



Value creation through expanding the online distribution channel

Journal:	<i>Industrial Management & Data Systems</i>
Manuscript ID	IMDS-08-2019-0424.R1
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	e-commerce, event study, abnormal returns, distribution channel, China

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Value creation through expanding the online distribution channel

Abstract

Purpose: Current literature provides limited insights into the supply chain contexts within which e-commerce can create higher value for firms. To address this literature gap, this research explores the value potential and thus value creation process of e-commerce initiatives for supply chain distribution channel expansions.

Design/methodology/approach: Using secondary data collected from multiple sources, this research conducted an event study to examine the stock market reactions to the announcements of e-commerce initiatives of Chinese firms.

Findings: The results indicate that the e-commerce initiatives increase average firm value by CNY 295.29 million in a three-day window around the initiative's announcement date. Moreover, we find that such stock market reactions are more positive for firms with poor operating performance, and more negative when firms deploy initiatives on their own (rather than third-party) platforms. Further, companies that integrate or complement their online sales with an offline sales channel experience more positive stock market reactions.

Originality/value: This study provides new insights into the value creation process of e-commerce from an operation and supply chain process perspective.

Keywords: e-commerce; event study; abnormal returns; distribution channel, China

1. Introduction

Stakeholders in general and investors in particular are paying increasing attention to the booming e-commerce (EC) market. Especially in thriving economies such as China, the relatively recent adoption and development of EC (e.g., Alibaba and JD.com) has created a boom on the stock exchanges (Luckerson, 2014). In particular, Alibaba raised more than US\$21.8 billion during its IPO on the New York Stock Exchange in 2014, representing the biggest IPO in the U.S. history (Krantz, 2014).

Research and industry examples alike have provided evidence that EC initiatives can have a positive impact on firm sales. In particular, prior studies have suggested that EC increases sales in three different ways: market expansion, brand switching, and relationship deepening (Geyskens *et al.*, 2002). However, contradictory arguments have also been observed. Various reports and research have highlighted concerns regarding the possible drawbacks of EC, such as increased channel conflict and intensified price competition, which may hurt a company's future cash flows (Tsay and Agrawal, 2004). Thus, while the benefits of EC initiatives are recognized from a revenue perspective, the cost implications are less clear, suggesting that the overall performance impact due to EC initiatives may be more complicated than expected. Subsequently, our research attempts to provide a more complete assessment of the performance impact of EC initiatives. In particular, we investigate how firms' EC initiatives affect their share prices, a proxy for overall firm value that takes sales and other performance implications into account.

Adopting an EC model does not only cause change to the demand side in terms of

1
2
3
4 consumer behavior but requires changes to supply chain structures and operations processes
5
6 (Geyskens *et al.*, 2002; Power and Singh, 2007). Power and Singh (2007) have noted that IT-
7
8 based supply chains must be accompanied by fundamental organizational change. Therefore,
9
10 it is unlikely that firms with different operations processes and supply chain structures will gain
11
12 the same benefits from EC initiatives. Subsequently, we further examine how the impact of EC
13
14 initiatives on share prices varies across different operational and supply chain conditions.
15
16 Specifically, we explore how contextual operational and supply chain factors, in terms of
17
18 operating cycle, platform ownership, and online–offline channel integration, affect the value
19
20 creation of EC in terms of increased stock prices.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28
29 Conducting an event study of 310 e-commerce initiatives announced by Chinese firms
30
31 between 2010 and 2017, our research shows that e-commerce initiatives do create value for
32
33 firms in terms of increased stock prices. Moreover, the stock market reactions to e-commerce
34
35 initiatives are more positive for firms with longer operating cycle but more negative when firms
36
37 deploy the initiatives on their own (rather than third-party) platforms. Further, companies that
38
39 integrate their online and offline sales channels experience more positive stock market
40
41 reactions. These findings advance our understanding of how EC initiatives create value and
42
43 how operations and supply chain management is a key factor in terms of process efficiencies
44
45 and distribution strategies when considering EC initiatives. In particular, our research
46
47 highlights the important roles that operating performances, supply chain distribution platforms,
48
49 and the integration of sales channels play in affecting the value creation potential of EC
50
51 initiatives. Our research not only encourages firms (especially those with long operating cycle)
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 to invest in EC to create value but also urges them to take advantage of third-party platforms
5
6 and offline channels in order to reap more benefits from their EC initiatives.
7
8
9

10 **2. Literature and hypotheses**

11 **2.1. Stock market reactions to e-commerce initiatives**

12
13
14
15
16 Prior studies have suggested that EC can contribute to a firm's future cash flows by reducing
17
18 costs such as transaction costs and distribution costs and improve sales in terms of reaching
19
20 new markets or increasing market shares in existing markets (Geyskens *et al.*, 2002; Homburg
21
22 *et al.*, 2014; Subramani and Walden, 2001). In terms of cost reductions, previous research
23
24 identified that adding EC, as a form of channel distribution expansion (Van Bruggen *et al.*,
25
26 2010), increases inter-channel competition and thus contributes to increasing distribution
27
28 efficiencies. Geyskens *et al.* (2002) highlighted that distribution cost reductions can be
29
30 attributed to ease of transaction processing (reducing human errors and customer disputes).
31
32 Further, inventory cost reductions can be attributed to decreases in intermediaries, and
33
34 marketing functions passed over to customers (Hoffman *et al.*, 1995). Thus, efficiency is
35
36 increased through increasing economies of scale of the production and purchasing power
37
38 (Homburg *et al.*, 2014). EC initiatives can help firms to disperse their supply chains and expand
39
40 their markets by reaching Internet users who have never visited the firms' physical stores
41
42 before. This benefit is particularly important nowadays because consumers are buying more
43
44 and more products and services online (Farber, 2016). On the other hand, firms can use EC to
45
46 enable consumers to switch from other competing brands, especially when the focal firms do
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 not have physical stores in their competitors' areas. Finally, by utilizing various EC tools and
5
6 technologies, firms can use EC initiatives to deepen customer relationship and enhance
7
8 customer experience, thus generating higher sales (Rigby, 2011). Geyskens *et al.* (2002)
9
10 summarized what they described as "demand-side advantages" via EC as market expansion,
11
12 brand switching, and relationship deepening.
13
14
15

16
17 However, multiple studies have also highlighted that the costs of adopting an EC
18
19 initiative can (initially) outweigh its benefits. Brick and mortar retailers may simply see a shift
20
21 of customers moving to the EC channel (Alba *et al.*, 1997). Companies may also notice a power
22
23 shift to consumers in terms of knowledge and price comparisons. Further, distribution costs
24
25 may actually increase in terms of high fixed start-up costs (Geyskens *et al.*, 2002). Transactions
26
27 costs may also increase when adding an EC channel through price reductions, while current
28
29 sales channels may view the EC channel as a competition rather than a complementation (Alba
30
31 *et al.*, 1997).
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39
40 Nevertheless, taken together, the reduction in costs and increase in sales can contribute
41
42 to a firms' future cash flows, thus resulting in positive stock market reactions. Although some
43
44 practitioners are concerned with the possible drawbacks of EC, such as increased channel
45
46 conflict and intensified price competition that may hurt firms' future cash flows (de Figueiredo,
47
48 2000; Tsay and Agrawal, 2004), empirical evidence suggests that the potential benefits of EC
49
50 outweighs its drawbacks (Pavlou and Fygenson, 2006; Dehning *et al.*, 2004). A well cited
51
52 business value model by Barua *et al.* (1995) suggests that the impact of EC is observable at the
53
54 strategic business unit level and that the value development is process driven (Chircu and
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Kauffman, 2000). Wiengarten et al. (2013) conducted a comprehensive literature view on IT
5
6 business value research. They concluded that depending on the level of strategic alignment and
7
8 contextual factors the value development is generally positive (Melville et al., 2004). Informed
9
10 by the prior studies, as well as the relatively contradictory cost reduction hypothesis and sales
11
12 improvement mechanisms discussed above, we propose our default hypothesis:
13
14
15

16
17 **H1.** Stock markets react positively to EC initiative announcements.
18
19

20 21 22 **2.2. Conditional considerations and e-commerce announcements** 23

24
25 We further explore the contextual factors that may affect a company's ability to generate
26
27 business value through EC. In our second hypothesis, we propose that the magnitude of
28
29 potential benefits could vary across firms with different performances in terms of operating
30
31 cycle prior to EC initiatives. A firm's operating cycle—the time for a firm from selling the
32
33 inventory to collecting cash from the customers—is a key operational performance indicator.
34
35 A shorter operating cycle indicates a stronger capability to turn inventory into cash quickly.
36
37 EC initiatives enable companies to be closer to their customers, reduce lead times and
38
39 streamline distribution processes (Geyskens *et al.*, 2002; Homburg *et al.*, 2014).
40
41
42
43
44

