International Journal of Advanced Studies in Business Strategies and Management | IJASBSM
p-ISSN: 2354-4236 | e-ISSN: 2354-4244
Volume 9, Number 1 March, 2021

Value Creation and Customer Satisfaction of Quick Service Restaurants in Lagos State, Nigeria

[1]Asikhia, O.U., [2]Magaji, N., [3]Fidelis, B. N., & [4]Adeniranye, A. F.
[1,2,3&4]*Department of Business Administration and Marketing, School of Management Sciences, Babcock University, Ilishan –Remo, Ogun State, Nigeria*

Article DOI: 10.48028/iiprds/ijasbsm.v9.i1.07

Abstract

The Quick Service Restaurant (QSR) industry is one of the key contributors to the Nigerian economy; providing substantial revenues to government and sizable employment opportunities at the processing and retailing levels. Previous studies in Nigeria investigated customer value from the customer's perspective but rarely has research sought to achieve both QSRs' owners/managers and customers' perspectives in a single study. Despite the increasing popularity of "*eating out*," Quick Service Restaurants in Nigeria have shown a negative growth rate, with decline in total income, as it has become increasingly difficult to satisfy modern restaurant customers who seek unique experiences that are more than just consuming food. Hence, this study investigated the effect of value creation on customer satisfaction of Quick Service Restaurants in Lagos State, Nigeria. Cross-sectional survey research design was adopted. The population of the study was 799 owners/managers, accountants and customers of Quick Service Restaurants in Lagos State, Nigeria. A well-structured and validated questionnaire was used for data collection. Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficients for the constructs ranged from 0.72 to 0.92. The response rate was 75.8 percent. Data were analysed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Findings revealed that value creation dimensions had no significant effect on customer satisfaction ($Adj.\ R^2$ = -0.011; $F_{(6,296)}$ = 0.450, p<0.05).The study concluded that value creation had no significant effect on customer satisfaction of Quick Service Restaurants in Lagos State, Nigeria. The study recommends that owners / managers of Quick Service Restaurants (QSRs) in Lagos State, Nigeria should go beyond transactional operations and develop customer relationship management programmes in order to enhance customer satisfaction.

Keywords*: Business model, Customer involvement, Customer satisfaction, Organisational resources. Value creation*

Corresponding Author: **Asikhia, O.U.**

Background to the Study

The quick service restaurant (QSR) industry makes sizeable contribution to Nigeria's economic growth. According to Ayeni (2015), the QSR industry employs over 500,000 workers at processing and retail levels, and the industry revenue is estimated at N230 billion. The Nigerian QSR industry is dominated by some 100 small- to medium-sized indigenous brands with over 800 outlets spread across the country (Ademigbuji, 2014). At an estimated population of 180 million people, the restaurants-per-person in Nigeria is very low and it is expected that the low restaurants-per-person will positively impact on the performance of QSRs. However, the performance of the firms in the industry has not matched expectation for reasons such as economic recession, reducing disposable income, rising infrastructure costs, perennial challenge with reliable and quality ingredients (Uvie-Emegbo, 2015), increasing competition from other food service operators, particularly the activities of the local retail restaurants popularly known as "Bukka" and nefarious activities of low level QSR employees. In order to survive and be profitable in the face of rising costs, intense competition and changing customer needs, it is imperative that QSRs come up with value creation initiatives to counteract the adverse effects of these factors.

The importance of value creation to firm performance stems from the long stressed view in the business literature that value creation is the main objective of organisations (Haksever et al., 2004). Drucker (1954) actually posited that the only valid purpose of a company is to create a customer. A plausible inference from these statements is that value creating efforts of organisations are targeted at providing benefits for customers. It is for the foregoing reasons that this study investigates value creation dimensions and customer satisfaction of Quick Service Restaurants in Lagos State, Nigeria. Hence the research hypothesis is stated;

H_0: Value creation dimensions have no significant effect on customer satisfaction of Quick Service Restaurants in Lagos State, Nigeria.

Literature Review

Value Creation

According to Haksever et al., (2004), philosophers and ethicists study the values held by an individual or groups of individuals, such as society. They deal with principles or values that should guide human behaviour. However, unlike ethicists, economists and engineers are interested in the value of things. Taking the concept of value of things further and emphasizing the value derived from activities, policies, and practices of a firms, Haksever et al., (2004) define value as "the capacity of a good, service, or activity to satisfy a need or provide a benefit to a person or legal entity" (p. 292). This definition includes any type of good, service, or act that satisfies a need or provides a benefit, which may be tangible or intangible, including those that positively contribute to the quality of life, knowledge, prestige, safety, physical and financial security, as well as providing nutrition, shelter, transportation, income, etc. Market values as well as nonmarket values are included in this definition and for value to exist it must be perceived as such by the recipient.

