Misalignment of Actor's Resources Leading to Value Co-destruction: A Systematic Literature Review for Future Research Frontier

Noreen Zahra
Dr. Hasan Murad School of Management, University of Management and Technology
Department of Management Sciences, Virtual University of Pakistan
Abdul Rashid Kausar
Dr. Hasan Murad School of Management, University of Management and Technology
ark@umt.edu.pk

Corresponding: noreen.zahra@hotmail.com

ARTICLE INFO	**ABSTRACT**
	The Service-Dominant Logic literature revolves around the phenomenological nature of value. To date, the literature has shown a biased and myopic view of value co-creation as an outcome of service interaction. Leading journals have given prominent space to value co-creation, but value co-destruction is yet least explored though it is also a realistic view of a service interaction. Value co-creation manifests the wellness of actors, but not all service interactions result in positive outcomes causing value co-destruction. The researchers have started the debate on value co-destruction relating to its conceptual description; still, the literature needs to be more cohesive. This article is a systematic literature review that explores the epistemological, theoretical, and contextual understanding of value co-destruction to synthesize fragmented literature from 2010 to date. This article provides an overview of value co-destruction seminal work, theoretical underpinnings, leading antecedents, and coping strategies in particular contexts. The systematic selection of literature affirms value co-destruction as a decline in the wellbeing of actors during service exchange due to the misalignment of actors' resources and a mirror image of value co-creation. This article offers co-existence, the role of context, contextual antecedents, and the temporal nature of co-destruction as future research directions.

INTRODUCTION

Over the last two decades, the research debates in marketing revolved around value, resources, service, and service system. Vargo and Lusch (Vargo & Lusch, 2004, 2008, 2016) brought the contemporary orientation in the discipline of marketing termed as Service-Dominant (S-D) logic focusing on value-in-use, operant resources, actors, and value cocreation (VCC). The contemporary S-D logic research offers an actor-centered view of resource integration. In such a view, the actors cocreate value while integrating operant resources in service-for-service exchange (Akaka et al., 2012; Greer et al., 2016; Spohrer et al., 2015). Value cocreation offers a mechanism for resource integration and service-for-service exchange, thus considered as a fundamental theme in S-D logic (Vargo & Lusch, 2017). Predominantly, value cocreation is defined as an integration of resources by the actors for mutual wellbeing governed by institutional arrangements (McColl-Kennedy & Cheung, 2019). Grönroos

(2008, 2012) defines value co-creation as a process where the actors cocreate and realize the value during the consumption (value-in-use) for mutual benefit. Likewise, Prahalad & Ramaswamy (2000) explain service interaction as a locus of cocreation of value among the actors. Hence, value co-creation received a prominent focus and space in leading journals. Still, the inherent limitation of the lexicon has undermined the significance of value co-destruction (VCD), which is another plausible outcome of resource integration (Buhalis et al., 2020; Plé, 2017).

Undeniably, adopting a value cocreation lens offers a valuable vantage to comprehend the resource integration that manifests the wellness of actors. Still, not all service interactions result in positive outcomes. The interest in value co-destruction has recently emerged as practitioners, and researchers observe non-positive outcomes and misuse of resources (Cova & Paranque, 2012; Jarvi et al., 2018; Kashif & Zarkada, 2015; Lv et al., 2021). Plé and Chumpitaz (2010) criticize the biased narrative of the positive outcome of resource integration in S-D logic literature and bring the notion of value co-destruction as a mirror image of value cocreation. The optimistic view of value cocreation has obscured the epistemological development of value co-destruction, a natural alternative product of resource integration. Echeverri & Skalen (2011) also argued that value co-destruction is a significant feature of service interaction previously neglected. Value co-destruction is a service interaction that declines at least one actor's wellbeing (Echeverri & Skålén, 2021). In literature, value co-destruction is conceptualized as failed resource integration (Plé, 2017; Plé & Chumpitaz, 2010). Smith (2013) illustrates value co-destruction as an inappropriate and unexpected integration of resources that declines at least one actor' wellbeing; either failed integration is intentional or accidental. Vafeas et al. (2016) further clarify value diminution as resource deficiencies caused by resource misuse by one or more actors. Though value co-destruction is an emerging debate as a natural alternative to value cocreation, the understanding and epistemological development of value co-destruction remain limited (Laud et al., 2019; Mahajan, 2019; Mengcheng & Tuure, 2022; Plé, 2017). It raises research opportunities to investigate value co-destruction literature in more depth.

The purpose of this study is threefold. The first purpose of conducting a systematic literature review on value co-destruction is variability in definition and terminology. Despite the broadly adopted definition of value co-destruction, the understanding of value co-destruction still varies, especially when compared to research on cocreation (Laud et al., 2019; Plé, 2017; Smith, 2013). It obscures the epistemological conceptual development and poses a challenge for future research. As a way forward, this study explores the recent literature published on value co-destruction to extend its epistemological understanding. It offers dissection of definitions to explore the commonly adopted properties of value co-destruction. It will also facilitate the exploration of the least explored properties for the entomological enrichment of the construct. The validation of value co-creation as a mirror image of value correlation will also establish while analyzing the divergent definitions of co-destruction (Ogunbodede et al., 2022). Second, the definitional clarity also requires exploration related to theoretical, contextual, and methodological adoption of value co-destruction. This scrutiny will enable the scholars to explore the appropriateness and application of value co-destruction with contemporary theories and methodologies. Bringing the context in the literature of value co-destruction while

reviewing the literature is another important objective of this study. This systematic literature review offers a synopsis covering definition, theoretical underpinning, contextual variation, and method adapted to study value co-destruction.

Another purpose of this article is to explore the leading antecedent of value co-destruction and its coping strategies. So far, up to the best of our knowledge, the leading antecedents of value co-destruction (McColl-Kennedy & Cheung, 2019) and its coping strategies are fragmented (Kashif & Zarkada, 2015). This systematic review contributes to amalgamating the leading antecedents of value co-destruction and its coping strategies by synthesizing the studies published in internationally acclaimed and peer-reviewed journals from 2010 to 2021. The third purpose of this systematic literature review is to offer future research frontiers to advance the debate of value co-destruction for scholars of S-D logic. So far, the synthesized literature on value co-destruction with the lens of resource integration is scant. The synthesized literature on value co-destruction will facilitate the scholars' scale development and quantitative measurement of relationships with other constructs. In addition, studies concerning scale development for value cocreation have been found; still, an attempt has yet to be made to measure the construct of value co-destruction. This study will provide scholars with the dimensions and properties of value co-destruction for scale development. This systematic literature review offers a summarization of current value co-destruction research to put forth the debate of actors' resource integration leading to value co-destruction offering future research frontiers.

