Chapter 9: Co-creation of value: A customer-integration approach

Authors: Tim Hughes and Ian Brooks

Abstract

The increasing influence of market competition on higher education has been criticized for a focus on short term gains rather than scholarly development. An alternative view of the market that may be more appropriate is provided by Service-Dominant logic (S-D Logic). Value co-creation takes place through resource integration and service exchange, enabled and constrained by institutions and institutional arrangements. Lecturers combine their knowledge with that of the students to develop the students' resources. A co-creative approach based on S-D Logic challenges universities to take on board how they create value for their students and other stakeholders. Implications are discussed for the student experience and student engagement. In addition, the role of the university in developing collaborative ecosystems in the wider community is discussed. A case study is provided to stimulate discussion on how far students can and should co-create their own curriculum.

1) Introduction

The idea of students as consumers of higher education is problematical, in a number of ways. The approach taken in this chapter is to consider higher education as an example of co-creation of value between the student and the university:

"Maybe the education service is one of the best representative examples of the value co-creation approach: if students do not work on their own, they cannot get a result regardless of lecturer performance" (Díaz-Méndez and Gummesson, 2012 p. 578).

The framework for co-creation, utilised in this chapter, comes from Service- Dominant Logic [S-D Logic] (Vargo and Lusch, 2004). This is an alternative explanation of markets to the established Goods- Dominant Logic. S-D Logic is put forward as a more satisfactory theoretical basis that explains the way markets operate. In particular, S-D Logic is compelling in analysing a complex and interactive service offering such as higher education:

"Higher education, as a service, has some specific characteristics. These include the high level of active involvement demanded of the individuals accessing the service; a prolonged service relationship, and a great variety in the nature of the service offered". (Chalcraft, Hilton and Hughes, 2015).

After reading this chapter, you should be able to:

- Critique the market-based view of students as customers
- Distinguish between a Goods-Dominant Logic and Service-Dominant Logic, as an explanation of markets
- Consider the implications of co-creation of value for higher education

2) Review of the literature on co-creation of value

The student as customer

The increasing influence of market competition on higher education has been a subject for discussion for some time (Williams, 1995). Critics of the market approach claim that treating students as consumers, is detrimental to education outcomes (Molesworth, Nixon and Scullion, 2009; Arum and Roksa, 2011), leading to a focus on short term gains rather than scholarly development. In particular, treating the student as a customer can lead to one-sided expectations that tutors are responsible for the student's learning rather than the student taking personal responsibility (Ng and Forbes, 2009). However, the extent to which this has actually happened is challenged (Koris et al. 2015) and there is some evidence that most students do not express a customer orientation towards their education (Saunders, 2015).

Presenting higher education as a market is then the subject of debate. A particular problem is that the student as customer view does lead to assumptions on how a market works that are not appropriate for analysing the provision of higher education. The idea that the student is a consumer who expects to receive a degree in return for a fee payment suggests an exchange view of the market stemming from a Goods- Dominant Logic. However, there is an alternative view of the market that may be more appropriate. Vargo and Lusch's (2004) concept of S-D Logic is put forward as a more satisfactory explanation of markets, based on co-creation of value-in-use rather than value- in-exchange.

The next section discusses the ideas around co-creation of value and S-D Logic in preparation for applying these ideas to higher education.

Co-creation of value and S-D Logic

Vargo and Lusch's seminal (2004) paper identified how marketing has shifted its dominant logic away from the exchange of tangible goods (Goods- Dominant Logic) towards the exchange of intangibles, specialized skills and knowledge and processes (S-D Logic). It is important to understand that Vargo and Lusch are not talking about a move away from goods towards services. They are claiming a new perspective on how the market works. Thus it is an explanation of both goods and services marketing. Value is only created when goods or service are consumed, in contrast to traditional economic theory that emphasizes value in exchange (e.g. value is conceptualized as the payment received for a product or service).

The idea that value is created in use is important. Value-in-use recognizes that customers are co-creators of their own value and they determine what is of value (Vargo & Lusch, 2006, 2008a). The customer creates value for himself or herself, but while interacting with the customer, the supplier can influence the process of value creation (Grönroos and Ravald , 2011). Starting with this idea, the strategic role of any supplier is therefore to support its customers in creating value (Ballantyne, Williams and Aitken, 2011).

Co-creation of value should not be confused with service co-production. Value creation is a customer perception and each customer will perceive the value received in their own unique way. In some cases the customer may also co-produce the service, for example by using self-service at supermarket checkouts. Mixing service co-production with value creation may have contributed to confusion in the earlier literature on S-D Logic (Vargo and Lusch, 2008b). Value is always co-created and sometimes may involve elements of co-production.

