

# Value co-creation in high involvement services: the animal healthcare sector

by Pyatt, A.Z., Wright, G., Walley, K. and Bleach, E.C.

**Copyright, Publisher and Additional Information:** This is the author accepted manuscript. The final published version (version of record) is available online via Elsevier. Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/IJRDM-11-2016-0209>






**Value co-creation in high involvement services: the animal healthcare sector**

Journal:	<i>International Journal of Retail &amp; Distribution Management</i>
Manuscript ID	IJRDM-11-2016-0209.R1
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	Service quality, Service delivery, Value co-creation, Value, Animal health sector

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



Value co-creation in high involvement services: the animal healthcare sector

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Abstract****Purpose**

This paper investigates the significance of value co-creation to the UK animal healthcare sector from the perspective of the key industry stakeholders: clients, veterinarians and paraprofessionals.

**Design**

Value co-creation constructs in the sector were identified and measured using a mixed methods approach comprised of qualitative NVivo© thematic analysis of depth interviews (n=13) and quantitative Exploratory Factor Analysis (n=271).

**Findings**

Qualitative results revealed nine underlying dimensions regarding service delivery in the sector: trustworthiness, communication, value for money, empathy, bespoke, integrated care, tangibles, accessibility and outcome driven service. Exploratory Factor Analysis of professional survey data loaded onto seven latent factors, with strong value co-creation dimensions identified.

**Research limitations/ implications**

The sampling process is sufficiently representative and diverse to present meaningful and valuable results; however, surveying should be extended to include the client group. Due to the originality of the research replication of the study will be beneficial to the broader understanding and application of value co-creation to the high-involvement services of animal healthcare.

**Practical implications**

Recognition of the importance of value co-creation to the sector should encourage professional stakeholders to develop and adopt integrated models of service provision and to provide improved levels of service quality.

**Originality and value**

The paper makes an original contribution to knowledge regarding value co-creation in respect of high involvement service provision. Its findings should be of value to academics interested in value co-creation in service sectors as well as animal healthcare practitioners seeking to offer better value and quality service provision.

**Keywords:** *Service quality Service delivery Value co-creation Value Animal health sector*

## Introduction

Domesticated animals form an important part of modern life, fulfilling roles as household companions, working animals and food producing livestock. Thus, the propensity of people to keep animals and the demand for animal related products and services are the two factors that underpin the scale of demand for animal healthcare. Traditionally the domain of veterinarians specialising in farm, equine or companion animal service, substantial numbers of other specialist animal healthcare providers have begun to enter the market and day to day care is now multifaceted and complex. The group of non- veterinary trained animal healthcare providers include for example, veterinary physiotherapists, animal chiropractors, veterinary nurses veterinary pharmacists, and collectively are known as paraprofessionals. Progressive veterinary organisation's appreciate the benefits of working with paraprofessionals (Moore, 1996; Reader, 2012; Sharp, 2008) and operate with established multi-disciplinary teams (Statham and Green, 2015). However, this is not widespread practice across the sector, despite developments in client popularity and usage of paraprofessional services (Kinnison *et al.*, 2014).

The clients' quest for better value means that enterprises need to be dynamic and able to quickly respond to evolving markets (Grönroos, 2006; Grönroos 2007; Vargo and Lusch, 2015). Industry sectors generally appreciate that service quality and a customer centric ethos attracts and retains clients, impacting on profitability (Buttle, 1996; Vargo and Lusch, 2004). In the competitive animal health industry client loyalty can no longer be guaranteed and customers will change service providers in the pursuit of higher service quality and better value. Often this sector has failed to maintain pace with developing client demands and has an over-reliance on historically successful delivery models which are professional rather than client centric (Lowe, 2009; Veterinary Development Council Report, 2012; Williams and Jordan, 2015). This is reflected in a lack of applied service quality research in the UK animal health sector when compared to the analogous human health sector and animal health industries in North America (Coe *et al.*, 2008; Grand *et al.*, 2013).

### Service and value co-creation constructs in animal health

Service quality is accepted as a fundamental driver for sustainability, success (Buttle, 1996; Vargo and Lusch, 2004; Zeithaml *et al.*, 2009) and is the foundation of all economic exchange (Vargo and Lusch, 2008). The contemporary service environment involves informed, educated and sophisticated clients who are consistently seeking better value, higher service quality and are open to greater flexibility when selecting a service provider (Walter *et al.*, 2010). In parallel with other enterprises these customer traits are also now evident within clients of the animal healthcare sector (Williams and Jordan, 2015). Comprehensive scrutiny of service quality has been completed in many areas of service provision (Wisniewski, 2001) including the retail sector (Carman, 1990), financial services (Abdullah *et al.*, 2011) and telecoms (Ahmed *et al.*, 2011) and additionally a diverse range of human healthcare sectors (Newsome and Wright, 1999; McClland and Vogus, 2014), but not in the animal healthcare sector. Human health sectors have equivalent counterparts to the animal healthcare sector such as nurses, physiotherapists, dentists and nutritionists. Similarities in the provision of human and animal healthcare and the types of professionals involved, make both the sectors and client expectations comparable and the lack of service quality inquiry into animal health provision noticeable.

Domesticated animals make an important socio-economic contribution to the UK through their role as household pets, riding or competition horses or as food producing animals, making the UK animal healthcare sector an expansive and potentially lucrative private sector. It is estimated that up to half of the UK households keep a companion animal such as a dog or a cat (Pet Food Manufacturers Association, 2013). Many of these pet owners consider the animals to have child-like qualities and to be a part of the family, (Brown and Silverman, 1999; Timmis, 2008) thus revealing high involvement behaviours during service provision. The most current UK horse industry survey estimate that there are 3.5 million riders in the UK and that maintenance of equine health is estimated to be worth £344 million annually (BETA, 2013), representing a significant industry solely centred on one group of domesticated animals. The UK also has substantial markets for food producing animals which are highly valuable to the population both in terms of production for the home market but also for sustainable export markets. Regardless of the differences in the animal sector characteristics, all animal healthcare provision is inherently providing a service. Despite

1 the changing nature of client expectations and the societal and financial importance of these animals,  
2  
3 appraisal of service quality provision and measurement techniques have yet to be explored in a meaningful  
4  
5 way. There is a scarcity of empirical service quality and client expectation and needs focused research (Coe  
6  
7 *et al.*, 2008; Lee, 2006) within the sector.  
8  
9

