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The present study outlines the development of a scale for customer value measurement and begins with a brief discussion of the origins of the customer value construct with two aspects: merchandise and differentiation value. In order to scale development after literature review, the related items were created. In this respect, employing literature on construct of customer value and seeking opinions of marketing experts. After test of validity and reliability in the next step, in order to conduct the main study, students in graduate and Ph.D. program of studies in Tehran area who have at least some experiences of buying the intended products (laptops and perfume and eau de cologne) were used. In total, 278 questionnaires were completed and gathered. In the other step, exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) were used. Final measure was designed consisting of 14 items; 8 items for merchandise value and 6 items for differentiation value. The present research showed that customer value in addition to physical and material aspects and comparison of product prices, also includes feeling and enjoyment associated with purchasing product and in some products, the latter type of value is more prominence.
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INTRODUCTION

The study of customer value is becoming significantly more important, both in research and in practice (Graf and Maas, 2008). Although customer value has become the object of much investigation only during the last few years, the value concept has always been “the fundamental basis for all marketing activity” (Holbrook, 1994).

Delivering superior value to customers is an ongoing concern of management in many business markets today, and the value concept is considered one of the most popular constructs among business managers and academia (Ravald and Gronroos, 1996). Market share and ultimately corporate profitability depend heavily on perceived customer value (Huber et al., 2007). Holbrook (1994: 22) goes as far as stating that value can be considered ‘... the fundamental basis for all marketing activities’.

Value creation has been a popular area in consumer and industrial marketing research and the interest is equally extensive in academia and industry (Heinonen, 2004). Creating and delivering customer value is seen as a cornerstone of marketing and competitive strategy and relationship management (Berghman et al., 2006) and understanding a customer’s value position is an important management tool for improving customer service delivery (Olaru et al., 2008).

Identifying and creating customer value is regarded as an essential prerequisite for long-term company survival and success (Porter, 1996; Woodruff, 1997). Understanding the way customer’s judge and value a service or product is crucial to achieving a competitive advantage. Scientists and practitioners have recognized the power of the customer value concept in identifying value for customers and managing customer behavior (Graf and Mass, 2008). In the context of global competition, offering...
the customer a product or service that has superior value is believed to be the best way to gain an advantage among competitors (Woodruff, 1997).

However, remarkably few firms have the knowledge and capability to actually assess value and gain an equitable return for the value they deliver to customers. Organizations therefore need to understand what drivers create value for customers in order to build a competitive advantage (Lapeer, 2000).

Customer value theory (Woodruff, 1997) stresses the importance of understanding customer perceptions of value-in-use and building the customer value hierarchy model. Suppliers are supposed to learn about customer value, create it and develop delivery processes. Yet, the value construct is complex and its use within the literature varies considerably (Olaru et al., 2008).

If it is true that retail customers are “value-driven” (Sweeney and Soutar, 2001), then managers need to understand what customers’ value and where they should focus their attention to achieve this needed market place advantage (Woodruff, 1997).

Despite value’s importance, however, there has been relatively little empirical research to develop an in-depth understanding of the concept. Even less research has focused on specifying its domain or on developing a practical and operational perceived value scale. In other hand many of researches used single item and single dimension for customer value measurement (Cretu and Brodie, 2007; Brodie et al., 2009). Therefore, this research is trying to explore on multidimensions of customer value. The objectives of the research are:

1. To discuss the origins of the customer value construct and its dimensions.
2. To investigate the development of a scale for customer value along two important dimensions: merchandise and differentiation value.

Some previous researches into marketing have emphasized the scale building for customer value. For example, Sweeney and Soutar (2001) developed a 19-item measure that can be used to assess customers' perceptions of the value of consumer durable goods at a brand level. The measure was developed for use in a retail purchase situation to determine what consumption values drive purchase attitude and behavior.

Four distinct, value dimensions emerged that were termed emotional, social, quality/performance and price/value for money. The reliability and validity of the scale was assessed in a pre-purchase situation, using exploratory and confirmatory analyses. All four value dimensions were found to help significantly in explaining attitudes and behavior.

In other research, Huber et al. (2007) indicated the customer value construct is reflected across four dimensions, that is, emotional, practical, logical and risk components. In industrial market context, Lapierrre (2000) argued the 13 value drivers were modeled as measure variables determined by the following three latent variables: product, service and relationship.

