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Executive Summary

The challenge of predicting consumer behaviour is widely considered by the literature as a rather daunting, but worthwhile task. Which manager or academic would not be interested in using or developing a framework enabling one to predict future behaviour better than existing measurements? Referring to the old saying, stating that ‘only what gets measured, gets managed’, indicating what the literature addresses as a need to track the influence of change through measurements. In order to address my research question and explore the proposition ‘Can a measurement of service quality based on consumer experience be a better predictor of consumer behaviour?’ this paper examines the existing literature in two fields of literature. On the one hand I will be investigating studies in the context of existing measurements of service quality to assess the first part of my research question to determine the ‘status quo’, application and characteristics of the literature on measurements of service quality. On the other hand the paper will select, appraise, and synthesize the relevant literature on consumer behaviour to address the second part of the research question, if, and if yes, how the phenomenon of consumer experience could be the foundation for a measurement of service quality capable of predicting consumer behaviour better than existing measurements of service quality.

By systematically reviewing the existing literature I am aiming on contributing to the literature addressing the challenges of predicting consumer behaviour.

The CRD framework is based on a three-stage process: Planning the review, conducting the review, and reporting and disseminating the findings of the review.

The logical sequence of the framework, starting by establishing the need for the review, all the way to the dissemination of the findings gives a clear outline, and additional insight on the way a systematic review can be conducted.

Nevertheless, because of the challenges associated with the use of systematic reviews to find evidence in social sciences, pointing out the differences between the original medical templates of systematic reviews, the CRD framework will be used as a guiding line, and draw from several methods and frameworks catered to the specific demands of my systematic review.

Some of the major differences between medical and social sciences are, for example, the diverse literature and variety of media existing in social sciences, the variety and variability of databases, and the terminological problems, as demonstrated in the variety of definitions in social sciences for the same phenomenon.
The systematic review process is divided into three stages in order to secure the best possible results of the research project.

The first stage of this process is the planning of the review, divided into three phases.

The purpose of the first phase of stage one is the identification of the need for a review. By searching for existing and ongoing reviews, and reviewing these, this phase will secure the call for the particular review and research question.

After establishing the need for a review the researcher will in the second phase preliminary assess the existing resources and data to define in more detail the objectives of the review and the methods to address the research question in a feasible and efficient fashion.

The final phase of planning the review is developing a review protocol containing the background information, the conditions of the research area and the methods used in the systematic review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1</th>
<th>Identifying the need for the review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Preparing a proposal for a systematic review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Developing a review protocol</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**STAGE 1**

**Planning the review**

**PHASE 1**

**Identifying the need for the review**

Phase 1 provides an insight on how to identify the essential need for a review by identifying and appraising existing reviews relevant to the research.

1.1.1 Rationale for undertaking systematic reviews

1.1.2 Identifying existing and ongoing reviews

1.1.3 Appraising available reviews

1.1.4 Key points and references
1.1.1 Rationale for undertaking reviews

According to Mulrow (1994, p. 597) systematic reviews are “providing health care providers, researchers, and policy makers with a tool to deal with unmanageable amounts of information to efficiently integrate existing information and provide data for rational decision making. Systematic reviews establish whether scientific findings are consistent and can be generalised across populations. Finally explicit methods used in systematic reviews limit bias and, hopefully, will improve reliability and accuracy of conclusions,” the foundation of the evidence-based approaches (Cochran, 2006). Systematic reviews are seen as a key tool incorporating the evidence-based approach in social sciences, aiming at “enhancing the quality of management reviews” (Tranfield, Denyer and Smart, 2003, p. 220). As a desired result systematic reviews could provide a foundation for methodological rigour, hence creating a dependable and trustworthy source of knowledge for academia and practitioners alike. Thus existing and ongoing reviews could be a valuable source to ensure the focus on my systematic review and research question, (see Figure 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages of systematic reviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explicit methods limit bias in identifying and rejecting studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions are more reliable and accurate because of methods used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large amounts of information can be assimilated quickly by healthcare providers, researchers, and policymakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay between research discoveries and implementation of effective diagnostic and therapeutic strategies may be reduced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results of different studies can be formally compared to establish generalisability of findings and consistency (lack of heterogeneity) of results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons for heterogeneity (inconsistency in results across studies) can be identified and new hypotheses generated about particular subgroups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative systematic reviews (meta-analyses) increase the precision of the overall result</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Greenhalgh (1997)

Figure 1. Advantages of Systematic reviews
1.1.2 Identifying existing and ongoing reviews

Before considering a systematic review, to avoid duplication of work, the researcher shall ensure that a systematic review, and by that I do refer to a non-outdated and good quality review, does not already exist, or is in progress.

To determine the existence of such systematic reviews, and guarantee the widest possible range of information, I retrieved information from different sources, such as electronic databases, key researchers and research centres in my field of interest, and my review panel.

1.1.3 Appraising available reviews

Considering the only recent introduction of systematic reviews in social sciences, the reviews have to be critically assessed by the quality of their methodology, their precision and their external validity. I apply a more detailed appraisal strategy to determine the quality of existing reviews is outlined in Figure 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appraisal strategy for reviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• What is the review’s objective?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What were the population/participants, methods, outcomes and research designs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What sources were used to identify the literature?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What strategies have been used to identify the research? What databases were searched, and were restrictions addressed, explained and justified?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What were the inclusion criteria, and if and how were they applied?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What criteria was used to assess the quality of the included literature, and were they reinforced?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How was the data from this literature extracted?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How were the data synthesised?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were differences in the studies addressed and investigated? How was the data combined? Was the reasoning behind this decision explained satisfactorily? Does the summary reflect the findings and evidence of the study?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Figure 2. Appraisal strategy for reviews
1.1.4 Key points and references

- Before starting a systematic review a thorough search for existing and ongoing reviews is necessary
- All available sources shall be included in this search to avoid redundant replications of efforts
- The quality of existing and ongoing reviews have to be carefully assessed
- If no suitable reviews to address the research question are found, the foundation to address the research question by the means of the systematic review of the literature is built

References:

Greenhalgh, T., (1997), How to read a paper: papers that summarise other papers (systematic reviews and meta-analyses) BMJ 315: 672–5


STAGE 1
Planning the review

PHASE 2
Preparing a proposal for a systematic review

Phase 2 of the planning of my systematic review focuses on the need for the preparation of the proposal. Particular attention will be given to gaining access and incorporating the necessary resources for conducting the review.

1.2.1 Literature Scoping
1.2.2 Background
1.2.3 Review question
1.2.4 Methods of the review
1.2.5 Project timetable
1.2.6 Expertise of the review team
1.2.7 Synthesis of extracted evidence
1.2.8 Dissemination
1.2.9 Key points and references
1.2.1 Literature Scoping

My research question: “Can a measurement of service quality based on consumer experience be a better predictor for consumer behaviour?” arose from a preliminary assessment of the existing literature in my field. This assessment was achieved by the ‘mapping the field’ exercise, scoping searches in electronic databases, reviewing and assessing existing reviews (Bero and Rennie, 1995), and studies relevant to my review (see Phase 1.1.2 and 1.1.3). In addition, I had the opportunity to take advantage of the knowledge of my fellow researchers, the faculty of Cranfield University School of Management, the Centre for Advanced Research in Marketing at the Cranfield University School of Management, my supervisor Dr. Stan Maklan, and other members of my review panel.

1.2.1.1 Mapping the field

The purpose of the initial search for the research question is to be ‘as broad as possible’. ‘Mapping the field’ (Jenkins, 2003), describes the use of a visual aids, maps of your fields of interest in order to think about your research question and identify overlapping areas (see Figure 3).

Figure 3. Mapping the field exercise

Extract from M. Jenkins (2003)
Through ‘Mapping the field’ I was able to start from a broad, exploratory stage, determining my field of interest, and by becoming more focused and exhaustive, narrowing down my research object and identifying the overlap of my fields of interest and research objective. The results of this exercise are outlined in Figure 4.

![Image of Figure 4](image.png)

**Figure 4. Mapping the field/Scoping the literature**

The map outlines the evolution process of the literature, symbolised on one side by the experience literature, which evolved experience marketing, and then to the consumer/customer/brand experience literature (see Figure 9). On the other side I applied the same rigorous process to the literature of marketing, starting with the marketing literature timeline (see Figure 6), and becoming more and more precise over scoping the literature of services marketing (see Figure 7), to service quality (see Figure 8), and finally measurements of service quality (see Figure 8). The synergy of both fields of interest led subsequently to my research question: “Can a measurement of service quality based on consumer experience be a better predictor for consumer behaviour?”
The selection of my general field of interest is influenced by my former career, prior research interest and activities in the field of marketing. My knowledge and expertise of the field and literature was also instrumental in scoping the literature and defining my research objective.

While there are different options for the layout of the literature timeline available, I choose deliberately a layout focusing on the key contributors and the essence of the contribution rather than the name of the article. This will give the reader an understanding and appreciation of the contribution to the field, and, in addition, will clearly outline the selection choices relevant to my research objective. To audit the reasoning leading to the selection of the objects of interest I will guide you through the timelines of relevant literature, highlighting the particular fields of interest to my research, starting with the timeline of marketing literature (see Figure 6). Marketing as a management discipline has been designed in the image of natural sciences (Zinkham and Hirschheim, 1992), which presumes that there is a similarity between the natural and social world, therefore concluding that the attributes of a phenomenon such as consumer behaviour can be interpreted in the same way as the attributes of a natural phenomenon (Wells, 1993).

Of particular interest to me in reference to my review and research question was the fact that while in marketing, a positivist’s aim is to use objective, quantitative methods in order to uncover the laws of consumer behaviour (Marsden and Littler, 1998) the aim of the interpretive research is to understand the individual and mutual significance that consumers link to their experiences by the means of naturalistic, qualitative methods (Mick and Buhl, 1992), stressing the “subjective meaning of the consumer's individual experience and the idea that any behaviour is subject to multiple interpretations rather than one single explanation” (Solomon, 1994, p.38).

This review of the marketing literature led me to a more in-depth observation of the literature in service marketing, which is illustrated by the timeline of Figure 7. This timeline traces the evolution of the service marketing literature, starting with the early stages (1963-1979), which was dominated by the effort of researchers to establish why the marketing of services is different from the marketing of goods/products. From 1980 to 1985 the contribution to the literature developed rather rapidly. This period caught my particular interest because of the introduction of concepts such as customer service, service quality and its influence on customer retention. In the present stage, starting in 1986, service marketing has been established as a mature field in the literature and concepts such as the service-dominant logic (Vargo and Lusch, 2004) are on the agenda of marketing managers worldwide. While reviewing the service and services marketing
literature I was intrigued by the notion of service quality as an antecedent to customer satisfaction and loyalty, therefore a possible source of differentiation and a competitive advantage for service providers (Oliver, 1981). The next step was to look into the literature on service quality, and in particular the existing measurements of service quality (see Figure 8). This indicates the need for a new measurement of service quality (Morrison-Coulthard, 2004).

The same process was applied to the second field of interest: consumer/customer/brand experience. While experience in the marketing literature can be considered broad, my particular interest is in the consumer and customer experience. This is defined as the notion of customer experience as a distinct economic offering, as different from services as services are from goods (Arrusy, 2002), and its influence on the behaviour of consumers and customers. One of the key themes was that the pure offering of goods and services is not sufficient enough to compete successfully for today's customer. Organizations have to compete on a more complex level by creating a holistic satisfactory customer experience through all stages of the buying process. This means managing the customer’s expectations and assessments before, during and after the buying process (Berry et al., 2002). During my research, courtesy of the continuing conversation with my colleagues and fellow researchers, I was able to identify that the emerging and common themes of consumer/customer experience were also present in studies exploring the phenomenon of brand experience; hence I will include this literature in my review, as charted in Figure 9. The selection of the included articles is following the strategies and frameworks described in Stage I, Phase 3 of the review outline ‘Developing a review protocol’.

The focus of my research are the highlighted themes of the experience marketing literature and measurements of service quality (see Figure 5), inspired by the apparent need to combine the two fields of interest. As Stuart Menteth et al. (2006) concludes, consumption experience must be investigated holistically to measure customer satisfaction in a more sufficient fashion than SERVQUAL and ACSI, thus addressing the necessity to develop a new measurement of service quality (Brady et al., 2002).
Hence the review questions are defined as:

Question 1 – Measurements of Service Quality

“What does the literature say about the research using measurements of service quality?”

Question 2 – Consumer/Customer/Brand Experience

“How can the concepts of consumer/customer/brand experience contribute to improve measurements of service quality?”

Figure 5. Mapping the field/Scoping the literature
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeline Marketing Literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Product-centred Paradigm</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Weid 1917)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marketing as facilitator for product exchange</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Copeeland, 1923)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drucker (1954) states that &quot;It is the customer who determines what a business is, what it produces, and whether it will prosper&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levitt (1960) suggests that firms should focus on fulfilling customer needs instead of focusing on selling products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The distinction between goods and services in marketing is blurred (Rathmell, 1965)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The importance of customer focus for the success of the organization (Kotler, 1967)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services marketing is unique (Gronroos, 1978; Guinnnesson, 1978)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal Marketing</strong> (Gronroos, 1981)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing practices of how companies relate to their consumer/business market are similar (Parasuraman et al., 1983; Zeithaml et al., 1985)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradigm shift from transactions to building customer relations (Dwyer et al. 1987; Gronroos 1991, Webster 1992, Morgan and Hunt 1994; Berry 1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The concept of organizations lead by market orientation (Kohli and Jaworski, 1990; Narver and Slater, 1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Satisfaction leads to greater customer loyalty (Anderson and Sullivan, 1993; Bearden and Teel, 1983; Bolton and Drew, 1991; Boulding et al., 1985; Fornell, 1992; LaBarbera and Mazurski, 1983; Oliver, 1990; Oliver and Swan, 1986; Yi, 1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shift in management paradigm from product-based to customer-based strategy (Kordupleski, Rust and Zahorik, 1993; Gla, 1994; Sheh, 2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality as perceived by the customer (Boulding et al., 1993; Rust, Noor, and Dickenson, 2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Profit Chain (Heskett et al., 1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer retention, loyalty, and customer share (Hoekstra et al., 1998; Reichheld, 1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Lifetime Value and its implications for the organization (Berger and Nair, 1998; Reinartz and Kumar, 2000; Rust, Lemen and Zeithami, 2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing need to focus on customer satisfaction (Oliver, 1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges of a paradigm shift towards customer-centricity in reference to the intangible factors such as customer satisfaction, loyalty, and so on, and the financial impact tracking (Hart, 1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept of market-driven company as an organization with superior skills in understanding customer-centricity (Day, 1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple goods/services distinction has become less relevant in marketing practice (Gronroos, 2000; Briner et al., 2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How Customer Lifetime Value impacts corporate strategy (Rust, Lemen and Zeithami, 2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of customer service for the organization (Parasuraman and Grewel, 2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on customer loyalty as the foundation for the success of the organization (Reichheld, 2001; Kumar and Shah, 2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational strategy shift from goods-centred to consumer-centred dominant logic (Vargo and Lusch, 2004)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The highlighted literature refers directly to my area of research.