10 Service-dominant logic emphasises the interactions between service provider and clients, proposing all  
11  
12 service to be inherently relational (Lusch and Vargo, 2011) as perceived relationships and cohesive bonds  
13  
14 underpin loyalty and trust, leading to co-operation and creating value in service (Grönroos, 2000). Client  
15  
16 actions have a functional (Gummesson, 1998) and dynamic impact on the service business and the other  
17  
18 clients involved with the organisation (Grönroos, 2007). In models of value co-creation, the client is  
19  
20 endogenous to and actively participates in the service provision (Grönroos, 2000; Vargo and Lusch, 2008).  
21  
22 Grand *et al.*, (2013) propose value co-creation to be highly relevant and valuable in the provision of animal  
23  
24 healthcare services to maintain long term relationships and build loyalty (Leppiman and Same, 2011). The  
25  
26 extant literature categorises value co-creation into five elements: process environment, resources, co-  
27  
28 production, perceived benefits and management structure (Bharti *et al.*, 2015). Only some of these  
29  
30 elements have been identified within the animal health literature (Shaw, 2004). The factor *resource*  
31  
32 *categorisation*, which encompasses concepts of relationship and trust, is an important element of value co-  
33  
34 creation (Bharti *et al.*, 2015) and is extremely pertinent to animal healthcare (Shaw, 2004). The  
35  
36 development of bonds between provider and client with mutual commitment to the process are essential  
37  
38 constituents of trust and are already reflected in animal healthcare literature (Coe *et al.*, 2008). Active  
39  
40 participation by the client has been defined as the extent to which clients may share information, provide  
41  
42 suggestions and engage in mutual decision-making processes (Chan *et al.*, 2010). This concept manifests  
43  
44 itself in the animal healthcare sector as clients wish to be educated and actively involved in the decision-  
45  
46 making process around the care of their animal (Coe *et al.*, 2008). Trust is identified as a fundamental  
47  
48 quality of human interaction and relationships (Grand *et al.*, 2013), it is an essential component in value co-  
49  
50 creation and has been shown to be important in the maintenance of the client-medical practitioner  
51  
52 relationship in human healthcare (Trachtenberg *et al.*, 2005). A similar tendency is apparent in the animal  
53  
54 health sector as client perception of service quality and so likelihood of future visits (loyalty) is strongly  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1 associated with developing positive interactions and relationships with health care professionals (American  
2 Animal Hospital Association, 2009; Brown and Silverman, 1999). The development of trust is shaped by the  
3  
4 communicative interaction and clients want to voice questions and concerns but be confident in the  
5  
6 practitioners' professionalism and overall decision making capabilities (Grand *et al.*, 2013).  
7  
8  
9

10 Value co-creation is an area of service quality theory which has not been applied to the animal healthcare  
11  
12 sector despite its apparent importance to client loyalty and consequently business success. Improvements  
13  
14 in the maintenance of medical recording techniques and accessibility of practices resulting from increased  
15  
16 industry corporatisation (Lee, 2006; Williams and Jordan, 2015) appear to facilitate client movement from  
17  
18 one healthcare provider to another, ultimately diminishing loyalty. Clients are familiar with switching  
19  
20 allegiance in many other areas of service provision which, combined with an increase in public awareness  
21  
22 of veterinary medicine due to a plethora of veterinary television programmes and ease of online searches,  
23  
24 further weakens practice loyalty. This is exacerbated by an industry move to larger practices where clients  
25  
26 do not have the opportunity to form all-important bonds with an individual veterinarian who they may see  
27  
28 at every visit (Lee, 2006). Continuity of care in human medicine, meeting client expectations and the  
29  
30 development of strong relationships between the patient and medical practitioner is known to improve  
31  
32 treatment compliance and outcomes (Bell *et al.*, 2002; Cabana and Jee, 2004; Safran *et al.*, 2001). Equally,  
33  
34 unmet client expectation has been demonstrated to contribute to patient dissatisfaction and increased risk  
35  
36 of negligence litigation (Bell *et al.*, 2002), suggesting a comparable risk for veterinary medicine and animal  
37  
38 healthcare practice. In the animal healthcare industry client loyalty can no longer be easily guaranteed and  
39  
40 customers will readily change service providers in pursuit of better value and higher service quality. In this  
41  
42 respect the animal healthcare sector has not kept pace with developing client behaviours and is seen to  
43  
44 have an over-reliance on historically successful models of customer loyalty (Lee, 2006; Lowe, 2009) which  
45  
46 fail to consider changes in client expectations of service.  
47  
48  
49  
50

51 Comparable human healthcare sectors have long recognised the significance of service quality and the field  
52  
53 has been subject to considerable inquiry (Vogus and McClland, 2016). In direct contrast, animal healthcare  
54  
55 practitioners provide successful and functional outcome driven service to clients but have yet to  
56  
57 acknowledge the full importance of service quality to business sustainability and success. The failure of the  
58  
59  
60

1 animal healthcare sector to identify with modern models of service provision is thought by industry  
2 commentators to be adversely affecting advancement of the industry and resultant business viability  
3  
4 (Lowe, 2009; Williams and Jordan, 2015). Knowing what clients want and expect, and managing client  
5 expectations are pre-requisites for service fulfilment (Lisch, 2014), the lack of such knowledge about the  
6 animal healthcare sectors constitutes a significant opportunity for empirical research.  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11

### 12 13 14 15 **Research Gap**

16 As an established service sector, the animal healthcare industries have yet to recognise the importance of  
17 service quality to their client and the potential significance of value co-creation to the sector. Service  
18 perception has been shown to be important in human healthcare and maintaining the client-provider  
19 relationship is known to influence treatment outcomes. There is limited assessment of service quality  
20 perceptions within animal healthcare stakeholders and the aim of this paper was to explore the role of  
21 value co-creation in the way service provider groups construct their notion of service-quality. Specifically,  
22 the objectives were:  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

- 31 • to understand how clients, veterinarians and paraprofessionals view the elements of  
32 animal health service delivery;  
33
- 34 • to compare the service perceptions in the context of value co-creation and  
35
- 36 • to assess construct service dimensionality in the context of value co-creation for the animal  
37 healthcare sector in the UK  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 Service provision was evaluated from the perspective of the animal healthcare stakeholder groups; defined  
44 as the client, the veterinarian and the paraprofessional, to enable the investigation of service quality  
45 perception and the relevance and potential application of value co-creation to this sector.  
46  
47  
48

