




ELSEVIER

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Industrial Marketing Management

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/indmarman

Research paper

Resource interaction and resource integration: Similarities, differences, reflections

Roberta Bocconcelli^a, Per Carlborg^b, Debbie Harrison^c, Nina Hasche^b, Klas Hedvall^{d,*}, Lei Huang^e^a Department of Economics, Society, Politics, University of Urbino, Urbino, Italy^b Örebro University School of Business, Örebro, Sweden^c Department of Strategy and Entrepreneurship, BI Norwegian Business School, Oslo, Norway^d Department of Technology Management and Economics, Chalmers University of Technology, Gothenburg, Sweden^e Department of Marketing and Strategy, Stockholm School of Economics, Stockholm, Sweden

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Resource interaction
Resource integration
IMP
SDL
Business networks
Ecosystems

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this paper is to provide a state-of-the-art comparison of the conceptualization of resources in 'Resource Interaction' (IMP) and 'Resource Integration' (SDL). Both are engaged with understanding how value is (co)-created, but with different emphases. Existing comparisons are limited and out of date. We trace how each has evolved over time by analyzing key developments. The focus of SDL has shifted from operant resources towards resource integration, and from a dyadic view towards ecosystem contexts. Within IMP, research takes a network perspective in investigating the nature of resource interaction in a variety of empirical contexts. An analysis of similarities and differences highlights key assumptions, the classification of resources, and the role for the actor. The comparison offers a thorough understanding of Resource Interaction and Resource Integration. The paper concludes by proposing suggestions for further research for Resource Interaction.

1. Introduction

The Industrial Marketing and Purchasing group (IMP) and Service-dominant logic (SDL) are two 'academic brands' (Cova, Ford, & Salle, 2009) within marketing theory that are actively debating the role of resources in a business context (see e.g., Brodie, Löbner, & Fehrer, 2019; Landqvist & Lind, 2019). Both IMP and SDL rely on the dynamic and evolutionary nature of resources as a key driver of value and exchange processes (e.g., Cantù, Corsaro, & Snehota, 2012; Peters et al., 2014) and take an inter-organizational perspective on how resources are utilized across firm boundaries (Baraldi, Gressetvold, & Harrison, 2012a; Vargo & Lusch, 2011).

Within IMP, there are four core assumptions about resources (Baraldi, Gressetvold, & Harrison, 2012b; Håkansson, Ford, Gadde, Snehota, & Waluszewski, 2009): resources are 'double-faced', resources exist in networked contexts, resource heterogeneity, and resources are open and variable objects. Building on these assumptions, a body of knowledge has developed to provide an understanding of how resources are combined for value creation in business networks. We term this 'Resource Interaction'. Within SDL, Vargo and Lusch (2004:3) advocated a shift from emphasizing operand resources (e.g., machines and

facilities) to regarding operant resources (e.g., knowledge and skills) as the fundamental source of competitive advantage. Understandings have progressively developed in SDL to explain how actors integrate resources to co-create value in service ecosystems. We term this 'Resource Integration'.

In this paper, we provide a state-of-the-art comparison of how resources are conceptualized within Resource Interaction and Resource Integration. Both draw on resources as a 'common denominator' to understand value creation. However, the theoretical points of departure and the focuses of the two are different (see also Ford, 2011). Each literature has seen a development of concepts and ideas concerning resources over the last years (e.g., Bocconcelli, Murmura, & Pagano, 2018; Prenkert, Hasche, & Linton, 2019; Brodie et al., 2019; e.g. Koskela-Huotari & Vargo, 2016). Researchers within both literatures adopt a variety of perspectives to investigate resources, resulting in a huge richness of contribution. As a result, previous comparisons, by Ford (2011) and Baraldi et al. (2012b) are out of date.

Hence, we contend it is timely to make a contemporary comparison to discern the differences (e.g., the theoretical foundations and the level of analysis) and identify any possible convergence. We posit that such a comparison could deepen our understanding concerning the

* Corresponding author at: Division of Supply and Operations Management, Department of Technology Management and Economics, Chalmers University of Technology, 412 96 Gothenburg, Sweden.

E-mail address: klas.hedvall@chalmers.se (K. Hedvall).

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2020.09.016>

Received 14 November 2019; Received in revised form 29 August 2020; Accepted 27 September 2020

0019-8501/© 2020 Published by Elsevier Inc.

Table 1
The 56 publications.

Resource Interaction (IMP)				
Prior to 2001	2001–2005	2006–2010	2011–2015	2016 to date
Håkansson, 1982 Håkansson, 1987 Snehota, 1990 Håkansson, 1993 Håkansson, 1994 Håkansson & Snehota, 1995 Ford et al., 1998	Baraldi & Bocconcelli, 2001 Wedin, 2001 Holmen, 2001 Håkansson & Waluszewski, 2002a Håkansson & Waluszewski, 2002b Baraldi, 2003 Forbord, 2003 Gressetvold, 2004 Baraldi & Waluszewski, 2005	Dubois & Araujo, 2006 Jahre et al., 2006 Harrison & Håkansson, 2006 Baraldi & Strömsten, 2006 Lind, 2006 Håkansson & Waluszewski, 2007 Gadde & Håkansson, 2008 Håkansson et al., 2009 Ingemansson, 2010	Baraldi et al., 2012a Baraldi et al., 2012b Cantù et al., 2012 Holmen & Pedersen, 2012 Gadde et al., 2012 Crespin-Mazet et al., 2014 Lind, 2015	Shih & Linné, 2016 Landqvist & Lind, 2019 Bocconcelli et al., 2018 Prenekert et al., 2019
Resource Integration (SDL)				
Prior to 2001	2001–2005	2006–2010	2011–2015	2016 to date
Constantin & Lusch, 1994	Vargo & Lusch, 2004	Vargo & Lusch, 2006 Lusch & Vargo, 2006 Vargo & Lusch, 2008 Vargo & Lusch (2010a) Vargo & Lusch (2010b) Gummesson & Mele, 2010 Mele et al., 2010	Vargo & Lusch, 2011 Kleinaltenkamp et al., 2012 Peters et al., 2014 Lusch & Vargo, 2014 Edvardsson et al., 2014	Vargo & Lusch, 2016 Koskela-Huotari & Vargo, 2016 Peters, 2016 Vargo & Lusch, 2017 Peters, 2018 Caridà et al., 2019

relatedness, strengths and weaknesses of the two, and provide input for further development. Notably, in this paper we focus on future possible developments of Resource Interaction. This is in line with the recent calls within the IMP community, for the necessity of opening up the theoretical debate and broader dialogue within and across neighboring research disciplines in relation to resources (Aramo-Immonen et al., 2020; Prenekert et al., 2019; Waluszewski, Snehota, & La Rocca, 2019).

The research questions underpinning the paper are threefold. Research question one asks ‘*how are resources conceptualized in Resource Interaction (IMP) and Resource Integration (SDL)?*’ The second research question focuses on comparison: ‘*what are the key similarities and differences in how resources are conceptualized?*’ In research question three, we focus on what researchers can learn from the comparison: ‘*what are some further directions for Resource Interaction?*’

Through a stepwise research design, we have identified 56 key references over a 20-year period to provide a solid foundation for comparison. We have not aimed at performing a systematic literature review to cover all aspects and/or developments; on the contrary, we aimed at collecting key references for both that allowed us to highlight similarities and differences in terms of how resources are conceptualized.

The paper proceeds as follows. In Section 2, we outline our research design. Next, we trace the conceptual development of Resource Interaction (Section 3) and Resource Integration (Section 4). Sections 5 and 6 make a comparison of the two. Section 7, the final section of the paper, proposes three themes for further research within Resource Interaction.

2. Research design

The overall aim of the paper is to compare how Resource Interaction and Resource Integration have evolved in the last two decades. Comparative research involves identifying similarities and differences, then comparing these in order to; “[...] enhance one’s understanding and awareness of other social entities” (Ragin, 2007:67). Here, the ‘entities’ are Resource Interaction and Resource Integration. The authors are familiar with both. Additionally, we have a mixture of theoretical backgrounds and experience levels. The complementary expertise of the author team is a strength when undertaking a comparative study (Nason & Pillutla, 1998). Moreover, to ensure the effectiveness of the steps in the research process, the authors took a realist research

approach.

In order to answer the research questions the key methodological choices were (i) how to select relevant papers, (ii) how to conduct a critical reading exercise, and (iii) how to build bases of comparison to catch relevant differences and similarities.

