



COMPETE THROUGH
{SERVICE}

RESEARCH PRIORITIES WORKSHOP

NOVEMBER 7, 2007



ASU W. P. CAREY
SCHOOL of BUSINESS
ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

the Center for Services
Leadership
FOCUS ON THE CUSTOMER



**COMPETE THROUGH SERVICE
RESEARCH PRIORITIES WORKSHOP**

NOVEMBER 7, 2007

**CENTER FOR SERVICES LEADERSHIP
W. P. CAREY SCHOOL OF BUSINESS
ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY**

Copyright ©

Center for Services Leadership
W. P. Carey School of Business
Arizona State University
Tempe, AZ 85287-4106
480-965-6201, www.wpcarey.asu.edu/csl



COMPETE THROUGH SERVICE RESEARCH PRIORITIES WORKSHOP

Table of Contents

Overview

Research Priorities by Topic

Appendix:

November 7, 2007 Workshop Agenda

List of Workshop Attendees



OVERVIEW

The Center for Services Leadership (CSL) is a research and executive education center within the W. P. Carey School of Business at Arizona State University (ASU) and an outreach arm from ASU to the business community and the global academic community.

The Center was founded in 1985 to pioneer the study of services when business schools were focusing primarily on products and manufacturing enterprises. Since then, the CSL has established itself as a globally recognized authority on how to compete strategically through the profitable use of services.

November 7-9 2007, CSL hosted the 18th annual Compete Through Service Symposium at the Phoenix Ritz Carlton. A by-invitation academic workshop, entitled the Services Research Priorities Workshop, preceded the Symposium. The Workshop celebrated the publication of the special issue of the Journal of Retailing on “Competing Through Service,” (2007, Volume 83, No. 1) co-edited by Ruth Bolton, Michael Levy, and Dhruv Grewal and sponsored by the CSL.

The Service Research Priorities Workshop opened with featured presentations by the Award Winner Presentations from the Journal of Retailing Special Issue on “Competing Through Service.” The topics and speakers were:

- The impact of code switching on service encounters, Stephanie Dellande, (Chapman University)
- Mobile service adoption from a consumer perspective, Mirella Kleijnen (Free University, The Netherlands)
- Treating defected customers as new customers may not be a good idea, Mert Tokman (James Madison University)
- The effect of customer service on retailers' shareholder wealth: the role of availability and reputation cues, Michael Wiles (Indiana University)

Attendees then participated in “think-tank” breakout sessions in which they used their combined experience and talents to develop a set of future research priorities for service researchers. This document is a summary of the discussion. As a springboard for the discussion, Mary Jo Bitner presented highlights from a forthcoming paper The Service Imperative, written by Bitner and Stephen W. Brown for the 50th Anniversary issue of Business Horizons in 2008.

This summary is organized around five break-out session topics, led by service research experts:

1. Co-creation and Co-Production, led by Robert Lusch (University of Arizona)



2. Customer Service Provider interactions, led by Mary Gilly (University of California, Irvine)
3. Service Design, led by Amy Ostrom (Arizona State University)
4. Customer Networks, led by Linda Price (University of Arizona)
5. The Role of Technology in Service Delivery, led by A. “Parsu” Parasuraman (University of Miami)

Naturally, the topic summaries cannot convey the intellectual excitement of the event. However, we hope they will stimulate future research on services topics.

Mary Jo Bitner
Ruth N. Bolton
Stephen Brown



Co-Creation and Co-Production: Research Priorities

Facilitator: Robert Lusch, University of Arizona

Participants: David Bowen, Thunderbird School of Global Management
Andrew Gallan, Arizona State University
Ronald Hess, College of William and Mary
Mike Hutt, Arizona State University
Cheryl Jarvis, Arizona State University
Mirella Kleijnen, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam
Stefan Michel, Thunderbird School of Global Management
Nancy Sirianni, Arizona State University

1. Do we agree on the meaning and distinction between co-production and co-creation?

- Co-creation is the over-arching system in which co-production is nested. All users of products (tangible and intangible) are co-creators of value. Whereas, co-production is optional and involves helping to produce the core product of the offering firm.
- A critical issue becomes what is not co-creation of value. Co-creation is such a broad construct it could possibly include virtually everything in society, not just the business topics we study. It is a topic of interest in the social sciences, but what can marketing contribute back to the social sciences in terms of a clear definition of the construct and its measurement?
- Co-production entails production of a core offering or a physical product
- Not only customers can be involved in co-production but also other members of the supply chain or value network.

