

Service-dominant logic as a framework for exploring research utilization

Tim Hughes

Professor of Applied Marketing

Faculty of Business and Law

University of the West of England

Mario Vafeas

Senior Lecturer

Faculty of Business and Law

University of the West of England

Abstract

This article links S-D logic to the call for better theoretical frameworks to understand research utilization in business and management. It contributes to explaining what happens in cocreating knowledge between researchers and research users and also contributes to the development of midrange theory on S-D logic. A framework is utilised, based on Vargo and Lusch's (2016) update on S-D logic. To demonstrate application, the framework is applied to an example of the authors' research on marketing agencies and their clients. Implications for theory and academic practice and policy are put forward. The S-D logic framework is not tied to any particular research method or way of working and has benefits in being applicable to marketing research and across the wider field of business and management. The idea of resource enhancement is put forward as a learning process in explaining what happens to the actors' resources in the course of resource integration.

Introduction

The call for academic research to be seen to create social and economic impact is a global issue. It is apparent in the 2020 strategy in Europe and the Star Metrics initiative in the US (LERU, May 2012). In the UK it was stressed in the 2014 Research Excellence Framework (REF 2014). The agenda for achieving wider impact is therefore an important issue for higher education contexts across the world, and yet it is under-researched

(Watermeyer, 2014). In Marketing and the wider field of Business and Management the impact agenda connects to the debate about the utilization of academic research. The contention of this article is that research utilization is a cocreative activity. An academic requires a third party to take some action or change their views as a result of the academic's research in order for utilization to take place. Therefore it always involves some element of cocreation. The purpose of the article is to take a framework from service-dominant logic (S-D logic) (Vargo and Lusch, 2004, 2008, 2011, 2014, 2016) and apply it to the cocreation of value from academic research, responding to the call for rigorous investigation of how the results of scientific research are utilized in management practice (Kieser, Nicolai and Seidl, 2015). Thus the aim is to contribute to theory on research utilization, as well as to the development of midrange theory on S-D logic (Vargo and Lusch, 2017).

The article begins with a discussion of the impact policy agenda across the world and its relationship with research utilization within management and marketing research. There follows a review of the limitations of the extant literature on knowledge generation and utilization in management, concluding with Kieser, Nicolai and Seidl's, (2015, p213) call for theoretical frameworks to fill a gap between "the utilization of management research and the social dynamics between academic and experiential knowledge". The argument, in this article, is that S-D logic has great potential to contribute to this gap in the way it conceptualises value in use from multiple points of view. As such, S-D logic is appropriate in incorporating the different perceptions of value of academics and practitioners dealing with the complexity and paradoxes of engaging with each other. A framework for utilization, utilising the core ideas of S-D logic, as restated by Vargo and Lusch (2016), is then discussed and applied to the academic/practitioner research utilization context. An illustrative example is provided, relating to the authors' experience of conducting research with marketing

agencies and their clients. The subsequent Discussion section considers the insights that might be gained and the practical implications for academic researchers.

The wider impact agenda and the policy context

The pressure on the higher education sector to demonstrate wider impact from research is apparent across the globe (Watson et al. 2011). The European 2020 Strategy includes wider impact, as one of the key criteria, in allocating research funding and the US Star Metrics initiative is designed to measure the impact of scientific investment (LERU, May 2012). In the UK, the perceived importance of university-business collaboration has been reinforced by a series of government reports (Wilson Report, 2012; Witty Report, 2013; Dowling Review, 2015). Thus impact is a political agenda with a widespread reach.

The achievement of wider social and economic impact requires academics to go beyond simply communicating their findings. The UK REF 2014 guidelines made it clear that dissemination activity on its own, without evidence of its benefits, would not be considered to be a demonstration of impact (REF 2014 report). This requirement suggests that academics need to collaborate with research users in demonstrating how the research findings have been utilized. In management research, research usage can be seen to be about both knowledge dissemination and knowledge production (Shapiro, Kirkman and Courtney, 2007). That is to say, it is not purely about disseminating and translating research from academics to practitioner audiences, but also requires both sides to engage together to cocreate new useable knowledge. This is a key point, achieving impact requires a third party to think or act in a way that is influenced by the research. This poses many challenges for academics researching in Marketing and in the wider field of Business and Management, as will be discussed in the following sections.

Utilization in management and marketing research

Utilization in marketing research is usefully seen in the context of the wider disciplinary debate over the practitioner relevance of management research. A gap between academia and practice is said to have opened up (Pfeffer and Fong, 2002; Rynes, 2007) and much of the teaching and research carried out in universities is said to be irrelevant to the needs to business (Huff, 2000; Bennis and O'Toole, 2005; Bartunek and Rynes, 2014). In other words, the outputs of management research are criticized for not having impact on the practice of management. Marketing, has been specifically criticized in this respect (Baker and Holt, 2004; Mentzer and Schumann, 2006; Reibstein, Day and Wind, 2009; Storbacka, 2014; Mason, Kjellberg and Hagberg, 2015).

The argument goes that the divergence is detrimental to the development of the marketing field (Reibstein, Day and Wind, 2009). Fendt et al.'s (2008) analysis of the theory-praxis gap suggests that usefulness, as embodied in pragmatism, should be an important criterion in designing research. Good theory needs to be based on both originality and practical utility (Corley and Gioia, 2011) and therefore needs to be based in the reality of the human experience of practice (Knights and Scarborough, 2010; Mason, Kjellberg and Hagberg, 2015). Collaboration with practitioners, customers and stakeholders is often an important element in theory development (Brodie, 2017) and in marketing management this requires an understanding of how research is relevant to the role of the practitioner in relation to the organization in which they work (Jaworski, 2011).

However, despite the longevity of the debate and the many solutions put forward in the literature, little progress has been made in increasing relevance (Bartunek and Rynes, 2014). It can be very difficult for researchers to move between the different communities of practice of academia and business (Shrivastava and Mitroff, 1984) because of the contradictions and paradoxes stemming from different practices, systems, time horizons,

incentives, objectives and world view between the communities (Bartunek and Rynes, 2014). Moreover, the pressure to produce high quality academic outputs may make it very difficult for an academic to spend the time and effort necessary to become a provider of ideas to the business world (Martin, 2012). There is also the question of motivation. As Jaworski (2011) observes, the academic marketing community is split on the desirability of collaboration with practice.

In summary, the utilization of management research in general and marketing research, in particular, has largely been discussed in relation to relevance to practice and to the significant challenges of engaging with practice. The next section takes a broader perspective in reviewing the existing literature conceptualising the ways knowledge is developed and shared with research users.

Knowledge creation and utilization

Gibbons et al.'s (1994) concept of Mode 1 and 2 knowledge creation can be seen to have been influential in the management literature on research utilization. Mode 1 (M1) means research that is conducted by academics without any involvement from practitioners. In M1 research, problems are set and solved within the academic community and the process of utilization is sequential, with discovery of new knowledge preceding its application. In contrast, Mode 2 (M2) research is conducted in the context of application and discovery and application are inseparable. An imperative of M2 is that the exploitation of knowledge requires participation from practitioners in its generation.

