

## A conceptual approach to the tourist value co-creation: Dimensions, antecedents and consequences

Pedro Miguel Carvalho <sup>1\*</sup>, Montserrat Díaz-Méndez <sup>2</sup>, María J. Quero-Gervilla <sup>3</sup>  
and Michael Saren <sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Polytechnic Institute of Viana do Castelo, CITUR, Portugal. Email: [pc@estg.ipv.pt](mailto:pc@estg.ipv.pt)

<sup>2</sup> University of Extremadura, Spain. Email: [mdmendez@unex.es](mailto:mdmendez@unex.es)

<sup>3</sup> University of Málaga, Spain. Email: [mqq@uma.es](mailto:mqq@uma.es)

<sup>4</sup> University of Leicester, UK. Email: [majsi@leicester.ac.uk](mailto:majsi@leicester.ac.uk)

\*Corresponding author

### Abstract

In the last decades, several studies related to the Service-Dominant Logic approach were carried out, where the tourism industry is not an exception. As such, multiple works associated with this research stream have been developed, with a special focus on the tourist value co-creation. This article presents a conceptual model that aims to aggregate the various dimensions of customer value co-creation with its antecedent and consequent factors in the tourism industry. On the other hand, it proposes practical implications for the tourist organizations building on conceptual contributions. Thus, this article reveals the importance of other constructs of tourist value co-creation which surpass the behavioral dimension of the customer, namely, attitude, significance and recognition. Furthermore, this study systematizes the multiplicity of antecedent and consequent factors, recognizing that they may be grouped into factors associated to the company as well as to the customer.

**Keywords:** Customer co-creation; Value co-creation; Service dominant-logic; Tourism marketing; Literature review

**Citation:** Carvalho, M.P., Díaz-Méndez, M., Quero-Gervilla, M.J. and Saren, M. (2023). A conceptual approach to the tourist value co-creation: Dimensions, antecedents and consequences. *European Journal of Tourism Research*, 34, 3407. <https://doi.org/10.54055/ejtr.v34i.2647>



© 2023 The Author(s)

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0). To view a copy of this license, visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

## 1. Introduction

In the 1970s, Lynn Shostack (1977), in an article published in the *Journal of Marketing*, presented, for the first time, Service Marketing as a distinct, separate and relevant field of research. Supported by the currents of marketing thought of that period, between 1977 and 2004, a large number of studies related to this new area of investigation were published (Berry & Parasuraman, 1993; Grönroos & Gummesson, 1985; Langeard & Eiglier, 1987), discussing concepts and models based on the service, with a research focus oriented to the facilitation and management of interactions between the company and the customer (Grönroos, 2006). However, in 2004, Vargo & Lusch (2004), also in an article published in the *Journal of Marketing*, presented a new perspective for marketing basing their arguments on a set of propositions. For these authors, economic theory had been fundamentally linked to units produced (products), which are imbued with value during the production process, ideally standardized and carried out in isolation from the customer, with the aim of being sold on the market for the capture and demand stimulation.

According to Vargo & Lusch (2004, 2008), these would be the basic ideas that had guided the development of all economic theory and of all disciplines that came from the work developed by Adam Smith (Smith, 2007). However, these authors refuted the classic orientation – ‘output-centric’, for a new orientation – ‘process-centric’.

Based on liberal and neo-liberal economic theory, marketing scholars have traditionally conceptualised marketing relationships as predominantly being those between buyers and sellers and constituted through uni-directional flows of information from corporations, to a rational, logical and homogenised consumer audience (Caruana and Crane, 2008). Nevertheless, Vargo and Lusch (2004) change the perspective of understanding markets and marketing with Service-dominant (S-D) Logic approach. These researchers contend as a basic principle that all economies are economies of services, since service is the fundamental basis for exchange. Manufacturing is just a special case of service provision (Vargo & Lusch, 2004). These researchers conceptualise service as a value creation process and value as an interactive construction between ‘actors’ (previously providers and consumers) as ‘resource integrators’ (Vargo & Lusch, 2008).

Thus, Vargo & Lusch (2006) contradicts the traditional worldview, in which firms are seen as the sole creator of value, recognizing that value is always co-created through the interaction of actors. Since then, several studies related to the development of co-creation of value in a dyadic, triadic and networked perspective were developed (Ballantyne & Varey, 2008; Vargo & Akaka, 2009; Grönroos, 2009; Gummesson & Mele, 2010; Chandler & Vargo, 2011; Akaka, Vargo & Lusch, 2012; Grönroos & Gummerus, 2014).

The S-D Logic has also received increasing attention in the tourism sector. (e.g. Park & Vargo, 2012; Horbel, 2013) and, within this industry, it is worth noting the abundance of studies carried out, with particular emphasis on customer value co-creation (Grisseemann & Stokburger-Sauer, 2012; Hsiao, Lee & Chen, 2015; Buononcontri, Morvillo, Okumus, & van Niekerk, 2017; Busser & Shulga, 2018; Xu, Liu & Lyu, 2018). However, although several researchers have emphasized the importance of carrying out more studies on the co-creation of value in this industry (cf. Grisseemann & Stokburger-Sauer, 2012; Cha, Yi & Bagozzi, 2016), it should be noted the scarcity of works that systematizes the knowledge produced on this key topic (Galvagno & Dalli, 2014; Mohammadi et al., 2020). However, there is no work that aims to identify the dimensions of customer value co-creation and to systematize its antecedent and consequent factors, applied to the tourism industry.

Given the difficulty of understanding, from a holistic perspective, the different complexities of knowledge about the value co-creation in this industry, due to the magnitude of studies carried out, there is an urgent need for systematization for a global understanding of this matter. In fact, it is justified to create a conceptual study, aggregating several empirical approaches, which allows the facilitation of the transmission of empirical knowledge and its practical implications with the industry's practitioners.

Following Brodie and Peters (2020, p.2), the empirical approach frames the midrange theory, which is “context-specific (...) and provides frameworks that can be used to undertake empirical observation and models to guide managerial practices”. This perspective bridges the theory-practice gap (Gummesson, 2017; Vargo & Lush, 2017), and frames the theoretical – empirical approach adopted in our work.

Building on this, the purpose of this study is twofold: (1) Develop a conceptual model that aggregates the dimensions of customer value co-creation with its antecedent and consequent factors in the tourism industry; (2) Propose practical implications for the tourist organizations building on conceptual contributions. To achieve these goals, we conducted a rigorous search for papers, in Scopus, EBSCO, Emerald, Elsevier and Taylor and Francis databases, using only empirical studies in the tourism industry and quantitative methodologies.

This article begins by addressing the principles of S-D Logic; then exposes the concepts of value co-creation based on this new marketing approach and, finally, in order to present a conceptual model that aggregates the different views of the scientific community, it addresses the tourist value co-creation, highlighting its different dimensions, as well as its antecedents and consequences.

## 2. The value co-creation from the perspective of Service-Dominant Logic

When the discussion of S-D Logic emerged, Vargo & Lusch (2004) assumed 8 foundational premises. Subsequently, several conceptual works related to the development of these premises have been developed (eg. Vargo & Lusch, 2006; Lusch & Vargo, 2006; Grönroos, 2006; Lusch, Vargo & O'Brien, 2007; Vargo & Lusch, 2008; Vargo & Akaka, 2009; Gummesson, Lusch and Vargo, 2010; Vargo, Lusch, Akaka & He, 2010; Vargo and Lusch, 2013; Vargo & Lusch, 2016; Vargo, & Lusch, 2017; Vargo et al., 2017). The latest review of the premises exposes 11 foundational premises and 5 of them were identified as axioms (Vargo & Lusch, 2016; Vargo et al., 2020) (Table 1).