We initiated the paper search from our existing knowledge of key references (e.g., literature reviews) over a 20-year period, from 2000 to the present date. This enabled us to start the process of selecting sources to be included in our critical reading exercise. We decided it was essential to include seminal works (e.g., Vargo & Lusch, 2004) and review articles (e.g., Baraldi et al., 2012b). We used the bibliographies of these works. We also conducted a forward-looking search by checking citations within Google Scholar. While other datasets (i.e. Web of Science and Scopus) rely on a set of source selection, Google Scholar follows an inclusive and automated approach including a wide range of sources (Martín-Martín, Orduna-Malea, Thelwall, & Delgado López-Cózar, 2018).

For Resource Interaction, this resulted in a working list of 20 publications, and for Resource Integration, 11 publications. There is clearly an imbalance: one explanation is that SDL is a relatively new area within Marketing compared to IMP, and there are fewer publications overall.

The authors then divided in two, one group focusing on Resource Interaction and the other on Resource Integration. The division of labor reflected the diversity within the author team. For example, we have differing extents of familiarity with IMP and SDL, research experience, and types of empirical studies conducted. The involvement of diverse, multiple researchers increased researcher triangulation (Flick, 2004).

The task, however, was the same; to read critically the relevant sources to obtain (i) understanding of the concepts in use over time, (ii) the levels of analysis and (iii) the variety of empirical contexts involved. Within each group, the authors individually read the sources. Afterwards, each group discussed each in turn and then together, in starting to synthesize developments over time. This process occurred in several iterations of individual reading and group discussions, which was always guided by the realist approach undertaken. During the critical reading exercise, the number of relevant publications increased from 20 to 36 for IMP and from 11 to 20 for SDL. In other words, the complete reading list contained 56 references. Table 1 below provides an overview of the publications selected.

Next, we constructed accounts of how Resource Interaction and

Resource Integration have evolved over the 20-year timeframe. Moreover, in the various writing phases the authors worked with different sections of the paper in diverse groupings. This facilitated having a fresh perspective on the paper (Nason & Pillutla, 1998). Section 3 presents an account of Resource Interaction, and Section 4, an account of Resource Integration.

Both accounts are based on our interpretation of the sources used. The reader will notice that the two sections are written in a different way. This is because Resource Integration has developed theoretically until quite recently, whereas Resource Interaction is more ‘iteration and reiteration’, i.e. moving back and forth between the empirical reality and concepts. We had no wish to artificially streamline the pace or shape of the two sections. Furthermore, it is not our intention that the two accounts are read as if there was a single line of development in each.

We decided to periodize the two accounts both to facilitate comparability in the research process and to equip the reader with a clearer structure to enhance readability. Periodization requires researchers to develop a series of phases or periods that relate to a research object (Jessop, 1990; Norcliffe & Bartschat, 1994). It maintains the uniqueness of each account, alongside enabling a comparison of the conceptual and empirical developments over time (Baron, Warnaby, & Hunter-Jones, 2013; Das, 2009). The 56 papers were allocated into five phases of roughly five years each to cover the past 20 years: prior to 2001, 2001–2005, 2006–2010, 2011–2015 and 2016-to date, respectively.

The five-year phases were a compromise between not being too micro or overly detailed (too short periods) or missing a fine-grained analysis by having too long periods of time (say 10 years) and therefore producing a too macro-level comparison. Over the course of five years, development in ideas and frameworks occurs. The periodization of the two accounts was based on a combination of; conceptual developments in the two, changes in levels of analysis, and set blocks of time. The benefit of periodizing the two accounts is to enable us to compare the conceptualization journeys of resources in a systematic way. Two major concerns are that the periodization presents a researcher imposition, and that there is some fluidity across the periods (these do not represent totally clear phases of time). The five phases underpin Figs. 1 and 2 (see below).

To address research question two, ‘what are key similarities and

differences in how resources are conceptualized, required bases of comparison. We used six themes (i) the assumptions made about resources, (ii) the main concepts, (iii) how resources are classified and analyzed, (iv) role for actors, (v) effects of resource interaction/integration, and (vi) empirical settings.

We were aware of divergences in the two literatures from existing articles (e.g. Baraldi et al., 2012a; Ford, 2011). For example, the role of actors (theme four) and empirical settings (theme six). Other themes relating to assumptions made, main concepts, analysis tools and effects emerged from our critical reading of the 56 sources. As we outlined above, the reading and discussion process across the authors centered on looking at commonalities and differences across the sources. We built the two research accounts from this reading exercise. Specifically, there was a focus on how resources have been conceptualized (research question 1) in the two accounts (Sections 3 and 4) within and across time-periods in generating themes for comparison.

3. Resource Interaction

Resource Interaction in business networks has been defined as “[...] the processes of combination, re-combination and co-development of resources that happens through the interaction among organizations” (Baraldi et al., 2012b:266). The spatial aspects, reflecting the networked context, are essential when considering resources within IMP (Ford, 2011) and it is argued that resources are ‘context dependent’ (Håkansson, 1993). The temporal aspect highlights how the outcome of previous interaction and expectations for the future, influence the combining of resources in the present (Håkansson et al., 2009; Jahre, Gadde, Håkansson, Harrison, & Persson, 2006). Section 3 discusses the definition, development and use of key concepts within Resource Interaction. Fig. 1 provides a conceptual timeline (see also Appendix 1).

3.1. The basic assumptions

Baraldi and colleagues’ (Baraldi et al., 2012b:266) review adopted four core assumptions and six corresponding propositions from Håkansson et al. (2009). The assumptions and propositions refer to both the nature of resources and how resources interact (see Table 2).

In brief, resources must have a known use value (Håkansson &




Fig. 1. A conceptual timeline of Resource Interaction.




Fig. 2. A conceptual timeline of Resource Integration.

Snehota, 1995) or are valuable when actors find them beneficial for current or future use. Following Penrose (1959), a single resource does not have value. Instead, it must be combined with other resources in a network setting (Håkansson, 1994). Moreover, changing one resource alters both its value and how it relates to other resources. The dynamic nature of resources means that they can always be utilized in new combinations in other business relationships over time (Håkansson & Snehota, 1995).

Assumption 3, regarding resource heterogeneity, has been claimed to be “the most important assumption related to resources” (Holmen & Pedersen, 2012:12). Resource heterogeneity is a strong motivator for actors when working together in combining resources, for example to stimulate innovation (Lind, 2015), develop new products (Crespin-Mazet, Grenier, Goglio-Primard, & Lombardo, 2014) and strengthen the role of SME suppliers (Bocconcelli et al., 2018).

3.2. Classifying and analyzing resources

The resource layer is a longstanding part of the explanation for the existence of business relationships: “The industrial network is a specific structure which binds together actors, activities, and resources in a certain pattern” (Håkansson & Johanson, 1988:375). Håkansson’s (1987) typology classified resources as physical, financial and human. It was later revised into the multi-layer ARA model (Håkansson & Snehota, 1995), itself later adapted to incorporate time and space (Håkansson et al., 2009).

In parallel to these developments in conceptualizing the resource layer within the ARA framework, and the application of this in various resource-centred studies (e.g. Harrison & Easton, 2002), the 4R

Interaction Model (Håkansson & Waluszewski, 2002a), commonly referred to as the ‘4R Model’ was published. The 4R Model “provides one way of classifying, mapping, and analyzing the processes of resource interaction in inter-organizational networks” (Baraldi et al., 2012b:268, our emphasis). It enables systematic analysis of how two or more resources interact. It was developed from a large empirical study of the greening of the IKEA catalogue (Håkansson & Waluszewski, 2002a) and within parallel projects such as an EU-wide Furniture Project (e.g. Baraldi & Bocconcelli, 2001), and various PhD theses (e.g. Baraldi, 2003; Forbord, 2003; Gressetvold, 2004; von Corswant, 2003; Wedin, 2001).

The 4R Model classifies resources into four types; products, facilities, business units and business relationships. Products and facilities are physical resources, with material properties (Håkansson & Waluszewski, 2002a). Products are combinations of products and services exchanged between business units (Baraldi & Bocconcelli, 2001). They range from a single physical item, such as components, to a whole system including after sales services. Products are adapted towards the customer’s usage context and/or the supplier’s context. Hence, product features are a result of interaction (Håkansson & Waluszewski, 2002a; Jahre et al., 2006).