A central and prevailing theme of S-D Logic is that value is created by service-for- service exchange (Vargo and Lusch, 2004, 2008b, 2016, 2017). S-D Logic, by emphasizing service provision, highlights the purpose that motivates relationships- "That is, the purpose of interaction, and thus relationship, is value co-creation through mutual service provision" (Vargo, 2009). Higher education can be seen as service, in which skills and knowledge are applied to gain new insights for the benefit of stakeholders. Prime stakeholders in this are students. Lecturers combine their knowledge with that of the students to develop the students' resources in terms of knowledge and skills.

Co-creation of value and higher education

Vargo and Lusch (2016) have recently restated the core ideas of S-D Logic as fundamental axioms, based on ten years of debate. Value co-creation takes place through **actors** taking part in **resource integration** and **service exchange**, enabled and constrained by **institutions and institutional arrangements**, establishing **service eco-systems** of **value creation**. Table 1 takes these ideas and adapts them to the higher education context.

Table 1 Application of core ideas from S-D Logic to higher education

Vargo and Lusch's (2016) core ideas of value co-creation	Application to higher education
Actors	Value co-creation takes place amongst generic actors. This is more complex than thinking about customer/supplier. In higher education, value is co-created between lecturers, students, administrators, support staff, networks connected to the university and others.
Resource integration	All economic and social actors are resource integrators (Axiom 3). Students come into higher education with a range of existing knowledge and skills. Lecturers integrate their knowledge with that of their students in the course of teaching and learning. Thus learning can be seen as the development of the students' operant resources over time.
Service exchange	Service is the fundamental basis of exchange (Axiom 1). Value is created by service exchange. Lecturers and other staff provide service, but value is only created when students engage with the service.
Institutions and institutional arrangements	Value co-creation is coordinated through actor-generated institutions and institutional arrangements (Axiom 5). The contexts of the different types of students are highly significant in understanding how they learn and utilize knowledge.
Service eco-systems	Higher education takes place within a service eco-system. A service ecosystem perspective enables managers to view their organization from a broader and more enlightening perspective (Greer, Lusch and Vargo, 2016)
Value creation	Value is always uniquely and phenomenologically determined by the beneficiary (Axiom 4). Academics and students will have a range of different perceptions in relation to the value of the educational experience and its longer term impact on each student's career. Value can be seen in utilisation and in the case of education; utilisation may not take place until many years after the original provision of service. The challenge in this is that at the point of delivery utilisation potential may not be obvious.

In higher education, value is co-created between lecturers and their students, but there are many other actors who contribute. The student experience is shaped by administration and support staff; the involvement of industry and, not least, by interacting with other students.

The actors integrate operant resources (Lusch and Vargo, 2011). Operant resources typically involve knowledge and skills (Vargo and Lusch 2004, 2008a) and it is the integration of the operant resources, from the actors, that creates value (Löbler, 2011; Lusch and Vargo , 2011; Kleineltankamp et al. 2012). When lecturers interact with students, both parties bring in a range of operant resources. A resource integration perspective encourages an examination of the nature of the resource inputs from the actors and a consideration of how these resources may change and develop in the process. An actor can be involved in resource integration at varying levels from very active to passive (Löbler, 2013). For example, a student in developing as an independent learner, over the course of their degree, should become more active in directing their own learning, requiring different resource inputs from their lecturers over time. The concept is also useful in considering types of students. A postgraduate part-time MBA student will bring operant resources from their work experience and will benefit from an approach that integrates this experience with the theoretical knowledge of the lecturer effectively. In addition, the students benefit from interacting with each other and integrating knowledge across different sectors. While a traditional value-in-exchange approach concentrates on the organisation's resources, S-D Logic takes account of how value is created by the interaction of all actors in integrating their resources (Dziewanowska, 2017).

In addition to integrating resources, the actors are involved in service exchange. Actors in the higher education institution provide a service to students, but value is only created when students are influenced by the service provided. The level of engagement in the service exchange may vary and this may have significant implications for the value created. Actors in higher education do not create value just by offering the service; it requires student engagement with the service for value to be created. Within S-D Logic, the core service in a university is a learning experience that is co-created and emergent (Ng and Forbes, 2009). Lusch and Wu, (2012 p4) put it this way: "At the very least, a service perspective provides us a means of holistically perceiving students' needs. Therefore, the value of a lecture is not something the instructor produces alone. The value of a lecture, as service, is always co-created with the students."

