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Abstract

Operating performance is the basic goal of any enterprise. This study aims to explore how to improve operating performance by service innovation and service quality and examine the moderation effect of team innovative. With rapidly changing environment, innovation would be the solution for the upcoming challenge, and to be ensuring for business sustainable growth and survival. As the environment is gradually complicated, the team work will provide a wide range of integration skills for organization success. That would offer a more effective innovation model (see Figure1) for jobs and make an important contribution to the organization. In this study, we take purposive sampling, collecting 230 valid questionnaires from restaurant senior executives with hierarchical regression analysis to verify the assumptions in this research. According to statistical results and analyses, service innovation had significantly positive relationship on business performance, quality of service had significant positive relationship on business performance, service innovation would have significantly positive influence on operating performance through moderating effect of team innovation, and service quality would have significantly positive influence on operating performance through moderating effect of team innovation.

Finally, the study conducted deep discussion on conclusions and managerial implications, as well as presented concrete research contributions and practical recommendations for academic field and practitioners.
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1. Introduction

Through service innovation and service quality, the restaurants could create business performance. With the changes in the external business environment, the service industry has gradually become the most important and the most potential development industry. For enterprises, with improving service quality and service innovation management model, they could create a more favorable business performance and competitive advantage. Taiwanese service sectors are included in the major countries in the world economic system and play an important role. Gallouj (2002) indicated that the service innovation actually exists, and each people has experienced with it. For example: in the restaurant consumption, the original restaurants made with different cognitive types of services that reached the service innovation. Tidd, J; Hull, F (2003) mentioned the service innovation is different from the past service concept or service delivery. In other words, the team work produces more effective innovation model by the way of its internal operation (Anderson, De Dreu & Nijstad, 2004; West, 2001). The process will pass additional value to customers through new or improved solutions to problems. Therefore, organizations increasingly team innovation in response to rapidly changing market environment (Edmondson, 1999; Ragazzoni et al, 2002). Service innovation can bring multiple benefits for the organization, and the service quality of customer expectations actually perceived the gap between before services and after service. Improve customer perception of service quality, the customer will increase satisfaction, then customer loyalty increases, and of course, the company's profit. Tang (1999) considered rapidly changing environment, the team innovation maintains its competitive advantage. Carlson & William (2006) increase team innovation and deliver new customer value in a market could improve organizational performance. Subramaniam & Youndt (2005) proposed innovation to create new products, services and performance in the work practices. Team innovation is a new idea, and make innovation applied into practices. New innovation concepts and ideas can obtain the performance improvement in an organization. The study aims at the following four objectives; first, service innovation had significantly positive relationship on business performance. Second, quality of service had significant positive relationship on business performance. Third, service innovation would have significantly positive influence on operating
performance through moderating effect of team innovation. Finally, service quality would have significantly positive influence on operating performance through moderating effect of team innovation.

2 Literature Review

Service quality seeks to measure firm performance along with certain core elements of the service dimensions. Service quality is the process to continuous increase in customers’ expectations and subsequent demands in the recent global competition market (Chen & Hu, 2013; Francis, Humphreys & Fry, 2003; Kim & Lee, 2011; Lin et al, 2009; Tsai et al., 2011). The company’s primary strategy is to provide customers with a high standard of service quality. Service quality refers to the extent to which customers perceive quality in the aspects of tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy, (Parasuraman et al., 1988).

The service quality could be found from a diverse range of industries, including hotel, fast food, education, airline, banking, telecommunication, health, and etc. Because the living standards increase in consumer tastes, consumers would expect to experience innovative goods or services of companies (Prince & Simon, 2009). Companies will provide innovative goods and services to exceed customer expectations and make possible to meet customer recognition and customer satisfaction. Kim & Renee (2005) proposed the value of innovation, encourage enterprises to focus on the business to flip the buyer and the company’s value. Van Ark, Broersma & den Hertog (2003) indicated that service innovation is often to improve new service concept that is different from the past. Van Ark, Broersma & den Hertog (2003) also indicated communicate with customers through the service delivery system or technology concepts, the leadership should integrate the process and update services.

Lievens and Moenaert (2000) proposed the higher the degree of innovation, the service innovation would be more possible to reach awareness of service results and service expectations. Amrit Tiwana (2001) pointed out in a rapidly competitive globalization market, high customer turnover can help companies achieve customer satisfaction and enhance customer loyalty and from existing customers are gain more profit. Tidd, J; Hull, F (2003) service innovation is different from the past concept of service, and service delivery process with added value to the customer and improve solutions to problems.

