

This is a postprint (final submitted manuscript) version of the following article:

Parris, D., Bouchet, A., Welty Peachey, J., & Arnold, D. (2016). Change is hard: Overcoming barriers to adopting a service technology. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 30(6), 615-629. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JSM-05-2015-0182>



Change is hard: Overcoming barriers to service innovation

Journal:	<i>Journal of Services Marketing</i>
Manuscript ID	JSM-05-2015-0182.R2
Manuscript Type:	Article
Keywords:	organizational change, customer relationship management, institutional theory, stakeholder theory, relationship marketing, service innovation

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Journal of Services Marketing

Change is hard: Overcoming barriers to service innovation

Abstract

Purpose: Creating value through service innovation requires new processes and ways of communicating to multiple stakeholders. Institutions and stakeholders within the service ecosystem, however, often resist change. Adopting a new service strategy entails two distinct costs—monetary and psychological. The tensions between an organization's need to generate incremental revenue, and the challenges of balancing business as usual and the costs associated with service innovation are explored. Specifically, this article explores the adoption of a customer relationship management (CRM) technology solution in a bureaucratic setting, and the sequence of events needed for successful implementation, with emphasis on overcoming various barriers and hurdles.

Design/methodology/approach: A case study methodology is used to gather and analyze data on how the Arizona State University (ASU) athletic department responded to the changing competitive environment via adopting a CRM technology solution. Data collection consisted of ten semi-structured interviews.

Findings: The experience of ASU illustrates that the primary benefits of a CRM technology solution include the generation of incremental revenue, capturing data, and personalized marketing. The main challenges are coordinating adoption, obtaining commitment, developing competency, estimating costs, and creating content.

Research Implications: A conceptual framework emerged from the data that describes the likelihood of a service technology's successful implementation based upon the interaction of the strength of key actors, organizational situation perception, and organizational commitment. The model extends the proposed duality of service innovation outcomes as either success or failure to acknowledge the likelihood of a partial implementation where marginal success is achieved.

Practical implications: The sequence of events needed for successful implementation of a service technology are highlighted, with emphasis on overcoming various barriers and hurdles. Implementation steps are provided, as well as a model to help pinpoint issues.

Originality/Value: The case study provides insight for overcoming pitfalls and barriers to adopting a new service technology in a traditionally bureaucratic organization where resistance to change is the norm, and innovation is not.

Keywords: organizational change, customer relationship management, institutional theory, stakeholder theory, relationship marketing, service innovation

Article classification: Case Study

1. Introduction

Enhancing revenue typically compels marketing managers to build loyal relationships with both potential and existing customers through service innovations. Creating value through service innovation requires new processes and ways of communicating to multiple stakeholders at individual (micro), organizational (meso), and societal (macro) levels (Chandler and Vargo, 2011). Innovation in services often requires changes in various dimensions such as the service concept, client interface, the delivery system, the technology, organizational relations, service products, service processes, and external innovations (Kinstoröm *et al.*, 2013; Dominiquez-Péry *et al.*, 2013; Su, 2011). Previous research supports Schumpeter's (1934) view that the process of creative destruction through innovation can lead to economic growth by focusing on the positive effects of service innovation (Christofi *et al.*, 2015; Danjum and Rasli, 2012; Mizik and Jacobson, 2003; Möller *et al.*, 2008; Salunke, 2013; Witell *et al.*, 2015).

Despite the "pro-change" bias in research (Roger, 1962; Witell *et al.*, 2015), perhaps a word of caution is warranted. Although organizations have shown a willingness to adopt service innovations, such as customer relationship management (CRM) technology solutions, reaping the promised economic benefits (Cheng and Krumwiede, 2012; Zhou *et al.*, 2005) of successful implementation—the process of executing the service innovation—has been somewhat elusive (Dickie, 1999; King and Burgess, 2008; Payne and Frow, 2006). A faulty implementation by the organization can actually damage customer relationships (Freedman and Sudoyo, 1999; Hackett, 1990; Rigby *et al.*, 2002). Nine out of ten new service offerings fail (Gourville, 2006) perhaps because implementation has different impacts at different levels (Witell *et al.*, 2015). Technology plays a large role in these innovations (Dabholkar, 2000; Drennan and McColl-Kennedy, 2003; Timmor and Raymon, 2007; Wunderlich *et al.*, 2015); however, successful

1
2
3 implementation requires a bundle of capabilities and competencies—human, technological, and
4
5 organizational (Gadrey *et al.*, 1995) to all synergistically work together. This article suggests the
6
7 interconnectedness of the organization and its members combined with the perceived external
8
9 and internal risk associated with adopting a new service innovation (i.e., changing) or staying
10
11 with the status quo influences success, failure, or partial implementation. Researchers have not
12
13 sufficiently addressed role of risk in service innovation (Witell *et al.*, 2015).
14
15

16
17 Service innovations should be implemented with a customer relationship orientation;
18
19 placing the focus on the customer while developing the relationship into an asset for both
20
21 stakeholders – the customer and the organization (Jayachandran *et al.*, 2005; Srinivasan and
22
23 Moorman, 2005). However, achieving a true customer relationship orientation in a bureaucratic
24
25 setting (organizations with limited autonomy) (Merton, 1957; Mills, 1951) is challenging. One
26
27 of the main internal risks of service innovation involves managing changes to “business as
28
29 usual,” along with the associated costs.
30
31
32

33
34 Implementing a service innovation incurs two distinct costs—monetary and
35
36 psychological. The monetary costs consist of the cost of the technology, training, and salary,
37
38 along with implementation costs. The psychological costs are changing the organizational
39
40 culture and processes, and increased visibility into individual employee contributions through
41
42 metrics. Organizational change is often hampered by a “business as usual” attitude—
43
44 isomorphism and dominate logics (Cousens and Slack, 2005; DiMaggio and Powell, 1983) and
45
46 the strategic task of aligning distinct, overlapping, and intersecting effects at the individual,
47
48 organizational, and societal levels (Chandler and Vargo, 2011; Witell *et al.*, 2015).
49
50
51

52
53 Carlborg *et al.*'s. (2014) review and synthesis of service innovation research highlights
54
55 the need for additional studies to gain a deeper understanding of the interactions of stakeholders
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 in the organization's service ecosystem. The majority of studies have examined the paradoxes of
4
5 adopting a service technology through the lens of customer reactions—satisfaction, readiness,
6
7 and behavioral intentions (Bolton and Lemon, 1999; Fournier and Mick, 1999; Meuter *et al.*,
8
9 2000; Mick and Fournier, 1998; Parasuraman, 2000; Timmor and Rymon, 2007; Zeithaml *et al.*,
10
11 1996). However, there is a paucity of research regarding the adoption of service innovations at
12
13 the organizational level in differing workplace environments (Bull 2003; Nair *et al.*, 2007; Ko *et*
14
15 *al.*, 2008; Alshawi *et al.*, 2011). Adopting a service innovation requires navigating and altering
16
17 the socially complex service ecosystem. Broad organizational buy-in is essential for a service
18
19 innovation to be a success; however, resistance to change is the norm (Welty Peachey and
20
21 Bruening, 2011; Hutchinson and Bouchet, 2014). Thus, Guastafsson *et al.*, 2015 call for
22
23 researchers to think outside of the box and pinpoint issues that are relevant for services
24
25 marketing and management by exploring core management aspects of integrating technology in a
26
27 service ecosystem.
28
29
30
31
32

33
34 The aim of this study, therefore, was to investigate the adoption of a service innovation in
35
36 a bureaucratic setting, and the sequence of events needed for successful implementation, with
37
38 emphasis on overcoming various barriers and hurdles. Specifically, the investigation focused on
39
40 the experience of Arizona State University (ASU) and its athletic department, which was the first
41
42 major athletic department in the United States to adopt a CRM technology solution. The
43
44 research questions for this endeavor were as follows: (a) what role do key stakeholders have in
45
46 gaining formal and informal buy-in? And, (b) what organizational factors impact implementation
47
48 success? Core management aspects of integrating a service innovation were explored through a
49
50 multi-disciplinary lens utilizing organizational change theory (institutional theory and
51
52 stakeholder theory) and informed by sports management and service innovation literature. In
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 synthesizing the findings and discussion, practical steps for practitioners for implementing a
4 **service technology** are provided, along with a proposed conceptual model to predict and test the
5
6 likelihood of a successful implementation – the model is based upon the interaction of the
7
8 strength of key actors, organizational situation perception, and organizational commitment. **The**
9
10 **model extends the proposed duality of service innovation outcomes as either success or failure**
11
12 **(Witell *et al.*, 2015) to acknowledge the likelihood of a partial implementation where marginal**
13
14 **success is achieved. In addition, the model pinpoints potential issues relevant to service**
15
16 **marketers and management and provides propositions for researchers to further test.**
17
18
19
20
21

22 **2. Service innovation**

23
24 As a result of the disruptive innovation of the Internet, more and more consumers—especially
25
26 Generation Y (born between 1979 and 1994) and younger generations—expect personalized
27
28 communication from organizations and brands (Parris, 2013). Personalization facilitates
29
30 modification of one or more aspects of the marketing mix to target a group of individual
31
32 customers instead of the entire consumer base (Arora *et al.*, 2008; Peppers and Rogers, 1993;
33
34 Shaffer and Zhang, 2002) to provide personalized products and services (Arora *et al.*, 2008; Kim,
35
36 2002). In order to meet these growing expectations, organizations adopt service innovations—a
37
38 **rebundling of diverse means that create novel resources to benefit actors in a given context**
39
40 **(Lusch and Nambisan, 2015), often requiring new organizational designs (Araujo and Spring,**
41
42 **2006).**
43
44
45
46
47

48 **There is a pro-change bias (Roger, 1962; Witell *et al.*, 2015) that service innovation**
49
50 **offers an effective means to develop or refine services and improve service quality (Berry *et al.*,**
51
52 **2006; Chen *et al.*, 2012). Even though the growing expectations of consumers and the**
53
54 **advancement of technology has sparked a widely accepted need for organizations to adopt**
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 service innovation, there is a limited amount of research on: the core management issues in
4
5 integrating a new technology (Gustafson *et al.*, 2015); the role of risk associated with innovation
6
7 and its multi-level effects (Witell *et al.*, 2015); how service innovation enhances business
8
9 performance and customer satisfaction (O’Cass *et al.*, 2013); and on how stakeholders manage
10
11 the socially complex service ecosystem (Carlborg *et al.*, 2014). Furthermore, theory based
12
13 frameworks in service innovation are lacking (Chae, 2012) perhaps because innovation research
14
15 tends to focus on manufacturing (Castro *et al.*, 2011; Kindström *et al.*, 2013).
16
17
18

