

## Expanding the context of service: from experiences to environments

Voydilo Anton

School of Business Administration, South China University of Technology, Guangzhou, Guangdong province, China

---

### Abstract

*Purpose* – The purpose of this paper is to expand the range of service above service afters and service scenario by using a service-environmentprospect to environment and empirical vision on value.

*Methodology* – our main method is to design a conceptual encaseswork of an expanded service content which bases on so-called S-D logic, service-environments visions.

*Discoveries* – The service environmentofferthe proposition whichhelps to the development of services marketing research by expanding the milieu of service in 2 directions: it's accent on service as general statement of every interchange permitting the cogitation of all illustrations of value-in-use which istaken as service encounter; it's conceptualization of the environment widens the time and place proportions that contingentlyholds back the research in service experience and Service scenarioabove social, physical and othermeasurements to take in a count the variety of organisations across a huge socio-historic surrounding.

*Research limitations and implications* – present article proposes a wide conceptual encaseswork for overlooking an expanded view of service environment. Future conceptual and empirical research should be requiredin terms of identificationwider specter of necessaryparticles of service environment and their impact on assessment of experience.

*Practical implications* – expanding the range of service environment is aware of taking part of consumers and other participants in this co-creation of the service environment. These facts direct us to the necessity of take into consideration aboutcapabilities and knowledge of consumers as good as their socio-historic vision in the words of service scenario or special service experiences.

*Originality* – here is being promoted anadaptivepossibility of service environment to assistin future goal taking of services marketing research by expanding the term of service throughout a diversity of exchange experience and directing towardsorganisations as a mainimpact on unique bits of experience.

**Keywords:** Co-creation, Service environment, organisations, S-d logic, Service experience

---

Date of Submission: 16-06-2020

Date of Acceptance: 02-07-2020

---

### I. Introduction

The research experience on “services” marketing has begun from the necessity of understanding and encountering with the unique market offers, that were notdescribed well enough by goods-centered models (Judd, 1964; Rathmell, 1966; Shostack, 1977). These differences have assisted with highlighting the aspects of exchange the nature of services (Zeithaml et al., 1985); same as direct communications amongorganisations and consumers (e.g. Gummesson, 1987) – and the environment which service happensin (Bitner, 1990, 1992). Thus the differentiating characteristics of services have helped services marketing into a mature sub-discipline, questions have been raised regarding apparent differences in the marketing of services and goods (e.g. Vargo and Lusch, 2004).

In 2003, a study featuring a panel of distinguished services marketing experts raised some significant issues regarding the foundations of the field (Grove et al., 2003). This research, published in the Journal of Services Marketing, suggested that: many among panel expressed concern that the term “services marketing” may be too limiting and observe[d] that the service versus goods difference may be obsolete as a means of directing attention to the nature of services (Grove et al., 2003, p. 115). Since then, work has been done to expand the range of service, beyond distinguishing characteristics of services and goods, as well as direct correlations amongcompanys and consumers. In specific, more late conceptualizations of service accentuateempirical views on value, which points toward service as the basis of all exchange (e.g., Maglio and Spohrer 2008; Vargo and Lusch 2004; 2011). Take into consideration two people having dinner in a restaurant. One person grew up eating a variety of foods and is excited to try new things to eat.

The other person grew up eating a limited variety of foods and has reservations about tasting new things. The service encounter – correlationamong the consumer and the company – for each person will likely

lead to different outcomes because of their past experiences and preferences, same as potential differences with employees (Bitner, 1990; Surprenant and Solomon, 1987). In addition, the service scenario will impact each consumer's experience differently as well. Thus, restaurant settings have been generally classified as service contexts, springs from the distinguishing features of services mentioned above. Now, imagine if these same two people purchased a specific frozen meal produced by the same restaurant. It is quite likely that each person will still have a unique experience due to differences in preferences as well as past experiences and socio-historic, organisational structures that encase a specific experience (Akaka et al., 2015). In fact, the latter scenario may offer more variation than the first because depending on the consumers' ability to cook, the experiences may be completely different. After all the restaurant encounter would be classified as a service context, generally, the frozen meal encounter would not. This is because focusing on products (services versus goods) highlights differences in terms of IHIP characteristics and direct/indirect correlation among companies and consumers. In other words, focusing on experiences takes the attention toward phenomenological prospects of experience and the social structures that impact them (Akaka et al., 2015). This makes it clear that any "type" of encounter offers opportunities to uniquely co-produce value.

