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ABSTRACT
Management of consumer waiting experiences is critical for practitioners in that unpleasant waiting experiences may result in negative service evaluations. This paper develops a conceptual framework in which predicted value of service, wait expectation (conceptualized as “consumer zone of wait tolerance” derived from the service literatures), wait disconfirmation (consumers’ comparisons between wait expectations and perceptions), and affective response to waiting are proposed to directly or indirectly affect service experience evaluation. In addition, this paper proposes that actions of the service provider moderate the relationship between affective response to waiting and service experience evaluation. Conclusions and contributions are discussed.

INTRODUCTION AND JUSTIFICATION
From a practitioner’s perspective, waiting lines can be damaging to businesses and have become an important marketing issue. Even though a growing number of companies have attempted to manage consumer waiting experiences through various strategies (e.g., increase of front-line employees, video displays with news updates as waiting time filler, or providing waiting time guarantees to their customers) (Kumar, Kalwani, and Dada 1997), consumer waits remain an unresolved issue. Consequently, more efforts need to be made to understand the waiting process and to reduce the potential negative impact of waits on consumers’ evaluations (Kostecki 1996).

From an academician’s viewpoint, various theories have been utilized to explain waiting phenomena and how waiting affects consumers’ evaluations and satisfaction, including social justice (e.g., Larson 1987), attribution (Chebat, Filiatrault, Gelinas-Chebat, and Vaininsky 1995; Taylor 1994), field theory (Dube-Rioux, Schmitt, and Leclerc 1989; Hui, Thakor, and Gill 1998; Houston, Bettencourt, and Wenger 1998), and social comparison theories (e.g., Zhou and Soman 2003). Among these studies, consumers’ affective responses to waiting and service evaluations have been frequently examined (e.g., Dube-Rioux et al. 1989; Houston et al. 1998; Hui and Tse 1996; Taylor 1994; Katz, Larson, and Larson 1991; Pruyn and Smidts 1998). However, the role of personal wait expectations has not been well documented and needs more exploration (Durrande-Moreau 1999) as well as other gaps.

First, the “expectation” concept in waiting has been linked with the concept of wait tolerance (Durrande-Moreau 1999) without a solid theoretical explanation. It has been portrayed as “probable duration,” “reasonable duration,” “acceptance of waiting time,” “acceptability of the wait,” and “acceptable waiting time” (Antonides, Verhoef, and van Aalst 2002; Chebat and Filiatrault 1993; Chebat and Gelinas-Chebat 1995; Houston et al. 1998; Hui and Tse 1996; Pruyn and Smidts 1998). The terms, definitions, and operationalizations appear to be somewhat inconsistent. Service expectations literature, which views expectations as a range of two levels of service expectations (i.e., the zone of tolerance), may help to further understand and refine this construct.

Second, existing wait research fails to explain the phenomenon as to why consumers sometimes stay and wait in long lines (e.g., Disney Land) and how their tolerances for waiting may differ. The value concept that emphasizes what is received (i.e., service) and what is given (i.e., monetary and non-monetary costs) (Zeithaml 1988) may provide an explanation. Nonetheless, little research addresses how different types of values may influence consumers’ tolerance for waiting.

Third, past research suggests that consumers’ service evaluations are positively influenced by their affective responses to waiting (Hui and Tse 1996; Pruyn and Smidts 1998; Taylor 1994). However, preliminary evidence indicates this relationship may not hold in all instances. Service providers’ recovery strategies may help alleviate the negative effect of waits (e.g., Sarel and Marmorstein 1998).

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK
The purpose of this paper is to conceptualize a framework for waiting by incorporating predicted value, wait disconfirmation, affective response to waiting, and service evaluation. More specifically, there are three objectives. First, this research attempts to clarify the roles of consumers’ wait expectations and wait disconfirmation in waiting. Second, it attempts to achieve a better understanding of the relationship between various types of predicted value and consumers’ tolerance for waiting. Third, this paper expands the affect-service evaluation relationship and proposes that actions of the service provider play a moderating in that relationship.

Through an integration of three sets of waiting models examined by Taylor (1994), Hui and Tse (1996), and Pruyn and Smidts (1998), this paper provides a conceptual framework (see Figure 1) that centers on the wait expectation-affect-service evaluation relationship. In addition, one antecedent of wait expectation (i.e., predicted value of service) and one moderator (i.e., actions of the service provider) of the relationship between affect and service evaluation are incorporated into the proposed framework.