### 49 **Method**

50 The mixed-method approach underpinning this study led to the method being implemented in two phases.  
51 Phase One was qualitative in nature and comprised a series of semi-structured depth interviews ( $n=13$ ) of  
52 the three stakeholder groups; clients, paraprofessional and veterinarians. Phase Two was quantitative and  
53 involved surveying of professional veterinarians and a range of paraprofessionals including veterinary  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1 nurses, veterinary pharmacists and musculoskeletal practitioners ( $n=271$ ). The overall method incorporated  
2  
3 the views of the key stakeholder providers in the animal healthcare sector and constitutes a representative  
4  
5 sample of sector participants. The lack of animal healthcare service literature presented a clear challenge to  
6  
7 the study and the decision to adopt a mixed methods strategy was intended to lessen these difficulties  
8  
9  
10 (Lisch, 2014).

11  
12 The qualitative research in Phase One was carried out using depth interviews to confirm the conceptual  
13  
14 base for the study, describe dimensions of service quality for the animal health sector and to inform the  
15  
16 quantitative survey. Results from the qualitative phase of investigation, in combination with the limited  
17  
18 animal health literature and comparable human health service literature were used to identify and validate  
19  
20 questionnaire items for testing in Phase Two of the study. The purpose of the Phase Two survey was to test  
21  
22 the value sets indicated by the output of the qualitative analysis and, through data reduction techniques, to  
23  
24 develop a conceptualization of service for comparison between the professional stakeholder groups  
25  
26 (veterinarians and paraprofessionals).  
27

28  
29 The interviews undertaken in Phase One employed the Critical Incident Technique (CIT) and the principles  
30  
31 of Grounded Theory (GT) informed the analytical approach. CIT encouraged the respondents to draw on  
32  
33 memorable events and encounters (Bitner *et al.*, 1990) bringing data rich content to the research (Hughes  
34  
35 *et al.*, 2007). CIT has had widespread and effective use in human health service research including work in  
36  
37 sectors such as dentistry (Victoroff and Hogan, 2006) and nursing (Keating, 2004), so can be an appropriate  
38  
39 method to investigate service provided by equivalent animal health professionals. GT was used to provide  
40  
41 systematic and flexible working guidelines to enable effective analysis of qualitative data with an iterative  
42  
43 strategy and so the construction of emergent theory (Charmaz, 2014). This technique has been widely  
44  
45 utilised within qualitative research in human healthcare (Higginbottom, 2014; Lingard *et al.*, 2008; Ononeze  
46  
47 *et al.*, 2009) and was therefore valuable to this study.  
48  
49

50  
51 The interviews were transcribed and scrutinized immediately post-interview, in accordance with GT  
52  
53 methodology (Charmaz, 2014), to ensure that each discussion informed the next. Transcripts were analysed  
54  
55 using the Qualitative Data Analysis (QDA) software package QRS NVivo®, enabling the identification of  
56  
57 themes within the data set (Corbin and Strauss, 2008; QRS NVivo®, 2014). The content analysis facility in  
58  
59  
60

1 NVivo© was used to identify elements most closely aligned with elements of value co-creation,  
2  
3  
4 *communication* and *integrated care*, selected following thematic analysis and based on animal and relevant  
5  
6 human health service literature. This analysis was undertaken to facilitate deeper understanding of the  
7  
8 nomenclature associated with service quality in the animal health sector and to underpin the construct  
9  
10 validity of the survey instrument.

11  
12 Results of the qualitative Phase One interviews permitted the development of the survey instrument,  
13  
14 which was modified for each of the professional stakeholder groups. Though comparable items were used  
15  
16 for each group, this customisation involved using the language and terminology to suit each sample group.  
17  
18 The survey instrument comprised 24 items covering nine dimensions identified from the literature and the  
19  
20 qualitative phase of the study, with each dimension was covered by two or three items to enhance validity  
21  
22 (Fowler, 2014). After a pilot study ( $n=10$ ), the survey was implemented in work places and through  
23  
24 attendance at events and venues, including professional training days and conferences. The survey  
25  
26 questionnaire was administered face-to-face and the data were subsequently recorded in SPSS (*version 24*).  
27  
28

29  
30 After scrutiny of descriptive data, Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was used to identify the key factors. If  
31  
32 the questions measure the same underlying dimensions, then it would be expected that these specific  
33  
34 questions would have a high correlation, in practice addressing different elements of the same factor.

35  
36 *Bartlett's Test of Sphericity* was used to indicate if the correlation matrix is significantly different ( $p<0.05$ )  
37  
38 from the identity matrix and to determine the presence of patterned relationships within the data. Further  
39  
40 measures of validity were required to ensure questionnaire validity for EFA and  
41  
42 the critical assumptions underlying factor analysis were tested using the *Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO)*  
43  
44 *Measure of Sampling Adequacy*. The KMO value should exceed the recommendation of 0.6 (Kaiser, 1960)  
45  
46 to determine the reliability of the scale, as values closer to one indicate patterns of correlations which are  
47  
48 relatively compact, indicating distinct and reliable factors. Determination of the questionnaire research  
49  
50 instruments' internal consistency and assessment of the reliability of scales was measured using Cronbach's  
51  
52 alpha (Field, 2013).  
53  
54

55  
56 Variable were subjected to EFA using Principal Component Analysis (PCA) as the extraction method and  
57  
58 Varimax rotation with Kaiser normalization. Varimax rotation was chosen to enable for better  
59  
60

1 interpretation, to determine an optimal simple solution and to help to describe patterns observed within  
2  
3 the data. Factor loadings were evaluated on two criteria: the significance of the loadings and the simplicity  
4  
5 of the factor structure. Items were excluded from factors according to guidelines developed by Churchill  
6  
7 (1979) and Kim and Mueller (1978), namely: loadings of less than 0.4, or cross-loadings greater than 0.35  
8  
9 on two or more factors. All factors with eigenvalues greater than 1.0 were extracted.  
10  
11

