

Antecedent of service innovation effectiveness in small and medium enterprises: a case of hospitality sector in Nepal

Gangaram Biswakarma

Faculty of Management, Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu

Achyut Gnawali

Faculty of Management, Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu

Bharat Khatri

Apex College, Pokhara University, Kathmandu

Abstract

For a country's economic growth and the productivity of the market, innovation is an integral factor. Service innovations today are transforming into a huge area for investigating dynamic relationships among technological and human processes that lead to the transition to the organization and management of services. In the hospitality industry, service innovation is very commonly needed. Conventional techniques in the hospitality industry are also very popular and notions prevail that hospitality is hard to innovate. With this the aim of this research is to examine the service innovation practices and its effectiveness in hospitality sector small and medium enterprises of Nepal. A sample of 308 responses has been collected from SMEs in hospitality sector. The findings indicate that the effectiveness of service innovation is limited. The highest correlation is observed with process innovation and followed by service innovation, organisational innovation, marketing innovation and human capital competency. It was found that there is an influence of service innovation, process innovation, marketing innovation, organizational innovation, and human capital competency on effectiveness of service innovation in SMEs of hospitality sector. SMEs from the hospitality sector could use innovation drivers to meet the ultimate company goals by service innovation effectiveness.

Keywords: Service innovation, innovation, SMEs, hospitality.

Introduction

Innovation is an essential element for economic progress of a country and competitiveness of an industry [13]. It plays a crucial role in transforming business dynamics, in developing competitive instruments and in achieving competitive strategy. Innovation is a compelling way to gain value and comparative edge [77]. Innovation plays an important role not only for large firms, but also for SMEs [6, 31]. Initially the idea of service innovation was debated and built over the past few decades. Services dominate the global economy rapidly, with more than 70% of workers in OECD countries and 58% of the global gross domestic product [9]. The hospitality sector is one of the most significant services sectors of modern industry. Globalization and market competitiveness have driven the modern organizations toward innovation in their

operations to gain sustainable competitive advantage [100]. Service innovation is a concept for improving service that is taken into practice [95]. Service innovation involves consumer changes that are seen as unique; or never previously noticed or new to a specific company. New or better methods of planning and delivering systems are service innovation.

As such, service innovation is much sought in the hospitality sector. Innovations in services today are evolving into an enormous field to research complex relations between technical and human processes leading the transition in service organisation and management. Innovations of service delivery systems can be used, but this is mostly used instead as innovation in consumer products. New and substantially modified service models, customer engagement platforms, service distribution mechanisms, lead to a new one or more renewed offerings and improves the marketable service. Customers perceive service in such a way that they can be a key factor in buying decisions. Innovation of service plays an important part in order to best serve customers. In hospitality sector conventional approaches are still prevalent are difficult to innovate in hospitality. With an evolving philosophy of service science that reflects contemporary society, the innovation services are given a strong path in a different way.

In that sense, the conventional method of service delivery of small to medium-sized undertakings is being used aggressively. Service innovation aims to keep the company prosperous and improve staff awareness and competence. Innovation of services allows small to medium-sized companies to deal with giant companies as well. Small and medium-sized businesses must explore opportunities to boost their productivity with restricted capital for innovative ways of operating and rising market shares. Innovation is one of the main philosophies for these competitive circumstances. To do so, people have to adjust the way they decide, try to do it differently and make decisions different from what they did. Organizational leaders must explicitly recognize the aims and purposes of this process and effectively engage in order to meet the objectives of this process in order to ensure that service developments in SMEs are successful. Service innovation is essential for small and medium-sized enterprises in sectors but the methodological research on innovation is relatively inadequate in SMEs in the hospitality sector.

Several scholars have shown that the achievements of SMEs have been significantly influenced by their innovation practices [54, 69]. [48] found that large companies are more innovative than SMEs. Additionally, according to [68] larger firms than SMEs are more adoptive to emerging technology. Researchers like [79, 99] found that product/service innovation activities of SMEs are more important than process innovation. Organizational leaders must explicitly recognize the aims and purposes of this process and effectively engage in order to meet the objectives of this process in order to ensure that service developments in SMEs are successful. Service innovation is essential for small and medium-sized enterprises in sectors but the methodological research on innovation is relatively inadequate in SMEs in the hospitality sector. In hospitality related literature, studies on service innovation, as well as its antecedents, are seriously scant [25].

Researches in innovation are mostly concentrated to manufacturing sector, focused to science and technology and its link to economic productivity, new product development [21]. The study of technical change in the service sector was largely neglected as services were viewed as low technology users [21]. Although innovation of services in the service sector, especially in hospitality, is crucial and evolving in the current situation. The literature on service innovation is expanding into a diverse and multidisciplinary body of knowledge spanning economics, marketing, organizational science and management perspectives [85, 74, and 67].

This study focused and emphasizes to the effectiveness of the service innovation that should be a priority of companies and managers in the development of the organization's smooth operations. Leaders in maintaining competitive companies should learn the connection between the guiding forces of service innovation and its performance. More precisely, recognizing the relation between different main factors most critical for service innovation would provide corporate managers with comprehensive advice on how to create a culture for ingenuity in employees in order to increase skills that increase the chance of success. Thus, the aim of this research is to examine the service innovation practices and its effectiveness in hospitality sector small and medium enterprises of Nepal.

Concept of Innovation

Innovation, in Joseph Schumpeter, a German economist view, who developed the early concept of innovation in economic development and entrepreneurship comprise the elements of creativity, research and development (R&D), new processes, new products or services and advance in technologies [63]. Similarly, [57] innovation is the creation of new wealth or the alteration and enhancement of existing resources to create new wealth. As such [92], innovation is as a process of idea creation, a development of an invention and ultimately the introduction of a new product, process or service to the market. [87] suggests that creativity is one of the most significant strategic arms and is seen as the key value potential of an organization in general. Likewise, [62] considered innovation as an effective way to improve firm's productivity due to the resource constraint issue facing a firm. [8] add that the capability in product and business innovation is crucial for a firm to exploit new opportunities and to gain competitive advantage.

The idea of innovation in the literature is becoming more diverse and complex. It is an innovative method that sets the way for a sequence of subsequent developments in a significant innovation. Especially in the hospitality innovation is a joint action between manufacturers, employers and founders. Innovation can therefore be used in the hospitality industry as a critical driver. Innovation is an innovative method that sets the way for a sequence of subsequent developments in a significant innovation. Hospitality innovation is a joint action between manufacturers, employers and founders. [11, 15, 1, 35, 82], such scholars have established various innovation fostering models. Scholars like [45, 28] presented the critical role of innovation in business profitability and the growth of the organisation.

