# Measuring the dramaturgical quality of the entertainment event experience in shopping centres

### Introduction

Shopping centre entertainment events, such as school holiday events, catwalk shows, and market days, are an experiential marketing strategy widely deployed by shopping centres on a seasonal and strategic basis to create an entertaining and lively atmosphere within their retail spaces (Sit, Merrilees, & Birch, 2003; Tsai, 2010). Those events allow shopping centre managers to provide their customers with another reason to visit the centre, to visit more often, to stay longer and, ultimately, to spend more at their retail spaces (Andreu, Bigne, Chumpitaz, & Swaen, 2006). The effectiveness of these entertainment events in evoking shoppers' patronage behaviours can be measured by the various dramaturgical elements (e.g. the actors, audience, setting and performance) constituting the entertainment event experience, which are captured within the service drama framework (Grove & Fisk, 1992). Such knowledge facilitates the consideration of how those dramaturgical elements can be strategically used to design and deliver a desired entertainment event experience (cf. Minor, Wagner, Brewerton, & Hausman, 2004).

This study aims to contribute to retailing literature by verifying the application of the service drama framework (Grove & Fisk, 1992; Grove, Fisk, & Dorsch, 1998) within the context of shopping centre entertainment events. Extant studies of shopping centre entertainment events have primarily emphasised a non-dramaturgical approach to examining the link between entertainment events and customers' subsequent behaviours (Lotz, Eastlick, Mishra, & Shim, 2010; Parsons, 2003). This approach is parsimonious because it simply examines the presence or absence of an entertainment event and its effect on shoppers' subsequent behaviours. However, such a simplistic approach offers little insight into the various dramaturgical elements emphasised by shoppers when experiencing a shopping centre entertainment event (cf. Lotz et al., 2010; Parsons, 2003). An appreciation of these dramaturgical elements could enhance academics' and practitioners' understanding of the effectiveness of entertainment events in fostering shoppers' loyalty behaviours. Therefore, the objective of this study is twofold: i) identify the elements relevant for measuring the dramaturgical quality of shopping centre entertainment events; ii) examine the interrelationships between those dramaturgical quality elements; and then iii) determine the effect of those dramaturgical quality elements on participants' behaviours. .

### Literature review

Dramaturgical quality refers to the perceived excellence or superiority of a service drama experience (Holbrook & Corfman, 1985; Maklan & Klaus, 2011). When measuring the dramaturgical quality of shopping centre entertainment events, the SERVQUAL framework would appear to be an obvious choice due to its wide citation and examination in the retail marketing literature (Anitsal & Paige, 2006; Long & McMellon, 2004; Wakefield & Blodgett, 1999). SERVQUAL comprises five dimensions: reliability; responsiveness; assurance; empathy; and tangibles (Parasuraman, Zeithaml, & Berry, 1988). However, Minor et al. (2004) argue that SERVQUAL is inappropriate or less meaningful for measuring the experiential quality of hedonic events such as live music performances because it was

primarily designed for utilitarian services such as banking, long-distance telephone service, securities brokerage, and credit card service. Moreover, Minor et al. (2004) contend that SERVQUAL's five dimensions are challenging to apply to crowd-based events such as live music performances due to their collective consumption nature. Such events requires the presence of other individuals, and the co-creation, co-delivery, and co-processing of the experience (Ng, Russell-Bennett, & Dagger, 2007). To address this deficiency, Minor et al. (2004) propose the service drama framework as a more appropriate mechanism for measuring the experiential quality of hedonic, collective events such as live music performances. This service drama framework was developed by Grove and Fisk (1992) and consists of four key dimensions: i) the actors or personnel performing or delivering the service drama; ii) the audience or the customer base or clientele; iii) the setting which comprises ambient conditions, spatial and layout quality, and other props associated with a service drama; and iv) the performance or outcome(s) derived from the interplay between the actors, audience and setting.