The following sections are dedicated to discussing the literatures for the constructs in the conceptual framework, including predicted value of service, zone of wait tolerance, wait disconfirmation, perceived wait duration, affective response to waiting, actions of the service provider, and service experience evaluation.

LITERATURE REVIEW
According to Taylor (1994), waiting for service is “the time from which a customer is ready to receive the service until the time the service commences” (p. 56). Waiting time is often regarded as a waste of time (Leclerc, Schmitt, and Dube 1995) and has been described by researchers as boring, frustrating, and irritating (Hui and Tse 1996; Katz et al. 1991). Nonetheless, research has suggested that overall value of service may help alleviate the negative emotions of waiting (Katz et al. 1991; Maister 1985).

Predicted Value of Service
The concept of perceived value has drawn considerable attention from consumer behavior researchers (e.g., Babin, Darden, and Griffin 1994; Bolton and Drew 1991; Sheth, Newman, and Gross 1991a, 1991b; Sweeney and Soutar 2001; Woodruff 1997; Zeithaml 1988). Zeithaml (1988) defined perceived value as “the consumer’s overall assessment of the utility of a product based on perceptions
of what is received and what is given” (p. 14). This subjective value perception may exist not only after the consumption experience but also prior to it (Day and Crask 2000; Huber and Herrmann 2000; Sweeney and Soutar 2001; Woodruff 1997). It is possible that consumers may anticipate benefits from a product or service before consumption. This paper adopts this perspective of value concept and refers to it as “predicted value.” When consumers are waiting to receive service, they are likely to anticipate certain types of value(s) they hope to obtain prior to consumption/usage regardless of their prior experience with the service. Predicted value of service refers to consumers’ anticipated utility acquired from consumption of a service. For this paper, the framework of consumption values proposed by Sheth, et al. (1991a, 1991b) is adopted for its wide applications to further understand how various types of value may impact consumer zone of wait tolerance.

Zone of Wait Tolerance, Perceived Wait Duration, and Wait Disconfirmation

In the services literature, expectations are defined as “beliefs about service delivery that function as standards or reference points against which performance is judged” (Zeithaml and Bitner 2003, p. 60). According to Zeithaml, Berry, and Parasuraman (1993), customer expectations are not static and tend to vary due to the heterogeneous nature of service performance. Therefore, customers may evaluate service performance based on two expectation standards: what they desire and what they view acceptable (Zeithaml et al. 1993). The range between these two standards is known as the “zone of tolerance.” According to Zeithaml et al. (1993), the zone of tolerance is defined as the extent to which customers recognize and are willing to accept service performance variation. Researchers support the idea that both desired and adequate service levels should be considered to better understand consumer expectations (e.g., Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry 1994; Walker and Baker 2000).

The concept of consumer zone of wait tolerance is developed in this paper representing consumer wait expectation. It refers to the extent to which customers recognize and are willing to accept the waiting time to receive the service. Consumer zone of wait tolerance, similar to zone of tolerance, consists of a range of two boundaries, i.e., desired wait and adequate wait expectations. Desired wait expectation, not previously discussed in wait research, refers to the most favorable waiting time in which the consumer hopes to receive a service and adequate wait expectation refers to the least favorable waiting time the consumer is willing to accept to receive a service. The former reflects what the consumer believes the wait “can be” and “will be” (Parasuraman, Berry, and Zeithaml 1991). It is proposed that the zone of wait tolerance may contract and expand. The greater the difference between desired wait expectation and adequate wait expectation, the wider will be the zone of wait tolerance for the consumer.

Based on discrepancy theory (Michalos 1985), the expectancy disconfirmation paradigm suggests that a consumer will compare his/her experience with a set of expectations. Research suggests that consumers are likely to establish pre-consumption expectations, make observations about performance, compare performance with expectations, and then form disconfirmation perceptions. According to Oliver (1997), negative disconfirmation refers to “the negative discrepancy that occurs when performance is below standard” and positive disconfirmation refers to “the positive discrepancy that occurs when performance is above standard” (p. 104). A confirmation of expectations, or zero disconfirmation, exists if performance is equal to the standard. This paradigm is mainly cognitive in nature due to the comparison process that requires deliberate processing of information (Oliver 1980).
disconfirmation, in this paper, refers to the comparison made by the consumer between his/her wait expectation (i.e., consumer zone of wait tolerance) and perception of wait duration. Perceived wait duration refers to the subjective estimate of the time over which the consumer is engaged in waiting. Wait literature has suggested that consumers’ perceptions of waiting time may influence their affective responses to waiting (e.g., Taylor 1994).