Mad et al. (1996) & Ostroff (1999) claimed that service innovation plays a key factor beyond competitors. Service innovation processes must be open,
manage the knowledge that generates innovation with driven by customer engagement, systems must updated and encourage and support employee engagement during development stage (Page and Schirr, 2008; Storey and Hughes, 2013). In recent years that scholars have attempted to review the extant literature on service innovation and provid important insights into the current state of the field (Biemans, Griffin, and Moenaert, 2015; Kuester, Schuhmacher, Gast, and Worgul, 2013; Papastathopoulou and Hultink, 2012), such as hotel, fast food, education, airline, banking, telecommunication, health, and etc.

Service innovation develops new or enhanced intangible offerings benefit to customers that involves the firm’s performance of a task/activity (Dotzel, Shankar, and Berry, 2013). Mele (2009) offers a vision of service innovation as a value innovation. Evans et al. (1996) is a measurement of operating achievement performance, it also review their overall competitiveness indexes.

Homburg and Pflesser (2000) stated that the market performance effectiveness on behalf of corporate marketing activities. Service innovation capacity will positively affect the company's performance. It brings benefits to a company with new product life (Aragon-Correa et al., 2007; Hult et al., 2004; Orfila-Sintes and Mattsson 2009; Panayides, 2006). Hussein and Jabnoun (2006) also claimed that profitability could increase by improving service quality. Koellinger (2008) also found service innovation and profitability have a positive relationship. (A) financial performance (Financial Performance): Used indicators, such as, return on investment, sales growth rate.

(B) operating performance (Operation Performance): In addition to financial performance, the market share, product / service quality, new products, marketing effectiveness, manufacturing value-added and other non-financial indicators are included.

(C) organizational effectiveness (Organizational Effectiveness): Refers to a non-financial indicators among stakeholders, such as to resolve conflicts, achieve business goals, staff morale and etc.

With the way of its internal operations and effective innovation model, new products and new services will meet old customers and create new customer needs (Anderson, De Dreu & Nijstad, 2004; West, 2001). Therefore, the organization gradually response to rapidly changing market environment (Edmondson, 1999; Ragazzoni et al, 2002), (AI-Beraidi &
Rickards, 2003). To remain competitive, a company should constant pursuit of innovation, such as the creation of new strategies, products, services, processes and attractive features, etc. Creative staff can increase the competitive advantage of the company's organization. In addition to hire creative employees, the organization must build a creative work environment for employees (Cummings and Oldham, 1997). Innovative organization and a creative staff is currently the considerable subject in the management literature (Scott, 1995). According to West & Farr (1990) defines innovation create in groups, organizations or society and it’s the application of new products, new processes and new procedures. It will benefit individuals, groups and even the wider community. Team innovation atmosphere plays an important role in the process of pursuit team goals (Ai-Beraidi & Rickards, 2003), and accelerate its efficiency (Ragazzoni, Baiardi, Zotti, Anderson, & West, 2002). Thus, organizations increase the team's innovation to respond to rapidly changing market, and continuous enables them to maintain and enhance its advantages (Tjosvold, 2004; West, 2002). Team innovation can have a beneficial impact on the effectiveness of long-term survival of the organization (Janssen, 2004). Burnside (1990; 1995) identified that creativity is new and useful ideas generated; and innovation is specific idea must be implemented with the team. Team innovation is a part of the collective achievements, knowledge sharing in the social hierarchy and the implementation (Locke & Latham, 1999). The realization of innovation must be taken place in the team during the transaction level in the organization. Team innovation is not only produced by the process of decision-making discussions. It is a process that members learn from each other and interact with each other, such as, absorption, assimilation, transformation, and the use of new knowledge. Thus, organizations must fully support the team enable to create an effective team (Scott & Bruce, 1994). Team innovation refers to introduction and application ideas, processes, products or procedures, and designed benefit to the individual, the group, the organization or wider society. (West and Farr, 1990, p. 9).
Team collaboration impacts on the creation of sharing understanding and knowledge development within the teams. Superior performance in product/service development and innovation is one of the main sources of competitive advantage in the modern market place. On this basis, an organization’s innovation capability is the extent to which it is able to discover business opportunities, and thereafter effectuate the innovation process in an efficient manner (Kratzer, 2001; Lee-Kelley and Blackman, 2005). According to Madhavan and Grover (1998), a consequence of this is that organizational members involved in innovation activities should participate in several innovation teams. Based on the objective of increasing the teams’ innovation capabilities, communication processes in a team will be influential for the team’s innovation potential. Both team composition and communication processes should be different the degree of innovation of the product development projects.

