AVE = .59)

- 1. The outlet treated me fairly (reverse scored)
- 2. I was not treated right by the outlet
- 3. I felt that the outlet was taking advantage of me
- 4. I felt that the outlet behaved in an unfair way towards me

Dissatisfaction^a ($\alpha = .96$, CR = .90, AVE = .70)

- 1. I was dissatisfied with the level of service that I received from the outlet
- 2. My expectations were not met
- 3. I was dissatisfied with the quality of service that I received
- 4. I was very satisfied with the outlet (reverse scored)

Social desirability^a ($\alpha = .89$, CR = .82, AVE = .54)

- 1. It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged
- 2. There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others
- 3. No matter who I am talking to, I am always a good listener
- 4. I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favours of me (reverse scored)

^aSeven-point scale (1 = ‘strongly disagree’ and 7 = ‘strongly agree’).

Appendix B. Forms of dysfunctional customer behaviour reported

Forms of dysfunctional customer behaviour reported	Percentage of informants reporting perpetrating such behaviour
1. Failing to tell an employee when a mistake had been made in the respondent's favour	20
2. Complaining without genuine cause	13.2
3. Using/consuming the facilities of a service outlet without intending to pay	13.4
4. Knowingly stealing an item from a service outlet	16.3
5. Arguing with or being openly rude to a service employee or fellow customer	17.4
6. Knowingly damaging or vandalising a service outlet's property	12.4
7. Physically touching/striking a service employee or fellow customer	7.4

Note: Informants were requested to indicate the form of misbehaviour that best characterised their performed misbehaviour. Consequently, this table constitutes a reflection of these behaviours, rather than an absolute and exact description of the individual misbehaviours perpetrated.

Appendix C. Correlations matrix and average variance extracted (AVE)

Constructs	V1	V2	V3	V4	V5	V6	V7	V8
V1 Layout and design	.73							
V2 Atmospheric	.49**	.75						
V3 Exterior	.53**	.50**	.79					
V4 Fellow customers	.49**	.48**	.47**	.77				
V5 Employee service	.40**	.23**	.30**	.12*	.81			
V6 Outlet vulnerability	-.18**	-.07	-.10	-.19**	-.17**	.75		
V7 Inequity	.39**	.26**	.36**	.23**	.69**	-.18**	.77	
V8 Dissatisfaction	.38**	.25**	.26**	.21**	.68**	-.24**	.69**	.84

Diagonal elements are the square root of the AVE; off-diagonal elements are the correlations between constructs. *Correlation significant at the .05 level; **correlation significant at the .05 level.

About the authors

Kate L. Daunt (*née Reynolds*) is currently a lecturer in marketing and strategy at Cardiff Business School, Cardiff University, UK. Her primary research interests include dysfunctional customer behaviour, service failure, exchange dysfunction, service encounters and design, and customer complaining behaviour. Her work has been published in a variety of marketing and management journals.

Corresponding author: Dr. Kate L. Daunt, Cardiff Business School, Cardiff University, Aberconway Building, Colum Drive, Cardiff, CF10 3EU, UK.

T +44(0)29 2087 6794

E DauntK@Cardiff.ac.uk

Lloyd C. Harris holds a marketing and strategy professorial position at Warwick Business School, the University of Warwick, UK. His main research interests include deviance during service, the interface between HRM and marketing, and organizational culture change. He has published widely in marketing, strategy, HRM, and general management journals.

T +44(0)24 7652 2309

E Lloyd.Harris@wbs.ac.uk