Affective Response to Waiting

Emotions are valenced reactions to events or objects. Clusters of emotions with the same polarity are usually referred to as either positive or negative affect (Oliver 1997). Affective responses in wait research have been referred to as emotional types of constructs and have been measured in various forms, such as anger (e.g., Taylor 1994) and pleasure (revised from Mehrabian and Russell 1974) (e.g., Chebat and Gelin-Chibat 1995; Houston et al. 1998; Hui and Tse 1996). Affective response to waiting is defined as a series of consumers’ feelings and emotions that are provoked by waiting for a service. Numerous studies in waiting identify affective responses as adjacent determinants of consumer service evaluations (Chebat and Gelin-Chibat 1995; Hui and Tse 1996; Taylor 1994).

Service Evaluations and Waiting

Consumers’ service evaluations are usually regarded in waiting research as either (1) evaluations of service quality (Chebat et al. 1995; Taylor 1994) or (2) evaluations of customer satisfaction (Katz et al. 1991; Pruyn and Smidts 1998). Transaction-specific satisfaction is adopted because it helps to capture consumers’ psychological responses to a product’s or service provider’s performance on a given occasion (Oliver 1977; Olsen and Johnson 2003). Service experience evaluation, in this paper, refers to the transaction-specific evaluation of satisfaction with a service experience (Cronin, Brady, and Hult 2000). While the relationship between affective response to waiting and service evaluation has been examined in past research, little attention has been drawn to the potential influence of actions of the service provider in that relationship.

Actions of the Service Provider, Fairness Perception, and Waiting

Service providers’ actions, from a social justice perspective, have been investigated in the service literature (Brasher, Brooks, and Boles 2004; Goodwin and Ross 1992; McColl-Kennedy and Sparks 2003; Smith, Bolton, and Wagner 1999; Smith and Bolton 2002; Tax, Brown, and Chandrashekaran 1998). However, social justice has been discussed in waiting mainly in the queue management context (Rafaeli, Barron, and Haber 2002). While queue systems may alter consumers’ fairness perceptions, other actions of the service provider may play roles in fairness perceptions as well (Taylor and Fullerton 2000). The role of these actions in waiting experience has received limited attention. In this paper, actions of the service provider refer to visible strategies implemented through service personnel in response to waiting customers. Both interactional and distributive justice variables, e.g., apology and compensation, respectively, are discussed in this paper.

According to social exchange theory (e.g., Deutsch 1975; Goodwin and Ross 1992; Tax et al. 1998), interactional justice represents the manner in which information is exchanged and outcomes are communicated and distributive justice concerns resource or reward allocation and the perceived outcome of exchange. For instance, an apology from the service provider has implications for quality of interpersonal treatment (e.g., courtesy, concern, empathy) which may help to enhance consumers’ evaluations of the encounter. In terms of service recovery, compensation (e.g., free merchandise, refunds) can be regarded as a strategy to restore distributive justice perceptions (Blodgett, Hill, and Tax 1997; Goodwin and Ross 1992; Tax et al. 1998).

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK DEVELOPMENT

Types of Predicted Value and Consumer Zone of Wait Tolerance

Predicted functional value is defined as the anticipated utility acquired through utilitarian or physical performance of alternatives. Sheth et al. (1991a, 1991b) stated that functional values may be attained from product/service attributes, such as price, performance, durability, and reliability. Sweeney and Soutar (2001) further suggest that value for money and quality are aspects of functional value. Raman and Leckenby (1998) concluded that consumers tend to spend more time at advertising web sites when they perceive the ads to have high utilitarian value. When the ad web sites are considered as important and useful, the time for consumers to spend on visiting the sites is likely to be longer. Therefore, there may be a positive relationship between perceived utilitarian benefits and consumers’ willingness to wait for a service. Correspondingly, when consumers predict higher functional value from consuming a service, it may be more likely for them to wait patiently and to be more tolerant compared to when the service is predicted to be of low/no functional value.

