



Vaasan yliopisto  
UNIVERSITY OF VAASA

**OSUVA** Open  
Science

This is a self-archived – parallel published version of this article in the publication archive of the University of Vaasa. It might differ from the original.

## The relationship between digitalization and servitization : the role of servitization in capturing the financial potential of digitalization

**Author(s):** Kohtamäki, Marko; Parida, Vinit; Patel, Pankaj C.; Gebauerd, Heiko

**Title:** The relationship between digitalization and servitization : the role of servitization in capturing the financial potential of digitalization

**Year:** 2020

**Version:** Accepted manuscript

**Copyright** ©2019 Elsevier Inc. This manuscript version is made available under the Creative Commons Attribution–NonCommercial–NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY–NC–ND 4.0) license, <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

### **Please cite the original version:**

Kohtamäki, M., Parida, V., Patel, P.C., & Gebauerd, H., (2020). The relationship between digitalization and servitization : the role of servitization in capturing the financial potential of digitalization. *Technological forecasting and social change* 151(February). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2019.119804>

**THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DIGITALIZATION AND SERVICITIZATION: THE  
ROLE OF SERVICITIZATION IN CAPTURING THE FINANCIAL POTENTIAL OF  
DIGITALIZATION**

**Marko Kohtamäki**

Professor / Adjunct Professor  
University of Vaasa, School of Management /  
University of South-Eastern Norway, USN Business School  
PO Box 700, FI-65101 Vaasa, Finland  
[marko.kohtamaki@uva.fi](mailto:marko.kohtamaki@uva.fi)

**Vinit Parida\***

Professor  
Entrepreneurship and Innovation  
Luleå University of Technology  
+46735435074  
[vinit.parida@ltu.se](mailto:vinit.parida@ltu.se);

**Pankaj C. Patel**

Professor of Management  
Villanova School of Business  
Villanova University  
800 E. Lancaster Avenue  
Villanova, PA 19085, USA  
Tel: (610) 519-4317  
Email: [pankaj.patel@villanova.edu](mailto:pankaj.patel@villanova.edu)  
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4934-8166>

**Heiko Gebauer**

Professor  
Department of Management and Engineering  
Linköping University  
[heiko.gebauer@liu.se](mailto:heiko.gebauer@liu.se)

**Research Highlights**

- Digitalization of manufacturing without servitization capabilities can lead to negative returns, i.e. digitalization paradox
- Digital servitization provides the logic according to which profiting from digitalization requires servitization in manufacturing firms. Thus, Servitization is needed in carving out a positive financial performance from digitalization.

- The study provides insights into the complex relationship between digitalization and financial performance, emphasizing the value of servitization in driving financial performance from digitalization, a call for digital servitization
- The results also emphasize the need for high investments on digitalization.
- Further studies are needed on the complex relationship between digitalization, servitization and company performance.

## **ABSTRACT**

The present study investigates the interaction between digitalization and servitization on financial performance of manufacturing companies. We challenge the simple linear assumption between digitalization and financial performance with a sample of 131 manufacturing firms and hypothesize a nonlinear U-shaped interaction between digitalization and servitization on financial performance. From low to moderate levels of digitalization, the interaction effect between digitalization and high servitization on company financial performance is negative and significant. From moderate to high levels of digitalization, the interplay between digitalization and high servitization becomes positive and significant, improving company financial performance. The results demonstrate the need for effective interplay between digitalization and servitization, a call for digital servitization. Without the interplay, a manufacturing company may face the paradox of digitalization. For managers of manufacturing companies, the study provides insights into the complex relationship between digitalization and financial performance, emphasizing the value of servitization in driving financial performance from digitalization. Thus, the study demonstrates how manufacturing companies can become data-driven by advancing servitization.

**Keywords:** Digital servitization business model, product-service systems (PSS), smart manufacturing (Industry 4.0), digitalization capabilities, Internet of Things (IOT), Customer Relationship Management (CRM)

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Digital servitization is an emerging concept that highlights the interplay between two central constructs in manufacturing and technology companies: digitalization and servitization (Coreynen, Matthyssens, & Van Bockhaven, 2016; Kohtamäki, Parida, Oghazi, Gebauer, & Baines, 2019; Opresnik & Taisch, 2015; Paschou, Adrodegari, Perona, Saccani; 2017). Digitalization is claimed to have a profound effect on companies, up and downstream operations, networks and ecosystems (Iansiti & Lakhani, 2014; Jacobides, Cennamo, & Gawer, 2018; Porter & Heppelmann, 2014). Companies such as Rolls-Royce, Kone, Caterpillar or Hilti have been moving towards digital business models, data-based value chains, and more flexible organizational forms, even towards more agile operations. This transition towards digitalization, smart products, Internet-of-Things, and the industrial internet has been shifting the capability requirements for manufacturing companies that reportedly struggle in this transition (Iansiti & Lakhani, 2014; Porter & Heppelmann, 2015). In addition to shifting the capability requirements, digitalization may also generate profound changes in interfirm transactions (e.g., blockchain) (Tapscott & Tapscott, 2017), power relationships between companies (e.g., Über and car companies) (Cusumano, 2015), and strategic identities (e.g., manufacturing firms becoming more like software companies) (Kohtamäki, Parida, et al., 2019; Lenka, Parida, Sjödin, & Wincent, 2018). However, manufacturing firms are continuously investing in remote diagnostics, data warehouses, analytics and various methods of data visualization (Grubic, 2018; Jonsson, Holmström, & Lyytinen, 2009; Tilson, Lyytinen, & Sørensen, 2010) to facilitate improved decision making, business intelligence and business development with limited evidence towards real profit gains (Talaoui, 2018).

While it seems evident that digitalization-related capabilities have a profound impact on manufacturing companies, and the positive effect of digitalization seems self-evident, the nature of the effect remains unclear, and serious concerns about the productivity of such IT investments have been raised over time (Brynjolfsson, 1993; Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2012). The existing empirical research does not provide sufficient evidence on the relationship between digitalization and company financial performance and potential moderating factors. Digitalization alone may be insufficient to generate positive financial performance effects in manufacturing companies, and thus, the companies need portfolios of advanced services to ensure value capturing from digitalization to achieve positive performance effects.

