

Research Article

OFFERING A MODEL TO MEASURE THE IMPACT OF THE SERVQUAL MODEL OF SERVICE QUALITY ON BRAND LOYALTY WITH EMPHASIS ON THE ROLE OF BRAND SWITCHING COST

* Fariba Farid¹, Shabahang Moghaddasi¹, Nafiseh Pakinasab¹, Shahab oddin Moghaddasi²

¹ University College of Nabi Akram, Marketing Management Field (MBA), Tabriz, Iran

²Industrial Management Institute (IMI), Master of Science in industrial engineering-technology, Sari, Iran

*Author for Correspondence

ABSTRACT

The aim of this paper is develop of a model for measure service quality factors in Servqual model and brand loyalty in respect to switching costs variable in relationship between two service quality and brand loyalty. This research is valuable for managers, especially for brand measures, marketers, as well as for academics and other researchers. managers are able to render this model for determination of switching costs in relationship between two: brand loyalty and service quality variables. This research has been done on the basis of last research. The results of this study have shown that in addition 5 factors of Servqual model (responsiveness, empathy, assurance, reliability, tangibles) which is considered as an affective factor of service quality. If we want to discuss about vitality, tangible variable is known as the most important influencing factor on brand loyalty and Responsiveness variable, assurance, empathy and reliability are in the next level of importance. According to the results, the costs of brand changing will not moderating the relationship between service quality and brand loyalty in the airline.

Keywords: *Switching Cost, Brand Loyalty, Service Quality, Servqual, Airlines, Spss.*

INTRODUCTION

In a highly competitive environment the provision of high quality services passengers is the core competitive advantage for an airline's profitability and sustained growth (Chen, 2008). In the past decade, as the air transportation market has become even more challenging, many airlines have turned to focus on airline service quality to increase service satisfaction. Service quality conditions influences a firm's competitive advantage by retaining customer patronage, and with this comes market share (Park et al., 2004; Morash and Ozment, 1994). Delivering high-quality service to passengers is essential for airline survival, so airlines need to understand what passengers expect from their services (Yu-Kai HUANG, 2009). During the past few decades service quality has become a major area of attention to practitioners, managers and researchers owing to its strong impact on business performance, lower costs, customer satisfaction, customer loyalty and profitability (Leonard and Sasser, 1982; Cronin and Taylor, 1992; Gammie, 1992; Hallowell, 1996; Chang and Chen, 1998; Gummesson, 1998; Lasser et al., 2000; Silvestro and Cross, 2000; Newman, 2001; Sureshchander et al., 2002; Guru, 2003 etc.). There has been a continued research on the definition, modeling, measurement, data collection procedure, data analysis etc., issues of service quality and brand loyalty and switching cost, leading to development of sound base for these researchers. (Nitin Seth and S.G. Deshmukh-2004). A conceptual model attempts to show the relationships that exist between salient variables. (Ghobadian et al., 1994). It is a simplified description of the actual situations. It is envisaged that conceptual models in service quality enable management to identify quality problems and thus help in planning for the launch of a quality improvement program thereby improving the efficiency, profitability and overall performance. (Nitin Seth and S.G. Deshmukh-2004)

Research Article

LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Service Quality:

Understanding and maintaining quality are the main concerns of business today. Providing quality is not a concern of manufacturing companies alone. The delivery of high-quality service becomes a marketing requirement among air carriers as a result of competitive pressure (Ostrowski et al., 1993). Chang and Yeh (2002) argue that quality in airline service is difficult to describe and measure due to its heterogeneity, intangibility, and inseparability, and only the customer can truly define service quality in the airline industry (Butler and Keller, 1992). (Yu-Kai HUANG, 2009) Service quality is a consumer's overall impression of the relative inferiority/superiority of the organization and its services (Bitner & Hubbert, 1994). The importance of service quality has been widely discussed by researchers. For example, Parasuraman, Zeithaml & Berry (1991) argued that delivering high quality in the service industry has been recognized as the most effective means of ensuring that a company's offerings are uniquely positioned in a market filled with "lookalike" competitive offerings. Goodman (1989) also asserted that businesses should be concerned with service quality issue because problems with service quality can make customer loyalty decline by 20%. (Jin-Woo Park Rodger Robertson and Cheng-Lung Wu, 2005) Since service quality is an important factor for airlines, several researchers have applied service quality related theories and methods in the airline industry (Alotaibi, 1992; Chang & Yeh, 2002; Chen, 1997; Kaynak, Kucukemiroglu & Kara, 1994; Ostrowski, O'Brien & Gordon, 1993; Sultan & Simpson, 2000). Most of the previous airline service studies have used the SERVQUAL method to evaluate service quality. However, the 22-item scale of SERVQUAL representing five dimensions is not appropriate for measuring all aspects of airline service quality due to the characteristics of airline service quality. Airline service quality is different from services in other industries. An airline service comprises tangible and intangible attributes. Airlines carry passengers to the destination using aircraft, and passengers experience diverse intangible services from airlines such as on time performance, inflight service, service frequency and so on. Shostack (1977) asserted that airline travel is intangible-dominant. It does not yield physical ownership of a tangible good. (Jin-Woo Park Rodger Robertson and Cheng-Lung Wu, 2005) Service quality can be defined as a consumer's overall impression of the relative efficiency of the organization and its services. Understanding exactly what customers expect is the most crucial step in defining and delivering high-quality service (Zeithaml et al., 1996). SERVQUAL is one of the best models for evaluating customers' expectations and perceptions (Pakdil and Aydm, 2007; Chen, 2008). Despite criticism from other research, SERVQUAL remains the most commonly used diagnostic model for evaluating service quality. SERVQUAL has five main dimensions to measure service quality: tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy (Zeithaml et al., 1996). (Yu-Kai HUANG, 2009). Previous airline service studies are concentrated in modelling the effect of perceived service quality at the aggregate construct level, though examining the effects of individual dimensions of service attributes has potentially great utility for airline managers (Patterson & Spreng, 1997). The effects of individual dimensions of airline service quality have not been fully investigated, if any, they have concentrated on the SERVQUAL's five dimensions, namely tangibles, responsiveness, reliability, assurance, and empathy (Alotaibi, 1992; Sultan & Simpson, 2000; Tsaur, Chang & Yen, 2002). Since it is required to modify and adapt SERVQUAL questions and dimensions to make them more relevant to airline service quality, it is worth deriving the nature of airline service quality dimensions and investigating the effects derived dimensions of airline service quality rather than just applying the SERVQUAL dimensions and questions for measuring airline service quality. In addition to SERVQUAL related studies, many scholars have measured airline service quality through various quality dimensions. Gourdin (1988) categorized airline service quality in terms of three items: safety, timelines and price. Elliott and Roach (1993) proposed food and beverage, timely luggage transport, seat comfort, the check in process, and in-flight service dimensions. Haynes (1994) used the processing of luggage, seat cleanliness, and the check-in process, the convenience of transit, timeliness, and handling of customer complaints as the standards of service quality. (Yu-Kai HUANG, 2009)

Research Article

B.Brand Loyalty:

Brand Loyalty is an important concept of today's brand marketing world. Many definitions were being proposed by many researchers, among which the most complete definition was being proposed by Jacoby and Olson (1970). They defined brand loyalty as the result from non-random, long existence behavior response, and it was a mental purchase process formed by some certain decision units who considered more than one brands. In early researches, researchers usually took the act of repurchase as the method of measure brand loyalty. But some researchers indicate that to measure brand loyalty the best way is to measure by affective loyalty (Bennett and Rundle-Thiele, 2000). (Reshma Farhat1 &Dr. Bilal Mustafa Khan-2011)Brand loyalty is consumer attitudes on a brand preference from previous use and shopping experience of a product (Deighton, Henderson, & Neslin, 1994; Aaker, 1991), and it can be measured from repurchase rate on a same brand. Assael (1998) defines that brand loyalty is that consumers satisfy their past experience in use of the same brand and incur repurchase behavior. Brand loyalty means brand preferences that consumers will not consider other brands when they buy a product (Baldinger & Rubinson, 1996; Cavero & Cebollada, 1997). Brand loyalty represents a repurchase commitment in the future purchase that promise consumers will not change their brand loyalty in different situations and still buy their favorable brands (Oliver, 1999)Fournier and Yao (1997) described the center of companies' marketing strategies is the development and maintenance of consumer brand loyalty. The phenomenon is especially seen in markets with tough competition, highly unpredictable and low product differentiation. Carroll and Ahuvia (2006) suggested that Brand love, in turn, is associated to higher levels of brand loyalty and positive word-of-mouth. Some drivers of brand loyalty are perceived risk, inertia, habit, involvement, satisfaction, and relationship between product or service providers (Rundle-Theile and Bennet, 2001). A series of very positive encounters will increase customer satisfaction, trust, relationship commitment and continuity (Hellier et al., 2003; Morgan and Hunt, 1994; Selnes, 1998). Aydin and Ozer (2005) stated some antecedents of customer loyalty. Corporate image, perceived service quality, trust and customer switching costs are the influential factors of brand loyalty. Moreover the results described that trust is one of the most important antecedents of brand loyalty. Although perceived service quality and perceived switching cost appeared to have the same level of influence on brand loyalty.