45
46 One aspect of the behavioral theory of the firm proposes that companies develop
47
48 aspirational performance levels that they try to meet through various managerial and
49
50 operational changes or initiatives that are the result of a problemistic search (Cyert and March,
51
52 1963). A managerial reaction, a quick fix solution, is to streamline inventory and distribution
53
54 and sales channels by investing in EC. Thus, EC could be a viable option for companies that
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 are experiencing performance difficulties. This is especially the case in the context of this
5
6 study, China, where technological solutions and innovations are still relatively inexpensive
7
8 (Dahlman, 2007; Lee and Tang, 2018). Whilst prices for IT in terms of hardware might globally
9
10 be at a similar level, the prices for implementation, service and maintenance may differ, being
11
12 relatively cheap in China¹. Thus, this puts Chinese firms at an advantage point leading to a
13
14 noticeable stock market reaction.
15
16
17
18
19

20 Shareholders might be aware of performance difficulties in turning inventory into sales
21
22 (i.e., cash). If a company has a longer operating cycle investors might view this as a great
23
24 opportunity if that company would initiate EC and subsequently improve performance. The
25
26 longer the operating cycles the greater the opportunity to improve performance and thus
27
28 generating shareholder value. In conclusion, a firm that has greater difficulties can potentially
29
30 expect higher performance improvements through EC initiatives. Longer operating cycles are
31
32 accompanied by longer inventory days, indicative of performance inefficiencies from an
33
34 inventory management perspective. Moreover, longer operating cycles could also be indicative
35
36 of distribution concern in terms of processes or from a sales perspective.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 EC initiatives enable poorly performing firms, especially those with limited geographic
46
47 coverage across a country, to reach new customers in remote areas virtually and thus increase
48
49 sales. Moreover, with new EC initiatives, firms do not have to establish physical stores, which
50
51 enables them to potentially operate at lower inventory levels through inventory pooling and
52
53
54
55

56
57
58 ¹ <https://www.industryweek.com/environment/viewpoint-why-china-cheaper>
59
60

1
2
3
4 decreased distribution lead times. Therefore, we expect firms with longer operating cycles to
5
6
7 benefit more from EC initiatives. Subsequently, we propose:

8
9 **H2.** The stock market reactions to EC initiative announcements are more positive
10
11
12 for firms with longer operating cycles.
13
14

15
16 Different strategic choices in Internet channel expansion may have different
17
18 implications for complexity and uncertainty. This is especially the case in the emerging,
19
20 dynamic Chinese online marketplace. Thus, we explore how investors interpret the complexity
21
22 and uncertainty embedded in two essential strategic choices for EC, i.e., platform selection and
23
24 channel integration, and react differently to firms' EC initiatives. First, the integration of an
25
26 electronic distribution channel with existing processes can make the system initially more
27
28 complicated (Choudhury and Karahanna, 2008). Routines need to be created or recreated,
29
30 process tasks redefined, and processing adjusted (Dionysiou and Tsoukas, 2013). Failure to do
31
32 so can have negative performance consequences. Choosing the option of outsourcing this
33
34 process, and thus the inherent complexity to a third-party platform, might benefit companies in
35
36 terms of their performance. Investors may view that complexity, and the risk of disruptions
37
38 with negative consequences, is reduced when companies do not develop their own distribution
39
40 channel, but rather, sell their products and services through a third-party provider. Further, by
41
42 employing technological and commercial capabilities (that are higher than their own) from
43
44 external providers, uncertainties from disruptions and fluctuations in demand (sales) might be
45
46 reduced. Again, shareholders may view this as a positive sign for companies initiating EC.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58

59 For example, some major third-party platforms such as Tmall.com and JD.com provide
60

1
2
3
4 one-stop services for firms to sell products over those platforms without much concern about
5
6 site maintenance, secure payments, and on-time delivery (Phillips, 2015). These popular third-
7
8 party platforms are attracting an increasing number of daily visitors (see, e.g.,
9
10 <http://www.alex.com/siteinfo/tmall.com>), helping firms to increase the visibility of their
11
12 products to potential customers. Visibility is an important consideration in the Chinese context,
13
14 because Chinese consumers, compared with Western counterparts, rely less on web search
15
16 engines (e.g., Baidu) when they are looking for brands or products (Decollas, 2017), thus
17
18 making it more challenging for self-owned EC sites to be discovered by Internet users.
19
20
21
22
23
24

25
26 On the other hand, it could be argued from an uncertainty perspective that, when
27
28 outsourcing the EC channel to a third party, control is handed over to the external provider.
29
30 Thus, uncertainty could also increase because the platform is not owned by the company itself
31
32 (Barthelemy, 2003). The company may need additional resources or processes to deal with
33
34 sales forecast and order fulfillment requirements. In addition, through outsourcing, the
35
36 distribution channel is split into two parts managed by two companies (i.e., the third party).
37
38 Thus, the company has lost its direct company contact, which is transferred to the third-party
39
40 platform (a service outsourcing triads problem discussed by Li and Choi (2009)). In such
41
42 circumstance, the company has greater difficulties in collecting customer information
43
44 including trends and feedback for forecasting. We test these opposing views in this research
45
46 and thus propose:
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54
55 **H3.** Stock market reactions to EC announcements are different between firms
56
57 deploying EC on their own platforms and firms selling through third-party
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 platforms.
5
6
7

8 Further, a relatively recent strategy that has been deployed by multiple service and
9 product companies is to strategically integrate offline with online sales channels to provide
10 more complex product offerings that increase the product value for customers. This strategy,
11 which is regularly referred to as *online-to-offline* (O2O) EC markets, has caused disruptive
12 changes in many industries such as transportation (e.g., Uber) and the restaurant business (e.g.,
13 Yelp) (Xiao and Dong, 2015). When integration capabilities are apparent, customer value is
14 potentially significantly increased, which can lead to increased sales and margins (i.e., through
15 adding services to products) (Kastalli and Van Looy, 2013). An O2O strategy example in the
16 manufacturing environment is the increased mass customization efforts of sport apparel
17 companies, where consumers can customize their shoes online and experience part of the
18 creation/manufacturing process (i.e., final assembly) in the store (e.g., Adidas 3D printing;
19 Thomasson and Michalska, 2017). Combining online services (e.g., the ordering process) and
20 the collection of the offline product (e.g., collection points) has clear implications for a
21 company's supply chain.
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 Despite the prevalence of this strategy, the benefit of adopting O2O is debatable. For
47 example, Walmart has been struggling with its EC operation even an "order online, pick-up
48 here" policy was applied. Adopting the O2O strategy may also increase the complexity in
49 operations by adding product and service assortments. Processes need to be integrated and
50 coordinated to deal with this increased complexity (Bode and Wagner, 2015).
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59

60 Aforementioned efforts provide potential benefits in terms of relatively higher revenues

1
2
3
4 and margins while requiring the management of the complexity. Thus, we examine whether
5
6 investors would have a different reaction to companies that employ an O2O strategy in their
7
8 EC initiatives:
9

10
11
12 **H4.** Stock market reactions to EC initiative announcements are different between
13
14 firms that integrate online with offline sales channels and firms that do not.
15
16
17
18

19 **3. Methodology**

20 **3.1. Sample**

21
22
23
24
25
26 We conducted an event study to examine the stock market reactions to EC announcements of
27
28 Chinese firms. We defined the event as the announcement of listed firms stating that they are
29
30 extending their distribution/sales channel (B2B and B2C) to the Internet. Media reports, from
31
32 newspapers, magazines and online news sites, were the primary source for event data
33
34 collection. The data collection process started by obtaining a list of 3,069 firm names from the
35
36 China Stock Market and Accounting Research (CSMAR) database. CSMAR is a
37
38 comprehensive database that allows accessing of data on stock trading, financial statements
39
40 and relevant media report of China's listed companies. These firms are listed on the Shanghai
41
42 and Shenzhen Stock Exchanges. We then searched for media reports of these firms from the
43
44 *WiseNews* database and *Financial News Database*. *Wiseneews* is a consolidated database that
45
46 records news from over 350 titles of newspapers, magazines, journals, and newswires
47
48 published in mainland China, Hong Kong, Macau, and Taiwan. The *Financial News Database*
49
50 is a sub-database in CSMAR providing financial news reports on the China market and
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 categorizing each news according to the relevant listed company trading codes. The use of two
5
6
7 databases enhanced the comprehensiveness of the data collection and facilitated cross-
8
9
10 validation among the media reports. The keywords used for the search were combinations of
11
12 the firm names with “e-commerce”, “electronic commerce”, ”online” and “internet.” Two
13
14
15 examples of the collected announcement titles are “Suning formally entered e-commerce” in
16
17
18 2010 and “Shunxin agriculture forge e-commerce platform” in 2011. We verified each
19
20
21 announcement carefully and eliminated announcements involving confounding events at the
22
23
24 event date. The confounding events include the announcements of dividends, merger, signing
25
26
27 government contracts, new products, lawsuits, unexpected earnings, and changes in major
28
29
30 managers. We retained the earliest announcement if repeated announcements were found for
31
32
33 the same firm. In addition, we focused on the first EC initiative of each firm because in a firm’s
34
35
36 second (or later) EC initiatives, both the firm and investors may learn from the first initiative
37
38
39 and thus encounter a different situation (Lo *et al.*, 2014).

