USING SERVICE FOR DEFINING PLACE VALUE PROPOSITIONS

Roberto Bruni[1]*, Andrea Moretta Tartaglione*[2]*, Gary Warnaby*[3]

Abstract

Purpose - Researchers have drawn on established principles of service(s) marketing to problematize urban areas as value propositions aimed at a range of potential place users, such as residents, businesses, tourists, and also inward investors. Frameworks which have been used to accomplish this include, for example, the servicescape and also the servuction system. However, more recent advances in service(s) research have the potential to extend our understanding of marketing in this specific spatial context. These advances underpin three relevant research streams when applied to places: (1) the S-D logic (e.g. urban places as value propositions created via resource integration by various place stakeholders); (2) service science (e.g. the 'smart cities' concept); and (3) network & systems theory (i.e. recognizing the inherent situational complexity in terms of the range of actors involved in creating a spatial value proposition and the 'nesting' of places, consistent with the service ecosystem concept).
Design/Methodology/approach - Using the metaphors of 'house' and 'home' to contrast the concepts of territory and place, the paper integrates the contribution of S-D logic, service science and network & systems theory, along with relevant literature from the discipline of human geography to review and synthesize service(s) research as applied to cities and towns.
Findings – The review and synthesis of the application of concepts relating to service(s) research in the context of places provides an opportunity to identify avenues for further research into this particular context.
Research limitations/implications – The conceptual approach developed in the paper should inevitably be further substantiated by empirical research. Nevertheless, the work could provide a first conceptual step for future research.
Practical implications – The work is useful to find new approaches to theoretically underpin place marketing and place management activities from a service-oriented perspective.
Originality – The use of the metaphors of house and home to contrast the concepts of territory and place is innovative because it is a means to underline the particularity of definitions of the concept of 'place' and its connection with the concept of 'value proposition of territories'.
Key words: territory, place, service, value, networks
Paper type – Conceptual paper

Introduction

Taking a service and resource-based perspective is, arguably, of particular relevance for the marketing of territories/locations. In this spatial context, the aim of much management/marketing activity is the attraction of inward investment, tourists, residents etc. The effectiveness of such initiatives is, in part, dependent on the specific nature of the agglomeration of territory-based resources (i.e. the constituent elements of a territory/location 'product'; such as industrial, commercial, retail and leisure facilities, residential accommodation, infrastructure, locational attributes such as accessibility, etc.), and

[1] Assistant Professor in Business Management, Department of Economics and Law, University of Cassino and Southern Lazio, r.bruni@unicas.it;
[2] Assistant Professor in Business Management, Department of Economics and Law, University of Cassino and Southern Lazio, a.moretta@unicas.it;
[3] Professor of Retailing and Marketing, Institute of Place Management , Manchester Metropolitan University, g.warnaby@mmu.ac.uk;

importantly, how these resources are coordinated and deployed by those with management responsibility for the locale in question.
This paper considers the nature of these territory/location based resources, making a fundamental distinction between operand and operant resources, and considers the nature of 'value' in this spatial context, highlighting the importance of value *propositions*. It builds on the Service-Dominant (S-D) logic, service science and network and systems theory to consider the differences between notions of the *territory* and the *place,* and we use the metaphors of 'house' and 'home' to contrast these notions. For the purposes of this paper, 'territory' is defined as a spatial entity under the jurisdictional control of a public administrative entity. In contrast, we consider 'place' from a more phenomenological perspective, as a system of values and a more subjective interpretation of a specific territory that has adopted a development strategy incorporating its perceived value proposition(s). The main aim of this paper is to integrate the potential contributions of the research streams of S-D logic, service science and network and systems theory, along with relevant literature from the discipline of human geography - to review and synthesize service(s) research as applied to cities and towns.
The paper is organized as follows. First, a brief outline of the three research streams is presented. Second, the paper continues by outlining the relevance of resources, the concept of value in a place context and the difference between territory and place. The article ends with conclusions and managerial implications.

