Research Paper *IJBARR*
Impact Factor: 4.729 *E- ISSN -2347-856X*
Refereed, Listed & Indexed *ISSN -2348-0653*

ONLINE MARKETING: CUSTOMER EXPERIENCE MEASUREMENT AMALGAMATION OF ENTITIES, PARAMETERS & VALUES BASED ON CUSTOMER REVIEWS GIVEN IN INDIANE-COMMERCE SITES

S. Somu Arumugam* **Dr. J. Parasuraman****
**Research Scholar, Department of Management, J.J. College of Arts and Science (Autonomous), Bharathidasan University, Pudukkottai.*
***Research Supervisor, Director, Department of Management, J.J. College of Arts and Science (Autonomous), Bharathidasan University, Pudukkottai.*

Abstract
This paper tries to take a fresh look on the kind of variables which amalgamate together and build itself towards a customer experience measurement. The customer experience measurement constitutes Entities, Parameters & Values and all the sub-points associated with them. There are three stages by which an online customer experience can be observed – User Reflection, Understanding User's Behaviour, User Influence. Here the focus is on getting the big picture, sense of performance (both customers & sites) and major weaknesses with the help of the points given by the customers through reviews.

Keywords: *User Experience Design, Experience Measurement, Online Experience Management, Online Customer Review Measurement.*

1. Introduction

Measuring online customer experience is becoming one of the key areas of development as long as it is concerned in the space of user experience design. Normally measurements are done based on customer behavior and it gets related with the customer experience. By observing the Entities, Parameters and Values associated with the customer experience we can square towards the exact parameters which becomes the source for constituting the customer experience measurement. The Entities related to customer experience can be an aspiration, safetly, comfort, ease of use, speed, geographical proximity, touch points of conversion, network, benchmarks and best practices, technology and analytical resources. Similar way the Parameters can be transparency, expectation management, time, post sales survey, repeated visits of customers and brand attributes. Also, the Values can be constituted by emotions which customer reflect in the medium, relationality, by listening to the customer, expertise shown towards the offerings, the experience itself reflected by others, the exclusivity shown in the offerings, etc., Now these Entities, Parameters and Values can be observed at the various stages of customer experiences viz., User Reflection, Understanding User's Behavior and User Influence. Once this is done then it will lead to a comprehensive framework by which online customer experience measurement can be brought in a structured way and also it becomes easier to do the measurement at each stage of the customer experience.At the User Reflection stage which is also the general knowledge stage, provides a basic sense of the online site performance which leads towards the initial experience. The second stage of Understanding User's Behavior identifies what users are doing online with the given interface and where problems arise. The final stage of User Influence determines whether the online site or application is compelling enough for the customers in terms of experience it offered.Now at each given stage, the measurement constituents Entities, Parameters and Values and its sub-parameters get applied so that it leads to a framework score so that each online customer experience is measured and quantified for further analysis. This analysis will lead to the understanding of the performance of a site based on customer experience and the weaknesses or problems in which the site can work out to improve its online customer experience.

2. Background and Related Work

Customer reviews are having long-standing relationship with core variables viz., Entity, Parameter, Value, etc., and many works has been carried out in the past which has affirmed the assumption. It has been (Hardeep Chahal, et al., 2015) established that robust relationship of customer experience with satisfaction, brand equity and word of mouth, but precautions need to be considered for generalisation as the overall model is found to be marginally fit. Intuition and previous research suggest that creating a compelling online environment for Web consumers will have numerous positive consequences for commercial Web providers (Novak, T.P., et al., 2000). Online executives note that creating a compelling online experience for cyber customers is critical to creating competitive advantage on the Internet (Novak, T.P., et al., 2000). Online shopping provides convenience to Web shoppers, yet its electronic format changes information-gathering methods traditionally used by customers (McKinney, et al., 2002). This change raises questions concerning customer satisfaction with the online purchasing process (McKinney, et al., 2002). Web shopping involves a number of phases, including the information phase, in which customers search for information regarding their intended purchases (McKinney, et al., 2002). Service organizations are increasingly utilizing advanced information and communication technologies, such as the Internet, in hopes of improving