40
41
42 As a result, we identified 371 announcements without confounding events over 2010–
43
44
45 2017 (March). We further eliminated 61 announcements because the financial data of the
46
47
48 associated firms were not complete, or the stocks were not traded on the announcement date.
49
50
51 Thus, the final sample consisted of 310 EC initiative announcements. Table 1 shows the
52
53
54 statistics of these 310 sample firms.

55
56
57 ---Insert Table 1 about here---

58
59
60 Our sample spanned 59 industries. The industries are based on the Chinese industry
classification of listed companies. Retail (F52), computer, communication and other

1
2
3
4 electrical device manufacturing (C39), and pharmaceutical manufacturing (C27) were the
5
6
7 three industries with the most EC initiative announcements, accounting for 10%, 7.7% and
8
9 6.8%, respectively, of all the announcements. The distribution of the announcements was
10
11
12 approximately even across the three industries; thus the cross-dependences among
13
14
15 announcements in terms of industry clustering is not a serious concern in our sample (Kothari
16
17 and Warner, 2007).

21 **3.2. Event study method**

22
23
24 We tested H1 based on the cumulative abnormal return (*CAR*), which is a standard measure of
25
26
27 the impact due to a focal event used in prior event studies. For a short-horizon event study, the
28
29
30 impact should be detected on the announcement day (event day or day 0). However, not every
31
32
33 investor might notice the event through public announcements; some investors may obtain the
34
35
36 information through leakage via private social networks (Zajac and Westphal, 2004). We
37
38
39 included the day prior to the event day (day -1) to deal with potential information leakage. In
40
41
42 addition, as public information may not be disseminated to all investors at the same speed, we
43
44
45 included the day after the event day (day 1) to deal with potential delay in information
46
47
48 dissemination to some investors. Therefore, the event window of *CAR* spanned three days (day
49
50 -1 to day 1) in our study (Meznar *et al.*, 1994). For robustness, we also reported the *CAR* spans
51
52 of five days (day -2 to day 2). Based on the market model estimation, the abnormal return on
53
54
55 one day (such as day 0) was calculated by the formula:

$$56 \qquad AR_{i0} = R_{i0} - a_i - b_i R_{m0} \quad (1)$$

where AR_{i0} is the abnormal return of firm i on a focal day, a_i and b_i are the OLS estimated coefficients of α_i and β_i produced by the following regression model:

$$R_{it} = \alpha_i + \beta_i R_{mt} + \varepsilon_{it} \quad (2)$$

where R_{it} and R_{mt} are the returns on day t of firm i and market portfolio m , respectively.

We used the China Securities Index (CSI) 300 as the market portfolio, covering 300 composite stocks listed on the Shanghai and Shenzhen stock exchanges.

Following previous event studies, we used the stock price data of the period day -200 to day -11 to estimate the coefficients for formulas (2) (e.g., Jacobs and Singhal, 2017). We calculated the CAR as the sum of all the daily mean abnormal returns from day -1 to day 1 and day -2 to day 2, respectively. We conducted a parametric paired t -test to examine whether the $CARs$ of our sample firms are significantly different from zero (i.e., null effect). We also conducted non-parametric Wilcoxon signed rank (WSR) tests as robustness checks.

3.3. Cross-sectional regression

In addition to assessing the direct effect of EC announcements on stock values, we investigate how contingency factors affected the variation of $CARs$ due to the EC initiative announcements. To examine H2 to H4, we regressed the $CARs$ (day -1 to day 1 and day -2 to day 2, in the market model) on the independent variables capturing the variation in firm and event characters. The measurements of these variables are discussed below.

We used operating cycle to measure a firm's operating performance for H2. A shorter operating cycle indicates a stronger capability to turn inventory into cash quickly. We

1
2
3
4 calculated the variable as the sum of days of inventory and accounts receivable (Lo *et al.*,
5
6
7 2014). Another form of operating cycle is the sum of days of inventory and accounts receivable
8
9 minus days of accounts payable (Hendricks *et al.*, 2009). Our results remain consistent with
10
11
12 this alternative measure.
13

14
15 *Self-owned platform* was coded as a variable for H3. If the announcement mentioned that
16
17 the firm would build its own online platform for EC, the variable was coded as “1,” and “0”
18
19 otherwise. Our sample did not include announcements when no relevant information was
20
21
22 given.
23
24

25
26 In recent years, the concepts of Internet plus and online-to-offline (O2O) have emerged,
27
28 motivating Chinese firms to integrate online and offline channels. Internet plus refers to
29
30 integrating the Internet into the operations of traditional industries (e.g., manufacturing and
31
32 retail) (Wang *et al.*, 2016). In O2O models, the orders of one channel can also be fulfilled by
33
34 another channel, which increases the flexibility and resource utilization in both channels (Zhao
35
36 *et al.*, 2016). We coded a binary variable (*Channel integration*) in line with the announcement.
37
38
39 If the announcement mentioned a plan to use Internet plus or O2O models or other similar
40
41 integration approaches, the variable was coded as “1.” If a firm was simply to create a new
42
43 online channel without mentioning any plan to integrate this with the current channel, the
44
45 variable was coded as “0.”
46
47
48
49
50
51

52
53 Two coders were in charge of the coding process for the variables of *Self-owned platform*
54
55 and *Channel integration* independently. One author verified each coding result and made the
56
57 final judgement if there were disputes between the coders. An example of the announcement
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 stating the use of O2O strategy and third-party platform is from Aokang International
5
6 (603001.SH) on March 13 2013, entitled “Aokang International advance O2O business with
7
8 Alibaba.” Another example of an announcement stating the use of O2O strategy, but a self-
9
10 own platform is from Youngor (600177. SH) on April 30 2015, entitled “Youngor develops
11
12 O2O sales platform.” We expect that the investors would react more positively to the
13
14 announcements which state that the online-offline channels will be integrated than the ones did
15
16 not mention the status of offline channels.
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 We also included several control variables in the regression analysis. First, *firm size*
24
25 measured by total assets and *financial performance* measured by return-on-assets were
26
27 controlled for, because large (in terms of assets) and profitable firms may have more resources
28
29 to expand their sales channels. Second, *financial leverage*, measured by the ratio of debt to
30
31 equity, was controlled for (Wiengarten *et al.*, 2017), because investors of firms with a high
32
33 level of leverage may be more sensitive to the cash flow prepared for debt repayment. Third,
34
35 *inventory* measured by inventory days was controlled for because new sales channels may
36
37 facilitate the reduction of inventory levels, or the firm would need extra inventory to fulfill the
38
39 additional orders from the new channel. Fourth, *firm age* was included since older firms may
40
41 have higher organizational inertia (Miller and Chen, 1994) and tend to use traditional sales
42
43 channels. We also included the *business model* of the firm as a control variable. We coded the
44
45 firm as using a B2B (coded as 1) or B2C (coded as 0) model based on whether the firm was
46
47 providing an industrial product or a consumer product. Further, *financial slack* was controlled
48
49 for because firms with better liquidity tend to have a stronger cash flow, which could facilitate
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

channel expansion. Financial slack was measured by the quick ratio, which is current assets minus inventory, divided by current liabilities. The announcement may state that a firm use both self-own and third-party platform for the initiative, thus, we coded this circumstance in a binary variable named *both platforms* (“1” for both platforms were used, “0” for single platform was used). Finally, we included dummy variables to control for the effects relating to year and industry such as economic conditions and industry rivalry. We performed a natural logarithm transformation on *operating cycle*, *firm size*, *firm age*, and *inventory* to correct for skewness and reduce the concern of multi-collinearity. The *self-own platform* and *business model* data were obtained from the announcements. *Firm age*, *year*, and *industry* data were taken at the year of the event; data of other independent variables were taken at the year prior to the event. Therefore, we are confident that the analysis results do not suffer from reverse causality. In summary, the regression model is specified as followed:

$$\begin{aligned}
 CAR_i = & \beta_0 + \beta_1(Firm\ size_i) + \beta_2(Inventory_i) + \beta_3(Financial\ performance_i) + \beta_4(Financial \\
 & leverage_i) + \beta_5(Firm\ age_i) + \beta_6(Business\ model_i) + \beta_7(Financial\ slack_i) + \beta_8(Both \\
 & platforms_i) + \beta_9(Operating\ cycle_i\ (H2)) + \beta_{10}(Self\text{-}own\ platform_i\ (H3)) + \beta_{11}(Channel \\
 & integration_i\ (H4)) + Industry_i + Year_i + Residual_i \quad (3)
 \end{aligned}$$