This article proceeds in a manner that the literature section provides the literature boundaries we set for the underlying study. The methodological section explains the design adopted to conduct the systematic literature review. It leads to a result and discussion section casing the prime purposes of this systematic literature review, including summarization of definition and theoretical underpinnings, leading antecedents of value co-destruction in contextual variety, coping strategies, and methodologies. It will also summarize the leading antecedents of value co-destruction and its coping strategies. Finally, future research frontiers are discussed to advance the literature's theoretical development of value co-destruction and policy implications for practitioners.

LITERATURE REVIEW

As mentioned in the previous section, this study outlines the literature from 2010 to date as value co-destruction as an emerging construct evolved in the selected time, but the theoretical underpinning of this construct started in 2004. Vargo and Lusch (2004) presented the new meta-theoretical framework for contemporary practices of firms and customers challenged by the fourth industrial revolution. The fourth industrial revolution brought rapid changes in the industries and societal models due to increasing interconnectivity and hassle-free access to information (Koh et al., 2019; Leopold et al., 2016). Thus, the traditional theories and framework need to be reconceptualized (Akaka et al., 2012; Vargo & Lusch, 2017). Now, the traditional bifurcation of customers, producers, suppliers, and stakeholders are reconceptualized as actors who are equipped with knowledge and skills and interconnected within their ecosystems for producing value cocreation (Brodie et al., 2019; Day, 2015;

Katzan, 2009; Zhang et al., 2022). Vargo and Lusch (2017) proposed five axioms to revisit and reconceptualize the traditional concepts in marketing, including operant resources, actors, value cocreation, service (exchange of knowledge, competencies, and skills), and institutional arrangement. The axioms of S-D logic elucidate the process of value cocreation where the actors exchange services (knowledge, skills, competencies) within the institutional arrangements to cocreate the value. The value is always unique and idiosyncratic, and value cocreation is core of the process (Vargo, 2012; Vargo & Lusch, 2017; Vargo et al., 2008). Since then, the value cocreation is attracted the attention of scholars and practitioners and many leading journals have published special editions and books on S-D logic and value cocreation.

Grönroos (2012), Prahalad and Ramaswamy (2004), Vargo et al. (2008), and Akaka and Parry (2019) seminal work define the properties of value as unique, phenomenological and cocreated by the actors. The value cocreation is attributed to actors' resources integration process resulting in the mutual wellbeing of actors. Their seminal work also provides theoretical support for the underlying study. Plé and Chumpitaz (2010) brought a new discussion of value co-destruction, which is why the article selection in the underlying study is based on 2010. The myopic and limited epistemology of construct value cocreation was challenged with the notion that all service exchanges may not result in the mutual wellbeing of actors. If the service-for-service exchange is not well carried with the agreed value proposal, it may result in a loss of resources loos, resulting in value co-destruction (Echeverri & Skålén, 2011; Plé, 2016, 2017). The seminal work of Plé (2017) brought future directions for scholars to reconceptualize the constructs of value cocreation and co-destruction while deviating from its biased for a more realistic understanding. This systematic literature review is an action call against Plé (2017) exploring the in-depth basis of the value cocreation construct. It includes exploring the properties of value co-destruction as a realistic and plausible outcome of service-for-service exchange. Throughout the article, the literature review, analysis, and discussion with systematic methodology depict the evolution of constructs from 2010 to date. It will facilitate the scholars and practitioners to enrich their understanding of the value co-destruction contract and its relevant elements and properties to lead the research in new avenues. The systematic approach helped in exploring the evolution of construct free to researcher's biases and selection error. The next section explains the methodology adopted for systematic literature review and the process of article selection and data extraction with inclusion and exclusion criteria.

DATA AND METHODOLOGY

Retrieving and Mapping Literature

As mentioned in the section above, the research in value co-creation and resource integration leads to the research priority while value co-destruction is still at its conceptual development stage. Research findings related to value co-destruction and its related dimensions are scant. This manuscript systematically presents systematic literature on actors' resource integration leading to value co-destruction to fill the gap. The core aim of this manuscript is to synthesize the value co-destruction definition, theoretical underpinning, leading antecedents, coping strategies, and methodology of published articles. It also covers the leading antecedents of value co-destruction and its previous coping strategies. We adopt systematic literature to address specific questions while utilizing explicit and transparent methods of searching the literature for critical appraisal. The purpose is to conclude what we know and have not yet explored while synthesizing the literature (Williams et al., 2020). We adopted the systematic literature review methodology proposed by Tranfield et al. (2003). In particular, as research in management science grows in volume, topic fragmentation and interdisciplinary research have increased (Williams et al., 2020); thus, the transparency and rigour apply to a review of the prior academic work with pre-defined selection criteria validate the selection of literature (Hiebl, 2021). Tranfield, Denyer, & Smart (2003) proposed a systematic literature review based on three stages, including planning the review (stage I), conducting a review (stage II), and reporting and dissemination (stage III).

Stage I: Planning the Review (Identification, - Preparation, and Development of a review protocol

During stage I, there are two phases. In phase 0 and phase I, we identify the gap to validate the need for a systematic literature review and draft questions as preparing a proposal for review. We drafted two important questions given below:

Q1: In the domain of service-dominant logic, what research journals have published covering the debate of actor's resource integration leading to value co-destruction to date regarding its definition, theoretical underpinning, and methodology?

Q2: Based on the results of the underlying study, what are the leading antecedents of value co-destruction and the coping strategies suggested in research journals?

In phase 2, we develop a review protocol. We developed a search strategy and inclusion and exclusion criteria for research articles aligned with questions. First, the databases like SCOPUS, Crossref, and Google Scholar were searched using Publish or Perish software programs. Table I explains the search strategy for keywords in databases. Such keywords navigate the systematic literature review to achieve the study's objectives.

