

**WestminsterResearch**

<http://www.westminster.ac.uk/westminsterresearch>

**Hope for the best, prepare for the worst: barriers to service innovation**

**Velayati, R., Shabani Nejad, I. and Nazarian, A.**

This article is © Emerald and permission has been granted for this version to appear here: <http://westminsterresearch.westminster.ac.uk/>

Emerald does not grant permission for this article to be further copied/distributed or hosted elsewhere without the express permission from Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

The final, published version in *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, will be available at:

<https://dx.doi.org/10.1108/QMR-05-2020-0062>

The WestminsterResearch online digital archive at the University of Westminster aims to make the research output of the University available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the authors and/or copyright owners.



**Hope for the best, prepare for the worst: Barriers to service innovation**

Journal:	<i>Qualitative Market Research</i>
Manuscript ID	QMR-05-2020-0062.R2
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	service innovation, Qualitative research, Thematic analysis, Banking

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

# Hope for the best, prepare for the worst: Barriers to service innovation

## Abstract

### **Purpose:**

Despite the growing scholarly interest in service innovation and its associated benefits for organizations, research into the barriers to developing new services remains scant. In addition, most of these studies have been mainly conducted at the firm level, failing to incorporate macro forces in the industry. To fill this gap, this research aims at investigating major industry trends as well as organizational attributes that affect organizations' capability in designing innovative services.

**Design/methodology/approach:** A qualitative approach was used. Twenty one semi-structured interviews with senior executives in different banks were conducted to collect data. Data were analyzed through thematic analysis.

**Findings:** The results suggest that privatization, technological shortcomings, legislative inefficiencies, and deposit-orientation instead of market orientation were major industry trends that affect service innovation. Furthermore, ambiguity in knowledge management regimes, silo mentality and the absence of a collaborative organizational culture, growing need to focus on human capital, and risk aversion were the main organizational attributes that should be addressed for effective service innovation.

**Practical implications:** Service innovation is a strategic asset for organizations. To effectively leverage the benefits, managers should have an end-to-end approach towards the subject. The findings of this research would inform managers of different obstacles in the development of new services from an organizational and industry-wide perspective. Based on the outputs of the interviews and a thorough review of the literature, managerial implications are presented.

**Originality/value:** This research is one of the few studies that explores service innovation challenges at both macro and micro levels of analysis, providing a more holistic view of the phenomenon in the context of service organizations.

**Paper type:** Research paper

**Key words:** Service innovation, Qualitative research, Thematic analysis, banking

## Introduction

During the past couple of years, service innovation has received increasing attention, reflected in the growing number of publications from various disciplines (Witell et al., 2015), with service innovation placed among the top three strategic priorities in service research (Ostrom

1  
2  
3 et al., 2015). This is, to a large extent, due to the demise of manufacturing industries and the  
4 role of services in reshaping the economies of not only developed but also developing contexts  
5 (Jaaron, and Backhouse, 2017), especially in the post-Fordism era (Moreira et al., 2020). In  
6 this regard, Lehrer et al. (2018) postulate that growing demand of customers for personalized  
7 experiences and services means businesses should reorganize their priorities and focus on  
8 service innovation instead of product innovation. Furthermore, Bantaue and Rayburn (2016)  
9 contend that organizations that can create knowledge, and apply it to provide new value  
10 propositions to customers through innovative services would enjoy a competitive advantage in  
11 future. However, the existing literature in service innovation suffers from ambiguities and  
12 conceptual overlaps. To be more specific, definitions of service innovation are still scattered,  
13 with service innovation, new service development (NSD) and service design being used  
14 interchangeably. Also, in many studies no clear distinction is made between the invention of a  
15 new service and service innovation (Witell et al., 2015), which further blurs our understanding  
16 of the construct.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

22  
23 At the same time, businesses are having a hard time meeting customer needs considering the  
24 environmental volatilities and rapid changes in market demands. According to Bantaue and  
25 Rayburn (2016, p. 670), there is “a disconnect between what leaders want to happen, what can  
26 happen, and what is happening”. Under such circumstances, offering high-quality services is  
27 no longer enough to stay competitive. Rather, organizations should constantly look for  
28 innovative services to stay ahead of their competitors and engage customers with their offerings  
29 (Jaaron, and Backhouse, 2017). So far, multiple studies have endeavored to provide insight into  
30 the factors that impede or catalyze service innovation. However, existing conceptualizations of  
31 service innovation are still poorly defined despite recent expansions in the field. (Jaaron and  
32 Backhouse, 2017). Likewise, Gustafsson et al. (2020) argue that both businesses and researcher  
33 have been seriously challenged by the rapidly changing nature of service innovation. As such,  
34 they insist on gaining a better understanding of innovations in the service domain as the existing  
35 frameworks do not yield adequate information about organizational and practical attributes of  
36 service innovation. Similarly, Witwell et al. (2015) contend that a variety of components,  
37 actors, interactions and contextual elements should be taken into account when dealing with  
38 service innovation. Thus, it is very important to go beyond organizational perspective and  
39 explore service innovation more comprehensively.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46 In addition, the majority of the studies have been conducted in the context of developed  
47 countries or remained at the firm level, thus lacking a detailed view of forces at work in service  
48 innovation in less developed contexts or at a broader perspective. Despite the fact that some of  
49 the already identified challenges or drivers transcend borders, there is still a serious lack of  
50 scholarly work on service innovation in developing countries and/or resource-based  
51 economies. As Ciera and Muzi (2020) suggest, understanding innovation in the context of  
52 developing countries is constrained due to the absence of reliable data. Such a shortcoming  
53 also restricts businesses’ capabilities to design innovative services in support of their national  
54 economic growth. Another serious pitfall in innovation studies conducted in this context is that  
55 they are mostly built on the basis of Oslo or Bogota manuals, inconsiderate of the different  
56 nature of innovation in these countries – which is in most of the cases incremental and not  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 radical-. Indeed, applying such metrics without attention to contextual delicacies has biased the  
4 results. Similarly, Tok (2020) argues that countries that have historically relied on their natural  
5 resources have to shift to more diversified economies, where innovation in value-added sectors  
6 plays a critical role because based on the Resource Curse Theory (RCT), many of the countries  
7 blessed with natural resources later become vulnerable due to the price fluctuations of such  
8 assets.  
9

10  
11  
12 With these points in mind, this study initializes an effort to address the gaps identified in the  
13 literature. In doing so, we try to shed more light on the concepts of service innovation, new  
14 service development and service design. Also, we explain under what circumstances a service  
15 invention should be regarded as a service innovation. Meanwhile, a major departure of this  
16 paper from existing research is identifying major barriers to service innovation at two levels,  
17 namely organizational and industry level. We adopt a qualitative approach since businesses  
18 operating in different contexts, pursue different objectives and need different capabilities and  
19 resources to achieve them. We argue that taking into account internal and external  
20 contingencies impacts the effectiveness of management policies, including decisions about  
21 service innovation initiatives. While existing empirical research provides an initial  
22 understanding in this regard, an in-depth analysis of service innovation in the specific context  
23 of this study is very important in delineating the phenomenon in developing as well as resource-  
24 rich countries that seek to implement economic transformation schemes.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

## 35 Literature review

### 36 Demystifying service innovation

37  
38 Service innovation is a multi-dimensional construct, which results in the creation of new value  
39 for customers after the new service is implemented (Ayala et al., 2017). First proposed by  
40 Barras (1986), service innovation is mainly built on the premise of developing radically new  
41 or considerably improved versions of existing services, referred to as radical and incremental  
42 innovations, respectively. Through using a reverse product cycle model applied to different  
43 cases in banking, insurance and accounting firms, he realized that service innovation takes an  
44 opposite path in comparison with products, from incremental and radical innovation to product  
45 innovation. Despite the significance of this study, it was later criticized by scholars for its  
46 excessive emphasis on technological innovations, rather than non-technological aspects (Ferraz  
47 and Santos, 2016). It is worth noting that such an exaggerated view of technology in the domain  
48 of service innovation could be traced back to the decline of industrial activities during the post-  
49 Fordism era. During this time, the service sector began to attract researchers. Initially, however,  
50 most of the studies on service innovation rested upon a technological approach to innovation,  
51 borrowed from the manufacturing industries. In 1990's and 2000's, the service sector was  
52 perceived as a genuine source of innovation by itself, departing from the traditional  
53 manufacturing-based approaches. Soon, questions regarding the how's and what's of  
54 innovation emerged, with scholars seeking to investigate service innovation from a service-  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

oriented perspective, i.e. differentiation approach. More recently, service innovation has been under scrutiny from a cross-sectoral lens, i.e. the integrative approach, where services and goods are integrated when studying innovation (Moreira et al., 2020).