Emergence of service innovation

Service innovation research shows three distinct phases, that reflects the era of evolution of service innovation i.e., Formation phase 1986–2000, Maturity phase 2001–2005 and Multidimensional phase 2006–2010. Between 1986 and 2000, the first period of included comparatively fewer publications. Service marketing rapidly grew out of a relatively low level as a sub discipline for marketing research in the 1980s [39]. The first stages of service-innovation study, [39] called into question the existing product-focused vision of innovation that regarded it as more or less synonymous with technological innovation, research and development (R&D), and new product development. In the formation phase, new views of services and service innovation provided foundations for further research [12, 37]. Following an expanded emphasis on innovative product and manufacturing processes [e.g. 96], the phase addressed a latent demand for services applicability. There was also considerable emphasis on the differences between product and process innovation, as drawn from [2]. Throughout the formation process these distinctions led to an increased demarcations perspective along with research the underlies that services have special characteristics [24, 40].

In 2001, marked the start of the second evolutionary phase, or the maturity phase. In this step the key concern was the participation of consumers, which was historically somewhat less discussed and their unintentional positions in the innovation process. The phase consists of the perspective of customer's active participation, involvement in the services process as co-creator of value of the service. The few prominent scholars in this direction were [61, 70, 78, 98, 3, 4, 65, 66, 101]. Studies continued to concentrate on how to learn from consumers and to participate in the field of creativity and innovation more consistently. The era emphasized the non-technological innovation such as [36, 49] and more attention were given that innovation is not only a concern of the technology. A broad range of concepts were integrated such as strategy, leadership, management in service innovation, studies such as [51, 53, and 97].

In 2006 third phase in the evolution, the article of [55] presented service innovation into a multidisciplinary perspective. Likewise, [10] presents the deployment of services perspective. Thereafter, areas like innovation management, technological and non-technological innovation were in the line. [5, 33, 83] studies presented the multidimensional perspective of service innovation. Shifting the concept of service innovation from technological perspective to customer's view point perspective, for example, [83] as well as [41] stressed that progress in technology and non-technology should not be separate but rather represent a view of synthesis.

Likewise, customer involvement, regarding strategy, innovation systems, business model innovation studies like [104, 64, 5, 43 94, 22, 33 84] were put forward in the concept of service innovation.

Process phases of service innovation

The process of innovation can incorporate both incremental and radical change. To develop an effective innovation process, it is needed to focus not only on products, technology and processes, but also on the culture of the organization, its norms, values and beliefs [46]. [59] points out that the innovation process needs continuous upkeep and renovation so it has much easier losses than acquisition to invent. Likewise, [81] shows that process approaches to change implementation in service innovation. [16, 17] emphasized on incremental innovation produces in the form of continuous improvement. In similar manner, [93] emphasized on organisational structure to support innovation in the organisation. [20] focuses on multiple stakeholders, Rothwell (1992) focuses on understand the needs of the consumers.

The innovation process begins with developing a flourishing ideal environment and then by management procedures capturing and analyzing it which ensure that ideas are effectively transformed into products or services. Innovation diffusion – the method of introducing and incorporating fully-fledged innovations – is the third pillar that drives this entire process.

Innovation is an incorporated process that evolves in three main phases. The creativity phase is where an innovation trip starts [34, 27]. The development of ideas is not a random process and should not be left to chance. This is where a good innovation plays a crucial role by ensuring the transition from an idea to an innovation. The third stage is the diffusion phase; executed diffusion greatly increases the chances of innovation's acceptance.

Dimension of service innovation

Schumpeter is the first investigator to establish invention theory. [88] describes innovation in five dimensions that is initiation of a new product/service or a new type of already known product/service, application of new or significantly improved methods of production, opening a new market, acquiring new sources of supplies, new industry structures such as the destruction of a monopoly position. Likewise, the dimensions of service innovation presented by several studies that are –service/product innovation [75, 50], process innovation [75, 50, 91, 38, 44], marketing innovation [75, 38, 50, 91, 44], organizational innovation [29, 86,38, 50,91, 44], human capital competency [18].

Service feature innovation: Service innovation means introduction of new products or services in order to create new markets or customers, or satisfy current markets or customers [102, 103]. Service is not a type of retail offerings but a value-creation viewpoint. According to [37], the emphasis on value by costuming lens is important and co-creating value along with customers provides the basis for characterizing the service by the collaborative, processual, experiential and relationship. A service innovation often requires reproducible components that in other situations or contexts can be found and systematically replicated. Hospitality companies, like hotels are a perfect example of an industry that might benefit from service innovation. First, from a customer's perspective

[30]; secondly, accelerations in information technology [73], thirdly, brand loyal behavior [73]. In order to add value to the guests' experience, hotel managers and marketers must meet the challenge of determining which services are preferred by hotel guests [73]. In contrast with product innovation research, the study in service innovation research is however low [26].

Process innovation: The process innovation is the implementation of a new manufacturing system. It is a method that can also take place economically in a new manner [88]. The direct effect of process innovation on efficiency in SMEs [23], and SMEs can be able to introduce transformation processes more quickly and at a lower cost of transitioning compared with larger companies thanks to their operational simplicity [19]. It covers organizations that manage and manage new products and services for customer design and manufacture. Thus, process innovation involves creating or improving methods of production, service or administrative operations [56] as well as developments in the processes, systems and reengineering activities undertaken to develop new products and services.

Marketing innovation: According to [52], marketing innovation deals with the market mix and market selection in order to meet a customer's buying preference. [22] suggests that marketing innovation has a vital role to play in achieving consumer expectations and resolving marketing opportunities. In this respect, any marketing innovation has to be directed at meeting customers' demand and satisfaction [7].

Organizational innovation: The new, collaborative/organizational structure/legal system that effectively re-drives or strengthens the company is organisational innovation. It addresses innovative ways to organize internal cooperation, lead and motivate employees, to building careers and to offset salary and benefits employment [76]. Organizational innovations can also be aimed at improving workplace satisfaction and nurturing internal knowledge and competence assets [47, 89]. Organizational innovation covers staff responsibilities, duties and new methods of coordinating and controlling staff [80].

Human capital competency: It is a widely held view that human capital represents an essential driver for innovation [18]. The [71] defines human capital as the knowledge, skills, competencies and attributes embodied in individuals that facilitate the creation of personal, social and economic well-being. It is the extensive experience and thought leadership in the area of competency-based management. It offers organisations, through a more creative approach to skills, the capabilities and attitudes of their human assets needed for the good exercise of a task.

