

Value Co-destruction in Services: A Review of the Past Literature and an Agenda for the Future

Review of Professional Management:
A Journal of Management
21(2) 205–226, 2023
© The Author(s) 2023
DOI: 10.1177/09728686231210740
rpm.ndimdelhi.org



Syeda Tahera Sadia¹ and Vikas Gautam¹

Abstract

The value co-destruction (VCD) as a concept has been overshadowed by the focus of services research on value co-creation. The usefulness of service and value has been mentioned multiple times in the literature on service-dominant logic. The logical idea that, if value can be jointly created, it can also be jointly destroyed through similar interactional processes among the service systems has simply been ignored by the services study. In order to better grasp the notion of VCD and to pinpoint prospective areas for related future research, this article attempts to bring it to light. This study aims to do an in-depth literature review to identify the major aspects related to VCD that have been studied so far and thereby identify the gaps in the VCD literature to highlight the scope for related future research.

Keywords

Value co-destruction, co-destruction of value, interactive value formation, S-D logic, resource integration, service system interactions, negative value outcomes

Received 6 April 2023; accepted 5 October 2023

¹Department of Marketing & Strategy, IBS Hyderabad, IFHE University, Hyderabad, India

Corresponding Author:

Syeda Tahera Sadia, Department of Marketing & Strategy, IBS Hyderabad, IFHE University, Hyderabad, India.

E-mail: tahera0004@ibsindia.org



Creative Commons Non Commercial CC BY-NC: This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 License (<http://www.creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>) which permits non-Commercial use, reproduction and distribution of the work without further permission provided the original work is attributed.

Introduction

According to Philip Kotler (1972), marketing is an organised method of creating and providing value to others in order to elicit the desired reaction. The fundamental element of marketing is transaction, which is nothing more than a trade of values between the parties. In addition to goods, services and money, other resources, such as time, energy and even feelings, can also be exchanged as things of value. Value has been defined by Vargo et al. (2008, p. 149), as ‘an improvement in system well-being’, where well-being refers to ‘system adaptiveness or ability to fit in its environment’. The study of Diener et al. (1999, p. 276) also explains well-being as a set of incidents that comprise the emotional responses of the people combined with their judgements of life satisfaction, thereby highlighting the need to ensure that there is an improvement in well-being to guarantee value to the customer. Value has also been regarded as a trade-off between resources that are sacrificed (costs) so as to receive certain returns (benefits) (Zeithaml et al., 1988).

Value co-creation (VCC), according to Vargo and Lusch (2004) and Vargo (2008), is said to happen when the customers integrate their resources with that of the organisation to derive value from the value propositions offered by the service provider. The focus of VCC is on the integration of resources that happens during the interaction between the service systems. Vargo et al. (2008, p. 145) defined service systems as ‘configurations of resources (including people, information, and technology) connected to other systems by value propositions’. These service systems are nothing but the actors that are involved in the interaction process and include firms, customers, suppliers, employees and all the other partners in a firm’s network. These service systems or actors tend to integrate their resources with that of the other systems in the interaction process so as to create value for themselves and also for the other systems involved (Lusch & Vargo, 2006; Spohrer et al., 2007; Vargo et al., 2008). This makes the customers or any other service system for that matter assume the role of a resource integrator, thereby facilitating value rather than being a mere passive receiver of value.

From the foregoing discussion, it is evident that the implicit premise of S-D logic is that interactions between service systems/actors have an innate tendency to lead to VCC. But it need not always be the case. The service literature has seen an overwhelming focus of research on VCC, which has simply overlooked the possibility of an equally important concept of value co-destruction (VCD). This study seeks to raise awareness of VCD in an effort to better comprehend the idea and to pinpoint areas that could be studied further in the future. This article seeks to bring attention to VCD, in an effort to better comprehend the concept of VCD by reviewing the work done so far on the concept and to identify potential areas for related future research.

Value Co-destruction

The term ‘value co-destruction’ was first coined by Plé and Cáceres (2010, p. 431), who defined it as ‘an interactional process between service systems that results in a decline in at least one of the systems’ well-being’. The study by

Echeverri and Skålén (2011) has highlighted that just like VCC, VCD should also be considered as an integral part of the interaction between the providers and customers. Their study states, 'While co-creation refers to the process whereby providers and customers collaboratively create value, co-destruction refers to the collaborative destruction, or diminishment, of value by providers and customers'. When value can be considered as a trade-off between costs and benefits (Zeithaml et al., 1988), VCD is said to occur when the costs of engaging and integrating resources in the interaction process exceed the benefits achieved in return. As Prior and Marcos-Cuevas (2016) pointed out, VCD can be considered as the net deficit between costs and benefits.