Studies on servitization to date link digital transition and servitization under the umbrella of digital servitization (Coreynen, Matthyssens, & Van Bockhaven, 2017; Parida, Sjödin, Wincent, & Kohtamäki, 2014a; Vendrell-Herrero, Bustinza, Parry, & Georgantzis, 2017) or alternatively integrate products, services and software under the concept of servitization (Baines & Lightfoot, 2014; Cenamor, Sjödin, & Parida, 2017). Although the servitization research has acknowledged the role of software, studies have lacked the necessary emphasis on the role of digitalization (Coreynen et al., 2017; Ng & Wakenshaw, 2017; Rymaszewska, Helo, & Gunasekaran, 2017). Only recently have we witnessed the conceptualization of digital servitization, with an emphasis on the interplay between digitalization and servitization. However, although the concept of digital servitization has been defined and established, we have very little empirical data on the interplay between its two major dimensions, digitalization and servitization (Kohtamäki, Parida, et al., 2019). As such, the literature on servitization and product-service systems taps into digital transition by studying how companies utilize remote diagnostics to create value for customers

(Brax & Jonsson, 2009; Frank, Mendes, Ayala, & Ghezzi, 2019; Grubic, 2018; Hasselblatt, Huikkola, Kohtamäki, & Nickell, 2018). Studies also analyze the role of smart products, or smart solutions, in digital transition (Kowalkowski, Kindström, & Gebauer, 2013; Lerch & Gotsch, 2015; Töytäri et al., 2018). Studies highlight the challenge that manufacturing companies face in value appropriation from investments in digitalization. The digital transformation disrupts all industries, and perhaps for the previously most stable industries, these disruptions emerging from the digital transformation, i.e., blockchain, artificial intelligence, and IoT are the most difficult. The current evidence reveals that manufacturing companies collect vast amounts of market data but often lack the necessary capabilities to utilize and capitalize the data (Ehret & Wirtz, 2017; Hasselblatt et al., 2018). All too often, investments in digitalization and big data analytics are made without a clear strategy of how the big data provided by customers would be used to generate greater new business opportunities and improved financial performance for companies. The key to unlocking the value of digitalization may be embedded in advanced services, operational services, and outcome-based services that enable the companies to capture the benefits of digitalization (Kohtamäki, Parida, et al., 2019; Visnjic, Neely & Jovannovic, 2018). Eventually, the value from the investments in digitalization should be captured through the business model, such the digital servitization business model. Very little research up to date exists on the relation between digitalization and servitization in the context of manufacturing companies.

The purpose of the study is to answer the calls for research on the financial impact of digitalization and the enabling role of servitization. By doing so, we extend the existing literature on digital servitization (Kohtamäki, Parida, et al., 2019; Sklyar, Kowalkowski, Tronvoll, &

Sörhammar, 2019) by examining the moderating role of servitization on the nonlinear (inverted U-shaped) relationship between digitalization and financial performance. We hypothesize that servitization mitigates the nonlinear and negative effect of digitalization on a company's financial performance. For managers in manufacturing firms, the study provides needed evidence on the complex relationship between digital servitization and financial performance, emphasizing the important role of servitization in the journey towards digitalization. To carve out the value from a higher level of digitalization, the manufacturer should invest in servitization capabilities, particularly on service offerings that support value capture from digitalization.

## **2. THEORY AND HYPOTHESES**

### *2.1. Digitalization and performance*

Digitalization is transforming ecosystems and value chains of manufacturing companies, changing how these companies interact across the firm boundaries upstream or downstream, improving supplier and customer interactions, enhancing data acquisition, warehousing, big data analytics, and implementation (Porter & Heppelmann, 2015). Digitalization is not only potentially providing new business opportunities but also increasing efficiencies. Digitalization of manufacturing companies and industries is discussed from different perspectives, using terms such as Internet-of-Things, Industrial Internet, Industry 4.0, digitization, and digitalization, among others. In the present study, we use the term digitalization by which we refer *to digitalization of downstream activities at the front end of the manufacturing company's value chain, where the company is collecting, warehousing, analyzing, and using market data for improved value co-creation and appropriation.*

Investments in digitalization can be vast, with challenging implementation and integration with various subsystems, e.g., various decision-making platforms and visualization tools. IT investments should improve data usage in the front end, but eventually at the back end, improving value chain activities as a whole (Porter, 2001; Porter & Heppelmann, 2015). Manufacturing companies invest in digitalization to enable the reduction of data processing costs by automatizing data collection, warehousing and diagnostics (Wamba et al., 2017). The improved use of data digitalization improves customer engagement and the development of product-service systems, including improvements in remote diagnostics and fleet management (Jayachandran, Sharma, Kaufman, & Raman, 2005). Although some evidence regarding the direct relationship between digitalization and performance has been presented, the relationship is complex, possibly nonlinear and moderated by other variables (Kohtamäki, Parida, et al., 2019). Such a view is in line with scholars who have previously demonstrated the opposite evidence claiming that the value of IT may be questionable (Brynjolfsson, 1993; Brynjolfsson & Hitt, 1998; Kettinger, Grover, Guha, & Segars, 1994), at least if not supported by complementary capabilities (Kim, Cavusgil, & Calantone, 2005). Hence, despite the significant financial potential, companies struggle regarding value appropriation from digitalization. Mere technological investments are not sufficient, but often the greatest challenges are faced regarding the organizational practices and capabilities – practices that have to be developed to take advantage of the systems.

Thus, why manufacturers struggle with capturing value from digitalization and what we know about this issue, is revisited as a digitalization paradox (Brynjolfsson, 1993; Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2012). For the digitalization paradox to occur, we find three main requirements. First,



vast investments in digitalization require significant increases in value creation and value appropriation to generate the needed returns. With easy-to-implement systems, the integration of product-service-software systems has become simpler and less costly, with systems adding simpler features that increase customer value, such as early warning signals for maintenance, automatically generated reports, or easy-to-document customer leads. With easy-to-implement and integrated systems, investments in digitalization may produce direct financial impact, as these investments focus on critical features related to improved financial performance, customer service and solution delivery that directly improve the effectiveness of customer co-creation and efficiency of solution delivery, thus also decreasing transaction costs (Sjödin, Parida, & Kohtamäki, 2019). With more complex systems, investments in new digital architectures require significant integration and, hence, often lengthy, heavy and costly integration projects (Haynes & Thompson, 2000; Landauer, 1995). Moreover, some IT systems may have overengineered features that are costly but do not produce significant business value to the servitized manufacturer or the manufacturer's customer. However, ex ante, the value of large-scale IT systems is very difficult to determine.

Second, the implementation of digitalization requires investments in other capabilities as well. For instance, investments in digitalization of value chains are known to shift routines and capabilities throughout the organization, from solutions sales to project management, R&D, supply chain and solution delivery, not forgetting the support activities, such as finance and human resource management (Kim et al., 2005; Kohtamäki, Parida, et al., 2019; Porter, 2001; Porter & Heppelmann, 2015). With easier systems to implement, the lower investment costs enable decreased payback times enabling higher financial performance. Instead of moderate to

high levels, investments in digitalization require significant reconfiguring of value chain activities (Porter, 2001), creating costly and radical organizational transformation projects that are difficult to implement. Development of organizational structures and new operational processes requires development work, new capabilities and activities, increasing implementation costs and project payback times and leading to missing returns (Wamba et al., 2017).

Third, the implementation of new digital systems requires development of human skills and competencies at the micro level – personnel need to learn how to use the new systems, which requires training, coaching and development of new IT skills (Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2012; Wamba et al., 2017). Sociomaterial perspectives have emerged in information systems and organization science, emphasizing the interplay and entanglement between material technologies and social practices, the interaction between material technologies and human actors. In these instances, at the microlevel, the usability of the IT systems and interfaces is emphasized, as well as the competence development and other microlevel social factors (Orlikowski, 2007; Orlikowski & Scott, 2018). When the complexity of socio-technical systems increases, so do the requirements regarding competence development. From the competence perspective, the implementation of new systems is costly and obviously takes time, increasing investment payback times.

Thus, manufacturers seem to struggle with the deployment of digitalization. They implement investments but struggle with creating and appropriating value from the investments. Mere technological investments are insufficient to generate financial performance, but complementary capabilities, such as servitization, are required.

