BUILDING BRAND EQUITY THROUGH USER EXPERIENCE DESIGN

Rares MOCANU

National University of Political Studies and Public Administration
6 Povernei St., Sector 1, 010374 Bucharest, Romania
rares.mocanu@facultateademanagement.ro

Andreea MITAN

National University of Political Studies and Public Administration
6 Povernei St., Sector 1, 010374 Bucharest, Romania
andreea.mitan@facultateademanagement.ro

Abstract: *Companies are more and more interested in providing a positive user experience (UX). The aim is to offer a smooth and pleasant experience with the application at hand. In the given context, opportunities should be shown how new marketing strategies consider a digital product from the beginning as an integral part of the corporate communication by the user experience purposefully and in the interaction with a mark is designed. The in-depth understanding and focused management of the Customer Experience (CX) and User Experience (UX) will be critical to future market presence. This includes the holistic view of customer experience, user experience and brand experience as inseparably interlinked disciplines. It is of central importance that each of the three "experiences" is largely subconscious and thus the perception, which is triggered in the interaction with digital products, can be specifically influenced.*

Keywords: *brand experience; user experience; consumer experience management; digital marketing; user journey; experience mapping; user persona; digital touchpoints.*

Introduction

The concept of customer experience was first introduced in 1998 by Jow Pine and Jim Gilmore in the context of an article in the "Harvard Business Review" (Gilmore 2009). Based on the recognition that the economic value of experiences over time surpassed those of products or services and by following an well designed customer experience management (CEM) the companies are able to create a holistic positive customer experience. The aim of CEM is to design and elaborate intense emotional bond resulting from all their interactions with the brand during the customer life cycle in order to increase customer satisfaction, loyalty and advocacy. The Customer Experience (CX) includes all interactions that a person can have with a company or brand which often includes awareness, discovery, cultivation, advocacy, purchases and quality service.

CX combines all those disciplines that were often considered separately so far and assessed: brand, advertising, service management, product management and distribution. An equal, coherent and credible at all contact points, brand experience is the main concern of the CEM. Consumers are not looking at a brands as a collection of different, strategically scheduled operations from marketing, sales or advertising. They experienced a brand holistically, mostly unconsciously, and not that differentiated through which point of contact that is addressed. And yet the consumer makes the decision if he likes a brand or not, based on his experiences at the contact points with

the brand as they are used to reinforce or to build the basic premise of the brand (Courage at al., 2009, p.4791).

The traditionally business model follow consumers based on a linear journey of brand purchase – first the consumer became aware of a brand, learned of a desirable quality it had (through advertising), and consciously decided to purchase it. After personally experiencing the benefits for themselves they became loyal buyers. It's most likely that consumers were always more complex than this and with the arrival of digital brand ecosystems along with the insights gained from behavioural economics it is proven that brand builders need to move on to a more accurate model of consumer decision journeys. The concept of shifting from a 'funnel' to a 'cycle' (first discussed by McKinsey) or even a more complex "experience matrix" system that will mapping out what the consumer does through to the interaction, decision and purchase moments makes sense.

Delivering relevant, branded touchpoint experiences becomes a lot more manageable when marketers clearly understand the needs of the people they are delivering those experiences for – and which touchpoints matter most to those people. The problem they currently face is that the technology used to reach audiences across digital touchpoints has tended to obscure any meaningful sense of who they are targeting and why. When brands' use of programmatic is driven primarily by behaviour, it becomes blind to the people they are interacting with – and the experiences those people might desire in relation with brand promise. Instead, marketers find themselves delivering the same experiences across all touchpoints, driven solely by the last action that people took. At a time when they need to be increasingly nuanced and responsive, this is the wrong way to go. When brands base their programmatic targeting on digital segmentation they tend to transform their results, because they focus on creating relevant moments with the people most likely to buy from them (Conner & Sparks, 2005, pp.170-222).

An extensive analysis of these models shows how brand equity and user experience may be understood better if examined in a broader framework that assesses the incremental effect of the brand at each of the various stages of the consumer's experience and choice process and how consumer experience management play a significant role in how determining actions and content (e.g. attributes) are learned and encoded and then retrieved and used in decisions and choice. These information processing effects would influence part-worth evaluation and combination rules, choice set generation and finally the decision rules used in choice. This broader definition extends the aggregate conceptualization inherent in the "additive" brand impact notion of brand equity (i.e. enhanced attractiveness captured in the utility function) to a more comprehensive approach that focuses on the brand's role across the multi-stage, dynamic consumer experience and choice process (Diamantopoulos at al., 2008, p.1203).