Table I: Search keywords used for the systematic literature review on value co-destruction

Databases	Keywords and search terms in titles and abstracts
SCOPUS	"Value cocreation" AND ("Value co-destruction" AND "Service-dominant logic")
Crossref	"Resource integration" AND ("service-dominant logic" OR "value cocreation")
Google Scholar	"Resource integration" AND ("service-dominant logic" OR "value co-destruction")
	"Value cocreation" AND ("value co-destruction" OR "value destruction")

Source: Authors

For inclusion criteria, we chose the studies published in English only. We apply the limit on the year of publication starting from 2004 as proposed service-dominant logic in the same year. This study covers the literature till 2021 in phase 1. In later stage, the limit on the year of publication started from 2010 to date as value co-destruction as construct and plausible outcome was first published in 2010. Journal and electronic articles and conference papers were included while restricting the search to management, marketing, and social science disciplines. We do not select dissertations, reports, unpublished work, and news and magazine articles while applying the exclusion criteria. Likewise, any research work published in other disciplines is excluded from this study. The only reason for applying this exclusion criterion is to keep the focus of the study within the domain of marking, management, and social sciences.

Stage II: Conducting a Review (identification, selection and quality assessment, and data extraction)

In phase 3 of stage II, we started searching the aforementioned key terms in selected databases, i.e., SCOPUS, Crossref, and Google Scholar, with the help of Publish or Perish which is a software program that retrieves and analyzes academic citations from a range of citation metrics. We conducted our first search in the SCOPUS database using the earlier-mentioned search strategy. We found 76 research studies in SCOPUS relevant to our scope of the study. Likewise, we found 69 relevant research studies in the Crossref database and 83 in Google Scholar. We read the abstract, keywords, and significant findings during the process. This practice facilitates the application of inclusion and exclusion criteria. While applying the inclusion and exclusion criteria, and wipeout the duplication of articles to refine the search. We found 74 research studies more relevant to our scope of the study. The selected articles were aligned with the research questions and objectives of the systematic literature review. Table II explains our search strategy, identifying pertinent documents, and the final selection of research articles. It explains the identification from each database retrieval to aim relevant for the final selection.

Table II: Summary of search results from databases

Database	Search scope	Key terms	Articles retrieved	Relevant articles	Aim relevant	Final
SCOPUS	Title, keyword and abstract	"Value cocreation" AND ("Value co-destruction" AND "Service dominant logic")	14	10		
		"Resource integration" AND ("service-dominant logic" OR "value cocreation")	48	36		
		"Resource integration" AND ("service-dominant logic" OR "value co-destruction")	38	27	76	
		"Resource integration" AND ("value cocreation" OR "value co-destruction)	47	39		
Crossref	Title, keyword and abstract	"Value cocreation" AND ("Value co-destruction" AND "Service dominant logic")	46	27		
		"Resource integration" AND ("service-dominant logic" OR "value cocreation")	18	14		
		"Resource integration" AND ("service-dominant logic" OR "value co-destruction")	37	29	69	
		"Resource integration" AND ("value cocreation" OR "value co-destruction)	35	28		**74**
Google Scholar	Title, keyword and abstract	"Value cocreation" AND ("Value co-destruction" AND "Service dominant logic")	142	100		
		"Resource integration" AND ("service-dominant logic" OR "value cocreation")	78	53		
		"Resource integration" AND ("service-dominant logic" OR "value co-destruction")	56	39	83	
		"Resource integration" AND ("value cocreation" OR "value co-destruction)	59	39		

Source: Literature search results

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Stage III: Conducting a review (data synthesis and analysis)

This section provides an overview of the value co-destruction definition published from 2010 to 2022. (See Table III for an overview).

Synthesizing the Literature Value Co-Destruction Definition

Table III shows the structure of prior literature related to value co-destruction definition. In addition, this section also accounts for the methodology and theoretical underpinning of the selected article. It is evident from the literature that most research studies used the conceptual explanation of Plé and Chumpitaz (2010) and Echeverri and Skålén (2011) while defining value co-destruction. Both articles are the most cited in the selected studies. (Plé, 2016), in his latest research, emphasizes the need for further research on value co-destruction, especially in the context of ecosystems. The seminal work of Plé and Chumpitaz (2010) and Echeverri and Skålén (2011) mutually define value co-destruction as a process where the interaction among actors results in a decline in at least one of the systems instead of value cocreation. The value co-destruction is initiated due to the misalignment of actors' resources, either accidental or intentional. Thus, the definitions provide the theoretical underpinning for extending the epistemological understanding of value co-destruction as a mirror image of value cocreation (Cabiddu et al., 2019; Calhau Codá & Silva Farias, 2021; Jarvi et al., 2018). The second observation is related to the theoretical underpinning for exploring value co-destruction. However, most studies apply the theoretical lens of S-D logic while elucidating value co-destruction. In the selected articles, the most cited articles on value co-destruction used the S-D logic to provide theoretical background (See table III). Crowther and Donlan (2011) endorse the value co-destruction construct as an accidental misuse of resources during interactions. Another most cited seminal work is by Smith (2013), where value co-destruction is attributed to the loss of resources during the service interaction. Plé and Chumpitaz (2010), Echeverri and Skålén (2011), and Smith (2013) provide adequate theoretical background for elucidating the process and outcome of value co-destruction, and rest of the research studies, either conceptual or empirical, are built on their epistemological foundations. For instance, Worthington and Durkin (2012) define value co-destruction as a process opposite to value cocreation. Likewise, Robertson et al. (2014) and Stieler et al. (2014) manifest value co-destruction as deficient or misused resources in online self-diagnosis and football, respectively. Tsiotsou (2016), with the lens of S-D logic and Consumer Culture Theory (CCT), brings the unique perspective of value co-construction and co-destruction of context, including historical meaning, tribal logic, rituals, and socialization processes. To the best knowledge, no research study has empirically tested this framework despite of frequently adopted S-D logic and consumer culture theory lens.

