

## The Relationship between Market Orientation and Service Innovation in the Insurance Business: A Spanish Investigation

Nora Lado

Universidad Carlos III de Madrid, Spain

Albert Maydeu-Olivares

Universidad Carlos III de Madrid, Spain

Miguel A. Martínez-Martínez

Universidad de Alcalá Henares, Spain

*This article analyses the effects of MO on innovation. The relationships among market orientation, innovation degree and innovation performance are investigated empirically using a representative sample of the insurance firms in the European Union. Our results indicate that (a) the greater the intensity of a firm's market orientation, the higher is its degree of innovation. As a firm's market orientation increases, so does its ratio of new products (new lines or modifications of existing products) relative to its competitors. And (b), we found a significant impact of market orientation onto innovation performance. However, this relationship is not direct, but mediated through innovation degree. This causal chain accounts for 63% of the variability of innovation performance.*

### Introduction

Studies of the factors that determine performance in the development and launching of new products have shown the importance of proper market analysis (Cooper and Kleinschmidt, 1986). One of the key factors for the success of a new product is whether consumers perceive an advantage or benefit not provided by any other product (Cooper, 1993). Other crucial factors in deciding whether any new product will be a success or a failure are marketing synergies and the quality of the marketing work. However, what best separates the sheep from the goats is the superiority of the actual product, although it should be stressed that the intensity of a firm's market orientation is crucial for success and innovation (Calantone, di Benedetto and Bhoovaraghavan, 1994).

The environment in which companies operate today is characterised by (a) increasingly rapid change in consumer behaviour and preferences, (b) ever faster technological progress and (c) growing competitive rivalry. These characteristics make it essential for companies to develop the necessary organisational capacity to generate market information, analyse it and respond to these changes. The set of activities and modes of behaviour developed by companies for permanent monitoring, analysis and response is referred to in the Marketing literature as *market orientation* (MO).

Recently, increasing interest have been shown in the relationship between MO and business performance (Narver and Slater, 1990; Ruekert, 1992; Jaworski and Kohli,

1993; Lambin, 1996; Diamantopoulos and Hart, 1993; Greenley, 1995; Deng and Dart, 1994; Selnes, Jaworski and Kohli, 1996; Pitt, Caruana and Berthon, 1996; Fritz, 1996; Greenley and Foxall, 1998). A large number of empirical studies have shown that the degree of a firm's market orientation is a determining factor in its financial and commercial results (e.g. Narver and Slater, 1990; Ruckert, 1992; Jaworski and Kohli, 1993; Lambin, 1996; Deng and Dart, 1994; Selnes, Jaworski and Kohli, 1996; Pitt, Caruana and Berthon, 1996). Moreover, two studies found the relationship between a market orientation and various measures of business performance to be robust across a number of external environments: different degrees of market turbulence, intensity of competition, and technological turbulence (Jaworski and Kohli, 1993; Slater and Narver, 1994).

One issue that has not received enough attention is why and how MO positively affects long-term business performance. It may be that MO induces better financial results partly because it enhances a firm's capacity for business innovation and improves its efficiency. As far back as 1954, Drucker held that a company has no more than two basic functions: marketing and innovation. We have recently witnessed the growing interest aroused by conceptualisation and measurement of the concept of marketing, the outcome of which is a body of theory on MO. However, as Deshpande, Farley and Webster (1993) point out, much less attention has been devoted to the second basic function - that is, innovation.

Despite the importance of globalisation, integration of markets and increasing firms' internationalisation, most studies on the intensity and consequences of companies' market orientation confine themselves to domestic markets (with some exceptions such as Selnes, Jaworski and Kohli, 1996; Webster, 1994; Pitt, Caruana and Berthon, 1996). The same goes for studies on business innovation. There is therefore a shortage of studies providing empirical evidence as to the validity of research on domestic markets when applied to global markets.

This article analyses the effects of MO on innovation in a specific type of service enterprise in Europe: insurance companies.

### Theoretical Framework and Proposed Model

According to Calantone, di Benedetto and Bhoovaraghavan (1994), companies that seek to adopt an optimum strategic stance must become strongly market oriented. Moreover, the attitudes of companies to risk-taking and innovation will be strongly influenced by the quality of their orientation towards market needs. To concentrate solely on innovation is no guarantee that products will succeed in the market if there is no parallel marketing effort.