Accordingly, scholars including Ferraz and Santos (2016), Casidy et al. (2019) and Henrique Taques et al (2020) propose three different approaches towards service innovation, namely assimilation, demarcation and synthesis. As an initial stream of research in service innovation literature, the assimilation or technologist view deals with the impact of technology in developing new services. Despite the historical significance of assimilation, this perspective has been criticized as it fails to incorporate the invisible elements of service innovation, thus leading to an underestimation of actual benefits. To ease such shortages, the demarcation or differentiation perspective is built on the premise that innovation in services is fundamentally different from product innovation, thus highlighting the need to consider theories with a service-specific nature that incorporate non-technological and non-visible aspects of innovation. Finally, the synthesis or integrative view aims to capture a deeper insight into both tangible and intangible aspects of innovation, and is usually applied in cross-sectional and cross-industry innovations. Examples include situations when service industries make use of manufacturing technologies or when manufacturing companies resort to servitization of their products. More recently, service innovation is perceived to incorporate interactive and supportive elements, both of which contribute to the development of sustainable competitive advantage (Salunke et al., 2019). To elucidate, the interactive dimension covers external and front-end innovations that directly lead to value creation for end users. In contrast, the supportive dimension refers to back-end production and internal capabilities that indirectly affect value creation, for instance through service process improvement (Casidy et al., 2019).

Service innovation, whether in the form of new service product, new service processes, or even new business models, results in value creation once commercialized (Ayala et al., 2017). The concept of commercialization is very important in defining service innovation, as evidenced by previous research. In fact, a review of various definitions of service innovation reveals that putting innovative services into practice is a recurrent theme in the service innovation literature. For instance, Toivonen and Tuominen (2009) believe that new services are innovative only when they are implemented in real terms. Also, scholars such as Biemans et al. (2015), and Skalen et al. (2014) emphasize on practicality as a defining attribute of innovation in services. Finally, operationalization of new services is the last step in a sequence of stages related to successful service innovation, i.e. idea generation, screening, assessment, development, piloting and launching. Such a distinction is in line with the Schumpeterian approach, in which innovation is different from invention (Jaaron and Backhouse, 2017). To be more specific, inventions have no inherent value by themselves, and should be offered in the market before they can be regarded as innovations (Witwell et al., 2015). Another source of ambiguity in service innovation relates to the conceptual overlap among service innovation, service design and new service development (NSD), which are currently used interchangeably. While service design relies on design principles to develop new services, NSD focuses on the processes that lead to new service generation. On the other hand, service innovation refers to the outcome of such processes, not on how the new service is created (Gustafsson et al., 2020). Also, Aspara

1  
2  
3 et al. (2017) distinguish between new service success and innovation proactivity. New service  
4 success reflects a firm's ability to introduce its new offering to the market effectively. In  
5 contrast, innovation proactivity pictures the willingness of businesses to innovate in their  
6 services, or an indication of being a pioneer in service innovation to seize market opportunities  
7 before rivals. Due to the complexity and multi-dimensionality of service innovation, there have  
8 been various classifications for the subject. To avoid confusion, Hasiao et al. (2017) offer four  
9 metrics against which service innovation can be categorized: (1) stand-alone innovative service  
10 products or items; (2) innovations in structural configurations related to existing services; (3)  
11 innovations resulting from improvements in or repositioning of existing services; and (4)  
12 innovations in business models that affect the whole organization. From another point of view,  
13 Snyder et al. (2016) argue that service innovation could be classified based on four different  
14 measures: (1) innovativeness extent- or the degree of change caused by the implementation of  
15 the service innovation; (2) the nature of change- or whether it requires changes in the core  
16 service product, processes, business models, etc.; (3) perceived newness of the service –along  
17 a continuum of new-to-the-firm versus new-to-the-market; and (4) means of provision- the  
18 technology, channels, customer interfaces, etc.

### 25 **Benefits of service innovation**

27 Previous studies confirm the strategic role of service innovation in the survival and  
28 competitiveness of businesses (Merrilees et al., 2011; Prajogo and Oke.2016; Lehrer et al.,  
29 2018; Casidy et al.2019). While traditionally, service innovation outcomes were assessed based  
30 on financial measures, there has been a shift to a broader perspective, where the true impact of  
31 such innovations is equal to the value they create for the customer (Witwell et al., 2015;  
32 Gustaffson et al., 2020). More specifically, service innovation has witnessed growing interest  
33 as researchers endeavor to understand how organizations could leverage the benefits arising  
34 from investments in this area. In doing so, it has been asserted that service innovation improves  
35 key business metrics, including business performance, brand equity and customer loyalty.  
36 Ferraz and Santos (2016) argue that service innovation calls for an entire reconfiguration of  
37 competition, as well as processes of opportunity recognition and exploitation. This, in turn,  
38 allows firms to develop new value propositions and better manage and utilize global resources,  
39 all of which have considerable impacts on performance. Similarly, Wu (2014) considers brand  
40 equity improvement via service innovation as an important mechanism to achieve customer  
41 loyalty. In fact, he believes customer loyalty and brand equity as valuable areas of research in  
42 service innovation literature. To attain higher levels of brand equity, he considers two streams  
43 of service innovation, namely technology leadership and service leadership. Reviewing  
44 previous studies, Wu (2014) concludes that positive customer responses to technology  
45 leadership would have a desirable influence on his overall perceptions of the brand equity due  
46 to pioneering advantages. In addition, both leaderships mean creating added value through  
47 delivering customized services to better serve market needs and differentiate the brand's  
48 services, which ultimately result in an improved brand equity in the minds of the customers.  
49 Likewise, customers' purchase intentions and brand preferences are influenced by brand equity,  
50 leading to higher loyalty levels and more positive attitudes towards the brand (Narteh, 2018).  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 In their study of the use of big data analytics in service innovation, Lehrer et al. (2018) state  
4 that the paradigm shift from a goods-dominant (GD) logic to a service-dominant (SD) logic,  
5 means businesses should no longer rely on the number of new products or services, but on the  
6 value created for customers through innovation mechanisms. In a similar vein, other scholars  
7 (Maglio and Spohrer,2008;Ordanini and Parasuraman,2011; Witell et al,2016; Aal et al,2016;  
8 Agarwal and Selen,2011; Ostrom et al,2010; Santamaría et al,2012) view service innovation  
9 as central to improved customer value, , long-term competitiveness and viability at both  
10 business and country levels However, a review of the existing literature on service innovation  
11 reveals that it suffers from frequent generalizations of findings in product innovation to this  
12 area.. The situation is even worse in the context of developing countries, where innovation has  
13 just recently begun to position itself as a key to economic prosperity, and service businesses  
14 still lag far behind their more advanced counterparts in terms of service innovation orientation  
15 (Velayati et al., 2019). As such, a major goal in this research is to deepen the existing  
16 understanding of service innovation, taking into account some industry/ country level  
17 parameters to cover contextual elements as well as organizational factors.

### 23 **Barriers to service innovation**

24  
25  
26 Das et al. (2017) contemplate that established service and manufacturing businesses have been  
27 challenged by fundamental changes and newcomers disrupting current market patterns. Despite  
28 the general consensus on the advantages these firms could obtain through engaging in service  
29 innovation, the notion has proved not be as easy as it may sound. They further argue that  
30 successfully launching innovative services needs a wide number of internal and external factors  
31 to be combined and harmonized, some of which are partially or completely beyond the firm's  
32 control. For instance, a firm needs to be able to use its current capabilities as well as exploring  
33 and embedding new technologies. Factors such as leadership style, business strategies, culture,  
34 and performance incentives are some of the internal elements that businesses should align with  
35 their innovation orientation. On the other hand, market dynamics, competitive climate, and  
36 technological advances are often viewed as external factors that should be considered. Taking  
37 a different perspective, Aspara et al. (2017) explore the impact of current service productivity  
38 on the firm's tendency to innovate. Through studying comprehensive data sets of financial  
39 markets over a period of fourteen years, these scholars conclude that having appropriate levels  
40 of productivity decreases the firm's tendency to engage in service innovation. They further  
41 argue that the more productive businesses are in their present service provision activities, the  
42 less successful they are in implementing new services in the market. Such a negative interplay  
43 mainly arises an excessive dependence on their track of success in existing markets. Also,  
44 based on capability-rigidity paradox, proposed by Atuahene-Gima (2005), businesses highly  
45 capable of exploiting their existing know-how, are less successful in marketing their service  
46 innovations although they may proactively come up with innovative solutions.

47  
48  
49 Other scholars have also provided explanations about the antecedents of service innovation.  
50 Chen et al. (2009) focus on the barriers to service delivery innovation, and argue that different  
51 operant resources, i.e. organizational (innovation orientation), relational (collaboration with  
52 external partners), and informational (IT capabilities, infrastructures, IT human resources, and  
53 IT-enabled intangibles), are necessary for successful service delivery innovation. Hsiao et al.



(2017) investigate the drivers of service innovation, categorized as empowering and motivated, with positive psychological capital as a mediator in the relationship between the antecedents and service innovation. In their multi-level analysis (team level and employee level), they realize that motivational factors outperform the other group in stimulating service innovation, and positive psychological capital significantly mediates this relationship. In addition, Prajog and McDermott (2014) explore the relationship between organizational factors of connectedness, centralization, and formalization and modes of business environments on innovation orientations (explorative and exploitative). They conclude that environmental dynamism has a considerable impact on explorative innovation compared to exploitation orientation. In addition, environmental hostility has a stronger negative impact on exploitative innovation. Finally, Storey et al. (2015) conduct a meta-analysis to identify success factors for service innovation. Despite common grounds between product and service innovation, these researchers refer to the marked differences in the two areas and argue that it is a mistake to generalize the findings of one to another. In their opinion, designing appropriate service attributes (such as quality level, technological complexity, responsiveness, etc.), organizational characteristics (absorptive capacity, strategic orientation, etc.), team characteristics (Front-line staff involvement, customer integration, etc.), process characteristics (technical development, R&D proficiency, formal development, etc.) and market characteristics (turbulence, uncertainty and attractiveness) are the factors that considerably lead to the success or failure of service innovations.

