Personality Traits of Service Providers and Customers' Perceptions of Service Quality: The Case of Air Cargo Services in the United Arab Emirates

Farouk Saleh[1] & Farzaneh Yarahmadi[2]

[1] Professor of Marketing, Director of the MBA Program, University of Dubai, Dubai, UAE

[2] Department of Marketing, Kalamoon University, Damascus, Syria

Correspondence: Farouk Saleh, Department of Marketing, University of Dubai, Dubai, UAE. E-mail: fsaleh@ud.ac.ae

Abstract

The debate of whether personality traits of service providers affect customers' perceptions of service quality has produced conflicting evidence. This paper examines this issue with an application in the air cargo industry in the UAE. We hypothesized no effect of personality traits on overall service quality or any of its dimensions.

We used two questionnaires to collect our data from a sample of 220 service providers and customers of the air cargo industry in the UAE. Collected data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, reliability analysis, and regression analysis. While the results of the reliability analysis indicate the soundness of the two questionnaires, the results of the regression analysis failed to reject the hypothesized no relationship between personality traits of service providers and overall customers' perceptions of service quality or any of its dimensions in the air cargo industry.

Keywords: personality traits, service providers, service quality, air cargo, UAE

1. Introduction

There are six international airports operating currently in the United Arab Emirates (UAE). The governmet continues to enhance this sector and its related services, especially air cargo services. Air cargo refers to transportation of property by an aircraft. This includes small package, priority reserved freight, and express service.

One of the critical elements of success for air cargo is devotion to quality. Shippers demand services of high standards. They tend to choose the airlines, airports, and routes that offer the best quality of services. Airport operators have the interest and the mandate to develop service quality standards for the whole airport.

There are factors that affect the delivery of quality services. These factors include the type of service, level of pressure from competition, and service delivery systems used. As malik (2012) indicated, the growth in the size of the service industry has increased the service contribution to the revenues of organizations. Furthermore, the quality of services plays an important role in customers' satisfaction.

Huang (2012) indicated that researchers have used different frameworks to develop the quality instruments with the implicit assumption that employees are the cornerstone of customer satisfaction and service quality. Recently, however, some reseaches have attempted to examine explicitly possible linkages between service quality and personality traits of the employees who deliver the services. Lin, Chiu, and Hsieh (2001) found supporting results for such linkages when they studied service quality in four service sectors in Taiwan. However, Al-Mutawa and Ibrahim (2013) found no such linkages when they studied service quality in four Islamic banks in the UAE and they concluded that these effects might be dependent on other factors such as culture, research design, or industry characteristics.

These conflicting pieces of evidence have motivated us to re-examine this issue of linkages between personality traits of the employees who deliver the services and customers' perceptions of service quality. We selected the air cargo industry in the UAE for our study so we can exclude the effects of culture as claimed by Al-Mutawa and Ibrahim (2013). We also used a similar research design to theirs in order to benchmark their results with ours.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. The next section reviews related literature. The second section outlines the research method and hypotheses. The third section presents and discusses the obtained results. The forth section concludes the paper with the limitatioms amd recommendations.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Personality Traits

Personality traits represent the characteristics of a person that account for consistent patterns of thinking, feeling, and acting. Costa and McCrae (1985 and 1992) developed a personality inventory instrument to measure what they considered to be the fundamental units of personality. They called these units of personality the Big Five Factors. They include neuroticism (N), extraversion (E), conscientiousness (C), agreeableness (A) and openness. Neuroticism represents emotional stability. It measures the tendency of a person to exhibit poor emotional adjustment and experience of negative effects such as fear, anxiety and impulsivity. Extraversion represents the tendency to be sociable, assertive, active, and directive. Conscientiousness represents achievement and dependability. Agreeableness represents the tendency to be likable, cheerful, adaptable, and cooperative. Openness is the disposition to be curious, creative, nonconforming, and autonomous.

Barrick and Mount (1991) reported some evidence on the relationship between personality traits and performance ratings   Similarly, Mount and Barrick (1998) investigated the relation of the *"BigFive"* personality dimensions to three job performance criteria (job proficiency, training proficiency, and personnel data) for a sample of different professionals (e.g., managers and police officers). The results indicated that the dimension of conscientiousness had consistent relation with all job performance criteria.

Landers and Lounsberg (2006) studied the relationship between Internet usage and the Big Five Factors. The results indicated that total Internet usage was negatively related to three of the Big Five *traits (a*greeableness, conscientiousness, and extraversion).