According to Narver and Slater (1990), on the other hand, market orientation is the competitive strategy that most efficiently generates the right kinds of behaviour to create enhanced value for the consumer and therefore assures better long-term results for enterprises. As these authors see it, MO is based on orientation towards the customer, orientation towards competitors and inter-functional coordination.

Kohli and Jaworski (1990) identify three structural behavioural components of market orientation: (1) generation and analysis of all relevant information about the market; (2) dissemination of this information among the various departments of the organisation in order to coordinate and arrange strategic planning; and (3) implementation of strategic initiatives designed to satisfy the market. Other authors have put forward similar definitions of the concept of MO. For example, Ruckert (1992) defines MO as the intensity with which companies (a) obtain and use information on customers, (b) develop strategic plans on the basis of that information, and (c) implement these plans, thus responding to customers' wishes and needs.

On the basis of these ideas, Lambin (1996) has produced a broader definition of the construct of market orientation, which he defines as a competitive strategy that involves all functional areas and levels of the organisation and embraces the different market participants. These participants or market forces are: the final customer, the intermediate customer (distributor), the competitors, and environmental factors. To create and hold on to a competitive advantage, companies must analyse and act on every one of these market forces with proper coordination between their functions. Market orientation, then, comprises nine elements as shown in Table 1.

Regarding the consequences of MO for the activities and capabilities required for business innovation, some authors hold that to go overboard in taking on the concept of marketing can be detrimental to a firm's ability to break new ground and favours only innovations demanded by the market (Bennett and Cooper, 1981). The argument is that over-emphasis on MO would lay too much stress on minor innovations, with negative consequences for the long term. Nevertheless, Lawton and Parasuraman (1980) investigated whether adoption of the marketing concept tends to reduce companies' capacity to innovate and found no significant effect. More recently, thanks to the contributions of Narver and Slater and Kohli and Jaworski to the MO construct and its measurement, clear empirical evidence has emerged on the positive effect of MO on business innovation (Narver and Slater, 1990, Deng and Dart, 1994, Slater and Narver, 1994, Atuahene-Gima, 1995, 1996; Pelham and Wilson, 1996, Greenley and Foxall, 1997, Gatignon and Xuereb, 1997).

Table 1. Components of market orientation.

ANALYSIS	COORDINATION	ACTION
• Analysis of final customer		• Actions on final customer
• Analysis of distributors	• Inter-functional	• Actions on distributors
• Analysis of competitors	coordination	• Actions on competitors
• Analysis of environment		• Actions on the environment

Source: Lambin, 1996.

When studying the influence of MO on companies' innovation, it is important to examine not only the possible effects of MO on the amount of new products being introduced in the market and on their degree of innovation, but also the effects MO on the performance of those new products. The latter does not seem to have been subjected to any empirical investigation yet. We shall consider these two aspects in the present research.

### Target Hypothesis

If we take MO to be the generation of market intelligence (i.e., ascertaining current and future customer needs, and monitoring competitors as well as environmental factors), it follows that MO is a source of ideas for new products and services and that it should therefore positively affect the degree of innovation in companies.

At the same time, the market-oriented firm's greater understanding of its market environment should also reduce the incidence of new product failures (Cooper, 1993, Ottum and Moore, 1997). In a recent study, Song and Parry (1996), using data on 788 new products introduced by 404 Japanese firms, examined the links between new product performance and several factors. Their findings clearly support the importance of market understanding for the success of new products. Also, in their cross-national research on the controllable factors of new product performance, Calantone, Schmidt and Song (1996, pp 341) concluded that "it is important to collect and assess market and competitive informations in order to understand customers' needs, wants and specifications for the product (...) to understand customers' purchase decisions, and to learn about competitors' strategies..." Given that MO provides enhanced knowledge of customers' preferences and wants and that enables companies to adapt better to these wants, we may assume that market orientation will positively affect innovation performance. Finally, there is empirical evidence that suggests that the volume or degree of a firm's innovation partly determines innovation performance (Calantone, di Benedetto and Bhoovaraghavan, 1994). This is why the new hypothesis is included in the target model.