Based on the service drama framework together with the findings by Minor et al. (Minor et al., 2004), four broad dimensions are proposed to be relevant for measuring the dramaturgical quality of a shopping centre entertainment event experience: i) the performer/(s); ii) the crowd; iii) the setting; and iv) the behavioural response. The performers (actors) deliver the shopping centre entertainment event (Minor et al., 2004). The crowd (audience) are the participants or spectators at the event (Abbott & Geddie, 2001; Wickham & Kerstetter, 2001). An understanding of the "crowd" is critical for the design and delivery of a desired entertainment event experience because of its collective consumption nature (Ng et al., 2007). The setting is the venue where an entertainment event is staged, including ambient quality, interactivity, compatibility, and convenience in terms of ease and time of access (Crompton, 2003; Minor et al., 2004). The behavioural response (performance) measures consumers' shopping and participation responses to the entertainment event's performance (Michon, Yu, Smith, & Chebat, 2007, 2008). Previous studies typically opt for a cognitive or attitudinal measure of the performance (e.g. satisfaction) (Minor et al., 2004), however, this study opts for a behavioural measure because entertainment events are ultimately staged to stimulate consumers to undertake patronage and spending activities at the shopping centre place. The behavioural response is hypothesised as a function of the performer, the crowd, and the setting. Therefore, the objective of this study is twofold: i) identify relevant dramaturgical elements that define the experiential quality of shopping centre entertainment events; ii) examine the interrelationship among those dramaturgical elements.

### Methodology

Based on the literature review and preliminary investigations (in-depth interviews with eight shopping centre managers and focus group discussions with four distinct groups of entertainment-event participants), a list of eighteen (18) items was developed to measure Experiential Quality (Andreu et al., 2006; Minor et al., 2004; Wickham & Kerstetter, 2001). Face-validity testing was conducted on the items with 34 randomly-selected shoppers at a school holiday event to check for semantic or phrasing issues. The validated items were embedded into a questionnaire and measured on a 5-point Likert-type agreement scale. The questionnaire also captured demographic characteristics including gender, age and household status. The questionnaire was administered to 280 participants at two varied family-oriented entertainment events (Family Week Festival and Let's Dance) at two varied shopping centres

located in South East Queensland (Australia). Family-oriented mall entertainment events were chosen as a starting point for investigation because family consumers generally represent a key market segment of shopping centres (Evans, Christiansen, & Gill, 1996; Roy, 1994; Talpade & Haynes, 1997). Systematic random sampling strategy was used wherein a field researcher attended each of the events and invited every third participant encountered to complete the questionnaire.

## **Results**

The majority of respondents were females (75%), aged between 26 and 50 years (64%), and family shoppers with school-aged children below 12 years old (49%), as would be expected given the family-focused entertainment events included in this study. Almost two-thirds of the respondents (64%) reported that they did not visit the mall exclusively for the entertainment events but also for other reasons, namely, shopping for fashion (30%), window shopping (25%), shopping for food (21%), and meeting family or friends (13%), supporting that a shopping centre offers a broad range of utilitarian and hedonic activities (Martin & Turley, 2004; Roy, 1994). On the whole, the respondents were interested in the shopping centre entertainment events, with interest levels ranging from 'some' interest (23%), 'moderate' (30%), 'quite a lot' (20%), to 'a great deal' of interest (9%).

Principal components analysis (PCA) with a varimax rotation was conducted (Table 1). The PCA presented four factors (eigenvalue greater than 1) that accounted for 67.12 percent of the total variance explained, indicating a well-explained factor solution (Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson, & Tatham, 2006). The loading items, percentage of the variance explained, Cronbach's alpha, and descriptive statistics of these four factors are also presented in Table 1. All four factors achieved very robust reliability (Cronbach's alpha over 0.70) (Kline, 1998). These four factors were labelled as "setting," "crowd," "behavioural response," and "performer." These factors were then converted into summated or composite factors to enable regression analysis whereby "behavioural response" is hypothesized as a function of "performer," "crowd," and "setting" (Table 2).