## *2.2. Digital servitization*

By servitization, current research refers to the transition from products to services and integrated solutions (Lightfoot, Baines, & Smart, 2013). Servitization is often described as a transition, where the company moves from providing pure stand-alone products and add-on services, to maintenance contracts, operational services, and finally, to outcome- or performance-based offerings (Huikkola & Kohtamäki, 2018; Kowalkowski, Windahl, Kindström, & Gebauer, 2015; Parida, Sjödin, Wincent, & Kohtamäki, 2014b; Visnjic, Jovanovic, Neely, & Engwall, 2017). This transition has been coined as servitization, service infusion, service transition, or service transformation (Kowalkowski, Gebauer, & Oliva, 2017; Rabetino, Harmsen, Kohtamäki, & Sihvonen, 2018; Raddats, Kowalkowski, Benedittini, Burton, & Gebauer, 2019). As such, servitization is a fully-fledged transformation from product to service orientation, which often manifests in integrated solutions, including customized products, and advanced services (Windahl & Lakemond, 2010). In time, products and services are integrated by using the product lifecycle (Arto, Valtakoski & Kärki, 2015; Rabetino, Kohtamäki, Lehtonen, & Kostama, 2015). Servitization studies tend to see the Internet-of-Things, digitalization and IT capabilities inherently related to servitization – full-fledged servitization would not exist without effective data acquisition, warehousing, analytics and utilization, through a variety of sensors, data warehouses, big data analytics and user interfaces, that enable servicing the installed base effectively, or increasing customer value by improving the usage of the product fleet being operated (Ardolino et al., 2018; Kohtamäki, Parida, et al., 2019; Martín-Peña, Díaz-Garrido, & Sánchez-López, 2018). The concept of servitization is considered to capture the digital technologies related to IoT and remote monitoring, and studies have also begun using the concept of digital servitization to underline the role of digital service technologies. Studies

highlight the interplay between digitalization and servitization (Martín-Peña, Sánchez-López, & Díaz-Garrido, 2019; Opresnik & Taisch, 2015; Rymaszewska et al., 2017). Digitalization enables new innovative services, business models and pricing models, which are required to capture the value from digitalization (Adrodegari, Pashou, & Saccani, 2017; Kohtamäki, Parida, et al., 2019).

Servitization studies tend to operationalize the level of servitization through offerings (Gebauer, Edvardsson, Gustafsson, & Witell, 2010; Partanen, Kohtamäki, Parida, & Wincent, 2017). Scope of service offerings provide a good reflection of the company's servitization, the industrial services bundled with customized products. The scope of service offerings is particularly relevant for companies and researchers, as it captures and communicates the company's solutions strategy, business model and the tactic utilized to create and appropriate value from the company's innovations or capabilities (Lenka, Parida, & Wincent, 2017; Rabetino et al., 2015; Töytäri, Rajala, & Alejandro, 2015), such as digitalization. Moreover, as service offerings vary less than products, service offerings can be used to measure servitization by a rather general scale capturing the scope of service offerings, in other words, broadness of the offering (Partanen et al., 2017). Hence, the scope of service offerings provides a valuable tool for researchers to capture the key component of servitization. During the evolution of the servitization literature, studies have developed multiple different measurement methods, which tend to use service offerings as a reflection of the level of servitization (Coreynen, Matthyssens, & Gebauer, 2018; Kohtamäki, Partanen, Parida, & Wincent, 2013). Studies have found that service offerings tend to reflect the quality and level of servitization reasonably well. The solution provider's strategy materializes into offerings and hence can be used to measure servitization (Gebauer, Fischer, &

Fleisch, 2010; Kohtamäki et al., 2013). For instance, Gebauer, Edvardsson, Gustafsson, and Witell (2010) utilized an interesting combination of dimensions to measure service strategy, such as number, broadness, and emphasis on services, regarding different service strategies. Kohtamäki et al. (2013) used the scope of industrial service offerings to study the effect of servitization on sales growth, finding a nonlinear direct effect and the positive moderating role of network capabilities. Using a reflective measurement model, Kohtamäki et al. (2013) measured three dimensions of service offerings, maintenance services, R&D services, and customer services. In the use of the reflective measurement model, the items and dimensions reflect the latent construct, which in their case were service offerings or, in other words, servitization strategies. Later, Partanen et al. (2017) validated the measurement method for the scope of industrial services in a customer relationship – their argument was that offerings are often co-created in customer relationship, and hence, customer relationship can be used as a unit of analysis in servitization research (Kohtamäki & Partanen, 2016). Using a typological approach, Forkmann, Henneberg, Witell, and Kindström (2017) also focused on servitization at the relational level. Recently, Coreynen, Matthyssens, and Gebauer (2018) developed their tool to measure servitization capacity by three main dimensions and multiple subdimensions. Their main dimensions were service development, service deployment, and service orientation. In the present study, we utilize the concept of servitization, considering that the scope of advanced service offerings, such as operational services, R&D services, and consulting services, provide a good reflection of the level of servitization.

Digital servitization is defined as a transition process from pure products and add-on services to smart product-service systems. Product-service systems also include software, as defined by the


first servitization study (Vandermerwe & Rada, 1988). As stated, in the context of servitization and product-service systems, a variety of concepts have been utilized, such as digital servitization, smart product-service systems, digitalized product-service systems, smart products, the Internet-of-Things, and the Industrial Internet, with various definitions. For a long time, studies have seen the opportunities that digitalization is generating for solution provider companies, suggesting that these industrial firms need to develop capabilities to seize these opportunities (Huikkola & Kohtamäki, 2017). As such, digital technologies should provide a platform for improved interactions with customers, enhancing data acquisition, data warehousing, big data analytics, and implementation (Cenamor et al., 2017; Eloranta & Turunen, 2016; Jayachandran et al., 2005). Hence, digital technologies should directly enhance the rationale of decision making by providing richer and more reliable data and analytics for decision making about customers and their fleets (Grubic & Jennions, 2018; Hasselblatt et al., 2018; Jonsson et al., 2009). Digital technologies should therefore integrate effectively with fleet management, providing opportunities for improved product lifecycle management, servicing the lifecycle, optimizing the fleet, consulting the customer regarding new investments, and even selling outcome-based services instead of products (Visnjic et al., 2018). For instance, Visnjic et al. (2018: 46) argue that companies “*evolve the market strategy from provision of pure products to provision of services and then outcomes, in order to achieve a better fit with customer needs and to grow their service businesses.*” However, this requires an evolving capacity to understand customers and develop capabilities to find better fit between customer needs and offerings.

In this study, digital servitization is viewed as the use of digital technologies to create and appropriate value from product-service offerings; thus, digital servitization is understood as the

interplay between digitalization and servitization. Servitization is required to appropriate value from digitalization for higher financial performance of a manufacturing company. Hence, for the present study, service scope provides a vehicle to study the interaction between digitalization and servitization, e.g., to what extent the interaction between digitalization and servitization explains the financial performance of manufacturing companies.

