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Abstract
This paper proposes a new service evaluation model: Consumerex – Consumer Experience Model. The model integrates theoretical advances from the fields of service marketing and relationship marketing and uses a multidimensional approach to assess all constructs that typically are considered in the evaluation of a service: quality, satisfaction, perceived value, and loyalty. Moreover, the model includes new sub-dimensions such experiential quality and experiential satisfaction, which are expected to be particularly relevant in services where customers are co-producers. The application of the model in the context of sport marketing is suggested.
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1. INTRODUCTION

The relevance of services

Services are transforming economies on a massive scale accounting for more than 70% of the GDP of the developed countries (Moussa & Touzani, 2010). This economic and social change is also occurring in the developing countries, where Agriculture and Manufacturing are being replaced by the Service sector, which already weight more than 40% of the GDP of emergent markets like China, and still growing, year after year (Ostrom, et al., 2010; Spohrer & Maglio, 2010; Achrol & Kotler, 2012). Therefore it is not surprising that the field of services has a growing importance among scholars and practitioners (Agency, 2014) and that "(…) increasingly, manufacturers, distributors, and retailers are providing value-added services, or simply excellent customer service, to differentiate themselves" (Kotler & Keller, 2009, p. 386).

In spite of that, for many years there was no clear distinction between 'products marketing' and 'services marketing' (Chernatony & Horn, 2003; Fisk & Grove, 2010; Moussa & Touzani, 2010). Marketing theory around services was dominated by the goods-paradigm. From a management point of view, it was considered that there are no differences in the customer decision making process when buying a product or when buying a service, thus marketing was basically the same, ignoring the unique characteristics of intangible goods (Zeithaml, Bitner, & Gremler, 2005; Berry, 2000; Grace & O’Cass, 2005).

However, the previous view no longer prevails. Services are now recognized as an independent field of study and services marketing is one of the most important areas of research in marketing theory (Kotler & Keller, 2009; Zeithaml & Bitner, 2003; Ostrom, et al., 2010). This recognition brought along new responsibilities for researchers and scholars, with much of the work being driven by the search and development of scales and models to evaluate services. This concern is also the main motivation of this paper.

The role of services in Sport Marketing

Since its origin in the 80’s that sports’ marketing has been following mainly a transactional marketing approach, driven by the need to bring sponsors into the business (Shannon, 1999; Hardy, Norman, & Sceery, 2012). Due to this, research has been focused on methodologies to improve sales of the club’s products portfolio, based in the management of sponsorships oriented both to B2C and B2B segments and studying team identification and fan engagement with theory roots in the fields of psychology and sociology (Shannon, 1999).

Without questioning the relevance of the so-called transactional marketing approach to sports business (for example to foster sales in the short-term), there is a lack of influence of the services marketing and relationship marketing fields in building a more robust theoretical body in sport marketing (Evans, James, & Tomes, 1996). The advantages of bringing together different marketing disciplines is pointed out by authors like Mullin, Hardy and Sutton (2000) who emphasize that the area of sport marketing necessarily involves services marketing (i.e. to manage quality perception and fans satisfaction), transactional marketing (i.e. to improve the sale of sports equipment) and relational marketing to connect with the surrounding entities (i.e. to improve long-term relations between sports teams, leagues and individuals).

This wider theoretical approach to sport marketing is also recommended in the work of other authors like Kotler, Kartajaya, & Setiawan (2010) who argue that a holistic and multidisciplinary marketing approach can help organizations to be better prepared to face future challenges.

Research opportunity

Services marketing literature has been evolving mainly around the study of quality, satisfaction, value perception and the way these constructs relate with each other and with the behavioural intentions construct. However, this trend is not visible in the theoretical and conceptual developments in the field of sport marketing.

Despite the gap between sport marketing and the wider theories of services and relationship marketing, one can find important developments in sport marketing literature. For example, important research advances can be found related to Club’s fans and supporters, namely the study around team identification, and antecedents
and consequences of sport spectators\textsuperscript{1} behavioural intentions (Theodorakis N. D., Koustelios, Robinson, & Barlas, 2009; Theodorakis, Wann, Carvalho, & Sarmento, 2010).

Sport marketing literature has revealed how important is to manage the relationship between the sports Club and its supporters, moving beyond purely transactional exchanges. Several studies have showed higher consumption intentions among fans with higher levels of identification and involvement with the Club (Hunt, Bristol, & Bashaw, 1999; Madrigal, 2000; Dale, van Iwaarden, van der Wiele, & Williams, 2005; Gwinner & Swanson, 2003; Tobar, 2006; Kwon & Trail, 2003). In terms of stadium attendances, several studies have also showed that the degree of emotional connection between the Club and its supporters, may also affect the behaviour and buying decision of match-day tickets, and season tickets. The same is true for the opposite case, with higher dropouts among fans with weaker degrees of connection, especially in sports contexts in which the Clubs' team has no positive outcomes (Sutton, McDonald, Milne, & Cimperman, 1997; Hill & Green, 2000; Matsuoka, Chelladurai, & Harada, 2003).

Also noteworthy are the conclusions in other studies related to the so-called peripheral elements, that show a positive influence of several factors, like the quality of facilities and stadiums environment (Wakefield & Sloan, 1995), the importance of winning or losing (Madrigal, 1995), the emotions lived (Sumino & Harada, 2004; Jones, Lane, Bray, Uphill, & Catlin, 2005; Biscaia R., Correia, Rosado, Maroco, & Ross, 2012; Madrigal, 2003; Kuenzel & Yassim, 2007), as well as the influence of the team performance, the quality of the game, the outcome, or the team opponents (Laverie & Arnett, 2000; Matsuoka, Chelladurai, & Harada, 2003; Westerbeek & Shilbury, 2003; Milne & McDonald, 1999), among many other topics of study.

However, much of this sport marketing literature is grounded in psychology, and sociology, with little connection with the service marketing literature; with the exception of a few studies that represent important attempts to link the two areas of expertise, with a focus on quality (Theodorakis N. D., Alexandris, Tsigilis, & Karvounis, 2013; Theodorakis & Alexandris, 2008), satisfaction (Yoshida & James, 2010), and the influence of perceived value on consumer processes and purchase of sports products (Murray & Howat, 2002; Kwon, Trail, & James, 2007; Lee, Trail, Kwon, & Anderson, 2011). These are relevant studies, with important conclusions, but they are still insufficient to explain the complex sport consumer behaviour. Hence there is an opportunity for a new line of research that explores broader conceptual models and that builds knowledge bridges between different marketing theories. This richer theoretical framework will enable more robust conclusions to meet the challenges of sports organizations.