The M2 approach has been widely advocated in the management literature. Van De Ven and Johnson's (2006) model involves the engagement of practice in problem formulation, theory building, research design and problem solving in advancing scientific knowledge. In design science (Van Aaken, 2005), the development of valid knowledge

related to field problems is favoured over the explanatory approach of the social scientists. Rather than aiming to find universal ‘truths’ the design scientist develops heuristic rules that managers adapt and redesign in implementation. Another way of sharing with practice is put forward in Evidence Based Management (Rousseau, 2007) which is about translating management principles into organizational practices (Rynes, Giluk and Brown, 2007). These approaches can be critiqued from a number of viewpoints. Action research develops solutions that come out of trying to serve the interest of the client, design science is over mechanistic and evidence based management suffers from lack of quality of evidence (Kieser, Nicolai and Seidl, 2015). Most importantly, all these approaches require a high level of proactive involvement by practitioners and therefore, in turn, require a degree of consensus on the subject matter and a willingness to be fully committed by all the stakeholders. In a recent paper, Nenonen et al. (2017) reflect on how collaborative theorizing with managers can happen, drawing from examples of four case studies. In all the case studies a significant proportion of the managers involved had bought into the programme and were involved in commenting on and critiquing theoretical frameworks. Nenonen et al. (2017) call for more research into this type of collaborative theorizing, but also call for research into situations where other approaches for achieving academic rigour and relevance are more suitable.

This is an important point; the reality of day to day engagement between scholars and practitioners is likely to involve a number of different ways of working together (Antonacopoulou, Dehlin and Zundel, 2011). The idea that research in management falls neatly into M1 or M2 is said to be simplistic (Huff, 2000; Bresnan and Burrell, 2012) and normative (Hessels and Van Lente, 2008; Kieser, Nicolai and Seidl, 2015). Hessels and Van Lente (2008) suggest that M1 and M2 should be seen as two ends of a continuum and point to Stokes (1997) typology of research as a way forward. The Stokes typology identifies four

quadrants relating to fundamental understanding versus consideration of use. Only one quadrant fulfils both criteria.

Kieser, Nicolai and Seidl, (2015, P213) recognize that research utilization needs to be defined broadly: “The concept of utilization does not restrict the ways and the context in which research is used, nor does it prescribe who can use it and what role its users play in the process”. Kieser, Nicolai and Seidl, (2015 P213) conclude that the fundamental problem in the debate is that there is a lack of a theoretical and empirical foundation. They suggest that a first step is to develop theoretical frameworks for research on “the utilization of management research and the social dynamics between academic and experiential knowledge”. The theoretical frameworks: “need to acknowledge that there are many different ways in which management research can be utilized” (P216). This is where S-D logic has great potential to contribute, as will be discussed in the next section.

S-D logic as a theoretical framework for examining research utilization

The concept of research utilization connects to the idea of cocreation and value in use, key ideas running through the work of Vargo and Lusch (2004-2017) and others on S-D logic. A central and prevailing theme of S-D logic is that value is created by service-for-service exchange (Vargo and Lusch 2008, 2011, 2016, 2017). The creation of knowledge through research can be seen as service, in which skills and knowledge are applied to gain new insights for the benefit of others. The realization of the benefit requires a third party to be influenced by or act on the research.

Vargo and Lusch have recently restated the core ideas of S-D logic, based on the debate that has developed since their initial article. To paraphrase Vargo and Lusch (2016), value is cocreated through: **Actors** involved in **resource integration** and **service exchange**, enabled and constrained by **institutions and institutional arrangements**, establishing

service ecosystems of value creation. Table 1 demonstrates the applicability of these ideas to research utilization.

Table 1 Relevance of themes in S-D logic to research utilization

Vargo and Lusch’s (2016) conceptualization of value cocreation	Relevance to research utilization
Actors	The current narrative in S-D logic encompasses value cocreation amongst generic actors. This idea is applicable to the situation of a number of different academic and non-academic stakeholders engaging together to develop, disseminate and act upon research.
Resource integration	All economic and social actors are resource integrators (Axiom 3). Academic and non-academic research users integrate a range of resources in utilizing research.
Service exchange	Service is the fundamental basis of exchange (Axiom 1). Value is created by service-for-service exchange. The creation of knowledge through research is service, in which skills and knowledge are applied to gain new insights for the benefit of others. Utilization requires the research to be used or to influence the behavior of a third-party.
Institutions and institutional arrangements	Value cocreation is coordinated through actor-generated institutions and institutional arrangements (Axiom 5). The contexts of the different communities of practice of academic and practitioner actors are highly significant in understanding cocreation in utilization of knowledge.
Service ecosystems	The coordination takes place within a service ecosystem. This concept is interesting in relation to understanding what different patterns of research utilization ecosystems can be observed and how ecosystems relate to each other.
Value creation	Value is always uniquely and phenomenologically determined by the beneficiary (Axiom 4). Value will be perceived differently by all the actors involved. This is highly relevant to the cocreation of knowledge because different perspectives on what is valuable knowledge need to be recognized, if the needs of different parties are to be satisfied. Therefore, academic and non-academic stakeholders will have a range of different perceptions in relation to the value of research and its impact.

Source: Adapted S-D logic literature (Vargo and Lusch, 2014, 2016, 2017).

S-D logic initially focussed on the roles of customers and suppliers in cocreation (Vargo and Lusch, 2004), however the perspective now taken is of cocreation taking place far more widely in exchanges between generic actors: “Value creation does not just take place through the activities of a single actor (customer or otherwise) or between a firm and its

customers but among a whole host of actors.” (Vargo and Lusch, 2016, p 9). The wider conceptualisation lends itself to consideration of the range of academic and non-academic actors that become involved in utilizing research findings.

The actors integrate operant and operand resources (Vargo and Lusch, 2011). Operant resources are the active agents in value creation, typically involving the knowledge and skills of the actors (Vargo and Lusch 2004, 2008) and it is the integration of the operant resources, from those involved, that creates value (Löbler, 2011; Vargo and Lusch, 2011; Kleineltankamp et al. 2012). Vargo and Lusch (2004) conceptualise that resources come into being through cocreation, leading to the idea of potential resources that are made to be useful by interacting with other potential resources (Vargo and Lusch, 2011). When academics engage with practitioners both parties bring in a range of operant resources. A resource integration perspective allows for an examination of the nature of the resource inputs from the parties and a consideration of how these resources may change and develop in the process. An actor can be involved in resource integration at different levels from very active to passive (Löbler, 2013). The study of how resources become, through use, is still emerging and subject to ontological considerations (Peters et al. 2014). The move towards cocreation as being between generic actors rather than between customer and supplier reflects a move, identified by Löbler (2011), towards a philosophical underpinning of intersubjectivity in S-D logic. An intersubjective approach allows for the incorporation of both subjective and objective perspectives and therefore recognises the value of considering resource integration as both emergent [focussing on the experience of the actors] and as interaction [focussing on the relationship between interaction and resources] (Peters et al. 2014).