In sum, the following hypotheses will be examined in this research:

H<sub>1</sub>: A firm's degree of innovation will be greater the higher its degree of market orientation.


H<sub>2</sub>: The results of a firm's innovation will be better the greater its degree of market orientation.

H<sub>3</sub>: The results of a firm's innovation will be better the greater its degree of innovation. These relationships are set out schematically in Figure 1.

### Methodology

The population universe considered in this article is defined as a set of insurance companies operating in the European Union which meet the following conditions: a) they operate in private insurance or "mass" insurance; b) they have a market share of more than 0.05%; and c) their management is independent. The list of European insurance companies was taken from the Financial Times Yearbook for 1995.

Figure 1. Model of relationships between MO and Innovation.



Note: There are 9 indicators for market orientation, 3 for degree of innovation and 4 for innovation performance. The dotted line denotes a non-significant effect.

It was assumed that senior executives were the people best qualified to assess their firms' market orientation degree, innovation degree, and innovation performance. These variables were therefore measured using the responses of firms' executives on a number of questions about their own companies. This information was gathered via a postal questionnaire. In view of the size of the target population (554 firms), it was decided to send the questionnaire to all companies.

#### Measurements

Since the target variables are not directly observable, a series of indicators was used for each one.

◆ *Measurement of degree of MO.* This was measured using nine sub-scales, one for each component of the model. All in all, the nine sub-scales consist of 30 items. Each item was presented as a statement representing the ideal behaviour of a market-oriented company. A scale from 0 to 10 was used for these items, where 0 indicated that the statement "was entirely untrue" of the firm, 5 that it was "more or less true" and 10 that "it was entirely true". The initial questionnaire is based on Lambin (1996), and has been subsequently used by Lado, Maydeu-Olivares and Rivera (1998) to measure the market orientation of insurance companies.

◆ *Measurement of degree of innovation in companies.* We used a scale developed by Miller and Friesen (1982) which has been used in numerous subsequent studies (e.g., Calantone, di Benedetto and Bhoovaraghavan, 1994). This is a Likert scale comprising three items.

◆ *Measurement of innovation performance:* We used the four-item scale developed by Atuahene-Gima (1996) to evaluate the extent to which the objectives set for new products are achieved in terms of sales, market share, sales growth and profits. Here, the respondent is asked to choose a new product/service that the company has introduced in the last five years; a new product is defined as an improved product, the expansion of a product line or a totally new product. This new product is used as a reference for responses as to the degree of achievement of objectives measured on a Likert scale.

#### Sample

137 European insurance companies returned valid questionnaires, giving a response rate of over 20%. In order to assess the possibility of non-response bias, the questionnaires were divided into quartiles on the basis of reception date (Armstrong and Overton, 1977). A t-test applied to the first and fourth quartiles (the earliest and the latest received) showed that there were no significant differences in the responses to the target scales.

Table 2 shows the distribution of premiums by country in the sample and the population of the European Union. The sample represented 17% of total premiums in the KU. However, the distribution of premiums by countries is somewhat different from that of the population.

Table 2. Distribution of premiums in sample and population.

Country	Premiums	sample %	Premiums	total EU (*) %
Austria	7759	7.8	12873	2.1
Belgium	8859	8.9	14973	2.6
Denmark	-	-	9186	1.5
Finland	632	0.6	9250	1.5
France	7522	7.6	146244	24.4
Germany	13582	13.8	152525	25.5
Greece	1344	1.4	1836	0.3
Italy	7060	7.2	39634	6.6
Ireland	57	0.1	4810	0.8
Luxembourg	-	-	4423	0.7
Holland	7363	7.5	36013	6.1
Portugal	1017	1.0	5223	0.9
Spain	9653	9.8	27582	4.6
Sweden	3250	3.3	11763	2.-
U. K.	30464	30.9	122342	20.4
<b>total</b>	<b>98562</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>598679</b>	<b>100</b>

(\*) Source: CEA, 1996.