## Methodology

Sorensen and Francesco (2017) argue that traditional perceptions of product innovation have been widely ascribed to service innovation. However, recently such conceptualizations have been contested by scholars as they do not shed enough light on critical aspects of SI. These aspects include the processes that lead to service innovation, reasons why such innovations occur or how they are organized and even consumed. In addition, it is important to investigate such issues from an interpretive perspective to fully grasp the interactivity, complexity and dynamism associated with service innovation and the barriers that exist in this respect. In fact, an interpretivist perspective would mean the research questions are investigated within their very peculiar social and historical settings and through the lens of individual experiences within this context (Creswell, 2012). **The case of study is Iran, with particular focus on the banking industry as a major revenue stream. Iran is a developing country striving to move to a more diversified economy, with less dependence on oil and gas. Thus, it provides a rich context, where understanding of service innovation (currently limited to the context of developed countries) could be expanded.** In line with the research philosophy and its epistemological subjective stance, the present study adopted a qualitative approach since it allows for better interpreting the ambiguities associated with the phenomenon under study (Fusch et al., 2018). Theoretical sampling was chosen as it is in line with gradual emergence of themes and concepts instead of an a-priori focus regarding participants' selection (Bagnasco et al., 2014) and would result in the selection of well-informed respondents whose insights would benefit the researcher with increased acumen (Edirisnghe et al., 2020). The sample consisted of various banking experts and academia. Details of the interviewees are provided in Appendix 1. To

1  
2  
3 maintain uniformity, all the interviews were conducted by a single researcher (Edirisnghe et  
4 al., 2020). Prior to the interviews, contacts were made via telephone and emails, with  
5 invitations sent electronically. The interviews took an average length of 40 to 65 minutes. Each  
6 respondent was provided with a brief description of the research purpose before the meeting.  
7 To fulfill ethical considerations, respondents were informed that participation was voluntary  
8 and they could withdraw from cooperation at any stage of the research. In addition, the  
9 participants were ensured that their identity would not be disclosed. During the interviews,  
10 the respondents were encouraged to elaborate their ideas, with follow-up questions being asked  
11 by the researcher where necessary. With the participants' consent, the interviews were recorded  
12 and later transcribed.  
13  
14  
15  
16

17 To effectively answer the research question in relation to the specific context of this study,  
18 thematic analysis was used to analyze the data. Green et al. (2017) argue that thematic analysis  
19 is a flexible approach in qualitative studies that allows for exploring emerging themes within  
20 data sets through "careful reading and re-reading of the data" (p. 3). Following Hussain et al.  
21 (2020) and Nowell et al. (2017), the six steps in thematic analysis were used: familiarizing  
22 oneself with the data by means of prolonged engagement with the data, development of initial  
23 codes, making sense of codes to develop themes, reviewing themes and testing for referential  
24 adequacy, defining themes through peer debriefing and team consensus and finally producing  
25 the report. It is worth noting that coding was done with the help of MAXQDA software, leading  
26 to the development of preliminary codes. To remove any possible conceptual overlap, the  
27 codes were reviewed meticulously and refined as secondary codes. The iterative nature of data  
28 collection and analysis ensured "being guided by the data and targeting the most  
29 knowledgeable respondents in each area (Velayati et al., 2019), which had a considerable  
30 impact on the quality of the data which were accumulated and analyzed. Another important  
31 component of any qualitative research is theoretical saturation. In simple terms, saturation is  
32 reached when no new or relevant pattern emerges; each category is well-developed in terms of  
33 the concept and properties; and the interplays between the categories are logically perceivable.  
34 In total, 21 semi-structured interviews were held before saturation was reached. . One final  
35 aspect in qualitative studies is triangulation as a tool to avoid biases and increase confidence in  
36 the outputs of the study. Based on the triangulation criteria proposed by Heale and Forbes  
37 (2013), this study incorporated data, investigator and theory triangulation. To be more specific,  
38 data were gathered through extensive literature reviews, semi-structured interviews, personal  
39 contemplation of the researchers, memo writing and observations. In addition, the interviews  
40 covered professionals with different areas of expertise, which would serve the inherent  
41 multiplicity of factors that influenced service innovation. Investigator triangulation was  
42 confirmed by asking a PhD candidate with special focus on innovation management once the  
43 concepts, methodological approach and findings were carefully reviewed. Finally, different  
44 streams were incorporated in developing the research and elaborating the findings, including  
45 service industries, innovation, and knowledge management.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55

## 56 **Findings and Discussion**

57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 The semi-structured interviews with industry experts were aimed at serving two purposes:  
4 Identifying the major industry trends with possible impacts on service innovation in  
5 organizations along with the specific challenges at the firm level in developing new services.  
6 Data analysis led to the identification eight macro and micro attributes with possible impacts  
7 on service innovation.  
8  
9

## 10 Major industry forces

- 13 • **Privatization**

15 During the past few decades, public banks have witnessed a sweeping wave of privatization  
16 throughout the world, through which governments endeavor to increase the productivity of  
17 these organizations and accordingly boost their economic growth. Iran has been no exception.  
18 In fact, the privatization process was launched in 2007, based on comprehensive research  
19 studies and benchmarks from other countries. The program consists of 3 phases, pre-  
20 privatization, privatization in progress and post-privatization, and is believed to highlight the  
21 need for further strengthening of innovative performance of the banks in Iran. The participants  
22 also believed that despite the initiation of privatization in the third national development plan  
23 of Iran, major breakthroughs took place during the fourth plan and in line with the 44<sup>th</sup> principle  
24 of the country's constitutional law, with banking as one of the pioneering industries to privatize.  
25 They further argued that privatization would facilitate new service development by means of  
26 optimizing resources and restructuring internal capabilities. Because banks need to maximize  
27 their stakeholders' profits after privatization, gaining competitive advantages through  
28 developing innovative services with added value for customers is crucial. In this respect, the  
29 interviewees argued that the monopolistic presence of the government in the industry was a  
30 serious impediment towards innovation in the design of the financial services. In a market  
31 where the banks were solely seen as a "public treasury", there was no need to compete, and  
32 thus to stay innovative:  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

42 *"From a historical perspective, the omnipresence of the Iranian government in the*  
43 *banking industry meant that policymakers allocated a considerable share of the*  
44 *banks' financial resources to public administration practices... Such monopolistic*  
45 *circumstances and the absence of private banks and financial institutes demotivated*  
46 *the banking industry to innovate" (Interviewee 2, p. 3).*  
47  
48

49 However, the respondents believed that the emergence of private banks along with  
50 demographic changes and the spread of technologies could lead to an increasingly important  
51 role ascribed to the development of new services for major industry players, which in turn,  
52 motivates institutes to reconfigure their existing infrastructures and capabilities to survive:  
53  
54  
55

56 *" I believe privatization in the banking industry of Iran will lead to a higher level of*  
57 *motivation, competition and innovation after the emergence of private banks as well*  
58 *as reducing the intervention of the government as the sole decision maker in this*  
59 *industry"(Interviewee 6, p 11).*  
60

1  
2  
3 Based on the above arguments, and in line with previous studies such as Zahra and Hansen  
4 (2000), Hong et al. (2016), and Some et al. (2020), it was agreed that privatization would have  
5 a positive impact on innovation.  
6

7  
8 However, Estrin and Pelletier (2018) have warned about adopting a too optimistic view towards  
9 privatization. In fact, they suspect that privatization alone could result in improved  
10 performance or increased innovation. They further emphasize that certain prerequisites should  
11 exist such as complementary regulations, structural reforms, appropriate public  
12 communication, sound capital markets and efficient strategies to preserve employee and  
13 consumer rights. In addition, these authors claim that due to the contextual delicacies of  
14 developing countries, adequate attention must be made to customize privatization strategies to  
15 local circumstances. Privatization only takes effect when social, political, legal and  
16 organizational infrastructures have been properly forecasted and prepared. Also as stated by  
17 Azar et al. (2013), using appropriate criteria to rank firms in terms of potential increased  
18 productivity after the transfer is another missing element in the privatization process in Iran.  
19 Accordingly, some of the interviewees referred to other industries in Iran such as aluminum,  
20 industrial machineries, and sugar, where privatization has failed to increase productivity, and  
21 ultimately turned into a crisis itself. They believed that in many industries, the transfer of public  
22 entities has been based not on merits, but to serve the political benefits of specific stakeholders.  
23 The absence of transparent monitoring and controlling procedures along with weak financial  
24 strategies were other factors that could lead to the failure of prescribed mandates in this regard.  
25 Thus, it was stated that to effectively launch privatization and reap the benefits, strategic and  
26 operational infrastructures should undergo serious modifications. Otherwise, hopes for  
27 desirable outcomes would fade in the face of existing shortages.  
28

29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35 • **Technological shortcomings**  
36