The purpose of this paper is to expand conceptually the context of service by drawing on a driving service-environments aspect to context and an empirical vision on value (Vargo and Lusch, 2008). This wide, systemic aspect is grounded in an evolving service-dominant (S-D) logic (Vargo and Lusch, 2004, 2004, 2008) and points toward the context of service as a complex and driving social and economic system, composed of networks of participants and the organisations that guide them (Akaka et al., 2013; Chandler and Vargo, 2011). Thus, correlations among different participants are impacted by socio-historic structures, or organisational arrangements and assess is uniquely experienced and phenomenologically defined (Akaka et al., 2015). Springs from this, we state that the context of service is not limited to specific "types" of encounters or physical and social spaces. Rather, the context in which service emerges and value is (potentially) produced might (or might not) involve the exchange of goods, and is settled within wider social and cultural structures and driving systems of service-for-service exchange. In short, S-D logic provides an alternative framework to address thoughts that have been brought by services marketing scholars regarding: the nature of services, the range of services and services and assess creation (Grove et al., 2003).

The foundational premises of S-D logic were introduced in the marketing references in 2004 as an alternative prospect for take into consideration how value is produced through exchange (Vargo and Lusch, 2004a). The underlying premise of S-D logic is that service – the employment of competences for the benefit of another – is the basis of all exchange. It is significant to note that the S-D logic conceptualization of service distinguishes among service (singular) as the employment of resources for the benefit of another and services (plural) as specific types of market offerings with unique characteristics (e.g. IHIP) (Vargo and Lusch, 2008). This is an insignificant difference because an S-D logic conceptualization of service (singular) helps to broaden the context of service, as opposed to services (plural), research to include all correlations that underlie social and economic exchange. Rather than focusing on value-in-exchange, or the price paid for something, S-D logic redirects attention toward value-in-use, or a market experience (Holbrook, 2006), in a specific context – i.e. value-in-context (Vargo et al., 2008). In other words, an S-D logic view focuses on value as phenomenological and contextual, which points toward the mainity of consumers' prospects and participation in value creation (i.e. value co-creation).

Over the past decade, S-D logic has been developed, revised and expanded through the participation of a growing number of services marketing (and other) scholars and their various research interests (see Lusch and Vargo, 2014). The ongoing development of S-D logic has expanded an array of service-related research and highlights the importance of understanding IHIP aspects of exchange (Zeithaml et al., 1985) as well as correlation (Gummesson, 1987) and relationships (Grönroos, 1995) in value creation. Thus, S-D logic's conceptualization of service expands the context of service beyond specific types of exchange encounters to that which encases all exchange encounters (Vargo et al., 2008). Moreover, late research regarding Service environment expands the foundational premises of S-D logic (see Lusch and Vargo, 2014) and underscores the complexity of the context that encases value creation, as well as exchange (Akaka et al., 2013). For example, rather than focusing on the co-creation of value as direct company/consumer correlations (e.g. Grönroos and Voima, 2013), a Service environment aspect take into considerations the direct and indirect correlations of multiple participants in value co-creation. More specifically, this aspect underlines the importance of socio-historic contexts of value creation by take into considering how combined levels of correlation and organisations impact experience (Akaka et al., 2015; Vargo et al., 2015). As it had been remarked, the aim of this article is to facilitate to a deeper understanding of the nature of service context; how it drivingly encases the creation of value and assessment of experience. To this end, we develop a conceptual framework of an expanded service context that is springs from an S-D logic, service-environments vision.

We explored the context of service by discussing the references regarding service experience, Service scenario and Service environment. Then we highlighted the empirical nature of assess by debating on previous research that establishes a phenomenological conceptualization of service experience (Helkkula, 2011; Helkkula

et al., 2012). We put together with a service environment vision of service context with a phenomenological view of service experience and take attention toward organizations' impact and impacted by service experiences; context and experience are co-produced. We conclude with a debate of expanding the context of service the implementation of a systemic aspect to service context and directions for future research.

## **II. Expanding the term of service**

The term of service is a main peculiarity of service research. As we said, service has been identified as having specific attributes: impalpability, inseparability, multiplicity and perishability (Zeithaml et al., 1985), same as direct interactivity among companies and consumers (e.g. Gummesson, 1987). Nevertheless, the problems have been brought up regarding the utility of the difference among services and goods (e.g. Grove et al., 2003; Vargo and Lusch, 2004).

This section shows conventional aspects forming up a concept in service environment, and propose a wider service environment aspect to surpass the services and goods difference and give us more driving and comprising prospect of service term.