Institutions and institutional logics are the formal and informal constraints (rules and norms) that shape actors' behaviour in resource integration (Edvardsson et al. 2014). Higher education institutions have their own logics that influence their expectations of students and impact on the way students are treated. Understanding the role that these institutional norms play in shaping behaviour and perceptions is highly relevant. At the same time it is useful to consider the differing institutional logics that have shaped the previous education of students. For example, international students will have been educated previously in many different contexts. Students may have come from institutions that encourage rote learning and discourage questioning and criticality.

Co-creation takes place within a service eco-system, a relatively self-contained system for co-creating mutual value through service exchange (Vargo and Lusch, 2014). Higher education institutions are part of an eco-system containing schools, colleges, the business community, public sector, charities etc. The idea of an eco-system reminds us of how universities are linked to the economy and society. Pressures for universities to demonstrate economic and social impact across

many advanced economies (Watson et al. 2011; Perkmann et al., 2013) reflect policy-makers expectations in this respect.

Axiom 4 underlines the need to consider perspectives on value from different points of view. According to S-D Logic terminology, lecturers provide students with a value proposition (Díaz-Méndez and Gummesson, 2012). If the value proposition is sufficiently motivating the actors (the students) commit their operant resources to the value creation process (Ballantyne and Varey, 2006). Therefore, universities present a value proposition, at a high level, to attract students to choose a particular institution in the first place. Determining value at an individual level can be highly complex due to the gap between the provision of the service and the use of the knowledge or skills provided. There is a challenge in determining the usefulness of knowledge provided well ahead of utilisation. For example, the full benefits of learning about management or marketing strategy might not be apparent until the student has worked his or her way up to a level in a company, where they have to make strategic decisions.

While value can be co-created, it can also be co-destroyed (Ple´ and Chumpitaz Ca´ceres, 2010), as a result of non-positive outcomes from actor-to-actor interactions (Prior, and Marcos-Cuevas, 2016). At a less extreme level, defective co-creation can occur when the actors under-participate, failing to input resources of sufficient quality or quantity to facilitate value co-creation (Greer, 2015), or when role conflicts occur (Chowdhury, Gruber and Zolkiewski, 2016). It is important to recognise the responsibility the student has for co-creating his or her own value.

Table 2 Key issues

The idea of the student as customer can be problematical in considering higher education
However, many of the problems with this approach can be seen to stem from a transactional, Goods-Dominant view of the market
Service-Dominant logic provides an alternative approach based on co-creation of value in use
In Service-Dominant logic higher education is the provision of service, involving integration of resources
Institutions coordinate service exchange in service eco systems
Value will be perceived differently by all the actors involved
It is important to recognise the responsibility the student has for co-creating his or her own value

3) Managerial implications

What are the implications of taking a co-creative approach to higher education management?

The role of the university

A co-creative approach, based on S-D Logic, challenges universities to take on board how they create value in the wider service eco-system: "It is essential that higher education recognize that what the university produces on campus, in the classroom, or online and packages to create an output (a college degree) is only the starting point of a longer process that co-creates value." (Lusch and Wu, 2012, p5). The expectation of universities in relation to their role in society and the economy has been discussed extensively in the literature (Perkmann et al., 2013). Universities are now seen as integral to regional innovation and economic development (Etzkowitz, 2011; MacKenzie and Zhang,

2014) and there are pressures for the higher education sector to be more outward facing and engaged with society and the economy across the world (Watson et al. 2011).

A service ecosystem perspective enables managers to view their organization from a broader and more enlightening perspective (Greer, Lusch and Vargo, 2016). Engagement and interaction in society and the economy requires universities to be outward facing and open beyond the academic community. This is a challenge for many academics unused to moving between the different communities of academia and practice (Shrivastava and Mitroff, 1984). Universities could provide greater support for academics in engaging with society and the economy. This includes providing training and mentoring for younger academics. PhD programmes could include a greater emphasis on how research is utilized. Academic careers are traditionally built on producing academic journal articles, but incentives to encourage the generation of wider impact from research would be valuable in encouraging wider engagement. The inclusion in the UK Research Evaluation Framework (REF) of Impact Case Studies provides an opportunity to demonstrate effective dissemination and impact of research outside the academic community.

As well as creating an internal environment that is supportive of academic engagement, universities need to be proactive in developing collaborative eco-systems (Rothwell, 1994, Perkmann et al. 2013). Reaching out to actors in communities outside the university is not new; however, there is plenty of room for further development. A starting point is to identify key stakeholder groups in the wider community. Taking business and management, as an example, connections with practitioners are frequently used to keep the syllabus up to date with current practice; to provide students with work experience; to bring in external speakers and to provide graduates with job opportunities. Thus the value of the student experience in applied subjects, such as business and management, can be seen to be enhanced greatly by engagement with the business community.