Figure 6. Timeline Marketing Literature
### Figure 7. Service Marketing Literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The service revolution</td>
<td>Reagan, 1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service typology</td>
<td>Judd, 1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The distinction between goods and services in marketing is</td>
<td>bi-ruled (Rathmell, 1966)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition of certain product offerings as more or less tangible</td>
<td>Hotstuck, 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are goods and services different?</td>
<td>Johnson, 1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing of service industries</td>
<td>Georg and Borksccale, 1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services marketing is unique</td>
<td>Gronross, 1978; Gommerson, 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services marketing requires a different management approach</td>
<td>Berry, 1980; Loverock, 1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measuring Customer Service and Service Quality</td>
<td>Oliver, 1981; Garvin, 1983; Parasuraman et al., 1985*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing practices of how companies relate to their consumer/biz market are similar (Parasuraman et al., 1983; Zeithaml et al., 1985)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service as an encounter between firm and customer</td>
<td>Solomon et al., 1985*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Role of Employees</td>
<td>Albrecht and Zemke, 1985; Schneider and Bowen, 1995; Johnson, 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Relationship between Employee and Customer Satisfaction</td>
<td>Schmuckler and Bowen, 1985; Schlesinger and Zemsko, 1991; Hallowell et al., 1996; Johnson, 1996; Rucci et al., 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaint Management</td>
<td>Fornell, 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moments of Truth</td>
<td>Carlson, 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day et al. (1988) agrees with Cronin and Taylor (1992), and Patterson et al. (1997) that customer satisfaction is not only a critical part of repurchase intentions, but the key determinant in retaining clients in professional services*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Service - Customer Relationship Link</td>
<td>Lewis and Einwist, 1983; Berry et al., 1989*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Design</td>
<td>Quinn et al., 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Satisfaction</td>
<td>Rust and Zahorik, 1993; Hallowell et al., 1996*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Profit Chain</td>
<td>Heskett et al., 1994*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Marketing and CRM</td>
<td>Sheehy, 1995; Stone, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making service improvements financially accountable</td>
<td>Rust et al., 1995*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing customer lifetime value and customer equity</td>
<td>Lemon et al., 2000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profitable long-term relationships with customers</td>
<td>Berger, 1998; Reinartz, 2000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple goods/services distinction has become less relevant in marketing practice (Gronross, 2000; Bitner et al., 2000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational strategy shift from goods-centred to service-centred dominant logic (Vargo and Lusch, 2004)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basing corporate strategy on service</td>
<td>Rust, 2004*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The highlighted literature refers directly to my area of research.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeline Service Quality Literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Notion of Service Quality (Sasser et al., 1978; Gronross, 1982)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship between service quality and costs (Crosby, 1979)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition of service quality as a form of attitude (Oliver, 1980; Holbrook and Corfman, 1985)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High quality service is the antecedent of customer retention (Gronross, 1982)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service quality includes technical and functional quality (Gronross, 1984)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVQUAL as a measurement for service quality (Parasuraman et al., 1988)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship between service quality and customer loyalty (Reichheld and Sasser, 1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised SERVQUAL (Parasuraman et al., 1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of measurement focusing on the outcomes of service quality (Mangold and Babakus, 1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of SERVPERF as an alternative to SERVQUAL (Cronin and Taylor, 1992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship between service quality and customer satisfaction (Boulding et al., 1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship between service quality and profitability (Rust and Zahorik, 1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of BANKSERV as an alternative to SERVQUAL in a financial service context (Avkiran, 1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service quality influences behavioural intentions (Cronin et al., 2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of BSQ as an alternative to SERVQUAL in a financial service context (Bahia and Nantel, 2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value, emotions and behaviour have to be included in an efficient measurement of service quality (Brady et al., 2002; Chui, 2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for a new approach to measure service quality (Brady et al., 2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems with SERVQUAL may be more serious than generally acknowledged (Morrison-Coulthard, 2004)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8. Timeline Service Quality Literature
Timeline Experience Marketing Literature

Experience is the interpretation of everyday events (Goffman, 1974)

Service as performance (Grove and Fisk, 1983)*

Consumption experience, 'a personal occurrence, often with important emotional significance, founded on the interaction with stimuli, i.e. the products or services consumed' (Holbrook and Hirschmann, 1982)*

Service as an encounter between firm and customer (Solomon et al., 1985)*

Moments of Truth (Canzian, 1987)

Notion of postmodern consumer, enchanting life through experiences (Firat and Doniaia, 1998, 1995)

Brand Experience (Thompson et al., 1989)*

Creating a customer-value-centric competence through positive customer experiences (Srivastava et al., 1999; Webster 1994), should lead to an increase in customer loyalty*

"Customer experience is rarely completely emotional, cognitive or rational (Banister et al., 1994, p. 89)"

ACI Customer's evaluation of total purchase and consumption experience, both actual and anticipated (Anderson et al., 1994; Fornell, 1992; Johnson and Fornell, 1991)

Customers seek inclusion in the experience through participation (Cova, 1996)

Experience that validate the belonging of the customer - tribes (Cova, 1997)

The anticipation of customer needs throughout the customer's experience with the product or service (MacMillan and McGrath, 1997)*

Experiences occur as a result of encountering, undergoing or living through things (Schmitt, 1999)*

Prior experiences influences not only loyalty (Ganesh, Arnold, and Reynolds, 2000), but furthermore intent and repurchase behaviour (Anderson, Fornell, and Lehmann, 1984; Monz and Schmitt, 1985)*

Customers evolve over time through the experience with service/product, hence the range of these experiences transcend the firm's offerings requires management by the firm (Prashad and Ramaswamy, 2000)*

"Anything that can be perceived or sensed - or recognised by its absence - is an experience" (Berry et al., 2002, page 86)*

Company needs to adopt a well-conceived comprehensive strategy to manage the customer's experience (Berry et al., 2002)*

Notion of customer experience as a distinct economic offering, as different from services as services are from goods (Armstrong, 2002)*

Customers are not pure rational beings, they decide by combining reason and emotion (Wind and Majahan, 2002)*

Seeking for experiences, the "new consumer" (Baker, 2003; Willmott and Nelson, 2003)

Gilmore and Pine (2002), defining the customer experience as an engaging tool to create a memorable event*

Notion of a customer relationship evolving over time through experiences at multiple touchpoints (Prashad and Ramaswamy, 2004)*

Need for consistent experience management through all touchpoints (Payne and Frow, 2004)*

Homburg, Koschat and Hoyer (2005) define customer satisfaction as a cumulative, global evaluation based on experience with firm over time*

Lived Brand experiences through event marketing (Whelan and Wohlfell, 2006)

Consumption experience must be investigated holistically to measure customer satisfaction in a more sufficient fashion than SERVQUAL and ACSI (Stuart-Menteth et al., 2006)*

"The highlighted literature refers directly to my area of research"

Figure 9. Timeline Experience Marketing Literature
1.2.2 Background

Marketing literature suggests that service quality is the key determinant of consumer behaviour in service industries. In order to assess service quality, research advocates the use of objective measurements (Parasuraman et al., 1988). SERVQUAL, a multiple-item scale for determining consumer perceptions, is still the most popular and widely used measurement of service quality (Buttle, 1996). It is criticised for its conceptual, methodological and interpretative flaws (Morisson-Coulthard, 2005). One of the major concerns raised by researchers is that SERVQUAL measures purchase intent, but not behaviour. The aim of my systematic review is to enhance and expand the existing knowledge of measurements of service quality on the one hand, and consumer experience on the other hand, in order to determine the relevance of addressing research into developing a new measurement for service quality addressing the flaws of existing measuring tools through the integration of consumer experience.

The management paradigm shift from goods-centred to service-dominant logic (Brodie et al., 2006; Lusch and Vargo, 2006) identifies the differences between marketing services and goods, the latter the traditional domain of marketing scholarship (Shah et al., 2006). This shift exposed the need for companies to deliver a high service quality in order to retain their customers (Anderson et al., 1997). To assess the quality of service it had to be measured in an objective way, and SERVQUAL was introduced in 1988 by Parasuraman et al. to address this need (Morrison Coulthard, 2004).

SERVQUAL measures the differences between expected and perceived service quality, which, as Parasuraman et al. (1988) claim can be used to ‘better understand the consumer, and as a result improve service’ (p.30) and service quality. Despite its popularity, and widespread application, SERVQUAL has been criticised on numerous occasions because of its conceptual, methodological and interpretative problems. Morrison Coulthard (2004) concludes that ‘the problems associated with SERVQUAL may be more serious than is generally acknowledged’ (p.491). Even though Parasuraman et al. (Parasuraman et al., 1991) made considerable changes to SERVQUAL in 1991, it still fails to address most criticisms raised by the literature (Buttle, 1996; Cronin and Taylor, 1992; Morrison Coulthard, 2004).

SERVQUAL is founded on the belief that satisfaction is the foundation of retention and service quality is the antecedent of satisfaction (Anderson et al., 1994), but these relationships remain
unproven (Buttle, 1996; Keaveney, 1995; Reichheld, 1993). Based on a research study in a retail context, Seiders et al. (2005) propose that the relationship between consumer satisfaction and repurchasing behaviour is moderated by consumer, relational, and marketplace characteristics. Additionally, researchers explore the relationship between repurchase intention and repurchases, concluding that consumer involvement, convenience, competitive intensity, household income have a moderating effect on repurchase behaviour, while involvement, satisfaction and convenience have a strong effect on repurchase intentions (Seiders et al., 2005). Figure 10 illustrates these points.

Figure 10. SERVQUAL

Mittal and Kamakura identify that consumers reporting strong purchase intent often fail to act upon it, suggesting that SERVQUAL’s focus on repurchase intentions alone, ignoring the key relationship between intention and actual behaviour, is problematic (Bolton, 1998; Kamakura et al., 2002; Mittal and Kamakura, 2001).

To address the limitations of SERVQUAL ‘a new approach to measure service quality’ (Brady et al., 2002/1:p.28), exploring the important relationship between service quality and purchase behaviour (Buttle, 1996), is required. The literature, while generally conceptual in nature, suggests that the exploration of consumer experience could be the foundation for this approach (Seiders et al., 2005). Definitions of consumer experience in scholastic journals differ widely, ranging from the notion of the experience seeking consumer (Pine II and Gilmore, 1998), over a
distinctive economic offering (Arussy, 2002) to a classification of all factors leading to consumer satisfaction (Homburg et al., 2005). Nevertheless, one reoccurring argument throughout the literature is that consumer experience could predict consumer behaviour through its emphasis on the magnitude of all direct and indirect encounters between consumer and the company (Berry et al., 2002; Prahalad and Ramaswamy, 2004).

1.2.3 Review questions

Why did I choose to pursue a systematic review of two fields of literature, measurements of service quality and consumer/customer/brand experience, as outlined in Figure 11? During multiple discussions with members of the Cranfield University research community, the question on the best possible strategy to conduct my systematic review to support my research objective was raised. Three alternatives based on my ‘mapping the field’ exercise and literature review emerged. Alternative 1 focused solely on systematically reviewing the literature on existing measurements of service quality, in particular SERVQUAL, and only hinting to the possible inclusion of consumer/customer/experience to address the findings of the review. Alternative 2 will be addressing the opposite approach, hence reviewing the literature of consumer/customer/brand experience only, and using measurements of service quality as a possible adaptation of the findings. Alternative 3 includes systematically reviewing the literature of both research fields. While this seems most compelling, based on the restrictions on time and resources during the MRes programme, it is non-operationalisable. Consequently I decided on a strategy incorporating the ‘best of both worlds’ as outlined in Alternative 4, delivering the best solution by conducting two systematic reviews, one into measurements of service quality and the other into consumer/customer/brand experience allowing me to address my research questions (as follows) in the best possible fashion:

Question 1 – Measurements of Service Quality

“What does the literature say about the research using measurements of service quality?”

Question 2 – Consumer/Customer/Brand Experience

“How can the concepts of consumer/customer/brand experience contribute to improve measurements of service quality?”
This method will deal with the limitations of Alternative 1 and Alternative 2, while at the same time aiming to come as close as possible to Alternative 3, which is based on the limitations an impossible task for the MRes. However, this strategy will build a solid and auditable foundation for a more detailed literature review once I start my PhD, allowing me to fill the gaps (Figure 11).

![Figure 11. Alternatives review strategies](image)

While ensuring the best possible result in defining my research question and the focus of my systematic review by following the process outlined in this paper, such as scoping existing reviews, awareness shall be given to the fact that due to the constraints of the process, the research question can, and shall, if necessary, be formulated according to the findings and result of the systematic review.
1.2.4 Methods of the review

The review will be guided by the criteria set in this review outline, in particular the instructions explicated in Stage II of the outline. This refers to identifying research, selecting relevant studies, assessing the studies, extracting, and synthesising the data. The details of the individual criteria will be more explicitly stated in the corresponding phase of the outline.

1.2.5 Project timetable/Key Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scoping Study Assessment MRes Hand-in-date</td>
<td>April 19th, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoping Study Assessment MRes Review Panel</td>
<td>April 27th, 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2.6 Expertise of the review team

My aim for setting up the review team was to have a representation of a wide range of expertise in the fields of the review, research question, and the process of conducting systematic reviews. The team will contribute their guidance and expertise throughout the process of the review. In particular I am interested in their contribution to explore and assess the quality of the literature, while during the same time creating awareness of recent developments and research in the field by taking advantage of their network. Furthermore, by constantly communicating and reflecting the findings with members of my review team I will ensure the highest possible standard of my review. The present stage of the panel reflects (Figure 12) the stage of my review and scoping the literature, and I am certain, that more members will be added through the dynamic process of review and reflection in different stages throughout the review. Currently I am in the process of contacting leading researchers in the field of service marketing and their research centres such as the Centre for Excellence in Service at the University of Maryland, and the Centre for Services Leadership at Arizona State University, encouraging them to engage in a discussion about my research question and literature that could be representing a relevant contribution.
1.2.7 Synthesis of extracted evidence

The findings of Stage I, Phase I of my systematic review outline will be presented to the MRes review panel in the Scoping Study Assessment presentation on April 27th, 2007. This review led to amendments and improvements of my systematic review as outlined in my response below:

### Amendments/Review Panel Recommendations

**MRes Review Philipp Klaus May 2007**

During the review panel session on April 27th, 2007, the review panel was generous enough to provide me with some valuable insight on how to improve my systematic review, which I would like to address as follows:

- **Working Title**

  The working title has been changed into:

  A Systematic Review of Measurements of Service Quality and Consumer Experience

- **Review Questions**

  The review questions are defined as:

  Question 1 – Measurements of Service Quality
“What does the literature say about the research using measurements of service quality?”

Question 2 – Consumer/Customer/Brand Experience

“How can the concepts of consumer/customer/brand experience contribute to improve measurements of service quality?”

- Customer Satisfaction/Reasoning Exclusion Search Terms Literature

I was asked to consider including customer satisfaction as a part of my systematic review, in particular the key word search, because of the literature on the correlation between customer satisfaction and customer behaviour.