In addition to integrating resources, the actors can be seen to be involved in service exchange. In identifying service as the fundamental basis of exchange (Axiom 1), Vargo and Lusch are recognising how value is created through the use of a product or service. The

researcher can be seen to be providing service to the research user. Utilization only occurs when a research user is influenced by or acts on the research findings. The level of user engagement in service exchange may vary from full involvement, in cocreating the research from the beginning, through to being a recipient who acts on newly created knowledge. In addition, the utilisation of the research may be immediate or delayed, as is the case where further technological developments are needed to realise the benefits of theoretical research. Thus the spectrum of involvement is wide, but the fundamental principle is that service exchange between academic and non-academic actors is necessary to achieve research utilization.

A relatively recent addition to cocreation is that of the discussion of role of institutions and institutional logics. These are the formal and informal constraints (rules and norms) that play a major role in shaping actors' behaviour in resource integration (Edvardsson et al. 2014). The emphasis on the institutional context has particular significance in considering utilization of academic research in the light of the literature on the challenges of moving between different communities of practice (Shrivastava and Mitroff, 1984; Bartunak and Rynes, 2014). Understanding the role that institutional norms play in shaping behavior and perceptions (Edvardsson et al. 2014) and in what ways institutionalized rules need to be maintained or broken in taking on new ideas (Koskela-Huotari et al. 2016) is highly relevant.

A service ecosystem needs to be established to coordinate the cocreation of value (Vargo and Lusch, 2014). A service ecosystem is a relatively self-contained, self-adjusting system of resource integrators, with shared institutional logics, cocreating mutual value through service exchange (Vargo and Lusch, 2014). An S-D logic approach to utilization changes the focus from outputs to the activities and processes taking place in a service ecosystem and suggests practice theory as an approach to better understanding (Vargo and

Lusch, 2016). Earlier work on practices in S-D logic suggests that practices exhibit commonalities relating to understandings, procedures and engagements (Schau, Muñiz and Arnould, 2009), that practices are spread across time and space through a process of translation (Kjellberg and Helgesson, 2007) and that it is possible to develop typologies of cocreation practices in specific contexts (Frow, McColl-Kennedy and Payne, 2016).

Exploring research utilization within different examples of service ecosystems would provide the opportunity to compare practice in varied contexts.

At the centre of the narrative of S-D logic is value creation. In S-D logic, value is a perception that is relative and individual, forming Axiom 4: “Value is always uniquely and phenomenologically determined by the beneficiary”. Axiom 4 underlines the need to consider perspectives on value from different points of view. It is particularly appropriate for focusing on understanding the differing perceptions of academics and practitioners involved in knowledge creation, where both sides are engaging with the contradictions and paradoxes inherent in the situation (Bartunek and Rynes, 2014). If the value proposition (Frow et al., 2014) is sufficiently motivating the actors commit their operant resources, specifically explicit and tacit knowledge (Ballantyne and Varey, 2006) to the value creation process. This covers a wide range of patterns of involvement, from simply combining the reader of a research report’s knowledge with that of the authors, through to joint research involving a high level of interaction and resource integration. Academic and non-academic stakeholders will have a range of different perceptions in relation to the value of research in general and specific research findings. Exploring different perspectives on what is valuable knowledge is important in understanding utilization from the points of view of the needs of different actors.

In putting forward S-D logic as a new perspective in the utilization of research it should also be recognized that value can also be codestroyed (Ple’, and Chumpitaz Ca’ceres,

2010). Research may have negative as well as positive impact, depending on how it is used and the value perception of different actors.

Example: Applying the framework

To illustrate application of S-D logic to research utilization, the authors have applied it to provide a lens to view their own proactive engagement with practitioners over a four year period in relation to their research with marketing agencies and their clients (Vafeas, Hughes and Hilton, 2016; Vafeas and Hughes, 2016). The agencies were all marketing agencies involved specifically in the marketing communication process. This included full-service advertising agencies, design agencies, digital marketing agencies, PR agencies and promotional agencies. The authors followed up the initial research with activities designed to engage with practitioners, disseminate the research results and encourage utilization of the research in the practitioners day to day practice. An overview of the research development and dissemination process is provided in Table 2.

Table 2 Stages of research and dissemination

Stage	Participants
<i>1. Initial case studies</i>	
Nine case studies developed from dyadic depth interviews with clients and their agencies	25 client and agency practitioners
<i>2. Agency/client workshops</i>	
Workshop a	56 agency practitioners
Workshop b	11 client practitioners
Workshop c	36 agency and client practitioners
<i>3. Presentations to practitioners</i>	
Presentation 1	84 agency practitioners

Presentation 2	30 agency and client practitioners
Presentation 3	50 agency and client practitioners
<i>4. Workshops with individual agencies</i>	
Nine separate workshops with individual agencies and follow-up with each agency: Agency 1 – 29 participants Agency 2 – 22 participants Agency 3 – 4 participants Agency 4 – 13 participants Agency 5 – 12 participants Agency 6 – 13 participants Agency 7- 7 participants Agency 8 – 5 participants Agency 9 – 7 participants	112 agency practitioners
Total number of practitioners engaged across all stages	404

Stage 1-Initial case study research

Initially clients were approached and if the client agreed to take part, their agency was contacted. Sampling was purposive through the selection of individuals with the potential to provide perspectives directly related to the purpose of the research (Silverman and Marvasti, 2008). Twenty five interviews were conducted with seven clients and eighteen agency executives. Two of the clients gave access to two of their agencies and nine separate cases were developed, each based on the relationship between a client and an agency. The clients included global, large, medium and small companies across a range of product and service sectors. The client interviewees all dealt directly with agencies and had job titles such as Marketing Director, Marketing Manager or Marketing Executive. The agencies ranged from a

top 5 London full-service agency, through medium sized agencies (some full service and others specialists in design, direct or digital marketing) to internal agencies (two cases).

The research findings covered a number of areas of potential interests to clients and agencies, as summarised in Table 3.

Table 3 Summary of initial research findings of potential interest to practitioners

Issues	Agency view of client	Client view of agency
Briefing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of focus • Lack of information • Lack of senior manager sign-off • Lack of time (and money) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of interrogation by agency • Lack of alignment • Agency cost estimates unrealistic
Knowledge and skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack understanding of creative process • Inability to evaluate creative work 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of understanding of client world • Narrow creative horizons
Goals and value judgements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risk-averse 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too safe • OR • Radical just for the sake of it • Enhancing their creative reputation
Interaction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prescriptive • Poor process management 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inflexible and stubborn • Account managers can impede communication
Relationship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Danger of complacency • Treated as a supplier not a partner • Better output for clients we like 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Threat of opportunism • Lack of transparency • Good relationship helps the work • Poor management of staff turnover

Stage 2-Agency/client workshops

The next stage was designed to share the research findings and analysis more widely with practitioners. The workshops ran over a period of six months. The first workshop aimed at agencies, the second at clients and the third intended to bring together both agencies and clients. The workshop delegates were charged for attendance and the subsequent income from delegate fees made the workshop series self-funding ending. The workshops included

presentation of the findings from the initial research; open discussion of the findings and group work. Where possible, delegate discussion and feedback was recorded and delegate feedback was collected at the end of each workshop.

Stages 3 and 4) Presentations to practitioners and individual agency workshops

Two further presentations were made to large audiences of practitioners. The nature of these sessions was more about straight dissemination of the research findings rather than a two-way dialogue. However in both sessions the authors offered to put on follow-up workshops with individual agencies that wanted them. In response to this, nine individual agency workshops were set up and were subsequently run covering a total of 112 agency executives. At the end of each workshop feedback was collected from the participants and an arrangement was made for a follow up session to take place in nine months' time.