"Setting" refers to the ambient quality of an entertainment event, which achieved the highest variance explained (40.0%) and the most favourable rating ( $\bar{x}$ =4.03, SD=0.55). Consistent with the extant retail literature (Grewal, Baker, Levy, & Voss, 2003; Michon et al., 2008), this finding reinforces the importance of atmospherics in creating and delivering retail customer experience. "Performer" relates to the artistes that deliver an entertainment event. Although it scored the lowest variance explained (7.0%), it had a fairly favourable rating ( $\bar{x}$ =3.45, SD=0.83), and thus denotes its experiential prominence within the context of shopping centre entertainment events. "Crowd" is about the crowd condition at an entertainment event and the extent to which it contributes to the experience. Its variance explained was the second highest (11.8%) and its descriptive statistic was moderately favourable ( $\bar{x}$ =3.42, SD=0.82). "Behavioural response" focuses on consumers' subsequent patronage and participation activities evoked by an entertainment event. It accounted for a moderate percentage of variance explained (8.3%) and achieved fairly favourable rating ( $\bar{x}$ =3.61, SD=0.67).

Table 1: Factor and reliability analyses

| Item    | Variance   | Cronbach's  | Mean  |
|---------|--|---|---|
| loading | explained  | alpha   | (SD)*   |
|         |  |   |   |
|         | 40.0%  | 0.87  | 4.09 (0.68)   |
|         |  |   | 4.04 (0.67)   |
| 0.77    |  |   | 4.05 (0.70)   |
| 0.75    |  |   | 4.18 (0.64)   |
| 0.68    |  |   | 3.85 (0.83)   |
| 0.61    |  |   | 3.95 (0.78)   |
|         |  |   |   |
| 0.86    | 11.8%  | 0.90  | 3.47 (0.88)   |
| 0.83    |  |   | 3.44 (0.91)   |
| 0.83    |  |   | 3.35 (0.92)   |
|         |  |   |   |
| 0.82    | 8.3%   | 0.83  | 3.31 (1.03)   |
| 0.79    |  |   | 3.10 (1.03)   |
| 0.64    |  |   | 3.87 (0.84)   |
| 0.59    |  |   | 3.45 (1.07)   |
|         |  |   | , ,   |
| 0.50    |  |   | 3.45 (1.07)   |
|         |  |   | ,   |
| 0.40    |  |   | 3.90 (0.84)   |
|         |  |   | , ,   |
|         |  |   |   |
| 0.91    | 7.0%   | 0.84  | 3.14 (1.24)   |
| 0.82    |  |   | 3.10 (1.13)   |
| 0.67    |  |   | 3.55 (0.98)   |
|         |  |   | , -,  |
|         | 0.82<br>0.81<br>0.77<br>0.75<br>0.68<br>0.61<br>0.86<br>0.83<br>0.83<br>0.83<br>0.82<br>0.79<br>0.64<br>0.59<br>0.50<br>0.40 | loading explained   0.82 40.0%   0.81 0.77   0.75 0.68   0.61 11.8%   0.83 0.83   0.82 8.3%   0.79 0.64   0.59 0.50   0.40 7.0%   0.82 7.0% | loading explained alpha   0.82 40.0% 0.87   0.81 0.77 0.75   0.68 0.61 0.90   0.83 0.83 0.90   0.82 8.3% 0.83   0.79 0.64 0.59   0.50 0.40 0.84   0.91 7.0% 0.84   0.82 0.84 0.84 |

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy=0.88; Barlett's test, p-value=.00 (chi-square=2850.61, degree of freedom=153); total variance explained=67.12%.