37 Nowadays technology is widely perceived as a game-changer for service industries, which  
38 influences customer experience positively when applied to service innovation (Banteau and  
39 Rayburn, 2016). Xu et al. (2014) state that information technology is key to increased  
40 productivity and growth, which explains why developed economies have invested huge  
41 amounts in ICT and other technologies to stay competitive through attaining service leadership  
42 and technology leadership. In this respect, the advent of Web 2.0 dramatically changed  
43 organizations' approach towards technology. Such advances not only changed existing business  
44 models in the banking industry, but also paved the way towards new businesses such as e-  
45 commerce and e-banking. Accordingly, the respondents believed that to meet the ever  
46 increasing demands of future markets, banks should be sensible and intelligent, act flexibly in  
47 their design processes based on the demand scale and nature through keeping the closest  
48 proximity to the customer, be able to effectively leverage social media, detect unseen markets  
49 through the provision of innovative services, and look for novel opportunities and revenue  
50 streams with the help of new technological landscapes. Meanwhile, serious obstacles,  
51 aggravated by the long history of sanctions on Iran, have hindered the realization of the industry  
52 potentials. To be more specific:  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

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

*"Lack of access to SWIFT networks, or global payment services such as VISA and MasterCard, as well as insufficient provision of software, hardware and cyber security infrastructures have considerably devastated the technological maturity of our financial system...a deficiency which calls for serious reengineering of our business models and capacities" (Interviewee 1, p. 13).*

It was also stated that like any other industry, business models in banking should be developed based on open collaborations to create long-term value for customers as well as other stakeholders. The banking value chain in Iran has been designed in a traditional, non-flexible format. On the other hand, new players such as Fintechs and Social Banks are emerging, which means the value chain would soon be disrupted. Timely identification of technological shortcomings followed by the customization of service innovations to the contextual specifications of Iran would lead to better customer experiences, and increased satisfaction. As one of the interviewees mentioned, Iranian banks have to embrace collaborations with emerging players in the field of technology to implement intelligent changes in their practices before it is too late for them.

Yet a more important challenge, according to some of the interviewees, was the absence of design thinking and real-time business analytics. They complained about the overemphasis on the use of technology in introducing and upgrading interfaces, and not how technology could be used to collaborate with customers, collect data to analyze their experiences, and incorporate design thinking. From the interviews, it became evident that despite the prevalence of big data and business analytics, many service organizations still suffer from decisions based on intuition, and/or political behaviors. In a similar vein, Banteau and Rayburn (2016) explain that developing a design-centric culture, use of prototypes and blueprints to define and test solutions through the use of technology in ideation, inspiration and implementation phases could considerably facilitate service design. With the help of technology, traditional methods could shift from static to iterative to identify what customers really need. This becomes possible through establishing constant flows of data from various data sources, investigation of customer search behaviors, social networks, geographical and even psychological data.

- **Legislative inefficiencies**

Considering the rapid pace of technology and increasing market complexities, regulatory agility plays a key role in the success of innovative services. According to the results of a study conducted by Canada's Economic Strategy Tables (2018), a modern regulatory system that values innovation adoption and fosters intellectual property rights protection requires cooperation between the policymakers and industry players. It also calls for serious reduction in overlapping reporting and supervisory mechanisms since such inefficiencies considerably increase transactional costs for service providers and discourage banks and financial institutes from taking innovative steps. In this respect, one of the interviewees referred to the establishment of two virtual banks in Iran a decade ago which were forced to close off by the Central Bank of Iran despite the initial investments as a result of legal noncompliance. During the interviews, it was also stated that the regulatory bodies in Iran suffer from lack of agility, which in turn brings about wasted opportunities. The respondents also believed the Central

1  
2  
3 Bank of Iran could have a significant impact on developing more adaptive legal practices and  
4 procedures with the aim of facilitating cooperation and knowledge sharing among key players  
5 of the industry.  
6  
7

8 *"At present, the banking industry in Iran is faced with many challenges resulting*  
9 *from poor legislations, such as the divergence of banks from their true missions,*  
10 *misconducts of the Islamic banking principles, improper distribution of banking debt*  
11 *instruments, etc. What further aggravates the situation is that the existing*  
12 *legislations were last update in the 1980's, which poses serious problems*  
13 *considering the speed and scale of changes within the banking domain since then.*  
14 *"(Interviewee 10, p. 14).*  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

20 The respondents believed that regulatory organizations could make use of technological  
21 advances to keep pace with business innovations. They firmly believed that regulators are in  
22 need of restructuring in order to better pass new laws or even abrogate cumbersome ones in  
23 favor of innovative activities. This gains paramount importance in the context of developing  
24 countries, where issues such as reporting, monitoring, client onboarding, compliance  
25 surveillance, and cybersecurity lag far behind global standards. Finally, it was emphasized that  
26 developing Shariah-compliant services is a major avenue for service innovation in Islamic  
27 banking, but policymakers, bankers and legislators need to come up with a common  
28 understanding to develop effective legal infrastructures and compliance measures. This is in  
29 line with the findings of Su'un et al. (2018) who ascertain the growing prevalence of Islamic  
30 banking products such as Mudaraba (the sharing of profit and loss), Wadiah (safekeeping),  
31 Musharaka (joint ventures), etc. due to their significant impact on the welfare of both Islamic  
32 and non-Islamic communities.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38 **• Deposit orientation instead of market orientation**  
39

40 Currently, the banking industry in many developing countries is going through multiple  
41 hardships, including monopolistic approaches, ambiguities about the roles of different elements  
42 within the banking ecosystem, structural disproportions in the deposits, intervention of  
43 unauthorized agencies and subsequent increase in the prime costs for banks, poor liquidity of  
44 banks' possessions, and low share of commissions in the revenue streams of banks. The  
45 situation is worsened in contexts with regular, often non-differentiated services, where fierce  
46 competition exists among a large number of players such as Iran. More specifically, in Iran  
47 more than 35 banks and financial institutes (considerably a large number compared to many  
48 other countries) operate under the approval of the Central Bank of Iran (CBI) while the  
49 government still exerts considerable control in specific areas despite the sweeping wave of  
50 privatization. To elucidate, many public organizations, healthcare centers, military and  
51 educational entities in the country are obliged to cooperate with specific banks and invest their  
52 resources in the form of current accounts (as a very low-cost resource). This means such  
53 governmentally favored banks could easily gain huge amounts of money without really having  
54 to compete with others or taking the burden to innovate, while others have to resort to paying  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 higher profits to attract customers. Thus, the latter only strive to gain access to more financial  
4 resources without any specific strategy that could differentiate them from competitors. As  
5 observed by the interviewees, such rivalry takes a destructive form and leads to "the contagion  
6 of unethical competitive conducts". In this regard, one of the respondents said:  
7  
8

9 *"If organizations are allowed to choose among competing banks to break the*  
10 *monopoly, the commission-based incomes of the banks would increase significantly,*  
11 *with considerable decrease in the prime costs of deposits... this will also encourage*  
12 *banks to design high quality services to attract and retain customers rather than*  
13 *tempting them based on higher financial profit rates" (Interviewee 15, p. 14).*  
14  
15

16  
17 Generally, it was agreed that in case banks routinely perform strategic analyses of their  
18 strengths and weaknesses and (re)define their segmentation strategies instead of competing in  
19 a red ocean, they would be more successful in developing new services for their specific  
20 targeted markets. According to the experts, differentiation through focusing on real market  
21 needs is a lost ingredient within the banking industry of many developing countries including  
22 Iran. However, if implemented properly, it would lead to the generation of competitive  
23 advantage for businesses. Similarly, previous literature suggests that market orientation  
24 (consisting of customer orientation, competitor orientation and inter-functional coordination)  
25 would improve the overall innovative performance of firms. The significance of market  
26 orientation lies in the fact that it enables firms to be more responsive to the market based on  
27 the information they collect about customers' needs and competitor moves. As a current-  
28 looking strategy, market orientation focuses pragmatically on the existing market, thus  
29 enabling businesses to better meet the present demand through prolonged dialogues with  
30 customers and deep market analysis (Bhattarai et al., 2019). Similarly, scholars such as Wang  
31 and Miao (2015), Dogbe et al. (2019) and Frega et al. (2018) confirm the positive impact of  
32 market orientation on organizational innovativeness.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

## 41 **Organizational challenges that impede service innovation**

42

43 In addition to the major industry trends, several factors at the organizational level were also  
44 identified throughout the interviews which played a significant role in the innovative  
45 performance of banks. In other words, the respondents believed the poor innovative  
46 performance of businesses also has roots in certain organizational attributes, as follows:  
47  
48