2. Is it possible to develop a standardized measurement instrument for co-creation; similar to SERVQUAL?

- The system of co-creation must be relevant and manageable to be studied and measured (i.e., the family as a system of co-creation, etc.), but where do co-creation relationships begin? How does pricing work?
- Is co-creation so unique that we can't measure it?
 - Measurement should be possible if it is theoretical, the definition must be thought through, and must be reflective of the 'reality' of co-creation that has been discussed in the literature already.
 - We should take a dyadic perspective of co-creation, because according to the theoretical definition of co-creation, it takes at least two to co-create. Measuring the customer's behaviors or activities only would be a measure of customer participation, not true co-creation. Measuring the customer's views of value creation without also including the provider's view of creation would suffer from the same inconsistencies as measuring co-



production - a firm-centered, goods-centered view of value creation. That is, it would value one side of an exchange over the other.

- Possibly a composite measure because co-production is multidimensional
- Customers view solutions as relational processes, we should consider these as dimensions
 - See Tuli, Kohli & Bharadwaj (2007) “Rethinking Customer Solutions: From Product Bundles to Relational Processes,” *Journal of Marketing*, 71 (July), 1-17.
- In the past, customer satisfaction was the main dependent variable in services work and customer performance has been understudied – it is key in co-creation research.
 - Measurement of customer performance is difficult because of the complexity of customers. They differ in their roles and levels of sophistication.
- Possible measurement dimensions for co-creation include:
 - Benefits/results of co-creation, the technical quality realized
 - Behaviors/functional means involved in co-creation
 - From the customer’s point of view, these behavioral processes are different than those of the firm. The customer integrates these processes with his/her other resources and this is where the value is created in co-creation.
 - Customer motivation and effort– these are necessary for co-creation, but how do firms encourage these in customers?
 - Related idea: measure service provider frustration when consumers won’t provide necessary motivation or effort to co-create; this is important because it leads to service provider burn out and turnover
 - Related idea: Dark side implications of co-creation – what happens when consumers don’t want a relationship with the firm or don’t want to put forth effort?
 - Can consumers outsource the effort required in co-creation so that it remains an economic exchange only? (not a true behavioral exchange because they aren’t putting forth the effort themselves)
 - Customer engagement – who takes responsibility for integration of the customer’s other resources during co-creation?
 - It might be useful to take a look at theories and models of employee motivation, engagement and empowerment to help inform our theory building and practice on the customer side of those concepts relative to co-creation. This approach would be true to the interdisciplinary charge of how to build service science.
 - Refer to the literature on customer engagement and the cross-functionality model to study this, identity theory has also been helpful in this area
 - The dual roles of the consumer in co-creation: the consumer works in co-creation and subsequently consumes – a measurement system should study both consumer roles to be effective



3. What are important areas of study in open innovation models where co-production is so prevalent?

- Open innovation – to what extent is the organization open to customers' design?
 - This includes open source and open architecture models, but how do they translate to a service context?
 - Open architecture is perhaps too open, can it reduce value?
 - But how much can you share and still have value? A company identity?
 - With open source models, many customers find themselves “accidentally” involved in co-production because they make a change to the source or a suggestion to the firm for a change, but what is their role next? Many times the firm is unsure of this as well. How involved should customers be?
 - Finding out what customers want and then designing around their needs/wants is much like a traditional marketing research model where customers' thoughts, reactions and ideas are taken into consideration in design.
 - At what stage in design is customer input the most valuable?
- With open innovation models, this is a different kind of co-creation of value – this occurs on a level where we change how consumer resources are integrated
 - A common interface must be agreed upon. As long as people agree on this guideline then business can be conducted and co-creation of value can be achieved
 - So with open innovation, the interface is a key construct
 - Codes can help services/capabilities become transferable, but how do you engineer these?
 - Additionally, we can develop inter-operable kinds of systems