### 2.3. Research model and hypotheses

Figure 1 describes the research model, main constructs and hypotheses, and the controlled relationships for company financial performance. In the study, the direct effect of six variables was controlled, such as the direct effects from digitalization and servitization, and then the effects of four control variables such as total assets, cash flow, number of patents, and company size. The following sections provide the rationale for our nomological model, the main hypothesis arguing for the nonlinear interaction effect of digitalization and servitization on company financial performance.



**Figure 1.** The research model.

### **The interaction between digitalization and servitization**

In transition to digital servitization, solution providers develop their service offerings to strengthen their scope of product-service systems, integrated solutions, or hybrid offerings (Rabetino et al., 2015). As such, digitalization provides capable technologies in the form of hardware and software to be utilized for improved value creation and appropriation (Kohtamäki, Parida, et al., 2019; Porter, 2001; Wamba et al., 2017). In deployment of advanced digital technologies related to data acquisition, warehousing, analytics and implementation, technological capabilities are insufficient to generate financial value, and instead, sufficient organizational resources and processes are required to create and appropriate value from digitalization (Cenamor et al., 2017; Coreynen et al., 2017; Kim et al., 2005). Here, we hypothesize how servitization, reflected by the scope of service offerings, enables coping with the so-called digitalization paradox.

The scope of service offerings provides a reflection of the company's servitization strategy and business model (Partanen et al., 2017). The company business model defines how the company intends to create and capture value in the markets – the strategy is required to create and appropriate value from the company systems, processes, resources and competencies. A broader scope of offering provides a larger capacity to customize solutions offerings for higher prices. However, the offerings should fit with the technological capabilities (Frank et al., 2019). Often the modularity of solutions plays a key role (Hellström, 2014; Kohtamäki, Rabetino & Einola, 2018; Rajala, Brax, Virtanen & Salonen, 2019). The potential value of digitalization has to be captured by the solutions offerings sold for industrial customers. These offerings embed smart solutions and services, such as R&D, optimization, operational and performance services. “*Only*



*when the information technology is embedded into organizational processes (e.g., strategy making), it is expected to offer sustainable benefit”* (Kim et al., 2005: 170). Thus, to carve out the value from IT investments, those investments have to align with the company strategy and business model (Kohtamäki, Parida, et al., 2019).

The present study suggests that servitization could mitigate the value leakage related to higher levels of digitalization. We hypothesize a nonlinear, U-shaped effect of the interaction between digitalization and servitization on company performance. From a low to moderate level of digitalization, we hypothesize a negative effect of the interaction between digitalization and servitization. Despite the increases in digitalization, servitization, from a low to moderate level of digitalization, fails to produce a positive financial impact. At a low level of digitalization, there is not much value to be captured, and hence, the overly expensive development-related capabilities, without the necessary strategic emphasis of digitalization in the company strategy, may consume the potential value. Instead, value capture requires extensive commitment to the development of digitalization and servitization to generate financial value from their interplay (Kohtamäki, Parida, et al., 2019). At higher levels of digitalization, servitization enables improved capacity to appropriate value from digitalization, as value can be appropriated by effective pricing of advanced services. Moreover, a broader portfolio of services (e.g., service scope) increases the opportunity to serve diverse customer segments that may benefit from highly customized offerings, while digitalization provides the backbone to implement this with lower coordination and implementation costs. Thus, increases in digitalization should be supported by the servitization and scope of service offerings to capture the financial benefits of digitalization, i.e., data acquisition, analytics and implementation.

To have a significant positive influence on financial performance, the manufacturing company has to invest enough in digitalization and servitization, so-called digital servitization. Significant investments in digital servitization bring these new innovations to the forefront, making digital servitization visible for R&D, solution sales and delivery. Similar findings have been previously made in servitization research, where researchers have found that the visibility of service offerings plays a significant role in their performance impact – thus, a company should pay enough attention to strategic initiatives to make an impact (Fang, Palmatier, & Steenkamp, 2008; Kohtamäki et al., 2013). Particularly strong strategic emphasis is needed in a traditional manufacturing firm operating in a relatively conservative sector; this has been demonstrated by some high-profile CEOs arguing how manufacturing companies should become software firms (Porter & Heppelmann, 2015) – a transition that has recently been coined as digital servitization, where not only the services but the software in particular play a significant role. Thus, to implement digital servitization to an extent that it has an impact on company financial performance, a significant strategic emphasis is required.

Finally, the combination of digitalization and servitization may provide the best configuration for operating in a complex and uncertain “joint sphere” of customized, integrated solutions, where a broad scope of offerings enables such customization to fully explore and utilize the value of digitalization (Kohtamäki, Henneberg, Martinez, Kimita & Gebauer, 2019). This is related to the explorative innovation stage of digitalization, where manufacturing companies are significantly expanding software competencies but also continue to explore how to exploit the software capabilities for improved value creation and capture. In this context, servitization provides

valuable support when carving out the value from investments in digitalization. Companies geared towards servitization may be more capable of adapting new digital technologies. Thus, servitization capabilities enable manufacturing companies to avoid the learning trap created by the digitalization paradox.

H1: Servitization mitigates the inverted U-shaped relationship between digitalization and company financial performance. Moderate to high levels of digitalization combined with high levels of servitization lead to increased financial performance in manufacturing companies.

## **METHODS**

### **Sample and data collection**

To test for the proposed hypotheses, a survey study targeting Swedish manufacturing firms was conducted in 2014, and the outcome data (i.e., performance data) were derived from archival sources to lower common method bias. Digitalization and servitization literature has predominantly focused on understanding the transformation of manufacturing firms from product providers to digital service providers (Baines et al., 2009; Parida et al., 2014). Therefore, consistent with prior studies, we investigate the influence of digitalization on firm performance moderated by the servitization of manufacturing firms. The survey focused on four manufacturing sectors: machine and equipment manufacturing, computer, electronics, and optical product manufacturing, electrical equipment, and telecommunications manufacturing.

Two additional filters were used to identify the sampling frame. First, our sample consists of manufacturing companies with more than 10 employees to ensure that we exclude microenterprises (as per European Union (EU) definition) as they have limited ability to offer

portfolio for services (Kohtamäki et al., 2013). Second, to ensure that the firms have ongoing business activity, firms with sales lower than USD 150,000 were excluded. Based on these criteria, we randomly selected 1,000 manufacturing companies from the ORBIS database.

A self-administered questionnaire was developed for a postal survey study. The variables and items in the questionnaire were adapted from prior studies and then translated and back-translated (English–Swedish–English) by two researchers to confirm translation equivalence (Brislin, 1970). Moreover, the questionnaire was pretested with four managers from manufacturing companies and four academic experts. Their feedback was incorporated into the questionnaire. To encourage participation, the survey was complemented with a cover letter motivating the purpose of the study. In the cover letter, participants were assured anonymity. The survey was addressed to the CEO or a manager who was responsible for digitalization-based business development (due to their ability to provide a holistic overview of the firms' operations related to the application of digitalization technologies for business growth) (Cenamor et al., 2017). After the initial mailing, the researchers sent two additional reminder letters to the sample firms.

In total, we received 135 responses from the firms in which we excluded four questionnaires that were incomplete. This final dataset with all the relevant variable information led to 131 responses, representing a 13% response rate. We regard the response rate to be satisfactory given the increased data collection efforts from researchers and similar responses in other management surveys (Baruch, 1999).

