This item was submitted to [Loughborough's Research Repository](#) by the author.
Items in Figshare are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved, unless otherwise indicated.

Knowledge dissemination in the global service marketing community

PLEASE CITE THE PUBLISHED VERSION

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/MSQ-03-2013-0048>

PUBLISHER

© Emerald

VERSION

AM (Accepted Manuscript)

LICENCE

CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

REPOSITORY RECORD

Lages, Cristiana R., Claudia M.N. Simoes, Raymond P. Fisk, and Werner H. Kunz. 2019. "Knowledge Dissemination in the Global Service Marketing Community". figshare. <https://hdl.handle.net/2134/12079>.

This item was submitted to Loughborough's Institutional Repository (<https://dspace.lboro.ac.uk/>) by the author and is made available under the following Creative Commons Licence conditions.

For the full text of this licence, please go to:
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/2.5/>

Knowledge Dissemination in the Global Service Marketing Community

Introduction

Knowledge dissemination is a core process of any academic discipline, so methods for improving the speed of knowledge flows deserve study. A global service marketing research community emerged over the last several decades, which was the first global research community within the marketing discipline (Berry and Parasuraman 1993). The rapid rise and sustained success of service marketing research over the last few decades transformed the discipline of marketing. A notable example of this transformation is the extensive work by Vargo and Lusch (2004, 2008) to popularize “service-dominant logic.” Service-dominant logic has implications for all of the marketing discipline as well as for many other disciplines.

Given the transformative role of service marketing, this paper examines the history of the service marketing community and argues that this community is an archetype for the emerging global service research community. In the early service marketing literature, two key research perspectives emerged in separate physical locations: the Nordic perspective originated in the Nordic countries and the North American perspective emerged in the United States of America (USA). These two perspectives are rooted in original differences, but they also share commonalities because they have mutually influenced each other (Berry and Parasuraman, 1993; Gummesson et al., 1997). In addition to these two research perspectives, the service marketing literature contains many contributions from scholars from other geographic locations and cultures. For example, early and distinct streams of research originated in France (e.g. Eiglier and Langeard) and in the United Kingdom (e.g. Cowell, Palmer, and Payne) (Fisk et al., 1993). Such geographically dispersed insights from scholars around the world led to a rapid spiral of service knowledge exchange triggered by a growing international service marketing community (Pilkington and Chai, 2007).

A global and much broader service research community is emerging. For several years, IBM and others have argued for the development of the fields of Service Science, Management and Engineering (SSME), which clearly requires a larger and more global research community (Spohrer et al., 2010). Simultaneously, research on service science priorities underlies the interdisciplinary nature of the field (Ostrom et al., 2010). New journals were also created. One of these, *Service Science*, invites papers on service theory, service management, operations and marketing, service engineering and systems, service economics and service education. In addition, professional associations emerged to meet the needs of this broader service research community. The first of these was Service Research and Innovation Institute (SRII) (<http://www.thesrii.org>). A second association with an even broader perspective is the International Society of Service Innovation Professionals (ISSIP) (<http://www.issip.org>). These developments create an environment and opportunity for service researchers to cooperate across disciplinary fields and country boundaries.

First, this paper begins with an explanation of the concept of community. Second, the evolution of the service marketing community is discussed. Third, a qualitative study of two key service marketing research perspectives is presented. Fourth, quantitative research that analyses the last 30 years of service marketing research is reported. Fifth, the transition to a global service research community is discussed. Finally, the implications of these findings are examined and the future of the global service research community is considered.

The Concept of Community

The argument that the service marketing community may be regarded as an archetype for building the emergent global service research community is based on the logic of research communities and research neighborhoods. The concept of “community” normally refers to the physical location of people. Such communities may vary from small towns to large cities. By applying the concept of

community to research communities, we describe the subject matter of the people in the community, not the physical location. Our meaning for research communities is fairly similar to what others have called knowledge communities (Andriessen, 2005) or scientific communities (Kienle and Wessner, 2005).

In all communities (physical or research) the experience of belonging is a common and essential characteristic (Block, 2008). Since research communities are based on subject matter, members of research communities may be from very disperse physical locations. A research community is linked by modern communication systems (phone, e-mail, web, etc.), which enable high bandwidth interaction among research community members that may be scattered across the planet. The concept of research neighborhood should also be introduced. As physical communities grow to the size of large cities, they can be characterized as having distinct neighborhoods within them. In similar fashion, as research communities grow ever larger, smaller research neighborhoods may emerge from within the broader research community and eventually grow to become their own research community. Thus, a typical large research community might include several smaller research neighborhoods.

Service Marketing: Evolution And Community Building

The service marketing research community emerged from the broader academic marketing research community. Fisk et al. (1993) identified three stages in the development and legitimization of the service marketing field based on metaphors from biological evolution: *Crawling-Out* stage (1953-1979), *Scurrying-About* stage (1980-1985) and the *Walking Erect* (1986-1992) stage. In the *Crawling-Out* stage, the early service scholars struggled to create the service marketing field and defended its right to exist. This stage was characterized by a debate regarding “goods marketing vs. service marketing” and the research was mainly conceptual (e.g. Grönroos, 1978; Gummesson, 1979). During the *Scurrying-About* stage, several service marketing conferences were sponsored by the American

Marketing Association in 1981, 1982, 1983 and 1985. These conferences fostered the emergence of a community of leading service scholars, which began the global service marketing community. The dissemination of service literature was helped by the establishment of the first service journals (*Service Industries Journal* in 1980 and the *Journal of Professional Service Marketing* in 1985), the first service marketing textbooks (i.e. Cowell, 1984; Lovelock, 1984)¹, and the prominent publication of service articles in the *Journal of Marketing* (e.g. Parasuraman et al., 1985), *Harvard Business Review* (e.g. Shostack, 1984) and *European Journal of Marketing* (e.g. Grönroos, 1982, 1984). Research topics during this stage included service quality, service encounters, and internal marketing. Finally, in the *Walking-Erect* stage, service marketing established itself as a field within and beyond the marketing discipline. Changes during this stage included an explosive growth in numbers of service marketing publications and greater theoretical and empirical rigor. New research topics such as service design, customer retention, and relationship marketing were investigated (Brown et al., 1994).