Table 2: Inter-correlations and regression analysis of summated experiential quality dimensions

|                                | Mean (SD)                             | Behavioural<br>Response (DV) | Performer (IV)  | Crowd (IV)       | Setting (IV)   |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------|
| Behavioural<br>Response        | 3.61 (0.67)                           |                              |                 |                  |                |
| Performer                      | 3.45 (0.83)                           | 0.56**                       |                 |                  |                |
| Crowd                          | 3.42 (0.82)                           | 0.52**                       | 0.58**          |                  |                |
| Setting                        | 4.03 (0.55)                           | 0.48**                       | 0.46**          | 0.46**           |                |
| Performer→Behavioural Response |                                       | β=0.33, t=5.67**             |                 |                  |                |
| Crowd→Behavioural Response     |                                       | β=0.22, t=3.68**             |                 |                  |                |
| Setting→Behavioural Response   |                                       | β=0.23, t=4.18**             |                 |                  |                |
| R <sup>2</sup> =0.40, F=63.38  | **                                    |                              |                 |                  |                |
|                                | e<0.00; DV=depeneta value, t=t value. | dent variable; IV=           | independent var | riable; SD=stanc | lard deviation |

<sup>\*</sup> Items measured on a five point agreement scale with 5 being strongly agree and 1 being strongly disagree.

## **Discussion and Implications**

Based on the service drama framework, four elements are identified to be relevant for measuring the dramaturgical quality of the entertainment event experience in a shopping centre, namely, "performer," "crowd," "setting," and "behavioural response." These four elements are structurally and positively related to each other, whereby "performer" exerts the highest positive effect on "behavioural response," followed by "setting," and "crowd." These findings, albeit preliminary in nature, suggest that the hosting of famous and recognisable performer(s) at an entertainment event can effectively conjure people's recognition of and instil their confidence in the entertainment event, and in turn trigger participation and shopping responses to the event. Consistent with extant literature (Minor et al., 2004), these findings verify the significance of ambient conditions and ease of spatial and temporal access in creating and delivering a hedonic event experience. Nevertheless, this study expands the setting concept proposed by the service drama framework by identifying other dramaturgical attributes relevant for the shopping centre entertainment event experience such as event interactivity and event compatibility to the target audience.

This study extends the retail marketing literature by illuminating the positive role that human crowd potentially plays in creating and delivering the desired experience of a hedonic collective event such as a shopping centre entertainment event. Extant retail marketing studies (Eroglu & Harrell, 1986; Eroglu & Machleit, 1990) have typically emphasised the negative effects of human crowd on the shopper experience. On the contrary, this study suggests that a socially dynamic experience is desired by the participants or spectators of a shopping centre entertainment event. Hence, when staging a collective hedonic event, retailers should seek to strategically entice, amass, and manage the audience that is conducive to create and deliver socially dynamic experience at the entertainment event (Grove & Fisk, 1997).

In conclusion, the findings of this study are not conclusive and thus require further validation and development. To strengthen validity and reliability, future research may consider testing the proposed list of dramaturgical quality elements with other or a larger sample of family-oriented entertainment events, as well as with other types of entertainment events (e.g. fashion shows and market days). Advanced analysis techniques (e.g. structural equation modelling) can be applied to more critically examine the interrelationship amongst those four identified dramaturgical elements.