Facilities are the resources required to develop, manufacture and transport products. Baraldi et al. (2012b) restrict the classification of facility resources to tangible artefacts such as warehouses or trucks.

Business units and business relationships are of a social character displaying intangible characteristics. They are categorized as organizational or social resources (Håkansson & Waluszewski, 2002a). Business units contain the knowledge, identity, reputation and routines of an organization. They can be the same as a company in a legal sense, but they can also be parts of one organization, e.g. a division or

Table 2 Assumptions within Resource Interaction.

Core assumptions	Propositions
1. Resources are ‘double-faced’ (within activities between 2 or more actors)	1. The value of a resource is dependent on its connections to other resources
2. Resources exist in networked contexts	2. A resource changes and develops characteristics over time
3. Resource heterogeneity	3. A resource is embedded in a multidimensional context
4. Resources are open and variable objects	4. All changes of a resource create tensions
	5. Interaction intensity influences the effects of a change in a resource
	6. Interaction breadth influences the number of resources that are affected by a resource change

departments. Business units use their skills and knowledge to organize, manage and control products and facilities (Baraldi et al., 2012b).

Business relationship resources emerge at the interface between business units. Interaction in a specific relationship both affects and is affected by other relationships and includes memories of what has happened in the past as well as expectations about future activities. Thus, business relationships facilitate opportunities and present restrictions to actors (cf. Ford, Gadde, Håkansson, & Snehota, 2003; Håkansson & Snehota, 1989).

The above explanation of the four resource types of the 4R model builds on both the well-known Håkansson and Waluszewski (2002a) study, and from parallel and subsequent empirical projects, e.g. PhD thesis (e.g. Gressetvold, 2004) or large team projects (e.g. Jahre et al., 2006). The use and application of the classification is therefore not fixed or singular.

Baraldi et al. (2012b):269–270 provide a useful summary of the application areas and empirical contexts in research using the 4R model. The 4R Model was developed within a technical development and innovation context (e.g. Håkansson & Waluszewski, 2002a). Later, the scope expanded to include logistics (e.g. Jahre et al., 2006), science-business (e.g. Ingemansson, 2010), and accounting and management control (e.g. Baraldi & Strömsten, 2006). For example, Jahre et al. (2006)'s fifty cases of resourcing in logistics networks each had a focal resource as the starting point. Other researchers focused more on the nature of resource interfaces (see Section 3.3 below). In sum, the expansion in empirical settings led to variety in how the 4R Model was utilized.

The diversification of empirical settings has continued. From 2012 onwards, expansion in themes has included; resource combining in new relationships (Gadde, Hjelmgren, & Skarp, 2012), resource interaction in complex solution development (Cantù et al., 2012), and the different roles played by business and non-business actors in resource combining (Crespin-Mazet et al., 2014). It has also encompassed; goal diversity and resource matching in project settings (Lind, 2015), how state actors act as resource mobilisers in facilitating networked innovation processes (Shih & Linné, 2016), start-ups (Landqvist & Lind, 2019), and SME-large customer relationships (Bocconcelli et al., 2018) has occurred. Some articles make explicit use of the 4R Model while others do not: the model is not used in a uniform way, and there is an openness regarding concepts. This latter point results in a variety of definitions and or uses.

3.3. The nature of resource interfaces

Resources interact via resource interfaces as a single resource becomes embedded in a network structure. Resource interfaces connect (i) one pair of resources of the same or different types, or (ii) multiple resources of different types. There are multiple understandings of how to define the concept. For example, Håkansson and Waluszewski (2002a, 2002b) and Baraldi (2003) present resource interfaces as the specific contact points between two resources, while Dubois and Araujo (2006:22) define resource interfaces as “interconnections between two or more entities at a shared boundary”. Baraldi et al. (2012b:267) suggest, “the concept of interfaces provides the building block for both analyzing resource combinations and for formalizing the interactions between the resources involved.”

This variety in understandings of the resource interface concept suggests plurality in the various research studies, and hints at different ontological perspectives adopted by different authors, which is in many ways not surprising. Recent research also suggest a wide ontological variety in business network research (Andersen, Medlin, & Törnroos, 2019; Guercini & Medlin, 2020) stemming from different authors' worldview and ontological approaches (e.g., constructivist and realist).

Different types of resource interfaces have been proposed by various researchers, alongside arguments relating to varying extents of directness and strength. *Technical* resource interfaces emerge between

products and facilities, *organizational* resource interfaces arise between business units and business relationships (Dubois & Araujo, 2006; Jahre et al., 2006) and *mixed* resource interfaces occur between physical and organizational resources (Jahre et al., 2006). Harrison and Håkansson (2006) propose that finding new ways to create mixed resource interfaces is a source of value identification and creation.

Furthermore, resource interfaces are argued to be both direct and indirect (Jahre et al., 2006) and connected (Dubois & Araujo, 2006). Such indirect or connected interfaces are important because they create imprints (Håkansson & Waluszewski, 2002b). Baraldi et al. (2012b:268) posit that such imprints “are in the form of pressures to develop certain other features that may be unimportant for a focal interface, but that are necessary for satisfying the technical, social or economic requirements of other resources in order to fit better in a network context.” In a related line of development, resource interfaces can also be deep/shallow, specific/unspecific and strong/weak (Baraldi & Waluszewski, 2005).

The creation, maintenance and changing of resource interfaces are underpinned by processes of resource combining by actors. Interactive business relationships allow firms to apply a process of “systematic combining” of resources across boundaries (Gadde & Håkansson, 2008). There are two types of resource combining, either (i) related to one specific business relationship, or (ii) spanning between business relationships. As such, business relationships have a dual role in the combining of resources, because they are both the outcome of previous resource combining, and a resource enabler that “drives continuing resource combining efforts” (Gadde & Håkansson, 2008:34).

3.4. Changing and managing resource combinations

How are resource combinations changed by actors? Notably, tensions are created because resource interfaces are embedded in resource networks (see proposition 4 in Table 2). Håkansson and Waluszewski (2002b:570) argue “...whenever there is movement of a resource in relation to other resources, there will be friction.” This is because resource interfaces are the outcome of past investments in stabilizing interdependencies over time (Baraldi et al., 2012a). To discuss the tensions in efforts to alter resources and the related resource interfaces, the concepts of ‘heaviness’ and ‘variety’ have been proposed (Baraldi & Bocconcelli, 2001; Håkansson & Waluszewski, 2002b).

Heaviness refers to the strength of a single interface. It is a measure of the difficulty in breaking apart resources because of the investments made in existing interfaces to adapt resources. Such adaptation comes at a cost; actors are required to invest time and money in the process of developing the interfaces. Such investments need to be utilized in the resulting ‘heavy resource structure’ (Håkansson & Waluszewski, 2002b). The heaviness of a resource structure could lead to resistance to change, and, on a larger scale, result in stability within a network. As in proposition 5 (Table 2), ‘interaction intensity influences the effects of a change in a resource.’

Variety is the term used to refer to the number of different possibilities for recombining resources in new ways. Specifically, Håkansson and Waluszewski (2002b:562) claimed that “[...] every single resource will have as many features as there are other resources it can be combined with...the possibilities for creating new resources by combining old ones are infinite.” In other words, resources have an inherent – and wide – range of unknown features (the resource heterogeneity assumption).

In a review of the two concepts, Prekert et al. (2019) argued that few authors provide explicit definitions. Instead, the definitions are often rather vague, overlapping, or the concepts are ‘taken for granted’. Considering the variety in ontological approaches (e.g., realism and constructivism), the differences and inconsistencies is not very surprising as different worldviews impact the way researchers interpret reality. We will return to a discussion of conceptual variation across scholars, papers and ideas, in Section 6.

4. Resource Integration

In this section we discuss the concept of operant resource, the centrality of the role played by resource integrators, how resource integration required interaction embedded in networks, to the current understandings of resource integration as a process shaped by institutions within service ecosystems. Fig. 2 provides an illustration (see also Appendix 2).

4.1. Operant resources as primary

From its inception, resources have been central within SDL. Drawing on prior work (Constantin & Lusch, 1994), SDL advocated two types of resources, *operand* and *operant*. Operand resources were viewed as objects, whereas operant resources (e.g., knowledge and skills) produce effects on the operand resources. The distinction between operand and operant resources separates SDL from a goods-dominant logic (Vargo & Lusch, 2004). The traditional logic assuming a Malthusian view on resources as things or “stuff” (Malthus, 1798) considers operand resources as primary. In contrast, SDL views operant resources as the fundamental source of competitive advantage (see foundational premise 4). Things are neutral until we learn what to do with them (Zimmerman, 1951). Accordingly, Vargo and Lusch (2004:2) argued, “resources are not; they become. ... this change in perspective on resources helps provide a framework for viewing the new dominant logic of marketing.”