**Table 1 - S-D logic axioms and foundational premises**

Axiom 1/FP1	Service is the fundamental basis of exchange.
FP2	Indirect exchange masks the fundamental basis of exchange.
FP3	Goods are a distribution mechanism for service provision.
FP4	Operant resources are the fundamental source of strategic benefit.
FP5	All economies are service economies.
Axiom 2/FP6	Value is co-created by multiple actors, always including the beneficiary.
FP7	Actors cannot deliver value but can participate in the creation and offering of value propositions.
FP8	A service-centred view is inherently customer oriented and relational.
Axiom 3/FP9	All social and economic actors are resource integrators.
Axiom 4/FP10	Value is always uniquely and phenomenologically determined by the beneficiary.
Axiom 5/FP11	Value co-creation is coordinated through actor-generated institutions and institutional arrangements.

According to Vargo, Lusch, Akaka and He (2010), the purpose of the exchange is to provide a service and obtain a service reciprocally - exchange a service for another service. Vargo and Lusch (2008) emphasize that the service consists of the application of operant resources (techniques and knowledge) for the benefit of another party. In this sense, Vargo and Lusch (2004, 2006) differentiate the concept of operant resources from operand resources. In this way, they highlight the operant resources as being intangible, dynamic and capable of creating value, referring concretely to the knowledge and techniques applied by the company's employees and their customers. In turn, operating resources should be conceptualized, as being static, generally tangible and requiring action to make them valuable. In effect, goods should be viewed as operating resources and transmitters of operating resources, which are used by other operating resources (eg. customers).

A crucial question raised by Vargo & Lusch (2006) is associated with the conception of value. According to this new perspective, the value is determined by the customer based on usage and not based on utility. The argument presented by the authors is that the value perceived by the customer (in the product or service) is dependent on the way he/she uses the product through his/her own knowledge. This premise allows us to justify that the customer is an active actor in the process of value creation and, therefore, must be seen as a value co-creator, according to Vargo & Lusch (2006).

In this regard, pioneer service marketing researchers from the Nordic school (Service Logic), accepted some premises presented by the S-D Logic and highlighted some common specifics. First of all, points out that suppliers create the necessary resources and means that allow customers to be able to create value for themselves - 'value-in-use' (Grönroos, 2006). This means that customers do not receive the value incorporated in the products, but perceive a value that is dependent on the way they use the products (Grönroos, 2009; Grönroos & Gummerus, 2014). The notion of "value-in-use" includes not only the use of the product itself, but also elements such as goods, information, personal encounters, interactions with systems and infrastructures, and possible interactions with other customers that, together, impact on the creation of value for the customer (Grönroos, 2006). However, the Nordic school of services does not agree with the S-D Logic premise *"that the user and service provider are always co-creators of value, nor with the notion that the firm as service provider can influence customers' value creation by allowing customers to join the firm's processes as value co-creators"* (Grönroos & Gummerus, 2014: 212), while recognizing that the company has the opportunity to co-create value with its customers and that they are the ultimate creators of value (for themselves). For this reason, the company should be seen as a valuable "facilitator" (Grönroos, 2009).

Partially opposing this idea, in line with the perspective of S-D Logic, Vargo et al. (2010) add, referring that the value creation involves the integration of customer competences and the customer involvement in the co-production of the company's value proposition. In fact, according to Vargo and Akaka (2009), there can be no value without the customers incorporating the company's offerings into their lives. On the other hand, the client's participation in the company's offer (eg. design, assembly, self-service) should be conceptualized as co-production. Thus, the customer's role in 'co-production' is optional, while the 'co-creation' of value is not. According to these authors, the value is always co-created.

A few years later, S-D Logic approach argues that value co-creation results from the intersections of activities of suppliers, customers and other actors (Vargo & Lusch, 2011). It means that value is always co-created and determined by multiple actors. By the way, Vargo, Lusch, Akaka and He (2010), Chandler and Vargo, 2011 and Skalen, Gummerus, Koskull and Magnusson (2015), highlighted the concept of "value-in-context", suggesting that the co-created value is also the result of the integration of other contextually specific resources, that is, each actor (customer, supplier or other actor) integrates the

value proposition from other actor with other resources in its own context. For example, the benefits of using a car are not only associated with its use, but are also determined by the integration of other resources, such as roads, fuel, driving skills and the use of context (for example, the integration of family activities, such as football matches at the weekend, determines a different value linked to daily activities related to work). In effect, the value is phenomenologically determined by the actor in his social context and it is perceived differently by the other actors (Park & Vargo, 2012; Horbel, 2013; Vargo et al., 2020).

### 3. Methodology

This study aimed to systematize the empirical knowledge produced by the scientific community, developing a literature review on the value co-creation of final customers in the tourism industry, assuming all quantitative studies in the field of S-D Logic as eligible, in order to promote full understanding of the phenomenon of interest (Pawson, 2006). Thus, this research was conducted through a rigorous search for papers, in Scopus, EBSCO, Emerald, Elsevier and Taylor and Francis databases, focusing on international peer-reviewed academic journal articles, excluding books, chapter books, conferences and other publications. The research process involved the temporal period between 2004 to 2021, in the areas of Business, Management and Tourism. Records were gathered using the keywords of “value co-creation”, “customer co-creation”, “customer co-creation” AND “tourism”, “hotel” in the title and abstract, considering the different ways of writing the term presented in the literature (Hoyer, et al., 2010).

As eligibility criteria, all studies exclusively linked to the tourist value co-creation were considered, using empirical approaches and only associated to (i) S-D Logic perspective, (ii) quantitative methodologies and (iii) written in English. Moreover, all studies with a focus on value creation, customer engagement, perceived experience and perceived value were considered in the exclusion criteria, as well as other studies of customer value co-creation disassociated from the tourism industry (Denyer & Tranfield, 2009).

The articles gathered were screen through a review on the title and abstract and, sometimes by reading the full text, when it was necessary. This process led to identification of 25 eligible studies related to the antecedents and consequences of the tourist value co-creation as well as 11 relevant studies for the construction of dimensions of tourist value co-creation.

The extraction, organization and synthesis of data was validated by two researchers, through a comparison process, allowing minimize misunderstandings in the interpretation (Denyer & Tranfield, 2009). Disagreements in interpretation were resolved, considering the point of view of the reviewer who was a specialist in the field of knowledge (Potter & Levine-Donnerstein, 1999). The validated data resulting from the contributions of both researchers, were organized in an excel worksheet and synthesized in two different tables.