My reasoning for the exclusion of customer satisfaction in my systematic review is as follows:

The focus of my systematic review, i.e. the questions addressed by my systematic review is about measurements of service quality and consumer experience. The review of these fields of literature will allow me to examine my PhD phenomena of interest on how the two fields will affect consumer behaviour in a financial services context. Literature suggests that there is a multitude of items affecting consumer behaviour, such as customer satisfaction, trust, word of mouth, convenience, brand, price, switching costs etc. However, I am not proposing to do a systematic review of all of these and other facilitators and moderators of consumer behaviour.

The panel suggested that customer satisfaction might be of special interest because of the literature linking customer satisfaction with consumer behaviour. Present-day marketing literature recognizes that achieving customer loyalty is more important than achieving customer satisfaction (Agustin and Singh 2005). In particular the link between service quality, customer satisfaction, customer loyalty, and financial outcome is not straightforward (Reinartz and Kumar 2000). Few studies have examined the link between satisfaction ratings and repurchase behavior (Bloemer and de Ruyter 1998; Mittal and Kamakura 2001; Zeithaml 2000). Adding to that stream of research, Seiders et al. (2005) summarized and extended the literature by proposing that the relationship between satisfaction and repurchase behaviour is moderated by customer, relational, and marketplace characteristics.

While I acknowledged and reviewed the literature in my scoping study, my research will focus on the link between service quality and repurchase behaviour to make a fair comparison of measurements of service quality and experience quality. In order to achieve the best possible result for my systematic review I have to be as exhaustive as possible in my specific fields of literature, hence I will opt to exclude customer satisfaction from the keyword search of my systematic review.

Figure 13. MRes Review
1.2.8 Dissemination

Together with my supervisor I submitted parts of the research in a journal article for a special issue of the Journal of Brand Management, focusing on the influence of the customer experience on the brand in a service-dominated economy. Furthermore I will include the findings in the submission to a special issue on global brand strategies of the Journal of Product and Brand Management, and a research proposal on marketing actions from the Marketing Science Institute and the Emory Brand Institute.

1.2.10 Key Points and References

- The literature scoping enabled me to use relevant frameworks, such as ‘mapping the field’ and reviewing existing literature to engage from an exploratory, broad, open-minded start to a narrow, focused and exhaustive exploration of my review objectives and research question
- The methods used proved themselves appropriate and feasible to the process
- The review team was, and will be selected according to the challenges in different stages of the review

References:


Brodie, R. J., Glynn, M. S. and Little, V. (2006), "The service brand and the service-dominant logic: missing fundamental premise or the need for stronger theory?", Marketing Theory, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 363.


STAGE 1
Planning the review
PHASE 3
Developing a review protocol

This phase of the systematic review outline emphasises the need of the review protocol in developing a systematic review. Building on the results and findings of Phase 2, the emphasis is now on the process, methods and methodology utilised in creating a review protocol.

1.3.1 Role of the protocol
1.3.2 Formulating review question
1.3.3 Search strategy
1.3.4 Study selection criteria and procedures
1.3.5 Study quality assessment
1.3.6 Data extraction strategy
1.3.7 Syntheses of extracted evidence
1.3.8 Approval of review protocol
1.3.9 Protocol modifications
1.3.10 Key points and references
1.3.1 **Role of the protocol**

Before proceeding with the systematic review the review protocol is presented to the review panel to ensure that the questions and research objectives are well developed. It outlines in detail the mechanics of the systematic review process, how to search, identify, appraise, collect, extract and synthesise literature relevant to my research objective. My protocol, keeping the emerging nature of my field of interest in mind, by no means written in stone, will not only outline the procedure of the systematic review, but guide me through managing the entire systematic review process. By developing a review protocol of the highest standard I ensure the validity of my literature reviews, attending to the need to assess the existing literature, including all relevant cross-disciplinary perspectives and alternative research findings from other fields (Tranfield, Denyer and Smart, 2003). In the following I will describe as exhaustively and detailed as possible the different components of my systematic review (see Figure 14).

**Components of a review protocol**

- Background/Purpose of the review
- Review Question
- Search strategy including search terms and resources to be searched
- Study selection criteria and procedures
- Study quality assessment checklists and procedures
- Data extraction strategy
- Synthesis of the extracted evidence
- Project timetable

![Figure 14. Components of a review protocol](image)

1.3.2 **Formulating review question**

I have formulated my research question based on the scoping of my field (see Figure 5), the literature timelines (see Figure 6, Figure 7, Figure 8, and Figure 9), the narrative synopsis of my fields of interest (see Paragraph 1.2.2 and 1.2.3), and the decision on my review strategy (see Figure 11). My review questions “What does the literature say about the research using measurements of service quality?” and “How can the concepts of consumer/customer/brand
experience contribute to improve measurements of service quality?” will be best addressed by systematically reviewing the ‘measurements of service quality’ and ‘consumer/customer/brand experience’ literature, as outlined in Figure 5.

Rather than solely focusing on the search of keywords in electronic databases I wanted to introduce another tool to ensure the best possible outcome of my review. One of the purposes of the systematic review is to give the reader an opportunity to audit the reasoning behind my particular research question. To combine possible synergistic effects of combining both fields of interest I would like to introduce a table (see Figure 15) based on a search with the software ‘Publish or Perish’, which according to the website www.harzing.com Research in International and Cross-cultural Management is a software analysing academic citations, using Google Scholar to obtain raw citations, analyse them, and present the statistics in table forms. The use of citations is described in the literature as an indicator for the importance of specific sub-areas and themes (Baumgartner and Pieters, 2000). Nevertheless, quantity of citation is only one side of the story, hence it was important for me to include indexes focusing on the quality and impact of the work in the field, such as the Hirsch’s h-index, an index providing a robust single number metric to quantify scientific research output by combining quality with quantity, and Egghe’s index, improving on the h-index by giving more weight top highly-cited articles, addressing this particular point. By tracking the different keywords of my research objectives and fields of study for my systematic review, as indicated by the data in Figure 15, that although the literature on the individual fields of study are rather rich, there are hardly any publications exploring the possible relationship of both fields of study (as highlighted below in grey shade). This absence, combined with the indications by the literature, that the two fields chosen could possible be contribute to each other in a significant way (Brady et al., 2002; Chui, 2002; Stuart-Menteth, 2006), (see Figure 8, Figure 9) is further indication of the need to explore my research question.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search Term</th>
<th>Papers</th>
<th>Citation Count</th>
<th>h Index¹</th>
<th>g Index²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Customer Experience</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>36475</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Experience</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>59714</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Experience</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>27612</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Quality</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>73969</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement? Service Quality</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>56633</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVQUAL</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>15826</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVPERF</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>5488</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BANKSERV</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Experience, Service Quality</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Experience, Service Quality</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Experience, Service Quality</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Experience, SERVQUAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Experience, SERVQUAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Experience, SERVQUAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience Quality</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience Quality, Service Quality</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Experience Quality</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Experience Quality</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Experience Quality</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 15. Publish or Perish citation count**

### 1.3.3 Search Strategy

In order to identify relevant research a search strategy implementing and discovering the relevant databases and other sources needs to be formulated. My strategy, as described in detail as follows, was guided by the components of my research question, and the fields of literature leading to the research question. These components were instrumental in tailoring the searches to the corresponding fields of literature, generating a thorough list of relevant studies suitable to

---

¹ **Hirsch's h-index**


The h-index is defined as follows: *A scientist has index h if h of his/her Nₜ papers have at least h citations each, and the other (Nₜ-h) papers have no more than h citations each.*

² **Egghe's g-index**

Proposed by Leo Egghe in his paper *Theory and practice of the g-index*, *Scientometrics, Vol. 69, No 1 (2006), pp. 131-152*. It aims to improve on the h-index by giving more weight to highly-cited articles.
address the aim of systematically reviewing the existing literature on the field of interest contributing to my research question. The selection of the literature was furthermore guided by the aim to be as unbiased as possible (Easterbrook et al., 1991). Developing a search strategy in itself was a rather challenging task, but courtesy of the support from members of the Cranfield University faculty, my research centre and our librarian, I was able to identify existing reviews and the volumes of potential key literature (see Phase 1.1.2, Phase 1.1.3, Phase 1.2.1, Phase 1.2.2, and Phase 1.2.3). Iterations of searches are a key ingredient of developing a successful search strategy, and could be based on my experience, most accurately described as a process involving continuous trials and redefinition of the findings through reflection and interaction with the members of my review team. This approach was useful in determining the most effective combination of search terms for the individual subject of interest, including, if applicable alternative terms, which are based on the findings from the literature scoping (see Phase 1.2.1). However, there is a fine line between broadness, in order to include all possible contribution, and being exhaustive and specific about the ‘core literature’ being systematically reviewed. This leads to a determination of a ‘degree of sensitivity’, tending to favour one, for example broadness, over the other, for example, depth focus of the search. The aim is to be as attentive to the methodological rigour of a systematic review as possible. But given the fact that the review will still include an interpretative ingredient, a review can by definition never be perfect, but build a solid foundation for future research and scholars. The ultimate goal of my search strategy is to segregate and review a broad and controllable selection of literature, allowing me a thorough investigation into the relevance of my research question.

Sources of research evidence

While one could argue that the topic of measurements of service quality and consumer/customer/brand experience is cross disciplinary and emerging in nature, hence should be addressed with all possible available sources of research evidence I will in the following explicitly explain my reasoning behind the inclusion and exclusion of certain sources.

Published Journal Articles

My first decision was to include only published journal articles in my systematic review, subsequently excluding all books, book chapters, and ‘grey literature’, such as conference proceedings, reports, and discussion papers. Admittedly, by excluding these sources, one could argue that relevant publications, not, or not yet published in published journals, could weaken the selection of literature, therefore having a negative impact on the quality of the review (CRD,
2001). However, according to Light and Pillemer (1984) this restriction may enhance the quality of the review based on the fact that published journals have reasonably strict requirements for their publications, concluding that this strategy leads to a better review, and therefore reaching a desirable ‘level of conceptual and methodological rigour’ (David and Khan, 2003, p.42). Besides the fact that published journal articles are easier to locate through the use of electronic databases Hunter and Schmidt (1990) point out that the results of unpublished and published works are not only essentially the same, but in addition the proclaimed bias based on the availability of published work is non-existent. Moreover, my research into the possible overlap of two fields of interest, containing a vast amount of relevant studies, is concerned with the directions of both fields, and as literature suggests, in these circumstances published journal articles will identify the direction of the studies (Cooper, 1989). Through the process of writing my scoping study and the ongoing discussion with my review team it became clear that relevant published information in books is referenced, hence included in published journal articles.

**Electronic databases**

The second decision was to determine the selection of electronic databases. After consulting the review team I opted to include the AIB/Inform Global and Business Source Premier (EBSCO) databases. The fields of interest are both extensively covered by ABI but based on the recommendation of the Cranfield University librarian the EBSCO database will be utilised as a counter reference.

**Key Words**

Electronic databases give the researcher the option to search by different search criteria, including the use of keywords, allowing for a traceable, systematic, visible and replicable selection process. In the first instance I will select the articles with a substantive relevance to my field of interest, as outlined by the search strings in Figure 16. Both fields of interest, even by using the most possible restricted keywords and search strings, deliver a vast majority of articles. By looking at the returning results I detected that the majority of them were ‘practitioner oriented’ papers, lacking the desirable methodological and conceptual rigour, hence disqualifying them for my further search. In addition, because of the indicated consensus on the definition of consumer/customer/brand experience, the majority of the articles use the phrase to describe existing phenomena, such as customer satisfaction rating, customer relationship management and internal marketing in a new way.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Keywords</th>
<th>Search String</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measurements of service quality</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Service* AND (quality OR measurement OR scale OR Rating OR SERVQUAL OR SERVPERF or BANKSERV or BSQ or encounter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service Encounter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service Quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Measurement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SERVQUAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SERVPERF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BANKSERV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BSQ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer/Customer/Brand Experience</td>
<td>Consumer Experience</td>
<td>(Experience* OR Encounter) AND (Consumer OR customer OR brand)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Customer Experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brand Experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience Quality</td>
<td>Consumer/Customer/Brand Experience Experience</td>
<td>(Experience* OR Encounter) AND (Quality OR scale OR measurement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Measurement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 16. Keywords**