### Results

Covariance structure analysis was used to determine whether the model sketched in Figure 1 was appropriate for these data. As indicated above, the constructs of innovation degree and innovation performance appearing in Figure 1 have three and four indicators respectively. As for the construct of market orientation, since the sample size is rather small we shall use as indicators the nine sub-scales instead of the original 30 items. The reliability of these sub-scales is provided in Table 3. As the table shows, all sub-scales exhibited acceptable levels of reliability.

Since the observed variables were approximately normal, maximum-likelihood estimation was used.

We should not expect any model to hold exactly in the population. Hence, issues concerning whether the proposed model fits exactly in the population should be rephrased in terms of how close is the model to the population covariance matrix. Here, we shall use the Root Mean Squared Error of Approximation (RMSEA: Steiger, 1990) to assess this discrepancy. A value of .05 has been suggested as an upper limit for close fitting model (Browne & Cudeck, 1993).

Other statistics have been suggested for judging the goodness of fit of a covariance structure model. For instance, the Root Mean Squared Residual (RMSR; Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1993), the Goodness-of-Fit Index (GFI; Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1993), and the

**Table 3. Reliability of the market orientation sub-scales**

<i>sub-scale</i>	<i>No. Items</i>	<i>Alpha Cronbach coeff.</i>
Analec	5	0.86
actiec	3	0.67
analdis	5	0.85
actidis	3	0.70
anacom	3	0.89
acticom	2	0.77
analenv	2	0.83
actienv	2	0.83
coord	5	0.83

**Notes:** ANALEC = analysis of final customer, ACTIEC = actions oriented towards the final customer, ANALDIS = analysis of distributor, ACTIDIS = actions oriented towards the distributor, ANALCOM = analysis of competitors, ACTICOM = actions oriented towards competitors, ANALENV = analysis of environment, ACTIENV = actions oriented towards the environment, COORD = inter-functional coordination.

Comparative Fit Index (CFI; gentler, 1990). Adequate to good fit is suggested by RMSR values approaching .05. For the GFI and the CFI indices, values between .80 and 1.00 indicate adequate to good fit.

For these data, the RMSEA was estimated as .054 with a 90% confidence given by (0.030; 0.075). Hence, the model provides a good approximation to the population covariance matrix. A formal test of close fit,  $H_0: RMSEA \leq .05$  yields  $p = .15$ , on 101 degrees of freedom. Other goodness of fit statistics for the model are SRMSR = .050, GFI = .88, CFI = .95.

**Table 4. Factor loadings for the final model**

<i>variables</i>	<i>market orientation</i>	<i>innovation degree</i>	<i>innovation performance</i>
analec	7.05 [0.77] (0.69)	0	0
actiec	4.32 [0.83] (0.38)	0	0
analdis	6.47 [0.74] (0.66)	0	0
actidis	3.32 [0.61] (0.44)	0	0
anacom	4.11 [0.73] (0.43)	0	0
acticom	2.95 [0.32] (0.32)	0	0
analenv	2.91 [0.32] (0.32)	0	0
actienv	2.63 [0.39] (0.39)	0	0
coord	6.40 [0.70] (0.75)	0	0
innode1	0	0.44 [0.62] (0.07)	0
innode2	0	0.68 [0.70] (0.09)	0
innode3	0	0.50 [0.63] (0.08)	0
innoperf1	0	0	0.69 [0.84] (0.08)
innoperf2	0	0	0.71 [0.84] (0.09)
innoperf3	0	0	0.87 [0.94] (0.10)
innoperf4	0	0	0.73 [0.81] (0.09)

**Notes:** standard errors of parameters are shown in round brackets, standardised parameters in square brackets. ANALEC = analysis of final customer, ACTIEC = actions oriented towards the final customer, ANALDIS = analysis of distributor, ACTIDIS = actions oriented towards the distributor, ANALCOM = analysis of competitors, ACTICOM = actions oriented towards competitors, ANALENV = analysis of environment, ACTIENV = actions oriented towards the environment, COORD = inter-functional coordination, INNODE1 = rate of introduction of new products, [NNODE2 = new product lines, INNODE3 = intensity of product modifications or changes, INNOPERF1 = achievement of sales growth objectives with new products, INNOPERF2 = achievement of market share objectives in new products, INNOPERF3 = achievement of sales volume objectives in new products, INNOPERF4 = achievement of profitability objective in new products.