C. Switching Cost:

According to Caruana *et al.*, (2003) defined switching cost as costs that deters customers from switching to competitors' product or services. According to Porter (1998) (as in Caruana *et al.*, 2003), switching cost is the cost involved in changing from one service provider to another. In addition to measurable monetary costs, switching costs also include time and psychological effort involved in facing the uncertainty of dealing with a new service provider Dick and Basu, (1994). According to Jackson (1985) (as in Caruana *et al.*, 2003), it is the sum of economic, psychological cost, and physical costs. It includes the psychological cost of becoming a customer of a new firm, and the time effort involved in buying new brand Klemperer, (1995); (as in Kim *et al.*, 2004). Hence, switching cost varies from customer to customer Shy, (2002). According Aydin *et al.*, (2005) switching cost gives firms some advantage as follows:

- i. The cost reduce customers' sensitivity to price and satisfaction level
- ii. Customer perceive functionally homogeneous brands

In another word even though customer had the opportunity to choose identical brands but they choose to stay loyal and continue to buy the same brand.

HYPOTHESIS

In this research, the following hypothesis which have been extracted based on the theoretical study, will be examined.

Research Article

A. Main hypothesis:

switching cost, abolish the relationship between service quality with loyalty brand in airline part.

B. Specific hypothesis:

First hypothesis: switching cost, abolish relationship between customer perceptions of tangible and brand loyalty in airline part..

The second hypothesis: switching cost, abolish the relationship between customer reliability with brand loyalty in airline part.

The third hypothesis: switching cost, abolish the relationship between customer responsiveness and brand loyalty in airline part.

The fourth hypothesis: switching cost, abolish the relationship between customer perceptions of empathy and brand loyalty in the airline part.

The fifth hypothesis: switching cost, abolish the relationship between customer perceptions of assurance and brand loyalty in the airline part.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

A. Sample:

In order to examine current hypothesis, passengers travel agency airlines selected as a survey in this research; to do this, one sample from East Azerbaijan’s airline selected. this sample contain 272 passengers that from all those considerable samples,60.7 percent males,39.3 percent of women,21.7 percent in the age group of below 30 years old,45.6 percent between 30 to 40 years old,23.5 percent between 40 to 50 years old, 9.2 percent are over 50 years old, and 25 percent have diploma and lower education level, 48.2 percent bachelor,26.8 percent master and more than master, as well as 56.6 percent single and 43.4 are married. from all those considerable samples, 9.6 percent for freelance,12.5 percent employee,22.8 percent teacher,24.6 percent university students,16.5 percent retired ,and other 14 percent.16.9 percent income is about 500000 toman,37.1 percent income is about 500000 to 1000000 and 31.3 percent income is about 1000000 to 2000000 and 14.7 percent of their wage is above 2000000.Ata airline 5.9 percent, Turkish 20.6 percent, Mahan 32.7 percent, and Atlas jet 21 percent, Krandon 8.5 percent, Anurair 5.9 percent and other airlines have 5.5 percent.

B.Measurement tools:

In recent research, in order to gather essential information and measure variable of this study, questionnaire has been used. According to available standard questionnaire with brand loyalty and switching cost topic, the questionnaire has been prepared by researcher.To achieve these parameters, the theoretical presentation has been used. Finally, in respect to these parameters a questionnaire has designed and a standard question service quality is used. The study uses Cronbach’s α to measure the internal reliability of the questionnaire. As shown in Table 1,Cronbach’s α of Switching Cost is 0.746, Brand Loyalty and Switching Cost are 0.88, Brand Loyalty is 0.828. According Guelford (1965) suggestion, when Cronbach’s α is greater than 0.7, it shows the questionnaire has a relative high internal reliability. The results of the study show that Cronbach’s α in all variables is higher than 0.7, It indicates that the reliability of the questionnaire is acceptable.