**Selection of Journals**

By looking at the vast majority of published journal articles in the fields of interest (see Figure 15) and the preliminary searches run with the keywords on the AIB/Inform Global and Business Source Premier (EBSCO) databases, the necessity of a further process of elimination became obvious. This tool should ideally address the need to introduce a reasonable and logical selection tool, while at the same time delivering or utilising an established framework to determine the quality of the selected literature. As a result of scoping the literature on possible models I became aware of the fact that, not surprisingly, journals are the most relevant source in disseminating scholarly knowledge in the field of marketing. While some well-renowned journals, for example the Journal of Marketing, cover the literature of interest since the 1920s, the last decades have seen a rapid extension of journals, covering a wide array of topics. The predominant way to measure the influence and relevance of a journal, hence the articles published in
the corresponding journal, for their science is through the index of structural influence (Salancik, 1986), allowing the comparison and a quality appraisal of the corresponding literature. In the marketing literature, I am fortunate enough to incorporate the work of Baumgartner and Pietner (2000), investigating the influence of marketing journals not only for their discipline in general, but also by the sub-areas of interest (see Figure 19). This includes areas such as consumer behaviour, marketing applications, and managerial marketing, which enables my review to be even more specific in the focus of my literature review according to the focus and influence of the particular journal in the sub-area of interest. To test the validity of these findings I compared the ratings (see Figure 18; Figure 19) with the influence indicators used in the citation analysis of the selected journals, courtesy of the Publish or Perish software. The software addresses possible shifts in importance of relevant journals in the time period after 2000, which was the foundation of the Baumgartner and Pieter's paper (2003). Furthermore, I did integrate the statistics available from the Social Sciences Citation Index, an index used to determine the influence of the publication from a particular journal on other publications/journals, giving me an additional criterion in observing the relevance of the published articles. As a result of this thorough process and ongoing consultations with my review panel I selected the following journals as the primary focus for the literature review (see Figure 17).
The following tables reflect the selection and appraisal criteria based on the influence ranking of the journals on the sub-area of marketing of interest to me. A visual outline describing the location of the selecting journals in their respective sub-areas is included in Figure 19. The table starts with the individual ranking of importance of the selected journals according to the research of Baumgartner and Pietner (2003). The next columns refer to the data extracted from the ‘Publish and Perish’ citation software including a measurement of the individual contributions rating (h index; g index). In addition I did include the AW Index, which measures the average number of citations to an entire body of work, adjusted for the age of each individual paper.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JCR</th>
<th>Journal of Consumer Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JMR</td>
<td>Journal of Marketing Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JM</td>
<td>Journal of Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACR</td>
<td>Advances in Consumer Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAR</td>
<td>Journal of Advertising Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MKS</td>
<td>Marketing Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JR</td>
<td>Journal of Retailing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPMP</td>
<td>Journal of Public Policy and Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JA</td>
<td>Journal of Advertising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBR</td>
<td>Harvard Business Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMS</td>
<td>Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMM</td>
<td>Industrial Marketing Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JR</td>
<td>Journal of Retailing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIBS</td>
<td>Journal of International Business Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBR</td>
<td>Journal of Business Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSR</td>
<td>Journal of Service Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNS</td>
<td>Management Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJM</td>
<td>European Journal of Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMR</td>
<td>Sloan Management Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSQ</td>
<td>Managing Service Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMR</td>
<td>California Management Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPIM</td>
<td>Journal of Product Innovation Management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 17. Journals selected**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Area 2 Consumer Behaviour</th>
<th>Impact Ranking</th>
<th>Papers</th>
<th>Citation Count</th>
<th>h Index</th>
<th>g Index</th>
<th>Cites/paper</th>
<th>AW Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>JCR Journal of Consumer Research</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>30873</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>30.93</td>
<td>46.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>JMR Journal of Marketing Research</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>52380</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>52.38</td>
<td>54.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>JM Journal of Marketing</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>95387</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>93.59</td>
<td>75.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ACR Advances in Consumer Research</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>5529</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>17.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>JAR Journal of Advertising Research</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>4885</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>19.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>MKS Marketing Science</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>23426</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>23.47</td>
<td>46.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>JR Journal of Retailing</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>15453</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>15.45</td>
<td>33.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>JPIM Journal of Public Policy and Marketing</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>3537</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>18.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>JA Journal of Advertising</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>7565</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>7.57</td>
<td>24.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Area 4 Marketing Applications</th>
<th>Impact Ranking</th>
<th>Papers</th>
<th>Citation Count</th>
<th>h Index</th>
<th>g Index</th>
<th>Cites/paper</th>
<th>AW Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>JM Journal of Marketing</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>95387</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>93.59</td>
<td>75.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>JMR Journal of Marketing Research</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>52380</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>52.38</td>
<td>54.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>JCR Journal of Consumer Research</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>30873</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>30.93</td>
<td>46.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>HBR Harvard Business Review</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>63924</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>63.92</td>
<td>70.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>JAMS Journal of the Academy of Marketing</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>17961</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>17.96</td>
<td>41.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>IMM Industrial Marketing Management</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>11240</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>11.24</td>
<td>34.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>JR Journal of Retailing</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>15453</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>15.45</td>
<td>33.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>JIBS Journal of International Business St.</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>33482</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>33.48</td>
<td>52.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>JBR Journal of Business Research</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>14818</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>14.82</td>
<td>38.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ACR Advances in Consumer Research</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>5529</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>17.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>MNS Management Science</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>96389</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>96.39</td>
<td>83.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>EJM European Journal of Marketing</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>14542</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>14.54</td>
<td>35.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Area 3 Managerial Marketing</th>
<th>Impact Ranking</th>
<th>Papers</th>
<th>Citation Count</th>
<th>h Index</th>
<th>g Index</th>
<th>Cites/paper</th>
<th>AW Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>HBR Harvard Business Review</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>63924</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>63.92</td>
<td>70.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>JM Journal of Marketing</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>95387</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>93.59</td>
<td>75.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MNS Management Science</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>96389</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>96.39</td>
<td>83.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>JMR Journal of Marketing Research</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>52380</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>52.38</td>
<td>54.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SMR Sloan Management Review</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>26446</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>26.45</td>
<td>45.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>JCR Journal of Consumer Research</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>30873</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>30.93</td>
<td>46.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>IMM Industrial Marketing Management</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>11240</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>11.24</td>
<td>34.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>CMR California Management Review</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>23976</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>23.77</td>
<td>44.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>MKS Marketing Science</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>23426</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>23.47</td>
<td>46.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>JPIM Journal of Product Innovation Man.</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>16775</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>16.81</td>
<td>38.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 18. Influence ranking marketing journals**
Bibliographic Management
I will use multiple supportive software, such as Microsoft Excel, the bibliographic software RefWorks and NVivo to manage all references and documents assessed and integrated in the review.

Documenting the search
To address the need of allowing for a traceable and systematic process, I will document the search in a satisfactory fashion in the review.

Figure 19. Influence articles sub-area
1.3.4 Study selection criteria and procedures

My selection criteria (see Figure 20) are guided by the aim of answering my research questions ‘What does the literature say about the research using measurements of service quality?’ and ‘How can the concepts of consumer/customer/brand experience contribute to improve measurements of service quality?’ This means selecting the articles relevant from the field of consumer/customer/brand experience and measurements of service quality. The distinction of inclusion and exclusion criteria reflects the characteristics of the field of interest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCLUSION CRITERIA</th>
<th>RATIONALE FOR INCLUSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic papers in referred scholarly journals (based on selection criteria in Figure 18) using AIB/Inform Global and Business Source Premier (EBSCO) databases</td>
<td>Primary source of academic literature on fields of interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No geographical or country of study restrictions</td>
<td>Comparisons across regions, countries and cultures are sought after</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry Restrictions</td>
<td>Service Quality is by definition related to studies in a service context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No restrictions on methodological or theoretical background of paper</td>
<td>Aim of the review is to incorporate and compare different methodological and theoretical approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only English language studies will be considered</td>
<td>Researcher only has access to English language sources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXCLUSION CRITERIA</th>
<th>RATIONALE FOR EXCLUSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Papers from Practitioner Journals</td>
<td>Lack of methodological and conceptual rigour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books and book chapters</td>
<td>Relevant knowledge incorporated in included literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Grey literature’</td>
<td>Irrelevant to my field of interest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 20. Inclusion and exclusion criteria

The study selection process, as outlined in Figure 21, starts in the initial stages with the search of keywords and search strings in the pre-determined databases (Paragraph 1.3.3) and uses a progression to narrow down the relevant literature included in the review (Fink, 1998). The further the process evolves the more relevance will be given to the more explicit study quality assessment, the focus of the next phase of the systematic review outline. The flow chart of my selection process (see Figure 21) can be utilised to detail the literature excluded and included on the different stages of the selection. In addition I aim to include my review team in revising and independently reassessing my selection criteria and literature choice.
1.3.5 Study quality assessment

The quality assessment of literature is a key component in the selection process of relevant studies and will be incorporated in different stages of the review. The quality appraisal will be given an auditable and appropriate tool to judge the validity and relevance of the chosen literature, while exploring quality differences, the foundation of a weighting in the analysis of the literature, eliminating bias, and guiding recommendations for the interpretations of my findings and future research. Quality is by definition a concept determined ‘in the eye of the beholder’, however by implementing the following criteria I intend to address these different point of views by focusing on established interpretations to determine the significance of the selected literature.
**General selection criteria**

After pre-selecting the literature on the base of the exclusion criteria stated in 1.3.4 the studies will be scrutinised to determine the relevance for the literature review on criteria based on the models and appraisal tool of Rose (see Figure 22) and Hart (1998) (see Figure 23).

---

**Rose’s ABCDE Model**

A. Theory: explanatory statement about social phenomenon.
B. Theoretical proposition: specific propositions to be investigated in the study.
C. Operationalisation: decisions about method; data collection technique; sampling; concepts and indicators; variables, units.
D. Fieldwork: collecting data; problems of implementation of stage C decisions
E. Results: data analysis leading to findings; interpretations feeding back to C,B and A.

---

**Figure 22. Rose literature appraisal tool**

**General Selection Criteria**

- What are the key sources?
- What are the major issues and debates about the topic?
- What are the origins and definitions of the topic?
- Literature search and review of your topic
- What are the key theories, concepts and ideas?
- How have approaches to these questions increased our understanding and knowledge?
- What are the key epistemological and ontological grounds for the discipline?
- What are the main questions and problems that have been addressed to date?
- How has knowledge in the topic been structured and organized?

Source: Hart (1998)

---

**Figure 23. General selection criteria Hart model**
In the next stage a more meticulous process of selection will be applied based on the following criteria for full text papers:

**Empirical papers must:**

- Contain a clear reference to the theoretical base, model or framework, on which the discussion is based, providing conceptual insight and guidance for hypotheses;
- If the work is cross-disciplinary, contain a clear indication of the grasp of the relevant arguments in all disciplines;
- Contain a comprehensive relevant review of literature with the indication of key authors, themes and contributions;
- Have a clear positioning of the argument within the existing theory;
- Contain an adequate description and full rationale for selecting a specific method to ensure internal and external validity;
- Include a sufficient record of empirical work (discussion of interviews, field work, questionnaires, tools for data analysis, etc);
- A discussion of the impact of finding on the understanding of the link service quality and organisational performance, or consumer/customer/brand experience and service quality
- Demonstrate that the method chosen was appropriate for the research question and theory, the statistical procedures were used correctly, and the major assumptions were reasonable
Conceptual / theoretical papers must:

- Contain a clear reference to the theoretical base, model or framework, on which the discussion is based, inform or improve my understanding of the theory it refers to, and provide conceptual insight and guidance for hypotheses;
- If the work is cross-disciplinary, give a clear indication of the grasp of the relevant arguments in all disciplines;
- Contain a comprehensive relevant review of literature with the indication of key authors, themes and contributions;
- Have a clear positioning of the argument within the existing theory;
- Make a meaningful contribution in terms of theory, empirical knowledge, and management practice

Conceptual / theoretical papers may contain:

- A list of suggestions for further research related to determining either the measurements of service quality, or the contribution of consumer/customer/brand experience to deliver superior service quality.

Methodological papers must contain:

- A clear reference to the theoretical base, model or framework, on which the discussion is based;
- A full discussion of the proposed method / improvement of the method
- Contain an adequate description and full rationale for selecting a specific method to ensure internal and external validity;
- Contain a comprehensive relevant review of literature with the indication of key authors, themes and contributions;
I would like to introduce a first review of the literature on consumer/customer/brand experience (see Figure 24), which reveals multiple definitions in the academic literature to demonstrate the particular challenges on selecting the desired context of my systematic review. Based on the high citation and literature results of the first searches (see Figure 15) it is necessary to add another selection criteria based on the definition of consumer/brand/experience. The definitions and area of literature of interest to me has been highlighted in Figure 18, Figure 19 and Figure 19. This will function as an additional selection criterion; they are based on the relevance and the results of my initial scoping of the literature, which eliminates certain definitions related to the practice of event marketing.
Stage 1 Phase 3

Figure 24. Definitions relevant to my review
Quality appraisal of selected studies

The papers that meet the stricter selection criteria will be subjected to the quality appraisal process. Each article will be rated on the scale of 1-3 within the following categories:

- Grasp of the existing knowledge
- Strength of the argument
- Methodological rigour
- Contribution to the field

Specific quality appraisal criteria are provided in the Quality Appraisal table (see Figure 25):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1 – Low or Absent</th>
<th>2 - Medium</th>
<th>3 - High</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grasp of the existing knowledge</td>
<td>Not enough information to assess; no awareness of the major arguments; theoretical/knowledge base insufficient for argument</td>
<td>Awareness of the major arguments; demonstrated ability to use it to support the argument</td>
<td>Fully aware of the spectrum of arguments in the field(s). Confident positioning of the argument in existing knowledge. Critical review.</td>
<td>This category does not apply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of the argument</td>
<td>Not enough information to assess; argumentation is weak and logic is prone to questioning.</td>
<td>The argument is well-constructed and applicable to the research, reflects the major arguments in the field.</td>
<td>The argument is strong and reasoned out, logical, and related to the existing knowledge; can be extended to the empirical stage.</td>
<td>This category does not apply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodological rigour; design and execution of the study</td>
<td>Not enough information to assess; design is flawed and does not reflect the argument. Data invalid or insufficient. Poor execution.</td>
<td>Design reflects the argument, the data are relevant and sufficient with minor reservations. Good execution.</td>
<td>Strong links between the design and the argument, original design, good quality and sufficient data. Excellent execution.</td>
<td>This category does not apply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to the field</td>
<td>Not enough information to assess; contribution is unclear or nonexistent.</td>
<td>Incremental contribution. Uses extensively others’ ideas and arguments.</td>
<td>Clear advancement of the knowledge/methods. Highly original, supported by data.</td>
<td>This category does not apply</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 25. Quality appraisal table

I would like to stress that, despite the fact that scoring will be a part of the appraisal process; the focus is on the individual quality components rather than the quality scores. At this stage I will include another appraisal tool, the Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP). This will be used for the assessment of the qualitative research literature, addressing a more in-depth approach to appraise qualitative research by addressing the questions of rigour, credibility, and relevance of the study (see http://www.phru.nhs.uk/learning/casp_qualitative_tool.pdf). The references in the publications that pass the quality assessment stage will be used to identify additional sources of information relevant to the focus of this systematic review. These sources will be subjected to the same selection and quality assessment criteria as the original publications. The integration of a strict selection and appraisal process, by critically reviewing
the literature in every stage, will serve as a foundation to compare literature, allowing a comparison of importance of different body of literature for my review.

1.3.6 Data extraction strategy

Data extraction is the process by which I obtain information from the selected literature in a visual form, the data extraction form (see Figure 26), providing an auditable document for the process of literature selection (Boaz, Hayden and Bernard, 1999). The data will be stored in a Microsoft Excel file.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Fields</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>Citation</td>
<td>Date of data extraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Country of Origin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>Characteristics</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>Verification</td>
<td>Eligibility of study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inclusion and exclusion criteria (Figure 20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Conceptual/Theoretical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Methodological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Empirical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quantitative/Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sample size/population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exclusion criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Design of the study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Method of data collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Method of data analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Additional characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General</th>
<th>Quality Assessment</th>
<th>See Figure 25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Abstract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Keywords</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Key citations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>My own summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Key findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>Inclusion/Exclusion</td>
<td>Reasoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialised</td>
<td>Research Field SQ or Experience</td>
<td>SQ or Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Underlying theory/theories</td>
<td>Underlying theory/theories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MindMap</td>
<td>Inclusion in MindMaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NVivo</td>
<td>NVivo Analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Figure 26. Data extraction forms

### 1.3.7 Synthesis of extracted evidence

The goal of the synthesis of my extracted evidence will be the assembly and synopsis of the literature included in my systematic review. This will include descriptive data synthesis, such as a description of the included literature, and to interpret the findings of my reviews (Mason, 1994). This is to not only addressing my research question, but to follow the ambition to aim at “enhancing the quality of management reviews” (Tranfield, Denyer and Smart, 2003, p. 220). Data interpretation as a qualitative analysis includes crucial points of the review, such as reflection on the literature, identifying key themes, comparison of concepts, and using these findings to build a coherent argument supported by the literature (Boyatis, 1998; Bryman and Burgess, 1994). While Microsoft Excel and RefWorks will be a foundation to allow the systematic and more descriptive part of the analysis, they are not sufficient enough to support the qualitative analysis of the data. Hence, I will use a tool that will enable me to reflect on the key themes, code, and compare the selected literature, NVivo (Gregorio, 2000). The features of the software package will allow me to code and aggregate data, enhancing the qualitative analysis of my systematic review (Hansen, 1999; Clisbee, 2003).
Consequently my reviews could provide a foundation for methodological rigour, creating a dependable and trustworthy source of knowledge for academia and practitioners alike.