Application of the S-D logic framework to the example

The actors

In the first place, the authors identified the actors who might be interested. In this case, the actors were defined as marketing professionals, using marketing agencies and account executives, managers and creatives from marketing communication agencies. Setting up a means of communication with these practitioners necessitated the involvement of other actors from professional associations, representing marketing and creative businesses in the region of the authors' university. In attracting practitioners, the authors were greatly helped by partnering with these professional network organisations. Actors from these networks promoted the workshops to their members, advised on the messages that would be most motivating in getting practitioners to attend and introduced the workshops. Therefore, the network helped in developing and communicating a value proposition. In this case, the value proposition was about improving the working relationship between agencies and clients and

this was motivating for a significant number of practitioners, who were willing to pay to come to the initial workshops and also to give up the time of a large proportion of their employees to take part in the workshops for individual agencies (see Table 2). Other actors involved included consultants working with advertising agencies, who were interested in using the research results in the course of their work with their clients. The agency community proved to be far more responsive than the client community. The value proposition appeared to be weaker in relation to clients, perhaps because they feel that if the agency relationship is not working they can change agencies. As Kieser, Nicolai and Siedl (2015) point out, other factors than scientific rigour determine practitioner adoption. The interest in the research from the agency community related to their perception of its relevance to their current business challenges.

Resource integration

S-D logic recognises the importance of integrating the operant resources (knowledge) of the actors in cocreation. Research utilization requires integration of new knowledge from the research to be integrated with the existing knowledge of the research users to create new knowledge, which becomes a resource for the user. As discussed earlier, S-D logic allows for the incorporation of both subjective and objective perspectives (Löbler, 2011; Peters et al. 2014) and therefore resource integration can be seen as emergent, as experienced by resource integrators and interactive, as viewed through considering the relationship between interaction and resources, this is illustrated in Table 4

Table 4 Resource integration

Stage of interaction	Interaction and resource integration	Experience of the resource integrators
Agency/client workshops	Combination of knowledge from interview analysis undertaken by the researchers with tacit knowledge of	Resource integration generated for practitioners in gaining new perspectives on their role in managing agencies/clients, as

	practitioners on day to day issues related to overcoming some of the challenges raised.	evidenced by feedback forms (See Appendix). Researchers gained greater understanding of contemporary contexts of agency client/working.
Presentations to practitioners	Low resource integration as mainly one-way presentation of research findings.	Some value for practitioners, as evidenced by feedback forms. Value for researchers in generating leads for Stage 4 Agency workshops.
Workshops with individual agencies	Combination of researchers' knowledge with different perspectives with highly contextual knowledge from practitioners across a range of functions within each agency.	Value for practitioners, as demonstrated by feedback (see examples in Table 5).

In the agency/client workshops the authors presented the findings from the initial case studies and then facilitated group discussions in a collaborative effort to extend the participants' understanding of the initial findings. The group discussions then moved on to discuss how some of the challenges thrown up by the research findings could be overcome. Therefore, an interactive process of resource integration took place. The experience of the resource integrators provides triangulation through evidence collected in feedback forms relating to the knowledge gained (see Appendix for selected examples). This tacit knowledge then enhanced the richness of the findings and was incorporated in subsequent larger scale practitioner presentations. The presentations then lead to the setting up of the individual agency workshops; where again the authors ran groups combining knowledge from the previous stages with tacit knowledge from the narrower context of each agency. The individual agency workshops focussed on the specific implications of the research findings for each agency and involved participants with different job roles within the agency. Hence,

at this point the resource integration was very much specific to the particular context of utilization.

A recurring theme in S-D logic is the questions of what happens to resources as a result of integration. In the context of resource integration between academics and practitioners the operant resources of the participants can be seen to have been enhanced through resource integration. Knowledge is an operant resource and through resource integration learning has taken place. This relates directly to research utilization. If research is to be used the research user needs to have learnt something new from the research and then to have operationalised this learning in their subsequent practice. This can be seen as the learning process which provides the participants with improved capabilities in dealing with the issues raised in the research more effectively in the future. At the end of the workshops, delegates were asked to fill in feedback forms on what they learnt and what they would do differently, as a result of the workshop (see Appendix). These feedback forms suggest that learning had taken place for most delegates and many expressed the intention to take action in their own context from what they had learnt. The individual agency workshops provided more direct evidence of resource enhancement because the initial workshops were followed up with a second workshop at which it was possible to collect feedback on how the participants incorporated learning from the initial workshops into their practice.

Table 5 Resource enhancement/learning from individual agency workshops

Knowledge gained	Example quotes from feedback sheets
Recognition of common problems for agencies	“It was a good opportunity to talk openly as an agency- we all seem to have the same problems and have come up with some good solutions.”
Agency understanding of client needs	“Need to be more proactive with clients and raise issues with them.” “I will ask my clients if they are getting what they want eg reports in a suitable format, explaining data clearly, meeting frequently; make it clear which statistics require client action”.
Agency understanding of client limitations	“Important that clients understand that they need to be fully involved in co-creative process”. “Interesting to hear the client quotes and feedback- highlights the amount of misunderstanding between client and agency.....

	<p>“Instigate a more structured, comprehensive, and formal 'kick-off' meeting with the client and team from (agency name), to ensure that everyone is clear about the background to the project and the scope of the project. As part of the kick-off, particularly on first projects, invest time to 'educate' the client into how (agency name) works so that expectations and demands are realistic from the start.”</p> <p>“Owner managers with no background in marketing can sometimes be the most difficult clients to deal with. This underlines the need to set expectations on both sides at the initial meeting after the appointment of the agency.”</p>
The need for better communication	<p>“It made me step back to think about how our clients might portray our work and maybe not understand why we do things the way we do. Key point for communications: that everyone feels valued, which in turn will produce better work.”</p> <p>“Learnt about new elements that could be introduced into marketing of the agency.”</p> <p>“We are going to ensure that our customers are kept better informed of the actions we are taking and why we are taking those actions. We are going to seek to streamline our monthly reporting to ensure that customers have the right information, rather than of all of the information.”</p>
Ideas for increased proactivity	<p>“Some good ideas for improving the process of educating clients.”</p> <p>“Make clients aware of instances where the agency is using knowledge gained from other sectors. Although this happens instinctively, 'flagging up' this cross-pollination will demonstrate to clients the benefit of working with an agency like (name of agency) that has a broad client portfolio.”</p>
Relationship quality	<p>“Learning about the small elements that can improve the client agency relationship.”</p> <p>“Take away and implement- don't base creative worth always on what you know the client likes- can be seen as complacency.”</p> <p>“There may be a case for having more regular face-to-face reviews with clients</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To get more commercial feedback from clients - To get an honest appraisal of the process from both sides - To demonstrate enthusiasm for the client's business” <p>“Need to do more inductions with brand managers on our packaging side and on how we can help SMEs.”</p>

Service exchange

It is interesting to reflect on the nature of the service exchanged at the different stages of research. Stage 1 (the case studies) was totally initiated and led by the authors, with the interviewees providing their time and knowledge. Stages 2 and 3 (agency and client workshops and presentations) were jointly conceived and planned between the authors and representatives of practitioner networks. The authors provided their analysis of the findings in the workshops, while the practitioners gave their time to absorbing this analysis. Stage 4

(individual agency workshops) were requested by agencies and focussed on their individual issues in relation to the research findings and what actions they might take. Therefore, at this stage, the service provided by the authors was exchanged and utilized in very specific contexts. An actor can be involved in cocreation at different levels from very active to passive (Löbler, 2011). In this example, the impetus in leading the service exchange moved from being purely that of the researchers, in the first stage, to becoming more jointly owned in the middle stages and more owned by practitioners in the individual agency workshops. This suggests patterns of service exchange that may be worth exploring in other contexts.