4. How can we achieve economies of scale in co-creation of value?

- This is a core problem of co-creation and IBM's main attraction to the area
- Pricing is difficult in co-creation
 - Net cash flows – who gets what piece of the economic gains?
 - How to extract positive cash flow from co-creation?
 - Are net cash flows an end or a resource in co-creation?
- It is difficult to make the gains in co-creation worthwhile, especially in the case of “one off” solutions, batch jobs or proprietary solutions
 - A possible solution: an intellectual property management system like IBM has, but their problem is that it is not widely used and the process to use it is complicated
 - Knowledge can't be digitized, it is a rich, textual experience that can be lost in post-engagement white papers, an informal, person-to-person solution-sharing network works better



Customer Service Provider Interactions: Research Priorities

Facilitator: Mary Gilly, University of California - Irvine

Participants: Jean-Charles Chebat, HEC Montreal
Stephanie Dellande, Chapman University
Dwayne Gremler, Bowling Green State University
Shruti Saxena, Arizona State University

1. How have new communications technologies affected what we know about information search for services?

- Communication technologies have changed the way social interactions happen. Environments that are ‘high tech-low touch’ are becoming commonplace wherein the technology is increasingly taking up the role of the traditional human interface.
- At the same time, as this high tech-low touch environment matures, we are witnessing an acceptance that technology is a tool and an enabler rather than a “new economy.”
- Usage and acceptance of communication technologies also reflect broader sociological changes wherein some customers are more accepting of technology while others are not. While it is clear that diverse customers exist, there is a need to clearly identify the new forms of segmentation.
- Research is also needed to capture changes on the employee front e.g., different metrics are needed in areas such as rewards systems (e.g., a Canadian firm captured employee performance and employee rewards via a 14 item scale which was added up to form a cumulative score. However, this did not take into account that while customers in more rural east Montreal preferred friendly service and customers in more urban downtown Montreal preferred fast service. This inability of the firm to tease out friendly service vs. fast service resulted in lack of employee motivation and customer satisfaction).

2. How has globalization affected what we know about service provider/ customer interactions?

- Firms, employees and customers are starting to recognize and acknowledge global differences—e.g., McDonald’s employees are generally trained to make eye contact with customers but since it is considered provocative in Russia, they had to adapt their employee training to be sensitive to such cultural differences.
- Local differences within a country are also being acknowledged in employee training and firm policies (e.g., while it is culturally acceptable for consumers to talk amongst themselves while waiting in service line in places such as Dallas, this is generally unacceptable in other places like California)
- At the same time differences exist among consumers and while firms have formalized norms about how employees should treat consumers, research is needed to understand the different ways (cues, bodily language, tone etc.) firm employees identify consumers and switch from being very friendly to ‘not-so-



- friendly' depending upon the nature of the consumer and/or context for the interaction.
- Research is also needed to examine the effect of the customer behavior on employees and firm outcomes (e.g., customer empathy toward employees in some situations).
 - It is also important to study what cues/ training firms can provide consumers to help them understand what is expected of them in any service environment (e.g., several pharmacies now have signs requesting customers not to talk on cell phones while interacting with pharmacists to ensure that the instructions are well understood).
 - Research is needed on just how much front line employees should be empowered in different industries to help them manage different consumers.
 - We are also witnessing changes in courtesy rules in the communication environment. For example while it was common to have cell phones ring during meetings until a few years ago (unless otherwise specified), interruptions due to cell phone ringing have substantially reduced in the recent past since it is generally perceived to be rude behavior. However, text messaging using Blackberries has become more prevalent. It is essential that firms understand these changes and identify new rules of interacting with consumers (e.g., as airplanes get technically equipped to allow consumers to use cell phones while in air, should airplane companies allow cell phone usage given that certain consumers may disturb their fellow passengers?).