Salvaggio et al (2007) conceptualized and empirically tested the relationships between managers' personality, manager's service quality orientation, and service climate for customers' services. They collected data from 1,486 employees and 154 managers in a grocery store to test their theoretical model.

Rezaei, Rezaei, Alipour, and Salehi (2011) explored the relationship between service quality and client satisfaction and personality in public companies in Iran using SERVQUAL. The analysis of data collected from 413 clients indicates a positive relationship between service quality and clients' satisfaction with empathy having the highest expected satisfaction while responsiveness had the lowest expected satisfaction. Personality, as a moderating variable, did not have an impact on the relationship between service quality and customers' satisfaction.

2.2 Service Quality

Traditionally, quality is viewed as conformance to specifications. This view is more applicable to manufacturing companies and their products. A more recent view considers quality as meeting or exceeding customers' expectations. This view is more applicable to services. Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry (1985 and 1988) developed and tested an instrument, known as SERVQUAL, to measure service quality gaps between expected quality and experienced quality by customers. The instrument focuses on five broad dimensions of service quality.

Carman (1990) tested the SERVQUAL in four service settings that were quite different from those used in the original test. He found that in some situations, the instrument was not generic enough for measuring service quality at any sector and that it needed to be customized by adding items or changing the wording in questions. Similarly, Finn and Lamb (1991) reported that "the SERVQUAL measurement model was not appropriate in a retail setting".

Cronin and Taylor (1992) criticized the conceptualization and measurement of *service quality,* and suggested a performance-based measure of *service quality* that was called 'SERVPERF'. Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry (1994) responded to the concerns of Cronin & Taylor (1992) and Teas (1993) by demonstrating that the validity and alleged severity of many of those concerns were questionable. They argued that although their approach for conceptualizing *service quality* could and should be revised, relinquishing it altogether in preference of the alternate approaches proclaimed by Cronin & Taylor and Teas did not seem warranted.

Paquette, Bellavance, Cordeau and Laporte (2012) measured quality service in dial-a-ride operations in a Canadian city. Through interviews, they identified 56 quality attributes that can help improve the service quality. The explanatory factor analysis allowed the authors to determine 13 dimensions of quality in dial-a-ride services.

Using these dimensions, they developed an optimization algorithm that generates the important criteria for users and how to segment the population to establish sub-groups of users for improving the services.

Al-Mutawa and Ibrahim (2013) examined the relationship between front-desk employee personality traits and customers' perceptions of Islamic bank service quality in the United Arab Emirates. They used the Mini-Markers to measure personality traits of front desk employees and SERVPERF instrument to measure customers' perceptions of service quality. Regression models were employed to determine the relationship between the five factors of personality traits and overall service quality and its dimensions.The study provided evidence indicating that personality traits do not have their own independent effects on customers' perceptions of Islamic bank service quality. Although Lin et al. (2001) found supporting results for such linkages when they studied service quality in four service sectors (not including banks) in Taiwan. Al-Mutawa and Ibrahim (2013) concluded that these effects may be dependent on other factors such as culture, research design, or industry characteristics. However, employees' gender was found to have significant effects on the empathy dimension of service quality.

3. Research Method

3.1 Sampling Frame and Procedures

The authors used two samples from the aviation sector. The first sample comprised front-desk employees and cargo operator staff who are working in the air cargo service at three airports. This sample was used to collect data on personality traits. The second sample comprised customers who receive services from the providers at the three international airports. These customers were representatives of cargo forwarding companies licensed in UAE. This second sample was used to collect data on perceived quality of air cargo services.

The authors contacted management of each airport to explain the nature and purpose of the research and assess their willingness to participate in the study.They obtained a list of the cargo-forwarding operators through the respective airports. In addition, the managers agreed to distribute the questionnaires tofront-desk employees. The total number of distributed questionnaires reached was 220 subjects (110 were distributed to service providers' employees and 110 were distributed to customers/users of cargo services who deal with those employees).

3.2 Developments of the Questionnaire

The authors employed two sets of questionnaires to collect the data. The first questionnaire consisted of two parts. The first part of the questionnaire asked each respondent to answer some general questions about his age, gender, nationality, marital status and education level. The second part consisted of (60) general statements where each respondents was asked to indicate the extent of agreement or disagreement with each statement by ticking the appropriate box. These statements were adopted from Crozier (2000) to measure respondents' personality traits (openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness and neuroticism). The questionnaire carried a statement of the purpose of the study and the authors' appreciation of cooperation in filling the instrument. The authors also informed the respondents that all information gathered would be treated with confidence and used for research purposes only. A copy of the questionnaire is included in Appendix A.