This research study considered five dimensions for effectiveness of service innovation in hospitality sector, that are - service/product innovation, process innovation, marketing innovation, organizational innovation and human capital competency.

Methodology

This study focused to the service innovation and its effectiveness in the context of small and medium enterprises in hospitality sector in Nepal. The research applied the descriptive and explanatory research design. The research is descriptive in nature as it describes the present situation of the service innovation in small and medium enterprises of hospitality sector in Nepal. The research applied the descriptive and explanatory research in hospitality sector in the study area. Additionally, the research is explanatory since it has been conducted to identify the extent and nature of cause-and-effect relationships of dimensions of service innovation to the effectiveness of the service innovation in the context of small and medium enterprises in hospitality sector in Nepal.

The population of interest consisted of SMEs in hospitality sector, which included travel and tourism, hotel and restaurants that is mid-range hospitality business in Kathmandu valley, Pokhara, Chitwan, Butwal, Bhairahwa/Lumbini, and Dharan. First the aforesaid mid-range hospitality businesses were selected and the employees working, managers and owner in these organisations were included in the study. A sample of 450 respondents was selected with convenience sampling of 150 each from hotels, restaurant & café, and travel & tours. However, only 308 responses have been collected - hotels (97 nos.), restaurant & café (107 nos.), and travel & tours (104 nos.). The primary source of data was collected through structured questionnaires. The questionnaire contains 29 opinion statements using a five-point Likert scale for each statement ranging from 'Strongly Agree' to 'Strongly disagree', coded by '5' representing 'Strongly Agree' and '1' representing 'Strongly Disagree'. The opinion items were adapted from [75] and [58]. The first part of the questionnaire deals with demographic information of respondents which includes nature of the company, gender, position, experience, education, legal registration, business experience, number of employee, type of the product of the organization where the respondent is associated with. The second part deals with questionnaires related to variables considered in this research. The overall Cronbach's Alpha of 29 numbers of items was 0.955.

Respondents' characteristics

In the study the majority of organizations surveyed were small enterprises than medium enterprises, small enterprises consists of 81.49% and 18.51% were medium enterprises. There was a participation of 31.49% of hotels, 34.74% of restaurant/café and 33.77% of travel & tours. The legal status of the organisations of the respondents was 43.18% in sole proprietorship, 39.61% in partnership and 17.21% in private limited company. The majority of the organisation 45.13% has 21 to 30 numbers of employees. Likewise, the majority of organisations were in the business two years 50.97%. There were 62.34% of male and 37.66% of female respondents. Most of the respondents were the owner of the business 44.48%, followed by 31.49% of managers and 24.03% of employee. The respondents have diverse educational level, the majority of them 50.97% were graduates and 31.82% of the respondents were having more than five years of work experience in the field of hospitality.

Table 1: Sample characteristics

Nature of Company	n	Percent	Gender	n	Percent
Small	251	81.49%	Male	192	62.34%
Medium	57	18.51%	Female	116	37.66%
Total	308	100.00%	Total	308	100.00%
Type of Organisation	n	Percent	Position	n	Percent
Hotel	97	31.49%	Employee	74	24.03%
Restaurant/Cafe	107	34.74%	Manager	97	31.49%
Travel & Tours	104	33.77%	Owner	137	44.48%
Total	308	100.00%	Total	308	100%
Experience	n	Percent	Education	n	Percent
Six Months	49	15.91%	Below Secondary	17	5.52%
Two Year	95	30.84%	Secondary	47	15.26%
Five Year	66	21.43%	Under Graduate	87	28.25%
More Than Five Year	98	31.82%	Graduate	157	50.97%
Total	308	100.00%	Total	308	100.00%
Legal Registration	n	Percent	Number of Employee	n	Percent
Sole Proprietorship	133	43.18%	1 to 10	82	26.62%
Partnership	122	39.61%	11 to 20	139	45.13%
Private Limited	53	17.21%	21 to 30	87	28.25%
Total	308	100.00%	Total	308	100.00%
Business Experience	n	Percent			
Six Month	12	3.90%			
Two Year	157	50.97%			
Five Year	73	23.70%			
More Than Five Year	66	21.43%			
Total	308	100.00%			

Results

Status of effectiveness of service innovation

Effectiveness of service innovation is the dependent variable of this research. The results show the descriptive statistics of effectiveness of service innovation. There are seven statements used to measure the effectiveness of service innovation in the respondents' organisation. The responses were collected in the five-point Likert scale. The result shows that the items have a mean value ranging from 4.20 to 4.55 i.e. the response were positive in regards of the efforts towards effectiveness of service innovation in SMEs in hospitality sector. Among the seven statements, the statement with code 'ESI2' has scored the lowest mean of 4.20 (SD=0.930) and statement with code 'ESI6' has scored the highest mean of 4.55 (SD=0.571). The highest agreement stated that the service innovation in the organization becomes first priority in business. Wherein, lowest mean shows that respondents are less agreed on the service innovation in their organization helps to increase employee competency. The respondents perceived that the service

innovation in my organization is effective and service innovation in the organization makes our business more competitive. Likewise, respondents perceived moderately that the service innovation is related with the increase employee knowledge, helps to motivate the overall staff or helps to make the strategy of the business. The overall mean of effectiveness of service innovation is 4.32 (SD= 0.495). This shows that the effectiveness of service innovation in SMEs is perceived moderately in practices and it helps to improve the business competitiveness. This shows that the organizations are still to explore the fullest of the service innovation in their respective business that may bring competitive advantage in the arena.

Status of service innovation

Service innovation in designing the service is one of the dimension of the overall service innovation. There were four statements used to explore the service innovation in the five-point Likert scale. The result shows that the items have a mean value ranging from 4.20 to 4.37 i.e. the response is moderate in concern to service innovation practice. The result shows that 'SI3' has the highest mean of 4.37 (SD=0.695) and 'SI2' has the lowest mean value of 4.20 (SD=0.930). The most agreed statement stating that organization provides comfortable and user friendly services. The least agreement was for the statement that organization emphasizes on quality of service delivery. It indicates that the organisations are committed to provide the customer centric services, however, they are not so focused to maintain the quality of the service they provided. The overall mean of service innovation is 4.27 (SD= 0.638). This shows that the organisation is moderately focused in service design and creative service delivery. The organizations are least emphasized to improving the service delivery and they are moderately focused to provide innovative service to increase market share.