P1: The greater the consumer’s predicted functional value of service, the wider the zone of wait tolerance.

Predicted social value refers to the anticipated utility acquired through association with specific social groups on a basis of demographic, socioeconomic, and cultural-ethnic groups (Sheth et al. 1991a, 1991b). That is, services that allow consumers to share with each other or enhance their social image possess higher social value. Houston et al. (1998) examined the effect of waiting costs on consumers’ acceptability of waits and found that wait acceptability is a function of the cost of waiting and the benefit of receiving the service. When waiting prevents the consumer from being punctual for an appointment/activity, which in turn, might harm the image of that person in front of his/her peers and colleagues, it is less likely for the consumer to accept the wait. When consumers perceive higher social value acquired by the service relative to costs, waiting may become more tolerable. Thus, there may be a positive relationship between predicted social value of service and consumer zone of wait tolerance.

P2: The greater the consumer’s predicted social value of service, the wider the zone of wait tolerance.

Predicted emotional value concerns the anticipated utility acquired from a service provider’s capacity to arouse feelings or emotional states (Sheth et al. 1991a). Services which are able to provoke consumers’ emotional responses usually possess emotional value. In the context of shopping, Hornik (1984) found that consumers who enjoy shopping perceive a shorter wait at the checkout line than those who do not enjoy shopping. The enjoyment provided via shopping activities may be considered as hedonic shopping value (Babin et al. 1994). That is, enjoyment, as part of consumer emotions, may help consumers reduce their attentions to how long they wait for a service, implying higher tolerance for the time spent waiting. Berry, Seiders, and Grewal (2002) further proposed that consumers would perceive the time and effort spent to experience the service as less important when the service has higher hedonic value. That is, consumers may not pay as much
attention to the time spent waiting when they perceive high emotional/hedonic value associated with the service. Therefore, when consumers anticipate higher emotional value, they may be more likely to approach the service and be more willing to wait for the service.

P3: The greater the consumer’s predicted emotional value of service, the wider the zone of wait tolerance.

Predicted epistemic value refers to the anticipated utility obtained from a product’s or service’s “capacity to arouse curiosity, provide novelty, and/or satisfy a desire for knowledge” (Sheth et al. 1991a, p. 162). Usually, this type of utility is obtained from stimuli that are unfamiliar and ambiguous or complex (Sheth et al. 1991b). Purely new experiences with products, services, or shopping trips may offer epistemic value according to Sheth et al. (1991a, 1991b). The novelty aspect of epistemic value in services can also be associated with its uniqueness in the marketplace. In explaining factors that may affect the zone of tolerance, Zeithaml and Bitner (2003) posited that consumers may have wider zones of tolerance when they perceive no other similar alternative available for them. This implies that consumers may be more willing to wait, i.e., wider zones of wait tolerance, when they perceive the service as unique and novel and not commonly available elsewhere. Therefore, when consumers predict higher epistemic value of the service, which may arouse their curiosity and provide a novel experience, their zones of tolerance may be wider.

P4: The greater the consumer’s predicted epistemic value of service, the wider the zone of wait tolerance.

Predicted conditional value is defined as consumers’ anticipated capacity of an alternative to “provide temporary functional or social value in the context of a specific and transient set of circumstances or contingencies” (Sheth et al. 1991b, p. 69). When an alternative is chosen based on its conditional value, the utility perceived by the consumer may not be the same outside the specific situation (Sheth et al. 1991a, 1991b). For example, graduation gowns elicit conditional value due to the special occasions in which these products serve their functions and fulfill consumers’ needs. Research has suggested that situational contingencies influence consumer purchase or choice behavior (Belk 1974, 1975) and time allocation, especially in discretionary activities (Hornik 1982). In services expectations, Zeithaml et al. (1993) proposed that situational factors are likely to temporarily lower consumers’ adequate service levels and thus widen the zone of tolerance. Therefore, when consumers predict higher conditional value of the service, which may elicit their curiosity and provide a novel experience, their zones of tolerance may be wider.

P5: The greater the consumer’s predicted conditional value of service, the wider the zone of wait tolerance.