### 4. Tourist value co-creation

S-D Logic's approach to tourism marketing is not restricted to understanding the needs and desires of customers, implying, thereby, involvement, collaboration and learning through the tourist. Thus, Park and Vargo (2012) assert that the tourist organizations and attractions will have the role of being one of the numerous sources of resources that tourists use to achieve the desired value in their experiences, assuming, in effect, a direct role (execute) and indirect or training role (facilitating self-service). In this sense, the referred researchers explain that “*Tourists should be viewed no longer as recipients of value or targets but as value co-creators who participate in, influence and collaborate with the firm in relationship, utilizing their own resources*” (p.242). Thus, the creation of value is interactive, through dynamic

networks involving various actors (eg. employees, tourists, other guests and technologies). Furthermore, value is created with the tourist and defined by individual tourists (experimenters), in the context of their own unique circumstances (eg. personal values, lifestyle and cultures). This means that tourists will not have the same experience, even when they find the same offer.

Tourists develop relationships with various actors (waiters, residents, local attractions, accommodation staff, transport, etc.) in the process of co-creating value, which co-create their experience. Customers in this industry also combine a diversity of resources, interacting with multiple actors, to co-create their experience. Therefore, companies should seek to meet the value propositions of all participants in the service ecosystem (Park & Vargo, 2012; Horbel, 2013). Although Horbel (2013) recognizes that, in most cases, tourism service providers do not cooperate actively. On the other hand, the tourist also “provides” value to the company by increasing its reputation and supporting the acquisition of new customers, through the “word of mouth” concession, assuming part of the development of new products and services, for example, granting suggestions or even creating meanings for the brand in customer communities (Vargo, Lush, Horbel & Wieland, 2011; Woratschek & Horbel, 2005).

Now, recognizing the importance that the co-creation of value has for tourist organizations and taking into account the multiplicity of studies that have been developed in this field, from different approaches: a conceptual (Shaw, Bailey & Williams, 2011; Chathoth et al., 2013; Sigala, 2016; Sigala, 2018), qualitative (ex. Wang, Li & Li, 2013; Malone, McKechnie & Tynan, 2018; Assiouras et al., 2019), quantitative (ex. Prebensen, Woo & Uysal, 2013; Xu, Liu & Lyu, 2018; Chuang, 2018) and the scarcity of works that systematize the empirical knowledge produced (eg. Shamim & Ghazali, 2014; Campos et al., 2015), there is an urgent need to present a (conceptual) model aggregating the different contributions that allows a better understanding of the essence of value co-creation and its different dimensions, antecedents and consequences, based on the S-D Logic perspective, centred on the tourism industry.

#### *4.1. Dimensions of tourist value co-creation*

In the hospitality sector, Sarmah, Kamboj and Rahman (2017) explain that value co-creation includes customer engagement and the customer's willingness to co-create. For these authors, customer involvement is referred to as “the degree to which customers take part in creating, producing and delivering new services” (2017, p. 2652), and customers are willing to co-create “if they consider their involvement in co-creation activities as benefits rather than costs” (2017, p. 2653). In turn, Busser and Shulga (2018) highlight five dimensions associated with value co-creation: recognition (the tourist's perception that he is getting intrinsic or extrinsic recognition for being involved in value co-creation practices), significance (individual belief tourists of the importance of their involvement in value co-creation); affective response (the tourist's entire emotional reaction to co-creation, such as interest, joy, happiness and fun); collaboration (ie cooperation for mutual gain between two or more actors involved in the co-creation of value) and contribution (sharing of tangible and intangible resources). In the same study context, Shulga et al. (2018) highlight four types of value co-creation, namely co-innovation; co-recovery (the process of joint collaboration between the customer and the service provider to create a solution to the service failure); experience co-creation (the process by which customers cooperate with service providers to define, shape, and personalize their experiences through settings and choices) and co-marketing.

Still in this sector, Ahn et al. (2019, 2020) present value co-creation as a multidimensional concept, structured in two groups, namely co-creation attitude and co-creation behaviour. For these researchers, the co-creation attitude depends on three dimensions: interaction attitude, knowledge sharing and responsive attitude. Building on the work of Yi and Gong (2013), Ahn et al. (2019, 2020) refer that value

co-creation behaviour depends on tourist participation behaviour and citizenship behaviour. For this purpose, Yi and Gong (2013) explain that participation behaviour is determined by factors such as information demand, resource contribution, responsible behaviour, and personal interaction. These authors also point out that citizenship behaviour is influenced by tourist feedback, advocacy, helping and tolerance.

Other works were developed, in other contexts of study. For example, in studies carried out in winter tourism companies, Prebensen et al. (2016) assess value co-creation based on the concepts: interest (mental situational) and participation (physical), just as Prebensen and Xie (2017) conceptualize value co-creation by integrating it into the participation construct. For these authors, participation includes: physical co-creation, psychological co-creation and self-perception of personal mastery (that is, how consumers perceive their knowledge and skills in relation to the performance of a certain activity).

In a study applied to cruise tourism, four dimensions to measure the quality of the experience in the value co-creation process, were presented by Huang and Choi (2019), namely: social interaction, interaction with employees, relationship with companions and tourist involvement with the activity. Chen et al. (2017), in the context of travel agencies, proposed the term co-creation dynamics drew on Prahalad and Ramaswamy's DART Model (2004), modifying it and loading six sub-constructs, namely dialogue (e.g., interactivity, engagement, propensity to act), access (e.g., sharing of information and knowledge), risk assessment (e.g., providing information to make informed decisions), transparency (e.g., openness), flexibility (the responsiveness of a business to adapt to changes in technology and market opportunities by introducing new offerings) and compatibility (the extent of match among partners with respect to culture orientations and abilities as well as the activities of the businesses and how they play toward successful integration). On the other hand, Assiouras et al. (2019), in an online panel composed of Greek tourists, explain that value co-creation depends on two dimensions: value in use and co-production. In turn, co-production is analyzed from three sub-dimensions, namely, knowledge sharing, equity and interaction. A study developed by Rather et al. (2019), applied to a famous tourist destination in India. For these researchers, value co-creation involves two dimensions: (i) value in use (which is perceived by the customer during service interactions, for example, product use, exchange of information from supplier to customer) and (ii) co-production (reflects shared inventiveness, co-design or shared production). Finally, in a study applied to a souvenir shop for tourists, Sthapit et al., (2018) conceptualize co-creation as comprising dimensions such as physical and psychological participation.

Table 2 presents the aggregation of the various dimensions identified in the studies carried out on the value co-creation from the perspective of S-D Logic in this industry, that makes it possible to understand the essence of value co-creation and its different dimensions.

As it is possible to understand, there are works whose customer value co-creation is differently conceptualized, in similar study contexts, for example, in the hotel sector, studies reveal significantly different dimensions of value co-creation (Ahn et al., 2019, Sarmah, Kamboj & Rahman, 2017; Shulga et al., 2018), as well as the co-creation of value is similarly conceptualized, in different contexts of study, for example, between souvenir shops and winter tourism companies (Prebensen et al., 2016; Stapit et al., 2018). This means that the scientific community is deeply divergent in the conceptualization of value co-creation and legitimizes the plasticity of theoretical models between different contexts of study. Indeed, it justifies the creation of a conceptual model that integrates different perspectives, extendable to different domains of the tourism industry. Furthermore, this literature review shows that the dimensions of customer value co-creation should not be reduced only to the two constructs proposed

by Yi and Gong (2013), very often found in the tourism industry literature - customer participation behaviour and customer citizenship behaviour. Thus, the scientific community has shown the relevance of other dimensions of value co-creation which transcends the behavioral aspect of the client (cf. Ahn et al., 2019, 2020), recognizing the importance of the client's pre-disposition for co-creation (attitude), as well as, the way the client recognizes its relevance in this process (significance) and the way it feels that it is being valued for it (recognition) (cf. Busser & Shulga, 2018).