This paper (1) initiates an integration of the multiple extant streams of analyzing user experience, brand equity, consumer learning and brand choice, (2) proposes the incorporation of user experience theories into models of brand choice and brand equity, and (3) suggests a possible synthesis of different brand equity and user experience perspectives. The framework incorporates the new realities, such as the rise of store brands and electronic commerce, which will influence the linkage between brand equity, consumer learning, and user experience.

Brand equity in digital world

Digital will become the loyalty backbone. Many key moments of truth for customers are happening online. This means that more and more of consumers, brand perceptions and attitudes will be based on purely digital interactions (in-app, website, wearable tech, etc.). This has made understanding of customers' digital interactions an essential part of any customer experience program. The voices of consumer (VoC) programs without a web presence engage only 2% to 10% of those who interact with their website (Marketing Sherpa). As we move into the future, this trend will continue. We know that mobile is an inherent part of today's digital experience. Global mobile and tablet internet usage just exceeded desktop use for the first time (GS Stat Counter, 2016) and we also see that 82% of consumers turn to mobile to help make a product decision (Google/Ipsos, 2015).

So it's really no longer a question that, these digital moments, across platforms (mobile, tablet, or desktop) are shaping essential KPIs that will ultimately inform the path to purchase. Nowadays a mobile first mindset and consumer experience design matters more than ever before.

Still there is an ongoing debate among practitioners and business academics about whether brands will retain their importance in this digital experience. As we know brands affect consumer decision rules, choice set formation, perceptions, tastes, perceived risk and information costs; we surmise that each is also differentially affected by the changes that result from the digital experience. To understand the effect of the digital experience on these different roles of brands, we need to understand the differences between the digital and conventional communications, sales and distribution channels (Esposito at al., 2010, pp.207-211). Digital (1) changes the cost for companies and brands to communicate with their customers, which includes lowering the costs of providing consumers with product information and providing companies with opportunities to do market research at lower cost – tracking and diagnosis, gaining actionable insights; (2) it changes the costs for customers to communicate with brands and other consumers by lowering consumers' costs of searching for product information and of participating in discussions with other consumers, and by making it easier for consumers to communicate their preferences to brands along with brand experience; (3) it also changes the form of communication between customers and brands by allowing consumers, for example, to interact about the product both with the company and with other product users; and 4) digital enhances transactional efficiencies (e.g. the cost of executing a transaction).

Therefore we can identify several important aspects now on how digital experience differentially affects various roles of brands; (1) reducing perceived risk and building trust – the new digitally driven metric, "Return on Conversation" – brand engage in a meaningful conversation with individuals and communities which evolves over time – if skillfully and patiently managed, may very well convert to commercial value and long term loyalty based on trust; (2) introducing and keeping a product in consumers' consideration set – lowers consumers' costs of searching for product information; (3) help brand experience extends beyond the awareness and acquisition journey to encompass the sales journey, the product/service usage journey (support), and, lastly, the loyalty/advocacy journey; (4) extends past a single touch point. It includes Facebook ads, billboards, online product pages, and customer service reps. – prospects are

learning about your services from friends and co-workers. As a result consumers are better informed about the quality of search goods and the brand actions. Such consumers may no longer require a brand as a guarantee for product quality since they can assess quality before purchasing the product (Ganglbauer et al., 2009, pp.418-421). It is important to understand that digital experience is not about the next seven days. It is not just a game of clicks received during the time an ad is running. Campaigns and conversions can have a value in immediate returns, but must also be evaluated for longevity. It's about creating digital relationships that go beyond a 'Like' or 'Follow'; relationships that consumers will enjoy and find rewarding long after the brand's investment. As a joint study by SAP, Siegel-Gale, and Shift Thinking suggests in accordance with what makes a brand successful in the digital age – that brands not only have to do things differently they also have to think differently. Where traditional brands focus on positioning their brands in the minds of their customers, digital brands focus on positioning their brands in the lives and doings of their customers. Furthermore, they engage customers more as users than as buyers, shifting their investments from pre-purchase promotion and sales to post-purchase renewal and advocacy so the key is to approach prospects not as buyers, but as future users (Patton, 2012, p.56-60).

Traditional advertising is what brand marketers still use to communicate with their audience – especially TV – but seeking ways to connect with target consumers to leverage their goodwill in terms of feedback following experiences and reshaping brand interaction will help build brand credibility.

We identify five ways in which brands can build equity through digital experience:
        Amplify the Brand Offer – digital experience can amplify the product offer by providing additional benefits.
        Support the Brand Offer – digital setup can support the brand offer making it easier for consumers to make purchase decisions.
        Creating a Brand Building Platform – digital brand-building platforms or a mix of digital assets formed in a comprehensive sequence that delivers a complete brand experience can play a central or leading role.
        Amplifying a Brand Building Platform – digital setup can be used to make brand-building work more effectively. The aim will be to deliver an authentic and consistent total brand experience that is aligned with the brand's strategy, positioning and purpose.