Wait Disconfirmation and Affective Response to Waiting

Research has shown that disconfirmation influences emotional responses (Bolton and Drew 1991; Muller, Tse, and Venkatsubramaniam 1991). Literature has suggested that service performance that falls above the zone of tolerance results in a highly satisfying outcome (e.g., surprise and delight) (Cronin 2003; Johnston 1995); on the other hand, when service performance falls below the zone of tolerance, the customer will judge the overall service as unsatisfactory and he/she will feel frustrated (Zeithaml and Bitner 2003). Moreover, when service performance falls within the zone of tolerance, consumers may be indifferent to the service performance and thus react in neither a positive nor negative manner (Cronin 2003; Oliver 1997; Zeithaml and Bitner 2003).

In the context of waiting in a polyclinic, Pryun and Smidts (1998) concluded that consumers’ affective responses to waiting depend on the difference between perceived waiting time and acceptable waiting time. Consumers were found to experience negative feelings when their perceived waiting time was longer than their acceptable waiting time. Hui and Tse (1996) and Houston et al. (1998) reported similar findings. Research also suggests that consumers may not react in a very positive or negative way when service performance falls within the zone of tolerance (i.e., zero disconfirmation) (Cronin 2003; Oliver 1997, Zeithaml and Bitner 2003). Therefore, it is assumed that consumers experience positive wait disconfirmation when perceived wait duration is shorter than desired wait expectation. As wait disconfirmation becomes more positive, consumers are likely to react to waiting with more positive feelings. On the contrary, consumers experience negative wait disconfirmation when perceived wait duration is longer than adequate wait expectation. As wait disconfirmation becomes more negative, consumers are likely to undergo more negative feelings about waiting. Moreover, when consumers experience zero disconfirmation, i.e., perceived wait duration falls within the consumer zone of wait tolerance, their affective responses may be less pronounced as compared to those who experience positive and negative wait disconfirmation.

P6: When comparing consumer zone of wait tolerance and perceived wait duration, for consumers who experience positive wait disconfirmation, there is a positive relationship between wait disconfirmation and their affective responses to waiting. For consumers who experience negative wait disconfirmation, there is a negative relationship between wait disconfirmation and their affective responses to waiting. Moreover, for consumers who experience zero disconfirmation, there is a weaker relationship between wait disconfirmation and their affective responses to waiting compared with the aforementioned relationships.

Perceived Wait Duration and Affective Response to Waiting

Affective responses to waiting has been identified as a variable that mediates the relationship between perceived wait time and service evaluation in a number of waiting studies (e.g., Chebat et al. 1995; Hui et al. 1998; Hui and Tse 1996; Taylor 1994). For example, Taylor (1994) concluded that consumers’ overall service evaluations are directly influenced by their affective responses to waiting (i.e., anger and uncertainty). As anger increases, overall evaluation of service decreases. Therefore, the relationship between perceived wait duration and affective response to waiting is also proposed as follows:

P7: As perceived wait duration increases, consumers’ affective responses to waiting tend to become more negative.

Modering Role of Actions of the Service Provider

Although there is a direct relationship between consumer affect and service evaluation (e.g., Hui and Tse 1996; Taylor 1994), wait situations may be better managed by service providers with plausible actions, such as apologies and compensation (Taylor and Fullerton 2000). McColl-Kennedy and Sparks (2003) concluded that firms modify customer emotions through specific actions when service failures occur. Through modification of emotions, it is likely that customer satisfaction can be achieved even after service failures. When the service provider apologizes to the consumer, he/
she may feel better and more positive about the service, which in turn, may influence the overall evaluation of the service. Social exchange theory (e.g., Goodwin and Ross 1992; McColl-Kennedy and Sparks 2003; Smith et al. 1999; Tax et al. 1998) is utilized in this research to better understand the role of actions of the service provider (i.e., apology and compensation).

**Apology**

An apology is a means of re-establishing psychological equity and can be expected to make up for any inappropriate or rude behavior (Goodwin and Ross 1992). Research has found that giving an apology has a predictive positive effect on customer satisfaction (McColl-Kennedy, Daus, and Sparks 2003; Smith et al. 1999; Tax et al. 1998). In the context of waiting, Taylor (1994) concluded that service providers communicate recognition of the delay and their concern to customers through apologies. Additionally, Sarel and Marmorstein (1998) suggested that customers’ anger responses tend to be lower when receiving a sincere apology from the frontline employees in the bank. Their studies did not further discuss how actions of the service provider (i.e., an apology) and consumers’ reactions to waiting may interactively influence subsequent service evaluations.