In (2016), the Vafeas et al. research work in the domain of value diminution is also found to be the most cited. This qualitative study manifests value co-destruction as misuse of resources by both actors separately (client and agency-situated antecedents) and jointly. The research studies by Vafeas et al. (2016), Williams et al. (2016), and Chowdhury et al. (2016) validate the accidental or intentional misuse of resources proposed by Plé and Chumpitaz (2010). The research studies of Prior and Marcos-Cuevas (2016), Daunt and Harris (2017), Zainuddin et al. (2017), and Hasche and Linton (2018) validate the conceptual explanation of value co-destruction as a decline in the wellbeing of service system (individual or organization). Kashif and Zarkada (2015) and Luo et al. (2019) adopt the value co-destruction definition from the perspective of a customer's misbehaviour. Smyth et al. (2018) bring the argument of conscious or unconscious engagement of actors in the process of service interaction that causes co-destruction. Interestingly, Skålén et al. (2015) argue that value co-destruction is a temporary dip in value co-creation. Camilleri and Neuhofer (2017) explain value co-destruction as eliminating opportunities for one party due to negligence. Cabiddu et al. (2019) bring the notion of value co-destruction as an improper arrangement of resources, knowledge, and lack of will to integrate, contradicting social relationships in the sphere of cultural capital, economic capital, and social capital. Caridà et al. (2019) provides a framework where the actor's mismatching of resources, practices, procedures, and engagement galvanize the value co-destruction. Table III provides the literature mapping of most cited and significant research studies. The conscious and unconscious engagement of actors also brings the discussion related to actor engagement. The literature equates the customer engagement with actor engagement whereas S-D logic deviates the from *Just* involvement and participation of customers while explaining the actor engagement. Though, actor engagement is out of the scope of this study, still, it brings a new direction in the value co-destruction literature. Likewise, the evolving nature of value co-destruction as temporary leads to the discussion of service recovery. The actions of actor to fix the issue of misuse or misalignment of resources (moving out of temporary dip) is a service recovery. Caridà et al. (2019) work and proposed framework is an attempt to incorporate the engagement actor and service recovery in the research area of cocreation and co-destruction.

Table III: Literature overview of value co-destruction definition

Year	Definition	Author	Study Methodology	Theoretical Underpinning
(2010)	"Value co-destruction is an interactional process between service systems. It results in a decline in at least one of the systems' wellbeing. The service systems interact directly or indirectly during the exchange to integrate and apply resources".	(Plé & Chumpitaz)	Conceptual	S-D logic
(2011)	"Value co-destruction refers to the collaborative destruction, or diminishment, of value by providers and customers."	(Echeverri & Skålén)	Single-case study design	S-D logic and Practice Theory
(2011)	"Accidental misuse of resources during interactions."	(Crowther & Donlan)	Semi-structured interviews and Conceptual analysis	S-D logic
(2013)	"Resource loss during the interaction between service systems that result in the decline in the wellbeing of at least one of the systems is value co-destruction."	(Smith)	Critical incidents technique	Conservation of resources and S-D logic
(2015)	"Actors, when not playing their defined roles, become value co-destructors. Customer misbehaviour impedes the interactional process between service system".	(Kashif & Zarkada)	Critical incident technique	S-D logic and Customer misbehaviour
(2016)	"After accessing and adapting the customer's resources, employees may accidentally or deliberately disintegrate the customer's resource with their resources, likely resulting in value co-destruction."	(Plé)	Conceptual paper	S-D logic
(2016)	"Value diminution as resource deficiencies caused by resource misuse by one or more actors."	(Vafeas et al.)	Case study approach	Client-agency relationships and S-D logic

(2017)	"A decline in the wellbeing of at least one interacting actor is an exhibition of value co-destruction."	(Plé)	Conceptual paper	S-D logic
(2017)	"Resource misuse, loss of wellbeing, failure of the organization to deliver the value proposition, inability to offer expected resources; customer failure to gain expected/desired resources during the resource integration process; and the customer encounters an unanticipated loss of accumulated resources is an exhibition of value co-destruction."	(Quacha & Thaichon)	In-depth interviews, Phenomenology	Social resource theory and S-D logic
(2018)	"Negatively valenced engagement, customer retaliation and revenge, lack of soft skills, negative attitude, delays, incompetency, and technology failure during interactions exhibit value co-destruction."	(Zhang et al.)	Qualitative, critical incidents technique	S-D logic and customer engagement
(2019)	"Value co-destruction may occur concurrently for a focal actor, resulting in a net displacement in wellbeing that is either enhanced or diminished at a given point."	(Laud et al.)	Systematic literature review	S-D logic
(2020)	"Value co-destruction is a behaviour construct defined as the act of abusing one's or other's resources in the interaction process, resulting in value reduction or destruction."	(Guan et al.)	Scale development, mixed method	S-D logic
(2021)	The dark side of value cocreation	(Calhau Codá & Silva Farias, 2021)	Systematic literature review	S-D logic

Source: Systematic literature review

Synthesizing the literature value co-destruction antecedents, coping strategies, and context

Table IV shows the structure of literature mapping related to leading antecedents of value co-destruction and its coping strategies in a particular context. From the selected articles, in the year 2010 to 2011, Plé and Chumpitaz (2010) and Echeverri and Skålén (2011) establish the value co-destruction as an emerging plausible service interaction outcome and value cocreation; any research study

163

identifying the leading antecedents and their coping strategies still needs further investigation. The research study by Worthington and Durkin (2012) in retail banking is an excellent attempt to explore the leading antecedents of value co-destruction and its coping strategies. Worthington and Durkin (2012) adopted the conceptual impression proposed by Plé and Chumpitaz (2010) and (Echeverri & Skålén, 2011). Almost all 48 selected research studies selected in the systematic literature review adopted the same conceptual impression and theoretical underpinning for exploring the leading antecedents of value co-destruction and its coping strategies. Likewise, while using the conceptual impression of customer misbehaviour, Kashif and Zarkada (2015) explore the value co-destruction causes in frontline employees working in the banking sector. Robertson et al. (2014) and Kim et al. (2020) explore the causes of value co-destruction in the sports industry while interviewing spectators while Prior and Marcos-Cuevas (2016), Jarvi et al. (2018), Corsaro (2019) used the context of firms and explore the manager's perspective on enlisting causes of value co-destruction. The most adopted practice is the manager's perceived understanding in identifying the manifestation of value co-destruction as a leading antecedent. Another leading context to study value co-destruction is tourism. Neuhofer (2016) and Dolan et al. (2019), and Järvi et al. (2020) identify the value co-destruction leading antecedents in the context of tourism. Likewise, online/virtual communities are also found of the leading context to explore the value co-destruction. Jmour and Hmida (2017), and Lv et al. (2021) both use the context of online/virtual communities to study value co-destruction. Table IV provides a literature mapping for most cited articles and significant research studies for quick orientation.