19
20 Service innovation has been explored through three schools of thought: assimilation—
21
22 introduction of new technology with services and manufacturing having similar issues;
23
24 demarcation—innovation in the service sector is distinct from manufacturing; and, synthesis—all
25
26 innovations are service innovations (Castro *et al.*, 2011; Coombs and Miles, 2000). This
27
28 investigation took the demarcation approach, a logic supported by scholars (Castro *et al.*, 2011;
29
30 Christofi *et al.*, 2015; Ettlíe and Rosenthal, 2011; Nijssen *et al.*, 2006).
31
32
33

34 Service organizations are notoriously complicated with complex social dynamics and
35
36 ecosystems. Thus, it is imperative for scholars to explore the individual (micro), organizational
37
38 (meso), and societal (macro) level impacts of service innovation (Chandler and Vargo, 2011;
39
40 Vargo and Lusch, 2014). Witell *et al.*, (2015) and Synder *et al.*, (2016) propose dualities are key
41
42 to understanding service innovation. While exploring the dualities such as adopt-reject, change-
43
44 static, or good-bad may provide deeper insight, it limits research to extreme cases; whereas, in
45
46 actuality, the majority of service innovation implementations fall along a spectrum of success.
47
48
49

50 Today, most transformative service experiences are powered by technology (Dabholkar,
51
52 2000; Drennan and McColl-Kennedy, 2003; Timmor and Raymon, 2007; Wunderlich *et al.*,
53
54 2015). Successful implementation of a service technology requires a bundle of capabilities and
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 competencies—human, technological, and organizational (Gadrey *et al.*, 1995). Creating value
4 through service innovation “introduces something new into the way of life, organization, timing,
5 and placement of what can generally be described as the individual and collective processes that
6 relate to customers” (Barcet, 2010, p.51). Thus, stakeholders across multiple levels of the
7 organization are impacted, making buy-in critical to success.
8
9

10 11 12 13 14 15 **3. Theoretical framework**

16 An organizational change theory perspective was adopted to guide this investigation.

17 Specifically, institutional theory and stakeholder theory serve as the foundation for helping to
18 understand the role of stakeholders in the adoption of a service technology and to explain the
19 organizational factors impacting implementation. Given that the analysis takes place at the
20 institutional and individual levels, these theories helped to inform the investigation, as numerous
21 previous studies in organizational change have framed their institutional- and individual-level
22 investigations with these two theories, respectively (Cousens and Slack, 2005; Welty Peachey
23 and Bruening, 2011).
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 *3.1 Institutional theory and organizational change*

37 Institutional theory enhances our understanding an organization’s role in the adoption and
38 implementation of a new service innovation. Institutional theory posits that organizations in a
39 field change their structure to conform to expectations about appropriate design and function
40 (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983). The term “field” describes any organizations within a collective
41 industry. Furthermore, organizational change is often hampered by isomorphism, which has
42 been described as “the constraining process that forces one unit in a population to resemble other
43 units that face the same set of environmental conditions” (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983, p. 149).
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

1
2
3 best ways to conduct business can affect organizations (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983; Slack and
4 Parent, 2006). The regulatory agencies to which ASU athletics reports, for example, include
5
6 both the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) and the Pac 12 Conference – both set
7
8
9
10 expectations on how to do business.
11

12
13 Service marketing is seldom a priority for such bureaucratic institutions. Typically,
14
15 bureaucratic institutions rely on centralized operations, whereas service marketing requires a
16
17 customer-centric attitude, which often means pushing decision-making down to lower levels of
18
19 an organization. Bureaucratic organizations might be uncomfortable with the more decentralized
20
21 decision-making approach required of service marketing and CRM. The resistance to change in
22
23 a bureaucratic ecosystem is high because change requires a large shift from centralized
24
25
26 operations, departments working in silos, and top-down decision-making to a more decentralized
27
28 decision-making approach with processes integrated across multiple departments.
29
30

31
32 Institutional studies illustrate the erosion of *dominant logics* serve to increase field-level
33
34 change in organizations (Cousens and Slack, 2005). Dominant logics has been defined as “a
35
36 central logic – a set of material practices and symbolic construction – which constitutes its
37
38 organizing principles and which is available to organizations and individuals to elaborate”
39
40 (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983, p. 248). As an example, the dominant logics regarding the
41
42 mechanisms for generating revenue within athletic departments have historically consisted of
43
44 ticket and sponsorship sales, donations, and radio/television rights. However, with the increased
45
46 costs of operating a Division I athletic program and environmental pressures on university
47
48 budgets, these dominant logics are eroding, thus opening up the search for new service
49
50
51 innovations to increase sales. Market demands and threats posed by competitors are primary
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 stimuli for firms to explore innovation as means to change, differentiate themselves, and get
4
5
6 ahead of their competition (Lee *et al.*, 2009).
7

8 3.2 Stakeholder theory and organizational change 9

10 Stakeholder theory (Freeman, 1984) provides a framework for exploring how managerial
11 decision-making and planning activities for CRM adoption should address “whether, why, and
12 how” to implement the innovation (Markus and Tanis, 2000, p. 189). Stakeholder theory
13 describes the social contract between business and societies (Quazi, 2003) in which
14 management’s purpose is to find the most advantageous balance among the key stakeholder
15 groups: customers, employees, business partners, communities, investors, and the environment
16 (Clarkson, 1995; Kok *et al.*, 2001; Schiebel and Pochtrager, 2003). In exploring the decision-
17 making processes of an organization the term stakeholder includes everyone with an interest (or
18 “stake”) in what the entity does. Stakeholder theory takes into account the interests of any group
19 or individuals (e.g., stakeholders) who can affect or be affected by the organization’s goals
20 (Freeman, 1984).
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 The ASU experience described herein demonstrates how stakeholders’ hierarchal levels
37 and socialization in the organization impact the way they receive and address the adoption of a
38 service innovation. In top strategic organizations – large or medium size firms such as ASU –
39 innovation is a strategic task that is guided by top management and involves many individuals
40 and departments in the innovation process (Sundbo, 1997, 2000). From a strategic perspective,
41 adopting a CRM technology solution goes beyond simply providing an information technology
42 solution and building a customer information database – it requires new organizational processes
43 in which management redefines who and what is really important (Fan and Ku, 2010).
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Analyzing the strategic actions an organization takes in response to stakeholders involves
4
5 integrating stakeholder and institutional theory (Oates, 2013).
6
7

8 **4. Methodology**

9

10 An exploratory, qualitative case study methodology was deployed to investigate the cultural
11 adoption of a technological strategy. Case study methodology is important to gaining deeper
12 insight into a phenomenon (Eisenhardt, 1989; Eisenhardt and Graebner, 2007), and was used to
13 gain access to critical data during a specific time period at the university. Since the aim was to
14 contribute to both practice and theory, an extreme case was sought (Pratt *et al.*, 2006). The
15 athletic department at ASU, a highly bureaucratic environment, was selected as the research
16 setting (Hutchinson and Bouchet, 2014). Yin (2003) notes “the case study method allows
17 investigators to retain the holistic and meaningful characteristics of real-life events” (p.2), while
18 exploratory analysis can be used to uncover multi-dimensional impacts and unanticipated
19 patterns in the data (Berg, 2009). A multi-level approach examines the interconnectedness
20 between the organization and its stakeholders (Chandler and Vargo, 2011; Witell *et al.*, 2015).
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 *4.1 Data Sample and Collection*

37

38 The initial step of data collection consisted of an email sent to athletic department personnel and
39 university employees who had played a role in the CRM adoption and implementation process.
40 This email asked if they would be interested in participation in either a face-to-face or telephone
41 interview and promised confidentiality. Semi-structured interviews allow for understanding
42 participants’ experiences (Rubin and Rubin, 1995; Yin, 2003). The interview questions were
43 developed from the service innovation literature and guided by institutional (DiMaggio and
44 Powell, 1983) and stakeholder (Freeman, 1984) theories. One of the authors conducted ten in-
45 depth, semi-structured interviews, which allowed the interviewees to expand upon initial
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 questions such as: “Why did you choose to go with a CRM technology solution?” “Who were the
4
5 key stakeholders influencing the decision to adopt a CRM solution?” “How did the stakeholders
6
7 engage with other stakeholders throughout the process?” “What are the challenges to the
8
9 adoption of a CRM system?” “What is the future for CRM?” The interviewing author was also
10
11 an employee at the university during the adoption and implementation process – this is critical
12
13 given that interviews are influenced by the rapport established in that context (Lincoln and Guba,
14
15 1985). In addition, the interviewing author maintained a reflective journal of his experiences.
16
17
18
19

20 Interviewees were selected based on their special knowledge or expertise and their active
21
22 role in the implementation and management of the CRM solution at ASU. Interviews were
23
24 conducted with four full-time athletic department administrators, two former graduate assistants
25
26 who worked with the CRM solution, one season ticket holder who used the CRM system, and
27
28 two company representatives that supply CRM technology to sport organizations. One
29
30 interviewee asked that their interview be used strictly for background purposes. This request
31
32 was granted. The length of the interviews ranged between 30 minutes and one hour. Each
33
34 interview was transcribed and sent to the interviewees for verification of accuracy.
35
36
37
38

39 *4.2 Data Analysis*

40 Consistent with Creswell (2003) and Strauss and Corbin (1990), open, axial, and selective coding
41
42 were used to analyze the data. Open coding was used during the initial stages of analyses by
43
44 organizing the data into preliminary codes. Based on recommendations from Miles and
45
46 Huberman (1994), some codes were assigned a priori based on the literature on service
47
48 innovation, institutional (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983), and stakeholder (Freeman, 1984)
49
50 theories, while others emerged from the data. For example, several of the open codes included:
51
52 organization situational context, dominate logics, stakeholder engagement (formal versus
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 informal), and organizational commitment to change. After the open coding process,
4 preliminary codes were organized into axial codes (Neuman, 2006). In the last stage of analysis,
5 selective coding was utilized to identify quotes that best represented the axial/conceptual codes
6 (Creswell, 2003).
7
8
9
10