## 12 Results

### 13 Phase One

14  
15 The dimensions of service quality in animal healthcare services were described through thematic analysis  
16  
17 completed in the NVivo© using the interview data. Nine underlying themes on service delivery in the  
18  
19 animal healthcare sector emerged and these were defined as: *integrated care, communication,*  
20  
21 *trustworthiness, value for money, outcome driven service, empathy, bespoke, accessibility and tangibles*  
22  
23 (Table 1). Dimensions of *integrated care, communication* and *trustworthiness* were strong emergent  
24  
25 themes from all stakeholder respondents, this was also seen in the content analysis results (Table 2). Each  
26  
27 of these three themes were further explained (through thematic analysis) to express the desirable  
28  
29 characteristics of the animal healthcare professionals in the context of service quality. *Integrated care*  
30  
31 defines the ability and readiness of professionals to engage and work with others (including other  
32  
33 professionals and clients); working with an open-mind and pro-active manner, having a clear  
34  
35 comprehension of the expertise of others and therefore able to actively seek to use the technical skills and  
36  
37 knowledge of other specialist practitioners when required. *Communication* indicates respectful and open  
38  
39 lines of two-way communication throughout the service encounter; the professional can relate to different  
40  
41 clients, be consistently professional but also can develop rapport. *Trustworthiness* encompasses a range of  
42  
43 skills extending from the technical ability and skillset of the professional, to ethical decision making  
44  
45 regarding animal treatment options. This dimension also incorporates professional transparency in  
46  
47 technical skills and abilities therefore instilling confidence in the client. The qualitative phase gave valuable  
48  
49 insight into the how to interpret the service quality and value co-creation in the sector.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Table 1: Dimensions and definitions of service quality in animal health services (qualitative interview results)**

The matrix coding in NVivo© facilitated a word count analysis (Table 2) the results of which indicated the emergent themes to be key dimensions of value co-creation in the animal healthcare sector and re-iterated elements central to value co-creation (including *integration, communication and trust*).

**Table 2: Content analysis of interview data**

*Phase Two*

Exploratory Factor Analysis enabled identification of the inter-relationship between variables and to determine the main factors accounting for the observable relationships within the data. Reducing dimensionality through EFA condensed both measurable and observable variables to a few latent variables sharing a collective variance. The results from *KMO* (0.813) and *Bartlett's Test of Sphericity* ( $\chi^2$ : 1259.787, df:2; sig: .000); were supportive of the data being appropriate for EFA. Variables loaded satisfactorily on to seven latent factors, explaining 59.43% of the total variance. Cronbach's alpha was used as a determinant of internal consistency and assessment of reliability of scales and six of the seven latent factors measured over the recommended Cronbach's alpha score of 0.7 confirming consistency and reliability of the research instrument used within the study. Table 3 shows the construct strengths for the seven latent factors extracted from the 24 variables, and the loadings for the principal factor to which each variable contributes.

The seven latent factors were individually named to best represent the variables within each factor and were labelled as: *Trust, communication, professional rapport, responsiveness, animal focus, credibility and access*. The results from the EFA indicated congruence with the qualitative data output.

**Table 3: Exploratory Factor Analysis: Elements of Animal Health Service (Professional Stakeholders)**

To appraise potential differences between the two professional stakeholder groups (paraprofessional and veterinarian) EFAs were undertaken for each of the sub-groups. Each dataset met the criteria for EFA and the results are summarised in Table 4. Results from the veterinarian group loaded onto eight factors and the paraprofessional groups generated a seven factor solution. This analysis was completed to identify

1 potential differences between the two professional groups but, due to the smaller sample size of  
2  
3 veterinarian group as compared to the paraprofessional, factor naming was not considered to be beneficial  
4  
5 to understanding.  
6  
7  
8  
9

10 **Table 4: Exploratory Factor Analysis: Elements of Animal Health Service by Professional Stakeholder**

11 **Group**

12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17 **Discussion**

18  
19 The first objective was to understand how the stakeholder groups view the elements of animal health  
20 service delivery. NVivo© and content analysis results indicated differences between the three groups,  
21 veterinarians, paraprofessionals and clients, on the issues of communication and collaboration. This  
22 analysis suggests congruence between paraprofessionals and clients and these two groups expressed  
23 opinions that are quite distinct from the perceptions of veterinarians. EFA for the veterinarians and  
24 paraprofessionals (Table 4) was suggestive of differences in the perception of service quality held by these  
25 stakeholders. A finding which is worthy of further, more detailed investigation.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 Overall, the qualitative results from thematic and content analysis for all three stakeholder groups (clients,  
35 veterinarians and paraprofessionals), highlighted strong emergent dimensions of *integrated care* and  
36 *communication* to be most important factors. An interesting outcome was the strength of the  
37 communication focused factors in the veterinarians sub-group (Table 4). This was somewhat at odds with  
38 the emphasis that is indicated by the interview analysis with clients, veterinarians and paraprofessionals  
39 (Table 2). This may be explained as clients did not participate in Phase Two of the study and may be  
40 suggestive of a mismatch between veterinary perception of client communication and actual client  
41 feedback, presenting a distinct area of interest which warrants further investigation. Dimensions of  
42 *integrated care* were evident for all professional groups within thematic analysis, content analysis and EFA.  
43  
44 Interdisciplinary care or multi-disciplinary team (MDT) working techniques are frequently and effectively  
45 used within human medicine (Atwal and Caldwell, 2005; Borrill and West, 2002) as paraprofessionals are  
46 fully integrated and valuable team members (Borrill *et al.*, 1999). Conversely in the animal healthcare  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1 sectors the paraprofessional is not so well utilised within the provision of service. Work completed in the  
2  
3  
4 Lowe Report (2009) established that the use of paraprofessionals is poorly developed within the veterinary  
5  
6 and animal healthcare field. This is despite a significant amount of literature advocating integrated care  
7  
8 (Lowe, 2009; Lowe, 2010; Mulligan and Doherty, 2008; Reader, 2012; Sharp, 2008). Results from the  
9  
10 present study concur with the literature on the importance of integrated care to the sector, reflecting the  
11  
12 need for the development of effective MDT working from the perspective of all sector stakeholders.  
13  
14 The second objective was to assess the service perceptions of the role of value co-creation held by  
15  
16 veterinarians and paraprofessionals. Dimensions of value co-creation were evident in the stakeholder  
17  
18 groups surveyed, with factors of *trust*, *communication* and *professional rapport* identified as essential  
19  
20 components of service quality within the sector. Outcomes from the study emulate similar findings in the  
21  
22 human healthcare literature, where treatment decision making is notoriously challenging due to the  
23  
24 uniqueness of each service encounter (Vogus and McClland, 2016) making healthcare service provision  
25  
26 complex, intangible and intrinsically based on client value co-creation. Development of patient-centric care  
27  
28 is an essential component of human healthcare (Rathert *et al.*, 2013) with value co-creation factors of  
29  
30 communication, empathy and holistic care linked to patient satisfaction (Bendall-Lyon and Powers, 2004;  
31  
32 Thiedke, 2007). The role of value co-creation in the provision of animal healthcare was affirmed in the  
33  
34 results from the present study, supporting the available animal health literature and indicating the  
35  
36 usefulness to service providers in this area who embrace value co-creation within the provision of service.  
37  
38 The third objective was to propose a construct of service dimensionality in the context of value co-creation  
39  
40 for the animal healthcare sector in the UK through an understanding of the veterinarians and the emergent  
41  
42 group of paraprofessionals. Themes of value co-creation were highly pertinent to both professional groups  
43  
44 but differences between the relative importance of some factors is evident. These could be accounted for  
45  
46 by the range of different practitioners (veterinary nurses, musculoskeletal workers and animal health  
47  
48 advisors) surveyed within the paraprofessional group and the different working practices of the  
49  
50 paraprofessional versus the veterinarian. The paraprofessional does not appear to be as heavily restricted  
51  
52 by time constraints as the veterinarian (Coe *et al.*, 2010), which may allow for more effective involvement  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1 and engagement of the client within the service process. An understanding of these difference from the  
2  
3 client perspective would provide valuable insight.  
4