Scientific background
As noted above, the academic theory underpinning this conceptual work is based on the contribution of three theoretical research streams.
The first stream is the Service-Dominant logic of marketing, introduced by Vargo and Lusch (2004, 2008) as a theoretical proposal founded on the co-creation of value, service and resource integration based on interaction and networked relationships (Vargo and Lusch, 2008). This perspective emphasizes that the source of value creation is through the exchange of intangibles, specialized skills and knowledge, and processes, rather than through the exchange of tangible goods via discrete transactions between firm and customer. Value creation is accomplished through the use and integration of the resources available to all parties in the relationship. Moreover, value is always uniquely and phenomenologically determined by the beneficiary, as articulated more recently in S-D logic Axiom 2 (Vargo and Lusch, 2016).
The second stream is Service Science, Management and Engineering (SSME), abbreviated to 'service science', originally promoted by the IBM Research Center. Service science is an interdisciplinary field that combines the study of organizations and technology to explain how service systems interact and evolve to co-create value (Maglio and Spohrer, 2008a). In recent years, service science has focused on the study of 'smart service systems' (Maglio and Spohrer, 2008a; 2008b), considered as the combination of IT systems with broader system dynamic interactions, adaptive skills, sustainability, adaptation and transforming of organizations and service innovation in multiple and complex contexts (Basole and Rouse, 2008). It is possible to recognize the concept of 'smart' in intelligent energy consumption, advanced organization of transport, advanced healthcare, and quality standards/ procedures. The concept of 'smart' represents a contribution to the integration of technology to human life and as a valid support in the processes that provide opportunities to gain increased effectiveness, thereby improving the quality of human life. This research stream contributes not only to improving the understanding of the role of technology on service provision, but also the interaction relationships between humans and non-humans.
The third stream - network and systems theory – is based on the consideration that we live in an interconnected world where no one is isolated (Håkansson and Snehota, 1995). Thus, marketers and enterprises cannot elude network connections and strategies that capture the power and usefulness of these relationships (Castells, 1996; Capra, 1997, 2002). In particular, network theories have shifted the focus from the dyadic relationship between a single supplier and a single customer to a multi-party, network approach (Gummesson, 2004), investigating relations between the nodes/actors and

the dynamics of the interactions among firms and other economic actors (Bartlett and Ghoshal, 1990). Several approaches have been developed in network theories. Some authors have analyzed the structure and function of networks, conceptualizing them in terms of organizational forms, including nodes, connections and aggregating forces and net-based organizational formats (see Richardson, 1972; Burt, 1992; Hedlund, 1986; Bartlett and Ghoshal, 1990). Others have focused on the management of networks, investigating issues such as autonomous nodes, central control, dynamic equilibrium and structural variability management (see Håkansson, 1987; Burt, 1992; Jones et al., 1997). Further, others have examined network strategies, such as resource sharing and common goal achievement (Jarrillo, 1988; Jones et al., 1997) in an attempt to evaluate networking and social relationships for competitiveness reinforcement (Polese, 2010).

Systems theories are useful to identify general references that can be extended to every type of relational activity between actors and/or elements, which can support the understanding of complex phenomena. According to Mele et al. (2010), several perspectives have paved the way for the development of systems theories, including General Systems Theory, Cybernetics (Beer, 1975), Organization studies, Biology (Maturana and Varela, 1975) and Sociology. Indeed, different approaches have been used for systems analysis, including viable systems (Espejo and Harnden, 1989; Barile, 2009), service systems, system dynamics and smart systems. With regard to system dynamics and smart systems, many studies have contributed to a better understanding of the influence of systems theories on business topics (Demirkan et al., 2008; Barile and Polese, 2010).

Building on these research streams, it is important to focus attention on those resources that constitute the foundational representations of the basic elements of a territory's value proposition. These resources can form the basis of the interactions between the actors, and also contribute to defining the value perception.

Location-based resources

In discussing the nature of resources, Vargo and Lusch (2004) draw on the work of Constantin and Lusch (1994) to distinguish between two types of resources - *operand* and *operant*. The distinction between these two types of resources has particular ramifications in a spatial context, and is discussed in more detail below.

Operand resources are resources on which an operation or act is performed to produce an effect. These resources can be thought of in economic terms as factors of production (e.g. land, minerals, other natural resources etc.), which are ultimately finite, and which can be converted into outputs at (relatively) low cost. In a spatial context, in the past it was often this type of resource that was emphasized in seeking to attract inward investment to a locale.