11
12 In qualitative research, a study is deemed to have trustworthiness if it has credibility,
13 transferability, dependability, and confirmability (Lincoln and Guba, 1985; Schwandt, 2007).
14 Credibility was achieved through the triangulation of the data which included member checks
15 and interviewee feedback regarding the transcripts. The ethnographic reflective journal served to
16 insure transferability. Specific attention was paid to the triangulation of the data. Because one
17 of the authors was uniquely involved in the process special effort was made to ensure the
18 accuracy of the data. These techniques help increase the confidence in the results of the data
19 collection and lessened the chance of bias (Fielding and Fielding, 1986). For dependability and
20 confirmability, the authors not involved in data collection served as auditors and reviewed all
21 data (Erlandson, 1993). Lastly, a peer debriefing was conducted with a senior product manager
22 who specializes in enterprise information systems and their implementation in large public
23 institutions – this individual reviewed both the findings and conceptual model. Peer debriefing
24 allows a peer to audit with the purpose of “exploring aspects of the inquiry that might otherwise
25 remain only implicit within the inquirer’s mind” (Lincoln and Guba, 1985, p. 308).
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 *4.3 Research context: Historical background and marketing challenges faced by ASU*

46 ASU has an enrollment of over 72,000 students, spread among four campuses in the Phoenix
47 area, and has the largest enrollment of any public university in the United States. ASU’s athletic
48 teams, known collectively as the Sun Devils, compete in Division I of the NCAA and are
49 members of the Pac 12 conference. In addition to ASU, the Pac 12 conference consists of the
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Universities of Colorado, Utah, Arizona, Oregon, Washington, California (Los Angeles and
4 Berkeley), Washington State, Oregon State, Stanford, and the University of Southern California.
5
6 ASU's athletic tradition can be tied to the success of the football program in the 1960s and 70s.
7
8 Under the leadership of Hall of Fame coach Frank Kush, the program enjoyed success at annual
9
10 bowl games and obtained national rankings.
11
12
13

14
15 Kush's retirement in the early 1980s ushered in new challenges, which coincided with a
16
17 period of transition for ASU due to the influx of new residents into the Phoenix area. These new
18
19 residents had few or no ties to the school or its athletic programs. In the 1990's, the athletic
20
21 department struggled with budget deficits and poor performances by its teams. The deficits were
22
23 blamed primarily on lagging attendance at football games. In addition, the Phoenix Suns
24
25 (National Basketball League), Arizona Diamondbacks (Major League Baseball), Arizona
26
27 Cardinals (National Football League), and the Phoenix Coyotes (National Hockey League)
28
29 moved into the Phoenix area and provided increased competition for entertainment dollars. As a
30
31 consequence, the role of the ASU athletic department's marketing team became critical to the
32
33 athletic programs' financial success. According to Lee *et al.* 2009 when competition is intense,
34
35 innovation often becomes the means for firms to maintain or gain their competitiveness. The
36
37 marketers needed to find a way to meet the wants and needs of sport fans in the greater Phoenix
38
39 area more effectively and efficiently than the competition.
40
41
42
43
44

45
46 Given the associated risks due to the changing environment and growing competition, the
47
48 school's athletic department faced the challenge of marketing to sports fans in Phoenix, while
49
50 dealing with a limited marketing budget. Risk often sparks innovation which is one dimension
51
52 of service innovation that deserves more scholarly attention (Witell *et al.*, 2015). Athletic
53
54 department personnel felt that the days of mass marketing their product were over, due to their
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 limited budget and the intensely competitive sports environment in Phoenix. Unlike some
4
5 Division I athletic programs, ASU's athletic department competes directly with professional
6
7 sports teams that have enjoyed a high level of success over the last decade. The Arizona
8
9 Diamondbacks, for example, won the 2001 World Series, and the Arizona Cardinals played in
10
11 the Super Bowl in 2009. As a result of this competitive environment, the university mandated
12
13 that the athletic department administrators find a solution or solutions to these marketing
14
15 challenges. In addition, the arrival of Gene Smith as athletic director in 2000 brought a sense of
16
17 urgency regarding revenue generation. New leadership often brings new agendas (Cousens and
18
19 Slack, 2005; O'Brien and Slack, 2004) facilitating the erosion of dominant logics and laying the
20
21 groundwork for change (Welty Peachey and Bruening, 2011).
22
23
24
25
26

27 The primary marketing goal of the ASU athletic department is to meet the wants and
28
29 needs of new and old sport fans, in order to increase revenue. Similar to any nonprofit
30
31 organization, the ASU athletic department needs to generate revenue, which is achieved through
32
33 a variety of revenue streams, including ticket sales, sponsorships, donations, television contracts,
34
35 and concessions. The athletic department, however, has direct control of only one of these
36
37 revenue streams, ticket sales. The PAC 12 conference controls television revenue, and ASU
38
39 outsources its sponsorship and concessions to third party vendors. Thus, ticket sales remain the
40
41 dominant revenue stream over which ASU has direct control, which means that the athletic
42
43 department must constantly strive to increase ticket sales. Ticket sales account for
44
45 approximately 38% of the athletic department revenue (personal communication, 2012). This
46
47 means that the athletic department must find better ways to manage the information regarding
48
49 season ticket holders and individual ticket sales.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

5. Findings and discussion

The interviews revealed that there were both benefits and challenges regarding ASU's adoption of a CRM technology solution. The assumption is a CRM solution linked to a service product that is innovative will lead to enhanced financial performance, customer satisfaction, and reputation (Cheng and Krumviede, 2012; Christofi *et al.*, 2015; Zhou *et al.*, 2005). However, successful implementation is not cheap, fast, or easy (Dickie, 1999), nor is it guaranteed, as failure is the norm for the majority of new service offerings (Gourville, 2006). The main benefit to adopting service technology, a CRM solution, was generating incremental revenue, which resulted from capturing better data and the opportunity for better personalized marketing. ASU also encountered five major challenges for implementing service innovation: a) coordinating adoption; b) obtaining commitment (buy-in); c) developing competency; d) estimating costs; and e) developing content.

5.1 Benefits of a Technology Service Innovation

5.1.1 Generating incremental revenue

To fully utilize the service technology ASU's athletic department personnel wanted to augment their CRM strategy with a commitment to generate revenue by implementing a full-service aggressive ticket sales department. The organization understood that adopting a service technology solution would likely fail without an integrated approach to technology, processes, and people. One of the biggest mistakes an organization can make is to under commit to the service innovation initiative (Dickie, 1999) by not allocating a bundle of resources—human, technological, and organizational (Gadrey *et al.*, 1995) to address and make the changes required across the service ecosystem (Kindström *et al.*, 2013; Dominguez-Péry *et al.*, 2013; Su, 2011).

1
2
3
4 Senior management at ASU realized adopting a service technology required redesigning
5 the sales process. This new ticket sales department would consist of an Assistant Athletic
6 Director of Ticket Sales and eight to 10 part-time employees devoted to season and group sales.
7
8 An ASU employee stated: "It should be mentioned that dedicating resources to a sales
9 department is very unusual at the college level. This is really more of a professional sports
10 model, but we are in Phoenix where we have to compete with the professional sports teams for
11 entertainment dollars." Research suggests that service innovation advances the creation of
12 sustainable advantage by enabling a company to offer superior value in contrast to competitors
13 (Salunke *et al.*, 2013). ASU personnel were hoping that service technology would allow the
14 athletic department to effectively handle customer acquisition, retention, and development.
15
16 According to an ASU employee, soon after the implementation of the technology a dedicated
17 sales force was hired to capture the value from the service innovation, which "drove sales
18 beyond our expectations." By utilizing CRM technology the sales force could target specific
19 demographics of fans, and thus, generate additional revenue. An employee noted: "Advertising
20 in Phoenix is expensive, CRM allows us (athletic department) to specifically target our
21 demographics. That helps us increase revenue and decrease advertising dollars."
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 5.1.2 Capturing Data

42
43 Another key benefit ASU derived from the technology service innovation was the ability to
44 capture data from its various interactions with customers. Service innovation forms value
45 creation and plays a major role in facilitating the interaction between an organization's services
46 and services sought by the customer (Mizik and Jacobson, 2003; Möller *et al.*, 2008). One senior
47 ASU administrator stated: "Until we adopted CRM, we knew very little about our customers. In
48 that way, college athletic departments are different than for-profit firms. A big part of the value
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 of CRM was it lets us capture data which allow us to understand our customers better.” The
4
5 technology service innovation helped the athletic department systematically sort and organize the
6
7 data that were gathered. The system allowed the department to build a database for customer
8
9 information that described relationships in detail—sales personnel could then access this
10
11 information to try to match the customer needs with products offered. Cheng and Krumwiede
12
13 (2012) illustrated a positive relationship between service innovation and customer orientation.
14
15
16 One senior administrator stated that the biggest benefit of implementing a CRM technology
17
18 solution is that it would “allow the organization to get the knowledge out of the sales rep’s head
19
20 and into a centralized database where it can be retrieved if that sales rep leaves the organization.”
21
22 Thus, CRM allows the athletic department to maximize value for stakeholders by taking
23
24 stakeholder (customer) interests into account and building stronger relationships with them
25
26 (Freeman, 1984). Essentially, the technology service innovation gave ASU the ability to better
27
28 understand its target audience.
29
30
31
32
33

34 ASU’s CRM content strategy revolved around utilizing the Devil’s Domain, the online
35
36 fan club accessed via the ASU athletic department website. Devil’s Domain is used to collect
37
38 basic information from Sun Devil fans, including birthdays, ticket purchasing preferences, and
39
40 favorite ASU sports. In exchange for this information fans get free access to the Devil’s Domain
41
42 portal, ticket and merchandise discounts, newsletters, and exclusive video highlights.
43
44 Subsequently, a study conducted by the athletic department found that 85% of fans described
45
46 themselves as “very satisfied” with the Devil’s Domain. A service innovation can improve the
47
48 service delivery to positively affect customer satisfaction (Danjum and Rasli, 2012). The data
49
50 generated via the Devil’s Domain helped the athletic department market its product in two
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 critical ways. First, the athletic department better understood where its marketing dollars needed
4 to be allocated. Second, ASU used the information to better position sales efforts.
5
6