### **2.1 Service experience**

In previous researches of services marketing, the "indivisible" (Zeithaml et al., 1985) and "conversational" (Gummesson, 1987) attributes of service displayed in a numerous researches, which are aimed with studying service experiences. Bitner (1990, p. 69) states that "in many cases, those individual encounters are the service from the consumer's point of view". Surprenant and Solomon (1987, p. 87) debated: the service encounter is a dyadic correlation among a consumer and a service provider. The nature of the correlation has been identified as a main definition of satisfaction specific measure in the service (cf. Czepiel et al., 1985). Thus, the service experience represents the context where service is swapped among company and consumer and satisfaction specific measure/dissatisfaction specific measure is determined. With the growth of interest in service experience, researches started to search for the roles in direct correlations, same way as the prospects of exchange connected to those roles (e.g. Arnould and Price, 1993; Solomon et al., 1985). Scholars started investigation of the emotional satisfaction specific measures of consumers (Johnson and Zinkhan, 1991) and number of phases in a service encounter (Walker, 1995) that impacts the satisfaction specific measure. This flow of studies points on understanding how service faces the satisfaction specific measure impact (e.g. Bitner, 1990; Bitner et al., 1990; Surprenant and Solomon, 1987) and leads to the growth of long-term relationships (e.g. Czepiel, 1990; Gummesson, 1987).

### **2.2 Service scenario**

Soon after study on service experience has started, the term of service was expanded to examine the service scenario (Bitner, 1992). Bitner (1992) proposed a typology of Service scenario – self-service, interpersonal services and remote services – to accent on differences in the importance degree of esthetics of physical spaces.

Bitner (1992) expands the term of service above the company/consumer correlation to take into consideration the "environment-user" relationship, and how it impacts the satisfaction specific measure in service exchange. After all Bitner's (1992) conceptualization of service scenario largely focused on man-made, physical aspects of the environment, the references regarding service scenario has been expanded above physical environments to include symbolic, natural and social surroundings (e.g. Johnstone, 2012; Tombs and McColl-Kennedy, 2010). Arnould (1998, p. 90) interprets the relationship among service experience and service scenario by promoting his point: "we can think of service scenario as nested products of managerial strategies and consumer inputs". Service scenarios are "staged" contexts that are conceived by both companies' and consumers' assets and outlooks. Arnould et al. describes that substantive and communicative staging make up the service environment that implemented in the service scenario. Tombs and McColl-Kennedy (2003) implement to the physical and symbolic context of service to involve a "social-service scenario" too. According to this outlook, the term of service points at the purchase incident, which relies on the viewpoint: "within a specific interval of time and space, certain behaviors are expected regardless of the individual's personality or late experiences". Therefore, service experiences are the main aspects of service scenario because the time/place ingredient of correlation is a main feature of service experience. Thus, in addition to the purchase incident, Tombs and McColl-Kennedy (2003) also identify the effect of social density on assessments of service experience. In a further researches the researchers identify that the indirect correlations among consumers impact the quality of a service scenario too (Tombs and McColl-Kennedy, 2010). Thus, this social environment is mainly tied to the physical space within a service encounter appears. Moving further physical and time dimensions, Rosenbaum and Massiah (2011, p. 481) implement socially symbolic and natural dimensions in their conceptualization of service scenario. The researchers propose that: "the socially symbolic dimension expands Bitner's work by

suggesting that a consumption setting also contains signs, symbols, and artifacts that are part of an ethnic group's symbolic universe and possess specific, often evocative meanings for group members.”

### **2.3 Service environments**

Late debates on service environments (Vargo and Lusch, 2011) assessed to concept and expand this crossing of service scenario and S-D logic (Nilsson and Ballantyne, 2014). Following this viewpoint, we can see that the term of service is socially built on the exchange and employment of consumer resources among multiple participants.

Systemic aspects of making up a concept service environment can be found in other papers regarding service science and service systems (e.g. Maglio and Spohrer, 2008). Present research aims toward correlation among people, technologies and companies as driving forces for the co-creation of value and the environment for service exchange.

S-D logic and its service environment prospect have been put together with the debate on service systems (Chandler and Lusch, 2014; Vargo et al., 2008) and the driving systems via which service is interchanged. Thus, the research about the service environment vision had been implied to the complexity of this service term by taking into consideration the main role of organisations in both value creation and exchange (Akaka et al., 2013; Vargo et al., 2015). Thus, the service environment prospective not only takes into consideration the way of correlations inside networks of participants and technology impact experience, but also underline the importance of the socio-historic contexts, made up of multiple organisations, that guide those correlations and value determination (Akaka et al., 2013).