In other words, more studies are needed to bring a broader and more integrated perspective of the various factors that research has identified as relevant (such as satisfaction, quality and value), but that have not yet echoed in a multidisciplinary model that incorporates the advances in marketing literature. This integrative model is an important contribution to the management and evaluation of services literature as well as to the sports management field. It is this gap that this study intends to fill, by proposing a multidimensional service evaluation model, applying the main constructs of services marketing to the sports context.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents a brief literature review that highlights the fundamental constructs that have been used in the evaluation of services and their relation. The third section presents the main concepts of our model and their sub-dimensions and proposes two alternative models regarding the main constructs. Finally, section 4 summarizes the main contributions of the Consumerex model to marketing theory and sport marketing research.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Key factors in the evaluation of services

Over several decades, ‘quality’ and ‘customer satisfaction’ were the two major themes in the service marketing literature (Rust R., 1998; Fisk & Grove, 2010; Furrer, 2003). The extensive research undertaken in this area developed important bases of knowledge about how consumers perceive and evaluate the provision of services, and established the main factors that influence consumer loyalty, behavioural intentions and purchase decisions (Brady, Knight, Cronin, Hult, & Keillor, 2005; Theodorakis, Howat, Ko, & Avourdiadou, 2014; Zeithaml & Bitner, 2003).

---

\textsuperscript{1} As clarified by Cronin, Brady and Hult (2000: p.213): ‘(...) spectator sports are sports events that are viewed by customers, whereas participation sports involve the skilled physical interaction of the customer in the event (e.g., miniature golf and bowling)’
Although there is an extensive and growing list of factors that have been considered, there are four dominant constructs in the literature on the subject, which are often portrayed in valuation models of service: service quality, service value, customer satisfaction and behavioural intentions (Athanassopoulos, 2000; Bolton & Drew, 1991; Chenet, Tynan, & Money, 1999; Cronin, Brady, Tomas, & Hult, 2000; Fornell, Johnson, Anderson, Cha, & Bryant, 1996). The following text synthesizes each of these factors.

**Perceived Quality**

Since its introduction in the marketing literature, perceived quality has been viewed as the result of the comparison between the expectations created (Parasuraman, Zeithaml, & Berry, 1985) and the evaluation of the performance of the service (Cronin & Taylor, 1994). That is why, among multiple definitions, we can frame the concept of perceived quality in the words of Tsitskari, Tsiotras, & Tsiotras (2006, p 623.): "it is the result of the comparison that customers make between their expectations about a service and their perception of the way the service has been performed".

Since the mid-80’s multiple models and instruments have emerged to evaluate the quality dimension of a service, as SERVQUAL scale, or SERVPERF scale. These models were very important to extend the study of this relevant dimension in different contexts and activities, namely in the sport spectator industry (McDonald, Sutton, & Milne, 1995; Lee, Trail, Kwon, & Anderson, 2011; Theodorakis & Alexander, 2008; Wakefield, Blodgett, & Sloan, 1996), and sport participant industry (Alexandris, Dimitriadis, & Kasiara, 2001; Crompton, MacKay, & Fesenmaier, 1991; Howat, Absher, Crilley, & Milne, 1996; Theodorakis N. D., Alexandris, Tsigilis, & Karvounis, 2013).

The service quality construct has long been understood to be a multidimensional and multi-level construct. Measuring quality through a multidimensional and hierarchical structure has the advantage of allowing a better assessment of the multitude of consumer behaviours, cultural differences, and unique characteristics of a specific service, which are difficult to evaluate using a one-dimensional approach (Dabholkar, Thorpe, & Rentz, 1996; Brady & Cronin, 2001).

Many have suggested that the quality of a service as perceived by customers has two dimensions: (1) functional quality (also labelled as ‘process’ or ‘peripheral’); and technical quality (also labelled as ‘outcome’ quality).

Other authors have suggested that the evaluation of service quality should also include a third dimension called service environment (or ‘interaction’ quality) (Gronroos C., 1984; Rust & Oliver, 1994; Dabholkar, Thorpe, & Rentz, 1996; Brady & Cronin, 2001; Parasuraman, Zeithaml, & Berry, 1985; Bitner, 1992) (McDougall & Levesque, 1994) (McAlexander, Kaldenberg, & Koenig, 1994). Basically, the service quality literature has been reaching a consensus that there is a dimension related to "what is" delivered by the service, distinct from the "how" the service is delivered, and that these two dimensions are also different from the "medium" where the service is provided or enjoyed.

In addition, more recent studies have also revealed that the hierarchical approaches of perceived quality are an important evolution in evaluating this construct as they showed better results than single-level models,

---

2 According to Kang (2006, p.37): "Functional quality focuses on "how", and considers issues such as the behaviour of customer-contact staff and the speed of service, whereas technical quality focuses on "what" and considers such issues as the end result of service provision"
especially in complex contexts of consumer behaviour (Licata, Mowen, Harris, & Brown, 2003; Brady & Cronin, 2001; Kang, 2006). This evolution, from one-dimensional tools to more complex and comprehensive models has also marked the evolution of the study of perceived quality in the sports context, although there are still few empirical studies that followed this approach (Clemes, Brush, & Collins, 2011; Yoshida & James, 2010; Theodorakis N. D., Alexandris, Tsigilis, & Karvounis, 2013).

Nowadays, with more than three decades of theoretical development, perceived quality has thus become one of the most important issues in service marketing literature. There is evidence that higher quality levels increase customer satisfaction and have a positive influence in value perception, improving profitability and enhancing loyalty through more favourable behavioural intentions (Zeithaml & Bitner, 2003; Kotler & Keller, 2009; Kang, 2006).

Perhaps one of the most important literature advances, is the confirmation that the construct of quality should consider not only the variables related to the way the service is provided, but also explore factors associated with the outcome of that service, replicating the pioneering recommendations of quality theory (Rust & Oliver, 1994; Gronroos C., 1984).