7
8 The implementation of the **service innovation** was conducted in conjunction with the
9 athletic department making a commitment to hiring a Director of Ticket Sales and a sales staff.
10 One employee shared: “Understand, the whole thing was based off of adopting CRM and hiring
11 a sales staff. In order to justify the expenses we had to show the impact on sales.” The two
12 decisions served to complement each other. First, the decisions sent notice to both internal and
13 external critics that ASU’s athletic department was serious about generating revenue with the
14 goal of becoming self-sustaining. Second, increased staffing allowed the athletic department to
15 actively solicit potential clients and provide information to current ticket holders.
16
17

18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 *5.1.3 Opportunities for personalized marketing*

28 CRM allowed the athletic department to establish bonds between the brand and its customers.
29 Having access to data allows organizations to improve their customer response by offering
30 personalized campaigns (Neslin and Shankar, 2009), which then builds stronger relationships
31 with stakeholders to maximize value (Freeman, 1984). Personalization focuses on building a
32 meaningful one-to-one relationship with each customer by understanding his or her needs and
33 helping him or her satisfy those needs efficiently and effectively. **According to Parvatyar and**
34 **Sheth (2001), CRM and relationship marketing are terms which are often used interchangeably.**
35 **Relationship marketing shifts the focus of the marketing exchange from transactions to**
36 **relationships (Rowley, 2005), while a CRM solution allows companies to market their products**
37 **in a more personalized manner.**
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 An advantage of personalization is increased consumer lock-in which decreases a
54 consumer’s propensity to switch after an initial investment has been made (Zauberman, 2003).
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 By utilizing **the technology service innovation**, ASU athletic department personnel could target
4 specific demographics of fans and notify them by email of special offers. In the first year (2004-
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

By utilizing **the technology service innovation**, ASU athletic department personnel could target specific demographics of fans and notify them by email of special offers. In the first year (2004-2005) utilizing CRM, for example, the athletic department extended an exclusive ticket offer to all members of the Devils Domain for the annual ASU/University of Arizona basketball game. The offer brought in \$14,000 in the first 48 hours (Berkowitz, 2004).

The technology service innovation also helps sponsors by giving them direct access to fans. For example, this access could be in the form of a coupon emailed directly to a certain demographic of the fan base. CRM enables ASU to regularly communicate with the team fan base, increasing their involvement, trust, and loyalty to the team, and building a strong longitudinal relationship (Tsiotsou, 2013). An ASU Assistant Athletic Director noted that these ticket offers typically see a 3 – 11 % response rate and stated that:

... by combining offers with exclusive content we've been very successful; a lot of people who get e-mail marketing just delete it. But because we send content, our fans read it, enjoy it, and view the offers as a special benefit of being part of the Devils Domain. They don't see it as advertising; they see it as a reward for membership.

Finally, at most universities, fundraising is tied to ticket sales. Essentially, the better the location of the seats the more one is asked to donate. The more tickets one sells the more revenue is raised via donations.

5.2 Challenges to CRM implementation

5.2.1 Coordinating adoption

Although **technology service innovation** can result in many benefits, it comes with varied challenges. One of the central challenges of utilizing a **technology solution** within a university's athletic department involves the coordination of activities across athletic department and

1
2
3 university lines. Critical to a successful implementation is managing the socially complex
4
5 service ecosystem at the micro, meso, macro levels (Chandler and Vargo, 2011; Witell *et al.*,
6
7 2015). Most professional sports organizations (for-profits) have their service technology systems
8
9 directly tied into both the ticket sales and ticket operations departments. Intercollegiate athletic
10
11 departments, however, typically have separate reporting lines for ticket sales and ticket
12
13 operations. One administrator noted: “Coordination and reporting lines are always going to be a
14
15 problem in athletic departments where departments are siloed. I’m sure for-profit companies
16
17 have silo problems as well, but they have a profit motif as an incentive to come together. In
18
19 college athletics we don’t have this.” The culture within an organization can affect information
20
21 processes (Sinkula, 1994), impacting employees’ motivation to either move toward a new service
22
23 or stay committed to an existing system (Janssen, 2003).
24
25
26
27
28

29
30 Another challenge centers upon which department within athletics should be charged
31
32 with overseeing the service innovation. Sheth (2002) discusses the challenges of who is in
33
34 charge of a technology service innovation implementation, and Sok and O’Cass (2015)
35
36 emphasize the critical role of employee empowerment to the delivery of service innovation.
37
38 Typically, in intercollegiate athletics, an external relations office oversees any revenue that
39
40 relates to ticket sales. For a technology solution to work effectively, however, there must be a
41
42 good relationship between whoever is overseeing the CRM system and the ticket operations
43
44 department. At ASU, the technology service innovation was overseen by an Assistant Athletic
45
46 Director of Revenue Generation, who answered to the Senior Associate Athletic Director for
47
48 External Relations, who also oversaw ticket operations at the school. However, this was a
49
50 unique arrangement. Allocation of resources—human, technical, and organizational (Gadrey *et*
51
52 *al.*, 1995), combined with employee empowerment is a critical strategic focus in achieving
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **service quality through service innovation (Sok and O’Cass, 2015).** At most schools the ticket
4
5 operations department reports to finance/operations and ticket sales reports to external relations.
6
7

8 The final challenge to overcome involves the mindset of intercollegiate athletic
9
10 departments *against ticket sales*. This mindset may be a byproduct of several factors, including
11
12 that fact that universities generally cover any cost overruns by athletic departments. In addition,
13
14 revenue generation is seldom tied to university evaluation and reward systems (e.g., “not part of
15
16 my contract”). Therefore, there is often little incentive for athletic department personnel to
17
18 enhance revenue via ticket sales. **The implementation of a service innovation is complex as it**

19
20
21 **can affect employees’ roles and require significant changes in behavior (Sok and O’Cass, 2015).**

22
23
24 **Thus, one of the main risks of service innovation is the “business as usual” attitude—**

25
26
27 **isomorphism and dominate logics (Cousens and Slack, 2005; DiMaggio and Paul, 1983) of**

28
29 **internal stakeholders.** Currently, very few athletic departments have full-time dedicated sales
30
31 staffs that focus on increasing season ticket sales. Regarding this, one staff member said:

32
33
34 “Ticket sales is tough work that few employees in the athletic department want to be bothered
35
36 with. When it comes to getting promoted to an athletic director’s job, experiences with donors
37
38 and fundraising is critical. Ticket sales, not so much.”

39
40
41 Specifically, the coordination challenge ASU faced centered on how to integrate a
42
43 **technology service innovation** between ticket operation, ticket sales, and the alumni relations
44
45 departmental staffs. Each of these stakeholders operates independently, with different priorities,
46
47 structure, and operations. This independence is a major barrier to service innovation
48
49 implementation and efficiency. One mid-level marketing employee in the athletic department
50
51 noted:
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 A system needs to integrate with your ticketing (operation) system and donor system so
4 that your donor/tickets notes are all in one place. Very few systems do this and the ones
5 that do cost a fortune. In an ideal world, you would have three-way, bi-directional feeds
6 between your ticketing system, your donation system, and your CRM system. Otherwise,
7 you're left to manually import data from ticketing and donor software onto the CRM
8 system, and the reality is that doesn't often happen.

9
10 A major problem ASU faced involved integrating the athletic department's technology
11 solution with the university's alumni relations department. The relationship between these two
12 departments is critical, because the alumni relations department is the primary point of contact
13 between the university and many of its stakeholders. One athletic department employee noted
14 that "most athletic departments don't have access to alumni data directly. That information is
15 usually guarded like Ft. Knox." Another senior level athletic department employee stated that
16 "we are lucky here (ASU). . . . There is a good working relationship between all the departments
17 on campus, but I've been at other schools where that is not the case." **Employees engaged in the**
18 **delivery of the service innovation "operate in a boundary spanning role between the firm and its**
19 **customers and are intimately involved in the implementation of the firms' strategic initiatives,**
20 **-serving as either catalysts for or barriers to new service development or service improvements"**
21 **(Sok and O'Cass, 2015, p. 140).** In order for a service **innovation** to be successfully adopted
22 within a **bureaucratic** setting, it is imperative for all personnel within the organization to "buy in"
23 to the concept.

50 51 5.2.2 Obtaining commitment (buy-in)

52 Athletic department personnel knew that in order for **the service innovation** to be successful, they
53 needed a commitment from the various stakeholders, those both affected by and affecting the
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 change (adoption of a CRM strategy) (Freeman, 1984). A service innovation can be perceived
4 by internal stakeholders as either promoting their well-being or challenging it (Witell *et al.*,
5 2015). The stakeholders included the athletic director, season ticket holders, and coaches. This
6
7
8 proved difficult due at least in part to the general segmentation (both psychologically and
9
10 physically) of a college campus. As Payne and Frow (2005) note, “CRM can fail when a limited
11
12 number of employees are committed to the initiative; thus, employee engagement and change
13
14 management are essential issues in CRM implementation” (p.167). In essence, the athletic
15
16 department must strive to overcome dominant logics of action (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983)
17
18 concerning traditional marketing tactics in Division 1 athletics in order for an effective CRM
19
20 system to be implemented. For example, one ASU Assistant Athletic Director explained that
21
22 “CRM systems are vitally important but only if the athletic department is committed to giving
23
24 them the resources and support necessary to succeed.” Another athletic department
25
26 administrator said:

33
34 This commitment needs to come from both upper and lower management. It is essential
35
36 for both executives running the organization and the sales and service representatives to
37
38 buy in and understand the benefits of a CRM strategy. It will not be successful if only one
39
40 of these thinks it’s great but the other one doesn’t.