**Table 2.** Studies for the construction of dimensions of tourist value co-creation

Dimensions	Sub-dimensions	Concept	Studies
Recognition	-	Linked to the perception of the tourist who is gaining intrinsic recognition (non-economic, by sharing ideas) or extrinsic (publicly exposed) for being involved in practices of value co-creation.	Busser & Shulga (2018)
Significance	-	Tourist's individual belief about the importance of their involvement and effort in the value co-creation. For the tourist it is essential to have the notion that it is worth the effort and time spent in the value co-creation.	Busser & Shulga (2018)
Attitude	Cognitive (or pre-disposition for co-creation)	How consumers believe that their knowledge and skills (personal mastery) contribute to the performance of a specific service.	Prebensen & Xie (2017)
	Affective	Associated with the tourist's emotional reaction to co-creation, showing interest, joy, happiness and fun.	Busser & Shulga (2018); Prebensen, Kim, & Uysal (2016); Sthapit, Coudounaris & Bjork, (2018)
	Conative	Linked to the intention of interaction, knowledge sharing and favourable response from the tourist in relation to the service provider.	Ahn, Lee, Back & Schmitt (2019); Chen et al. (2017); Ahn et al. (2020)
Tourist behaviour	Participation	Different ways should be highlighted: seeking information (tourists collect data to clarify service requirements and reduce environmental uncertainty); contribution with resources (share their tangible and intangible resources to achieve the desired results); responsible behaviour (tourists reveal that they are aware of their own responsibilities and are willing to cooperate, complying with the rules and accepting the guidelines of the employees); and personal interaction (establish personal interactions with employees, residents and other tourists).	Hsiao, Lee & Chen (2015); Busser & Shulga (2018); Prebensen, Kim, & Uysal (2016); Prebensen & Xie (2017); Chen et al. (2017); Sthapit Coudounaris & Bjork (2018); Huang & Choi (2019); Ahn et al. (2019); Ahn et al. (2020)
	Citizenship	In this sub-dimension, the following should be highlighted: feedback from the tourist (they actively provide suggestions that will be beneficial for improving the service); advocacy (clients actively promote the organization and its employees to people outside the organization, contributing to improving the reputation and evaluation of the organization's products and services); help (tourists take the initiative to help other customers); and tolerance (they show greater tolerance in situations where the service provided by employees does not meet expectations).	Hsiao, Lee & Chen (2015); Busser & Shulga (2018); Tuan, Rajendran, Rowley & Khai (2019); Ahn et al. (2019); Ahn et al. (2020)

#### 4.2. Antecedents and consequences of tourist value co-creation

The study of the antecedents and consequences of the co-creation of customer value has also received attention from the scientific community, in a context of services (Ranjan & Read, 2016; Neghina, Caniels, Bloemer & Birgelen, 2014) and, in a very applied to the tourism industry. Interestingly, there are several researchers who point out that it is necessary to do more research on the variables that can be “drivers”



of the co-creation activities of the clients, as well as explain that there is even little practical investigation on the antecedents and consequences of the client's participation in this industry (eg. Grissemann and Stockburger-Sauer, 2012; Cha et al., 2016). However, in this setting, it is worth noting the existence of several articles focused on understanding the antecedents and consequences of the tourist value co-creation, using the previous methodological approach, which deserve to be corroborated in future research works.

As we can understand in Table 3, antecedents and consequences are identified with very different characteristics, and within the tourism industry, the studies are applied to organizations from different sectors, namely hotels and resorts (Xu et al., 2014; Hsiao, Lee, & Chen, 2015; Morosan & DeFranco, 2016; Taheri et al., 2017; Sarmah, Kamboj & Rahman, 2017; Tu, Neuhofer & Viglia, 2018; Shulga, Busser & Kim, 2018; Xie, Guan & Huan, 2019; González-Mansilla, Berenguer-Contrí, & Serra-Cantalops, 2019; Ahn et al., 2019, 2020), travel agencies (Grissemann & Stockburger-Sauer, 2012; Chen et al., 2017; Busagara et al., 2020; Tariq, Rashid & Waseem, 2020), entertainment, thematic parks (Luo et al, 2019), winter experiences (Prebensen, Kim & Uysal, 2016; Prebensen & Xie, 2017), cruise tourism (Wu, Lv, Cavusoglu & Cobanoglu, 2021), services tourism (Tuan et al, 2019; Lei, Ye, Wang & Law, 2020) and tourist food (Busser & Shulga, 2018; Chen, Wu & Huang, 2018; Shulga, Busser, Bai & Kim, 2021). As it is possible to verify, there are antecedents belonging to the companies (eg. knowledge of customers' needs or service delivery) and to the customers (eg. propensity for customer innovation or consumer habits of using technology), as well as consequences resulting from the value co-creation that translate into benefits for companies (eg. customers' loyalty or customers' expenses) and customers (eg. service quality or satisfaction).

A significant number of studies have highlighted the antecedents (eg. Hsiao, Lee & Chen, 2015; Tuan et al., 2019) and consequences (eg. Xu et al., 2014; Busser & Shulga, 2018) of tourist value co-creation. However, no study has systematized the multiplicity of factors following a S-D Logic approach, recognizing that they may be grouped into factors strictly linked to the company, as well as to the customer. The systematization of antecedents and consequences known in the literature from an S-D Logic perspective is crucial for a holistic understanding of customer value co-creation in the tourism industry.

**Table 3.** Recent empirical studies on the antecedents and consequences of the tourist value co-creation

Article	Study context	Antecedents (variables)	Consequences (variables)
Grissemann & Stockburger-Sauer (2012)	Travel agency (Austria)	Company support to co-create	1. Customer satisfaction with the company; 2. Customer loyalty; 3. Customer expenses.
Xu, Marshall, Edvardsson & Tronvoll (2014)	Hotel service failure		1. Perception of customer justice; 2. Satisfaction with recovery; 3. Repurchase intention.
Hsiao, Lee, & Chen (2015)	Hotels (Taiwan)	Service-oriented organizational citizenship behaviour (overall employees): - Loyalty (how they promote business benefits and services to people outside the company); - Service delivery (the way in which employees show responsible care and attitudes and behaviours to effectively provide customer services);	