3. What marketing metrics are relevant in assessing services effectiveness?

- It is important to assess different aspects of services which typically seem contrary to each other—e.g., personalization and speed; personalization/customization vs. standardization.
- There is also a need to examine whether we need new paradigms in defining and measuring services—e.g., customization and spontaneity as an integral part of services.
- To examine new paradigms, firms and academics will have to move away from the existing thinking and create a different reality, examples of which abound us (CISCO with their new forms of technologies allow video-conferences to happen in such a way that employees feel that they are in the same room; Secondlife.com is a raging success wherein brands like P&G's European hair care line, Shockwave are promoting, studying and evaluating their products in the virtual world).
- Metrics are also needed to examine different aspects of employees such as emotional intelligence and what employees bring to the service interaction, to ensure better firm recruitment, training and appraisals.
- Another construct that must be examined in detail is "quality of life" and how the firm-customer interaction changes people's lives (both consumers and employees). Metrics are also needed to operationalize and measure "quality of life" as a part of transformative service research initiatives



4. How does a lessening of information asymmetry between service customers and providers impact service outcomes such as quality, satisfaction and word-of-mouth?

- One of the biggest challenges being faced by firms today is making customers understand that while they may have information, it is the service providers that have expertise. It is this expertise that drives value for the service offering.
- Thus while information asymmetry has been reduced the expertise asymmetry remains—especially in certain sectors such as healthcare. However, there are other sectors such as automobile purchases and other infrequent service usage industries where the need for firm expertise is reduced shifting the power equation toward the consumers.
- There is a need for new typologies of service industries to examine different parameters such as
 - Services where the traditional customer-firm relationships hold and where these relationships have been transformed;
 - Different degrees of customer compliance needed in services
 - Level of impact of customer compliance (employee, firm, family, society, etc.)
 - Frequency of interaction between consumers and firms
- There is a need for transformative service research initiatives where marketing efforts to protect consumers are studied.
- It is also important to examine the dark side--the impact of non-compliance in services--to highlight the magnitude of its impact especially in fields such as healthcare.
- However, it is necessary to recognize the challenges in such studies, which include the need for data that is longitudinal in nature and constructs that are difficult to operationalize; all of which results in studies that are difficult to publish.
- Research is also needed regarding the often discussed issue--how do firms cope when the “expert” employee leaves and takes with him/her the customers that are loyal to the employee rather than the firm?

Research Imperatives:

1. Services typology must be revisited (dimensions include information asymmetry; compliance; frequency of interaction)
2. Newer metrics are needed (e.g., personalization vs. standardization; speed, consistency vs. personalization).
3. Consumers with lots of information but lacking expertise.
4. Research initiatives are needed on topics that are difficult to study and operationalize but are important to the ‘quality of life’ of customers their family members, employees/the firm, and society.
5. It is important to recognize that many services research topics cannot be studied like goods research (e.g., no scanner bar codes exist on services) and thereby new research methods are needed to capture and study customer/ service provider interactions that ensure realism in the data.



Service Design: Research Priorities

Facilitator: Amy Ostrom, Arizona State University

Participants: Iana Nelson, Arizona State University
Aleda Roth, Clemson University
Vicki Smith-Daniels, Arizona State University
Michael Wiles, Indiana University

1. Definitions, Processes and Methodologies

- There is a need for definitions and conceptual framing on the scope of service innovation, including process definitions and decision-making processes, as well as strong methodological thought pieces to form a foundation that other researchers can use as a starting point
- Trans-disciplinary language – there is a need to break discipline silos and provide common definitions, so that the terms that are employed are understood and used by all service design researchers, regardless of discipline

2. Research Areas of Interest in Service Design

- Conceptual Framing of Service Innovation
- Methodological Pieces
- Financial Implications of Service Design
- Innovation in Service and Innovation in Business Models
- Differences between radical service innovations and incremental service innovations
- Service Design Successes and Failures
- Systematic Approaches to Service Innovation – Mechanisms that Underlie the Processes
- Addressing Service Design Issues from the Customer's Perspective
- Understanding How Service Innovations Occur Over Time (Longitudinal Studies)
- Service Innovation in Customer –to-Customer Settings
- Service Innovation in Technology-Mediated Services
- Service Design Approach for Co-Produced Services
- User-Centered Design



Customer Networks: Research Priorities

Facilitator: Linda Price, University of Arizona

Participants: Ruth Bolton, Arizona State University
Paul Fombelle, Arizona State University
Hope Schau, University of Arizona
James Ward, Arizona State University
Matthew O'Brien, Bradley University

Proposition 1: Customers form relationships with networks of individuals, not just individuals.