Table IV: Literature overview of value co-destruction antecedents, coping strategies, and context

Year	Authors	Leading antecedents of value co-destruction	Coping strategies	Context
(2012)	(Worthington & Durkin)	"Irresponsible borrowing and lending include excessive spending, using credit for living expenses, interest and charges, and rising credit limits."	Understand consumer psychology, and behavioural economics	Retail banking
(2014)	(Robertson et al.)	"A decline in value experienced, interaction among actors, atmosphere, not allowed to support their team."	Assess the positive or negative value effect	Sport management
(2015)	(Kashif & Zarkada)	"Employee's perceptions of organizational support, Strategies adopted by employees to deal with misbehaviour, customer blaming, lack of information"	Bridge the communication gap, monitor staff activities, staff hiring and training	Banking industry
(2016)	(Prior & Marcos-Cuevas)	"Goal prevention: actor desires not realized Net deficit: resources misuse."	Normalizing processes at the exchange and relationship stage to balance the relative power of the actor	Senior managers from the supplier firm

(2017)	(Jmour & Hmida)	"Corporate misbehaviour, failure of the consumer experiences, Conflicts, Negative interactions, Loss of resources, Incomplete or misinterpreted information, brand inconsistency, dissatisfaction, frustration."	Not suggested	Virtual community
(2018)	(Jarvi et al.)	"Absence of Information Insufficient level of trust Mistakes Inability to serve Inability to change Absence of clear expectations Customer misbehaviour Blaming".	Provide Information after-sales services better in-house communication task clarity among employees good controlling offer superior service	Supply- and marketing departments of firms
(2019)	(Corsaro)	"Conscious(power dependence, contractual agreement, generous attitude, misaligned value desired, and social embeddedness) Far-sighted (potentiality of resources, optimistic attitude) Short-sighted (misperception of one's own, wrong benchmarking and ambiguous behaviours) Insecure (risk aversion, dysfunctional ties, emotional decision making, and inertia."	Awareness of value and realization of the context, Planning and forecasting Communication and contracts	Managers in multiple industries, including automation mechanics, ICT, consumer services and distribution
(2020)	(Buhalis et al.)	"Provider: High-level service expectations, rules not followed, damage, Sexual harassment, Cancelations Users: Overmarketing, Safety/Security, Arrangements, expectations not met Residents/locals: Noise pollution, traffic, parking, overcrowding, Crime, Inflation Competitors/hoteliers: Unfair competition, reduced demand, unable to compete."	Address the interest, perception, and behaviour of stakeholders. Intervene through regulation and legislation by local authorities and ensure the balance.	Sharing economy, Airbnb,
(2020)	(Järvi et al.)	"Inability to provide a service, contextual rigidity, incoherent marketing communication, excessive expectations, insufficient communication, inappropriate behaviour."	Aligned customer- and provider-side expectations, proactively probed customer needs, minimized the violations, and quick service recovery	Tourism and hotel industry

| (2021) | (Lv et al.) | "Social loafing, knowledge hiding, communication overload, distrust, inappropriate behaviour, conflict, perceived functional and justice and interpersonal benefits lead to negative word of mouth, switching behaviour and counterproductive work behaviour." | Reduce social loafing and knowledge hiding. Encourage the culture of sharing and mutual benefit while using spiritual and material with punitive measures | Online travel communities |

Source: systematic literature review

Tables III and IV provide literature mapping for value co-destruction definition, leading antecedents, coping strategies, and context. Since the initiation of the S-D logic worldview (Vargo & Lusch, 2004, 2006, 2008), the debate around operant resources, service, resource integration, and value cocreation is leading at research frontiers (Echeverri & Skålén, 2021; Vargo & Akaka, 2012; Vargo et al., 2008; Wilden et al., 2017). Value cocreation is a process where the actors exchange their services (knowledge, skills, processes, and core competencies) for transforming resources for mutual benefit (Akaka et al., 2021; Vargo & Lusch, 2017). In addition, Maglio et al. (2009) and Spohrer et al. (2015) presented ISPAR (Interact-Serve-Propose-Agree-Realize) model for service systems interaction. Though this model explains the service interaction between systems for value cocreation, it still shows the plausibility of dispute, lack of agreement, non-welcoming service interaction, criminal act, and non-realization of value as service interaction outcome. In both papers, the term value co-destruction does not match value cocreation. The systematic literature review affirms the initiation of the value co-destruction debate in 2010 by (Plé & Chumpitaz). The myopic view of value cocreation identified by Plé and Chumpitaz (2010) and Echeverri and Skålén (2011) introduce value co-destruction in the literature. In both research studies, the optimistic view of value cocreation is criticized for all the right reasons supplied by ISPAR model. They argue that during the service interaction, the value can be subsequently co-destroyed by actors. In the seminal work of Plé and Chumpitaz (2010), value co-destruction is defined as a service interaction between service systems that result in a decline in at least one of the systems' wellbeing, either accidental or intentional. Echeverri and Skålén (2011) argue that an optimistic view of value cocreation does not resonate with the real world as not all interactions connote positive outcomes. They title value co-destruction as, "downside of interactive value formation" and define value co-destruction as collaborative destruction of value by actors. The systematic literature review affirms the impression that most of the research studies took value co-destruction conceptual impression from the Plé and Chumpitaz (2010) and Echeverri and Skålén (2011) research work. To date, these two research studies are the most cited studies in the domain of value co-destruction.

Later, the research stream catering actions of actors, e.g., customer misbehaviour (Kashif & Zarkada, 2015), resource misuse (Plé, 2016), loss of wellbeing, failure to deliver the value proposition, inability to offer resources, customer failure to gain expected and, unexpected loss (Guan et al., 2020; Laud et al., 2019; Quacha & Thaichon, 2017) encompasses the definition of value co-destruction in recent literature. Calhau Codá and Silva Farias (2021) define value co-destruction as the dark side of value

cocreation. There is no disagreement that research on value co-destruction is not disassociated from value cocreation. Most of the research studies espoused the theoretical underpinning of Practice Theory (Echeverri & Skålén, 2011), Conservation of Resources Theory (Smith, 2013), Customer Behaviour (Kashif & Zarkada, 2015), Client-Agency Relationships Theory (Vafeas et al., 2016), and Social Resource Theory (Quacha & Thaichon, 2017) along with meta-theoretical support from S-D logic. The dissection of multiple definitions of value co-destruction brings some converging dimensions and properties that may facilitate the scholars for scale development. The converging dimensions and properties of value co-destructions given below to be used for scale development studies in future.

