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Abstract. Customers have over the years been used to buying products and services in shops or by ordering over the phone. By the end of the last century shopping over the Internet was added as a new important channel for commerce. As a result, it has become more and more important for organizations to attract customers and their site on the Internet; the interface is one part of this. In the discourse of marketing there is a field named servicescape and a related field named e-servicescape. For the providers of information systems the different views of service, servicescape and e-servicescape can be confusing. Hence it has to be considered interesting if the intention is to build not only reliable and trustable systems but also information systems that are in accordance with what the e-servicescape user needs and demands. The question raised in this paper is whether there is a need for further research on the relation and connection between the terms servicescape and e-servicescape. To determine if e-servicescape is fully possible, plausible or not possible in comparison with servicescape the Conceptual model of servicescape by Harris and Ezeh (2008, p. 393) is used.

Key words Servicescape, e-servicescape, e-commerce

1 Introduction

It is difficult to pinpoint whether e-servicescape is a discourse included in servicescape or if it is a discourse standing for itself however connected and closely related to servicescape. What makes the discourse even more confusing is that there are terms like, m-commerce and e-commerce that affect the discourse as they try discussing at least parts of what is included in e-servicescape.

Over the last decades there has been an increase in the development of commerce over the Internet (e-commerce). This is due to a combination of several parts where the key elements are marketing (section 1.1) and information system (section 1.2). The Swedish Retail and Hospitality Research Institute – HUI (hui.se 2014) in cooperation with PostNord (postnord.com 2014) and Svensk Digital Handel (dhandel.se 2014) state that e-commerce in Sweden in 2013 was showing the strongest growth since 2007 with an increase of 17 percent. This compares with a 1.9 percent increase for conventional retail industry. The turnover for e-commerce in Sweden in 2013 was 37 billion Swedish kronor. In total, e-commerce is now six percent of total retail sales in Sweden. Disregarding grocery stores, e-commerce represents 10 percent of sales. Considering the development of e-commerce, the digital encounter with the customer must be argued as important.

Due to the development, the view of marketing as a tool to communicate with the market has changed. The foundation of marketing used to have a focus on goods. Recent discourses
added that service, service management and servicescape have to be considered as playing an important role in gaining attention, interest, desire and action by the customers. The combination of marketing and information system (IS) is visualized through e-servicescape. According to the growing market of goods and services offered over the Internet the concept of e-servicescape has been developed and has gained interest.

From the marketing discourse through servicescape a field named e-servicescape has been developed. Harris and Goode (2010, p. 239) define e-servicescape by claiming:

“We use the terms e-servicescape”, online servicescape and online environment interchangeably throughout. Nevertheless, we are favorably biased toward the term “e-servicescape”, since the label emphasizes the context of online exchange and highlights that purchasing online involves an element of self-service, even when products are purchased.”

1.1 Marketing

Marketing has gone through different stages in which it has been developed, changed and discussed from different perspectives. Interest has been paid concurrently to the 4P-model (Product, Price, Place and Promotion) and to consumer behavior. Service Management has received more attention though and over the years theories focused on services have been developed. As regards Service Management, the delivery of service and service processes are in focus. Grönroos (2004, 2008) stresses the interaction between the customer and the service provider as well as between quality and productivity, and therefore the importance of a service oriented approach is emphasized.

Kotler (1973) defined A Generic Concept of Marketing in which he describes marketing as a tool for creating and offering values to others for the purpose of achieving a desired response. This implicates that the marketer is a specialist in understanding people’s wants and values, furthermore what is needed for them to act. Kotler (1974) developed the concept by adding the atmospheric variable, i.e. recognizable through people’s senses, which refers to the effort to design buying environments. Such an environment produces specific emotional effects that enhance purchase probability, which leads back to the theoretical foundation of sensory marketing. Achrol and Kotler (2012 p. 50) renewed it so it would be included in the digital third millennium “the growing impact of digitization and virtual media considerably expand the scope and impact of sensory satisfactions”. Kotler (1973) discusses the impact people’s senses have on purchasing decisions, based on the blend of shopping atmosphere and purchase behavior. Achrol and Kotler (2012, p.38) discuss the Internet and state:

“Those of us who grew up in the physical world cannot begin to imagine life as it will be for those who grow up in a digital world. The digital world will offer nearly endless possibilities of shaping life and experiences so that the physical world will pale in significance and may well become a secondary world in which our bodies live wired to a digital reality.”