## **Variables**

### *Dependent variable*

To complement the survey data, we collated data on the dependent variable through secondary sources. However, as the existing activities related to digitalization and service scope can have a lag effect on firm performance, we focused on three-year returns on assets (ROA) growth (2013-2015). Prior studies have called for inclusion of secondary financial data to be used in servitization and digitalization literatures (Kohtamäki et al., 2013).

#### *Independent variable*

The measurement for digitalization is based on a refined version of the scale from digital technology use for customer relationship management (Jayachandran et al., 2005). Digitalization holds the promise to generate higher value for customers by improving the extent of interaction and communication based on the use of digital technologies for relationship management. We used four subconstructs: digital sales support (e.g., “we use digital technologies for providing the sales force in the field with customer information”) ( $\alpha = 0.84$ ), digital service support (e.g., “we use digital technologies for providing customized service scripts for the particular customer’s needs”) ( $\alpha = 0.70$ ), digital analysis support (e.g., “we use digital technologies for providing forecasts on customer preferences and needs”) ( $\alpha = 0.79$ ), and data integration and access support (e.g., “we use digital technologies for integrating customer information from different contact points”) ( $\alpha = 0.75$ ). Each item was measured using a 7-point scale from “1” = strongly disagree to “7” = strongly agree. The Cronbach’s alpha for the combined construct was 0.89.

#### *Moderating variable*

The scale for service scope is a reflective 22-item scale based on prior studies (Kohtamäki et al., 2013; Partanen et al., 2017). The proposed scale maps and measures the extent to which practical

services are offered to the customer based on a seven-point scale (1= not at all to 7 = to a large extent). The scale includes three subconstructs: operational services (e.g., “managing the customer's maintenance function, service for operating the product sold to the customer, providing performance guarantees and others”) ( $\alpha = 0.76$ ), R&D services (e.g., “prototype design, prototype development and testing, analyses of product’s manufacturability, and others”) ( $\alpha = 0.91$ ), and consulting services (“technical consulting, process oriented consulting, product user training, and others”) ( $\alpha = 0.78$ ). Here, we focused on measuring the advanced components of servitization, as most companies provide basic services to some extent, and therefore the basic services do not vary between companies (e.g., “most of the companies provide some form of warranty and spare parts”). Hence, to study the level of servitization, it is more relevant to measure advanced services.

### *Control variables*

We controlled for the effect of alternate variables on the proposed relationships. We controlled for company size (number of employees), total assets, cash flow, and number of patents. Company size controls for firm stability as more stable firms would commit to increasing employee base. The cash flow and total assets can influence the relationship of digitalization and higher performance. Finally, property rights protection can give certain firms a favorable advantage as they can mitigate competition and lock-in customers, leading to higher performance; therefore, we controlled for the number of patents granted. Finally, we also controlled for the direct effect of servitization, which we used as the moderating variable. Servitization has been found to affect company performance (Kohtamäki, Hakala, Partanen, Parida, & Wincent, 2015).

**Table 1.** Measurement constructs and items.

<b>MAIN CONSTRUCTS AND ITEMS</b>
<b>Servitization (Based on Kohtamäki et al., 2013; see also Partanen et al., 2017)</b>
<b><i>Operational services (OS)</i></b>
1 Managing the customer's maintenance function
2 Service for operating the product sold to the customer
3 Service for operating customer's process
4 Outsourcing services
5 Providing performance guarantees
6 Selling performance without selling the actual product
<b><i>R&amp;D services (RD)</i></b>
1 Prototype design
2 Prototype development and testing
3 Product design
4 Product development
5 Analyses of product's manufacturability
6 Factory design
7 Process design
8 R&D-oriented support
9 Feasibility studies
<b><i>Consulting services (CS)</i></b>
1 Technical consulting
2 Business consulting
3 Process-oriented consulting
4 Product user training
5 Product demonstration
6 Customer seminars
7 Writing informal material
<b>Digitalization (based on Jayachandran et al. 2005)</b>
<b>Digitalization of sales support -</b>
1 Provides sales force in the field with customer information
2 Provides sales force in the field with competitor information
3 Assigns leads and prospects to appropriate sales personnel
4 Provides customized offers to salespeople in the field
<b>Digitalization of service support</b>
1 Allows customer support personnel to access data on customer interactions with all functional areas
2 Provides customers access to a knowledge base of solutions to commonly occurring problems (e.g., frequently asked questions)
3 Schedules and tracks service delivery
4 Is able to customize service scripts to the particular customers' needs
<b>Digital analysis support</b>
1 Enables assessment of channel performance
2 Enables forecast of customer preferences
3 Measures customer loyalty
4 Calculates customer lifetime value
5 Enables assessment of service profitability
<b>Data integration and access support</b>
1 Combines customer transaction data with external source data
2 Integrates customer information from different contact points (e.g., mail, telephone, Web, fax)
3 Allows relevant employees access to unified consumer data
<b>DEPENDENT VARIABLE</b>
Financial performance (ROA growth 2013-2015)
<b>CONTROL VARIABLES</b>
Number of employees
Total assets
Number of patents
Cash flow

## RESULTS

The analyses begin by presenting a correlation matrix. Then, the results of the regression analyses with the plotted curves are presented. Table 1 demonstrates the number of cases, the mean, minimum and maximum values, standard deviation, and correlations between the measures.

**Table 2.** Correlation matrix.

Variable	Mean	SD	Min	Max	1	2	3	4	5	6
1 Company financial performance	0.088	9.327	-35.726	96.759	1					
2 Digital servitization	3.325	1.350	1	6.083	0.0468	1				
3 Servitization	2.984	1.095	1	5.392	0.0083	0.6102*	1			
4 Number of employees	208.741	842.342	15	9036.000	-0.0049	0.2160*	0.1437	1		
5 Total assets	766239.700	3182556.000	12643	25600000	-0.0037	0.2617*	0.2097*	0.8130*	1	
6 Number of patents	19.985	136.046	0	1530.000	-0.0013	0.1566	0.0956	0.9330*	0.6905*	1
7 Cash flow	8.167	15.293	-64.414	99.546	0.0601	0.2570*	0.1984*	0.064	0.2944*	0.0075

\*p<0.05 (two-tailed)

The proposed research model was tested using multilevel specification, *mixed* routine in Stata 14.0. Industry membership is the level 2 variable. The model was analyzed against the ROA growth variable for 2013-2015. The research model was analyzed in three steps, namely, the effects of control variables, in model 1, the direct and nonlinear effects of the main independent variable in model 2, and in model 3, the added direct effect of servitization and, in particular, the moderating effect of servitization on the linear and nonlinear relationship. The results of the multilevel analysis are reported in Table 2.

The present study and model 1 control for the effects of the control variables, such as total assets, cash flow, number of patents, and company size. While total assets, number of



patents, and company size demonstrate no significant effects on the dependent variable, the effect of cash flow is marginally significant.

In Model 2 in Table 2, the linear term is positively ( $\beta = 5.460, p < 0.05$ ), and the squared term of digitalization is negatively ( $\beta = -0.794, p < 0.05$ ) associated with ROA growth. Figure 2 supports the proposed hypothesis.