In contrast, *operant* resources can be defined in terms of resources that produce *effects*, thereby providing firms with the potential to multiply the value of their natural resources, and create additional operant resources. Vargo and Lusch (2004) argue that operant resources are often invisible and intangible, and are likely to be dynamic and infinite rather than static and finite (as is usually the case with operand resources). Thus, operant resources could be thought of in terms of Prahalad and Hamel's (1990) concept of core competences, and in terms of organizational processes. In a spatial context, they can be thought of as the particular skills, processes etc. that can coalesce in a locale as a consequence of particular place-specific conditions that enhance its competitiveness, sometimes articulated in terms of 'clusters' (see for example, Porter, 1998).

Indeed, this resource-based approach has been applied to spatial entities. Musterd and Murie (2010) identify four main theoretical frameworks that have been proposed to conceptualize the essential conditions for competitiveness in an increasingly globalized world, which implicitly draw on the principles of this resource-based view. These frameworks can be broadly divided into two perspectives (analogous to the notions of operand and operant resources), relating to the existence of what can be termed *hard* and *soft* conditions.

The first *'operand resource/hard conditions' perspective* can be further divided into two interrelated approaches – *hard conditions* and *economic cluster theory*. The first of these focuses on the creation

of what have been termed 'hard' conditions, such as availability of capital and an appropriately skilled labour force, an institutional context with the right set of regulations and sufficiently attractive tax regimes, good infrastructure and accessibility, availability and affordability of office space, and educational facilities. These conditions are deemed attractive to those inward investors seeking to locate within a particular locale, and management/marketing effort would be centered on creating, exploiting and promoting these conditions. The second approach – economic cluster theory - draws on the concept of agglomeration, whereby various activities are assumed to cluster together in a particular locale because they have linkages to each other, use the same public and private services and institutions, and are connected to the same environment, and also profit from each other's presence and proximity. Economic cluster theory has been influential in both academic and policy arenas as a means of explaining spatial competitiveness.

By contrast, the *'operant resource/soft conditions' perspective* emphasizes the importance of specific amenities that create an environment that attracts those specific types of people who are perceived as integral to the most promising economic activities for the economic development of a locale. The most famous proponent of this framework is Richard Florida (2002, 2005), and his notion of the 'creative class'. Florida (2002, pp. 68-69) describes the creative class in terms of a 'super creative core' of people such as scientists and engineers, university professors, novelists, artists, entertainers, architects and 'the thought leadership of modern society', as well as 'creative professionals', who work in a wide range of knowledge-intensive industries such as high-tech sectors, financial services, the legal and health care professions and business management. Members of this 'creative class' are, Florida argues, drawn to creative centres or hubs, not for the traditional economic reasons outlined in terms of 'hard' conditions, but because they seek abundant high-quality amenities and experiences, an openness to diversity of all kinds, and above all, the opportunity to validate their identities as creative people. However, this approach is not without its critics: Musterd and Murie (2010) note that this creative class thesis has been the subject of extensive critique, arising from the amorphous nature of 'soft' factors, and the consequently weak empirical basis to its underpinning argumentation.

A related approach that can be categorized under this 'soft conditions' perspective is *network theory*. This highlights the importance of place-specific personal ties, local relations, and organizational affiliations etc. There is resonance with cluster theory, but this network approach is distinguished by a more overt focus on the concept of embeddedness in a particular locale, drawing on notions of place attachment.

Arguably the differences between these different 'operand resource/hard conditions' and 'soft conditions' perspectives on spatial competitiveness are relative rather than absolute. These perspectives are inevitably to some extent an oversimplification of a very complex (and interconnected) reality, and the distinctions between the different resource types will be permeable, especially in terms of how they create *value* for place users.

Defining 'value'

In this section, the nature of the concept of 'value' in this spatial context is discussed from an S-D logic perspective, drawing on the S-D logic's 'foundational premises' (FPs), through which it was originally explicated by Vargo and Lusch (2004, 2008).