Institutions and institutional arrangements

Institutions and their logics are important in understanding service ecosystems (Vargo and Lusch, 2016). The practitioner actors themselves represented a range of different institutional logics from each other. For example, clients come from many sectors and with a range of professional backgrounds. Agencies contain actors with different professional backgrounds and affiliations. Feedback from the individual agency workshops suggests that the value of sharing the research lies in the fact that clients and agencies seldom discuss openly the state of their relationship. If clients are unhappy, they generally switch provider without explanation (there are plenty of alternative providers). If agencies are unhappy, they generally persevere without confronting the client because they are fearful of upsetting and losing the client. Sharing the research brought to light and shared the beliefs and attitudes of both partners in the relationship.

The fundamental difference in world views of academics and practitioners is well documented (Shrivastava and Mitroff, 1984; Bartunek and Rynes, 2014). The authors were very aware of the need to incorporate the views and of different groups of actors in sharing the research. The benefit of cocreation is that it involves bringing in a range of actors with

different viewpoints. Indeed, there would seem to be little benefit of cocreating with other actors with exactly the same views as each other.

Service ecosystem

A service ecosystem is a relatively self-contained, self-adjusting system of resource integrators, with shared institutional logics and mutual value cocreation through service exchange (Lusch and Vargo, 2014, p. 161). In working with agencies, through an existing network, over a prolonged period, the authors tapped into an existing ecosystem. Supporting, promoting and running the workshops with members, involved social networking practices; impression management practices (the network was seen to be putting on valuable educational events for their members) and community engagement practices, reinforcing members' escalating engagement with the brand community (Schau, Muñiz and Arnould, 2009). In engaging with the ecosystem a process of translation of the research findings took place (Kjellberg and Helgesson, 2007) with the dialogue in the workshops by necessity relating to the interests of the practitioners and using practitioner 'language'.

However, the authors' engagement with clients was far less effective and not sustained over time. The ecosystem of clients appeared to be far less developed, probably because of the wide diversity of clients and lack of common identity. Furthermore, there is a lack of a meaningful service ecosystem that incorporates both clients and agencies. This was a major barrier to achieving utilisation of the research findings.

Value creation

As discussed earlier, value in S-D logic, is seen as an individual perception (Vargo and Lusch, 2004). Ratings were obtained from the delegates to the initial workshops using 4-point scales in which the vast majority scored the workshops as Excellent or Good against a number of criteria. Positive value perception is also demonstrated in the case of delegates who came to presentations and then asked for workshops to be run in their agency. These

delegates can be seen to have been sufficiently motivated in relation to the research to have encouraged further activities. Table 5 provides examples of the knowledge gained by participants in the individual agency workshops, showing potential instrumental and conceptual use of the knowledge. The increased involvement of practitioners at the different stages suggests that value in use may develop over time, but this aspect of operationalisation of learning is difficult to demonstrate because it requires prolonged and significant engagement with specific practitioners. An example of this is a digital marketing agency that the authors have maintained a relationship with over the last 2 years. A director of the company stated that the research highlighted certain key areas to focus on:

- Educating clients about the process
- More extensive kick-off session
- Being more adaptable in communication
- End of project sign off by clients

The authors have seen how, as a result, the agency has made changes in the processes adopted across the agency in dealing with their clients. Furthermore, one of the authors has recently observed the agency in attending a series of meetings with a client from an early point in a project. The benefits of the approach are apparent in the openness of the dialogue with the client over a complex briefing and development process to produce a new website for the client.

The value the authors derived from the process was very different from that perceived by the practitioners. For the authors, the extended and time consuming stages of interaction in this case provided corroboration of the research findings and extended the initial findings, giving more insight into the context of implementation and also how the new media environment may be changing the relationship between agencies and clients. The authors gained ideas for future research and also for new areas of marketing teaching.

Discussion and implications

Theory/models

Applying S-D logic to thinking about utilization of research provides a theoretical framework that goes beyond the simple M1 to M2 continuum or the classification of research into 4 quadrants. The framework in Table 1, does not try to put different research projects on a scale. Rather, Vargo and Lusch's (2016) elements of S-D logic identify factors that can help to explain utilization. Thus S-D logic overcomes the limitations of polarization of research into M1 and M2 and covers the whole continuum, allowing for different levels and types of resource integration between different actors within a research/practice/user ecosystem. This ecosystem can encompass one-to-one knowledge exchange; one-to-many knowledge exchange or many-to-many knowledge exchange.

The S-D logic framework entails a consideration of the actors involved in cocreating value in use. Identifying user groups and stakeholders and their networks is important to understanding who is utilizing research. Closely related to this is understanding the value proposition that will motivate different actors. Where a proactive approach is taken towards research utilization, an important first step may be to identify the actors who might be potential research users. In developing a motivating value proposition and communicating with potential users it can be very helpful to work with network leaders. Research could usefully explore and analyse different types of actor networks and their involvement in utilising research. In recognizing that value is phenomenological, S-D logic embraces the different world views of the academic and the practitioner (Shrivastava and Mitroff, 1984; Bartunek and Rynes, 2014). The example shows how a compelling value proposition ensured participation from different parties. The practitioners were interested and involved because the research was perceived to address some pressing business challenges.

Research utilization can be seen to take place through the integration of operant resources. The authors' example in Table 4 shows how this can be viewed from an

interactional perspective or a subjective perspective. As previously mentioned, in the literature review, Vargo and Lusch (2004, 2011) conceptualise that new resources come into being through cocreation. The examples in Table 5 suggest that the participating actors were building on their existing knowledge to come up with new ideas for future actions. This suggests that not only new operant resources may be created, but also that existing operant resources can be enhanced through resource integration. The idea of resource enhancement in this context, as being about gaining of new knowledge and combining it with existing knowledge, connects resource integration to the existing literature on organizational learning and the development of knowledge (Cohen, & Levinthal, 1990; Galunic and Rodan, 1998; Spender 2008). It also has links with the knowledge management literature on how knowledge moves between communities of practice (Brown and Duguid, 1998), and the challenges in knowledge transfer (Easterby-Smith, Lyles and Tsang, 2008). The idea of resource enhancement extends our understanding of resource integration and suggests new avenues for further research, extending into learning and knowledge transfer. Longitudinal research designs are likely to be most effective in exploring the complexity involved in this. Identification of patterns of application can be informative in developing midrange theory. The example demonstrates how the service exchange became more context specific over time, as represented in Table 6. As the stages progressed, it became more apparent which groups of users would be most interested in using the knowledge and by last stage (the individual agency workshops) the authors were providing their time and knowledge to the benefit of practitioners in particular organizations. The role of closeness to context in cocreation would be worth further research because it can be seen to be relevant in different situations.