Status of process innovation

The process innovation dimension was measured with four statements in the five-point Likert scale. The result shows that the items have a mean value ranging from 4.20 to 4.37, shows a moderate agreement of the respondents towards process innovation in their organization. Among the four statements, the statement with code 'PI1' has scored the lowest mean of 4.20 (SD=0.930) and statement with code 'PI2' has scored the highest mean of 4.37 (SD=0.695). The most agreed statement, stating that the organization emphasizes on improving internal operation of business process. Likewise, the least mean shows that respondents are less agreed that their organization focus on improving effectiveness of process innovation. The overall mean of process innovation is 4.26 (SD= 0.568), it shows that a moderate focus of these organisation is towards process innovation. The organisations emphasize moderately the information and communication technology and lesser focused to creating or improving method of production.

Status of marketing innovation

The dimension of marketing innovation was measured with five statements in the five-point Likert scale. The result shows that the items have a mean value ranging from 4.09 to 4.44 i.e. the response indicates a moderate to low marketing innovation practice in the organisation. Among the five statements, the statement with code 'MI3' has scored the lowest mean of 4.09 (SD=0.971) and statement with code 'MI2' has scored the highest mean of 4.44 (SD=0.677). The results indicate that the organization focused on changes in pricing strategy. Most organizations also have good system to meet the current needs of marketing factors. However, respondents are less agreed on their organization focuses on new sales channel. The overall mean of marketing innovation is 4.31 (SD= 0.514), shows that the small and medium enterprises in hospitality sector give importance to marketing innovation moderately. The organizations are lesser focused to the changes in product / service promotion, the organization emphasizes on utilization of social media marketing and emphasizes on seasonal changes in marketing instruments.

Status of organizational Innovation

The organisational innovation dimension was measured with four statements in the five-point Likert scale. The results show the items have a mean value ranging from 4.23 to 4.32 i.e. the response is with moderate agreement towards organisational innovation. Among the four statements, the statement with code 'OI2' has scored the lowest mean of 4.23 (SD= 0.843) and statement with code 'OI3' and 'OI4' have scored the highest mean of 4.32 (SD= 0.763 and 0.711) respectively. The most agreed statement, stating that organization emphasizes on new way of decision making for division of work and organization focuses on establishing culture of creativity and innovation. The least agreement was on organization emphasizes on new method of responsibilities. The overall mean of Organizational Innovation is 4.29 (SD=0.554). This shows that the organisations are moderately practicing organisational innovation. The organisations find that the organizational innovation as an important driver for effectiveness of service innovation and trying to focuses on establishing culture of creativity and innovation. The organizations are initiating new method of responsibilities, decision making for division of work and business practices.

Status of human capital competency

The human capital competency dimension of service innovation was measured with five statements used in the five-point Likert scale. The result shows that the items have a mean value ranging from 4.19 to 4.33 i.e. show a moderate initiation maintain human capital competency in the organisations. Among the three statements, the statement with code 'HCC3' has scored the lowest mean of 4.19 (SD=0.782) and statement with code 'HCC2' has scored the highest mean of 4.33 (SD=0.713). The most agreed statement, stating that organization emphasizes on new ways of organizing and empowering staff and least agreed by the respondents that the organization is emphasizes on improving work satisfaction. The overall mean of human capital competency is 4.25 (SD=0.508).

This shows that the organizations are moderately emphasizing the dimension of human capital competency in their organisation. The organisations are emphasizing least towards nurturing internal knowledge and competence assets and on promoting the creativity of employee. However, organizations put efforts on retaining staff and maintain flexibility in the workplace. Additionally, organizations are moderately involved on new ways of organizing and empowering staff.

Table 2: Descriptive analysis of dimension service innovation and the effectiveness of service innovation

Variables	Mean	SD
Service innovation	4.27	0.638
Process innovation	4.26	0.568
Marketing innovation	4.31	0.514
Organizational Innovation	4.29	0.554
Human capital competency	4.25	0.508
Effectiveness of service innovation	4.32	0.495

Relationship of antecedents of service innovation and the effectiveness of service innovation

Pearson Correlation analysis was used to determine the relationship between the antecedents of service innovation and the effectiveness of service innovation. The result shows that the dimension service innovation and effectiveness of service innovation correlation coefficient as $r=0.829$, $p<0.01$, which implies that the two variables are strongly positive correlated. The correlation coefficient of service innovation is statistically significant at 1% significant level. Likewise, process innovation and effectiveness of service innovation correlation coefficient as $r=0.842$, $p<0.01$, which implies that the two variables are strongly positive correlated at 1% significant level of significance. Similarly, correlation coefficient between marketing innovation and effectiveness of service innovation is $r=0.738$, $p<0.01$, which implies that the two variables have strong positive correlation at 1% significant level of significance. In the similar manner, the correlation coefficient between the organizational innovation and effectiveness of service innovation is 0.784 , $p<0.01$, which implies that the two variables have strong positive correlation at 1% significant level. Similarly, correlation coefficient between the human capital competency and effectiveness of service innovation is $r=0.681$, $p<0.01$, which implies that the two variables havemoderate positive correlation at 1% significant level. The highest correlation is observed with process innovation and followed by service innovation, organisational innovation, marketing innovation and human capital competency.

Table 3: Relation between Service Innovation and its Effectiveness

Variables	Service Innovation	Process Innovation	Marketing Innovation	Organizational Innovation	Human Capital Competency
Pearson Correlation	.829**	.842**	.738**	.784**	.681**
Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000

Impact analysis of antecedents of service innovation on the effectiveness of service innovation

Multiple linear regression analysis was used to analyze the influence of antecedents of service innovation on the effectiveness of service innovation in SMEs in hospitality sector. The impact is expressed in the following equation:

$$\hat{Y} = \alpha + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_4 X_4 + \beta_5 X_5 + e_i$$

Where,

\hat{Y}	=	Effectiveness of Service Innovation (dependent variable)
X_1	=	Service Innovation
X_2	=	Process Innovation
X_3	=	Marketing Innovation
X_4	=	Organizational Innovation
X_5	=	Human Capital Competency
α	=	Constant
$\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_5$	=	Regression coefficients of factor 1 to factor 5 respectively
e_i	=	Error term

Table 4: Regression analysis output

R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	F	Sig.
.857 ^a	0.817	0.811	0.14733	181.123	.000 ^b
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	0.686	0.155		4.416	0
SI	0.318	0.108	0.41	2.955	0.004
PI	0.442	0.079	0.508	5.607	0.001
MI	0.022	0.138	0.023	0.162	0.002
OI	0.097	0.096	0.109	1.017	0.011
HCC	0.065	0.041	0.067	1.603	0.012