**Table 3.** Multilevel moderated regression results.

VARIABLES	<u>Model 1</u>	<u>Model 2</u>	<u>Model 3</u>
	Company profit performance	Company profit performance	Company profit performance
Digitalization		5.460** (2.331)	25.01** (11.28)
Digitalization squared		-0.794** (0.393)	-3.789** (1.866)
Servitization			9.626*** (2.583)
Digitalization * Servitization			-7.003*** (2.703)
Digitalization squared * Servitization			1.038** (0.451)
Number of employees	2.12e-05 (0.000804)	0.000102 (0.000554)	3.33e-05 (0.000702)
Total assets	-1.24e-07 (1.06e-07)	-4.72e-08 (1.23e-07)	-7.74e-09 (1.65e-07)
Number of patents	0.00172 (0.00383)	0.00117 (0.00223)	5.49e-05 (0.00291)
Cash flow	0.0418* (0.0221)	0.0238 (0.0296)	0.0134 (0.0440)
Constant	-0.120 (1.011)	-7.992*** (2.260)	-33.25*** (10.82)
P-value	4.752	59.25	103
Chi-squared	0.314	<0.001	<0.001
Observations	131	131	131
Number of groups	18	18	18

Robust standard errors in parentheses

\*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*  $p < 0.1$

Hypothesis 1 proposed that the scope of service offerings moderates the inverted-U type effect on digitalization on performance, such that the decreasing returns from digitalization to firm performance are mitigated by higher levels of servitization. The third model adds servitization as a component to the model and tests the moderating effect of servitization on digitalization. In Model 3 in Table 2, the interaction term of service scope and the squared term of digitalization associated with ROA growth is significant ( $\beta = 1.038, p < 0.05$ ). Figure 3 shows that at high levels of digitalization, ROA growth is greater for higher levels of service scope. The results provide support for Hypothesis 1, particularly at higher levels of digitalization, where the marginal effects demonstrate significance (from approx. 4.9 until 6 of the x-axis). The marginal effect is also significant at intermediate levels of digitalization (from approx. 4.0 until 4.6). Thus, the results demonstrate the significant interaction at a high level of digitalization (see the plotted curves in Figure 2).



**Figure 2.** The moderating effect of servitization on the nonlinear relationship between digitalization and company financial performance.

## **DISCUSSION**

### **Theoretical contribution**

The present study set out to challenge the simple linear assumptions underlying the causal relationship between digitalization and company performance to analyze the financial impact of digital servitization, which is the interplay between digitalization and servitization. In particular, we find a significant nonlinear, U-shaped effect of the interaction between digitalization and servitization on company financial performance. Moreover, the study also revealed a nonlinear, inverted U-shaped effect of digitalization on company financial performance; however, due to lack of significance for the margin's effects for this direct nonlinear effect of digitalization, we do not infer significance. Finally, the results demonstrate a direct relationship between servitization and company financial performance, a relationship much debated in the prior literature. The study provides an alternative explanation for the complex interplay between digitalization, servitization and financial performance (Luoto, Brax & Kohtamäki, 2019).

As the main contribution of the study, we find a nonlinear U-shaped interaction between digitalization and servitization on company financial performance. From low to moderate levels of digitalization, the interaction effect between digitalization and high servitization on company financial performance is negative and significant. From moderate to high levels of digitalization, the interplay between digitalization and high servitization becomes positive and significant, improving company financial performance. Thus, the results reveal the need for servitization in carving out a positive financial performance from digitalization. In this interplay, the results also emphasize the need for high investments on digitalization. Thus, the results emphasize the need for effective interplay between digitalization and servitization, the true need for digital

servitization. Without the interplay, manufacturing company may face the paradox of digitalization.

Based on the results of the empirical study, we conclude that servitization matters in the digitalization of a manufacturing company. The present study provides evidence on the complex relationship between digitalization and company financial performance and the existence of a digitalization paradox. Finally, the empirical study also demonstrated the controlled direct effect of servitization on company financial performance. This effect is interesting, as it provides further evidence on the direct financial benefits of servitization in manufacturing companies by using ROA growth as an archival measure of company financial performance (Wang, Lai, & Shou, 2018).

### **Managerial implications**

The results of this study have significant implications for industrial manufacturing companies implementing digital servitization. Simple, easy-to-implement IT systems seem to produce a direct effect on company financial performance if the deployment costs are low. At higher quality and cost levels, IT investments should be supported by other organizational capabilities, making the investments even more difficult and expensive to implement. From moderate to high levels of digitalization, the investments should be supported by the development of higher levels of servitization, which materialize as advanced service offerings and possibly other organizational capabilities. It seems that servitization may enable companies to cope with the digitalization paradox. Development of both digitalization and servitization are complex processes of organizational change (Bigdeli, Baines, Bustinza & Shi, 2017; Martinez, Neely,

Velu, Leinster-Evans & Bisessar, 2017; Martinsuo & Hoverfält, 2018; Raddats, Zolkiewski, Story, Burton, Baines & Bigdeli, 2017), and the simultaneous evolvement of these requires ambidextreous innovation capabilities.

### **Limitations and suggestions for further research**

As with every study, the current study is not without limitations. The present study uses a relatively small sample of Swedish manufacturing companies, which may limit generalizability. Future studies can focus on additional moderators and mediators to further unpack the nonlinear relationship between digital servitization and company performance. Furthermore, as the present study tested the link between digitalization and financial performance, the effects of digitalization should be further studied to a variety of additional outcome variables, such as sales growth and company market value. Finally, in-depth qualitative studies could help develop a more detailed understanding of the needed capabilities, practices and microfoundations.

## References

- Adrodegari, F., Pashou, T., & Saccani, N. (2017). Business Model Innovation: Process and Tools for Service Transformation of Industrial Firms. *Procedia CIRP*, 64(1), 103–108.
- Ardolino, M., Rapaccini, M., Saccani, N., Gaiardelli, P., Crespi, G., & Ruggeri, C. (2018). The role of digital technologies for the service transformation of industrial companies. *International Journal of Production Research*, 56(6), 2116–2132.
- Arto, K., Valtakoski, A., & Kärki, H. (2015). Organizing for solutions: How project-based firms integrate project and service businesses. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 45(1), 70–83.
- Baines, T. S., & Lightfoot, H. (2014). Servitization of the manufacturing firm: Exploring the operations practices and technologies that deliver advanced services. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 34(1), 2–35.
- Bigdeli, A. Z., Baines, T. S., Bustinza, O. F., & Shi, V. G. (2017). Organisational Change towards Servitization: A Theoretical Framework. *Competitiveness Review : An International Business Journal*, 27(1) 12–39.
- Brax, S., & Jonsson, K. (2009). Developing integrated solution offerings for remote diagnostics: A comparative case study of two manufacturers. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 29(5), 539–560.
- Brynjolfsson, E. (1993). The productivity paradox of information technology. *Communications of the ACM*, 36(12), 66–77.
- Brynjolfsson, E., & Hitt, L. M. (1998). Beyond the productivity paradox. *Communications of the ACM*, 41(8), 49–55.
- Brynjolfsson, E., & McAfee, A. (2012). *Race against the machine: How the digital revolution is accelerating innovation, driving productivity, and irreversibly transforming employment and the economy*. Lexington: Digital Frontier Press.
- Cenamor, J., Sjödin, D. R., & Parida, V. (2017). Adopting a platform approach in servitization: Leveraging the value of digitalization. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 192(October), 54–65.
- Coreynen, W., Matthyssens, P., & Gebauer, H. (2018). Are You Ready for Servitization? A Tool to Measure Servitization Capacity. In M. Kohtamäki, T. Baines, R. Rabetino, & A. Bigdeli (Eds.), *Practices and tools for servitization: Managing service transition* (pp. 25–39). London: Springer International Publishing.
- Coreynen, W., Matthyssens, P., & Van Bockhaven, W. (2016). Boosting servitization through digitization: Pathways and dynamic resource configurations for manufacturers. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 60.
- Coreynen, W., Matthyssens, P., & Van Bockhaven, W. (2017). Boosting servitization through digitization: Pathways and dynamic resource configurations for manufacturers. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 60(42–53), 42–53.
- Cusumano, M. (2015). Technology strategy and management: How traditional firms must compete in the sharing economy. *Communications of the ACM*, 58(1), 32–34.
- Ehret, M., & Wirtz, J. (2017). Unlocking value from machines: Business models and the industrial internet of things. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 33(1–2), 111–130.