All parameter estimates in this model are significant but for the direct relationship between market orientation and innovation performance ( $b_1 = 0.25$ ,  $t$ -value = 1.27). In other words, the effect of market orientation onto innovation performance is all conveyed through the firm's degree of innovation.

The model was re-estimated after setting  $b_1 = 0$ . The RMSEA, GFI and CFI for the revised model do not change, and SRMSR = .052. We provide in Table 4 the factor loadings of the revised model. The direct relationships (and their standard errors) between the latent variables in this model were  $b_2 = 1.06$  (0.18),  $b_3 = 0.90$  (0.18). These two direct effects are very similar, as evidenced by their standardised values: 0.73 and 0.79. According to the model, 53% of the variance of the latent variable innovation degree is attributable to market orientation, while 63% of the variance of innovation performance is attributable to the effect of market orientation mediated by the degree of innovation.

### Conclusions

In line with results of previous studies, we have found that the extent of firms' market orientation has a significant positive effect on innovation in insurance companies. Our results indicate that the greater the intensity of a firm's market orientation, the higher is its degree of innovation ( $H_1$ ). As a firm's market orientation increases, so does its ratio of new products (new lines or modifications of existing products) relative to its competitors.

However, we have found that market orientation does not have a direct effect on innovation performance ( $H_2$ ). Instead, that effect is completely mediated through degree of innovation. Thus, degree of innovation has a significant effect on innovation performance ( $H_3$ ). The firms that placed most new or modified products on the market stated that they had more successfully achieved the goals they had set themselves in terms of market share, sales and profitability of their innovations.

We believe that this research makes three main contributions: First, it responds to calls from several authors for extending research on MO to outcome variables other than economic performance (Kohl and Jaworski, 1990; Lambin, 1996), and specifically to new products (Narver and Slater, 1990). Second, since we targeted (and obtained a sample of) all relevant companies in the European Union, we advance our understanding of MO in the ambit of a supranational market, in this case the European Union. This is particularly important at a time when firms are increasingly involved in internationalisation processes and require studies whose conclusions are applicable to global markets. Third, this research examines empirically market orientation in the service sector, whose distinguishing characteristics - such as the intangibility and heterogeneity - are of special interest to the field of marketing.

### Footnote

This research was partially supported by DGESIC, Project PB97-0084.

### References

- Armstrong, S. and Overton, T. (1977), "Estimating Nonresponse Bias in Mail Surveys", *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 14, pp. 396-402.
- Atuahene-Gima, K. (1995), "An Exploratory Analysis of the Impact of Market Orientation on New Product Performance", *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 12, pp. 275-293.
- Atuahene-Gima, K. (1996), "Market Orientation and Innovation", *Journal of Business Research*, 35, pp. 93-103.
- Bennett, R. and Cooper, R. (1981), "The Misuse of Marketing an American Tragedy" *Business Horizons*, 25, Nov.-Dec. 1981, pp. 51-61.
- gentler, P. (1990), "Comparative Fit Indexes in Structural Models", *Psychological Bulletin*, 107, 238-246.
- Browne, M. and Cudeck, R. (1993), "Alternative Ways of Assessing Model Fit". In "Testing structural equation models", K. A. Bollen & J. S. Long (Eds.) pp.136-162. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Calantone, R., Schmidt, J. and Song, M. (1996) "Controllable Factors of New Products Success: A Cross-National Comparison", *Marketing Science*, 15, N° 4, 341-358.
- Calantone, R.; di Benedetto, A. and Bhoovaraghavan, S. (1994), "Examining the Relationship between Degree of Innovation and New Product Success", *Journal of Business Research*, 30, pp. 143-148.
- CEA (1997), *European Insurance 1996 in Figures*, Comite Europeen des Assurances.
- Cooper, R. (1993), "Winning at New Product: Accelerating the Process from idea to Launch" 2<sup>a</sup> Ed. Addison-Wesley Pub. Co. MA
- Cooper, R. and Kleinschmidt E. J. (1986), "An Investigation into the New Product Process: Steps, Deficiencies, and Impact," *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 3, pp. 71-85.
- Deng, S. and Dart, J. (1994), "Measuring Market Orientation: A Multi-factor, Multi-items Approach", *Journal of Marketing Management*, 10, pp. 725-742
- Deshpande, R.; Farley, J. and Webster, F. Jr. (1993), "Corporate Cultures, Customer Orientation, and Innovativeness in Japanese Firms: A Quadrad Analysis", *Journal of Marketing*, (January) 57, pp. 23-27.
- Diamantopoulos, A. and Hart, S. (1993), "Linking market orientation and company performance: preliminary evidence on Kohli and Jaworski's framework", *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 1, 93-121.
- Drucker, P. (1954), "The Practice of Management", NY, Harper and Row Pub. Inc.
- Fritz, W. (1996), "Market orientation and corporate success: findings from Germany", *European Journal of Marketing*, vol. 30, 8, 59-74.