43
44 Another senior level executive added:

45
46 The process in deciding whether or not to invest in a CRM initiative is significant;
47
48 therefore it is essential that the organization as a whole has bought into the idea of
49
50 database marketing. Unlike some departments that operate autonomously, a CRM
51
52 strategy relies on numerous departments being able to communicate to be effective.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Thus, as can be seen, obtaining commitment within a higher education setting is
4 particularly challenging due to the decentralized nature of a college campus.
5
6

7
8 The ASU experience illustrates how the informal system among stakeholders produces
9 intrapreneurship—the act of behaving like an entrepreneur while working within a large
10 organization. An intrapreneur is an employee who enables organizational change by assuming or
11 being granted direct responsibility to create, discover, and implement new ideas, opportunities,
12 and innovations for the organization. Employee empowerment, a proactive orientation in which
13 employees expect that they can influence organizational activities and decisions (Spreitzer,
14 1995), enhances a firm's service innovation and service quality (Sok and O'Cass, 2015).
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 However, the process is guided by the management system and the culture of the institution
25 (Sundbo, 1997; 2000). According to institutional theory (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983), these
26 changes are very difficult to implement consistently over the long term, due to dominant logics
27 of action. These dominant logics need to be broken down, and then rebuilt with a new logics of
28 action (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983; Cousens and Slack, 2005). Sometimes, it is new actors,
29 such as an intrapreneur, who will be best positioned to lead and guide this change (DiMaggio
30 and Powell, 1983).
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 41 *5.2.3 Developing competency* 42

43 Although having a systematic way of sorting the data compiled by the athletic department would
44 be beneficial to ticket sales, a technology service innovation is effective only if stakeholders are
45 able to operate it. Professional sports organizations tend to be more advanced in their use of
46 service technologies than their college counterparts. This is a byproduct of complicated
47 university reporting lines and a lack of technical knowledge available in athletic departments. A
48 professional sports organization, which by definition is a for-profit firm, can hire a long-term
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 employee exclusively to oversee the **service innovation** initiative. However, an executive that
4
5 has worked in both college and professional sport organizations stated that hiring a long-term
6
7 employee to specifically oversee **implementation of a service technology** is more challenging
8
9 within an intercollegiate athletic department, where typically there is less latitude to pay salaries
10
11 needed to hire potential employees. The employee hired needs to be able to bridge the gap between
12
13 the technical aspects of the software and the sales-related function of the system. In addition, the
14
15 employee needs to have a key understanding of the main function of the system, which is to
16
17 increase sales and service. ASU officials were in agreement that if you invest in a system, you
18
19 must invest in a person (or department) to operate it. All institutions struggle with balancing
20
21 capacity—the amount of work the employees can do—with the amount of work the organization
22
23 needs to complete. As employee head count is always an issue within intercollegiate athletics
24
25 that could present a problem.
26
27
28
29
30

31
32 Dominant logics (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983) in intercollegiate athletics suggest that
33
34 within athletic departments there is often a reluctance to pay competitive salaries to non-
35
36 coaching personnel. This was true at ASU regarding the position overseeing **implementation for**
37
38 **the service technology, the CRM solution.** ASU relied on graduate assistants to handle many
39
40 aspects of the marketing function. By the time the graduate assistants figured out the intricacies
41
42 of their job their assistantships had expired. ASU learned that a CRM **technology solution** would
43
44 require a more dedicated, long-term level of service. Another area of concern is whether or not
45
46 an athletic department can get athletic department employees on board with the **service**
47
48 **innovation initiative**, and can the department marshal key stakeholders at the university to
49
50 support CRM? This was a constant struggle at ASU. One of the ways that ASU thought it could
51
52 support a CRM solution was to dedicate a website with original, exclusive content specifically
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 for ASU fans. This website would serve as an added value benefit to season ticket holders. If
4
5 value can be maximized for various stakeholder groups (athletic department employees, season
6
7 ticket holders and other fans, university administration), then implementation of a change
8
9 process such as adopting a service innovation may go more smoothly (Freeman, 1984).
10
11

12 13 *5.2.4 Estimating costs*

14
15 As with any new technology, cost is a critical issue. Implementing a technology solution can be
16
17 costly and requires skilled workers who can navigate the system. Implementing a service
18
19 innovation is a long and expensive process. Thus, costs need to be measured against the benefits
20
21 when deciding whether or not a service innovation is right for a particular organization. Since
22
23 ASU was the first intercollegiate athletic department to implement a CRM technology solution,
24
25 getting an estimated cost was difficult. However, athletic department personnel estimated that
26
27 there would be initial costs of \$20,000 and another \$25,000 to \$30,000 needed annually to
28
29 maintain the system (Berkowitz, 2004). The fact that ASU was the first athletic department to
30
31 utilize CRM could initially be viewed as a negative, but there was also an advantage—the
32
33 institution was able to negotiate a competitive price on the theory that if it was successful ASU
34
35 would recommend the system to other schools. One former ASU employee stated that “CRM
36
37 can’t be a flash in the pan idea because the benefits will not be reaped in the first year.” The
38
39 organization needs to allot time to decide on a system, implement that system, and reap the
40
41 rewards of this approach. Another ASU Assistant Athletic Director stated:
42
43
44
45
46
47

48
49 Organizations need to take their time and make sure that they have a good understanding
50
51 about the front end cost of CRM. Since we were the first athletic department to go to a
52
53 CRM system we didn’t have the benefit of calling around to other teams and asking how
54
55 they got started. The schools and teams that come after us have a huge advantage.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 It is critical for a sport organization to ascertain a way to estimate the cost of not only purchasing
4 a **service technology**, but also for the cost of implementation. As first movers, ASU was
5
6 challenged to determine all of the potential costs without being able to refer to other athletic
7
8 departments.
9
10

11 12 *5.2.5 Developing content*

13
14 Finally, ASU's athletic department staff noted that a CRM system is only as good as the content
15
16 provided and can take years to build. Content needs to be current and provide accurate, detailed
17
18 information so that users will want to consistently visit the website. Several athletic department
19
20 employees noted that this could be where ASU struggles regarding CRM. One mid-level athletic
21
22 department employee stated:
23
24

25
26
27 For CRM to be successful you need content that people want to view. Unfortunately,
28
29 at ASU [and other schools], that means dealing with the coaches from the individual
30
31 sports. You need their permission to interview players, assistant coaches, etc. That's
32
33 tough to get. Too often administrators are reluctant to push coaches to cooperate.
34
35

36
37 This strategy had mixed results. While fans liked having access to the exclusive Devil's
38
39 Domain, getting coaches and administrators to grant exclusive interviews proved problematic.
40
41 There was resistance to change on the part of ASU's coaches regarding making players and
42
43 themselves available for interviews and video segments. And, the athletic department and the
44
45 university were reluctant to provide exclusive information to just one media outlet. This in turn
46
47 made the Devil's Domain less exclusive. In this case, individuals may not have felt that the new
48
49 CRM system would result in direct benefit to them, or could even negatively impact their areas
50
51 of responsibility, thereby leading to resistance to the change (Welty Peachey and Bruening,
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 2011). Athletic departments are rooted in tradition, and these dominant logics are extremely
4
5 difficult to change (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983).
6
7

8 James Ward, Professor of Marketing in ASU's W. P. Carey School of Business,
9
10 cautioned that a CRM system's effectiveness depends a great deal on the size and quality of the
11 fan database, as well as on how the organization uses it (Knowledge, 2005). For instance, once a
12 database is built, organizations can be tempted to overuse the system for short-term sales gains
13 (Knowledge, 2005). This overuse often occurs by pushing too many offers and communications
14 to fans. One athletic department Marketing Manager noted:
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 This content needs to be up-to-date information that the end user can't get elsewhere.

23
24 This often leads to potential problems in college athletics where coaches typically control
25 access to players, etc. This can lead to problems with mainstream media that is also
26 interested in gaining access to real-time information.
27
28
29
30
31

32 The idea of owning the content that one creates is a unique concept for athletic
33 departments. For years the dominant logics and basic assumptions within college sports was that
34 universities put the product on the field, networks broadcasted the games, and the local news
35 covered the highlights. However, this model is increasingly coming under pressure as athletic
36 departments are realizing the value that they can harness by owning the content they produce,
37 essentially forming a new dominant logics of action regarding effective marketing strategies
38 (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983).
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 Slowly, some dominant logics regarding operations and administration of intercollegiate
49 athletics are eroding. Perhaps this is due to the limits of most athletic departments' revenue
50 models which consist of ticket sales, sponsorship sales, and television rights fees. In essence,
51 college athletic administrators are learning that all the "low hanging fruit has been picked". As
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the costs of sponsoring Division I athletics continue to escalate, athletic departments must
4
5 continue to strategize how new service innovations can raise revenue.
6
7

8 **6. Practical implications**

9
10 In referring back to our original research questions, the purpose in presenting ASU's experience
11 was to highlight the benefits and challenges associated with an organization's decision to adopt
12 service innovation. Isomorphic pressures (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983) on institutions and
13 stakeholders within the service ecosystem make resistance to change a norm. However,
14
15 "business as usual" is challenged by the external environment and growing consumer
16
17 expectations for the firm to create value through innovation (Lee *et al.*, 2009; Parris, 2013).
18
19

20
21 While there are limits on what can be learned from a single situation, this case study provides
22
23 insight into how an organization can overcome dominant logics to implement a service
24
25 innovation.
26
27

28 *6.1 Implementation steps for practitioners*

29
30
31
32 Even though service innovation is not a new concept (Miles, 1993) and technology plays a large
33
34 role in these innovations (Dabholkar, 2000; Drennan and McColl-Kennedy, 2003; Timmor and
35
36 Raymon, 2007; Wunderlich *et al.*, 2015) there is a paucity of research that helps service
37
38 marketers and management to ideate and pinpoint core management issues associated with
39
40 integrating technology in a service ecosystem (Guastafsson *et al.*, 2015). The case study
41
42 presented could, and indeed, should be used by any organization exploring the possibility of
43
44 adopting a service technology. Four recommendations are drawn from this study. Service
45
46 marketers and management should: 1) make a long-term commitment to service technology as an
47
48 analytical tool to engage customers in the organizational culture that allows customers to interact
49
50 with the organization, not just as a tool for short-term sales; 2) ensure that the organization has
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the technical capabilities to fully utilize the technology; 3) work hard to obtain commitments
4 from all stakeholder groups and realize that a commitment from the top does not necessarily
5 mean a commitment from everyone; and 4) pursue a carefully crafted series of steps to
6 implement a **service innovation**.

