

**EXPLORATION OF ANTECEDENTS OF SERVICE DELIVERY  
INNOVATION AND ITS IMPACT ON THE  
FIRM PERFORMANCE**



सिद्धिमूर्त्त प्रबन्धनम्  
भा. प्र. सं. इन्दौर  
IIM INDORE

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Fellow Programme in Management

Indian Institute of Management, Indore

**By**

Rajeev Verma [2009FPM13]

JUNE 2013

**Thesis Advisory Committee:**

Prof. Jayasimha K.R.

[Chair]

Prof. Ashish Sadh

Prof. Patturaja Selvaraj

[Member]

[Member]

## ABSTRACT

Service firms are fostering innovation so as to gain competitive advantage [Sheth, 2011]. Literature suggests that in service firms, factors contributing to the innovativeness are more intangible in nature [Hunt, 1999, 2000, 2002; Madhavaram and Hunt, 2008]. Hence, the existing notion of innovation in manufacturing sector cannot be directly adopted into the service sector [Hunt and Morgan, 1997; Vargo and Lusch, 2004; Paswan, D'souza and Zolfagharian, 2009]. To study the specific case of service innovation in the delivery process i.e., service delivery innovation [Avlontis, Paulina and Spiros, 2001] various intangible firm resources have been studied by researchers [Conner and Prahalad, 1996; Madhavaram and Hunt, 2008] to identify their role in the innovation process. Researchers have classified these resources into various classification schemes such as tangible and intangible [Hunt, 2000]; physical, human and organizational [Barney, 1991]; operant and operand [Vargo and Lusch, 2008] and basic, composite and interconnected [Madhavaram and Hunt, 2008]. Under the Hunt [2000] resource classification, intangible firm resources have been further classified as collaborative, integrating and organizational entities that produce efficient market offerings. These resources have been identified as a source of competitive advantage under the resource advantage [RA] theory [Hunt, 1997, 2002, 2011]. Further, service-dominant [S-D] logic framework [Vargo and Lusch, 2004, 2006, 2008] advocates intangible dynamic resources as the basis for firm competence. Based on the above framework, various models have been proposed to measure effectiveness of service innovation [Ordanini and Parasuraman, 2011; Storey and Kahn, 2010; Chen, Tsou and Huang, 2009].

However, our review found that the previous literature [Ordanini and Parasuraman, 2011, Storey and Kahn, 2010; Chen, Tsou and Huang, 2009; Merz, He and Vargo, 2009; Gronroos, 2006] has neglected the potential of intangible resources in the service development and innovation one hence there is a call of more research in this domain. Our review suggests that there are very few

studies that look at collaborative, integrating and organizational resource entities [Hunt, 2000] in a single model. The present research derives insight from RA theory and SDL framework to propose a conceptual framework for investigating the antecedents and consequent of service innovation in a project led service environment. The enablers of service innovation includes innovation orientation [IO], market orientation [MO], knowledge integration mechanism [KIM], IT infrastructure [ITI], customer [CC] and business partner collaboration [BC]. These enablers have been selected based on the reviewed literature [Hurley and Hult, 1998; Chesbrough, 2006; Kohli and Jaworski, 1990; De luca and Gima, 2007; Wasko and Faraj, 2005; Ordanini and Parasuraman, 2011]. The role of technology turbulence and market uncertainty has also been studied as controlled variables.

The study of sustainable competitive advantage in light of service innovation has largely remains understudied and there is a call for more empirical findings in this domain [Bhardwaj, Varadarajan and Fahy, 1993; Hoffman, 2000; Storey and Kahn, 2010]. Juan Lu, Ivan and Cheng-Jui [2010] suggest innovation as a key for competitive advantage in service industry. Storey and Kahn [2010] studied the effect of service performance on sustainable competitive advantage of the firm. The effect of service delivery innovation on sustainable competitive advantage has been tested in the proposed model. Further, the mediating role of service delivery innovation has also been studied in the overall model. Literature largely remains silent on exploring the role of customer orientation in the service innovation process [Ordanini and Parasuraman, 2011; Kennedy, Goolsby and Arnould, 2003]. Hence, the moderating role of customer orientation [CO] of team leader/ project manager has also been studied in the above relationship.