Subsequently, Fisk and Grove (2010) described three additional and more recent evolutionary stages of the service marketing research community. The three stages are based on metaphors from social evolution: the Making Tools stage (1992-2000), the Creating Language stage (2000-2010), and the Building Community stage (2010-the future). In contrast with the discrete biological evolution stages, the new social evolution stages are continuous and cumulative because culture changes over time (Fisk and Grove, 2010). The *Making Tools* stage is characterized by the incorporation of technology into services, for example through the use of self-service technologies. Simultaneously, the development and application of more advanced and sophisticated methodological research tools (e.g. measurement scales and data analysis techniques) took place. This stage constitutes the basis for further development of the more general service field. In the *Creating Language* stage (2000-2010), the technical language rooted in the service marketing field was widely disseminated within the marketing

¹ It should be noted that service textbooks had already been published in the Nordic region of Sweden, Finland and Denmark (1979, 1980, 1982).

discipline and the business field in general. Terms such as service encounters, service quality, servicescapes and service recovery were widely adopted. It was during this stage, that a “service dominant logic” began spreading beyond service marketing. IBM’s SSME initiative also helped create service language that was more interdisciplinary. In the context of these social evolution stages, it is essential to remember that the Making Tools and Creating Language stages have not stopped. They are the essential foundation for the next stage, *Building Community* (2010-The Future). This stage is characterized by collaboration among service researchers across academic disciplines. In this context, we take inspiration from Campbell’s (1969) “fish-scale” metaphor for disciplines. Campbell believed that disciplines should overlap like the scales of fish. These overlapping areas facilitate communication and collaboration among scholars.

Recently, a broader revised classification of the history of service marketing anchored in three paradigms was proposed. The first was the *goods paradigm* (pre-1970s); the second was the *services vs. goods paradigm with focus on the differences* (1970s-2000s); and the *service paradigm based on goods/services integration and interdependency* (2000s-present) (Gummesson and Grönroos, 2012).

Qualitative Study: The Outset of the Service Marketing Community

Two distinct research perspectives shaped the service marketing community: the Nordic and North American schools. In our community/neighborhood logic, the Nordic and North American schools are research neighborhoods. Researchers representing both perspectives have been actively involved in the service marketing community from the early days to current time. To understand the contribution of both schools within the service marketing community, we conducted exploratory interviews with four notable service marketing experts. These interviews provided qualitative depth to the comparison between Nordic and North American research perspectives. The panel of four service experts was selected based on the following criteria: (1) the expert was a thought leader in the early

years of the service marketing field; (2) the expert made significant contributions to research and teaching in service marketing; (3) the expert was awarded the American Marketing Association's Services Marketing Special Interest Group (SERVSIG) "Career Contributions to the Services Discipline" Award (now named for Christopher Lovelock); and (4) they were the first scholars to receive the Career Contributions Award from their regions. Of the four service experts interviewed, two were from Nordic universities and two were from North American universities. The panel was comprised of Christian Grönroos, Evert Gummesson (Nordic School), Leonard L. Berry and the late Christopher Lovelock (North American School).

Qualitative Results

Based on responses from the four service experts and a thorough literature review (for example, Lovelock, 1983, 2000; Grönroos and Gummesson, 1985; Berry and Parasuraman, 1993; Grönroos, 1994a, 1994b, 2005; Bitner, 2000; Brown, 2000; Gummesson, 2002b, 2004; Edvardsson, 2005; Pilkington and Chai, 2007) the following were the dominant topics: cross-functionality and interdisciplinary; services as processes and perceived service quality; external marketing, internal marketing, interactive marketing; methodological approach; and managerial relevance of academic research. It is worth noting that the Nordic School literature discusses its main underlying assumptions and the North American literature seems to overlook the discussion of its core assumptions. A possible explanation is that the North American literature is more fragmented due to its numerous contributors. Therefore, in order to present the cornerstones of the North American approach, we will rely mostly on the North American experts' comments from Lovelock and Berry.

1. The Nordic School of Service Marketing

In Northern Europe, research on service marketing emerged in the mid-1970s and became more intense in the final years of the decade leading to the emergence of the Nordic School of Service Marketing in mid-1980s. This school is grounded on “...acquired informal memberships based on recognition for commitment to a discipline through research, publications and practice” and the common denominators are geography and culture (Gummesson et al., 1997, p. 12). Early contributors included Evert Gummesson, Christian Grönroos, Richard Normann, Uolevi Lehtinen, Leif Edvinsson, Jarmo Lehtinen, Lars-Johan Lindqvist, Tore Strandvik and Veronica Liljander. The aim of the establishment of the “Nordic School” was to compete in the international academic and business arena with a unique research identity and an established brand name (Gummesson et al., 1997).

During informal conversations, Grönroos and Gummesson referred to the underlying ‘innovative’ views on Service Marketing advocated by the Nordic perspective. In particular, these scholars emphasized the unconstrained theoretical and methodological roots of service studies. They claim that, in the beginning, the Nordic School of Service was more interested in theory generation and in-depth understanding rather than theory testing and statistical evidence, and it relied on multi-methods such as grounded theory, narrative research, action research and anthropology/ethnography in addition to case study research (Gummesson, 2001). They also argued that management should not consider marketing as a separate function from all the other business functions and management should focus on inter-functional collaboration (Grönroos, 1994) among, for instance, sales, marketing, production, and distribution departments.