### 6 **Conclusion**

7  
8 Business models within the animal healthcare sector are rapidly developing, as are client demands and  
9  
10 expectations. To match the requirements of the modern client the animal healthcare industry should  
11  
12 advance awareness and application of marketing theory, in-line with other comparable health sectors. This  
13  
14 study has proposed value co-creation as a significant tool to bridge the potential gap between client  
15  
16 experience of service and professionals' perception of the service provided and as a means to enhance  
17  
18 business competitiveness.  
19

### 21 *Industry implications and contribution to knowledge*

22  
23 The ultimate purpose of investigation into models of service quality within the animal health sector is to be  
24  
25 able to develop workable practices and solutions for recommendation to industry. These practices may  
26  
27 need to consider the level of involvement or relative value of the animal (financial or emotional value) to  
28  
29 the client and the potential impact on client behaviour. Findings from the study and the extant literature  
30  
31 suggest that the factors affecting client active engagement in the service encounter and so co-creation of  
32  
33 value are multi-faceted and complex. These results could enable further determination of value co-creation  
34  
35 within the service encounter and therefore acceptance of the usefulness of marketing theory unique to this  
36  
37 sector. The study makes a novel and specific contribution to theoretical application of marketing theory to  
38  
39 the animal healthcare sector which could be developed into practical and workable solutions for animal  
40  
41 health businesses which are currently experiencing considerable development and change (Lowe, 2009:  
42  
43 Williams and Jordan, 2015). These solutions would bring the enhanced client loyalty, improved animal  
44  
45 treatment compliance and outcome and the ensuing benefits of improved business success. Furthermore,  
46  
47 the solutions proposed by this study could include the development of integrated care models tailored to  
48  
49 the sector, models of multidisciplinary team working like those established in equivalent human healthcare  
50  
51 provision. The study makes a wider contribution to the service quality research as value co-creation has  
52  
53 been considered as an important element of service quality in analogous and equivalent human healthcare  
54  
55 professions but not for the animal healthcare industry in the UK.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

*Recommendations for future study*

It should be noted that the qualitative phase of the study included three relevant stakeholder groups of clients, veterinarians and paraprofessionals whereas the survey was based on the two professional groups and excluded the client group. It is therefore recommended that the survey be repeated to include the client group to gain additional insight into service perception. Value co-creation was emergent from the qualitative and quantitative phases but warrants further specific qualitative analysis to gain a true and comprehensive understand of its relevance and application to this sector; the format of which would be informed by the results from this study. Future work should also focus on the development of multidisciplinary team working models to embrace value co-creation through operable and practicable solutions within animal healthcare business.

## References

- Abdullah, F., Suhaimi, R., Saban, G. and Hamali, J. (2011). "Bank service quality (BSQ) index", *The International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, Vol. 28 No.5, pp. 542-555.
- Ahmed, I., Shaukat, M. Z., Nawaz, M. M., Ahmed, N. and Usman, A. (2011). "Determinants of the satisfaction and repurchase intentions of users of short messenger services (SMAS): A study in the telecoms sector of Pakistan", *International Journal of Management*, Vol. 28 No. 3, pp. 763-863.
- American Animal Hospital Association (2009). "Compliance: Taking quality care to the next level", *American Animal Hospital Association (AAHA)*, available at [https://www.aaha.org/public\\_documents/professional/resources/complianceexecutivesummary.pdf](https://www.aaha.org/public_documents/professional/resources/complianceexecutivesummary.pdf) (accessed 30 August 2015).
- Atwal, A. and Caldwell, K. (2005). "Do all health and social professionals interact equally: A study of interactions in multidisciplinary teams in the United Kingdom", *Scandinavian Journal of Caring Sciences*, Vol. 19, pp. 268-273.
- Bell, R. A., Kravitz, R. L., Thom, D., Krupat, E. and Azari, R. (2002). "Unmet expectations for care and the patient-physician relationship", *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, Vol. 17, pp. 88-885.
- BETA. 2013. *British Equestrian Trade Association National Equestrian Survey 2011*. [On-line]. Available from: <http://www.beta-uk.org/pages/riders/news/survey-reveals-new-spending-patterns-in-equestrian-industry.php> (accessed 23 September 2013).
- Bharti, K., Agrawal, R. and Sharma, V. (2015). "Value co-creation: Literature review and proposed conceptual framework. *International Journal of Market Research*", Vol. 57 No.4, pp. 571-604.
- Bitner, M. J., Booms, B. H. and Tetreault, M. S. (1990). "The service encounter: Diagnosing favourable and unfavourable incidents", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 54 (January), pp. 71-84.
- Bendall-Lyon, D. and Powers, T. L. (2004). "The impact of structure and process attributes on satisfaction and behavioural intentions", *Journal of Service Marketing*, Vol. 18 No.2, pp. 114-121.