Table 1: Cronbach’s α

Variables	Measurement item	Cronbach’s α
Brand Loyalty (BA)	19	0.828
Switching Cost (SC)	5	0.746
BA-SC	24	0.88

Research Article

3) Testing of Hypothesis:

In this research, the following hypothesis which have been extracted based on the theoretical study, will be examined.

Table 2:Testing of hypothesis

MODEL		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
Dependent Variable: Brand Loyalty	(Constant)	0.883	0.199		4.428	0.000
	Switching Cost	0.536	0.032	0.728	16.765	0.000
	Service Quality	0.075	0.066	0.050	1.144	0.253
Dependent Variable: Brand Loyalty	(Constant)	0.990	0.179		5.534	0.000
	Switching Cost	0.054	0.035	0.734	15.628	0.000
	tangible	0.027	0.052	0.024	0.519	0.604
Dependent Variable: Brand Loyalty	(Constant)	1.041	0.157		6.625	0.000
	Switching Cost	0.549	0.030	0.745	18.124	0.000
	Reliability	0.005	0.037	0.005	0.124	0.901
Dependent Variable: Brand Loyalty	(Constant)	1.107	0.165		6.715	0.000
	Switching Cost	0.551	0.030	0.747	18.326	0.000
	Responsiveness	-0.022	0.034	-0.026	-0.636	0.525
Dependent Variable: Brand Loyalty	(Constant)	1.017	0.151		6.730	0.000
	Switching Cost	0.547	0.030	0.743	18.122	0.000
	Empathy	0.016	0.031	0.021	0.510	0.611
Dependent Variable: Brand Loyalty	(Constant)	0.877	0.151		5.807	0.000
	Switching Cost	0.532	0.030	0.722	17.565	0.000
	Assurance	0.087	0.033	0.107	2.597	0.010

According to the table 2 results and calculated sig., all of the table hypothesis are rejected except the fifth hypothesis, which indicates the moderator relationship of cost on loyalty and assurance, which due to that the sig. is less than 0.05, the hypothesis is confirmed.

Also the result shows that the effective factors on quality are sorted such below in the point of the level of impact:

Table 3:Ranking of variables

Variables	Mean Rank
tangible	4.59
Responsiveness	2.98
Reliability	2.23
Empathy	2.35
Assurance	2.85

If we want to discuss about vitality, tangible variable is known as the most important influencing factor on brand loyalty and Responsiveness variable, assurance, empathy and reliability are in the next level of

Research Article

importance. According to the results, the costs of brand changing will not moderating the relationship between service quality and brand loyalty in the airline.

Table 4: Determining the relationship between the variables for modeling

MODEL		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
Dependent Variable: Switching Cost	(Constant)	0.946	0.197		4.806	0.000
	Brand Loyalty	1.013	0.055	0.746	18.400	0.000
Dependent Variable: Switching Cost	(Constant)	2.363	0.352		6.720	0.000
	Service Quality	0.729	0.118	0.354	6.206	0.000
Dependent Variable: Service Loyalty	(Constant)	2.257	0.137		16.523	0.000
	Brand Loyalty	0.202	0.038	0.307	5.297	0.000
Dependent Variable: tangible	(Constant)	1.595	0.213		7.486	0.000
	Service Quality	0.719	0.071	0.524	10.096	0.000
Dependent Variable: Reliability	(Constant)	-0.575	0.234		-2.457	0.015
	Service Quality	1.079	0.078	0.634	13.784	0.000
Dependent Variable: Responsiveness	(Constant)	0.152	0.282		0.537	0.592
	Service Quality	0.938	0.094	0.519	9.946	0.000
Dependent Variable: Assurance	(Constant)	-0.367	0.275		-1.332	0.184
	Service Quality	1.100	0.092	0.589	11.961	0.000
Dependent Variable: Empathy	(Constant)	-0.805	0.293		-2.749	0.006
	Service Quality	1.164	0.098	0.587	11.889	0.000

RESULTS

The research is sought to identify the effect of brand equality on brand loyalty and service quality of active airlines in Tabriz City. In this research, the fifth hypothesis (assurance variable) is has been accepted. Nevertheless, the main hypothesis of research is rejected , according to the results of the research, thereby, the switching cost is not able to adjust the relation between brand loyalty and quality of services in the airlines. The results of analysis indicated that tangible variable is known as the influential quality of service on brand loyalty and after that, Responsiveness variable, assurance, empathy and reliability were in the following rank.