Finally, the Nordic School has been characterized by a close link between researchers and practitioners. For instance, Hanken School of Economics (Finland) and its research centre CERS - Centre for Relationship Marketing and Service Management - cooperate with partner companies. Another example from the Nordic countries is the CTF - Service Research Centre- based in Karlstad,

Sweden, which celebrates its 27th anniversary this year. The CTF's business idea is to contribute "to the scientific knowledge on value-creation through service." (CTF, 2012).

2. *The North American School of Service Marketing*

The service marketing community in North America entails a wide range of researchers with various backgrounds, which makes it difficult to describe the "North American School." As Lovelock (2004) stated during the interview, "*There is not and never has been a uniform 'North American' school.*" He suggested there were two separate perspectives on services in the USA during the mid-1980s to late 1990s. The first was based on a consumer behavior perspective and includes work from Berry, Parasuraman, Zeithaml, Brown, Crosby and Bitner. The second was based on a service management perspective, which is more aligned with the Nordic School approach, and is mirrored in work developed by Chase, Heskett, Sasser, Schneider, Bowen, Lovelock, Grove and Fisk.

Overall, service research conducted by North American authors reflects the cross-functionality aspect of managing and marketing services. All business functions are managed to achieve customer satisfaction and customer relationships leading to long-term profitability (Bitner, 2000). Bitner (2000) argues that her research seeks to combine marketing, human resources, social and environmental psychology as well as organizational behavior literatures. Similarly, Brown, influenced by European researchers, draws on a variety of disciplines in his work, namely operations and human resources management (Brown, 2000). Hence, service marketing cannot be separated from other management functions such as operations and human resources (Lovelock, 1983). This interdisciplinary and cross-functionality is corroborated with contributions made by researchers in service operations (e.g. Sasser, Chase, Heskett, Fitzsimmons), human resources (e.g. Bowen), and management (e.g. Schneider) (Berry and Parasuraman, 1993).

The North American research tradition on service marketing was initially characterized by a focus on quantitative methods. Over time a variety of methodologies, namely cases and critical incidents in addition to the survey based quantitative studies, emerged (Bitner, 1997). Both qualitative and quantitative approaches became indispensable. As an example, the team of Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry (PZB) employed qualitative research to create frameworks and then quantitative methods to test these frameworks (Zeithaml, 2000). Also Bitner adopted both qualitative and quantitative methods (Bitner, 2000). In contrast, Lovelock was widely recognized for his teaching cases. In 1993, he had written approximately 70 cases (Berry and Parasuraman, 1993) and by 2000 he had already more than 100 cases (Lovelock, 2000).

The North American perspective on service marketing is rooted in the challenges faced by managers of service companies in the 1970s. Such context led to close cooperation between the academic and business communities. Hence, service marketing research reflects managerially relevant problems faced by practitioners (Bitner, 2000). The bridge between academic research and service practice is substantiated by regular interaction between academics and managers. This interaction is facilitated by existing services research centers sponsored by service professionals (Zeithaml, 2000) based in universities such as Arizona State University (Center for Services Leadership), Texas A&M (Center for Retailing Studies), and the University of Maryland (Center for Excellence in Service).

3. Lessons from the Early History: Integrating the Nordic and North American Perspectives

Commonalities between the Nordic and North American approaches on service marketing prevail over the differences (Berry, 2004). As Lovelock noted, “...*North American vs. Nordic is a false dichotomy*” (2004). Despite the existence in the early 1980s of substantial differences, the field was not totally polarized. Indeed, one of the characteristics of service marketing was the early cross-pollination of European and North American findings (Lovelock, 2000).

The Nordic School's underlying assumption was that service marketing was an under-researched area and thus understanding rather than empirical testing was vital. Accordingly, the Nordic School tended to be more conceptual while the North American perspective tended to favor empirical testing. Now there is broader understanding that theory testing is also pertinent (Grönroos, 2004). Many of the issues are common across perspectives, namely the interdisciplinary nature of research, the holistic approach to services, the focus on topics relevant to academia, service marketers and managers. Additionally, both groups of researchers (Nordic and North American) have converged on the same topics such as service quality, internal marketing and relationship marketing (Berry, 2004) as well as the criticism of the 4P's paradigm.

An early service conference in Sweden in 1988 created opportunities for participants from the Nordic and North American perspectives to meet. This conference became the Quality in Services (QUIS) Conference, an international research symposium on service excellence in management that brings together leading scholars and managers from all over the world. The CTF organizes this conference bi-annually in cooperation with the Center for Services Leadership, Arizona State University (USA) and Warwick Business School (UK).

The boundaries between North American and Nordic experts became blurred and began to overlap as researchers integrated each other's views into their respective lines of inquiry. This is similar to what Campbell (1969) advocated for overlapping interdisciplinary relationships. For example, Parasuraman (2000) and Berry (2000) agree with Gummesson (2004) about the need for researchers to analyze more complex problems that can be called "big-picture issues." Brown (2000) acknowledges that European researchers such as Grönroos and Gummesson helped him to look at service marketing from a *holistic* management perspective, taking into account areas such as operations and human resources management. Similarly, Lovelock (1983, 2000) argues that service marketing cannot be separated from other management functions such as operations and human resources. Nonetheless,

according to Gummesson, the North American viewpoint tends to look at service marketing, service management and human resources management as separate subjects; and therefore, the integration of the subjects is not achieved (Gummesson, 2004).

Both the Nordic and North American perspectives on service marketing agree that the traditional 4Ps paradigm is incomplete when creating and delivering services. The Nordic School regards the product as part of the total service offering rather than its traditional sense as a preproduced, prepackaged solution to be marketed and consumed (Grönroos, 2000a). North American researchers (e.g. Booms and Bitner, 1981; Zeithaml and Bitner, 1996) argue for an expanded marketing mix for services (i.e., they add to the traditional 4P's another 3 P's: people, physical evidence, and process).