Results presented in Table 4.19 show multiple correlation coefficient (R), coefficient of determination (R square), and F-ratio which are used to predict the goodness-of-fit of the regression model. R of independent variables X1, X2, X3, X4, and X5 on the effectiveness of service innovation (\hat{Y}) is 0.857, which shows that effectiveness of service innovation has positive correlation with the five independent variables. Further, R square is 0.817, which suggests that 81.7% of the variation of effectiveness of service innovation is explained by the five independent variables. The model is a good predictor of the relationship between the dependent and independent variables F-ratio is 181.123 ($p=0.001$). As a result, the independent variables (service innovation, process innovation, marketing innovation, organizational innovation, and human capital competency) are significant in explaining the variance in effectiveness of service innovation. The results of regression summarizes the beta coefficients shows that Process Innovation, ($\beta_2 = 0.442$, $p=0.000$) carries the heaviest weight for effectiveness of service innovation, followed by Service Innovation ($\beta_1=0.318$, $p=0.004$), Organizational Innovation ($\beta_4=0.097$, $p=0.011$), Human Capital Competency ($\beta_5=0.065$, $p=0.012$), and Marketing Innovation ($\beta_3= 0.022$, $p=0.002$).

We can write the estimated equation as follows:

$$\hat{Y} = 0.686 + 0.318 * X1 + 0.442 * X2 - 0.022 X3 + 0.097 * X4 + 0.065 * X5 + e_i.$$

The result shows that process innovation is the significant antecedent while the other independent variables i.e. service innovation, marketing innovation, organizational innovation, human capital competency are significant.

Discussion

This study was aimed at analyzing the antecedent of service innovation effectiveness in SMEs of hospitality sector. While service innovation is not a recent phenomenon, innovation research in general appears to concentrate on technical innovation by manufacturing companies [32, 36, and 94]. With this perspective, innovation studies concentrate on commodity (e.g., goods) and method (e.g., manufacturing systems) innovation e.g., [96], generally avoiding service innovation and its intrinsic possibilities. However, in developed economies, the service sector now dominates their gross domestic products, and its share continues to grow [43]. Therefore, both services and service innovation represent central drivers of broader economic growth and innovation [42, 72].

In the hospitality sector SMEs in Nepal, the effectiveness of service innovation is limited. This shows small companies mildly and also calls for market productivity to be strengthened. In service architecture and innovative service provision, SMEs have a moderate emphasis. Organizations are least dependent on better customer delivery and are moderately focused on providing new services in order to maximize market share. SMEs also concentrate on process innovation moderately. Organizations have modest emphasis on ICT and less focus on the development or enhancement of production processes. Similarly, hospitality-based SMEs offer marketing creativity moderate significance. The companies are less concerned about product/service promotion shifts

and stress the use of social media ads and seasonal changes in marketing instruments. Similarly, organizational creativity is mildly practiced by SMEs. The SMEs have a little emphasis on artistic and creativity culture. The organisations are initiating a new system of accountability, decision-making and market separation. SMEs also emphasize fairly the dimension of their organisation's human capital competence. The companies are not focusing on the promotion of internal expertise and skills and on the promotion of employee innovation. But companies make sure to protect their employees and to keep their workplace flexible.

In addition, companies participate moderately in innovative approaches to organize and inspire employees. The SMEs are more focused to marketing innovation than the other innovation practices in SMEs of hospitality sector, followed by organizational innovation, least emphasize is given to human capital competency, service innovation and process innovation. The finding is aligned with the notion of [43], the innovation process can be planned, intentional, or unintentional, such that it emerges through an interactive learning process initiated by any involved parties. Related to the distinction between product and service innovation is a distinction between innovations in manufacturing versus service sectors. Wherein the findings are not supportive in the context of the innovation practice the SMES of hospitality sector in Nepal. As it was emphasized that travel agencies and hotels as a small tourist business require service innovation rather than method innovation, much like the findings of studies carried out in [79,99]. These findings can suggest that organisations that successfully control services innovation aspects add to the efficiency of service innovation. This perspective indicates organizations that effectively manage dimensions of service innovation helps to generate positive outcome in its effectiveness.

This study found that positive relationships exist among all the factors of service innovation and effectiveness of service innovation. All the service innovation dimensions of service innovation correlated with effectiveness of service innovation. These findings are consistent with the literature on innovation. Although there are some studies examining innovation [80, 90] and activities of innovation in tourism industry [50] in literature; the empirical studies on innovation issue, especially in tourism industry is very low.

The highest correlation is observed with process innovation and followed by service innovation, organisational innovation, marketing innovation and human capital competency. It signifies that the organisation should focused to process innovation where the organization need to involve in changes in the service process aimed at reducing the costs, wastes and lead time or at improving service efficiency. Organisation need to focus on improving effectiveness of process innovation by focusing on improving internal operation of business process. Thereafter, the organisations need to emphasize towards service innovation in organization emphasizes on continuity in improving of service delivery. Service innovation helps organization to maintain the quality of service delivery. In hospitality sector service innovation provides comfortable and user friendly service. Hospitality sector SMEs need to focus on providing innovative service too increase market share.

Subsequently, organizational innovation needs to be focused as a new, embracing collaborative/organizational structure or legal framework that efficiently redirects or enhances the business in certain fields of hospitality sector. New method of business practices. New method of responsibilities and decision making for division of work need to emphasize by the organization. Organizational innovation focuses organization on establishing culture of creativity and innovation. In line with these, organization need to focus the marketing innovation that deals with the marketing mix and market selection in order to meet a customer's buying preference. SMEs in hospitality sector need to focus on changes in service promotion. It emphasizes SMEs towards the new sales channel in the market. Seasonal changes in marketing instruments are carefully handled in the hospitality sector with the help of marketing innovation. Utilization of social marketing is very crucial for SMEs in hospitality sector. Equally important, human capital competency need to be focused on promoting the creativity of employee and new ways of organizing, directing and empowering staffs. It will help on retaining staff, maintain flexibility and control cost in hospitality sector. The SMEs in hospitality sector need to emphasize in nurturing internal knowledge and competence assets.