For example, in the sport context, recent research by Theodorakis, Alexandris, Tsigilis, & Karvounis (2013) already divided the quality in functional quality and outcome quality, thus separating the elements related to the quality of the game (e.g.: players performance, game quality, team characteristics, etc.), from the elements which support the provision of services related to the game (e.g.: facilities, interactions with employees, etc.). One can argue that these different dimensions that shape perceived quality are even more relevant in the context of football, where the outcome, and the game itself, are factors that strongly influence not only the satisfaction of sport spectators but also their intentions to consume, to recommend, and to return (Theodorakis & Alexandris, 2008; Brady, Voorhees, Cronin, & Bourdeau, 2006; Mullin, Hardy, & Sutton, 2007).

**Consumer Satisfaction**

Like quality, customer satisfaction is also one of the most studied topics in the marketing literature (Mittal & Frennea, 2010; Haumann, Quaiser, Wieseke, & Rese, 2014; Homburg, Koschatz, & Hoyer, 2006; Kim, Magnusen, & Kim, 2014). Higher levels of satisfaction tend to reduce dropout rates, increase loyalty levels, reducing investment and increasing the profitability of organizations (Yoshida & James, 2010; Zhang, Lee, Judge, & Johnson, 2014; Cronin, Brady, Tomas, & Hult, 2000; Palmatier, 2008).

In a nutshell, we can define satisfaction as a "(...) pleasurable fulfilment response toward a good, service, benefit or reward " (Yoshida & James, 2010, p. 339). The classification of satisfaction as being an attitude has its roots in different social theories and concepts such as the 'Evaluative Congruity Model' (Sirgy, 1984; Chon & Olsen, 1991; Chon, 1992; Chon, Christianson, & Ch-King, 1998), the 'Attribution Theory' (Folkes, 1988; Oliver & DeSarbo, 1988; Pearce & Moscardo, 1984), the 'Importance-Performance model' (Barsky, 1992; Martilla & James, 1977; Oh & Parks, 1997), or the 'Equity Theory' (Oliver & Swan, 1989; Erevelles & Leavitt, 1992).

However, the conceptual framework that seems to be more influential in the study of satisfaction is the 'expectation-disconfirmation paradigm', suggested by Oliver (1981). This concept was introduced in the context of customer satisfaction studies in retail and in the services sector. Its basic premise is that the consumer satisfaction level results from subjective and/or direct comparisons, between expectations and perceptions (Oliver, 1981; 1980). Oliver’s work was based on the 'Adaptation level theory' of Helson (1964). The influence of the paradigm of non-confirmation (expectancy-disconfirmation paradigm) is so present in the conceptualization around the study of satisfaction and quality that it partly explains why these two factors are so related (McCollough, Berry, & Yadav, 2000; Yuksel & Yuksel, 2001; Kim, Magnusen, & Kim, 2014).

Most of the literature produced over the past decades also shows that satisfaction is today understood as a construct where affective and cognitive factors have an important role (Madrigal, 1995; Caro & García, 2007). To this understanding, several studies made an important contribution by including emotional factors in the satisfaction construct, as mentioned in the work of Kim, Magnusen, & Kim (2014, p. 343): 'Studies from this era helped form the foundation of what would eventually grow into a widespread belief among contemporary marketers that consumer satisfaction levels and long-term behavioral intentions can be significantly affected by emotions during the pre-, actual, and post-consumption stages”.

Some of these studies have the particularity of showing that satisfaction in the sports context also appears to be a multidimensional construct. This means that it is possible to distinguish the satisfaction with the game from
the satisfaction with the service (Yoshida & James, 2010; Biscaia R., Correia, Yoshida, Rosado, & Marôco, 2013). This distinction allows a parallelism with the work around quality, which has also proved the multidimensionality of the construct with two different dimensions, technical and functional quality (Grönroos C., 1984; Rust & Oliver, 1994; Brady & Cronin, 2001). The sport industry is also interested in studying the dynamics of consumer satisfaction, this being an important topic with a growing relevance in sports' marketing research (Kim, Magnusen, & Kim, 2014; Sarstedt, Ringle, Raithel, & Gudergan, 2014; Biscaia R., Correia, Yoshida, Rosado, & Marôco, 2013).

These factors suggest the possibility of satisfaction to be a multidimensional construct, with variables focused on measuring the satisfaction with the service experience on one hand, and measuring the satisfaction with how the service is provided on the other hand.

**Service Value**

The formation of perceptions of service value, is one the most important topics in the evaluation of services (Brady, Knight, Cronin, Hult, & Kelller, 2005). Several sectorial studies confirm that higher levels of 'perceived value' can be translated into purchase and recommendation intentions (Al-Sabahy, Ekinci, & Riley, 2004; Dodds, Monroe, & Grewal, 1991; Grewal, Krishnan, Baker, & Robin, 1998; Netemeyer, et al, 2004; Petrick & Backman, 2002). However the study of perceived value only began to gain expression in the 90's decade and it still is an area that "(...) has often not been clearly defined in studies of the subject" (Sánchez-Fernández & Iniesta-Bonillo, 2007).

One of the definitions of perceived value most cited in the literature was proposed in the pioneering work in the study of quality and satisfaction: "the consumer's overall assessment of the utility of a product based on perceptions of what is received and what is given" (Zeithaml V., 1988, p. 14). The meaning of "utility" present in this definition is strongly linked to the economic judgment made by the consumer, who perceives the value of a product or a service depending on its price and the received benefits, or from the trade-off between the effort and the reward resulting from the acquisition or consumption of a good or service (Sweeney & Soutar, 2001). It is the rational meaning implied in this definition that leads some authors to consider the 'value' as a particularly cognitive construct, being a rational assessment that "captures any benefit-sacrifice discrepancy" (Patterson & Spreng, 1997, p. 4).

Nevertheless, the literature has also added new perspectives to the study of value by integrating the emotional and social dimension in a more complete construct for assessing the perceived value of a service (Sheth, Newman, & Gross, 1991; Sweeney & Soutar, 2001; Richins & Dawson, 1992; Walsh, Shiu, & Hassan, 2014; Petrick J. F., 2002). Due to this evolution, nowadays it is possible to use several scales and models that explain more than 60% of the variance of the perceived value through the assessment of the functional, social and emotional sub-dimensions in a multidimensional approach. (Kwon & Kwak, 2014; Lee, Trail, Kwon, & Anderson, 2011; Walsh, Shiu, & Hassan, 2014; Petrick J. F., 2002).

