

Economics and Business Review

Volume 2 (16) Number 2 2016

CONTENTS

ARTICLES

Testing the weak-form efficiency of agriculture's capital markets

Binam Ghimire, Kolja Annussek, Jackie Harvey, Satish Sharma

The risk of the increasing divergence of the eurozone and the problem of macroeconomic imbalances in a three-gap model

Jacek Pera

Structural barriers to research and development activities in emerging markets: the case of Poland, the Czech Republic, Slovakia and Hungary

Anna Odrobina

Relationships and trust in perceiving price fairness: an exploratory study

Michael B. Hinner

Comparing consumers' value perception of luxury goods: Is national culture a sufficiently explanatory factor?

Beata Stępień, Ana Pinto Lima, Lutfu Sagbansua, Michael B. Hinner

Attitude toward luxury among Polish and Portuguese consumers

Wioleta Dryl, Arkadiusz Kozłowski

The institutionalization of practice: a processual perspective on value co-creation

Zofia Patora-Wysocka

The value of trust in inter-organizational relations

Małgorzata Chrupała-Pniak, Damian Grabowski, Monika Sulimowska-Formowicz

Improving student outcomes through the well designed use of computer technology in university business classes

Wendy Swenson Roth, Deborah S. Butler

BOOK REVIEWS

Robert B. Cialdini, Steve J. Martin, Noah J. Goldstein, *Mała wielka zmiana. Jak skutecznie wywierać wpływ [The small big. Small changes that spark big influence]*, Gdańskie Wydawnictwo Psychologiczne, Sopot 2016 (*Henryk Mruk*)

Rodrik Dani, *Economics Rules. The Rights and Wrongs of the Dismal Science*, W.W. Norton & Company, New York 2015 (*Marzena Brzezińska*)

Editorial Board

Ryszard Barczyk
Witold Jurek
Cezary Kochalski
Tadeusz Kowalski (Editor-in-Chief)
Henryk Mruk
Ida Musiałkowska
Jerzy Schroeder
Jacek Wallusch
Maciej Żukowski

International Editorial Advisory Board

Udo Broll – School of International Studies (ZIS), Technische Universität, Dresden
Wojciech Florkowski – University of Georgia, Griffin
Binam Ghimire – Northumbria University, Newcastle upon Tyne
Christopher J. Green – Loughborough University
John Hogan – Georgia State University, Atlanta
Bruce E. Kaufman – Georgia State University, Atlanta
Steve Letza – Corporate Governance Business School Bournemouth University
Victor Murinde – University of Birmingham
Hugh Scullion – National University of Ireland, Galway
Yochanan Shachmurove – The City College, City University of New York
Richard Sweeney – The McDonough School of Business, Georgetown University, Washington D.C.
Thomas Taylor – School of Business and Accountancy, Wake Forest University, Winston-Salem
Clas Wihlborg – Argyros School of Business and Economics, Chapman University, Orange
Jan Winięcki – University of Information Technology and Management in Rzeszów
Habte G. Woldu – School of Management, The University of Texas at Dallas

Thematic Editors

Economics: *Ryszard Barczyk, Tadeusz Kowalski, Ida Musiałkowska, Jacek Wallusch, Maciej Żukowski* •
Econometrics: *Witold Jurek, Jacek Wallusch* • **Finance:** *Witold Jurek, Cezary Kochalski* • **Management and Marketing:** *Henryk Mruk, Cezary Kochalski, Ida Musiałkowska, Jerzy Schroeder* • **Statistics:** *Elżbieta Gołata, Krzysztof Szwarz*

Language Editor: *Owen Easteal* • **IT Editor:** *Marcin Reguła*

© Copyright by Poznań University of Economics and Business, Poznań 2016

Paper based publication

ISSN 2392-1641

POZNAŃ UNIVERSITY OF ECONOMICS AND BUSINESS PRESS
ul. Powstańców Wielkopolskich 16, 61-895 Poznań, Poland
phone +48 61 854 31 54, +48 61 854 31 55, fax +48 61 854 31 59
www.wydawnictwo-ue.pl, e-mail: wydawnictwo@ue.poznan.pl
postal address: al. Niepodległości 10, 61-875 Poznań, Poland

Printed and bound in Poland by:
Poznań University of Economics and Business Print Shop

Circulation: 300 copies

The institutionalization of practice: a processual perspective on value co-creation¹

*Zofia Patora-Wysocka*²

Abstract: Drawing on the processual perspective in management this article explores the process of the institutionalization of new practice in the context of value co-creation. The Service-Dominant logic perspective places the notion of value creation in the interaction between an organization and its customers. Therefore the contemporary research stream shows a bias towards the notion of a customer as a crucial contributor and beneficiary in the value creation process [Vargo and Lusch 2006a, 2008]. Following recent calls for research with a holistic approach it may be assumed that there is an underdeveloped processual perspective on value co-creation that offers a cognitive framework of routines and activities performed on an everyday basis within the Giddensian structuration theory. Using the Giddensian theory value co-creation can be perceived as a platform for the adoption of new practices. The purpose of the article is to determine the role of value co-creation processes in the context of initiating and institutionalizing of new practice in an organization. A comparative case study was carried out which illustrates the thesis that spontaneous actions form an important category of initiating change within the everyday use of value co-creation.