Resource misuse or misintegration has been considered as the major cause of VCD (Laud et al., 2019; Plé & Cáceres 2010). The resources that are integrated by the service systems to create value for the other systems might also be utilised in a manner that has detrimental effects on the other systems, thereby resulting in VCD for at least one of the systems involved. Every system entering the interaction process has certain expectations about its roles and responsibilities and that of the other systems in terms of resource integration, in order to create value. According to Plé and Cáceres (2010), resources are considered to be misused when they are utilised in a manner that is considered unexpected or inappropriate by other systems involved in the interaction process.

Literature Review

The services literature presents evidence of a few studies that have focused on co-destruction of value and several aspects related to the same. The authors have done a review of such literature so as to gain a good understanding of what are the different aspects (about VCD) that have already been studied. This helps in two ways: first, it helps us in understanding the concept of VCD better, second, it helps us in identifying the areas that are yet to be researched. The findings, or rather the observations, of the literature review are given in Table 1.

Potential Areas of Future Research

From the literature review (discussed above), it can be observed that research on VCD has been gaining momentum over the years, and yet there is so much that still needs to be researched to learn more about VCD. It would, hence, be really helpful to look for the potential areas of future research, primarily from the perspective of 'Transformative Service Research' (TSR). TSR can be defined as any research endeavour that, at its core, examines the connection between service and well-being and places a focus on both indicators of growing and decreasing well-being. TSR primarily exemplifies research that is concerned with bringing about 'uplifting changes' that are meant to enhance the quality of life for people (both consumers and workers), families, communities, society and the ecosystem as a whole (Anderson et al., 2013). According to this TSR methodology, the emphasis on well-being issues in services also arises when at least one of the

Table I. Major Findings of the Literature Review.

Topic	Major Findings	Relevant Literature
Co-destruction definition	'An interactional process between service systems that results in a decline in at least one of the systems' well-being.' 'Co-destruction refers to the collaborative destruction, or diminishment, of value by providers and customers'	Plé and Cáceres (2010, p. 431) Echeverri and Skålén (2011, p. 355)
Value destruction-through-misuse	This term was set up in contrast to the term, 'value-in-use' related to co-creation. According to Plé and Cáceres (2010), VCD happens primarily because of misuse of resources by service systems. Resources are said to be misused when one or more service systems integrate or utilise the resources (their own or that of the other service systems) in a manner that is considered inappropriate or unexpected by the other service systems in the interaction process. When one or more service systems' resources are misused, it can have a negative impact on the value of at least one of the other systems engaged in the exchange. The authors further explain that when there is congruency in expectations of the service systems, then it leads to VCC, whereas the incongruency in expectations of the service systems results in VCD.	Plé and Cáceres (2010)
Types of 'misuse of resources' that lead to VCD	Resource misuse by one/more of the service systems is considered as the source of VCD. Two ways in which resources can be misused: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Accidental resource misuse 2. Intentional resource misuse 	Plé and Cáceres (2010)
Types of value formation	Two types: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Non-interactive value formation:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is also known as the exchange view of value. • Value is considered to be embedded into the products by the manufacturer during the production process, by combining all the resources together and giving it a shape of final output, which can be used. • It is objectively measured in terms of the price that the customer pays for the products. 	Echeverri and Skålén (2011)

(Table I continued)

(Table 1 continued)

Topic	Major Findings	Relevant Literature
Interaction value practices (practices, arising from interaction among the service systems. (These activities can lead to both VCC and VCD.)	<p>2. <i>Interactive value formation:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Value is considered to be co-created, while actually using the product and during the interaction taking place between the provider and the customer. • The value that is co-created is based on the set of preferences of the service system and is derived based on the contextual experiences enabled by that product. • Here, value is subjectively assessed by the service system. 	Echeverri and Skålén (2011)
	<p>Five interaction value practices:</p> <p>1. <i>Informing:</i> This is a practice where information sharing happens between employees and customers. This information mostly pertains to the issues related to the service.</p> <p>2. <i>Greeting:</i> This refers to the manner in which the employees and customers approach and greet each other.</p> <p>3. <i>Delivering:</i> This refers to delivery of the core service.</p> <p>4. <i>Charging:</i> This refers to that part of the interaction process between the customers and employees, which includes paying, charging and issuing tickets, etc.</p> <p>5. <i>Helping:</i> This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the help that employees/staff offer to the customers • the help that customers give each other • the help the customers provide to the employees/staff. <p>The authors also clearly explain that each of these practices can lead to either co-creation or co-destruction, depending upon the congruency in the elements of practice (procedures, understandings and engagements) for each of the above-mentioned practices. The interaction results in VCC when the actors or service systems draw on congruent elements of practice. Otherwise, it results in VCD when the elements drawn by the interacting actors are incongruent.</p>	