In sport marketing, the existing studies show that the Clubs’ fans have a tendency to buy products related to the club motivated more by the emotional and symbolic dimensions than by the utilitarian dimensions, like the price (Kwon & Armstrong, 2006; Kwon, Trail, & James, 2007). In this context, the perceived value factor has an important effect on customers’ intentions. The service value perception can be even more relevant than other specific factors like 'team identification', a very common topic of study in the context of sport marketing. An example of this can be found in the work of Kwon, Trail e James (2007), who investigated the potential mediating effect of perceived value on the relationship between team identification and intent to purchase collegiate team-licensed apparel, and found that "(...) the team identification alone did not drive the purchase intentions (...) it is important to take into account the perceived value" (2007, p. 540). In this study, team identification explained 13.2% of the variance in perceived value whereas perceived value explained 42.6% of the variance in purchase intentions.

These findings suggest that consumers in the sports context seem to have the same type of behaviour found in other service sectors. In sports, the construct of perceived value is a process that also appears to be multidimensional and whose dynamics seems to be influenced by economic, emotional and social perceptions (Kwon & Kwak, 2014; Walsh, Shiu, & Hassan, 2014; Lee, Trail, Kwon, & Anderson, 2011).
Loyalty and Behavioral Intentions

The literature on service marketing and sport marketing has not dedicated a special attention to the construct of behavioural intentions. The most used factors are derived from the work of Oliver (1980; 1997), Zeithaml et al (1996), and Cronin and colleagues (Cronin, Brady, Tomas, & Hult, 2000; Brady, Voorhees, Cronin, & Bourdeau, 2006).

It is true that some authors have studied the behavioural intentions, but often in a one-dimensional logic, which for Zeithaml, Berry and Parasuraman (1996) is a weakness since this is a minimalist approach which “…does not capture the full range of potential behaviours” (1996, p. 37).

Examples can be found in the work of authors such as Cronin and Taylor (1992), who focused on assessing the purchase intentions, using just a single-item in a model applied to four sectors (banking, pest control, dry cleaning and fast food). Or in the work of Boulding, Kalra, Staelin, & Zeithaml (1993) in the context of hospitality, which focused on the repeated buying intention, as well as in word-of-mouth, based solely on the recommendation of third parties (e.g. "How Likely are you to stay again at Hotel Alpha" and "How Likely are you to recommend Alpha Hotel to a friend?").

However, the assessment of this ‘intention to repurchase’, would be the main target of criticism from researchers like Oliver (1999) and Zeithaml, Berry, & Parasuraman (1996). Indeed, it was due to this context of criticism that the behavioural model developed by Zeithaml, Berry, & Parasuraman (1996) would become an important milestone, not only for having a multi-sectorial application but also for having a multidimensionality approach. The authors identified five dimensions related to behavioural intentions: (1) loyalty to company (loyalty); (2) propensity to switch (switch), (3) willingness to pay more (pay more), (4) external response to problems (external response), and (5) internal response to problems (internal response).

Inspired by the work of Zenithal, Berry, & Parasuraman (1996), the authors Cronin, Brady, Tomas, & Hult (1996) proposed three indicators to measure behavioral intentions: repurchase intentions, positive word-of-mouth intentions and, customer loyalty. As stated by the authors (Brady, Knight, Cronin, Hult, & Keillor, 2005, p. 221): “Service providers that deliver good service are suggested to have customers who are loyal, will recommend the service, and say positive things about the provider”. All these conceptual approaches are widely present in the service marketing literature (Petrick & Bachman, 2002; Tam, 2000; Brady, Knight, Cronin, Hult, & Keillor, 2005) as well as in literature related to the sport marketing (Theodorakis N. D., Alexandris, Tsigilis, & Karvounis, 2013; Clemes, Brush, & Collins, 2011; Yoshida & James, 2010; Koo, et al., 2009).

It should be noted that the fact that ‘behavioural intentions’ are most often assessed with unidimensional measures is a methodological weakness. Moreover, despite the fact that most of the studies proclaim to be measuring behavioral intentions, in fact they are only measuring loyalty, as these studies only use the items that were validated by Zeithaml et al (1996) to measure the dimension of loyalty. On the other hand, there is evidence in the marketing literature to define loyalty around multiple dimensions such as cognitive, affective, conative and active loyalty (Blut, Evanschitzky, Vogel, & Ahlert, 2007; Han, Kim, & Kim, 2011; McMullen & Gilmore, 2002; Bobâlcâ, Gâtej, & Ciobanu, 2012).

Our literature review regarding ‘behavioural intentions’ revealed two important findings: (1) on the one hand we are witnessing a semantic confusion in the literature that claims to be measuring ‘behavioral intentions’ when, in fact, it is measuring ‘loyalty’. This practice is so widespread that it has apparently become the norm; (2) On the other hand, there are important theoretical advances in how to measure the loyalty construct in a multidimensional approach that are not being widely used by the rule mentioned in the previous point.

These findings suggest the possibility of measuring loyalty with stricter scales, and multiple dimensions, correcting the apparent semantic confusion that has led this construct to be confused with behavioral intentions.

---

3 N.A.: The authors’ evaluated four types of services - computer manufacturers, retail chain, automobile insurer and life insurer.

4 The items usually used are based on the following questions, validated by Zeithaml et al (1996) to measure loyalty, as subdimension of behavioral intentions: “Say positive things about XYZ to other people”; “Recommend XYZ to someone who seeks your advice”; “Encourage friends and relatives to do business with XYZ”; “Consider XYZ your first choice to buy”, “Do more business with XYZ in the next few years”. The other items proposed by Zeithaml et al (1996) were not statistically valid to assess the remaining dimensions of behavioral intentions, namely: propensity to switch (switch), willingness to pay more (pay more), external response to problem (external response), and internal response to problem (internal response).
Relation between constructs

A major weakness found in the literature around service evaluation is the lack of consensus regarding the relation between the different constructs. In particular, several approaches have been used to model the effects of quality, satisfaction and perceived value on the behavioural intentions construct (Brady, Knight, Cronin, Hult, & Keillor, 2005).