the efficiency, cost-effectiveness, and/or quality of their customer-facing operations. More of the contact a customer has with the firm is likely to be with the back-office and, therefore, mediated by technology (Froehle, C.M. and Roth, A.V., 2004). Transcendent customer experiences (TCEs), which have aspects of flow and/or peak experience, can generate lasting shifts in beliefs and attitudes, including subjective self-transformation (Schouten, J.W., et al., 2007). With data from a pre-test/post-test quasi-experimental field experiment we examine the impact of TCEs on customers' integration in a brand community. Because TCEs are highly desirable and valued for their own sake, customers value marketing activities they perceive as instrumental to them (Schouten, J.W., et al., 2007). Paradoxes in use of the term customer experience are noted (Palmer, A., 2010). As a verb, experience describes a process of learning, leading to learned response, but as a noun emphasises novelty and the lack of predictable, learned response (Palmer, A., 2010). By incorporating emotions and perceptual distortion over time, customer experience overcomes many problems associated with static, partial measures of service quality (Palmer, A., 2010). Nowadays the experience factor plays an increasingly important role in determining the success of a company's offering (Gentile, C., et al., 2007). The literature on Customer Experience is growing fast and the debate among scholars and practitioners is fervent (Gentile, C., et al., 2007). While many studies explore such theme from a theoretical viewpoint, tools aimed at supporting marketing managers in devising the right stimuli to support an excellent Customer Experience are still scarce (Gentile, C., et al., 2007). Retailers recognize that greater understanding of customers can enhance customer satisfaction and retail performance (Puccinelli, N.M., et al., 2009). It is to enrich this understanding by providing an overview of existing consumer behavior literature and suggesting that specific elements of consumer behavior—goals, schema, information processing, memory, involvement, attitudes, affective processing, atmospherics, and consumer attributions and choices—play important roles during various stages of the consumer decision process (Puccinelli, N.M., et al., 2009). Companies are extending their operational and decision structures to include those of their customers, suppliers, distributors, and alliance partners. Product-centric strategies are replaced by customer-centric strategies that facilitate value creation (Chan, J.O., 2005). Focuses on transactional efficiency are replaced by new requirements to integrate and optimize the value chains between the customer, the firm and its extended enterprise (Chan, J.O., 2005). Disparate business processes and systems, compounded by the proliferation of customer contact points and channels, have created incompatible and disconnected views of customers (Chan, J.O., 2005). The inability to synchronize information and processes across various customer touch points may result in negative customer experience and lost opportunities for the firm (Chan, J.O., 2005). Customers' expectations are key determinants of their consumption experiences, satisfaction, and loyalty (Ofir, C. and Simonson, I., 2007). It can be examined that alternative theoretical predictions about the impact of stating expectations before purchase on post-purchase perceptions of the shopping experience and the firm (Ofir, C. and Simonson, I., 2007). It can be suggested that asking customers to articulate their expectations can backfire and lead to lower post-purchase evaluations of the shopping and consumption experience (Ofir, C. and Simonson, I., 2007). A series of field experiments indicate that compared with a control group, stating pre-purchase expectations leads customers to focus on negative aspects of the shopping experience and perceive the same performance more negatively (Ofir, C. and Simonson, I., 2007). The tendency for consumers to rate their shopping experiences less favorably after stating pre-purchase expectations is inconsistent with confirmation bias as well as assimilation, contrast, and positivity effects (Ofir, C. and Simonson, I., 2007). An analysis of 1,587 reviews from Amazon.com across six products indicated that review extremity, review depth, and product type affect the perceived helpfulness of the review (Mudambi, S.M. and Schuff, D., 2010). Product type moderates the effect of review extremity on the helpfulness of the review (Mudambi, S.M. and Schuff, D., 2010). For experience goods, reviews with extreme ratings are less helpful than reviews with moderate ratings (Mudambi, S.M. and Schuff, D., 2010). For both product types, review depth has a positive effect on the helpfulness of the review, but the product type moderates the effect of review depth on the helpfulness of the review (Mudambi, S.M. and Schuff, D., 2010). Review depth has a greater positive effect on the helpfulness of the review for search goods than for experience goods. It can be argued that prior customer experiences will influence future customer experiences (Verhoef, P.C., Lemon et al., 2007). The importance is also there of the social environment, self-service technologies and the store brand (Verhoef, P.C., Lemon et al., 2007). Customer experience management is also approached from a strategic perspective by focusing on issues such as how and to what extent an experience-based business can create growth (Verhoef, P.C., Lemon et al., 2007). There is a role of macro factors in the retail environment and how they can shape customer experiences and behaviors (Grewal, D., et al., 2009). Several ways (e.g., promotion, price, merchandise, supply chain and location) to deliver a superior customer experience are identified which should result in higher customer satisfaction, more frequent shopping visits, larger wallet shares, and higher profits (Grewal, D., et al., 2009).