- 49 • **Ambiguity in knowledge management regimes**

50  
51 The 21<sup>st</sup> century has witnessed increasing demands for knowledge societies, which has caused  
52 fundamental changes in business structures. Growing complexity in customer needs and  
53 expectations as well as shorter product life cycles are only two of the challenges that  
54 businesses, including banks, deal with nowadays. Thus, knowledge management (KM) has  
55 turned into a top priority for modern organizations (Pancholi and Pancholi, 2014).  
56 Accordingly, Venkitachalam, and Willmott (2017) define strategic knowledge management  
57 (SKM) as "harnessing know-how that is comparatively non-replicable so as to influence  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 environments as well as to respond to them” (p. 313), which explains why it is often viewed  
4 critical for overall productivity and innovation performance. However, the participants in this  
5 research were concerned about the widespread belief in less developed contexts, in which  
6 SKM is perceived to materialize by establishing IT systems and databases. Such  
7 misperceptions would signal the absence of a strategic approach towards the nature and  
8 fundamental role of knowledge in fostering innovation. As stated in the interviews, limited  
9 views of knowledge-as-systems and lack of an end-to-end approach towards knowledge-based  
10 innovation would be detrimental to the operationalization of KM strategies to create long-term  
11 value. It was further argued that in order to develop innovation capabilities, organizational  
12 learning should be strengthened through appropriate mechanisms. It was also emphasized that  
13 monitoring competitors, receiving timely feedbacks from customers and use of the  
14 experiences of global players could serve as important facilitators of organizational learning  
15 and innovation. The respondents argued that doing business in vacuum is not possible, and  
16 that businesses should never cease learning. This would help them to be fully aware of market  
17 dynamism and even proactively initiate changes through constantly refreshed understanding  
18 of current and future forces affecting rivalry. It was mentioned that:

25 *"Our managers generally look for reaching short-term goals. They also adopt a*  
26 *reactive, and not proactive, approach towards innovation and change. Thus, many*  
27 *valuable opportunities are lost or hunted by competitors" (Interviewee 7, p. 4).*

32 Despite the above arguments, there was a general consensus among the respondents that quite  
33 a large number of organizations still lack clear SKM practices. More specifically, the  
34 participants believed that in many cases, senior executives cannot make informed decisions  
35 about choosing between internal generation of knowledge (i.e. in-house R&D), and external  
36 sourcing (i.e. alliances, acquisitions, outsourcing, etc.). In this respect, previous studies (for  
37 instance, Capron and Mitchell, 2009) suggest a combination of internal and external sourcing.  
38 Grigoriou and Rothaermel (2016) suggest that in the face of competence-destroying changes,  
39 managers should first study their internal knowledge production processes because firms with  
40 a good level of internal knowledge generation capability and/or with high coordination costs in  
41 terms of knowledge assimilation would not benefit much from external sourcing strategies.  
42 Moreover, Venkitachalam and Willmot (2017) contend that reaching a balance between  
43 knowledge codification (establishing people-to-systems ties and documentation of tacit  
44 knowledge in the form of explicit knowledge) and personalization (developing individual-to-  
45 individual interactions to facilitate knowledge transfer) is another important issue to be  
46 considered. This would result in excessive knowledge structuration or knowledge proliferation  
47 respectively.

- 48 • **Silo Mentality and the absence of a collaborative organizational culture**

56 Yiu et al. (2019) state that the transition from a product-dominant logic to a service-dominant  
57 logic requires consideration to a multiplicity of factors, ranging from organizational structures  
58 and appraisal systems to organizational processes and culture. Schein (1996) defines  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 organizational culture as a set of values that serve to provide norms and expected behaviors of  
4 organizational members. As an invisible yet very powerful force, organizational culture has  
5 been found to positively associate with financial and market performance, organizational  
6 effectiveness, employee attitudes and knowledge management practices (Hoogan and Coote,  
7 2014). In this regard, one of the most cited problems in the interviews was the tendency to  
8 keep knowledge and experiences to oneself, rather than sharing it with others although such  
9 collaborative practices have been found to positively impact organizational dynamism in  
10 practical and theoretical terms. In fact, the participants viewed their organizations as a  
11 constellation of individual silos suffering from low efficiency in knowledge sharing and  
12 management. According to the respondents, such conservative approaches and viewing  
13 knowledge as a source of monopolistic organizational power might stem from the existence of  
14 an organizational culture not open to knowledge-based cooperation. Meanwhile, some of the  
15 participants stated that over-reliance on knowledge possession originates at times from  
16 managers' concerns about highly skilled employees leaving the organization, and not because  
17 of their worries about their own positions in the firm. Since employee turnover results in the  
18 loss of organizational knowledge, managers tend to keep key expertise and know-how to  
19 themselves, and not accessible by employees. Meanwhile, the participants believed the only  
20 solution to effectively deal with the environmental complexities was to encourage knowledge  
21 cooperation both inside and outside the boundaries of the organization. In this respect:

22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29 *"Choosing a participatory approach towards strategy implementation, instead of*  
30 *traditional top-down practices, will foster a positive sense among employees"*  
31 *(Interviewee 2, p. 7).*  
32

33  
34 Regarding the impact of organizational culture on innovation, Oyemomi et al. (2018) refer to  
35 switching modes of knowledge proposed by Sullivan and Nonaka (1986), i.e. socialization,  
36 externalization, combination and internalization of knowledge, and state that successful  
37 conversion and sharing of knowledge is to a great extent influenced by organizational culture  
38 and support. They further point out that an enabling culture, in which knowledge sharing is  
39 encouraged, results in improved performance. Similarly, fostering an organizational culture  
40 that encourages interactions among members improves learning and resource sharing and  
41 innovation performance (Yiu et al., 2019).  
42  
43  
44

45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- **Growing need to focus on human capital**

The proliferation of the resource-based view (RBV) and knowledge-view theory of the firm, gave rise to human capital as a strategic resource responsible for developing sustainable competitive advantage (Ortega-Lapiedra et al., 2019). In fact, sustainable economic productivity is not a function of physical resources possessions, but a direct product of knowledge and human capital of businesses. So, tangible growth is achieved only when organizations invest in their human resources. Human capital refers to the cumulative capabilities, knowledge, and experiences of members (Zhou et al., 2019) at different organizational levels. As such, it goes beyond traditional perceptions of human resources because in the new perspective, the emphasis is placed on knowledge production and sharing

1  
2  
3 in and among different groups of stakeholders. In line with this, it was mentioned that under  
4 current circumstances:  
5

6  
7 *"The role of human resources has become even more critical as they have the closest*  
8 *interface with customers. Thus, banks have started to take serious steps to empower*  
9 *their personnel.... If employees feel they are valued by the organization, they*  
10 *reciprocate and act as knowledge transfer intermediaries at various levels. Even in*  
11 *more modern channels of service delivery, the reciprocity rule works, so employees*  
12 *should be valued and encouraged to fulfill their own part in the innovation process"*  
13 *(Interviewee 2, p. 9).*  
14  
15

16  
17 Previous studies also confirm the significance of human capital in the innovation process. Zhou  
18 et al. (2109) contend that employees' expertise and know-how are the key inputs for innovation.  
19 Organizations with higher levels of human capital tend to better identify and distribute valuable  
20 information to be put into practice. Thus, training and job enrichment for employees would  
21 ultimately lead to deeper assimilation of specific skills. Finally, employees with more job-  
22 specific expertise challenge the prevailing norms and look for innovative solutions to address  
23 existing and potential inefficiencies. Considering the fact that education is often a metric to  
24 measure human capital level in the industry, banks and financial services are labeled as  
25 organizations with high human capital. Hence, these findings resonate with the context under  
26 study, and call for designing service-oriented HR management practices, as confirmed by  
27 Ostrom et al. (2015).  
28  
29  
30  
31

32  
33 • **Risk aversion**

34  
35 Service innovation is inherently paradoxical. On one hand, it is considered to be a major driver  
36 of economic growth and business competitiveness; on the other hand, service innovation does  
37 not necessarily lead to success, with a comparable rate of failure in relation to product  
38 innovation (Storey et al., 2016). In addition, during the interviews, it was emphasized that  
39 financial services are high-risk in nature. Custody risks, principal-agent risks, systemic risks of  
40 the market, uncertainties arising from outsourcing activities as well as the entrance of Fintechs,  
41 and suboptimal penetration of advanced technological safeguards such as AI and analytics to  
42 identify high risk factors are only some of the challenges banks and financial institutes are  
43 faced with. This, in participants' views, would ultimately lead to a certain degree of risk  
44 aversion among executives, which in turn impedes service innovation. What exacerbates the  
45 situation in the context of many developing countries such as Iran is related to the prevalence  
46 of "public management mental model" among these executives. In other words, although  
47 privatization has been widely implemented in the industry, many of the newly established  
48 private banks are managed by retired directors from the public sector. Despite the valuable  
49 experience they have gained throughout the years, these executives still have public governance  
50 mindsets, failing to act in a positive risk-taking manner to seize market opportunities, radically  
51 stressing the downsides of service innovation. Such a risk-averse culture may delay or even  
52 prevent the organization from introducing innovative solutions. As one of the interviewees  
53 mentioned:  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 "It is easy to blame people in case of failure, which is very common when it comes  
4 to service innovation. However, if an innovative solution succeeds, the benefits are  
5 dispersed among a vast number of people and agencies. In addition, our organizations  
6 are not really open to mistakes; you might even lose your job in case of major errors  
7 or financial loss. This for sure has a negative impact on managers' propensity to take  
8 risks associated with innovation"(Interviewee 18, p. 3).  
9  
10