The S-D logic suggests that if marketing is viewed as an exchange process, then the fundamental unit of exchange is the application of specialized skills and knowledge (FP1), as opposed to physical goods. Arising from this, it is posited that *'Operant resources are the fundamental source of competitive advantage'* (FP4), and that consequently, *'All economies are service economies'* (FP5). This has implications for the role of the customer, who as a result, can be regarded as a co-creator of service, arising from the interaction of resources undertaken as part of the exchange process. Thus, customers are becoming increasingly involved in the process of value creation (Prahalad and Ramaswamy, 2000). Consistent with this, from an S-D logic perspective Vargo and Lusch (2004) argue that the customer becomes primarily an operant resource (i.e. a co-producer) rather than an

operand resource (i.e. a "target" for the activities of marketers). Thus, FP6 of the S-D logic states that: '*The customer is always a co-creator of value'*.
Consequently, how value is conceptualized and determined is a key issue. The S-D logic sees value as perceived and determined by the customer on the basis of 'value in use' - resulting from the application of operant resources. Firms (or in this specific context, locales) can, therefore, only make 'value propositions', as articulated in FP7: '*The enterprise cannot deliver value, but only offer value propositions'.* These value propositions may or may not be taken up by customers (or perhaps more accurately in a spatial context, *users*). This means therefore, that; '*A service-centred view is inherently customer-oriented and relational'* (FP8).
How the firm/locale and customer/user interact is consequently crucial. As noted above, an S-D logic perspective regards the customer/user primarily as an operant resource, who combines with firm/location resources to co-create value. Accordingly, customers/users are active participants in relational exchanges and co-production through the integration of their individual (and possibly collective) resources; thus, as articulated in FP9: '*All social and economic actors are resource integrators'* The result of this is that the actual definition of value is ultimately defined by the customer/user. Thus FP10 states that *Value is always uniquely and phenomenologically determined by the beneficiary'* (Vargo and Lusch, 2008).
Similarly, in service science, all actors are considered as resources, and all service tools are considered useful instruments for business activities (Mele and Polese, 2010). Systems are dynamic configurations of resources that create and deliver value between the provider and the customer through service (Spohrer et al., 2007). Value-creation processes among service systems take place through three main activities: (1) proposing a value-creation interaction with another service system, (2) acceptance of the proposal, and (3) realizing the proposal (Spohrer et al., 2007, 2008). Therefore, in service science, value creation is the outcome of value proposition-based interaction mechanisms (Spohrer et al., 2008), in which relations between interacting systems based on a win-win logic, are consciously determined and finalized for mutual satisfaction (Maglio and Spohrer, 2008a; Spohrer et al., 2008).
This win-win logic is also present in network theories, which endorse the idea of considering all stakeholders in a network (Gummesson, 2008), and they nourish the win-win logic of collective satisfaction and participation, strengthening the effectiveness of value co-creation processes. According to network theory, value is created in a many-to-many logic of reticular interactions and is affected by every activity performed by the network actors, their satisfaction, and their competitive behaviour. In the same way, systems theories (particularly the viable systems approach), introduce the viability concept, linking it to consonant and resonant interaction among systems that share their own resources for the system's benefit in a win-win relationship, stressing value co-creation processes and experiences. Value further depends on the capability of a system to survive and accomplish other goals in its environment. In this sense, value means improving systems within an environment. A system has the ability to look for and foster dynamic satisfactory evolutionary paths in line with value creation processes in which all actors need to be satisfied as suggested by the S-D logic.
In a specific spatial context (for a more extensive discussion see Warnaby, 2009), this raises some interesting implications, which are discussed in the next section. In terms of concepts of 'territory' and 'place'.

Value in a spatial context: Territory vs. Place?