7
8
9
10
11
12
13 *Suggested implementation steps.* Successful adoption and implementation of a **service**
14 **innovation** requires that the organization go through a series of implementation steps, such as the
15 following:
16
17

- 18
19
20 1) *Select a preliminary champion for **the service innovation**.* Someone must be able to
21 articulate the potential benefits of **the service innovation**, implementation challenges, and
22 sell the idea to a broad array of stakeholders **at all levels of the service ecosystem:**
23 **individual (micro), organizational (meso), and societal (macro) (Chandler and Vargo,**
24 **2011; Witell et al., 2015).**
- 25
26
27 2) *Learn about **service innovations** and their potential benefits.* This knowledge is critical
28 for preparing the necessary persuasive proposal.
- 29
30
31 3) *Compare the **service innovation**'s potential benefits with desired improvements.*
32 Essentially, determine what the organization needs done and compare that with what the
33 **service innovation** can do.
- 34
35
36 4) *Develop a persuasive proposal, with emphasis on cost/benefits.* Without a solid proposal,
37 the necessary buy-in, commitments, and “backstopping” will not occur. A proposal
38 should be written that covers all details, and be able to be delivered in a short “elevator
39 speech.”
- 40
41
42 5) *Ensure executive sponsorship and commitment.* Successful implementation absolutely
43 must have support from higher levels of the organization, starting with the **Executive**
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Suite, all relevant Vice Presidents, Directors, and so on. An executive supporting the
4
5 project has the ability to help overcome various kinds of resistance.
6
7

- 8
9 6) *Hire a project manager and empower personnel.* Someone must be directly accountable,
10 and it may not be the initial champion. These employees must be technically proficient,
11 fan-focused, and relationship builders.
12
13 7) *Select implementation partner.* The implementation partner is the software vendor.
14
15 8) *Define the key performance indicators that will measure the project success.* The desired
16 outcomes should be formulated into key performance indicators so that service
17 technology performance can be better evaluated.
18
19 9) *Consider launching in phases.* Implementers should break down all of the activities
20 needed and phase them in over time.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 Following these suggested implementation steps to adopting a service technology will
31 help service organizations develop a proactive strategy—a game plan—to address the potential
32 pitfalls and barriers experienced by ASU.
33
34
35
36

37 **7. Theoretical implications: Conceptual model for likelihood of implementation success**

38 Integration of the findings led to a conceptual framework for describing the likelihood of a
39 service technology's successful implementation across a wide range of organizations based upon
40 the interaction of the strength of key actors, organizational situation perception, and
41 organizational commitment. This conceptual framework starts with the search for a service
42 innovation by key actors in the organization as a reflection of either the risk of losing revenue,
43 the opportunity to increase revenue and customer satisfaction, or both. Next, key actors engage,
44 assess, evaluate, and coordinate across the organization and all stakeholders to test assumptions
45 and gain buy-in. The model ends with the role of critical stakeholders and organizational
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 interactions that impact the likelihood of the implementation reaching one of three outcomes: 1)
4 full implementation, 2) partial implementation, and 3) failed implementation (See Figure 1).
5
6

7
8
9
10 Insert Figure 1 Here
11
12
13
14

15 7.1 Search for service innovation

16
17 Given organizational dominate logics of action and resistance to change, especially in a
18 bureaucratic setting, adoption of a service innovation is precipitated by the perception among key
19 stakeholders that there is a real risk of losing revenue and decreasing customer satisfaction, that
20 there is an opportunity to increase revenue and increase customer satisfaction, or ideally both.
21
22

23
24
25
26
27 “Business as usual” is challenged when the competitive environment requires a greater
28
29 responsiveness to the market and a stimulus for the firm to innovate (Lee *et al.*, 2009; Sok and
30
31 O’Cass, 2015). Risk plays a critical role in fostering change, which is one dimension of service
32
33 innovation that deserves more scholarly attention (Witell *et al.*, 2015).
34
35

36
37 Generally, change occurs slowly in bureaucratic organizations— resistance to change is
38 the norm (Welty Peachey and Bruening, 2011; Hutchinson and Bouchet, 2014). Thus,
39
40 significant pressure must be present to instigate the change process, and the identification and
41
42 formal recognition of the key actor(s). The erosion of *dominant logics* of action serves to
43
44 increase field-level change (Cousens and Slack, 2005). The key actors are the intrapreneurs who
45
46 have assumed or been tasked with improving the status quo, guided by the management system
47
48 and the culture of the institution (Sundbo, 1997; 2000). Employees can be driven to support or
49
50 resist the process of innovation (Janssen, 2003), and their perceived empowerment can
51
52 significantly influence organizational initiatives, such as adopting a service innovation (Sok and
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 O’Cass, 2015; Spreitzer, 1995). Lastly, the key actor(s) must search for, review, and select the
4
5
6 service innovation.

7 8 7.2 Assessment—Evaluation—Coordination

9
10 With the service innovation identified, the key actor(s) must engage across the formal and
11
12 informal power structures of the organization to test “whether, why, and how” to implement the
13
14 innovation (Markus and Tanis, 2000, p. 189). Formal power centers are represented by the
15
16 assorted departments, directors, and leaders from whom resources will be utilized in the
17
18 implementation and ongoing support of the service technology. Service innovation requires new
19
20 processes and ways of communicating across the entire service ecosystem, which impacts
21
22 stakeholders at the micro, meso, and macro levels (Chandler and Vargo, 2011; Witell *et al.*,
23
24 2015). The success of the key actor(s) in this process is dependent on the institutional power the
25
26 key actor has marshaled to engage the assorted stakeholders, and is why support from the top of
27
28 the organization is essential. The key actors will engage along formal communication channels
29
30 to: 1) validated the technology selection, 2) ensure the proposed solution fits the customer needs
31
32 of today, 3) evaluate the strategic differentiation possible through implementation of the
33
34 technology solution, and 4) assess the organization’s capabilities of delivering the proposed
35
36 solution. Failure to complete this formal validation process leaves the key actor(s) vulnerable to
37
38 implementing a solution that either fails to meet organizational needs, cannot be implemented by
39
40 the organization, and/or fails to meet customer needs.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 Simultaneously, the key actor(s) must engage the informal power centers to generate buy-
49
50 in among team members who will be responsible for actually carrying out the work. These
51
52 conversations and changes involve the risk factors which drove the organization to assess service
53
54 innovation, and a potential underlying concern among front-line team members is the perception
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 they have not/are not doing their job well. Thus, their potential concern about the new change is
4
5 that it could mean losing their jobs, which would likely generate resistance to the change.
6

7
8 Additionally, with the adoption of a **technology** solution, metrics associated with the
9
10 effectiveness of individual roles makes each team member's contribution more apparent to
11
12 everyone within the organization. For many, this visibility can feel like a threat or a direct
13
14 incursion into their autonomy. At this level, organizational power is not persuasive, and the key
15
16 actor(s) ability to engage with employees and influence them on a personal level will determine
17
18 the effectiveness of the **service innovation** implementation.
19
20

21
22 These actions will occur across the functional areas of the organization; however,
23
24 different functional areas will have greater or lesser direct involvement or individual employee
25
26 exposure than others. Specifically, the information technology and service teams will have the
27
28 greatest amount of work to complete as part of the **service innovation** and processes
29
30 implementation while the sales and marketing functions will have the most to gain. As a result,
31
32 the key actor(s) must leverage a combination of formal and informal engagement tools to bring
33
34 all functional areas into alignment.
35
36
37

38 *7.3 Critical stakeholder and organizational interactions*

39
40 The interplay between the strength of the key actor(s), organizational situation perception, and
41
42 organizational commitment to **service innovation** will dictate whether the **service innovation**
43
44 implementation is fully implemented. Strength of key actor(s) measures how well the key
45
46 actor(s) manage the formal and informal assessment, evaluation, and coordination tasks.
47
48

49
50 Organizational situation perception measures the perceived consequences/opportunities of non-
51
52 action/action. Consequences and opportunities result in varying implementation outcomes.
53
54

55
56 Organizations weigh consequences more heavily than opportunities—resulting in greater
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 organizational engagement (erode dominate logics) when risks are dire, than when opportunities
4 are great. The strength of the key actor(s) and organizational situation perception combine with
5
6 organization commitment to determine the implementation outcome.
7
8

9
10 Organizational commitment can best be represented by the resources allocated to the
11 implementation. Full dedication of resources and staff can successfully migrate small or large
12 complex historical data/legacy processes, whereas low dedication of resources and staff will not
13 be successful in migrating historical data/processes. A mitigating factor to resource commitment
14 is the value placed on historical data and/or legacy processes. If these data sets and processes are
15 perceived as low value, than an implementation can move forward without incorporating them,
16 freeing stretched resources to focus elsewhere. However, if they are perceived as mission critical
17 and resources are not allocated to manage their migration, this can lead to a failed
18 implementation.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 *7.4 Propositions for implementation success*

32 The combination of the strength of key actor(s), organizational situation perception, and
33 organizational commitment are utilized to propose 36 relevant propositions (see Figure 1).
34 Touted failure rates for service innovation implementation range from 55% (Rigby et al., 2002)
35 to 63% (Prezant, 2013). Although the conceptual framework aligns with these failure rates with
36 53% (19 out of the 36 propositions) failing, this is due to the framework being representative of
37 the probability based on the listed factors combining in practice. ASU's successful
38 implementation was a result of strong key actors, severe consequences of non-action paired with
39 significant opportunity to increase revenue and improve customer satisfaction, with full
40 dedication of resources, despite high perception of value for historical data and processes.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55 However, successful implementations are not the norm.
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

The conceptual framework can serve as a visual tool for practitioners to evaluate the likelihood of implementation success, as well as stimulate scholars to test the propositions advanced. The model extends the proposed duality of service innovation outcomes as either success or failure (Witell *et al.*, 2015) to acknowledge the likelihood of a partial implementation where marginal success is achieved. This study addresses gaps in the service innovation literature and can help service marketers and management navigate socially complex service ecosystems (Carlborg *et al.*, 2014) and their intersecting and overlapping multi-level effects (Chandler and Vargo, 2011) to pinpoint core management issues in integrating a new technology (Gustafson *et al.*, 2015) and overcome barriers to service innovation. The conceptual framework is a starting point to build knowledge regarding service innovation, as Hambrick (2007) states “theories are not ends in themselves” (p. 1346).

8. Conclusion

Implementing a service innovation has allowed companies in various industries to target specific customers within the marketplace who would be receptive to purchasing a designated product. The availability of data will continue to expand as a higher percentage of buying is transacted online. Subsequently, as service innovations technologies advance, data analytics will enable service marketers and managers to better define their consumers’ buying patterns. Understanding these buying patterns will be more important as service organizations learn how to track the spending patterns of consumers’ auxiliary revenue. Furthermore, as service innovations through technology advance to combine personalization and customer self-selection (i.e., customization), service organizations will be able to provide personalized-customized hybrid bundles (Parris, 2013) to their customers. Service organizations can utilize service innovations to move customers up the value chain, and generate revenue streams. However, the

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

success of the service innovation begins with developing a winning game plan for implementation.