Article	Study context	Antecedents (variables)	Consequences (variables)
		- Participation (provide suggestions actively to improve the organization's services based on their knowledge of customers).	
Morosan & DeFranco (2016)	Hotels (USA)	Consumer habits of using technology (mobile devices).	1. Perceived value (hotel stay) 2. Intention to stay at the hotel.
Prebensen, Kim & Uysal (2016)	Winter Experience Tour Company (Norway)		Satisfaction.
Prebensen & Xie (2017)	Winter Experience Tour Company (Norway)		It increases the value of the perceived experience.
Taheri, Coelho, Sousa, & Evanschitzky (2017)	Hotels (Iran)	1. Monitoring of mood (concerns how individuals control their feelings) 2. Mood repair (concerns how individuals adjust their own emotions).	
Chen, Kerr, Chou & Ang (2017)	B2B travel agencies (Taiwan and Malaysia)	1. Adoption of technology 2. Environmental changes (eg. changes in consumer habits, social values, government regulations, etc...).	Service innovation.
Sarmah, Kamboj & Rahman (2017)	Luxury hotels (India)	1. Propensity for customer innovation (customer's tendency to adopt new products / services more often compared to other customers). 2. Need for the hotel customer to interact with the service team.	Intention to adopt new services.
Busser & Shulga (2018)	Hotel and fast-food restaurant	1. Customer opening (tourist willingness to consider, accept and integrate creative and new ideas in the co-creation of value). 2. Brand authenticity (it is seen as being true, genuine, rare and singular by the tourist, as well as revealing longevity and longitudinal consistency).	1. Hedonic well-being (associated with positive feeling, which can be understood as the result of an affective and cognitive assessment); 2. Eudemonic well-being (associated with functioning well, through joint co-creation activities and sharing decision-making); 3. Competitive service advantage perceived; 4. Trust; 5. Commitment.
Tu, Neuhofer & Viglia (2018)	Hospitality (through Chinese online platform)		Customer willingness to pay.
Shulga, Busser & Kim (2018)	Hotel and resort experiences (USA)		1. Satisfaction; 2. Loyalty; 3. Trust.
Chen, Wu & Huang (2018)	Tourist food companies (Taiwan)		1. Trust; 2. Unplanned purchases.
Tuan, Rajendran, Rowley & Khai (2019)	Tourist service companies (Vietnam)	Corporate social responsibility (CSR): CSR for social and non-social stakeholders; CSR for customers; CSR for employees; CSR for the government.	
Assiouras, Skourtis, Giannopoulos, Buhalis, & Koniordos (2019)	Greek tourists online panel		Willingness to get involved in the client's citizenship behaviour (Feedback, Advocacy, Help, Tolerance).

Article	Study context	Antecedents (variables)	Consequences (variables)
Xie, Guan & Huan (2019)	Hotels (China)	Knowledge of customers' needs by the hotel's frontline staff.	
González-Mansilla, Berenguer-Contrí & Serra-Cantallops (2019)	Hotels (Spain)		1. Customer participation in the creation of value; 2. Brand value.
Ahn, Lee Back & Schmitt (2019)	Resorts (experienced customers)	1. Value of fun (pleasure and fun); 2. Value of return on investment (by comparing perceived utility or consumption experience with invested resources, such as money, time and effort); 3. Excellence in services (the degree to which products or services meet customer expectations).	
Luo, Wong, King, Liu, & Huang (2019)	Shangai Disney Resort		Service quality.
Lei, Ye, Wang & Law (2020)	Mobile Instant Messaging in the tourism organizations (China)	1. Perceived media richness of mobile Instant Messaging. 2. Perceived social presence of mobile Instant Messaging.	Perceived value of personalization
Ahn, Back, Barišić & Lee (2020)	Integrated resorts (Croatia)	1. Interaction attitude (customers' willingness to respond positively to a brand). 2. Responsive attitude (customers' willingness to respond effectively to brand requests for engaging in communication).	
Busagara, Mori, Mossberg, Jani & Andersson (2020)	Tour operators and cultural enterprises in (Tanzania)		New services development
Tariq, Rashid & Waseem, 2020	Travel industry (Pakistan)	1. Co-creation operator of operant resources (customers) 2. Co-creation space of operand resources (presentation aids, meeting rooms and proper stationary items). 3. Co-creation tool of operand resources (software usage, availability of computers and the internet connection).	
Wu, Lv, Cavusoglu & Cobanoglu (2021)	Cruise Tourism (China)		1. Service personal values (value to a peaceful life, value to social recognition and value to social integration). 2. Customer satisfaction. 3. Customer loyalty.
Shulga, Busser, Bai & Kim (2021)	Coffeeshop brand (USA)	Customer trust	Customer involvement with brand

## 5. Conclusions and implications

A rigorous literature review of S-D Logic literature in the tourism sector, using quantitative methodologies, reveals that the tourism value co-creation can be understood, from four fundamental dimensions: recognition, significance, attitude or pre-disposition for co-creation and behaviour (participation and citizenship). On the other hand, it is possible to perceive that there are a range of antecedents and consequences of the value co-creation strictly linked to the company, as well as to the customer. Therefore, with a view to a better understanding of the antecedents, consequences and dimensions of the value co-creation, figure 1 presents a summary of the main contributions of these studies. It should also be noted that the model described, in addition to harmonizing with different

study contexts in the tourism industry, legitimizing its ductility based on other theoretical models equally cross-sectoral tested in this field (Prebensen, Kim & Uysal, 2016; Sthapit, Coudounaris & Bjork, 2018), aggregates the different conceptualizations of the tourist value co-creation presented in the literature, according to the perspective of S-D Logic.



Although this article presents a conceptual approach, it can contribute to a more holistic view of the tourist value co-creation, not being limited to observing this concept only from the perspective of customer participation behaviour and customer citizenship behaviour (Yi & Gong, 2013), commonly conceptualized by the scientific community. Thereby, this paper recognizes the relevance of other dimensions, not yet highlighted in any conceptual model, due to its complementarity in the conceptualization of value co-creation. Hence, this article reveals the importance of other dimensions of tourist value co-creation which go beyond the behavioural dimension of the customer, namely: (i) Attitude or pre-disposition of the tourist towards co-creation, in line with a diversity of studies that present the attitude as a multidimensional construct, aggregator of three components: cognition, affection and conation (Ajzen, 1993; Hilgar, 1980). This dimension may be particularly relevant in predicting client behaviours, as evidenced in the literature (cf. Ajzen & Fishbein, 1977; Ajzen, 1991); (ii) Significance, that is, the tourist's perception of the importance of their effort and time used in the value co-creation, due to the value-in-use obtained in the service experience (Rather, Hollebeek and Islam, 2019), may be determinant in the behaviour of customer participation, as demonstrated by Assiouras et al. (2019); (iii) Recognition for participation in the value co-creation. This dimension reveals that some consumers are extrinsically motivated and demand material compensation for their ideas and feedback, while others are intrinsically motivated, seeking fame and public recognition. Indeed, the recognition of tourists may persuade their behaviour to participate in co-creation activities (cf. Kumar et al., 2010).

On the other hand, no study has shown that tourist value co-creation can be stimulated by improving the performance of factors strictly linked to the company (eg. communication with the customer or greater employee accountability), as well as recognizing the factors that facilitate the value co-creation which are linked to the customer itself. Furthermore, no study has listed the benefits arising from the tourist value co-creation. However, this article allows us to understand, in a systematic way, the main outcomes of the tourist value co-creation, showing that they translate into benefits for the customer himself, as well as for the company.

The conceptual contributions emphasized have several practical implications for practitioners in the tourism industry. Since then, this article contributes to elucidate the tourist organizations, about the importance of tourist involvement in the value co-creation. In effect, tourist organizations may stimulate the tourist's pre-disposition for co-creation, communicating the multiples benefits of his engagement in participating in value co-creation tasks (e.g., by obtaining a faster and more adapted service and/or a reduction in the economic costs of the relationship). On the other hand, organizations may make the customer more aware of the significance of value co-creation, making him perceives the importance of the time and effort dedicated to the organization, providing experiences whose value proposition is strongly determined by the tangible resources (eg. physical effort) and intangible resources (eg. information) transmitted by himself. Finally, for tourists to obtain recognition (intrinsic or extrinsic) for being involved in practices of value co-creation, tourist organizations must create an incentive package that aggregates elements of a material nature (eg. prizes, offers or discounts) and immaterial (eg. public recognition), which helps the customers feel recognized for their efforts and time dedicated to value co-creation activities.