The second questionnaire contained SERVPERF items. It was used to measure customers' perceived quality of actual air cargo services performed. The questionnaire contained two parts. The first part asked each respondent to answer some general questions about his age, gender, nationality, marital status, and the education level. The second part contained the five features pertaining to air cargo quality services (tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy). Each respondent was asked to allocate 100 points to the five dimensions to establish a weighting system for the five dimensions. The questionnaire had 21 statements about the air cargo services. Respondents were asked to provide on a five-point numerical scale their assessments of service performance based on their actual experience. Responses to these 21 items were used to assess the quality dimensions of air cargo services. The questionnaire also asked each respondent to rate the overall quality of the services provided by the air cargo handler. The questionnaire carried a statement of the purpose of the study and the authors' appreciation of cooperation in filling the instrument. The authors also informed the respondents that all information gathered would be treated with confidence and used for research purposes only. A copy of the questionnaire is included in Appendix B.

3.3 Research Variables and Measurement

3.3.1 Personality Trait Dimensions

These are the characteristics of the person that account for consistent patterns of thinking, feeling and acting. On the personality questionnaire, the authors asked each respondent to indicate the extent of his/her agreement or disagreement with each of the sixty statements using a five-point numerical scale ranging from one (1) strongly disagree to five (5) strongly agree. Twelve statements represented each dimension. Summation of the scores for

the twelve statements representing a dimension provided an assessment score for the personality dimension. Thus, the maximum score for a dimension would be sixty and the lowest score would be twelve.

3.3.2 Service Quality Dimensions

These are the main components or dimensions of service quality as advocated in the quality literature. They are tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance and empathy. The questionnaire contained twenty-one (21) items representing the five dimensions (five for tangibles, five for reliability, three for responsiveness, four for assurance, and four for empathy). Each participant was asked to indicate his assessment of the performance level (based on the actual experience of using the cargo services at the airports) using a five-point numerical scale ranging from one (low quality performance) to five (high quality performance).Summation of the scores for the items of a dimension provided an assessment of the quality of that dimension**.**Summation of the scores for all the items provided an assessment of the overall service quality.

3.3.3 Overall Service Quality

This is a single measure of total quality assessment. The questionnaire asked each participant to rate the overall quality of the services provided using a five-point numerical scale ranging from one (low quality performance) to five (high quality performance). This variable was used as a second measure to judge the reliability of the total response provided for the 21 quality items.

3.4 Research Hypotheses

This paper has two general hypotheses. These hypotheses address the question of whether employees' personality traits affect customers' perceived quality of air cargo services or any of its dimensions. We expect a positive relationship between personality traits of the service providers and perceived overall service quality or any of its dimensions. Thus, the two research hypotheses are stated in the null form as follows:

H_{01}: Employees' personality traits have no significant effects on customers'perceived overall quality of air cargo services.

Ho_2: Employees' personality traits have no significant effects on customers' perceived quality of any of the dimensions of air cargo services.

3.5 Data Analysis

The authors used descriptive statistics, reliability analysis, and regression analysis to analyze collected data. Reliability analysis was used to judge the interrelationships among the multi-item measures of each of the two questionnaires. The regresson analysis was used to measure expected effects of each of the personality traits of service providers on customers' perceived overall quality of cargo services or any of its dimensions. The regression model was stated in the following general form:

$$Y = X_1 + X_2 + X_3 + X_{4+} + X_5 + \varepsilon \tag{1}$$

Where

Y = Perceived overall service quality or one of its dimensions.

X_1 = Personality dimension ofOpenness,

X_2 = Personality dimension of Conscientiousness,

X_3 = Personality dimension of Extraversion,

X_4 = Personality dimension of Agreeableness,

X_5 = Personality dimension of Neuroticism,

ɑ, ß = regression parameters.

ε = error term

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Sample Distribution and Survey Responses

An equal number of questionnaires was distributed to service providers (employees) and to customers (users) of air cargo services. The authors received back 86 completed questionnaires from both samples (42 questionnaires from service providers and 44 questionnaires from customers). Table 1 shows the numbers of distributed and received questionnaires from service providers (employees) and customers dealing with the service providers.