1. Vision (Vision)
Vision is to motivate members to work hard, have a clear objective to provide direction to the development efforts of the members, and appropriate working methods of the member (West, 1990).

2. Participation of security (Participative safety)
The members are excited to participate in the decision-making process. When team members put forward new ideas and improved ways of doing things, there would be considered to be respected and understood (West, 1990).

3. Innovation support (Support for innovation)
Members endorse and give practical support the implementation of innovation, expectations, motivation, and improved and proposed new ideas in the working environment (West, 1990).

4. The task-oriented (Task orientation)
Team members achieve a common vision or goals through assessment, quality control systems on job performance excellent expression with concern and commitment (West, 1990). Task-oriented members concern about the high performance standards of the team tactics, procedures (Anderson & West, 1994).

Service innovation and performance: Hult et al (2004) and Panayides (2006) represents service innovation capacity will have positive effect on the company's performance. Since service innovation will make benefit for new life of product to the company.

Service quality and performance: Heskett et al (1994) and Loveman (1998) also pointed out enhancing the quality of customer service awareness; the customer
accepts high-quality services after their satisfaction, thereby the company increase profitability.

Hussein and Jabnoun (2006) also represented financial institutions could increase profitability by improving service quality.

Team innovation would be a moderator of the relationship between variables and firm performance (Cropley & Cropley 2015). In this study, it will exam the service innovation would have significantly positive influence on operating performance through moderating effect of team innovation, and service quality would have significantly positive influence on operating performance through moderating effect of team innovation.

3. Methodology

This study is conducted with purposive sample in northern, middle, and southern Taiwan. A total of 360 employees of the Taiwanese restaurants participated in this survey. McDonald’s, KFC, Wowprime, Din Tai Fung, Tripodking restaurants are selected to distribute the questionnaires. The questionnaires were filled out with anonymity and confidential. The questionnaires were distributed and collected once a week. A total of 226 were returned and fully completed. A return rate is approximately 63%.

The questionnaire contained four constructs and seventeen dimensions for the main study. All the variables were analyzed with pilot test to ensure all of them had reliability exceeding value 0.7 suggest by Hair et al. (1998). Items with lower reliability were eliminated.

Service Innovation

This study applied the innovation scale from Avlonitis et al (2001) to measure service innovation. New-to-the-market services, new-to-the-company services, new delivery processes, service modifications, service line extensions are selected as major dimensions. Likert 7-point scale (1-strongly disagree, 7-strongly agree) are applied in the questionnaires. The Cronbach’s α is 0.8627, and each dimension in this construct is larger than 0.7 (see table 1).

Service Quality

This study amended the scale from SERVQUAL (Parasuraman et al., 1988) to measure service quality. Tangible, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy are selected as major dimensions. Likert 7-point scale (1-strongly disagree, 7-strongly agree) are applied in the questionnaires. The Cronbach’s α is 0.8351, and each dimension in this construct is larger than 0.7 (see table 1).

Performance

This study applied organization performance scale from Venkatraman &
Ramanujam (1986) to measure performance. Financial performance, operation performance, and organizational effectiveness are selected as major dimensions. Likert 7-point scale (1-strongly disagree, 7-strongly agree) are applied in the questionnaires. The Cronbach’s α is 0.9763, and each dimension in this construct is larger than 0.7 (see table 1).

Team innovation

This study applied scale of Team Climate Inventory (TCI) (Anderson & West, 1998). TCI proposed four main dimensions: vision (Vision), a sense of security to participate (Participative safety), innovation support (Support for innovation) and task-oriented (Task orientation) to measure the climate of team innovation. Likert 7-point scale (1-strongly disagree, 7-strongly agree) are applied in the questionnaires. The Cronbach’s α is 0.9156, and each dimension in this construct is larger than 0.7 (see table 1).