(Table 1 continued)

(Table 1 continued)

Topic	Major Findings	Relevant Literature
VCD in online environment	<p>Interactions among the following four elements were considered as online engagement: people, organisation, technology and service design. The following are the factors that influence the development of VCD induced by online customer engagement (on the basis of the aforementioned four elements):</p> <p><i>a. People:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retaliation and revenge by customer • Employees lacking soft-skills • Employees speaking negatively about their company <p><i>b. Organisation:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negative attitudes of the company (such as deception, avoiding and confrontational) • Long delays resulting from organisation's incompetency. <p><i>c. Technology:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technology failure 	Zhang, et al. (2018)
Formation of actor perceptions of VCD	<p><i>1. Goal prevention:</i></p> <p>This occurs when actors' desires are unrealised. This involves the actors' belief that their desired goals/outcomes were not realised from their interaction with other service systems involved in the interaction process.</p> <p>Causes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resource misalignment • Praxis/process misalignment • Absence of resources or practices <p>Main outcome:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Actor disappointment <p><i>2. Net deficits:</i></p> <p>This occurs when actors experience excessive costs, which could be in the form of psychological, emotional or other costs. Thus, these net deficits can be explained as the difference between the actor's perceived costs and perceived benefits as a result of collaboration with other service systems in the interaction process.</p>	Prior and Marcos-Cuevas (2016)

(Table 1 continued)

(Table 1 continued)

Topic	Major Findings	Relevant Literature
Different actor engagement styles influencing the actor's experience of VCD	<p>Causes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resource misuse <p>Main outcome:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Actor anxiety <p>Two bases for categorising actor engagement styles, that carry the potential to influence the actor's experience of VCD, are as follows:</p> <p><i>1. Explicitness of the actor's purchase goals:</i></p> <p>This refers to the extent to which the actor articulates their desire clearly and deliberately to other actors.</p> <p>The actor is said to be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explicit about the purchase goals when the actor is very clear in articulating their desire • Hybrid about the goals when he/she is sometimes clear in articulating their desires and sometimes not • Implicit about the purchase goals when the actor is not very clear in articulating his/her desire <p><i>2. Style of participation:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active: When the actors actively participate in the actor-to-actor interaction process • Hybrid: When customers participate in certain situations but not in other circumstances • Passive: When actors choose not to or do not intend to participate in interaction <p>The combination of the above actor styles results in VCD in the forms of goal prevention and net deficits.</p>	Prior and Marcos-Cuevas (2016)
Characteristics of actor-to-actor relationships in a service ecosystem that give rise to VCD	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Need for trade-off between possible benefits against opportunity costs 2. Inconsistency in the goals and priorities of different actors 	Prior and Marcos-Cuevas (2016)

(Table 1 continued)

(Table 1 continued)

Topic	Major Findings	Relevant Literature
VCD concerning online interactions among actors or service systems, in the context of fashion luxury	<p>The process of VCD under four main types/ themes of resources that are involved in the interactions between luxury brands and customers, happening online. The four main resources are as follows:</p> <p><i>1. Love:</i></p> <p>Customers who are emotional have higher standards for the reciprocity and caring shown by companies in their encounters. Such people demand a reward for their 'love'. In the online setting, it is challenging to keep an individualised approach, making this difficult to accomplish. For many customers, the lack of human interaction leads to VCD.</p> <p><i>2. Status:</i></p> <p>Some customers, particularly those of luxury brands, who do not want to be affiliated with people from other social classes, find it irritating that online platforms are accessible to the general public. A certain group of individuals experience value destruction as a result of this. There could be a loss of value for the company as well, particularly when the brand name is mocked and tagged in an online setting, which eventually lowers the value for many other customers.</p> <p><i>3. Information:</i></p> <p>Co-destruction of value in terms of information occurs in the following situations in the online environment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information is important in online environments, mainly due to the inability to touch products physically. • Online information about the bad experiences of consumers or people they know may devalue the brand as well as the product being purchased. The consequences of the brand not responding to such comments could be even worse. • Brands should exercise caution when posting any images or videos because different users may perceive them differently. 	Quach and Thaichon (2017)

(Table 1 continued)

(Table 1 continued)