It is significant to point out that moving to a service-environment view will not decrease the importance of service encounters and services scenario in affecting service experiences. Rather, this idea assists to determine further relationship among service experience and services scenario, by putting them together inside the service environment (Vargo and Lusch, 2011). Therefore, the ranges that concept service can be described as aggregate levels of intercommunications and establishments. In addition, a pointing on establishments proposes that changes in service term can be made through changes in social structure. The sustenance and change of establishments in service environments happens through an iterative and recursive process called establishmentalization (Vargo et al., 2015). The next section is keeping on debating on a service environment prospect by elaborating establishments encases experience at aggregate levels of service environment.

### **III. The way of service context encases experience: toward an establishment prospect**

The underlying necessity for understanding a driving aspect for service context is evident in the research that aims to better understand what affects the creation of value and the assessment of experience (e.g. Akaka et al., 2015; Helkkula et al., 2012). Lately, Helkkula (2011) carried out a systematic references review to conceptualize the concept of service experience. She identified few aspects leading the investigation of service experience and debating on the way of each prospect correlates to services marketing and management. Her discoveries show three main characteristics of service experience in the references: outcome-based, process-based and phenomenological. The debate on service context above discovers differences in the focus of service experience across specific views of context too.

More to add, research on services scenario centers on satisf specific measure, social intercommunications and healing as a core outcomes related to service experience (Rosenbaum and Massiah, 2011), and it also shows other dimensions' of service context (physical, social, social-symbolic and natural) facilitate to the common process services getting experience by. According to Helkkula (2011), latest phenomenological explanations of service experience put together with S-D logic vision of service. She states that much of the efforts done by a phenomenological prospect is pointed on hedonistic experiences. Mostly because of hedonistic undermeanings related to the term “experience”, Vargo and Lusch (2008) stated for the term phenomenological, rather than empirical, in describing value creation. Luckily, in S-D logic vision, service experience is conceptualized as hedonistic and practical, but is principally centered on value-in-use (Sandstrom et al., 2008), or value-in-context, rather than value-in-exchange (Vargo et al., 2008)

Thus, a service-environments visions propose that all exchange-related experiences will be regarded as service experiences (Akaka et al., 2015) and will be co-produced (Pralhad and Ramaswamy, 2004) through the intercommunications among companies, consumers and others. Latest papers stating about value co-creation from a service environments viewpoints to the idea the socio-historic contents affect phenomenological visions on value and the assessment experience (e.g. Akaka et al., 2015). Vargo et al. (2015) on Scott (2001) to determine establishments as “humanly devised rules, norms and meanings that enable and constrain human specific measure”. Therefore, they debate on establishmentalization as a driving force for value co-creation, same as innovation and market organization. This points toward establishments as a main participant not only in the co-creation of value and positive assessments of experience, but also in the co-destruction of value (Plé and

ChumpitazCáceres, 2010). It is worth to remark that a service-environment prospect lets “zooming out” (Vargo and Lusch, 2011) to examine and contextualize wide socio-historic construct design, the intercommunications among individual participants stay a main facet of experience too (Akaka et al., 2015).

**IV. The expanded context of service**

The shift to a service environments visions does not reduce the importance of research about any specific service experience or services scenario. Rather, as will be debated, conceptualizing context throughout the service environments objective enables the allocating of service encounters (i.e. intercommunications among companies and consumers) and services scenario within service environments. It is significant to add, as an environments prospect of service assists to enlighten the understanding of direct intercommunications among companies and consumers, the research on service experiences assists to enlighten the pattern and driving of services scenario and service environments.

Table I, and the subsequent debate, displays a framework for bearing in mind the aggregate levels of service environment are embedded inside the service environment and affect assessment of service experience. Moreover, a service-environment aspect is springs from the idea that every exchange is service exchange, and present research on specific service encounters and services scenario, same as service environments, is not limited to any specific type of company or corporation.

The conceptualization of service context as a service encounter focuses on direct intercommunications, specifically among companies (or workers) and consumers. After all this prospect delivers a significant insight to understand intercommunication among companies and consumers and how company efforts affect a specific measure, on its own it limits the understanding of the many environmental factors which facilitate to value creation and the assessment of experience.