One of the initial differences between the Nordic and North American perspectives was based on methodological issues. There is a tendency in Northern Europe to adopt a more qualitative approach based on case studies and action research, while in North America the use of a more survey based quantitative approach tends to be the norm. Gummesson (2002a) still argues that in order to generate marketing theory, an inductive and systematic case-study approach should be followed instead of an approach based on deductive and reductionist surveys. Additionally, other methods such as grounded theory, introspection and narrative research emerge as possible research strategies (Gummesson, 2002a). While initially the Nordic School tended to conduct mostly qualitative research (e.g. Gummesson, 1977, 1987; Grönroos, 1979, 1998) and the North American researchers were likely to adopt more quantitative approaches (e.g. Parasuraman et al., 1988), today both schools acknowledge that both qualitative and quantitative approaches are indispensable (Berry, 2000). Berry (2000), for instance, considers that qualitative methods may be employed as preliminary for modeling and empirical research can be used to test and refine the model. Contrary to Berry, Gummesson (2001) does not agree that qualitative studies are only for exploratory research. In order to strengthen his argument, Gummesson gives the example of cases, which cannot be purely regarded as theoretical overtures to

statistical testing of hypotheses. In sum, while the differences in research methods employed were more significant in the early stages of service marketing, these differences have faded over time.

Quantitative Study: Verifying the Development of the Service Marketing Community

To verify our qualitative insights about the service research community, we collected descriptive data (e.g. authorship, title, keywords) from all service articles published in top peer-reviewed marketing and service journals over the last 30 years (1982-2011). In particular, we collected the information of all articles in *Journal of Service Management* (formerly *International Journal of Service Industry Management*), *Journal of Services Marketing*, *Journal of Service Research*, *Managing Service Quality* and *Service Industries Journal*. In addition, we considered top peer-reviewed marketing research outlets including the *European Journal of Marketing*, *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, *Journal of Consumer Research*, *Journal of Marketing*, *Journal of Marketing Research*, *Journal of Retailing*, *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, and *Marketing Science*. These journals are the most visible outlets for service research and provide important platforms for knowledge exchange within the service community (Kunz and Hogueve, 2011).

Next, we classified articles as service or non-service publications. The decision was based on the publication outlet, title of the article, keywords, and abstract. If an article contained “service” in its title or keywords, it was automatically classified as service related. Every publication in a service-related journal was, by definition, classified as service related (Kunz and Hogueve, 2011). Furthermore, we coded an article as service related if its topic was related to service marketing (i.e., explicitly mentioned in the abstract). This process resulted in 5,432 service articles written by 6,450 authors.

Quantitative Results

We analyzed the ratio of service articles in the marketing journals (within the service journals every article was classified as service related). We did this ratio calculation for three different time periods (1982-1991; 1992-2001; 2002-2011) to show the development of service-related articles in the top marketing journals over time. The results are shown in Table 1. It can be observed that in general the number of service articles increased significantly from 1982-2001 and the ratio became 18% since 2001. Further, while in some journals the ratio of service related articles was always very high (e.g. European Journal of Marketing), in other journals the ratio is still growing very strongly (e.g. International Journal of Research in Marketing, Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science). Thus, although service research was always present in specific marketing journals over the last 30 years, some journals only recently acknowledge the relevance of service research within the marketing research field.

< Table I about here >

Additionally, for all service articles, we extracted the affiliation data and identified the country of the contributing authors. We identified authors from 61 countries. The countries with the most articles were the USA (1,644 articles) and the UK (976 articles). Subsequently, we constructed a symmetric country-collaboration matrix based on the affiliating countries of the co-authors of the service related articles. One element m_{ij} of the matrix contains the number of articles with co-authors from country i and country j . The country-collaboration matrix was the basis for the multidimensional scaling (MDS) and served as a similarity matrix between the countries. High values indicate that countries collaborate more strongly, while low values indicate weak collaboration. Because the USA and the UK dominate the country-collaboration matrix, we transformed the matrix using a Salton transformation, which expresses every country-collaboration count in relation to all articles of the two

countries, and then inverted the resulting matrix into a dissimilarity matrix (i.e., $S = I - \text{diag}(M)^{-1/2} \times M \times \text{diag}(M)^{-1/2}$; Kunz and Hogreve, 2011; Ahlgren et al., 2003).

Next, we mapped the global collaboration between countries by means of MDS and identified clusters of international collaboration. The MDS tries to determine an optimal representation of the relationship between the countries in a lower dimensional space. The stress value indicates the goodness of fit of the result to the original data. A stress value between .10 and .20 indicates a fair model. We ran the MDS-algorithm for various dimensional models and decided to take a 2-dimensional graphical representation due to the superior stress level (stress I = .11). Thus, every country received a specific position in the 2-dimensional space in relation to the other countries based on author collaboration. Figure 1 shows this country collaboration space. If two countries are positioned close to each other, their collaboration is relatively close compared to countries that are positioned further away from each other.

< Figure 1 about here >

Because the USA and the UK were the most collaborative countries in the matrix, they are positioned in the middle of the plot. Very close to them are countries where English is one of their official languages (i.e. Canada, Australia, Singapore). Since the journals in our data all publish in the English language, these collaboration patterns for English speaking countries may be connected to the common use of the English language (see circle A in Figure 1). All German-speaking countries are positioned in the plot in the upper left corner (see circle B in Figure 1). As indicative of the Nordic school, Norway and Sweden are closely positioned together as well as Denmark and Finland (see circles C1 and C2 in Figure 1). Surprisingly, the Nordic countries are clustered into two groups and more separated from each other than expected. Finally, it can be observed that Brazil, Portugal and Spain are closely positioned in the lower right corner (see circle D in Figure 1). Thus, these results suggest that similar language and culture play a role in service research collaboration.

We also investigated in which journals authors from various countries publish. Table 2 shows the number of articles with a contributing author from a particular country for the various journals in our sample. It can be observed that for some journals it is mostly authors from a few countries who publish there (e.g. *Journal of Retailing*, *Journal of Marketing*), while other journals attract authors from around the world (e.g. *Journal of Service Research*, *Journal of Service Management*, *Service Industries Journal*).