The student experience

In higher education, value is co-created between a number of different actors including lecturers, students, administrators, support staff, networks connected to the university and others. Student satisfaction is impacted by a range of elements in their overall educational experience. Therefore, a holistic approach needs to be adopted rather than dealing with each dimension in isolation in creating a valued education (Lai et al. 2015). This requires universities to understand the overall experience of students from the student's point of view.

This is not easy because value is always uniquely and phenomenologically determined by the beneficiary (Axiom 4). Hence value will be perceived differently by all the actors involved. While universities cannot cater for every individual student's whim it is possible to relate to the needs of different groups. For example international student cohorts coming from a range of backgrounds will perceive their experience in the light of their educational backgrounds and cultures. The contexts of the different types of students are highly significant in understanding how they learn and utilize knowledge. Effective resource integration requires an understanding that students come into higher education with a range of existing knowledge and skills.

A co-creative approach requires universities to take a user perspective and this can be challenging for a large institution organised around functions and faculties. Supporting individuals through

providing personal tutors who engage with individual students throughout their educational experience is one approach, but this does require engagement of the student with the process.

Student engagement

As discussed earlier in the chapter, taking a value-in-exchange approach to considering the student as customer implies that tutors are responsible for student learning, ignoring the role that students have to play, as active and responsible learners.   In S-D Logic the supplier offers value propositions, but does not create value. The customer, as user, creates value for themselves facilitated by the supplier (Gronroos, 2011). In the higher education context the role of the university is to provide the conditions in which students can create their own value. This requires a new approach recognizing their limited control over students, according to Wardley,Bélanger and Nadeau, (2017, p1010):

"One must be cognizant of the fact that the goal of engaging students in the co-creation of value is one that is fundamentally outside of institutional control. Students have decision-making independence which means that they cannot be tightly controlled by administration and this is evident through the strong support for the new definition of autonomy. Consequently, institutions need to develop strategies encouraging, managing, and enhancing student involvement without having ultimate control over the students and their behaviours."

Wardley, Bélanger and Nadeau, (2017) go on to itemise elements of engagement that institutions should provide to support students in their personal growth. These include: the autonomy given to students in carrying out their work; the degree that the student feels responsible for their work; the meaningfulness of the tasks and skills required; the feedback provided and organisational support provided.

Interaction is a key concept in co-creation. The supplier seeks opportunities to become a co-creator of value, but this can only be realised when opportunities for interaction with customers exist. Providing opportunities for interaction may start long before the acceptance of a student at a university. The use of social networks replaces the passive view of customers with an active view in which applicants are invited to use their own initiative rather than simply react to predetermined marketing activities (Fagerstrøm and Ghinea, 2013). Social media strategies can allow interactive co-creation from early on (Fujita, Harrigan and Soutar, 2017).

How far should the role of the student as co-creator extend? There is an argument that students should have a limited role in co-designing their courses because of their lack of experience and knowledge of what they might need to learn for their future. Thus students should be seen as customers or collaborators, but not as co-designers, according to Fleischman, Raciti and Lawley (2015). However, there may be situations in which students can become co-designers of their educational experience. In the case study, provided at the end of this chapter, we present an example of an innovative degree "Team Entrepreneurship", provided by a UK university, in which the students can design their own degree experience, within a university-supported structure.

4) Conclusion

While S-D Logic has been debated since 2004 there has been only limited research into the implications of S-D Logic in contexts of application. As previously mentioned, higher education provides a particularly interesting context for understanding co-creation, because of the proactive nature of the role of the student in their education and because of the prolonged nature of the interaction between the student and the educational institution.

The co-creation perspective suggests many areas for further research. It would be of great interest to explore perceptions of value of current students compared with alumni, who have the benefit of viewing the value of their education in the context of how it has helped them in their career and practice. A wider perspective can be added by looking at perceptions of value amongst employers of the university's students in different subject areas. New technology is increasingly impacting on the student experience and there is much to learn about the role of digital technology and face-to-face interaction in co-creation of the student journey. Universities across the world have to show the wider impact of their activities on society at large and a co-creation approach could be informative in guiding this. For example, there is much to do in mapping the service eco-systems of a university and understanding how different actors in the eco-systems engage and interact with the university.

5) Case Study - The Team Entrepreneurship course at Bristol Business School

The Team Entrepreneurship course (UWE Bristol, 2017) at the University of the West of England provides an illuminating case study in relation to co-creation of value. The course, with its formal title of BA (Hons) Business (Team Entrepreneurship), enrolled the first cohort of 37 undergraduates in September 2013 (UWE Bristol, 2013). The aim of the course is to produce graduates with degrees plus experience of running their own businesses.