Like value, value creation is a concept with many meanings (Fayolle, 2007; Gronroos, 2011). On one hand, value creation means the customer's creation of value-in-use. On the other hand, value creation is used to describe the whole process of development, design, manufacturing and delivery as well as back-office and front-office activities, including the customer's creation of value-in-use (Gronroos, 2011). Gronroos (2008) explained that value for customer or customer value means that customers, after being assisted by the provision of resources or interactive process, are better or feel better off than before. Based on the foregoing, the researcher adapted Haksever et al., (2004) definition of value and Gronroos's (2008), definition of value for customer to define value creation as the creation of customer value through the deployment of good, service, resource or activity to satisfy customer's need or provide a benefit to a customer.

Value Creation Dimensions

A review of extant literature revealed that the dimensions of value creation comprise: business model, environmental scanning, customer involvement, organizational innovation, organizational resources, and stakeholder orientation. Business model is considered a veritable tool for improving firm performance because it is generally accepted that a business model has value creation at its core (Teece, 2010; Zott and Amit, 2010). Amit and Zott (2001) see the business model as an innovation platform that is capable of transforming entire industries. In addition to value creation, a business model also encapsulates the mechanism for delivering and capturing value for a firm.

Environmental scanning is the collection of information about events and relationships in a company's external environment, the knowledge of which would assist top management in its task of charting the company's future course of action (Aguilar, 1967). Aaker (1983), cited in Zhang et al., (2011) opined that environmental scanning should focus on target information needs, allocate effort among employees exposed to relevant information, and have an effective system for storing, processing and disseminating information. Environmental scanning has also been defined as assessing the societal environment and task environment to identify trends, threats and opportunities as a base for formulating strategies (Harrison and John, 1998). Yu et al., (2019) considered environmental scanning to be a requirement for strategic plan development in complex and constantly changing business environments.

Customer involvement (CI) refers to the degree to which customers are involved in a firm's new product development NPD) and continuous improvement programmes (Feng et al., 2014). CI may range from providing minor design suggestions to being responsible for the whole development process of a new product (Chen and Paulraj, 2004). Since customers can be involved not only in market opportunity analysis but also in product testing, product commercialization and continuous improvement, CI has been considered as one of the most often used methods to improve new product performance (Feng et al., 2014).

Organisational innovation refers to the implementation of a new or significantly improved product (good or service), or process, a new marketing method, or a new organisational method in business practices, workplace organisation or external relations (OECD, 2005). Organisational innovation comprises mainly new product development, process innovation, and administrative innovations. A product innovation is the introduction of a good or service that is new or significantly improved with respect to its characteristics or intended uses. A process innovation involves new ways of producing products or services as well as new ways of delivering them to customers (Blumentritt, 2004). Administrative innovation refers to procedures that enable innovation to be an inherent part of a company's operation (Laforet and Tann, 2006).

Organisational resources all assets, capabilities, organisational processes, attributes, information, and knowledge controlled by the organisation that allow it to implement more effective and efficient business strategies. These firm-specific heterogeneous resources can be classified into three categories of capital resources, namely: physical (plant and equipment), human (skills and knowledge) and organisational (capabilities associated with formal and informal planning, controlling and coordinating) (Barney, 1991). According to Daft (1983), company resources include all assets, capabilities, organisational processes, information, knowledge, attributes and so on controlled by a firm. Kamasak (2017) defined organisational resources as comprising tangible resources (cash, financial investments, physical structures and raised capital), intangible resources (e.g. brand, corporate image and organisational culture) and capabilities (e.g. human capital, networking capabilities and business processes).

A company's stakeholder orientation represents how much the company attends to the interests of all its relevant stakeholders and thus attempts to address such interests (Greenley and Foxall 1996, 1997, 1998). Stakeholder orientation has also been referred to as the organisational culture and behaviors that induces organisational members to continuously be aware of, and to positively act upon, a variety of stakeholder issues (Maignan et al., 2011). Four stakeholder groups consistently identified as relevant to most corporations are: customers, competitors, employees, and shareholders (Greenley and Foxall, 1996, 1997, 1998). The first two stakeholders, customers and competitors, are the components of the market orientation (Narver andj Slater 1990).

Customer Satisfaction

According to Kotler (2001), "satisfaction is the feeling of pleasure or disappointment resulting from comparing the performance (or outcome) of a product or service perceived quality in relation to the buyer's expectation" (58). In their study of customer satisfaction in the restaurant industry, Andaleeb and Conway (2006), maintained that the offering for the full service restaurant industry must be considered as a mixture of service and product features that will be considered by the customers. For this reason, they argued that customers are likely to consider specific aspects of the transaction such as product features (food quality and restaurant ambience), service features (responsiveness of the server), as well as price, to be satisfied with their overall restaurant experience.