By collecting data from 419 service sector professionals working largely in Indian Information Technology and Commercial banks, we tested the aforesaid relationship under 9 hypotheses [H1 to H9]. Out of the collected sample, Information Technology firms represent tacit services and Commercial banks represent explicit services. This classification is based on the service firm classification scheme proposed by De Luca and Gima [2007]. It has been done purposely to collect a representative sample. The structural model has been tested using AMOS 18.0. It shows that innovation orientation, market orientation, knowledge integration mechanism, IT infrastructure and customer collaboration strengthens service delivery innovation process.

However, business collaboration does not have significant impact on the service innovation process [Ordanini and Parasuraman, 2011; Chen, Tsou and Huang, 2009]. Further, customer orientation strengthens service delivery innovation - performance relationship and hence advances available literature by establishing itself as an efficient moderator. The controlled variables namely market uncertainty and technological uncertainty does not have significant impact on the tested model. Overall, this proposed innovation framework presents a roadmap for marketing researchers to explore the connection between enablers of service innovation and firm resources. This work contributes in understanding resource allocation process of the service firms.

# CONTENT

<b>ABSTRACT</b>	ii
<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>01 -07</b>
1.1 Background	01
1.2 Statement of the Problem	01
1.3 Rationale of the Study	03
1.4 Research Objective	06
1.5 Organization of the Study	06
<b>2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE</b>	<b>08 - 38</b>
2.1 Defining Service Innovation	09
2.2 The Typology of Service Innovation	14
2.3 Theoretical Framework	17
2.3.1 The Resource Advantage Theory of Competition	17
2.3.2 R-A Theory as a Foundation to the SDL Framework	19
2.3.3 The Service Dominant Logic Framework	20
2.4 Service Innovation from the Lens of SDL and RA Theory	24
2.5 Literature Review on Service Innovation	25
2.6 Identification of Research Gaps	32
<b>3. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND RESEARCH HYPOTHESES</b>	<b>39 - 56</b>
3.1 Conceptual Framework	39
3.2 The Research Hypothesis	40
3.2.1 Innovation Orientation	40
3.2.2 Market Orientation	42
3.2.3 Knowledge Integration Mechanism	44
3.2.4 Information Technology Infrastructure	46
3.2.5 Customer Collaboration	48
3.2.6 Business Partner Collaboration	50
3.2.7 Sustainable Competitive Advantage	51
3.2.8 Customer Orientation	53
3.2.9 Controls	54
3.3 Conceptualization of Constructs	54

<b>4. PILOT TESTING</b>	<b>57 - 60</b>
4.1 Introduction	57
4.2 Pre-test	57
4.3 Sample Description	58
4.4 Measures	59
4.4.1 Construct Reliability	59
4.4.2 Measuring Construct Validity using CFA	60
<b>5. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>61 - 76</b>
5.1 Research Setting	61
5.2 Sampling and Data Collection	63
5.3 Sample Description	64
5.4 Measures	68
5.4.1 Innovation Orientation	69
5.4.2 Market Orientation	69
5.4.3 Knowledge Integration Mechanism	69
5.4.4 Information Technology Infrastructure	70
5.4.5 Customer Collaboration	70
5.4.6 Business Partner Collaboration	71
5.4.7 Service Delivery Innovation	71
5.4.8 Sustainable Competitive Advantage	71
5.4.9 Customer Orientation	72
5.5 Scale Reliability and Validity	72
5.5.1 Measurement Model	72
5.6 Common Method Variance	76
<b>6. RESULTS</b>	<b>77 - 91</b>
6.1 Checking the Assumptions for Testing	77
6.1.1 Normality Check	77
6.1.2 Linearity Check	78
6.1.3 Testing for Heteroscedasticity	78
6.1.4 Checking for Multicollinearity	78
6.2 Model Specification	79
6.3. Findings	80
6.3.1 Testing the Structural Model	80

