

The relevance of co-creation in start-ups

- A case study of a start-up, engaging in co-creation with their stakeholders



Author: Natascha Christine Illum Larsen

Master thesis: Cand.Soc. Organizational Innovation and Entrepreneurship

Copenhagen Business School – 15th of May, 2017

Supervisor: Assistant professor, Ellen Mølgaard Korsager, department of management, politics and philosophy

Total Character count: 162,192

Total Page Count: 75/97

Abstract

The thesis will investigate how start-ups can engage in co-creation with their stakeholders, and why it is relevant for them to do so. This focus is based on the lack of research centered on co-creation in the context of start-ups, in an otherwise blooming field of research with focus on co-creation. This means that the overall goal of this thesis is to investigate the relevance of doing research in regards to co-creation in start-ups.

In order to write this thesis, I explored a case, of a start-up, named Kød&Bajer, a concept bar, engaging in co-creation with their stakeholders. I used a narrative analysis, which focused on the view of the owners of Kød&Bajer and their perception of how they co-created, and why it was relevant for them. By analyzing K&B through a narrative analysis, I could create a story out of the fragmented tales told to me in the bar of Kød&Bajer.

This narrative analysis, told the story of how K&B engaged in co-creation with their stakeholders, through the initiatives Kød&Bajer did, and through the community platform, which was created in the bar. I also found that co-creation truly plays a relevant role for start-ups, because co-creation helped shape the identity of Kød&Bajer, and created the basis for a restructuring of the organization. I find that co-creation in start-ups, are a valuable area for further research, because of the start-up different use of co-creation, in comparison to the established organization.

Acknowledgement

This thesis symbolizes the end of my two years of study at Copenhagen Business School on MSoc.Sc in Organizational Innovation and Entrepreneurship. The thesis is a result of several months of hard and intensive work.

I wish to express my sincere appreciation to my supervisor, Ellen Mølgaard Korsager, for her valuable input and support throughout the process. She has provided me with ideas, motivation, and given me guidance, but most importantly, she has given me constructive critique that I could use.

Furthermore, I would like to thank Emma Ström, Olivia Egeberg and Olivia Svendsen, the owners of Kød&Bajer, for letting me tack along, and devoting time and resources for this thesis.

Table of contents

Introduction	5
Research Question	6
Company.....	6
Analysis strategy	6
Review	6
Identity as internal in the organization	8
Organizational image.....	12
Co-creation	15
Start-ups and co-creation	19
Co-creation in relations to entrepreneurial processes.....	21
How to investigate the case of K&B.....	23
Narratives	24
Setting.....	26
Method.....	29
Research design	29
Data collection methods.....	31
A narrative analysis.....	34
Analysis.....	35
Chapter 1: K&B before the opening of the bar	36
Meeting the prerequisites of the brand co-creation model	37
The tasting events.....	40
The Christmas market.....	43
The focus groups.....	46
Summing up	48
Chapter 2: K&B after the opening of the bar	49
The opening days.....	50
Creating a community platform	51
The three association words.....	55
Summing up.....	57
Chapter 3: Engaging two customer segments in co-creation	58
K&B and the Westmarket customers	59

The co-creation between K&B and the Westmarket customers	61
Restructuring K&B as a consequence of the two customer segments	65
Summing up	67
Discussing and concluding on the research question	68
Co-creation's role in start-ups	68
K&B and co-creation	71
Concluding	74
Bibliography	76
Appendices	79

Introduction

This thesis looks into the role of co-creation in today's start-ups. Scholars' perception of the organization has changed over the last few decades. From seeing the organization as a standalone, to the organization as a network of suppliers and partners, to the final stage in our time, where co-creation happens with stakeholders (Ozcan & Ramaswamy, 2014).

This transformation can be seen as a consequence of the changing consumer. The consumer no longer wants customization but personalization, which means that the company can no longer assume to know, what the customer wants (Gambetti & Graffigna, 2014). Instead, they need to include the customer in the process of creating the desired products or services. This process of co-creation has been investigated by several scholars in established organizations such as Nike, Lego, Dell and Ford (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2004; Schultz & Hatch, 2016; Gambetti & Graffigna, 2014). They look at the co-creation of products and services between organization and stakeholders, often situated in online community platforms.

The gap in the existing literature, revolves around the lack of research done about co-creation in start-ups. In my review of the existing literature concerning co-creation, I only found one case concerning co-creation in a start-up. Ozcan and Ramaswamy (2014) looked at the case of Local Motors, a start-up that specializes in custom-made cars. The case was compared to a case of co-creation in Nike, an established organization. The conclusion of this investigation was that both organizations managed to enact co-creation with their stakeholders (Ozcan & Ramaswamy, 2014)

Often the arguments of co-creation in established organizations are colored by the assumption that they have the power, money and the celebrity status to engage consumers in co-creation. So does this mean that co-creation is meant for the established organizations or are start-ups able to engage stakeholders through other means? Ozcan and Ramaswamy make an argument for start-ups to be able to co-create alongside established organizations.

My purpose is to build on the findings of Ozcan and Ramaswamy, by expanding the research on start-ups with another case. The case is of a start-up named Kød&Bajer, hereafter called K&B. I

look into how a start-up can co-create with its stakeholders, and I do so by using narrative tools in order to get an in-depth understanding of why K&B finds it relevant to do so. Consequently, this means that my data-collection and analysis are made with a narrative focal point. By doing so, I structure the story of K&B's co-creation process with its stakeholders.

Research Question

Based on the above argument, the following research question has been guiding my research:

How can start-ups engage in co-creation, and why is it relevant for them to do so?

Company

K&B is a concept bar located at Westmarket, a foodcourt in Vesterbro. Their concept is the authentic Nordic setting, and all of the beers are from Nordic microbreweries. Beside beer, the bar distinguish itself by selling Nordic smoked and dried meat from the wild. This includes bear, moose, beaver and reindeers as examples. The bars design is also Nordic styled (see appendix 1).

K&B officially opened their bar on the 26th of January 2017, but the company have existed since September 2015. Currently, K&B owns the bar at Westmarket, but they are in the process of branching out, including the founding of a distribution company for Nordic microbreweries and an underground festival. The focus in this thesis has been on the overall creation of the K&B concept and the K&B bar.

Analysis strategy

Review

Organizational identity is a term credited by Albert and Whetten's (1985) research into organizational behavior, thus the notion of the term has existed for several decades (Pratt, Schultz, Ashforth, & Ravasi, 2016). Most of the organizational identity research that is founded on Albert and Whetten's idea about organizational identity, states that identity is a relational construct, formed through interaction with others (Gioia, Schultz, & Corley, 2000). It is an

organization's members' shared understanding of the structures that are presumed to be important and permanent in the organization, and which also distinguish the organization from other organizations. Organizational identity is the enduring core and individuality of the organization (Albert & Whetten, 1985).

Organizational identity is at the center of this review, it is the foundation which the different terms explored, center around. This thesis centers on the possibility and relevance of co-creation of identity in start-ups. This statement presumes that the consumer has an active role in the creation of an organization's identity (Schultz & Hatch, 2016). The collaboration between organization and consumer is not to be taken for granted, it is rather a development that has been observed through different scholarly approaches.

This review introduces some of the different theoretical standpoints that have been argued over the last couple of decades in regards to organizational identity creation. It begins with identity viewed in the context of culture as something internal in the organization (Schein, 1990). This theory led by Schein, delves into the key points of identity, and helps explain the importance of why identity and the creation of it is relevant for scholars to study. Schein argues that the organization is solely responsible for its identity, and does not acknowledge the influence of the external environment. This point of view, which Schein argues for, prompts me to further examine the identity creation of organizations.

The main argument for a continuous exploration into the subject of identity creation is based on the need for involvement from outside stakeholders. Here the term of image in context to identity is introduced. The scholars advocating this view argue that outside stakeholders' influence the organization to create the organization's image based on the perceived opinions of the public (Dutton & Dukerich, 1991). Image scholars recognize the importance of outside stakeholders in the creation of organizational identity, but they look at the stakeholders through the eyes of the organization, without involving them directly in the identity creation (Marziliano, 1998). The conclusion to this argument is that the outside stakeholders are recognized, but they are given a passive role rather than an active one.

This leads me to make an argument for an even more interrelated process to exist between organization and outside stakeholders than that of culture and image alone. My argument is based on the assumption that co-creation which features theoretical elements from both culture and image, can activate and engage organization and stakeholders in the creation of organizational identity.

The argument of co-creation is followed up by a section that is centered around entrepreneurial processes in start-ups. In this section I argue for why process models like the lean model and the business canvas model are inadequate to describe the processes that happens in start-ups. Instead, we should look at entrepreneurial processes as an organic process that compliments the teachings of co-creation.

Identity as internal in the organization

Albert and Whetten (1985) may have coined the term of organizational identity, but the way that it is perceived by different scholars differentiate greatly. Several scholars identify organizational identity in the context of organizational culture and state that organizations are cultures (Aten, Howard-Grenville, & Ventresca, 2012).

Research into the area of organizational culture stems from anthropological approaches, and are based on the way anthropology examines culture (Mike, 2014). Culture in a social context is believed to be explained through rituals, symbols, shared beliefs, and assumptions (Aten, Howard-Grenville, & Ventresca, 2012). It addresses the deeper structures of the organization and the agreement that exists within.

Culture in the context of the organization is perceived as something that is shared and unique to the organization and its members. Consequently, culture becomes an integrating mechanism, which helps stabilize and hold together the organizational members, who may define themselves as diverse and non-related outside of the organization (Meyerson & Martin, 1987).

Meyerson and Martin (1987) argue that: *“organizational cultures are resistant to change, incrementally adaptive, and continually in flux.”* (Meyerson & Martin, 1987, s. 2). These contradictory statements are based on cultures being socially constructed realities, and thus they make the same argument as Aten et. al that culture equals the organization (Aten, Howard-Grenville, & Ventresca, 2012). They further argue that this contradiction can be explained through three different paradigms: Integration, differentiation and ambiguity. The two last paradigms work with culture through the assumption that organizations consist of subunits, and a discrepancy that dominate the agenda of the organization, which is shattered by ambiguity, making the overall identity prone to continuous change and disruption (Aten, Howard-Grenville, & Ventresca, 2012).

The first paradigm on the other hand is set in the context of integration, and it continues the trail of shared values, creating a master ‘blueprint’ for the organization to follow (Aten, Howard-Grenville, & Ventresca, 2012). It is also here that Schein is theoretically located, and he is one of the most dominant figures in the context of organizational identity viewed through culture.

He argues that culture cannot be presumed to exist in an organization, before culture can be ‘developed’, prerequisites needs to be met. The members of the organization needs to have enough of a shared history and stability for culture to form. *“Culture is what a group learns over a period of time as that group solves its problems of survival in an external environment and its problems of internal integration. Such learning is simultaneously a behavioral, cognitive, and an emotional process.”* (Schein, 1990, s. 2)

Schein argues, that organizational culture may evolve over time, but does so in a controlled conscious process that is defined in three stages. The first stage is the unfreezing stage, which is when the unknown is acknowledged in the sense that new elements are realized and evaluated consciously on different levels. In the second stage the new changes are adapted and shared, this is where the organizations members learn about the new meanings. The last stage is the refreezing stage, and here the new practices and elements have become the norm, and thus outside practices are once again ignored and alienated (Aten, Howard-Grenville, & Ventresca, 2012). Schein's change model assumes that founders or managers can affect cultural change in

organizations, and they are often the ones that initiate the unfreezing stage. The influence of the leaders in organizations is one of the main points, which Schein makes throughout his research (Schein, 1993; Schein, 1990; Schein, 1996).

Founders or managers try to imbed their own assumptions into the organization, and can find if they are dominant enough, that they may have a powerful effect on the emerging or existing culture of the organization. Though sometimes they find that the members of the organization have their own experience to draw from and thus change is not as straight forward as first presumed by the founder or manager. Instead, the process of changing or emerging culture is a tale of a shared learning process in regards to cultural assumptions and the group's collective experience (Schein, 1990).

The integration of assumptions has been spoken of lightly to this point, as something 'easily' redefined, and something that may be 'redefined' by one person's word alone, but assumptions are the final stage to which culture is to be understood. Schein created a model that explained organizational culture in three levels. The first level is that of observable artifacts, this level is followed by values, and finally there is the level of underlying assumptions (Schein, 1990).

The observable artifacts are present from ones first step into the organization. It is the smell and feel of the place, the décor, dress code and so forth, but it can manifest itself in the more archival elements too, such as annual reports or statements. These artifacts are easy to identify, but it is hard to address what each singular artifact means for the culture of the company and subsequently for the identity of the place (Schein, 1990). We may recognize its existence, but do not grasp its meaning to the members of the organization.

The second layer of culture is that which deals with values, it is here that the actual deciphering begins. It is here that the organization makes official statements about their values, their ideologies, mission and vision, et cetera. (Schein, 1990).

Finally, there is the layer of assumptions, underlying, taken for granted assumptions that determine the thought process, feelings, behavior and perceptions of the organization's members (Schein, 1990). Culture exists on all three levels, but the level of assumptions is where it is impossible for the organization to 'fake it'. Assumptions exist on such a deep, integrated level that the founder or manager may voice the desire for change and change artifacts and outer values. However, they first succeed at changing culture, when the assumptions change. This is also the reason why some cultures may be perceived as ambiguous (Meyerson & Martin, 1987).

Schein views culture as the taken for granted and shared implicit assumptions in a group. These assumptions define how the group members perceive themselves, and thus how they react to different environments. An important side note to make is that members of a culture are not aware of this, until they face a different culture (Schein, 1996).

Organizational culture is defined as something that is shared and unique to the organization and its members (Meyerson & Martin, 1987). Schein views culture as shared implicit assumptions of the group that brings them to perceive the organization in a certain way (Schein, 1996).

Organizational identity is viewed as the organization's members' shared understanding of the structures that are presumed to be important and permanent in the organization, and which distinguish the organization from other organizations (Albert & Whetten, 1985). Schein and his fellow scholars engaging in organizational culture, deals with culture in the same way that Albert and Whetten define organizational identity, and thus it becomes relevant in the context of identity creation.

Schein believes that culture is changeable, and that it can be seen in a relational context inside the organization (Schein, 1990). The fact that Schein deals exclusively with the members of the organization, create limitations in regards to further exploration of identity creation and recognition. He argues that the members and especially the founders or managers are the drivers of culture change and emergence (Schein, 1993). The goal with this thesis, is to look at the co-creation of identity that happens between the organization and other stakeholders, and how this process unfolds. Schein and his colleagues introduce valuable concepts and tools by identifying

identity as linked with culture, but they come up short, when the process is taken outside of the context of the organization and its immediate members.

Culture has been defined and redefined by different scholars in the context of organizational theory. Culture defined in today's organizational theory, focuses on the organization as an integrated part in an eco-system that involves outside stakeholders, it does not view the organization as a separate entity (Mike, 2014). This means that culture should not be dismissed in the discussion about organizational identity. Instead, it can help us understand how the organization perceive the image, which they believe outside stakeholders' project towards them.

Organizational image

In the above section, the argument was constituted by the belief that identity and culture were inextricably interrelated, they are used to define one another and thus this interrelatedness appear to exist (Hatch & Schultz, 2002). In this section, an argument is made for a dynamic relationship between culture and images in order to explain organizational identity. Dutton and Dukerich (1991) argue that an organization's identity is closely linked to its culture, because the identity offers a set of skills and a way of using these skills that produces distinctive ways of doing things.

As opposed to Schein, Dutton and Dukerich claim that opinions and reactions of others, whom are not direct members of the organization, affect the identity of the organization through mirroring (Dutton & Dukerich, 1991). They acknowledge the influence, which other stakeholders have toward the creation of identity in an organization, by stating that mirroring helps motivate organizational members by aligning with or trying to change the public perception. They believe that we: *"might better understand how organizations behave by asking where individuals look, what they see, and whether or not they like the reflection in the mirror. . . what people see as their organization's distinctive attributes (its identity) and what they believe others see as distinctive about the organization (its image) constrain, mold, and fuel interpretations..."* (Dutton & Dukerich, 1991, s. 550-551).

If an organization's identity is based on its distinctive attributes, and its image is based on what others see as distinctive about the organization, then an argument for a fluid identity, affective of change, can be made (Gioia, Schultz, & Corley, 2000). Earlier I defined organizational identity using Albert and Whetten's definition of the term, postulating that organizational identity is the characteristics, which are enduring and viewed as permanent (Albert & Whetten, 1985). Gioia et al. makes a counter argument to this statement by involving mirroring and saying that by involving the public's perception, to an organization's identity and more importantly reacting to this perception, an organizations identity is adaptable to change (Gioia, Schultz, & Corley, 2000).

Berg and Gagliardi support this argument by stating that an organization must change to remain, what it has always been, in order to preserve its identity (Berg & Gagliardi, 1985). This paradoxical statement presents the argument that identity is not, and cannot be enduring for an organization, to survive and prosper in a constant changing environment (Gioia, Schultz, & Corley, 2000). This means that identity is indeed changeable, because without change, it could not exist in a changeable world.

Having argued for why image is important to organizational identity, it is now time to look at what concrete measurements organizations take to involve, address and act on the relationship to the public and the imaging they omit. An image is not simply the styled boutique window or the streamlined folder handed out (Hatch & Schultz, 2002), it is the whole of the enacted environment, and it is where one has to create new labels and categories, which create sense to the stakeholders (Marziliano, 1998). This can be done either internally or externally, internally it is about making sense of previous experience, and using this to build a solid front. Externally is where the image comes into play. The image is created in the pretense to be managed and controlled, and the organization believes the perceived image to reflect on the organization. This is done in order for the organization to gain authority, because it is through the authority that the organization's actions become valuable, or rather become able to give value to the outsider, meaning that they portray a positive image of the organization (Marziliano, 1998).

Making a conscious effort to portray a certain image to the stakeholders outside of the immediate organization, may be more difficult than expected. Members at all levels of the organization transmit images of the organization, so believing that the organization solely can create an official image is wrong (Berg & Gagliardi, 1985). Dysfunctions of the organizational identity dynamics is when the organization believes to transmit a certain image to the public, but it may not be what they actually do transmit, meaning that a disparity between perceived image and actual image can exist (Hatch & Schultz, 2002).

The first argument that was made in this section about identity and image stated that even though the focus is on image, it does not exclude the relevance of culture in organizations. Rather it uses culture to help explain the importance of image, in the context of organizational identity, by referring to the symbols and norms that an organization portray in order to create an image (Dutton & Dukerich, 1991; Gioia, Schultz, & Corley, 2000; Hatch & Schultz, 2002). The difference between image and culture scholars, is in the premise that by recognizing image creation in an organization, you also recognize that outsiders of an organization have influence on the organizational identity. An organization's identity and image is guided and activated by individuals' interpretation of an issue, and their following action. Therefore, patterns of the organization's actions change over time, because of the influence of these individual reactions and actions (Dutton & Dukerich, 1991).

Image scholars recognize the importance of outside stakeholders in the creation of organizational identity, but their interpretation of their role, creates a picture that does not include them on the same level as the organization's members. They recognize that change happens, as a response to the public's opinion and reaction to the organization, but they also argue that the organization can influence the image (Marziliano, 1998). Their main argument is about how the organization is responsible for the image creation and the direct identity creation. However, they do it influenced by the public's opinion. By arguing this, they place the outside stakeholders in a passive role instead of an active one. They create the image based on their belief of, what the outside stakeholders want it to be (Dutton & Dukerich, 1991), which may not be the actual case since they have not actively included them in the process.

I make an argument for an even more interrelated process to exist between organizations and outside stakeholders, and do this by looking at co-creation and how it activates both parties in the creation of organizational identity.

Co-creation

Until now, the focus has been on organizational identity, and the evolution of the concept, from its first formulation by Albert and Whetten (1985), to its interrelatedness to culture, and the view that it only existed internally in the organization (Schein, 1990). Then the interrelatedness between organizational identity and culture was expanded to also include the term of image. Image theory acknowledge culture's role in identity creation, but stretches the definition to include the recognition of outside forces in the creation of identity (Dutton & Dukerich, 1991). However, image theory do not recognize a collaboration between internal and external stakeholders, but instead work with the notion that internal members create a 'believed' image, based on what they perceive to be the outsiders' reaction to the organization (Dutton & Dukerich, 1991).

This last section takes the creation of identity to a new level, and evolves the role of the outside stakeholders by giving them a central and including role in the creation of organizational identity; this is done through the term of co-creation. *"Co-creation is joint creation and evolution of value with stakeholding individuals, intensified and enacted through platforms of engagements, virtualized and emergent from ecosystems of capabilities, and actualized and embodied in domains of experiences, expanding wealth-welfare-wellbeing."* (Ozcan & Ramaswamy, 2014, s. 21) This view on co-creation is based on the assumption that value is created together with the organization and the stakeholding individuals (Gambetti & Graffigna, 2014).

Until now I have used the term of outside stakeholders to distinguish between the organization's members, and those who are not. Outside stakeholders range between a multiplicity of different stakeholders, which include business partners, nongovernmental organizations and consumers.

The focus in this section is mainly on consumers, since co-creation happens when consumers move from being passive receivers to active co-creators (Schultz & Hatch, 2016).