What Achrol and Kotler (2012) argue on digital reality corresponds to the importance of analyzing the discourse of servicescape and e-servicescape in combination with IS issues.
1.2 IS

IS (Alter, 1992) can be divided into: Information, People and Information Technology (IT), these works together in several combinations. Formatted data, images, text and sounds are categorized as information. Even though IS can automate work there are always people working with and in the system in the background. Hence they also affect the system. Hardware and software are the main parts of IT. Alter (1992, p.9) claims that "consequently, understanding information technology is not equivalent to understanding information systems". Furthermore he argues that there is no direct connection between development of IS and knowledge of what the needs, wants and values are. Sometimes there is a dichotomy between the developer and the target group that conveys a risk that the system will not be coherent with the user needs and interests. According to Langefors (1973) it is important with attentive users so they can be involved in the process. Galliers (2009) states that people gather information with the purpose to make decisions and that a mobile device can support it. IS must make sense for the user and should to be designed with the user in mind. Galliers (2011) argues that in order for IS to be useful to users the systems need to be developed based on the users' demands. According to Markus (2000) benefits could be expected when IS is perceived as useful to people. Halonen and Thomander (2008) pinpoint what make IS successful:

- System design includes system quality, information quality, and service quality.
- System delivery includes use and user satisfaction.
- System outcome includes benefits and self-guidance.

In order to meet the customers' requirements Bouwman et al. (2009) argue that the composition of service is crucial for the mobile service industry. Keen and Mackintosh (2001) put forward that the value of mobile phone applications is that they create freedom for the customers in the sense that they are not limited by time and space. Rather the customers are able to get information about goods and services and can shop whenever and wherever they want, which is a service that few physical stores can provide. In this context, it is important to include that people are not always willing to adopt new technologies and change their habits:

"In summary, past history shows that advances in mobile technology can enable the deployment of new services but are in no way guarantees that these services will be broadly adopted. Indeed, as discussed in one of our earlier studies, consumers have often proved reluctant to adopt new services - however fancy the underlying technology might be." (Carlsson 2006, p. 189)

Browne et al. (2004) point out that buying behavior on-line still need face-to-face and voice-to-voice contact between people, and that customer service is of importance. The authors state that technique lags technology i.e. behavior change not as rapid as technology is adopted. Wetherbe (1998) highlights that process transformations are both internal and external; the former provides goods and service and the latter provides consumption processes. Browne et al. (2004 p.238) claim that "A consumption process is a series of steps and tasks that people use to fulfill a need". The authors argue the need of understanding and adopting the consumption process when offering services.

1.3 Aim

This paper tackles the functionality when moving from servicescape to e-servicescape. Additionally, if there is a need for further research about what is fully possible, plausible and not possible in an e-servicescape compared with a servicescape. The paper thereby discusses
e-servicescape as a framework and its functionality both seen from the service-provider and the service user viewpoints.

The research question is:

*What are the differences and the similarities between servicescape and e-servicescape?*

## 2 Study and Methodology

The study is carried out in order to analyze and discuss what is argued in the e-servicescape discourse. A literature review was conducted with the purpose of finding a pattern in what is put forward regarding servicescape, e-servicescape and IS. The mentioned terms are representing some terms used in the literature search process and other terms used were, for instance, m-commerce, e-commerce, service, digital service and digital landscape. In addition some Swedish terms like handel and e-handel were used. In order to find peer reviewed articles the University library and “One Search” was used. In addition to this, some highly respected research institute publications, from the Swedish market, were taken into account. As selection criteria servicescape models were the focal point, and within that framework retail and marketing, for example, were used. In accordance with the selection criteria e-servicescape was in the limelight. An advantage of working in this manner is the access to the research front, which can encourage further research in e-servicescape and IS. On the other hand it has its limitations due to the confidence put into the work of others. It also has to be mentioned that there is a limitation of the number of articles regarding e-servicescape.