**Compensation**

Compensation, or outcomes, can take various forms, such as additional free service and actual monetary compensation (Zeithaml and Bitner 2003). Research suggests that compensation helps restore distributive justice that, in turn, increases consumer satisfaction (Goodwin and Ross 1992; Smith et al. 1999). Bitner, Booms, and Tetreault (1990) first concluded that compensation given to a customer for his/her long wait in a restaurant may help reinstate customer satisfaction. Smith and Bolton (2002) further found that emotional responses tend to influence how customers react to compensation provided after service failure. Consumers with negative emotional responses valued compensation more than those with no emotional responses (Smith and Bolton 2002).

Therefore, consumers who are presented an apology or compensation when finally being served after long waits may perceive interactional or distributive justice, respectively, and will be expected to have more positive feelings about the service provider and thus enhanced customer satisfaction compared with those who are not provided any recovery attributes. The positive relationship between affective response and service experience evaluation may become stronger due to the fact that the service provider does not ignore but acknowledges and apologizes for the customer’s long wait; on the contrary, the positive relationship may be weaker with the absence of apology and compensation.

\( P8: \) Affective response to waiting will have a stronger effect on service experience evaluation when an apology or compensation is present than when an apology or compensation is absent.

In addition to the individual effects, research has suggested that consumer satisfaction is enhanced by the combination of apology and preferred compensation (Goodwin and Ross 1992; Mattila 2001; McCollough, Berry, and Yadav 2000). Making customers feel better about a failure through a mere provision of interactional justice (e.g., apology) may not always be effective unless distributive justice (e.g., compensation) is also addressed. Thus, the following three-way interaction is proposed:

\( P9: \) Service experience evaluation is dependent on a three-way interaction involving affective response to waiting, the presence of apology, and the presence of compensation.

**CONCLUSION**

The proposed conceptual framework of consumer waiting experience is differentiated from previous models in four ways and may advance academic understanding of the consumers’ waiting experiences. First, in response to the suggestion that models outlining direct and indirect relationships among various wait-related variables are limited and there is a need to establish more comprehensive models and refine related constructs (Taylor and Fullerton 2000), this framework expands the expectation-affect-service evaluation relationship with two additional variables (i.e., predicted value of service and actions of the service provider) which have not been well discussed in wait research. Second, the concepts of consumer zone of wait tolerance and wait disconfirmation are developed with a more solid theoretical foundation based on service expectation literature and expectancy disconfirmation paradigm wherein they consider two types of wait expectations (i.e., desired and adequate wait expectations) and perceived wait duration. Third, the relationship between various types of predicted value of service and consumer zone of wait tolerance is proposed. To our knowledge, this is the first framework that considers the pre-consumption value perception (i.e., predicted value) rather than post-consumption value perception, via the five types of value dimensions (Sheth et al. 1991a, 1991b) to understand consumer wait experience. Fourth, this paper discusses the moderating role of actions of the service provider (i.e., apology and compensation) in the relationship between consumer affective response to waiting and service experience evaluation. This is important as past studies in waiting have merely focused on the direct relationship between affect and service evaluation (Chebat et al. 1995; Hui and Tse 1996; Taylor 1994; Taylor and Fullerton 2000).

This paper develops a conceptual framework to better understand consumers’ waiting behavior by incorporating services literature, value literature, expectancy disconfirmation paradigm, and social exchange theory. In terms of the concept of consumer zone of wait tolerance, this paper explores how zone of wait tolerance might expand or contract due to different types of predicted value without focusing on how each of the two boundaries (i.e., desired and adequate wait expectation) may be affected. Further discussion may examine consumer zone of wait tolerance from this latter perspective.

In summary, it is critical to empirically test the proposed relationships and to determine the effects of specific types of predicted value, wait disconfirmation, and providers’ actions on service evaluations in service settings (e.g., restaurant). Due to the fact that value may vary across individuals and situations (Woodruff 1997), it may be necessary to develop items in accordance with the consumption value framework to measure predicted values that tailor to a specific context chosen for empirical investigation. Given support from the literature, wait disconfirmation (i.e., difference between consumers’ zone of wait tolerance and perceived wait duration) should be measured via three measures, consumers’ desired and adequate wait expectations and their perceptions of waiting.
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