As opposed to culture, co-creation is not an old term, that has been redefined and renamed and thus has reentered the academic scene (Mike, 2014). The academic scene has gone from seeing the business as a standalone, to the organization as a network of suppliers and partners, to the final stage in our time where co-creation happens with stakeholders (Ozcan & Ramaswamy, 2014). Scholars find that not all organizations take part in co-creation, and often a rigid, hierarchal management is to blame for this (Sanders & Stappers, 2008).

When we talk of co-creation, we often put it in relations to the brand and the identity that is collectively shared (Black & Veloutsou, 2017). The consumers co-create brands through their actions, using images, symbols and language that create brand meanings and values. This manifests itself in the sense that it becomes brand identity and reputation (Black & Veloutsou, 2017).

Brand identity can be seen as a group identity that is shared between engaged stakeholders and organizations. This is expressed through shared values, vision, behavior, et cetera (Burmam, Hegner, & Riley, 2009). Brand identity is formed through co-creation between stakeholders and organization. This section looks at co-creation and how it creates identity. The identity can be perceived as the brand identity, because it is shared outside of the organization, which means that talking about organizational identity is not sufficient in this section.

An important point to make in regards to co-creation, is that the consumers rarely engage in it on their own, and thus communities or more specifically brand communities, are one of the ways to which co-creation can be engaged. Communities provide social structure to the relationship between companies and consumer, which creates transparency and therefore access (Hatch & Schultz, 2010).

One of the ways to look at the relevance of these brand communities, and co-creation in general, is to look at how they collaborate with the building blocks of the brand co-creation model, which Prahalad and Ramasawamy (2004) introduces. The four building blocks consist of dialogue, access, risk and transparency (DART).

The first building block is concerned with dialogue, as co-creation requires collaboration, and a deep connection between organization and consumers (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2004). Dialogue is linked to knowledge, knowledge shared among the organization and its consumers in brand communities. By the sharing of knowledge, hidden resources may be uncovered, and the organization can gain from this pool of knowledge, which the consumers create the basis for (Schultz & Hatch, 2016).

An important aspect of co-creation is that the organization does not leave the consumers in a position where they are the only ones engaging in the dialogue. Both sides need to participate actively in the dialogue (Hatch & Schultz, 2010). This claim leads to the second building block, which is the access that the organization provides to the consumer, in order for them to engage in co-creation (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2004). This happens when the company gives the consumer access to beta products, and ask for their help in finding bugs or their opinion about a product (Black & Veloutsou, 2017). Access goes both ways, the consumers gain access to more than just the sculpted front of the organization, and the company seeks a greater access to the consumer. This expands the interaction that happens, when consumers purchase products or services. Access requires a willingness, on the part of the organization, to allow new technologies and insights to be available for co-creation activities, because the organization is often the initiator in this process (Schultz & Hatch, 2016).

The third building block, transparency, is seen as a direct consequence of the access block. The advantage of transparency is the co-creation that comes to exist, when both organization and consumers agree to share ideas and experiences (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2004). It is also in the block of transparency, that the company culture is exposed to and analyzed by the consumer, which might find the organization inadequate, making the organization vulnerable to external

judgments of internal properties (Schultz & Hatch, 2016). Transparency may also challenge attitudes toward protecting the intellectual property rights in companies (Hatch & Schultz, 2010).

The last building block is about risk. Co-creation creates risks for both companies and consumers. Despite the fact, that co-creation assumes equal engagement by organizations and consumers it rarely seems to be the case (Ozcan & Ramaswamy, 2014). Often the organization is the most eager to engage in co-creation. Therefore it is often the agent, who experience disappointment, when consumers do not return their keenness, or mistreat the information the company entrusted to them. In other situations, consumers may feel exploited, when they feel that companies have taken advantage of their ideas, and contributions without acknowledging the active role, which the consumer has played (Schultz & Hatch, 2016).

The building blocks are not limited to only being understood in the context of communities. The number of actors involved are irrelevant, it is the mutual relationship of inclusion and exclusion, that the actors define their position in, which is of relevance. (Bouwen, 2001). If a company manages to create close interaction with; *“significant others who provide the necessary challenge and safety to pose a new framework. This form of interaction represents the identification and realization of new knowledge and truly innovative ideas.”* (Bouwen, 2001, s. 364)

In all of the four building blocks, communication is important. If the communication is lacking or imbalanced, so is the relationship between organization and stakeholder. Bouwen discusses three different modes of dealing with the reflection on the relational aspects, in the sharing of implicit and explicit knowledge in the communities (Bouwen, 2001). The implicit mode is where the relational is in the action of talking and interacting, while the content is, what is ‘actually’ happening among the interacting parties. The implicit, often transfers in social contexts and is imbedded in the cultural situation. The explicit mode is where reflection is ongoing in regards to the social processes, and the relationships are being developed and generated within the group of actors themselves. Integrated or dialogical mode is where there exist a practice of enacting, and reflection on relational practices, that are explicit and incorporated in context-of-practice (Bouwen, 2001).

The point that is made with the brand co-creation model and Bouwen's reflection on relational aspects is, that co-creation is created and practiced in different shapes, on several levels, and by many stakeholders. The only continuous aspect of it is, that both internal and external stakeholders take part in the process of co-creation, on preferred equal terms. It is here, that co-creation diversifies itself, from viewing identity creation only through culture, or through culture and image. Co-creation does not situate itself, from viewing culture and image in the same context. The organization co-creates, by defining the consumption experience in relation to attributes, symbolic meanings, and functional consequences that they draw from the consumer experience (Gambetti & Graffigna, 2014). This is how culture was defined earlier, and image plays a role in the way that organizations try to react on the premises, which the brand communities offer to them (Black & Veloutsou, 2017).

Co-creation embraces and evolves culture and image, by removing the previous context in which they were defined, and redefining the terms, in the context of a collaboration between organization and consumers, where they exist on equal footing. The business world was once a stage, where the audience were the consumers. Time has changed, and the consumers are now active actors on the stage, co-creating the play, in corporation with the organization (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2000).

Start-ups and co-creation

The literature about identity and co-creation deals with established organizations such as LEGO (Hatch & Schultz, 2002), Dell, Ford, Microsoft (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2000) and Nike (Ozcan & Ramaswamy, 2014). This appears to be contradictory to Albert and Whetten's (1985) definition of identity as something that is defined by core values and established practices, since these organizations have adopted co-creation later in their existence. As earlier mentioned, other scholars argued against this definition by saying that identity could be seen as a continuous process that changed over time (Gioia, Schultz, & Corley, 2000).

The view that identity is changeable is used as an argument in the studies that deals with the established organizations. The same argument can be transferred to start-ups, but few studies have been made where the focus is on co-creation and identity in a start-up. This thesis looks at identity and co-creation in the context of a start-up, and thus separates itself from most of the existing literature that deals with it in the context of established organizations.

Ramasawamy and Ozcan do offer one example of a start-up that has been studied in the context of co-creation. Local Motors is a start-up that has a micro-factory where people can build their own car over a period of time, having Local Motors provide the tools and training to do so. Local Motors further engage in an online platform that Ramasawamy and Ozcan calls an engagement platform, where up to 5,000 amateur enthusiasts with interest in cars share knowledge. On this platform, they participate actively in order to develop new products, tools and strategies for Local Motors, while their clients can live-stream their efforts to build their car gaining advice and knowledge from the community (Ozcan & Ramaswamy, 2014).

When a start-up engage in co-creation from the beginning of their existence, they involve the stakeholder to take part in their identity creation with a clean slate (Ozcan & Ramaswamy, 2014). They unconsciously invite them in to help form basic assumptions, which was the fundamental aspect of culture that Schein discussed (Schein, 1990). The stakeholders help design, develop and manage the start-up (Ozcan & Ramaswamy, 2014). The start-up also has the opportunity to tap into a great resource of knowledge that exists within stakeholder communities. Local Motors use their engagement platform to build their business on, and other platforms like this can be started by other start-ups in the same way.

The case with Local Motors, investigated by Ramasawamy and Ozcan helps establish precedence for the relevance of studying start-ups in the context of co-creation, and not just the bigger established organizations, that by brand alone can create a community platform. The start-up may not have this power, but they can borrow knowledge from established community platforms (Ozcan & Ramaswamy, 2014). This creates an argument for why this thesis holds relevance, this thesis tries to build on the argument that Ramasawamy and Ozcan makes, by studying a start-up

through co-creation. I further explore what relevance co-creation has to start-ups, with the case of K&B.

Co-creation in relations to entrepreneurial processes

When looking at co-creation between start-up and consumer, it is important to recognize which processes co-creation takes part in and what this means to the company. Start-ups are created on the basis of entrepreneurial processes which are defined as: *“all cognitive and behavioral steps from the initial conception of a rough business idea, or first behavior towards the realization of a new business activity until the process is either terminated or has led to an up-and-running business venture with regular sales.”* (Davidsson, 2008, s. 75). At this given time, several models and blueprints state that they can outline the processes that needs to be included to create a successful start-up.

Two of these models are the business canvas (Osterwalder & Pigneur, 2010) and the lean model (Olsen, 2015). Both offer an overall blueprint that in theory should be applicable for all entrepreneurial ventures to some extent, of course based on the premise they make it their own in the process (Osterwalder & Pigneur, 2010). By applying these models to an idea, it should be given that we have the perfect formula for creating a successful business. If this statement held true, it would be a given that all people engaged in entrepreneurial activities because they would create a higher output than what the market could offer before (Shane & Venkataraman, 2000).

The reality contradicts this statement of their existence of a perfect model for entrepreneurial ventures. Shane and Venkataraman (2000) argue that there exist three different premises that should be investigated in the context of entrepreneurial opportunities. 1) The existence of entrepreneurial opportunities 2) The discovery of entrepreneurial opportunities and 3) The Decision to exploit entrepreneurial opportunities (Shane & Venkataraman, 2000). Another way to formulate these premises is by saying that entrepreneurial opportunities are the examination of how, by whom and with what opportunities to create future goods and services are discovered (Davidsson, 2008).

The overall argument that Shane and Venkataraman make is that it all comes down to the function of the shared characteristics of the opportunity and the nature of the individuals that enacts it (Shane & Venkataraman, 2000). Therefore, the existence, discovery and exploitation of entrepreneurial opportunities is about having the right people at the right time recognize a possible venture (Davidsson, 2008).

By following the argument of Shane and Venkataraman, the idea about the perfect model that fits all becomes obsolete, and instead models like the business canvas and the lean model become guidelines for entrepreneurs that have already situated themselves and recognized the entrepreneurial opportunity.

Even though Shane and Venkataraman's talk about 'the right people', it should not be understood as them looking at traits, rather they look at knowledge and setting in regards to these people, something they share with Gartner (2016), that discards the entrepreneurial field that looks at traits in order to explain entrepreneurship.

Gartner believes in behavior, but in the context of it viewed as our actions, creating the future, and forming tomorrow (Gartner, 2016). Nothing is for sure, and the only thing that holds us back are rigid traditions and fear of failure. By viewing entrepreneurship as creative destruction, we find the epitome of ambiguity in the sense that we know failure will come someday, but we still need to work with the assumption that we will succeed (Gartner, 2016).

This view of Gartner leads the discussion back to co-creation and the relevance of it in regards to start-ups. Gartner argues that there is no formula for guaranteed success as entrepreneur, something, which Venkataraman and Shane agree in. Their argument is based on the right opportunities and the right people coming together at the right time (Shane & Venkataraman, 2000). Gartner's argument is based on Schumpeter's creative destruction and the flux of time, which is ever changing (Gartner, 2016). Co-creation is not about a set model that leads the way to success, it is about involving all stakeholders in a venture in order to create a flexible organization that is not held back by rigid presumptions of how things should be. Co-creation works with the

idea of Gartner, since it does not exist as of yesterday, but is striving to be in the present that will build the tomorrow (Gartner, 2016). Every venture is unique, and theorists may offer some few processes as denominators, but beside those, it is hard to label the process of entrepreneurship.

How to investigate the case of K&B

When I was reading about co-creation, I noticed that the cases explored, dealt heavily with online communities and the influence they had on co-creation. Ramasawamy and Ozcan (2004) use the cases of Nike and Local Motors, and speak about the online communities that create interaction with stakeholders. The products of Nike and Local Motors are technology based, and this pattern of technology and online communities playing a role in co-creation is seen in all of the cases I have encountered (Schultz & Hatch, 2016; Sanders & Stappers, 2008).

The case that I have investigated is based on the co-creation of a concept, which first physical feature became a bar. The technology and online presence in this case, is limited to social media in the form of a homepage, instagram and Facebook. Co-creation is about the shared value creation between organization and stakeholders, which is enacted through platforms of engagements, which happens in ecosystems relevant to the process (Ozcan & Ramaswamy, 2014). This definition holds no mentioning of technology, but do refer to platforms, which can be seen as the communities, whic are created in the co-creation process. K&B do create their own community platform, but not online, instead they use the bar as the platform.

K&B have engaged their stakeholders through different initiatives. K&B used their stakeholders to shape the concept of K&B, even before they opened their physical bar. When K&B established that they would open a bar, they used co-creation in order to create the design and products of K&B. The case of K&B is about a start-up, which managed to engage their stakeholders from the beginning and who activated them and their knowledge throughout the different processes of their development. This thesis is about the journey that K&B went through with their stakeholders, and how they co-created not only products, but also their concept.

This journey can be seen as a story, created through the fragmented tales of K&B and their stakeholders. K&B is based in the physical world, engaging physically with their stakeholders in their co-creation activities, they were not situated in a digital world. This meant that everyday encounters became their own fragmented stories in the bigger story of K&B (Boje, 2001). As an observer of these everyday stories and tales, I became able to see the bigger picture of K&B's co-creation with their stakeholders. I saw the story unfold in front of me, told by K&B and their stakeholders. To understand how fragments of many stories become one story, one has to look at narratives.

Narratives

Narrating a story is similar to a way of thinking. It helps one interpret the world and enables people to interpret the interpretation processes of others in their interpretation of the world and associate these interpretations to broader understandings, occurrences and experiences (Fletcher D. , 2007).

By using narrative analysis style, one can understand how entrepreneurial processes are organized 'relationally' between people. *"Relational ideas are concerned with how people come to be and know the world interactively through dialogue, exchanges, conversations, relations, joint acts and co-ordinations. This means that ways of acting, performing and coordination are always an expression of relationship to past and future conversations, events, experiences, cultures and ideas."* (Fletcher D. , 2007, s. 650) What the above quote means is that it is important to take into account the constructionist, multi-voiced and multi-faceted aspects of entrepreneurship. The notions of entrepreneurship cannot be seen as fixed entities in individuals' personalities, but instead it is constantly being constructed in relation to something in the past, present or future (Fletcher D. , 2007).

Narrative analysis is founded in storytelling, when narrators tell a story they give narrative form to experience. They position actors in space and time and create order to which there can be made sense of what happened—or what is imagined to have happened (Weick & Sutcliffe, 2005). So narratives can be understood as an attempt to recognize what has happened and to explain this

occurrence. Narrative, therefore, can be seen as providing an entry into two realms: the first is the realm of experience, where speakers lay out how they as actors experience certain events and convene their subjective meaning onto these experiences; and the second realm of narrative is the resources that are put to use, to make sense of this (Bramberg, 2012).

This means that the notion of narrative practices is not simply defined by linguistic tools perpetuated towards written stories such as bibliographies, instead it can be incorporated into interviewing practices of all kinds, including interviews and focus- or brainstorming groups. It also creates the opportunity of using narrative practices in different settings and the field for narrative inquiry can be translated into institutional and everyday storytelling practices, such as during dinnertime, at the bar, or in meetings (Bramberg, 2012). This is the foundation of the case of K&B, I found my case in the bar, talking with the owners and the patrons, and the people who passed by for a single beer. No bibliographies, no written stories, instead the story of K&B was an oral story found in the bar.

By viewing the world through narrative, one looks upon a connected and integrated story, it is the fundamental way we create meaning in our everyday and in our times of reflection, we inter-relate and connect with each other through narrative, but before narrative, there is antenarrative (Fletcher D. , 2007). It is the start of our narrative, it is when everything is still fragmented, messy and non-linear. It is before the story has received a beginning, a plot and an ending. Antenarrative is the pre-narrative speculation. It is an improper storytelling, and a promise of proper narrative to be born through the antenarrative (Boje, 2001).

Antenarrative holds five dimensions, which constitute the premises of which we can discuss its relevance from. 1) Antenarrative is 'before', it is before all the structural are plastered to the story, before theory and frames, and before narrative. 2) It is where the speculative level are in play, it is where sense-making and the flow of the experience is still ambiguous and a full understanding of meanings and perceptions has not solicited fully. 3) It is where the analysis does not focus on the linear construction of the story, but where other elements holds its focus such as the sensemaking experience. It is also here that plurivocality is acknowledged and analyzed. 4) Antenarrative simply

tells and tries to understand, it has no ending or conclusion, and it holds no themes, it comes before that. 5) It is the collective memory before it becomes the story itself. It is the multi-stranded stories of experiences that lack collective census (Boje, 2001). In the case of K&B, this means that the many everyday stories and tales I heard at the bar, help shape the story of K&B, the story of how K&B co-create and why it is relevant for them. All these fragments create a mosaic that tells the story of K&B.

Setting

September 2015, three girls sit down in one of the rooms, located at KEA – Københavns Erhvervsakademi, to brainstorm entrepreneurial ideas, they are having an elective course in entrepreneurship, and they are taking the first step towards creating Kød&Bajer.

Olivia E, Olivia S and Mie came from different backgrounds, before they started their education at KEA in design and entrepreneurship with focus on innovation. Olivia E had taken a bachelor in landscape architecture and urban-design, while Olivia S came straight from high school. Mie had struggled to get into an art academy, before she chose to pursue the education at KEA.

The elective course the girls were taking at the time, centered on starting ones own company. They were given three months, a supervisor and all the guidance they could wish for. Several days passed with intensive brainstorming and Post-Its everywhere. The first main idea centered around a breakfast food-court inspired by something equivalent to what they had seen in Poland. The idea turned out to be too extensive, and the girls had to drop it, which led them to work from the theory of simplicity above everything else. Simplicity was one of the key fundamentals taught to them by the teachers involved in their education. Based on this stand, the girls reevaluated their ideas and looked at the Post-Its with ideas again. On one of the Post-Its from the brainstorming session the words Beer&Bear were written, which would turn out to be the first mention of Kød&Bajer.

Olivia E was born and raised in Sweden, and since she arrived in Denmark she had noticed the lack of Swedish beer in Denmark. She researched this phenomenon and found that often, when Danes

go to Sweden, they buy their alcohol in the supermarket just like they would in Denmark. The difference is that in Sweden the supermarkets are only allowed to sell drinks with an alcohol content of maximum 3.5%, meaning that drinks with a higher alcohol content are sold at the system bolaget. The system bolaget is a liquor store that holds all the heart can desire in terms of alcohol, and if they do not have what you want, they will get it for you no matter where in the world it comes from.

This division that existed in Sweden made Danes less aware of the world famous Swedish microbreweries. This predicament together with the fact that Nordic meat was scarce in Denmark became the focus of the girls' entrepreneurial adventure. They voiced that their mission would be to own their own bar, but before pursuing this first idea, the girls took a different route that was more easily realized in the form of pop-up related events.

In the beginning, the concept of K&B was based on Nordic microbreweries from Sweden and Norway, and wild meat from Nordic animals like bear, beaver and moose. At the time, it was not further specified and through different trials, the concept evolved.

Throughout December 2015, the girls had a stall at Israels Plads, selling bottled beers from Nordic microbreweries and meat from wild Nordic animals. They used this month to test their idea and talk to people about the concept. They started 2016 with doing an internship in their own company and developing the idea further. In March 2016, their internships ended and Mie left the company to pursue her art dreams.

The two remaining founders continued doing pop-up shops and catering events, and they soon found out, that a great idea did not mean a streamlined course. With each event, they realized new important insights to their start-up. *"So we bought this transportable tap installation, that simply didn't fit our kegs . . . once we made toast with venison, but it was too time consuming, so after that we learned that we didn't want to work with food. . . we tried catering, but it was a circus to do. . . we had to drag so much around and then we also got paid too little for our troubles, but it's something you learn in the beginning."* (Olivia E, Interview, 8/3-2017, p. 78)

In the summer of 2016, the girls were ready to either close down K&B or change course completely. They had no more money, and it was turning out to be exhausting being only the two of them involved in K&B, they missed having a third partner. Around this time, the girls heard about Westmarket, a food-court opening in Tove's Gallery on Vesterbro. They decided to revisit their first mission of owning an actual bar, and they pitched their idea and concept to the people behind Westmarket, who loved the concept. Now all they needed was money and a third partner in their project.

Shortly thereafter, they met Emma, a Swede living in Denmark. She became part of the team and together the three partners raised capital through own funds and families' help. They claimed an 18 m² room in Westmarket, and worked towards the opening of the market despite unforeseen problems like the food mafia. The food mafia owned 16 of the stalls in the food-court, becoming the deciding vote in all matters of relevance. Despite these hindrances, K&B opened for the first time together with the rest of Westmarket on the 26th of January 2017.

The small concept bar has stuck with its original vision of K&B, and now holds eight taps with different Nordic beers from microbreweries, around the Nordic countries. Beside this, they sell bottled beers and Nordic meat, which are wild meat in dried and smoked versions, sliced thinly and served on small special-made ceramic plates on a wood plank, with Swedish sour crispbread. Beside beer you can order lingonberry juice, but that is it, the name is Kød&Bajer and that is what they serve, nothing else and it seems to attract a diverse set of people.