4.2. Reconfiguring the terminology

By 2006, the important role of resource integration was recognized (Vargo & Lusch, 2006). All economic entities were argued to be resource integrators. This resulted in a ninth foundational premise (Vargo & Lusch, 2006). However, resource integration required further investigation: “We have discovered that this idea of resource integration has found almost instant resonance. [...] Like most aspects of S-D logic, this resource-integration concept needs refinement and elaboration” (Lusch & Vargo, 2006:283).

Both networks and interaction were acknowledged as useful to understand how resource integration enabled value co-creation. This is one link between IMP and SDL. In a 2010 special issue, Vargo and Lusch's editorial argued: “S-D logic...with its service-for-service, resource-integration perspective, represents a shift in thinking away from dyadic notions of production and consumption connected by transactional value delivery, toward the co-creation of value through complex, interactive, resource-integrating networks, especially including those associated with the service beneficiary” (Vargo & Lusch, 2010a:167–168).

The recognition of value co-creation situated in networks was SDL's response to critiques about vagueness regarding the role of the network (Lusch & Vargo, 2006). Citing the work of Håkansson and Prekert (2004), Lusch and Vargo (2006:285) advocate SDL to have a more explicit connection to “the interactivity and networking.” Later, Mele, Russo Spena, and Colurcio's (2010) empirical article analyzed innovation projects as value co-creation process of interaction and resource integration (see also Gummesson & Mele, 2010). Network interaction between actors became an antecedent to resource integration.

In 2008, Vargo and Lusch (2008:3, our emphasis) posited, “...all economic actors (e.g., individuals, households, firms, nations, etc.) are resource integrators.” Furthermore, in 2011 Vargo and Lusch argued that “of particular note is the interactive, network orientation introduced by the IMP group (e.g., Håkansson & Snehota, 1995), which began to replace the dyadic perspective. [...] Perhaps most directly, similar to the stance we take here, is the emergence of economic-actor-to-economic-actor perspective (e.g. Håkansson & Prekert, 2004), replacing (at least partially) the producer-consumer perspective” (Vargo & Lusch, 2011:183). The use of the term ‘actors’ is adopted from IMP “with something less than complete comfort” (Vargo & Lusch, 2008:9). This is a second link between IMP and SDL.

Accordingly, foundational premise 9 was changed to “all social and economic actors are resource integrators” (Vargo & Lusch, 2008:9). Essentially, it indicates an emphasis on ‘resource integrators’ rather than ‘resource integration’, and a shift from organizations to actors.

4.3. From networks to systems with an institutional lens

From 2010 onwards, ideas about resource integration were further developing and the concept of *service ecosystems* was emerging. Vargo and Lusch (2010b:176) outlined: “[...] service ecosystems emerge and evolve through relationships among service-for-service providing, resource-integrating actors.” The introduction of the service ecosystem context directed the focus away from dyads and networks.

Moreover, resources were no longer limited to being ‘market facing’; both private resources (e.g. friendship) and public resources (e.g. health care) were incorporated. This expansion was leaning towards a more complex model. Layers of resource integrating actors and their specific configurations in ecosystems became an emergent topic. By duplicating layer on layer of resource-integrating actors, the density dimension in resource integration occurs (inspired by Normann, 2001). High density implies the best combination of resources for an actor at a given time (see Fig. 3 adopted from Lusch & Vargo, 2014: 132).

Value (sometimes *value-in-use*) was increasingly assumed as a core concept emphasizing the active role of actors as resource integrators (Lusch & Vargo, 2014). In addition, Edvardsson, Kleinaltenkamp, and Tronvoll (2014) proposed SDL to adopt institutions as a new lens to explain the resource integrating activities in service ecosystems. Institutions refer to the rules, norms, and beliefs that provide a social context for understanding resource integration (Vargo & Lusch, 2016). Notably, the ‘value assessment’ concept assumes a central role when an institutional perspective to Resource Integration is adopted (Edvardsson et al., 2014). Hereafter, SDL started to conceptualize Resource Integration relating to institutions with more systemic thinking. This can be viewed as different to IMP (see Vargo & Lusch, 2011).

4.4. Resource Integration as a process

Increasingly, Resource Integration emphasizes the process of how actors co-create value (e.g., Caridà, Edvardsson, & Colurcio, 2019; Kleinaltenkamp et al., 2012). To explore the institutional context in which resource integration process takes place, Koskela-Huotari and Vargo (2016) introduced a new concept, ‘*resourceness*’. Specifically, the concept aids understanding of how potential resources become realized resources.

Resourceness was initially defined as “the quality and realization of potential resources through the process of human appraisal and action which then transforms potential resources into realized resources” (Lusch & Vargo, 2014:121). Later, Koskela-Huotari and Vargo (2016) provided a re-interpretation: “the ability of potential resources to facilitate the accomplishment of something desirable—is determined by the availability of other, complimentary and inhibiting potential resources, including the actors’ ability to integrate and apply these resources” (Koskela-Huotari & Vargo, 2016:164). This also resulted in a change from considering resources as ‘things’ that are tangible (operand) and intangible (operant), to viewing resources as abstractions that describe the functions that substances or ideas can contribute to the achievement of a desired end (Koskela-Huotari & Vargo, 2016).

Vargo and Lusch's (2017) future-oriented paper encouraged SDL scholars to develop more evidence-based midrange theory on SDL's core concepts, including Resource Integration. Echoing the call, and using a practice theory approach, Caridà et al. (2019) empirically illustrated Resource Integration as an embedded process of value co-creation through three practices (matching, resourcing and valuing) and the role of institutions shaping these. In parallel, Peters (2016, 2018) identified two types of Resource Integration, *homopathic* (summative processes) and *heteropathic* (emergent processes) when applying a critical realist




Fig. 3. The density dimension within Resource Integration, adopted from Lusch and Vargo (2014): 132.

approach. Notably, interaction was perceived as a necessary but not sufficient condition for resource integration processes (Peters, 2016:3000). As a final remark, we acknowledge the existence of different ontological approaches in Resource Integration research, spanning from realist to constructivism (see for example Peters et al., 2014).

5. Comparison

In this section we address the second research question; ‘what are the key similarities and differences in how resources are conceptualized?’ Table 3 provides a summary using the six themes introduced and

discussed in Section 2.

5.1. Similarities

First, some of the terms used, e.g. resources and relationships, are the same. This is potentially trivial, but also a possible source of confusion when the same terms are given different conceptual understandings and are underpinned by different assumptions. We reflect further on the differences in the conceptualization of resources specifically in Section 5.2 below. More generally, this is an issue of how to communicate research ideas which are often underpinned by different

Table 3

A comparison of the conceptualization journeys.

Theme	Resource Interaction (IMP)	Resource Integration (SDL)
Pillars	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resources exist in interaction, when combined with other resources Heterogeneity & embeddedness (see Table 2 for complete list of assumptions and propositions) Resources have interfaces (technical, organizational, mixed) Both physical and social resources contain a knowledge dimension, as do the interfaces between them 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resources exist as objects (prior to 2016) Resources are abstractions (since 2016) and ‘becoming’ in service ecosystem and institutional contexts
Main concepts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interaction, 4R model, resource interfaces, resource combining, heaviness & variety, relationships, business networks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operand & operant resources, value in use, resource integration, service ecosystems, institutions, resourceness, actors as resource integrators, relationships
Classification and analysis of resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Early classified as physical, financial and human resources. The 4R model - Products, facilities, business units and business relationships 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operand and operant Internal/external resources Resource integration is analyzed through actors’ integrating activities in the institutional and service ecosystem context
Role for actors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resources are connected through resource interfaces Actors have a role in the collective creation of resource combinations A resource’s embeddedness in a resource structure means that efforts to change depend on variety and heaviness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All social and economic actors are resource integrators (See Foundational Premise number 9 and Axiom 3) Contexts (e.g.institutional context) shaping what and how resources are connected The assessed value always informs the integration of resources
Effects of resource interaction/integration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Value is created through the combining of resources over time Through interaction, the resource interfaces can be added and/or changed Resources gain features via interaction with other resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Value (at a certain point of time) Co-created value is phenomenologically experienced when the actors integrate their resources
Empirical settings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> B2B context, e.g. innovation, solutions, logistics, accounting, start-ups, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Service Marketing A2A Service for service

ontologies and depth of analytical precision (Andersen et al., 2019; Aramo-Immonen et al., 2020; Prenkert et al., 2019). We return to this point in Section 6, discussion.