Journal of Services Marketing

References

- Alshawi, S., Missi, F., & Irani, Z. (2011), "Organizational, technical and data quality factors in CRM adoption—SMEs perspective", *Industrial Marketing Management*, 40(3), pp. 376-383.
- Araujo, L., and Spring, M. (2006), "Services, products, and the institutional structure of production", *Industrial Marketing Management*, 35(7), pp. 797–805
- Arora, N., Dreze, X., Ghose, A., Hess, J., Iyengar, R., Jing, B., Joshi, Y., Kumar, V., Lurie, N., Neslin, S., Sajeesh, S., Su, M., Syam, N., Thomas, J. and Zhang, Z.J. (2008), "Putting one to-one marketing to work: Personalization, customization, and choice", *Marketing Letters*, 19(3-4), pp. 305-321.
- Barcet, A. (2010), "Innovation in services: A new paradigm and innovation model", In F. Gallouj and F. Djellal (Eds.), *The handbook of innovation and services: A multidisciplinary perspective*, Cheltenham, Edward Elgar, pp. 49–67.
- Bolton, R.N., and Lemon, K.N. (1999), "A dynamic model of customers' usage of services: Usage as an antecedent and consequence of satisfaction", *Journal of Marketing Research*, 30 (May), pp.171-186.
- Berg, B.L. (2009), *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences*, 7th ed. Boston: Allan and Bacon.
- Berkowitz, K. (2004), "Selling your sports", *Athletic Management*, 16(5), August/September
- Berry, L.L., Shankar, V., Parish, J.T., Cadwallader, S., and Dotzel, T. (2006), "Creating new markets through service innovation", *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 47(2), p.56.

- 1
2
3 Boulding, W., Staelin, R., Ehret, M., & Johnston, W. J. (2005), "A customer relationship
4 management roadmap: What is known, potential pitfalls, and where to go", *Journal of*
5
6 *Marketing*, 69(4), pp. 155-166.
7
8
9
- 10 Bull, C. (2003), "Strategic issues in customer relationship management (CRM) implementation",
11
12 *Business Process Management Journal*, 9(5), pp. 592-602.
13
14
- 15 Carlborg, P., Kindström, D., and Kowalkowski, C. (2014), "The evolution of service innovation
16 research: a critical review and synthesis", *The Service Industries Journal*, 34(5), pp. 373
17
18 398.
19
20
21
- 22 Chae, B.K. (2012), "An evolutionary framework for service innovation: Insights of complexity
23 theory for service science", *International Journal of Production Economics*, 135(2), pp.
24 813-822.
25
26
27
28
- 29 Chandler, J.D., and Vargo, S.L. (2011), "Contextualization and value-in-context: How context
30 frames exchange", *Marketing Theory*, 11(1), pp. 35-49.
31
32
33
- 34 Cheng, C.C., Chen, J.S., and Tai Tsou, H. (2012), "Market-creating service innovation:
35 verification and its associations with new service development and customer
36 involvement", *Journal of Services Marketing*, 26(6), pp. 444-457.
37
38
39
40
- 41 Cheng, C.C., and Krumwiede, D. (2012), "The role of service innovation in the market
42 orientation—new service performance linkage", *Technovation*, 32(7), pp. 487-497.
43
44
45
- 46 Christofi, M., Leonidou, E., Vrontis, D., Kitchen, P., and Papasolomou, I. (2015), "Innovation
47 and cause-related marketing success: a conceptual framework and propositions", *Journal*
48 *of Services Marketing*, 29(5), pp. 354-366.
49
50
51
52
- 53 Clarkson, M.B.E. (1995), "A stakeholder framework for analyzing and evaluating corporate
54 social performance", *Academy of Management Review*, 20(1), pp. 92-117.
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
- Coombs, R. and Miles, I. (2000), "Innovation, measurement and services: the new problematique", in *Innovation Systems in the Service Economy, Economics of Science, Technology, and Innovation*, Springer, US, pp. 85-103.
- Cousens, L., and Slack, T. (2005), "Field level change: The case for North American major league professional sport," *Journal of Sport Management*, 19, pp. 13-42.
- Dabholkar, P. A. (2000), "Technology in service delivery: Implications for self-service and service support", in SWARTZ, T.A. and IACOBUCCI, D. (Eds), *Handbook of Services Marketing and Management*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, pp. 103-110.
- Danjum, I., and Rasli, A. (2012), "Imperatives of service innovation and service quality for customer satisfaction: Perspective on higher education", *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 40, pp. 347-352.
- Dickie, J. (1999), "Why CRM projects fail", *CRM Journal*, 1(1) Available at: www.first-wave.net
- DiMaggio, P. J., and Powell, W. W. (1983), "The Iron Cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields", *American Sociological Review*, 48(2), pp. 147-160.
- Dominguez-Péry, C., Ageron, B., and Neubert, G. (2013), "A service science framework to enhance value creation in service innovation projects. An RFID case study", *International Journal of Production Economics*, 141(2), pp. 440-451.
- Drennan, J., and McColl-Kennedy, J.R. (2003), "The relationship between Internet use and perceived performance in retail and professional service firms", *Journal of Services Marketing*, 17(3), pp. 295-311.

- 1
2
3 Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989), "Building theories from case study research", *Academy of*
4
5 *Management Review*, 14(4), pp. 532-550.
6
7
8 Eisenhardt, K. M., and Graebner, M. E. (2007), "Theory building from cases: opportunities and
9
10 challenges", *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(1), pp. 25-32.
11
12
13 Erlandson, D. A. (1993), *Doing Naturalistic Inquiry: A Guide to Methods*. Sage.
14
15 Ettl, J.E., and Rosenthal, S.R. (2011), "Service versus manufacturing innovation", *Journal of*
16
17 *Product Innovation Management*, 28(2), pp. 285-299.
18
19
20 Fan, Y. W., and Ku, E. (2010), "Customer focus, service process fit and customer relationship
21
22 management profitability: The effect of knowledge sharing", *The Service Industries*
23
24 *Journal*, 30(2), pp. 203-223.
25
26
27 Fielding, N. G. and Fielding, J. L. (1986), *Linking Data: The Articulation of Qualitative and*
28
29 *Quantitative Methods in Social Research*, Sage, Beverly Hills, CA.
30
31
32 Fournier, S., and Mick, D.G. (1999), "Rediscovering satisfaction", *The Journal of Marketing*,
33
34 63(4), pp. 5-23.
35
36
37 Freeman, R. E. (1984), *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach*,
38
39 Pitman/Ballinger (Harper Collins), Boston, MA.
40
41
42 Freedman, J., and Sudoyo, R. (1999), "Technology's effect on customer service: Building
43
44 meaningful relationships through dialogue", *Integrated Marketing Communications*
45
46 *Research Journal*, 5(1), pp. 3-8.
47
48
49 Giga "Seven out of Ten CRM projects Fail", *Computing*, 16 August 2001, p.27.
50
51
52 Gourville, J.T. (2006), "Eager sellers, stony buyers", *Harvard Business Review*, 84(6), pp. 99-
53
54 106.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Gupta, S., & Lehmann, D. R. (2003), "Customers as assets", *Journal of Interactive Marketing*,
4
5
6
7 17(1), pp. 9-24.

8 Gupta, S., Lehmann, D. R., & Stuart, J. A. (2004), "Valuing customers", *Journal of Marketing*
9
10
11
12 *Research*, 41(1), pp. 7-18.

13 Gustafsson, A., Aksoy, L., Brady, M.K., McColl-Kennedy, J.R., Sirianni, N.J., Witell, L., and
14
15
16
17
18
19 Wuenderlich, N.V. (2015), "Conducting service research that matters", *Journal of*
20
21
22
23 *Services Marketing*, 29(6/7), pp. 425-429.

24 Hackett, G.P. (1990), "Investment in technology-the service sector sinkhole", *Sloan*
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
Management Review, 31(2), pp. 97-103.

Hambrick, D. C. (2005), "Upper echelon theory: Origin, twists and turns, and lessons learned",
In K. G. Smith & M. A. Hitt (Eds.), *Great Minds in Management: The Process of Theory*
Development, New York, Oxford, pp. 109-127.

Hutchinson, M., and Bouchet, A. (2014), "Organizational redirection in highly bureaucratic
environments: de-escalation of commitment among Division I athletic departments",
Journal of Sport Management, 28 (2), pp. 143-161.

Hutchinson, M., and Bouchet, A. (2014), "Achieving organizational de-escalation: Exit strategy
implementation among United States collegiate athletic departments", *Sport Management*
Review, 17(3), pp. 347-361.

Janssen, O. (2003), "Innovative behavior and job involvement at the price of conflict and less
satisfactory relations with co-workers", *Journal of Occupational and Organizational*
Psychology, 76(3), pp. 347-364.