< Table II about here >

In summary, the service marketing research field increased in importance over the last 30 years. Despite service not being a dominant topic in marketing journals, the ratio has been mostly increasing within these outlets. A cornerstone for this development is international collaboration, which was strongly based on cultural affinities among the countries. This international trend can also be observed in the various peer-reviewed journals of service research, even though some journals are more internationally oriented than others.

Discussion: The Transition to a Global Service Research Community

Our findings capture and describe the formation of a dynamic and global service marketing research community based on wide-ranging contributions from scholars from diverse academic backgrounds and cultures. Service research became an established field within the marketing discipline since the 1990s and every established marketing journal now includes service research to a certain degree.

The overall patterns in the service marketing community showed that, as the community expanded, collaboration amongst researchers enlarged the scope of the service marketing field. Those collaborations were initially marked by geographical proximity, but they evolved to entail wider forms of collaboration. Four drivers may be identified as having fostered the expansion of the service

marketing research community: *International Collaboration, Knowledge Dissemination, Eclectic Scientific Approaches*, as well as *Tolerance and Inclusion*.

1. International Collaboration

The international collaboration that accelerated the emergence and success of the early service marketing research community has continued over the last decades. While this paper emphasizes the role of the two early research neighborhoods, the Nordic and the North American, the service marketing community never became polarized and contributions from researchers all over the world were published in English language journals. While the origins of many service marketing theories may be traced back to Nordic (e.g. Grönroos, Gummesson) and USA-based (e.g. Lovelock, Berry) scholars, early contributors also included French (e.g. Eiglier and Langeard) and British scholars (e.g. Cowell, Palmer and Payne). Meanwhile, authors based in the Netherlands (e.g. de Ruyter, Lemmink, and Wetzels), Australia (e.g. Ballantyne, Johnson, and Patterson), Germany (e.g. Schmidt, Stauss, Meyer) and Singapore (e.g. Wirtz) emerged.

In fact, the spatial analysis of country collaboration suggests the central role that the USA and UK played over the last 30 years. In particular, the USA and the UK were and are critical for global research collaboration and for building the service research community. Smaller country clusters also emerged, suggesting that cultural proximity facilitates international collaboration. Today, most countries have several service marketing scholars belonging to growing service research groups.

2. Knowledge Dissemination

The expansion of the service marketing community was fueled by regular face-to-face exchanges and dissemination of knowledge among global service researchers at various service marketing conferences. Over time, perspectives in service marketing became more convergent as

scholars from all over the world established contacts and shared ideas in global events.

Conferences such as QUIS, Frontiers in Service Conference and AMA SERVSIG became events with the active involvement of international researchers. In addition, the emergence of international service research neighborhoods (e.g. the ASU Center for Services Leadership based in USA; CTF based in Sweden; CERS based in Finland, and, Service Researchers based in the UK) helped accelerate the dissemination of service knowledge. More recently, modern communication technology has also increased the ability of research neighborhoods to interact via such tools as e-mail, Skype calls, and social media.

The service community has also been active in the creation of scientific journals (e.g. *Journal of Service Management*, *Journal of Service Research*, *Journal of Services Marketing*, *Managing Service Quality*, *Service Industries Journal*, *Service Science*, etc.) as specialized outlets for the dissemination of service work. An analysis of contributing authors for various journals showed that many service journals are highly international and global collaboration is visible in these outlets.

Despite the need for interdisciplinary research, existing journals vary in terms of their openness to interdisciplinary work. For example, while the *Journal of Service Research* is clearly positioned to attract interdisciplinary research, some of the other journal outlets have more specific subject areas. This state of affairs reflects the need of academic reward systems to be classified into specific academic profiles and disciplines such as Marketing, Operations, and Organizational Behavior. Nevertheless, it is important to note that none of these journals is narrowly focused (Svensson et al., 2008).

3. Eclectic Scientific Approaches

Service marketing quickly developed eclectic scientific approaches that integrated knowledge by merging concepts, approaches and methods, which blurred the borders among disciplines. Vargo and Lusch (2004) emphasized the importance of an integrated service-dominant logic for the marketing

field. A vigorous international discussion of a service-based logic ensued. Certainly, service marketing concepts and models existed since the 1970s (Grönroos, 2006) but Vargo and Lusch's (2004, 2008) articles brought greater focus on issues such as customer's co-production of value and value creation (cf. Grönroos, 1978, 1994b; Gummesson, 1979, 1991 and 1996). In short, by carefully building on and synthesizing more than 30 years of research in the service field, Vargo and Lusch (2004, 2008) fuelled a global debate on service logic that cuts across multiple disciplines, scientific backgrounds and geographical locations.

4. Tolerance and Inclusion

Two values emerged early during the evolution of the service marketing community that are relevant to building a global service research community. These values can be summarized as tolerance and inclusion. First, early service scholars from the Nordic and North American perspectives asserted their unique perspectives, but such perspectives were met with friendly tolerance rather than hostility. For example, Grönroos (1983a, 1983b) presented the Nordic School perspective at the second American Marketing Association Services Marketing Conference. Second, early service conferences exhibited a strong bias toward inclusion. For example, the Frontiers in Service, SERVSIG, and QUIS conferences all took steps to include participants from new countries and new academic fields.

The discussion above highlights that the development of the service marketing field and the nature of the scientific collaborations and outputs expanded the scope of service marketing, sometimes overlapping and entering adjoining areas. Such evolution suggests a pervasive influence of service marketing in the overall service research arena. Its global reach allows drawing implications on the increasingly interdisciplinary and comprehensive nature of service research.