Multiple authors explain the construct of value co-destruction from different perspectives. For example, the value of co-destruction is defined as the decline in at least one of the service systems' wellbeing (Plé, 2017; Plé & Chumpitaz, 2010; Smith, 2013). Value co-destruction could be a collaborative destruction process (Echeverri & Skålén, 2021). Value co-destruction is an exhibition of misuse of resources, either intentional, unintentional, or accidental (Crowther & Donlan, 2011; Guan et al., 2020; Plé, 2016; Vafeas et al., 2016). Value co-destruction may occur due to unclear actors' roles (rights and responsibilities) (Kashif & Zarkada, 2015). Value co-destruction is a failure of the organization to deliver the value proposition and a customer failure to gain the desired outcome in the resource integration process (Quacha & Thaichon, 2017). Value co-destruction may occur due to a lack of required resources (Zhang et al., 2018). The missing links identified from most cited definitions are related to the nature of value co-destruction and context and require more conceptual studies. The debate related to nature, context, and embeddedness has been initiated in the value cocreation process (Akaka, 2013a, 2013b; Akaka et al., 2015) but so far missing in the literature on value co-destruction.

Still, the systematic analysis of literature affirms that, to date, are conceptual papers proposing an epistemological explanation of value co-destruction, framework, models, and propositions; thus, value co-destruction becomes an emerging research stream (Cabiddu et al., 2019). As future research frontier, value co-destruction needs further epistemological in-depth explanation. For instance, research lack in the area of the temporal nature of value co-destruction (Skålén et al., 2015), value cocreation and value co-destruction co-existence (Jarvi et al., 2018), and the role of context in value co-destruction (Akaka & Parry, 2019). All such dimensions are essential for bringing epistemological clarity to value co-destruction. The systematic literature review also validated the argument by bringing the value co-destruction as a mirror image of value cocreation.

Likewise, exploring the leading antecedents of value co-destruction is very important. So far, this research area has been less explored (Calhau Codá & Silva Farias, 2021; Echeverri & Skålén, 2021). To date, the context of tourism (Järvi et al., 2020), sports (Robertson et al., 2014), banking (Kashif & Zarkada, 2015; Worthington & Durkin, 2012), and online communities (Jmour & Hmida, 2017; Lv et al., 2021) are explored, and most of the studies used critical incident technique as a methodology to explore the phenomenon. Most of the selected research articles exploring value co-destruction are qualitative studies; thus, another future research area is quantitative validation of proposed

dimensions, frameworks, and models of value co-destruction. Järvi et al. (2020) research article is an excellent quantitative inquiry and provides aspiration for future quantitative studies. Likewise, the scale development by Guan et al. (2020) in the context of tourism also provide a lead for value co-destruction scale development in diverse context.

Another promising research stream identified during the systematic literature review is actor engagement styles, perceptions, and service ecosystems. Prior and Marcos-Cuevas (2016) and Luo et al. (2019) offers research motivation for exploring actor engagement which requires research inquiries for expanding boundaries of value co-destruction manifestations. Table 4 also offers the research motivation related to the divergence of manifestation of value co-destruction related to context. The systematic literature review revealed that leading antecedents of value co-destruction are fragmented concerning the context. The antecedents of value co-destruction in technology-assisted service interaction (Jmour & Hmida, 2017; Lv et al., 2021) are dissimilar from business firms (Corsaro, 2019; Jarvi et al., 2018; Prior & Marcos-Cuevas, 2016). Though misusing resources during service interaction, accidental or intentional, offers a theoretical background for value co-destruction, it is still unique. As Axiom 4 of S-D logic defines value as unique and determined by the beneficiary (Vargo & Lusch, 2017), the expected outcome of service interaction (cocreation or co-destruction) is also unique to all actors engaged in service exchange. As an emerging field, it is worth exploring how actors uniquely and phenomenologically experience the value of co-destruction and its leading antecedents in diverse contexts. The analysis of systematic literature review in the domain of value co-destruction provides a few questions for future researchers given below:

1. *What is the nature of value co-destruction? Can it be changed during the service exchange to service recovery?*
2. *How does the context or service ecosystem influence the value co-destruction, intentional or unintentional?*

CONCLUSION AND POLICY IMPLICATION

The myopic and fundamentally optimistic view of value cocreation in S-D logic literature is challenged as value co-destruction, which is also a plausible outcome of service interaction. Value co-destruction is an emerging area of research, yet fragmented and less explored than value cocreation. Value co-destruction is at its abstract stage of theoretical clarity and thus offers diverse research frontiers. This research article attempts to map the literature on value co-destruction relating to the definition, leading antecedents, coping strategies, and context. To our knowledge, selected articles encompass the diversity of definitions and manifestation of value co-destruction. This article contributes to the debate on the diversity of leading antecedents of value co-destruction in different contexts. This article provides the converging dimensions and properties of value co-destruction that will facilitate the development of value co-destruction scale. It also provides the missing links of nature and contextuality in the epistemological enrichment of value co-destruction. The promising research areas that emerged from the analysis and discussion are the temporal nature of value co-destruction,

value cocreation and value co-destruction co-existence, the role of context and contextual antecedents. It is observed that the most adopted methodologies in value co-destruction conceptual and qualitative. It is suggested to adopt quantitative studies for theory testing to fill this methodological gap. This study also uses the ISPAR model as theoretical support for value co-destruction. Inclusively, this article advances the epistemological debate on value co-destruction, its leading antecedents, and coping strategies. The limitation of this article is excluding the debate of service recovery, co-recovery, and interactive value formation (IVF) relating to value co-destruction.

Though it is a systematic literature review that brings the emerging areas and future research directions for researchers, it still offers practical insights for practitioners of service industries. The synthesis of antecedents and coping strategies for value co-destruction presented in this study provides data-driven strategies to cope the value co-destruction. Depending upon their service proposal, the service industries practitioner may revisit and redesign their service experience, with the contemporary explanation of value co-destruction presented in this study. Later, they can adopt the coping strategies to transform the co-destruction into service recovery and value cocreation.