Second, both Resource Interaction and Resource Integration now emphasize the idea of ‘resources becoming’, and stress the availability of other resources as the preconditions for this. In Resource Interaction, a single resource gains value by being combined with other resources in network contexts. Within Resource Integration, there are different understandings of the concept of resources over time. Resources were initially seen as tangible and intangible, whereas more recently they have been re-conceptualized as an abstraction (Koskela-Huotari & Vargo, 2016). The implication is that it is through actors integrating (potential) resources in the relevant context that enables resources to gain resourcefulness.

Third, there is a *role for the actor* within both Resource Interaction and Resource Integration (see also Ford, 2011). There are developments over time within Resource Integration regarding who is the actor. Within Resource Interaction there are nuances relating to the status of the actor, for example as a resource within the 4R model or outside of this specific analytical framework. We elaborate further on the status of the actor and what activities/processes actors perform in relation to resources in Section 5.2.

That the notions of *value* and *value creation* are intricately connected to resources is a fourth similarity. In Resource Interaction, actors jointly combine resources for the creation of value while in Resource Integration, actors collaboratively integrating resources is an underlying mechanism of value co-creation. With respect to the appraisal of the value of resources, though, there are different views (see Section 5.2).

5.2. Differences

First, there are differences in the *processes involved in ‘how resources become’*. Within Resource Interaction, a resource does not exist unless it is combined with other resources via resource interfaces. Within Resource Integration, a recent development is to consider resources as abstractions rather than things. Yet the perspective is from the ‘outside’: actors act on the resources within a given institutional context. By contrast, within Resource Interaction, the discussion is ‘inside’ the interaction. This difference is reflected in the pillars underpinning the nature of resources (see Table 3).

A second difference is how resources are *classified and analyzed*. We suggest that Resource Integration does not currently analyze resources as such. For example, ‘operant’ and ‘operand’ resources are differentiated, but the features of these two resources are not elaborated. Instead, the processes of integrating resources for value creation (e.g., the practices involved) are emphasized. One current focus is on resource integration being shaped by contexts such as service ecosystems and institutions (and vice versa, contexts shaping resource integration).

By contrast, within Resource Interaction there is one tool to classify resources and resource interfaces (the 4R Model). It should be noted, though, that the model is not used in a uniform way.

Third, *how resources can be changed and managed* varies between the approaches. Within Resource Interaction, resources are embedded within a resource structure at the network level. Over time, features of resources and resource interfaces are developed. In Resource Integration, a potential resource can have a lot of “resourcefulness”, which changes depending on the institutional arrangements (Koskela-Huotari & Vargo, 2016). It can be said the relatively new concept ‘resourcefulness’ shares a similar assumption with Resource Interaction – that of resource heterogeneity. However, the two approaches depart in how resource heterogeneity is enacted; the role of the shaping context (Resource Integration), or interactions between resources embedded in network contexts (Resource Interaction).

The ability to manage resources is therefore different; actors can attempt to activate and manage resources within Resource Interaction,

but they may meet challenges in changing a resource or resource interface. Any actor might envision a change, but the existing resource structure must be considered before mobilizing efforts to have any success. Resource Integration has less of a focus on the existing resource structure, but more on the shaping contexts like institutions (Koskela-Huotari & Vargo, 2016). This is possibly due to SDL having a more macro-level focus (Vargo & Lusch, 2017).

How value arises is a fourth difference. Within Resource Interaction, the value of a resource depends on it being combined with other resources. Identifying potential new interfaces and embedding these in the existing resource structure is a key source of value (e.g. Cantù et al., 2012; Harrison & Håkansson, 2006). In Resource Integration, value-in-use is central (although disputed), implying an actor-centric view with value as an outcome of resource integration activities (Lusch & Vargo, 2014). Moreover, Resource Integration specifically points to the importance of value assessment (evaluation), a notion that is less emphasized in Resource Interaction.

Lastly, the *context and empirical settings* of Resource Interaction has varied over time. It encompasses the B2B setting, with initial contexts including innovation and logistics, and more recently, SMEs and start-ups. We argue that although Resource Integration is said to be relevant in every setting – A2A (Actor-to-Actor; see Vargo & Lusch, 2011) – there are currently relatively very few empirical works (although this is under development). This makes the distinction between the level of analysis and the context of the analysis somewhat problematic.

6. Discussion

Section 4 pointed to several links between Resource Interaction and Resource Integration, and Section 5 stressed that some ideas and terms are similar. However, such similarities should be treated with caution. Aramo-Immonen et al. (2020) argued how IMP concepts are modified and translated into the norms of the citing disciplines, or recognized by citing disciplines without a deeper appreciation of differences in ontology. The comparison made in Section 5 highlights such differences.

We recognize that scholars use alternative lenses when studying various aspects of a phenomena. Leroy, Cova, and Salle (2013) argue that researchers consecutively zooming in (observing at micro level) and zooming out (observing at macro level). There are risks involved in using both lenses. When zooming in, it is easy to get too close and not be able to make sense of the details. When zooming out on the bigger picture, the researcher risks missing all the nuances and to lose touch with the everyday practices of firms.

As is clear from Section 5, Resource Interaction is empirically grounded, and draws on contextual descriptions and empirical generalizations. This is in keeping with the way in which knowledge is developed within IMP (Ford, 2011). The result is an open language system with less of an overarching syntax, and with terminology stemming from many rich empirical studies. As such, Resource Interaction contains a broad range of concepts. Moreover, IMP more broadly offers mid-range theories (Brodie, Saren, & Pels, 2011:77), e.g. frameworks such as the ARA Model.

It may be argued that when studies ‘zoom in’, what is created is a plethora of notions discussing essentially the same thing using several different concepts. We can question whether all these concepts are clearly defined (cf. Prenkert et al., 2019), which can lead to difficulties of suitable theorizing. Put another way, there is a risk of shaping a narrative that is perhaps ‘local’ and potentially inaccessible due to fuzziness.

Resource Integration, on the other hand, is more theoretically-driven with – as yet – fewer empirical examples (Baraldi et al., 2012a, 2012b; Brodie et al., 2019). A grand narrative is suggested by the originators/architects (Vargo & Lusch, 2004, 2008, 2017) with an overarching framework with a centralized language system and syntax, underpinned by foundational premises and axioms.

The inherent risk is to lose touch with the ‘everyday’ revealed from

rich empirical studies due to too much ‘zooming out’ (Leroy et al., 2013). As noted by Hunt (1983:12), “*theorists concerned with developing general theories should be alert to the problems involved in empirically testing their theoretical constructions.*” Notably, there are still very few examples of mid-range theories related to Resource Integration and critiques emphasize the lack of applicability to managerial practice (Hietanen, Andéhn, & Bradshaw, 2018). This lack of analytical tools and models can be explained by the relatively young research domain and a strong focus on general theory building.

Moreover, the notion of *time* (cf. Halinen, Medlin, & Törnroos, 2012) is an interesting point of departure between the two approaches. Time is an explicitly important dimension in Resource Interaction (Håkansson et al., 2009). Many studies have a longitudinal, dynamic research design to analyze processes of resource interaction over multiple periods. This is in keeping with foundational IMP ideas of relationships underpinned by sequences of interaction episodes.

In Resource Integration, there is a more outcome-oriented focus, in the form of value. Leroy, Cova, and Salle (2012) question the lack of a long-term temporal dimension in SDL and that SDL has not utilized research knowledge from neighboring research disciplines. In particular, Leroy et al. (2012:69) state that “*the common umbrella offered by the value co-creation concept does not explicitly take into account the long term dimension included in the notions of relationships and networks as a BtoB process... It seems more appropriate to explain short term interactions typical of service activities i.e. ‘service encounters’ and ‘consumption experiences’, focused on particular episodes.*”

It is somewhat ambiguous as to whether value is an outcome of, or a part of, the resource integration process. However, the idea of value as an outcome of resource integration appears to be dominant, especially in earlier SDL works. In sum, Resource Interaction emphasizes empirical findings with processual focus, and Resource Integration general theories with an outcome focus. Resource Interaction tends to zoom in (to the empirical world) while Resource Integration zooms out (to the abstract world).