When it comes to generalization it is in accordance with what Gummesson (2000) and Glaser and Strauss (1967, 1995) argue that too much attention is given to generalization and that generalization is possible even from single events. Glaser and Strauss (1967, 1995 p.17-18) states “We believe that each form of data is useful for both verification and generation of theory, whatever the primacy of emphasis”.

## 3 Servicescape

Servicescape has been added to the marketing discourse as an important approach with the purpose to bring a different view of marketing. Booms and Bitner (1982) developed the 4P-model and adds three P:s, i.e. Participants, Physical evidence and Process of service assembly. Participants are all who play a role in providing service. Physical evidence occurs when the service provider and the customer interact in the environment to assemble the service. Process of service assembly appears when the service is delivered and includes the actual procedures, mechanisms and flow of the service activities. Bitner (1992) developed the servicescape concept and defines it as the environment in which the service is brought together, allowing the provider and the customer to interact, combined with tangible commodities that facilitate performance or communication of the service.

Servicescape is discussed by Ezeh and Harris (2007), who state that it is vital to a service organization. They argue that it could be determinant for the customers as well as for the employees, and emphasize that for a fruitful servicescape its design is crucial. Harris and Ezeh (2008) pinpoint four important variables for the servicescape (Fig. 1).
The four servicescape variables are: Ambient conditions, design factors, staff behavior and staff image. These affect the loyalty intentions, which will be influenced by personal factors and environmental factors.

“All the moderators in the conceptual model were found to be strong facilitators of relationships in the servicescape. Therefore, service managers should take these into consideration when designing the servicescape and implementing the overall marketing function.” (Harris and Ezeh, 2008 p. 410)

Gummesson (2004) discusses the importance of understanding the interaction between the customer and the service provider. The interface will play an important role and is therefore of interest for the provider as well as for the customer. They will meet in the interaction and the customer will play a main role, regardless of whether the interaction would be face-to-face, ear-to-ear, e-mail-to-e-mail or by a customer-facing website. The services that the provider offers will often be produced and delivered more or less at the same time the customer consumes them. Gummesson (2004) states that the networks’ role in marketing is undervalued and that practitioner must face the importance of building networks in order to be prosperous. Marketing is performed everywhere in the society and the term Word of mouth in a network perspective relates to people who share experiences of shopping and service. Today’s consumption is a way of living, and therefore the technology must be in accordance with the consumers’ demands and needs.

The customers’ role is important in the process of creating value for the customer (e.g. Grönroos, 2004, 2008; Gummesson, 2004; Achrol and Kotler, 2011; Lusch and Vargo, 2011; Keen and Williams, 2012). Their participation can be seen as a resource in the creation of the service and is reflected in interaction within the network. Lusch and Vargo (2011) argue that activities and functions are important parts of service, which have to be designed in a way that appeals to the user. Bouwman et al. (2008) state the idea that mobile service is not just about continuous communication. Edvardsson et al. (2011) claim the need of integrating the customer and pinpoint the need of moving from creating for, to creating with and by the user. Thereby it is possible to strengthen the credibility and trust in the service and the servicescape.
Edvardsson et al. (2011) focus on the technology aspect of service interactions, because technology plays a part in physical and digital service environments. Additionally an experience room was introduced, which means a place allowing representations of simulated service experiences. In the creation of service the importance of customer participation and interaction is stated (e.g. Grönroos, 2008; Vargo and Lusch, 2007). Both activities and functions in a servicescape have to be designed in a manner that attracts and adds value to the user.

Goodwin (1996) showed that customer uniqueness and personalization means that the customer can customize the service, in accordance with their needs and demands, from a service provider. This also means to offer a unique service for every customer and the service must be designed and delivered in order to meet the needs and demands of a specific customer.