The course structure is ground-breaking - no classrooms, compulsory lectures or exams - the degree course is based on methods pioneered in Finland and also run successfully in Spain and Hungary. The undergraduates join together in teams which run a wide array of business projects. The emphasis of the course is on learning-by-doing, whilst building team enterprises. There are no traditional classroom lectures. There are no exams.

At launch, course leader Carol Jarvis from UWE's Bristol Business School said, "Running a real business – devising a product or service and selling it to customers – is what drives the students' learning. All students have an equal financial stake in the companies they create and will learn to manage the risks and rewards this entails."

The course is based on the Team Academy programme developed by Johannes Partanen in Finland in 1993 (Tiimiakatemia, 2013; Partanen, 2015). There is now a network of institutions delivering Tiimiakatemia courses in 12 countries (Tiimiakatemia Global, 2016). The programme handbook (Rivers, 2017, p.4) states the guiding principles for the course:

> "Not students | But team entrepreneurs
>
> Not classrooms | But an open plan office
>
> Not teaching | But learning
>
> Not teachers | But coaches

| Not simulations | But real ventures |
| Not control | But self-organising" |

However, there are a series of written assignments which enable the Team Entrepreneurs (TEs) to demonstrate their mastery of theory, concepts and models through reading and application in enterprises. These assignments are grouped into mandatory modules through which academic credit is gained. The modules are organised in three strands throughout the three years, developing individuals, teams and ventures. Modules have specified learning objectives and recommended reading but the teams will seek additional learning as they identify their need for it. For example, one final year assignment is based on the TEs providing consultancy-style advice to the first and second year TE teams.

The framework of S-D logic provides a lens to view elements of co-creation on the Team Entrepreneurship course and to make comparisons with more traditional undergraduate business courses.

Key actors

The main actors involved are much the same as on a more traditional course: the students, their tutors, module and programme leaders and visiting practitioners. What is different is the roles played by the actors. The Team Entrepreneurs are expected to be highly proactive in organizing their work and study to meet their individual and group aims. Tutors are coaches with the aim of facilitating TEs in achieving these aims. Module leaders have to provide academic frameworks and assessment that maintain rigor, within this more fluid environment. The Programme Leader is responsible for maintaining and developing the unique value proposition. Business leaders and other practitioners are encouraged to be more closely involved with the programme on an ongoing basis than in traditional courses.

Resource integration

TEs come to the course with their own individual knowledge, skills and capabilities (operant resources), as do all students. However the TEs integrate their resources with each other by working together in teams to create businesses across the whole timeframe of the degree and often beyond this.

TEs integrate their operant resources with those of academic staff, as do traditional students. But the nature of the programme, as a business incubator, encourages integration with less traditional resources, as may be required by the needs of the businesses they are developing. For example, a team of TEs founded a food catering and delivery business Pelico (Mason-Jones, 2017). They negotiated the use of UWE kitchen facilities (operand resources), researched food business processes (operant resources from other actors) to launch and run a food service business. The TEs integrated a range of resources and through this learning-by-doing they significantly enhanced their own operant resources.

Service exchange

It follows that the service exchange between the TEs and the university develops to meet the different needs of TEs trying to establish a business and varies from that of typical undergraduate programmes. The university needs to be flexible in understanding its role in providing service to the students.

Most importantly the greatest value is co-created when TEs work with practitioners and academics to apply appropriate theory to the reality experienced in their business start-ups. This exchange is facilitated by the Team Coaches and it requires the university to be closely linked with the business community and to be able to broker and facilitate substantial practitioner support on an ongoing basis.

Institutions and institutional arrangements

Universities, faculties and subject fields have established cultures and ways of working. The Team Entrepreneurship guiding principles (Rivers, 2017) encourage different ways of thinking and working and diverge from university institutional norms.

The Team Academy programme (Tiimiakatemia, 2013; Partanen, 2015) and partner institutions, delivering the programme globally, influence the culture developed within the TE programme and the TE teams and TE-generated businesses start to create new institutional arrangements.

Service eco-systems

The University provides a broad service eco-system with academics and practitioners in a wide range of disciplines. While the access to service in this ecosystem is largely predetermined on more traditional programmes, the TEs can negotiate access to actors and resources within the wider eco-system, as the need arises in their business development. Furthermore, the TE programme can be seen as a service eco-system in itself working within the wider eco-system of the Tiimiakatemia Global network of similar courses.