1  
2 Borrill, C. and West, M. (2002). "Team working and effectiveness in healthcare; findings from the healthcare  
3 team effectiveness project", Aston Centre for Health Services Organisational Research: UK.

4  
5  
6 Borrill, C., Carletta, J., Carter, A., Dawson, J., Garrod, S., Rees, A., Richards, A., Shapiro, D. and West, M.  
7  
8 (1999). "The effectiveness of health care teams in the National Health Service", Aston University: UK

9  
10  
11 Brown, J.P. and Silverman, J.D. (1999). "The current and future market for veterinarian and veterinary  
12 medical services in the United States", *Journal of American Veterinary Medicine Association*, Vol. 215 No.5,  
13  
14 pp.166.

15  
16  
17  
18 Buttle, F. (1996). "SERVQUAL: Review, critique, research agenda", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 30  
19  
20 No.1, pp. 8-32.

21  
22 Cabana, M. D. and Jee, S. H. (2004). "Does continuity of care improve patient outcomes?", *Journal of Family*  
23  
24 *Practice*, Vol. 53 No.12, pp. 974-980.

25  
26  
27 Carman, J. M. (1990). "Consumer perceptions of service quality: An assessment of the SERVQUAL  
28 dimensions", *Journal of Retailing*, Vol.66 No.1, pp. 35-55.

29  
30  
31  
32 Chan, K.W., Yim, C.K. and Lam, S.S. (2010). "Is customer participation in value creation a double edged  
33 sword? Evidence from professional financial services across culture", *Journal of Marketing*. Vol. 74 No.3,  
34  
35 pp. 48-64.

36  
37  
38 Charmaz, K. (2014). "Constructing grounded theory". 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. SAGE: London.

39  
40  
41 Churchill, G.A. (1979). "A paradigm for developing better measures of marketing constructs", *Journal of*  
42  
43 *Marketing Research*. Vol. 16 No.1, pp. 64-73.

44  
45  
46 Coe, J. B., Adams, C. L. and Bonnett, B. N. (2008). "A focus group study of veterinarians' and pet owners'  
47  
48 perceptions of veterinarian-client communication in companion animal practice", *Journal of American*  
49  
50 *Veterinary Medicine Association*, Vol. 233 No.7, pp. 1072-1080.

51  
52  
53 Coe, J. B., Adams, C. L., Eva, K., Desmarais, S. and Bonnett, B. N. (2010). Development and validation  
54  
55 of an instrument for measuring appointment-specific client satisfaction in companion-animal practice.  
56  
57 *Preventive Veterinary Medicine*, Vol. 93 No.2-3, pp. 201-210.

1 Corbin, J. and Strauss, A. (2008). " *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing*  
2 *grounded theory*". 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. SAGE: Thousand Oaks, CA.

3  
4  
5  
6 Field, A. (2013) *Discovering statistics*. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. SAGE: UK

7  
8  
9 Fowler, P. (2014). " *Research philosophies - importance and relevance*". Cranfield School of Management:  
10 Cranfield: UK.

11  
12  
13 Grand, J.A., Lloyd, J.W., Ilgen, D.R., Abood, A. and Sonea, I.M. (2013). "A measure of and predictors for  
14 veterinarian trust developed with veterinary students in a simulated companion animal practice", *Journal*  
15 *of the American Veterinary Association*, Vol. 242 No.30, pp.322-304.

16  
17  
18  
19  
20 Grönroos, C. (2000). " *Service management and marketing: A customer relationship management*  
21 *approach*", Wiley: UK.

22  
23  
24 Grönroos, C. (2006). "Adopting a service logic for marketing", *Marketing Theory*, Vol. 6 No.4, pp. 395-417.

25  
26  
27 Grönroos, C. (2007). " *Service management and marketing: managing the service profit logic*", 3rd ed. John  
28 Wiley & Sons: UK.

29  
30  
31 Gummesson, E. (1998). "Implementation requires a relationship marketing paradigm", *Journal of the*  
32 *Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol.26 No.3, pp. 242-249.

33  
34  
35  
36 Higginbottom, G. (2014). "The roots and development of constructivist grounded theory", *Nurse*  
37 *Researcher*, Vol. 21 No.5, pp. 8-13.

38  
39  
40 Hughes, H., Lipu, S., Williamson, K. and Lloyd, A. (2007). " *Critical incident technique*". QUT: Australia

41  
42  
43 Kaiser, H.F. (1960). "The application of electronic computers to factor analysis", *Educational and*  
44 *Psychological Measurement*, Vol. 20, pp. 141-51.

45  
46  
47  
48 Keating, D. (2004). Versatility and flexibility: Attributes of the critical incidence technique in nursing  
49 research. *Nurse Health Science*, Vol. 4 No.1-2, pp. 33-39.

50  
51  
52  
53  
54 Kinnison, T., May, S. A. and Guile, D. (2014). "Inter-professional practice: From veterinarian to the  
55 veterinary team", *Journal of Veterinary Medical Education*, Vol. 41 No. 2, pp. 172-178.

- 1  
2 Kim, J. and Mueller, C.W. (1978). "Factor Analysis. Statistical methods and practical issues". SAGE: USA.  
3  
4  
5 Lee, D. (2006). "Marketing veterinary services". *Veterinary Clinics of North. America: Small Animal Practice*,  
6  
7 Vol. 36 No.2, pp.281-295.  
8  
9  
10 Leppiman, A. and Same, S. (2011). "Experience marketing: conceptual insights and difference from  
11  
12 experiential marketing", *Regional Business and Socio-Economic Development*, Vol 5, pp. 240-258.  
13  
14 Lingard, L., Albert, M. and Levinson, W. (2008). "Grounded theory, mixed methods, and action research",  
15  
16 *British Medical Journal (BMJ)*, Vol. 337 pp. 459-461.  
17  
18  
19 Lisch, R. (2014). "Measuring service performance: Practical research for better quality", Gower Publishing  
20  
21 Ltd: UK.  
22  
23  
24 Lowe, P. (2009). "Unlocking potential: A report on veterinary expertise in food animal production: 2009",  
25  
26 DEFRA.UK.  
27  
28  
29 Lowe, P. (2010). "A public or private profession?" *Veterinary Record*, Vol. 166, pp. 211-212.  
30  
31  
32 Lusch, R. F. and Vargo, S. L. (2011). "Service dominant logic: A necessary step", *European Journal of*  
33  
34 *Marketing*, Vol. 45 No. 7/8, pp. 1298-1309.  
35  
36  
37 McCelland, L. E. and Vogus, T. J. (2014). "Compassion practices and HCAHPS: Does rewarding and  
38  
39 supporting workplace compassion influence patient perceptions?" *Health Research and Educational Trust*,  
40  
41 Vol. 49 No.5, pp. 1670-1683.  
42  
43  
44 Moore, B. (1996). "Employing a paraprofessional in practice". *In Practice*, Vol. 18 No.7, pp. 341-342.  
45  
46 available at: <http://inpractice.bmj.com/content/18/7/341.abstract> (accessed 12 January 2016).  
47  
48  
49 Mulligan, F. J. and Doherty, M. L. (2008). "Production diseases of the transition cow", *The Veterinary*  
50  
51 *Journal*, Vol. 176, pp. 3-9.  
52  
53  
54 Newsome, P. and Wright, G. (1999). "A review of patient satisfaction: 1. concepts of satisfaction", *British*  
55  
56 *Dental Journal*, Vol. 186 No. 4, pp. 161-165.  
57  
58  
59  
60