Value Creation Dimensions and Customer Satisfaction

The QSR industry is increasingly multifaceted and extremely competitive (Mhlanga, 2018) and customers are becoming more demanding and increasingly selective of the types of services they receive (Bhasin, 2018). Several studies have been carried out in the area of value creation dimensions and their effect on customer satisfaction. Though most of the studies reported that value creation dimensions have positive and significant effect on customer satisfaction, a few studies found negative and significant effect. For instance, Marchet et al., (2017) found that business models employed by third party logistics (3PL) companies have a positive effect on the satisfaction of shippers, and that the 3PL companies' business models is a major criterion for the selection of 3PL companies by the shippers. Rundh (2016) reported a positive effect of innovative packaging employed by food packaging companies on customer satisfaction while Karabulut (2015) also found product innovation, process innovation and administrative innovation to positively impact customer satisfaction. Rubera and Kirca (2017) concluded that firm innovation has positive effect on customer satisfaction and firm value such that customer satisfaction is an intermediate outcome that partially mediates the effects of firm innovation on firm value. In their study on the effect of customer value anticipation capability on customer satisfaction and loyalty, Flint et al., (2010) discovered that customer value anticipation positively affect both customer satisfaction and customer loyalty. In addition, they reported that customer value anticipation capability also has a strong effect on customer loyalty by operating through customer satisfaction. In the same vein, Anning-Dorson et al., 2018 established that involvement capability of service firms helps them to exploit their relational assets and create and manage strong customer participation. Additionally, it was found that involvement capabilities enable service firms to capitalise on the competencies of customers, which in turn improves the outcomes of their innovativeness. Overall, the results showed that the interaction between involvement capability and innovativeness enhances firm performance (customer satisfaction) significantly.

Contrary to the findings of previous studies on value creation dimensions and customer satisfaction, Otulia et al., (2017) found that organisational resources have a negative effect on organisational performance measured by customer satisfaction, employee satisfaction and economic sustainability. Based on the result of their study, they opined that the most critical factor for organisational performance is the availability of well-trained personnel who will ensure the efficient utilisation of organisational resources not just the availability of resources. Kuehnl et al., (2016) established that superior value proposition did not translate to high customer value perception (an antecedent of customer satisfaction). More importantly, they affirmed that firms' business models, internal and external environment are better predictors of customers' value perception than superior value proposition at the product level.

Theoretical Foundation

Dynamic Capabilities

Dynamic Capabilities (DC), developed by Teece et al., (1997), refers to "the firm's ability to integrate, build, and reconfigure internal and external competences to address rapidly changing environments" (516). DC examines how firms address changes in their turbulent business environment through reconfiguration of their firm-specific competencies into new competencies (Teece, 2007). Dynamic Capabilities is concerned with mechanisms for bringing about organizational change, change management, issues of strategic renewal, adaptation and growth. Because of its concern with mechanisms for change, it links to innovation and organisational learning (Easterby-Smith et al., 2009). Eisenhardt and Martin (2000) defined DC as "the firm's processes that use resources – specifically the processes to integrate, reconfigure, gain and release resources – to match and even create market change" and "the organizational and strategic routines by which firms achieve new resources and configurations as markets emerge, collide, split, evolve, and die" (1107).

In the perspective of DC, and in contrast to the RBV, there exists a very clear distinction between resources and capabilities. Competitive advantage sources lie, in the context of DC, with greater emphasis on capabilities than on resources because the value of resources in the context of dynamic markets tends to depreciate quickly (Collis and Montgomery, 2008). Resources remain important, not per se, but based on the configuration conferred by DC (Cavusgil et al., 2007; Liao et al., 2009), because it is not clear that all companies use their resources in the same ways, even those resources that are easily accessible (Cardeal and Antonio, 2012). Instead, firms combine these resources with inside knowledge, in order to put together the pieces of a puzzle, to find solutions, and to achieve strategic and operational objectives. The way these resources are interconnected and the most appropriate combinations and types of interconnections are relevant in DC (Kay, 2010).

As important as having useful resources, is the possession of capabilities that allows the integration and use of these resources (Barney and Wright, 1998). Over time, firms have opportunities to improve their organizational processes or routines (which reflect how things are done in the company). Combining this path dependency effect with the fact that, due to their strong intangible component, organizational resources or routines are ambiguous (in the sense that their relationship with competitive advantage is not evident and is often the result of the integration of various packages of resources) and are also socially complex, these processes/routines are difficult for competitors to imitate, which increases the firm's potential to achieve competitive advantage (Teece et al., 1997).

Dynamic capabilities help firm's sense opportunities and then seize them by successfully reallocating resources, often by adjusting existing competencies or developing new ones. An enterprise with strong DC will be able to innovate and respond to or create changes in the market by profitably building and renewing resources, assets and capabilities in the appropriate way (Teece, 2018). Dynamic capabilities are important to this study because the dimensions of value creation employed are essentially capabilities, which when they are properly developed, integrated and reconfigured will enable a focal firm create benefits that will enhance customer satisfaction.