The findings of this study indicate that there is an influence of service innovation, process innovation, marketing innovation, organizational innovation, and human capital competency on effectiveness of service innovation in SMEs of hospitality sector. The finding of the study indicates the process innovation carries the heaviest weight for effectiveness of service innovation, followed by service innovation, organizational innovation, human capital competency and marketing innovation. The notion of process innovation comes first in this study differs sole connection with [79, 99], where it was mentioned small tourist business require service innovation rather than method innovation. The study findings imply to organizations that by improving service innovation, process innovation, marketing innovation, organizational innovation, and human capital competency can increase in effectiveness of service innovation. These results provide some insight into the importance of service innovation and its effectiveness in the organization.

The main aim in the current study was to examine whether a relationship exists between service innovation and effectiveness of service innovation, the study also focus on identifying major factors that contributes in effectiveness of service innovation. This study found that positive causal relationships of service innovation dimensions and effectiveness of service innovation in SMEs of hospitality sector. This research work also involved restaurants and café, travel agencies and hotels in Nepal by using innovative measurements perspective. In order to deliver innovative and new creative goods or facilities to our guests in advance, travel agents and hotel, restaurant managers should track innovation efforts in accordance with the findings. Hence, from all the studies conducted from past research concludes that there is a significant impact of service innovation in the organization. The organization having a service innovation gets more benefit in the future. Moreover, it also helps in the smooth functioning of the business through the management of the human capital competency. The dimensions of service innovation positively effects effectiveness of service innovation in SMEs.

Conclusion

The larger purpose of this study was to determine if drivers of service innovation has an effect on its effectiveness in the context of SMEs of hospitality sector in Nepal. SMEs of hospitality sector could utilize the drivers of service innovation to achieve the overall business goals through effectiveness of service innovation. This service innovation might bring competitive advantages to all the participants in the new business model. For SMEs of the hospitality industry in Nepal as well as internationally, service excellence can be the vector of economic development and competitive benefit. With the growing development of today's services and economy, the significance of recognizing the principles and practices of service innovation is also rising. It is also possible to fail and excel in service innovation. The outcome can only be said from experience. Nevertheless, no inconvenience or profit can always be sought and sought by hospitality small and medium-sized companies, since it is the path to human development. Therefore, the company should concentrate on service innovation that can change the way the service is provided and delivers convenient and friendly service, in order to introduce an appropriate service innovation.

Reference

- [1] Abernathy, W. J., & Clark, K. B. (1985). Innovation: Mapping the winds of creative destruction. *Research policy*, 14(1), 3-22.
- [2] Abernathy, W. J., & Townsend, P. L. (1975). Technology, productivity and process change. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 7(4), 379-396.
- [3] Abramovici, M., & Bancel-Charensol, L. (2004). How to take customers into consideration in service innovation projects. *The Service Industries Journal*, 24(1), 56-78.
- [4] Alam, I. (2002). An exploratory investigation of user involvement in new service development. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 30(3), 250–261.
- [5] Amara, N., Landry, R., & Doloreux, D. (2009). Patterns of innovation in knowledge-intensive business services. *The Service Industries Journal*, 29(4), 407-430.
- [6] Anderson, A., Wahab, K. A., Amin, H., & Chong, R. (2009). Firm Performance: An Analysis from the Theory of Innovation. *Australian Graduate School Entrepreneurship*.
- [7] Appiah-Adu, K., & Singh, S. (1998). Customer orientation and performance: a study of SMEs. *Management decision*, 36(6), 385-94.
- [8] Bakar, L. J. A., & Ahmad, H. (2010). Assessing the relationship between firm resources and product innovation performance. *Business Process Management Journal*.16(3), 420-435.

- [9] Baltacioglu, T., Ada, E., Kaplan, M. D., Yurt And, O., & Cem Kaplan, Y. (2007). A new framework for service supply chains. *The Service Industries Journal*, 27(2), 105-124.
- [10] Barlow, J., Bayer, S., & Curry, R. (2006). Implementing complex innovations in fluid multi-stakeholder environments: experiences of 'telecare'. *Technovation*, 26(3), 396-406.
- [11] Barnett, H. G. (1953). Innovation: the basis of cultural change.
- [12] Barras, R. (1986). Towards a theory of innovation in services. *Research Policy*, 15(4), 161-173.
- [13] Beaver, G. (2002). *Small business, entrepreneurship and enterprise development*. Pearson Education.
- [14] Becker, B., & Gerhart, B. (1996). The impact of human resource management on organizational performance: Progress and prospects. *Academy of management journal*, 39(4), 779-801.
- [15] Becker, S.W. & Whisler, T.L. (1967), The innovative organization: a selective view of current theory and research. *The Journal of Business*, 40(4), 462-469.
- [16] Bessant, J., & Francis, D. (1999). Developing strategic continuous improvement capability. *International journal of operations & production management*, 19(1)
- [17] Bessant, J., & Caffyn, S. (1997). High-involvement innovation through continuous improvement. *International Journal of Technology Management*, 14(1), 7-28.
- [18] Bonesso, S., Gerli, F., Pizzi, C., & Boyatzis, R. E. (2020). The role of intangible human capital in innovation diversification: linking behavioral competencies with different types of innovation. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 29(3), 661-681.
- [19] Buckley, J., & Mirza, H. (1997). Introduction in International Technology Transition by SMEs. UK: Macmillan.
- [20] Cagliano, R., Blackmon, K., & Voss, C. (2001). Small firms under MICROSCOPE: international differences in production/operations management practices and performance. *Integrated Manufacturing Systems*. 12(7), 469-482.
- [21] Cainelli, G., Evangelista, R., & Savona, M. (2004). The impact of innovation on economic performance in services. *The Service Industries Journal*, 24(1), 116-130.
- [22] Carbonell, P., Rodríguez-Escudero, A. I., & Pujari, D. (2009). Customer involvement in new service development: An examination of antecedents and outcomes. *Journal of product innovation management*, 26(5), 536-550.
- [23] Castillejo, A., Barrachina, M., Llopis, A., & Samchis, J. (2008). The role of process innovation on SME growth. *Spanish Ministry of Science and Technology*.
- [24] Chan, A.D., Go, F.M., & Pine, R. (1998). Service innovation in Hong Kong: Attitudes and practice. *Service Industries Journal*, 18(2), 112-124.