User experience is customer experience

There no exception that companies expose their customers to complicated sales processes, confusing websites and apps, long waiting times for hotlines, incompetent service, incomprehensible communication and their application to complicated products. CEM aims to turn satisfied customers into loyal customers and loyal customers into enthusiastic brand or product ambassadors. It is obvious that in this context not only hard facts such as sales, usage intensity or the value of the shopping cart count. Rather, indirect effects such as word of mouth and referrals become important indicators of a company's success (Finneran & Zhang, 2003, pp.475-496).

Looking at digital products, the user experience should be considered as integral part of the customer experience. As already described, digital products and digital experience path are one of the key touchpoints where the user interacts or customer experiences a

brand therefore a good user experience is required for a good customer experience (Frokjer et al., 2000, pp.345-352). A good digital user experience must enable the user to easily find his desired information on a website / landing page or in an app as quickly as possible or at least dealing with the intuitive and engaging task that delivers a micro-moment experience with the brand. This consumer expectation of the product and brand experience should be met and possibly surpassed using triggered associations and emotions that will play an important role in brand likeability.

A good customer experience, on the other hand, gives the user the feeling of one pleasant, professional and helpful interaction between him and brand, ultimately leading to a positive overall impression the company. Ideally, CX and UX are exactly matched and have the same equal quality. This smooth user experience could be rapidly destroyed when for example the website is crowded with information, doesn't have an intuitive flow of the content or the e-mail newsletter or the landing page has no relevance to the user (Harper, 2017). Conversely, a company may have an outstanding advertising strategy and brand perception, a competent sales team and one well-designed organizational structure (C-factors) - but as long as the interacting with a user's website, mobile app, software or content (UX factors) does not work smoothly, fails at the overall customer experience. UX is therefore an important component. Both play a crucial role for the image of a brand, for the loyalty of a customer and thus for the success of a company. Errors in each of the mentioned areas lead to a bad experience with the company or the brand (Boehner, 2007; Ganglbauer et al., 2009).

Paul Watzlawick (2016) described the phenomenon of the impossibility of non-communicating: "You cannot not communicate, because every communication (not just with words) is behavioral and doesn't have a counterpart and just as one cannot behave doesn't mean that you cannot not communicate – because each person responds to the content of communication in the context of the relationship between the communicators" (Watzlawick, 2016). This applies to people as well as to products. The way a product is designed is how it "behaves" (e.g. in animations and transitions – the transition between two states of a page or an element of an interface or a sequence of communication content within the context) and with each interaction certain emotions and associations emerge. It tells a story. It is therefore important to design digital products and content such that they specifically has to trigger emotions and associations at the right moment and in the right story context: you must match the sender, who is usually a company or the brand with the expected user experience. In this interaction with the digital products of a company it must be "triggered" the same story like those that it communicates on all its channels (Rae, 2015). The user experience and brand experience must be congruent and to be able to be quickly understood apart from the noise surrounding the user because the rational mind is the purchase driver in most cases even though perception of digital products / communication and the associated triggering of emotions and associations are mostly subconscious and driven by the subconscious thoughts, feelings and passions which drives impulse purchase decisions, that justified " a posteriori" – rationally after being made emotionally.

The goal must be to mentally influence the thinking and decision-making of the consumer and, as a result, to break the deadlock of low involvement. Another objective is to stimulate the consumer at his neural contact points (focal points) and then to substantiate these with emotional values in order to influence decision making and enhancing engagement. Behavioural anchoring for example – states that the first piece

of information your customer receives is highly important and it can be the basis for any subsequent decision making and set the tone for their purchasing behavior. As individuals, we are rarely able to evaluate the value of something based on its intrinsic worth, but instead we feel the need to compare it with the alternative or surrounding options – for example, if a customer are looking at two hotel rooms which are priced similarly but one offers a free coffee in the morning, he is much more likely to go with the free coffee and to explore the quality of the rooms offered or any detailed features. So comparing bundle packages or deals against each other is the way to take advantage of this "anchoring effect" (Patton, 2012, p.86).

Customer experience and user experience as brand experience factor

Successful CX requires knowledge of best practices and a well-considered plan. That plan must be based on an outside-in view of customer wants and needs as defined by your VOC data, customer insight and other research methodologies. It takes tools like personas and journey maps to establish a customer-centric design, and a CX strategy that defines priorities in relation with consumer behaviour, justifies investment and drives cross-functional collaboration (Willis, 2016).