4. Results

4.1. Event analysis of CARs

In Table 2, we examine whether the stock market reacts positively to EC announcements (H1).

In the market model analysis, the average *CAR* of three-day window (day -1 to day 1) is

1
2
3
4 significantly positive (1.126%, $p < 0.05$). The average *CAR* of the five-day window (day -2 to
5
6 day 2) is also significantly positive (1.280%, $p < 0.05$). Given the average market value of
7
8 firms in our sample is 26,231.26 million Chinese Yuan (CNY), the announcement increases
9
10 firm value by 295.29 million CNY in the three-day window and 335.68 million CNY in the
11
12 five-day window. In addition, we present results from market adjusted returns to examine
13
14 whether the *CAR* is biased by time and industry clustering (Brown and Warner, 1980). The
15
16 market adjusted *CARs* of the three-day and five-day windows are 1.245% and 1.615%,
17
18 respectively, which are significant at the 0.01 level. Thus, we conclude that H1 is supported.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 In addition, we conducted non-parametric WSR tests to increase the robustness of the
27
28 event analysis. In the market model analysis, the median *CARs* of the three-day and five-day
29
30 windows are 0.31% and 0.46%, respectively, which are significant at the 0.05 level. In the
31
32 market adjusted model, the median *CARs* of the three-day and five-day windows are 0.67%
33
34 and 0.43%, respectively, which are significant at the 0.01 level. We also examined the *CARs*
35
36 from day -10 to day -3 and found that the change is non-significant ($p > 0.1$), which indicates
37
38 the information leakage concern is not serious in the period prior to our event window. These
39
40 tests offer additional support to H1.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 ---Insert Table 2 about here---

49 50 51 **4.2. Cross-sectional regression results**

52 Table 3 shows the descriptive statistics and correlations of variables in the regression analysis.
53
54 The average VIF is 1.644 and no single VIF is larger than four, which suggests that multi-
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 collinearity is not a serious concern in our analysis.
5

6
7 ---Insert Table 3 about here---

8
9 ---Insert Table 4 about here---

10
11
12 Table 4 presents the regression results documenting under what circumstances
13
14 shareholders will react more positively to EC initiative announcements. The dependent variable
15
16 of the models in Panel 1 is *CAR* of day -1 to day 1 and in Panel 2 is *CAR* of day -2 to day 2
17
18 from the market models. The control models in both panels contain all control variables. The
19
20 full models examined H2, H3, and H4. In H2, we posit that markets react more positively to
21
22 the EC announcements of poorly performing firms. The coefficients of operating cycle in the
23
24 full models are 0.027 (Panel 1, $p < 0.01$) and 0.028 (Panel 2, $p < 0.05$), respectively. A deviation
25
26 of one standard deviation **above** the operating cycle mean (1.091) increases the *CARs* by
27
28 2.946% to 3.013%. This change equates to an increase of market value by 772.74 million and
29
30 790.31 million CNY, respectively. Thus, H2 is supported.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39
40 H3 posits that markets react differently to the EC initiative announcements of firms
41
42 using self-owned platforms and third-party platforms. The coefficients of *Self-own platform* in
43
44 the full models are -0.029 (Panel 1, $p < 0.05$) and -0.036 (Panel 2, $p < 0.01$). Using a self-
45
46 owned platform decreases the *CARs* by 2.86% to 3.63%. This equates to a decrease of market
47
48 value of 750.21 million and 952.19 million CNY, respectively. Thus, H3 is supported,
49
50 suggesting that stock market reactions are more negative for firms using self-owned platforms
51
52 than third-party platforms.
53
54
55
56
57

58
59 H4 posits that markets react differently to the EC initiative announcements of firms
60

1
2
3
4 with and without the integration of online with offline channels. The coefficients of *Channel*
5
6 *integration* in the full models are 0.035 (Panel 1, $p < 0.05$) to 0.050 (Panel 2, $p < 0.01$). The
7
8
9 channel integration strategy increases the *CARs* by 3.53% to 4.98%. This equates to an increase
10
11
12 of market value of 925.97 million and 1307.63 million CNY, respectively. Thus, H4 is
13
14
15 supported, suggesting that the stock market reactions are more positive for firms with rather
16
17
18 than without the integration of online with offline channels.
19
20
21

22 **5. Discussion and Conclusion**

23
24
25 This research explored the extent of value generation by conceptualizing the dependent
26
27
28 variable through changes in a company's stock prices (*CAR*). Our results indicate that in the
29
30
31 context of the Chinese market, EC initiatives do create value from a stock market (i.e.,
32
33
34 shareholder) perspective. We further explore the contextual conditions under which companies
35
36
37 are more likely to generate value. We explored this through the contextual factor of a firm's
38
39
40 operating performance, distribution mode, and channel integration. Our results indicate that
41
42
43 companies that are in a performance dip (i.e., long operating cycles) and that use external
44
45
46 electronic distribution channels (third-party platforms) create higher value through EC.
47
48
49 Further, companies that initiate EC by integrating online with offline sales channels are in a
50
51
52 superior position to create value in terms of stock evaluations.

53
54
55 Unlike prior EC studies conducted in the Western context, we studied the potential
56
57
58 value in the Chinese context (e.g., Ferguson *et al.*, 2005; Subramani and Walden, 2001). We
59
60
61 believe that conducting our study in China provided a much-needed, diversified insight into

1
2
3
4 the value creation process of EC. From an operations and supply chain perspective, China has
5
6 been consistently growing into a hub from a logistics and production perspective and also from
7
8 an innovation perspective (Bhalla *et al.*, 2008). Furthermore, the Chinese context of our study
9
10 provides the important nuance of our first hypothesis. We explored the market reactions in a
11
12 market largely untested in relation to the studied phenomena, i.e., China. Whilst the company
13
14 level performance implications of EC are largely known, the stock market reactions of the
15
16 shareholder have not extensively studied. This research thus provides important insights from
17
18 a managerial as well from an investor's perspective.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 Although more and more firms in general, and Chinese companies in particular, are
27
28 responding to the internal and external stakeholder pressure to sell products and services to
29
30 their customers via EC, it is unclear how firms can generate high levels of value in EC from an
31
32 operational and supply chain perspective. In particular, some underperformers in traditional
33
34 sales channels are exposed to the intensified competition in online markets and the resulting
35
36 competitive disadvantage they may face when adopting EC. Nevertheless, our research
37
38 suggests that, in contradiction to this perception, prior poor performing (operationally) firms
39
40 are able to benefit more from the adoption of EC. More specifically, we find that firms with
41
42 longer operating cycles can gain higher returns from EC. This finding might be due to the
43
44 capability of EC to enable firms to increase sales, reduce costs and lead times, and better match
45
46 supply and demand (Geyskens *et al.*, 2002; Homburg *et al.*, 2014; Subramani and Walden,
47
48 2001), thus, helping firms who are not performing well in their traditional channels. These
49
50 performance gains are even more pronounced when taking into account the considerable
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 geographical spread of China and the relatively limited geographical coverage of those
5
6 underperformers (Dobbs et al., 2013). Therefore, our results should encourage Chinese firms
7
8 with low operating performance to take advantage of the capabilities of EC in the Chinese
9
10 context, transforming the disadvantages they are facing in these contexts.
11
12
13