Keywords: value co-creation, practice, spontaneous actions, institutionalization, adoption, processual approach.

JEL codes: M31, M39, L20, L21.

Introduction

The article explores the problem of the institutionalization of practice in the realm of the value co-creation process in a firm in the theoretical and empirical senses. Value and value creation are vague and ill-defined notions [Grönroos 2008]. They imply a basic meaning of gaining benefits against some costs. However these advantages can be perceived in a situational context and they

¹ Article received 11 December 2015, accepted 16 May 2016. The paper was prepared as part of a project financed by the National Science Center, grant no. DEC-2011/03/D/HS4/01651.

² University of Social Sciences, Department of Management, ul. Sienkiewicza 9, 90-113 Łódź, Poland, zpatora-wysocka@spoleczna.pl.

are uniquely determined by the actors involved in value creation. “Value for customers means that (...) they are, or feel better off than before” [Grönroos 2008]. From this perspective value acquires functional and phenomenological dimensions. The process of value creation is still little known because, on account of its experiential character, it is hard to tell “when it starts, what it includes and when it ends” [Grönroos 2011]. The processual perspective in management and marketing may seem an appropriate cognitive approach to the issues of value creation. It calls for the perception of the reality studied from the angle of routines and actions recreated in everyday organizational practice [Schatzki 1996]. Thus, stating that value emerges *inuse* implies a processual approach [Vargo 2008; Grönroos 2011]. Nevertheless in the literature there is an emphasis on the role of a customer as the creator of value. The role of an enterprise that in fact *facilitates value creation* is an underdeveloped issue [Grönroos 2011]. The interactionist view on the process of value co-creation makes it possible to view the problems tackled in a holistic way which is implicit in revisiting the ideas in Vargo and Lusch’s work [Vargo and Lusch 2008]. The purpose of this article is to determine the role of value co-creation processes in the context of initiating and institutionalizing (adopting)³ new practice in an organization. The Giddensian structuration theory framework and processual cognitive schema were used to illustrate the thesis that spontaneous actions are an important factor in initiating changes in an enterprise within the everyday practice of value co-creation.

The article offers a theoretical perspective on the issue, to a large extent using the processual cognitive approach. The first section introduces the concept of value co-creation using the interactionist viewpoint. The second section of the article is aimed at putting value co-creation into a practice-based approach. The third, empirical section of the article illustrates the thesis proposed and offers a case study of the clothing enterprises studied. The article is closed by conclusions and recommendations.

1. The interactionist view on value co-creation

From the interactionist perspective value and its creation call for a holistic approach going beyond the traditional cognitive framework in marketing that has been inherited from the economy and which is based on the distribution and economic exchange of goods and services. Value is produced in a kind of *isolation from customers* and delivered to them [Edvardsson et al. 2012]. The process of value exchange takes place in which a customer is not involved in

³ For more legible reading, the term ‘adoption’ is used interchangeably with ‘institutionalization’, although the latter concept gives more visibility and appropriateness to the problem of spontaneous change and value co-creation from processual perspective.

the activity of creating services and value. Nevertheless recent developments of the Service-Dominant logic paradigm have questioned this approach and proposed new ideas of value co-creation as a process of “interaction between two actors on an individual level” [Vargo and Lusch 2004; Laamanen and Skalen 2015: 381]. It may be assumed that a new cognitive schema has been established, based on the interactionist vision of marketing. According to Łukasz Sułkowski interactionism perceives management and marketing “from the angle of social contacts (communication, power, culture, social conflicts)” [Sułkowski 2012]. The context of social relations and interaction is crucial for a modern understanding of the process of value co-creation. It is a starting point for the definition of such aspects of value co-creation such as the personalization of experience, *value-in-use*, *value-in-context*, resource integration and the service system perspective [Baran 2013; Peters et al. 2014; Edvardsson et al. 2014; Chandler and Vargo 2011].

On the basis of the work of Vargo and Lusch, which identified the foundational premises of the Service-Dominant logic, the process of value co-creation is perceived by the scholars mainly as a dyadic model of exchange between the final customer and the enterprise. Thus, nowadays there is growing tendency to substitute the initial theoretical bias towards the role of the final customer in the value creation process by a more processual and holistic view. As is emphasized by Vargo and Lusch in an update of their *introductory article* the Service-Dominant logic is *an open-source evolutionary* concept which is not held by the authors as being an idea that is not subject to any further discussion or refinement [Vargo and Lusch 2008]. Thus, responding to a kind of misunderstanding of some aspects of the S-D logic, the authors assume that the starting point is the relational and experiential character of the value creation process. Value is created *implicitly* as part of networks, constellations and the resource integration process. By the use of resources “all economic actors such as customers, suppliers and other interested stakeholders” act and interact to co-create value in the given service system [Vargo and Lusch 2006b: 283–284]. The service system in question is determined by their knowledge, skills, intentions and motivations integrated into the networks and relationships [Edvardsson et al. 2014]. The service system is also driven by rules, norms and activities performed on a daily basis by the service system’s actors. These define the contextual framework of a system and, at the same time, relate to the experiential and contextual nature of the value assessment process.