The above discussion relating to spatial value propositions, in terms of 'operand resource/hard conditions' and 'operant resource/soft conditions' perspectives, also raise questions relating to the fundamental nature of *what* is being managed/marketed in this specific spatial context. The context, from an S-D Logic perspective, is considered in terms of a set of unique actors with unique reciprocal links among them (Chandler and Vargo, 2011).
The concept of 'place' is a central concept within the field of human geography (Henderson, 2009), but it can be used in many different ways and contexts (Cresswell, 2004). In reviewing the history of

the idea of place, Cresswell (2004, p. 51) identifies three levels at which the concept can be generally approached. First, a *descriptive (or ideographic)* approach 'most closely resembles the common-sense idea of the world being a set of places each of which can be studied as a unique and particular entity', and is concerned with place distinctiveness/particularity. Cresswell argues that the second, *social constructionist* approach still concerns itself with place particularity, but only as a manifestation of more general underlying social processes. The third *phenomenological* approach to place 'seeks to define the essence of human existence as one that is necessarily and importantly 'in-place''.

In subsequent work, which focuses more specifically on places as entities that can potentially be marketed, Cresswell and Hoskins (2008, p. 394) posit that the notion of place simultaneously evokes two elements: (1) *materiality* (in that a place has tangible form, manifested by, for example, discrete administrative boundaries, topography, built environment, etc.) and (2) a 'less concrete' *realm of meaning* (corresponding more closely to the social constructionist/phenomenological levels of place mentioned above). This second element relates more to what people do, say and feel about a specific locale.

This dual conceptualization of place has resonance with the 'operand resource/hard conditions' and 'operant resource/soft conditions' perspectives mentioned previously. Thus, 'operand resource/hard conditions' could be regarded as corresponding to the materiality of the place in the sense that these 'hard' conditions are usually more physical, relating to issues such as factors of production etc. located within the jurisdictional area of the locale being marketed. In other words, within the *territory* in relation to which the value proposition is being created. Thus, the locale could be regarded as essentially the glass into which various hard factors are poured, and which hopefully creates a cocktail that is attractive to appropriate target audiences.

By contrast, Cresswell and Hoskins' (2008) notion of 'realm of meaning', relating to the more phenomenological aspects of place, could be regarded as referring more explicitly to operant resources/soft conditions. Thus, it has the potential to create a more overtly emotional attachment to a particular place, which might of course, be a communal phenomenon, built around shared identity and culture (see Aitken and Campelo, 2011). Consequently, this 'realm of meaning' notion stresses the power of 'place' in the sense that people (and organizations) become rooted in a particular locale and feel a strong sense of attachment to it (as a result *inter alia* of the networks of social relations of which they are a part).

Integrating the research streams: The emergence of 'place' from territory

The contributions of Cresswell (2004) and Cresswell and Hoskins (2008) reinforce the integrated visions of these three relevant research streams, interpreting the place as an emergent and contextual value proposition.

In service science, value creation is the outcome of value proposition-based interaction mechanisms (Spohrer et al., 2008), in which relations between interacting systems based on a win-win logic, are consciously determined and finalized for mutual satisfaction (Maglio and Spohrer, 2008a; Spohrer et al., 2008). This research stream considers technology as a useful resource to improve the interaction mechanisms between actors in systems and a component of quality of life improvement. From a place marketing and management perspective, such technology can contribute to territorial organization, improving its offering, multiplying the interactions between the actors and generating systems to measure the achievement of goals in the territory as, for instance, in the SMART cities projects (Shapiro, 2006). The integration of technology into human life in this way is not only an added resource to the resource system of the territory, but also it represents the opportunity to link human life with 'things', thereby increasing the opportunities to stimulate value emerging from the territory. The S-D Logic contributes by understanding and explaining resource integration in the context of a specific place, and moreover, the nature of the value co-creation is necessarily considered as a consequence of the involvement of actors/subjects who are directly or indirectly involved. Here, systems thinking contributes by focusing attention on the emerging context, on the subjectivity of

value, and on the relevance of the dynamic of the relationships. This approach focuses attention on interaction and on the dynamics of relations to 'create' the place 'value proposition'; thus, it is not necessarily relevant to study and explain what the things (elements in a system) 'are' but more 'how they interact'. The city is a territory that emerges as a place through the perception of an observer and the emergent characteristics of the place, which interact with each other.