The user experience (UX) considers the use of a user with a (digital) product or band as well as the feelings and associations along with the experience resulting from this interaction. The term is a collective term for different categories of digital and experience design. A current model describing UX is the "umbrella" model by Dan Willis (Willis, 2016). This divided UX in Visual Design (choice of colors, shapes, etc.), information architecture (division of content, navigation paths, and search capabilities), interaction design (interaction between user and product), usability (effective, efficient and satisfactory achievement of goals) user insights and content strategy (user choice, intentions, affective and structured handling digital content)

Usually UX is used in metrics such as, success rate, error rate, abandonment rate, time to complete task and clicks to completion (success rate, error rate, dropout rate, execution time per task / activity, clicks to complete) are measured to assess the quality and performance of a product – but also, the image that forms in the user's head of the product as it uses or the proposed brand experience it becomes increasingly important: what associations and emotions are triggered during the use or user actions. UX thus refers to the experience of a digital product on a functional and emotional level (Scheier & Dirk, 2006).

Analyzing several research done by consulting companies like Watermark Consulting; Accenture and MCorp Consulting between 2016 and 2018 which compares the performance of the stocks of so-called "customer experience management leaders" with those of "CEM objectors". The CEM leaders and objectors are made up of the first and last ten listed companies from the "Customer Experience Index" of Forrester Research. The leaders include companies such as Amazon and AT&T and from the last ten listed United Airlines and Wal-Mart.

Five key criteria for a successful customer experience design have been extracted as follows:

Focus on more than customer satisfaction:

Fewer satisfied customers contribute to business success, neither through referrals nor through repeated purchases or lower price sensitivity. But even satisfied customers can switch to the competition at any time. To maximize the return on investment on CEM, companies need to create interactions that generate not only satisfaction but loyalty – for example weaving a narrative that place the user at the center of brand experience giving the impression of something larger than the user expects. As such the user will get a sense of propose that should stem directly from the brand experience pushing to more immersive actions.

Ensure satisfaction and shine with small surprises:

To achieve excellence in customer experience it is important to master the multiplicity of customer satisfaction and experience design by minimizing customer frustration and annoyance. Based on this, it is wise to deliver "nice to have" elements and other positive surprises that lead to a special interaction experience between the brand and the customer.

Design special experiences specifically and emotionally:

Customer experience guides leave nothing to chance. It is mandatory to have a deep understanding of the brand and user touchpoints area and know how to play them. You have to specially choreograph interactions in such a way that they not only fulfill the rational expectations of the customers, but positively affect them in an interesting and impressive way.

Create user experiences using cognitive science:

Customer experience leaders often manage the reality and perception of their customer experience equally. They understand how user experiences brand interactions. In user experience design, properties which are self-visible for instance a triangle in picture, or the bold font of "their" in the above example, help to create focus which facilitates the cognitive activity of the brain and reduces the cognitive load as the user doesn't have to spend time searching for the relevant details. Users don't read the content they scan it – this is the reason, self-evident properties like different shapes, sizes, colors, fonts, orientations and so on are used to emphasize the main concepts – it is a commonly held belief that we can process $7 +/- 2$ stimuli at once in our working memory, but there's plenty of competing research that suggest it is more about $4 +/- 1$, or that we can group pieces of information together in a content set and thus, actually memorize better. So making targeted use of the findings of cognitive science it is therefore important in order to create positive and lasting loyalty-generating impressions.

Understand the relationship between User Experience and Brand Experience:

Happy and satisfied users become satisfied and loyal customers creating potential users (WoM). The value of this cycle cannot be overestimated - brand managers and UX managers frequently come into conflict mainly because nowadays following strict brand guidelines can lead to a poor user experience – the brand manager argues that content needs to be brand compliant in order to support the brand and the UX manager argues that a poor user experience harms the brand. Ultimately, this circular argument is the wrong conversation to be having. A brand's identity and a brand's user experience both

fall under the overarching umbrella of the brand promise. The brand promise includes the fundamental story, values, and positioning of the brand. With a well-defined brand promise, UX decisions can be driven by that promise and maintain a consistent brand even if brand identity elements aren't present.

User experience and user journey mapping

User experience map is not the same thing as a user journey map. They sounds similar, but not exactly the same. A customer journey map outlines the touch points that consumers experience from first exposure to sale and even post-sale interactions with a brand. A user experience map takes it one step further, examining the complete picture of the customer experience with a brand, analyzing behavior and interactions across touchpoints and channels. Rather than a linear path from point A to point B, a customer experience map provides an understanding of the process that every type of target customer goes through when interacting with your brand, visually organizing every possible interaction a consumer could have with a brand throughout the entire buying journey (Hassenzahl & Tractinsky, 2006, p.91).