In other research, Roig et al. (2006) found that perceived value was a multidimensional construct composed of six dimensions: functional value of the establishment; functional value of the personnel; functional value of the service; functional value price; emotional value; and social value. Heinonen (2004) developed a conceptual model of customer perceived value and empirically investigated. By linking value and quality models, customer perceived value is conceptualized as a function of benefit and sacrifice of technical, functional, temporal and spatial value dimensions. The empirical findings indicate that time and location are perceived as important value dimensions and that they are even more important dimensions than outcome and process elements.

THE CONCEPT OF CUSTOMER VALUE

Customer value is the net benefits a customer obtains from a product or a store. Customer value has received enduring research interests in marketing area for the past two decades (Zeithaml, 1988; Dodds et al., 1991; Holbrook, 1994; Chen and Dubinsky, 2003). It plays a key role in predicting customer choice.

While the marketing literature contains a variety of definitions stressing different aspects of the concept, Ulaga (2003) four recurring characteristics identified: (1) Customer value is a subjective concept (Kortge and Okonkwo, 1993); (2) it is conceptualized as a trade-off between benefits and sacrifices (Zeithaml, 1988); (3) benefits and sacrifices can be multifaceted (Grisaffe and Kumar, 1998); and (4) value perceptions are relative to competition (Gale, 1994). In short, customer value is generally defined as the trade-off between the benefits (“what you get”) and the sacrifices (“what you give”) in a market exchange (Zeithaml, 1988).

Typically, most definitions and conceptualizations focus on the economic worth of tangible outcomes (Hansen et al., 2008). Anderson and Narus (1990: 5) suggest a broader conceptualization, and define value as “…the worth in monetary terms of the economic, technical, service and social benefits a customer receives in exchange for the price it pays for a product offering”.

Anderson et al. (1993) define value in business markets as “the perceived worth in monetary units of the set of economic, technical, service, and social benefits received by a customer firm in exchange for the price paid for a product offering, taking into consideration the available alternative supplier’s offerings and prices.”

Zeithaml (1988) has suggested that perceived value can be regarded as a “consumer’s overall assessment of the utility of a product (or service) based on perceptions of what is received and what is given.” She referred to
this assessment as a comparison of a product or service’s ‘get’ and ‘give’ components. Clearly, these two components (quality and price) have different and differential effects on perceived value for money.

Zeithaml (1988) argued that some consumers perceive value when there is a low price, others perceive value when there is a balance between quality and price. Thus, for different consumers, the components of perceived value might be differentially weighted. Additionally, Zeithaml (1988) found that some consumers obtained value from all relevant ‘get’ and ‘give’ components, leading to her definition of perceived value.

Ulaga and Eggert (2006) also maintain the trade-off notion, but they stress the multifaceted nature of the benefits and sacrifices in this trade-off, shifting the focus away from tangibles to some extent. As a contrast, Wilson (1995) defines value in a relationship as the outcomes that result from a collaborative relationship that enhance the competitive abilities of the partners. Newman (1988) showed value as the benefits received by the customer divided by the resources sacrificed to acquire them. Formally, the conceptualization can be portrayed as in Equation (1),

\[ CV = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} B_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} S_i} \]  

(1)

Where CV is a function of the total sum of benefits (B) received divided by the total sum of sacrifices (S) made by the customer to receive the benefits. Roig et al. (2006) indicated two important characteristics in customer value. First, it is inherent to the use of the product, which differentiates it from personal or organizational values. Second, it is perceived by customers, and cannot be determined objectively by the seller. Only the customer is able to perceive whether or not a product or service offers value.

Flint et al. (1997) state that value can be approached in three different directions: values, desired values, and value judgements. According to this classification, “value” in a business context is defined as “centrally held enduring core beliefs, desired end-states, or higher order goals of the individual customer or customer organization that guide behavior”.

Desired customer values, to the contrary, are “the customers’ perceptions of what they want to have happen in a specific kind of use situation, with the help of a product or service offering, to accomplish a desired purpose or goal” (Woodruff and Gardial, 1996). A value judgement is “the customer’s assessment of the value that has been created for them by a supplier given the trade-offs between all relevant benefits and sacrifices in a specific-use situation” (Flint et al., 1997).