- [25] Chen, J.S., Tsou, H.T., & Huang, A.Y.H. (2009). Service delivery innovation antecedents and impact on firm performance. *Journal of Service Research*, 12(1), 36–55.
- [26] Chesbrough, H. (2004). A failing grade for the innovation academy. http://news.ft.com/cms/s/9b743b2a-0e0b-11d9-97d3-00000e2511c8, dwp_uuid= 6f0b3526-07e3-11d9-9673-00000e2511c8. html.
- [27] Cooper, R. G., & Edgett, S. J. (2002). The dark side of time and time metrics in product innovation. *Visions*, XXVI, 22, 14-16.
- [28] Cosh, A., Hughes, A., & Wood, E. (1996). *Innovation in UK SMEs: causes and the consequences for firm failure and acquisition*. University of Cambridge.: ESRC Centre for Business Research.
- [29] Damanpour, F. (1991). Organizational innovation: A meta-analysis of effects of determinants and moderators. *Academy of management journal*, 34(3), 555-590.
- [30] Dan Reid, R., & Sandler, M. (1992). The use of technology to improve service quality: A look at the extent of service improvements to be gained through investments in technology and expanded facilities and programs. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 33(3), 68-73.
- [31] De Jong, J. P., & Vermeulen, P. A. (2006). Determinants of product innovation in small firms: A comparison across industries. *International small business journal*, 24(6), 587-609.
- [32] De Vries, E. J. (2006). Innovation in services in networks of organizations and in the distribution of services. *Research policy*, 35(7), 1037-1051.
- [33] Den Hertog, P., Van der Aa, W., & De Jong, M. W. (2010). Capabilities for managing service innovation: towards a conceptual framework. *Journal of service Management*.21(4), 490–514.
- [34] Dinsdale, G., & Moore, M. (2002). *Organizing for Deliberate Innovation, a Toolkit for Teams*. Canadian Centre for Management Development.
- [35] Dosi, G. (2000). *Innovation, organization and economic dynamics: selected essays*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- [36] Drejer, I. (2004). Identifying innovation in surveys of services: a Schumpeterian perspective. *Research policy*, 33(3), 551-562.
- [37] Edvardsson, B. (2005). Service quality: beyond cognitive assessment. *Managing Service Quality: An International Journal*, 16(1), 107-121.
- [38] Fagerberg, J., Mowery, D. C., & Nelson, R. R. (Eds.). (2005). *The Oxford handbook of innovation*. Oxford university press.
- [39] Fisk, R.P., Brown, S.W., & Bitner, M.J. (1993). Tracking the evolution of the services marketing literature. *Journal of Retailing*, 69(Spring), 61–103.

- [40] Frambach, R.T., Barkema, H.G., Nootboom, B., & Wedel, M. (1998). Adoption of a service innovation in the business market: An empirical test of supply-side variables. *Journal of Business Research*, 41(2), 161–174.
- [41] Gago, D. & Rubalcaba, L. (2007). Innovation and ICT in service firms: towards a multidimensional approach for impact assessment. *Journal of Evolutionary Economics*, 17(1), 25–44.
- [42] Gallouj, F. (2002). *Innovation in the service economy: the new wealth of nations*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- [43] Gallouj, F., & Windrum, P. (2009). Services and services innovation. *Journal of Evolutionary Economics*, 19(2), 141–148.
- [44] Gault, F. (2018). Defining and measuring innovation in all sectors of the economy. *Research policy*, 47(3), 617-622.
- [45] Geroski, P., & Machin, S. (1992). Do innovating firms outperform non-innovators?. *Business Strategy Review*, 3(2), 79-90.
- [46] Gunasekaran, A., Okko, P., Martikainen, T., & Yli-Olli, P. (1996). Improving productivity and quality in small and medium enterprises: cases and analysis. *International Small Business Journal*, 15(1), 59-72.
- [47] Hall, C. M., & Williams, A. M. (2008). *Tourism and innovation*. London: Routledge
- [48] Harris, M.N., Rogers, M. & Siouclis, A. (2003). Modeling firm innovation using panel probit estimators, *Applied Economics Letters* 10 (11), 683-686.
- [49] Hipp, C., & Grupp, H. (2005). Innovation in the service sector: The demand for service-specific innovation measurement concepts and typologies. *Research Policy*, 34(4), 517–535.
- [50] Hjalager, A. M. (2010). A review of innovation research in tourism. *Tourism management*, 31(1), 1-12.
- [51] Hull, F.M. (2004). Innovation strategy and the impact of a composite model of service product development on performance. *Journal of Service Research*, 7(2), 167–180.
- [52] Johne, A. (1999). Successful market innovation. In *Innovationsmanagement* (pp. 163-170). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.
- [53] Johne, A., & Harborne, P. (2003). One leader is not enough for major new service development: Results of a consumer banking study. *Service Industries Journal*, 23(3), 22–39.
- [54] Joyce, P., Seaman, C. & Woods, A. (1994). *The economic growth implications of control and innovation strategies in small businesses*. London Central Training and Enterprise Council.

- [55] Karniouchina, E.V., Victorino, L. & Verma, R. (2006). Product and service innovation: Ideas for future cross-disciplinary research. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 23(3), 274–280.
- [56] Khazanchi, S., Lewis, M. W., & Boyer, K. K. (2007). Innovation-supportive culture: The impact of organizational values on process innovation. *Journal of operations management*, 25(4), 871-884.
- [57] Kuratko, D. F. (2016). *Entrepreneurship: Theory, process, and practice*. Nelson Education.
- [58] Lan, Q., & Wu, S. (2010). An empirical study of entrepreneurial orientation and degree of internationalization of small and medium-sized Chinese manufacturing enterprises. *Journal of Chinese Entrepreneurship*, 2(1), 53-75.
- [59] Leonard-Barton, D. (1995). *Wellsprings of Knowledge*. Harvard Business School Press, Boston, MA.
- [60] Lopes, L. F., & Godinho, M. M. (2005). *Services Innovation and Economic Performance: An analysis at the firm level*. Danish Research Unit for Industrial Dynamics.
- [61] Louro, M.J., & Cunha, P.V. (2001). Brand management paradigms. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 17(7–8), 849–875.
- [62] Lumpkin, G. T., & Dess, G. G. (1996). Clarifying the entrepreneurial orientation construct and linking it to performance. *Academy of management Review*, 21(1), 135-172.
- [63] Lumpkin, G. T., & Dess, G. G. (2001). Linking two dimensions of entrepreneurial orientation to firm performance: The moderating role of environment and industry life cycle. *Journal of business venturing*, 16(5), 429-451.
- [64] Maglio, P.P., & Spohrer, J. (2008). Fundamentals of service science. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 36(1), 18–20.
- [65] Magnusson, P.R., Matthing, J., & Kristensson, P. (2003). Managing user involvement in service innovation: Experiments with innovating end users. *Journal of Service Research*, 6(2), 111–124.
- [66] Matthing, J., Sandén, B., & Edvardsson, B. (2004). New service development: Learning from and with customers. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 15(5), 479–498.
- [67] Miles, I. (2005) Innovation in services. In: Fagerberg J, Mowery DC, Nelson RR (eds) *The oxford handbook of innovation*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp 433–458
- [68] Mole, K., & Worrall, L. (2001). Innovation, business performance and regional competitiveness in the West Midlands: evidence from the West Midlands Business Survey. *European Business Review*.13(6), 353-364.