User Journey Mapping has its roots in Story Mapping (Battarbee, 2003, p.109), a well-known and proven method in Agile (Agile Software) development which gradually has been transformed it into the User Journey Mapping method. In contrast to Story Mapping, which aims at collecting functions of the system under development, User Journey Mapping is focused on learning about relevant user processes and paths in order to identify areas with need for user research and development.

A user journey map is a research-based tool. It examines the story of how a customer relates to the business, brand or product over time. As you might expect – no two customer journeys are identical. However, they can be generalized to give an insight into the "typical journey" for a customer as well as providing insight into current interactions and the potential for future interactions with customers.

Customer journey maps can be useful beyond the UX design and marketing teams. They can help facilitate a common business understanding of how every customer should be treated across all touch points: communication channels, digital assets, sales, logistics, distribution, service, etc. This in turn can help break down "organizational silos" and start a process of wider customer-focused communication in a business (Chitturi et al., 2008, p.49).

They may also be employed to educate stakeholders as to what customers perceive when they interact with the business. They help them explore what customers think, feel, see, hear and do and also raise some interesting "what ifs" and the possible answers to them.

The aim of the method is to learn in a short time about relevant user processes and identify and plan necessary UX activities, even before entering the user research phase. Possibly all relevant stakeholders and knowledge carriers should participate in this workshop. This could be, for example, the product owner, the product manager, marketing manager, software architect, developer and a user representative.

A customer journey map is a very simple idea: a diagram that illustrates the steps your customer(s) go through in engaging with your brand, whether it is about a product, an online experience, retail experience, or a service, or any combination. The more touchpoints you have, the more complicated — but necessary — such a map becomes. Sometimes customer journey maps are "cradle to grave," looking at the entire arc of engagement (Garrett, 2006, p.35).

Which are the important elements in creating a User Journey Map?

User-personas:
If you can't tell a typical user's story, how will you know if you've captured their journey? – Fictional characters reflecting the user types, pinpointing who they are and what they do with brand products in relevant contexts. Personas are distilled essences of real users. With personas, we build empathy with target users, focus on their world, share insights/knowledge with other stakeholders to gain consensuses, make defensible decisions reflecting the persona's/user group's exact needs, and gauge our designs' effectiveness through their eyes.

A timescale:
Customer journeys can take place in a week, a year, a lifetime, etc., and knowing what length of journey you will measure before you begin is very useful indeed.

A clear understanding of customer touchpoint:
What are your customers doing and how are they doing it – customer touchpoints are places of interaction with your brand rather than "channels" which are planned points of interaction.

A clear understanding of the channels in which actions occur:
Channels are the points where an interaction takes place – from Facebook pages to retail stores. This helps you understand what your customers are actually doing.

An understanding of any other actors who might alter the customer experience:
For example, friends, family, colleagues, competing brands, etc. may influence the way a customer feels about any given interaction.

A plan for "moments of truth":
These are the positive interactions that create good feelings in customers and which you can use at touchpoints where frustrations exist.

What Do Customers Expect from Touchpoints?

Appropriate (e.g. that both the context of the interaction and the cultural tone of the interaction meet the needs of the customer or user)
Relevant (e.g. that the function performed by the interaction meets the utility requirements of the customer or user)
Meaningful (e.g. that the interaction was perceived as important or purposeful by the customer or user)
Endearing (e.g. that the interaction created some form of bond with the user or customer for example through desirability, creating delight or a playful tone)

It's important to note that these are all things that can be designed – though it may take some user research to get to the bottom of how that design might take shape.

User experience mapping acknowledge the multitude of channels that customers interact with a brand throughout the buying journey in a more cohesive and comprehensive way. This is particularly important, as it's increasingly common for consumers to navigate across channels to make buying decisions and purchases. In response, brands must embrace omni-channel marketing – adopting a holistic view with the customer at the center, based on the understanding that today's consumers are navigating between a varieties of touchpoints to make purchases (Bevan, 2009).

Even multi-channel marketing falls short by treating individual marketing channels as stand-alone entities with their own strategies, which often results in a disjointed and distinctly different experience from channel to channel. The goal, and a goal that can be achieved with customer experience mapping, is to foster a consistent, positive experience across every channel and at every possible touchpoint throughout the buyer's journey.

Summary

User Journey Mapping is a creative method for a quick entry in complex UX projects. It allows us to learn in a short time about relevant user processes and identify and plan necessary UX activities, even before entering the user research phase. At a kickoff workshop with all stakeholders present, the User Journey Mapping takes about four hours of time and requires an experienced moderator to effectively lead the group in the process. In a slightly altered form User Journey Mapping can also be used in interviews. Either way, a successfully created user journey map serves to decide about user research activities and to prioritize the work on design concepts.