- Eloranta, V., & Turunen, T. (2016). Platforms in service-driven manufacturing: Leveraging complexity by connecting, sharing, and integrating. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 55, 178–186.
- Fang, E. (Er), Palmatier, R. W., & Steenkamp, J.-B. E. M. (2008). Effect of service transition strategies on firm value. *Journal of Marketing*, 72(5), 1–14.
- Forkmann, S., Henneberg, S. C., Witell, L., & Kindström, D. (2017). Driver configurations for successful service infusion. *Journal of Service Research*, 20(3), 275–291.
- Frank, A. G., Mendes, G. H., Ayala, N. F., & Ghezzi, A. (2019). Servitization and Industry 4.0 convergence in the digital transformation of product firms: A business model innovation perspective. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 141(April), 341–351.
- Gebauer, H., Edvardsson, B., Gustafsson, A., & Witell, L. (2010). Match or mismatch: Strategy-structure configurations in the service business of manufacturing companies. *Journal of Service Research*, 13(2), 198–215.
- Gebauer, H., Fischer, T., & Fleisch, E. (2010). Exploring the interrelationship among patterns of service strategy changes and organizational design elements. *Journal of Service Management*, 21(1), 103–129.
- Grubic, T. (2018). Remote monitoring technology and servitization: Exploring the relationship. *Computers in Industry*, 100(December 2017), 148–158.
- Grubic, T., & Jennions, I. (2018). Remote monitoring technology and servitised strategies—factors characterising the organisational application. *International Journal of Production Research*, 56(6), 2133–2149.
- Hasselblatt, M., Huikkola, T., Kohtamäki, M., & Nickell, D. (2018). Modeling manufacturer's capabilities for the Internet of Things. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, 33(6), 822–836.
- Haynes, M., & Thompson, S. (2000). The productivity impact of IT deployment: An empirical evaluation of ATM introduction. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, 62(5), 607–619.
- Hellström, M. (2014). Solution business models based on functional modularity – the case of complex capital goods. *Journal of Service Management*, 25(5), 654–676.
- Huikkola, T., & Kohtamäki, M. (2017). Solution providers' strategic capabilities. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, 32(5), 752–770.
- Huikkola, T., & Kohtamäki, M. (2018). Business models in servitization. In M. Kohtamäki, T. S. Baines, R. Rabetino, & A. Z. Bigdeli (Eds.), *Practices and tools for servitization: Managing service transition* (pp. 61–81). London: Palgrave McMillan.
- Iansiti, M., & Lakhani, K. R. (2014). Digital Ubiquity. How Connections, Sensors, and Data Are Revolutionizing Business. *Harvard Business Review*, 92(11), 90–99.
- Jacobides, M. G., Cennamo, C., & Gawer, A. (2018). Towards a theory of ecosystems. *Strategic Management Journal*, 39, 2255–2276.
- Jayachandran, S., Sharma, S., Kaufman, P., & Raman, P. (2005). The role of relational information processes and technology use in customer relationship management. *Journal of Marketing*, 69(October), 177–192.
- Jonsson, K., Holmström, J., & Lyytinen, K. (2009). Turn to the material: Remote diagnostics systems and new forms of boundary-spanning. *Information and Organization*, 19(4), 233–252.

- Kettinger, W. J., Grover, V., Guha, S., & Segars, A. H. (1994). Strategic information systems revisited: A study in sustainability and performance. *MIS Quarterly*, *18*(1), 31–58.
- Kim, D., Cavusgil, S. T., & Calantone, R. J. (2005). The role of information technology in supply-chain relationships: Does partner criticality matter? *Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing*, *42*(4), 541–558.
- Kohtamäki, M., Hakala, H., Partanen, J., Parida, V., & Wincent, J. (2015). The performance impact of industrial services and service orientation on manufacturing companies. *Journal of Service Theory and Practice*, *25*(4), 463–485.
- Kohtamäki, M., Henneberg, S. C., Martinez, V., Kimita, K., & Gebauer, H. (2019). A configurational approach to servitization: Review and research directions. *Service Science*, *In press*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1287/serv.2019.0245>
- Kohtamäki, M., Parida, V., Oghazi, P., Gebauer, H., & Baines, T. S. (2019). Digital servitization business models in ecosystems: A theory of the firm. *Journal of Business Research*, *104*(November), 380–392.
- Kohtamäki, M., & Partanen, J. (2016). Co-creating value from knowledge-intensive business services in manufacturing firms: The moderating role of relationship learning in supplier-customer interactions. *Journal of Business Research*, *69*(7), 2498–2506.
- Kohtamäki, M., Partanen, J., Parida, V., & Wincent, J. (2013). Non-linear relationship between industrial service offering and sales growth: The moderating role of network capabilities. *Industrial Marketing Management*, *42*(8), 1374–1385.
- Kohtamäki, M., Rabetino, R., & Einola, S. (2018). Paradoxes in servitization. In M. Kohtamäki, T. S. Baines, R. Rabetino, & A. Z. Bigdeli (Eds.), *Practices and tools for servitization: Managing service transition* (pp. 185–199). London: Springer International Publishing.
- Kowalkowski, C., Gebauer, H., & Oliva, R. (2017). Service growth in product firms: Past, present, and future. *Industrial Marketing Management*, *60*(1), 82–88.
- Kowalkowski, C., Kindström, D., & Gebauer, H. (2013). ICT as a catalyst for service business orientation. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, *28*(6), 506–513.
- Kowalkowski, C., Windahl, C., Kindström, D., & Gebauer, H. (2015). What service transition? Rethinking established assumptions about manufacturers' service-led growth strategies. *Industrial Marketing Management*, *45*(1), 59–69.
- Landauer, T. K. (1995). *The trouble with computers: Usefulness, usability and productivity*. Boston: M.I.T. Press.
- Lenka, S., Parida, V., Sjödin, D. R., & Wincent, J. (2018). Towards a multi-level servitization framework: Conceptualizing ambivalence in manufacturing firms. *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, *38*(3), 810–827.
- Lenka, S., Parida, V., & Wincent, J. (2017). Digital capabilities as enablers of value co-creation in servitizing firms. *Psychology & Marketing*, *34*(1), 92–100.
- Lerch, C., & Gotsch, M. (2015). Digitalized Product-Service Systems in Manufacturing Firms: A Case Study Analysis. *Research-Technology Management*, *58*(5), 45–52.
- Lightfoot, H., Baines, T. S., & Smart, P. (2013). The servitization of manufacturing: A systematic literature review of interdependent trends. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, *33*(11), 1408–1434.
- Luoto, S., Brax, S., & Kohtamäki, M. (2017). Critical meta-analysis of