Chandler and Vargo compare the issue to some assumptions in the Penrosian *Theory of the Growth of the Firm* [1959] that illustrate how a firm can compete through acquired resources that yield comparatively more service output in a given context. There are *bundles of potential services* situated in different networks, relationships and multidirectional resource exchanges that create a unique value assessment context [Chandler and Vargo 2011]. Peters et al. adopt a more directly interactionist perspective in relation to the role of resources in

S-D logic. The resource integration process is recognized as a set of interactions “of nature, man and culture (...), and as a series of activities” performed on a daily basis by human agents. Resources “evolve out of the interactions. (...) They are not, they become” [Peters et al. 2014; Payne, Storbacka, and Frow 2008]. Summing up, the value co-creation process and all its elements can be spontaneous and unforeseeable. As is noted by Baran the key category of the value structure is customer involvement: “Often only the customer’s activity unlocks the potential of the value delivered with the product or the service. To one customer the same product can be of great value, whilst to another it can be valueless” [Baran 2013].

Value comes into existence *in-use* by the social context and thus it is phenomenologically and practically defined by the actors involved in its creation. At the same time there is a tacit agreement about the *value-in-use* term as far as the fundamental role of a customer is concerned. “Value is created by the user for the user” [Grönroos 2011]. The final customer is the value creator. Nevertheless there are some inconsistencies when it comes to establishing an enterprise’s role as a party in the value co-creation process. According to Grönroos, a firm as a developer, producer and supplier of goods and services is only a *value facilitator*. Thus value can never be delivered. Instead it can be a kind of *value proposition* perceived in the resource-based view as a resource constellation [Laamanen and Skälén 2015: 383]. At the organizational level the crucial aspect is the capability to “understand the resource integration process” by a customer as well as by employees recreating collaborative actions [Neghina et al. 2015]. Thus this is an interaction process that may be a *platform* and an *opportunity* for the enterprise to become a value co-creator [Grönroos 2008; 2011]. However the interaction process should be based on direct and reciprocal involvement in the development process of the goods or services. The approach permits the exploration of the underestimated role of an enterprise in this value co-creation cycle as well as posing important questions about the initiation of spontaneous changes within the process of value co-creation.

Vargo and Lusch, revisiting some initial premises of the dyadic firm-customer relation, suggest that S-D logic can be applied to different fields of social exchange and not only to marketing issues. Value co-creation is centred around networks and interactions. It may be assumed that there are value co-creation configurations which differ, depending on the direction of the exchange process. S-D logic may be referred to as various systems comprising “individuals, families, firms, societies, nations” [Vargo and Lusch 2008]. Maglio and Spohrer draw on Vargo and Lusch’s perspective to conceptualize a service system that forms “dynamic value co-creation configurations of resources (people, technology, organizations and shared information)”. Moreover S-D logic goes beyond the twofold schema of relationships in as far as “every service system is both a provider and client of service that is connected by value propositions in value chains, value networks or value-creating systems” [Maglio and Spohrer

2008]. Chandler and Vargo focus this problem on “actors, dyads, triads, complex networks and service ecosystems” viewed as the co-creation of the market perspective [Chandler and Vargo 2011; Frow et al. 2014].

Edvardsson et al. move towards the inclusion of service systems in the notion of social systems. They put forward a thesis that interaction and resource integration, as well as value co-creation processes are determined by social forces [Edvardsson et al. 2012], so actors, norms, rules, resources and activities are deployed and integrated to co-create value. In order to observe the mechanisms and outcomes of the value co-creation process a more holistic perspective is needed. It is assumed here that the processual approach could contribute to this idea.

2. Value co-creation from the processual perspective

The processual perspective on value co-creation is still a new and underdeveloped approach. It is one of the foundations of the interpretative paradigm in social sciences which generally developed when considering the problems of the understanding of novelty, change and persistence in social reality. The processual approach is focused on the exploration of the processes of transformation and adoption in everyday routines and the cognitive schema of practice. In strategy management it is developed as part of the *Strategy-as-Practice* research stream [Orlikowski 1992; Johnson, Melin, and Whittington 2003; Jarzabkowski 2005; Langley 2007 etc.]. Nevertheless in marketing there are only occasional references to the processual approach. Research work on the processual structure in marketing mainly draw on the Giddensian structuration theory [1984] and apply key structuration notions to the problems of value co-creation [Baran 2013; Edvardsson et al. 2012; Echeverri and Skalen 2011; Schau, Albert, and Arnould 2009; Shove, Pantazar, and Watson 2012].

The structuration theory evolves around the notion of practice. Human activity is the very micro-factor that shapes social systems. The creation, persistence and change in social systems take place as part of the recreation of everyday activities. Social systems are of a processual character. However practice and social structures are linked. Practice is then determined by rules, norms and meanings which make up the common schema of social order, whilst social structures are preserved in the flow of daily actions and routines. In Giddens's words there is a *practical consciousness* that has nothing to do with the conscious and discursive understanding of the social reality. Actors have a tendency to “go on in the context of social life” in reality [Giddens 1984]. Thus schemas of action are characterized by different levels of persistence. Some of them are changeable but some can be institutionalized. According to Giddens practices that form the majority of the most persistent schemas become institutions [Giddens 1984].