#### References

- Abbott, J. A. L., & Geddie, M. (2001). Event and venue management: Minimizing liability through effective crowd management techniques. *Event Management*, 6, 259-270.
- Andreu, L., Bigne, E., Chumpitaz, R., & Swaen, V. (2006). How does the perceived retail environment influence consumers' emotional experience? evidence from two retail settings. *International Review of Retail, Distribution & Consumer Research*, 16(5), 559-578.
- Anitsal, I., & Paige, R. C. (2006). An Exploratory Study on Consumer Perceptions of Service Quality in Technology-Based Self-Service. [Article]. *Services Marketing Quarterly*, 27(3), 53-67. doi: 10.1300/J396v27n0304
- Crompton, J. L. (2003). Adapting Herzberg: A conceptualization of the effects of hygiene and motivator attributes on perceptions of event quality. *Journal of Travel Research*, 41(3), 305-310.
- Eroglu, S., & Harrell, G. (1986). Retail crowding: Theoretical and strategic implications. *Journal of Retailing*, 62(4), 346-363.
- Eroglu, S., & Machleit, K. (1990). An empirical study of retail crowding: antecedents and consequences. *Journal of Retailing*, 66, 201-221.
- Evans, K., Christiansen, T., & Gill, J. (1996). The impact of social influence and role expectations on shopping centre patronage intentions. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 24(3), 208-218.
- Grewal, D., Baker, J., Levy, M., & Voss, G. B. (2003). The effects of wait expectations and store atmosphere evaluations on patronage intentions in service-intensive retail stores. *Journal of Retailing*, 79, 259-268.
- Grove, S. J., & Fisk, R. P. (1992). The Service Experience as Theater. [Article]. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 19(1), 455-461.
- Grove, S. J., & Fisk, R. P. (1997). The impact of other customers on service experiences: a critical incident examination of "getting along". *Journal of Retailing*, 73(1), 63-85.
- Grove, S. J., Fisk, R. P., & Dorsch, M. J. (1998). Assessing the theatrical components of the service encounter: A cluster analysis examination. *Service Industries Journal*, 18(3), 116-134.
- Hair, J. H., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E., & Tatham, R. L. (2006). *Multivariate Data Analysis* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Holbrook, M., & Corfman, K. P. (1985). Quality and value in the consumption experience: Phaedrus rides again. In J. Jacoby & J. Olson (Eds.), *Perceived Quality: How Consumers View Stores and Merchandise* (pp. 31-57). Lexington, MA.: Lexington.
- Kline, R. B. (1998). *Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modeling*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Long, M., & McMellon, C. (2004). Exploring the determinants of retail service quality on the internet. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 18(1), 78-90.
- Lotz, S. L., Eastlick, M. A., Mishra, A., & Shim, S. (2010). Understanding patrons' participation in activities at entertainment malls. [Article]. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 38(6), 402-422. doi: 10.1108/09590551011045366
- Maklan, S., & Klaus, P. (2011). Customer experience. [Article]. *International Journal of Market Research*, 53(6), 771-792.

- Martin, C. A., & Turley, L. W. (2004). Malls and consumption motivation: an exploratory examination of older Generation Y consumers. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 32(10), 464-475.
- Michon, R., Yu, H., Smith, D., & Chebat, J.-C. (2007). The shopping experience of female fashion leaders. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 35(6), 488-501.
- Michon, R., Yu, H., Smith, D., & Chebat, J.-C. (2008). The influence of mall environment on female fashion shoppers' value and behaviour. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management*, 12(4), 456-468.
- Minor, M., Wagner, T., Brewerton, F., & Hausman, A. (2004). Rock on! An elementary model of customer satisfaction with musical performances. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 18(1), 7-18.
- Ng, S., Russell-Bennett, R., & Dagger, T. (2007). A typology of mass services: the role of service delivery and consumption purpose in classifying service experiences. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 21(7), 471-480.
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1988). SERVQUAL: a multiple-item scale for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality. *Journal of Retailing*, 64(1), 12-40.
- Parsons, A. G. (2003). Assessing the effectiveness of shopping mall promotions: customer analysis. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 31(2), 74-79.
- Roy, A. (1994). Correlates of mall visit frequency. Journal of Retailing, 70(2), 139-161.
- Sit, J., Merrilees, B., & Birch, D. (2003). Entertainment-seeking shopping centre patrons: the missing segments. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 31(2), 80-94.
- Talpade, S., & Haynes, J. (1997). Consumer shopping behavior in malls with large scale entertainment centers. *The Mid-Atlantic Journal of Business*, 33(2), 153-162.
- Tsai, S. (2010). Shopping mall management and entertainment experience: a cross-regional investigation. *Service Industries Journal*, 30(3), 321-337.
- Wakefield, K., & Blodgett, J. (1999). Customer response to intangible and tangible service factors. *Psychology & Marketing*, 16(1), 52-68.
- Wickham, T. D., & Kerstetter, D. L. (2001). The relationship between place attachment and crowding in an event setting. *Event Management*, 6, 167-174.