REFERENCES

Akaka, M. A. (2013a). *The co-creation of value-incultural- context* (Vol. 15). https://doi.org/10.1108/s0885-2111(2013)0000015018

Akaka, M. A. (2013b). *The complexity of context: A service ecosystems approach for international marketing* (Vol. 21). https://doi.org/10.1509/jim.13.0032

Akaka, M. A., Koskela-Huotari, K., & Vargo, S. (2021). Formalizing service-dominant logic as a general theory of markets: taking stock and moving forward. *AMS Review*, *11*, 1-15.

Akaka, M. A., & Parry, G. (2019). Value-in-context: An exploration of the context of value and the value of context. In *Handbook of Service Science, Volume II* (pp. 457-477). Springer.

Akaka, M. A., Vargo, S., & Lusch, R. (2012). An Exploration of Networks in Value Cocreation: A Service-Ecosystems View. In S. Vargo & R. Lusch (Eds.), *Special Issue – Toward a Better Understanding of the Role of Value in Markets and Marketing* (Vol. 9, pp. 13-50). Emerald Group Publishing Limited. https://doi.org/10.1108/S1548-6435(2012)0000009006

Akaka, M. A., Vargo, S., & Schau, H. J. (2015). The context of experience. *Journal of service management*, *26*(2), 206-223. https://doi.org/10.1108/josm-10-2014-0270

Brodie, R. J., Fehrer, J. A., Jaakkola, E., & Conduit, J. (2019). Actor engagement in networks: Defining the conceptual domain. *Journal of Service Research*, *22*(2), 173-188.

Buhalis, D., Andreu, L., & Gnoth, J. (2020). The dark side of the sharing economy: Balancing value co-creation and value co-destruction. *Psychology & Marketing*, *37*(5), 689-704. https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.21344

Cabiddu, F., Moreno, F., & Sebastiano, L. (2019). Toxic collaborations: co-destroying value in the B2B context. *Journal of Service Research*, *22*(3), 241-255.

Calhau Codá, R., & Silva Farias, J. (2021). Interactive Value Formation: Exploring the Literature on Dark Side of the Service Experience from the Perspective of Value Co-Destruction (VCD). *Services Marketing Quarterly*, 1-21. https://doi.org/10.1080/15332969.2021.1997505

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.

Caridà, A., Edvardsson, B., & Colurcio, M. (2019). Conceptualizing resource integration as an embedded process: Matching, resourcing and valuing. *Marketing theory*, *19*(1), 65-84.

Chowdhury, I. N., Gruber, T., & Zolkiewski, J. (2016). Every cloud has a silver lining — Exploring the dark side of value co-creation in B2B service networks. *Industrial Marketing Management*, *55*, 97–109. https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2016.02.016

Corsaro, D. (2019). Value co-destruction and its effects on value appropriation. *Journal of Marketing Management*, *36*(1), 100-127.

Cova, B., & Paranque, B. (2012). Value creation versus destruction: The relationship between consumers, marketers and financiers. *Journal of Brand Management*, *20*(2), 147-158.

Crowther, P., & Donlan, L. (2011). Value-creation space: The role of events in a service-dominant marketing paradigm. *Journal of Marketing Management*, *27*(13-14), 1444-1463.

Daunt, K. L., & Harris, L. C. (2017). Consumer showrooming: Value co-destruction. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, *38*, 166-176. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2017.05.013

Day, G. (2015). Achieving Advantage with a Service-Dominant Logic. In R. Lusch & S. Vargo (Eds.), *The Service-Dominant Logic of Marketing: Dialogue, Debate and Direction* Routledge: Taylor & Francis Group.

Dolan, R., Seo, Y., & Kemper, J. (2019). Complaining practices on social media in tourism: A value co-creation and co-destruction perspective. *Tourism Management*, *73*, 35-45.

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.

Echeverri, P., & Skålén, P. (2021). Value co-destruction: Review and conceptualization of interactive value formation. *Marketing theory*, *21*(2), 227-249.

Greer, C. R., Lusch, R., & Vargo, S. (2016). A service perspective: Key managerial insights from service-dominant (S-D) logic. *Organizational Dynamics*, *45*(1), 28-38.

Grönroos, C. (2008). Service logic revisited: who creates value? And who co-creates? *European business review*, *20*(4), 298-314.

Grönroos, C. (2012). Conceptualising value co-creation: A journey to the 1970s and back to the future. *Journal of Marketing Management*, *28*(13-14), 1520-1534.

Guan, X., Gong, J., Xie, L., & Huan, T.-C. (2020). Scale development of value co-destruction behavior in tourism. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, *36*, 100757.

Hasche, N., & Linton, G. (2018). The value of failed relationships for the development of a Medtech start-up. *Journal of Small Business & Entrepreneurship*, *30*(1), 97-119.

Hiebl, M. R. (2021). Sample selection in systematic literature reviews of management research. *Organizational research methods*, 1-33. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428120986851

Jarvi, H., Kahkonen, 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.

Jmour, A., & Hmida, I. C. B. (2017). Not Always a Co-creation: Exploratory Study of Reasons, Emotions and Practices of the Value Co-destruction in Virtual Communities. In R. Jallouli, O. R. Zaïane, M. A. Bach Tobji, R. Srarfi Tabbane, & A. Nijholt, *Digital Economy. Emerging Technologies and Business Innovation* Cham.

Kashif, M., & Zarkada, A. (2015). Value co-destruction between customers and frontline employees: A social system perspective. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, *33*(6), 372-691.

Katzan, H. (2009). Principles of service systems: An ontological approach. *Journal of Service Science*, *2*(2), 35-52.

Kim, K., Byon, K. K., & Baek, W. (2020). Customer-to-customer value co-creation and co-destruction in sporting events. *The Service Industries Journal*, *40*(9-10), 633-655.

Koh, L., Orzes, G., & Jia, F. J. (2019). The fourth industrial revolution (Industry 4.0): technologies disruption on operations and supply chain management. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, *39*(1), 817-828.

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.

Leopold, T. A., Ratcheva, V., & Zahidi, S. (2016). *The future of jobs: employment, skills, and workforce strategies for the Fourth Industrial Revolution*.

Luo, J. G., Wong, I. A., King, B., Liu, M. T., & 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):* (3), 1309–1329. https://doi.org/, https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-12-2017-0792

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.