14
15 Chinese firms may follow the practices of their Western counterparts when adopting
16
17 EC. For instance, Chinese firms may follow Western firms to develop their own EC sites rather
18
19 than use third-party EC platforms. Firms in the Western world traditionally rely more on their
20
21 own websites than third-party websites to sell products to customers (PwC, 2017). Our results
22
23 challenge this traditional view by showing that Chinese firms benefit less when deploying EC
24
25 through their own platforms. Such a contradiction might be due to differences in consumer
26
27 behaviors in China when compared with other developed countries. In particular, Chinese
28
29 consumers are used to visiting third-party EC platforms directly rather than relying on search
30
31 engines when looking for products (Decollas, 2017), thus making self-owned EC sites less
32
33 visible. Moreover, due to security, privacy, counterfeit, and other concerns, Chinese consumers
34
35 trust popular and familiar third-party platforms more than obscure self-owned websites (EU
36
37 SME Centre, 2014). Therefore, instead of encouraging Chinese firms to follow their Western
38
39 counterparts and develop their own EC sites, we urge them to make use of popular third-party
40
41 EC platforms to reap more benefits, especially when they have a lack of resources to develop
42
43 their own sites.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54
55 Another important managerial implication of our research is that companies initiating
56
57 EC can significantly increase their generated value by following an O2O strategy. Multiple
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 industry examples of successful O2O business models provide anecdotal evidence on the
5
6 potential added value of O2O for stakeholders and customers. Our results have empirically
7
8 confirmed that stock market reactions to EC initiative announcements are more positive when
9
10 firms integrate online with offline sales channels. Thus, management is well advised to develop
11
12 process capabilities to integrate offline with the newly added online sales channels.
13
14
15

16
17 Further, a strategy that combines online and offline sales channels (i.e., O2O) enables
18
19 companies to offer more products and services. This seems to equip companies with
20
21 capabilities valued by shareholders, who appreciate the future gains that such a strategy may
22
23 entail (Kastalli and Van Looy, 2013). Thus, shareholders increase their confidence in such a
24
25 company and EC initiatives have a stronger impact on firm value generated on the stock market.
26
27 Despite O2O EC marketplaces requiring high levels of process coordination and integration,
28
29 which is indicative of capability to successfully deal with the complexities of channel
30
31 expansion through EC initiatives, it seems that outsourcing the distribution sales function to a
32
33 third-party platform is an appropriate approach for companies to focus on the complexity of
34
35 the product itself.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 **6. Limitations and Future Research**

46
47 As with all research of this nature, there are some limitations that need to be considered when
48
49 interpreting our results. These limitations also in turn provide new opportunities for future
50
51 studies.
52
53
54

55 Firstly, we rely on the event study methodology to assess the short-term stock market
56
57 reactions to EC announcements. Future research could adopt alternative methodologies to
58
59
60

1
2
3 measure the long-term impact of EC initiatives (e.g., measure abnormal operating performance;
4 see Barber and Lyon (1996) for details) and verify the conclusion made in our research.
5
6

7
8 Moreover, our focus on stock market reactions also implies that our sample is
9
10 constrained to large, publicly-listed companies, which may limit the generalizability of our
11
12 findings to private and small firms. This limitation is a particular concern because small and
13
14 medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) in China have accounted for more than 50% of total EC sales
15
16 (Phillips, 2015). It thus is necessary for future research to gain a better understanding of
17
18 whether and how EC could benefit SMEs in China. Similarly, our research also excludes
19
20 foreign firms that provide products and services to Chinese customers via EC. While more and
21
22 more foreign firms are trying to enter the Chinese market through EC, they may face quite
23
24 different challenges such as cultural differences and regulatory requirements, which are worth
25
26 further investigation.
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 **References**

- 34
35
36 Alba, J., Lynch, J., Weitz, W., Janiszewski, C., Lutz, R., Sawyer, A. and Wood, S. (1997),
37
38 “Interactive home shopping: consumer, retailer, and manufacturer incentives to
39
40 participate in electronic marketplaces”, *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 61, pp. 38–53.
41
42
43
44 Barber, B.M. and Lyon, J.D. (1996), “Detecting abnormal operating performance: The
45
46 empirical power and specification of test statistics”, *Journal of Financial Economics*,
47
48 Vol. 41 No. 3, pp. 359-399.
49
50
51
52 Barthelemy, J. (2003), “The seven deadly sins of outsourcing”, *Academy of Management*
53
54 *Executive*, Vol. 17 No. 2, pp. 87–100.
55
56
57
58 Barua, A., Kriebel, C.H. and Mukhopadhyay, T. (1995), “IT and business value: an analytic
59
60

- and empirical investigation”, *Information Systems Research*, Vol. 6 No. 1, pp. 3-23.
- Bhalla, A., Sodhi, M.M.S. and Son, B.G. (2008), “Is more IT offshoring better? An exploratory study of western companies offshoring to South East Asia”, *Journal of Operations Management*, Vol. 26, pp. 322–335.
- Bode, C. and Wagner, S.M. (2015), “Structural drivers of upstream supply chain complexity and the frequency of supply chain disruptions”, *Journal of Operations Management*, Vol. 36, pp. 215–228.
- Brown, S.J. and Warner, J.B. (1980), “Measuring security price performance”, *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol. 8 No. 3, pp. 205–258.
- Choudhury, V. and Karahanna, E. (2008), “The relative advantage of electronic channels: a multidimensional view,” *MIS Quarterly*, Vol. 32 No. 1, pp. 179–200.
- Chircu, A.M. and Kauffman, R.J. (2000), “Limits to value in electronic commerce-related IT investments”, *Journal of Management Information Systems*, Vol. 17 No. 2, pp. 59-80.
- Cyert, R.M. and March, J.G. (1963), *A Behavioral Theory of the Firm*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Dahlman, C.J. (2007), “China and India: emerging technological powers”, *Issues in Science and Technology*, Vol. 23 No. 3, .
- Decollas, S. (2017), “Chinese e-commerce strategy: e-marketplace, social e-commerce or own website?”, available at: <http://dmb-shanghai.com/ecommerce/2017/02/09/chinese-e-commerce-platforms> (accessed 29 April 2019).
- Dehning, B., Richardson, V.J., Urbaczewski, A. and Wells, J.D. (2004), “Reexamining the

- 1
2
3
4 value relevance of e-commerce initiatives, *Journal of Management Information Systems*,
5
6
7 Vol. 21 No. 1, pp. 55-82.
- 8
9 de Figueiredo, J.M. (2000), “Finding sustainable profitability in electronic commerce”, *Sloan*
10
11
12 *Management Review*, Vol. 41 No. 4, pp. 41–52.
- 13
14
15 Dionysiou, D. and Tsoukas, H. (2013), “Understanding the (re)creation of routines from within:
16
17
18 a symbolic interactionist perspective”, *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 38 No. 2,
19
20
21 pp. 181–205.
- 22
23 Dobbs, R., Chen, Y., Orr, G., Manyika, J., Chui, M. and Chang, E. (2013), “China’s e-tail
24
25
26 revolution”, McKinsey Global Institute, available at: <http://issues.org/23-3/dahlman/>
27
28
29 (accessed 29 April 2019).
- 30
31 EU SME Centre (2014), “Selling online in China”, available at: [http://ccilc.pt/wp-](http://ccilc.pt/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/EU-SME-Centre-Report-Selling-Online-in-China-Update-Jul-2014.pdf)
32
33
34 [content/uploads/2017/07/EU-SME-Centre-Report-Selling-Online-in-China-Update-Jul-](http://ccilc.pt/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/EU-SME-Centre-Report-Selling-Online-in-China-Update-Jul-2014.pdf)
35
36
37 [2014.pdf](http://ccilc.pt/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/EU-SME-Centre-Report-Selling-Online-in-China-Update-Jul-2014.pdf) (accessed 29 April 2019).
- 38
39 Farber, M. (2016), “Consumers are now doing most of their shopping online”, *Fortune*,
40
41
42 available at: <http://fortune.com/2016/06/08/online-shopping-increases> (accessed 29
43
44
45 April 2019).
- 46
47 Ferguson, C., Finn, F. and Hall, J. (2005), “Electronic commerce investments, the resource-
48
49
50 based view of the firm, and firm market value”, *International Journal of Accounting*
51
52
53 *Information Systems*, Vol. 6 No. 1, pp. 5–29.
- 54
55 Geyskens, I., Gielens, K. and Dekimpe, M.G. (2002), “The market valuation of Internet
56
57
58 channel additions”, *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 66 No. 2, pp. 102–119.
59
60