Table 6 Role of specific context in cocreation

Context specific: Medium ←—————→ High			
Stages of dissemination:	Presentations to network members	Workshops with network members	Individual agency workshops
Academics input:	Research based knowledge	Research based knowledge	Research based knowledge
Practitioners input:	Their time and attention	Plus: Feedback on research in agency contexts	Plus: Application into their practice
Network organizers input:	Access to networks Promotion of the event Admin support	Access to networks Promotion of the event Admin support	NA

Recent thinking on S-D logic has emphasized the different institutional logics of the actors involved in shaping their behaviors in a service ecosystem (Edvardsson et al. 2014; Vargo and Lusch, 2016) and the importance of practices that take place in ecosystems (Frow, McColl-Kennedy and Payne, 2016). In the example, the authors engaged with an existing network for the agency actors and stakeholders, but had more difficulty in engaging with client actors. The failure to establish an ecosystem that was inclusive of the different types of actors provides a perspective on the limitations of way the research was utilized in the example. Further studies of ecosystems and how they are established in research user communities would be beneficial.

If utilization is to take place, the research user will have learnt something/changed their opinion/acted differently, as a result of exposure to new knowledge. Hence, the importance of understanding the value perceptions of research users, recognising that each actor will have their own individual perception of the process, what they have learnt and how they intend to use the knowledge. Table 7 presents the authors’ interpretation of the motives of key players. This includes marketing consultants who requested to use the authors’ presentation with their clients.

Table 7 Multiple actor perspectives

Actors	Perspective
Agency	Ensuring latest knowledge for competitive advantage Improve practice Better commercial results
Client	Improve practice (but only a limited amount of clients were motivated enough to be involved)
Network	Demonstrate value to members
Consultants	Add value to clients Demonstrate that they are leading edge
Researchers	Publication Demonstrate value to practice

It is envisaged that where the research users have positive perceptions, about their involvement, this will influence their views on whether they are prepared to commit their resources to further stages of the research. More research is needed to understand what motivates different groups of practitioners to engage with research at different stages and on how engagement in different ways and at different stages affects utilization. This would help academics to understand the value that different groups of users derive from the research in order to improve utilization of research findings. Outside of the research utilization context there is much to learn about the motivation of different actors in different situations to cocreate. Further research could usefully explore actors' motivations to cocreate and how motivation develops or declines over time in the course of cocreation.

Kieser, Nicolai and Seidl, (2015) provide guidelines of the features that theoretical frameworks for research on utilization should possess. 1) They need to take account of the context. S-D logic's approach to value in use is highly contextual and covers the actors, their institutional logics and arrangements and the ecosystems of utilization. 2) Knowledge gets transformed in the process. The concept of resource integration and service exchange can be applied very directly to knowledge transformation. 3) The scientific domain needs to be clearly conceptualized. The domain of S-D logic has been developed extensively in the

academic literature over the last thirteen years. 4) Utilization is shaped by its political and social context. Again, S-D logic's recognition of institutional logics and arrangements and the ecosystems of utilization cover this. 5) Prospective theoretical frameworks need to acknowledge there are many different ways in which management research can be utilized. In recognizing that value is individual and phenomenological, S-D logic provides a way of considering different types of utilization under the unifying concept of value in use. That is to say it considers utilization as something that needs to be seen from multiple user perspectives.

The contribution to theory on research utilization within S-D logic is midrange, as suggested by Vargo and Lusch (2017, p7): "At the core of S-D logic related midrange theory development is the issue of how to apply our collective skills, experiences and knowledge (operant resources), to provide benefit to households, practitioners, policy makers and others. If there is no benefit, by definition, there is no value in use and, thus arguably, the bridge from metatheory to application has failed." It is particularly apt to apply S-D logic to our own context of research in marketing and the engagement of marketing scholars with research users.

Academic practice

The practical contribution of this article is to suggest a strategic approach for researchers in disseminating ideas and cocreating knowledge. The first step is to identify the actors. Who might be interested in the research and which aspects are important to them? Most academics engage in networks with other academics in their field, but less are likely to be engaged in practitioner networks. Management academics could adapt their networking skills to potential user networks if they wish to conduct engaged research. Finding a way to cross the boundaries between academics and practitioners (Knights and Scarborough, 2010)

is essential. In the example, engagement with practitioner networks over a prolonged period, while not involving a full partnership, was sufficient to make the authors aware of what aspects of the research topic would be of significant interest to this audience. The main requirement for the academic researcher in crossing the boundary is the motivation to do so and a willingness to spend the time in understanding the practitioner world. The dissemination and subsequent further development of the findings, in the example, was facilitated greatly by the involvement of existing networks.

In the process of engagement, the authors did not, in the main, use academic language, but translated the findings to the practitioner context. Thus to an extent two dialogues needed to take place with a degree of translation/adaption to the context (Shapiro, Kirkman, and Courtney, 2007) and a knowledge of the managerial roles of the participants (Jaworski, 2011). It is acknowledged that knowledge can be used conceptually and symbolically, as well as instrumentally (Cornelissen, and Lock, 2005; Age, 2014). The authors were not trying to tell practitioners what to do, but to enrich their understanding of the decision situation (Nicolai and Seidl, 2010). This involved theory that influenced action through the practitioners selectively adapting ideas in a conceptual manner. Conceptual as well as instrumental use is demonstrated in the feedback from the individual agency workshops in Table 5. The idea of resource enhancement, on the academic side, can also be applied to the authors' learning in facilitating the ongoing dialogue with practice and in enhancing their ability to interact effectively with practitioners at all stages.

Evaluation of research utilization is challenging. The criteria for the UK REF relates to the "reach" of the impact (how widely has the impact been felt?) and "significance"- (how much difference was made to the beneficiaries?) (Phillips and Maes, 2012). But Phillips and Maes (2012, p12) also state: "It might be that in many cases impact can only be described qualitatively". The authors managed to get feedback on changes made by agency

practitioners through returning to those practitioners and asking about changes made. SD-Logic underlines the need for qualitative assessment of value from different viewpoints in determining benefits within the impact agenda.

The learning from such engagement can also have great benefits in enhancing the contemporary relevance of teaching (Phillips and Maes, 2012). The authors' own university runs large marketing programmes at undergraduate and postgraduate level. The findings from the research are now incorporated in the syllabus at both levels to better equip students in their future roles. In addition, several of the practitioners involved volunteered to deliver guest lectures to students on undergraduate and postgraduate courses.

Applying S-D logic to view the research user as the cocreator in knowledge utilization also has significant implications for the management of business schools and for policy. The practitioner community should be seen as a resource that needs to be integrated with the resources of the business school if impact from research is to be realised. Consideration needs to be given to building research centres and teams that contain the range of skills required to both conduct excellent research and engage effectively with research users. Developing academics teams that can do this has implications for business schools in the way that the academic is trained, motivated, assessed and rewarded.