K&B distinguish between Westmarket customers and their customers. They have two clienteles that come in, the customers who are already in Westmarket to explore and then notice them, and those who come for K&B, the people upon whom they build their concept. *"... in the first half of the day, the Westmarket customers are here, and then the people that come because of us, arrive later in the day. So in the beginning of the day, it's older customers, and then later it's those we expected to be our target group."* (Olivia E, Interview, 8/3-2017, p.78)

K&B does not mind this extra customer segment that has stumbled upon them, rather they embrace it. *"It's a fortunate situation for us to begin here no matter what, because if we had been somewhere else, people would need to find us first and visit us with a purpose. So I believe it's a nice way to make a name for ourselves and create attention around us."* (Olivia E, Interview, 8/3-2017, p. 78)

The small concept bar is going so well, that already two month after opening they hired four employees to help run the bar, and they are looking for a communication intern, because the girls are not done playing entrepreneurs. Their next project is a distribution company called "beerserk", (playing on the old Nordic word berserk), which represents microbreweries from the Nordic countries. Besides this current project the girls also dream of bottleshops around the world presenting Nordic beer.

Method

My thesis has revolved around the case of K&B in order to explain the relevance of start-ups engaging in co-creation, and how this may be done. This means that my method is centered around how to investigate a case study, creating an analysis from which important points can be made.

I start out presenting a research design, which addresses the reasoning behind using a single case study and the relevance of collecting qualitative data. This is followed by introducing the data collection methods, which is introduced as a triangulation of methods (Yin, 1994). Finally, I argue for the relevance of a narrative analysis.

Research design

Case studies are empirical investigations, where the focus is on existing phenomenon, which exist in real-life context. Case studies helps explore complex social phenomena, which holds several variables of interest together with numerous sources of evidence (Yin, 1994). The case study method offers several different types of case study designs. In this thesis, I am using an explanatory case study design. *"An explanatory case study is often close examination of data both*

at a surface and deep level in order to explain the phenomena in the data” (Zaidah, 2007, s. 3) By using this approach, I create the foundation for doing a narrative analysis, which is founded on the possibility of interpreting on the data (Boje, 2001).

Case studies are suitable when the questions one wants to answer are ‘how’ and ‘why’ questions. Case studies are furthermore used, when the extent of control over behavioral events are limited (Yin, 1994). In those cases, the researcher has no chance to control events in the context, which is the case with this case study, where the identity creation may happen uncontested to my involvement with the case.

For this study, I have chosen a qualitative case study approach as opposed to a quantitative approach. A quantitative research approach would have involved an extensive study with a representative sample of participants (Yin, 1994). The sample in my study is not representative. It is based on relevant informants that represent the stakeholder groups engaged in the co-creation together with the owners and employees of K&B. In addition to having a representative sample, the study would have to be responsive to a standardized questionnaire, for it to be quantitative (Yin, 1994). None of the methods I have engaged relates to questionnaires or other qualitative methods. I reason that the quantitative research approach would be inadequate for exploring the themes in action here. It would only generate an overview of the different aspect of identity and branding in regards to K&B, instead of dwelling into the complex relationship that exists between company and consumer.

The qualitative approach offers freedom when exploring findings and phenomenon, discovered during the interview process. I do not have to fear that my involvement may change events. My concern is solely on asking the wrong questions or misinterpreting the data collected. *“This qualitative case study is an approach to research that facilitates exploration of a phenomenon within its context using a variety of data sources”* (Baxter & Jack, 2008, s. 544). The researcher is not limited in the methods available to qualitative studies. Rather they are given free opportunity to explore within the limits of reasoning.

Data collection methods

Yin offers six sources of evidence, that he finds relevant to use in case studies. I activate three of these, creating a triangulation of methods, which offers an attempt to construct higher validity (Yin, 1994).

My main method of data collection was interviews. The interviews were semi-structured and defined as narrative positioned (Georgakopoulou & De Fina, 2015). By structuring the interviews this way, I made them as fluent and open-ended as possible. The interviews were often conducted in a group setting at K&B, where I interviewed couples or friends visiting there together. I do not perceive these group settings as focus groups, since focus groups consist of a limited number of homogenous participants that discuss a predetermined subject (Krueger, 2011). My interview groups were a random gathering of people, who I found interesting after observing them at the bar.

The discussion of interview groups and focus groups leads to the second method in my triangulation of methods, participant observation. *“Participant observation is a method of data collection in which the investigator uses participation in an area of ongoing social life to observe it.”* (Platt, 2011). The researcher may have been a long time member of the social community he or she is researching, or the researcher may be a faceless participant in a larger crowd. This means that the lines between a participant observer and an observer is blurred (Platt, 2011). In my investigation of K&B, I took the role of participant observer several times, both at the bar, but also at focus groups directed by K&B. Often my observations ended with me turning on memo on my iPhone and dwelling deeper into the thoughts of a particular interesting person or group, using the semi-structured interview method.

The last method used, was that of archival research. Here I did a content analysis on the documents in order to understand and interpret them (Corti, 2011). K&B gave me access to their Dropbox and Google drive from the beginning, and I used these to get an overview of the path that K&B had taken. By using the archival research method, I got insights into some aspects of K&B, which the owners had not addressed themselves in the interviews. One day I was sitting with Olivia E, we were looking at the Google drive together, and the process made her remember

several of their former ideas and aspirations, which were long forgotten, igniting a talk about how their stumbling beginning had been.

The three methods, which I have predominantly used in my data collection, are all methods mentioned by Yin, as methods relevant for case studies. They form a triangulation of methods, which help complement each other (Yin, 1994). By doing archival research I find areas that I can further discuss with the owners creating questions for my semi-structured interviews. My semi-structured interviews are further validated by observing and participating in the settings, which are discussed in the interviews. When I am part of the clientele of K&B, I experience a better understanding of what my interview participants experience and react to.

The most dominant data collection method in this study has been that of semi-structured interviews. In the beginning of this section I addressed it as narrative positioned interviews, which is an example of semi-structured interviews. Semi-structured interviews is the overall definition for a multitude of interview techniques that are loosely placed within the definition of semi-structured interview. The definition of a semi-structured interview is based on it being fluid and flexible in its form, created based on themes or areas of interest (Mason, 2011). My semi-structured interviews are positioned as narrative, because of their structure, which is designed as close to a conversation as possible, while still asking questions.

Narratives have played an important role in this thesis, not only through a narrative inspired analysis, but also in the collection of data. All data is qualitative, and has been gathered through participant observation, archival research and semi-structured interviews. A great amount of my time has been spent in K&B's bar, listening to people talk and sometimes inserting myself in their conversations in order to get an explanation to something said or to take it down a road that is relevant to my study. Through hours and hours spend with strangers, I found that I was not doing semi-structured interviews as a participant in the settings in the ethnographical way associated with anthropology. Instead, I was a researcher putting my interviewees in a narrative position, where their story became the focus (Georgakopoulou & De Fina, 2015).

Interviews viewed from a narrative point is often where the role of the interviewer is to have the interviewee talk without conscious awareness to the situation with the interviewer (Georgakopoulou & De Fina, 2015), a situation that easily comes to exist, when the conversation happens in a bar. The interview is helped along, with strategically positioned questions that keeps the flow of the conversation without interrupting the interviewee (Georgakopoulou & De Fina, 2015). This is also a point that Hollway and Jefferson (2008) argue for by saying that face-to-face semi-structured interviews are the most established qualitative research method for finding out about people's experiences in context, and the meanings that these hold.

The big scope of narrative inspired interviews is the diminished interviewer control over wording and the information garnered. This often leads to expressive interviewees that might tell stories the interviewer had not thought possible beforehand (Georgakopoulou & De Fina, 2015). The points above create a strong argument for using this technique of narrative in all interviews conducted, but many of the same problem statements that are apparent in 'normal' interviews are also present here. The informant's contributions may be insufficient, theme and topics are still narrated by interviewer, and the natural barrier of holding back information that the interviewee might find private or affronting (Georgakopoulou & De Fina, 2015). It also sets a role for the interviewer, which they will have to fulfill to create the fluent process of a narrative interview, which is that of a good listener, because without a good audience, it is hard to tell a good story.

Finally, on the subject of narrative inspired interviews I find it important to address the issue of the mentioning of stories, because the interviews that I conducted did not revolve around great stories (Bruner, 1987). They focused on small stories, or fragments of stories, fragments that may have built themselves into a whole story throughout the interview (Georgakopoulou & De Fina, 2015), but just as often the interviews themselves were simply fragments themselves of an ongoing story, the story of the co-creation of K&B's identity.

These fragmented stories are introduced in the analysis as multiple quotes from different actors. The quotes have been translated from Danish to English, and can be found in the appendix in Danish.

A narrative analysis

Moving beyond narrative as a tool for conducting interviews, the focus now rests on its most used form, which is when it is a method for analysis. Narrative analysis is created on the challenge of understanding and interpreting the multilayered meanings that exist in interviews and the connections that these layers create between them (Georgakopoulou & De Fina, 2015). The conversation is interpreted in an attempt to recognize the embedded meanings and evaluations of the speaker and their context. Through narrative analysis, researchers can understand *“the contingent, the local, and the particular”*. (Georgakopoulou & De Fina, 2015, s. 250)

Stories are *“told in being lived and lived in being told.”* (Carr, 1986, s. 177) The first part of the quote is about the link with and to experience. The second part is about how storytelling activity is always a social activity. The two parts of the quote are interrelated, and thus inseparable. Using analysis of narrative, we activate both parts, because the way we express ourselves cannot be detached from the explanation of the dynamics of interaction itself. So by joining narrative inspired interviews with narrative analysis it becomes clear that the narrative telling is existing in the interaction with the researcher.

Eisenhardt builds on this interaction with his own argument for how to use a narrative analysis in the case of single-case studies. When faced with a single-case study, it is important to present the qualitative data in a way that gives as complete a rendering of the story as possible. The narrative analysis should be built on quotations from informants and then intertwined with relevant theory that helps demonstrate the connection between empirical evidence and the theory I place it in context with (Eisenhardt & Graebner, 2007).

In my case, this means that I create an analysis that tells the story of K&B and how they co-create with their stakeholders, and the relevance of this co-creation. I tell the story through my collected data, and intertwine it with literature that helps explain what the data is saying, putting it in a theoretical context. To some extent this context is based on the same premises as that of Local Motors, the start-up case that Prahalad and Ramasawamy introduced. Prahalad and Ramasawamy

looks at how a start-up can co-create (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2004), and my own investigation is building upon their findings.

Analysis

As established in the review, co-creation in start-ups is a phenomenon, which has not gained much attention from the scholars engaged in co-creation theory. This thesis has investigated a case of a start-up that engages in co-creation with their stakeholders. The goal of this thesis is to further explore the relevance of co-creation in start-ups, a point already made by Ozcan and Ramaswamy with their case, Local Motors, another start-up engaging in co-creation (Ozcan & Ramaswamy, 2014).

The research question investigated was: How can start-ups engage in co-creation and why is it relevant for them to do so? The research question will be looked at through a narrative analysis, that focuses on the perception of the owners of K&B, and how they viewed the process of co-creation between them and their stakeholders.

Using narrative analysis, helps me take into account the multi-voiced aspect of entrepreneurship and how notions of entrepreneurship rather than existing as static or fixed entities in people's personalities, are constantly being constructed in relation to something in the past, present or future (Fletcher, 2007). A narrative analysis is designed in a way that it interprets and understands the layers of meaning from the interviews and observations (Georgakopoulou & De Fina, 2015). The analysis is created from quotes, which have been gathered through the many talks I have involved the owners of K&B in, their customers and their employees. This means that it is built on an antenarrative, which is fragmented and non-linear (Fletcher D. , 2007). Through the separated stories that I have been told, an overall story has emerged, the story of K&B and its co-creation with its stakeholders.

The analysis is split into three chapters that investigate different areas of co-creation in the context of K&B, in order to be able to answer the research question. The first chapter is about the involvement of the consumer, before K&B opened their first bar. This chapter looks into the

initiatives that K&B did in order to include their customers, and the learning process they went through doing so. In this chapter, I establish that K&B do meet the prerequisites of co-creation by using the brand co-creation model (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2004). The model helps establish the relevance of the initiatives, and the chapter makes the point of the prerequisites of co-creation taking place in K&B already before the opening.

The second chapter is about the co-creation between K&B and their stakeholders after K&B opened their first physical bar. The main focus here is on how K&B created a platform for a community to exist upon. The K&B bar became the community platform, where the owners of K&B could engage with their stakeholders and co-create.

The first two chapters answers the first part of the research question, which was how can start-ups co-create. It does so by establishing some practices that K&B engage in, in order to activate and engage their stakeholders. Furthermore, it puts these practices in a theoretical context of co-creation to solidify the relevance of these practices for K&B.

The final chapter can also be seen in the theoretical context of co-creation, but it engages co-creation with contingency theory, in order to recognize the importance of the external environment. It answers the last part of the research question, which was why it is relevant for start-ups to co-create. It does so, by looking at the second and unexpected customer segment, which the K&B owners experience, when they open their bar in Westmarket. It looks at how the external environment creates uncertainty for K&B, and how they deal with this through co-creation.

Chapter 1: K&B before the opening of the bar

The first chapter of this analysis helps answer the first part of the research question, which was how can start-ups engage in co-creation. It does so by identifying some initiatives, which K&B engaged in already prior to their opening at Westmarket. These initiatives are examined through the brand co-creation model, first introduced in the review. The model establishes the prerequisites, which should be met for co-creation to happen.

This first chapter of the story of K&B, and their attempt to co-create with their consumers revolves around the beginning. It is not the beginning of K&B, when it was discovered on a yellow Post-It after a brainstorming session. It is the beginning of the collaboration between K&B and their stakeholders.

This chapter tells the story of some of the initiatives that K&B took in order to engage their stakeholders in the co-creation of K&B as how we know it today. It is primarily a tale, told by the owners of K&B. Their antenarrative of the initiatives, which they engaged in, is narrated into a story of how they engaged in co-creation.

The chapter is divided into three sections, which represent three initiatives K&B engaged in, in order to co-create with their stakeholders. The first initiative was that of the tasting events, a two-day event, which focused on the opinions of stakeholders, who K&B perceived to be their target group. The second initiative that I have focused on in this chapter, was the Christmas market that K&B took part in at Israels Plads. The final initiative was the focus groups, that were held only shortly before the opening of K&B, and where I was present myself.

I have selected these three initiatives, because they reflect the diversity and thought process that K&B have shown, in order for them to include their stakeholders in the process of creating the concept of K&B. To understand the relevance of these initiatives, I explain them in the context of the brand co-creation model by Prahalad and Ramasawamy (2004). The model introduces the prerequisites, which should be met in order for an organization to co-create with their stakeholders. By establishing that K&B have met these prerequisites, it becomes possible to address their co-creation with stakeholders.

Meeting the prerequisites of the brand co-creation model

This chapter helps answer the first part of my research question, which was how can start-ups engage in co-creation. In order to answer it, we need to understand what co-creation is and how one meets the prerequisites of it.

Earlier I defined co-creation, using Ramaswamy and Ozcan's definition of the term. They defined the term as a joint creation of value between organization and stakeholders, which was enacted through platforms of engagement (Ozcan & Ramaswamy, 2014). Their definition perceives co-creation as something that is shared between stakeholders. It looks at the elements activated in the process, together with the elements that need to be present for co-creation to become a possibility.

The brand co-creation model by Prahalad and Ramaswamy (2004), engages in the co-creation definition by defining four building blocks, which together, create the prerequisites for co-creation between organization and stakeholders (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2004). For an organization to engage in co-creation with their stakeholders, a set of assumptions need to be fulfilled as presented in the co-creation definition above. The brand co-creation model, helps define and ensure that these assumptions are met, by defining prerequisites that should be met for co-creation to exist.

The brand co-creation model was introduced in the review, as part of the section about co-creation. I will quickly summarize the model here, before activating it in the initiatives, to help define how K&B meet the prerequisites of co-creation with their stakeholders.

The four building blocks consist of dialogue, access, risk and transparency. The first building block is concerned with dialogue, as co-creation requires collaboration, and a deep connection between organization and consumers (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2004). Access goes both ways, the stakeholders gain access to more than just the sculpted front of the organization, and the organization seeks a greater access to their stakeholders, which expands the interaction that happens, when they purchase products or services (Schultz & Hatch, 2016).

The third building block, transparency, is a direct consequence to access. Transparency exists when both organization and stakeholders agree to share ideas and experiences (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2004). The last building block, is about risk. Co-creation can create risks for the

organization. By engaging in co-creation, the organization gives the stakeholders great power, by sharing ideas and unfinished products with outsiders of the organization that can misuse this information (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2004).

The argument I make in this chapter, is that K&B meets the prerequisites, which are necessary to engage in co-creation through the initiatives that they set up. The co-creation model helps as a framework within which all three initiatives can be explained and understood.

Before I begin the exploration of the initiatives, I need to address the definition of *concept*, which is the term that K&B's owners use, in our talks about their co-creation with their stakeholders. In my review and in the above summarizing of brand co-creation model, I speak about brand and identity in the context of co-creation. They are the theoretical terms used in the cases investigated about co-creation in organizations, but this case looks at a start-up, and thus it changes the rules of engagement. K&B do not wish to only create products with their stakeholders. They look to define themselves through the collaboration with their stakeholders. *"How do they (the customers) perceive the concept? We need to hear what they have to say. . . what does the concept mean to them."* (Emma, interview, 24/4-2017, p. 87)

For K&B, the defining word is concept. They refer to concept in all our talks, so I asked what they perceived a concept to be. *"A concept for me is the way you frame your business, it is what defines and frame your business. A concept can be an idea, an idea that holds different elements which is framed. . . the concept is both brand and identity in my opinion. They are part of the concept because we develop them."* (Emma, Interview, 24/4-2017, p. 86). Using Emma's definition of concept, it is clear that concept is situated in the same context as identity and brand for K&B. This means that the theory centering around identity and brand, can be used to understand their perception of concept and co-creation.

Having this knowledge, it is time to position the brand co-creation model in the context of the initiatives that I have selected for further investigation. The model offers a theoretical framework

that helps frame the initiatives, and lets the reader know if they meet the prerequisites of co-creation that Prahalad and Ramasawamy define.

The tasting events

I found out about the tasting events, through the archival research method, skimming through the google drive of K&B. After talking with the girls about it, I discovered that it was the first big initiative that the owners of K&B engaged in, to involve their stakeholders.

The tasting events took place over two days, in the autumn of 2015. At that time, K&B had their office at a shared office-space, but they were able to borrow a room for the events. They tried to create a room that spoke to the senses. *“It was supposed to be both a visual experience, but also a touch and smell and tasting experience. We had furs, and we burned this pine needle oil, and we also had muted light and music, so we would like it to be an overall sensory experience, and it was hard to create in an office.”* (Olivia S, Interview, 30/3-2017, p. 83).

At the tasting events, the girls served different kinds of meat and beer, which they were thinking of using. The overall goal of the tasting events was to get feedback on the sensory room experience and the products they wished to serve. The purpose of tasting events was to get a better understanding of what K&B was, and could be. *“Beer alone is not a concept, but there exist several beer bars that are concept bars. It is the concept that attracts customers, the fact that you have something special.”* (Emma, Interview, 24/4-2017, P. 86). The quote explains how it is not enough for K&B to introduce their customers to their products. They wish to receive feedback on all aspects of the concept of K&B, and develop it together with their customers, because as Emma mentions, beer alone is not a concept.

When K&B held the tasting events, there was no physical bar, but they were doing pop-up events and catering, still experimenting with the concept. Even though this was the case, many of the subjects discussed at the tasting events, are now part of K&B in the Westmarket, in pure or modified form. Going through K&B’s notes from the tasting events, I found that the participants

had mentioned the possibility of having a stall at a food market. The tasting events happened more than a year, before K&B heard about Westmarket.

One of the initiatives that K&B adopted, was that of the tasting platters with several kinds of meat on them. The people at the events also mentioned changing the beers regularly in order to make people come again, and that is one of K&B's strongest assets now.

Even though the girls adopted several of the suggestions, they also dismissed quite a few. One of the suggestions was about including more products to the menu, so that K&B did not only sell beer and meat, but spiced it up with whiskey and other hard liquors. Furthermore, it was suggested that the meat was supplemented with different Nordic tapenades, so that the concept became more like Nordic tapas. The girls dismissed these suggestions, but this does not mean that they do not still co-create. Co-creation is not about giving the stakeholders complete control of the organization, it is about joining together to create value (Ozcan & Ramaswamy, 2014). This means that K&B find themselves in situations, where they dismiss suggestions from stakeholders.

"We can't please everyone. . . we kind of need a filter that we listen through. We take it in, but we do not necessarily use it. Often people come with suggestions, because they imagine we have not thought about it ourselves. Like have you thought about having alcohol free beer or have you thought about having more beers and of course we have thought about it, but there is a reason for why we haven't done it." (Emma, Interview, 24/4-2017, p. 88).