Maglio, P. P., Vargo, S., Caswell, N., & Spohrer, J. (2009). The service system is the basic abstraction of service science. *Information Systems and e-business Management*, *7*(4), 395-406.

Mahajan, G. (2019). Critically exploring value destruction to create more value. *Journal of Creating Value*, *5*(1), 3-10.

McColl-Kennedy, J. R., & Cheung, L. (2019). Value Cocreation: Conceptualization, Origins, and Developments. In S. Vargo & R. Lusch (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of service-dominant logic* (pp. 63-79). SAGE.

Mengcheng, L., & Tuure, T. (2022). Information technology–supported value co-creation and co-destruction via social interaction and resource integration in service systems. *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, *31*(2), 101719.

Neuhofer, B. (2016). Value co-creation and co-destruction in connected tourist experiences. In *Information and communication technologies in tourism 2016* (pp. 779-792). Springer.

Ogunbodede, O., Papagiannidis, S., & Alamanos, E. (2022). Value co-creation and co-destruction behaviour: Relationship with basic human values and personality traits. *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, *46*(4), 1278-1298.

Plé, L. (2016). Studying customers' resource integration by service employees in interactional value co-creation. *Journal of Services Marketing*, *30*(2).

Plé, L. (2017). Why do we need research on value co-destruction? *Journal of Creating Value*, *3*(2), 162-169.

Plé, L., & Chumpitaz, C. R. (2010). Not always co-creation: introducing interactional co-destruction of value in service-dominant logic. *Journal of Services Marketing*, *24*(6), 430-437.

Prahalad, C. K., & Ramaswamy, V. (2000). Co-opting customer competence. *Harvard business review*, *78*(1), 79-90.

Prahalad, C. K., & Ramaswamy, V. (2004). Co-creating unique value with customers. *Strategy & Leadership*, *32*(3), 4-9.

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.

Quacha, S., & Thaichon, P. (2017). From connoisseur luxury to mass luxury: Value co-creation and codestruction in the online environment. *Journal of Business Research*, *81*, 163–172.

Robertson, N., Polonsky, M., & McQuilken, L. (2014). Are my symptoms serious Dr Google? A resource-based typology of value co-destruction in online self-diagnosis. *Australasian Marketing Journal (AMJ)*, *22*(3), 246-256.

Skålén, P., Pace, S., & Cova, B. (2015). Firm-brand community value co-creation as alignment of practices. *European Journal of Marketing*, *49*(3/4), 596-620.

Smith, A. (2013). The value co-destruction process: a customer resource perspective. *European Journal of Marketing theory*, *47*(11), 1889–1909.

Smyth, H., Lecoeuvre, L., & Vaesken, P. (2018). Co-creation of value and the project context: Towards application on the case of Hinkley Point C Nuclear Power Station. *International journal of project management*, *36*(1), 170-183.

Spohrer, J., Demirkan, H., & Lyons, K. (2015). Social Value: A Service Science Perspective. In K. Kijima (Ed.), *Service Systems Sceince* (Vol. 2, pp. 3-36). Springer.

Stieler, M., Weismann, F., & Germelmann, C. C. (2014). Co-destruction of value by spectators: the case of silent protests. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, *14*(1), 72-86.

Tranfield, D., Denyer, D., & Smart, P. (2003). Towards a methodology for developing evidence-informed management knowledge by means of systematic review. *British journal of management*, *14*(3), 207-222.

Tsiotsou, R. H. (2016). A service ecosystem experience-based framework for sport marketing. *The Service Industries Journal*, *36*(11-12), 478-509. https://doi.org/10.1080/02642069.2016.1255731

Vafeas, M., Hughes, T., & Hilton, T. (2016). Antecedents to value diminution: A dyadic perspective. *Marketing theory*, *16*(4), 469-491.

Vargo, S. (2012). *The nature and understanding of value: A service-dominant logic perspective* (Vol. 9). https://doi.org/10.1108/s1548-6435(2012)0000009005

Vargo, S., & Akaka, M. A. (2012). Value Cocreation and Service Systems (Re)Formation: A Service Ecosystems View. *Service Science*, *4*(3), 207–217.

Vargo, S., & Lusch, R. (2004). Evolving a New Dominant Logic in Marketing *Journal of Marketing*, *68*(1), 1-17.

Vargo, S., & Lusch, R. (2006). Service-dominant logic: reactions, reflections and refinements. *Marketing theory*, *6*(3), 281-288.

Vargo, S., & Lusch, R. (2008). Service-dominant logic: Continuing the evolution. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, *36*(1), 1-10. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-007-0069-6

Vargo, S., & Lusch, R. (2016). Institutions and axioms: an extension and update of service-dominant logic. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, *44*(1), 5-23. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-015-0456-3

Vargo, S., & Lusch, R. (2017). Service-dominant logic 2025. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, *34*(1), 46-67. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijresmar.2016.11.001

Vargo, S., 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.

Wilden, R., Akaka, M. A., Karpen, I., & Jan, H. (2017). The Evolution and Prospects of ServiceDominant Logic: An Investigation of Past, Present, and Future Research. *Journal of Service Research*, *20*(4), 345-361.

Williams, B., Kang, S.-C., & Johnson, J. (2016). (Co)-Contamination as the Dark Side of Co-Production: Public value failures in co-production processes. *Public Management Review*, *18*(5), 692-717.

Williams, R., Clark, L. A., Clark, W. R., & Raffo, D. M. (2020). Re-examining systematic literature review in management research: Additional benefits and execution protocols. *European management journal*, *39*(4), 521-533.

Worthington, S., & Durkin, M. (2012). Co-destruction of value in context: Cases from retail banking. *The Marketing Review*, *12*(3), 291-307.

Zainuddin, N., Dent, K., & Tam, L. (2017). Seek or destroy? Examining value creation and destruction in behaviour maintenance in social marketing. *Journal of Marketing Management*, *33*(5-6), 348-374.

Zhang, T., Lu, C., Torres, E., & Chen, P.-J. (2018). Engaging customers in value co-creation or co-destruction online. *Journal of Services Marketing*.

Zhang, Y., Yuan, Y., & Shao, B. (2022). Co-creating value with customers in online service recovery: Bridging the links between mandatory and voluntary customer participation. *Electronic Commerce Research Applications*, *55*, 101188.