- 1
2
3 Jayachandran, S., Sharma, S., Kaufman, P., & Raman, P. (2005), "The role of relational
4 information processes and technology use in customer relationship management",
5
6 *Journal of Marketing*, 69(4), pp. 177-192.
7
8
9
- 10 Kerr, S. (1975), "On the folly of rewarding A, while hoping for B", *Academy of Management*
11
12 *Journal*, 18, pp. 769-783.
13
14
- 15 Kim, W. (2002), "Personalization: Definition, status, and challenges ahead", *Journal of Object*
16
17 *Technology*, 1(1), pp. 29-40.
18
19
- 20 Kindström, D., Kowalkowski, C., and Sandberg, E. (2013), "Enabling service innovation: A
21
22 dynamic capabilities approach", *Journal of Business Research*, 66(8), pp. 1063-1073.
23
24
- 25 King, S. F., & Burgess, T. F. (2008), "Understanding success and failure in customer relationship
26
27 management", *Industrial Marketing Management*, 37(4), pp. 421-431.
28
29
- 30 Knowledge, (2005), "Teams cozy up to the fans with CRM's 'personalized marketing' strategy",
31
32 *Knowledge@W.P Carey*. Available at:
33
34 <http://knowledge.wpcarey.asu.edu/article.cfm?articleid=1163> (accessed 5 June 2012).
35
36
- 37 Kok, P., McKenna, T., and Brown, A. (2001), "A corporate social responsibility audit within a
38
39 quality management framework", *Journal of Business Ethics*, 31(4), pp. 285-297.
40
41
- 42 Ko, E., Kim, S. H., Kim, M., and Woo, J. Y. (2008), "Organizational characteristics and the
43
44 CRM adoption process", *Journal of Business Research*, 61(1), pp. 65-74.
45
46
- 47 Lee, R.P., Ginn, G.O. and Naylor, G. (2009), "The impact of network and environmental factors
48
49 on service innovativeness", *Journal of Services Marketing*, 23(6), pp. 397-406.
50
51
- 52 Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985), *Naturalistic Inquiry* (Vol. 75). Sage.
53
54
- 55 Lusch, R.F., and Nambisan, S. (2015), "Service innovation: A service-dominant logic
56
57 perspective", *MIS Quarterly*, 39(1), pp. 155-175.
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
- Lusch, R.F. and Vargo, S.L. (2014), *Service-Dominant Logic: Premises, Perspectives, Possibilities*. Cambridge, UK, Cambridge University Press.
- Markus, M. L., and Tanis, C. (2000), "The enterprise systems experience-from adoption to success", *Framing the domains of IT research: Glimpsing the future through the past*, 173, pp. 207-173.
- Merton, R. K. (1957), *Social Theory and Social Structure* (rev.). New York, NY, Simon and Schuster.
- Meuter, M.L., Ostrom, A.L., Roundtree, R.I., and Bitner, M.J. (2000), "Self-service technologies: understanding customer satisfaction with technology-based service encounters", *Journal of Marketing*, 64(3), pp. 50-64.
- Mick, D.G., and Fournier, S. (1998), "Paradoxes of technology: Consumer cognizance, emotions, and coping strategies", *Journal of Consumer Research*, 25(2), pp. 123-143.
- Miles, I. (1993), "Services in the new industrial economy", *Futures*, 25(6), pp. 653-672.
- Mills, C. W. (1951), *White Collar*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mizik, N., and Jacobson, R. (2003), "Trading off between value creation and value appropriation: The financial implications of shifts in strategic emphasis", *Journal of Marketing*, 67(1), pp. 63-76.
- Möller, K., Rajala, R., and Westerlund, M. (2008), "Service innovation myopia? A new recipe for client-provider value creation", *California Management Review*, 50(3), pp. 31-48.
- Nair, C., Chan, S., & Fang, X. (2007), "A case study of CRM adoption in Higher Education", In *Proceedings of the 2007 Information Resources Management Association International Conference*.

1
2
3 Neslin, S., and Shankar, V. (2009), "Key issues in multichannel customer management: Current
4
5 knowledge and future directions", *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 23(1), pp. 70-81.

6
7
8 Neuman, W.L. (2006), *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*, 6th
9
10 ed. Boston: Pearson Education.

11
12 Nijssen, E.J., Hillebrand, B., Vermeulen, P.A., and Kemp, R.G. (2006), "Exploring product and
13
14 service innovation similarities and differences", *International Journal of Research in*
15
16 *Marketing*, 23(3), pp. 241-251.

17
18
19 Oates, G. (2013), "Exploring the links between stakeholder type, and strategic response to
20
21 stakeholder and institutional demands in the public sector context", *International*
22
23 *Journal of Business and Management*, 8(21), pp. 50-62.

24
25
26 O'Brien, D., and Slack, T (2003), "An analysis of change in an organizational field: The
27
28 professionalization of English Rugby Union", *Journal of Sport Management*, 17(4), pp.
29
30 417-448.

31
32
33 O'Cass, A., Song, M., and Yuan, L. (2013), "Anatomy of service innovation: Introduction to the
34
35 special issue", *Journal of Business Research*, 66(8), pp. 1060-1062.

36
37
38 Parasuraman, A. (2000), "Technology Readiness Index (TRI) a multiple-item scale to measure
39
40 readiness to embrace new technologies", *Journal of Service Research*, 2(4), pp. 307-320.

41
42
43 Parris, D. L. (2013), "Conceptually meeting expectations of Generation Y by building
44
45 personalised-customised hybrid bundles to target action sports consumers", *International*
46
47 *Journal of Revenue Management*, 7(2), pp. 138-154.

48
49
50 Parvatiyar, A., and Sheth, J. (2001), "Customer relationship management: Emerging practice,
51
52 process and discipline", *Journal of Economic and Social Research*, 3(2), pp. 1-34.

53
54
55 Payne, A., and Frow, P. (2005), "A strategic framework for customer relationship management",
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

Journal of Marketing, 69(4), pp. 167-176.

Payne, A., & Frow, P. (2006), "Customer relationship management: from strategy to implementation", *Journal of Marketing Management*, 22(1-2), pp. 135-168.

Peppers, D., and Rogers, M. (1993), *The One to One Future: Building Relationships One Customer at a Time*, Currency Doubleday, New York, NY.

Pratt, M.G., Rockmann, K.W., and Kaufmann, J.B. (2006), "Constructing professional identity: The role of work and identity learning cycles in the customization of identity among medical residents", *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(2), pp. 235–262.

Prezant, J. (2013), "63% of CRM initiatives fail", available at: <http://www.dmnews.com/crm/63-of-crm-initiatives-fail/article/303470/> (accessed 14 November 2015).

Quazi, A. M. (2003), "Identifying the determinants of corporate manager's perceived social obligations", *Management Decision*, 41(9), pp. 822-831.

Rigby, D. K., Reichheld, F. F., & Schefter, P. (2002), "Avoid the four perils of CRM", *Harvard Business Review*, 80(2), pp. 101-109.

Rogers, E.M. (1962), *Diffusion of innovations*, The Free Press, New York, NY.

Rowley, J. (2005), "Customer relationship management through the Tesco Clubcard loyalty Scheme", *International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management*, 33(3), pp. 194-206.

Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (2011), *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data*. Sage.

Salunke, S., Weerawardena, J., and McColl-Kennedy, J.R. (2013), "Competing through service innovation: The role of bricolage and entrepreneurship in project-oriented firms", *Journal of Business Research*, 66(8), pp. 1085-1097.

- 1
2
3 Schiebel, W., and Pochtrager, S. (2003), "Corporate ethics as a factor for success: The
4
5 measurement instrument for the University of Agricultural Sciences", *Supply Chain*
6
7
8 *Management*, 8(2), pp. 116-121.
9
- 10 Schumpeter, J.A. (1934), "*The Theory of Economic Development: An Inquiry into Profits,*
11
12 *Capital, Credit, Interest, and the Business Cycle*", Harvard University Press, Cambridge,
13
14
15 MA.
16
- 17 Sheth, J. (2002), "The future of relationship marketing", *Journal of Services Marketing*, 16(7),
18
19 pp. 590-592.
20
21
- 22 Shaffer, G., and Zhang, Z. J. (2002), "Competitive one-to-one promotions", *Management*
23
24 *Science*, 48(9), pp. 1143-1160.
25
26
- 27 Sinkula, J. M. (1994), "Market information processing and organizational learning", *Journal*
28
29 *of Marketing*, pp. 35-45.
30
31
- 32 Slack, T., and Parent, M. M. (2006), *Understanding sport organizations: The application of*
33
34 *organization Theory*, Human Kinetics.
35
- 36 Snyder, H., Witell, L., Gustafsson, A., Fombelle, P., and Kristensson, P. (2016), "Identifying
37
38 categories of service innovation: a review and synthesis of the literature", *Journal of*
39
40 *Business Research*, 99(7), pp. 2401-2408
41
42
- 43 Sok, P. and O'Cass, A. (2015), "Achieving service quality through service innovation
44
45 exploration–exploitation: the critical role of employee empowerment and slack
46
47 resources", *Journal of Services Marketing*, 29(2), pp. 137-149.
48
49
- 50 Spreitzer, G.M. (1995), "Psychological empowerment in the workplace: Dimensions,
51
52 measurement, and validation", *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(5), pp. 1442-1465.
53
54
- 55 Srinivasan, R., & Moorman, C. (2005), "Strategic firm commitments and rewards for customer
56
57
58
59
60

- relationship management in online retailing”, *Journal of Marketing*, 69(4), pp. 193-200.
- Su, C.S. (2011), “The role of service innovation and customer experience in ethnic restaurants”, *The Service Industries Journal*, 31(3), pp. 425-440.
- Sundbo, J. (1997), “Management of innovation in services”, *Service Industries Journal*, 17(3), pp. 432-455.
- Sundbo, J. (2000), “Organization and innovation strategy in services”, *Services and the Knowledge-based economy. Continuum, London*, pp. 109-128.
- Timmor, Y., and Rymon, T. (2007), “To do or not to do: the dilemma of technology-based service improvement”, *Journal of Services Marketing*, 21(2), pp. 99-111.
- Tsiotsou, R. (2013), “Sport team loyalty: Integrating relationship marketing and a hierarchy of effects”, *Journal of Services Marketing*, 27(6), pp. 458-471.
- Welty Peachey, J., and Bruening, J. (2011), “An examination of environmental forces driving change and stakeholder responses in a Football championship subdivision athletic department”, *Sport Management Review*, 14(2), pp. 202-219.
- Witell, L., Anderson, L., Brodie, R.J., Colurcio, M., Edvardsson, B., Kristensson, P., Lervik Olsen, L., Sebastiani, R., and Wallin Andreassen, T. (2015), “Exploring dualities of service innovation: implications for service research”, *Journal of Services Marketing*, 29(6/7), pp. 436-441.
- Wünderlich, N.V., Heinonen, K., Ostrom, A.L., Patricio, L., Sousa, R., Voss, C., and Lemmink, J.G. (2015), ““Futurizing” smart service: implications for service researchers and managers”, *Journal of Services Marketing*, 29(6/7), pp. 442-447.
- Yin, R. K. (2003), *Applications of Case Study Research (Applied Social Research Methods)*, Series, 4th, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.

1
2
3 Zauberman, G. (2003), "Intertemporal dynamics of consumer lock-in", *Journal of Research*,
4
5 30(3), pp. 405-419.
6
7

8 Zeithaml, V.A., Berry, L.L., and Parasuraman, A. (1996), "The behavioral consequences of
9
10 service quality", *Journal of Marketing*, pp. 31-46.
11

12 Zhou, K.Z., Yim, C.K., and Tse, D.K. (2005), "The effects of strategic orientations on
13
14 technology-and market-based breakthrough innovations", *Journal of Marketing*, 69(2),
15
16 pp. 42-60.
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

Figure 1: Conceptual framework likelihood of a service technology's successful implementation