Table 1. Sample distribution of employees and customers

Sample	Distributed	Returned	Percentage
Service providers (employees)	110	42	38.18 %
Users of Cargo Services (customers)	110	44	40.00 %
Total	220	86	39.10%

As shown, the employee sample (service providers) had a close response rate to the customers' sample. The overall response rate was an acceptable rate of about 39%

Table 2 shows a comparative frequency distribution of the demographic variables for the two samples of usable responses (service providers and customers). The demographic variables include age category, gender, nationality, marital status, and educational level.

Table 2. Sample distribution of demographic variables

Variable	Service Providers		Customers	
Age Category	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Under 20 years	0	0.00	00	0.00
20 years to less than 30 years	10	23.80	12	27.27
30 to less than 40 years	23	54.77	19	43.18
Forty (40) years and above	9	21.43	13	29.55
Gender				
Male	35	83.33	35	79.55
Female	7	16.67	9	21.45
Nationality				
UAE nationals	6	14.29	11	25.00
Non-UAE nationals	36	85.71	33	75.00
Marital Status				
Single	14	33.33	13	29.55
Married	27	64.29	31	70.45
Other	1	2.38	0	0.00
Educational Level				
High School level or below	3	7.14	4	9.09
University level	38	90.48	37	84.09
Post-University level	1	2.38	3	6.82

The table above shows the distribution of the age categories for the two samples. The majority of respondents are classified in the age range of 30 to 40 years and above (more than 75%). The table also shows that the majority of respondents for the two samples were male (82%), married and non-UAE nationals. However, the distribution of levels of education is almost the same.

4.2 Reliability Analysis

The authors performed reliability analysis to collected data. Table 3 shows the obtained Cronbach's alpha coefficients for the service quality dimensions.

Table 3. Reliability analysis results-service quality dimensions

Factor	Number of Items	Alpha
Tangibles	5	0.7195
Reliability	5	0.8504
Responsiveness	3	0.6058
Assurance	4	0.7730
Empathy	4	0.7698
Total	All 21 items	0.9348

The table above shows an overall reliability coefficient of 0.9348, which is higher than the minimum accepted level of 0.70 indicated by Price (1972). The table also shows acceptable levels of reliability for each of the service quality dimensions (tangibles, reliability, assurance and empathy, except responsiveness).

The authors also performed a correlation analysis between the independent score of the overall assessment of service quality and the summation score for the service quality items of 21 to confirm data reliability. The correlation coefficient was 0.86 and significant at the level of 0.01. Table 4 reports the obtained Cronbach's alpha coefficients for the personality dimensions.

Table 4. Reliability analysis results-personality questionnaire

Factor	Number of Items	Alpha
Openness	12	0.763
Conscientiousness	12	0.646
Extraversion	12	0.671
Agreeableness	12	0.715
Neuroticism	12	0.697
Total	All 60 items	0.886

Table 4 above shows an overall reliability coefficient of 0.886, which is higher than the minimum accepted level of 0.70 indicated by Price (1972). However, the two dimensions of conscientiousness and extraversion have relatively low levels of reliability than the minimum of 0.70 but the authors consider them to be acceptable.

4.3 Regression Analysis Results

The authors excluded responses of two customers to run the regression analyses using a pair-match design where the personality traits of an emplyee were regressed against the summation score of the customer serviced by the employee. Six regression analysis were performed in the same way The first regression used overall service quality as the dependent variable and the scores of the five personality dimensions, as the independent variables.The other five regression analyses used the five personality traits as the independent variables and the summation score for each of the five service quality dimesions as the dependent varaible. Table 5 shows the results of the first regression analysis.

Table 5. Overall service quality and personality dimensions

Variable	B	t-statistic	Significance
Extraversion	.037	.165	.870
Conscientiousness	.346	1.464	.152
Openness	- .317	-1.493	.144
Agreeableness	- .088	- .437	.665
Neuroticism	.032	.144	.887

Model R^2= 0.085. Model's F value = 0.819, p.≥0.144, n(observation)= 86.

