

Customer Perceived Value—A Key in Marketing of Integrated Solutions

Nina Helander, Virpi Sillanpää, Vilma Vuori and Olavi Uusitalo

Introduction

The foundations of successful marketing and sales of integrated solutions are based on deep understanding of how to create value for the customer and help the customer to achieve its goals (Ulaga and Chacour 2001). It is not enough to just to know the customer's current and explicit needs; the secret is in identifying also the hidden and future-oriented needs of the customer. This requires an understanding of value perception. It can be further argued that value perception is consisted of several things, also in the business-to-business marketing. This is especially the case in the context of integrated solutions, where the purchaser needs to evaluate a mix of goods and services, and the overall benefits and costs of the integrated solution (Davies et al. 2006).

For example, it is not easy for a marketer to recognize which are the elements in the total offering that act as the key source of value creation. Furthermore, a complex integrated solution cannot usually be developed and produced by a single company; instead, the system integrator needs to be surrounded by a network of suppliers participating in the creation of the integrated solution (Helander 2004). However, to date little has been written about the role of the supplier organizations, networks and the implications that their participation has on the customer's overall value perception (Brady et al. 2005).

N. Helander (✉) · V. Sillanpää

Information Management and Logistics, Tampere University
of Technology, Tampere, Finland
e-mail: nina.helander@tut.fi

O. Uusitalo

Industrial Management, Tampere University of Technology, Tampere, Finland

V. Vuori

Department of Management, University of Vaasa, Vaasa, Finland

© Springer International Publishing AG 2017

A. Kavoura et al. (eds.), *Strategic Innovative Marketing*, Springer Proceedings
in Business and Economics, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-56288-9_6

The aim of this paper is to contribute to this gap. Our special emphasis is on integrated solutions, where the complexity of the offering sets several kinds of challenges for marketing (Davies et al. 2006). In order to examine these problematics, we have conducted a qualitative case study from the industrial automation sector. The case study describes the challenges of developing integrated solutions that are a mix of hardware components, software and services. Increased intelligence in system solutions enables various benefits, e.g., the integration of software to devices and systems makes it possible to improve performance without replacing physical components. However, this new role of software as a highly abstract and intangible element may also raise new kinds of challenges both for the marketer and the customer.

The paper is organized as follows: first we briefly describe the theoretical base of our study building on value creation and integrated solution literature. Then we report our research methods and the case study. Finally, we draw conclusions.

Value and Integrated Solutions

Value is a concept that is commonly used by both academics and actors in the field, but it is often rather unclear what is actually meant by it in different contexts (Lepak et al. 2007, Gummerus 2013, Bourguignon 2005, Ulaga and Chacour 2001, Ford and McDowell 1999). Bowman and Ambrosini (2000) argue that the definition of value is especially unclear in strategic level. In order to understand value in strategy better, they make a division between use value and exchange value, as well as between value creation and capture. Use value is subjectively assessed by customers whereas exchange value is only realized at the point of sale. These relate both to value creation, whereas value capture is determined by the perceived power relationships between buyers and sellers (Bowman and Ambrosini 2000). In this study, we emphasize the viewpoint of value creation, but also the viewpoint of value perception, i.e., the customer's viewpoint.

To build an analytical tool to carry out the empirical study, we will elaborate the concept of value through highlighting three interrelated and supplementary views: the content, process, and context views (Helander 2004). These three angles are used to clarify the rather imprecise discussion surrounding value as a concept.

The *content view to value perception* emphasizes that the concept of value can be regarded as the trade-off between benefits and sacrifices (Walter et al. 2001, Lapierre 2000, Parolini 1999, Slater 1997, Berry and Yadav 1996, Ravald and Grönroos 1996). These benefits and sacrifices can be understood in monetary terms, but they can also be seen as including non-monetary rewards, such as competence, market position, and social rewards (Walter et al. 2001). Non-monetary costs can include, e.g., time, effort, energy, and conflict invested by the customer to obtain the product or service. In this study, value is understood in both monetary and non-monetary terms. Nevertheless, it can still be argued that defining value as the trade-off between benefits and sacrifices offers a content-based view of value as a

concept—emphasis is placed on what the customer perceives to be the benefits and sacrifices. In this way, the customer himself/herself defines the content of the value under consideration.