**Project plan**

The outlined project plan below (see Figure 27) will help me with the timely delivery of the systematic review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Systematic Review Project Plan</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>September</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1 Planning the review</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Forming the review panel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Mapping your field of study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Producing a Review Protocol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Identifying and evaluating studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Conducting a systematic search</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Evaluating studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Extracting and synthesising data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Conducting the data extraction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Conducting data synthesis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1 Descriptive analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2 Thematic analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Utilising the findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Informing research</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Informing Practice</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews</td>
<td>Continuously</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>Continuously</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 27. Project Plan**

### 1.3.8 Approval of review protocol

The current version of the review protocol will be submitted to my MRes review panel on April 19th, 2007, and the official review will be conducted on April 27th, 2007. During this event I did have an opportunity to receive valuable feedback, guidance and direction from the panel before the commencing the review and, as indicated prior (see Figure 13) these suggestions were incorporated in the review.

### 1.3.9 Protocol modifications
While the protocol will deliver a framework of a guidance, I will make certain that it will not restrict me in the constant endeavour of addressing the research question in the most efficient, effective, and relevant way.
1.3.11 Key points and references

- The review protocol is the foundation of the systematic review, hence it is from the utmost importance to
- Be very specific not only in the definition of the research question, but also
- Rigorous in the selection and quality appraisal criteria
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**STAGE 2**

**Conducting the review**

After agreeing to the review protocol I will in the subsequent stage start with the process of identifying and searching for relevant literature. The selected literature will be appraised based on the quality assessments laid out in the review protocol, and the extracted data will be synthesised, while the entire process will be monitored and documented on a continuous base.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 4</th>
<th>Identifying the research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td>Selecting relevant studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 6</td>
<td>Assessing the quality of studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 7</td>
<td>Extracting data and Monitoring progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 8</td>
<td>Synthesising data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Stage 2**

56  Phase
Stage 2

Planning the review

Phase 4

Identifying the research

2.4.1 Aim of the search for studies
2.4.2 Generating a search strategy
2.4.3 Electronic databases
2.4.4 Reference lists
2.4.5 Bibliographic management
2.4.6 Document retrieval
2.4.7 Documenting the search
2.4.8 Key points and references
2.4.1  Aim of the search for studies

Searching for studies is an intricate and lengthy process. This phase provides information on how I conducted a comprehensive search to recognize important studies, how I retrieved these studies and a documentation of my search.

The aspiration of my search is to produce a list as complete as possible of studies which suitable for answering the research questions of my review, hence identification of relevant studies by a thorough, unbiased search strategy, as outlined in 1.3.3 is crucial. The soundness of the review conclusion is founded on the depth and thoroughness of the search strategy to capture the relevant literature, emphasizing the significant difference between systematic and traditional reviews. In particular quality assessments such as publication, methods, sample size (see 1.3.4 and 1.3.5) play a significant role in assuring the best possible review quality. Being aware of the perils of biases I did incorporate as many suitable variations of searches and expertise of my panel members to ensure as comprehensive and unbiased a search as possible.

2.4.2  Generating a search strategy

Developing an effective search strategy can be considered a skill and it was from the utmost importance to involve as many skilled experts as possible in this process (as outlined in 1.2.6). My initial searches conducted to identify reviews (see Phase 1.1.2) and to estimate the quantity of potentially relevant literature (see Phase 1.2.1) provide a contribution to the design of my search strategies. During the process of developing this review I soon found out that the development of a search strategy is an ongoing and evolving process, i.e. strategies are build on a constant communication about the ongoing results with the review team and consultation with experts in the field to ensure that all relevant search terms and literature are covered. As the NHS CRD Report No. 4, 2nd Edition, states so correctly ‘The attributes of a search strategy can be described in terms of the ability to identify relevant articles to exclude irrelevant articles. Searches with high sensitivity tend to have low specificity, in that a large proportion of articles they retrieve are not relevant to the question posed.’ Figure 16 demonstrates the required structured approach of search terms I implemented for searching the electronic database ABI/Proquest requires a structured approach. The developed group of search terms, identified from the in-depth study of relevant reviews and pilot searches covering each facet of my review questions include a range of text words in the title and abstract of studies as well as any available
subject indexing terms that are assigned by the database producer. The iterative process of developing the optimal search strategy called for adjustment of search strategies based on the knowledge of the subject area. However, due to the broad definition of some key parts of my research questions I soon realized that I not only had to spend a lot of time scanning through a vast amount of references in order to identify a limited number of relevant studies, but also to constantly communicate with experts in the field and the review panel in order to identify potentially relevant studies.

2.4.3 Electronic databases

As outlined in my review protocol I opted to conduct my searches in the AIB/Inform Global and Business Source Premier (EBSCO) databases. The fields of interest are both extensively covered by ABI but based on the recommendation of the Cranfield University librarian the EBSCO database will be utilised as a counter reference.

2.4.4 Reference lists

Examining the reference lists of the relevant publications found through database searches gave me an opportunity to identify further literature for consideration (see Figure 28). Furthermore I did use the Publish or Perish software (see Figure 15) to trace citations of important papers, which exposed additional valuable references.

2.4.5 Bibliographic management

Following my review protocol and the input of the panel I will use multiple supportive software, such as Microsoft Excel, the bibliographic software RefWorks and NVivo to manage all references and documents assessed and integrated in the review.

2.4.6 Document retrieval

During the process of creating the review I did realise that in order to assess the relevance of studies it is crucial to have access to the full articles. Only with the full article, which sometimes
requested the incorporation of additional services such as the British Library, I was often able to assess the relevance of the study to address my review question.

2.4.7 Documenting the search
One major aim in the process of conducting systematic reviews should be to ensure that the review is replicable and transparent. The NHS CRD Report refers to this challenge as follows: ‘For readers to evaluate the thoroughness of the search for potentially relevant studies, this part of the review should be documented in adequate detail. The search should be documented as it develops, and reasons for changes and amendments should be noted at the time. The unfiltered search results should be saved in their entirety and retained for future potential reanalysis. Even though full details of the search may not appear in journal publications it is always possible to include a note to readers to the effect that full details are available on request.’ The documentation process is outlined in Figure 28.
2.4.8 Key points and references based on NHS Centre for Reviews and Dissemination

- A far-reaching search for relevant literature is vital to the quality and depth of the review.
- A close cooperation between librarians, the review panel and the researcher is desirable to enhance the search strategy.
- The utilisation of different search and methods and sources can enhance the review.
- Use the knowledge of experts and your panel to identify relevant literature.
- Systematically recording and managing references with designated software will help in creating the review.
- The search should be well documented and search results should be saved and retained for future potential reanalysis.
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STAGE 2
Planning the review
PHASE 5
Selecting relevant studies

2.5.1 Study selection criteria
2.5.2 Study selection process
2.5.3 Reliability of inclusion decisions
2.5.4 Key points and references
2.5.1 Study selection criteria
My selection criteria (see Figure 21) are guided by the aim of answering my research questions ‘What does the literature say about the research using measurements of service quality?’ and ‘How can the concepts of consumer/customer/brand experience contribute to improve measurements of service quality?’ This means selecting the articles relevant from the field of consumer/customer/brand experience and measurements of service quality. The distinction of inclusion and exclusion criteria reflects the characteristics of the field of interest, following logically from the review questions and was checked upon its reliability in a pilot study conducted prior to the review panel meeting.

2.5.2 Study selection process
The study selection process, as outlined in Figure 21, starts in the initial stages with the search of keywords and search strings in the pre-determined databases (Paragraph 1.3.3) and uses a progression to narrow down the relevant literature included in the review (Fink, 1998). The further the process evolves the more relevance will be given to the more explicit study quality assessment, the focus of the next phase of the systematic review outline. The flow chart of my selection process (see Figure 21) can be utilised to detail the literature excluded and included on the different stages of the selection. In addition I used the technique of cross-referencing and the inclusion of the expertise of my review team in revising and independently reassessing my selection criteria and literature choice and to test the reproducibility of my search process.

2.5.3 Reliability of inclusion decisions
While striving for subjectivity in the inclusion of studies by integrating as often as possible my panel members in the discussion of which studies to include in the review I need to admit that due the time constrains this subjectivity cannot be guaranteed. However, I intend to disseminate all my findings and references in electronic format to encourage and request advice on missing studies.

2.5.4 Key points and references (NHS CRD Report No. 4, 2nd Edition)
• Studies should be selected in an unbiased way, based on selection criteria arising from the review questions, and that have been piloted to check their reliability.
• Study selection is a staged process involving sifting through the citations located by the search, retrieving full reports of potentially relevant citations and, from their assessment,
identifying those studies that fulfill the inclusion criteria.

- Ideally parallel independent assessments should be conducted to minimise the risk of errors of judgement.
- The study selection process will be documented, detailing reasons for inclusion and exclusion.
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STAGE 2
Planning the review

PHASE 6
Assessing the quality of studies

2.6.1 Study quality assessment
2.6.2 Quality assessment instruments
2.6.3 Key points and references
2.6.1 Study quality assessment

The quality assessment of literature is a key component in the selection process of relevant studies and was incorporated in different stages of the review. The quality appraisal gives an auditable and appropriate tool to judge the validity and relevance of the chosen literature, while exploring quality differences, the foundation of a weighting in the analysis of the literature, eliminating bias, and guiding recommendations for the interpretations of my findings and future research. Quality is by definition a concept determined ‘in the eye of the beholder’, however by implementing the criteria laid out in 1.3.5 I intended to address these different point of views by focusing on established interpretations to determine the significance of the selected literature.

After pre-selecting the literature on the base of the exclusion criteria stated in 1.3.4 the studies were scrutinised to determine the relevance for the literature review on criteria based on the models and appraisal tool of Rose (see Figure 22) and Hart (1998) (see Figure 23).

2.6.2 Quality assessment instruments

In the next stage a more meticulous process of selection was applied based on the criteria for full text papers as outlined in 1.3.5.

The papers that met the stricter selection criteria were subjected to the quality appraisal process. Each article was rated on the scale of 1-3 within the following categories:

- Grasp of the existing knowledge
- Strength of the argument
- Methodological rigour
- Contribution to the field

Specific quality appraisal criteria are provided in the Quality Appraisal table (see Figure 25):
2.6.3 Key points and references

- Quality assessment of research entail the evaluation of a study's internal and external strength
- Quality assessment can be used to determine a minimum quality threshold for the selection of relevant literature included in a review.
- Then a more detailed assessment is incorporated to explore the quality differences, hence the eligibility of the relevant studies to be included in the review
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Stage 2

Planning the review

Phase 7

Extracting data and monitoring progress

2.7.1 Design data extraction forms
2.7.2 Content data extraction forms
2.7.3 Method of data extraction
2.7.4 Multiple publications of same data
2.7.5 Evaluating progress for the review
2.7.6 Key points and references
2.7.1 Design data extraction forms

The process of developing the data extraction form was guided by the fact that there is no single correct way to create a data extraction form. However, it should give the researcher a visual representation of the key components of the study relevant to address the research questions. Furthermore I did keep in mind that the data extraction form will be used in the descriptive and thematic data analysis as the foundation for my synthesis and created the form best addressing the needs of representing the studies relevant to address my research questions (see Figure 26).

2.7.2 Content data extraction forms

My extraction sheet will produce a data repository from which my analysis will emerge. The content was driven by what kind of information will be most relevant to address my research questions. In my particular case and based on my previous experiences my own summary of the article and the inclusion of key quotes emerging from the literature analysis in NVivo were from the utmost importance, hence a key part of the content. However, it was also vital to include all data required for the approach of a meta-synthesis of my data (see Phase 8).

2.7.3 Method of data extraction

Data extraction is the process by which I obtained information from the selected literature in a visual form, the data extraction form (see Figure 26), provides an auditable document for the process of literature selection (Boaz, Hayden and Bernard, 1999). The data is stored in a Microsoft Excel file in a consistent and auditable way.

2.7.4 Multiple publications of same data

The data sources used in the studies accepted for inclusion in the review were carefully checked to avoid including multiple publications based on the same data
2.7.5 **Evaluating progress for the review**

Multiple meetings and ongoing communications with the review team and my supervisor ensured that the progress of the review was carefully monitored.

2.7.6 **Key points and references**

- Carefully designed data extraction forms can be minimising the chances for human errors
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STAGE 2

Planning the review

PHASE 8

Synthesising data

2.8.1 Aims of data synthesis
2.8.2 Data synthesis
2.8.3 Key points and references
2.8.1 Aims of data synthesis

The aim of data synthesis in a systematic review is to collate and summarise the results of included primary studies in a meaningful way. I achieved this through a descriptive and thematic analysis, done through the tabulation and figures (see Phase 2.8.2), and linked to the review question. This phase is divided into the data analysis, i.e. break down individual studies into their components, extracting key concepts, ideas, and theories; and the data synthesis, i.e. connecting the overall themes of individual studies into general themes and trends, hence transforming the data into a new form. To accomplish both parts of my data synthesis I will be utilising MindJet mapping software to deliver a qualitative meta-synthesis of my analysis. While my review protocol was based on the assumption that I will use NVivo qualitative research software for the meta-synthesis of my analysis I soon realized that MindJet software is delivering the same advantages as the NVivo software, but my familiarity with MindJet and the more creative form of visualization make it a superior choice for my review.