There are, however, two lines of research that stand out in the study of the potential relationships between constructs: the 'satisfaction models' and the 'comprehensive models'. The first approach positions the satisfaction construct as the central mediating construct between quality and perceived value, on one side, and behavioural intentions, on the other side (Anderson & Fornell, 1994; Andreassen, 1998; Clow & Beisel, 1995; Fornell, Johnson, Anderson, Cha, & Bryant, 1996; Hallowell, 1996; Heskett, Jones, Loveman, Sasser, & Schlesinger, 1994; Mohr & Bitner, 1995; Spreng, MacKenzie, & Olshavsky, 1996). The second conceptual stream supports the previous relationship but, in addition, it hypothesizes that quality and value have a direct effect on behavioural intentions (Anderson & Sullivan, 1993; Cronin, Brady, Tomas, & Hult, 2000; Bagozzi, 1992; Brady, Knight, Cronin, Hult, & Keillor, 2005). The main distinction between these two types of models is well explained by Brady, Knight, Cronin, Hult, & Keillor (2005, p. 217): "There is little argument that satisfaction influences behavioural intentions. The primary point of contention in service evaluation models is whether satisfaction directly affects behavioral intentions and whether it is the only direct effect".

Regarding the relationship of perceived quality with other constructs, there is evidence that the construct of quality is an antecedent of both constructs of satisfaction (Anderson & Fornell, 1994; Parasuraman, Zeithaml, & Berry, 1985; Parasuraman, Zeithaml, & Berry, 1988; Goutieb, Grewal, & Brown, 1994) and perceived value (Chang & Wildt, 1994; Gale, 1994; Parasuraman & Grewal, 2000; Sirohi, McLaughlin, & Wittink, 1998; Sweeney, Soutar, & Johnson, 1999) but has only an indirect influence in the construct of behavioural intentions, which is consistent with the 'satisfaction models' view. However, other studies in the service marketing literature suggest that quality can also have a direct impact and positive influence in all the constructs previously mentioned (Anderson & Sullivan, 1993; Cronin, Brady, Tomas, & Hult, 2000; Bagozzi, 1992; Brady, Knight, Cronin, Hult, & Keillor, 2005), thus supporting the ‘comprehensive models’ view.

It should be noted that there are other types of models, which differ in the variable that assumes the mediating role. For instance, there is a line of research that positions value as the central mediating construct (value models). In the ‘value models’, the dimensions of service quality and satisfaction are antecedents of the perceived value, and have an indirect impact in the behavioural intentions of customers (Chang & Wildt, 1994; Gale, 1994; Parasuraman & Grewal, 2000; Sirohi, McLaughlin, & Wittink, 1998; Sweeney, Soutar, & Johnson, 1999). There are also models that consider satisfaction as an antecedent of quality (Athanassopoulos, 2000; Boulding, Kalra, Staelin, & Zeithaml, 1993; Lee & Cunningham, 2001; Zeithaml, Berry, & Parasuraman, 1996).

**Figure 2 – Approaches used to model the effects of quality, satisfaction and perceived value on the behavioural intentions construct**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comprehensive Model</th>
<th>Value Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceived Value</strong></td>
<td><strong>Perceived Value</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceived Quality</strong></td>
<td><strong>Perceived Quality</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behavioral Intentions</strong></td>
<td><strong>Behavioral Intentions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consumer Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td><strong>Consumer Satisfaction</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In sport marketing there are not many studies exploring the relation between the constructs. Despite that, the lack of consensus regarding the type of relation among constructs is also present. Several studies conclude that quality is an antecedent of satisfaction and perceived value (Yoshida & James, 2010; Clemes, Brush, & Collins, 2011; Theodorakis N. D., Alexandris, Tsigilis, & Karvounis, 2013).\(^5\) Regarding the relationship between satisfaction and behavioural intentions of sport spectators, Yoshida & James (2010) identify a direct relationship of functional quality and satisfaction with the service on intentions and consumption behaviour while Tsuji, Bennett, & Zhang (2007) reveal the existence of an indirect relationship between those constructs.

However, there is a consensus in the marketing and sports management literature, that an increase in supporters satisfaction level reduces complaints (Mullin, Hardy, & Sutton, 2007), foster retention levels (Yoshida & James, 2010; Gray & Wert-Gray, 2012), increases purchase intentions and attendances in sporting events (Kwon, Trail, & Anderson, 2005; Wakefield & Blodgett, 1996; Greenwell, Fink, & Pastore, 2002; Laverie & Arnett, 2000; Zhang, Lee, Judge, & Johnson, 2014), and generates a positive word-of-mouth (Thamnopoulos, Tzetzi, & Laios, 2012), enhancing loyalty (Trail, Anderson, & Fink, 2005).

Moreover, in the sport marketing literature, there is evidence for the direct and/or indirect influence on behavioural intentions by the construct of satisfaction (Kwon, Trail, & Anderson, 2005; Wakefield & Blodgett, 1996; Greenwell, Fink, & Pastore, 2002; Laverie & Arnett, 2000; Zhang, Lee, Judge, & Johnson, 2014; Tsuji, Bennett, & Zhang, 2007; Yoshida & James, 2010), quality (Theodorakis, Kambitis, Laios, & Koustelios, 2001; Theodorakis N., Koustelios, Robinson, & Barlas, 2009; Wakefield & Blodgett, 1996; Fernandes & Neves, 2014), and perceived value (Kwon & Armstrong, 2002; Kwon & Armstrong, 2006; Kwon & Trail, 2003; Byron, Zhang, & Baker, 2013; Kwon, Trail, & James, 2007).

To summarize, although there is consensus on the strong interdependence among the various constructs (Boksberger & Melsen, 2011), there is no agreement yet on how, as a whole, quality, value and satisfaction, influence consumer behavior, or other outcome measures of a service (Brady, Knight, Cronin, Hult, & Keillor, 2005). This question is also present in the sports context (Theodorakis, Howat, Ko, & Avourdiadou, 2014). Basically, quality, satisfaction and value can apparently have a direct or indirect effect on behavioural intentions, and be partially mediated or fully mediated according to the conceptual models that are used (Li & Petrick, 2010).