The quote is an example of what Wilson and Woodside (2001) talks about. They perceive sensemaking as an expression of automatic thinking, which happens as part of the decision-making, and influence our choices. This means that the dialogue between K&B and their target group is created through the influence of past and present experiences. The participants are asked about their immediate opinion and do not have the opportunity to reflect for a longer period, thus reacting through automatic thinking, engaging in sensemaking as part of an automatic response.

K&B engage in dialogue with the participants, and then afterwards they reflect and make sense of the information given. Wilson and Woodside make a point about how the decision-making process differs between consumer and organization. The consumer acts from an automatic thinking, while the organization engage in explicit thinking (Wilson & Woodside, 2001). This means that the participants talked about what they would like, and then K&B investigated what was possible.

Wilson and Woodside's automatic and explicit thinking helps explain K&B in the context of the brand co-creation model. K&B engage in dialogue with their stakeholders. By hosting the tasting events, they give the stakeholders access to their products and their sensory image of how they have imagined the design of K&B. The transparency helps the stakeholders' form an image of what K&B is and what they would like it to be. The risk comes to exist in this example by the stakeholders engaging in automatic thinking. They say the first thing that comes to mind, and if K&B adopt without a critical analytic mindset, they might experience consequences that would have been otherwise avoided. *"The risk is, if they don't understand what we imagine, and then want to work with it."* (Emma, Interview, 24/4-2017, p. 88). Co-creation for K&B is not about letting the stakeholders change their beer bar into a coffee shop, it is about letting the stakeholders create K&B, the meat and beer concept, with them.

The fact that the owners of K&B and their stakeholders engage in two different ways of thinking, means that they also engage in two different sensemaking processes. I have already addressed the risk of this, but it also has an advantage to it. *"We become kind of blind to it."* (Emma, Interview, 24/4-2017, p. 87). What Emma refers to here, is how the owners of K&B are viewing K&B in one context alone and how they do not manage to look away from this view. The stakeholders present fresh solutions or ideas that the owners, then need to consider, and this helps them break from this 'blindness', they experience. One could argue that this is due to the automatic thinking the stakeholders engage in.

K&B may have engaged in all four building blocks at their tasting events, subsequently meeting the prerequisites for co-creation. The idea about prerequisites is, that even though they are met, it does not necessarily mean that you engage in the co-creation, that you desire (Sanders &

Stappers, 2008). K&B did not feel like the tasting events gave them the opportunity to explore their concept together with their stakeholders, the way they felt were necessary. *“The first we tried was just this tasting event around a table, and the surroundings were these office surroundings, and we really wanted to make this sensory experience.”* (Olivia S, Interview, 30/3-2017, p. 83). This led K&B to get a stall at Christmas market a couple of months later.

The Christmas market

In December 2015, K&B had a stall at the Christmas market at Israels Plads. The girls felt that the Christmas market was where they truly investigated their stakeholders and their desires, and developed on K&B's identity. The Christmas market stretched over a month, and K&B was there every day. They had gotten a stall made out of wood, and they decorated it with furs and skins, and replicated the atmosphere from the tasting events, but now in a more authentic setting.

“It was a way to test our concept on a different level, so we got to come out and try our concept and see if it could be scaled up. . . It was so different to come to Israels Plads, in a container that was made of wood, and we could just go crazy and decorate it the way we liked and test it and see what worked and what did not work. What do people need to hear and see and how do they react to this when we try it on them etc.. We could test several things as we went on, and rearrange and so on. Do people understand when we do like this, and we got to understand what the concept could do to the consumer.” (Olivia S, Interview, 30/3-2017, p. 84).

As Olivia explains in the above quote, the Christmas market gave them the freedom to investigate everything and anything. They could explore without repercussions, and they could fix their concept in a liquid state, that was changeable. The Christmas market also distinguished itself from the tasting event in several ways, and made the connection with the participants more authentic.

First of all the Christmas market was with customers and not participants. The tasting event had been a fabricated event with volunteers, that came together because K&B asked them to. Many individuals visited the Christmas market, and some decided to stop at K&B and try them out as customers. *“Well, there were some people who came by several times. . . People sat on the furs,*

and we had this basket with blankets, that people took from without encouragement. . . they thought it was really cozy. . . they hung around because we had created a room, where they would like to be.” (Olivia S, Interview, 30/3-2017, p. 84). This conscious choice from the stakeholders’ side to engage with K&B is important to the girls, and they often mention it in the context of co-creation.

The second difference between the tasting events and the Christmas market was the authenticity of the K&B set-up. At the tasting events, K&B had to remodel a white office room into the sensory experience they associated with K&B’s concept. At the Christmas market, the setting was authentic, with the walls made of wood and the chairs being woodblocks instead of office chairs. The above quotes from Olivia S, also relates to this side of their investigation. K&B are interested in their stakeholders’ opinion of this sensory experience, which they put such a great focus on, and this is also apparent when talking to them. *“People commented a lot on our music, we were playing jazz then, and it was Christmas and it just fitted the mood.”* (Olivia S, Interview, 30/3-2017, p.83).

It can also be argued that K&B grant more access to the stakeholders at the Christmas market, because they show a more authentic setting for their vision of K&B, which the stakeholders can observe and relate too.

The final difference between the tasting events and the Christmas market was the dialogue between K&B and their stakeholders. At the tasting events, K&B asked questions they had fabricated beforehand and the participants answered and discussed it between each other, careful not to offend others and their opinions. At the Christmas market, K&B engaged in conversation with some of the customers, and people shared what they wanted to, through the conversation, not stifled by an expectation or a set of unwritten rules. *“You are just standing there, and there are not much to do, and then you just want to talk with people. . . We just talked with our customers about the concept for a whole month.”* (Olivia E, Interview, 29/3-2017, p. 80).

The main point that K&B makes repeatedly, is about the dialogue between them and their stakeholders. The first of the building blocks from the brand co-creation model is that of dialogue, dialogue creates the foundation for the three other building blocks (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2004). K&B engage in dialogue with their stakeholders, and do so actively, as proven in the quotes above, but they need the collaboration of their stakeholders to engage in dialogue. Schultz and Hatch (2016) makes the point that most often it is the organization that needs to engage in co-creation, since the consumer rarely do so on their own.

The initiatives that K&B engage in, situates them in a situation where they can communicate with their stakeholders, and meet the prerequisites of co-creation. The engagement of the consumer then determines if co-creation takes place. *“We ask the customer about what they want and we listen to them. . . Our customers love to share their opinions with us.”* (Emma, interview, 24/4-2017, p. 88). K&B experience that their stakeholders want to participate actively in the creation of K&B’s concept, without reservations.

The automatic and explicit thinking introduced in the section about the tasting events, is relevant in the setting of the Christmas market. The customers at the Christmas market, base their opinions on the sensemaking that helps them understand and label the world (Weick & Sutcliffe, 2005). They form opinions through automatic thinking, and it is then K&B’s responsibility to take these opinions and look at them through explicit thinking, in order to find the relevant elements and adopt them into their concept.

Both the tasting events and the Christmas market was prior to K&B deciding to get a physical bar. The following six months K&B underwent some changes that also shaped the company. One of the founders left the team, and they became financially drained. The two remaining founders did pop-up events and catering in order to further explore their concept, but also realizing, that this would not be the way they should go.

In the summer 2016, K&B made a deal with Westmarket about them getting a permanent stall there, and they included Emma as a third co-owner, breathing fire into K&B again. Now they

needed to once again engage their stakeholders in co-creation in order to find out how K&B would fit into Westmarket.

The focus groups

On the 12th of December 2016, I had my first meeting with the girls of K&B. The following two days I was engaged in focus groups together with Emma, the co-owner, and Mathias a mutual friend and extern consultant on the project. K&B wished to have these focus groups, one and a half month before the grand opening of their first physical bar in Westmarket. They wanted to use the focus groups to help them refine their design, and get some last opinions on the concept itself.

The previous initiatives were based on the concept of K&B as a whole, which was reflected in their questions and fields of interests. The Owners of K&B now had a placement and room that they needed to become a permanent element of K&B, the first K&B bar. This meant that new questions were raised, and in order to answer them they engaged their stakeholders once more.

The participants were not friends and family, but instead they were recruited through social media. K&B announced on their Facebook page that they were seeking participants for focus groups in regards to their upcoming opening in Westmarket. This meant that the participants were people who already had prior knowledge to K&B, and found the concept interesting enough to follow on social media. One of the participants began following them, after experiencing them at the Christmas market. *“I was sold already when I saw your stall at the Christmas market last year. It was just. . . It just stood out from the other stalls, because it was like home-away-from-home. Even though I was busy, I skipped past some of the other stalls in order to spend more time in yours, it just seemed so cozy.”* (Participant, focus group, 14/12-2016, p. 90).

These people were beer enthusiasts, some even brewed their own beers, and one of the participants had owned his own bar before. They were what could be described as lead users, and they were given the opportunity to help shape K&B and their first physical bar.

The owners of K&B offer the stakeholders their version of their beta products, by giving them access to both products and design before having properly launched (Black & Veloutsou, 2017). *"We get a customer perspective, we get another perspective on it, than the one we have. We see this as our home. You get blind to it, so we need someone else's view. Customer knowledge."* (Emma, Interview, 24/4-2017, p. 87). They do this in order to create an enlightened dialogue where the stakeholders are given all the required information in order to truly comment on the concept presented. If the owners of K&B had hidden information from the stakeholders, they would have risked getting distorted feedback, which would have been of no use to them.

K&B are an open organization that share rather than hide their ideas. This is seen in the focus groups, where they asked the participants to help them decide on several aspects of the structure of K&B, and not just design and products. The owners of K&B were entertaining the idea of having a paying membership club, which was rejected by the focus groups. *"It is too business minded to ask for membership. A membership is a commitment, and then you are forced to use it."* (Participant, focus group, 13/12-2016, P. 89). *"I would rather pay for every single arrangement. . . I would really think it sucked if I had to pay 500 kroners, and then I went to Thailand for three months and then when I came home, it was exam period."* (Participant, focus group, 13/12-2016, P. 89). The owners of K&B trust the opinion of the focus groups, and discard the idea about a paying membership club.

The example of the paying membership club, takes me to the last building block, which was about risk. Prahalad and Ramasawamy argues that co-creation creates risks for both organization and consumers. This might be the case for organizations that works with intellectual property rights (Schultz & Hatch, 2016), but in the K&B's case, they stand alone with the risk. When the owners of K&B ask the focus groups about the paying membership club, they reject the idea, which means that K&B discards it. By engaging in co-creation, K&B trusts the opinion of few, with big decisions, regarding the concept of K&B. The owners take a risk every time they engage their stakeholders in co-creation. They adopt suggestions given by few, because they trust them to represent their target group. The number of actors involved in co-creation are to some extent irrelevant, it is the mutual relationship of inclusion and exclusion that is important (Bouwen, 2001). The owners of

K&B can co-create innovative ideas with few, as long as they are significant to K&B. The stakeholders participating in the focus groups are perceived by K&B as relevant actors *“we need to listen to them, and let them partake in the co-creation”* (Emma, Interview, 24/4-2017, P. 87)

Summing up

This chapter was designed to help answer the first part of the research question, which was how can start-ups engage in co-creation. The chapter identifies some initiatives that the owners of K&B engaged in already prior to their opening at Westmarket. These initiatives were examined through the brand co-creation model, first introduced in the review. The model establish the prerequisites, which should be met for co-creation to happen.

I have established throughout the initiatives taken by the owners, that the prerequisites of co-creation have been met. They engage in dialogue that is shared with their stakeholders, they are open about their ideas and ‘beta’ products, which is the block of access. They let the stakeholders come close to them and their concept, creating transparency, and lastly they situate themselves in a position of risk, because they listen and adapt suggestions from few, concerning their whole concept. These are the points I have established throughout the initiatives, which means that K&B do meet the prerequisites of co-creation.

I talk about K&B meeting the prerequisites of co-creation as if they alone engage in this process of seeking co-creation. I do this because as Schultz and Hatch said, co-creation is something that the organization engage the stakeholder in most often, and not the other way around (Schultz & Hatch, 2016). This however does not mean, that the stakeholders are not interested in co-creation, the owners of K&B experience how the stakeholders place themselves organically and situated in contexts where they offer their inputs.

The narrative story told through the quotes of the owners of K&B, makes it apparent that they feel that their collaboration with their stakeholders is to be perceived as co-creation. They believe that they go beyond the prerequisites of co-creation and actually engage with their stakeholders.

“What does this concept mean to me, and what does it mean to the other girls and what does it

mean to our customers. How do they view the concept, we need to hear that.” (Emma, Interview, 24/4-2017, p. 88)

The concluding statement of this chapter is that I have established that the prerequisites of co-creation is met, and that the owners of K&B themselves, feels like they engaged in co-creation with their stakeholders through the initiatives. To further explore the first theme of my research question I look into how K&B co-created, when they became a physical bar.

Chapter 2: K&B after the opening of the bar

In the first chapter, I established that K&B had met the prerequisites of co-creation with their stakeholders already before the opening of the bar. This chapter looks at the story of K&B after the opening of the K&B bar. It considers how the owners of K&B could co-create with their stakeholders after the opening, in a busy everyday life. This means that this chapter once again looks at the first part of the research question about how start-ups can engage in co-creation.

This chapter presents three sections, which revolves around K&B and its evolution in regards to co-creation. The first theme of this chapter is about the opening days of Westmarket and subsequent K&B's bar. It is based on my observations, and gives a small insight into the authentic reactions of the customers.

The second theme is about the community platform K&B created through their bar. Co-creation scholars often discuss co-creation in the context of online community platforms (Schultz & Hatch, 2016; Black & Veloutsou, 2017; Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2004; Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2000). In this theme, K&B shows how a community may exist outside of online platforms.

The final theme is about the associations that stakeholders and the owners of K&B have in regards to the concept, and how these associations may help explore the depth of co-creation between K&B and their stakeholders.

The opening days

The opening day of Westmarket and subsequent K&B, finally arrived on the 26th of January 2017. The girls decided to have a preopening the day before, an idea several of the stalls shared with them. At the preopening, I tasted bear and beaver for the first time in my life, and through the exclamations I heard around me, I could hear I was not the only one to have a new experience that day.

“It was a crazy experience to open, because it all happened so fast. We were done with the construction like two minutes before the doors were opened and then in came this flood of people. It was kind of special and then it just rolled from then on.” (Olivia E, Interview, 26/4-2017, p. 82)

When I arrived 15 minutes after the opening, I expected to find a couple of people hanging around the bar, but quite another view met me when I arrived. The small 18 square-meter room that is now the official bar of K&B was packed. People were everywhere, and it took me several minutes to say hallo to the girls behind the bar, since they were elbow high in tasks. Emma was cutting meat for the tastings, Olivia S and Olivia E were changing constantly position from pouring beer to talking to people that just dropped by to say hallo. The tempo was fast, but at the same time it seemed like the girls were having fun, even though they seemed a bit nervous to get it right. It was my first time experiencing the girls in action, and I was impressed by what I saw.

Strangers flocked to K&B. The most common phrases heard muttered was: “Is that real bear?”, “look they have bear!” and “what kind of beers do you have?” Strangers seemed interested in the concept, despite the opulence of different choices that was constantly present, walking the broad corridors of Westmarket. This was also the impression of the girls. *“People asked us about our concept and history, quite a lot.”* (Olivia E, Interview, 26/4-2017, p. 82)

The Nordic theme stood out to the customers. *“It’s so cool that there is mooseheart, and the interior, oh I love the interior.”* (Customer, Interview, 26/01-2017, p. 93). K&B had managed to stand out on their opening night, hopefully a good sign for their future.

On the official opening day, I arrived at K&B at 11:15 am, over an hour later than the big opening. While walking the corridors of Westmarket, I was stunned to see how many people were milling

around, but then again I did have a taste of it already the day before, when the preopening took place. Different to the preopening, this was noon and not night, something that made me believe that K&B would be empty when I arrived. One of the concerns that K&B had, was if they would have any customers in the hours around noon, because who drinks beer at that time?

I finally hustled my way to K&B and saw that the girls' worries had been put to shame. The place was not as packed as the day before, but people were not ignoring K&B, they were still interested in the beer bar. Especially the free meat samples brought people fourth, which also resulted in K&B removing them, two hours into the opening. *"People expected meat samples, they got mad when we removed them, but it was too expensive to continue them"* (Olivia E, Interview, 26/4-2017, p. 83).

The girls had focused on K&B being a beer bar that sold Nordic meat, with emphasis on beer bar, but it seemed as if it was the meat that excited people. *"I love this selling Nordic meat, it's so unique and well exotic I guess."* (Customer, Interview, 26/01-2017, p. 93). Customers were trying the meat, but were also buying it with them home to show guests.

Another point that was interesting was the engagement that the customers portrayed. People asked the girls quite a few questions about the origins of the meat and beer, and they also conversed with other customers, recommending the beer they were drinking or asking about how the meat tasted. The idea about making the bar with seating arrangements, which differed from the other stalls, seemed to be paying off. *"We noticed the table and benches and chairs as the first thing. . . it is nice to sit away from the main area."* (Customer, Interview, 26/01-2017, p. 93). People enjoyed the secluded place, and conversations happened organic, rather than forced. It seemed like the K&B bar was becoming the platform, to which their community could be built upon.

Creating a community platform

For the next three months, I got to observe and participate in the K&B bar, stopping by every second day, chatting with the owners and the customers. I saw how the girls went from being

inexperienced bar owners, to confident self-assured bar owners, and most importantly I saw how a community was created organically.

"We really have a lot of patrons, that returns on a daily basis, and that is really nice. I think this can be defined as a community, well there exist community in here, yeah." (Olivia E, Interview, 26/4-2017, p. 84). K&B quickly got patrons that visited on a regular basis. The noon hours were always slow, but around afternoon and into the evening, the bar was full of people. Because K&B had its own tables and a big bar where people could sit, they did not catch and release, like most of the other stalls. They had the opportunity to seat their customers, and have customers and personal mingle and talk. This grew the foundation for a community being created.

Hatch and Schultz (2010) define communities in the context of the brand co-creation model by Prahalad and Ramasawamy, which was used in the first chapter of the analysis. Communities can be seen as an entity capable of providing social structure to the connection between organization and consumer, creating transparency and through that, access (Hatch & Schultz, 2010). The community comes to exist through community engagement, social networks, brand use and impression management. These elements creates cultural capital that is shared by the organization and the community (Hatch & Schultz, 2010).

Most literature talks about community platforms in an online context, because this is how consumers can be mobilized and connected (Black & Veloutsou, 2017). The owners of K&B connects their customers through the space they create in the bar, giving the consumers the opportunity to engage in conversation and co-creation activities. *"We have talked a lot with our customers, and just talked a lot with people in general. We have to change things, based on what our customers say and the impression we receive from them."* (Olivia E, Interview, 29/3-2017, p. 80). Ozcan and Ramasawamy talk about co-creation platforms of engagement, where the organization position themselves in the same space as their consumers and engage in conversation (Ozcan & Ramaswamy, 2014).

K&B encourage their consumers to engage in an active dialogue, through the setting they create and through their own participation in the dialogue. They view their consumers as their equal, and reflect and act on the information they get from the consumers (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2000). This relates to the explicit thinking that the organization engage in as described in the first chapter (Wilson & Woodside, 2001), but it can also refer to how the owners of K&B draw the stakeholder into a process with them. *“When we were doing the music quiz, this guy was sitting at the bar and he was like “oh that sounds so cool, you’re doing a music quiz.” And then he helped us with it. He was part of deciding the songs and the questions and he was just so cool. Without him, it would never have been so fun, because he had this other view on it than us. Another perspective that we could not get without our customers.”* (Emma, Interview, 24/4-2017, p. 88). The example is not groundbreaking in the creation of K&B concept creation, but it illustrates how this everyday involvement with stakeholders leads to co-creation, may it be of the services, products, design or the concept.

The social community the owners of K&B have built can be seen as an eco-system of capabilities (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2004). The community offers knowledge, which they share with K&B; it may be about their impression of the bar and its products, or about the concept. Alternatively, it may be knowledge, which is delivered and understood outside of this immediate context of K&B itself.

One day, when I came to the bar to talk with Emma, she had just said goodbye to an interesting customer. *“When I told him about our concept, he told me, he was a historian, with his specialty in the late Viking time. . . It was so interesting to listen to him talk.”* (Emma, Interview, 24/4-2017, p. 88). The girls often experienced that their customers shared their knowledge with them in regards to beer, or as in this example, with history of the old Vikings. Hunters and beer enthusiasts were often the ones with stories to tell, engaging actively in the community. The girls could then take these stories and tell them to other customers, having expanded their knowledge.

In my chats with customers, I experienced this engagement from the consumers’ side first hand. People came with their honest opinion about what they liked and what they did not fancy, they

did not feel like they were not allowed to come with their honest opinions. Some even offered to help K&B in the areas they felt were lacking. One customer was a graphic designer and had owned her own company, where she was responsible for the social media. In our chat, she commented on how K&B did not manage to tell their story properly on their social media. *“They could create amazing storytelling with their facebook and instagram. . . Showing pictures and telling the stories of the animals they have here, or the hunt maybe.”* (Customer, Interview, 4/3-2017, p. 94). Before she left, she had given the girls her number, if they would like some consulting. This conversation spiked the idea of getting a communication intern that could take over the social media.

