

1 1. INTRODUCTION

2 Tourists' customer-to-customer (C2C) interactions are often viewed by managers as an
3 uncontrollable aspect of the service encounter (Nicholls, 2010), yet they represent a crucial
4 source of social value for tourists. Tourism consumption in contexts such as cruise ship travel,
5 group tours, holiday resort stays, and festival and event visitation often involves spending
6 time with peers and significant others, interacting and connecting with strangers, or simply
7 being co-present as part of a larger collective. The social value of such encounters may not be
8 directly linked to the immediate service exchange but rather, it is formed in the process of
9 tourists' C2C co-creation. The purpose of this paper is therefore to empirically explore
10 tourists' C2C co-creation by focussing specifically on social practices in the context of
11 festival visitation, and to discuss the social value implications of C2C co-creation for tourism
12 management.

13 Extant research undertaken within tourism, leisure, events and hospitality servicescapes
14 highlights the positive effect of collaborative C2C encounters on hospitality patrons' well-
15 being (Rosenbaum, 2006), on vacationing families' relationships (Lehto, Choi, Lin, &
16 MacDermid, 2009), and conference attendees' personal business relationships (Gruen,
17 Osmonbekov, & Czaplewski, 2007). Furthermore, successful C2C interactions are shown to
18 influence managerially-relevant outcomes, such as tourists' evaluation of service experience
19 and quality (Huang & Hsu, 2010; Kim & Lee, 2012; Levy, Getz, & Hudson, 2011; Martin,
20 1996; Milman, Zehrer & Tasci, 2017, Papathanassis, 2012; Wei, Lu, Miao, Cai, & Wang,
21 2017; Wu, 2007).

22 In addition to positive individual value outcomes, C2C-oriented encounters may represent a
23 source of collective social value and well-being, thus contributing to a blooming collaborative
24 or sharing economy (Belk, 2010; Cheng, 2016; Sigala, 2017) and socially responsible service
25 economies (Altinay, Sigala, & Waligo, 2016; Grönroos, 2011; Lamers, van der Duimb, &
26 Spaargarena, 2017). There is some recognition of the effect of collaborative practices on
27 strengthening stakeholder ties within tourism communities, both physical (Hamilton &
28 Alexander, 2013) and virtual (Rowley, Kupiec-Teahan, & Leeming, 2007). Similarly,
29 collective value in terms of trust and intimacy among backpackers (Germann Molz, 2013),
30 and the forming of both a spontaneous and long lasting sense of community among tourists
31 sharing their experiences (Arnould & Price, 1993; Goulding & Shankar, 2011; Kim & Jamal,
32 2007; Mackellar, 2009) have been identified.

1 The importance of the C2C co-creation perspective in services is highlighted by the
2 Customer-Dominant (C-D) logic, introduced by Heinonen, Strandvik & Voima (2013) as a
3 new ontological position distinct from the now well-established Service-Dominant (S-D)
4 logic in marketing (Vargo & Lusch, 2008). The C-D logic considers the importance of value
5 formed within experiences and practices situated in and influenced by customers' own social
6 contexts, rather than emphasising business-to-customer co-creation of service-related value
7 from the firm's perspective (Heinonen & Strandvik, 2015; Holttinen, 2014). Interestingly, the
8 C-D perspective has yet to be adopted in empirical tourism studies to explore the co-creation
9 concept. Additionally, only a few papers to-date have attempted to understand the C2C co-
10 creation process and the social forms of value that emerge (Finsterwalder & Kuppelwieser,
11 2011; Loane & Webster, 2014; Reichenberger, 2017.; Rihova, Buhalis, Moital, & Gouthro,
12 2013; Urich, 2014). These are important research gaps that this paper aims to address.

13

14 2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

15 *2.1 Recent developments in value co-creation research: S-D and C-D logic in marketing*

16 For decades marketing research has explored the notion of 'perceived' or 'consumer value'
17 (see e.g., Gallarza, Saura, & Holbrook, 2011 for review). Assuming that value is highly
18 subjective to each customer, researchers strive to identify specific types of value in order to
19 find out what customers' needs are and to determine how a specific product or service
20 offering fulfils these needs (e.g. Sheth, Newman, & Gross, 1991; Williams & Soutar, 2009).
21 Sheth et al.'s (1991) multi-dimensional value model (social, emotional, functional, epistemic
22 and conditional) and Holbrook's (1999) consumer value typology (efficiency, excellence,
23 status, esteem, play, aesthetics, ethics, spirituality) have been adopted in tourism research that
24 explores how each value dimension may influence tourists' purchase decision-making in
25 different situations and phases of the consumption process (Duman & Mattila, 2005; Gallarza
26 & Saura, 2006; Sanchez, Callarisa, Rodriguez, & Moliner, 2006; Williams & Soutar, 2009).

27 While perceived value continues to attract the attention of tourism scholars, recent
28 perspectives grounded in service marketing literature increasingly acknowledge the role of the
29 consumer not only in perceiving but actively co-creating value (Grönroos, 2011; Löbner &
30 Hahn, 2013; Lusch & Vargo, 2014; McColl-Kennedy, Cheung, & Ferrier, 2015; Vargo &
31 Lusch, 2008). The now well-established S-D logic in marketing figures prominently in many
32 tourism papers (Buonincontri, Morvillo, Okumus, & Van Niekerk, 2017; Cabiddu, Lui, &

1 Piccoli, 2013; Grisseman & Stokburger-Sauer, 2012; Prebensen, Vittersø, & Dahl, 2013;
2 Shaw, Bailey, & Williams, 2011). The S-D logic views co-creation in terms of participatory,
3 interactive activities that involve different actors, while value (sense of being better-off) is
4 defined as 'value-in-use'; that is, "the value for customers, created by them during their usage
5 of resources" (Grönroos & Gummerus, 2014, p. 209).