### 3. CONCEPTUALIZATION AND HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT

Regardless of the theoretical developments around quality, satisfaction, value and behavioural intentions, there is a void of studies that address all these dimensions with multidimensional scales. This study aims to fill this gap in the service marketing literature, with a particular focus on the sport spectator consumption. The model presented next, is named 'CONSUMEREX - Consumer experience model'; since the authors consider that this instrument includes a number of aspects that determine the consumer experience, applied to the sports context, and in particular, stadium events.

\(^5\) Yoshida and James (2010) consider that quality and satisfaction are multidimensional constructs. They show that technical and functional quality factors are antecedents of technical satisfaction (designated 'game satisfaction') and functional satisfaction (designated 'service satisfaction'), respectively.
To the best of our knowledge, this is the first research work using multidimensional scales for all the fundamental constructs. It is expected that the proposed model will have a very high explanatory power, both with respect to the variation of each construct, as well as the understanding of the relationships among the different factors and their influence on the consumers’ loyalty and behavioural intentions.

The conceptualization of the CONSUMEREX model is presented below, in two distinct phases. The first part is called the ‘intra-construct approach’, and emphasizes the innovative aspects of the model in assessing the variables that determine each construct. In anticipation, we can summarize that for the ‘quality’ construct, the model suggests the introduction of a third and new dimension focused on the experience lived by the consumers. Thus, the quality construct will be divided into three sub-dimensions: technical quality, functional quality, and experiential quality. A similar hypothesis is proposed for the satisfaction construct, which is a novelty in the marketing literature. In addition, the model includes multidimensional scales for both the perceived value construct (an approach that is not common to find in the assessment of the service value) and for the loyalty construct, incorporating theoretical advances from the discipline of relationship marketing.

The second part of the model presentation is related to the ‘inter-construct approach’, and suggests relationships between constructs based on the ‘comprehensive-models’, whose theoretical application in other academic works has shown best results. To validate this type of relationship, this paper also suggests testing a competing model, where the satisfaction factor is positioned as a moderator variable. This competitor model, called ‘satisfaction-model’ also appears in the marketing literature as an alternative conceptualization in the evaluation of services - for details on this, see the working of Brady et al (2005).

### Intra-construct approach

**Perceived Quality.** Over the past decades, several studies have revealed the advantages of analyzing quality according to two sub-dimensions (technical and functional quality). Indeed, this view was already recommended in the pioneering work of the Nordic school, concerning the study of quality in the service sector (Gronroos C., 1982; 1984). This two-fold dimensions approach around quality has also been increasingly present in recent research, particularly in the context of sport spectators and sport participants (Clemes, Brush, & Collins, 2011; Ko, Zhang, Cattani, & Pastore, 2011; Theodorakis N. D., Alexandris, Tsigilis, & Karvounis, 2013).

As a result of this, the models that have a multidimensional approach to measure quality, showed higher levels of explained variation (always above 60%), when compared to one-dimensional models (typically below 45%) as exemplified by the unidimensional scales like SERVQUAL (Parasuraman, Zeithaml & Berry, 1988), SERVPERF (Cronin & Taylor, 1992), or SPORTERV (Theodorakis, Kambitis, Laios, & Koustelios, 2001), among other instruments.

It should also be highlighted that the inclusion of the sub-dimensions of functional and technical quality has been pushing towards a new conceptualization and broader use of hierarchical and multidimensional theoretical models in the assessment of the perceived quality construct. These advantages explain the emergence of a new modelling approach concerning the constructs used to assess perceived quality. In fact, several recent studies have applied hierarchical models in different sectors from education to e-services, including the health related services, telecommunications and sports (Clemes, Gan, & Kao, 2007; Collier & Bienstock, 2006; Dagger, Sweeney, & Johnson, 2007; Kang, 2006; Clemes, Brush, & Collins, 2011; Ganguli & Roy, 2013). This advance in the literature is very important as studies of hierarchical and multidimensional nature increase the adjustment capacity of the models to the specificities of the sectors under review.

The growing importance around the co-creation of value (Vargo & Lusch, 2004; Grönroos, 2012; Woratschek, Horbel, & Popp, 2014), and the consolidation of service-based economies, also led researchers to look at the importance of the consumption experience (Agency, 2014). This means that researchers are increasingly interested in understanding the complexity of the process in which customers are both producers and consumers of the service provided (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2004; Vargo & Lusch, 2008). This evolution has already influenced the literature on quality, with the addition of a third dimension to the two sub-dimensions mentioned above (technical and functional). This dimension is mainly focused on the customer’s experience (Yoshida & James, 2011).

The importance around the ‘service experience’ is not a new topic. This issue has been widely discussed in the marketing literature (Kotler & Keller, 2009; Zeithaml, Bitner, & Gremler, 2005), and sport management literature (Mullin, Hardy, & Sutton, 2007). However, the study around the ‘service experience’ has been mainly focused on the effect of ambience, or physical design and decor elements. This topic is also commonly called
'service environment' (Rust and Oliver, 1994), 'physical environment quality' (Brady & Cronin, 2001), 'sportscape' (Wakefield, Blodgett, & Sloan, 1996), 'servicescape' (Hightower, Brady, & Baker, 2002; 1992; Bitner, 1992), or 'aesthetic quality' (Yoshida, James, & Cronin, 2013).

In other words, much of the previous studies have analysed the 'service environment' from the perspective of the service-provision (process-related), and not so much from the perspective of the service-experienced (emotions-related). Therefore, the novelty of this approach is related to the more recent phenomenon that is shifting the focus of this factor from the so-called functional quality to a new dimension focused on the customer experience (Yoshida & James, 2011). There are several studies that prove the relevance of emotions and experience enjoyed by consumers during the consumption processes (Wakefield, Blodgett, & Sloan, 1996; Hightower, Brady, & Baker, 2002; Yoshida, James, & Cronin, 2013).

This is something even more important in the so-called 'hedonic services', like spectator sports, music festivals, etc. (Holt, 1995; Holbrook & Hirschman, 1982; Yoshida, James, & Cronin, 2013), where the consumer is clearly one of the main co-creators of that service (Drengner, Jahn, & Gaus, 2012). In this context, the herein proposed model suggests that the quality construct is structured around three sub-dimensions, named as functional quality, technical quality, and experiential quality.