1 Ononeze, V., Murphy, A. W., MacFarlane, A., Byrne, M. and Bradley, C. (2009). "Expanding the value of  
2 qualitative theories of illness experience in clinical practice: A grounded theory of secondary heart disease  
3 prevention", *Health Education Research*, Vol. 24 No.3, pp. 357-368.

4 Pet Food Manufacturers Association (PFMA). (2013). "PFMA 2013 Pet population 2013", available at  
5 <http://www.pfma.org.uk/pet-population/> (accessed 19 September 2013).

6 QRS International. (2014). NVivo 10, available at <http://www.qsrinternational.com/learning> (accessed 10  
7 September 2014).

8 Rathert, C., Wyrwich, M. D. and Bohren, S. A. (2013). "Patient-centred care and outcomes. A systematic  
9 review of the literature", *Medical Care Research and Review*, Vol. 70 No.4, pp. 351- 379.

10 Reader, J. (2012). "Paraprofessionals and modern large animal practice", *Veterinary Record*, Vol.170, pp.  
11 354-356.

12 Safran, D. G., Montgomery, J. E., Chang, H., Murphy, J. and Rogers, W. H. (2001). "Switching doctors;  
13 predictors of voluntary disenrollment from a primary physician's practice", *Journal of Family Practice*, Vol.  
14 50 No.2, pp. 130-136.

15 Shaw, J., Adams, C. L. and Bonnett, B. N. (2004). "What can veterinarians learn from studies of physician-  
16 patient communication about veterinary-client-patient communication?", *Journal of American Veterinary  
17 Medicine Association*, Vol. 224 No. 5, pp. 676-684.

18 Sharp, B. (2008). "Physiotherapy in small animal practice", *In Practice*, Vol. 30, pp. 190-199.

19 Statham, J. and Green, M. (2015). "Cattle veterinary services in a changing world", *Veterinary Record*, Vol.  
20 176, pp. 276-280.

21 Thiedke, C. C. (2007). "What do we really know about patient satisfaction?" *Family Practice Management*,  
22 Vol. 14 No. 1, pp. 33-36.

23 Timmins, R. (2008). "The contribution of animals to human well-being: A veterinary family practice  
24 perspective", *Journal of Veterinary Medical Education*, Vol. 35 No.4, pp. 540-544.

25 Trachtenburg, F., Dugan, E. and Hall, M.A. (2005). "How patients' trust relates to their involvement in  
26 medical care", *Journal of Family Practice* Vol.54, pp.344-353.

27 Vargo, S. L. and Lusch, R. F. (2004). "Evolving to a new dominant logic for marketing", *Journal of Marketing*,  
28 Vol. 69, pp 1-17.

1 Vargo, S. L. and Lusch, R. F. (2008). "Why "service"?", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 36,  
2 pp. 25–38.  
3

4  
5  
6 Vargo, S. L. and Lusch, R. F. (2015). "Institutions and Axioms: An extension and update of service-dominant  
7 logic", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 44 No. 1, pp. 5-23.  
8  
9

10  
11 Veterinary Development Council (VDC). (2012). "*Veterinary Development Council Report 2012*, British  
12 Veterinary Association (BVA): UK.  
13

14  
15 Victoroff, K. Z. and Hogan, S. (2006). "Students' perception of effective learning experiences in dental  
16 school: A qualitative study using a critical incident technique", *Journal of Dental Education*, Vol.70 No.2, pp.  
17 124-132.  
18  
19  
20

21  
22 Vogus, T.J. and McClland, L.E. (2016). "When the customer is the patient: Lessons from healthcare  
23 research on patient satisfaction and service quality ratings", *Human Resource Management Review*. Vol. 26  
24 (March), pp.37-49.  
25  
26  
27

28  
29 Walter, U., Evardsson, B. and Ostrom, A. (2010). "Drivers of customers' service experience: A study in the  
30 restaurant industry", *Managing Service Quality*, Vol. 20 No. 3, pp. 236-258.  
31  
32

33  
34 Williams, S. and Jordan, H. (2015). "Veterinary futures; the drivers of changes", VETFUTURES: UK.  
35

36  
37 Wisniewski, M. (2001). "Using SERVQUAL to assess customer satisfaction with public service sectors",  
38 *Managing Service Quality*, Vol. 11 No. 6, pp. 380-388.  
39

40  
41 Zeithaml, V. A., Bitner, M. J. and Gremler, D. D. (2009). "*Services marketing*", 5<sup>th</sup> Ed. McGraw Hill: New  
42 York, NY.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



### Value co-creation in high involvement services: the animal healthcare sector

Table 1: Dimensions and definitions of service quality in animal health services (qualitative interview results)

#### Nine dimensions and definitions of service quality in animal health services

Dimension	Definition
<b>Integrated care</b>	Ability and readiness to work with other healthcare professionals in an open -minded manner
<b>Communication</b>	Preparedness to communicate openly with client, respectfulness, rapport and professional interactivity
<b>Trustworthiness</b>	Integrity (honesty and morality) and competence (training, skills and technical ability) of practitioner
<b>Value for money</b>	Willingness to provide comprehensive service within a justifiable pricing strategy
<b>Outcome driven service</b>	Dependable and accurate service which is a result focused provision
<b>Empathy</b>	Caring and compassionate service with due regard for clients' needs and animal health and welfare
<b>Bespoke</b>	Custom tailored service providing detailed individualised attention
<b>Accessibility</b>	Geographical proximity of resources and service; accessibility of professionals and ease of contact
<b>Tangibles</b>	Physical resources, facilities, equipment and appearance of professionals