6.3.2 Testing the Mediating Effect	86
6.4 General Discussion	88
6.5 Post –hoc Analysis	90
<b>7. CONCLUSION AND MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS</b>	<b>92 - 98</b>
7.1 Conclusion	92
7.2 Managerial Implications	96
<b>8. LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS</b>	<b>99 - 103</b>
8.1 Limitations	99
8.2 Future Research Directions	100
<b>LIST OF REFERENCES</b>	<b>104</b>
<b>APPENDIX</b>	
<b>Appendix A:</b> Research Questionnaire	120
<b>Appendix B:</b> Items from Original Measures	124
<b>Appendix C:</b> Normality Plots	127
<b>Appendix D:</b> Linearity Plots [Line of best fit]	128
<b>LIST OF FIGURES</b>	
<b>Figure 3.1:</b> Conceptual Model	40
<b>Figure 5.1:</b> Gender Profiling of the Respondents	66
<b>Figure 5.2:</b> Age Profiling of the Respondents	67
<b>Figure 5.3:</b> Profiling of the Respondents based on Management Cadre	67
<b>Figure 6.1:</b> Tested Structural Model with Control Variables (path diagram)	82
<b>Figure 6.2:</b> Tested Structural Model Along with Interaction Variables	85
<b>Figure 6.3:</b> Structural Model Testing the Mediating Role of Service Delivery Innovation	87
<b>Figure 6.4:</b> Interacting Effect of Customer Orientation with Service Innovation on Sustainable Competitive Advantage	90
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b>	
<b>Table 2.1:</b> Evolution of Service Innovation Concept	12
<b>Table 2.2:</b> Comparison between New Product and Service Development	13
<b>Table 2.3:</b> Service Innovation Classification Schemes	16

<b>Table 2.4:</b> Fundamental Premises under the Resource Advantage Theory	17
<b>Table 2.5:</b> Conceptual Transition for Practitioners	21
<b>Table 2.6:</b> Foundational Premises of S-D logic	21
<b>Table 2.7:</b> Key Theoretical Contributions under Service Dominant Logic Approach for the Development of Research Domain	22
<b>Table 2.8:</b> Bibliography on the Service Innovation Literature before the Emergence of SDL Framework	26
<b>Table 2.9:</b> Studies on Service Innovation	29
<b>Table 2.10:</b> Key contributors on service innovation using RA or SDL framework	30
<b>Table 2.11:</b> Key Constructs Along with Their Theoretical and Managerial Motivation towards Identifying Literature Gaps	34
<b>Table 3.1:</b> Definitions of Innovation Orientation as Cited in Literature	41
<b>Table 3.2:</b> Definitions of Market Orientation as Cited in Literature	43
<b>Table 3.3:</b> Definitions of Knowledge Integration Mechanism as cited in Literature	45
<b>Table 3.4:</b> Definitions of Customer Collaboration as Cited In Literature	48
<b>Table 3.5:</b> Definitions of Business Collaboration as Cited In Literature	50
<b>Table 3.6:</b> Distinctness of Various Constructs	55
<b>Table 3.7:</b> Summary of Hypotheses and Supporting Literature	56
<b>Table 4.1:</b> Profiling of the Respondents	58
<b>Table 4.2:</b> Construct Reliability Values using the Pilot Sample Data	59
<b>Table 4.3:</b> Construct Validity [AVE values] using the Pilot Sample Data	60
<b>Table 5.1:</b> Profiling of the Respondents	65
<b>Table 5.2:</b> Scales and their References	68
<b>Table 5.3:</b> Reported Scale Reliability Values	73
<b>Table 5.4:</b> Reported Average Variance Extracted [AVE] Values	74
<b>Table 5.5:</b> Discriminant Validity of the Scale	75
<b>Table 6.1:</b> Skewness and Kurtosis Values for the Variables	77
<b>Table 6.2:</b> Test Results from Normality Check	78
<b>Table 6.3:</b> Multicollinearity Statistics	79
<b>Table 6.4:</b> Model Fit Indices	83
<b>Table 6.5:</b> Standardized Regression Weights with Controlled Variables	83
<b>Table 6.6:</b> Model Fit Indices with Moderating Variable	84
<b>Table 6.7:</b> Summarized Hypothesis Test Results	85
<b>Table 6.8:</b> Testing the Moderating effect: Direct and Indirect Effects	86
<b>Table 6.9:</b> Model Fit Comparison of the Default Models	91
<b>Table 6.10:</b> Structural Equation Estimates for Model-1 and Model-2	91