In this study, principal components factor analysis (Principal Component) has been conducted. Using the principal component analysis method and setting an Eigen Value of greater than 1.0 (see table 1) for the selection criteria, common factors were extracted from the returned questionnaires. All the factors loading for the dimensions are all larger than 0.5 (see table 1) (Jöreskog, K. G. & Sörbom, 1996). The total variance explained of service innovation is up to 69.636% (see table 1). The total variance explained of service quality is up to 64.512% (see table 1). The total variance explained of performance is up to 80.046% (see table 1). The total variance explained of team innovation is up to 69.265% (see table 1).

4. Results and Analysis

Regression Analysis for Service innovation and Performance:
The regression analysis shows that service innovation has significant effect on performance (\( F = 204.058, p < 0.001 \)) (see table 2).

Regression Analysis for Service Quality and Performance:
The regression analysis shows that service quality has significant effect on performance (\( F = 73.231, p < 0.001 \)) (see table 3).

According to interaction effect from regression analysis, vision and task orientation dimensions from team innovation construct have positive significant effect on performance. For service innovation and team innovation interaction effect, it also has a positive significant effect (0.035**). The table shows that variance explained (\( \Delta R^2 \))
increased by 0.043, F value is 12.623 (see table 4) and has significant effect.

For service innovation and team innovation interaction effect table, only vision dimensions from team innovation construct has positive significant effect on performance. For service quality and team innovation interaction effect, it also has a positive significant effect (0.056*). The table shows that variance explained ($\Delta R^2$) increased by 0.083, F value is 9.463 (see table 5) and has significant effect.

Since service innovation would have significantly positive influence on operating performance through moderating effect of team innovation, and service quality would have significantly positive influence on operating performance through moderating effect of team innovation. Team innovation is divided into high, middle, and low groups. The moderation effect graph is shown on graph 1 and 2. The graph1 shows that two unparalled lines. That means higher service innovation will have higher performance, and it is moderated by team innovation. The graph2 shows that higher service quality will have higher performance, but it isn’t moderated by team innovation.

5. Conclusion and Implication

5.1 Theoretical and managerial implications

This study aims to explore the relationship among service innovation, service quality, performance, and team innovation. According to the findings, it suggests Taiwanese restaurants should strength service innovation and service quality to enhance the firm performance.

This study confirms the service innovation and the firm performance has positive effect. The interaction between service innovation and team innovation would strength the firm performance. This also happens to the service quality.

It is really important for the restaurants to create environment for innovation development and quality improving. An environment without having a culture of innovation, and team supporting, employees couldn’t have abundant resources and confident to contribute ideas and enhance firm’s performance. In the service industry, service innovation will certainly sustain the organization competitive advantage. Every leaders and executives must understand that innovation and creativity are not formed overnight. Organizations must make their best efforts to support teams to create innovation and have relevant channels to encourage effective communication. Organizations must also exam each process of service quality concisely, and make sure continue to improve every process to meet
customer’s needs and expectation. This study provides relevant scales of service innovation, service quality, team innovation and firms’ performance for Taiwanese restaurants. With novelty service innovation, and better service quality, restaurants could sustain competitive advantage and superior operating performance.

6. Recommendations
(A) Enhance the interaction between leaders and members in the organization
Leaders should maintain good relationship with members in the organization and give adequate understanding of the subordinates. Diversified thinking and skill is very important in a service-oriented enterprise. A leader should listen to, interact and communicate with members.

(B) Establish and improve the selection system and human resource management
Employees will be the most valuable resources in the organization. They also play a key factor to sustain competitive advantages. Their judgment, experience and ability decide the success or failure of the organization. Organization should facilitate HR innovation system such as evaluation and selection system. It should also establish in-service education and training employees program. Encourage subordinates continue to absorb new knowledge, new ideas.

(C) Authorization (empowerment)
Giving authorization (empowerment) to members to deal with customer comments, it means leaders should observe the ability of members and make the appropriate authorization. Leaders must also observe the performance of the team members to decide whether to give more authorization or training.

Follow-up recommendation on the research
(A) Adopt different methods to the study
This study only took the quantitative research methods, in the follow-up studies might apply qualitative research methods, or both, such as: “Focus Groups (focus interview)” or “in-depth interviews” to conduct in the research. That will deeply understand the context among the service innovation, service quality, team innovation and performance in the organization.

(B) To exam different variables or interaction effect
This study conduct the relationship between the team innovation and service innovation, however, there might be different other factors to affect the organization performance, for instance, organizational characteristics or organizational innovation.