- Gatignon, H. and Xueref, J. (1997), "Strategic Orientation of the Firm and New Product Performance", *Journal of Marketing Research*, vol 34, February, 77-90.
- Greenley, G. and Foxall, G. (1998), "External Moderation of Association among Stakeholder Orientation and Company Performance", *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 15, 51-69.
- Greenley, G. and Foxall, G. (1997), "Multiple Stakeholder Orientation in UK Companies and the Implications for Company Performance", *Journal of Management Studies*, 34, 2, 259-284.
- Jaworski, B. and Kohli, A. (1993), "Market Orientation: Antecedents and Consequences", *Journal of Marketing*, 57 (July), pp. 53-70.
- Jöreskog, Karl G. and Sörbom, Dag (1993), "*LISREL 8. User's reference guide*" Chicago, IL: Scientific Software.
- Kohli, A. and Jaworski, B. (1990), "Market Orientation: the Construct, Research Propositions, and Managerial Implications", *Journal of Marketing*, 54, 1-18.
- Lado, N., Maydeu-Olivares, A. and Rivera, J. (1998) "Measuring Market Orientation in Several Populations: A Structural Equations Approach", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 32, 1/2, 23-39.
- Lambin, J.-J. (1996), "The Misunderstanding about Marketing. Today, Marketing is too Important to be Left to Sole Marketing Function. An Empirical Study in the Private Insurance Sector", *CEMS Business Review*, 1, 1-2, pp. 37-56.
- Lawton, L. and Parasuraman, A. (1980), "The Impact of the Marketing Concept on New Product Planning", *Journal of Marketing*, Winter 1980, 19-25.
- McDonald, R. and Marsh, H. (1990), "Choosing a multivariate model: Noncentrality and goodness of fit", *Psychological Bulletin*, 107, 247-255.
- Miller, D. and Friesen, P. (1982) "Innovation in Conservative and Entrepreneurial Firms: Two Models of Strategic Momentum", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 3, pp. 1-25.
- Narver, J. and Slater, S. (1990), "The Effect of a Market Orientation on Business Profitability", *Journal of Marketing*, Oct., pp. 20-35.
- Ottum, B. and Moore, W. (1997) "The Role of Market Information in New Product Success/Failure", *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 14, 258-273.
- Pelham, A. and Wilson, D. (1996), "A Longitudinal Study of the Impact of Market Structure, Firm Structure, Strategy, and Market Orientation Culture on Dimensions of Small-Firm Performance", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 24, 1, 27-43.
- Pitt, L.; Caruana, A. and Berthon, P. (1996), "Market Orientation and Business Performance: some European Evidence", *International Marketing Review*, 13, 1, 5-18.

- Ruekert, R. (1992), "Developing a Market Orientation: An Organizational Strategy Perspective", *International Journal of Marketing*, 9, pp. 225-245
- Selnes, F., Jaworski, B. and Kohli, A. (1996), "Market Orientation in United States and Scandinavian Companies: A cross-cultural Study", *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, Vol. 12, 2, pp. 139-157.
- Slater, S. and Narver, J. (1994), "Does Competitive Environment Moderate the Market Orientation-Performance Relationship", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 58, January, pp. 46-55.
- Song, M. and Parry, M. (1996), "What Separates Japanese New Products Winners from Losers", *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 13, pp 422-439.
- Steiger, J. (1990), "Structural model evaluation and modification: An interval estimation approach", *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 25, 173-180.
- Webster, F. Jr. (1994), "*Market-Driven Management*", John Wiley & Sons Inc., New York.