Gummesson (1994) further states that by expanding the range of service term to see the same service from two advantages: that of the consumer and that of the provider we can more easily appreciate that the context of each of them is radically different. This points toward the need for a service environments prospect that removes the diversity among “producers” and “consumers” focusing on A2A, vision of value creation (Vargo and Lusch, 2011). After all the conceptualization of services scenario widens the range of service context above a dyadic intercommunication, this vision also stays focused on the company’s capability to produce and deliver a service experience. It is tied to underlying diversities among services and goods, and continues to accentuate the necessity to research specific contexts that do not correspond with traditional models. On the other hand, the thought of a service environments vision of service term needs scholars to reconceptualize service as the usage of resources for the profits of others and the basis of any exchange, rather than a good with unique advantages. This determination of service reveals the range of service environment beyond traditional prospects of service adjustment as transformed from the production and consumption of products. As we said before, an S-D logic, service environments prospect delivers another vision, which erases the “producer-consumer” division by promoting the idea that consumers are always co-creators of value (Vargo and Lusch, 2008). This focus on service as the basis of all exchange also transcends the goods-verses-services diversity (Vargo and Lusch, 2004a) and stands for the conceptualization of intercommunication among multiple participants throughout markets. Nilsson and Ballantyne (2014, p. 377) state: S-D logic prompts us that service intercommunication and determinations of value-in-use can happen in lots of contexts different from traditional. The farmers’ markets can be an obvious example, same as the widening attractiveness of the internet as a service facility. This S-D logic vision of service scenario put together with Sanstrom et al.’s (2008, p. 120) states that “value cannot be predetermined by the service provider, but is determined by the user of a service”.

<b>Components of context</b>	<b>Service encounter</b>	<b>Service scenario</b>	<b>Service ecosystems</b>
<b>Conceptualization of service</b>	Market offerings that involve direct interspecific measure between firm and customer	Self-service, interpersonal services, remote services	Employment of knowledge and skills for the benefit of others
<b>Focal relationship(s)</b>	Firm-customer dyad	Firm-customer; customer-customer	Networks of multiple actors
<b>Parameters of service</b>	Peripheral and core service interspecific measures	Contrived physical space with physical, social, symbolic and natural dimensions	Socio-historic structures; intersecting and overlapping institutions
<b>Service experience</b>	Satisfspecific measure, relationship	Satisfspecific measure, social connection, healing	Phenomenological value determination

**Table 1:** The extended context of service

Service-environments vision highlights the immersion of micro-, meso- and macro- levels of intercommunication and establishments that facilitate to value creation (Chandler and Vargo, 2011). It is worth to remark that the levels are relative and each constitutes the other (c.f. Latour, 2007).

After all dyadic intercommunications among companies and consumers are often taken as a micro level, this is not necessarily the case. Moreover, these levels of intercommunications and establishments are not limited by specific types of exchange encounters. But, they can be applied to other circumstances, because all cases, the company and consumer intercommunications are set within varying levels of establishments and affect the assessment of experience. To account for a driving socio-historic prospect on context (Akaka et al., 2015), a service environment prospect suggests a meta layer of analysis that allows scholars fluctuate among those levels of aggregation and establishment structure for better understanding of the production of value. After all the participants in a particular encounter may share some establishments and establishment arrangements (e.g. culture), they may disperse between other establishments (e.g. religion or political parties), what affects the assessment of the experience. Thus, researchers are eager to get a better understanding of a specific service encounter, and can look at establishments related with its specific service scenario, same as wider socio-historical contexts, that can probably facilitate the value creation and affect the phenomenological assessment of a service experience (see Akaka et al., 2013).

### **V. The co-creation of experience**

During service environment prospect cases the research on the service encounters and services scenario, phenomenological experiences are meant to be co-produced throughout the specific measures and intercommunications of numerous participants merging and changing resources to improve the value of their and others' lives. Thus, service experiences are not springs from individual moments in time through intercommunications among companies and consumers; experiences emerge throughout driving service contexts. The service contexts are built and rebuilt throughout iterative and recursive social and cultural processes, and service experiences are assessed and reassessed over time and space (Akaka et al., 2015). Helkkula et al. (2012) brought up the concept of "value in the experience" (VALEX), which combines an S-D logic vision of value with a phenomenological vision of experience. They define VALEX as "the value that is directly or indirectly experienced by consumers within their phenomenological lifeworld contexts" (p. 61). One of the main thoughts the researchers bring up is that "the context for value in the experience is not determined by the service provider, but rather by the individual's lifeworld", and this empirical type of value is "interim in nature and matter to change".

Thus, both service context and service experience are co-produced throughout specific measures and intercommunications among numerous participants. Expanding the context of service using a service environment prospect gives insight to phenomenological conceptualizations of service experience (i.e. diverse intercommunications and establishments affect experience), and it also shows us the way of service contexts are built. It is necessary to note, because adoption of a service environment aspect to service context needs the consideration of social processes shape service experiences. In specific, this service-environment aspect to context and phenomenological vision on experience states that service context and service experience are incessantly restored throughout the principle of practices same way as the reshaping of establishments and systems over the time (Akaka et al., 2013). This accent on establishments enlightens the social and cultural context that prevails above direct intercommunications among companies. In addition, it widens the range of service context, same as service experience, to contain all market intercommunications and related establishments. Moreover, by focusing on establishments' affect experience, it appears to be very clear that unique experiences often originate from differences in establishments and socio-historic prospects rather than diversity of goods, as old-school services frameworks may propose. This vision of service context offers understanding about the driving of service experiences that can assist in leading to the future research (Akaka et al., 2013).