The present paper opens several future lines of research. For example, the measurement of the dimensions proposed in the conceptual model, through the validation of a questionnaire, and the analysis of possible effects between the identified dimensions. It is further suggested, using the list of identified antecedents and consequences, to carry out empirical studies that support the work recently developed by the scientific community, understanding more explicitly the influence of antecedents on the value co-creation, as well as the implications of different dimensions of the tourist value co-creation. Moreover, this study covers specific issues concerning the research agenda exposed by Storbacka et al. (2016) namely, actor disposition and engagement properties. Therefore, further research is needed based on conceptual model presented to construction of mid-range theory as referred by these researchers, namely anchoring on actor engagement framework as microfoundation for value co-creation.

## References

- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50, 179 – 211. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(91\)90020-T](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T)
- Ajzen, I. (1993). Attitude theory and the attitude-behavior relation. In: D. Krebs and P. Schmidt (eds.) *New directions in attitude measurement* (pp. 41 – 57). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (1977). *Attitude-Behavior Relations: A Theoretical Analysis and Review of Empirical Research*. *Psychological Bulletin*, 84 (5), 888 – 918.
- Ahn, J. Back, K.-J., Barišić, P., Lee, C.-K. (2020). Co-creation and integrated resort experience in Croatia: The application of service-dominant logic. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 17,100443. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2020.100443>
- Ahn, J., Lee C.-K., Back, K.-J., & Schmitt, A. (2019). Brand experiential value for integrated resort customers' co-creation behavior. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 81, 104 - 112. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2019.03.009>

- Akaka, M.A., & Chandler, J.D. (2011). Roles as resources: A social roles perspective of change in value networks. *Marketing Theory*, 11 (3), 243-260. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1470593111408172>
- Akaka, M., A., Vargo, S. L., & Lusch, R. F. (2012). An exploration of networks in value cocreation: A service-ecosystem view. *Review of Marketing Research*, 9, 13 - 50. [https://doi.org/10.1108/S1548-6435\(2012\)000009006](https://doi.org/10.1108/S1548-6435(2012)000009006)
- Assiouras, I., Skourtis, G., Giannopoulos, A., Buhalis, D., & Koniordos, M. (2019). Value co-creation and customer citizenship behavior. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 78, [102742]. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2019.102742>
- Ballantyne, D., & Varey, R. J. (2008). The service-dominant logic and the future of marketing. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 36, 11 - 14. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-007-0075-8>
- Berry, L.L., & Parasuraman, A. (1993). Building a new academic field - The case of service marketing. *Journal of Retailing*, 69(1), 13 - 60. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-4359\(05\)80003-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-4359(05)80003-X)
- Brodie, R. J. Glynn, M. S., & Little, V. (2006). The service brand and the service-dominant logic: missing fundamental premise or the need for the stronger theory. *Marketing Theory*, 6(3), 363 - 379. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1470593106066797>
- Brodie, R.J., Hollebeek, L.D., Jurić, B., & Ilić, A. (2011). Customer engagement: Conceptual domain, fundamental propositions and implications for research. *Journal of Service Research*, 14 (3), 252 - 271. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094670511411703>
- Brodie, R.J., & Peters, L.D. (2020). New directions for service research: refreshing the process of theorizing to increase contribution. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 34(3), 415-428. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JSM-01-2019-0048>
- Buononcontri, P., Morvillo, A., Okumus, F., & van Niekerk, M. (2017). Managing the experience co-creation process in tourism destinations: empirical findings from Naples. *Tourism Management*, 62, 264 - 277. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2017.04.014>
- Busagara, T., Mori, N., Mossberg, L., Jani, D. and Andersson, T. (2020). Customer information sharing and new service development: is there a link? *The Bottom Line*, 33(2), 133-147. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BL-09-2019-0112>
- Busser, J. A., & Shulga, L. V. (2018). Co-created value: Multidimensional scale and nomological network. *Tourism Management*, 65, 69 - 86. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2017.09.014>
- Campos, A. C., Mendes, J., Oom do Valle, P., & Scott, N. (2015): Co-creation of tourist experiences: a literature review. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 21(4), 369-400. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2015.1081158>
- Caruana, R., & Crane, A. (2008). Constructing consumer responsibility: Exploring the role of corporate communications. *Organization Studies*, 29, 1495 - 1519. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840607096387>
- Cha, M.-K., Yi, Y., & Bagozzi, R. P. (2016). Effects of Customer Participation in Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Programs on the CSR-Brand Fit and Brand Loyalty. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, 57(3), 235 - 249. <https://doi.org/10.1177/19389651515620679>
- Chandler, J. D., & Vargo, S. L. (2011). Contextualization and value-in-context: how context frames exchange. *Marketing Theory*, 11 (1), 35 - 49. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1470593110393713>
- Chathoth, P., Altinay, L., Harrington, R. J., Okumus, F., & Chan, E. S. W. (2013). Co-production versus co-creation: A process based continuum in the hotel service context. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 32, 11 - 20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2012.03.009>
- Chen, J.-S., Kerr, D., Chou, C. Y., & Ang, C. (2017). Business co-creation for service innovation in the hospitality and tourism industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 29 (6), 1522 - 1540. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-06-2015-0308>
- Chen, S.-H., Wu, J.-J., & Huang, C.-Y. (2018). "We made, we trust": Coproduction and image congruence in the food-tourism factories. *Asia Pacific Management Review*, 23, 310 - 317. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmr.2018.01.002>