Chaudhuri (2006: 133) proposed a model that describes two routes from these two types of value leading to different outcomes. First, merchandise value leads to satisfaction, repatronage intent, and customer share. This route, based on cognitions of what is received versus what is sacrificed, is utilitarian in nature and derives from a rational approach to shopping. Second, differentiation value leads to positive affect, commitment, and willingness to pay. This second route, based on store differentiation and uniqueness, is affective in nature and derives from a hedonic approach to shopping.

Merchandise value amounts to the customer’s perception of the tangible and intangible (that is, quality) elements of a store’s products weighed against the sacrifices (that is, price, time, etc.) that the customer has to make to obtain these products. Differentiation value is the customer’s perception of the favorable uniqueness of the store’s quality relative to the quality of alternative stores. Whereas merchandise value occurs when good quality merchandise is offered for a low price (that is, a “good deal”), differentiation value normally occurs when the highest quality (in terms of tangible and/or intangible quality attributes) is offered at a higher price over that of other stores (Chaudhuri, 2006: 134).

The rationale for suggesting only two basic types of value is grounded in the literature on marketing and consumer behavior, in which the notion of value has also been associated with two basic types: hedonic and utilitarian value (Babin et al., 1994; Holbrook and Hirschman, 1982). This is also in conformity with the definitions of merchandise value, which involves cognitions arising out of the consideration of the benefits versus costs (utilitarian value) of a store, and differentiation value, which leads to feelings of enjoyment and the like (hedonic value) arising out of the knowledge of the perceived superiority of certain attributes of a store versus other stores (Chaudhuri, 2006: 136).

Babin et al. (1994) indicated value recognizing both (1) a utilitarian outcome resulting from some type of conscious pursuit of an intended consequence and (2) an outcome related more to spontaneous hedonic responses captures a basic duality of rewards for much human behavior. It reflects the distinction between performing an act “to get something” as opposed to doing it because “you love it”. For example, people can gain extrinsic rewards (monetary awards, prizes, etc.) from participation in competitive events, but they can also gain a more intrinsic, personal, and emotional reward from competitively derived pleasure.

Utilitarian consumer behavior has been described as ergic, task-related, and rational (Batra and Ahtola, 1991; Babin et al., 1994). Utilitarian value might depend on whether the particular consumption need stimulating the shopping trip was accomplished. Often, this means a product is purchased in a deliberate and efficient manner. Compared to utilitarian aspects, hedonic value is more subjective and personal than its utilitarian counterpart and results more from fun and playfulness than from task completion (Holbrook and Hirschman, 1982). Thus, hedonic value reflects shopping’s potential entertainment and emotional worth (Babin et al., 1994). Therefore,
merchandise value and differentiation value lead to utilitarian and hedonic value, respectively (Chaudhuri, 2006: 137).

In this study we use merchandise and differentiation value type of customer value for scale development and consider two type products that is, utilitarian and hedonic product.

METHODOLOGY

Scale development procedures

Development of initial set of scale items

Based on process proposed by Gilbert and Churchill (1979) in relation to development of an appropriate measure in marketing, the first step is to study the scope of the intended construct that is, searching literature in relation to it. After literature review, the related items should be created. In this respect, employing literature on construct of customer value and seeking opinions of Ph.D. students of marketing with fulfillment of a questionnaire about relevant items for measurement of customer value, 61 items were extracted. These items were formulated based on existing literature research on customer value and opinions of Ph. D. students of marketing on the intended constructs in present study included merchandise or utilitarian value with 31 items and differentiation or hedonic value with 30 items. Then the next step was followed; the items were formulated using semantic differential scale.

Purification of items

After formulating the related items using five points semantic differential scale, fitness of items to intended construct were examined by 9 Ph. D. students of marketing. We asked from each participant in scale items evaluation that determines opinions about extracted items (that is, “is not relevant” and “is very relevant”). In this respect, content validity was focused and Lawshe coefficient (content validity ratio = CVR) was calculated. Based on this coefficient (0.78 for 9 referees), the items considered irrelevant by marketing experts were eliminated and number of items decreased to 31 ones including 20 items for merchandise value and 11 items for differentiation value.

Product selection

In order to choose a stimulus for gathering data from consumers and consider merchandise and differentiation value in stimulus, utilitarian and hedonic products were chosen based on Holbrook and Hirschman’s (1982) approach. In order to choose these two types of products, six products were chosen based on previous research (Park and Moon, 2003) consisting of: laptops, cell phones, digital cameras, perfume and eau de cologne, watches and blue jeans.