### **VI. Conclusion**

Presented framework promoted facilitates to the progression in services marketing study by expanding the term of service in two ways: 1, its accent on service as the basis of any exchange lets the deliberation of all patterns of value-in-use, in-context to be presumed as a service experience; 2, its idea formation of context widens the time-and-place measurements that slows down the research in service experiences and services scenario above physical, social and relational measurements to take into consideration the diversity of establishments throughout a broader socio-historic area.

It is the specific measures and intercommunications of numerous participants and their related establishments that facilitate to the co-creation of experience together with context. This service-environment prospect promotes another aspect for idea formation of value is proposed, and experiences are assessed (Vargo and Lusch, 2004a, 2008). S-D logic arisen from an attempt to combine and

expand previous study that aimed for the employment of adequacy for the profit of others as the idea of interchange. Such logic of interchange has brought the attention toward “empirical” and “phenomenological” features of value and gets in line with Holbrook’s (2006) vision of value as an assessment of an experience, which affects and is affected by wider assets and social patterns. (Penaloza and Mish, 2011). Moreover, S-D logic widens the environment of service studies as a whole because “there are no significant differences among services and goods or among service companies and manufacturers” (Martin, 2012). This wide feature of service has been identified as an significant theoretical framework for promoting the research on service (Martin, 2012; Ostrom et al., 2010) and probably providing a basement for proceeding to a science of service (Maglio and Spohrer, 2008). The expanded term of service, springs from a service environments vision, recenters scholars to a wider range of market supplement than previously taken into consideration to be a piece of services facilities. It brings the service at the vanguard of social and economic study.

The accents on establishments in service environments and service contexts suggests that phenomenological visions on value and assessment of experience are driven widely by diversification in establishments, rather than goods. Formation of the idea for context as combined levels of establishments what provides understanding to the implemented nature of service as well. The idea that service context and service experience are not limited to particular kinds of market promotions and are co-produced through the combination and interchange of funds has significant involvements for scholars and managers anticipating to improve service experiences. For managers, expanding the range of service context takes attention to the taking a part consumers and other participants in the co-creation of the service context in a row with the experience. This aims for the necessity to examine the adequacy and abilities of consumers together with their socio-historic prospects in the construct and development of a service scenario or a more specific service encounter. The examination of consumer adequacy is especially significant as technological approaches permit consumers to take on more positions that is usually held by companies. This expanded vision gives us understanding for social and cultural participants, specifically establishments, that affect the assessment of a service experience together with the context which experience takes place in. Supervisors might be able to pointing out particular social participants that can be attached to strengthen the common service experience of a specific service experience. Enhancing the empirical value of specific service experiences and services scenario can assist in enhancing the probability of developing long-term interrelationships with consumers. For scholars, the expanded service context permits for service-centered concepts and frameworks can be reexamined outside of their traditional “services” encases and applied to a wider range of social and economic exchange. This can lead to study that explores different questions about the role of goods in the expanded service context. Springs from this, we could also examine a recategorization of service context (Bitner’s 1992) throughout an S-D logic, service-environment vision. This may help to reveal what constructs of service context are the most influential in assessment of different experiences. This expansion of the context of service is a basic step in development of a deeper understanding of how service experiences are co-produced throughout markets. The framework presented here promotes that prior works became even more significant as the context of service expands. Services marketing scholars have done significant progress in studying and interpreting driving exchange-related phenomena and promoting main understandings to what service experience is and how it is produced. Though, the elaboration of S-D logic during the past decade (see Lusch and Vargo, 2014) and the undoubted necessity for more driving frameworks to assist with understanding the complexities of approaches in technology and globalization, which indicate that there is much work to do. We hope that this prospect helps to renew and inspire further work in this excitatory area.