11  
12 Through a review of previous studies, Torugsa and Arundel (2017) argue that from a traditional  
13 point of view, the heavier weight of penalties and poor rewards systems to acknowledge  
14 innovative efforts, combined with aggravated public scrutiny, unfavorably affect risk-taking  
15 behaviors. Also, the existence of several -often contradicting- goals increases managerial  
16 timidity, which means even in case of service innovations, incremental rather than disruptive  
17 changes are embraced. Meanwhile, these authors challenge these prevailing attitudes towards  
18 risk aversion, Based on the concept of "revealed barriers" which was proposed by D'Este et al.  
19 (2012), innovation not only creates awareness of potential impediments for managers, but also  
20 equips them with better insight for developing strategies to cope with such burdens.  
21  
22  
23

### 24 **Theoretical and managerial implications**

25  
26 Based on the findings discussed above, this research contributes to the current understanding  
27 of service innovation from both theoretical and managerial perspectives. To start with, the  
28 present study sheds light on a collection of ambiguities regarding service innovation  
29 conceptualization. More importantly, it provides a more comprehensive view of the barriers to  
30 service innovation that goes beyond organizational level and incorporates major industry trends  
31 as well. Finally, it takes into consideration the contextual delicacies that affect service  
32 innovation of organizations in a developing and resource-abundant country. As already  
33 discussed, knowledge about such context-based differences matter to academia and  
34 practitioners and is in need of further explorations. In addition, the findings also highlight  
35 several important issues. For in instance, during the interviews, it was mentioned that  
36 businesses, including banks and financial institutes, should strengthen their market orientation  
37 to capture existing revenue streams. While this is true, it needs to be mentioned that excessive  
38 focus on current market demands could lead to missed opportunities to identify future trends.  
39 In this respect, Bhattarai et al. (2019) refer to market disruptive capability as complementary  
40 to market orientation. Based on the dynamic capability view, proposed by Teece et al. (2007),  
41 this capability is future-centric, enabling firms to prepare themselves for upcoming market  
42 changes beforehand. They further state that market disruption would help businesses increase  
43 their innovative performance through the design of new services and products ahead of  
44 competition, forcing other market players to follow and act accordingly. Likewise, Das et al.  
45 (2017) state that while traditionally financial institutes could rely on incremental innovation in  
46 their existing services, they now need radical innovations to reshape the market. Meanwhile, it  
47 should also be noted that taking such an approach imposes risks and costs on the organization,  
48 and should thus be meticulously analyzed so as to avoid exponential burden on the  
49 organization.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 In addition, the interviewees mentioned that risk aversion is a major stumbling block in service  
4 innovation. Although risk-aversion has been extensively associated with lower engagement of  
5 senior managers in innovation, it might contradictorily be perceived as a chance to launch more  
6 innovative practices in case organizations formulate effective strategies to deal with risks. This  
7 means risk management, and not risk aversion, should be regarded as a major component of  
8 strategic decision making processes. Thus, even when key decision-makers are not receptive  
9 to risks, it does not follow that they cannot effectively implement innovation. To do so,  
10 designing content-specific strategies along with transforming risk aversion to risk awareness  
11 and management through training and professional development could prove helpful (Torugsa  
12 and Arundel, 2017). Another important organizational asset mentioned by the participants  
13 was human capital. Previous studies encourage direct communication and participation of  
14 employees as a tool to convey ideas, expertise and know-how. Although well-educated  
15 employees tend to speak up more, they would feel frustrated if they realize their ideas are not  
16 being valued by the organization (Zhou et al., 2019). Therefore, organizations with  
17 distinctively higher human capital levels should be cautious in implementing direct voice  
18 mechanisms as this might negatively impact their innovative performance in case of poor  
19 transfer of ideas into real solutions. It should also be noted that making direct suggestion may  
20 not be a proper approach due to variations in the expertise and skills, budget restrictions, and  
21 different feasibility levels, among others. Thus, as suggested by Zhou et al. (2017), managers  
22 should think of differentiating participatory mechanisms to generate ideas. Ultimately, the  
23 respondents viewed the ability to manage internal and external volatilities through innovating  
24 as a major asset for senior executives. To them, such an ability means constantly implementing  
25 changes in existing practices to better align the business with the environment. Thus,  
26 transformation occurs in two levels: 1) top managerial level, where executives are well-  
27 informed towards the strategic importance of innovation, and 2) spreading such knowledge to  
28 lower levels, which breaks possible resistance towards change.

### 38 **Research Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research**

39  
40 The limitations in the present research highlight the need for more rigorous exploration of  
41 service innovation challenges and capabilities to address such obstacles. The data were  
42 collected from senior executives in banks and financial institutes, which despite their inherent  
43 strategic value, may not cover the intricacies associated with different organizational levels and  
44 inter-organizational networks. This gains more prominence considering the growing  
45 interdependencies among stakeholders and the prevalence of new business models such value  
46 co-creation and coopetition where not only customers but also other players of the value chain  
47 such as competitors could synergize with the business to innovate. Thus, an interesting field of  
48 research would be investigating service innovation challenges and strategies with focus on  
49 these interdependencies. In addition, it is not clear how the interaction between market  
50 orientation and market disruption would affect organizational performance despite the  
51 complementary nature of both constructs. Indeed, understanding such complexities would help  
52 businesses make a more informed decision to allocate their resources to these two streams of  
53 activity. Finally, based on the configurational theory, the success of any innovative initiative  
54 depends on a variety of factors, and there are multiple ways to effectively leverage such  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 innovations. In addition, the decision about which way to take depends largely on the context  
4 a firm operates in (Torugsa and Arundel, 2017). Consequently, another prospect research area  
5 could be studying the interplay among various inter and intra-organizational factors that affect  
6 service innovation success or conduct cross-sector or cross-national studies in this respect.  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

## 25 **References**

26 Aal, K., Pietro, L.D., Edvardsson, L.D., Renzi, M.F., and Mugion, R.G. (2016), "Innovation in service  
27 ecosystems: An empirical study of the integration of values, brands, service systems and experience  
28 rooms", *Journal of Service Management*, Vol.27 No.4, pp. 619–651.

29  
30  
31 Agarwal, W., and Selen. (2011), "Multi-dimensional nature of service innovation-operationalisation of  
32 the elevated service offering construct in collaborative service organizations", *International Journal of*  
33 *Operations & Production Management*, Vol.31 No.11, pp. 1164-1192.

34  
35  
36 Ascii. H.B., Tan, F.Z., and Altintas, F., (2016), "A strategic approach for learning organisations: Mental  
37 models", *Paper presented at the 12th International Strategic Management Conference*, pp. 2-11.

38  
39 Aspara, J., Klein, J., Luo, X., and Tikkanen, H. (2017), "The dilemma of service productivity and  
40 service innovation: An empirical exploration in financial services", *Journal of Service Research*, Vol.21  
41 No.2, pp. 249–262.

42  
43  
44 Ayala, N. F., Paslauskis, C. A., Antonio, G., Frank, A.G. (2017), "Knowledge sharing dynamics in service  
45 suppliers' involvement for servitization of manufacturing companies", *International Journal of*  
46 *Production Economics*, Vol.193 No.13, pp.538-553

47  
48 Azar, A., Lashgari, Z., and Amraei, H. (2013), "Performance, challenges and solutions of privatization  
49 in Iran", *Financial Economy (Financial Economy and Development)*, Vol.5 No. 16, pp. 9-25.

50  
51 Bagnasco, A., Ghirello, L., and Sasso, L. (2014), "Theoretical Sampling", JAN. Editorial.

52  
53 Bantau, G., and Rayburn, S. (2016), "Advanced information technology: Transforming service  
54 innovation and design", *The Service Industries Journal*, Vol.36 No. 13/14, pp.699-720.

55  
56  
57 Bhattarai, Ch., Kwong, C., and Tasavori, M. (2019), "Market orientation, market disruptiveness  
58 capability and social enterprise performance: An empirical study from the United Kingdom", *Journal*  
59 *of Business Research*, Vol.96, pp.47-60, Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2018.10.042>.

1  
2  
3 Biemans, Wim G., Abbie Griffin, and Rudy K. Moenaert (2016), "Perspective: New Service  
4 Development: How the Field Developed, Its Current Status and Recommendations for Moving the Field  
5 Forward," *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, Vol.33 No. 4, pp.382-397  
6

7 [Casidy](#), R., Nyadzayo, M. and Mohanc, M. (2019), "Service innovation and adoption in industrial  
8 markets: An SME perspective", *Industrial Marketing Management*, Available at:  
9 doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2019.06.008  
10

11  
12 Capron, L., Mitchell, W. (2009), "Selection capability: How capability gaps and internal social frictions  
13 affect internal and external strategic renewal", *Organization Science*, Vol.20 No.2, pp.294-213.  
14

15  
16 Chen, J., Tsou, H., and Huang, A. (2009), "Service delivery innovation: Antecedents and impact on  
17 firm performance", *Journal of Service Research*, Vol.12 No.1, pp. 36–55.  
18

19  
20 Chiva, R., Ghauri, P., and Alegre, J. (2013), "Organizational learning, innovation and  
21 internationalization: A complex system model", *British Journal of Management*, Vol. 25, pp.687–705,  
22 Available at: <http://10.1111/1467-8551.12026>.