In the literature the concept of institutionalization has a processual context which places a strong emphasis on action. Olivier proposes the idea of institutionalized organizational behaviour being described as “permanent, recreated and long-lasting activities (...) determined by specific values, repetitive and resisting change” [Oliver 1992]. Defining institutionalization Martinez and Dacin refer to “the processes by which societal expectations of an appropriate organizational form and behaviour come to take on a rule-like status in (...) action” [Martinez and Dacin 1999; Edvardsson et al. 2014]. Thus it may be assumed that institutional schemas are derived from ongoing and daily-recreated practices. Edvardsson et al. added some partial problems of value co-creation in service systems. They distinguish some fundamental levels of the impact of institutional logic on resource integration within service systems. There are regulative, normative and cognitive institutionalized rules that determine standards of actions and widely known norms and values in groups of people and organizations. Institutions shape the way actors behave and perceive their teams. These rules matter when it comes to the process of resource integration and collaboration on “transforming potential value into value-in-use” [Edvardsson et al. 2014]. They can hinder as well as initiate value co-creation. According to the structuration theory the structures of rules determine routinely and almost unconsciously recreated actions. Such spontaneity may result in the creation of new practices and the adoption of new schemas of daily routines or it may be followed by the disappearance of one-time activities. When an organization operates in a turbulent market spontaneous actions may imply the grasping of opportunities. However what matters is the fact that even unplanned activities are characterized by a kind of consistency within the context of the organizational or service system. That is that unplanned and spontaneous activities are not unpurposeful. Thus service systems are shaped by social norms, values and forces [Edvardsson et al. 2011; Gummerus 2013]. They are dynamic and processual constellations of actors, resources and technology that enable action within value co-creation. In the same vein the functioning of service systems is based on the exchange of practices within the value co-creation process. The very interaction and exchange take place both on the level of dyads and multi-lateral relationships within the introduction of resource integration. The context of everyday relationships and practices provides the framework for value assessment. Using the structuration theory, value co-creation becomes a area for the reproduction, but also the change, of routines and practices. What is particularly interesting is the definition of the role of spontaneous actions in the context of interactions and the exchange of practices within value co-creation processes. Adopting new practice in the realm of value co-creation may be of significance when explaining organizational change in firms that are value co-creators along with their business partners and customers.

The process of adoption is a kind of perpetuation of new action schemas on a daily basis. When considered from the point of view of the contemporary

economy, organizational change is more market-like, becoming turbulent and unforeseeable. A greater pace of market changes imposes pressure to make fast decisions. Very often organizational practices are responses to the market environment. They reflect norms and recognizable schemas of 'proper' modes of action. Therefore practices may not be easily determined. Instead they very often emerge spontaneously as well as during a routine.

It can be assumed that spontaneity is important in initiating changes in the course of routine, everyday actions in the context of the value co-creation process. It may trigger the process of transforming and therefore the temporal endurance of organizational life. The exchange of practices in the value co-creation context is consistent with the dynamic integration of resources and interactions of actors within the service system. Value assessment is then important in that it determines whether actions undertaken spontaneously become institutionalized and adapted to the everyday organizational practice. The value creation process interpreted from the processual perspective is not "valuable per se. Actions become valuable through interaction with their context" [Gummerus 2013]. They are daily and spontaneous actions that can initiate or hinder crucial changes within the standard practice of a firm. The empirical work presented in this article is of an exploratory character and it is based on theoretical concepts that add value to delimiting the phenomenon of the process of the adoption of new practice within value co-creation. It is aimed at revealing the crucial sub-categories of this phenomenon.

3. The adoption of a new practice in the context of value co-creation in clothing enterprises

The article presents the results of a comparative case study. A case study design is a method that aims at providing an insight into the practice-driven phenomenon [Gherardi 2012]. I gathered data through interviews, the collection of documents and non-participatory observation of daily work in the enterprises. The research was carried out in SMEs from the clothing industry operating in the Łódź Province. The specific character of the fashion industry within which the companies researched function is based on a seasonal cycle and fashion trends. These are the main factors that determine the need to constantly work on the development of fashion products in a fashion cycle. In the context of the work processes in the enterprises and the provision of services this is related to the need for constant development, often difficult to perceive, as it is based on frequent, regular, small changes routinely introduced into the day-to-day practice. The value co-creation process can be a platform for the observation of the practice transformation process.

The cases were selected carefully due to the character of the research problem and the researcher's knowledge of the local industry. The study included

two enterprises offering services to external customers, which are companies manufacturing products under their own brand name, including fashion designers. Three semi-structured interviews with the owners of the enterprises were conducted within a year. The interviews were based on a loose framework of themes to be explored and consisted of two parts. The aim of the first part of the interview was to determine the characteristic of the enterprises studied, whilst the second one explored such areas as the product development process in a seasonal cycle, the context of the provision of services, the specific character of untypical and difficult orders (services), work methods in the realm of relationships with customers and the outcomes of challenging services. The interviews lasted between one hour and one and a half hours. Notes were made during and soon after the interviews and visits to the enterprises.

The *Alfa* enterprise has been operating in the apparel industry for over ten years. Its main office is located in Łódź. It is concerned with manufacturing finished products for Polish and foreign companies operating under their own brands. It offers the sewing of denim clothes for men, women and children and other fabrics delivered. It also offers support in relation to the creation and development of collections. The enterprise has a qualified staff and modern machines, including pick stitching machines, double-needle sewing machines, overlock machines, feed-off-the-arm sewing machines, strapping machines, hem sewing machines, an automatic belt loop attaching machine, buttonholers, and bartack sewing machines. The enterprise cooperates with a plethora of fabric suppliers and other service suppliers such as embroidery shops, haberdashery manufacturers and a laundry.