Topic	Major Findings	Relevant Literature
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ease of access to information also creates the possibility of cascading, in which customers engage in similar behaviour after witnessing others disparage and criticise a company, even if they previously had a favourable attitude towards it. <p>4. <i>Services:</i></p> <p>When it comes to online services, there may be instances where customers' expectations are not fulfilled, particularly in the case of high-value customers who want more individualised services. Dissatisfaction could result from this, which could eventually lead to the customers' perception of value being destroyed.</p>	
Co-destruction in ecosystems	<p>Ecosystem here refers to the contexts that involve several stakeholders.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In ecosystems, a single actor's activities could unintentionally or intentionally co-create or co-destroy value for that actor or other stakeholders. • In addition, for one or more players in this ecosystem, VCC and VCD may alternate over time or even co-exist. • As a result, co-creation and co-destruction of worth can be seen as two sides of the same coin. 	Plé (2017)
VCD in different kinds or categories of relationships	<p>1. <i>B2C interactions:</i></p> <p>Customer misbehaviour leads to VCD, which can lower employee/staff well-being at the company.</p> <p>2. <i>B2B interactions:</i></p> <p>Value destruction is a result of certain unfavourable circumstances, such as lack of actor trust, poor coordination and communication, a lack of human capital and an imbalance of power.</p> <p>3. <i>Public actor interactions:</i></p> <p>VCD occurs when the value formed is diminished because of public's engagement, resulting in the generation of bad or negative outcomes. This typically occurs as a result of failures to provide services in accordance with set norms and/or inappropriate use of resources by the provider or user.</p>	Järvi et al. (2018)

(Table 1 continued)

(Table 1 continued)

Topic	Major Findings	Relevant Literature
Reasons that lead to VCD	<p>Numerous factors contribute to value co-destruction. Each of these causes has the potential to result in an ineffective interaction between the actors, which would then result in a decrease in well-being for either one or both, which is nothing more than VCD. Eight factors lead to VCD:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Absence of information <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Customer fails to produce information • Provider cannot provide accurate information and • Customer cannot process information. 2. An insufficient level of trust <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Customer is unwilling to offer details or information • Inability to trust • Customer acts selfishly 3. Mistakes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wrong assumptions • Incorrect product 4. An inability to serve <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expensive offerings • Poor customer relationship management • Failure to deliver on promises made to customers • Sluggish provider processes 5. An inability to change <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provider fails at responding to contingencies • Customer fails to adopt new behavioural ways 6. The absence of clear expectations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Absence of clear needs • Customer has inaccurate expectations 7. Customer misbehaviour <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Customer acts disruptively • Customer misuses product • Incorrect storing 8. Blaming <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harmful complaining • Groundless blaming 	Järvi et al. (2018)

(Table 1 continued)

(Table 1 continued)

Topic	Major Findings	Relevant Literature
Categorisation of the causes of VCD into time segments during the interaction or purchasing process	<p>It is important for managers to understand which antecedents/reasons of VCD arise at which point of time. Knowing this will allow them to anticipate these pitfalls and provide workers with the proper training.</p> <p>The following three time frames (during the collaboration process) can be used to group these reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Before collaboration <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inability to change • Absence of clear expectations 2. After collaboration <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Customer misbehaviour • Blaming 3. Time-independent (the following factors can take place anytime throughout the collaboration process): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Absence of information • Insufficient level of trust • Mistakes • Inability to serve 	Järvi et al. (2018)
The bad/negative effects of customer misbehaviour on employees during work	<p>Customer misbehaviour's effects on staff (how it leads to VCD among employees):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A major cause of frustration, rage, irritation and even depression among employees. • Has an adverse/negative impact on co-worker relationships (when employees are insulted in front of their peers, they feel humiliated). • The persistence of incidents involving misbehaving customers has an impact on employee's commitment to stay in one's position and with one's employer organisation. 	Kashif and Zarkada (2015)
Employee perceptions of customer misbehaviour and organisation's support in such situations	<p>The motives behind customers' inappropriate behaviour, according to employees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Customer misbehaviour is a tool to serve their individual interests. • A means to acquire influence over other clients. 	Kashif and Zarkada (2015)

(Table 1 continued)

(Table 1 continued)

Topic	Major Findings	Relevant Literature
Employee coping mechanisms to address workplace instances of inappropriate behaviour	<p>Employee perceptions of organisational (lack of) support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The technology, time and expertise required for successful customer interactions are not provided to employees. • Because service providers value their customers so highly, they only consider the (unfavourable) feedback provided by customers and ignore that of their employees. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Following the rules but improvising the solutions as needed • Because the company rewards service and because fellow employees appear to value effective customer handling, employees tend to exhibit empathy, compassion and tolerance. 	Kashif and Zarkada (2015)
Causes of diminished value in business-to-business interactions	<p>The paper found five major resources that, due to a lack of or improper use, account for low-value outcomes. The five major identified dimensions along with their constituent elements are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Absence of trust <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risk aversion • Fear of opportunism 2. Inadequate communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inadequate organisational structure • Inadequate information sharing 3. Inadequate coordination <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inadequate time • Untimely stakeholder interventions 4. Inadequate human capital <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inadequate experiential knowledge • Inadequate skills/ability • Static mental models 5. Power/dependence imbalance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced motivation • Goal incongruence • Groupthink • Conflict • Reduced goal commitment 	Vafeas et al. (2016)