## References

- [1]. Akaka, M.A., Vargo, S.L. and Lusch, R.F. (2013), “The complexity of context: a service ecosystems approach for international marketing”, *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 21 No. 4, pp. 1-20.
- [2]. Akaka, M.A., Vargo, S.L. and Schau, H.J. (2015), “The context of experience”, *Journal of Service Management*, Vol. 26 No. 2, pp. 206-223.
- [3]. Arnould, E.J. and Price, L.L. (1993), “River magic: extraordinary experience and the extended service encounter”, *Journal of consumer Research*, Vol. 20 No. 1, pp. 24-45.
- [4]. Arnould, E.J., Price, L.L. and Tierney, P. (1998), “Communicative staging of the wilderness servicescape”, *Service Industries Journal*, Vol. 18 No. 3, pp. 90-115.
- [5]. Bitner, M.J. (1990), “Evaluating service encounters: the effects of physical surroundings and employee responses”, *The Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 54 No. 2, pp. 69-82.
- [6]. Bitner, M.J. (1992), “Servicescapes: the impact of physical surroundings on customers and employees”, *The Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 56 No. 2, pp. 57-71.
- [7]. Bitner, M.J., Booms, B.H. and Tetreault, M.S. (1990), “The service encounter: diagnosing favorable and unfavorable incidents”, *The Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 54 No. 1, pp. 71-84.
- [8]. Bitner, M.J., Brown, S.W. and Meuter, M.L. (2000), “Technology infusion in service encounters”, *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 28 No. 1, pp. 138-149.
- [9]. Chandler, J.D. and Lusch, R.F. (2014), “Service systems a broadened framework and research agenda on value propositions, engagement, and service experience”, *Journal of Service Research*, Vol. 18 No. 1, pp. 6-22.