The other enterprise researched, *Beta*, also has its main office in Łódź. The enterprise is concerned with inward processing. Its customers are often worldwide, highly-renowned, premium fashion brands. The company has been operating for a relatively long period – over twenty years. It has the appropriate resources and staff making it possible to fulfill even very complicated orders requiring the manual preparation of products. The enterprise specializes in sewing women's and teen apparel [Patora-Wysocka 2015a, 2015b].

The key categories of the adoption (institutionalization) of new practice within the value co-creation process were identified (Table 1, 2, 3). The main categories are: spontaneous actions as part of the services rendered, value assessment by the value co-creator (an enterprise), new emerging practice process and new practice adoption. These four categories gives cognitive visibility to the process of the adoption of spontaneous changes within the value co-creation process.

The case of the *Alfa* enterprise represents the dyadic form of a customer-enterprise relationship, although in this case the customer is a different company selling collections under its own brand name. Value co-creation is centred around reciprocal interactions comprising the product development process. *Alfa* spontaneously started to render certain services. The enterprise had no previous experience in production for *premium* brands. What is more it did

Table 1. Partial categories of the conceptual framework of adoption of spontaneous changes in value co-creation. An example of the *Alfa* enterprise

Partial categories	Informant's opinion
<p>Spontaneous activities (rendering untypical services not previously offered to foreign customers – <i>premium</i> brand owners)</p>	<p>“Yes, they were the ones who contacted me, first via e-mail, and then there were telephone and direct contacts (...) On their own, via e-mail. They found me here via e-mail (...)” <i>In relation to a different partner:</i> “Also via the Internet. I can't really remember now what it looked like but it was also thanks to the Internet. He was looking for, I don't know, a company in Poland at the time (...) Yes. He was looking for a company... and he came to see what I could do. And then he said: Ok, let's do it. We'll make the whole collection (...) Yes, we were in touch all the time, he would even come here to see how we did it (...) Oh, yes, I learnt a lot then. We all did.”</p>
<p>Assessment of value and new practice emerging (spontaneous decision to render services and positive assessment of value initiated the need to use the resources – skills and routines – in a different way)</p>	<p>“It was a challenge. That's right. The fact that I said we could do something different. Frankly speaking, I liked it. Because it is something new. You can prove yourself (...) and I've noted that my employees started to like it too. Because they like sewing something different, as then they can say proudly that they have solved a problem, managed to do something out of the ordinary, something really exclusive.” „(...) And these are appliquéd fabrics, or other solutions are added... That's it. A lot of Swarovski elements... at that time Swarovski wasn't as well-known as it is today. Now everyone is crazy about it but then it wasn't as popular.”</p>
<p>New practice adoption (decision to render service entailed a change in the way the company worked on the product; spontaneous activities were institutionalized as part of everyday praxis; moreover, this defined the business model oriented towards cooperation with foreign premium brands)</p>	<p><i>In relation to cutting threads:</i> “It's very important. They pay attention to it, or they're even sensitive to it, but I think it's because... it's standard here now, but at first we were also surprised: how can you find fault with one small thread that you can't even see because it's hidden, but now... We were surprised. But now it's our standard. We now know that not even a piece of thread can be visible, not even near the inside stitches or hidden somewhere under the lining because they can spot it. And now it's our standard, right?” “(...) But, you know, it's connected with prices because you know, the lower the amount of something, the more it costs. But this is the path I've chosen. I think it's more profitable to make less but for a higher price, and something more unique.”</p>

Source: [Patora-Wysocka 2015a, 2015b].

not plan this because it was the customer who found *Alfa* and made contact. The customer then came to Poland to check its skills and resource profile. The partners undertook to cooperate within a clear context of interaction and direct involvement in the product development process with the customer. The owner of *Alfa* emphasizes that as a result of this the company gained a number of new skills. It is possible to state that in this case value is close to the con-

cept of *value in-use* in the realm of everyday activities (Table 1). This use gains a new meaning as it cannot be related to the use of a product or a service by the customer, but to the processual context of work on the service, as a result of which the service co-creator acquires new skills that are crucial in everyday practice. There is *value in-action* emerging. From the processual perspective this is connected with the mode of daily working and the company's customer profile. The adoption of resource integration took place due to the fact that routines, values and norms are set up in very specific constellations. As the owner emphasized: "(...) I've noted that my employees started to like it too. Because they like sewing something different as then they can say proudly that they have solved a problem, managed to do something out of the ordinary, something really exclusive" (Table 1). What is more, over the course of time, the adoption of this mode of activity reoriented the business model.