1
2
3
4 Hendricks, K.B., Singhal, V.R. and Zhang, R. (2009), “The effect of operational slack,
5
6 diversification, and vertical relatedness on the stock market reaction to supply chain
7
8 disruptions”, *Journal of Operations Management*, Vol. 27, pp. 233–246.
9

10
11
12 Hoffman, D.L., Novak, T.P. and Chatterjee, P. (1995), “Commercial scenarios for the Web:
13
14 opportunities and challenges”, *Journal of Computer Mediated Communication*, Vol. 1,
15
16 p. 3.
17
18

19
20 Homburg, C., Vollmayr, J. and Hahn, A. (2014), “Firm value creation through major channel
21
22 expansions: evidence from an event study in the United States, Germany, and China”,
23
24 *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 78 No. 3, pp. 38–61.
25
26

27
28 Jacobs, B.W. and Singhal, V.R. (2017), “The effect of the Rana Plaza disaster on shareholder
29
30 wealth of retailers: implications for sourcing strategies”, *Journal of Operations
31
32 Management*, Vols. 49–51, pp. 52–66.
33
34

35
36 Kastalli, I.V. and Van Looy, B. (2013), “Servitization: disentangling the impact of service
37
38 business model innovation on manufacturing firm performance”, *Journal of Operations
39
40 Management*, Vol. 31, pp. 169–180.
41
42

43
44 Kothari, S. P., & Warner, J. B. (2007). Econometrics of event studies. In *Handbook of
45
46 empirical corporate finance* (pp. 3-36). Elsevier.
47
48

49
50 Krantz, M. (2014), “Alibaba prices at \$68, becomes top U.S. IPO”, *USA Today*, available at:
51
52 [http://www.usatoday.com/story/money/markets/2014/09/18/alibaba-deal-price-
53
54 ipo/15846185/](http://www.usatoday.com/story/money/markets/2014/09/18/alibaba-deal-price-ipo/15846185/) (accessed 29 April 2019).
55
56

57
58 Lee, R.P. and Tang, X. (2018), “Does it pay to be innovation and imitation oriented? An
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 examination of the antecedents and consequences of innovation and imitation
5
6 orientations”, *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, Vol. 35 No. 1, pp. 11–26.
7
8
9 Li, M.E.I. and Choi, T.Y. (2009), “Triads in services outsourcing: bridge, bridge decay and
10
11 bridge transfer”, *Journal of Supply Chain Management*, Vol. 45 No. 3, pp. 27–39.
12
13
14 Lo, C.K., Pagell, M., Fan, D., Wiengarten, F. and Yeung, A.C. (2014), “OHSAS 18001
15
16 certification and operating performance: the role of complexity and coupling”, *Journal*
17
18 *of Operations Management*, Vol. 32 No. 5, pp. 268–280.
19
20
21
22
23 Luckerson, V. (2014), “Everything you need to know about the mega Chinese IPOs coming to
24
25 America”, *TIME*, available at: <http://time.com/27469/chinese-ipos/> (accessed 29 April
26
27 2019).
28
29
30
31 Melville, N., Kraemer, K. and Gurbaxani, V. (2004). Review: “Information technology and
32
33 organisational performance: An integrative model of IT business value”. *MIS Quarterly*,
34
35 *Vol. 28* No. 2, pp. 283-322.
36
37
38
39
40 Meznar, M.B., Nigh, D. and Kwok, C.C.Y. (1994), “Effect of announcements of withdrawal
41
42 from South Africa on stockholder wealth”, *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 37
43
44 No. 6, pp. 1633–1648.
45
46
47
48 Miller, D. and Chen, M.J. (1994), “Sources and consequences of competitive inertia: a study
49
50 of the US airline industry”, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 39, pp. 1–23.
51
52
53
54 Pavlou, P.A. and Fygenson, M. (2006), “Understanding and predicting electronic commerce
55
56 adoption: An extension of the theory of planned behavior” *MIS Quarterly*, Vol. 30 No.
57
58 1, pp. 115-143.
59
60

1
2
3
4 Phillips, S. (2015), “*E-Commerce in China*”, China-Britain Business Council, London.

5
6
7 Power, D. and Singh, P. (2007), “The e-integration dilemma: the linkages between Internet
8
9 technology application, trading partner relationships and structural change”, *Journal of*
10
11
12 *Operations Management*, Vol. 25, pp. 1292–1310.

13
14
15 PwC (2017), “Total retail 2017: ecommerce in China – the future is already here”, available at:
16
17
18 [https://www.pwccn.com/en/retail-and-consumer/publications/total-retail-2017-](https://www.pwccn.com/en/retail-and-consumer/publications/total-retail-2017-china/total-retail-survey-2017-china-cut.pdf)
19
20
21 [china/total-retail-survey-2017-china-cut.pdf](https://www.pwccn.com/en/retail-and-consumer/publications/total-retail-2017-china/total-retail-survey-2017-china-cut.pdf) (accessed 29 April 2019).

22
23 Rigby, D. (2011), “The future of shopping”, *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 89 No. 12, pp. 65–
24
25
26 76.

27
28 Subramani, M. and Walden, E. (2001), “The impact of e-commerce announcements on the
29
30 market value of firms”, *Information Systems Research*, Vol. 12 No. 2, pp. 135–154.

31
32
33 Thomasson, E. and Michalska, A. (2007), “Adidas to mass-produce 3d-printed shoe with
34
35
36 Silicon Valley start-up”, available at: [https://www.reuters.com/article/us-adidas-](https://www.reuters.com/article/us-adidas-manufacturing-idUSKBN1790F6)
37
38
39 [manufacturing-idUSKBN1790F6](https://www.reuters.com/article/us-adidas-manufacturing-idUSKBN1790F6) (accessed 29 April 2019).

40
41
42 Tsay, A.A. and Agrawal, N. (2004), “Channel conflict and coordination in the e-commerce
43
44
45 age”, *Production and Operations Management*, Vol. 13 No. 1, pp. 93–110.

46
47
48 Van Bruggen, G.H., Antia, K.D., Jap, S.D., Reinartz, W.J. and Pallas, F. (2010), “Managing
49
50
51 marketing channel multiplicity”, *Journal of Service Research*, Vol. 13 No. 3, pp. 331–
52
53
54 340.

55
56
57 Wang, Z., Chen, C., Guo, B., Yu, Z. and Zhou, X. (2016), “Internet plus in China”, *IT*
58
59
60 *Professional*, Vol. 18 No. 3, pp. 5–8.

1
2
3
4 Wiengarten, F., Humphreys, P., Cao, G. and McHugh, M. (2013), “Exploring the important
5
6
7 role of organizational factors in IT business value: Taking a contingency perspective on
8
9 the resource-based view”, *International Journal of Management Reviews*, Vol. 15, pp.
10
11
12 30-46.

13
14
15 Wiengarten, F., Fan, D., Lo, C.K. and Pagell, M. (2017), “The differing impacts of operational
16
17 and financial slack on occupational safety in varying market conditions”, *Journal of*
18
19
20
21
22 *Operations Management*, Vol. 52, pp. 30–45.

23
24
25 Xiao, S. and Dong, M. (2015), “Hidden semi-Markov model-based reputation management
26
27 system for online to offline (O2O) e-commerce markets”, *Decision Support Systems*,
28
29
30 Vol. 77, pp. 87–99.

31
32
33 Zajac, E.J. and Westphal, J.D. (2004), “The social construction of market value:
34
35 institutionalization and learning perspectives on stock market reactions”, *American*
36
37
38 *Sociological Review*, Vol. 69 No. 3, pp. 433–457.

39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60 Zhao, F., Wu, D., Liang, L. and Dolgui, A. (2016), “Lateral inventory transshipment problem
in online-to-offline supply chain”, *International Journal of Production Research*, Vol.
54 No. 7, pp. 1951–1963.