Conclusions

The example, provided for this article, demonstrates the applicability of S-D logic as a theoretical framework to view the particular empirical context of academics working with practitioner research users to cocreate research utilization. Of course, there are many different ways and contexts in which research findings are utilised and our contention is that S-D logic provides an approach that would be widely applicable and meets the requirements that Kieser, Nicolai and Seidl (2015) set in calling for a common theoretical framework for

researching utilization in Management. S-D logic is not tied to any particular research method or way of working. It can apply to crossdisciplinary working between academics from different fields and practice and also across countries. From a practical point of view, the framework highlights some imperatives for researchers seeking to make a difference to the wider society and economy.

Therefore, the main contribution of this paper is to link S-D logic to the debate about the utilization of academic research. The link between research utilization and S-D logic has not previously been recognised. The application of S-D logic as a framework overcomes the polarisation of thinking about knowledge creation being on M1 or M2 continuum, encompassing all the different levels and types of interaction that may take place, without making normative assumptions about what mode is desirable.

There is much to learn within S-D logic on what happens to resources following resource integration. In the example, for this article, an important outcome from resource integration is resource enhancement and this is directly relevant to utilization, as it applies to considering the effect that the cocreative process has had on the knowledge of the research users. This introduces a new perspective on resource integration linking the result of resource integration to the literature on learning.

A limitation of this article is that the application of the S-D logic framework to the engagement with research users was applied in retrospect. Utilizing the framework from the start of research projects through to utilization, on a longitudinal basis, would allow researchers to set up ongoing analysis from the start. For example, researchers could look at the practices of different actors at different points in the process; the change in the actors' operant resources over time; the role of actors' at different points; the formation of ecosystems and changing value perceptions over time.

References

- Åge LJ (2014) How and why managers use conceptual devices in business-to-business research. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing* 29(7/8): 633-641.
- Antonacopoulou EP Dehlin E and M Zundel (2011) The Challenge of Delivering Impact: Making Waves Through the ODC Debate. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 47(1): 33–52.
- Baker S and Holt S (2004) Making marketers accountable: a failure of marketing education? *Market Intelligence and Planning* 22(5): 557-567.
- Ballantyne D and Varey R (2006) Creating value-in-use through marketing interaction: the exchange logic of relating communicating and knowing. *Marketing Theory* 6: 335.
- Bartunek J and Rynes S (2014) Academics and Practitioners are Alike and Unlike: The Paradoxes of Academic-Practitioner Relationships. *Journal of Management* 50(5): 1181-1201.
- Bennis WG and O’Toole JT (2005) How Business Schools Lost Their Way. *Harvard Business Review* May: 96-104.
- Bresnan N and G Burrell (2012) Journals à la mode? Twenty years of living alongside Mode 2 and the new production of knowledge. *Organization* 20(1): 25–37.
- Brodie RJ (2017) Enhancing theory development in the domain of relationship marketing: how to avoid the danger of getting stuck in the middle. *Journal of Services Marketing* 31(1): 20 – 23.
- Brown JS and Duguid P (1998) Organizing Knowledge. *California Management Review* 40 (3): 90-111.
- Cornelissen J P and Lock A R (2005) The uses of marketing theory: constructs, research propositions, and managerial implications. *Marketing Theory* 5(2): 165-184.
- Cohen D M and Levinthal D A (1990) Absorptive capacity: A new perspective on learning and innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 35:128–152.
- Corley K G and Gioia D A (2011) Building theory about theory building: what constitutes a theoretical contribution? *Academy of Management Review* 36(1): 12-32.
- Dowling Review. 2015:
https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/440927/bis_15_352_The_dowling_review_of_business-university_research_collaborations_2.pdf (Accessed 18/8/15).
- Easterby-Smith M Lyles MA and Tsang E WK (2008) Inter-Organizational Knowledge Transfer: Current Themes Future Prospects. *Journal of Management Studies* 45(4): 677-690.
- Edvardsson B Kleinaltenkamp M Tronvoll B McHugh P and Windahl C (2014) Institutional logics matter when coordinating resource integration. *Marketing Theory* 14(3): 291-309.
- Etzkowitz H and Leydesdorff L (2000) The dynamics of innovation: from National Systems and “Mode 2” to a Triple Helix of university–industry–government relations. *Research Policy* 29: 109–123.
- Fendt J Kaminska-Labbë R and Sachs W (2008) Producing and socializing relevant management knowledge: Re-turn to pragmatism. *European Business Review* 20(6): 471-491.
- Frow P McColl-Kennedy J Hilton T Davidson A Payne A and Brozovic D (2014) Value

- propositions: a service ecosystem perspective. *Marketing Theory* 14(3): 327-351.
- Frow P, McColl-Kennedy J and Payne A (2016) Co-creation practices: Their role in shaping a health care ecosystem. *Industrial Marketing Management* 56: 24–39
- Galunic DC and Rodan S (1998) Resource Recombinations And The Potential For Schumpeterian Innovation. *Strategic Management Journal* 19:1193-1201.
- Gibbons M, Limoges C, Nowotny H, Schwartzman S, Scott P and Trow M (1994) *The new production of knowledge. The Dynamics of Science and research in Contemporary Societies*. London: Sage.
- Hessels L and van Lente H (2008) Re-thinking new knowledge production: A literature review and a research agenda. *Research Policy* 37: 740-760.
- Hodgkinson GP Herriot P and Anderson N (2001) Re-aligning the Stakeholders in Management Research: Lessons from Industrial, Work and Organizational Psychology. *British Journal of Management* 12(Special Issue): 41-48.
- Huff AS (2000) 1999 Presidential Address: Changes in Organizational Knowledge Production. *Academy of Management Review* 25(2): 288-293.
- Jaworski B J (2011) On managerial relevance. *Journal of Marketing* 75(4): 211-224.
- Kieser A Nicolai A and Seidl D (2015) The practical relevance of management research: turning the debate on relevance into a rigorous scientific research program. *The Academy of Management Annals* DOI: 10.1080/19416520.2015.1011853
- Kjellberg H and Helgesson CF (2007) On the nature of markets and their practices. *Marketing Theory* 7(2): 137–162.
- Kleineltankamp K Brodie R Frow P Hughes T Peters L and Woratschek H (2012) Resource Integration. *Marketing Theory* 12(2): 201-205.
- Knights D and Scarborough H (2010) In search of relevance: Perspectives on the contribution of academic-practitioner networks. *Organization Studies* 31(9 and10): 1287-1309.
- Koskela-Huotari K Edvardsson B Jonas J Sörhammar Dand Witell L (2016) Innovation in service ecosystems—Breaking, making, and maintaining institutionalized rules of resource integration. *Journal of Business Research* (69): 2964–2971.
- LERU – League of European Research Universities. 2012. Research universities and research assessment:
http://www.leru.org/files/general/LERU_PP_2012_May_Research_Assesment.pdf (accessed 20/2/2017)
- Löbler H (2011) Position and potential of service-dominant logic- Evaluated in an ‘ism’ frame for further development. *Marketing Theory* 11(1): 51-73.
- Löbler H (2013) Service-Dominant Networks: An Evolution from the Service-Dominant Logic Perspective. *Journal of Service Management* 24(4): 420–34.
- Martin R (2012) The Price of Actionability. *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 11(2): 293-299.
- Mason K, Kjellberg H and Hagberg J (2015) Exploring the performativity of marketing: theories, practices and devices. *Journal of Marketing Management* 31(1-2): 1-15.
- Mentzer JT and Schumann DW (2006) The Theoretical And Practical Implications Of Marketing Scholarship. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice* 14(3): 179-190.