- [69] Moore, S. A., & Weiler, B. (2009). Tourism–protected area partnerships: stoking the fires of innovation. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 17(2), 129-132.
- [70] Normann, R. (2001). *Reframing Business—When the Map Changes the Landscape*. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons.
- [71] OECD (2001), *The Well-being of Nations: The Role of Human and Social Capital*, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, Paris.
- [72] OECD (2005). Privireasupraconceptului de IMM-urișiAntreprenoriat/The concept of SME and entrepreneurship - overview, Paris.
- [73] Olsen, M. D., & Connolly, D. J. (2000). Experience-based travel: How technology is changing the hospitality industry. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 41(1), 30-40.
- [74] Ostrom, A.L., Bitner, M.J., Brown, S.W., Burkhard, K.A., Goul, M., Smith-Daniels, V., Demirkan, H., & Rabinovich, E. (2010). Moving forward and making a difference: Research priorities for the science of service. *Journal of Service Research*, 13(1), 4–36.
- [75] Otero-Neira, C., Lindman, M. T., & Fernández, M. J. (2009). Innovation and performance in SME furniture industries: An international comparative case study. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*.
- [76] Ottenbacher, M., & Gnoth, J. (2005). How to develop successful hospitality innovation. *Cornell hotel and restaurant administration quarterly*, 46(2), 205-222.
- [77] Pitelis, C. N. (2009). The co-evolution of organizational value capture, value creation and sustainable advantage. *Organization studies*, 30(10), 1115-1139.
- [78] Prahalad, C. K., & Ramaswamy, V. (2004). Co-creating unique value with customers. *Strategy & Leadership*, 32(3), 4–9.
- [79] Pratten, C. F. (1991). *The competitiveness of small firms* (pp. 1-261). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [80] Rademakers, M. (2005), Corporate universities: driving force of knowledge innovation, *The Journal of Workplace Learning*, 17 (1/2), 130-136.
- [81] Raymond, L., & St-Pierre, J. (2010). R&D as a determinant of innovation in manufacturing SMEs: An attempt at empirical clarification. *Technovation*, 30(1), 48-56.
- [82] Rothwell (1992): *Successful industrial innovation: critical factors for the 1990s*, in: *R & D Management*, 22 (3), p. 221-239
- [83] Rubalcaba, L., Gago, D., & Gallego, J. (2010). On the differences between goods and services innovation. *Journal of Innovation Economics*, 5(1), 17–40.
- [84] Rubalcaba, L., Gallego, J., & den Hertog, P. (2010). The case of market and system failures in services innovation. *Service Industries Journal*, 30(4), 549–566.

- [85] Rubalcaba, L., Michel, S., Sundbo, J., Brown, S. W., & Reynoso, J. (2012). Shaping, organizing, and rethinking service innovation: a multidimensional framework. *Journal of Service Management*, 23(5), 696-715.
- [86] Salavou, H., Baltas, G., & Lioukas, S. (2004). Organisational innovation in SMEs. *European journal of marketing*, 38(9/10), 1091-1112.
- [87] Sandvik, I. L., & Sandvik, K. (2003). The impact of market orientation on product innovativeness and business performance. *International journal of Research in Marketing*, 20(4), 355-376.
- [88] Schumpeter, J. A., & Nichol, A. J. (1934). Robinson's economics of imperfect competition. *Journal of political economy*, 42(2), 249-259.
- [89] Shaw, G., & Williams, A. (2009). Knowledge transfer and management in tourism organisations: An emerging research agenda. *Tourism management*, 30(3), 325-335.
- [90] Sundbo, J. (1997), Management of innovation in services, *The Service Industries Journal*, 17 (3), 432-455.
- [91] Tavassoli, S., & Karlsson, C. (2015). Persistence of various types of innovation analyzed and explained. *Research Policy*, 44(10), 1887-1901.
- [92] Thornhill, S. (2006). Knowledge, innovation and firm performance in high-and low-technology regimes. *Journal of business venturing*, 21(5), 687-703.
- [93] Tidd, J. and Hull, M.F. (2003). *Service Innovation: Organizational Responses to Technological Opportunities and Market Imperatives*, Imperial College Press, London
- [94] Toivonen, M., & Tuominen, T. (2009). Emergence of innovations in services. *Service Industries Journal*, 29(7), 887-902.
- [95] Tseng, M. L., Lin, Y. H., Lim, M. K., & Teehankee, B. L. (2015). Using a hybrid method to evaluate service innovation in the hotel industry. *Applied Soft Computing*, 28, 411-421.
- [96] Utterback, J.M. (1996). *Mastering the Dynamics of Innovation* (2d ed.). Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- [97] van Riel, A.C.R., Lemmink, J., & Ouwersloot, H. (2004). High-technology service innovation success: A decision-making perspective. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 21(5), 348-359.
- [98] Vargo, S.L., & Lusch, R.F. (2004). Evolving to a new dominant logic for marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 68(January), 1-17.
- [99] Vaux, J.H., Gomes, M.P.S.F., Grieve, R.J., Ezingear, J.N., Race, P. & Woolgar, S.W. (1996). SME perception as constraint on accessing university research and expertise. *Proceedings from COST A3 Workshop* (pp. 151-170), Milan.

- [100] Verma, R., & Jayasimha, K. R. (2014). Service delivery innovation architecture: An empirical study of antecedents and outcomes. *IIMB Management Review*, 26(2), 105-121.
- [101] von Hippel, E. (2001). Perspective: User toolkits for innovation. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 18(4), 247-257.
- [102] Wan, D., Ong, C. H., & Lee, F. (2005). Determinants of firm innovation in Singapore. *Technovation*, 25(3), 261-268.
- [103] Wang, C. L., & Ahmed, P. K. (2004). The development and validation of the organisational innovativeness construct using confirmatory factor analysis. *European journal of innovation management*. 7(4), 303-313.
- [104] Yang, C.C. (2007). A systems approach to service development in a concurrent engineering environment. *Service Industries Journal*, 27(5), 635-652.