- Cova, B., Dali, D., & Zwick (2011). Critical perspectives on consumers' role as 'producers': Broadening the debate on value co-creation in marketing processes. *Marketing Theory*, 11 (3), 231 - 242. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1470593111408171>
- Denyer, D., & Tranfield, D. (2009). Producing a systematic review. In D. A. Buchanan & A. Bryman (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of organizational research methods* (pp. 671-689). Sage Publications Ltd.
- Edvardsson, B., Gustafsson, A., & Roos, I. (2005). Service portraits in service research: a critical review. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 16(1), 107 - 121. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09564230510587177>
- Galvagno, M. & Dalli, D. (2014). Theory of value co-creation: a systematic literature review. *Managing Service Quality: An International Journal*, 24 (6), 643-683. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MSQ-09-2013-0187>
- González-Mansilla, Ó., Berenguer-Contrí, G., & Serra-Cantalops, A. (2019). The impact of value co-creation on hotel brand equity and customer satisfaction. *Tourism Management*, 75, 51 - 65. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2019.04.024>
- Grissemann, U. S., & Stokburger-Sauer, N. E. (2012). Customer co-creation of travel services: The role of company support and customer satisfaction with the co-creation performance. *Tourism Management*, 33, 1483 - 1492. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2012.02.002>
- Grönroos, C., & Gummesson, E. (1985). The nordic school of services - An introduction. In: C. Grönroos and Gummesson, E. (eds.) *Service Marketing - Nordic School Perspectives*, Stockholm: University of Stockholm, 6 - 11.
- Grönroos, C. (2006). Adopting a service logic for marketing. *Marketing Theory*, 6(3), 317 - 333. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1470593106066794>
- Grönroos, C. (2009). Marketing as promise management: regaining customer management for marketing. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, 24(5/6), 351 - 359. <https://doi.org/10.1108/08858620910966237>
- Grönroos, C., & Gummerus, J. (2014). The service revolution and its marketing implications: service logic Vs service-dominant logic. *Managing Service Quality*, 24(3), 206 - 229. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MSQ-03-2014-0042>
- Gummesson, E. (2002). Relationship marketing and the new economy: It's time for deprogramming. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 16(7), 585 - 589. <https://doi.org/10.1108/08876040210447315>
- Gummesson E. (2017). *Case Theory in Business and Management. Reinventing Case Study Research*. Stockholm: SAGE publishing.
- Gummesson, E., Lusch, R., & Vargo, S. L. (2010). Transitioning from service management to service-dominant logic: observations and recommendations. *International Journal of Quality and Service Sciences*, 2(1), 8 - 22. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17566691011026577>
- Gummesson, E., & Mele, C. (2010). Marketing as value co-creation through network interaction and resource integration. *Journal of Business Market Management*, 4(4), 181 - 198. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12087-010-0044-2>
- Horbel, C. (2013). Service-dominant logic and tourism management. Enriching each other. *Die Betriebswirtschaft*, 73(2), 131 - 142.
- Hoyer, W. D., Chandy, R., Dorotic, M., Krafft, M., & Singh, S. S. (2010). Consumer Cocreation in New Product Development. *Journal of Service Research*, 13(3), 283-296. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094670510375604>
- Hsiao, C. Lee, Y.-H., & Chen, W.-J. (2015). The effect of servant leadership on customer value co-creation: A cross-level analysis of key mediating roles. *Tourism Management*, 49, 45 - 57. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2015.02.012>
- Huang, S., & Choi, H.-S. C. (2019). Developing and validating a multidimensional tourist engagement scale (TES). *The Service Industries Journal*, 39 (7-8), 469 - 497. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02642069.2019.1576641>

- Hunt, S. (2000). *A general theory of competition: Resources, competences, productivity, economic growth*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Kumar, V., Aksoy, L., Donkers, B., Venkatesan, R., Wiesel, T., & Tillmanns, S. (2010). Undervalued or Overvalued Customers: Capturing Total Customer Engagement Value. *Journal of Service Research*, 13 (3), 297 – 310. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094670510375602>
- Langeard, E., & Eiglier, P. (1987). *Service: Le marketing des services*. Paris: Wiley.
- Lei SI, Ye S, Wang D, Law R. (2020). Engaging Customers in Value Co-Creation Through Mobile Instant Messaging in the Tourism and Hospitality Industry. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 44(2), 229-251. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1096348019893066>
- Luo, J., Wong, I., King, B., Liu, M., & Huang, G. (2019). Co-creation and co-destruction of service quality through customer-to-customer interactions: Why prior experience matters. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 31 (3), 1309 – 1329. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-12-2017-0792>
- Lusch, R., & Vargo, S. L. (2006). Service-dominant logic: reactions, reflections and refinements. *Marketing Theory*, 6(3), 281 – 288. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1470593106066781>
- Lusch, R., Vargo, S. L., & O'Brien, M. (2007). Competing through service: Insights from service-dominant logic. *Journal of Retailing*, 83(1), 5 – 18. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretai.2006.10.002>
- Malone, S. McKechnie, S., & Tynan, C. (2018). Tourists' emotions as a resource for customer value creation, co-creation and destruction: A customer-grounded understanding. *Journal of Travel Research*, 57(7), 843 – 855. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287517720118>
- Mathis, E., Kim, H., Uysal, M., Sirgy, J., & Prebensen, N. (2016). The effect of co-creation experience on outcome variable. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 57, 62 – 75. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2015.11.023>
- Mele, C. Pels, J., & Storbacka, K. (2015). A Holistic Market Conceptualization. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 43, 100 – 114. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-014-0383-8>
- Merz, M. He, Y., & Vargo, S. L. (2009). The evolving brand logic: a service-dominant logic perspective. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 37(3), 328 – 344. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-009-0143-3>
- Mohammadi, F., Yazdani, H.R., Jami Pour, M. and Soltanee, M. (2020). Co-creation in tourism: a systematic mapping study. *Tourism Review*, 76(2), 305-343. <https://doi.org/10.1108/TR-10-2019-0425>.
- Morosan, C., & DeFranco, A. (2016). Co-creating value in hotels using mobile devices: A conceptual model with empirical validation. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 52, 131 – 142. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2015.10.004>
- Neghina, C., Caniels, M. C., Bloemer, J. M., & van Birgelen, M. J. (2015). Value co-creation in service interactions. Dimensions and antecedents. *Marketing Theory*, 15(2), 221 – 242. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1470593114552580>
- Park, S.-Y., & Vargo, S.L. (2012). The service-dominant logic approach to tourism marketing strategy. In: R. H. Tsiotsou and R. E. Goldsmith (eds.), *Strategic Marketing in Tourism Services* (pp. 231 – 246). UK: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Pawson, R. (2002). *Evidence-Based Policy: A Realist Perspective*. London: Sage Publications.
- Potter, W. J., & Levine-Donnerstein, D. (1999). Rethinking validity and reliability in content analysis. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 27(3), 258-284. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00909889909365539>
- Prahalad, C.K., & Hamel, G. (1990). The core competence of the corporation. *Harvard Business Review*, 68, 79 – 91.
- Prahalad, C.K. & Ramaswamy, V. (2004). Co-creation experiences: The next practice in value creation. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 18(3), 5-14. <https://doi.org/10.1002/dir.20015>
- Prebensen, N. K., Woo, E., & Uysal, M. S. (2013). Experience value: antecedents and consequences. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 17(10), 910 – 928. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2013.770451>