The owners of K&B managed to create a platform through the bar, from where a community blossomed. Customers spoke to each other and to the girls about everyday life or concrete suggestions for the bar. The bar became an entity from where social structure connected K&B and their customers. By creating a community, the girls managed to engage in co-creation the way Ozcan and Ramasawamy define the term. They create jointly with stakeholders through a platform of engagements, that has come to exist through the social structure defined as a capability ecosystem, and which is actualized through experience (Ozcan & Ramaswamy, 2014). What this means is that the bar brings K&B and their stakeholders together, forming a platform where they share their mutual knowledge, in a social community, that exist on the basis of their experience with what K&B is and how they would like it to be.

The owners of K&B feels like they engage in co-creation, but the co-creation I have discussed until now has been co-creation that requires the owners to participate physically in the community of the bar for them to interact with their stakeholders. A couple of months ago the girls hired part-time workers for the bar, so that they could focus on other areas of K&B. This means that their time at the bar have been reduced, and until now, co-creation in the case of K&B has been defined as a hands-on creation.

“I still feel like we have a good contact with our customers, and maybe even a better contact than before. Because when we are here in shorter periods of time, then you get a better contact with them, because you can better accommodate it and you feel more up to it. Whereas if you are here

all the time, you might be tired and you do not feel like engaging with your customers. So I honestly think it is better that we spend less time here now.” (Olivia E, Interview, 26/4-2017, p. 82).

The argument Olivia makes is that they being there less hours might have further intensified the co-creation. This means that they also trust their new employees to participate in the co-creation on behalf of K&B as well. *“It is important that we have some employees that are good at customer contact. . . Our employees are really good at listening to our customers and hear what they like and what they want.”* (Olivia E, Interview, 26/4-2017, p. 82).

The owners of K&B does not feel like the removal of them in person, and the implementation of employees in the everyday life of the bar, diminish the co-creation they perceive to take place. This is an analysis created based on the owners of K&B’s understanding of what co-creation is to them and how they enact it, together with how they perceive it to be relevant. However, it might be relevant to look at the depth of co-creation that happens between K&B and their stakeholders.

The three association words

When I began interviewing customers at the K&B bar, I ended the interviews by asking them to mention three words they associated with the concept of K&B. In the beginning this was simply done to see, if there was a correlation between what they had said throughout the interview and what association they had about K&B. Often people contradict themselves, and several times I had people say that there were so many beer bars popping up everywhere, and then describe K&B with the word unique or original. By asking the interviewees for three words that described the concept of K&B in their opinion, I got a better understanding of what they had truly been saying in the interviews.

The further in the process I came, the more I realized that these three words could help explore another aspect of my research. Dutton and Dukerich (1991) spoke about the organizational image, and how the organization will mirror, what they perceive to be the public’s opinion of the organization. Until now, an argument for co-creation has been made, because of the engagement between the owners of K&B and their stakeholders, both before and after the opening of the bar.

However, do K&B truly engage in co-creation or do they simply mirror the perceived opinion of their stakeholders.

Instead of only asking the customers about their view of the concept through the three defining words, I also asked the owners of K&B and their employees the same question. Define the concept of K&B with three words. By doing this, I could get a better understanding of how deep the co-creation between the owners of K&B and their stakeholders ran. Did they simply mirror what they believed their stakeholders were saying, or did they actually understand them and engage with them on a level where they shared the same vision of K&B?

The interviewed customers gave a multitude of words associated with K&B's concept. Nordic, manly, cozy, hipster, informal, raw and openness, these were some of the most frequently used terms to describe K&B's concept by the customers. However the most used word of them all were unique. Out of all of the people, I interviewed, only two did not describe K&B with the words unique or original. The owners focused a great deal on the quality and authenticity of K&B, but also the Nordic was mentioned, and like the customers, they also mentioned uniqueness.

When I told the owners about my little experiment, they were quite exited to hear about it, and what the customers had said. *"That is a really good idea, I haven't thought about it that way before, but yeah we might be defining it completely different from our customers."* (Olivia E, Interview, 8/3-2017, p. 79). They recognized the importance of them associating the same words to the concept as their customers, and agreed on the associations that the customers had stated. A few of the words baffled them, like hipster and manly, even though they could see where the association came from. *"Sometimes it annoys me how much focus there is on the fact that we are three girls owning a beer bar, and well other times I use it to my advantage."* (Olivia S. Interview, 30/3-2017, p. 84). Being three girls running a beer bar does not mean that the manly association of it disappears.

My point in asking for the three association words was to determine, if the co-creation that I had observed between K&B and their customers was as authentic as I perceived it to be. I believe that

by asking for three association words, I might have further proven that the owners of K&B do co-create with their stakeholders. It shows that the associations directed towards K&B and the concept is comparable, and that the conversations which the owners of K&B and their stakeholders engage in, is founded on the same premise. Using Weick, one could argue that both K&B and their stakeholders have engaged in the same presumptions regarding how they perceive K&B (Weick & Sutcliffe, 2005). They base their understanding of K&B on the same associations, which I argue warrant the conclusion that the owners of K&B is enacting co-creation with their stakeholders, and do not simply mirror their perceived opinion.

Summing up

In the first chapter I established that the owners of K&B had met the prerequisites of co-creation with their stakeholders already before the opening of the bar. This chapter looked at the story of K&B after the opening of the K&B bar. The main point of this chapter was the community that formed in the bar of K&B. Through the community, the owners of K&B could engage in co-creation together with their stakeholders, and the first part of the research question was answered through this.

How can a start-up engage in co-creation? This was the question given, and in the case of K&B the answer is through the community platform they create with the bar. They continue to work from the basis of the brand co-creation model introduced in the first chapter, and do so through the community creating a framework from where co-creation can exist. They use the community to create dialogue and engage their stakeholders in the other building blocks by having them participate in the development of new initiatives like a music quiz for instance. The chapter also established that a community platform, do not have to be online for it to exist. The depth of the co-creation was further established through the association words, which stakeholders and K&B mentioned in regards to the concept of the bar.

Furthermore, this chapter also began answering the last part of the research question, which dealt with the relevance of co-creation. The girls mention how the opinions, suggestions and collaboration with stakeholders, help them form the K&B that both they and their stakeholders

envision. Both Emma and Olivia E, refer in the chapters to how they go “blind”, and that fresh eyes help them in the creation of K&B’s concept. However, the most important point of the relevance of co-creation to a start-up is introduced in the last chapter, that looks at the consequence of co-creation.

Chapter 3: Engaging two customer segments in co-creation

The third chapter in the story of K&B looks into a surprising aspect of K&B’s development. The owners of K&B had done their research in regards to their expected customers, they had as already established, engaged in co-creation with their perceived target group. They held tasting events, focus groups and even pop-up shops in order to figure out what K&B should be. When K&B opened, they created a community in the bar, where they played an active role together with their customers. What they had forgotten to take into account was the influence of the external environment.

The external environment consist of outside conditions or situations that influence the performance of the organization (Burke & Litwin, 1992). In the case of K&B, the primary external force they encountered was that of Westmarket and the customers of Westmarket. Having their bar in a food-court, meant that people who would not define themselves as the target group of K&B were exposed to the bar, and K&B became exposed to them.

In regards to the research question given, this relates to the last part of it, which was, why is it relevant for start-ups to co-create? The question is introduced by looking at the influence the external environment has on the co-creation between organization and stakeholders. By engaging in co-creation, the owners of K&B creates insights into the external environment, giving them a new perspective from which they may expand their organization.

In this chapter, three themes are explored. The first theme is about identifying the Westmarket customer in the context of K&B. The second theme deals with K&B’s co-creation with their new customer segment. The final theme in this chapter is about the changed perspective, and the consequence of having this new customer segment.

K&B and the Westmarket customers

When you open the homepage of Westmarket the first text that is presented says: *“In the heart of Vesterbro, between Vesterbrogade and Mætthusgade, lays Westmarket – Vesterbro’s food-court, which will make the Copenhagen bellies happy. Come and experience a world of fresh products and experiences.”*¹ The food-court has attracted a diversified crowd. You can see both students on SU, and women covered in expensive furs walking the halls of Westmarket.

The owners of K&B often made a distinction between their customers, and the Westmarket customers. The Westmarket customers were defined by the girls as: *“You know, those people that walk into Westmarket and looks around and then they discover us and tries us out. . . they don’t know about us before they get here.”* (Emma, Interview, 24/4-2017, p. 86). These Westmarket customers come in all shapes and sizes, but the defining element about them is the lack of knowledge they have about K&B prior to their visit to Westmarket.

For further clarification about the term of Westmarket customers, the title is not for all customers of Westmarket, but the customers of Westmarket who engage with K&B. There exist two customer segments for K&B at the given moment. The customers I have discussed until now in the two prior chapters, whom K&B have expected to engage with, since they defined them as their target group. I define these customers as the K&B customers. The other segment will be called “the Westmarket customers” for convenience, and they are the ones addressed in this chapter.

Westmarket requires its tenants to open from ten in the morning to seven in the evening, all seven days a week, and no exceptions. This means that even though K&B is a beer bar, it is open already from ten in the morning. This also means that the clientele changes throughout the day. *“In the first half of the day, the Westmarket customers are here, and then the people that comes for us, arrive later in the day. So at the beginning of the day, it is older customers, and then later it is those we expected to be our target group.”* (Olivia E, Interview, 8/3-2017, p. 79).

¹ Translated from Danish from: <http://westmarket.dk/>

Instead of solely thinking about how to present their bar to their target group, they now have to rethink the bar in another context, where another crowd can be their potential customers. *“ . . . It is extremely important to catch the eye of people in here (westmarket), because when you walk around in a place like this, then you walk around looking, and then you make a choice about where to go. So it is extremely important to catch their eyes.”* (Olivia E, Interview, 29/3-2017, p. 80).

While hanging out at K&B, I spoke with several of the customers that K&B define as Westmarket customers. The difference in attitude between the Westmarket customers and the K&B customers were clear. Quite a few of those I spoke with, thought K&B was interesting, but did not necessarily see it as a place they needed to revisit. *“We have tried it now, now we want to try something different.”* (Customer, Interview, 2/2-2017, p. 92). This attitude differed from the K&B customers, who were engaged in the bar and concept.

Some of the customers, who started out as Westmarket customers, became K&B customers, after having encountered the place. *“I did not know about K&B before Westmarket opened. . . I live upstairs, so it’s convenient for me to come down here and grab a beer or two.”* (Customer, Interview, 14/4-2017, p. 96). If the defining element of Westmarket customers were that they had no prior knowledge of the place before visiting, then it reasons that the quoted man transformed from a Westmarket customer to a K&B customer, because he began visiting Westmarket, with the purpose of visiting K&B.

The Westmarket customer in the context of K&B, are loosely connected through some characteristics. They have no prior knowledge of Westmarket before their visit, and they do not necessarily find themselves interested in revisiting the place even though they enjoyed the visit, for them K&B is simply a new experience, and not their new hangout spot.

The owners of K&B have acknowledged and reacted to the new customer segment. *“It is a fortunate situation for us to begin here no matter what, because if we had been somewhere else, people would need to find us first and visit us with a purpose. So I believe it’s a nice way to make a name for ourselves and create attention around us.”* (Olivia E, Interview, 29/3-2017, p. 80).

The new customer segment of K&B is a reaction to the placement of their first physical bar. It is created through the interdependence that exists between K&B and Westmarket. Pfeffer and Salancik (2003) talk about resource dependence between organization and external environment. There exists resource dependence between K&B and Westmarket, because Westmarket has resources that K&B need in regards to customers and space. This resource dependence goes both ways, because without shops like K&B there would be no Westmarket (Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003).

The owners of K&B have experienced how the external environment has influence over their business. They may have imagined that by building their concept on certain characteristics, they would attract a certain clientele, but by collaborating with Westmarket, they have found themselves with a second customer segment. They embrace and welcome this second segment, but do they include them the same way in the co-creation as they did their target group?

The co-creation between K&B and the Westmarket customers

The owners of K&B quickly established the definition for the Westmarket customers, as those with no prior knowledge of them and customers, who did not necessarily revisit. They acknowledged that these customers were part of their customer segment and therefore their stakeholders. Some of the changes that they are working on in K&B are based on the realization that they need to include this new customer segment.

Until now, I have made an argument, centered on the owners of K&B engaging in co-creation with their stakeholders. They have done so by meeting the prerequisites of co-creation according to the brand co-creation model, and further created a community platform from where they interact and co-create with their stakeholders. However, can they co-create with customers that stumble upon the bar in their exploration of Westmarket and then never visit them again? I believe that they have the opportunity to do so, because of the inclusion they offer in the bar.

“It is so rewarding to talk with our customers, and as we have experienced, what the customers say, is often what works.” (Olivia E, Interview, 26/4-2017, p. 82). What this quote expresses is that

K&B does not discriminate between K&B customers and Westmarket customers, in their interaction with them in the bar. There might exist a community there, but anyone can enter that community and become part of it, for a brief moment. A point that is shared with the start-up case that Prahalad and Ramasawamy present.

The case of Local Motors, the start-up Prahalad and Ramasawamy look at, includes an online community platform, they discuss how all stakeholders can engage in the platform, in the way that is right for them and their needs (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2004). An online community platform can also be visited once by someone, who offers his or her opinion and then disappear into the oblivion again. Co-creation is based on engagement between organization and stakeholders, (Ozcan & Ramaswamy, 2014), but that does not speak to the briefness of this engagement. This means that the engagement of Westmarket customers, can be viewed as an expression of co-creation on the same level as the patron that sits in the bar every night. The previous example of the man that helped with the music quiz or the woman, who offered to help them with their social media strategy, can just as well be Westmarket customers engaging in co-creation, as they may be K&B customers.

This second customer segment is a reaction to the population ecology, which is the population density of the market. In K&B's case, the market is the Westmarket, and the competition surrounding the market, is the other bars located in Westmarket (Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003). Because of the population ecology, the owners of K&B have found themselves in a situation where they need to do something to attract more customers. *"It was so nice in the beginning, we were so busy, we were the only ones selling beer in here, well that has become a problem now."* (Olivia E, Interview, 26/4-2017, p.83) Several of the other stalls has begun selling beer, which means that the Westmarket customers to K&B have dwindled. *"If you wanted a beer with your food, you had to buy it at our place before, now even the fish shop sells beer on tap."* (Emma, Interview, 24/4-2017, p. 89).

In the previous section, the girls talked about how they needed to catch the eyes of the Westmarket customers. This can be seen as a reaction from their side to react to the needs of the

westmarket customer. The Westmarket customers visit Westmarket, often to see something new and to have a meal. This means that the owners of K&B, need to react in two different ways. First, they might need to begin to sell actual meals, an idea earlier foreign to them. By selling meals, they have the opportunity to meet the need of the Westmarket customers. The initiatives in this direction are still in the early idea fase, which the initiatives for the second reaction is not.

The second way for K&B to react to the needs of the Westmarket customers is by catching their eyes when they walk the halls. One of the ways that they wish to do this is by painting the barstools turquoise, and setting up displays of painted glass windows. These initiatives are a reaction to the uncertainty that K&B experience in regards to their position at Westmarket.

A way to look at this uncertainty is through isotropy, which is when it is unclear, which elements of the environment to pay attention to, and what to ignore (Sarasvathy, Dew, Read, & Wiltbank, 2008). K&B believe they know what to do and change, based on their observations of Westmarket and the other food stalls and bars. *"If you look at Duckit (a food stall), they do really well, and if you look at them with an aesthetic eye, then maybe you would not. . . well anyway they are not something for me, but it works and it is all up in your face and they have understood the concept here (Westmarket). We can see that we also need to adapt to the concept here."* (Olivia S, Interview, 30/3-2017, p. 86). The question then arises from an isotropy view, are the girls focusing on the wrong things and ignoring the right ones?

A way to answer this is through co-creation. The uncertainty the owners of K&B experience regarding if they focus on the right elements of their concept, can be addressed through the co-creation they have engaged in until now. Now the important aspect lies in addressing the right customer segment, the Westmarket customers.

The new changes to the design will be based on feedback from the customers. *"We were thinking about putting a lot of different suggestions up and ask our customers what they think about it. I were thinking about doing the map (another new idea) in photoshop and then ask a lot of people what they thought about it."* (Olivia E, Interview, 29/3-2017, p. 80). The intention behind this

thought is based on co-creation, since it activates the prerequisites of the brand co-creation model. K&B engage in dialogue, giving their stakeholder access to their ideas, showing transparency, and taking the risk of listening and following the suggestions of their stakeholders (Schultz & Hatch, 2016). However, having established that there exist two customer segments, can K&B then be sure that they remember to address the right segment?

The only way to be sure, that they address the right customers, is by asking them if they knew about K&B, but the owners of K&B are not engaging in market research, they are engaging in co-creation in their community. This means that they need to consider other parameters in their goal of co-creating with the Westmarket customers. In the beginning of this chapter, I quoted Olivia E for saying that the Westmarket customers were often present during the day, while the K&B customers arrived in the evening. This means that by addressing the daytime customers, K&B are able to engage a higher percentage of Westmarket customers, than K&B customers.

By recognizing and engaging the Westmarket customers in co-creation, K&B try to create a competitive advantage to their competitors in Westmarket. They experience insights into the Westmarket customers' ideas and values, and establish a new perspective, that can give them an edge in the competition for the customers at Westmarket.

The way that K&B reacts to the challenge of capturing and including the Westmarket customers can be seen in the context of the jigsaw puzzle metaphor (JPM), which works as a transformational design (Sarasvathy, Dew, Read, & Wiltbank, 2008). The JPM views the market opportunity as something that already exist, and the role of the entrepreneur is that of the explorer. The entrepreneur explore and design in order to fit the opportunity, they do not try to transform it (Sarasvathy, Dew, Read, & Wiltbank, 2008). The owners of K&B tries to design their bar to the needs of their customers. This means that they need to recognize the diversity of the Westmarket customers instead of stubbornly hold on to their original concept and design.

This theme has focused on how the owners of K&B have perceived the external environment of Westmarket, and engaged in it, by recognizing the customer segment that Westmarket creates for

them. By doing so, they have received insights that have given them a new perspective on their customer segments, but also on the concept of K&B. The last section in this chapter looks at what consequences this new perspective has had for K&B.

Restructuring K&B as a consequence of the two customer segments

In the previous sections, it was established that K&B had two customer segments as a consequence of it opening a bar in Westmarket. This meant that the owners would also need to cater to two different sets of wishes and needs. They recognized that the external environment plays a significant, bigger role in their business than first expected.

After a few months at Westmarket, the girls decided to react to the consequence of the external environments influence. They decided to take certain steps in order to maintain the original concept and still make a successful K&B in Westmarket. The girls decided to make K&B into different branches. *"We had a meeting yesterday, where we talked about the main idea having a lot of branches, and then the branches can turn in different directions as long as they keep to the main concept. . . Let us say that we have K&B (in Westmarket), but it does not have to be a hundred percent like the main idea. We can have a bit of color etc. and maybe we will make this more into a beer bar, and then maybe we will make an event branch and a distribution branch, and then we separate them. Because we were like we cannot do this, because it is not part of the concept."* (Olivia E, Interview, 29/3-2017, p. 80).

By branching out, the girls are confident that they can cater for both customer segments in a better way. The focus for K&B in Westmarket will be on the Westmarket customers, while the K&B customers will have the opportunity to experience K&B in an actual bar, which is one of the next steps for the girls. K&B are confident that the K&B customers will follow them to a new bar, and then they can focus more exclusively on the Westmarket clientele.

This might seem as a drastic decision from the owners of K&B's side, but it should be seen as a reaction to the external environment, and a proof of how the Jigsaw puzzle metaphor (Sarasvathy, Dew, Read, & Wiltbank, 2008). The girls have a two-year contract with Westmarket, and they

realize it is part of their concept now, and they are happy about this. However, they still envision the original concept that they co-created with the K&B customers. If they are to follow the teachings of the JPM, they cannot react to this vision in the Westmarket, but need to create it in another context.

This chapter has dealt with the outside forces that influence the decision making process of K&B. The consequence of the external environment was a restructuring of the internal environment in an attempt to create a design that works well, and create value for organization and stakeholders (Sarasvathy, Dew, Read, & Wiltbank, 2008). *"We have so different customers here. . . It is important that we listen to them."* (Emma, Interview, 24/4-2017, p. 87). This insight exists because of the owners of K&B's engagement with their stakeholders. If they did not participate actively to engage with them, they would not have the insights to make the decision of a restructuring.

"It is relevant to have others opinion. We have an idea of what our concept should be, but we need to know if it is even in demand and interesting, and how we should communicate it, and what is interesting to our concept. Maybe it is something completely different than what we have imagined." (Emma, Interview, 24/4-2017, p. 87). As a start-up, the owners of K&B work in an environment of novelty. Outcomes to novelty are seen as unpredictable (Sarasvathy, Dew, Read, & Wiltbank, 2008). This situates them in a role of uncertainty where they act, based on the external environment's influence (Burke & Litwin, 1992), but as earlier described using isotropy, it is difficult to know where to focus. By using co-creation, a clearer understanding of the external environment is achieved. Another way to look at how co-creation can help with uncertainty is through effectuation.

Sarasvathy et al. (2008) introduces effectuation as a way to gain stability over an environment for a limited time, and thus act with certainty. The effectuator, who in this case is K&B, has three means available. These means are looked at in the context of what effect K&B can create. The effectuator asks what effects can we create, given who K&B are, what they know, and whom they know. The course of action is co-determined with the relevant stakeholders then (Sarasvathy, Dew, Read, & Wiltbank, 2008).