The spontaneous decision to render services for an unusual customer initiated the extension of the scope of the services offered by *Beta*. That institutional

Table 2. Partial categories of the conceptual framework of the adoption of spontaneous changes in value co-creation based on the example of the *Beta* enterprise. An example of a positive value assessment outcome

Partial categories	Informant's opinion
<p>Spontaneous activities (decision to render services for an unusual foreign customer operating in the furniture industry)</p>	<p>"We make jeans sofas, I mean covers, and we cooperate with a company manufacturing furniture, and we simply sew such covers for the sofas and then they put it on the frame, and you can buy a jeans sofa, right? (...) Yes, yes, they found us through fabric suppliers, you know? They went to a fabric wholesale company, they asked someone... and this person recommended us."</p>
<p>Assessment of value and new practice emerging (spontaneous decision to render untypical services initiated the emergence of a new mode of using everyday routines and the extending of the scope of the services rendered)</p>	<p>"Well, frankly speaking... we didn't have a clue how to do it, I mean... The first time. They were completely different, some structures, huge... and then you just put it on. (...) They provided us with a kind of a template but we had to add the shrinkage factor because it is washed, right? (...) At first, we made a three-person sofa, then some corner sofa was added, and then some single items, like a pouf, oh, here's the pouf (...). Sometimes, they even ask us what we would change or add (...). You have to be flexible, otherwise you won't make it."</p>
<p>New practice adoption (consolidation of a new mode of acting entails a change in the way the company works on the product and the development of direct and indirect network relations)</p>	<p>"This year they went to some fair because we manufactured a lot... Then there was something like that, I mean we produced for them all the time (...). Now they found some customer from Russia, who ordered a lot of this from them, so we had a good beginning of the year with them, really good. We all thought for some time that everyone got bored with this, but surprisingly a new market appeared."</p>

arrangement emerged from interaction through networks of partners and then it came to the exchange of practices. A new customer came up with a new idea and a new product concept. *Beta* had to slightly change the previous way of resource integration. A completely new mode of using routines and capabilities was crucial for the process of co-creation (Table 2). The process of product development was at first a novelty for both parties. After a positive value co-creation process there were new product adjustments that were based on changing the form of the key concept. The process of value co-creation resembles the emergence of *know-how*. It may be assumed that the *Beta* case represents a micro-service system which is a unique configuration of partners, the resources they possess as well as an idea for a product that enabled market exploration within the co-creation process.

Practices can evolve, change and disappear (Table 3). A processual schema emerges when it is created and recreated within the value co-creation and exchange of practices. Referring to the very specific context of the *Beta* case it may be assumed that there is no reproduction process. Negatively assessed

Table 3. Partial categories of the conceptual framework of the adoption of spontaneous changes in value co-creation using the example of the *Beta* enterprise. An example of a negative value assessment outcome

Partial categories	Informant's opinion
Spontaneous activities (decision to render services for a fashion designer)	<i>In relation to an order from a fashion designer:</i> "How did he find us? It was thanks to that woman, the woman who would visit us because she used to work in, what do you call it, <i>Zeta</i> , that's right (a different <i>Beta</i> customer). She was also some kind of a designer or someone like that, well, she knew, she contacted us through <i>Zeta</i> ."
Assessment of value and new practice emerging (the way services were rendered was demanding for <i>Beta</i> , differing from the previous mode of action)	"Delta had quite a specific idea of what they wanted (...) They have their visions (...) We sometimes had to bring them down to earth, as some things just can't be done (...) Generally, you can say there is something like prestige or something like that but such cooperation is hard (...). <i>Delta</i> also had a friend. We worked here together, and she also worked there. We kept in touch. The girl supervised this. But we also had a few meetings with <i>Delta</i> ." ZP-W: "Did she come here?" B: "Yes, yes, she supervised everything here (...) because, you know, they make small series (...), they don't do any bigger ones, so you know, the price is also a bit different than for someone who orders 1,000 items (...). This is more tailoring than a sewing room..."
New practice adoption (the new mode of action was not consolidated)	ZP-W: "Do you see this as a breakthrough in your company?" B: No, absolutely no, this was just an episode."

value made it unproductive to carry on the exchange of practices. The method of work on the product development required by the customer differed from the concept of the service system that was cultivated by *Beta*. At the same time *Beta* has skills, material resources and access to suppliers and other service providers that are of significance in the process of value co-creation. Nevertheless there is a disparity within the resource integration in as far as it is driven by intention, financial aims, time-priorities and the scale of scope. The outcome of the value co-creation assessment was negative so the adoption of new practice was impossible (Table 3).

Conclusions and recommendations

The case study and the theoretical analysis support the idea that there is practical and theoretical significance in the process of adopting spontaneous actions within the value co-creation context. The processual stream of thought, together with its conceptual framework and vocabulary, provide comprehensive and meaningful foundations for the understanding of change in marketing. It is focused on exploring transformation processes from the perspective of routines, daily activities and interactions that shape service-systems. It also opens up underdeveloped issues in Service-Dominant logic which take up the issue of value co-creation from the perspective of an enterprise that is also one side of this process. Spontaneous actions thus initiate new resource reconfiguration, new value propositions, assessments and outcomes. It may be assumed that the phenomenon dealt with is central to other types product groupings. Nevertheless the exploratory purpose of the empirical work presented here offers challenges for the adoption of the multi-case study design. The research was aimed at revealing sub-categories of the adoption of the emergence of new practice within the value co-creation process. However the category of practice itself is built upon institutional and behavioural contexts. Thus all explanatory aspects should be unbundled in future research.