A major area of research is how a positive 'user experience' – or interaction experience – of the use of digital artefacts (e.g. web sites, applications, virtual experiences and digital assistants) can be promoted (Hassenzahl & Tractinsky, 2006, pp.91-97). This experience does not only include usability, but also other cognitive, socio-cognitive and affective aspects of users' experience in their interaction with artefacts, such as users' enjoyment, aesthetic experience, desire to repeat use, positive decision to use a digital artefact and enhanced mental models. Research in this area is timely because we are approaching the 'loyalty decade', where interaction experience will become the main success factor (Nielsen, 2008, p.79). Hence, the success of digital artefacts is to a large extent positively influenced by the extent to which they promote a high-quality experience in their users.

Furthermore, user experience (UX) manifests as quality in design, in interaction and in value, with diverse measures from many methods and instruments. One of the challenges related to UX is how to select appropriate measures to address the particularities of an evaluation context. The necessity and utility of UX measures is apparent, because such measures enable professionals to benchmark competitive design artefacts and to select appropriate design options. However, both the construct validity and predictive power of some UX measures are of particular concern. Consequently, modelling users' experience – as a basis for producing design guidance – is especially important. Generally speaking, two types of model are distinguished in the

behavioural sciences: whereas measurement models are used to measure the constructs in a particular domain, structural models are used to establish (causal) relations between constructs (Edwards & Bagozzi, 2000, p.309). These two types of model are indispensable to advance progress in a number of disciplines. First, sound measures need to be established with desirable properties (e.g. reliability, validity and sensitivity) to provide a sound basis for measuring UX. Second, explanatory or predictive structural models need to be developed – linking antecedents through behaviour to consequences – for the purpose of understanding, predicting and reasoning about processes of UX to inform system design.

Practical implications and conclusions

A series of research activities for understanding, scoping and defining UX have been undertaken in recent years, resulting in a broad but yet unconsolidated body of knowledge of UX. Apparently, the basic issue about the distinction between UX and usability requires a deeper and more systematic conceptual analysis. Identification of the uniqueness of UX does not imply abandoning the traditional usability approaches, which should actually serve as the base for incorporating some new requirements of UX.

In accord with the common understanding of UX as subjective, dynamic and context-dependent, UX measurement should essentially be self-reported, trajectory-based and adaptive. Traditional techniques such as questionnaire, interview, and think-aloud remain important for capturing self-reported data. With the advent of open-source, multimedia social software such as blogs and video-wiki (e.g. Law & Nguyen-Ngoc, 2008, pp.124-125), it has become increasingly practical to capture as well as share experience over a range of timeframes and contexts. However, what could be impractical are the resources required to analyses a huge body of rich experiential data that would result from such an approach. Further, a trajectory-based approach implies measuring various aspects of UX both in different contexts and at different points of time: user expectation (imaginary UX), user-affect (momentary UX) and user-emotion (long-term UX) (cf. Russell, 2009, p.215).

User experience is a multidimensional concept and a commonly accepted definition is still lacking. As (Hassenzahl & Tractinsky, 2006, pp.319, 689) argue, the concept of user experience attempts to go beyond the task oriented approach of traditional HCI by bringing out aspects such as beauty, fun, pleasure, and personal growth that satisfy general human needs but have little instrumental value. Therefore, when compared to basic usability, enjoyability plays an essential role in user experience. The extent to which an interactive product is enjoyable to use is referred to as the product's hedonic quality (Hassenzahl et al., 2000; Hassenzahl, 2001). The shift of emphasis from usability to experiential factors has forced researchers to consider what user experience actually is and how to evaluate it (Vermeeren et al., 2010, p.695).

It has been found that 'perceived usefulness' loses its dominant predictive power when applied to hedonic systems such as a movie website (Van der Heijden, 2004), and this is where perceived enjoyment becomes useful as a factor for explaining user acceptance. (Schrepp et al., 2006, p.1005) show that hedonic quality has also an important impact on the attractiveness of business management software that is used for work purposes. Companies see good user experience as being vital for continuous commercial success, especially since positive long-term user experience is believed to improve customer

loyalty. For example, (Garrett, 2006, p.37) and (Jordan, 2000, p.33) suggest that if people have delightful experiences with a product, they are more willing to buy the next product from the same company. Indeed, the results of (Chitturi et al., 2008, pp.48-63) show that delighting customers with hedonic quality improves customer loyalty in car owners, as measured by word of mouth and repurchase intentions, more than utilitarian quality does.