2.8.2 Data Synthesis

To “provide a means of drawing insight from studies and for addressing issues pertinent to management research” (Tranfield et al., 2003) I will analyse and synthesise the selected literature in an inductive way. This process is a recommended guide to concentrate wide-ranging data into emerging themes as a foundation for a model or theory about theses themes, complimenting the use of the MindMap software (Thomas, 2003; Leseure et al. 2004). The process of inductive coding began with detailed reading of the studies while at the same time I was looking for and coding themes within studies and intra-studies. These emerging themes were constantly refined and built the categories outlined in the MindMaps, the foundation for my key themes (Thomas, 2003). This inductive method allowed me to take into account the resemblance and diversity of the selected studies to write my report in a narrative meta-synthesis-style, identifying the principal theories and themes of the relevant literature (Sandelowski et al., 1997, p. 366).
2.8.2.1 Descriptive Analysis

Based on the study selection process outlined in 2.5.2 in order to address

Review Question 1 – Measurements of Service Quality

“What does the literature say about the research using measurements of service quality?”

the following literature (see Figure 29) was selected:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Sample Size/Popu</th>
<th>Method of Data Collection</th>
<th>Own Summary (key notes only)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Zeithaml, A; Berry, Leonard L.; Parasuraman, A.</td>
<td>Communication And Control Processes In The Delivery Of Services</td>
<td>Journal of Marketing</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Services Stage 1, Financial Services Stage 2, Services Stage 3</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>EP versus PE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Zeithaml, A</td>
<td>Consumer Perceptions Of Price, Quality, And Value</td>
<td>Journal of Marketing</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Beverages</td>
<td>397 customers</td>
<td>Longitudinal Survey</td>
<td>Validity Test model versus SERVQUAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Zeithaml, A; Berry, Leonard L.; Parasuraman, A.</td>
<td>The behavioral consequences of service quality</td>
<td>Journal of Marketing</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Computer manufacturer, Retail chain, Automobile Insurer, and Life Insurer</td>
<td>1247 and 698 customers</td>
<td>Surveys</td>
<td>Empirical data for influence of service quality on recommendations and loyalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Westbrook, Robert A.</td>
<td>A Rating Scale for Measuring Product/Service Satisfaction</td>
<td>Journal of Marketing</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Automobiles, Banks, Wristwatches, Television, Washing Machines, Refrigerators</td>
<td>119 respondents</td>
<td>Surveys</td>
<td>Exposing the differences and antecedents of loyalty in reference to customer satisfaction and service quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Zeithaml, A</td>
<td>Service quality, profitability, and the economic worth of customers: What we know and what we need to learn</td>
<td>Academy of Marketing Science. Journal</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Services</td>
<td>391 surveys</td>
<td>Surveys</td>
<td>Use of technology in the delivery of services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Van Dyke, Thomas P.; Prybutok, Victor R.; Kappelman, Leon A.</td>
<td>Cautions on the use of the SERVQUAL measure to assess the quality of information systems services</td>
<td>Information Systems Journal</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Information Systems</td>
<td>58 MBA students</td>
<td>Experimental Design</td>
<td>Impact of type of service on perceived service quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Teas, R. Kenneth</td>
<td>Expectations, performance evaluation, and consumers’ perceptions of quality</td>
<td>Journal of Marketing</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Random Consumers</td>
<td>579 anecdotes</td>
<td>Anecdotes</td>
<td>Foundation for measurements such as SERVQUAL. The meaning and understanding of the differences between value and quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Sureshchandar, G.S.; Rajendran, Chandrasekharan; Anantharaman, R.N.</td>
<td>Determinants of customer-perceived service quality: A confirmatory factor analysis approach</td>
<td>The Journal of Services Marketing</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Financial Services</td>
<td>13 focus groups, 5531 customer questionnaires</td>
<td>Focus Groups, Surveys</td>
<td>Theoretical piece integrating role theory (sociological research) to develop theory in a service marketing context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Sureshchandar, G.S.; Rajendran, Chandrasekharan; Kamalanathan, T.J.</td>
<td>Customer perceptions of service quality: Acquaint</td>
<td>Total Quality Management</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Services</td>
<td>Literature Business US</td>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>Status Quo of existing literature pointing out the deficits and possible future directions for research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Teas, R. Kenneth</td>
<td>Expectations as a comparison standard in measuring service quality: An assessment of a reassessment</td>
<td>Journal of Marketing</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Services</td>
<td>Literature Business US</td>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>Theoretical piece giving my research foundation in the need for more dynamic measurements of service quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Michael R. Solomon, Carol Surprenant, John A. Crespi, Evelyn Girman</td>
<td>Role Theory Perspective on Dyadic Interactions: The Service Encounter</td>
<td>Journal of Marketing</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Services</td>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>Literature/Data</td>
<td>Developing the importance of perceived service quality and the service employee for organisational efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Journal/Media</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Literature/Content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Mittal, Banwari; Lassar, Walfried M</td>
<td>Why do customers switch? The dynamics of satisfaction versus loyalty</td>
<td>The Journal of Services Marketing</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Health Care, Car Repair &amp; Other Services</td>
<td>Health Care, Car Repair &amp; Other Services</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Literature/Review on e-commerce service quality trying to relate back to SERVQUAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Roth, Alek V.; Jackson, William E, III</td>
<td>Strategic determinants of service quality and performance: Evidence from the banking industry</td>
<td>Management Science</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Financial Services</td>
<td>Literature Worldwide, Literature Data</td>
<td>The Gap Model - Inserted Look - importance of service personnel and communication in the service quality deliver process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Schneider, Benjamin; Parkington, John J.; Button, Virginia M</td>
<td>Employee and Customer Perceptions of Service in Banks</td>
<td>Administrative Science Quarterly</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Financial Services</td>
<td>Managers (NA) and 30 Female Consumers</td>
<td>Focus Groups, In-depth Interviews</td>
<td>Literature/Analysis: Determines that SERVQUAL as a measurement for service quality in the IS industry is not reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Seth, Nehin; Deshmukh, S G; Vrat, Prem</td>
<td>Service quality models: a review</td>
<td>The International Journal of Quality &amp; Reliability Management</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Services</td>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>SERVQUAL fails to address some of the aspects of customers perceived service quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Sivasubr, Egnace; Baker-Prewitt, Jamie L</td>
<td>An examination of the relationship between service quality, customer satisfaction, and store loyalty</td>
<td>International Journal of Retail &amp; Distribution Management</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Department Store/Retail</td>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>Using Factor Analysis to address some aspects of perceived service quality missing in SERVQUAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Parasuraman, A.; Zeithaml, Valerie A.; Berry, Leonard L</td>
<td>A Conceptual Model of Service Quality and Its Implications for Future Research</td>
<td>Journal of Marketing</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Retail Banking, Credit Card, Securities Brokerage, Product Repair and Maintenance</td>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>Comparison of different measurements of perceived service quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Robledo, Marco</td>
<td>Measuring and managing service quality: Integrating customer expectations</td>
<td>Marketing Intelligence &amp; Planning</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Services</td>
<td>Literature/Data, Literature/Data</td>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>First Model of Service Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Stewart Robinson</td>
<td>Measuring service quality: current thinking and future requirements</td>
<td>Marketing Intelligence &amp; Planning</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Services</td>
<td>Literature/Data</td>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>Response to criticism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Ostrom, Amy; Iacobucci, Don</td>
<td>Consumer Trade-Offs and the Evaluation of Services</td>
<td>Journal of Marketing</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>The experience services included hotels, fast food outlets, hair salons, and checking accounts. The credence services included tax consultants, psychotherapists, physicians, and financial investments</td>
<td>Literature/Data</td>
<td>Literature Review on service quality in B2B market, 104000 Customers</td>
<td>Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Journal and Volume</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Mentzer, John T.;...</td>
<td>Developing a logistics service quality scale</td>
<td>Journal of Business Logistics</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Defense Logistics Agency</td>
<td>Firms</td>
<td>Multiple Measurements Comparison of different measurements of perceived service quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Gordon H.G; McDougall, Terrence Levesque</td>
<td>Customer satisfaction with services: putting perceived value into the equation</td>
<td>Journal of Service Marketing</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Dentist, AutoService, Restaurant, Haircut</td>
<td>12-16 Marketing Managers Stage 1, Employees and 7 Focus Groups Stage 2 (Data n.a.), 11 Senior Managers Services Stage 3</td>
<td>In-Depth Interviews, Focus Groups</td>
<td>Influence and relevance of emotions in the perception of service quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Liljander, Veronica; Strandvik, Tore</td>
<td>Emotions in service satisfaction</td>
<td>International Journal of Service Industry Management</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Public Service</td>
<td>263 employees and 1657 customers</td>
<td>Interview and surveys</td>
<td>Status QoService Quality and relevance of measurements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Mehta, Subhash C; Lalwani, Ashok K; Han, Soon Li</td>
<td>Service quality in retailing: relative efficiency of alternative measurement scales for different product-service environments</td>
<td>International Journal of Retail &amp; Distribution Management</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Retail Supermarkets and Electronics</td>
<td>161 customers</td>
<td>Surveys</td>
<td>Comparison service quality models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Barbara R. Lewis</td>
<td>Service Quality Measurement</td>
<td>Marketing Intelligence &amp; Planning</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Services</td>
<td>72 Students, 151 female heads of household s, 47 students</td>
<td>Interviews, Self-Administrated Questionnaires</td>
<td>Ecommerce application service quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Gao, Guang Lee; Hsio-Fen Lin</td>
<td>Customer perceptions of e-service quality in online shopping</td>
<td>International Journal of Retail &amp; Distribution Management</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>Online Book Store</td>
<td>Overall response rate was 25% (3069 questionnaires)</td>
<td>Mail Survey</td>
<td>Exploring the notion of expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Johnston, Robert</td>
<td>The determinants of service quality: Satisfiers and dissatisfiers</td>
<td>International Journal of Service Industry Management</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Banking</td>
<td>1152 customers</td>
<td>Multiple Measurements</td>
<td>Alternative approach to SERVQUAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Journal</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Sample Size / Method</td>
<td>Research Focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Lee, Haksool; Lee, Yongki; Yoo, Donggeun</td>
<td>The determinants of perceived service quality and its relationship with satisfaction</td>
<td>Journal of Services Marketing</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>123 customers / 110 customers</td>
<td>Questionnaires</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Mathew Joseph, Cindy McClure, Beatriz Joseph</td>
<td>Service quality in the banking sector: the impact of technology on service delivery</td>
<td>The International Journal of Bank Marketing</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Banking</td>
<td>Informative Service Managers from 112 organisations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Bo Edvardsson</td>
<td>Service quality: beyond cognitive assessment</td>
<td>Managing Service Quality</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>389 students</td>
<td>Self-reported activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Christine T. Emen, Geoffrey V. Reed, Martin R. Binks</td>
<td>Importance-performance analysis and the measurement of service quality</td>
<td>European Journal of Marketing</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>120 customers</td>
<td>SERVQUAL, Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Hillel, Linda L.; Jacobson, Robert</td>
<td>Market share and customers' perceptions of quality: When can firms grow their way to higher versus lower quality?</td>
<td>Journal of Marketing</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>452 customers from 51 banks</td>
<td>Surveys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Jacobucci, Drew; Grayson, Kent; Ostrom, Amy</td>
<td>Customer Satisfaction Fables</td>
<td>Sloan Management Review</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>448 customers</td>
<td>Surveys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>L. Jean Harrison-Walker</td>
<td>The measurement of word-of-mouth communication and an investigation of service quality and customer commitment as potential antecedents</td>
<td>Journal of Service Research</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>300 customers</td>
<td>Surveys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Buttle, Francis</td>
<td>SERVQUAL: Review, critique, research agenda</td>
<td>European Journal of Marketing</td>
<td>Global Services</td>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>Literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Cronin, Joseph Jr; Brady, Michael K.; Hult, Thomas M.</td>
<td>Assessing the effects of quality, value, and customer satisfaction on consumer behavioral intentions in service environments</td>
<td>Journal of Retailing</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>471 customers</td>
<td>Surveys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The article first discusses the service concept and implications for service quality. It then focuses on the role of customer experiences, and then discusses the role of emotions in service quality.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>J. Joseph Cronin, Jr., Steven A. Taylor</td>
<td>Measuring Service Quality: A Reexamination and Extension</td>
<td>Journal of Marketing</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Surveys</td>
<td>612 customers</td>
<td>Table on empirical testing of SQ and encounter outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Kode Ruyter, Martin Wetzels, Josee Bloemer</td>
<td>On the relationship between perceived service quality, service loyalty and switching costs</td>
<td>International Journal of Service Industry Management</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Surveys</td>
<td>660 customers</td>
<td>The findings support the theory that consumer expectations are affected by the consumption experience. For an accurate measure of service quality using the gap theory, consumer expectations must be measured prior to the service, with evaluation occurring after the service encounter. Any attempt to measure the quality of a service encounter after the service has occurred will result in biased results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Prabha A, Dhillon, C. David Shepherd, Deyle I Thorpe</td>
<td>A comprehensive framework for service quality: An investigation of critical conceptual and measurement issues through a longitudinal study</td>
<td>Journal of Retailing</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Surveys</td>
<td>Photography/Photography/Photography</td>
<td>Literature/Research Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Brown, Steven W.; Fisk, Raymond P.; Bitter, Mary Jo</td>
<td>The development and emergence of services marketing thought</td>
<td>International Journal of Service Industry Management</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Surveys</td>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Bolton, Ruth N.; Drew, James H</td>
<td>A Longitudinal Analysis of the Impact of Service Changes on</td>
<td>Journal of Marketing</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>Attempt to track attitude longitudinal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Aaker, David A.; Jacobson, Robert</td>
<td>The financial information content of perceived quality</td>
<td>Journal of Marketing Research</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>Financial Services - hint to superiority of longitudinal design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Ashborn, Patrick; McCleary, Karl J.; Swan, John E</td>
<td>SERVQUAL revisited: a critical review of service quality</td>
<td>Journal of Services Marketing</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Surveys</td>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>Literature/Research Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Bell, Simon J.; Auh, Seigyoung; Smalley, Karen</td>
<td>Customer Relationship Dynamics: Service Quality and Customer Loyalty in the Context of Varying Levels of Customer Expertise and Switching Costs</td>
<td>Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Surveys</td>
<td>Financial Services</td>
<td>Accountability and impact of service quality on organisational performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 29. Literature Review Question 1
Figure 30 represents the distribution pattern of the selected publications to address my first review questions, outlining that the literature on service quality measurements evolved apparently in a ‘wave-like’ movement, peaking in the early 1990s, triggered by the introduction and research into possible applications of SERVQUAL, the most popular and far-spread measurement of service quality. While the second peak in the graph, between 1999 and 2001, was driven by critical discussion and the search for alternatives to measure service quality more efficiently and more precisely. Recently, in 2005 two major literature reviews critiquing SERVQUAL have been published.

![Figure 30. Publication Dates](image)

Figure 31 allows for a further examination of the literature by connecting the timeline to the use of qualitative and quantitative, or a mix of both methods. The beginning of the timeline represents the focus on the exploratory qualitative approach in order to grasp and explain the construct of perceived service quality, building measurements of service quality, while from 1998 the focus was more on the quantitative part of the research, i.e. developing hypothesis and delivering empirical data of the application of service quality measurements. Since 2002, however, the focus shifted from studies to discussions and reviews of measurements of service quality, possibly indicating a shift back to an exploratory stage again.
Figure 31. Comparison Qualitative and Quantitative Studies

Figure 32 demonstrates the sources of publications for the chosen literature, outlining that the vast majority of the studies were published at the Journal of Marketing (15 between 1980 and 2004), International Journal of Service Industry Management (6 between 1993 and 2002), while the other studies are rather spread between multiple publications.

Figure 32. Publication Count
The favourite location of studies about measurements of service quality seems to be the United States, followed by a distant second, the United Kingdom (see Figure 33).

![Figure 33. Locations of Studies](image)

The next part of the synthesis (see Figure 34; Figure 35) examined the context of the studies, i.e. in which industries were the studies conducted, establishing ‘Services’, i.e. multiple, unspecified context as most popular, followed by Financial Services and Banking, while multiple other service context were chosen for the individual studies.

![Figure 34. Context (Part 1)](image)
Taking this synthesis further I explored the differences between studies set in a single and a multiple context, which revealed that the majority of the studies are split between either a single context, or in a set of three or more context (see Figure 36).

Adding a timeline to the analysis (see Figure 37) did not any significant insight, but the data extraction sheets allowed me to explore the fact that Financial Services, including Banking are the by far most popular choice for a single context study setting.
Surveys are traditionally used in the measurement of service quality, so it should come as no surprise that it is the most-often used method of data collection (see Figure 38).

Figure 37. Single Versus Multiple Context Timeline

Figure 38. Method Data Collection

Figure 39 reveals research papers and literature reviews as the majority of the study designs.
Study design and the method of data collection have a direct influence on the method of data analysis, favouring regression and confirmatory factor analysis for research papers collecting data through questionnaires and surveys. However, there seem to be not a real consensus on how to approach the data analysis generated in qualitative research and qualitative enquiry (see Figure 40.)