Table 5 shows that the model's coefficient of determination is very low (8.5%). This indicates that other important variables are missing from the model. In addition, there was no significant relationship between overall service quality and any of personality dimensions. Similar insignificant results were obtained for each of the service quality dimesnions. These results fail to reject the two research hypotheses. These reults also lead the authors to conclude that there is no linkage between personality traits of service providers and customers' perceived overall service quality or any of its dimensions. These results corroborate the findings of Al-Mutawa and Ibrahim (2013) that were obtained from the banking industry in the UAE on the linkagesbetween personality traits and customers' perceptions of service quality.

5. Conclusions

This paper reached the conclusion that the effects of personality traits of service providers on customers' perceptions of service quality of air cargo are insignificant. This creates a paradox when one argues that the responsibility of delivering high-quality service ultimately rests on front-line employees (and their managers) and therefore, the success of market-focused initiatives depends on employees' acceptance of quality culture. Heskett, Jones, Loveman, Sasser& Schlesinger (1994) indicated that front-line service employees are the critical link to the customers' expectations as they are determined primarily by the personal needs of the customer, the customer's past experience of service providers, word-of-mouth communications and external communications (from the service provider and others).

We also argue that customers use their experiences to evaluate service quality of service provider using some form of heuristics when determining their expectations of comparable and non-comparable providers. As services differ from goods because they are intangible, heterogeneous and are simultaneously produced and consumed, customers usually don't evaluate one aspect of the service after another and then integrate these evaluations together. The evaluation process seems to be more complex than the regular information integration processes.

The results of this paper are subject to some limitations. One possible limitation has to do with the effect of non-response bias. There is a possibility that non-respondents might hold different assessment views than those who responded. However, the good levels of response rates would reduce the effect of such a non-response bias, if any. A second possible limitation deals with the effect of the sample size and its representation. The authors realize that a larger sample might have produced different results. A third possible limitation deals with the use of a linear additive regression model and its specification. A different form of the model and some additional variables might have generated different results.

We suggest two recommendations. They deal with service quality required for air cargo and hiring policies of employees. For quality services, we recommend appointment of a balanced independent body or a commission to establish detailed guidelines of quality service programs that describe the standards, measurements, monitoring, and how to implement them according to the needs of the users and the characteristics of the airport.

For employment policies, we suggest establishing a federal program to provide general guidance for the recruitment, selection, and training processes to ensure consistent identification and hiring of qualified employees that offer quality services.

References

Al-Mutawa, S. A., & Ibrahim, M. E. (2013). Effects of gender and personality traits of front-desk employees on customers' assessment of service quality: Evidence from Islamic banks in UAE. *International Journal of Business and Management*, *8*(15), 1-19.

Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The big five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, *44*(1), 1–26.

Carman, J. M. (1990). Consumer perceptions of service quality: An assessment of the SERVQUAL dimensions. *Journal of Retailing*, *66*(1), 33–55.

Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. (1992). *Revised NEO personality inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO five-factor (NEO-FFI) inventory professional manual*. Odessa CA: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1985). *The NEO personality inventory manual.* Odessa, CA: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Cronin, J. J., & Taylor, S. A. (1992). Measuring Service Quality: A Reexamination and Extension. *Journal of Marketing*, *56*(3), 55–68.

Crozier, G. (2000). *Test Your Personality.* London, UK: Institute of Management.

Finn, D. W., & Lamb, C. W. (1991). An Evaluation of the SERVQUAL scales in a retailing setting. *Advances in Consumer Research*, *18*, 483–490.

Heskett, J. L., Jones, T., Loveman, G., Sasser, W. E., & Schlesinger, L. (1994). Putting the service profit chain to work. *Harvard Business Review*, *72*(2), 164–174.

Huang, C. (2012). Service Quality of Night Markets in Taiwan. *International Journal of Marekting Studies*, *4*(3), 36–44. http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ijms.v4n3p36

Landers, R. N., & Lounsbury, J. W. (2006). An investigation of big five and narrow personality trait in relation to internet usage. *Computers in Human Behavior, 22*(2), 283–293.

Lin, N., Chiu, H., & Hsieh, Y. (2001). Investigating the relationship between service providers' personality and customers' perceptions of service quality across gender. *Total Quality Management*, *12*(1), 57–67.

Malik, S. U. (2012). Customer satisfaction, perceived service quality and mediating role of perceived value. *International Journal of Marketing Studies*, *4*(1), 68–76. http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ijms.v4n1p68

Mount, K. M., & Barrick, M. R. (1998). Five reasons why the 'Big Five' article has been frequently cited. *Personnel Psychology*, *51*(4), 849–857.