So first we ask what effects can K&B create. K&B wishes to run a successful bar in Westmarket, given the fact that K&B has a strong concept created together with their stakeholders. They know that they need to revise the concept in the Westmarket context, where they know that their competitors are the other Westmarket stalls. These premises are discovered and handled through co-creation and the interaction K&B has with their stakeholders. This means that co-creation creates stability to an otherwise uncertain environment, once again making a point for the relevance of co-creation.

Summing up

The third chapter in the story of K&B looked into how the external environment played an unexpected role in K&B's concept development. The external environment consists of outside conditions or situations that influence the performance of the organization (Burke & Litwin, 1992). In the case of K&B, the primary external force they encountered was that of Westmarket and the customers of Westmarket. Having their bar in a food court meant, that people who would not define themselves as the target group of K&B were exposed to the bar, and K&B became exposed to them.

I defined a second customer segment, born through the placement of the K&B bar. The owners of K&B embraced the Westmarket customers, and recognized the importance of engaging them on equal footing as they had done with the K&B customers. By doing, so the owners of K&B created insights into the external environment, giving them a new perspective from which they decided to expand their organization. This answers the last part of the research question, which was why is it relevant to look at co-creation in start-ups?

The main points outlined in this chapter regarding the research question, is that of the insights that co-creation give the organization about their stakeholders and consequently the restructuring of K&B, in order to co-create with both customer segments. In relations to this, an ending point of stability in an otherwise uncertain environment was credited to co-creation. Without co-creation, the owners of K&B would not know how to react to the external environment of Westmarket and

the competitors located there. Co-creation creates insight into the stakeholders, but also into the organization.

Discussing and concluding on the research question

This thesis has looked at co-creation in the context of start-ups. It has explored the research question of: How can start-ups engage in co-creation, and why is it relevant for them to do so?

This last part will discuss and summarize the findings from the data and the existing literature. This means that I will divide it up into three sections. The first section looks at the research question through the literature dealing with co-creation, putting emphasis on the existing case of Local Motors, introduced in the review. The second section looks at the research question in the context of K&B, and answers it through the findings of the case study of K&B. The final section summarizes the most important findings of the thesis, for a final overview of the relevance of this thesis.

Co-creation's role in start-ups

Scholars' perception of the organization has changed over the last few decades. From seeing the organization as a standalone, to the organization as a network of suppliers and partners, to the final stage in our time, where co-creation happens with stakeholders (Ozcan & Ramaswamy, 2014).

This transformation can be seen as a consequence of the changing consumer. The consumer no longer wants customization but personalization, which means that the company can no longer assume to know what the customer want (Gambetti & Graffigna, 2014). Before the new millennium, the consumer was seen as a passive audience, subjected to one-way communication that had a predetermined role of consumption (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2000). In the new millennium, the consumer is seen as an active player, part of an enhanced network. They are collaborators, competitors and co-developers, that engage actively in a multilevel dialogue (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2000). This means that the organization needs to include the customer in the co-creation process.

How this is done, is centered on the argument of the uniqueness of each entrepreneurial venture (Moroz & Hindle, 2011). There exist no systematic guide to how to co-create, which is apparent with the case of K&B. Co-creation evolves, centered on the needs of the organization and the stakeholders.

An example of how to co-create is presented by Black et al. He believes that stakeholders can contribute to co-creation in two ways. Firstly, they can express their opinions about the brand, which makes them an uncontrolled force of information. Secondly, they can engage actively in the development of new products, which means that they become a controlled part of the process (Black & Veloutsou, 2017).

The start-up, which Ramaswamy and Ozcan discuss, engages in both aspects introduced by Black. Local Motors engage in an online platform that Ramaswamy and Ozcan call an engagement platform, where up to 5,000 amateur enthusiasts with interest in cars share knowledge. On this platform, they participate actively in order to develop new products, tools and strategies for Local Motors, while their clients can live-stream their efforts to build their car gaining advice and knowledge from the community. The online community has several times helped design new tools for Local Motors (Ozcan & Ramaswamy, 2014). Local motors co-create with their stakeholders as both an uncontrolled force of information and as a controlled part of the process.

This also leads to the next argument about how start-ups can co-create. Local Motors uses the online community of engagement in order to engage and communicate with their stakeholders. A start-up can borrow knowledge from established community platforms as Local Motors did (Ozcan & Ramaswamy, 2014), or from communities they themselves create as in the case of K&B. These communities are seen as a central aspect of co-creation, because they engage both sides, and give the organizations the opportunity and space to draw the stakeholder in.

What I mean by this is that the organization gets the opportunity to engage in dialogue with the stakeholders, give them access to the development of products and services, and show the necessary transparency that gives the consumer insight into the organization's culture, also

situating themselves in a position of risk. This relates to the brand co-creation model, and helps show, that if the organization manages to fulfill all four prerequisites, they are actively engaging in co-creation (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2004; Schultz & Hatch, 2016).

However, Schultz and Hatch make the argument that if the company does not manage to engage all four of the prerequisites, they fail to engage in co-creation. The organization may create a framework that shows the different outcomes that may happen, if the Organization has emphasis on some of the prerequisites, but not all of them. An example could be if the organization emphasizes transparency and risk, but does not engage in access and dialogue. Then they might end up in a position, where they look foolish and where the risk they take can lead them to being robbed by competitors (Hatch & Schultz, 2010).

This risk can especially be daunting for start-ups, that do not have a brand and an established identity to fall back on (Ozcan & Ramaswamy, 2014). This also leads to the last part of the research question, which was why it is relevant for start-ups to co-create.

When a start-up engage in co-creation from the beginning of their existence, they invite the stakeholder to take part in their identity creation and not just the product development (Ozcan & Ramaswamy, 2014). They unconsciously invite them in to help form basic assumptions, which was the fundamental aspect of culture that Schein discussed (Schein, 1990). The stakeholders help design, develop and manage the start-up (Ozcan & Ramaswamy, 2014). The start-up has the opportunity to tap into a great resource of knowledge that exists within stakeholder communities.

By using this resource of knowledge and engaging in co-creation, the organization gets an in-depth understanding of their stakeholders. Prahalad and Ramaswamy argue that the customer judges an organization's products not by their features, but by the degree to which the product or service give them the experience, they want (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2000). By letting the stakeholders create alongside the organization, the probability of fulfilling this desire of the customers are much greater.

The last point in regards to the relevance of start-ups engaging in co-creation, relates to the novelty of the organization. The start-up is new and is just developing its first products or services. It is at a place where it can easily tumble, because the foundation is still being created. When a start-up engage in co-creation, they offer their stakeholders the possibility to create the organization with them. When Nike co-creates, they involve the stakeholders in the development of one product, which is part of the Nike family (Ozcan & Ramaswamy, 2014). My argument is, that when a start-up co-creates they do not simply co-create products, they co-create an identity based on values shared with their stakeholders.

This argument is further discussed in the next section, where I once again discuss the research question, but this time I do it in relations to K&B and the findings from the analysis.

K&B and co-creation

In my analysis I found that the owners of K&B engaged in co-creation with their stakeholders. I explored how they did so, and why it was relevant for them to do so. This section summarizes those findings, and situate them in the context of the theory discussed above, in order to argue the relevance of this study.

The first two chapters answered the first part of the research question, which was, how can start-ups co-create. It did so by establishing some practices that K&B engaged in, in order to activate and engage its stakeholders. The owners of K&B identify some initiatives that they engaged in already prior to their opening at Westmarket. These initiatives were viewed through the brand co-creation model in order to establish the prerequisites, which should be met for co-creation to happen.

The owners of K&B engaged in dialogue with their stakeholders, they openly shared their ideas and visions for K&B, giving the stakeholders access to them. They let the stakeholders come close to them and their concept, creating transparency, and lastly they situated themselves in a position of risk, because they listened and adapted suggestions from few, concerning their whole concept (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2004).

This framework from the brand co-creation model, was also apparent after the opening of the K&B bar, where K&B built an engagement community from the bar (Ozcan & Ramaswamy, 2014). Doing so the owners created a forum, where stakeholders could express their opinions about the brand, or as the owners argue, the concept. This means that the stakeholders become an uncontrolled force of information referring to Black et. al and his definition of co-creation. Black's second definition of co-creation is also present in the co-creation between K&B and its stakeholders. The stakeholders can engage actively in the development of new products, which means that they become a controlled part of the process (Black & Veloutsou, 2017). An example of this is the man, who created the music quiz with the girls.

The community platform created by the K&B owners is necessary for them in order to co-create, because as Hatch and Schultz argue, the stakeholders rarely engage in co-creation on their own (Hatch & Schultz, 2010). An argument that I have made several times throughout this thesis, and which Ramaswamy and Ozcan share with me in their case study of Local Motors. They argue for co-creative engagement designs to involve the stakeholder in the co-creation (Ozcan & Ramaswamy, 2014). Co-creation is the joint creation and value sharing between the organization and stakeholders, but literature tells the story of how this co-creation is initiated by the organization and not the stakeholders (Schultz & Hatch, 2016; Gambetti & Graffigna, 2014; Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2004; Ozcan & Ramaswamy, 2014). This is also the case with K&B and the stakeholders, the owners of K&B create the co-creative engagement designs through initiatives such as focus groups and the community platform, and then the stakeholders engage with them.

The consumers are not forced into these engagement initiatives, they welcome them, because they seek the personalized experience instead of the customized product, previously offered (Gambetti & Graffigna, 2014). The stakeholders want to engage in co-creation, but they need the organizations to initiate the contact (Hatch & Schultz, 2010), and a way for them to do so is by creating these co-creative engagement designs, such as the community engagement platforms, which both Local Motors and K&B do.

By answering the first part of the research question, it becomes apparent that K&B and Local Motors engage in co-creation with their stakeholders, using the same tactics of co-creative designs. They both engage in community platforms as their main source of co-creation, the difference being Local Motors situating it online and K&B's is physical.

The changes between these two start-ups' co-creation process differs most significantly in the last part of the research question. In the last section I discussed why it was relevant for start-ups to co-create putting emphasis on the argument that start-ups co-create more than products with their stakeholders, they co-create the identity of the organization. The same argument is made for K&B and the co-creation with the stakeholders. The owners argue that they co-create the concept with their stakeholders, a term, which for them encompassed both identity and brand.

The difference between the two start-ups, and where the findings from K&B differs from co-creation in general, is in the discussion of the external environment. The third chapter in the story of K&B looked into how the external environment played an unexpected role in K&B's concept development. The external environment consists of outside conditions or situations that influence the performance of the organization (Burke & Litwin, 1992). In the case of K&B, the primary external force they encountered was that of Westmarket and the customers of Westmarket. Having their bar in a food-court, meant that people who would not define themselves as the target group of K&B were exposed to the bar, and K&B became exposed to them.

By engaging in co-creation with this unexpected customer segment, K&B was given knowledge to understand the external environment and react to it. This meant a restructuring of K&B, in order to include both of their customer segments in the co-creation process. By co-creating, K&B created stability in the otherwise uncertain environment, they engaged in (Sarasvathy, Dew, Read, & Wiltbank, 2008). Without co-creation, K&B would not have known how to react to the external environment of Westmarket and the competitors located there.

Both the case of Local Motors and the case of K&B create examples of the relevance of co-creation in start-ups. Furthermore, I argue that start-ups gain even more from co-creation than established organizations, based on the experience the start-ups have of co-creating the organization's identity with their stakeholders. The point that I make, could be the basis for further research into the area of co-creation in start-ups. The focus regarding the existing literature is on the value creation that happens through shared product development in established organizations. A focus for start-ups could be on the possibility of shared identity creation between organization and stakeholders.

This point will not be explored further in this thesis, instead a final summary and concluding remarks will be added, for clarification of the points that have been made throughout the thesis.

Concluding

This thesis set out to answer the research question of: How do start-ups engage in co-creation and why is it relevant for them to do so? This was done based on the problem statement that literature is scarce in the field of research that deals with co-creation in the context of start-ups. When reading about co-creation I found one example of co-creation being researched in a start-up, and I used this case of Local Motors to identify aspects, that could be further investigated. This created the basis for the research question, and I used the case of K&B to answer it by doing a narrative analysis, that told the story of K&B's owners' experience of co-creation in relations to their bar and subsequent their concept.

The analysis found that K&B met the prerequisites of co-creation already before the opening of the bar, using the brand co-creation model by Ramaswamy and Prahalad (2004). After the opening of the bar, K&B experienced how the bar itself acted as a community platform from where co-creation could take place. The analysis also highlighted how the owners of K&B were the ones that engaged the stakeholders in the co-creation, as Hatch and Shultz mention, the stakeholders are rarely the ones engaging in co-creation first (Hatch & Schultz, 2010).

K&B also found that the external environment played a role in their co-creation. Due to their placement in Westmarket, they got a second customer segment, but also more competitors. Through co-creation with these Westmarket customers, they stabilized the uncertain environment, finding that a restructuring of K&B was necessary in order to accommodate both customer segments. By engaging in co-creation, K&B were able to engage in a joint creation and value sharing with their stakeholders, co-creating a concept that resonates with both parties.

This thesis has shown the relevance of co-creation in the context of start-ups, and why this field should be a field of research. Start-ups have the possibility to not only co-create products with their stakeholders, but also to co-create an identity, which is shared by their stakeholders.

Bibliography

- Albert, S., & Whetten, D. (1985). Organizational Identity. I L. Cummings, & M. Staw, *Research in organizational behavior* (s. 263-295). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Aten, K., Howard-Grenville, J., & Ventresca, M. J. (2012). Organizational culture and institutional theory: A conversation at the border. *Journal of management Inquiry*, s. 78-83.
- Baxter, P., & Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative case study methodology: study design and implementation for novice researchers. *The qualitative report*, 544-459.
- Berg, P., & Gagliardi, P. (1985). Corporate Images: A symbolic perspective pf the organization-environment interface. *Paper presented at the SCOS conference on corporate images, Antibes*.
- Black, I., & Veloutsou, C. (2017). Working consumers: Co-creation of brand identity, consumer identity and brand community identity. *Journal of business research*, 416-429.
- Boje, D. (2001). *Narrative methods for organizational and communication research* . London: SAGE publications, Inc.
- Bouwen, R. (2001). Developing relational practices for knowledge intensive organizational contexts. *Career Development international*, 361-369.
- Bramberg, M. (2012). Narrative analysis. I H. Cooper, *Handbook of research methods in psychology: vol 2. Quantitative, Qualitative, neuropsychological, and Biological* (s. 77-94). American Psychological Association.
- Bruner, J. (1987). *Actual minds, Possible worlds*. United states of america : Harvard University Press.
- Burke, W., & Litwin, G. (1992). A causal model of organizational performance and change. *Journal of management*, 523-545.
- Burmann, C., Hegner, S., & Riley, N. (2009). towards an identity-based branding. *Marketing theory*, 113-118.
- Carr, W. (1986). Theories of theory and practice. *Journal of philosophy of education*, 177-187.
- Corti, L. (2011). Archival research. I M. Lewis-Beck, A. Bryman, & T. Liao, *The Sage handbook of social science research methods* (s. 21). SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Davidsson, P. (2008). *The entrepreneurship research challenge*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Dutton, J., & Dukerich, J. (1991). Keeping an eye on the mirror: image identity in organizational adaptation . *Academy of management journal*, 517-554.
- Eisenhardt, K. M., & Graebner, M. (2007). THEORY BUILDING FROM CASES: OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGE. *Academy of management journal*, 25-32.
- Fletcher, D. (2007). 'Toy story': The narrative world of entrepreneurship and the creation of interpretive communities. *journal of business venturing*, 649-672.
- Fletcher, D. E. (2006). Entrepreneurial processes and the social construction of opportunity. *Entrepreneurship and regional development*, s. 421-440.

- Foreman, P. O., & Whetten, D. A. (2016). Great debates in organizational Identity study. I M. Pratt, M. Schultz, B. E. Ashforth, & D. Ravasi, *The Oxford handbook of organizational identity*. Oxford university press.
- Gambetti, R., & Graffigna, G. (2014). Value co-creation between the 'inside' and the 'outside' of a company: Insights from a brand community failure. *Marketing theory*, 155-178.
- Gartner, W. (2016). Conclusion: An 'Entrefesto'. I W. Gartner, *Entrepreneurship as Organizing Selected Papers of William B. Gartner* (s. 341-345). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
- Gartner, W. (2016). What are we talking about when we talk about entrepreneurship. I W. Gartner, *Entrepreneurship as Organizing Selected Papers of William B. Gartner* (s. 94-117). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
- Georgakopoulou, A., & De Fina, A. (2015). *Handbook of narrative analysis: Series Blackwell handbooks of linguistics*. Wiley.
- Gioia, D., Schultz, M., & Corley, K. (vol 25 2000). Organizational identity, image, and adaptive instability. *Academy of management review*, s. 63-81.
- Gioia, D., Schultz, M., & Corley, K. G. (vol. 25 2000). Organizational identity, Image, and adaptive instability. *academy of management review*, s. 63-81.
- Hatch, M., & Schultz, M. (2002). the dynamics of organizational identity. *Human relations*, s. 989-1018.
- Hatch, M., & Schultz, M. (2010). Toward a theory of brand co-creation with implications for brand governance. *Brand management*, 590-604.
- Hollway, W., & Jefferson, T. (2008). The free association narrative interview method. I L. Given, *The SAGE encyclopedia of qualitative research methods* (s. 296-315). Sevenoaks, California: SAGE Publications, INC.
- Katz, J., & Gartner, W. (1988). Properties of emerging organizations. *Academy of management*, 429-441.
- Krueger, R. (2011). Focus Group. I M. Lewis-Beck, A. Bryman, & T. Liao, *The Sage encyclopedia of social science research methods* (s. 392-395). Sage Publications, Inc.
- Leeds-Hurwitz, W. (2009). Social construction of reality. I S. Littlejohn, & K. A. Foss, *Encyclopedia of communication theory* (s. 892-894). Thousand Oaks: SAGE publications Inc.
- Marziliano, N. (1998). Organizational Images: Between being and appearing. *Corporate reutation review* , 158-164.
- Mason, J. (2011). Semistructured interviews. I M. Lewis-Beck, A. Bryman, & T. Liao, *The Sage handbook of social science research methods* (s. 1021). SAGE Publication, INC.
- Meyerson, D., & Martin, J. (1987). Cultural change: an integration of three different views. *journal of management studies*, s. 623-643.
- Mike, B. (2014). Footprints in the sand: Edgar Schein. *organizational Dynamics* (43/, s. 321-328.
- Moroz, P., & Hindle , K. (2011). Entrepreneurship as a process: Toward harmonizing multiple perspectives . *entrepreneurship theory and practice*, 781-818.

- Olsen, D. (2015). *The lean product playbook: how to innovate with minimum viable products and rapid customer feedback*. Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Osterwalder, A., & Pigneur, Y. (2010). *Business model generation*. Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G. (2003). *The external control of organizations: A resource dependence perspective*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Platt, J. (2011). Participant observation. I M. Lewis-Beck, A. Bryman, & T. Liao, *The sage handbook of social science research methods* (s. 798-799). Sage Publication, Inc.
- Prahalad, C., & Ramaswamy, V. (2004). *The future of competition: Co-creating unique value with customers*. Boston: Harvard business school press.
- Prahalad, C., & Venkat, R. (2000). Co-opting customer competence. *Harvard business review*, 77-87.
- Pratt, M., Schultz, M., Ashforth, B., & Ravasi, D. (2016). Introduction: Organizational Identity: mapping where we have been, where we are, and where we might go. I M. G. edited by: Pratt, M. Schultz, B. E. Ashforth, & D. Ravasi, *the oxford handbook of organizational identity* (s. 1-23). Oxford university press.
- Ramaswamy, V., & Ozcan, K. (2014). *The co-creation paradigm*. Stanford: Stanford university press.
- Ravasi, D., & Schultz, M. (2006). Responding to organizational identity threats: exploring the role of organizational culture. *Academy of management Journal*, s. 433-458.
- Sanders, E., & Stappers, P. (2008). Co-creation and the new landscapes of design. *CoDesign*, 1-16.
- Sarasvathy, S., Dew, N., Read, S., & Wiltbank, R. (2008). Designing organizations that design environments. *Organisation studies*, 331-350.
- Schein, E. H. (February 1990). Organizational culture. *American psychologist*, s. 109-119.
- Schein, E. H. (1993). On dialogue, culture, and organizational learning. *Organizational dynamics*, s. 27-38.
- Schein, E. H. (1996). culture: the missing concept in organization studies. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41, s. 229-240.
- Schultz, M., & Hatch, M. (2016). Brand co-creation model. I G. E. Carroll, *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Corporate Reputation*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE publications, Inc.
- Shane, S., & Venkataraman, S. (2000). The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research. *Academy of management review*, 217-226.
- Weick, K., & Sutcliffe, K. (2005). Organizing and the process of sensemaking. *Organization science*, 409-421.
- Wilson, E., & Woodside, A. (2001). Executive and consumer decision processes: Increasing useful sensemaking by identifying similarities and departures. *Journal of business and industrial marketing*, 401-414.
- Yin, R. (1994). *Case study research - design and research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Zaidah, Z. (2007). Case study as a research method. *Journal Kemasyarakatan*, 1-8.