- servitization research: Constructing a model-narrative to reveal paradigmatic assumptions. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 60(1), 89–100.
- Martinez, V., Neely, A., Velu, C., Leinster-Evans, S., & Bisessar, D. (2017). Exploring the journey to services. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 192(October), 66–80.
- Martín-Peña, M. L., Díaz-Garrido, E., & Sánchez-López, J. M. (2018). The digitalization and servitization of manufacturing: A review on digital business models. *Strategic Change*, 27(2), 91–99.
- Martín-Peña, M. L., Sánchez-López, J. M., & Díaz-Garrido, E. (2019). Servitization and digitalization in manufacturing: The influence on firm performance. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, Forthcoming. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JBIM-12-2018-0400>
- Martinsuo, M., & Hoverfält, P. (2018). Change program management: Toward a capability for managing value-oriented, integrated multi-project change in its context. *International Journal of Project Management*, 36(1), 134–146.
- Ng, I. C., & Wakenshaw, S. Y. (2017). The Internet-of-Things: Review and Research Directions. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*.
- Opresnik, D., & Taisch, M. (2015). The value of Big Data in servitization. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 165, 174–184.
- Orlikowski, W. J. (2007). Sociomaterial practices: Exploring technology at work. *Organization Studies*, 28(9), 1435–1448.
- Orlikowski, W. J., & Scott, S. V. (2018). Sociomateriality: Challenging the Separation of Technology, Work and Organization. *Academy of Management Annals*, 2(1), 433–474.
- Parida, V., Sjödin, D. R., Wincent, J., & Kohtamäki, M. (2014a). A survey study of the transitioning towards high-value industrial product-services. In *Procedia CIRP*.
- Parida, V., Sjödin, D. R., Wincent, J., & Kohtamäki, M. (2014b). Mastering the transition to product-service provision: Insights into business models, learning activities, and capabilities. *Research Technology Management*, 57(3), 44–52.
- Partanen, J., Kohtamäki, M., Parida, V., & Wincent, J. (2017). Developing and validating a multi-dimensional scale for operationalizing industrial service offering. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, 32(2), 295–309.
- Paschou, T., Adrodegari, F., Perona, M., & Sacconi, N. (2017). The digital servitization of manufacturing: A literature review and research agenda. *ResearchGate*, (September), 1–20.
- Porter, M. (2001). Strategy and the internet. *Harvard Business Review*, 79(2), 62–78.
- Porter, M., & Heppelmann, J. (2014). How smart, connected products are transforming competition. *Harvard Business Review*, 92(11), 66–68.
- Porter, M., & Heppelmann, J. (2015). How smart, connected products are transforming companies. *Harvard Business Review*, (October), 96–112.
- Rabetino, R., Harmsen, W., Kohtamäki, M., & Sihvonen, J. (2018). Structuring servitization related research. *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, 38(2), 350–371.
- Rabetino, R., Kohtamäki, M., Lehtonen, H., & Kostama, H. (2015). Developing the concept of life-cycle service offering. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 49(August), 53–66.
- Raddats, C., Kowalkowski, C., Benedittini, O., Burton, J., & Gebauer, H. (2019). Servitization: A contemporary thematic review of four major research streams. *Industrial Marketing Management*,

- (October 2018), 1–70.
- Raddats, C., Zolkiewski, J., Story, V. M., Burton, J., Baines, T., & Ziaee Bigdeli, A. (2017). Interactively developed capabilities: evidence from dyadic servitization relationships. *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, 37(3), 382–400.
- Rajala, R., Brax, S. A., Virtanen, A., & Salonen, A. (2019). The next phase in servitization: Transforming integrated solutions into modular solutions. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 39(5), 630–657.
- Rymaszewska, A., Helo, P., & Gunasekaran, A. (2017). IoT powered servitization of manufacturing – an exploratory case study. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 192(October), 92–105.
- Sjödin, D. R., Parida, V., & Kohtamäki, M. (2019). Relational governance strategies for advanced service provision: Multiple paths to superior financial performance in servitization. *Journal of Business Research*, 101(August), 906–915.
- Sklyar, A., Kowalkowski, C., Tronvoll, B., & Sörhammar, D. (2019). Organizing for digital servitization: A service ecosystem perspective. *Journal of Business Research*, (In Press).
- Talaoui, Y. (2018). BI-in-Practice: A look at how BI enacts framing contests and affects the service transition path. In M. Kohtamäki, T. Baines, R. Rabetino, & A. Bigdeli (Eds.), *Practices and Tools for Servitization* (pp. 233–247). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Tapscott, D., & Tapscott, A. (2017). How blockchain will change organizations. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 58(2), 9–14.
- Tilson, D., Lyytinen, K., & Sørensen, C. (2010). Research commentary-digital infrastructures: The missing IS research agenda. *Information Systems Research*, 21(4), 748–759.
- Töytäri, P., Rajala, R., & Alejandro, T. B. (2015). Organizational and institutional barriers to value-based pricing in industrial relationships. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 47(5), 53–64.
- Töytäri, P., Turunen, T., Klein, M., Eloranta, V., Biehl, S., & Rajala, R. (2018). Aligning the mindset and capabilities within a business network for successful adoption of smart services. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 35(5), 763–779.
- Vandermerwe, S., & Rada, J. (1988). Servitization of business: Adding value by adding services. *European Management Journal*, 6(4), 314–324.
- Vendrell-Herrero, F., Bustinza, O. F., Parry, G., & Georgantzis, N. (2017). Servitization, digitization and supply chain interdependency. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 60, 69–81.
- Windahl, C., & Lakemond, N. (2010). Integrated solutions from a service-centered perspective: Applicability and limitations in the capital goods industry. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 39(8), 1278–1290.
- Visnjic, I., Jovanovic, M., Neely, A., & Engwall, M. (2017). What brings the value to outcome-based contract providers? Value drivers in outcome business models. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 192(October), 169–181.
- Visnjic, I., Neely, A., & Jovanovic, M. (2018). The path to outcome delivery: Interplay of service market strategy and open business models. *Technovation*, 72–73, 46–59.
- Wamba, S. F., Gunasekaran, A., Akter, S., Ren, S. J., Dubey, R., & Childe, S. J. (2017). Big data analytics and firm performance: Effects of dynamic capabilities. *Journal of Business Research*, 70, 356–365.
- Wang, W., Lai, K.-H., & Shou, Y. (2018). The impact of servitization on firm performance: a meta-analysis.

*International Journal of Operations & Production Management, 38, 7.*