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Interactions between perceived uncertainty types in service dyads
This paper investigates the dynamic interactions between uncertainty types in service dyads between servitized manufacturers and their customers. This is an important research area because servitized manufacturers face multi-source uncertainty and need to manage this uncertainty effectively to avoid business failure. A conceptual framework of four uncertainty types is investigated: environmental, technological, organisational, and relational uncertainty. We present insights from four empirical cases of service dyads collected via multiple sources of evidence including 54 semi-structured interviews, observations, and secondary data. The cases show seven interaction paths with direct knock-on effects between two uncertainty types and indirect knock-on effects between three or four uncertainty types. The findings suggest a causal chain from environmental, technological, organisational, to relational uncertainty. This research contributes to the servitization literature by (i) confirming the existence of uncertainty types, (ii) providing an in-depth characterisation of technological uncertainty, and (iii) showing the interaction paths between four uncertainty types in the form of a causal chain.

General information
State: Published
Organisations: Department of Management Engineering, Engineering Systems
Contributors: Kreye, M.
Pages: 90-99
Publication date: 2018
Peer-reviewed: Yes

Publication information
Journal: Industrial Marketing Management
Volume: 75
ISSN (Print): 0019-8501
Ratings:
BFI (2018): BFI-level 2
Web of Science (2018): Indexed yes
BFI (2017): BFI-level 2
Scopus rating (2017): CiteScore 3.76 SJR 1.663 SNIP 1.722
Web of Science (2017): Impact factor 3.678
Web of Science (2017): Indexed yes
BFI (2016): BFI-level 2
Scopus rating (2016): CiteScore 3.38 SJR 1.919 SNIP 1.795
Web of Science (2016): Impact factor 3.166
BFI (2015): BFI-level 2
Scopus rating (2015): CiteScore 3 SJR 1.461 SNIP 1.518
Web of Science (2015): Impact factor 1.93
BFI (2014): BFI-level 2
Scopus rating (2014): CiteScore 3.07 SJR 1.622 SNIP 1.735
Web of Science (2014): Impact factor 1.82
BFI (2013): BFI-level 2
Scopus rating (2013): CiteScore 2.79 SJR 1.483 SNIP 1.567
Web of Science (2013): Impact factor 1.897
BFI (2012): BFI-level 2
Scopus rating (2012): CiteScore 2.51 SJR 1.497 SNIP 1.64
Web of Science (2012): Impact factor 1.933
BFI (2011): BFI-level 2
Scopus rating (2011): CiteScore 2.36 SJR 1.039 SNIP 1.556
Web of Science (2011): Impact factor 1.53
BFI (2010): BFI-level 2
Scopus rating (2010): SJR 1.235 SNIP 1.597
Web of Science (2010): Impact factor 1.694
BFI (2009): BFI-level 2
Scopus rating (2009): SJR 1.167 SNIP 1.449
BFI (2008): BFI-level 2
Scopus rating (2008): SJR 1.076 SNIP 1.437