3. Entities, parameters & values amalgamation mechanism for online customer experience measurement based on customer's review,

Table 1: Amalgamation of Entities, Parameters and Values For Online Customer Experience

User Reflection	User Behaviour	User Influence
1)Entities	**1)**Entities	**1)**Entities
Network	Comfort	Comfort
Speed	Speed	Speed
Aspiration	Aspiration	Safety
	Safety	
	Network	
	Bench marking	
2)Parameters	**2)**Parameters	**2)**Parameters
Time	Time	Repeat visit
Post sale survey	Post sale survey	Brand attributes
Brand attributes	Brand attributes	
	Repeat visit	
3)Values	**3)**Values	**3)**Values
Emotion	Emotion	Emotion
Expertise	Experience	Experience
Listening the customer	Convenience	

As the table-1 clearly explained about the Entity-network, speed, aspiration and Parameter-time, post-sale survey, brand attributes and Values-emotion, expertise, listening the customers are highly effective on user reflection. In the same criteria to taken user behaviour and user influence.

4. Experiments And Results

4.1 Descriptive test : Descriptive statistics test-user reflection and user behaviour and user influence.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics – User Reflection

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance	Skewness	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error
Entity-Aspiration	34	4	-2	2	.35	1.412	1.993	-.471	.403
Entity-Speed	34	4	-2	2	.68	1.121	1.256	-.266	.403
Parameters-Time	34	4	-2	2	.24	1.182	1.398	-.604	.403
Parameters-Brand Attributes	34	4	-2	2	.15	1.209	1.463	-.408	.403
Value-Emotions	34	4	-2	2	1.03	1.000	.999	-1.029	.403
Value-Listening to Customer	34	4	-2	2	.68	1.007	1.013	-.801	.403
Valid N (listwise)	34								

As the table-2 explain about the calculated Skewness Value 0.403 is greater than the significant value for 0.05. The null hypothesis is rejected and concluded that there is a significant relationship to the user's reflection. The null hypothesis is expressed as "There is no relationship between two quantities." The hypothesis depending upon significant values. In this cases significant value is lesser than skewness value. So that the null hypothesis is rejected. The hypothesis is rejected so there is a significant relationship to the user's reflection to the online customer experience amalgamation of entities, parameters & values based on customer reviews given in India's e-commerce sites.

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics – User Behaviour

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance	Skewness	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error
Entity-Aspiration	34	4	-2	2	.35	1.412	1.993	-.471	.403
Entity-Speed	34	4	-2	2	.68	1.121	1.256	-.266	.403
Entity-Safety	34	4	-2	2	.47	1.308	1.711	-.622	.403
Entity-Comfort	34	4	-2	2	.56	1.260	1.587	-.624	.403
Parameters-Repeated Visit	34	4	-2	2	.41	1.131	1.280	-.635	.403
Parameters-Time	34	4	-2	2	.24	1.182	1.398	-.604	.403
Parameters-Brand Attributes	34	4	-2	2	.15	1.209	1.463	-.408	.403
Value-Emotions	34	4	-2	2	1.03	1.000	.999	-1.029	.403
Value-Experience	34	4	-2	2	.26	1.163	1.352	-.063	.403
Valid N (listwise)	34								

As the table-3 explain about the calculated Skewness Value 0.403 is greater than the significant value for 0.05. The null hypothesis is rejected and concluded that there is a significant relationship to the user's behaviour. The hypothesis is rejected so there is a significant relationship to the user's behaviour to the online customer experience amalgamation of entities, parameters & values based on customer reviews given in India's e-commerce sites.