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60




Table 2: Content analysis of interview data

Content Analysis of Interview Data				
Dimensions of Service	Content Analysis based on word frequency			Total
	Veterinarian	Client	Para-professional	
Integrated care	5,205	7,951	14,678	27,834 (22%)*
Communication	2,535	8,194	9,292	20,021 (15%)*
Trustworthiness	2,732	8,216	6,173	17,121
Value for money	7,519	2,448	5,885	15,852
Outcome driven service	2,432	5,983	3,491	11,906
Empathy	2,016	4,974	4,375	11,365
Bespoke	3,597	4,207	3,338	11,142
Accessibility	2,505	3,558	4,362	10,425
Tangibles	630	0	899	1,529
				<b>127,195</b>

\* % of total word count

Table 3: Exploratory Factor Analysis: Elements of animal health service (professional stakeholders)

**Exploratory Factor Analysis: Elements of Animal Health Service (Professional Stakeholders)**

Factor	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<b>Trust (<math>\alpha = 0.843</math>)</b>							
Continuity of care	.530						
Equipment	.646						
Animal welfare	.428						
There is time for compassion	.538						
Price reflects service provided	.730						
Clients are not faced with unexpected costs	.705						
<b>Communication (<math>\alpha = 0.749</math>)</b>							
There is time for compassion		.453					
It is easy to talk to clients		.859					
Clients understand		.805					
Client relationship with professionals is good		.625					
<b>Professional rapport (<math>\alpha = 0.750</math>)</b>							
I actively seek to work with others			.461				
Clients are made to feel welcome			.458				
It is important to stay up to date			.770				
Rapport development			.798				
<b>Responsiveness (<math>\alpha = 0.708</math>)</b>							
Team working				.418			
Professional appearance				.678			
Prompt response to calls				.688			
Second opinion				.461			
<b>Animal focus (<math>\alpha = 0.721</math>)</b>							
Expectations of animal handling					.557		
Clients expect out of hours care					.770		
<b>Credibility (<math>\alpha = 0.726</math>)</b>							
Work within own specialism						.534	
Expectations of animal handling						.430	
Clients expect me to take control of the situation						.650	
I provide health plans						.580	
<b>Access (<math>\alpha = 0.678</math>)</b>							
Location is important							.795
Clients can contact me by email and text							.481
<b>% of variance explained</b>							
	11.68	10.58	9.18	8.05	7.82	6.78	5.34
<b>Cumulative % of variance explained</b>							
	11.68	22.26	31.44	39.49	47.31	54.09	59.43
<b>Sample: n = 271; all respondents</b>							

$\alpha$ =Cronbach's alpha

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60




Table 4: Exploratory Factor Analysis: Elements of animal health service by professional stakeholder group

<b>Exploratory Factor Analysis: Elements of Animal Health Service by Professional Stakeholder Group</b>	
<b>Veterinarians</b>	<b>Paraprofessionals</b>
<b>EIGHT FACTOR SOLUTION</b>	
<b>FACTOR 1</b> (17.12 of variance)	<b>FACTOR 1</b> (11.37 of variance)
12 Easy to talk to clients on their level	15 Price reflects service given
13 Clients able to understand what I am telling them	16 Clients not faced with unexpected costs
11 Time to treat clients with compassion	11 Time to treat clients with compassion
20 Expect out of hours' care	06 Equipment is up to date, clean & works
22 Clients can contact me by text/email	03 Always able to provide continuity of care
19 Clients feel welcome	
<i>10 Animals' welfare always main priority</i>	
<i>16 Clients not faced with unexpected costs</i>	
<b>FACTOR 2</b> (9.71 of variance)	<b>FACTOR 2</b> (9.70 of variance)
18 Actively seek to work with others	12 Easy to talk to clients on their level
05 Health professionals work together	13 Clients able to understand what I am telling them
21 I am comfortable with second opinion	<i>14 My relationship with clients is good</i>
<b>FACTOR 3</b> (8.53 of variance)	<b>FACTOR 3</b> (9.05 of variance)
09 Location is important to clients	23 It is important to stay up to date
07 Clients expect clean & tidy appearance	24 Developing a rapport with clients is important
<i>14 My relationship with clients is good</i>	18 Actively seek to work with others
<b>FACTOR 4</b> (8.30 of variance)	<b>FACTOR 4</b> (8.86 of variance)
<i>10 Animals welfare always main priority</i>	21 I am comfortable with second opinion
08 Calls or emails are promptly responded to	05 Health professionals work together
03 Always able to provide continuity of care	19 Clients feel welcome
24 Developing a rapport with clients is important	07 Clients expect clean & tidy appearance
<i>23 It is important to stay up to date</i>	<i>08 Calls or emails are promptly responded to</i>
<b>FACTOR 5</b> (7.87 of variance)	<b>FACTOR 5</b> (7.86 of variance)
15 Price reflects service given	02 Excellent animal handling skills
06 Equipment is up to date, clean & works	20 Expect out of hours care
<i>16 Clients not faced with unexpected costs</i>	10 Animals welfare always main priority
<b>FACTOR 6</b> (7.04 of variance)	<b>FACTOR 6</b> (7.73 of variance)
02 Excellent animal handling skills	<i>14 My relationship with clients is good</i>
01 Work within own area of specialism	17 I provide health plans for animals under my care
<i>23 It is important to stay up to date</i>	04 Clients expect me to take control of situation
	01 Work within own area of specialism
	<i>08 Calls or emails are promptly responded to</i>
	<i>22 Clients can contact me by text/email</i>
<b>FACTOR 7</b> (5.61 of variance)	<b>FACTOR 7</b> (6.57 of variance)
04 Clients expect me to take control of situation	09 Location is important to clients
<i>14 My relationship with clients is good</i>	<i>22 Clients can contact me by text/email</i>
<b>FACTOR 8</b> (5.17 of variance)	
17 I provide health plans for animals under my care	

*Italicised text indicates cross loaded items.*

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