Methodology

A cross-sectional survey research design was employed for the study. The study made use of two target populations. The first target population for the study were owners/managers and accountants of 207 outlets of QSRs located within Lagos State and registered with Lagos State Chapter of Restaurant and Food Services Proprietors Association of Nigeria (REFSPAN). This made the first population four hundred and fourteen (414). Census method was used for the first population because of the relatively small size. The second target population for the study comprised customers of QSRs registered with Lagos State Chapter of REFSPAN. Lagos State Chapter was chosen for this study because it has over 50% of QSRs in Nigeria (REFSPAN). The QSR customers (second target population) have an infinite population; therefore, the sample size for the second population was determined using a formula for the sample size determination of an infinite population ("Qualtrics," n.d.). The calculated sample size for the second study population was three hundred and eighty-five (385) respondents. For the second target population, multi-stage sampling technique was employed because it offered a convenient way of finding survey sample. At the first stage, Lagos State was divided into the five old administrative divisions created in May 1968 by virtue of Administrative Divisions [Establishment] Edict No. 3 of April 1968 namely: Ikeja, Badagry, Ikorodu, Lagos and Epe. The total sample size of 385 respondents was surveyed in proportion to the outlets in each administrative division. At the second stage, the choice of QSR outlets whose customers were surveyed in each administrative division was selected through purposive sampling. The selection criterion for the purposive sampling of QSR outlets was customer traffic. This was to ensure that the researcher reached a wider number of QSR customers. At the third and final stage, convenience sampling technique was used in administering the research instrument to the customers of the QSRs within the premises of the QSR outlets. The QSR customers were asked to provide objective information on one of the measures of firm performance for the study – customer satisfaction. Data was collected from the owners / managers and accountants with the aid of close-ended structured questionnaire.

The validity of measurement was established through content and construct validity. For the content validity, the research instrument was given to colleagues in the doctoral seminar class and other researchers in the Department of Business Administration and Marketing, Babcock University to ascertain that the items adequately covered the domain of the constructs. To further improve content validity, a principal component factor analysis was used to check the adequacy of the sample size. The common measures of sampling adequacy, Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measures (KMO) and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity, were used to test the significance of the variables. The construct validity of all variables involved in the study was established through Exploratory Factor Analysis. Cronbach's Alpha was used to determine the internal reliability of the items in the questionnaire in this study. The Cronbach's Alpha is a reliability coefficient that indicates how well the items in a set in the questionnaire are positively correlated to one another. The Cronbach's Alpha values for the constructs ranged between 0.72 and 0.92.Inferential analysis was carried out using statistical tools of multiple linear regression analysis models to establish the relative effect of the sub-independent variables on the sub-variable of the dependent variable (customer satisfaction).

Response Rate

A total of 799 copies of questionnaire were administered to 414 owners/managers and accountants, and Quick Service Restaurants (QSR) customers in Lagos State, Nigeria, respectively. Out of 799 copies of questionnaire that were distributed, 606 (i.e., 303 copies from each group) were correctly filled and returned. This represented 75.8 percent. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) and Saunders et al., (2007), a response rate of 50 percent is adequate, 60 percent is good, and 70 percent is very good. Therefore, the response rate of 75.8 percent is very good and hence acceptable for drawing conclusions on the study. The results are shown in Table 1

Table 1: Response Rate

Categories	Target Respondents	Successful Respondents	Response Rate (%)
Owners/managers and accountants	414	303	73.2
Customers	385	303	78.7
Entire Sample	799	606	75.8

Source: Field survey (2020).

Results and Discussion

The data for value creation dimensions was generated by adding all the responses on business model, environmental scanning, customer involvement, organisational innovation, organisational resources, and stakeholder orientation. Specifically, the questions related to: organisational resources sub-variables (physical resources, financial resources, experiential resources, informational capabilities, and relationship building capabilities), and stakeholder orientation sub-variables (customer orientation, employee orientation, shareholder orientation, and competitive orientation) were each respectively combined to form total average indices of organisational resources and stakeholder orientation. Also, data for customer satisfaction was generated by adding the scores of the items of the variable in the questionnaire administered to the customers. Data from six hundred and six (606) respondents were gathered and analysed using SPSS version 21 software. The results of the multiple linear regression analysis are shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Summary of multiple regression analysis for effects of value creation dimensions in relation to customer satisfaction.

<table>
<tr><th>N</th><th>Model</th><th>B</th><th>Sig.</th><th>T</th><th>ANOVA (Sig.)</th><th>R</th><th>R^2</th><th>Adjusted R^2</th><th>F (df)</th></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="9">606</td><td>(Constant)</td><td>4.479</td><td>0.000</td><td>17.292</td><td rowspan="7">0.845[b]</td><td rowspan="7">0.0095</td><td rowspan="7">0.009</td><td rowspan="7">-0.011</td><td rowspan="7">0.450 (6, 296)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Business Model</td><td>-0.031</td><td>0.615</td><td>-0.504</td></tr>
<tr><td>Environmental Scanning</td><td>-0.038</td><td>0.611</td><td>-0.510</td></tr>
<tr><td>Customer Involvement</td><td>0.003</td><td>0.945</td><td>0.070</td></tr>
<tr><td>Organisational Innovation</td><td>0.005</td><td>0.930</td><td>0.088</td></tr>
<tr><td>Organisational Resources</td><td>0.073</td><td>0.384</td><td>0.872</td></tr>
<tr><td>Stakeholder Orientation</td><td>-0.070</td><td>0.409</td><td>-0.827</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td colspan="8">Predictors: (Constant), business model, environmental scanning, customer involvement, organisational innovation, organisational resources and stakeholder orientation</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td colspan="8">Dependent Variable: Customer Satisfaction</td></tr>
</table>