(Table 1 continued)

(Table 1 continued)

Topic	Major Findings	Relevant Literature
A spectrum of dimensions of value formation, produced by various social practices in the sharing economy (Airbnb).	<p>This study proposed the term ‘value diminution’ in contrast to ‘value co-destruction’. Vafeas et al. (2016) defined value diminution as follows: ‘The perceived suboptimal value realization that occurs as a consequence of resource deficiencies in, or resource misuse by, one or more interacting actors. Any or all of the actors may, to a greater or lesser extent, be victims of value diminution.’</p> <p>The following are the six themes of guest–host social practices and their subcategories, which together produce a spectrum of dimensions of value formation (both VCC and VCD):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcoming • Evaluating location and accommodation • Expressing feelings • Helping and interacting • Recommending • Thanking 	Camilleri and Neuhofer. (2017)
Scale development of VCD behaviour in tourism	<p>This research supports the idea that value can be co-created or co-destroyed during interactions when the elements of practices drawn by the interacting service systems are not consistent with one another or are incongruent.</p> <p>The Chinese tourism business serves as the study’s context. The writers created a scale to quantify the value destruction of the travel and tourism sector. The study’s findings indicate that five dimensions make up the measurement scale for VCD behaviour in tourism, which are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bad interpersonal communication behaviour • Bad interpersonal interaction behaviour • Irresponsible customer behaviour • Employee contract violation behaviour • Irresponsible employee behaviour 	Guan et al. (2020)
Introducing the notion of ‘value no-creation’	<p>According to the authors, on the interaction and value framework outcomes continuum, value no-creation (outcome: difference in value-in-context) lies between co-destruction (outcome: decline in value-in-context) and co-creation. (Outcome: increase in value-in-context.) The framework also demonstrates how the process alternates between co-creative, no-creative and co-destructive interaction episodes, leading to the no-creation relationship conclusion.</p>	Makkonen and Ilkkonen (2017)

(Table 1 continued)

(Table 1 continued)

Topic	Major Findings	Relevant Literature
Typology of resource misintegration manifestations	<p>VCD manifestations have been found based on a review of the literature on the subject. A manifestation is a clear indication that resource misintegration has in fact occurred rather than a cause. These manifestations offer proof or a precursor to the potentially reduced well-being of one or more focal actors in the service system, giving managers an opportunity to address the VCD impacting the well-being of the service systems in various areas.</p> <p>Ten such distinct manifestations were identified:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lack of resources to integrate 2. Blocked access to integrate resources 3. Unwillingness to integrate resources 4. Misunderstanding of how to integrate resources 5. Disagreement on how to integrate resources 6. Deceptive integration of resources 7. Negligent integration of resources 8. Incapacity to integrate resources 9. Excessive integration of resources 10. coercive integration of resources 	Laud et al. (2019)
Impact of VCD on different domains of well-being along with examples	<p>During the interactional value process, VCD causes at least one of the support systems to experience a decline in well-being. From the literature review, six different domains of well-being have been identified. These domains have been listed below along with examples of decreased well-being (as a result of VCD) in each such domain, which are as follows:</p> <p><i>1. Professional well-being:</i></p> <p>Actors' assessments of their current job development and work experiences are included in this area of well-being.</p> <p>Examples: role ambiguity, burnout or job loss</p> <p><i>2. Leisure well-being:</i></p> <p>The assessment of the leisure time and involvement of the interacting systems falls under this area of well-being.</p> <p>Examples include having less time to participate in or experiencing less hedonic enjoyment from leisure activities.</p>	Laud et al. (2019)

(Table 1 continued)

(Table I continued)