Lastly, on an ontological level, the differences we observe today between the two approaches appear to be smaller than 10 years ago. Now there seems to be a relativistic ontological assumption within the SDL tradition, although different ontological/epistemological perspectives co-exist (Pohlmann & Kaartemo, 2017). This ontological position studies dynamic and complex interactions and typically regards time as an important factor as activities and interaction are formed in processes over time; it is hence more similar to Resource Interaction. The relativistic ontology tries to denote diversity and complexity in different phenomena during a specific period.

This ontology has been rooted in IMP for a long time, while it is historically more difficult to trace within SDL. Our study also indicates (see Section 4) SDL's turn to add institutions as a new lens to explain the mutual shaping of resource integrating activities and contexts, somehow leads the stream to embrace social constructionism. However, it is not well explained how this turn sits with efforts to develop a positivist theory (Hietanen et al., 2018; Vargo & Lusch, 2016), which could result in confusion for readers.

7. Conclusions

This paper has provided a state-of-the-art comparison of the conceptualization of resources within Resource Interaction and Resource Integration. In so doing, it has heeded the call for theoretical development of Resource Interaction. The comparison is timely as both approaches involves a growing interest in the roles of resources in a business context, and the extant comparisons of IMP and SDL ideas (Baraldi et al., 2012a, 2012b; Ford, 2011) are out of date. Now we return to the three research questions articulated at the outset of the paper in order to conclude. The response articulated is underpinned by the realist research perspective outlined in the Research Design.

The first research question problematized *how resources are*

conceptualized. Sections 3 and 4 outlined the conceptualization journeys. The sections identify key concepts and trace important theoretical developments. Further, the conceptualization of resources in Resource Integration and Resource Interaction is systemic (resources are dispersed) and malleable (resources are not given functions a priori) in its very nature, hence emphasizing the need for interorganizational coordination.

The second research question, focusing on *the key similarities and differences in how resources are conceptualized* is addressed in Section 5. As we emphasized in Section 6, the similarities observed need to be treated with caution as the same term may be interpreted and used differently. Moreover, and again with reference to Section 6, ‘open language’ is a key characteristic of Resource Interaction, while Resource Integration has a more deterministic syntax (axioms, foundational premises etc.). In addition, while Resource Interaction studies tend to zoom in to the empirical world, Resource Integration scholars zoom out to the abstract world.

Research question three has the objective of outlining some further directions for Resource Interaction. Here we address three key themes: conceptual refinement, value generation and an overarching framework.

In terms of conceptual refinement, the open language system and extensive empirical research within Resource Interaction encompasses a wide range of concepts. This can result in issues regarding the clarity of conceptual definitions, and the relatedness and coherence between concepts, which makes ‘going the last analytical mile’ somewhat problematic.

One result is unnecessary complications when communicating the contributions of Resource Interaction research with other neighboring research disciplines. In terms of ‘efforts to formalize and refining the existing concepts’, it could be that Resource Interaction research needs to be developed in a more ‘guided’ way. In line with the arguments of Waluszewski et al. (2019), we suggest that the research enters a phase underpinned by conceptual refinement and definition, or a shift from empirical to conceptual understandings.

Scholars interested in Resource Interaction arguably need to use the existing concepts in a more systematic way, describing in more detail how concepts are defined and how concepts are related to each other. For example, ‘finding the inconsistencies in definitions’ is one way to further develop the language of Resource Interaction, and to make it easier to communicate to a wider audience.

The second theme we suggest regards *value generation*. Both approaches argue that value is created by actors combining resources (Cantù et al., 2012; Harrison & Håkansson, 2006; Lusch & Vargo, 2014). Yet although it is commonly understood that the generation of value is central for actors in the business landscape, the notion of value and the mechanisms for value generation are seldom explicitly discussed in detail within IMP and in relation to Resource Interaction. Further developing the notion of value generation from the combining of resources in an interorganizational context would be timely. For example, emphasis on the dynamics of resource interaction over time could add to the understanding of how value is co-created and assessed in a multi-actor context subject to change. Hence, for an interorganizational context – a context that often is seen as a challenge for research on value generation (e.g. Kowalkowski, Persson Ridell, Rödell, & Sörhammar, 2012; La Rocca & Snehota, 2014) – IMP and the Resource Interaction approach may provide opportunities for development.

The third theme relates to considering a *Resource Interaction framework* to give young scholars guidance as well as clarifying existing research. Based on the comparison in this study, we suggest that a future ‘Resource Interaction framework’ should concentrate on zooming out – partly learning from Resource Integration – in order to shape a more generally valid base of knowledge. Of course, here we acknowledge the long history of substantial empirical studies. However, we believe Resource Interaction would theoretically benefit from a future research direction encompassing more generally oriented claims. We

noted earlier in the paper that IMP in general has had limited success in leaving imprints on adjacent fields (Aramo-Immonen et al., 2020). However, by zooming out and sharpening the contours of Resource Interaction, a greater impact could be possible.

Finally, we return to Table 3, the comparison of the conceptualization journeys, built from 6 key themes. The sixth theme, ‘empirical settings’, is where IMP generally and therefore also Resource Interaction typically takes as the starting point as an empirically derived knowledge base. Further development of central concepts, refinement of the 4R model and perhaps the elaboration of new models, the role for actors, and the effects of resource interaction – including value generation – can be inspired by contemporary business contexts. For example, how resource interaction is impacted by external shocks, such as Covid-19, which might also result in the lifting of current regulatory barriers to collaborative innovation, or other perhaps less dramatic examples of changes impacting business networks, e.g. as roles

change as new business models and platforms develop.

Contemporary ways of organizing business and collaboration can provide interesting challenges to how to understand Resource Interaction. For example, when a combination of resources becomes a platform technology within a network, which might underpin an actor changing their network role, or how resource interfaces are changed by designing circular economy business models. This is also arguably the best place to discover and develop what is *not* currently there in our understanding of Resource Interaction, and it is in keeping with the way of generating new ideas and frameworks within IMP.

Acknowledgements

Lei Huang has received support from Louis Fraenckel Foundation Scholarship (stipendiefond), Sweden.

Appendix A

IMP and Resource Interaction: development of concepts regarding resource interaction.

Pre 2001	2001–2005	2006–2010	2011–2015	2016–2018
Interaction model – resources only have value in interaction with other resources	4R model to classify and analyze resources Modelling resource interaction	Types of resource interfaces Dimensions of resource interfaces	The role of the actor in resource combining	The role of the actor in resource combining Expansion into different empirical contexts, e.g. SMEs, start-ups, etc.
ARA model ● Resource collections, resource constellations, resource ties, resource networks ● Resources exist in networked contexts Resource heterogeneity	Resource interfaces & resource combinations	DPU (Developing-Producing-Using) model of 3 network settings		
Håkansson, 1982, 1987, 1994 Håkansson & Snehota, 1995	Holmen, 2001 Baraldi & Bocconcelli, 2001 Håkansson & Waluszewski, 2002a, 2002b Baraldi & Waluszewski, 2005	Jahre et al., 2006 Dubois & Araujo, 2006 Håkansson & Waluszewski, 2007 Håkansson et al., 2009	Cantù et al., 2012 Crespin-Mazet et al., 2014	Shih & Linné, 2016 Landqvist & Lind, 2019 Bocconcelli et al., 2018

Appendix B

SDL and Resource Integration: development of concepts regarding resource integration.

Pre 2001	2001–2005	2006–2010	2011–2015	2016–2018
Operant resources, operand resources	Operant resources & service logic	Economic actors as resource integrators S-D Logic and resource integration perspective Service ecosystems and resource-integrating networks	Resource Integration & Service Ecosystems Institutional logics in Resource Integration	Institutions & Resource Integration Resourceness (process of resources “becoming,” using an institutional perspective) Deepening Resource Integration as a process ● Homopathic (summative processes), Heteropathic (emergent processes) ● Matching, Resourcing, Valuing
Constantin & Lusch, 1994	Vargo & Lusch, 2004	Vargo & Lusch, 2006, 2008, 2010a, 2010b	Kleinaltenkamp et al., 2012 Peters et al., 2014 Lusch & Vargo, 2014 Edvardsson et al., 2014	Koskela-Huotari & Vargo, 2016 Peters, 2016 Vargo & Lusch, 2017 Caridà et al., 2019

References

Andersen, P. H., Medlin, C. J., & Törnroos, J.Å. (2019). Re-appraising interaction and process for industrial network research: the future plunging mirror hall metaphor. *Industrial Marketing Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2019.06.011> In Press.