Source: Researcher's Findings (2020)

The analysis in Table 2 shows the result of the multiple linear regression analysis on the effect of value creation dimensions (business model, environmental scanning, customer involvement, organisational innovation, organisational resources and stakeholder orientation) on customer satisfaction of Quick Service Restaurants in Lagos State, Nigeria. The analysis revealed that none of the value creation dimensions have any significant effect on customer satisfaction of Quick Service Restaurants in Lagos State, Nigeria. The result showed that customer involvement (β = 0.003, t = 0.070, p>0.05), organisational innovation (β = 0.005, t = 0.088, p>0.05) and organisational resources (β = 0.073, t = 0.872, p>0.05) have positive but insignificant effect on customer satisfaction of Quick Service Restaurants in Lagos State, Nigeria. The result further showed that business model (β = -0.031, t = -0.504, p>0.05), environmental scanning (β = -0.038, t = -0.510, p>0.05) and stakeholder orientation (β = -0.070, t = -0.827, p>0.05) have a negative and insignificant effect on customer satisfaction of Quick Service Restaurants in Lagos State, Nigeria.

Also, the R value of 0.0095 revealed that a very weak relationship exists between the explanatory variables and the explained variable, which is further confirmed by the low coefficient of determination value 0.009. The coefficient of multiple determination, adjusted R^2 is extremely low and negative -0.011 ($F_{(6,296)}$ = 0.450, p=0.845) indicating that value creation dimensions do not in any way determine the customer satisfaction of Quick Service Restaurants in Lagos State, Nigeria. Also, the F-statistics (df = 6,296) = 0.450 at p = 0.845 (p>0.05) indicates that the overall model is not significant in predicting the effect of value creation dimensions on customers satisfaction. This implies that value creation dimensions (business model, environmental scanning, customer involvement, organisational innovation, organisational resources and stakeholder orientation) had no significant effect on customer satisfaction of Quick Service Restaurants in Lagos State, Nigeria.

The regression results showed that holding all value creation dimensions employed in this study to a constant zero, customer satisfaction would still be somewhat positive. The analysis also showed that when customer involvement, organisational innovation and organisational resources are improved by one unit customer satisfaction will be improved by an insignificant and negligible value of by 0.003, 0.005 and 0.073 respectively. This indicates that an increase in customer involvement, organisational innovation and organisational resources would lead to a subsequent insignificant increase in customer satisfaction of Quick Service Restaurants in Lagos State, Nigeria. Similarly, an improvement by one unit in business model, environmental scanning, and stakeholder orientation will cause an insignificant decrease of 0.031, 0.038 and 0.070 respectively in customer satisfaction of Quick Service Restaurants in Lagos State, Nigeria. The result of the analysis indicate that Quick Service Restaurants in Lagos State, Nigeria should seek for other measures that will enhance customer satisfaction other than the value creation dimensions employed in this study. Therefore, the null hypothesis (H_{01}) which states value creation dimensions have no significant effect on customer satisfaction of Quick Service Restaurants in Lagos State, Nigeria was not rejected.

Discussion

The result of multiple linear regression analysis on the effect of value creation dimensions (business model, environmental scanning, customer involvement, organisational innovation, organisational resources and stakeholder orientation) on customer satisfaction of Quick Service Restaurants in Lagos State, Nigeria revealed that value creation dimensions had a negative and insignificant effect on customer satisfaction of Quick Service Restaurants in Lagos State, Nigeria.

Conceptually, when organisations create functional, experiential, symbolic or cost benefits for customers through the provision of products or during an interactive process, this results in the customers feeling better off than they were before the use of product or service provided by the organisations or interaction with the organisations (Gronroos, 2008; Haksever et al., 2004; Smith and Colgate, 2007). This sense of better feeling translates to satisfaction. Haksever et al., (2004) noted that the creation of value for customers is actually the main objective of organisations. Expectedly, each of the value creation dimensions provides benefits for customers and ultimately enhances firm performance when strategically deployed by organisations. Specifically, in conceptual terms business model has value creation at its core since it is a description of the rationale of how an organisation creates, delivers and captures value (Osterwalder and Pigneur, 2010; Teece, 2010; Zott and Amit, 2010). Environmental scanning contributes to the meeting of customers' needs leading to satisfaction by providing top management with necessary information and knowledge in the organisation's external environment which assist with the formulation of appropriate strategic plans and decisions (Zhang et al., 2011). Furthermore, customer involvement influences customer satisfaction because customers are the arbiters of value (Priem, 2007). Therefore, when customers are involved in the process of new product development (NPD), the likelihood of success of NPD is enhanced and the risk of unintended consequences in the NPD process is significantly mitigated.