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

Table 1: Descriptive statistics of sample firms, n = 310

	Number of employee (thousand)	Sales volume (Million CNY)	Total Assets (Million CNY)	Market value (Million CNY)	Firm age
Mean	10.16	19430.85	21112.68	26231.26	16.45
Median	3.87	4782.15	3363.69	8978.40	16.00
Std. Deviation	27.43	79524.55	159550.03	70344.13	5.03
Minimum	0.08	113.96	23.66	824.00	3.00
Maximum	376.20	1247271.00	2786045.00	811334.45	37.00

Table 2: Event analysis of EC initiatives; n=310

	Market Model			Market Adjusted Model		
	Mean	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	Mean	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Abnormal return day -1	0.587%	2.502	0.013	0.625%	2.694	0.007
Abnormal return day 0	0.454%	1.926	0.055	0.449%	1.622	0.106
Abnormal return day 1	0.084%	0.292	0.77	0.171%	0.559	0.577
Cumulated abnormal return day -1 to 1	1.126%	2.398	0.017	1.245%	2.587	0.010
Cumulated abnormal return day -2 to 2	1.280%	2.150	0.032	1.615%	2.785	0.006

Table 3: Descriptive statistics and correlations of variables

No.	Variables	Mean	S.D.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1	CAR day -1 to 1	0.011	0.083												
2	CAR day -2 to 2	0.013	0.105	.845**											
3	Firm size	22.446	1.357	.009	-.005										
4	Inventory	4.393	1.37	-.068	-.059	-.006									
5	ROA	0.059	0.065	.022	-.001	-.044	-.044								
6	Financial leverage	1.309	1.644	.031	.060	.282**	.103	-.274**							
7	Firm age	16.455	5.035	.060	.051	.141*	.103	-.142*	.160**						
8	Business model	0.21	0.408	-.102	-.072	.082	-.052	-.125*	.085	-.025					
9	Financial slack	1.663	2.262	-.069	-.103	-.362**	-.084	.165**	-.297**	-.238**	-.058				
10	Both platforms	0.117	0.321	-.029	.000	.222**	.014	.057	.163**	-.071	-.137*	-.103			
11	Operating cycle	4.908	1.091	-.063	-.054	-.090	.463**	-.081	.066	.039	.025	.053	-.007		
12	Self-own platform	0.771	0.421	-.099	-.081	.064	.054	-.114*	.149**	.072	.149**	-.063	-.162**	.097	
13	Channel integration	0.316	0.466	.192**	.211**	.003	.032	-.003	.136*	.059	-.197**	-.078	-.008	.018	.123*

Note: ** indicates $p < 0.01$; * indicates $p < 0.05$; two-tailed test; $n = 310$

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

Table 4: Cross-sectional regression analysis (market model)

Independent variables	Panel 1: dependent variable: CAR of day -1 to day 1						Panel 2: dependent variable: CAR of day -2 to day 2					
	Control Model			Full Model			Control Model			Full Model		
	Coef.	S.E.	<i>p</i>	Coef.	S.E.	<i>p</i>	Coef.	S.E.	<i>p</i>	Coef.	S.E.	<i>p</i>
Intercept	-0.955	6.080	0.875	7.211	6.852	0.293	-4.033	8.723	0.214	7.253	9.358	0.438
Firm size	0.000	0.004	0.962	0.002	0.004	0.603	-0.001	0.005	0.850	0.001	0.005	0.802
Inventory	0.000	0.005	0.924	-0.017	0.008	0.041	-0.002	0.006	0.665	-0.019	0.009	0.044
ROA	0.118	0.084	0.159	0.119	0.085	0.162	0.114	0.104	0.273	0.110	0.106	0.302
Financial leverage	-0.001	0.002	0.787	-0.002	0.002	0.415	0.002	0.004	0.589	0.001	0.005	0.886
Firm age	0.001	0.001	0.262	0.002	0.001	0.097	0.001	0.001	0.701	0.001	0.001	0.391
Business model	-0.027	0.010	0.008	-0.021	0.011	0.054	-0.020	0.012	0.097	-0.010	0.012	0.402
Financial slack	-0.005	0.002	0.049	-0.005	0.002	0.044	-0.008	0.003	0.023	-0.008	0.003	0.027
Both platforms	-0.009	0.013	0.506	-0.009	0.012	0.492	0.000	0.016	0.996	0.000	0.014	0.975
Operating cycle (H2)				0.026	0.010	0.008				0.028	0.011	0.015
Self-own platform (H3)				-0.029	0.013	0.026				-0.036	0.016	0.025
Channel integration (H4)				0.035	0.012	0.004				0.050	0.014	0.000
Industry dummies	Included			Included			Included			Included		
Year dummies	Included			Included			Included			Included		
Chi ²	78.021			99.306			90.347			112.932		
Incremental Chi ²				21.286						22.585		
				0.000						0.000		

Reply to Reviewer 1

Comments:

This study adopts an event study method to investigate the shareholder value of e-commerce initiatives. It also examines the roles of the operating cycle, distribution channels, and online-offline integrations on the market value. Overall, I commend this study a job well done, and below, I provide several comments for the authors' consideration in moving this paper forward.

Response: Thank you for your detailed suggestions and overall positive review of our manuscript. We appreciate your excellent comments and suggestions for us to improve the paper. After addressing your comment, the quality of the manuscript has improved in terms of hypothesis development, sample collection descriptions and data analysis. We elaborate the changes according to your comments below:

Comments:

1) In Hypothesis Development (H1), the authors mentioned that empirical evidence suggests the potential benefits of EC outweigh its drawbacks. Can the authors provide references to support this statement? Also, please be explicit about the potential benefits.

Response: Thank you for this suggestion. We followed your advice and added references supporting our statement. Furthermore, we are now more explicit about the potential benefits. Please refer to page 5 of the revised manuscript for the change.

Comments:

2) The last sentence in H1 development includes demand and supply side, however, the whole theoretical development seems only focused on cost reduction mechanism, there is no elaboration on demand/supply side.

Response: Thanks for this suggestion. We have taken the statement regarding demand/supply side benefits of EC out.

Comments:

3) In H2 development, the authors first talked about the obstacles (performance difficulties)

1
2
3 and then claimed that technological solutions/innovations are not expensive, maybe the relation
4 could have been more clearly developed.
5
6

7 **Response:** Thanks for noticing this. We agree that this statement was underdeveloped.
8 Subsequently, we added the following explanation to our argument leading to hypothesis 2 (p.
9 7):
10
11

12
13 *“This is especially the case in the context of this study, China, where technological solutions*
14 *and innovations are still relatively inexpensive (Dahlman, 2007; Lee and Tang, 2018). Whilst*
15 *prices for IT in terms of hardware might globally be at a similar level, the prices for*
16 *implementation, service and maintenance may differ, being relatively cheap in China. Thus,*
17 *this puts Chinese firms at an advantage point leading to a noticeable stock market reaction.”*
18
19
20
21
22
23

24
25 **Comments:**

26 4) Also, in H2 development, how a shareholder can sense the benefits from a long operating
27 cycle?
28
29

30 **Response:** Thank you very much. We agree that this sentence was confusing and needed more
31 explanation. We have rewritten this section into the following on page 7: *“Shareholders might*
32 *be aware of performance difficulties in turning inventory into sales (i.e., cash). If a company*
33 *has a longer operating cycle investors might view this as a great opportunity if that company*
34 *would initiate EC and subsequently improve performance. The longer the operating cycles the*
35 *greater the opportunity to improve performance and thus generating shareholder value. In*
36 *conclusion, a firm that has greater difficulties can potentially expect higher performance*
37 *improvements through EC initiatives. Longer operating cycles are accompanied by longer*
38 *inventory days, indicative of performance inefficiencies from an inventory management*
39 *perspective. Moreover, longer operating cycles could also be indicative of distribution concern*
40 *in terms of processes or from a sales perspective”*. We hope that this clarifies our argument
41 and rationale for hypothesis 2.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 **Comments:**

55
56 5) On page 12, the authors may specify the “confounding events”, what could they be?
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Response:** Thank you for the comment. The confounding events include announcements of
4 dividends, merger, signings government contracts, new products, lawsuits, unexpected
5 earnings, and changes in major managers. We noted these events in the section 3.1. (sample)
6 to increase the transparency of our sample collection procedure.
7
8
9

10
11
12
13 **Comments:**

14
15 6) I am fine with the execution of the event study method in this paper. Good luck with
16 moving this paper forward.
17

18
19 **Response:** We would like to thank you again for your constructive and concrete instructions
20 for us to improve the manuscript. We believe that the revised manuscript was greatly improved.
21 We hope that the changes in our theoretical development and empirical operationalization can
22 address your concerns.
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

Reply to Reviewer 2

Comments:

I hope my comments are useful. Good luck and all the best with the improvement of the paper.