Implications and Future Directions: Building a Global Service Research Community

This paper discussed the foundations and evolution of the service marketing field and the emergence of a global service research community. Considering the interdisciplinary and global nature of the research priorities (Ostrom et al., 2010), we proposed that the service marketing field should serve as an aspirational model for the much larger and even more global emerging service research community. The initial values of the service marketing field based on tolerance and inclusion offer guidance for how the service research field should evolve to address the current and future challenges of service science.

Conditions similar to those that led to the emergence of the service marketing community (more than three decades ago) are now causing the emergence of a global service research community based on wide-ranging contributions from scholars from diverse academic backgrounds and cultures. This new stage will lead to a restructuring of research communities and neighborhoods. Service marketing becomes a research neighborhood within the emerging broader service research community. Other research neighborhoods are beginning to emerge within this new community, which will include the fields of service arts, service management, service engineering, and service science. With care, the emerging service research community can propagate the tolerance and inclusion that guided the growth of the service marketing community. Further, the existing interdisciplinary networks that resulted from the interaction among service marketing researchers are already helping nurture progress in the emerging service research field.

It is our view that this emerging global service research community should take the service marketing research community as an archetype model. The future of the emerging global service research community will require a modern perspective that can be described with two metaphors: the “big tent” (Rust, 2006) and “T-Shaped People” (Fisk and Grove, 2010). The big tent is anchored in four tent poles: science, management, engineering, and arts (Fisk and Grove, 2010), which is in line with the

initial IBM's SSME initiative that includes: *service science* (psychology, systems science, and sociology); *service management* (marketing, operations and finance); and *service engineering* (industrial, software, process, and human factors engineering). Fisk and Grove (2010) also added the *service arts* entailing performing arts (e.g. theatre), visual arts (e.g. painting), design, and architecture. The big tent metaphor reminds us that the emerging global service research community should strive to be as open and inclusive of new ideas as possible.

Simultaneously, the T-Shaped people metaphor has been popularized by IBM's Jim Spohrer, i.e., T-shaped people are deeply trained in a core service subject, but have broad knowledge of other service research areas in services. This metaphor focuses on the need to prevent research specialization from becoming research isolation. Such T-shaped people are essential to developing a wider community of service scholars and business leaders that are more focused on addressing customer needs than their discipline's specific interests (Fisk and Grove, 2010). The T-shaped people metaphor reminds us that the emerging global service research community should maximize interactions among service scholars.

Consequently, as new service research topics are being explored (e.g. the service economy, service experiences, service arts, perceived value) an open minded, interdisciplinary and international research perspective is essential. Considering the wide scope in the nature of the field, the implications for service researchers is that they may learn from the service marketing community. In particular, it seems that researchers will need to be able to develop strong international collaborations capable of integrating over-arching approaches to research problems (e.g. multiple methods, interdisciplinary views). Additionally, researchers should also create adequate forums and outlets (e.g. periodical conferences, workshops, websites) that would promote face-to-face as well as remote interactions so that knowledge is exchanged in open and creative ways. Tolerance and inclusion should permeate the way the service research community communicates and evolves.

These implications for scholars go beyond the service research community. As knowledge spreads across the world, researchers from other scientific communities will need to establish international partnerships and networks. Considering the existing international challenges and globalization, researchers need international collaboration systems similar to the service marketing research community to proactively address the challenges of the research environment and service research practice to effectively advance knowledge in their respective fields.

References

- Ahlgren, P., Jarneving, B. and Rousseau, R. (2003), "Requirements for a Cocitation Similarity Measure, with Special Reference to Pearson's Correlation Coefficient", *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, Vol. 54 No. 6, pp. 550–560.
- Andriessen, J.H.E. (2005), "Archetypes of Knowledge Communities", in van den Besselaar, P., De Michelis, G., Preece J. and Simone, C. (Ed.), *Communities and Technologies 2005*, Springer, Milan, Italy, pp. 191-213.
- Berry, L.L. (2000), "Leonard Berry, Texas A&M University", in Fisk, R. P., Grove, S. J. and Joby J. (Ed.), *Services Marketing Self-Portraits: Introspections, Reflections, and Glimpses from the Experts*, Chicago: American Marketing Association, pp. 1-18.
- Berry, L.L. (2004), Personal Communication – email, 21 May 2004.
- Berry, L.L. and Parasuraman, A. (1993), "Building a New Academic Field- The Case of Services Marketing", *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 69 No. 1, pp. 13-60.
- Bitner, M.J. (1997), "Services Marketing: Perspectives on Service Excellence", *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 73 No. 1, pp. 3-6.
- Bitner, M.J. (2000), "Mary Jo Bitner, Arizona State University," in Fisk, R. P. Grove, S. J. and Joby, J. (Ed.), *Services Marketing Self-Portraits: Introspections, Reflections, and Glimpses from the Experts*, Chicago: American Marketing Association, pp. 19-35.
- Block, P. (2008), *Community: The Structure of Belonging*, Berrett-Koehler Publishers Inc., San Francisco.
- Booms, B.H. and Bitner, M.J. (1981), "Marketing Strategies and Organizational Structures for Service Firms," in Donnelly, J. H. and George, W. R. (Ed), *Marketing of Services*, American Marketing Association, Chicago, pp. 47-51.