![Figure 39. Study Design](image)

![Figure 40. Method of Data Analysis](image)
Looking at the underlying theory, the guiding framework or key focus\(^1\) (see Figure 41) of the studies one could either conclude that there is a clear agreement that Expectation-Confirmation theory, or SERVQUAL, which is based on the same theory, but often referred in the literature as a theory, are more than dominant, or even accepted. However, a more thorough examination (see Phase 9) will reveal that this is not necessary the case.

![Figure 41. Underlying Theory/Framework/Key Focus](image)

Based on the study selection process outlined in 2.5.2 in order to address

Review Question 2 – Consumer/Customer/Brand Experience

“How can the concepts of consumer/customer/brand experience contribute to improve measurements of service quality?”

the following literature (Figure 42) was selected:
Experience as the key determinant

2006 Daengbuppha, Jaruwan; Jenkinson, Angus Do organisations now understand the rationalizing service logic, or...?

2006 Mascarenhas, Oswald R.; Millard, N. Services quality and satisfaction... a holistic CRM model, i.e. EXQ

2006 Bowers, Michael R.; Schneider, Benjamin R.; White, Susan S. Linking service climate and customer perceptions of service quality: Test of... a holistic CRM model, i.e. EXQ

2006 Carbone, Lewis P.; Haack, Stephen H. Total customer experience drives value: Towards an interpretive approach to measuring... an holistic CRM model, i.e. EXQ

2006 Rosenthal, Stephen R.; Schembri, Sharon Experience as the key determinant of service quality... an holistic CRM model, i.e. EXQ

2006 Millard, N. Experience as the key determinant of service quality... an holistic CRM model, i.e. EXQ

2006 Schembri, Sharon, Sanders, John, Hartel, Charmine E.J.; Szmigin, Isabelle; Kristy E. Reynolds Ability of Experience Design Elements... an holistic CRM model, i.e. EXQ

2006 Hartel, Charmine E.J.; Szmigin, Isabelle; Kristy E. Reynolds Ability of Experience Design Elements... an holistic CRM model, i.e. EXQ

2005 Bennett, Rebekah; Dedeke, Adenekan Customer community and co-creation: perceiving through the native's eye... an holistic CRM model, i.e. EXQ

2003 Dedeke, Adenekan Service quality: A fulfilment-oriented approach... an holistic CRM model, i.e. EXQ

1997 Liljander, Veronica; Mittal, Banwari Critical customer experiences in professional business-to-business service encounters... an holistic CRM model, i.e. EXQ

1996 Mittal, Banwari; Carbone, Lewis P.; Sandberg, Jorgen Leading-edge studies indicate that... an holistic CRM model, i.e. EXQ

1994 Hochstein, Stephen H. Customer experience in... an holistic CRM model, i.e. EXQ

1989 Bansal, Harvir S.; Fernandez, Karen V. The impact of involvement on... an holistic CRM model, i.e. EXQ

Figure 42. Literature Review Question 2
The timeline of the relevant literature choose an interesting pattern, clearly indicating an increase of interest of the phenomenon customer experience in the context of measurements of service quality since 2002 (see Figure 43), coinciding with the time (see Figure 31) the reviews and discussion papers on the measurements of service quality build the majority of the literature to address my first review question.

The year 2002 also marks the date when qualitative, exploratory research passes quantitative studies, highlighted by seven qualitative studies in 2006 (see Figure 44).
As Figure 45 indicates, there seems to be, unlike in the literature to address my first research question, no dominating publication to address the phenomenon customer experience in the context of service quality measurements, which could also be interpreted as a healthy plurality.

**Figure 45. Publications**

Furthermore, there seems either no real agreement, in which context customer experience shall be studied and applied, or a healthy diversification and variety in methodologies (see Figure 46).

**Figure 46. Context of Studies**
Just as in the literature addressing my first review question (see Figure 36; Figure 37) the timeline does not reveal a pattern, but the split between single and multiple, i.e. three or more context is remarkable (see Figure 47; Figure 48).

![Figure 47. Single Versus Multiple Context](image)

![Figure 48. Single Versus Multiple Context Timeline](image)
Figure 49 renders the United States as the prime location for the majority of the studies, while no other single location stands out besides them.

While the majority of the studies are qualified as research papers discussions, theoretical and qualitative pieces in general build the bulk of the relevant literature, probably depicting an exploratory stage of the phenomenon Figure 50.
The following graph (see Figure 51) also indicates a broad array of data collection methods used in the literature, including some first-time approaches, such as the mind-cam.

![Method of Data Collection](image)

Figure 51. Method of Data Collection

The method of analysis graph also shows an emphasis on qualitative and exploratory methods (see Figure 52).

![Method of Data Analysis](image)

Figure 52. Method of Data Analysis
The underlying theory, the guiding framework or key focus is mostly based on principles of service marketing (see Figure 53).

The data exposed some possible gaps that could be integral in the design of a future study addressing existing gaps. While the majority of the studies are based in the United States, a study in a European context could add value to the existing literature. The industry context, keeping in mind that one of the themes refers to the context-specific nature of the customer experience, should preferably be situated in a single context. Looking at a possible context Financial Services and Banking could be a perfect setting, because there is plenty of research done, allowing a better comparison of the possible impact of new measurements of service quality. Furthermore, as many authors point out in their limitations, which are also included in a more comprehensive data extraction sheet used as foundation for the charts above, a longitudinal study would be a far superior study design to explore the possible influence of a new measurement of service quality. In addition the study could be used to address the lack to either test, or even develop new theory in the context of measurements of service quality. Looking at the thematic analysis of the relevant literature and summarising the studies delivers indications, as outlined above, of how to address these recommendations on how customer experience could possible enhance measurements of service quality.
2.8.2.2 Qualitative Synthesis

While the narrative synthesis of qualitative research is quite challenging and normally included in the discussion section, I decided to report these findings within the context of the review (see Phase 9) by applying the same criteria used to judge the quality of the included studies to the synthesis itself; therefore making the process of conclusion as transparent and replicable as possible.

2.8.3 Key points and references

- The aim of my data synthesis was to collate and summarise the data extracted from studies included in the review.
- Data synthesis is the tabulation of study characteristics and results.

References


Reporting and disseminating

Reporting is the zenith of the systematic review. My report shall be standing up to the rigorous selection and appraisal methods I applied in the scoping process of this review, and deliver a contribution to knowledge.
STAGE 3

Reporting and disseminating

PHASE 9

The report and recommendations

3.9.1 Executive summary
3.9.2 Main text of the review
3.9.3 References, tables and appendices
3.9.1 Executive Summary

The challenge of predicting consumer behaviour is widely considered by the literature as a rather daunting, but worthwhile task. Which manager or academic would not be interested in using or developing a framework enabling one to predict future behaviour better than existing measurements? Refering to the old saying, stating that ‘only what gets measured, gets managed’, indicating what the literature addresses as a need to track the influence of change through measurements. In order to address my research question and explore the proposition ‘Can a measurement of service quality based on consumer experience be a better predictor of consumer behaviour?’ this paper examines the existing literature in two fields of literature. On the one hand I will be investigating studies in the context of existing measurements of service quality to assess the first part of my research question to determine the ‘status quo’, application and characteristics of the literature on measurements of service quality. On the other hand the paper will select, appraise, and synthesize the relevant literature on consumer behaviour to address my second review question, if, and if yes, how the phenomenon of consumer experience could be the foundation for a measurement of service quality capable of predicting consumer behaviour better than existing measurements of service quality.

By systematically reviewing the existing literature I am aiming on contributing to the literature addressing the challenges of predicting consumer behaviour.

3.9.2 Main text of the review

3.9.2.1 Background information

Marketing literature suggests that high-quality service is the antecedent of customer retention in service industries. In order to assess service quality, research advocates the use of objective measurements. SERVQUAL, a multiple-item scale for determining consumer perceptions, is still the most popular and widely used measurement of service quality. It is criticised for its conceptual, methodological and interpretative flaws. One of the major concerns raised by researchers is that SERVQUAL measures purchase intent, but not behaviour. The aim of my systematic review is to enhance and expand the existing
knowledge of measurements of service quality on the one hand, and consumer experience on
the other hand, in order to determine the relevance of addressing research into developing a
new measurement for service quality addressing the flaws of existing measuring tools
through the integration of consumer experience (see Phase 1.2.2).

3.9.2.2 The review questions
As a result of my scoping study, review protocol and the guidance of my panel and review
team the following review questions were selected:

Question 1 – Measurements of Service Quality
“What does the literature say about the research using measurements of service quality?”

Question 2 – Consumer/Customer/Brand Experience
“How can the concepts of consumer/customer/brand experience contribute to improve
measurements of service quality?”

3.9.2.3 Review methods
The methods used in my review are clearly outlined in Stage 1 and Stage 2 of this review,
including detailed descriptions of the search process and strategies, inclusion and exclusion
criteria, assessments of relevance and validity of primary studies, data extraction, data
synthesis, and investigation of differences between studies.

3.9.2.4 Results of the review
“What does the literature say about the research using measurements of service quality?”
Marketing literature suggests that high-quality service is the antecedent of customer
retention in service industries. In order to assess service quality, research advocates the use
of objective measurements. The results of the data synthesis (Phase 8) and the thorough
study of the relevant literature allowed me to conduct my review in an inductive fashion by
using MindMap software to visualise the emerging themes and possible generalisations. The
results of this approach are outlined in Figure 54 highlighting the following underlying
themes of the studies:

3 A larger version of the Figure is attached at the end of the document.
Importance for the organization/Antecedents and consequences of service quality

The well-documented management paradigm shift from goods-centred to service-dominant logic (Brodie et al., 2006; Lusch and Vargo, 2006), identifies the differences between marketing services and goods, the latter the traditional domain of marketing scholarship (Shah et al., 2006). This shift exposed the need for companies to deliver a high service quality in order to retain their customers (Anderson et al., 1997). To assess the quality of service it had to be measured in an objective way, and SERVQUAL was introduced in 1988 by Parasuraman et al. to address this need (Morrison Coulthard, 2004).

Superior service quality has been found to increase favorable behavioral intentions and decrease unfavorable intentions (Rust et al, 1994), increase customer satisfaction and loyalty (Westbrook, 1988), adding value for the customer, hence triggering desirable behavior pattern such as repurchases and recommendations (Zeithaml et al., 1985; Mittal and Kamakura, 1997), increase organizational performance (Heskett et al., 2000; Bell et al., 2005) and profits (Sureshchandar et al., 1993). Service quality research also exposed the key role of the social aspects, i.e. service employees and communication in the delivery of service (Roth and Jackson, 1994), leading to applications such as the ‘service scripts’ in services (Sureshchandar et al., 1993).
Measurements of Service Quality/SERVQUAL

The need for a measurement of service quality is well documented and in 1988 Parasuraman et al. introduced SERVQUAL, the, as of today, still most popular and wide-spread measurement of service quality (Morrison-Coulthard, 2005). SERVQUAL, however, is not the only measurement of service quality and alternatives and variations, often based on the criticism to SERVQUAL have been introduced, such as the Teas (1985) model, SERVPERF (Cronin and Taylor, 1992), Rust and Oliver’s (1994) model based on the three-components conceptualization of service quality, Johnston (1999) index approach, the measurement of service satisfaction based on the sociology-based ‘Quality of Life’ approach (Ennew et al., 2000), using factor analysis (Sivadas and Baker-Hewitt, 1994) or the focus on behavior rather than intentions (Iacobucci et al., 2000). However, the focus of the literature, the preferred choice of academics and practitioners alike is still SERVQUAL, despite numerous and ongoing critique, hence I will take a more in-depth look at this particular measurement.
SERVQUAL/Contributions and Criticism

Based on the notion that service quality is becoming an increasingly important differentiator among competing businesses in the retail sector, a multiple-item instrument called SERVQUAL for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality was introduced. SERVQUAL is a 22-item instrument that addresses customer-based assessments of service quality. SERVQUAL is divided into 5 dimensions: 1. tangibles, 2. reliability, 3. responsiveness, 4. assurance, and 5. empathy, which are described in more detail in the outline below (see Figure 58). I state that potential applications include categorizing the firm's customers into quality segments and tracking service levels of individual stores in a chain, indicating that SERVQUAL allows marketers to understand customers' perceptions of service quality.
SERVQUAL has been applied and incorporated to explore the influence of technology on service quality (Zeithaml, 1988), the application of the perceived service quality in e-commerce (Mittal and Lassar, 1994; Lewis, 1999), the importance of service personnel and communication on service quality (Roth and Jackson, 1994; Heskett et al., 1994), taxonomy of services (Van Dyke et al., 1991) and customer-perceived aspect of logistic services (Ostrom, 1996). Despite the popularity of SERVQUAL there has been plenty of criticism towards SERVQUAL (see Table 1) and the existing measurements of service quality in general. While the details of the criticism can be found in the corresponding figures there are some re-emerging themes and trends that deserve our attention. As Robinson (1995) states ‘perhaps it is time to recognise that SERVQUAL has been just one contribution, albeit an important one, in the evolution of an understanding of service quality and its measurement.’ This, however, indicates that we are still in the process of evolution, but evolution towards where? The reviewed literature clearly states on the shortcomings of the existing measurements of service quality, such as criticizing the fact that service quality can be measured by the existing dimensions of service quality alone (Johnston, 1999), issues of validity (Dabholkar et al., 2001), non-applicability in certain services (Schneider et al.,
Literature reviews summarizing the existing literature on service quality measurements and SERVQUAL give a pretty clear picture by stating that SERVQUAL has major flaws (Buttle, 2001), more works need to be done before a reliable measurement will be available (Asubonteng et al., 2005) and requiring a new measurement for service quality (Morisson-Coulthard, 2005). But what is required to deliver a superior, reliable measurement of service quality, what does the literature suggest as the possible missing link to fill this gap?

Figure 59. SERVQUAL
The Missing Link

The literature is quite explicit on what is missing in order to deliver a measurement of service quality addressing the existing critique and flaws. While some research warn about the interpretation and data deriving from measurements in general (Liljander and Strandvik, 1998), others point out that the current conceptualization of service quality are based on a flawed paradigm and should be measured as an attitude instead (Edvardsson, 2000; Bolton and Drew, 2004). There is also the call for inclusion of factors such as the brand and brand extension (Buttle, 2001) and the relevance of emotions (McDougall and Leveque, 1998). A major trend emerging from the literature is that the missing piece could be found by integrating the construct of customer experience as one of the determining factors of perceived service in the measurement of service quality (Johnson and Mathews, 2000). The experiential factors are seen as a possible key ingredient in a superior measurement of service quality (Lee and Lin, 1999; Hellofs and Jacobson, 2000; Ruyter et al., 2001).
The findings of the selected literature led directly to the second research question

“How can the concepts of consumer/customer/brand experience contribute to improve measurements of service quality?”

The inductive approach of the meta-synthesis allowed me to separate the themes emerging from the literature into two mind maps, one outlining the construct customer experience in more general terms and a second one synthesising the themes concerning customer experience and measurements of service quality. The review will start with the construct and facets of customer experience (see Figure 614).