23  
24 [Cirera](#), X., Muzi, S. (2020), "Measuring innovation using firm-level surveys: Evidence from  
25 developing Countries", *Research Policy*, Vol.49 No.3.

26  
27 Creswell, J. W. (2012), "Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and  
28 Qualitative Research", (4th Edition), Pearson.  
29

30  
31 Das, P., Verburg, R., Verbraeck, A., Bonebakker, L. (2017), "Barriers to innovation within large  
32 financial services firms: An in-depth into disruptive and radical innovation projects at a bank",  
33 *European Journal of Management*, Vol.21 No.1, pp. 96–112.

34  
35 Dogbe, C., Tian, H.Y., Pomegbe, W. Sarsah, S. and Otoo, Ch. (2019), "Market orientation and new  
36 product superiority among small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs): The moderating role of  
37 innovation capability", *International Journal of Innovation Management*. 1-25, Available at:  
38 <https://doi.org/10.1142/S1363919620500437>.

39  
40 Eisingerich, A. B. and Rubera, G. (2010), "Drivers of Brand Commitment: A cross-national  
41 investigation", *Journal of International Marketing*, Vol.18 No.2, pp. 64-79.  
42

43  
44 Edirisnghe, D., Nazarian, A., Foroudi, P., Lindridge, A. (2020), "Establishing psychological  
45 relationship between female customers and retailers: A study of the small-to-medum-scale clothing  
46 retail industry", *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*. Available at:  
47 <https://doi.org/10.1108/QMR-12-2017-0167>.

48  
49 Estirin, S., and Pelletier, A. (2018), "Privatization in developing countries: What are the lessons of  
50 recent experience?", *World Bank Research Observer*, Vol.33 No.1, pp. 65-102.  
51

52  
53 Ferraz, I., and Santos.N(2016), "The relationship between service innovation and performance: a  
54 bibliometric analysis and research agenda proposal", *RAI Revista de Administração e Inovação*, Vol.13  
55 No.4, pp.251-260  
56

57  
58 Frega, J., Ferraresi, A., Quandt, C., and da Veiga, C. (2018), "Relationships among knowledge  
59 management, organizational innovativeness and performance: Covariance-based versus partial least-  
60 squares structural equation modelling", *Journal of Information & Knowledge Management*, Vol.17  
No.1, pp.1-19.

- 1  
2  
3 Fusch, P., Fusch, G., and Ness, L., (2018), "Denzin's Paradigm Shift: Revisiting Triangulation in  
4 Qualitative Research", *Journal of Social Change*, Vol.10 No.1, pp. 19-32.  
5  
6 Green, M.H., Davies, Ph., and Ng, I. (2017), "Two strands of servitization: A thematic analysis of  
7 traditional and customer co-created servitization and future research directions", *International Journal*  
8 *of Production Economics*, Vol.192, pp.40-53, Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2017.01.009>  
9  
10 Gricoriou, K., and Rothaermel, F. (2016), "Organizing for knowledge generation: Internal knowledge  
11 networks and the contingent effect of external knowledge sourcing", *Strategic Management Journal*,  
12 Vol.38, pp.395-414  
13  
14 Gürhan-Canli, Z., and Batra, R. (2004), "When corporate image affects product evaluations: The  
15 moderating role of perceived risk", *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol.41 No.2, pp. 197-205.  
16  
17 Gustafsson, A., Snyder, H., and Witell, L. (2020), "Service innovation: A new conceptualization and  
18 path forward", *Journal of Service Research*, Vol.23 No.2, pp. 111-115.  
19  
20 Heale, R., and Forbes, D. (2013), "Understanding triangulation in research" *Evidence Based Nursing*.  
21 16(4).  
22  
23 Henrique Taques, F., López, M., Basso, L., & Areal,N(2020). Indicators used to measure service  
24 innovation and manufacturing innovation, *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*,  
25 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jik.2019.12.001>  
26  
27 Hogan, S., and Coote, V. (2014), "Organizational culture, innovation and performance: A test of  
28 Schein's model", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol.67 No.8, pp.1609-1621.  
29  
30 Hong, J., Feng, B., Wu, Y., and Wang, L. (2016), "Do government grants promote innovation efficiency  
31 in China's high-tech industries?", *Technovation*, Vol.57/58, pp.4-13, Available at:  
32 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2016.06.001>  
33  
34 Jaaron, A., and Backhouse, Ch. (2017), "Operationalization of service innovation: a system thinking  
35 approach", *The Service Industries Journal*, Vol. 39 No9-10, pp. 561-583  
36  
37 Kunz, W., Schmitt, B., and Meyer, A. (2011), "How does perceived firm innovativeness affect the  
38 consumer?", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol.64 No.8, pp. 816-822.  
39  
40 Lehrer, Ch., Wieneke, A., Brocke,J.V., Jung,R, and Seidel,S.(2018), " How Big Data Analytics Enables  
41 Service Innovation: Materiality, Affordance, and the Individualization of Service", *Journal of*  
42 *Management Information Systems*, Vol.35 No.2, pp.424-460.  
43  
44 Maglio, P., and Spohrer, J. (2008), "Fundamentals of service science", *Journal of the Academy of*  
45 *Marketing Science*, Vol.36 No.1, pp. 18-20.  
46  
47 Merrilees, B., Rundle-Thiele, S., and Lye, A. (2011), "Marketing capabilities: Antecedents and  
48 implications for B2B SME performance", *Industrial Marketing Management*, Vol.40 No.3, pp. 368-  
49 375.  
50  
51 Moreira, M., Kuk, G., de Aquino Guimaraes, T., and Albuquerque, P. (2020), "The genealogy of service  
52 innovation: The research field tells its own story", *The Service Industries Journal*. Available at:  
53 <https://doi.org/10.1080/02642069.2020.1732355>.  
54  
55 Narteh, B. (2018), "Brand equity and financial performance: The moderating role of brand likeability",  
56 *Marketing Intelligence and Planning*, Vol.36 No.3, pp.1-16.  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Nowell, L.S., Norris, J.M., White, D.E., and Moules, N.J. (2017), "Thematic analysis: Striving to meet  
4 trustworthiness criteria", *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, Vol.16, pp. 1-13.  
5  
6 O'Cass, A., Boisvert, J., and Ashill, N. J. (2011), "How brand innovativeness and quality impact attitude  
7 toward new service line extensions: the moderating role of consumer involvement", *Journal of Services*  
8 *Marketing*, Vol.25 No.7, pp.517-527  
9  
10 Ordanini, A., and Parasuraman, A. (2011), "Service innovation viewed through a service-dominant  
11 logic lens: a conceptual framework and empirical analysis", *Journal of Service Research*, Vol.14 No.1,  
12 pp.3-23.  
13  
14 Ortega-Lapiedra, R., Marco-Fondevila, M., Scarpellini, S., and Llena-Macarulla, F. (2019),  
15 "Measurement of human capital applied to the business eco-innovation", *Sustainability*, Vol.11, pp.1-  
16 16, Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/su11123263>.  
17  
18 Ostrom, L., Bitner, M.J., Brown, S.W, Burkhard, K.A., Goul, M., Smith-Daniels, V., and Rabinovich,  
19 E. (2010), "Moving forward and making a difference: research priorities for the science of service",  
20 *Journal of Service Research*, Vol.13 No.1, pp.4-36.  
21  
22 Ostrom, A., Parasuraman, A., Bowen, D., Patricio, L., and Voss, Ch. (2015), "Service research priorities  
23 in a rapidly changing context", *Journal of Service Research*, Vol.18 No.2, pp.127-159.  
24  
25 Oyemomi, O., Liu, Sh., Neaga, I., Chen, H., and Nakpodia, F. (2018), "How cultural impact on  
26 knowledge sharing contributes to organizational performance: Using fsQCA approach", *Journal of*  
27 *Business Research*, Vol.94, pp.313-319, Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.bursres.2018.02.027>.  
28  
29 Pinar, M., Girard, T., and Eser, Z. (2012), "Consumer-based brand equity in banking industry:  
30 Comparison of local and global banks in Turkey", *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, Vol.30  
31 No.5, pp.359-375  
32  
33 Popaitoon, S., and Popaitoon, P. (2016), "Motivation Synergy, Knowledge Absorptive Capacity and  
34 NPD Project Performance in Multinational Automobiles in Thailand", *Journal of High Technology*  
35 *Management Research*, Vol.27 No.2, pp.1-11.  
36  
37 Prajogo, D., and McDermott, Ch. (2014), "Antecedents of service innovation in SMEs: Comparing the  
38 effects of external and internal factors", *Journal of Small Business Management*, Vol.52 No.3, pp.521-  
39 540.  
40  
41 Prajogo, D., and Oke,A.(2016), "Human capital, service innovation advantage, and business  
42 performance: The moderating roles of dynamic and competitive environments," *International Journal*  
43 *of Operations and Production Management*, Vol.36 No.9, pp.974-994.  
44  
45 Robinson, M., Sayer, D., and Pallister, I. (2007). *Banking on Innovation? KPMG LLP*.1-27.  
46  
47 Salunke, S., Weerawardena, J., & McColl-Kennedy, J. R. (2013), "Competing through service  
48 innovation: The role of bricolage and entrepreneurship in project-oriented firms", *Journal of Business*  
49 *Research*, Vol.66 No.8, pp.1085-1097  
50  
51 Santamaría, L., Jesús Nieto, M., and Miles, I. (2012), "Service innovation in manufacturing firms:  
52 evidence from Spain", *Technovation*, Vol.32 No.2, pp.144-155.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



Skålén, P., Gummerus, J., Koskull, C.V., Magnusson, P. (2015), "Exploring value propositions and service innovation: a service-dominant logic study", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol.43 No.2, pp.137-158.