Proposition 2: Organizations also form relationships with a network of other firms: a constellation of solution providers.

1. Two NPR Stories sparked the conversation.

- Medical care has been transformed by the amount of information that consumers (patients) have and share.
 - Friends no longer send flowers but information and knowledge
 - Doctors at first tried to limit patient's access to outside information (internet, friends, etc...). This may have been an attempt to maintain power or control.
 - How can doctors actually use and leverage information networks?
 - Customer-Customer networks can become resources.
 - Can we connect others with the same disease
 - help find cures
 - social support/relationships
- Online Gaming: 50-60% of people who play online games know the people they are playing with. These games have created networks of meaningful relationships
 - World of Warcraft: very little interaction with company itself, but a very complex set of relationships with others.
 - Clans form with clear sets of social sanctions and norms
 - Play because of the game or because it is a meeting ground? Service as the 3rd place (Rosenbaum 2006)

2. What Keeps You Up at Night?

- People have many life roles or a portfolio of roles. How does one juggle work, personal, and relationship goals? (Becker 1965)
 - Organizations/services become more valued if you can have a place that brings several aspects of your life together.
 - Can one reinforce multiple roles/identities through one service provider?
 - Can one create a synergistic affect?



- Goal congruence may be very important- whether is economic, social, moral.....
- Each social network has set of norms that optimize group goals
- Example: Where can I go that both my husband and daughter will come together and have fun?
 - Important to coordinate relationship goals
 -
- Many organizations are also part of a constellation/portfolio of services
 - Organization must recognize others in this portfolio and create partnerships to ensure portfolio creates satisfying experience
 - Can service facilitate relationship goals?
 - Can firms tap into already established networks?
 - Example: A great family vacation relies on multiple service providers
- I hate Starbucks but.....
 - Valued organizations create uniquely indispensable social networks. If you leave organization you lose part of your social identity. (Ashforth and Mael 1989)
 - Is the network portable? Other alternatives for social capital? How dependent are you? Is it easy to recreate network elsewhere?
- Code Switching
 - Does community create its own lingo?
 - Members can create and share meaning

3. Key Challenges

- How to design services that create networks that helps individuals achieve social/relational/network goals.
- How to design metrics not based on individual behaviors but based on network dynamics.
- Implications for organizations that are part of a constellation of solutions
 - Partnering/distribution
- Heterogeneity of networks. Important for organization to identify what the important network goals of their customers are? What are their relational goals?

4. Research Questions/Gaps

- What are the dimensions of an effective network?
- Typology of social support
- Mechanisms and mediating/moderating factors?
- Customer share of heart?



Technology's Role in Service Delivery: Research Priorities

Facilitator: A. "Parsu" Parasuraman


Participants: Haluk Demirkan, Arizona State University
Shankar Ganesan, University of Arizona
Naomi Mandel, Arizona State University
Martin Mende, Arizona State University
Elliot Rabinovich, Arizona State University
Mert Tokman, James Madison University
Nancy Wuenderlich, Technical University of Munich, Germany

Research Opportunity 1: The Need to Align the Firms' and the Customers' Perspectives on Service Technology:

Although both perspectives clearly are not independent from each other, there seems to be a gap between firms' and customers' perspectives on service technologies. The majority of the firm-oriented literature focuses on organizations aiming to cut costs (i.e., increase productivity or efficiency) by means of technology. Despite a noteworthy literature on customers' technology-adoption, however, service research has not properly examined how service consumers assess/experience the efficiency and effectiveness of service technologies. Therefore, it should be promising to examine potential disconnects between the firm's and customer's perspectives vis-à-vis technology efficiency/effectiveness. Exploring this (and similar) issues will be challenging as our discussion also identified a lack of appropriate **metrics/measures** to properly capture efficiency and/or effectiveness of the focal service technology. Various additional (and related) research opportunities might include the following: What are dominant motivations/goals of customers as they use service technologies? How can established theoretical frameworks help us better understand the customers' technology experience? For instance, from an attribution theory perspective, might consumers believe that firms use technologies to "increase the distance" between themselves and their customers (e.g., when customers are discouraged to interact with employees and encouraged to use self-service technologies instead)? Which distinctive customer attributions are triggered by positive and negative technology encounters (e.g., extending the work on attribution and self-service technologies done by Bendapudi and Leone 2003). Finally, we might need to discuss (and measure) the broader implications of service technologies, for instance, examining their impact on consumers' well-being and 'quality of life'.