Also, in conceptual terms, organisational innovation provides benefits for customers, ultimately, leading to customer satisfaction by generating functional, experiential, symbolic and/or cost benefits for customers through product innovation (the introduction of a good or service that is new or significantly improved with respect to its characteristics or intended uses), process innovation (new ways of producing products or services as well as new ways of delivering them to customers (Blumentritt, 2004) and administrative innovation - instituting procedures that enable innovation to be an inherent part of a company's operation (Laforet and Tann, 2006). Organisational resources, which comprise tangible resources, intangible resources and capabilities (Kamasak, 2017) enable organisations meet their main objective of creating customer value / benefits by allowing top management of organisations implement effective and efficient business strategies (Barney, 1991). Daft (1983) particularly affirmed that capabilities facilitate the transformation of a firm's available resources into valuable outputs. In effect, without organisational resources, it will be impossible for organisations to provide benefits for their customers. Customers are one of the four stakeholders groups that have been repeatedly identified as relevant to most organisations. Since an organisation's stakeholder orientation (SO) represents how much the company attends to the interests of all its relevant stakeholders and thus attempts to address such interests, SO conceptually bring about customer satisfaction by facilitating the entrenchment of organisational culture and behaviors that induce organisational members to continuously be aware of, and to positively act upon, a variety of customer issues (Greenley and Foxall, 1996, 1997, 1998).

There are previous empirical findings on the effect of value creation dimensions on customer satisfaction that corroborate the findings of this study. For instance, Otulia et al., (2017) found that organisational resources had a negative effect on organisational performance measured by customer satisfaction, employee satisfaction and economic sustainability. Based on the result of their study, they opined that the most critical factor for organisational performance is the availability of well-trained personnel who will ensure the efficient utilisation of organisational resources not just the availability of tangible resources. In essence, a full complement of resources (tangible, intangible, and capabilities) is critical for the achievement of firm performance. Moreover, Kuehnl et al., (2016) established that superior value proposition did not translate to high customer value perception (an antecedent of customer satisfaction). More importantly, they affirmed that firms' business models, internal and external environment are better predictors of customers' value perception than superior value proposition at the product level. In effect, the prevalence of organisational resources is not a sufficient condition for customer satisfaction; the internal and external business environment must be favourable, in addition to the deployment of suitable business model. On the contrary, there are studies that contradict the findings of this study with respect to the interaction effect of value creation dimensions on customer satisfaction. Marchet et al., (2017) found that the business models employed by third party logistics (3PL) companies have a positive effect on the satisfaction of shippers. Rundh (2016), reported a positive effect of innovative packaging employed by food packaging companies on customer satisfaction while Karabulut (2015) also found product innovation, process innovation and organisational innovation to positively impact customer satisfaction. Rubera and Kirca (2017) concluded that firm innovation has positive effect on customer satisfaction and firm value such that customer satisfaction is an intermediate outcome that partially mediates the effects of firm innovation on firm value. In their study on the effect of customer value anticipation capability on customer satisfaction and loyalty, Flint et al., (2010) discovered that customer value anticipation positively affect both customer satisfaction and customer loyalty. In addition, they reported that customer value anticipation capability also has a strong effect on customer loyalty by operating through customer satisfaction.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, the findings of Otulia et al., (2017) and Kuehnl et al., (2016) offer some explanations of the reasons for the negative and insignificant effect of value creation dimensions on customer satisfaction of QSR in Lagos State. The tough external environment typified by insecurity challenges, economic recession, and reducing disposable income (Uvie-Emegbo, 2015) could have adversely impacted customer value perception (particularly, experiential and cost value) and, by extension, customer satisfaction. Closely linked to the external business environment condition is the increasing competition from the activities of local retail restaurants popularly known as "Bukka," whose cost advantage could switch customer value perception away from QSRs. Moreover, tough external environment often translates to challenging internal business environment resulting in rising raw material costs (Ononiwu, 2015), high infrastructure costs, difficulty in attracting much needed human capital, all of which impact the creation of customer value. On the strength of the foregoing findings, which established that value creation dimensions had negative and insignificant effect on overall market, therefore this study did not reject the null hypothesis one (H_{01}) that value creation dimensions have no significant effect on customer satisfaction of Quick Service Restaurants in Lagos State, Nigeria.

Theoretically, even though Dynamic Capabilities Theory identifies the dimensions of the main independent variable, value creation, in this study namely: business model, environmental scanning, customer involvement, innovation, organisational resources and stakeholder orientation as organisational resources (Daft, 1983; Kamasak, 2017), which when integrated and reconfigured in response to changes in the external business environment will result in the achievement of predetermined organisational objectives (Tecce, 2007), the findings of the study did not support the Dynamic Capabilities because of the influence of the internal and external environment as reported by Kuehnl et al., (2016). Therefore, this study did not reject the null hypothesis one (H_{01}) that value creation dimensions have no significant effect on customer satisfaction of Quick Service Restaurants in Lagos State, Nigeria.