- Brown, S.W., Fisk, R.P. and Bitner, M.J (1994), "The Development and Emergence of Services Marketing Thought", *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, Vol. 5 No. 1, pp. 21-48.
- Brown, S.W. (2000), "Stephen W. Brown, Arizona State University," in Fisk, R. P., Grove, S. J. and Joby J. (Ed.), *Services Marketing Self-Portraits: Introspections, Reflections, and Glimpses from the Experts*, American Marketing Association, Chicago, 53-70.
- Campbell, D.T. (1969), "Ethnocentrism of Disciplines and the Fish-Scale Model of Omniscience," in Sherif, M. and Sherif, C. W. (Ed.), *Interdisciplinary Relationships in the Social Sciences*, Aldine, Chicago, 328-348.
- Cowell, D.W. (1984), *The Marketing of Services*, Heinemann, London.
- CTF (2012), CTF Service Research Center, available at: <http://www.ctf.kau.se/> (accessed 3 September 2012).
- Edvardsson, B. (2005), "Guru's View- Service Quality: Beyond Cognitive Assessment", *Managing Service Quality*, Vol. 5, pp. 127-131.
- Fisk, R.P., Brown, S.W. and Bitner, M.J. (1993), "Tracking the Evolution of the Services Marketing Literature", *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 69 No. 1, pp. 61-103.
- Fisk, R.P. and Grove, S.J. (2010), "The Evolution and Future of Service: Building and Broadening a Multidisciplinary Field," in Maglio, P. P., Kieliszewski, C. A. and Spohrer, J.C. (Ed), *Handbook of Service Science*, Springer, New York, pp. 641-661.
- Grönroos, C. (1978), "A Service-Orientated Approach to Marketing of Services", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 12 No 8, pp. 588-601.
- Grönroos, C. (1979), *The Marketing of Services: A Study of the Marketing Function in Service Firms*, Swedish School of Economics and Business Administration, Finland.

- Grönroos, C. (1982), "An Applied Service Marketing Theory," *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 16 No. 7, pp. 30-41.
- Grönroos, C. (1983a), "Innovative Marketing Strategies and Organization Structures For Service Firms," in Berry, L. L., Shostack, L. G. and Upah, G. D. (Ed), *Emerging Perspectives on Services Marketing*, American Marketing Association, Chicago, pp. 9-21.
- Grönroos, C. (1983b), "Seven Key Areas of Research according to The Nordic School of Service Marketing," in Berry, L. L., Shostack, L. G. and Upah, G. D. (Ed), *Emerging Perspectives on Services Marketing*, American Marketing Association, Chicago, pp. 108-110.
- Grönroos, C. (1984), "A Service Quality Model and its Marketing Implications," *European Journal of Marketing*, 18 (4), 36-44.
- Grönroos, C. (1994a), "From Marketing Mix to Relationship Marketing: Towards a Paradigm Shift", *Management Decision*, Vol. 32 No. 2, pp. 4-20.
- Grönroos, C. (1994b), "From Scientific Management to Service Management", *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, Vol. 5 No. 1, pp. 5-20.
- Grönroos, C. (1998), "Marketing Services: The Case of a Missing Product", *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, Vol. 13 No. 4-5, pp. 322-338.
- Grönroos, C. (2000a), "Christian Grönroos, Hanken Swedish School of Economics Finland," in Fisk, R. P., Grove, S. J. and Joby J. (Ed.), *Services Marketing Self-Portraits: Introspections, Reflections, and Glimpses from the Experts*, American Marketing Association, Chicago, pp. 71-108.
- Grönroos, C. (2000b), *Service Management and Marketing: A Customer Relationship Approach*, John Wiley, Chichester
- Grönroos, C. (2004), Personal Communication – conversations and emails.

- Grönroos, C. (2005), "The Nordic School- Seminar on the Nordic School of Thought",
Seminar on the Nordic School of Thought, 18 May, Swedish School of Economic and Business
Administration, Helsinki, Finland.
- Grönroos, C. (2006), "Adopting a Service Logic for Marketing", *Marketing Theory*, Vol. 6 No. 3, pp.
317-333.
- Grönroos, C. and Gummesson, E. (1985), in Christian Grönroos, C. and Evert Gummesson, E. (Ed),
Service Marketing- Nordic School Perspectives Series, University of Stockholm, Stockholm,
Sweden, pp. 6-10.
- Gummesson, E. (1977), *Marketing and Purchasing of Professional Services*, University of Stockholm,
Stockholm, Sweden.
- Gummesson, E. (1979), "The Marketing of Professional Services—An Organizational Dilemma",
European Journal of Marketing, Vol. 13 No. 5, pp. 308-318.
- Gummesson, E. (1987), "Using Internal Marketing to Develop a New Culture- The Case of Ericsson
Quality", *Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing*, Vol. 2 No. 3, pp. 23-28.
- Gummesson, E. (2001), "Are Current Research Approaches in Marketing leading us Astray?"
Marketing Theory, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 27-48.
- Gummesson, E. (2002a), "Relationship Marketing and a New Economy: It's Time for De-
programming", *Journal of Services Marketing*, Vol. 16 No. 7, pp. 585-589.
- Gummesson, E. (2002b), *Total Relationship Marketing*, 2nd ed., Butterworth-Heinemann, London.
- Gummesson, E. (2004), Personal Communication – conversation and interview, 6th April.
- Gummesson, E. (1991), "Marketing-orientation Revisited: the Crucial Role of the Part-time Marketer",
European Journal of Marketing, Vol. 25 No. 2, pp. 60-75.
- Gummesson, E. (1996), "Relationship marketing and imaginary organizations: A synthesis", *European
Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 30 No. 2, pp. 31-44.