The *process view* emphasizes that value is not merely tied to the actual object of exchange; instead it is dependent on the successfulness of the whole relationship between the customer and the supplier. Thus this view underscores the importance of understanding value creation as a process during which the customer and supplier interact. During the interaction, the goods and related services are exchanged, but also a great deal of interaction occurs between the parties influencing how the customer perceives the total value gained.

The *context view*, for its part, puts forward the notion of differential value: the supplier should be able to create more value than the customer could achieve by choosing some other solution created by another, competitive supplier or by the customer itself. Differential value is very hard to define and measure as the customers' expectations are based on the alternatives available on the market; i.e., the impact of similar or substitute products is remarkable (Parolini 1999). Thus, measuring of differential value always requires also a mapping of other potential solutions and comparison of those with the one under consideration. In the context of integrated solutions this is not, however, an easy task.

The possibility a false perception of value is more likely when there is presence of intangible elements and services; systemic and complex goods; benefits that are not immediate; post-purchase costs and costs of consumables; products and services that are new to the customer; and lastly, infrequently purchased goods (Parolini 1999). Most of these characteristics are present in marketing and sales of integrated solutions (Brady et al. 2005). For this reason it can be argued that integrated solutions are not easily evaluated by the customer in the purchasing situation. As there are so much of complexity related to the integrated solution, it can be argued that the customer sets more weight in the evaluation on the process view of value.

Case Study

We have conducted a qualitative study in order to empirically examine the value perception in a real-life industrial setting. We use a case study, as it is a good method when new perspectives are sought or when there is little knowledge available about the phenomenon under study (Patton 1987). We have examined three deliveries of integrated solutions through the viewpoints of the case company (the solution integrator), the customers of the deliveries and the suppliers participating in producing the deliveries. Our empirical data consists of 14 thematic interviews; 6 interviewees from sellers sales and marketing, 5 customers representing three different projects and three suppliers, representing two different subcontractors.

Our case company is a high-tech company that operates in the industrial automation sector. It provides its organizational customers larger automated production lines based on integration of software programs into electromechanical

components; i.e., their offer is a mix of software and hardware. In recent years the case company has started to move from device supplier toward providing entire system solutions, automated production lines. The shift has not been easy, as the employees of the company have not always understood the different business logic that is required in order to be a genuine system provider instead of a device supplier. This has caused several problems in the company's business relationships. Moreover, the transformation has complicated the understanding of what kind of value the company is in fact providing to its customers.

Empirical Findings

The aim of automated production lines delivered by the case company was to create value for the customer by providing more efficient and effective production capabilities. Since the customers were engaged in tough competition, production capabilities played a very important role in the customers' business processes. Customers placed a great value on flexible production processes that enable using a single production line for both mass production and production of customized products. Thus the customers saved both in production line investments and in floor space plus attained shorter production times. This kind of flexibility of a production line required extensive software solutions, thus the role of software was essential in the overall integrated solution.

Most of the benefits of 'more effective production' were easy to measure in monetary terms. However, some potential benefits were hidden and challenging to predict, since the realization of the benefit was not immediate. For example, the benefit of the component-level tracking which was available feature in the integrated solution will not be realized until there is a failure in customer's end products. The case company was able to communicate the general level benefits for the customer, but somehow they missed the opportunities to create customer specific value. In some occasion the marketing and sales people did not realize the potential value creating features, such as component-level tracking, of then-current version of its integrated solution. Such problems identifying the things that customers really value are of course related to the nature of the relationship, the lack of closeness, and also problems in sharing of information between the parties in the relationship.

The customers were expecting the case company to take a more active role in the marketing and after-sales of the integrated solutions, especially related to marketing of its software solution. However, the case company was not active even in contacting those customers to whom they had already delivered an earlier version of the system solution. One reason for the silence could be that some customer deliveries had been so difficult from the viewpoint of the case company that the personnel were a little bit cautious about getting in touch with the customer again.

In addition to direct value in the form of more effective and efficient production, the customers expected also indirect value in the form of consistent and clear

service. Especially they would have appreciated to interact only with the case company, from whom they had thought to have a turnkey solution. Instead, several persons from different suppliers were dealing with the matters at the customer's premises. These issues should have been dealt by the case company itself. Thus, the case company was not able to orchestrate its supplier network. Because of this the customers felt disappointed and were troubled by the fact that they did not always know who to contact if problems arise with the production line.