Value creation

Evidence of value creation will be most significant in terms of the lifetime impact on the TEs. The UWE Bristol course has only been running for a few years, but the Finnish experience is that, at two years after graduation, 42% of students are entrepreneurs and the businesses they create provide additional value in extending the Tiimiakatemia eco-system. As the UWE Bristol programme started in 2013, it is only possible so far to use shorter-term proxy measures at this stage. The instruments in use in England are the National Student Survey (NSS) and Destination of Leavers from Higher Education survey (DHLE). For the first graduating TE cohort, "DLHE and NSS data shows high levels of attainment and satisfaction, with 100% of graduates saying that the programme prepared them well for starting their own business. Graduates not running their own companies are proving to be highly employable within professional and managerial roles." (University Alliance, 2017)

In the short time that the UWE Bristol course has been running, there have been other recognitions of the value created. TEs from UWE Bristol have been named Student Director of the Year by the Institute of Directors for both 2016 (Institute of Directors, 2016) and 2017 (Director Magazine, 2017). Future research needs to be done to quantify the value creation of businesses founded as a

result of the programme, as they develop. There is also a broader value creation in the UK from the contribution of these cohorts of TEs towards economic growth.

Value for the university, seen from an exchange point of view, is the tuition fee income. However, a broader view of value, as perceived within S-D Logic, recognises that the programme provides pedagogic learning on new ways to engage with students and that the engagement of students in the Bristol community through their businesses contributes to the University's brand and future student recruitment.

In the global context, the TEs and the course contribute value towards the achievement of a number of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), notably SDG 4 Quality Education target 4.4: "By 2030, substantially increase the number of youth and adults who have relevant skills, including technical and vocational skills, for employment, decent jobs and entrepreneurship" (United Nations General Assembly, 2015).

Conclusions

The case study provides a particular example of co-creation of value in higher education. The Team Entrepreneurship approach would not be suitable for all business students. Recruitment is strict in terms of selecting students that are suited to this type of learning. Staff selection is based on ability to engage with business and to facilitate the students' learning in the course of developing a business. S-D Logic provides a useful lens to view co-creation in the case and to compare the case with a more traditional approach.

Useful links

Tiimiakatemia (2013) *Tiimiakatemia in a nutshell*. Available from: http://www.tiimiakatemia.fi/en/tiimiakatemia/tiimiakatemia-nutshell/

Mason-Jones, S. (2017) *A first taste of Pelico – a new Bristol business*. Available from: http://365bristol.com/story/2017/06/08/the-first-taste-of-pelico-–-a-new-bristol-business/4788/

6) Further Investigation

What are the implications of thinking about higher education, as a service in which value is co-created in use, against thinking of higher education as a service that is consumed by students?

What are the services and elements of service provided to students in higher education and where are the best opportunities for universities to improve the value provided to students?

How can universities be more effective in engaging all types of students to study?

How far should students be involved in co-designing the courses that are provided for them to study?

In what ways should co-creation between lecturers and students vary at different levels of study (e.g. levels 1-3 of undergraduate course and undergraduate/postgraduate levels)?

References

Arum, R. and Roksa, J. (2011) "Academically Adrift: Limited Learning on College Campuses". Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Ballantyne, D. and Varey, R.J. (2006) "Creating value in use through marketing interaction: the exchange logic of relating, communicating and knowing". Marketing Theory, 6 (35), pp.335-348.

Ballantyne, D. Williams, J. and Aitken, R. (2011) "Introduction to service dominant logic: From proposition to practice". Industrial Marketing Management, 40 (2), pp.179-180.

Chalcraft, D. Hilton, T. and Hughes, T. (2015) "Customer, collaborator or co-creator? What is the role of the student in a changing higher education servicescape?" Journal of Marketing in Higher Education, 25 (1), pp.1-4.

Chowdhury, I. N. Gruber, T.B. and Zolkiewski, J. (2016) " Every cloud has a silver lining — Exploring the dark side of value co-creation in B2B service networks". Industrial Marketing Management, 55 pp. 97-109.

Díaz-Méndez, M. and Gummesson, E. (2012) "Value co-creation and university teaching quality: Consequences for the European Higher Education Area (EHEA)". Journal of Service Management, 23 (4), pp.571-592, https://doi.org/10.1108/09564231211260422

Director Magazine (2017) *Director of the Year - Alex Gatehouse, co-founder and CEO, Pelico*. Available from: https://www.director.co.uk/alex-gatehouse-student-director-22953-2/ [Accessed 14 February 2018].

Dziewanowska, K. (2017) "Value types in higher education – students' perspective". Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 39 (3), pp. 235-246, DOI:10.1080/1360080X.2017.1299981

Edvardsson, B. Kleinaltenkamp, M. Tronvoll, B. McHugh, P. and Windahl, C. (2014) "Institutional logics matter when coordinating resource integration". Marketing Theory, 14 (3), pp. 291-309.