When developing new services it is important to involve and observe the customer during the innovation process (Statistics Sweden, 2007; Helkkula et al., 2012). Understanding the underlying reasons beyond behavior is critical for being able to identify what can be improved and also to understand if there are any barriers to overcome. Virtual reality technologies are useful for shaping an e-commerce environment. Kim and Hardin (2010, p.736) claim that “Virtual services and virtual worlds are often described as three-dimensional, voice enabled, social environments that include a spatial layout, aesthetics and ambient conditions. In other words, all of the conditions needed to provide customers with social networking and servicescape opportunities”.

Rogers (1995, 2003) points out that it is important to study the individual, and the network affecting the individual, in order to influence the individual to test innovations and technologies since the social network around the individual is important.

### 4 E-servicescape

Nowadays IS can be seen as a part of the servicescape discourse. Mummalaneni (2005, p.526) defines the virtual servicescape “…as the environment of the virtual storefronts created through Web page design is not unlike the atmosphere of the brick-and-mortar stores with their emphasis on layout, merchandise-displays, lighting, signage and so on”. Vilnai-Yavetz and Rafaeli (2004) also claim that e-service can be categorized as a virtual servicescape and thereby will affect the awareness and feelings of the user.

Keen and Mackintosh (2001) discuss the term m-marketing and claim that it is more or less impossible to over-hype the influence of m-commerce, and they consider wireless shopping as a way to the freedom economy, i.e. an economy where customers can swap, sell and buy goods and services whenever they want. Keen and Williams (2012) argue that innovators has to be updated on the market’s value changes in order to gain market advantages. Many researchers stress that trust is a complicated aspect that is connected to many various disciplines e.g. social psychology (Lewicki and Bunker, 1995), sociology (Lewis and Weigert, 1985), marketing (Ganesan, 1994) and to IS (Papadopoulou et al., 2001). Morgan and Hunt (1994) and Papadopoulou et al. (2001) determine that trust is crucial in nearly all contexts of interactions.

According to Rivard and Lapointe (2012) the physical-to-virtual transfer of commercial activity in e-commerce compels people to think out of the box when building trust and loyalty. The authors also claim that in order to maintain these it is important to establish the credibility of the message being sent as well as the source of that message. Papadopoulou et al. (2001) discuss trust in e-commerce and they connect trust to relationship marketing and
servicescape. Doney and Cannon (1997) identified five trust-building processes: calculative, prediction, capability, intentionality, and transference, and later Papadopoulou et al. (2001) added credibility. All together they were put into a model for trust formation in digital service applications and in e-commerce in virtual servicescapes. The three trust building processes in the model adapted to the E-servicescape are (Papadopoulou et al., 2001):

To make a promise means interactivity (e.g. interactive advertising, messages rendering with real-time segmentation during interaction, message exposures and customer responses occur in real-time and full interactive, personalized communication).

To enable a promise includes neutrality (e.g. extensive search and recommendations driven by the customers, objective and neutral presentations, preview and experience of 3D virtual products, personalized dialogue and interaction with agents and orders being placed at same time and space with promise made).

To keep a promise includes payments and delivery (e.g. online payments, online or physical delivery and after-sales service).

In order to shape a trustable e-servicescape, Papadopoulou et al. (2001) put forward that Web sites should be converted to customer-centric e-servicescapes that offer a digital experience, which can enhance the development of a long-term relationship between the business and the customer. Trust strengthens customer loyalty as the customer engages in interactions and promises are fulfilled within the servicescape. Papadopoulou et al. (2001 p. 327) state that "Each time a promise is made, enabled and kept, it is evaluated with the intentionality, the capability and the credibility process confirming the customer’s trusting beliefs in the business benevolence, competence and credibility. The level of trust is also related to the experience that the customer gains within the e-servicescape". Virtual digital services, including web avatars and agents made familiar with customer behavior and preferences through collected data, provide the customers with alternatives during their searches in accordance with previous experience, and suggest suitable service alternatives to enrich the customer experience. Focus has been paid on the importance of enabling customers to become co-producers rather than just obtaining customer requirements and thereby building the digital service application (Alter, 2010). Papadopoulou et al. (2001) state that there are many opportunities to shape strong servicescapes by utilizing technological development.