REFERENCES

Aaker, D. A. (1991). Managing brand equity: Capitalizing on the value of a brand name. New York: Free Press.
Alotaibi, K.F. (1992). An empirical investigation of passenger diversity, airline service quality, and passenger satisfaction. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis. Arizona State University, AZ.

Research Article

- Assael, H. (1998).** Consumer behavior and marketing Action, 6th ed. Cincinnati, Ohio: South-Western.
- Aydin, S. & Ozer, G. (2005).** The analysis of antecedents of customer loyalty in the Turkish mobile telecommunication market. *European Journal of Marketing*, 39(7/8), 910-925.
- Baldinger, A.L., & Rubinson, J. (1996).** Brand loyalty: The link between attitude and behavior. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 36, 22-34.
- Bennett, R. and Rundle-Thiele, S. (2000).** “Attitudinal loyalty – personality trait or brand specific?” ANZMAC 2000 Visionary Marketing for the 21st Century: Facing the Challenge, Griffith University School of Marketing and Management, pp. 97-101.
- Bitner, M.J., & Hubbert, A.R. (1994).** Service quality: New directions in theory and practice. In R.T. Rust & R. Oliver (Eds.), *Encounter satisfaction versus overall satisfaction versus quality* (pp. 77). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Carroll, B. A. & Ahuvia, A. C. (2006).** Some antecedents and outcomes of brand love. *Marketing Letters*, 17(2), 79-89.
- Cavero, S., & Cebollada, J. (1997).** Brand choice and marketing strategy: An application to the market of laundry detergent for delicate clothes in Spain. *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 10, 57-71.
- Caruana, A. (2003).** The Impact of switching cost on customer loyalty: A study among corporate customers of mobile telephony. *Journal of Targeting Measurement and Analysis for Marketing* Vol 12, 3, 256-268
- Chang, T.Z. and Chen, S.J. (1998).** “Market orientation, service quality and business profitability: a conceptual model and empirical evidence”, *Journal of Services Marketing*, Vol. 12 No. 4, pp. 246-64.
- Chang, Y.H., & Yeh, C.H. (2002).** A survey analysis of service quality for domestic airlines. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 139(1), 166-177.
- Chen, K.J. (1997).** Consumer tolerance zone: Implications on Philippine Airlines domestic service delivery. *Journal of Global Marketing*, 11(2), 93-105.
- Chen, C. F. (2008).** Investigating structural relationships between service quality, perceived value, satisfaction, and behavioral intentions for air passengers: Evidence from Taiwan, *Transportation Research Part A*, Vol. 42, 709-717.
- Cronin, J.J. and Taylor, S.A. (1992).** “Measuring service quality: a reexamination and extension”, *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 6, July, pp. 55-68.
- Dick, A.S. and Basu, K. (1994).** Customer loyalty: toward an integrated conceptual framework. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 22, 99-113.
- Deighton, J., Henderson, C.M., & Neslin, S.A. (1994).** The effects of advertising on brand switching and repeat purchasing. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 16, 28-43.
- Elliott, K. M. and Roach, D. W. (1993).** Service quality in the airline industry: are carriers getting an unbiased evaluation from consumers? *Journal of Professional Services Marketing*, Vol. 9, 71-82.
- Fournier, S. & Yao, J. L. (1997).** Reviving brand loyalty: a reconceptualisation within the framework of consumer-brand relationship. *International Journal of Marketing*, 14, 451 - 473.
- Gammie, A. (1992).** “Stop at nothing in the search for quality”, *Human Resources*, Vol. 5, Spring, .35-8.
- Ghobadian, A., Speller, S. and Jones, M. (1994).** “Service quality concepts and models”, *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, Vol. 11 No. 9, pp. 43-66
- Gourdin, K. (1998).** Bringing quality back to commercial travel. *Transportation Journal*, Vol. 27, 23-29.
- Goodman, J. (1989).** The nature of customer satisfaction. *Quality Progress*, 22(2), 37-40.
- Guru, C. (2003).** Tailoring e- service quality through CRM, *Managing Service Quality*, Vol. 13 No. 6, pp. 20-531.
- Guilford, J.P. (1965).** *Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education*, 4th ed., New York : Mc Graw-Hill.
- Hallowell, R. (1996).** “The relationships of customer satisfaction, customer loyalty and profitability: an empirical study”, *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, Vol. 7 No. 4, pp. 27-42.