Aramo-Immonen, H., Carlborg, P., Hasche, N., Jussila, J., Kask, J., Linton, G., & Öberg, C. (2020). Charting the reach and contribution of IMP literature in other disciplines: a

bibliometric analysis. *Industrial Marketing Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2020.02.022> In Press.

Baraldi, E. (2003). *When information technology faces resource interaction*. Doctoral thesis Sweden: Uppsala University, Department of Business Studies.

Baraldi, E., & Bocconcelli, R. (2001). The quantitative journey in a qualitative landscape: developing a data collection model and a quantitative methodology in business network studies. *Management Decision*, 39(7), 564–577.

Baraldi, E., Gressetvold, E., & Harrison, D. (2012a). Resource interaction in inter-organizational networks: introduction to the special issue. *Journal of Business Research*,

- 65(2), 123–127.
- Baraldi, E., Gressetvold, E., & Harrison, D. (2012b). Resource interaction in inter-organizational networks: foundations, comparison and a research agenda. *Journal of Business Research*, 65(2), 266–276.
- Baraldi, E., & Strömsten, T. (2006). Embedding and utilising low weight: value creation and resource configuration in the networks around IKEA's lack table and Holmen's newsprint. *IMP Journal*, 1(1), 39–70.
- Baraldi, E., & Waluszewski, A. (2005). Information technology at IKEA: an "open sesame" solution or just another type of facility? *Journal of Business Research*, 58(9), 1251–1260.
- Baron, S., Warnaby, G., & Hunter-Jones, P. (2013). Service(s) marketing research: developments and directions. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 16, 150–171.
- Bocconcelli, R., Murrura, F., & Pagano, A. (2018). Interacting with large customers: resource development in small B2B suppliers. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 70, 101–112.
- Brodie, R. J., Löbler, H., & Fehrer, J. A. (2019). Evolution of service-dominant logic: towards a paradigm and metatheory of the market and value cocreation? *Industrial Marketing Management*, 79, 3–12.
- Brodie, R. J., Saren, M., & Pels, J. (2011). Theorizing about the service dominant logic: the bridging role of middle range theory. *Marketing Theory*, 11(1), 75–91.
- Cantù, C., Corsaro, D., & Snehota, I. (2012). Roles of actors in combining resources into complex solutions. *Journal of Business Research*, 65(2), 139–150.
- Caridà, A., Edvardsson, B., & Colurcio, M. (2019). Conceptualizing resource integration as an embedded process: matching, resourcing and valuing. *Marketing Theory*, 19(1), 65–84.
- Constantin, J., & Lusch, R. F. (1994). *Understanding resource management*. Oxford, OH: The Planning Forum.
- von Corswant, F. (2003). *Organizing interactive product development*. Doctoral thesisSweden: Chalmers University of Technology.
- Cova, B., Ford, D., & Salle, R. (2009). Academic brands and their impact on scientific endeavour: the case of business market research and researchers. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 38(6), 570–576.
- Crespin-Mazet, F., Grenier, C., Goglio-Primard, K., & Lombardo, E. (2014). Developing a usage network: combining business and non-business resources to implement innovation. *IMP Journal*, 8(3), 133–149.
- Das, K. (2009). Relationship marketing research (1994-2006): an academic literature review and classification. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 27(3), 326–363.
- Dubois, A., & Araujo, L. (2006). The relationship between technical and organisational interfaces in product development. *IMP Journal*, 1(1), 21–38.
- Edvardsson, B., Kleinaltenkamp, M., & Tronvoll, B. (2014). Institutional logics matter when coordinating resource integration. *Marketing Theory*, 14(3), 291–309.
- Flick, U. (2004). Triangulation in qualitative research. In U. Flick, E. von Kardorff, & I. Steinke (Eds.), *A companion to qualitative research* (pp. 178–183). London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Forbord, M. (2003). *New uses of an agricultural product? A case study of development in an industrial network*. Doctoral thesisNorway: Norwegian University of Science and Technology.
- Ford, D. (2011). IMP and service-dominant logic: divergence, convergence and development. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 40, 231–239.
- Ford, D., Gadde, L.-E., Håkansson, H., Lundgren, A., Snehota, I., Turnbull, P., & Wilson, D. (1998). *Managing business relationships*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Ford, D., Gadde, L.-E., Håkansson, H., & Snehota, I. (Eds.). (2003). *Managing business relationships* (2nd ed.). London: Wiley.
- Gadde, L.-E., & Håkansson, H. (2008). Business relationships and resource combining. *IMP Journal*, 2(1), 31–45.
- Gadde, L.-E., Hjelmgren, D., & Skarp, F. (2012). Interactive resource development in new business relationships. *Journal of Business Research*, 65, 210–217.
- Gressetvold, E. (2004). *Product development - effects on a company's network of relationships*. Doctoral thesisNorway: Norwegian University of Science and Technology.
- Guercini, S., & Medlin, C. J. (2020). A radical constructivist approach to boundaries in business network research. *Industrial Marketing Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2020.04.014> (In Press).
- Gummesson, E., & Mele, C. (2010). Marketing as value co-creation through network interaction and resource integration. *Journal of Business Market Management*, 4, 181–198.
- Halinén, A., Medlin, C. J., & Törnroos, J. Å. (2012). Time and process in business network research. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 1(2), 215–223.
- Harrison, D., & Easton, G. (2002). Patterns of actor response to environmental change. *Journal of Business Research*, 55(7), 545–552.
- Harrison, D., & Håkansson, H. (2006). Activation in resource networks: a comparative study of ports. *The Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing*, 21(4), 231–238.
- Håkansson, H. (Ed.). (1982). *International marketing and purchasing of industrial goods – An interaction approach*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
- Håkansson, H. (1987). *Industrial technological development: a network approach*. London: Croom Helm.
- Håkansson, H. (1993). Networks as a mechanism to develop resources. In P. Beijer, J. Groenewegen, & O. Nuys (Eds.), *Networking in Dutch industries* (pp. 207–223). Apeldoorn: Garant.
- Håkansson, H. (1994). Economics of technological relationships. In O. Granstrand (Ed.), *Economics of technology* (pp. 253–270). Amsterdam: Elsevier Science B.V.
- Håkansson, H., Ford, D., Gadde, L.-E., Snehota, I., & Waluszewski, A. (2009). *Business in networks*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Håkansson, H., & Johanson, J. (1988). Formal and informal cooperation strategies in international industrial networks. In F. J. Contractor, P. Lorange, & P. (Eds.), *Cooperative strategies in international business* (pp. 369–379). Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Håkansson, H., & Prenter, F. (2004). Exploring the exchange concept in marketing. In H. Håkansson, D. Harrison, & A. Waluszewski (Eds.), *Rethinking marketing: Developing a new understanding of markets* (pp. 75–97). Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
- Håkansson, H., & Snehota, I. (1989). No business is an island: the network concept of business strategy. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 5(3), 187–200.
- Håkansson, H., & Snehota, I. (Eds.). (1995). *Developing relationships in business networks*. London: Routledge.
- Håkansson, H., & Waluszewski, A. (2002a). *Managing technological development: IKEA, the environment and technology*. London: Routledge.
- Håkansson, H., & Waluszewski, A. (2002b). Path dependence: restricting or facilitating technical development? *Journal of Business Research*, 55(7), 561–570.
- Håkansson, H., & Waluszewski, A. (Eds.). (2007). *Knowledge and innovation in business and industry. The importance of using others*. London: Routledge.
- Hietanen, J., Andén, M., & Bradshaw, A. (2018). Against the implicit politics of service-dominant logic. *Marketing Theory*, 18(1), 101–119.
- Holmen, E. (2001). *Notes on a Conceptualisation of resource-related embeddedness of inter-organisational product development*. Doctoral thesisDenmark: University of Southern Denmark.
- Holmen, E., & Pedersen, A.-C. (2012). What is resource heterogeneity, and how can a firm handle the resource heterogeneity encountered in its business relationships? A case of handling heterogeneity of fish farms in outbound logistics of fish feed. *IMP Journal*, 6(3), 210–239.
- Hunt, S. D. (1983). General theories and the fundamental explananda of marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 47(Fall), 9–17.
- Ingemansson, M. (2010). *Success as science but burden for business: on the difficult relationship between scientific advancement and innovation*. Doctoral thesisSweden: Uppsala University Department of Business Studies.
- Jahre, M., Gadde, L.-E., Håkansson, H., Harrison, D., & Persson, G. (2006). *Resourcing in logistics: the art of systematic combining*. Lund: Liber.
- Jessop, B. (1990). Regulation theory in retrospective and perspective. *Economy and Society*, 19(2), 153–216.
- Kleinaltenkamp, M., Brodie, R. J., Frow, P., Hughes, T., Peters, L. D., & Woratschek, H. (2012). Resource integration. *Marketing Theory*, 12(2), 201–205.
- Koskela-Huotari, K., & Vargo, S. L. (2016). Institutions as resource context. *Journal of Service Theory and Practice*, 26(2), 163–178.
- Kowalkowski, C., Persson Ridell, O., Røndell, J. G., & Sörhammar, D. (2012). The co-creative practice of forming a value proposition. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 28(13–14), 1553–1570.
- La Rocca, A., & Snehota, I. (2014). Value creation and organisational practices at firm boundaries. *Management Decision*, 52(1), 2–17.
- Landqvist, M., & Lind, F. (2019). A start-up embedding in three business network settings: a matter of resource combining. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 80, 160–171.
- Leroy, J., Cova, B., & Salle, R. (2012). The value co-creation concept: Mixing up apples and oranges? *28th annual industrial marketing and purchasing group conference, IMP Group, Sep 2012, Roma, Italy*. hal-01655560.
- Leroy, J., Cova, B., & Salle, R. (2013). Zooming in vs zooming out on value co-creation: consequences for BtoB research. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 42(7), 1102–1111.
- Lind, F. (2006). *Resource combining across inter-organisational project boundaries*. Doctoral thesisSweden: Chalmers University of Technology.
- Lind, F. (2015). Goal diversity and resource development in an inter-organisational project. *The Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing*, 30(3/4), 259–268.
- Lusch, R. F., & Vargo, S. L. (2006). Service-dominant logic: reactions, reflections and refinements. *Marketing Theory*, 6(3), 281–288.
- Lusch, R. F., & Vargo, S. L. (2014). *Service-dominant logic: PREMISES, perspectives, possibilities*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Malthus, T. (1798). *An Essay on the Principle of Population*. London: J. Johnson, in St. Paul's Church-Yard.
- Martín-Martín, A., Orduna-Malea, E., Thelwall, M., & Delgado López-Cózar, E. (2018). Google scholar, web of science, and scopus: which is best for me? *Journal of Informetrics*, 12(4), 1160–1177.
- Mele, C., Russo Spina, T., & Colurcio, M. (2010). Co-creating value innovation through resource integration. *International Journal of Quality and Service Sciences*, 2(1), 60–78.
- Nason, S. W., & Pillutla, M. M. (1998). Towards a model of international research teams. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 13(3/4), 156–166.
- Norcliffe, C., & Bartschat, T. Z. (1994). Locational avoidance by non metropolitan industry. *Environment and Planning*, 26(7), 1123–1145.
- Norman, R. (2001). *Reframing business: when the map changes the landscape*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Penrose, E. (1959). *The theory of the growth of the firm*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Peters, L. D. (2016). Heteropathic versus homopathic resource integration and value co-creation in service ecosystems. *Journal of Business Research*, 69(8), 2999–3007.
- Peters, L. D. (2018). Resources and resource integration. In S. L. Vargo, & R. F. Lusch (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of service-dominant logic* (pp. 338–356). London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Peters, L. D., Löbler, H., Brodie, R. J., Breidbach, C. F., Hollebeek, L. D., Smith, S. D., ... Varey, R. J. (2014). Theorizing about resource integration through service-dominant logic. *Marketing Theory*, 14(3), 249–268.
- Pohlmann, A., & Kaartemo, V. (2017). Research trajectories of service-dominant logic: emergent themes of a unifying paradigm in business and management. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 63, 53–68.
- Prenter, F., Hasche, N., & Linton, G. (2019). Towards a systematic analytical framework of resource interfaces. *Journal of Business Research*, 100, 139–149.
- Ragin, C. C. (2007). Comparative methods. In W. Outhwaite, & S. P. Turner (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook for social science methodology*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Shih, T., & Linné, Å. (2016). State actors' mobilisation of resources for innovation: a case study of a Chinese vaccine. *IMP Journal*, 10(2), 296–316.