Rivard and Lapointe (2012) suggest that if the IS application could be flexible at an individual level it will be easier to develop the interaction, which will influence forthcoming attributions. Unwillingness to try new IS often corresponds to the negative assessments that other users have made regarding the system implementation. In e-commerce, the physical-to-virtual transfer of commercial activity forces us to rethink the ways traditional rules for building trust and loyalty can be applied.

To create a servicescape that can meet and satisfy customers’ needs for comfort, convenience, safety, security, privacy and support, the providers need to understand which servicescape features impact customer satisfaction and behavior (Lee, 2011). Bitner (1992) stated three factors as servicescape variables (i.e. ambient conditions, space/function and signs/symbols/artifacts) while Lee (2011) highlights ambient conditions and serviceability. Grönroos (2008) pinpoints the importance of customer interaction in the creation of the service, which will be vital element in the process of creating value for the customer. To understand the nature of service creation Lusch and Vargo (2011) claim it is important to understand two parts of service, activities and function. These have to be formed in a way that attracts and brings value to the user. It is essential to involve and observe your service
customers in the innovating process while developing new services as well as understanding underlying reasons for the behavior (Helkkula, et al., 2012; Meyer and Schwager, 2007).

To sum up, the service providers should integrate the customer and facilitate the move from creating for to creating with and creating by the user and thereby make it possible to strengthen the trust and overcome resistance in the servicescape (Edvardsson et al., 2012).

5 Discussion

With a starting point in how Harris and Ezeh (2008 p. 393) describe the variables in the conceptual model of servicescape (fig 1.) we formed a tool to compare and analyze servicescape and e-servicescape (table 1.). The variables are i) Ambient Conditions – Music, Aroma, Cleanliness ii) Design Factors – Implicit Communicators, Furnishing iii) Staff Behaviour – Customer, Credibility iv) Staff Image – Competence, Physical Attractiveness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Servicescape variables vs. e-servicescape</th>
<th>Fully possible</th>
<th>Plausible</th>
<th>Not possible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ambient condition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aroma</td>
<td>Text/picture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanliness</td>
<td>Text/picture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicit communicators</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnishing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer orientation</td>
<td>Social media, phone, e-mail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td>Presentation Social media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff image</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>Presentation Social media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical attractiveness</td>
<td>Presentation Social media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Servicescape variables vs. e-servicescape

Ambient conditions can partly be connected to e-servicescape. Firstly, music is a way to attract customers but at the same time it can also make customers to leave or avoid the site. Music can be used to make customers feel comfortable and to strengthen the organization’s image. Thereby the impression of the organization and the goods and services provided can be more attractive to the customer. Some organizations use a jingle for achieving the customer’s recognition which for some can have a positive effect but for others rather the opposite. The second term is Aroma. So far it is not possible to use aroma in the e-servicescape. This makes aroma differ from servicescape. Although aroma can be described to the customer it cannot be used as a tool in the e-servicescape. The third, cleanliness is like aroma only to be described in text and by images but not possible for the customer to get the real impression and feeling of it.

Design factors are divided in two parts, implicit communicators and furnishing. Both are tools to communicate with the customer and are used in a servicescape to influence the customer behaviour. They are also used to guide the customer in the servicescape and to offer a positive shopping experience. In an e-servicescape they are also used to influence the behaviour of the customer although there are limitations when it comes to what is possible to present and to perform on a digital screen.
Staff behaviour, including customer orientation and credibility, are well known servicescape tools to attract customers and make them feel comfortable and safe in the shopping environment. In the e-servicescape it is possible to work with these tools as well but in a different way as they only can be performed in a digital manner. The customer will in an e-servicescape have the opportunity to meet staff behaviour through for instance social media. The problem with social media for the provider is that it is out of their control. It is possible for the providers to let customers write comments on their site but this can be a hazardous as customers with bad experiences can give a negative input to other customers.

The second area involving staff is staff image, including competence and physical attractiveness. Similar to staff behaviour even staff image is possible to work with in an e-servicescape. However it will not be as easy as in a servicescape since the customer only will meet images of the staff. In some e-servicescape customers are invited to use the staff’s competence by asking questions on the site. This kind of e-service has its limitations since the customer do not know how soon the question will be answered and of the quality of the answer. Like for staff behaviour, staff image social media will play an important role.