Topic	Major Findings	Relevant Literature
	<p>3. <i>Financial well-being:</i></p> <p>This area of well-being is the focal actors' assessment of their financial status and security.</p> <p>Examples include a decrease in lifestyle security and comfort.</p> <p>4. <i>Health and safety well-being:</i></p> <p>The focal actors' assessment of their state of bodily health is included in this area of well-being.</p> <p>Examples: poor health and mobility</p> <p>5. <i>Emotional well-being:</i></p> <p>The evaluation of the focal actor's emotional condition is referred to as this domain of well-being.</p> <p>Examples: negative felt emotions, such as anger, sadness, anxiety or fear</p> <p>6. <i>Social well-being:</i></p> <p>This domain of well-being refers to a sense of togetherness and good interpersonal ties among the main actors.</p> <p>Examples: isolation, loneliness and/or loss of trust in others</p>	
VCD in hotel services	<p>Six potential VCD antecedents were found to be the sum of a number of potential variables that might have contributed to poor service experiences in hotel services. They are listed below:</p> <p><i>1. Provider-originated antecedents:</i></p> <p>These are the factors or antecedents in hotel services, that customers did not expect and thus led to VCD. These factors include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Inability to provide a service:</i> Typically, this relates to issues with the services provided to the customer while they were staying at the hotel. • <i>Contextual rigidity:</i> This relates to problems with a hotel, internal or external, that may limit how well its employees can provide services to guests. • <i>Incoherent marketing communication:</i> This is when a company communicates with its clients in a way that is inaccurate and leaves them with false and unrealistic expectations. 	Järvi et al. (2020)

(Table I continued)

(Table 1 continued)

Topic	Major Findings	Relevant Literature
Antecedents of VCD in online travel communities	<p>2. <i>Customer-originated antecedents:</i> These are the elements or precursors in hotel services that characterise client behaviour that the business and its staff did not anticipate and as a result caused VCD. These elements include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Excessive expectations:</i> This factor describes the situations where the customers develop unreasonable and unrealistic expectations regarding the hotel visit. • <i>Insufficient communication:</i> This element relates to a guest's failure to communicate with hotel employees while they are staying there. • <i>Inappropriate behaviour:</i> This is used to describe instances in which customers act inappropriately or in ways that deviate from accepted norms of social behaviour. 	Lv et al. (2021)
	<p>Online travel communities are best characterised as social networks that allow travellers to exchange knowledge, advice and travel experiences while also offering advice and support to other travellers. Most of the time, it is provided at no cost. Negative behaviours in these communities mainly result in VCD by restricting other members' access to reliable knowledge and information. In the context of online travel communities, the antecedents to VCD are as follows:</p> <p><i>Social loafing:</i> In contrast to when they work alone, community members tend to put forth less effort when working with others. They make fewer information- and knowledge-based contributions and instead prefer to wait for others to do so.</p> <p><i>Knowledge hiding:</i> This can be characterised as an undesirable behaviour in which members purposefully withhold or conceal information that is needed by others or that could be beneficial to them.</p>	

(Table 1 continued)

(Table 1 continued)

Topic	Major Findings	Relevant Literature
Outcomes of VCD in online travel communities	<p><i>Communication overload:</i> This describes a situation in which a community's demands for communication surpass its members' capacity for communication, leading to VCD in those individuals. It usually happens when community members invest time, effort, information and knowledge into participating in frequent interactive communication but do not receive enough benefits as a result. This leads them to believe that the situation is unfair and causes a lot of psychological pressure, ultimately leading to VCD.</p>	
	<p><i>Distrust:</i> Distrust is a type of non-cooperative behaviour that is associated with negative beliefs or lack of confidence in the qualities or behaviours of the other person. As an illustration, it can impact interpersonal relationships and contribute to VCD when community members believe that other members are incompetent, malicious or deceptive.</p>	
	<p><i>Conflict:</i> Conflict is defined as the interaction between two or more parties who have conflicting objectives, which may lead to member tension, hostility, apathy and other negative feelings.</p>	
	<p><i>Inappropriate behaviour:</i> When members act in a disrespectful, demeaning, unreasonable or aggressive manner towards other members, that behaviour is deemed improper. Such behaviour has a bad emotional impact on the other members, resulting in VCD. For instance, treating other community members with an impolite attitude or yelling at people on purpose to express their own feelings, etc., can result in VCD for the community's members.</p>	
	<p>When members of the online community experience VCD, their well-being is declined. So, in order to bring back the equilibrium and improve their well-being, they tend to engage in coping behaviours. The outcomes of VCD, as experienced in online travel communities are as follows:</p>	Lv et al. (2021)

(Table 1 continued)

(Table 1 continued)