- Prebensen, N. K., Kim, H. L., & Uysal, M. (2016). Cocreation as Moderator between the Experience Value and Satisfaction Relationship. *Journal of Travel Research*, 55 (7), 934-945. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287515583359>
- Prebensen, N., & Xie, J. (2017). Efficacy of co-creation and mastering on perceived value and satisfaction in experiential consumption. *Tourism Management*, 49, 45-57. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2016.12.001>
- Ranjan, K. R., & Read, S. (2016). Value co-creation: concept and measurement. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 44, 290 – 315. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-014-0397-2>
- Sarmah, B., Kamboj, S., & Rahman, Z. (2017). Co-creation in hotel service innovation using smart phone apps: an empirical study. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 29 (10), 2647 - 2667. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-12-2015-0681>
- Shamim, A., Ghazali, Z., & Albinsson, P.A. (2017). Construction and validation of customer value co-creation attitude scale. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 34 (7), 591 – 602. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JCM-01-2016-1664>
- Shaw, G. Bailey, A., & Williams, A. (2011). Aspects of service-dominant logic and its implications for tourism management: Examples from the hotel industry. *Tourism Management*, 32, 207 - 214. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2010.05.020>
- Schembri, S. (2009). Reframing brand experience: The experiential meaning of Harley-Davidson. *Journal of Business Research*, 62 (12), 1299 - 1310. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2008.11.004>
- Schau, H.J., Muñoz Jr, A.M., & Arnould, E.J. (2009). How brand community practices create value. *Journal of Marketing*, 73, September, 30 - 51. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.73.5.30>
- Shostack, G. L. (1977). Breaking Free from Product Marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 73 – 80.
- Shulga, L.V., Busser, J.A., Bai, B., (Lina) Kim. H. (2021). The Reciprocal Role of Trust in Customer Value Co-Creation. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*. 45(4), 672 – 696. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1096348020967068>
- Shulga, L. V.; Busser, J.A., & Kim, H. L. (2018). Generational Profiles in Value Co-creation Interactions. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 27 (2), 196 - 217. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19368623.2017.1340218>
- Sigala, M. (2016). Learning with the market. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 28(6), 1245-1286. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-06-2014-0285>
- Sigala, M. (2018). Implementing social customer relationship management. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 30(7), 2698 - 2726. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-10-2015-0536>
- Skalen, P. Gummerus, J. Koskull, C., & Magnusson, P. (2015). Exploring value propositions and service innovation: a service-dominant logic study. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 43(2), 137 – 158. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-013-0365-2>
- Smith, A. (2007). An inquiry into the nature and causes of the wealth of nations. MetaLibri Digital Library. Disponível em: [https://www.ibiblio.org/ml/libri/s/SmithA\\_WealthNations\\_p.pdf](https://www.ibiblio.org/ml/libri/s/SmithA_WealthNations_p.pdf)
- Sthapit, E; Coudoumaris, D. N., & Bjork, P (2018). The memorable souvenir-shopping experience: antecedents and outcomes. *Leisure Studies*, 37 (5), 628 - 643. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02614367.2018.1519031>
- Storbacka, K., Brodie, R. J., Böhmman, T., Maglio, P. P., & Nenonen, S. (2016). Actor engagement as a microfoundation for value co-creation, *Journal of Business Research*, 69 (8), 3008-3017. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.02.034>
- Taheri, B., Coelho, F. Sousa, C. M. P., & Evanschitzky, H. (2017). Mood regulation, customer participation, and customer value creation in hospitality services. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 29(12), 3063 – 3081. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-07-2016-0389>

- Tariq, A., Rashid, Y., & Waseem, A. (2020). Value Co-Creation in Travel Industry: Examining the Impact of Operand and Operant Resources on Actor Experience. *Journal of Management Sciences*, 7(1), 31-46. <https://doi.org/10.20547/jms.2014.2007103>
- Tsaur, S.-H., Yen, C.-H., & Hsiao, S.-L. (2013). Transcendent experience, flow and happiness for mountain climbers. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 15, 360 – 374. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.1881>
- Tu, Y., Neuhofer, B., & Viglia, G. (2018). When co-creation pays. Stimulating engagement to increase revenues. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 30 (4), 2093 - 2111. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-09-2016-0494>
- Tuan, L. T., Rajendran, D., Rowley, C., & Khai, D. C. (2019). Customer value co-creation in the business-to-business tourism context: The roles of corporate social responsibility and customer empowering behaviors. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 39, 137 - 149. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2019.04.002>
- Vargo, S. L., & Akaka, M. A. (2009). Service-dominant logic as a foundation for service science: clarifications. *Service Science*, 1(1), 32 – 41. <https://doi.org/10.1287/serv.1.1.32>
- Vargo, S.L., Koskela-Huotari, K., & Vink, J. (2020) Service- Dominant Logic: Foundations and Applications. In Bridges, E. and Fowler, K. (Eds.) *The Routledge Handbook of Service Research Insights and Ideas*, (p. 3-23). New York: Routledge.
- Vargo, S. L., Koskela-Huotari, K., Baron, S., Edvardsson, B., Reynoso, J., & Colurcio, M. (2017). A system perspective on markets – Toward a research agenda. *Journal of Business Research*, 79, 260 – 268. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2017.03.011>
- Vargo, S. L. & Lusch, R. (2004). Evolving to a new dominant logic for marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 68, 1 – 17. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.68.1.1.24036>
- Vargo, S. L., & Lusch, R. (2006). Service-dominant logic: what it is, what is not, what it might be. In: R.F. Lush and S. L. Vargo (eds.), *The Service-Dominant Logic of Marketing: Dialog, Debate, and Directions* (pp. 43 – 56). New York: M. E. Shape.
- Vargo, S. L., & Lusch, R. (2008). Service-dominant logic: continuing the evolution. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 36, 1 - 10. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-007-0069-6>
- Vargo, S. L., & Lusch, R. (2013). Service-dominant logic: prologue and prospects. *Die Betriebswirtschaft*, 73(2), 91 - 93.
- Vargo, S. L., & Lusch, R. (2016). Institutions and axioms: an extension and update of service-dominant logic. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 44, 5 – 23. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-015-0456-3>
- Vargo, S. L., & Lusch, R. (2017). Service-dominant logic for 2025. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 34, 46 – 67. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijresmar.2016.11.001>
- Vargo, S. L., Lusch, R., Akaka, M. A., & He, Y. (2010). Service dominant-logic: a review and assesment. *Review of Marketing Research*, 6, 125 – 167. [https://doi.org/10.1108/S1548-6435\(2009\)0000006010](https://doi.org/10.1108/S1548-6435(2009)0000006010)
- Vargo, S. L., Lusch, R. Horbel, C., & Wieland, H. (2011). Alternative Logics for Service(S): From Hybrid Systems to Service Ecosystems. In: D. Spath and W. Ganz (eds.), *Taking the Pulse of Economic Development - Service Trends* (pp. 123 – 135). Munich: Hanzer Verlag.
- Wang, D., Li, X. R., & Li, Y. (2013). China's "Smart tourism destination" initiative: a taste of the service-dominant logic. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 2, 59 - 61. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2013.05.004>
- Wieland, H., Hartmann, N. N., & Vargo, S. L. (2017). Business models as service strategy. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 45, 925 – 943. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-017-0531-z>
- Woratschek, H., & Horbel, C. (2005). Are Variety Seekers Bad Customers? - An Analysis of the Role of Recommendations in the Service Profit Chain. *Journal of Relationship Marketing*, 4(3), 43 - 57. [https://doi.org/10.1300/J366vo4no3\\_04](https://doi.org/10.1300/J366vo4no3_04)

- Wu, H., Lv, X., Cavusoglu, M. & Cobanoglu, C. (2021). Chinese cruise customers' loyalty: the impact of customer participation and service personal values. *Tourism Review*, 76(1), 255-276. <https://doi.org/10.1108/TR-03-2019-0085>
- Xie, L., Guan, X., & Huan, T.-C. (2019). A case study of hotel frontline employees' customer need knowledge relating to value co-creation. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 39, 76 - 86. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2019.02.002>
- Xu, H. Liu, Y., & Lyu, X. (2018). Customer value co-creation and new service evaluation: the moderating role of outcome quality. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 30 (4), 2020 - 2036. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-08-2016-0467>
- Xu, Y., Marshall, R., Edvardsson, B., & Tronvoll, B. (2014). Show you care: initiating co-creation in service recovery. *Journal of Service Management*, 25 (3), 369 - 387. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JOSM-11-2012-0253>
- Yi, Y., & Gong, T. (2013). Consumer value co-creation behavior: Scale development and validation. *Journal of Business Research*, 66 (9), 1279 - 1284. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2012.02.026>

Received: 14/11/2021

Accepted: 30/11/2022

Coordinating editor: Martina G. Gallarza