(C) Avoid common method variance
When the independent variable measured by self-report from the same source that
might cause common method variance and the result will be additive bias with linear confounding (Podsakoff & Organ, 1986). This study based on the past scholars literature to create the scales order to reduce the bias common source. We still recommend the follow-up researchers to collect independent variable data from different sources to avoid one-sided error occurred.

(D) Hierarchical Linear Model (HLM)
There are many different levels in the organization, including the individual, team, department and the whole organization. It is obviously that there are a certain variables in one level that will affect other variables in the others. The advantage of hierarchical linear model (hierarchical linear model, HLM) provides researchers examine the relationship between different levels, and make adjustment in variance within the groups in an appropriate level analysis. That will exam how a higher level impact a lower level. Therefore, the researchers recommend hierarchical linear model might be applied in the following research to exam cross-level between variables.
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**Figure 1**: Conceptual Model
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**Graph 1**: Service Innovation and Team

**Graph 2**: Service Quality and Team
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Cronbach’s α</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Total Variance Explained (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service Innovation (0.8627)</td>
<td>1. New delivery processes</td>
<td>0.8033</td>
<td>0.529-0.824</td>
<td>4.876</td>
<td>69.636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Service modifications</td>
<td>0.9413</td>
<td>0.695-0.862</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. New-to-the-market</td>
<td>0.8255</td>
<td>0.531-0.752</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. New-to-the-company</td>
<td>0.7235</td>
<td>0.628-0.802</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Service line extensions</td>
<td>0.9264</td>
<td>0.642-0.869</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Quality</td>
<td>1. Tangible</td>
<td>0.9405</td>
<td>0.642-0.827</td>
<td>12.863</td>
<td>64.512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Reliability</td>
<td>0.7836</td>
<td>0.537-0.819</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Responsiveness</td>
<td>0.8878</td>
<td>0.672-0.839</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Assurance</td>
<td>0.7340</td>
<td>0.653-0.841</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1:** Constructs Reliability, Validity and Factor Analysis
### Table 2: Service Innovation and Performance Regression Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Regression Coefficient</th>
<th>t Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service Innovation</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.669***</td>
<td>14.285</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **R²** = 0.447
- **Adjusted R²** = 0.445
- **F Value** = 204.058***
- **D-W** = 1.677

* p < 0.05  ** p < 0.01  *** p < 0.001

**IV:** Independent variable  
**DV:** Dependent variable

### Table 3: Service Quality and Performance Regression Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Regression Coefficient</th>
<th>t Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.171*</td>
<td>2.276</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **R²** = 0.620
- **Adjusted R²** = 0.617
- **F-value** = 73.231***
- **D-W** = 1.710
Table 4: Service Innovation and Team Innovation Moderation Effect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Variable</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>0.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.637</td>
<td>-0.431</td>
<td>0.423</td>
<td>0.224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td>0.266</td>
<td>0.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service Innovation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New-to-the-market services</td>
<td>0.193*</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service modifications</td>
<td>0.449***</td>
<td>0.149*</td>
<td>0.186*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New-to-the-company services</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.145*</td>
<td>0.182*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New-to-the-company services</td>
<td>0.177*</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service line extensions</td>
<td>0.326**</td>
<td>0.201*</td>
<td>0.116*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Team Innovation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.181**</td>
<td>0.111*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.637***</td>
<td>0.431***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative safety</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for innovation</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Innovation × Team Innovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.035**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>0.585</td>
<td>0.693</td>
<td>0.760</td>
<td>0.803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td>0.585</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$ Value</td>
<td>71.587***</td>
<td>44.428***</td>
<td>16.103***</td>
<td>12.623***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05  ** p < 0.01  ***p < 0.001
**Table 5:** Service Quality and Team Innovation Moderation Effect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV</th>
<th>DV</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor</td>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Variable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1.194</td>
<td>0.795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>1.216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.676</td>
<td>0.696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>0.261</td>
<td>0.920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangible</td>
<td>0.166**</td>
<td>0.126*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>0.687***</td>
<td>0.429***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td>0.118**</td>
<td>0.189**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>0.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>0.181**</td>
<td>0.111*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Innovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.256**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative safety</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for innovation</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Quality × Team Innovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>0.486</td>
<td>0.565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td>0.486</td>
<td>0.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$ Value</td>
<td>47.939***</td>
<td>25.576***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p <0.05 ; **p<0.01 ; *** p<0.001