Etzkowitz, H. (2011), "Normative change in science and the birth of the Triple Helix". Social Science Information, 50 (3-4), pp. 549-568.

Fagerstrøm, A. and Ghinea, G. (2013) "Co-creation of value in higher education: using social network marketing in the recruitment of students" . Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 35(1), pp. 45-53. DOI: 10.1080/1360080X.2013.748524

Fleischman, D. Raciti, M. and Lawley, M. (2015) "Degrees of co-creation: an exploratory study of perceptions of international students' role in community engagement experiences". Journal of Marketing for Higher Education, 25(1), pp. 85-103. DOI:10.1080/08841241.2014.986254

Fujita, M. Harrigan, P. and Soutar, G. (2017) "A netnography of a university's social media brand community: Exploring collaborative co-creation tactics". Journal of Global Scholars of Marketing Science, 27(2), pp. 148-164. DOI: 10.1080/21639159.2017.1283798

Greer , D. (2015)"Defective co-creation", European Journal of Marketing, 49 (1/2), pp. 238 – 261. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/EJM-07-2012-0411

Greer,C.R. Lusch, R.F. and Vargo, S.L. (2016) "A service perspective: Key managerial insights from service-dominant (S-D) logic". Organizational Dynamics, 45, pp. 28-38.

Grönroos, C. and Ravald, A., (2011)"Service as business logic: implications for value creation and marketing". Journal of Service Management, 22 (1), pp. 5 – 22.

Gronroos, C. (2011) A service perspective on business relationships, Industrial Marketing Management, 40(2), pp 240-247.

Institute of Directors (2016) *IoD announces Director of the Year Awards 2016 winners*. Available from: https://www.iod.com/news/news/articles/IoD-announces-Director-of-the-Year-Awards-2016-winners [Accessed 26 February 2018].

Kleineltankamp, K. Brodie, R. Frow, P. Hughes, T. Peters, L. Woratschek, H (2012)"Resource Integration". Marketing Theory, 12 (2), pp. 201-205.

Koris, R. Örtenblad, A. Kerem,K. and Ojala, T. (2015) "Student-customer orientation at a higher education institution: the perspective of undergraduate business students". Journal of Marketing for Higher Education, 25:1, 29-44. DOI:10.1080/08841241.2014.972486

Lai, M.M. Lau, S.H. Mohamad Yusof N.A. and Chew, K.W. (2015) "Assessing antecedents and

consequences of student satisfaction in higher education: evidence from Malaysia". Journal of Marketing for Higher Education, 25(1), pp. 45-69. DOI:10.1080/08841241.2015.1042097

Löbler, H. (2011) "Position and potential of service-dominant logic- Evaluated in an 'ism' frame for further development". Marketing Theory, 11(1), pp. 51-73.

Löbler, H. (2013)"Service-dominant networks". Journal of Service Management, 24 (4), pp. 420 – 434. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/JOSM-01-2013-0019

Lusch, R.F. and Vargo, S.L. (2006) "Service-dominant logic: reactions, reflections and refinements". Marketing Theory, 6 (3), pp. 281-288.

Lusch, R.F. and Vargo, S.L. (2011) "Viewpoint Service-dominant logic: a necessary step". European Journal of Marketing, 45 (7/8), pp. 1298-1309.

Lusch, R. and Wu, C. (2012) "A service science perspective on higher education. Center for American Progress". August 1–12. Downloaded on 15/01/18 from www.americanprogress.org/issues/education/reports/2012/08/13/11972/a-service-science-perspective-on-higher-education/

Mackenzie, N. G. and Zhang, Q. (2014) "A regional perspective on the entrepreneurial university: Practices and policies." In A. Fayolle, and D. T. Redford (eds.), *Handbook on the entrepreneurial university*, pp. 188-206, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Mason-Jones, S. (2017) *A first taste of Pelico – a new Bristol business*. Available from: http://365bristol.com/story/2017/06/08/the-first-taste-of-pelico-–-a-new-bristol-business/4788/ [Accessed 26 February 2018].

Molesworth, M. Nixon, E. and Scullion, R. (2009) "Having, being and higher education: The marketisation of the university and the transformation of the student into consumer". Teaching in Higher Education, 14(3), pp. 277–287. doi:10.1080/13562510902898841

Ng, I. C. L and Forbes, J. (2009) "Education as service: The understanding of university experience through the service logic". Journal of Marketing for Higher Education, 19 (1), 19, pp. 38–64.

Partanen, J. (2015) *Glimpses of individual learning : what team coaches need to know about individual learning and the practices of Tiimiakatemia. volume I*. Partus.