- [10]. Chandler, J.D. and Vargo, S.L. (2011), "Contextualization and value-in-context: How context frames exchange", *Marketing Theory*, Vol. 11 No. 1, pp. 35-49.
- [11]. Czepiel, J.A. (1990), "Service encounters and service relationships: implications for research", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 20 No. 1, pp. 13-21.
- [12]. Czepiel, J.A., Solomon, M.R., Surprenant, C.F. and Gutman, E.G. (1985), "Service encounters: an overview", in von Czepiel, J.A. (Hrsg), *The Service Encounter, Managing Employee/Customer Interaction in Service Business*, pp. 3-16.
- [13]. Davies, B., Barron, S. and Harris, K. (1999), "Observable oral participation in the servuction system: toward a content and process model", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 44 No. 1, 47-53.
- [14]. Giddens, A. (1984), *The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration*, University of California Press, Berkeley, CA. Grönroos, C. (1995), "Relationship marketing: the strategy continuum", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 23 No. 4, pp. 252-254.
- [15]. Grönroos, C. and Voima, P. (2013), "Critical service logic: making sense of value creation and co-creation", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 41 No. 2, pp. 33-150.
- [16]. Grove, S.J., Fisk, R.P. and John, J. (2003), "The future of services marketing: forecasts from ten services experts", *Journal of Services Marketing*, Vol. 17 No. 2, pp. 107-121.
- [17]. Gummesson, E. (1987), "The new marketing – developing long-term interactive relationships", *Long Range Planning*, Vol. 20 No. 4, pp. 10-20.
- [18]. Gummesson, E. (1994), "Service management: an evaluation and the future", *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, Vol. 5 No. 1, pp. 77-96.
- [19]. Helkkula, A. (2011), "Characterising the concept of service experience", *Journal of Service Management* Vol. 22 No. 3, pp. 367-389.
- [20]. Helkkula, A., Kelleher, C. and Pihlström, M. (2012), "Characterizing value as an experience: implications for service researchers and managers", *Journal of Service Research*, Vol. 15 No. 1, pp. 59-75.
- [21]. Holbrook, M.B. (2006), "Consumption experience, customer value, and subjective personal introspection: an illustrative photographic essay", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 59 No. 6, pp. 714-725.
- [22]. Johnson, M. and Zinkhan, G.M. (1991), "Emotional responses to a professional service encounter", *Journal of Services Marketing*, Vol. 5 No. 2, pp. 5-16.
- [23]. Johnstone, M.L. (2012), "The servicescape: the social dimensions of place", *Journal of Marketing Management*, Vol. 28 Nos 11/12, pp. 1399-1418.
- [24]. Judd, R.C. (1964), "The case for redefining services", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 28 No. 1, pp. 58-59.
- [25]. Kim, N. and Lee, M. (2012), "Other customers in a service encounter: examining the effect in a restaurant setting", *Journal of Services Marketing*, Vol. 26 No. 1, pp. 27-40.
- [26]. Latour, B. (2007), *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network Theory*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- [27]. Lusch, R.F. and Vargo, S.L. (2014), *Service-dominant Logic: Premises, Perspectives, Possibilities*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- [28]. Maglio, P.P. and Spohrer, J. (2008), "Fundamentals of service science", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 36 No. 1, pp. 18-20.
- [29]. Martin, C.L. (2012), "A quarter of a century: reflections of the first 25 years of the *Journal of Services Marketing*", *Journal of Services Marketing*, Vol. 26 No. 1, pp. 3-8.
- [30]. Nilsson, E. and Ballantyne, D. (2014), "Reexamining the place of servicescape in marketing: a service-dominant logic perspective", *Journal of Services Marketing*, Vol. 28 No. 5, pp. 374-379.
- [31]. Ostrom, A.L., Bitner, M.J., Brown, S.W., Burkhard, K.A., Goul, M., Smith-Daniels, V., Demirkan, H. and Rabinovich, E. (2010), "Moving forward and making a difference: research priorities for the science of service", *Journal of Service Research*, Vol. 13 No. 1, pp. 4-36.
- [32]. Penalzoza, L. and Mish, J. (2011), "The nature and processes of market co-creation in triple bottom line firms: leveraging insights from consumer culture theory and service dominant logic", *Marketing Theory*, Vol. 11 No. 1, pp. 9-34.
- [33]. Plé, L. and ChumpitazCáceres, R. (2010), "Not always co-creation: introducing interactional co-destruction of value in service-dominant logic", *Journal of Services Marketing*, Vol. 24 No. 6, pp. 430-437.
- [34]. Prahalad, C.K. and Ramaswamy, V. (2004), "Co-creation experiences: the next practice in value creation", *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, Vol. 18 No. 3, pp. 5-14.
- [35]. Ramaswamy, V. (2011), "It's about human experiences [ . . . ] and beyond, to co-creation", *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 40 No. 2, pp. 195-196.
- [36]. Rathmell, J.M. (1966), "What is meant by services?", *The Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 30 No. 4, pp. 32-36.
- [37]. Rosenbaum, M.S. and Massiah, C. (2011), "An expanded servicescape perspective", *Journal of Service Management*, Vol. 22 No. 4, pp. 471-490.
- [38]. Sandström, S., Edvardsson, B., Kristensson, P. and Magnusson, P. (2008), "Value in use through service experience", *Managing Service Quality: An International Journal*, Vol. 18 No. 2, pp. 112-126.
- [39]. Scott, W.R. (2001), *Institutions and Organizations*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- [40]. Shostack, G.L. (1977), "Breaking free from product marketing", *The Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 41 No. 2, pp. 73-80.
- [41]. Solomon, M.R., Surprenant, C., Czepiel, J.A. and Gutman, E.G. (1985), "A role theory perspective on dyadic interactions: the service encounter", *The Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 49 No. 1, pp. 99-111.
- [42]. Surprenant, C.F. and Solomon, M.R. (1987), "Predictability and personalization in the service encounter", *The Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 51 No. 2, pp. 6-96.
- [43]. Tombs, A. and McColl-Kennedy, J.R. (2003), "Social-servicescape conceptual model", *Marketing Theory*, Vol. 3 No. 4, pp. 447-475.
- [44]. Tombs, A.G. and McColl-Kennedy, J.R. (2010), "Social and spatial influence of customers on other customers in the social-servicescape", *Australasian Marketing Journal*, Vol. 18 No. 3, pp. 120-131.
- [45]. Vargo, S.L. and Lusch, R.F. (2004a), "Evolving to a new dominant logic for marketing", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 68 No. 1, pp. 1-17.
- [46]. Vargo, S.L. and Lusch, R.F. (2004b), "The four service marketing myths remnants of a goods-based, manufacturing model", *Journal of Service Research*, Vol. 6 No. 4, pp. 324-335.
- [47]. Vargo, S.L. and Lusch, R.F. (2008), "Service-dominant logic: continuing the evolution", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 36 No. 1, pp. 1-10.
- [48]. Vargo, S.L. and Lusch, R.F. (2016), "Institutions and axioms: an extension and update of service-dominant logic", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*.

- [49]. Vargo, S.L., Maglio, P.P. and Akaka, M.A. (2008), "On value and value co-creation: a service systems and service logic perspective", *European Management Journal*, Vol. 26 No. 3, pp. 145-152.
- [50]. Vargo, S.L., Wieland, H. and Akaka, M.A. (2015), "Innovation through institutionalization: a service ecosystems perspective", *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol. 44 No. 1, pp. 63-72.
- [51]. Walker, J.L. (1995), "Service encounter satisfaction: conceptualized", *Journal of Services Marketing*, Vol. 9 No. 1, pp. 5-14.
- [52]. Zeithaml, V.A., Parasuraman, A. and Berry, L.L. (1985), "Problems and strategies in services marketing", *The Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 49 No. 2, pp. 33-46.

Voydilo Anton, et. al. "Expanding the context of service: from experiences to environments."  
*IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM)*, 22(6), 2020, pp. 01-09.