Further, it is perhaps possible to affirm that a place emerges from the territory as a systemic entity by the subjects' perceptions, and ability to sense, feel, act and react. The emerging place is not dependent upon the utility or functionality of the space, but comes from the recognition of the system of value elements and by the perceived context of the interactive subjects. For this reason, the act of defining what is place and what is not place (i.e. the notion of the "non-place" – see Augé, 1993) could be not necessarily a precondition stated by the functionality of the space but, on the contrary, could appear through the perception of the interactive subjects. Although such places may be contained within normal administrative boundaries, this need not necessarily be the case, as noted with the concept of "fuzzy" places (Warnaby et al. 2010). In particular, such fuzzy places could be characterized by specific symbols, practices, activities and institutions, and could defy clear jurisdictional definitions. Place can thus be configured as an emerging system, perceived by actors able to recognise a form of the value proposition, and able to contribute to exchange value-integrating resources, and it is the act of resource integration between actors (i.e. stakeholders) and place, that makes the place an emerging system. To explain this more succinctly, it may be useful to use the metaphors of 'house' and 'home' to contrast the concepts of territory and place.

In general, in the English language, the noun *house* is used to refer to a building, a structure, that is objectively identified for specific characteristics, shapes, geographical position, boundaries, dimensions, ownership etc. The concept of *home* is something different; that is, immaterial, perceived and emotional, and is a personal, intimate and 'deep' way to refer to where someone lives. It is a concept that derives from the subjective perception of the people who interpret the 'structure' that they are living in a particular moment of their life; is used to express the combination of perceptions, values, sentiments that the building (house) generates.

At the same time, the territory is comparable to the 'house' metaphor, because it represents something identifiable, characterized by boundaries, by clear 'ownership' represented by the administrative government and population. Place emerges from the perceptions of subjects involved in the 'experience' of the territory, and in the emergent and perceived benefit coming from a perceived territorial value proposition.

Considering the previous contributions emanating from the different research streams outlined above, place can be considered as a subjective representation of the interaction between people and the territory. It is necessary that territory and people are able to interact and integrate resources, probably sharing knowledge and aligning their specific codes, norms and rules; and in so doing, reducing entropy and increasing the opportunity to find a common definition of the concept of value. Generally, it could be seen as a process that generates a correspondence between territory and people that are searching for their opportunities to perceive value, thereby stimulating the emergence of the 'place'. In the table below (Table 1), a comparison between territory and place is presented.

Table 1 – Comparing territory and place

	Territory	**Place**
Nature	A *defined entity*, identifiable objectively; clear identification is relevant for the survival of the system	An *emerging entity*, identifiable by subjects able to integrate resources and recognize benefits from the territory
Government body	A *government body* (in general, one which is democratically elected) is present and establishes norms, rules, strategy and an administrative path to follow	The place emerges through the interaction of stakeholders in the territory and by the action of the administrative government of the territory; in that way, the place has not necessarily got a formal government body, but an *emergent governance* as the result of the adaptive paths of different governments decisions toward a common direction
Boundaries	Defined *administrative boundaries* that delineate the territorial structure dividing the internal by external resources and actors	*Without boundaries* because the boundaries of the place value proposition depend on the perceptions of the subjects involved
Structure	A defined o*rganization* characterizes the territory and is connected with the administrative boundaries and the government body	The structure is not always well identified. The place emerges as a *system of relationships* between the interactive actors in the territory, led by a common purpose.
Offering	Institutional *offering* toward a population, protecting the social life and (eventually) citizen wellbeing	There is a path towards a *value proposition* that can be recognized by the sensitiveness of stakeholders
Value	Value is something defined by the local government and transferred toward the population following the logic of *value creation*	Because resource integration and value in exchange are the characteristics of the place (considered a perceived entity), the concept of *value co-creation* is more applicable
Integration with the environment	Adaptive; following norms established by government body	Adaptive; following shared rules by stakeholders

Source: authors' elaboration

From the table above, the concept of place as emergent entity is evident, and this could represent a stimulus for government bodies of the territory concerned, as well as for different stakeholders. Various consequences could emerge, including the dynamic of relationships, the opportunity to stimulate the emergence of a more indirect mode of governance and value co-creation, arising from the cooperation between the different actors involved in a common path toward the definition of the overall value proposition of the place. Thus, from the same spatial territory there could emerge different 'places' with a multiplicity of strategies. The local government of the territory could work toward the definition of the opportune strategies to address the emergence of the 'places' consistent with each territory.