Appendices

Setting meeting with Olivia E. 08/03-2017

OE: så havde vi købt det her fadøls anlæg I, som bare overhovedet ikke passed til vores fustager. . . så vi improviserede bare, og fik fat i en bormaskine. . . og masser af gaffatape og så prøvede vi bare, men der var bare øl ud over det hele, men vi kunne skænke øl, så vi tjente nogle penge, men vi tabte også rigtig mange, pga øl lige ned i kloakken bogstaveligt talt. . . Så det lærte vi meget af. Så lavede vi toast en gang med vildt kød, og det var meget omstændigt, så efter det fandt vi ud af at vi slet ikke skulle have noget med mad og gøre. Vi holdte et event for et marketingsbureau og prøvede det at lave catering . . . det var et værre show . . . vi havde så meget vi skulle slæbe rundt på . . .og så kom vi til og tage alt for lidt betalt i forhold til hvad vi skulle have, men det var også noget man lære i starten, men der fandt vi også ud af at det var ikke noget vi skulle. . . og så fandt vi også bare ud af at vi nu skulle have noget fast.

N:Hvad gjorde i, i starten mht at involvere folk og få deres input?

OE: Jamen det gjorde vi meget ved, dengang Mie stadig var en del af det, holdt vi en del fokus grupper og inviterede folk til og komme og smage på det forksellige kød og sige hvad de syntes om det og snakke om hele stemning og hvad de syntes om det og sådan alle mulige ting. Hvad de syntes var vigtigt, så der holdt vi en del fokus grupper, og også bare når vi var ude på de der events og sørge for at få snakket med mennesker og fonemme hvad de syntes. Så har vi også lavet spørgeskemaer, og interviewer og ja kigget på statistikker. Så det synes jeg vi har gjort ret meget forarbejde til.

N: Nu har i jo snakket om det at i har jeres kunder og så har i Westmarkets kunder, hvordan synes du det passer ind i konceptet?

OE:Jamen jeg synes egentlig det passer meget godt ind, vores kundesegment er ligesom delt i løbet af dagen, på den første del af dagen kommer de her westmarket kunder og så kommer nogle af de andre som kommer her for os måske lidt senere på dagen, dem der kommer målrettet for os. Så i starten af dagen er det sådan lidt mere ældre mennesker og så i slutningen af dagen er det så dem som vi havde forventet lidt mere skulle være vores målgrupper. Så jeg synes det fungerer meget fint, og det er en heldig situation for os at starte op her lige meget hvad fordi at hvis havde

ligget et andet sted, så skulle folk først have fundet os og have taget sådan målrettet hen for at finde os. Så jeg tror det er en meget god måde at få et navn på og gøre opmærksom på os selv.

N: Hvis du skulle beskrive conceptet K&B med tre ord hvad falder dig ind?

OE: Uha (lang pause) det synes jeg er meget svært, vi blev spurgt om det her forleden, men jeg kan slet ikke huske hvad jeg svarede der. Må jeg tænke over det?

N: Nej, det skal være hvad der falder dig ind.

OE: Så vil jeg sige unikhed, og øhh kvalitet, oooog autencitet det er jo et ord man helst ikke skal bruge, men det synes jeg egentlig det er, det er et ret vigtigt ord i forhold til de produkter vi har og hvad for et valg af produkter vi har. Det at det ikke bare er de her helt nye hypede bryggerier, men det også er de mere traditionelle bryggerier i sverige og det samme med kødet at det er et meget autentisk udvalg vi har også med hele stemningen. Det synes jeg var svært, god øvelse.

N: jamen jeg spørg fordi jeg har spurgt alle de kunder jeg har interviewet om det samme, og jeg gør det for at se om i deler de samme associationer omkring K&B med jeres kunder.

OE: Ej, det er en virkelig god ide. Jeg har slet ikke tænkt på det på den måde, men ja selvfølgelig. Det kan jo være at vi definere det helt anderledes end vores kunder gør.

Interview with Olivia E 29/03-2017

O: vi havde et møde i går hvor vi talte om at grundideen har en masse filialer, og så må de andre koncepter godt skeje ud til alle sider, så længe de holder sig til grundideen.

N: hvad kunne det så være?

O: jamen så siger vi at vi har K&B, men det behøver ikke at være sådan hundred procent som grund ideen, vi kan godt have lidt farver og sådan, og så laver vi måske det her til mere en ølbar, og så laver vi måske en event del og en distribution del, og så skiller vi det meget ad, for vi har været sådan meget argh vi kan ikke gøre det her for det er ikke en del af konceptet. Vi føler at der skal mere herinde for at tiltrække vesterbro hipsterdel.

N: er det ting der er baseret på bare jeres ideer eller har i haft nogen ind over?

O: nej det er tanker vi alle har gået og haft i længere tid. Vi skal også have rewood ind over.

N: hvad er det?

O: det er et firma der laver ting med genbrugstræ, så vi vil gerne have dem ind over og se hvad de synes og hvis de kan lave noget.

N: hvordan kan det være i bruger kunden mindre nu?

O: jamen man finder jo ud af hvad der virker og ikke virker, og da vi udviklede konceptet troede vi jo at det skulle være i en bar med sit eget lokale. Altså en lukket bar, og vi har glemt og tænkt over at det bliver noget helt andet når det sådan ligger i et madmarked og det sådan er helt åbent. Og når det er så lille plads man har, så har vi fundet ud af at vi skal ændre nogle ting.

N: hvordan med når du siger at i skal ændre nogle ting hvordan finder i ud af det?

O: det er bare noget vi føler, jamen fx at man går og kigger på hvad konkurrencen er og hvad der får folk til at gå til de andre bare, altså hvad er blikfang, det er sindssygt vigtigt herinde at have blikfang, for når man går rundt et sted som her, så går man rundt og kigger og så laver man et valg til hvor man skal gå ind. Så det er sindssygt vigtigt og lave blikfang. Så man laver små justeringer i sit udtryk.

N: kunne i tænke jer at involvere jeres kunder mere i jeres udvikling?

O: nu? Det har vi også tænkt os og gøre, vi har tænkt os at sætte en masse foreslag op og så spørge vores kunder hvad de synes om det, så jeg skal lave noget med fx det der kort i photoshop og så spørge en masse mennesker hvad de synes om det.

N: er det noget du føler i har gjort? (co-creation)

O: ja det synes jeg vi, vi har været rigtig gode til og holde de der fokus grupper og snakke med mennesker når vi så har været ude og stå, den måned vi stod på israels plads føltes som en lang undersøgelse. Der gjorde vi ikke andet end at snakke med folk om konceptet.

N: er der noget folk har sagt som gjorde indtryk på jer som i ikke havde regnet med.

O: folk har gået meget op i det med at smage på øl som ikke findes i danmark, og det var jo egentlig ikke en del af konceptet i starten, men det har vi lært at lægge meget fokus på, fordi vi tilfældigvis havde nogle nye øl med i starten og så havde tænkt os at det skulle være en blanding, men folk gik meget op i de nye så det er så blevet en af vores stærke sider i konceptet.

Interview with Olivia E 26/04-2017

Koncept:

OE: Noget der har noget unikt, noget der ikke er som alt andet. Et koncept er hvor man har nogle retningslinjer at holde sig efter. Jeg synes at branding og identitet er en stor del af at lave et

koncept, både den visuelle identitet og branding og markedsføring og ja alt, koncept er ligesom hele virksomhedens dna man skal lave.

N: Skaber i co-creation med jeres kunder?

OE: Vi kommer jo til at ændre nogle ting ud fra hvad vores kunder siger og giver udtryk for og hvad vi kan mærke stemningsmæssigt.

N: Hvorfor er det relevant at arbejde med co-creation.

OE: Det er for at please ens kunders behov og for at optimere salg, det nytter ikke bare at køre efter det man selv synes hvis man ikke lytter til ens kunder, så kommer til at hænge på den.

At indgå i co-creation. Det er spændende, men det kan også være svært, for man har sådan en meget klar ide om hvad ens koncept og hvad man selv synes det skal være, og så kommer der en ude fra og siger det ikke skal være sådan og det kan være meget personligt. Men det er super givende og som vi har erfaret så det kunderne siger de vil have er også det der virker.

N: Hvad har i gjort ofr at co-create:

OE: Snakket rigtig meget med kunderne når de var her, og snakket rigtig meget med menneskerne generelt, altså vores venner og familier og mennesker man møder.

Risiko:

OE: Det kan være at de ikke er lige så indsatte i det som vi er og bare laver sådan et førstehåndsindtryk, at de laver en meget hurtig bedømmelse mens vi ligesom er dykket mere ned i det. Det kan betyde at vi bliver meget farvet af andres indtryk og glemmer ens egen ideer fordi man er her så meget. Det er svært når man har været her så længe at se det med de øjne man så det med den første gang, så bliver man sådan lidt åååh.

N: Tiltag i gjorde før vs efter.

OE: Inden åbningen så var det helt klart fokus grupper og snakke med familier og venner, og efter åbningen så er det mere gået over i kunde kontakt, og høre hvad de mennesker som er her fysisk siger. Og hvad deres indtryk er her når de kommer her.

N: Hvordan føler du i skaber et community?

OE: Vi har virkelig mange stamkunder der vender tilbage dagligt og det er jo fedt på den måde. Så hele det her westmarket er en community, der er rigtig meget fællesskab herinde.

N: Skåret timer ned, hvordan er det med kundekontakt.

OE: Vi er her stadig mere end alle vores ansatte er, hver især, så jeg synes stadig vi får en god kontakt med vores kunder og måske en endnu bedre kontakt, for når man så er her i kortere perioder, så får man bedre kontakt fordi man ligesom kan overskue det og har lyst, hvor hvis man er her hele tiden så er man måske træt og magter den store kontakt med kunderne. Så udstråler man at man er træt, så jeg synes faktisk det er bedre at vi er her lidt mere sjældent.

N: Ansatte og co-creation:

OE: Det er vigtigt at vi har nogle ansatte der er god til kundekontakt og som ved hvem vores stamkunder er og som virkelig gør en indsats, de har lige så stor en rolle i forhold til det her som vi har. Vores ansatte er rigtige gode til og fortælle os hvad de hører fra vores kunder, om hvad de synes om det eller hvad der mangler, så det er de rigtige gode til. De holder også regnskab på hvor mange der spørger efter hvedeøl for det har vi ikke haft i lang tid. De føler sig hjemme.

Åbning:

OE: Jeg husker der var rigtig meget medie herinde og der var rigtig meget fokus på vores koncept i forhold til mange andre steder herinde. Det var fedt fordi vi havde rigtig travlt fordi vi var de eneste der solgte øl herinde, det er der så blevet nogle problemer med efterfølgende. Jeg kan huske at kunderne var meget skeptiske og lige skulle se det hele an, ikke bare hertil men generelt. Nu er folk ligesom faldet til ro og har accepteret at det er sådan det er. I starten så kiggede folk meget og skulle høre det hele. Folk spurgte også rigtig meget ind til konceptet og vores historie, det gør folk ikke rigtig så meget mere. Jeg tror at det var fordi de havde følehornene ude og sådan lige skulle se det hele an. Jeg tror også det kunne have noget at gøre med at i starten var alt nyt og vi ville også rigtig gerne fortælle den her historie og man bliver jo lidt træt af at fortælle den hundred gange. Og i starten gik vi ligesom i detaljer med alt og det gør vi nok ikke ligeså meget mere. Sygt mange mennesker.

N: Var det som du forestillede dig da i åbnede?

OE: Nej ikke rigtig, folk forventede rigtig meget smagsprøver med kødet, og de kunne ikke betale sig for os og have. Og folk blev sure over at der ikke var flere smagsprøver.

Men det var en vild oplevelse at åbne, for det hele skete bare så hurtigt, vi var færdig med og bygge to minutter før dørene åbnede og så skete det hele bare, og så kom der bare en flod af mennesker ind. Det var lidt specielt og så kørte det bare. Det var så rart i begyndelsen, vi havde jo

mega travlt, også fordi vi var ligesom de eneste der solgte øl herinde. Men det er jo blevet et problem nu. Det ved jeg ikke om du har hørt?

N: jo det har jeg.

Interview with Olivia S 30/03-2017

Isarels plads:

OS: Jamen jeg er helt enig i at det var en stor undersøgelse, for det var en måde at teste vores format af på et helt andet plan, så for at komme ud og prøve vores koncept af og se om det kunne bære når man eskalerede det up. Det første vi prøvede var jo bare sådan en testsmagning rundt om et bord og så var omgivelserne bare sådan nogle kontor omgivelser og vi ville jo gerne lave den der sanseoplevelse, det giver vi også rigtig meget op i den gang.

N: hvad mener du med sanse oplevelse?

OS: At det skulle være en oplevelse for både en visuel oplevelse, og en røre og dufte og smage oplevelse og skind og vi brændte sådan noget fyrnåleolie af og sådan og havde dæmpet lys, og musik og det måtte gerne være sådan en heloplevelse for alle sanserne. Og det havde været rigtig svært og skabe det i de kontoromgivelser. Så det var noget helt andet og komme ud på israels plads i en container som var bare træ, og der kunne man bare gå helt crazy og indrette det som man ville og teste det af og se hvad virker og hvad virker ikke, hvad har folk brug for at høre og se og hvordan reagere de når vi udsætter dem for det her og hvad sker der hvis vi udsætter dem for det her og sådan. Vi kunne teste rigtig mange ting af undervejs, og rykke om og nye skilte og sådan, og forstår folk det her hvis vi gør sådan her, og forstå hvad konceptet kunne gøre ved brugeren.

N: hvad respons fik i på det?

OS: Altså vi blev bekræftet i at en af vores stærkeste sider var den der sanseoplevelse og helhedsoplevelse fordi folk ligesom blev og satte sig, vi var de eneste der havde stole, der var sådan nogle fælles arealer som folk ikke rigtig satte sig ved, de gik meget rundt og så gik de videre. Folk satte sig meget ved os på skindene, vi havde sådan en kurv med tæpper og på eget initiativ blev tæpperne ligesom taget op, og der blev kommenteret meget på vores musik, vi spillede kun jazz der, og det passede meget ind der og det var jul og sådan. Og de syntes det var hyggeligt der og noget som jeg tror vi brænder for hver især er at skabe rum og rumoplevelser og det virkede

helt vildt godt der også selv om det var så skrabet, hvilket nok også var en af grundene til at det virkede så godt, fordi omgivelserne også var så skrabet. Hvorimod her hvor alle forsøger at skabe deres eget rum, hvor når man går forbi så forventer man en bestemt stemning, der var det sådan mere marked makred, og så blev de hængende fordi vi havde skabt et rum hvor de godt kunne tænke sig at være.

N: kan du huske nogle mennesker derfra?

OS: Altså vi havde nogle som kom tilbage flere gange, vi havde en mand som solgte øreringe og jeg tror vi som personer, vi kan jo rigtig godt lide og snakke med personer. Og så står man der og der er ikke rigtig så meget og så man vil gerne snakke med folk. Og ham fik vi lavet nogle perverterede jokes med og sådan noget, og han havde designet sådan nogle øreringe man kunne sætte ind i øret som der så kunne sidde i spænd, og han havde lige taget patent på den, og han var så forbi nogle gange og vi fik alle lov til og prøve den her ørering, det var ret grineren, men han kom flere gange og han var en mand der havde mange penge og han ville gerne hjælpe os på vej og vi fik hans kort og han var meget business, men man ved også bare at han gjorde det fordi vi var tre piger. Nogen gange irritere det mig virkelig hvor meget focus der er på at vi er tre piger der ejer en øl bar. Men så igen, nogle gange bruger jeg det til min fordel, fordi man får bare mere hjælp, ved at spille på at man er kvinde, og så er det også ret sjovt at vise de der mænd at man ved hvad snakker om. Men jeg tror egentlig bare mest det handler om at jeg vil ses som iværksætter, og ikke en kvindelig iværksætter.

Nå men hvad var det nu du spurgte om? Nårh jo mennesker. Men du ved det var meget sjovt når man står uden for på et marked, det er jo ikke et sted man forventer at folk kommer tilbage til, jo måske for at købe nogle ting eller noget men de kom tilbage flere gange bare for at hænge ud og drikke nogle øl og snakke med os, det var ret sjovt. Og så var der jo også flere kunder der kom og efterspurgte noget forskelligt kød, for det er jo også noget vores koncept kan, "jamen så har de elg men jeg har engang mens jeg var oppe i norden og vandret fået det og det og kan i skaffe det hjem, jeg vil gerne have det og sådan." Det trækker nogle minder hos folk, og uh så er der skind og så får de lige flashback fra da de var i grønland og så fik de lige det. Og det startede allerede der på israels plads hvor vi har helt nye og kødet var skåret på en helt anden måde, og vi eksperimenterede meget med det hen af vejen og sådan, men du ved det at man tager det, for der er jo mange folk der har et forhold til vildt kød og norden, men de er bare ikke vant til og blive

konfronteret med det i deres hverdag så det sætter mange tanker i gang. Der er mange der har sådan en oplevelse.

N: Westmarket kunder vs jeres kunder.

OS: Vi har lige haft et måde her i forgårs for at genoverveje hvad skulle konceptet være, for nu har vi været her i noget tid, og nu har vi ligesom en ide om hvad der virker og hvad der skal foregå. Vi har ligesom valgt at skille konceptet fra her. Vi skal have separeret baren fra konceptet, for vi bliver nødt til og tjene nogle penge på det her sted og den konkurrence der er her., det format der er her havde vi forventet var lidt anderledes på nogle punkter.

N: hvordan?

Jeg tror at vi havde tænkt at det var nemmere og skabe det rum vi gerne ville end det er, men det er også fordi at så har man nogle erfaringer som man tager med i det nye fordi vi var gode til og skabe det der rum på israels plads fordi det var samme format med tre vægge og åbning, men der var det bare. . . men det er jo også noget med folks forventninger og markedet men jeg tror at vi har indset at det er svære og skabe et rum her som er nok, hvor sanseoplevelsen skinner igennem og det er nok til og få folk tændt, her kæmper man mere om kunderne og der handler det mere om blikfang og paw, man kan se duckit klare sig rigtig godt og hvis man skulle se på dem med det æstetiske øje så ville man måske ikke... ja det er i alt falde ikke noget for mig, men det virker og det er voldsomt oppe i ens face og de har ligesom forstået formatet, og det kan vi se at vi ligesom også skal tilpasse os formatet mere og den konkurrence vi er i her. Som er at skal vi tjene penge så skal vi ligesom se os som en ølbar for at vi er bedre stillet i konkurrencen. Men konceptet er jo meget mere end det, konceptet er jo back to nature oplevelse og kombinationen af øl og kød og vi vil jo stadig have kød her, men det er bare hele den her sanse oplevelse og den er bare rigtig svær og skabe her. Vi har prøvet og der er også mange der kommentere på det nu at det er dejligt at man gør ind i et rum, og at der er den her belysning og sådan. Men jeg tro ikke det er det der kommer til og bære os økonomisk og jeg tror at hvis folk kan tage det her videre og vi kan arbejde videre med konceptet et andet sted så tror jeg de vil tage derhen. Og så må vi gøre noget andet her. Så vi har ligesom skiltet konceptet ad og det er også meget for at tilpasse os westmarket kunder. Vores koncept fungere kun hvis vi ikke gør på kompromi med det og det tror jeg vi skal indse at det skal vi ikke, men så bliver vi nødt til og adskille den her filial med konceptet for at det kan køre rundt økonomisk.

N: inkludere kunden i den nye process

OS: Jamen i den nye process her, så har vi en ide med nogle nye vinduer, der skal være ligesom en kasse med gamle vinduer som skal dække noget af det her og som skille væg, og vi snakkede om at snakke med nogle af vores kunder de næste dage om at hvad ville du synes om hvis der var en væg her, hvordan ville du reagere på det og så teste det af på nogle dage og hvis man så får et enstemmigt nej så skal man nok lade hver med at gøre det.

Interview with Emma 24/04-2017

N: hvad er en Westmarket kunde?

E: Jamen du ved de der mennesker, som kommer til Westmarket og så går de og kigger på det hele, og så opdager de os, og prøver os, og så prøver de måske også et par andre steder. Altså de er ikke kommet her med det formål at besøge os ligesom vores faste kunder. Normalt ved de slet ikke vi eksistere før de ser os her.

N: Hvad indebære koncept for dig?

E: Koncept for mig er det der indrammer ens business. Det der definere og indrammer ens business. Et koncept kan være en ide, en ide indebærer at det indeholder nogle elementer. Så øl alene er ikke et koncept, men der findes ølbarer som er koncepter. Og på den måde kan man ligesom sige at det indrammer det. Det er ens koncept som tiltrækker ens kunder, det at man har noget specielt. Koncept i min verden er det som man holder sig efter.

Koncept er både vores brand og identitet, det er jo de vi udvikler vores brand på og vores identitet, som er det nordiske.

N: hvordan indgår i i co-creation?

E: vi har jo meget forskellige kunder, dem der kommer her for special øl, og dem der bare kommer for en øl og så dem der kommer fordi det bare ser så hyggeligt ud. Der er også en stor del der bare gerne vil spise her og have en øl, og det er lige meget hvad for en øl det er. De vil bare gerne have en oplevelse herinde.