Response: Thank you for reviewing our manuscript and providing insightful comments for us to improve the quality. We followed your excellent suggestions as closely as we can to revise the manuscript. Specifically, we enhanced the literature discussion, empirical operationalization and analysis, and implications. The changes in this version are elaborated below:

Comments:

Additional Questions:

1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?: the paper examines whether e-commerce in supply chain contexts can produce higher value for firms. Some studies have used event study to examine the impact of e-commerce adoption on market value (as the authors have cited some, e.g., Geyskens et al., 2002; Homburg et al., 2014; Subramani and Walden, 2001). Therefore, H1 does not add significant contribution to the literature. The study of the effect of the contextual factors is more interesting.

Response: Thank you very much for this thoughtful comment. We agree with the reviewer that the general performance implications of EC are largely known. However, as noted by the reviewer, probably meant to be used in a different perspective, we provide an important nuance in terms of context exploring this relationship. Firstly, we explore the market reactions in a market largely untested in relation to the studied phenomena, i.e., China. Secondly, whilst the company level performance implications of EC are largely known, the stock market reactions of the shareholder have not extensively studied. We believe this provides an important nuance that deserves further investigation from a managerial as well from an investor's perspective. We reiterate this point now in more detail in the discussion section of our paper (pp. 20-21).

Comments:

2. Relationship to Literature: Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the

1
2
3 relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any
4 significant work ignored?: the literature is relatively weak as many studies related to
5 ecommerce are not discussed in the literature. Below are some of these studies:
6
7

8
9 Urbaczewski, Andrew, et al. "Reexamining the Value of Relevance of E-Commerce
10 Initiatives." *Journal of Management Information Systems* 21.1 (2004): 57-84.
11

12
13 Dehning, Bruce, et al. "Reexamining the value relevance of e-commerce initiatives." *Journal*
14 *of Management Information Systems* 21.1 (2004): 55-82.
15

16
17 **Response:** We agree that the literature review regarding EC was relatively incomplete.
18 However, due to IMDS' requirements regarding article length (maximum 8000 words
19 including references and tables), we had to cut the sections regarding EC value significantly.
20 Nevertheless, we added the most important references back into the paper in order to offer a
21 more complete picture of the previous literature. Furthermore, we now refer the reader to a
22 comprehensive literature review paper (Wiengarten et al., 2013) and conceptual paper
23 (Melville et al., 2004) on IT business value research. We also included the paper you suggest
24 in our manuscript. The changes can be found on pages 5-6.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 **Comments:**

35
36 3. Methodology: Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts, or
37 other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is based been
38 well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?: please specify what kind of
39 confounding events are considered
40
41
42

43
44 **Response:** Thank you for the comments. We have considered the confounding events including
45 include announcements of dividends, merger, signings government contracts, new products,
46 lawsuits, unexpected earnings, and changes in major managers. We added a statement into the
47 sample description section (p. 12).
48
49
50
51
52

53 **Comments:**

54
55 please show some announcement examples.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Response:** Thank you for the suggestion. We have included a few examples of the translated
4 announcement titles in the manuscript, including Suning, Shunxin agriculture, Aokang
5 International and Youngor.
6
7
8
9

10
11 **Comments:**

12
13 Fama-French three factor model normally is used for developed market like USA. Since China
14 is an emerging market, it seems not appropriate to use Fama-French three factor here. The
15 authors need to use other model to show the robustness of the results.
16
17

18
19 **Response:** Thanks for the suggestions. We deleted the Fama-French model from our analysis
20 and used market adjusted model as a robustness check for the sample clustering concern (p.
21 18).
22
23
24

25
26 **Comments:**

27
28 There are concerns with the operation of the testing variable.
29 For example, it is normal that firms not disclose that they have offline channels in the
30 announcement, while in reality, they have implemented such channels.
31
32

33
34 **Response:** Thank you. We agree that firms may not disclose the offline channels. Thus, the
35 online-offline channel integration message was not delivered to the investors. We expect that
36 the investor would not have additional reaction to these announcements (compared to the firms
37 who claim to integrate their online and offline channels. We added this explanation in the text
38 (p. 16).
39
40
41
42
43
44

45
46 **Comments:**

47
48 Moreover, the authors do not consider announcements that have both self-own and third party
49 platforms. However, it is common that firms have both platform adopted. Ignoring these firms
50 in the study, may affect the representativeness of the findings.
51
52

53
54 **Response:** Thank you for your insightful comments. We concur to your view that an online
55 channel expansion initiative can use both self-own and third-party platform. The current
56 measurement coded self-own platform as "1", which ignores the possibility that the initiative
57 is using both. To address your valid concern, we went through all the announcements again to
58
59
60

code a variable of “both platforms” were adopted. We then entered this variable into our model as a control. The hypotheses testing results were not falsified in the new models. In addition, we found that the coefficient of “both platforms” are not significant ($p > 0.1$), which suggests that the merit brings by the adopting self-own platform is cancelled out by the third-party platform. We updated these results in the resubmitted manuscript.

Comments:

4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?: yes

Response: Thank you very much for your endorsement to our data analysis, result presentation and conclusion.

Comments:

5. Implications for research, practice and/or society Does the paper identify clearly between any implications for research, practice and/or society? Does the paper bridge the gap between theory and practice? How can the research be used in practice (economic and commercial impact), in teaching, to influence public policy, in research (contributing to the body of knowledge)? What is the impact upon society (influencing public attitudes, affecting quality of life)? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?: Due to the concerns of the operation of the testing variables as discussed in the Methodology, implication of the findings may be questionable. Moreover, there is no discussion on limitations of the research.

Response: Thank you very much for your comment. We revised the operation of the test variables in the resubmitted manuscript as per your excellent suggestions. We believe that the revised analysis can increase the validity of our implication discussion.

we have added a limitations section to discuss the limitations of this study. We also provided some suggestions for the future research to consider. Specifically, we added the following paragraphs in pp. 23-24:

1
2
3 *As with all research of this nature, there are some limitations that need to be considered when*
4 *interpreting our results. These limitations also in turn provide new opportunities for future*
5 *studies.*
6
7

8
9 *Firstly, we rely on the event study methodology to assess the short-term stock market reactions*
10 *to EC announcements. Future research could adopt alternative methodologies to measure the*
11 *long-term impact of EC initiatives (e.g., measure abnormal operating performance; see Barber*
12 *and Lyon (1996) for details) and verify the conclusion made in our research.*
13
14

15
16 *Moreover, our focus on stock market reactions also implies that our sample is constrained to*
17 *large, publicly-listed companies, which may limit the generalizability of our findings to private*
18 *and small firms. This limitation is a particular concern because small and medium-sized*
19 *enterprises (SMEs) in China have accounted for more than 50% of total EC sales (Phillips,*
20 *2015). It thus is necessary for future research to gain a better understanding of whether and*
21 *how EC could benefit SMEs in China. Similarly, our research also excludes foreign firms that*
22 *provide products and services to Chinese customers via EC. While more and more foreign*
23 *firms are trying to enter the Chinese market through EC, they may face quite different*
24 *challenges such as cultural differences and regulatory requirements, which are worth further*
25 *investigation.*
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 We believe that the limitation discussion adds implications for the further research in the
35 relevant fields.
36
37
38
39
40

41 **Comments:**

42
43 6. Quality of Communication: Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against the
44 technical language of the field and the expected knowledge of the journal's readership? Has
45 attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure,
46 jargon use, acronyms, etc.: Overall, this paper is well written and is easy to understand.
47
48
49

50 **Response:** Thank you again for your suggestions for us to improve the paper. We believe that
51 the manuscript was greatly improved after addressing the concerns from the review team.
52
53
54
55
56

57 **References:**

58
59 Dahlman, C.J. (2007), "China and India: emerging technological powers", *Issues in Science*
60

1
2
3 *and Technology*, Vol. 23 No. 3, .

4
5 Lee, R.P. and Tang, X. (2018), "Does it pay to be innovation and imitation oriented? An
6 examination of the antecedents and consequences of innovation and imitation
7 orientations", *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, Vol. 35 No. 1, pp. 11–26.

8
9
10
11
12 Melville, N., Kraemer, K. and Gurbaxani, V. (2004). Review: Information technology and
13 organisational performance: An integrative model of IT business value. *MIS Quarterly*,
14 Vol. 28 No. 2, pp. 283-322.

15
16 Phillips, S. (2015), "*E-Commerce in China*", China-Britain Business Council, London.

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
Wiengarten, F., Humphreys, P., Cao, G. and McHugh, M. (2013), "Exploring the important
role of organizational factors in IT business value: Taking a contingency perspective on
the resource-based view", *International Journal of Management Reviews*, Vol. 15, pp.
30-46.