If enjoyment of hedonic quality plays an essential role not only in user experience but also in creating customer loyalty, the question then arises of what the appropriate timeframe for evaluating user experience is. Traditional usability evaluation methods focus on 'first-time' experiences with products and learnability (Courage et al., 2009; Mendosa & Novick, 2005).

Offline and online environments are increasingly converging and it will be of the utmost importance to look at these two worlds holistically, to merge them fundamentally. The focus is on the needs and experiences of the consumer that he has at any point of contact with a company or brand. The terms "customer experience" and "user experience" describe this point of view and are the focus of successful companies in their strategic orientation. They place the experience of a user with a company or its products at the center of consideration and, when used correctly, can make a significant contribution to added value. The holistic view of user experiences and marketing, the viewing of digital products like apps and websites not merely as information carriers, but as a concrete marketing tool, even as a brand ambassador, which deliberately trigger subconscious associations and emotions, is a fundamental prerequisite for fighting for the attention of the successfully succeeding consumers.

References

Battarbee, K. (2003). Defining co-experience. In *Proceedings of the 2003 International Conference on Designing Pleasurable Products and Interfaces* (pp.109-113), Pittsburgh.

Bevan, N. (2009). What is the difference between the purpose of usability and user experience evaluation methods. In *Proceedings of the Workshop UXEM'09 (INTERACT'09)*, Uppsala.

Boehner, K., DePaula, R., Dourish, P., & Sengers, P. (2007). How emotion is made and measured. *International Journal of Human–Computer Studies*, 65, 275–291.

Bollen, K., & Ting, K. (2000). A tetrad test for causal indicators. *Psychological Methods*, 5(1), 3–22.

Box, G., & Jenkins, G. (1976). *Time Series Analysis: Forecasting and Control*, rev. edision, Oakland, CA: Holden-Day.

Bulmer, M. (2001). Social measurement: what stands in its way? *Social Research*, 62(2).

Chitturi, R., Raghunathan, R., & Mahajan, V. (2008). Delight by design: the role of hedonic versus utilitarian benefits. *Journal of Marketing*, 72, 48–63.

Collier, J.E., & Bienstock, C.C. (2006). Measuring service quality in e-reading. *Journal of Service Research*, 8(3), 260–275.

Conner, M., & Sparks, P. (2005). Theory of planned behaviour and health behaviour. In Conner, M., & Norman, P. (Eds.), *Predicting Health Behaviour: Research and Practice with Social Cognition Models* (pp.170–222). Maidenhead, Berkshire: Open University Press.

Courage, C., Jain, J., & Rosenbaum, S. (2009). Best practices in longitudinal research. In *Proceedings of the International Conference Extended Abstract on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (pp.4791–4794).

Cyr, D., Head, M., & Ivanov, A. (2006). Design aesthetics leading to m-loyalty in mobile commerce. *Information & Management*, 43, 950–963.

Czerwinski, M., Horvitz, E., & Cutrell, E. (2001). Subjective duration assessment: an implicit probe for software usability? In *Proceedings of IHM-HCI 2001, Lille, France* (pp.167–170).

David, P., Song, M., Hayes, A., & Fredi, E. (2007). A cyclic model of information seeking in hyperlinked environments: the role of goals, self-efficacy, and intrinsic motivation. *International Journal of Human Computer Studies*, 65, 170–182.

Davis, F. (1993). User acceptance of information technology: system characteristics, user perceptions and behavioral impacts. *International Journal of Man–Machine Studies* 38, 475–487.

Davis, F., & Venkatesh, V. (1996). A critical assessment of potential measurement biases in the technology acceptance model: three experiments. *International Journal of Human–Computer Studies* 45, 19–45.

Diamantopoulos, A. (2006). The error term in formative measurement models: interpretations and modelling implications. *Journal of Modelling in Management* 1(1), 7–17.

Diamantopoulos, A., Riefler, P., & Roth, K.P. (2008). Advancing formative measurement models. *Journal of Business Research,* 61, 1203–1218.

Dourish, P. (2001). *Where the Action Is: The foundations of Embodied Interaction*. MIT Press.

Draper, S.W. (1993). The notion of task in HCI. In *Proceedings of CHI'93, Amsterdam, the Netherlands* (pp. 207–208).

Edwards, J.R., & Bagozzi, R. (2000). On the nature and direction of relationships between constructs and measures. *Psychological Method,s* 5(2), 155–174.

Esposito Vinzi, V., Chin, W., Henseler, J., & Wang, H. (2010). *Handbook of Partial Least Squares: Concepts, Methods and Applications in Marketing and Related Fields*. Berlin: Springer.