Table 4: Descriptive Statistics – User Influence

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance	Skewness	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error
Entity-Speed	34	4	-2	2	.68	1.121	1.256	-.266	.403
Entity-Safety	34	4	-2	2	.47	1.308	1.711	-.622	.403
Entity-Comfort	34	4	-2	2	.56	1.260	1.587	-.624	.403
Parameters-Repeated Visit	34	4	-2	2	.41	1.131	1.280	-.635	.403
Parameters-Brand Attributes	34	4	-2	2	.15	1.209	1.463	-.408	.403
Value-Emotions	34	4	-2	2	1.03	1.000	.999	-1.029	.403
Value-Experience	34	4	-2	2	.26	1.163	1.352	-.063	.403
Valid N (listwise)	34								

As the table-4 explain about the calculated Skewness Value 0.403 is greater than the significant value for 0.05. The null hypothesis is rejected and concluded that there is a significant relationship to the user's influence.

The hypothesis is rejected so there is a significant relationship to the online user's experience influence of Entities, Parameters & Values Based on Customer Reviews Given in India's E-Commerce Sites.

Table 5: Tests of Between-Subjects Effects , Dependent Variable: Entity-Aspiration

Source		Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Intercept	Hypothesis	1.097	1	1.097	.643	.436
	Error	23.296	13.660	1.705[a]		
BrandAttribute	Hypothesis	15.458	4	3.865	2.059	.129
	Error	33.792	18	1.877[b]		
Time	Hypothesis	4.930	4	1.233	.657	.630
	Error	33.792	18	1.877[b]		
Emotion	Hypothesis	7.458	4	1.864	.993	.437
	Error	33.792	18	1.877[b]		
ListeningCustomer	Hypothesis	4.247	3	1.416	.754	.534
	Error	33.792	18	1.877[b]		
a. .355 MS(Emotion) + .362 MS(ListeningCustomer) + .283 MS(Error)						
b. MS(Error)						

As the table-5 explain about the calculated F Value is greater than the significant value. The null hypothesis is rejected and concluded that there is a significant relationship to the user's reflection and also brand attributes F value 2.059 is greater than the significant value 0.129. So that the parameter-brand attributes are more effective to the user's reflection.

Table 6: Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Parameters-Repeated Visit

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	30.727[a]	18	1.707	2.225	.062
Intercept	.053	1	.053	.069	.796
Comfort	.729	4	.182	.237	.913
Safety	8.666	4	2.166	2.824	.063
Speed	3.873	4	.968	1.262	.328
Aspiration	1.378	4	.344	.449	.772
Emotion	.149	1	.149	.194	.666
Experience	.564	1	.564	.736	.405
Error	11.508	15	.767		
Total	48.000	34			
Corrected Total	42.235	33			
a. R Squared = .728 (Adjusted R Squared = .401)					

As the table-6 explain about the calculated F Value is greater than the significant value. The null hypothesis is rejected and concluded that there is a significant relationship to the user's reflection and also Entity-safety F value 2.824 is greater than the significant value 0.063. So that the Entity-safety are more effective to the user's behaviour.

Table 7: Tests of Between-Subjects Effects Entity-Safety

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	17.667[a]	6	2.945	2.049	.093
Intercept	3.526	1	3.526	2.454	.129
Repeatedvisit	7.630	4	1.908	1.327	.285
Emotion	.874	1	.874	.608	.442
Experience	2.663	1	2.663	1.853	.185
Error	38.803	27	1.437		
Total	64.000	34			
Corrected Total	56.471	33			
a. R Squared = .313 (Adjusted R Squared = .160)					

As the table-7 explain about the calculated F Value is greater than the significant value. The null hypothesis is rejected and concluded that there is a significant relationship to the user's reflection and also Value-experience F value 1.853 is greater than the significant value 0.185. So that the Value-experience are more effective to the user's Influence.