N: Hvorfor mener du det er relevant at inddrage jeres kunder i det her?

E: At have andres meninger. Vi har jo en ide om hvad vores koncept skal være, men vi skal jo også vide om det overhovedet efterspørges og er interesseant og hvordan vi så skal kommunikere og også hvad der er interessant i vores koncept. Måske er det noget helt andet end det vi har tænkt i

starten. Nogle gange skal man også passe på hvor meget man egentlig lytter til dem, for vi har jo også selv en god forståelse af hvad der er relevant og fungere for os.

N: hvordan?

E: Jamen så bestemmer vi at vi have en quiz, fordi mandag og tirsdag er så stille, men hvad for en quiz skal det være? Skal det være en musik quiz, eller en nordisk quiz eller madquiz, og så får vi input fra folk, så de ligesom kan sige hvad de vil have. Men det er altid sjovt at have andres ideer og tanker, for så kommer der noget helt andet ud af det, og jeg var jo ikke med fra start, så det har også taget mig noget tid og sætte mig ind i hvad det her koncept betød for de andre, og hvad det betyder for mig, eller hvordan jeg ser på det, og det er jo det samme for vores kunder. Hvordan ser de konceptet? Vi må høre hvad de synes om det og deres umiddelbare tanker.

N: Hvad føler du i har gjort for at co-create.

E: Markedsundersøgelser, som var test på hvordan vi skulle og om det gav mening for os, og det gjorde det jo så. At spørge kunder og så hvad de efterspørger, og lytte til dem. Det at interagere med baren. Kigger de på skiltene, eller kigger de ikke på skiltene, forstår de hvad der står eller forstår de ikke hvad der står. Hvad er det folk spørg om, så vi hele tiden optimere. Og forsøge at forstå hvordan vi kan tage det ind.

N: Hvad får i ud af at lade dem være en del af processen.?

E: Jamen vi får jo et kunde perspektiv, vi får jo et andet perspektiv på det, som vi jo ikke rigtig har. Vi ser jo det her som vores hjem, man bliver jo ligesom blind på det her, så helt sikkert det.

Customer knowledge. Vi får ideer. Mange der synes det er mega fedt. Som siger ting som det her er nice. Som da vi skulle snakke om musikquizen, så var der en mand der sad her og var sådan årh skal i lave en musik quiz fuck hvor nice, og så hjalp han til, og bestemte sange og spørgsmål og han var bare helt vild sej. Uden ham havde vi ikke lavet den så sjov. For han havde en anden indstilling til den end os. Et andet perspektiv som vi ikke kunn få uden vores kunder.

N: har du andre eksempler på kunder der på den måde giver noget til jer?

E: Øhmm, jamen jeg talte med den her mand en dag, og jeg fortalte ham om vores concept og sådan, og så fortalte han mig at han var historiker, og hans speciale var den sidste del af vikingetiden. Og vores koncept er ligesom taget fra den tid af kan man godt sige. Og så snakkede vi om berserk, og han fortalte om hvor det stammede fra og sådan. Det var virkelig interessant at snakke med ham.

N: Risikoen af at inddrage dem.

E: Risikoen er hvis man ikke forstår hvad vi vil med vores koncept og man så vil arbejde med det. Der er en del efterspørgsel på billig øl, men vi kan ikke have billig øl, for det er ikke en del af vores koncept. Der er mange der vil have mad, men vi kan ikke have mad for det er ikke en del af vores koncept. Så vi skal holde øje med hvad vi tager ind og diskutere videre. Så bare fordi man taler med nogle, behøver man ikke at følge deres anvisninger og foreslag. Så kan man bare sige tak og så hey hey. Der er jo den risiko for at tage dem ind på den side.

N: Overvejelser når i tager imod foreslag?

E: Vi vil jo gerne optimere vores salg, så lytter til hvad de har at sige om det. Der kommer fx rigtig mange ølentusaister, og de vil gerne se noget nyt hele tiden og hver gang og det går jo ikke. Vi kan ikke have så mange ting på lageret af gangen, og vi skal jo bestille en palle af gangen. Vi kan ikke please alle. Men det er en god tilgang at have at lytte hvad folk har at sige, men så sortere i det. Vi skal ligesom have et filter vi lytter igennem. Vi tager det ind men behøver ikke at bruge det. Vi er begyndt at forstå hvad der virker her i westmarket, men det har jo taget tid og komme dertil, og finde ud af hvad folk vil have. Men det er bare nice at folk engagere og vil komme med foreslag, men nogle gange er det også fordi de tror vi ikke selv har tænkt på det. Har i tænkt over at have alkohol fri øl eller har i tænkt over at have flere øl og selvfølgelig har vi tænkt over det, men der er en reason til at vi ikke har gjort det. Vi tænker hele tiden at veje op og give det mening. Vi skal jo tænke på dem der kommer her for vores skyld og for special øllen.

N: Processen i forhold til foreslag.

E: Nu når vi ikke arbejder så meget sammen her så skriver vi sammen på messenger hele tiden om alt det vigtige. Nu da vi har kontoret kan vi få vendt alt. Hvis jeg skulle få et godt foreslag så ville jeg skrive det på facebook, og så kunne vi tage det ordentligt en anden gang. Men man slænger det ud så folk kan tænke på det og så tager vi det så face to face når vi har mulighed for det.

Afsluttende snak

E: Førhen, hvis du ville have en øl med din mad, så skulle du købe den hos os. Nu sælger selv fiskemanden øl på hane. Seriøst fiskemanden? Så vi har bare slet ikke så mange kunder nu. Men det bliver forhåbentlig ændret snart.

Focus group 13/12-2017

Emma is finishing up the focus group, and the last point they will talk about is the paying membership club, that Emma introduces the concept of.

I1: Jeg kan forstå at i gerne vil gøre det, for at få ambassadører og sådan, men for mig er det en sindssyg høj pris for noget der er uprøvet (500 om året), det kan jeg ikke være med i følelsesmæssigt.

I2: Nej det kan jeg heller ikke, men jeg synes det at man har en eller anden tilknytning og rabatordning, men jeg synes stadig at man kunne være en form for ambassadør for jer, men at man så betalte for hvert enkelte arrangement og måske var med på en liste der fik tilbudet. Det tror jeg er meget bedre. Jeg synes det ville være mega ærgeligt hvis jeg betalte 500 kroner, og så tog jeg lige tre måneder til thailand og så var det eksamensperiode og så har jeg ikke været med til et eneste arrangement.

I1: Det er også bare for meget business at be om medlemskab.

I3: Medlemskab forpligter og så skal man nærmest bruge det.

I1: Man ville være ærgerlig over at skyde penge i jer hvis i nu kikser, så hellere overveje det når i er etableret.

Focus group 14/12-2017

E: okay lækkert, er der noget andet ved vores koncept som i tænker omkring? (læser beskrivelse af koncept op) hvordan lyder i det?

R: jeg synes det lyder rigtig hyggeligt, men altså jeg var solgt allerede da jeg så jeres bod ved julemarkedet sidste år, det var bare.. den stod bare frem fra de andre boder nemlig fordi den var sådan home away from agtig, så selv om jeg havde travlt så sprang jeg nogle af de andre boder over for at se på jeres mere for den bare virkede så hyggelig.

E: hvor sødt:

R: så jeg har egentlig bare gået og ventet på i kom i gang. Så for mig er det meget det der med at det er home away from home, og med alle dyreskindene og det bare virker hyggeligt.

C: ja også det der med at man bare lige kan droppe ind på vej hjem fra arbejde.

R: det virker også som om det ikke skræmmer folk væk som ikke er kæmpe øl entusiaster, de ville også finde det spændende.

C: ja man tænker sådan uh det lyder spændende.

E: hvis man lavede sådan en aften hvor man præsenterede menuen og sådan, ville i så komme?

R: jeg ville synes det var rigtig relevant, og jeg kommer generelt meget sådan nogle steder.

C: ja og jeg kommer for lidt.

R: ja altså jeg kommer fx også på nørre bryghus ølklub fx, og betaler kontinentet gerne det er bare steget meget hurtigt, fra at være 200 til og være 380 nu.

E: betaler du gerne det?

R: ja altså for det jeg får for det, men det er bare steget meget hurtigt, hvor det ville have været bedre hvis det var gledet sådan mere så os der har været med fra starten ikke føler at man nærmest får sådan et slag i baghovedet. Men der får man, du kan komme ned og drikke en øl om ugen, de har sådan et sortiment på tre tror jeg, og så kan man ellers komme en gang om måneden til sådan et foredrag med øl og ikke bare deres egne men om øl fra hele verden hvor Emil deres Brygger så fortæller om de her øl, og så får du en dl ca og så får man nogle historier og så bliver man mere tilbøjelig at prøve nyt. Og især hvis de inviterer brygmester eller for jer slagtermester forbi til at fortælle om noget speciel viden så kommer jeg meget gerne forbi fordi det er spændende. Og man skaber også lidt mere de der familiære relationer til stedet så man er mere tilbøjelig til og tage de steder i stedet, så man bliver lidt det der stamkunde, og det kan jeg rigtig godt lide at man sådan er fast et sted.

E: er der mere som du gerne vil have ud af det her medlemskab med dem?

R: jeg synes det er meget hyggeligt med events, nørrebro bryghus har fx lavet påskeevents så havde de hængt påskeæg som man så skulle finde og så kunne ens nr så blive trukket og så kunne man så vinde og sådan

E: så sådan nogle sjove ting, men hvad med procent? Får du det i baren?

R: ja du får ti procent for alt mad og øl men ud over det så får du når du har fødselsdag får mulighed for at spise tre-retters med tilhørende øl for to personer til halv pris, hvilket gør at vi i hvertfald to gange om året går ned og spiser den her store menu

E: det er smart

R: ja så det er ens faste sted og fejre fødselsdag hvid den ikke falder på en søndag som min gjorde i år. Ja og så ville det være fedt med en medlemsmail som forklare hvad der er på programmet det næste stykke tid så man ved det og så får man måske lov til og deltage i arrangementer billigere fordi man er medlem.

E: er du medlem af nogle?

C: nej

E: Hvad med sådan noget som Matas eller?

C: nårh ja, ja masser så.

E: hvad får du så ud af det?

C: jamen bare det at få en mail og blive gjort opmærksom på noget, så ja egentlig mest det at blive gjort opmærksom på noget, for jeg synes jeg lever sådan et travlt liv så det at blive gjort opmærksom på noget på min mail eller facebook så er der sådan at man bliver opmærksom, sådan nå er der det?

R: ja jeg synes bare at nogle gange drukner på min facebook.

C: ja det går det nok også på min. Så det er nok mest på mail at jeg sådan bliver gjort opmærksom.

E: for vi havde nemlig tænkt at vi skulle lave sådan nogle medlemskaber eller medlemklub, så folk kunne købe for en bestemt pris eller hvor vi fortæller om det kød eller bajer og man så kan få 5 eller 10 procent i baren og så en masse forskellige events og så som skulle have forskellige navne som ulve aften eller bjørne eller elg aften hvor medlemmer kan komme. Er det noget i kunne være interesseret i?

R: ja helt klart.

C: dte kan jeg også godt lide sådan nogle events aftner, jeg er også medlem af Change hvor jeg kommer til deres medlemsaftner en gang i mellem, det kan jeg godt lide. Så får man bare set den nye kollektion før andre, det er ikke fordi jeg skal se den før andre, men det er meget hyggeligt og så har man prøvet det.

R: ja der er også en anden ro ved det måske, for så bliver det hele præsenteret.

C: ja jeg har også arbejdet inde i magasin i mad og vin og vi havde sådan nogle aftner hvor levenradøre kom ind og præsenterede ting og det var ikke fordi jeg altid købte noget men alligevel var det fedt og høre om og nogle gange bliver man fristet.

R: det er også det der med historien, for så er det ikke længere at man fik noget chokolade, men man fik noget chokolade af ham her som fik det lavet her og med de her råvare og man kan sådan linke det til mange flere ting.

C: ja man får også lyst til mere og anbefale ting og sådan, så hvis jeg fx var nede hos jer og høre om kød og øl så ville jeg være meget mere sådan årh det her skal i prøve og sådan og så har man lige den ekstra historie og fortælle, og det kan man jo også mærke på andre.

Interview with customers 26/01-2017

N: Hvad tænker I om hvad I ser?

I1: jamen jeg kan virkelig godt lide det her, også det her med det nordiske tema. Jeg elsker at de sælger nordisk kød. Man kan vel egentlig sige at det er ret unikt og eksotisk.

I2: ja det nordiske er ret unikt, og så er det jo fantastisk at man kan få elghjerte, ja og bare indretningen her. Amen det er jeg ret vild med.

I1: ja det er træ og sådan ret råt i det.

N: hvad var det første i lagde mærke til da i så stedet?

I2: jamen vi så bordet og bænkeene først, og så lagde vi mærke til baren, og alt decorationen, og så så vi pigerne, og det var først efter det vi lagde mærke til navnet. Vi havde godt set navnet inde på Westmarkets hjemmeside. Så det skulle vi da prøve.

I1: Ja det er lidt spændende, med det her concept og så også indretningen. Jeg kan godt lide at man ikke skal sidde midt ude i det hele, men at man sætter lidt væk fra fællesarealet.

Interview with customers 02/02-2017

N: Hvad synes I om K&B?

I1: Det er rigtig fint. Pænt sted og god service.

I2: ja det er en fin bar.

N: kunne I forestille jer at komme igen?

I1: det tror jeg ikke.

N: hvorfor ikke?

I1: jamen nu har vi prøvet det her, og så vil vi prøve noget andet næste gang. Vi kan godt lide og prøve noget forskelligt hele tiden.

Interview with customers 04/03-2017

N: jeg skal lige vise jer noget. Det er deres ølbriketter, og bagpå er der historier. Det er rensdyrenes historie, og bjørenes historie og nordens historie. Og de er udskåret i kartoffeltryk.

C: aah, er det bare mig der ikke kan se hvor bjørnen er i den her?

L: jeg kan godt, her er der noget øre, snude og mund.

N: ja og så noget hals her.

L: jeg kan så ikke norden her.

C: øh der er træerne her og sådan. Men det er det der sker når man bruger whitespace, det er som når man lagde det her, så nu kan jeg godt se det, for jeg har fået dem tegnet op for mig, men man sidder sådan lidt, det er det gode og lidt det dårlige ved at folk bruger whitespace.

N: Hvad er white space?

C: det er normalt ville man nok have gjort det omvendt, de har lavet en form for negativ, først ville man have gjort det her udenom i sort, og de ville have tegnet øjerne op i sort, men her har de gjort det omvendt og undladt at tegne det op men i stedet det udenom som i en negativ, og brugt whitespace. Så i stedet for at tegne et bjerg og et træ og et træ mere så har de valgt og lave kun det der ikke bliver fulgt som er det. Men nogle gange... men jeg kan også vise dig et rigtig godt eksempel som fx fedex logoet.

N: Hvad for et?

C: FEDEX

N: er det ikke bare nogle bogstaver?

C: jo det tror du det er, men alle grafiske designer er vilde med det.

L: hvad for et? Er det ikke bare det der blå og orange et?

C: jo, men det er meget specifikt, for prøv og se hvad der sker i mellem E og X

L: uh det er en pil.

N: se det skulle jeg også have forklaret før jeg så det.

L: ja det har jeg heller aldrig lagt mærke til.

C: det er også derfor grafiske designer er tosset med det, det er et af de bedste eksempler på at der er noget mere i det med betydning for ellers..

L: det ville man jo aldrig som alment menneske lægge mærke til.

C: det er jo nemlig det.

N: er det sted i kunne forestille jer at komme igen og hvis i skulle komme her igen hvem skulle det så være med?

C: Mark

L: ja en date, eller en kæreste, mine forældre kunne jeg også helt sikkert få med herhen.

C: Ah det kunne faktisk være noget jeg måske kunne få min far med til, han gider aldrig ud når han endelig er herovre.

N: han kunne jo også få nogle historier.

L: dte jeg også tænker er at jeg jo havde den der periode hvor jeg levede meget low carb high fat, og det er jo meget ind, den der paleo livsstil, og så er det nogen gange så pissesvært at gå ud og hygge sig for hvis man går ud for noget ost og vin så er der ofte noget brød og sådan noget til det er svært at gå et sted hen, men det her sted rammer ligesom det lientel.

C: ja gå og få en snack uden at det bliver kedeligt.

Snakker om det at Bjørn er sæson præget

C: det kunne være lidt sjovt at få nogle af de informationer ude fra.

L: det kunne være meget sjovt at kunne man have det stående nogle steder. Det kunne være meget sjovt hvis er stod at det bærer præg af at det er sæson vare fordi at det er for og holde bestanden nede.

N: ja det er også på deres hjemmeside har de en hel del information stående og så deres facebook er ikke lige så opdateret, ofr hvor meget kan man proppe på væggene for meget info kan man give på den måde.

C: nu er jeg jo selvfølgelig lidt farvet af det, men det er jo en åbenlys marketings mulighed for de sociale medier, dte ligger lige til højrebenet. Ikke at man bare fortæller om hvad der sker i butikken og hvad er denne måneds et eller andet, men der er noget og bryde det op med som stadig er relateret, og som fortæller deres historie og deres etiske holdning. Fortæl historien om gevirerne også, fortæl hvem der leverer kødet til dem og hvad er deres tanker om det. For de er jo videregiver af andres produkter.

For eller bliver det bare hurtigt sådan noget som SMAG fx laver med månedens tilbud, og der er jo masser af historie i det her og især også det med ta man kan fortælle hvorfor Bjørn ikke kan fås nu.

N: hvis i skulle ofrestille jer nogle ting som k6b kunne gøre? Hvad føler i at de kan efter den her oplevelse af dem?

L: de kunne sagtens ølsmagning, den ligger lige højrebenet.

C: ja helt klart. Og tilbyd det også til firmaer, altså her tænker jeg rent og skær pengemæssigt er det jo en sindssyg god mulighed for at lave de der rystesammen aftner, og de kan komme ud og de kan lave noget eller i kan komme til dem.

L: jeg tænker måske også noget polterabend, jeg ved ikke om mænd kunne se sådan noget som sjovt. Og såise bjørnepølse og øl.

C: og de går jo lidt efter den der meget hyggelige og hjemlige stemning så quizaften er heller ikke udelukket, men det ville måske ikke være så godt herinde, hvism na havde 60 mennesker der forsøgte og lavede en quiz og man så havde en dj der stod og spillede beyonce derude i fællesarealet.

N: kan i se det udenfor danmark's grænser?

L: umiddelbart i norden, norden er jo oplagt, jeg ved ikke lige om jeg ville kunne se det i sydeuropa. Jeg tænker også umiddelbart om den overhovedet ville kunne lige i odense, som jeg oplever det er det mere sådan noget som kræz og froggys der overlever.

C: jeg er bare overrasket over hvor meget odense har vokset de sidste par år.

L: ja jeg har lidt den oplevelse at alt der ikke er typisk cafeburger holder et år og så drejer det nøglen om.

C: jeg har overhovedet ikke nogle ideer om hvad der ligger der. Men aarhus.

L: aarhus helt sikkert, Aalborg kender jeg ikke noget til.

C: er odense for kedelig?

L: jamen jeg ved ikke, men Irma kunne ikke engang overleve.

N: men kunne i godt se den som en enkelt stående bar liigende på vesterbro fx

C: ja det synes jeg, man kan bare se når et sted som vinhanen har kunne overleve og fået så meget omtale så kan jeg ikke forestille mig at den ikke kunne. Det handler om marketing, lets be real det handler om at få de rigtige mennesker til og snakke om det.

N: hvordan synes i det passer ind i westmarket.

L: super godt.

C: det er jo ligesom torvehallerne og papirøen.

L: den kunne passe ind alle tre steder.

C: jeg regner med at den kan være her, den stikker ikke ud, det eneste som jeg synes stikker ud er den steff houlberg der ligger.

L: det der også er sjovt at sidde og observere er hvor mange aldersgrupper der er her.

N: og det ændre sig i hele tiden de har åbent. Hvad ville i sige ud fra hvordan i oplever hvad ville i så sige var deres målgruppe?

C: umiddelbart dem der sidder i baren nu, nogle ældre herrer, men alligevel sidder vi ved et bord hvor der kun er kvinder, men jeg synesm na skulle passe på med at tælle os med.

L: ja jeg ville også sige mænd, fra slut tyverne og op.

N: op til hvad?

L: ja en slutningen af halvtreds tresserne.

C: ja men i bund og grund handler det ikke om deres alder men deres interesser, hvis man abonnere på gastro kunne man nok godt synes det var sjovt og komme herind.

L: ja eller hvis man er øl entusiast. Eller kan lide og gå ud, hvis man bruger byen.

N: tre ord

L: uformelt, råt og nordisk

C: mandigt, nordisk og hyggeligt, sådan dansk kultur over det uhm øl hygge

Interview with customer 14/04-2017

N: Hvor har du hørt om K&B fra?

I: Øh fra her.

N: så du kendte ikke til det før?

I: nej jeg kendte ikke til K&B før åbningen af Westmarket.

N: hvad synes du om det?

I: jamen det er fint. Altså jeg bor ovenpå, så det er nemt for mig lige at komme herved og tag en øl eller to.

N: kommer du her tit så?

I: mja, jeg kommer da en gang i mellem, altså ikke hver dag, men sådan hver anden dag måske.