The interactionist view on value co-creation places a strong emphasis on the relational and multidirectional character of social order. The notion of value co-creation includes dynamic relations, actions and resources. The Giddensian view on social change takes these ideas one step further, focusing on the recursiveness of social structures and practice. Reproduction of daily activities is a basic element for structures and these structures are then foundations for actions. That structural 'flow' is 'going on' within the frames of norms, values, rules and resources that form the environment of value co-creation. The research indicates that much depends on the suitability of co-creators for their service systems. Partners can have appropriate material resources, skills and access to adequate services. However the processual perspective shows that

consistency at the level of intentions, motives and norms determining business goals is also of significance. In this respect one can come up with recommendations for entrepreneurs. They would be mostly of cognitive value and cannot be generalized as 'the drawback' of the processual perspective is its phenomenological bias towards the exploration of a situational context. Summing up, practice and spontaneous actions may be perceived as important cognitive spheres for the processes of value co-creation and adoption.

References

- Baran, G., 2013, *Marketing współtworzenia wartości z klientem społecznotwórcza rola marketingu w procesie strukturacji interakcyjnego środowiska doświadczeń*, Uniwersytet Jagielloński, Instytut Spraw Publicznych, Kraków.
- Chandler, J.D., Vargo, S.L., 2011, *Contextualization and Value-in-context: How Context Frames Exchange*, *Marketing Theory*, vol. 11, no. 1: 35–49.
- Echeverri, P., Skålén, P., 2011, *Co-creation and Co-destruction: A Practice-theory Based Study of Interactive Value Formation*, *Marketing Theory*, vol. 11, no. 3: 351–373.
- Edvardsson, B. et al., 2011, *Expanding Understanding of Service Exchange and Value Co-creation: a Social Construction Approach*, *Journal of the Academy Marketing Science*, vol. 39: 327–339.
- Edvardsson, B. et al., 2012, *Service Systems as a Foundation for Resource Integration and Value Co-Creation*, In Special Issue – Toward a Better Understanding of Value in Markets and Marketing, vol. 9: 79–126.
- Edvardsson, B. et al., 2014, *Institutional Logics Matter When Coordinating Resource Integration*, *Marketing Theory*, vol. 14, no. 3: 291–309.
- Frow, P. et al., 2014, *Value Propositions: A Service Ecosystems Perspective*, *Marketing Theory*, vol. 14, no. 3: 327–351.
- Gherardi, S., 2012, *How to Conduct a Practice-based Study. Problems and Methods*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham.
- Giddens, A., 1984, *The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration*, California University Press, Berkeley.
- Grönroos, C., 2008, *Service Logic Revisited: Who Creates Value? And Who Co-Creates?*, *European Business Review*, vol. 20, no. 4: 298–314.
- Grönroos, C., 2011, *Value Co-creation in Service Logic: A Critical Analysis*, *Marketing Theory*, vol. 11, no. 3: 279–301.
- Gummerus, J., 2013, *Value Creation Processes and Value Outcomes in Marketing Theory: Strangers or Siblings?*, *Marketing Theory*, vol. 13, no. 1: 19–46.
- Jarzabkowski, P., 2005, *Strategy as Practice. An Activity Based Approach*, SAGE Strategy Series, SAGE Publications, London.
- Johnson, G., Melin, L., Whittington, R., 2003, *Guest Editor's Introduction. Micro Strategy and Strategizing: Towards an Activity Based View*, *Journal of Management Studies*, vol. 40, no. 1: 3–22.
- Laamanen, M., Skålén, P., 2015, *Collective-conflictual Value Co-creation: A Strategic Action Field Approach*, *Marketing Theory*, vol. 15, no. 3: 381–400.

- Langley, A., 2007, *Process Thinking in Strategic Organization*, Strategic Organization, 5(3): 271–282.
- Maglio, P.P., Spohrer, J., 2008, *Fundamentals of Service Science*, Journal of the Academic Marketing Science, no. 36: 18–20.
- Martinez, R.J., Dacin, M.T., 1999, *Efficiency Motives and Normative Forces: Combining Transactions Costs and Institutional Logic*, Journal of Management, vol. 25, no. 1: 75–96.
- Neghina, C. et al., 2015, *Value Co-creation in Service Interactions: Dimensions and Antecedents*, Marketing Theory, vol. 15, no. 2: 221–242.
- Oliver, C., 1992, *The Antecedents of Deinstitutionalization*, Organization Studies, vol. 13, no. 4: 563–588, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/017084069201300403>.
- Orlikowski, W.J., 1992, *The Duality of Technology: Rethinking the Concept of Technology in Organizations*, Organization Science, 3(3): 398–427.
- Patora-Wysocka, Z., 2015a, *Technologia i zmiana organizacyjna z perspektywy procesualnej w zarządzaniu*, EU Academic Work in Wrocław Under Review.
- Patora-Wysocka, Z., 2015b, *Instytucjonalizacja w procesie zmian spontanicznych w przedsiębiorstwie*, Przedsiębiorczość XXI wieku – oblicza i perspektywy, II edycja Międzynarodowej Konferencji Naukowej Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, accepted for publication.
- Payne, A., Storbacka, K., Frow, P., 2008, *Managing the Co-creation of Value*, Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, vol. 36, no. 1: 83–96.
- Penrose, E., 1959, *The Theory of the Growth of the Firm*, John Wiley, New York.
- Peters, L.D. et al., 2014, *Theorizing about Resource Integration through Service-Dominant Logic*, Marketing Theory, vol. 14, no. 3: 249–268.
- Schatzki, T.R., 1996, *Social Practices: A Wittgensteinian Approach to Human Activity and the Social*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Schau, H.J., Albert, M.M. Jr, Arnould, E.J., 2009, *How Brand Community Practices Create Value*, Journal of Marketing, vol. 73, no. 5: 30–51.
- Shove, E., Pantzar, M., Watson, M., 2012, *The Dynamics of Social Practice*, Sage, London.
- Sułkowski, Ł., 2012, *Epistemologia i metodologia zarządzania*, PWE, Warszawa.
- Vargo, S.L., 2008, *Customer Integration and Value Creation. Paradigmatic Traps and Perspectives*, Journal of Service Research, vol. 11, no. 2: 211–215.
- Vargo, S.L., Lusch, R.F., 2004, *Evolving to a New Dominant Logic for Marketing*, Journal of Marketing, vol. 68, no. 1: 1–17.
- Vargo, S.L., Lusch, R.F., 2006a, *Service-Dominant Logic: What It Is, What It Is Not, What It Might Be*, in: Lusch, R.F., Vargo, S.L. (eds.), *The Service-Dominant Logic of Marketing: Dialog, Debate and Directions* Armonk, M.E Sharpe, Inc., New York.
- Vargo, S.L., Lusch, R.F., 2006b, *The Service-Dominant Logic of Marketing: Reactions, Reflections, and Refinements*, Marketing Theory, vol. 6, no. 3: 281–288.
- Vargo, S.L., Lusch, R.F., 2008, *Service-Dominant Logic: Continuing the Evolution*, Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, vol. 36, no. 1: 1–10.