**Hip.1: The consumer perceived quality is explained by three sub-dimensions: functional quality (Hip.1a), technical quality (Hip.1b) and experiential quality (Hip.1c).**

**Consumer Satisfaction.** Marketing literature is consensual in recognizing that quality is an antecedent of satisfaction (Theodorakis N. D., Alexandris, Tsigilis, & Karvounis, 2013; Brady, Knight, Cronin, Hult, & Keillor, 2005; Koo, et al., 2009). However, contrary to what happens to quality, satisfaction has not been analyzed as a multidimensional construct. In part, this is due to the fact that the construct of satisfaction can theoretically be framed as a response to a cognitive assessment, determined by the perceived quality. That is, satisfaction is understood as a "judgment that a product or service feature provided" (Oliver, 1997, p. 13), or as also referred by Yoshida and James (2010, p. 339) "(...) a pleasurable fulfilment response toward a good, service, benefit or reward".

This may partially explain why most studies evaluate customer satisfaction based on scales of 3 or 4 items, mostly influenced by the work of Cronin and colleagues (Cronin, Brady, & Hult, 2000; Brady & Cronin, 2001). Basically, most researchers evaluate satisfaction by comparing performance with expectations in one-dimensional scales (Haumann, Quaiser, Wieseke, & Rese, 2014). Only recently, Yoshida and James (2010) proved the multidimensionality of the construct of satisfaction within the sport marketing context, suggesting two sub-dimensions: satisfaction with the game, and satisfaction with the service. With this research, the authors showed that functional quality is an antecedent of service satisfaction, and that technical quality is an antecedent of game satisfaction (technical satisfaction). With this finding, Yoshida and James (2010) establish a correspondence between the sub-dimensions of quality and the sub-dimensions of satisfaction. Therefore, there seems to be enough empirical support to propose the segmentation of satisfaction into three sub-dimensions: satisfaction with the service, technical satisfaction, and a new dimension that we call ‘experiential satisfaction’, which is related with the experience lived by the customer.

In short, this proposal is based on three considerations: (1) the empirical evidence that quality is an antecedent of satisfaction; (2) recent studies confirm that quality sub-dimensions precede the sub-dimensions of satisfaction; and (3) the evidence demonstrated by Yoshida and James (2010) in the context of sport that satisfaction is a multidimensional construct.

**Hip.2: Consumer satisfaction is explained by the sub-dimensions: technical satisfaction (Hip.2a), service satisfaction (Hip.2b) and experiential satisfaction (Hip.2c).**

6 Holbrook and Hirschman (1982) argue for the recognition of the experiential aspects of consumption, namely: consumer fantasies, feelings, and fun. Based on this paradigm, the authors suggested an experiential view focused on the symbolic, hedonic and aesthetic nature of consumption. According to Drengner, Jahn, & Gaus (2012, p. 60): “A fundamental element of those services [hedonic services] is that customer interaction becomes central for the consumption experience”.
**Perceived Value.** Focused on the notion of cost effectiveness associated with the consumption of a product or service, the study about perceived value by customers started by following mainly a functional perspective, centered around the cost-benefit analysis of the product or the service (McDougall & Levesque, 2000; Sweeney & Soutar, 2001). However, and similarly to the evolution towards a multidimensional approach observed around the constructs of quality and satisfaction, there is evidence today that suggests that perceived value can also be assessed according to three sub-dimensions: functional, emotional and social (Walsh, Shiu, & Hassan, 2014; Kwon & Kwak, 2014; Lee, Trail, Kwon, & Anderson, 2011).

Considering that there is also consensus that perceived value can have a moderator role between quality and behavioral intentions, as well as be an antecedent of satisfaction (Brady, Knight, Cronin, Hult, & Keillor, 2005; Brady & Cronin, 2001), there are also theoretical evidence to relate the three sub-dimensions of perceived value (functional, emotional, and social) to the three similar dimensions, proposed in the present model to the quality and satisfaction constructs.

**Hip.3: The value perceived by consumers, is explained by the sub-dimensions: functional value (Hip.3a), emotional value (Hip.3b) and social value (Hip.3c).**

**Loyalty.** The construct of loyalty is not commonly used in the context of service evaluations, where most scholars prefer to include behavioural intentions. This construct (behavioural intentions) has been regarded as a dependent variable on quality, satisfaction and perceived value. And as refereed by Zeithaml, Berry, & Parasuraman (1996, p. 33) behavioural intentions “can be viewed as indicators that signal whether customers will remain with or defect from the company”.

Marketing literature reveals that behavioral intentions are usually treated as a one-dimensional construct comprised of 3 or 4-items scales. These items focus on evaluating the purchase intention (or repurchase intention), the generation of positive feedback (WOM?) and the recommendation to third parties. Brady et al. (2005, p. 221) synthesize well the choice of these options: “Service providers that deliver good service are suggested to have customers who are loyal, will recommend the service, and say positive things about the provider”. These scales typically rely on Oliver’s work (1980; 1997), Zeithaml, Berry and Parasuraman (1996) and Cronin and colleagues (Brady, Voorhees, Cronin, & Bourdeau, 2006; Cronin, Brady, Tomas, & Hult, 2000).

However, there is evidence suggesting a semantic confusion between loyalty and behavioral intentions. In fact, most of the studies use the items validated in the work of Zeithaml, Berry and Parasuraman (1996). Although these items used were used to measure the dimension of loyalty, scholars continue to denote the construct as behavioral intentions. This same phenomenon can be found in the scales used in the work of Cronin and his colleagues (Brady, Voorhees, Cronin, & Bourdeau, 2006; Cronin, Brady, Tomas, & Hult, 2000), based on the previous instrument developed by Zeithaml et al. (1996). But if we consider the loyalty construct, there are advances in the relational marketing literature that suggest that consumer loyalty should be formulated around four dimensions: cognitive, affective, conative and active (Blut, Evanschitzky, Vogel, & Ahlert, 2007; Han, Kim, & Kim, 2011; McMullan & Gilmore, 2002; Bobâlcă, Gâtej, & Ciobanu, 2012).