Some, H., Cano-Kollmann, N., M/judambi, R., and Cosset, J.C. (2020), "The effect of privatization on the characteristics of innovation", *Financial Management*. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1111/fima.12311>.

Sorenso, F., and Lapenta, F. (2017), "Research methods in service innovation", *Edward Edgar Publishing, Ltd*.

Storey, Ch., Cankurtaran, P., Papstathopoulou, P., and Hultink, E. (2016), "Success factors for service innovation: A meta-analysis", *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, Vol.33 No.5, pp.527-548.

Su'un, m., Possumah, B., Appiah, M., Hilmiyah, N. (2018), "Determinants of Islamic banking adoption across different religious groups in Ghana: A panoptic perspective", *Journal of International Studies*, Vol.11 No.4, pp.138-154.

Toivonen, M., & Tuominen, T. (2009), "Emergence of innovations in services", *The Service Industries Journal*, Vol.29, pp.887-902.

Tok, E. (2020), "The incentives and efforts for innovation and entrepreneurship in a resource-based economy: A survey on perspective of Qatari residents", *Sustainability*, Vol. 12 No. 626, pp. 1-20. Available at <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12020626>

Torugsa, N., and Arundel. A. (2017), "Rethinking the effect of risk aversion on the benefits of service innovations in public administration agencies", *Research Policy*, Vol.46 No.5, pp. 900-910.

Velayati, R., Kordnaeij, A., Khodadad Hosseini, H., and Azar, A. (2019), "Developing a framework for the interactive prerequisites of prosumption in the banking industry of Iran", *Journal of Organisational Studies and Innovation*, Vol.6 No.2, pp.1-15.

Venkitachalam, K., and Willmott, H. (2017), "Strategic knowledge management-Insights and pitfalls", *International Journal of Information Management*, Vol.37 No.4, pp. 313-316.

Wang, G., and Miao, C.F. (2015), "Effects of sales force market orientation on creativity, innovation implementation and sales performance", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol.68 No11, pp.2374-2382.

Witell, L., Snyder, H., Gustafsson, A., Fombelle, P., and Kristensson, P. (2016), "Defining service innovation: a review and synthesis", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol.69 No.8, pp.2863-2872.

Wu, Ch. (2014), "The study of service innovation for digiservice on loyalty", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol.67 No5, pp.819-824.

Yiu, H.L., Ngai, E., and Lei, Ch. (2019), "Impact of service-dominant orientation on the innovation performance of technology firms: Roles of knowledge sharing and relationship learning", *Decision Sciences*, 1-35. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1111/deci.12408>.

Zahra, Sh., and Hansen, C. (2000), "Privatization, entrepreneurship and global competitiveness in the 21<sup>st</sup> century", *Competitiveness Review*, Vol.10 No1, pp.83-103

Zhou, Y., Fan, X., and Son, J. (2019), "How and when matter: Exploring the interaction effects of high-performance work systems, employee participation and human capital on organizational innovation", *Human Resource Management*, Vol.58, pp. 253-268. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.21950>

-, (2018), "Report from Canada's Economic Strategy Tables: Seizing opportunities for growth".

-, (2019), "Global Innovation Index 2019", Cornell SC Johnson College of Business, World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO).

#### Appendix 1: Interview information

Interviewee Number	Profession	Age	Gender	Approximate Duration
1.	Chief Marketing Manager	46	Male	51 minutes
2.	Business Consultant	42	Male	45 minutes
3.	IT Manager	61	Male	37 minutes
4.	Marketing Vice President	51	Male	70 minutes
5.	IT Manager	32	Male	62 minutes
6.	Strategy Development Manager	36	Female	53 minutes
7.	Lecturer	38	Female	45 minutes
8.	R&D Manager	45	Male	68 minutes
9.	R&D Manager	41	Female	60 minutes
10.	Legislation Consultant	52	Female	48 minutes
11.	HR Manager	50	Female	72 minutes
12.	Chief Marketing Manager	49	Male	47 minutes
13.	HR Manager	56	Male	49 minutes

14.	CEO	44	Female	45 minutes
15.	Business Consultant	39	Female	53 minutes
16.	Lecturer	29	Female	55 minutes
17.	Product Manager	47	Male	62 minutes
18.	Strategy Vice President	38	Male	59 minutes
19.	Chief Marketing Manager	61	Female	47 minutes
20.	Strategy Development Manager	40	Male	74 minutes
21.	Lecturer	29	Female	36 minutes
Topics discussed				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Discussing the significance of service innovation and possible outcomes</li> <li>- Evaluating the innovative performance of the industry</li> <li>- Exploring mega trends with possible impacts on service innovation</li> <li>- Examining organizational attributes that encourage or hinder the development of new services</li> </ul>				

Dear Reviewers,

We would like to thank you for your attention to our paper "Hope for the best, prepare for the worst: Barriers to service innovation". We are glad the revisions have been accepted and would like to sincerely thank you for your insightful comments. A few minor revisions that were mentioned have been implemented, which we hope proves satisfactory.

Regards,

Authors

<b>Reviewer 1</b>	
<b>Reviewer's Comment</b>	<b>Authors' Response</b>
This is an interesting paper and the limitations previously pointed out have been addressed carefully	Thank you very much. We are glad the revisions have been effective.
The literature review has been extended (as suggested) to include brand equity service innovation using recent refs. The research questions are now being explored theoretically too which was partially missing.	Thank you. As you mentioned, we tried to strengthen the theoretical foundations of the research by using updated references from high-ranking journals. We also did our best to establish a better link between the research objectives and the existing literature.
Generally speaking, the method and findings have been explained well and the number of long verbatim quotation has been substantially reduced and replaced with clear explanations relating to the literature review.	Thematic analysis is a powerful tool to analyze qualitative data. We also replaced the long quotations with theoretical support, which we believe considerably improved the quality of the work. Thank you for your advice.
The discussion of the findings is now adequate for the rest of the paper. Authors have reviewed this section carefully adding clear explanation and arguments backed up with literature. Also, the both theoretical and empirical contributions have been reviewed.	We are glad to hear that. As suggested in the first round of revisions, we added theoretical support to our arguments. We also redeveloped the theoretical and practical contributions of the work in a clearer language.
The paper addresses well a gap in the literature and provides an interesting insight in an often understudied area (not in terms of subject but rather in terms of bias towards specific countries with other regions largely ignored).	Thank you so much. We believe the extensive review of literature helped us better identify the gaps that this research aimed to cover, i.e. conceptual ambiguities of service innovation, as well as barriers to service innovation at two different levels in parallel, with specific focus on a rather untouched context.
The paper is well written and clear. It offers an interesting reading and some good food for thought.	Thank you. During the revision phase, we carefully read the paper, correcting misspellings and/or poor structures.
<b>Reviewer 2</b>	
<b>Reviewer's Comment</b>	<b>Authors' Response</b>

<p>This Paper has been improved significantly and it is now in a high standard, but there are some small points that need to be considered. It seems authors have decided to change the title which I support but it seems the old title still remain in some area and that need to be changed both in the document (Title page) and may be on the system</p>	<p>We would like to thank you for your attention. Yes, there seems to be a mistake about the new title, but please be sure that it will be corrected for the final submission.</p>
<p>The paper has been improved significantly and now has a much better storyline and flow. But I still think there is a need for better highlights of the contribution in the Introduction. You may also add a bit about the context, of course not much, by justifying it better why Iran and a context</p>	<p>Thank you. We tried to better highlight the contributions of this research, with extra information about the context. Also, information about the context was placed in the methodology section to justify the qualitative approach.</p>
<p>The LR section has been rewritten completely and now has much better and stronger arguments. It is now much clearer for the reader why the research question proposed for this study is important, but having said that I don't think some of the headings are chosen with enough thoughts and better to think about them very carefully</p>	<p>We shortened/ redeveloped some of the titles in the literature section, and hope they turn out to be satisfactory.</p>
<p>This section is far better than before and by adding thematic analysis it certainly became stronger not only in terms of method but also in terms analysis of the data</p>	<p>Thank you. We agree that the new version is quite stronger and more perceivable for the reader.</p>
<p>As I mentioned, the thematic analysis made the paper stronger and analysis make much better sense for reviewer. Also, by reducing the length of the direct quotation the flow of the data analysis is much easier to follow</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. We are happy the section is seen as a dramatically improved version of our first submission.</p>
<p>Both theoretical and practical contributions have been explained much better and clearer. In the previous version, there were some contradictions that not existed in this version</p>	<p>Thank you so much. During the revision phase, we redeveloped both the theoretical and practical implications based on extensive data analysis and review of literature.</p>
<p>Generally speaking, the level of commutation has been improved</p>	<p>We reread the paper, making correction where necessary to improve the language. Thank you for noticing the effort.</p>