Conclusion and Recommendation

In conclusion, value creation dimensions (business model, environmental scanning, customer involvement, organisational innovation, organisational resources and stakeholder orientation) had no significant effect on customer satisfaction of Quick Service Restaurants in Lagos State, Nigeria ($Adj.\ R^2$ = -0.011; $F_{(6,296)}$ = 0.450, p<0.05). Based on the findings of this study, it is recommended that Quick Service Restaurants (QSRs) in Lagos State, Nigeria put efforts to increase value creation particularly in order to enhance customer satisfaction, which is clearly in need of rejuvenation. In this regard, it is recommended that QSRs should go beyond transactional operations and develop Customer Relationship Management programmes in order to enhance customer satisfaction. Such programmes would provide avenues for obtaining valuable feedback from customers and facilitate the development of products and services in tandem with customer tastes, preferences and expectations.

References

Ademigbuji, A. (2014). *Fast food industry…not so fast anymore The Nation Newspaper*, https://thenationonlineng.net/

Aguilar, F. I. (1967). *Scanning the business environment*, Macmillan Press.

Amit, R., & Zott, C. (2001). Value creation in e-business, *Strategic Management Journal, 22*, 493-520.

Andaleeb, S. S., & Conway, C. (2006). Customer satisfaction in the restaurant industry: An examination of the transaction-specific model, *Journal of Services Marketing, 20* (1), 3-11.

Anning-Dorson, T., Hinson, R. E., Amidu, M., & Nyamekye, M. B. (2018). Enhancing service firm performance through customer involvement capability and innovativeness, *Management Research Review, 41* (11), 1271-1289.

Ayeni, B. (2015). Synergy in the food chain: A catalyst for economic and agricultural development. *AFFCON 2015 National Conference / Food Expo*, Ikeja, October 14-16, Lagos, Nigeria.

Barney, J. B. (1991). Firms resources and sustained competitive advantage, *Journal of Management, 17* (1), 99-120.

Barney, J. B., & Wright, P. (1998). On becoming a strategic partner: the role of human resources in gaining competitive advantage, *Human Resource Management, 37* (1), 31-46.

Bhasin, H. (2018). *SWOT analysis of Nandos, Marketing 91 blog*. https://www.marketing91.com/

Blumentritt, T. (2004). Does small and mature have to mean dull? Defying the ho-hum at SMEs, *Journal of Business Strategy*, *25* (1), 27–33.

Cardeal, N., & Antonio, N. (2012). Valuable, rare, inimitable resources and organisation (VRIO) resources or valuable, rare, inimitable resources (VRI) capabilities: what leads to competitive advantage?, *African Journal of Business Management, 6* (37), 10159- 10170.

Cavusgil, E., Serggie, S. H., & Talay, M. B. (2007). Dynamic capabilities view: Foundations and research agenda, *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice, 15* (2), 159-166.

Chen, I. J., & Paulraj, A. (2004). Towards a theory of supply chain management: The constructs and measurements, *Journal of Operations Management, 22* (2), 119-150.

Collis, D. J., & Montgomery, C. A. (2008). Competing on resources, *Harvard Business Review, 86* (7,8), 140-150.

Daft, L. R. (1983). *Organisational theory and designs*, West Publishing Company.

Drucker, P. F. (1954). *The practice of management*, Harper Collier.

Easterby-Smith, M., Lyles, M. A., & Peteraf, M. A. (2009). Dynamic capabilities: Current debates and future directions, *British Journal of Management, 20*(1), S1-S8.

Eisenhardt, K. M., & Martin, J. A. (2000). Dynamic capabilities: What are they?, *Strategic Management Journal, 21*(1), 1105-1121.

Fayolle, A. (2007). *Entrepreneurship and new value creation: The dynamic of the entrepreneurial process*, Cambridge University Press.

Feng, T., Sun, L., Sohal, A. S., & Wang, D. (2014). External involvement and firm performance: Is time-to-market of new products a missing link?, *International Journal of Production Research, 52* (3), 727-742.

Flint, D. J., Blocker, C. P., & Boutin, P. J. (2010). Customer value anticipation, customer satisfaction and loyalty: An empirical examination, *Industrial Marketing Management, 40* (2), 219-230.

Greenley, G. E., & Foxall, G. R. (1998). External moderation of associations among stakeholder orientations and company performance, *International Journal of Research in Marketing, 15* (1), 51–69.

Greenley, G. E., & Foxall, G. R. (1997). Multiple stakeholder orientation in U.K. companies and the implications for company performance, *Journal of Management Studies, 34* (2), 259–84.

Greenley, G. E., & Foxall, G. R. (1996). Consumer and non-consumer stakeholder orientations in UK companies, *Journal of Business Research, 35*(2), 105–116.

Gronroos, C. (2011). A service perspective on business relationships: The value creation, interaction and marketing interphase, *Industrial Marketing Management, 40* (1), 240–247.