Paquette, J., Bellavance, F., Cordeau, J., & Laporte, G. (2012). Measuring quality of service in dial-a-ride

operations: the case of a Canadian city. *Transportation*, *39*, 539–564. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11116-011-9375-4

Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V., & Berry, L. (1985). A conceptual model of service quality and its implications for future research. *Journal of Marketing*, *49*(1), 41–50. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1251430

Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V., & Berry, L. (1988). Servqual: A multiple item scale for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality. *Journal of Retailing*, *64*(1), 12–40. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963(99)00084-3

Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V., & Berry, L. (1991). Refinement and reassessment of SERVQUAL scale. *Journal of Retailing, 67*(2), 181–190.

Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V., & Berry, L. (1994). Reassessment of expectations as a comparison standard in measuring service quality: Implications for further research. *Journal of Marketing*, *58*(1), 111–124.

Price, J. L. (1972). *Handbook of Organizational Measurement*. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.

Rezaei, M., Rezaei, H., Alipour, H., & Salehi, S. K. (2011). Service quality, client satisfaction and client personality in the public companies. *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*, *5*(3), 483–491.

Teas, R. K. (1993). Expectations, performance evaluation, and consumers' perception of quality. *Journal of Marketing*, *57*(4), 18–34.

Appendix A

Dear Participant

This is a short instrument that measures one's general attitude toward general statements. we are using it to collect data for a research study that deals with cargo services.We appreciate your cooperation by filling the instrument and returning it to the stated address on the attached envelop. The instrument will take few minutes of your valuable time. All information provided will be treated with confidence and will be used for research purposes only.

1. *Please indicate your* age category:

    ☐ Under 20
    ☐ 20 to less than 30
    ☐ 30 to less than 40
    ☐ 40 and above

2. *Please indicate your* sex

    ☐ Male
    ☐ Female

3. *Please indicate your* nationality:

    ☐ UAE National
    ☐ Non-UAE National

4. *Please indicate your* marital status:

    ☐ Bachelor (Single)
    ☐ Married
    ☐ Others

5. *Please indicate your* highest educational level:

    ☐ High school or below
    ☐ University
    ☐ Post-University (Graduate studies)

6. Following are 60 general statements. You are asked to indicate the extent of your agreement or disagreement with each statement by ticking (✔) the appropriate box. Please use the following numerical scale:

StronglyDisagree				StronglyAgree
1	2	3	4	5

No	Statement	1	2	3	4	5
1	I do not require the company of other people					
2	At parties, others tend to be the center of attention					
3	I believe important decisions are best made in a group situation.					
4	I like to take time to get to know people.					
5	I generally make the first move when getting to know new people.					
6	It is important to have the freedom to make your own decisions.					
7	I need regular social contact in my work to keep me happy.					
8	I enjoy being the center of attention.					
9	I prefer group activities to working on my own.					
10	I generally find it easy to get to know new quickly.					
11	I feel nervous when in an unfamiliar, social situations.					
12	It is important to have support of your fellow workers.					
13	In group situations, I prefer others to take the lead					
14	I like to consider all alternatives carefully when making an important decision.					
15	I like to think I am direct and honest in my dealings with others.					
16	I tend to take the lead in group situations.					
17	Some people think I am unpredictable and impulsive.					
18	I give a lot of thought to the impact of my words and actions on others.					
19	I am always concerned with the needs of others.					
20	I find it easy to deal with unplanned circumstances.					
21	I like to make a good impression on others.					
22	I am sometimes accused of being insensitive to the feelings of others.					
23	Most people see me as a very dependable person.					
24	It is important to use tact and diplomacy to avoid hurting the feelings of others.					
25	I think people's feelings need to be considered when making decisions.					
26	I prefer coming up with new ideas than turning them into practical reality.					
27	I tend to prefer "tried-and-tested" solutions.					
28	I tend to base my decisions on concrete evidence.					
29	I often spend time just to think about things.					
30	Rules are there to be broken.					
31	I dislike emotionally charged situations					
32	I like to think of myself as pragmatic.					
33	I enjoy finding new ways of doing things.					
34	I can be deeply moved by a piece of poetry.					
35	I enjoy solving practical problems.					
36	Change is necessary to avoid stagnation.					
37	In order to get things done, it is often necessary to cut corners					
38	I like to have a routine to follow.					
39	I do not allow myself to be affected much by other people's expectations.					
40	I like to have the freedom to do things the way I want.					
41	I am generally critical of the established way of doing things.					
42	Status is far less important than actual performance at work.					
43	It is always important to stick by the rules.					
44	I dislike work that involves rigidly following a set of procedures and systems.					
45	I think I am a fairly conventional person at heart.					
46	I dislike too much change.					
47	I like to think of myself as a perfectionist.					
48	Self-control over your emotions is important.					
49	I have trouble coping under pressure					
50	I tend to accept people at face value.					
51	I generally succeed in anything I do.					
52	I find it easy to express my emotions.					