Table 8: ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	13.105	4	3.276	1.804	.155[b]
	Residual	52.660	29	1.816		
	Total	65.765	33			
a. Dependent Variable: Entity-Aspiration						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Value-Listening to Customer, Value-Emotions, Parameters-Time, Parameters-Brand Attributes.						

Table 9: Co-efficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	.270	.367		.736	.468	-.480	1.020
	Parameters-Brand Attributes	.428	.203	.366	2.103	.044	.012	.843
	Parameters-Time	.325	.204	.272	1.590	.123	-.093	.743
	Value-Emotions	.067	.240	.048	.281	.781	-.423	.558
	Value-Listening to Customer	-.186	.246	-.132	-.755	.456	-.689	.318
a. Dependent Variable: Entity-Aspiration								

As the table -9 explain about the calculated t-test value is greater than the significant value. The null hypothesis is rejected and concluded that there is a significant relationship to the user's reflection and also parameter-brand attributes t-test value 2.103 is greater than the significant value 0.044. So that the parameter-brand attributes are more effective to the online user's reflection to amalgamation of entities, parameters & values based on customer reviews given in India's e-commerce sites.

Table 10: ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	13.967	6	2.328	1.832	.130[b]
	Residual	34.298	27	1.270		
	Total	48.265	33			
a. Dependent Variable: Parameters-Brand Attributes						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Value-Experience, Entity-Speed, Entity-Aspiration, Value-Emotions, Entity-Safety, Entity-Comfort						

Table 11: Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	-.024	.308		-.077	.940	-.657	.609
	Entity-Comfort	.199	.187	.207	1.061	.298	-.185	.583
	Entity-Safety	.217	.178	.235	1.221	.233	-.148	.581
	Entity-Speed	-.036	.184	-.034	-.197	.846	-.414	.342
	Entity-Aspiration	.212	.146	.248	1.455	.157	-.087	.512
	Value-Emotions	-.103	.208	-.085	-.496	.624	-.531	.324
	Value-Experience	.051	.202	.049	.254	.801	-.362	.465
a. Dependent Variable: Parameters-Brand Attributes								

As the table-11 explain about the calculated t-test value is greater than the significant value. The null hypothesis is rejected and concluded that there is a significant relationship to the user's reflection and also Entity-Aspiration t-test value 1.455 is greater than the significant value 0.157. So that the Entity-Aspirations are more effective to the online user's behaviour amalgamation of entities, parameters & values based on customer reviews given in India's e-commerce sites.

Table 12: ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	12.748	4	3.187	2.332	.079[b]
	Residual	39.635	29	1.367		
	Total	52.382	33			
a. Dependent Variable: Entity-Comfort						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Parameters-Time, Value-Experience, Value-Emotions, Parameters-Repeated Visit						

As the table-13 explain about the calculated t-test value is greater than the significant value. The null hypothesis is rejected and concluded that there is a significant relationship to the user's reflection and also Value-Experience t-test value 2.015 is greater than the significant value 0.053. So that the Value-Experiences are more effective to the online user's Influence of Entities, Parameters & Values Based on Customer Reviews Given in India's E-Commerce Sites.

Major Weaknesses: Table 14: One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 0					
	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Entity-Comfort	2.586	33	.014	.559	.12	1.00
Entity-Safety	2.098	33	.044	.471	.01	.93
Entity-Ease	1.406	33	.169	.324	-.14	.79
Entity-Speed	3.520	33	.001	.676	.29	1.07
Entity-Aspiration	1.458	33	.154	.353	-.14	.85

As the table-14 explain about the calculated two tailed significant Values of Entity comfort, Entity safety and Entity speed is 0.014, 0.044 and 0.001 is lesser than the significant value for 0.05. The null hypothesis is Accept and concluded that there is no significant relationship to the Comfort, Safety and Speed. It is major weakness of Online Customer Experience Amalgamation of Entities.