In this context, we should highlight the work developed by Blut, Evanschitzky, Vogel, & Ahlert (2007), which validated the items proposed by Zeithaml et al. (1996) to measure the sub-dimension of ‘Conative Loyalty’, and the items developed by Oliver (1997; 1999) to measure the sub-dimension of ‘affective loyalty’. Therefore, and considering that in our model we want to evaluate all constructs using multidimensional scales, we propose to replace the behavioral intentions construct by the loyalty construct, which is the explained (or dependent) construct in our model. Thus we formulate the following hypothesis.

**Hip.4: Loyalty is explained by the sub-dimensions: cognitive loyalty (Hip.4a), affective loyalty (Hip.4b), conative loyalty (Hip.4c) and active loyalty (Hip.4d).**

To summarize, the conceptualization suggested in the CONSUMEREX model, proposes a multidimensional approach to assess all constructs that typically are used to evaluate a service: quality, satisfaction, perceived value, and loyalty. To the best of our knowledge this multidimensional approach is novel in the marketing literature - see figure 3.

---

7 Abreviation of word-of-mouth
Inter-construct Approach

As previously mentioned, there is consensus on the fundamental constructs that should be used in service evaluation. However there is a lack of agreement regarding the kind of relation that these constructs have with each other and their impact on consumption.

Following the recommendations of Brady & Cronin (2001) e Brady, Knight, Cronin, Hult, & Keillor (2005) the present work adopted the comprehensive models approach. According to this conceptual base, the constructs of quality, satisfaction, and perceived value, all have a positive impact on behavioral intentions. The constructs of value and satisfaction also have a mediating role between the construct of quality and behavioral intentions.

This study also raises the possibility of satisfaction being a mediator of the relationship between value and loyalty - see Figure 3. The following hypotheses are formulated:

- **Hip.5a**: Quality has a direct and positive effect on value
- **Hip.5b**: Quality has a direct and positive effect on satisfaction
- **Hip.5c**: Quality has a direct and positive effect on loyalty
- **Hip.5d**: Value has a direct and positive effect on satisfaction
- **Hip.5e**: Value has a direct and positive effect on loyalty
- **Hip.5f**: Satisfaction has a direct and positive effect on loyalty

**Figure 3 - Dimensions of the Consumer Experience Model – CONSUMEREX**

Introducing a competing model

In order to check the reliability and robustness of the CONSUMEREX model this research also tests an alternative model, called 'satisfaction-model' (see Figure 3). The main model conceptualizes a direct and positive influence of all constructs (comprehensive model), while the rival model proposes that satisfaction is the result of the value and perceived quality of consumers, which means that it is satisfaction that precedes loyalty. In this context, it is hypothesized that the main model (Consumerex model) has more influence on loyalty than the competing model.

**Hip.6**: The comprehensive model has a higher explanatory power of the variance in loyalty than the competing model
4. Conclusion

This paper proposed the first completely multidimensional model for services evaluation and assessment, CONSUMEREX. The model integrates all the constructs that typically are considered in the evaluation of a service: quality, satisfaction, perceived value, and loyalty. The main novelty is that all these constructs are assumed to have several sub-dimensions.

The main contributions of our model are related with the quality and satisfaction constructs. The quality construct has already been divided into two sub-dimensions: functional quality and technical quality. However, there are services, like the hedonic services, where the consumer is a co-producer and where the experience lived and related emotions are particularly important. To incorporate this, our model adds a new quality sub-dimension: experiential quality.

Considering the large number of studies showing that quality is an antecedent of satisfaction and taking into account our first proposal of having three quality sub-dimensions, the second contribution of our model is to propose three sub-dimensions for the satisfaction construct: functional satisfaction, technical satisfaction and experiential satisfaction. It should be noted that this proposal is quite different from the existing literature since satisfaction has, almost always, been analyzed as a unidimensional construct. A notable exception is Yoshida and James (2010) who, in a sport context, suggested separating satisfaction with the game (technical satisfaction) from satisfaction with the service (functional satisfaction). Our model goes one step further by also proposing the sub-dimension of experiential satisfaction.

Regarding the perceived value construct our model follows others authors (Walsh, Shiu, & Hassan, 2014; Kwon & Kwak, 2014; Lee, Trail, Kwon, & Anderson, 2011) and proposes to assess this construct according to three sub-dimensions: functional, emotional and social. Finally, consumer loyalty is formulated around four dimensions: cognitive, affective, conative and active (Blut, Evanschitzky, Vogel, & Ahlert, 2007; Han, Kim, & Kim, 2011; McMullan & Gilmore, 2002; Bobâlcă, Gâtej, & Ciobanu, 2012).

With respect to the relationship among the various constructs, we proposed two alternative models. The first model is a comprehensive model which considers that quality is an antecedent of value and satisfaction and that satisfaction has a mediating role between the two former constructs and loyalty. However quality and value also have a direct effect on consumer loyalty. In addition, to check the robustness of this first main model, we also proposed an alternative model, where quality and value only influence loyalty indirectly through the satisfaction construct. By testing two alternative models we hope to contribute to a clarification of the type of relation that exists among the various constructs.

If the conceptual proposals presented here are empirically validated, this proposal will represent a major contribution to the field of service marketing. Moreover it will have important consequences and applicability to the professional world, namely by marketers and sport managers in the so-called sport spectator industry.

---

8 Most studies include the dimension 'behavioral intentions' but use items that only assess 'loyalty'. To correct this semantic confusion, in our model the dependent construct is loyalty.
Appendix 1 - Global CONSUMEREX Model, including constructs, primary dimensions, secondary dimensions, items provided and all the connections and relations between factors and variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Quality</th>
<th>Technical Quality</th>
<th>Experiential Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SP – Sports cape</td>
<td>PL – Player Performance</td>
<td>EN – Match Day Entertainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN – Interaction with employees</td>
<td>TE – Team Performance</td>
<td>SO – Sociability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP – Security Performance</td>
<td>OP – Opponent Characteristics</td>
<td>VA – Valence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB – Food &amp; Beverage</td>
<td>GA – Game Quality</td>
<td>DE – Design &amp; Aesthetics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC – Schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td>GA – Game Atmosphere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR – Price</td>
<td></td>
<td>CR – Crowd Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR – Broadcasting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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