Aims and Scope

Economics and Business Review is the successor to the Poznań University of Economics Review which was published by the Poznań University of Economics and Business Press in 2001–2014. The Economics and Business Review is a quarterly journal focusing on theoretical and applied research work in the fields of economics, management and finance. The Review welcomes the submission of articles for publication dealing with micro, mezzo and macro issues. All texts are double-blind assessed by independent reviewers prior to acceptance.

Notes for Contributors

1. Articles submitted for publication in the Economics and Business Review should contain original, unpublished work not submitted for publication elsewhere.
2. Manuscripts intended for publication should be written in English and edited in Word and sent to: review@ue.poznan.pl. Authors should upload two versions of their manuscript. One should be a complete text, while in the second all document information identifying the author(s) should be removed from files to allow them to be sent to anonymous referees.
3. The manuscripts are to be typewritten in 12' font in A4 paper format and be left-aligned. Pages should be numbered.
4. The papers submitted should have an abstract of not more than 100 words, keywords and the Journal of Economic Literature classification code.
5. Acknowledgements and references to grants, affiliation, postal and e-mail addresses, etc. should appear as a separate footnote to the author's name^{a,b,etc} and should not be included in the main list of footnotes.
6. Footnotes should be listed consecutively throughout the text in Arabic numerals. Cross-references should refer to particular section numbers: e.g.: See Section 1.4.
7. Quoted texts of more than 40 words should be separated from the main body by a four-spaced indentation of the margin as a block.
8. Mathematical notations should meet the following guidelines:
 - symbols representing variables should be italicized,
 - avoid symbols above letters and use acceptable alternatives (Y^*) where possible,
 - where mathematical formulae are set out and numbered these numbers should be placed against the right margin as... (1),
 - before submitting the final manuscript, check the layout of all mathematical formulae carefully (including alignments, centring length of fraction lines and type, size and closure of brackets, etc.),
 - where it would assist referees authors should provide supplementary mathematical notes on the derivation of equations.
9. References in the text should be indicated by the author's name, date of publication and the page number where appropriate, e.g. Acemoglu and Robinson [2012], Hicks [1965a, 1965b]. References should be listed at the end of the article in the style of the following examples:

Acemoglu, D., Robinson, J.A., 2012, *Why Nations Fail. The Origins of Power, Prosperity and Poverty*, Profile Books, London.

Kalecki, M., 1943, *Political Aspects of Full Employment*, The Political Quarterly, vol. XIV, no. 4: 322–331.

Simon, H.A., 1976, *From Substantive to Procedural Rationality*, in: Latsis, S.J. (ed.), *Method and Appraisal in Economics*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge: 15–30.
10. Copyrights will be established in the name of the E&BR publisher, namely the Poznań University of Economics and Business Press.

More information and advice on the suitability and formats of manuscripts can be obtained from:

Economics and Business Review

al. Niepodległości 10

61-875 Poznań

Poland

e-mail: review@ue.poznan.pl

www.ebr.ue.poznan.pl

Subscription

Economics and Business Review (E&BR) is published quarterly and is the successor to the Poznań University of Economics Review. The E&BR is published by the Poznań University of Economics and Business Press.

E&BR is listed in ProQuest, EBSCO, and BazEkon.

Subscription rates for the print version of the E&BR: institutions: 1 year – €50.00; individuals: 1 year – €25.00. Single copies: institutions – €15.00; individuals – €10.00. The E&BR on-line edition is free of charge.

Correspondence with regard to subscriptions should be addressed to: Księgarnia Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego w Poznaniu, ul. Powstańców Wielkopolskich 16, 61-895 Poznań, Poland, fax: +48 61 8543147; e-mail: info@ksiegarnia-ue.pl.

Payments for subscriptions or single copies should be made in Euros to Księgarnia Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego w Poznaniu by bank transfer to account No.: 96 1090 1476 0000 0000 4703 1245.