The two personal factors, variety-seeking behaviour and perceived sacrifice (Fig. 1.) have the similar impact in a servicescape as in an e-servicescape. However, in an e-servicescape the customer does not have the same limitation because they shop without being in contact with other customers and thereby can feel more free to buy products of their own interest which they would not buy in a physical shop.

In the conceptual model (Fig. 1.) Harris and Ezeh (2008) discuss environmental factors including perceived economic turbulence and perceived competitive intensity. The authors argue that there are factors that have an impact on the customers and their loyalty. As the customer using e-servicescape in fact can be a customer to a company operating from a totally different part of the world the environmental factors can influence the customers. Hence a customer in an e-servicescape has to rely on what the provider tells on the site and in some way what other customers write on various social media. The servicescape variables, personal factors and environmental factors are intended to build and strengthen the loyalty intentions of the customer. But as shown there are differences between the impacts they have on a servicescape compared to an e-servicescape. All the servicescape variables are tools used in the servicescape environment with the intention to build customer loyalty. In an e-servicescape some variables are much the same but others are more or less not useful in order to build customer loyalty in an e-servicescape. With this in mind it can be argued that e-servicescape has to be further developed in order to help to shape IS suited for e-commerce.

IS are tools for making e-service effective and for customizing the service option for the service provider and the provider’s customers. Most people today are familiar with the Internet, which is a part of their everyday life. They are comfortable with traditional service supply and used to deal with their demands and needs through traditional service providers. Besides they are attracted to digital services, otherwise there had been less interest from the providers to create e-servicescapes.

The issue that the digital services is not always relevant for different operators and customers indicates that IS perhaps have been focused too much on the technology issue and less in real user demand. This has been recognized in previously research covering design issues in developing IS (Langefors 1986; Rogers 1995, 2003; Browne, Durrett and Wetherbe 2004; Rivard and Lapointe 2012). Hence it can be of interest for different actors to consider that a uniform view of what e-servicescape is can be of great importance. The differences in
what existing digital services actually provide and the perceived demands and needs are also manifested by the lack of a uniform picture of what e-servicescape stands for and how it is related to servicescape and other digital services. Therefore it would be of great benefit for all using digital service if there could be one way of looking at e-servicescape. This reaction is also supported by the resistance from the users and a lack of trust towards the digital service provider. Resistance and trust have been covered by many studies (Lewicki and Bunker 1995; Joshi 1991; Rivard and Lapointe 2012; Doney and Cannon 1997) and they are often a result of no or less involvement and interaction between supplier and user. This has been recognized and perceived by some researchers as proof of poor servicescapes. Therefore this paper suggests that the service providers collaborate with providers of digital service applications and together develop a unified image of e-servicescape.

6 Conclusion

In this paper it is argued that there is a need for considering further research on e-servicescape. According to the discussion the border between e-servicescape and servicescape has to be defined. It also has to be included in the discourse if e-servicescape is a connected, yet autonomous, part of servicescape, or if it is included in servicescape. The research question was whether there are differences and similarities between servicescape and e-servicescape. The answer to that is there are differences for three out of four of the variables (see table 1.).

For those working with providing IS it is of interest how they can support the needs, wants and demands of the systems and thereby provide the possibility to build prosperous e-servicescape. It is also of interest how the IS providers in the e-servicescape can build effective virtual servicescapes in which the users are feeling comfortable with the service while consuming or using the service offered.

Further research on the consumers’ views on e-servicescape in comparison with servicescape is of interest since servicescape, to-date, has been in focus. This is due to the fact that e-servicescape, as a framework, is more recent. For instance focus groups could be useful in order to ascertain the reaction and view of goods and services provided in an e-servicescape.

Service based on IS is therefore of great importance for the providers of services as well as for the individuals, giving them opportunities to cost-effective solutions and the opportunity to contribute to the sharing of knowledge, information and opinions. It is therefore highly important that IS are designed in a way that attracts and meets the demands and needs of service. Hence, further research on e-servicescape is recommended.
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