Two product types were chosen using Vaughn (1986) scale and 57 students participated in this process. After collection of data, based on Batra and Ahtola’s (1991) approach that one product may have both utilitarian and hedonic elements but that even so products can be characterised as primarily hedonic or utilitarian, the product obtained the highest average in relation to items on utilitarian products and the lowest one on relation to items on hedonic product was chosen as utilitarian product and the product obtained the highest average in relation to items on hedonic products and the lowest one on relation to items on utilitarian product was chosen as hedonic product. The product for utilitarian side was laptop with average of 2.9 and 1.4 for utilitarian and hedonic product items, respectively and chosen product for hedonic side was perfume and eau de cologne with averages of 3 and 1.25 for hedonic and utilitarian products, respectively.

Pretest

In order to purify the items and examining reliability, 45 questionnaires consisting of 31 extracted items in relation to laptops and perfume and eau de cologne were distributed and collected. Cranach’s α extracted using SPSS software was equal to 0.79. In order to increase α value, the items that would increase this value were deleted. Eliminating 6 irrelevant items increase α value to 0.853. At the end this step of present study, total number of items decreased to 25; 15 items for merchandise value and 10 items of differentiation value.

Main study

In the next step, in order to conduct the main study, students in M.A. and Ph.D. program of studies in Tehran area who have at least on experience of buying the intended products (laptops and perfume and eau de cologne) were used. In total, 278 questionnaires were completed and gathered. Based on collected data, 53% of sample consisted of females and the rest (47%) were males. Also 78% of students were in M.A. program of studies and 22% in Ph. D.

RESULTS

In first phase after data collection, exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was employed using SPSS software. In order to ensure adequacy of sample for conducting EFA, Kaiser-Meyer-Olin (KMO) test was used and value of 0.756 was reported which suggests adequacy of sample for conducting EFA. After conducting EFA, irrelevant items were deleted. Commonalities are shown in Table 1. Commonalities below 0.5 were eliminated because of irrelevancy of items. At the end of EFA, items were decreased to 22; 14 for merchandise value and 8 for differentiation value.

In the next step and based on previous research (Babin et al., 1994; Lapierre, 2000; Sweeney and sotuar, 2001), confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) using LISREL software was conducted in order to purify the measure. Extracted model was of good fitness (RMSEA = 0.08, CFI = 0.95, NFI = 0.91, NNFI = 0.92, GFI = 0.91).

Employing t-value reported in model irrelevant items were eliminated and total items decreased to 14: 8 for merchandise value and 6 for differentiation value. All value for standardized factor loading was above 0.5. Composite reliability and average variance extracted (AVE) were also extracted and statistical data are summarized in Table 2. Data suggest presence of reliability.

Also using method described by Fornell and Larker (1981) in which shared variance is compared with AVE and AVE of each construct should be greater than the shared variance with any other construct, it was concluded that discriminant validity is confirmed.
Table 1. Communalities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Extraction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Merch. 1</td>
<td>0.577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merch. 2</td>
<td>0.771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merch. 3</td>
<td>0.624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merch. 4</td>
<td>0.672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merch. 5</td>
<td>0.817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merch. 6</td>
<td>0.779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merch. 7</td>
<td>0.778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merch. 8</td>
<td>0.726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merch. 9</td>
<td>0.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merch. 10</td>
<td>0.696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merch. 11</td>
<td>0.673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merch. 12</td>
<td>0.663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merch. 13</td>
<td>0.615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merch. 14</td>
<td>0.656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merch. 15</td>
<td>0.653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diff. 1</td>
<td>0.605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diff. 2</td>
<td>0.586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diff. 3</td>
<td>0.678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diff. 4</td>
<td>0.484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diff. 5</td>
<td>0.473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diff. 6</td>
<td>0.781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diff. 7</td>
<td>0.758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diff. 8</td>
<td>0.630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diff. 9</td>
<td>0.632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diff. 10</td>
<td>0.626</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Merch: Items for merchandise value. Diff: Items for differentiation value.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Purpose of the present study was to develop a measure for customer value which is based on Chaudhuri’s (2006) approach, consist of merchandise and differentiation value leading to utilitarian and hedonic value. Based on paradigm proposed by Gilbert and Churchill (1979), research step was designed and after conducting reliability and validity tested and EFA and CFA, final measure was designed consisting of 14 items; 8 items for merchandise value and 6 items for differentiation value. The present study supported Chaudhuri’s (2006) and Babin’s et al. (1994) views and showed that customer value consist of merchandise or utilitarian value and differentiation or hedonic value. This article describes the development of a practical two-dimensional scale of customer value.