Research Opportunity 2 - Understanding Technologies' Impact on Customer Loyalty

Technology provides customers with a huge amount of information on competitive alternatives (e.g., priceline.com) Do we really understand the impact this information resource has on customer loyalty? Research is needed to understand and model the extent, nature and forms of this impact. Of equal interest is understanding whether or not customers switch based on information they receive about superior alternatives, as well as the contingency factors (e.g., customer, context and product/service characteristics) that might influence customer proneness to switch. The implications of such



understanding for adapting extant models of customer loyalty (that have primarily been developed in non-technology context) are also worth exploring.

Research Opportunity 3: Contingency-Based Research

There is a need for contingency-based frameworks: Two promising research contingencies are (a) traits of technology users and (b) technology service contexts.

(a) Traits: Previous research has identified important moderators such as, for instance, perceived control/need for control (e.g, Oyedele and Simpson 2007), the need for human interaction (Dabholkar and Bagozzi 2002), and technology readiness (Parasuraman 2000). Can we synthesize these characterizations into meaningful segmentation frameworks that help us manage service relationships in light of distinct customer profiles?

(b) Contexts: It is also important to understand the relevance/role of technology in various service contexts. Promising research avenues include (for instance) an examination of relational vs. transactional settings or routine vs. non-routine services. Further, while the existing literature on B-2-C settings is important and valuable, there is an urgent need for research focusing on service technologies in B-2-B settings. A starting point for such research is to examine (a) how adoption of technologies by business customers might be different and (b) why? Also needed is research on understanding the role of service technologies in C-2-C as well as C-2-B settings (e.g., in terms of generation and disseminating customer feedback). Another important research domain identified by our group pertains to **service recovery** situations in the context of technology-based service delivery. Illustrative issues worthy of research in this domain include the following:

- We need to distinguish technology as a tool for service recovery efforts as well as a source of service failure. We might reflect on whether a service failure can flip technology-related preferences consumers have in a non-failure service process -- for instance, might consumers who typically prefer technology-based interactions display a need/desire for low tech-high touch interactions in service recovery settings?
- Related research could analyze if customers experience a technology “breakdown” when there actually is *no* objective breakdown (that is, the technology works as intended/designed), perhaps because some technologies are not fully understood by the ‘average’ consumer. Are there disconnects between technology designers’ and customers’ perspectives? (This relates back to the aforementioned issue of how firms need to better understand customers’ perspective on technologies to manage potential conflicts in terms of technology effectiveness and efficiency).

A final (big) step in the realm of contingency-inspired research is to merge both user-trait and context-related contingencies into an overarching framework that helps to understand whether (different) customers desire different types of service technology (e.g., simple vs. complex technologies) in different settings and, if so, why?



Research Opportunity 4: Technology Management in Service Networks

A recent and important development in modern service markets is that firms provide technology-based services collaboratively, i.e., as service networks. This development has various research implications. For instance, what are holistic management approaches for technology-based service networks? In case of service failures in technology networks, who gets blamed by the customers (vs. who is supposed to be blamed)? Do consumers have a tendency to simply blame the last point of contact or the service providers in whose service ‘factory’ the technology-breakdown happens? How do these incidents (distinctively) impact the customers’ images of and relationships with the service network members?