Topic	Major Findings	Relevant Literature
How VCD takes place in self-service technologies (SSTs)	<p><i>Negative word-of-mouth:</i> This refers to a scenario where consumers pass along or share their bad consumption experiences—or those of others—to others in an effort to discourage them from consuming a product. Consumers who perceive VCD as negative emotions have a tendency to let those negative emotions out through negative word-of-mouth.</p>	
	<p><i>Switching behaviour:</i> This is a term used to describe a phenomenon where customers cease using a certain service and switch to another. The main causes of the same are unhappiness, disappointment and regret. When faced with VCD, consumers frequently engage in switching activity as a coping mechanism.</p>	
	<p><i>Counterproductive work behaviour:</i> This refers to potentially adverse behaviours enacted by members that may negatively impact businesses and/or stakeholders such as workers, investors and clients. A few members may participate in counterproductive behaviours to vent their negative emotions when they experience negative emotions because this tends to cause VCD for them.</p>	
	<p>The four major themes of customer inabilities (summarised from 15 factors), which result in VCD in customer interactions with SSTs, are as follows:</p>	Galdolage (2021)
<p><i>Poor co-learning:</i> One of the major reasons as to why customers experience VCD is that they do not cooperate in learning about SST transactions. Customers' poor learning of SST transactions, which results in VCDs, is primarily caused by their inability to seek the most accurate information, follow instructions, refuse to share necessary information and recall information.</p>		
<p><i>Poor cooperation:</i> VCD in SSTs are also caused by customers' poor cooperation with SSTs. The major types of customer poor cooperation that resulted in VCD in SSTs were generally recognised as not complying with the requirements, refusing to accept the terms and conditions, refusing to accept responsibility and refusing to change habits.</p>		

(Table 1 continued)

(Table 1 continued)

Topic	Major Findings	Relevant Literature
	<p><i>Poor connections with service employees:</i> Customers' interactions with the service provider in the context of SST are usually restricted to instances in which they experience issues or challenges with SST performance. They become irritated if they are unable to reach the service personnel during critical situations.</p> <p><i>Poor correcting skills:</i> Other significant causes of VCDs include client shortcomings in error prevention and recovery in SSTs. Many SSTs typically provide warnings and indications of potential errors, so that customers can recognise them and act quickly to avoid errors, as was brought up by the respondents. Customers' poor error-prevention skills and inattention to these cautions, however, lead to VCD in SSTs.</p>	

service systems involved in the interaction process has been harmed—either unintentionally, unknowingly or occasionally even intentionally—by services. And VCD by definition talks about well-being diminished or decreased and, hence, studying VCD from the TSR perspective will hold interesting implications for not just managers and researchers but also the society at large. Because much of the literature was focused on the co-creation of value, researchers have not focused much on the co-destruction of value and this article acts as a point of reference for the researchers in future by giving a detailed review of the work that has already been done in the area of VCD and also by listing out the potential areas (related to VCD) for future research.

Given the increasing level of interactive value formation in recent years, I believe that just as the co-creation of value, the co-destruction of value is also inevitable. So, from the TSR perspective, the following are the potential areas of future research (related to VCD):

- Impact/effects of co-destruction on the well-being-oriented outcomes of customers/employees.
- Given the growing co-production role of customers and the importance of consumers in value creation, the role of consumers in VCD activities and their effect on both consumer and employee well-being (Anderson & Ostrom, 2015).
- Scale development to measure VCD.

Other areas for potential future research:

- Potential drivers of stress experienced by service employees and customers (as a result of VCD).
- Drivers of the behaviours of service systems that result in co-destruction. In order to understand the concept of co-destruction better, it would be useful to study what actually drives the behaviours of consumers, or employees or any other service systems, such that it causes them to behave in a way that leads to VCD.
- Given that value is thought to have many facets and cover a range of dimensions (economic, relational, experiential, etc.), is it conceivable or logical to think that one type of value might make up for another? If so, it would imply that an interaction could have both VCC and VCD for the same actor (for example, economic VCD on the one hand and experiential or relational VCC on the other).
- Is such a situation conceivable? If so, how precisely would this happen? How could it possibly be measured? (Plé, 2017).
- Ecosystem dynamics, or co-destruction contexts with a variety of stakeholders, should be the main emphasis of research on co-destruction processes. The co-destruction process may be much more complex when multiple and diverse actors and service systems are engaged in ecosystems than it is when only two actors are present.

The co-creation and co-destruction of value are like the two sides of the same coin. If VCC is possible, then VCD is also equally possible. So, studying VCD might offer interesting and fascinating avenues for research, specifically in services marketing, while also helping us to get a wholesome understanding of the interaction value process.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship and/or publication of this article.

References

- Anderson, L., & Ostrom, A. L. (2015). Transformative service research: Advancing our knowledge about service and well-being. *Journal of Service Research, 18*(3), 243–249.
- Anderson, L., Ostrom, A. L., Corus, C., Fisk, R. P., Gallan, A. S., Giraldo, M., Mende, M., Mulder, M., Rayburn, S. W., Rosenbaum, M. S., Shirahada, K., & Williams, J. D. (2013). Transformative service research: An agenda for the future. *Journal of Business Research, 66*(8), 1203–1210.