Our study shows that multiple value dimensions explain consumer choice better, both statistically and qualitatively, than does a single ‘value for money’ item and should produce superior results when investigating consumption value.

Our scale suggests that expressions of pure enjoyment, feeling and uniqueness are fundamental aspects of differentiation value. In comparison, cost and price orientation are fundamental aspects of merchandise value.

The present research showed that customer value in addition to physical and material aspects and comparison of product prices, also includes feeling and enjoyment associated with purchasing product and in some products the latter type of value is more prominence. The scale recognizes that consumer value is indicated in both merchandise and differentiation terms.

The customer is portrayed, in a product purchasing context, as both intellectual and emotional. This approach acknowledges that not all consumer behavior is directed toward satisfying some functional, physical, or economic need. Therefore, this model is beginning to evolve into more realistic representations of consumption experiences and customer value, accounting for consumers’ hedonic and emotional sides in addition to any rational brand or store and product choice decisions. This model suggests that in order to gain a better understanding of the customer value construct and its relationships with other constructs, a comprehensive conceptualization that includes various multifaceted perspectives is required. Thus, it is recommended that in measuring customer value, enjoyment and emotional aspects are also considered so that an accurate insight is obtained in relation to customer value.

On the other hand, presenting products to consumers should be done in a way that they feel obtaining both values so that they perceive more value and in this way, marketing activities become more effective. The scale may be useful in testing taxonomy of market place structure hypothesizing that exchange environments have both "economic and festive" implications. This scale might help explain some apparently pleasure-oriented and irrational consumer behaviors. For example, differentiation value may be a key element of impulse buying and representing the hedonic complexity associated with impulse purchasing. Also, recognition of the importance of the different dimensions of value should enable marketers to develop more sophisticated positioning strategies. Our results show the importance of emotional value on consumer’s willingness to buy product category normally considered as functionally oriented. Therefore, marketers should investigate what type of value is important to consumers given their target market and product type so that they can design and formulate their marketing activities based on it and managerial efforts need to be focused on increasing the perceived value of the product offering. However, the model also shows that a targeted use of marketing resources can only be achieved via a deep understanding of the relationships between different value dimensions and different product traits.

Among the limitations of the present study, the one which showed that only one product of each type was
Table 2: Confirmatory factor analysis results and composite reliability and AVE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Customer value</th>
<th>Merchandise value</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor loading</th>
<th>Composite reliability</th>
<th>AVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This product is economically cost-effective*</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>This product is not economically cost-effective</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This product is not of much benefit to me</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>This product is of much benefit to me</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This product is of good quality*</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>This product is not of good quality</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function of this product is not according to my expectations</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Function of this product is according to my expectations</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This product does not meet my needs</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>This product meets my needs</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buying this product is so costly</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Buying this product is not so costly</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This product has not satisfied me</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>This product was satisfied me</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price of this product is not fair*</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Price of this product is fair</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buying this product is not a pleasant experience</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Buying this product is a pleasant experience</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This product is not distinct from others</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>This product is distinct from other ones</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquiring this product is enjoyable*</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Acquiring this product is not enjoyable</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having this product does not lead me to be admired by others</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Having this product does lead me to be admired by others</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This product creates positive feeling in me*</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>This product does not create positive feeling in me</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having this product does not make me unique among my friends</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Having this product does make me unique among my friends</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marked questions are reverse question/ (Fitness indexes: RMSEA = 0.08, CFI = 0.95, NFI = 0.91, NNFI = 0.92, GFI = 0.91). Composite reliability computed as $(\sum \lambda)^2 / (\sum \lambda)^2 + \sum \text{var}(\epsilon) / \text{Average variance extracted}$, which is the proportion of variance in the construct that is not due to measurement error (Fornell and Larcker, 1981).

considered and another one which showed that students with experience of using this product were studied may have implications in relation to generalizability of the study’s conclusions. Thus in order to generalize the measure extracted in present research, it is recommended that it will be tested among other consumers using more products and reliability and validity of it will be measured in those contexts. Also, future research is needed to develop scales similar to the customer value scale for other consumption contexts and in other culture.
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