Research Opportunity 5: Extending Knowledge on the Different Roles of Employees and Customers as Technology Users/Adopters

An employee-firm relationship functions based on a different set of rules, norms, standards and values compared to the (typical) customer-firm relationship. Does the service literature properly account for the distinct circumstances under which service employees versus customers adopt and use service technologies? Research is needed to shed light on whether the rich insights gained from employee-contexts necessarily hold in customer settings (as illustrated by the various necessary modifications of the employee-inspired Technology Acceptance Model in a customer setting). Related research on service employees as technology adopters/users might also examine if – at times - technology failures can be explained by a lack of technology-related internal marketing. Addressing research questions like this one can also lead to an understanding on how employees’ and customers’ technology attitudes might be interrelated. For instance: Can service employees’ technology-related experiences influence customers’ views about the firm’s service technologies? Can employee technology readiness be a predictor of customers’ technology readiness and successful customer technology adoption?

Research Opportunity 6: Extending JR-Special Issue

Inspired by one of the JR-Special Issue presentations (Michael Wiles), the group suggested that it would be worthwhile to examine the short-term and long-term effects of a firm’s technology announcements. For instance, do such announcements impact a firm’s value (e.g., revenues, profitability, share price)?

Research Opportunity 7: Linking Service Blueprinting and Traditional Product Innovation Techniques

Service innovation is different from traditional approaches to product innovation. Besides, service innovation might be one of the most inspiring future research arenas in services. In this context, researchers might examine whether and how existing approaches of service design/innovation - such as service blueprinting - and ‘classical’ product development approaches can be fruitfully integrated.



APPENDIX

Compete Through Service Research Priorities Workshop Agenda November 7, 2007

8 – 8:30am	Breakfast
8:30 – 9am	Introductions Welcome to CSL/Symposium” – Stephen W. Brown, CSL Workshop Overview – Ruth N. Bolton, ASU
9 – 10:30am	Award Winner Presentations <i>from Journal of Retailing</i> Special Issue on “Competing Through Service” <i>The impact of code switching on service encounters</i> , Stephanie Dellande, (Chapman University) <i>Mobile service adoption from a consumer perspective</i> , Mirella Kleijnen (Free University, The Netherlands) <i>Treating defected customers as new customers may not be a good idea</i> , Mert Tokman (James Madison University) <i>The effect of customer service on retailers' shareholder wealth: the role of availability and reputation cues</i> , Michael Wiles (Indiana University)
10:30 – 10:45am	Break
10:45 – 11am	“The Service Imperative” - Mary Jo Bitner, CSL
11 – 12pm	Emerging Issues in Services Research and Practice Break Out Session Facilitators: Mary Gilly (University of California, Irvine) Bob Lusch (University of Arizona) Amy Ostrom (Arizona State University) A. Parasuraman (University of Miami) Linda Price (University of Arizona)
12 – 12:45pm	Lunch and Report Out
12:45	Transportation to Symposium



Workshop Attendees

Mary Jo Bitner	Arizona State University
Ruth Bolton	Arizona State University
David Bowen	Thunderbird School of Global Management
Steve Brown	Arizona State University
Jean-Charles Chebat	HEC Montréal
Stephanie Dellande	Chapman University
Haluk Demirkan	Arizona State University
Michael Denning	Arizona State University
Paul Fombelle	Arizona State University
Andrew Gallan	Arizona State University
Shankar Ganesan	University of Arizona
Mary Gilly	University of California, Irvine
Dwayne Gremler	Bowling Green State University
Ronald Hess	College of William and Mary
Mike Hutt	Arizona State University
Cheryl Jarvis	Arizona State University
Mirella Kleijnen	Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam
Kate Loveland	Arizona State University
Robert Lusch	University of Arizona
Naomi Mandel	Arizona State University
Martin Mende	Arizona State University
Stefan Michel	Thunderbird School of Global Management
Iana Nelson	Arizona State University
Matthew O'Brien	Bradley University
Amy Ostrom	Arizona State University
Parsu Parasuraman	University of Miami
Linda Price	University of Arizona
Elliot Rabinovich	Arizona State University
Aleda Roth	Clemson University
Shruti Saxena	Arizona State University
Hope Schau	University of Arizona
Nancy Sirianni	Arizona State University
Vicki Smith-Daniels	Arizona State University
Mert Tokman	University of Alabama
Jim Ward	Arizona State University
Michael Wiles	Indiana University