Gronroos, C. (2008). Service logic revisited: Who creates value? and who co-creates?, *European Business Review, 20* (4), 298–314.

Haksever, C., Chaganti, R., & Cook, R. G. (2004). A model of value creation: Strategic view, *Journal of Business Ethics, 49*, 291-305.

Harrison, J. S., & John, C. H. S. (1998). *Foundations in strategic management*, South-Western.

Kamasak, R. (2017). The contribution of tangible and intangible resources, and capabilities to a firm's profitability and market performance, *European Journal of Management and Business Economics. 26* (2) 252-275.

Karabulut, A. T. (2015). Effects of innovation types on performance of manufacturing firms in Turkey, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 195*(1), 1355-1364.

Kay, N. (2010). Dynamic capabilities as context: The role of decision, system and structure, *Industrial and Corporate Change, 19* (4), 1205-1223.

Kotler, P. (2001). *A framework for marketing management*, Prentice Hall.

Kuehnl, C., Furst, A., Homburg, C., & Staritz, M. (2016). Towards a differentiated understanding of the value-creation chain, *British Journal of Management, 1* (1), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.12206

Laforet, S., & Tann, J. (2006). Innovative characteristics of small manufacturing firms, *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development, 13*(3), 363–380.

Liao, J., Jill, R., Kickul, J. R., & Ma, H. (2009). Organisational dynamic capability and innovation: An empirical examination of internet firms, *Journal of Small Business Management, 47*(3), 263-286.

Maignan, I., Gonzalez-Padron, T. L., Hult, G. T. M., & Ferrell, O. C. (2011). Stakeholder orientation: development and testing of a framework for socially responsible marketing, *Journal of Strategic Marketing, 19* (4), 313-338.

Marchet, G., Melacini, M., Perotti, S., Sassi, C., & Tappia, E. (2017). Value creation models in the 3PL industry: What 3PL providers do to cope with shipper requirements, *International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics Management, 47* (6), 472-494.

Mhlanga, O. (2018). Factors impacting restaurant efficiency: A data envelopment analysis, *Tourism Review, 73*(1), 82-93.

Mugenda, O. M., & Mugenda, A. G. (2003). *Research methods: Quantitative and qualitative approaches* (*revised ed*), African Centre for Technology Studies (ACTS).

Narver, J. C., & Slater, S. F. (1990). The effect of market orientation on business profitability, *Journal of Marketing, 54* (1), 20–35.

OECD. (2005). *Oslo manual*, OECD.

Ononiwu, A. E. (2015). Virtual enterprise and the fast food industry: a case study of fast food operators in Edo State, *International Journal of Engineering, Business and Enterprise Applications, 11*(2), 198-200.

Osterwalder, A., & Pigneur, Y. (2010). *Business model generation: A handbook for visionaries, game changers and challengers*, John Wiley & Sons.

Otulia, P. O., Mbeche, I. M., Wainaina, G., & Njihia, J. (2017). Influence of organisational resources on performance of ISO certified organisations in Kenya, *European Scientific Journal, 13*(34), 119-133.

Priem, R. L. (2007). A consumer perspective on value creation, *Academy of Management Review, 32*(1), 219-235.

Qualtrics. (n.d.). *Determining sample size: How to ensure you get the correct sample size Qualtrics blog*, https://www.Qualtrics.com/

Rubera, G., & Kirca, A. H. (2017). You gotta serve somebody: The effects of firm innovation on customer satisfaction and firm value, *Journal of the Academy Marketing Science, 45*(1), 741–761.

Rundh, B. (2016). The role of packaging within marketing and value creation, *British Food Journal, 118*(10), 2491-2511.

Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2007). *Research Methods for Business Students*(4th ed.). Prentice Hall Financial Times.

Smith, J. B., & Colgate, M. (2007). Customer value creation: A practical framework, *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice, 15*(1), 7-23.

Teece, D. J. (2018). Business models and dynamic capabilities, *Long Range Planning, 51* (1), 40-49.

Teece, D. J. (2010). Business models, business strategy and innovation, *Long Range Planning, 43*(1), 172-194.

Teece, D. J. (2007). Explicating dynamic capabilities: The nature and micro foundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance, *Strategic Management Journal, 28*(13), 1319-1350.

Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management, *Strategic Management Journal, 18*(7), 509-533.

Uvie-Emegbo, A. (2015). *Taking a bigger bite out of the Nigerian QSR industry*, Financial Nigeria magazine. http://financialnigeria.com

Yu, W., Chavez, R., Jacobs, M. A., Wong, C. Y., & Yuan, C. (2019). Environmental scanning, supply chain integration, responsiveness, and operational performance: An integrative framework from an organizational information processing theory perspective, *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, *39* (5), 787-814.

Zhang, X., Majid, S., & Foo, S. (2011). The contribution of environmental scanning to organisational performance, *Singapore Journal of Library & Information Management. 40* (1), 65-88.

Zott, C., & Amit, R. (2010). Business model design: An activity system perspective, *Long Range Planning*, *43* (2/3), 216–226.