Research Article

Hellier, P. K. ,Geursen, G. M., Carr, R. A. & Rickard, J. A. (2003). Customer repurchase intention: A general structural equation model. *European Journal of Marketing*, 37(11/12), 1762-1800.

Hsin Kuang Chi, (2009).The Impact of Brand Awareness on Consumer Purchase Intention: The Mediating Effect of Perceived Quality and Brand Loyalty

Jacoby, J. and Olson, J.C. (1970). An Attitude Model of Brand Loyalty: Conceptual Underpinnings and Instrumentation Research, John Wiley & Sons, New York, NY.

Jin-Woo Park, Rodger Robertson and Cheng-Lung Wu-2005 Investigating the Effects of Airline Service Quality on Airline Image and Passengers' Future Behavioural Intentions: Findings from Australian international air passengers

Kaynak, E. Kucukemiroglu, O. & Kara. A. (1994). Consumers' perceptions of airlines: A correspondence analysis approach in a global airline industry. *Management International Review*, 34, 235-254.

Lasser, W.M., Manolis, C. and Winsor, R.D. (2000). "Service quality perspectives and satisfaction in private banking", *Journal of Services Marketing*, Vol. 14 No. 3, pp. 244-71.

Leonard, F.S. and Sasser, W.E. (1982). "The incline of quality", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 60. No. 5, pp. 163-71.

Morgan, R. M. & Hunt, S. D. (1994). The commitment-trust theory of relationship marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 58, 20-38.

Newman, K. (2001). "Interrogating SERVQUAL: a critical assessment of service quality measurement in a high street retail bank", *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, Vol. 19 No. 3, pp. 126-39.

Oliver, Richard L. (1999). Whence Consumer Loyalty? *Journal of Marketing*, 63, 33-44.

Ostrowski, P.L., O'Brien T.V., & Gordon G.L. (1993). Service quality and customer loyalty in the commercial airline industry. *Journal of Travel Research*, 32(2), 16-24.

Pakdil, F. and Aydm, O. (2007). Expectations and perceptions in airline service: An analysis using weighted SERVQUAL scores, *Journal of Air Transport Management*, Vol. 13, 229-237.

Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L.L. (1991). Refinement and reassessment of the SERVQUAL scale. *Journal of Retailing*, 67(4), 420-450.

Patterson, P.G., & Spreng R.W. (1997). Modelling the relationship between perceived value, satisfaction, and repurchase intentions in business-to-business, services context: An empirical examination. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 8(5), 414-434.

Rundle-Thiele, S. & Bennett, S. (2001). A brand for all seasons: A discussion of brand loyalty approaches and their applicability for different markets. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 10(1), 25-37.

Shy, O. (2002). "A quick and easy method for estimating switching costs", *International Journal of Industrial Organization*, Vol. 20, pp. 71-87.

Shostack, G.L. (1977). Breaking free from product marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 41(2), 73-80.

Sultan, F., & Simpson, M.C. (2000). International service variants: Airline passenger expectations and perceptions of service quality. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 14(3), 188-216.

Silvestro, R. and Cross, S. (2000). "Applying service profit chain in a retail environment", *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, Vol. 11 No. 3, pp. 244-68.

Sureshchander, G.S., Rajendran, C. and Anatharaman, R.N. (2002). "The relationship between service quality and customer satisfaction: a factor specific approach", *Journal of Services Marketing*, Vol. 16 No. 4, pp. 363-79.

Tsaur, S.H., Chang T.Y., & Yen, C.H. (2002). The evaluation of airline service quality by fuzzy MCDM. *Tourism Management*, 23, 107-115.

Zeithaml, V. A., Berry, L. L. and Parasuraman, A. (1996). The behavioral consequences of service quality, *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 60, 31-52.