- Nenonen S Brodie R J Storbacka K, and Peters LD (2017) Theorizing with managers: how to achieve both academic rigor and practical relevance? *European Journal of Marketing* 51(7/8):1130-1152.
- Nicolai A and Seidl D (2010) That's Relevant ! Different Forms of Practical Relevance in Management Science. *Organization Science* 31: 1257-1287.
- Nowotny H Scott P and Gibbons M (2001) *Re-Thinking Science: Knowledge and the Public in an Age of Uncertainty*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Peters L D Löbner H Brodie R J Breidbach C F Hollebeek L D Smith S D Sörhammar D and Varey R J (2014) Theorizing about resource integration through service-dominant logic. *Marketing Theory* 14 (3): 249-268.
- Pfeffer J and Fong CT (2002) The End Of Business Schools? Less Success Than Meets The Eye. *Academy of Management Learning and Education* 1(1): 78-95.
- Phillips M and Maes K (2012) LERU – League of European Research Universities. Research universities and research assessment”, available at: http://www.leru.org/files/general/LERU_PP_2012_May_Research_Assesment.pdf (accessed 15/02/2017).
- 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): 430–37.
- REF 2014 website: <http://www.ref.ac.uk/panels/assessmentcriteriaandleveldefinitions/> (accessed 20/1/2017).
- Reibstein DJ Day G and Wind J (2009) Guest editorial: is marketing academia losing its way? *Journal of Marketing* 73:1-3.
- Rousseau DM (2007) A Sticky, Leveraging, And Scalable Strategy For High-Quality Connections Between Organizational Practice And Science. *Academy of Management Journal* 50(5): 1037-1042.
- Rynes S (2007) Editor's Afterword. Let's Create A Tipping Point: What Academics And Practitioners Can Do, Alone and Together. *Academy of Management Journal* 50(5): 1046-1054.
- Rynes SL, Giluk TL and Brown KG (2007) The very Separate Worlds of Academic And Practitioner Periodicals in Human Resource Management: Implications For Evidence-Based Management. *Academy of Management Journal* 50(5): 987-1008.
- Schau HJ Muñiz AM and Arnould EJ (2009) “How brand community practices create value. *Journal of Marketing* 73(5).
- Shapiro D L Kirkman B L and Courtney HG (2007) Perceived Causes And Solutions Of The Translation Problem In Management Research. *Academy of Management Journal* 50(2): 249-266.
- Shrivastava P and Mitroff II (1984) Enhancing Organizational Research Utilization: The Role of Decision Makers' Assumptions. *Academy of Management Review* 9(1): 18-26.
- Silverman D and. Marvasti A B (2008) *Doing Qualitative Research: A Comprehensive Guide*. California: Sage.
- Spender JC (2008) Organizational Learning and Knowledge Management: Whence and Whither? *Management Learning* 39(2): 159–176.

- Stokes D E (1997) *Pasteur's Quadrant: Basic Science and Technological Innovation*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Storbacka K (2014) Does publish or perish lead to stylish rubbish? *Journal of Business Market Management* 7(1): 289-295.
- Vafeas M Hughes T and Hilton T (2016) Antecedents to value diminution: A dyadic perspective. *Marketing Theory* 16(4): 469–491.
- Vafeas M and Hughes T (2016) An examination of the dimensions and antecedents of institutionalized creativity. *Industrial Marketing Management*. 55: 59-69.
- Van De Ven AH and Johnson P E (2006) Knowledge For Theory And Practice. *Academy of Management Review* 31(4): 802-821.
- Vargo S L and Lusch RF (2004) Evolving to a New Dominant Logic for Marketing. *The Journal of Marketing* 68(1): 1-17.
- Vargo S L and Lusch RF (2008) Service-dominant logic: continuing the evolution. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 36:1-10.
- Vargo S L and Lusch RF (2011) It's all B2B..... and beyond: Toward a systems perspective of the market. *Industrial Marketing Management* 40(2): 181-187.
- Vargo S L and Lusch RF (2014) Inversions of service-dominant logic. *Marketing Theory* 14(3): 239-248.
- Vargo S L and Lusch RF (2016) Institutions and axioms: an extension and update of service-dominant logic. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* DOI 10.1007/s11747-015-0456-3
- Vargo SL and Lusch RF (2017) Service-dominant logic 2025, *International Journal of Research in Marketing* <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijresmar.2016.11.001>
- Watermeyer R (2014) Issues in the articulation of 'impact': the responses of UK academics to 'impact' as a new measure of research assessment. *Studies in Higher Education* 39(2): 359-377.
- Watson D R Hollister SE Stroud and Babcock E (2011) *The engaged university: International perspectives on civic engagement*. Oxford: Routledge.
- Wilson T (2012) A Review of Business-University Collaboration: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/business-university-collaboration-the-wilson-review> (accessed 20/2/2017).
- Witty A (2013) Sir Andrew Witty's Independent Review of Universities and Growth, Preliminary findings. Department for Business Innovation and Skills: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/249720/bis-13-1241-encouraging-a-british-invention-revolution-andrew-witty-review-R1.pdf (accessed 20/2/2017).

Appendix: Client/Agency Relationship Event.

Friday 21st November 2015

What did you learn today that you can take away and implement? (Selected quotes)

Agency: Lots of tips and thought provoking ideas about the client-agency relationship.

Agency: How important it is to collaborate and practice integrated marketing and PR

Agency: Most importantly client training/support to assist them in dealing with an agency.

Agency: Lots of things- but it's mainly re-enforced lots of discussions I've had internally , both with accounts and creative teams. (*following the first workshop*) One key thing is the importance of putting creative in front of clients. I've done it myself and seen it have a massive improvement on the work we produce.

Client: I've got some plans for in-house training and setting up more client/agency meetings with staff across the organisation.

Client: People matter in the relationship on both sides; need to improve the understanding of a good client/agency relationship within the business; Invest in the relationship, it pays off in the long-term; discuss research and workshops with marketing team.

Client: Importance of transparency, communication and maintenance of good agency/client relations.

What impact will this workshop have on the way you do your job? (Selected quotes)

Agency: I will be giving the agency/client relationship a lot more attention. Help me think more creatively about building the relationship.

Agency: Collaborate more with complementary agencies.

Agency: Open and honest with clients. Give them the ability to feedback controversy.

Agency: It will make us reassess the cause of our frustration with client's feedback and communication.

Agency: I'll be feeding this back to the rest of the agency.

Agency: While I think we already have a good grasp and implementation of the values explored, there were a number of good approaches to communicating and presenting those ideas that I will adapt.

Agency: I will be a lot bolder with my clients and ask more probing question. More open to partnering with others.

Client: I will be looking at training and induction of marketing staff and induction meetings with agencies.

Client: Look to see how we can get the most from our agency relationship. Review current approach and make necessary changes.