Perkmann, M. Tartari, V. McKelvey, M. Autio, E. Broström, A.D'Este, P. Fini, R. Geuna, A. Grimaldi, R. Hughes, A. Krabel, S. Kitson, M. Llerena, P. Lissoni, F. Salter, A., and Sobrero, M. (2013) "Academic engagement and commercialisation: A review of the literature on university–industry relations." Research Policy, 42, pp. 423-442.

Ple´, L. and Chumpitaz Ca´ceres, R. (2010) 'Not always Co-creation: Introducing Interactional Co-destruction of Value in Service-dominant Logic', Journal of Services Marketing 24(6), pp. 430–37.

Prior, D.D. and Marcos-Cuevas, J. (2016) "Value co-destruction in interfirm relationships: The impact of actor engagement styles". Marketing Theory, 16 (4), pp. 533-552.

Rivers, A. (2017) *Programme Handbook BA(Hons) Business (Team Entrepreneurship) 2017-18*. Bristol: University of the West of England.

Rothwell, R. (1994) "Towards the fifth-generation innovation process," International Marketing Review, 11(1), pp. 7-31.

Saunders D.B. (2015) "They do not buy it: exploring the extent to which entering first-year students view themselves as customers". Journal of Marketing for Higher Education, 25 (1), pp. 5-28. DOI: 10.1080/08841241.2014.969798

Shrivastava, P. and Mitroff, I.I. (1984) "Enhancing Organizational Research Utilization: The Role of Decision Makers' Assumptions". Academy of Management Review, 9 (1), pp. 18-26.

Tiimiakatemia (2013) *Tiimiakatemia in a nutshell*. Available from: http://www.tiimiakatemia.fi/en/tiimiakatemia/tiimiakatemia-nutshell/ [Accessed 27 February 2017].

Tiimiakatemia Global (2016) *Tiimiakatemia Global*. Available from: http://www.tiimiakatemia.com/en/ [Accessed 14 February 2017].

United Nations General Assembly (2015) *Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. [online]. pp. 1–35. Available from: http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/70/1&Lang=E.

University Alliance (2017) *UWE Bristol: Team Entrepreneurship*. Available from: https://www.unialliance.ac.uk/2017/08/02/uwe-bristol-team-entrepreneurship/ [Accessed 26 February 2018].

UWE Bristol (2017) *BA(Hons) Business (Team Entrepreneurship)*. Available from: https://courses.uwe.ac.uk/N191/business-team-entrepreneurship [Accessed 14 February 2018].

UWE Bristol (2013) *Learning by doing; UWE Bristol runs new course for budding entrepreneurs*. Available from: http://info.uwe.ac.uk/news/uwenews/news.aspx?id=2693 [Accessed 14 February 2018].

Vargo, S. L. (2009) "Toward a transcending conceptualization of relationship: a service –dominant logic perspective". Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing, 24 (5/6), pp. 373-379.

Vargo, S.L. and Lusch, R.F. (2004) "Evolving to a New Dominant Logic for Marketing". Journal of Marketing, 68 (1), pp. 1-17.

Vargo, S.L. and Lusch, R.F. (2008a) "Why "service"". Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 36, pp. 25-38.

Vargo, S.L. and Lusch, R.F. (2008b) "Service-dominant logic: continuing the evolution". Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 36, pp 1-10.

Vargo, S.L. and Lusch, R.F. (2011) "It's all B2B……. and beyond: Toward a systems perspective of the market". Industrial Marketing Management, 40 (2), pp. 181-187.

Vargo, S.L. and Lusch, R.F. (2014) "Inversions of service-dominant logic". Marketing Theory, 14 (3), pp. 239-248.

Vargo, S. L. and Lusch R. F. (2016) "Institutions and axioms: an extension and update of service-dominant logic". Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 44(1), pp. 5-23.

Vargo, S.L. and Lusch, R.F. (2017) "Service-dominant logic 2025". International Journal of Research in Marketing, 34 (1) pp. 46-67.

Wardley, L.J. Bélanger, C.H. and Nadeau, J. (2017) "A co-creation shift in learning management: work design for institutional commitment and personal growth". High Education, 74, pp. 997–1013. DOI 10.1007/s10734-016-0090-0

Watson, D. Hollister, R. Stroud, S.E., and Babcock, E. (2011) The engaged university: International perspectives on civic engagement. Oxford: Routledge.

Williams, G. (1995) "The "marketization" of higher education: Reforms and potential reforms in higher education finance". In W.D. Dill & B. Sporn (Eds.), Emerging patterns of social demand and university reform: Through a glass darkly (pp. 170–193). Oxford: Pergamon Press.