# Contents

<b>Total Quick Response System: A Flexible Management Approach for Global Operations</b>	<b>299</b>
Choong Y. Lee, Wei Sha, Xiaomu Zhou	
<b>Does Human Resource Management Really have Strategic Relevance: A Critical Analysis</b>	<b>311</b>
Martin Clarke	
<b>Comparing Middle Manager Perceptions of White and African Americans: Thirty-Eight to Zero</b>	<b>324</b>
Joseph Tomkiewicz	
<b>Examining the Product Adaptation Decision Process of European and Japanese Manufacturers in the United States using an Expert System</b>	<b>331</b>
James S. Moore, Zohar E. Shipandler	
<b>Non-Financial Performance Measurement in Hotels: A Theoretical Framework</b>	<b>340</b>
B.C. Ghosh, Leong Choon Chiang, Lee Weng Kee	
<b>Decision-Making Styles among Australian, New Zealand, Chinese and Philippine Managers: A Comparative Analysis</b>	<b>346</b>
Kojo Saffu, Aminu Mamman, Attahir Yusuf	
<b>A Health Manpower Projection Model : The Case of Ministry of Health Hospitals in Saudi Arabia</b>	<b>355</b>
Adel S. Al-Dosary, Mohammed Raziuddin	
<b>Towards a New Services Marketing Paradigm for Developing Countries</b>	<b>366</b>
Allan C. Reddy	
<b>The Relationship between Market Orientation and Service Innovation in the Insurance Business: A Spanish Investigation</b>	<b>374</b>
Nora Lado, Albert Maydeu-Olivares, Miguel A. Martínez-Martínez	
<b>The Volatility of United States 5-Year Treasury Note Futures</b>	<b>386</b>
Raymond A.K. Cox, John B. Mitchell	
<b>Fuzzy Customer Satisfaction Measurement: A Study of Fast Food Restaurant</b>	<b>396</b>
Ying-Feng Kuo, Ling-Show Chen	
<b>Innovation and Technology Management in Small and Medium Japanese Manufacturing Firms</b>	<b>406</b>
A.A.E. Shabayek	

*continued*

## INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT

**EDITOR - CHRISTOPHER ORPEN**

Dorset Business School  
Bournemouth University, England

**ASSOCIATE EDITOR - PETER BURGESS**

Graduate School of Management  
Royal Melbourne University of Technology, Australia

### EDITORIAL BOARD

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Dean Tjosvold</b><br>Simon Fraser University, Canada | <b>James C. McElroy</b><br>Iowa State University            |
| <b>Charles Hobson</b><br>Indiana University             | <b>Shaker A. Zahra</b><br>George Mason University           |
| <b>Yao-Su Hu</b><br>University of Warwick, England      | <b>Michael C. White</b><br>Louisiana Tech University        |
| <b>Saeed Samicee</b><br>University of South Carolina    | <b>Thomas G. Evans</b><br>University of South Carolina      |
| <b>Mark R. Edwards</b><br>Arizona State University      | <b>R. D. Nair</b><br>University of Wisconsin                |
| <b>Paul Hertz</b><br>University of Miami                | <b>Raimo Nurmi</b><br>Turku School of Economics,<br>Finland |
| <b>Josef Bonnici</b><br>University of Malta, Malta      |   |

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT will accept original articles that deal with the theory and practice of management, including articles about finance, personnel, accounting, marketing, production and business policy. Articles should preferably be no longer than 10 typed pages and should ideally conform to the style of the American Psychological Association. A 100 word abstract should be provided. Manuscripts should be submitted in duplicate

Articles in International Journal of Management are abstracted in Business Index, Work-Related Abstracts, Anbar Management Abstracts, Contents Pages in Management, and Personnel Management Abstracts.

Manuscripts should be submitted to the Managing Editor at  
**INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT**  
**P.O. BOX 982, POOLE, DORSET BH12 5YF ENGLAND**