- Snehota, I. (1990). *Notes on a theory of business enterprise*. Doctoral thesisSweden: Uppsala University.
- Vargo, S. L., & Lusch, R. F. (2004). Evolving to a new dominant logic for marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 68(January), 1–17.
- Vargo, S. L., & Lusch, R. F. (2006). Service-dominant logic: what it is, what it is not, what it might be. In R. F. Lusch, & S. L. Vargo (Eds.). *The Service-dominant logic of marketing: dialog, debate, and directions* (pp. 43–56). Armonk, NY: ME Sharpe.
- Vargo, S. L., & Lusch, R. F. (2008). Service-dominant logic: continuing the evolution. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 36, 1–10.
- Vargo, S. L., & Lusch, R. F. (2010a). “Relationship” in transition: an introduction to the special issue on relationship and service-dominant logic. *Journal of Business Market Management*, 4, 167–168.
- Vargo, S. L., & Lusch, R. F. (2010b). From repeat patronage to value co-creation in service ecosystems: a transcending conceptualization of relationship. *Journal of Business Market Management*, 4, 169–179.
- Vargo, S. L., & Lusch, R. F. (2011). It’s all B2B ... and beyond: toward a systems perspective of the market. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 40(2), 181–187.
- Vargo, S. L., & Lusch, R. F. (2016). Institutions and axioms: an extension and update of service-dominant logic. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 44(1), 5–23.
- Vargo, S. L., & Lusch, R. F. (2017). Service-dominant logic 2025. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 34, 46–67.
- Waluszewski, A., Snehota, I., & La Rocca, A. (2019). What remains to be discovered? Manifesto for researching the interactive business world. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, 34(1), 232–239.
- Wedin, T. (2001). *Networks and demand: the use of electricity in an industrial process*. Doctoral thesisSweden: Uppsala University.
- Zimmerman, E. W. (1951). *World resources and industries: a functional appraisal of availability of agricultural and industrial resources*. (Harper).

Roberta Bocconcelli is Associate Professor of Business Marketing at the Department of Economics, Society, Politics of the University of Urbino, Italy. She has published in international journals such as *Journal of Business Research*, *Industrial Marketing Management*, *Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing*, and *Journal of Business-to-Business Marketing*. Her research interests are mainly in Business Marketing and Business Networks.

Per Carlborg is a senior lecturer at the Örebro University School of Business, Sweden. His

current research focuses on business model transformation and circular economies. As a teacher, he is responsible for the Master program of Sustainable Business at Örebro University. He has published in *Industrial Marketing Management*, *Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing*, *Service Industries Journal* etc.

Debbie Harrison is a Professor of Strategy at BI Norwegian Business School, Oslo, Norway. Her research interests are in the area of inter-organisational relationships and networks. She is currently involved in projects about creating circular economies in multi-stakeholder initiatives, system innovations in antibiotics in agriculture, and the roles of users in markets. She has co-published several books and articles regarding markets, networks and relationships, in journals including *Research Policy*, *Industrial Marketing Management*, *Journal of Management Studies*, and *Marketing Theory*. Harrison also teaches several courses in business networks and strategy.

Nina Hasche is an Assistant Professor of Marketing at Örebro University School of Business, Sweden. Her research interests focus on change and development processes in business relationships and networks, with recent projects looking at business collaborations and the creation of value, trust and legitimacy. Her research has been published in outlets such as *Journal of Business Research*, *Industrial Marketing Management*, *Public Management Review*, *European Journal of Innovation Management*, *Journal of Small Business and Entrepreneurship* etc.

Klas Hedvall is a PhD affiliated to the Department of Technology Management and Economics at Chalmers University of Technology in Gothenburg, Sweden. His research addresses services and solutions in business networks, with a specific focus on the automotive and transport industry. Klas has co-authored a chapter in the book *Practices and Tools for Servitization: Managing Service Transition*, and published in the *Journal of Business Research*, *Industrial Marketing Management*, *Transportation Research Procedia* and *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*.

Lei Huang is a Research fellow at the Center for Market Studies at Stockholm School of Economics. She has written two book chapters in edited volumes published by *Studentlitteratur* and *Emerald*. Her research interests are in the area of value co-creation, solution marketing and management and digital transformations in the industrial markets.