Customers were also dissatisfied with the unclear pricing—in the first place salespersons had promised software upgrades at too low a price, but after the feedback from the persons responsible for the software they tried to raise the price. It seemed that neither the salespersons nor the customers understood the importance and the value of software in the integrated solutions. Everybody seemed to value only physical and tangible equipment. This became evident when the customers wanted to have separate prices for different parts of the integrated solution, but for the software part, they were ready to pay almost nothing.

Conclusions and Discussion

From our case study we can draw up several viewpoints on the marketing of integrated solutions. Next, we will open up these viewpoints and also discuss some of the potential future research needs that we have been able to identify.

As regards the process perspective on value perception, the biggest shortcomings were in the software integration and overall project management phases in our case study. It seems that the separate functions (R&D, marketing, sales and top management) of the case organization did not understand each other well enough. Because of this the role of software was not properly understood. Probably a deep understanding of the customers and their value perception within the case organization would have solved this internal problem. It seems that neither marketing and sales nor top management saw the potential of software in value creation.

From the customers' viewpoint, the most problematic matters were the information sharing and forced interaction with several actors, as their desire was to just interact with the case company. This shows us the importance of the well-performing relationship management and the well-working customer interface, which also facilitates the process of value creation. Customers value the easiness of just interacting with one company. Thus a poorly managed supplier network may cause dramatic decrease in the customer value perception, even though the object of exchange would be of good quality. The process and the interaction around the actual delivery of the integrated solution is thus the key to the overall value perception. When looking the value perception from the context viewpoint, differential value is a key issue, too. In the case of complex integrated solutions it becomes rather difficult for customers to compare alternative solutions and distinguish among them. In such cases, the ability to identify indirect indicators of the value

creation capability of the case company would have played an important role. For example, the reference projects of the case company could have acted as indicators of the value creation capability.

Nevertheless, if the case company wants to succeed in future, it needs to pay more attention to such things as its project management competencies and the ability to handle responsibilities and risks. Moreover, it becomes a matter of reputation and trustworthiness; the case company should convince the customer of its value creation capabilities and competencies. These viewpoints of capabilities of the suppliers are interesting avenue for future research to open in more detail. We will continue this study by going into more details of the discussion of supplier value creation capabilities.

References

- Berry, L.L., and M.S. Yadav. 1996. Capture and communicate value in the pricing of services. *Sloan Management Review* (Summer), 41–51.
- Bourguignon, A. 2005. Management accounting and value creation: the profit and loss of reification. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting* 16: 353–389.
- Bowman, C., and V. Ambrosini. 2000. Value creation versus value capture: Towards a coherent definition of value in strategy. *British Journal of Management* 11: 1–15.
- Brady, T., A. Davies, and D. Gann. 2005. Creating value by delivering integrated solutions. *International Journal of Project Management* 23: 360–365.
- Davies, A., T. Brady, and M. Hobday. 2006. Charting a path toward integrated solutions. *MIT Sloan Management Review* 47 (3): 39–48.
- Ford, D., and R. McDowell. 1999. Managing business relationships by analyzing the effects and value of different actions. *Industrial Marketing Management* 28: 429–442.
- Gummerus, J. 2013. *Value creation processes and value outcomes in marketing theory: Strangers or siblings?* vol. 13, 19–46.
- Helander, N. 2004. *Value-creating networks: an analysis of the software component business.* Acta Universitatis Ouluensis, G Oeconomica 16, Oulu: University of Oulu.
- Lapierre, J. 2000. Customer-perceived value in industrial contexts. *Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing* 15 (2/3): 122–140.
- Lepak, D., K. Smith, and M. Taylor. 2007. Value creation and value capture: A multilevel perspective. *Academy of Management Review* 32 (1): 180–194.
- Parolini, C. 1999. *The value net. A tool for competitive strategy.* Wiley.
- Patton, M. 1987. *How to use qualitative methods in evaluation.* California: Sage.
- Ravald, A., and C. Grönroos. 1996. The value concept and relationship marketing. *European Journal of Marketing* 30 (2): 19–30.
- Slater, S.F. 1997. Developing a customer value-based theory of the firm. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 25 (2): 162–167.
- Ulaga, W., and S. Chacour. 2001. Measuring customer-perceived value in business markets a prerequisite for marketing strategy development and implementation. *Industrial Marketing Management* 30: 525–540.
- Walter, A., T. Ritter, and H.G. Gemünden. 2001. Value creation in buyer-seller relationships. *Industrial Marketing Management* 30 (4): 365–377.