53	I find it difficult to relax and unwind after a hard day's work.
54	I tend to be rather critical of other people.
55	When something is important, I tend to worry about my success.
56	I tend to leave things to the last minute.
57	I think you should keep your emotions under control.
58	I like to get to know someone well before I agree to do things.
59	I sometimes feel I have let people down.
60	I find that tension makes me perform better.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Appendix B

Dear Participant

This is a short instrument dealing with quality perceptions of the services provided to you by airline Cargo. We are using it to collect data for our research study of cargo service quality.We appreciate your cooperation by filling the instrument and returning it to the stated address on the attached envelop. The instrument will take few minutes of your valuable time. All information provided will be treated with confidence and will be used for research purposes only.

The research Team

1. Please indicate *your* age:

☐ Under 20
☐ 20 to less than 30
☐ 30 to less than 40
☐ 40 and above

2. Please indicate *your* gender:

☐ Male
☐ Female

3. Please indicate *your* nationality:

☐ UAE National
☐ Non-UAE National

4. Please indicate *your* marital status:

☐ Bachelor (Single)
☐ Married
☐ Other

5. Please indicate your highest educational level:

☐ High school level or below
☐ University level
☐ Post-University (Graduate studies) level

6.   Listed below are five features pertaining to air Cargo services. Please allocate a total of 100 points among the five features according to how important each feature is to you (the more important a feature is to you, the more points you should allocate to it).

No.	Feature	Definition	Points
1	Tangibles	The physical appearance of the Airport Cargo area (e.g., staff, facilities, and communication materials).	
2	Reliability	The ability of the Cargo staff to perform the promised service dependably and accurately.	
3	Responsiveness	The willingness of the Cargo staff to help customers and provide prompt services.	
4	Assurance	The knowledge and courtesy of the Cargo staff and their ability to convey trust and confidence.	
5	Empathy	Level of care and individualized attention that the Cargo staff provides to customers.	
	Total points allotted		**100**

7.   Based on your experience as a user of air Cargo Services, please indicate your assessment of the performance level of the Cargo section or department (by circling a number) for each of the following 21 features of its services using the following scale.

Low				High
1	2	3	4	5

	When it comes to:	Performance Low………High				
1	Having physical facilities that are visually appealing	1	2	3	4	5
2	Having staff who give customers individual attention	1	2	3	4	5
3	Having operating hours that are convenient to customers	1	2	3	4	5
4	Having staff who are always willing to help customers	1	2	3	4	5
5	Having error-free records	1	2	3	4	5
6	Keeping promises given to customers	1	2	3	4	5
7	Providing sufficient online and tracking services	1	2	3	4	5
8	Being able to obtain a service when I need it	1	2	3	4	5
9	The general appearance of the staff	1	2	3	4	5
10	Having appealing materials (e.g. forms, statements, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
11	Understanding the specific needs of customers	1	2	3	4	5
12	Having modern equipment and technology	1	2	3	4	5
13	Performing services correctly	1	2	3	4	5
14	Providing prompt services to customers	1	2	3	4	5
15	Feeling safe in conducting transactions with the Cargo section	1	2	3	4	5
16	Having staff who are approachable and consistently courteous to customers	1	2	3	4	5
17	Having staff who are never too busy to respond to customers' requests	1	2	3	4	5
18	Having knowledgeable staff to answer customers' questions	1	2	3	4	5
19	Having staff who instills confidence in customers	1	2	3	4	5
20	Informing customers exactly when services will be performed	1	2	3	4	5
21	Having customers' interests at heart	1	2	3	4	5

8.   How would you rate the overall quality of the services provided by the air Cargo? (Please circle a number on the following scale to indicate your rating)

Low……………..…….…..………………..……………		…High		
1	2	3	4	5

9.   If you have any comments you would like us to look at, please provide them in the space below.

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Thank you for your co-operation.