4 A larger version of the Figure is attached at the end of the document.
Figure 61. Customer Experience
Definitions of and insights from customer experience

The definitions of customer experience are truly broad reaching from customer’s actual and anticipated purchase and consumption experience (Fornell, 1992; Andersson et al., 1994), a distinctive economic offering (Arrusy, 2002), the result of encountering, undergoing or living through things (Schmitt, 1999), to the notion of new, experience seeking consumer (Baker, 2003; Prahalad, 2000; Cova, 1996; Firat and Dohlakia, 1988, 1995) as co-creator of value and experiences (Berry et al. 2002; Hoch, 2000). The latter indicating the influence of customer experience on experiential marketing strategies (Dewey, 1963; Berry et al., 2002), but also establishing the influence of customer experience in a consumer goods context (Belk et al., 1989; Boyer and Hult, 2006). Furthermore, customer experience is acknowledged as a construct relevant to the exploration of consumer behaviour (Starr and Fernandez, 2007) by measuring emotions in a qualitative and quantitative way (Pullmann and Gross, 2004). The phenomenon of customer experience has been applied to research for customer experience as source of competitive advantage in New Product Development (NPD) (Rosenthal and Capper, 2006), as moderator for loyalty in a b2b setting (Bennett et al., 2005), power as part of the consumption and purchase encounter (Menon and Bansal, 2007) and the influence of fun in a service context (Morgan and Rao, 2003).
The purpose of this paper is to present grounded theory as an alternative approach for conceptualising and modelling the consumer experience. It is suggested that the grounded theory approach can be a valuable tool in capturing the insights and meanings of visitors’ experience and could be applied in future research in consumer behaviour (Olivey et al., 2009).

Customer evaluation of total purchase and consumption experiences, both actual and anticipated (Anderson et al., 1994; Fornell, 1992; Johnstone and Fornell, 1991)

Customer always have an experience when they interact with a firm. The question for managers is whether the firm is prepared to systematically manage the customer experience or simply offers for the best. The customers overall experience is influenced by sensory and emotional cues - evokes a value perception that determines brand preference. Through experience management principles, a firm can design a composite of cues that resonate with customers and earn their loyalty (Hedelin et al., 2000)

Notion of customer experience as an distinct economic offering, as different from services as services are from goods (Artz, 2002)

Customer experience is rarely completely emotional, cognitive or rational (Barrie et al., 1994, p. 89)

Experiences occur as a result of encountering, undergoing or living through things (Schmitt, 1999)

Successful experiences are those that the customer finds unique, memorable and sustainable over time, would want to repeat and build upon, and enthusiastically promote via word of mouth (Pine & Gilmore, 1998, 1999).

The first moment of truth is about obtaining customers’ attention and communicating the benefits of an offer. The second moment of truth is about providing the tools the customer needs to experience these benefits when using the product. The combination of these two moments of truth makes up the total customer experience (Loftman, 2000)

Gupta and Vlasic (1999) state that an experience occurs when a customer has any sensation or knowledge acquisition resulting from some level of interaction with different elements of a context created by a service provider.

Notion of postmodern consumer, anchoring life through experiences (Ritchie and Dintleman, 1988, 1995).

Customers seek inclusion in the experience through participation (Covi, 1995)

Value-adding interactions of customers are centred around participation (Barry et al., 2002, Hoch, 2002)

Seeking for experiences, the “new consumer” (Baker, 2000; Willmott and Nelson, 2003)

Figure 62. Definitions and Insights

Importance of customer experience for the organization

The emergence of customer experience as a crucial factor for the competitiveness (Jenkinson, 2006), value creation (Prahalad and Ramaswamy, 2004) and the survival of the organization (Carbone and Haeckl, 1994) by putting the view and experience of the customer in the centre of their strategy (Chan, 2005) is well-documented. Customer
experience, by being hard to copy is seen as the source of a sustainable competitive advantage (Berry et al., 2002). Research links customer experience to customer loyalty (Haeckl et al., 2003; Mascarenhas et al., 2006; Reichheld and Markey, 2006), customer satisfaction (Burton et al., 2003; Pullmann and Gross, 2004), recommendations and positive word-of-mouth (Pine and Gilmore, 1998, 1999). But what constitutes a favourable customer experience and how can an organization create these experiences? Literature reveals mostly conceptual ideas without being too detailed on the implementation of successful policies for practitioners. The notion of the holistic nature of the customer experience (Mascarenhas et al., 2006) and a holistic experience management (Carbone, 1998) throughout all customer touch points (Payne and Frow, 2004) is just one theme. Another focuses on the kind of experience the organization shall deliver, defining them as emotional engaging (Millard, 2006), memorable (Shaw and Ivens, 2002), value creating (Jenkinson, 2006), unique, sustainable over time (Pine and Gilmore, 1999), inviting the consumer to co-create experiences and value (Rowley et al., 2007; Vargo and Lusch, 2007). As mentioned, the majority of the literature is rather conceptual in nature and as indicated in the data synthesis part and the discussions of the studies there is a need to explore customer experience further, especially in the possible application as foundation for a measurement of service quality (Stuart-Menteth et al., 1996).
Figure 63. Importance Customer Experience for Organization
Customer Experience and Service Quality

The analysis of the literature and themes concerning this unique combination are outlined in Figure 64\(^5\). The dimensions of customer experience are suggested to be the guide for all service encounters (Prenshaw et al., 2006). Customer experience could also address the critique addressed to existing measurements of service quality of excluding the critical emotional aspects of the service encounter (Liljandre and Strandvik, 1998), hence living up to the demand of Craig et al. (1989) to put customer experience back into consumer research. Literature states that contemporary research on service quality and satisfaction is limited, especially considering the fact that customer satisfaction is determined by other facts, such as e.g. emotional factors and social norms, which are deeply rooting in the customer experience (Swan and Bowers, 1998).

The magnitude of successful customer experience as focus of the organizational strategy in order to address the challenges of CRM and the relationship concept (O’Loughlin et al., 2004; Rogers, 2003) and the new service-dominated economy (Vargo and Lusch) lead to the conclusion that customer experience can be seen as the key determinant of service quality evaluation (Schembri, 2006). Schneider et al. (1998) research indicated that customer experience is the final concept of perceived service quality, and Schembri and Sandberg (2002) conclude that customer experience addresses the flaws of dominant service qualities theories successfully by understanding the services constituted in the customer experience (Schembri, 2006; Vargo and Lusch, 2007).

\(^5\) A larger version of the Figure is attached at the end of the document.
Figure 64. Service Quality Context Customer Experience
3.9.2.5 Discussion

During the taught sessions of the module leading to the systematic review we were encouraged to see the discussion part of our review as an opportunity to not only help the reader with the interpretation of the review, but furthermore to express our experiences with the process of systematically reviewing the literature relevant to address our review question and deliver enrich the review with, if available, findings and observations beyond the scope of the review. Reflecting on the learning process of the systematic review I can clearly value the advantages of being now in a position to have access to a rich and unique source of data supporting in reference to my research question. In my particular case the results of the review give me the confidence of having an opportunity to make a significant contribution to knowledge. In addition I will use some of the techniques implemented and utilized in the review to select, assess and summarise future literature in the context of my PhD research. Reflecting on the process I will in the future amend data extraction forms and software like MindMap, which suit my learning and filing style better, and incorporate my review team even more closely. However, while being quite thorough, and keeping time limitations and quality assessments in mind, there is more to say about the review questions beyond the scope and possibilities of the systematic review. Since January 2007 I receive via alert al least one time per week a list of publications with the reference ‘customer experience’ from the ABI database. This list includes most of the time between 10 and 25 articles, most of them almost exclusively from business ‘practitioner’ publications. The sheer amount of data is overwhelming and not a week goes by without an announcement of a new ‘customer experience’ division, a ‘how to’ guide, or the announcement of a new head of customer experience. Unfortunately these documentations are not included in the review, and ever so often, the holistic picture, especially in my research area, cannot be complete without these observations or ongoing discussions with the business and academic community throughout conferences and other points of exchange. To recapitulate and enrich the review I would like to add in this discussion the observation that customer experience seems to be ‘on the mind’ of the academic and ‘on the top of the list’ for practitioners, while both seem to be struggling to grasp the phenomenon and implement it in an advantageous fashion. The limitations of my systematic review are in scope and depth due to time and word constraints, the danger of bias and human error.
3.9.2.6 Conclusions

As a result of my scoping study, review protocol and the guidance of my panel and review team the following review questions were selected:

Question 1 – Measurements of Service Quality

“What does the literature say about the research using measurements of service quality?”

The literature indicates that despite their popularity and widespread application current measurements of service quality display major flaws and research indicates and suggests to explore more reliable and better constructs to measure service quality in a satisfactory fashion.

Question 2 – Consumer/Customer/Brand Experience

“How can the concepts of consumer/customer/brand experience contribute to improve measurements of service quality?”

The literature clearly states that the construct of consumer/customer/brand experience can be key in creating a superior measurement of service quality, hence addressing the multiple and far-reaching critique on existing measurements of service quality.

The implications for the future research are to address the limitations of existing measurements by following the call from the literature for ‘a new approach to measure service quality’ (Brady et al., 2002/1:p.28), through the construct of customer experience (Schembri, 2006) exploring the important relationship between service quality and purchase behaviour (Buttle, 1996), is required.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Criticism</th>
<th>Reference:</th>
<th>Key Message</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Basis</td>
<td>Oliver (1980)</td>
<td>→ Perceived Quality is an attitude, hence the use of expectation-disconfirmation model as the basis for SERVQUAL is not appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cronin and Taylor (1992, 1994)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Andersson (1992)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>→ Failure to use economic, statistical and psychological theory to inform the development of SERVQUAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Orientation</td>
<td>Mangold and Babakus (1991)</td>
<td>→ Focus on only the functional aspect of the service-delivery process does not deliver for accurate evaluations of service quality. Measuring functional (the process, ‘how’) and technical (the outcome ‘what’) aspects together accounts for more variation in choice behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richard and Allaway (1993)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sureschander et al. (2001)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brady et al. (2002)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liljander and Strandvik (1997)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chui (2002)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Dimensionality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carman</td>
<td>(1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finn and Lamb</td>
<td>(1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saleh and Ryan</td>
<td>(1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babakus and Boller</td>
<td>(1992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headley and Miller</td>
<td>(1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandamme and Leunis</td>
<td>(1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>(1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brady et al.</td>
<td>(2002)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

→ Numerous studies have failed to identify the underlying dimensions reported by Parasuraman et al. (1988), even finding a larger number of dimensions; furthermore, the scales’ five factors cannot be confirmed by research.

### Methodology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carman</td>
<td>(1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouman and van der Wiele</td>
<td>(1992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown et al.</td>
<td>(1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iacobucci et al.</td>
<td>(1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolton and Drew</td>
<td>(1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronin and Taylor</td>
<td>(1992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulding et al.</td>
<td>(1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAlexander et al.</td>
<td>(1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hahm et al.</td>
<td>(1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avkiran</td>
<td>(1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee et al.</td>
<td>(2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brady et al.</td>
<td>(2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lam and Woo</td>
<td>(1997)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

→ Despite the revision of the original SERVQUAL (Parasuraman et al., 1991) the use of the often as ambiguous described expectation statement and its usefulness of the evaluation of service quality are still questionable. In addition, this statement can lead to practical difficulties such as boredom and confusion in respondents, both of which may jeopardize the quality of the data obtained.

→ It is more appropriate to ask respondents about standards than expectations and to include financial factors; SERVQUAL is too simple to provide a general understanding of customer evaluation or to be useful in empirical prediction.

→ The disconfirmation paradigm used by SERVQUAL as the basis for the assessment of service quality is questionable, and numerous studies have been demonstrated that performance-only measures are superior to SERVQUAL.

→ SERVQUAL’s performance items are subject to instability even in a one-week test-retest interval, hence doubtful in the usefulness to measure service quality.

### Psychometric Problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brown et al.</td>
<td>(1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter et al.</td>
<td>(1993)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

→ Studies looking at SERVQUAL’s interpretation of service quality in terms of different scores provide strong
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>→ There is little evidence that customer assess service quality in the terms of the gap model. In addition SERVQUAL’s gap scores, averaging the scores across dimensions cannot be justified due the instability of the dimension structure, instead each item has to be treated individually and not as a component of an a priori dimension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>→ Likert scales in combination with the use of gap scores has a significant potential for the misinterpretation of responses; they are missing options to increase the validity of the data, and through the possible selection of a mid-point to record a neutral or DK response may therefore not reflect the respondent’s actual expectations or perceptions. The SERVQUAL scales have no verbal scales, making them object to bias, and despite the presence of superior question formats, SERVQUAL fails to use them, hence missing an opportunity to improve the likelihood of eliciting accurate and valid responses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>→ The rating of expectations influences the ratings of perceptions used in SERVQUAL, creating a priming effect, but, more importantly, the measurement of expectations contributes little to the measurement of service quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Areas of Criticism SERVQUAL
STAGE 3

Reporting and disseminating

PHASE 10

Getting evidence into practice

3.10.1 Introduction
3.10.2 Disseminating to the academic community
3.10.3 Disseminating to the public
3.10.4 Key points and references
3.10.1 Introduction

Systematic reviews are seen as a key tool incorporating the evidence-based approach in social sciences, aiming at “enhancing the quality of management reviews” (Tranfield, Denyer and Smart, 2003, p. 220). As a desired result systematic reviews could provide a foundation for methodological rigour, hence creating a dependable and trustworthy source of knowledge for academia and practitioners alike.

3.10.2 Disseminating to the academic community

3.10.3 Disseminating to the public

The pinnacle of the reporting of the findings of my review is to discuss the themes and their relevance both to academics and practitioners. The ultimate objective of systematic reviews is to improve the quality of research and practice. This includes communicating and distributing the acquired knowledge to my appropriate audience. A desirable way to propagate the review is in the form of publishing articles for academic and practitioner alike and in an even more interactive fashion during conferences and discussions.

Together with my supervisor I submitted parts of the research in a journal article for a special issue of the Journal of Brand Management, focusing on the influence of the customer experience on the brand in a service-dominated economy. Furthermore I will include the findings in the submission to a special issue on global brand strategies of the Journal of Product and Brand Management, and a research proposal on marketing actions from the Marketing Science Institute and the Emory Brand Institute. In addition the findings have already been incorporated in my key speeches during practitioner conferences in Germany and the United Kingdom and are incorporated in future research proposals.
3.10.5 Key points and references

- My systematic reviews shall provide a foundation for methodological rigour, hence creating a dependable and trustworthy source of knowledge for academia and practitioners alike.
- Every given opportunity shall be taken to communicate and distribute the acquired knowledge to my appropriate audience.

References:


i Underlying Theory/Framework/Key Focus refers to either the underlying theory of the article, but, if not clearly and explicitly stated to what the author(s) define as the guiding framework or key focus/contribution of their study, for example philosophies and methods such as phenomenology and Ethnography, or descriptors such as Brand Communication.

ii See above