Conclusions and implications

New perspectives and new interpretations in management in the context of territories can, therefore, emerge, potentially generating benefits for organizations, public administrations, cities, and nations, which, moreover, can contribute to improving the quality of life for people. In particular, considering the territory (and the emerging 'place') as a value provider, it is possible to consider the place marketing as the activity, set of institutions and processes for creating, communicating, delivering and exchanging offerings relating to the place that have value for stakeholders.

The offering of the territory needs to be recognized within the system of value perception of the stakeholders concerned; the territory offering will be perceived and evaluated by the consequent demand from territory stakeholders, and by the efforts of the government of the territory. These need to be concentrated to enable the maximum level of resource integration, which hopefully enables an alignment of perceptions between all the actors involved. For this reason, from a management perspective, the dynamic of relationships and the generation of effects upon the territory structure through the decision making activity is relevant; this creates the need to stimulate sharing (between offering and stakeholders) of the value elements, thereby reducing entropy and more effectively managing perceived complexity. In that way, the actors could invest in the territory because they believe in becoming part of a system (i.e. the perceived 'place') and, in a sustainable way, the investments will be perceived as much more useful to them. The investment is, therefore, not a speculative one, but rather, it represents a strategy to improve resource integration towards a common purpose (and minimizing potential conflicts through increased tolerance, and an acceptance of less-then-optimum outcomes on an individual basis for the 'greater good') in order to make the territory a 'better place'.

In conclusion, consistent with the research streams presented above, it is possible to argue that the stakeholder perceives its interpretation of the place, by interpreting the territory value proposition. The metaphors of 'house' and 'home' could be useful to represent the concept of 'emerging place' and in this work is contrasting the relation between 'territory' and 'place' concepts.

The topic represents one of the contribution that provide the efforts to merge together different research streams in place marketing and management studies and further research efforts could be useful to deep methods to measure the value perception in the territories, models and schemes to measure the place perception arising from the comparison between actors' experience and the physical aspects of the territory itself.

References

Aitken R., Campelo A. (2011). "The 4Rs of Place Branding", *Journal of Marketing Management* 27(9–10): 913–3.

Augé M. (1995). *Non-Places: an introduction to supermodernity.* Verso, London.

Barile S. (2009). *Management Sistemico Vitale*, Giappichelli, Torino.

Barile S., Polese F., (2010) "Smart Service Systems and Viable Service Systems: Applying Systems Theory to Service Science". *Service Science* 2(1-2):21-40.

Bartlett C.A., Ghoshal S. (1990). "The multinational corporation as an interorganizational network", *Academy of Management Review*, 15(4): 603-25.

Basole R.C., Rouse W.B. (2008). "Complexity of service value networks: Conceptualization and empirical investigation". *IBM systems journal*, *47*(1): 53-70.

Beer S. (1975). *Platform for Change*; John Wiley, London and New York.

Burt R. (1992). *Structural Holes*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

Capra F. (1997). *The Web of Life*, Flamingo/HarperCollins, London.

Capra F. (2002). *The Hidden Connections*, HarperCollins, London.

Castells M. (1996). *The Rise of a Network Society*, Blackwell, Oxford.

Chandler J.D., Vargo S.L. (2011), "Contextualization and value-in-context: how context frames exchange". *Marketing Theory* 11(1):35–49.

Constantin J.A., Lusch R.F. (1994). *Understanding resource management*. Oxford OH: The Planning Forum.

Cresswell T. (2004). *Place: A Short Introduction*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.

Cresswell T., Hoskins G. (2008). "Place, Persistence, and Practice: Evaluating Historical Significance at Angel Island, San Francisco, and Maxwell Street, Chicago*", Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 98(2): 392–413.

Demirkan H., Kauffman R.J., Vayghan J.A., Fill H.G., Karagiannis D., Maglio P.P. (2008). "Service-oriented technology and management: Perspectives on research and practice for the coming decade. Perspectives on the Technology of Service Operations". *Electronic Commerce Research and Applications* 7(4):356–376.