Finneran, C., & Zhang, P. (2003). A person–artefact–task (PAT) model of flow antecedents in computer-mediated environments. *International Journal of Human–Computer Studies,* 59, 475–496.

Finstad, K. (2010). The usability metric for user experience. *Interacting with Computers*, 22(5), 323-327.

Frokjer, E., Hertzum, M., & Hornbæk, K. (2000). Measuring usability: are effectiveness, efficiency, and satisfaction really correlated? In *Proceedings of CHI2000* (pp.345–352).

Garrett, J. (2006). Customer loyalty and the elements of user experience. *Design Management Review*. Winter 17 (1), 35–39.

Ganglbauer, E., Schrammel, J., Deutsch, S., & Tscheligi, M. (2009). Applying psychophysiological methods for measuring user experience: possibilities, challenges and feasibility. Workshop on user experience evaluation methods in product development. August 25, 2009. Uppsala.

Gray, W.D., & Salzman, M.C. (1998). Damaged merchandise? A review of experiments that compare usability evaluation methods. *Human–Computer Interaction,* 13, 203–261.

Harper, B., Slaughter, L., & Norman, K. (2017). Questionnaire administration via the WWW: a validation and reliability study for a user satisfaction questionnaire. In *Paper Presented at WebNet 2017*, Association for the Advancement of Computing in

Education,   Toronto,   Ontario,   Canada.   Retrieved   from
   http://www.lap.umd.edu/webnet/paper.html (accessed 20.08.2018).
Hartmann, J., Sutcliffe, A., & De Angeli, A. (2008). Towards a theory of user judgment of
   aesthetics and user interface quality. *Transactions on Computer–Human Interaction*
   15(4), Article 2.
Hassenzahl, M. (2001). The effect of perceived hedonic quality on product appealingness.
   International Journal of Human – Computer Interaction 13(4), 481–499.
Hassenzahl, M. (2004). The interplay of beauty, goodness, and usability in interactive
   products. *Human-Computer Interaction* 19(4), 319–349.
Hassenzahl, M., & Tractinsky, N. (2006). User experience – a research agenda. *Behaviour
   & Information Technology* 25(2), 91–97.
Jordan, P.W. (2000). *Designing Pleasurable Products: An Introduction to New Human
   Factors*. London: Taylor & Francis.
ISO 9241–210 (2010). Ergonomics of human-system interaction – Part 210: Human-
   centered design for interactive systems Vernier, Geneva.
Mendosa, V., & Novick, D.G. (2005). Usability over time. *In ACM 23rd International
   Conference on Computer Documentation* (pp.151–158), ACM.
Patton, J. (2012). User Story Mapping: Discover the Whole Story, Build the Right Product.
   O'Reilly & Associates, Sebastopol.
Pine, G. (2009). Welcome to the experience economy. *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved
   from https://hbr.org/2009/07/welcome-to-the-experience-economy (accessed 21
   Sept. 2018).
Rae, T.A. (2015). Design value index results and commentary. dmi: design management
   institutions. http://www.dmi.org/?page=DesignDrivesValue (accessed 21 Sept.
   2018).
Ropstroff, S., & Wiechmann, R. (2012). *Scrum in der Praxis: Erfahrungen, Problemfelder
   und Erfolgsfaktoren*. Heidelberg: dpunkt Verlag.
Scheier, Christian, and Dirk hero. (2006). How advertising works. Planegg: Haufe. Study:
   Watermark Consulting, a US-based customer experience advisory firm. Retrieved
   from http: //watermarkconsult.net/CX-ROI (accessed 21 Sept. 2018).
Schrepp, M., Held, T., & Laugwitz, B. (2006). The influence of hedonic quality on the
   attractiveness of user interfaces of business management software. *Interacting with
   Computers* 18, 1055–1069.
Van der Heijden, H. (2004). User acceptance of hedonic information systems. *MIS
   Quarterly* 28(4), 695–704.
Tractinsky, N., & Zmiri, D. (2006). Exploring attributes of skins as potential antecedents
   of emotion in HCI. In Fishwick, P. (Ed.), *Computing*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Vermeeren, A., et al. (2010). User experience evaluation methods: current state and
   development needs. In *Proceedings of the NordiCHI Conference*.
Watzlawick,   P.   (2016).   The   axioms   of   Paul   Watzlawick.   Retrieved   from
   http://www.paulwatzlawick.de/axiome.html (accessed 21 Sept. 2018).
Willis,   D.   (2016).   The   UX   umbrella.   Retrieved   from
   http://www.dswillis.com/talks/2014/4/the-uxumbrella (accessed 21 Sept. 2018).