Table-15: One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 0					
	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Parameters-Trans	4.307	22	.000	.957	.50	1.42
Parameters-Repeated Visit	2.122	33	.041	.412	.02	.81
Parameters-Expectation	4.539	33	.000	.824	.45	1.19
Parameters-Brand Attributes	.709	33	.483	.147	-.27	.57
Parameters-Time	1.161	33	.254	.235	-.18	.65

As the table-15 explain about the calculated two tailed significant Values of Parameter transparency, repeated visit and expectation is 0.000, 0.041 and 0.000 is lesser than the significant value for 0.05. The null hypothesis is Accept and concluded that there is no significant relationship to the transparency, repeated visit and expectation. It is major weakness of Online Customer Experience Amalgamation of Parameter.

Table 16: One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 0					
	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Value-Emotions	6.005	33	.000	1.029	.68	1.38
Value-Relational	10.166	22	.000	1.391	1.11	1.68
Value-Listening to Customer	3.918	33	.000	.676	.33	1.03
Value-Exclusivity	2.946	33	.006	.559	.17	.94
Value-Experience	1.327	33	.193	.265	-.14	.67

As the table-16 explain about the calculated two tailed significant Values of Emotions, Relational, listening to customer and Exclusivity is 0.000, 0.000, 0.000 and 0.006 is lesser than the significant value for 0.05. The null hypothesis is Accept and concluded that there is no significant relationship to the Emotions, Relational, listening to customer and Exclusivity. It is major weakness of Online Customer Experience Amalgamation of Values.

5. Implications and Conclusions

This research has provided a number of important contributions to the literature. Firstly, it has defined an online customer reflection and its difference to a service. Secondly it has provided customer behaviour for the existing customer reflection change models. Thirdly it has developed the existing stage models to provide a more detailed and customer influence is more important. This research the parameter-brand attributes are more effective to the user's reflection and Entity-safety are more effective to the user's behaviour and finally value-experience are more effective to the user's influence.

References

1. Compare: "Customer Experience Management: What it is and why it matters". SAS. Retrieved 2015-07-15. Customer experience is defined as your customers' perceptions – both conscious and subconscious – of their relationship with your brand resulting from all their interactions with your brand during the customer life cycle.
2. Novak, T.P., Hoffman, D.L. and Yung, Y.F., 2000. Measuring the customer experience in online environments: A structural modeling approach. Marketing science, 19(1), pp.22-42.
3. McKinney, V., Yoon, K. and Zahedi, F.M., 2002. The measurement of web-customer satisfaction: An expectation and disconfirmation approach. Information systems research, 13(3), pp.296-315.
4. Froehle, C.M. and Roth, A.V., 2004. New measurement scales for evaluating perceptions of the technology-mediated customer service experience. Journal of Operations Management, 22(1), pp.1-21.
5. Schouten, J.W., McAlexander, J.H. and Koenig, H.F., 2007. Transcendent customer experience and brand community. Journal of the academy of marketing science, 35(3), pp.357-368.
6. Palmer, A., 2010. Customer experience management: a critical review of an emerging idea. Journal of Services marketing, 24(3), pp.196-208.
7. Gentile, C., Spiller, N. and Noci, G., 2007. How to sustain the customer experience: An overview of experience components that co-create value with the customer. European Management Journal, 25(5), pp.395-410.
8. Puccinelli, N.M., Goodstein, R.C., Grewal, D., Price, R., Raghubir, P. and Stewart, D., 2009. Customer experience management in retailing: understanding the buying process. Journal of retailing, 85(1), pp.15-30.
9. Chan, J.O., 2005. Toward a unified view of customer relationship management. Journal of American Academy of Business, 6(1), pp.32-38.
10. Ofir, C. and Simonson, I., 2007. The effect of stating expectations on customer satisfaction and shopping experience. Journal of Marketing Research, 44(1), pp.164-174.
11. Mudambi, S.M. and Schuff, D., 2010. What makes a helpful review? A study of customer reviews on Amazon. com.
12. Verhoef, P.C., Lemon, K.N., Parasuraman, A., Roggeveen, A., Tsiros, M. and Schlesinger, L.A., 2009. Customer experience creation: Determinants, dynamics and management strategies. Journal of retailing, 85(1), pp.31-41.