- Gummesson, E. and Grönroos, C. (2012), “The Emergence of the New Service Marketing: Nordic School Perspectives”, *Journal of Service Management*, Vol. 23 No. 4, pp. 479 – 497.
- Gummesson, E., Lehtinen, U. and Grönroos, C. (1997), “Comment on Nordic Perspectives on Relationship Marketing”, *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 31 No. 1-2, pp. 10-16.
- Kienle, A. and Wessner, M. (2005), “Principles for Cultivating Scientific Communities of Practice”, in van den Besselaar, P., De Michelis, G., Preece, J. and Simone, C. (Ed.), *Communities and Technologies 2005*, Springer, Milan, Italy, pp. 283-299.
- Kunz, W.H. and Hogueve, J. (2011), “Toward a deeper understanding of service marketing: The past, the present, and the future”, *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, Vol. 28 No. 3, pp. 231–247.
- Lovelock, C.H. (1983), “Classifying Services to Gain Strategic Marketing Insights”, *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 47, pp. 9-20.
- Lovelock, C.H. (1984), *Services Marketing: Text, Cases and Readings*, Prentice-Hall Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.
- Lovelock, C.H. (2000), “Christopher H. Lovelock, Lovelock Associates”, in Fisk, R. P., Grove, S. J. and Joby J. (Ed.), *Services Marketing Self-Portraits: Introspections, Reflections, and Glimpses from the Experts*, American Marketing Association, Chicago, pp. 133-153.
- Lovelock, C.H. (2004), Personal Communication – email. May 19th, revised version: 5 July 2005.
- 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.
- Parasuraman, A. (2000), “A. Parasuraman, University of Miami,” in Fisk, R. P., Grove, S. J. and Joby J. (Ed.), *Services Marketing Self-Portraits: Introspections, Reflections, and Glimpses from the Experts*, American Marketing Association, Chicago, pp. 153-172.

- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V.A. and Berry, L.L. (1985), "A Conceptual Model of Service Quality and its Implications for Future Research", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 49, pp. 41-50.
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V.A. and Berry, L.L. (1988), "SERVQUAL: A Multiple-Item Scale for Measuring Consumer Perceptions of Service Quality", *Journal of Retailing*, Vol. 64 No. 1, pp. 12-40.
- Pilkington, A. and Chai, K.H. (2008), "Research Themes, Concepts and Relationships: A Study of International Journal of Service Industry Management (1990-2005)", *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, Vol. 19 No. 1, pp. 83-110.
- Rust, R.T. (2006), "SSME- Let's Not Forget About Customers and Revenue," in *IBM SSME Conference*, Palisades, NY, 1-3.
- Shostack, G.L. (1984), "Designing Services that Deliver". *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 62 No. 1, pp. 133-139.
- Spohrer, J.C., Gregory, M. and Ren, G. (2010), "The Cambridge-IBM SSME White Paper Revisited", in Maglio, P. P. Kieliszewski, C. A. and Spohrer, J. C. (Ed), *Handbook of Service Science*, Springer, New York, pp. 677-706.
- Svensson, G., Slåtten, T. and Tronvoll, B. (2008), "Scientific Identity in Top Journals of Services Marketing: Review and Evaluation", *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, Vol. 19 No. 1, pp. 134-147.
- Vargo, S.L. and Lusch, R.F. (2004), "The Four Service Marketing Myths: Remnants of a Goods-Based, Manufacturing Model", *Journal of Service Research*, Vol. 6 No. 4, pp. 324-333.
- Vargo, S.L. and Lusch, R.F. (2008), "Service Dominant Logic: Further Evolution", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 36 No. 1, pp. 1-10.

Zeithaml, V.A. (2000), "Valarie A. Zeithaml, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill," in

Fisk, R. P., Grove, S. J. and Joby J. (Ed.), *Services Marketing Self-Portraits: Introspections, Reflections, and Glimpses from the Experts*, American Marketing Association, Chicago, pp. 189-207.

Zeithaml, V.A. and Bitner, M.J. (1996), *Services Marketing*, The McGraw-Hill Companies Inc., New York.

Figure 1. International Collaboration Space

Note: Figure presents the optimal 2-dimensional configuration according to MDS (stress I = .11). Abbreviation: Switzer = Switzerland, Malaysi = Malaysia, Netherl = Netherlands, New Zea = New Zealand, Portuga = Portugal, ROC = Taiwan, Singapo = Singapore, Sloveni = Slovenia, South A = South Africa, South K = South Korea, Thailan = Thailand, UAE = United Arab Emirates.

Tables

Table I. Number of Service Articles in top Marketing Journals over time (1982-2011)

	Total Number of Articles			Number of Service Articles			Service Ratio (%)		
	1982-1991	1992-2001	2002-2011	1982-1991	1992-2001	2002-2011	1982-1991	1992-2001	2002-2011
European Journal of Marketing	465	539	682	99	115	183	21.3	21.3	26.8
International Journal of Research in Marketing	171	254	269	9	24	43	5.3	9.4	16
Journal of Consumer Research	460	373	685	21	14	45	4.6	3.8	6.6
Journal of Marketing	333	299	451	33	56	93	9.9	18.7	20.6
Journal of Marketing Research	446	380	586	14	38	59	3.1	10	10.1
Journal of Retailing	220	220	314	38	62	83	17.3	28.2	26.4
Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science	368	314	454	38	68	126	10.3	21.7	27.8
Marketing Science	239	259	544	13	38	78	5.4	14.7	14.3
Total	2,702	2,638	3,985	265	415	710	9.8	15.7	17.8

Table II. Author Country Distribution for Selected Journals

	Journal of Marketing	Journal of Retailing	European Journal of Marketing	Journal of Service Research	Journal of Services Marketing	Managing Service Quality	Journal of Service Management	Service Industries Journal
USA	436	399	134	402	670	204	173	216
UK	5	9	228	39	112	204	105	928
Taiwan	0	2	6	6	3	5	41	329
Australia	5	13	63	44	106	52	32	46
Spain	1	2	20	9	10	0	34	241
Canada	18	24	28	28	40	12	25	60
Netherlands	17	19	28	77	2	18	45	28
Germany	19	1	10	41	8	3	28	37
China	7	5	22	5	22	7	3	34
France	3	0	15	4	4	0	9	73
Sweden	2	0	19	17	14	33	80	47
South Korea	1	1	3	1	25	1	11	44
Israel	3	7	6	13	4	1	9	15
Singapore	2	4	4	11	12	12	17	15
Finland	0	0	15	0	3	7	36	27
Portugal	0	2	7	5	3	0	1	38
Norway	0	1	11	9	3	15	12	15
Italy	0	2	2	6	3	0	19	19
New Zealand	1	0	19	10	13	4	17	18
Greece	0	0	19	0	20	15	3	7