Espejo R., Harnden R. (Eds.) (1989). *The viable system model: interpretations and applications of Stafford Beer's VSM*. Chichester: Wiley.

Florida R. (2002). *The Rise of the Creative Class…and How it's Transforming Work, Leisure, Community & Everyday Life*. Basic Books, New York.

Florida R. (2005). *Cities and the Creative Class*. New York and London: Routledge.

Gummesson E. (2004). "From one-to-one to many-to-many marketing", in Edvardsson, B., Gustafsson, A., Brown, S. and Johnston, R. (Eds), *Service Excellence in Management: Interdisciplinary Contributions, Proceedings from the QUIS 9 Symposium*, Karlstad University, Karlstad, pp. 16-25.

Gummesson E. (2008). *Total Relationship Marketing*, 3rd ed., Butterworth-Heinemann, Burlington.

Håkansson H., Snehota I. (1995). *Developing Relationships in Business Network*, Routledge, London.

Håkansson H. (1987). *Industrial Technological Development – A Network Approach*, Croom Helm, Beckenham.

Hedlund G. (1986). "The hypermodern MNC – a heterarchy?", *Human Resource Management*, (25): 9-35.

Henderson G. (2009). "Place", in D. Gregory, R. Johnston, G. Pratt, M. J. Watts and S. Whatmore (eds) *The Dictionary of Human Geography* (5th ed, pp. 539–41). Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Jarrillo J.C. (1988). "On strategic network", *Strategic Management Review*, 9: 31-41.

Jones C., Hesterly W.S., Borgatti S.P. (1997), "A general theory of network governance: exchange conditions and social mechanisms", *Academy of Management Review*, 22 (4): 911-46.

Maglio P.P., Spohrer J. (2008a). "Fundamentals of service science". *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 36(1):18-20.

Maglio P.P., Spohrer J. (2008b). “Special issue on Service Science, Management, and Engineering”, *IBM Systems Journal*, 47(1).
Maturana H.R.,Varela F.J. (1975). *Autopoietic systems*. BLC Report 9. University of Illinois.
Mele C., Pels J., Polese F. (2010). “A Brief Review of Systems Theories and Their Managerial Applications”. *Service Science* 2(1/2):126–135.
Musterd S., Murie A. (2010). *Making competitive cities*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
Polese F. (2010). “The Influence of networking culture and social relationships on value creation”, *Quaderni di Sinergie,“Firms' Management: Processes, Networks and Value”,* 16: 193-215.
Porter M.E. (1998). “Clusters and competition: new agendas for companies, governments and institutions”. In Porter, M. E. *On competition* (pp. 197-287). Boston MA: Harvard Business School Press.
Prahalad C.K., Hamel G. (1990). “The core competence of the corporation”. *Harvard Business Review*, 68(3): 79-91
Prahalad C.K., Ramaswamy V. (2000). “Co-opting customer competence”, *Harvard Business Review* 78(1):79-87.
Richardson G.B. (1972). “The organization of industry”, *The Economic Journal*, 82: 883-96.
Shapiro J. M. (2006). “Smart cities: quality of life, productivity, and the growth effects of human capital”, *The review of economics and statistics*, *88*(2): 324-335.
Spohrer J., Anderson L., Pass N., Ager T. (2008). “Service science and service dominant logic”, *Otago Forum 2*, pp. 4-18.
Spohrer J., Maglio P.P., Bailey J., Gruhl D. (2007). “Steps toward a science of service systems”, *IEEE Computer*, 40(1): 71-7.
Vargo S.L., Lusch R.F. (2004). “Evolving to a new dominant logic for marketing”. *Journal of Marketing*, 68: 1−17.
Vargo S.L., Lusch R.F. (2008). “Service-dominant logic: continuing the evolution”. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 36(1): 1-10.
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.
Warnaby G. (2009). “Towards a service-dominant place marketing logic”. *Marketing Theory*, 9(4): 403-423.
Warnaby G., Medway D., Bennison D. (2010). “Notions of Materiality and Linearity: The Challenges of Marketing the Hadrian’s Wall Place “Product”’, *Environment and Planning A* 42(6): 1365-82.