- Camilleri, J., & Neuhofer, B. (2017). Value co-creation and co-destruction in the Airbnb sharing economy. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 29*(9), 2322–2340.
- Diener, E., Suh, E. M., Lucas, R. E., & Smith, H. L. (1999). Subjective well-being: Three decades of progress. *Psychological Bulletin, 125*(2), 276.
- Echeverri, P., & Skålén, P. (2011). Co-creation and co-destruction: A practice-theory based study of interactive value formation. *Marketing Theory, 11*(3), 351–373.
- Galdolage, B. S. (2021). Barriers for entering the digital world: Exploring customer value co-destruction in self-service technologies. *FIIB Business Review, 10*(3), 276–289.
- Guan, X., Gong, J., Xie, L., & Huan, T. C. (2020). Scale development of value co-destruction behavior in tourism. *Tourism Management Perspectives, 36*, 100757.
- Järvi, H., Kähkönen, A. K., & Torvinen, H. (2018). When value co-creation fails: Reasons that lead to value co-destruction. *Scandinavian Journal of Management, 34*(1), 63–77.
- Järvi, H., Keränen, J., Ritala, P., & Vilko, J. (2020). Value co-destruction in hotel services: Exploring the misalignment of cognitive scripts among customers and providers. *Tourism Management, 77*, 104030.
- Kashif, M., & Zarkada, A. (2015). Value co-destruction between customers and frontline employees: A social system perspective. *International Journal of Bank Marketing, 33*(6), 672–691.
- Kotler, P. (1972). A generic concept of marketing. *Journal of Marketing, 36*(2), 46–54.
- Laud, G., Bove, L., Ranaweera, C., Leo, W. W. C., Sweeney, J., & Smith, S. (2019). Value co-destruction: A typology of resource misintegration manifestations. *Journal of Services Marketing, 33*(7), 866–889.
- Lusch, R. F., & Vargo, S. L. (2006). Service-dominant logic: Reactions, reflections and refinements. *Marketing Theory, 6*(3), 281–288.
- Lv, X., Zhang, R., & Li, Q. (2021). Value co-destruction: The influence of failed interactions on members' behaviors in online travel communities. *Computers in Human Behavior, 122*, 106829.
- Makkonen, H., & Olkkonen, R. (2017). Interactive value formation in interorganizational relationships: Dynamic interchange between value co-creation, no-creation, and co-destruction. *Marketing Theory, 17*(4), 517–535.
- Plé, L., & Cáceres, R. C. (2010). Not always co-creation: Introducing interactional co-destruction of value in service-dominant logic. *Journal of Services Marketing, 24*(6), 430–437.
- Plé, L. (2017). Why do we need research on value co-destruction? *Journal of Creating Value, 3*(2), 162–169.
- Prior, D. D., & Marcos-Cuevas, J. (2016). Value co-destruction in interfirm relationships: The impact of actor engagement styles. *Marketing Theory, 16*(4), 533–552.
- Quach, S., & Thaichon, P. (2017). From connoisseur luxury to mass luxury: Value co-creation and co-destruction in the online environment. *Journal of Business Research, 81*, 163–172.
- Spohrer, J., & Maglio, P. P. (2008). The emergence of service science: Toward systematic service innovations to accelerate co-creation of value. *Production and Operations Management, 17*(3), 238–246.

- Vafeas, M., Hughes, T., & Hilton, T. (2016). Antecedents to value diminution: A dyadic perspective. *Marketing Theory, 16*(4), 469–491.
- Vargo, S. L. (2008). Customer integration and value creation: Paradigmatic traps and perspectives. *Journal of Service Research, 11*(2), 211–215.
- Vargo S. L., & Lusch, R. F. (2004). Evolving to a new dominant logic for marketing. *Journal of Marketing, 68*(1), 1–17.
- Vargo, S. L., Maglio, P. P., & Akaka, M. A. (2008). On value and value co-creation: A service systems and service logic perspective. *European Management Journal, 26*(3), 145–152.
- Zeithaml, V. A., Berry, L. L., & Parasuraman, A. (1988). Communication and control processes in the delivery of service quality. *Journal of Marketing, 52*(2), 35–48.
- Zhang, T., Lu, C., Torres, E., & Chen, P. J. (2018). Engaging customers in value co-creation or co-destruction online. *Journal of Services Marketing, 32*(1), 57–69.