6 Co-creating customers are conceptualised as resource integrators who possess certain skills,
7 knowledge and capabilities (termed 'operant resources') and use these to 'act upon' generally
8 tangible, static things ('operand resources') to create an effect (Vargo & Lusch, 2008). More
9 recent value literature has therefore turned its attention to the nature and aspects of customers'
10 resource integration (co-creation) (e.g., Baron & Harris, 2008; McColl-Kennedy et al., 2015;
11 Payne, Storbacka, & Frow, 2008; Peñaloza & Mish, 2011). For instance, Cabiddu et al.
12 (2013) study the importance of Information Technology as a resource used by stakeholders in
13 co-creating value in tourism networks. Other authors identify the specific nature of resources
14 that tourists and tourism organisations draw on to create positive outcomes, such as service
15 satisfaction or loyalty (Grisseman & Stokburger-Sauer, 2012; Mathis, Kim, Uysal, Sirgy, &
16 Prebensen, 2016; Prebensen et al., 2013; Prebensen & Xie, 2017).

17 Customers' operant and operand resources are typically explored using a goal-oriented
18 approach; i.e. focusing on understanding the nature of resources as means to identify
19 opportunities for enhancing customers' value (Prebensen et al., 2013). While the above
20 studies acknowledge the importance of factors, such as tourists' participation, skills,
21 motivation, the environment, and opportunities for social interactions, as resources needed to
22 co-create customers' value more effectively, they tend to view resource integration as
23 ultimately rendering value for the organisation. The assumption that firms or brands co-create
24 value through facilitating customers' resource integration means that even consumer value
25 (value-in-use) is viewed as the final step of a process that begins with and is always facilitated
26 by the provider (Anker, Sparks, Moutinho, & Grönroos, 2015; Grönroos & Gummerus, 2014).

27 A new service marketing perspective that challenges this assumption is the Customer- (or
28 Consumer-) Dominant (C-D) Logic (Heinonen et al., 2013). The C-D logic relocates value-
29 creating agency into customers' own life contexts and beyond specific visible service
30 interactions that are normally in service providers' sphere of influence, rendering customers'
31 value-forming processes 'invisible' to service organisations (Medberg & Heinonen, 2014).
32 Similar to S-D logic, value in C-D logic is defined as 'value in use', although its formation
33 relates to a "dynamic process which is not uniquely related to the service offerings of service

1 providers” (Tynan, McKechnie, & Hartley, 2014, p. 1060). Nevertheless, it is still possible for
2 companies to get involved in customers’ value creation. As Anker et al. (2015) suggest, active
3 participation in customer co-creation can help to facilitate customers’ own value outcomes,
4 and thereby lead to positive associations with the brand. The authors further argue that
5 innovation and social entrepreneurship outcomes can be achieved through respectful
6 observation of consumer practices in a relevant on- and off-line market domain using a range
7 of observational methods. This perspective is in line with Payne, Storbacka & Frow’s (2008)
8 earlier assertion that by mapping out the processes, resources and practices customers use to
9 manage their activities and relationships, organisations can identify specific opportunities for
10 co-creation that will result in more valuable outcomes.

11 According to C-D logic, value is both intra- and inter-subjectively determined; i.e. it stems
12 from personal experiences as well as social contexts and processes that may involve a number
13 of different actors (Heinonen & Strandvik, 2015). As Helkkula, Kelleher & Pihlström (2012a)
14 note, value is a multi-dimensional construct that originates in lived and imagined past, current
15 and future experiences, and is both individually and socially constructed. But not many
16 studies explore empirically the processes through which such value emerges, and what this
17 then means for customers and companies. Mainly an experiential approach has been adopted
18 in C-D logic studies that emphasise individuals’ subjective and contextual value, created in
19 experiences that take place outside of traditional servicescapes and may be only remotely
20 associated with specific brands. For example, Medberg & Heinonen (2014) refer to some
21 ‘mental and invisible actions of the customer’, but do not discuss the mechanics of such
22 actions beyond focusing on the value they generate. Heinonen et al. (2013, p. 109) see value
23 as formed in “customers’ behavioural and mental processes when customers interpret
24 experiences and reconstruct an accumulated customer reality”. Tynan et al.’s (2014) study of
25 customers’ value creation in the context of luxury car consumption uncovers experiential/
26 hedonic value created in sensory, behavioural, emotional, relational (through association with
27 brand communities) and social (related to interactions with others) experiences.

28 Importantly, the C-D logic perspective highlights the importance of a social context beyond
29 encounters with the service organisation. However, while identifying inter- and intra-
30 subjective, phenomenological value that tourists experience as they co-create in C2C
31 contexts, research also needs to take into account the “*routines, activities and practices* of
32 customers” (Heinonen et al., 2013, p. 116, emphasis added). As Ellway & Dean (2016) note,

1 practices and experiences are intertwined in value co-creation. Similarly, Helkkula, Kelleher,
2 & Pihlström (2012b, p. 563) argue that

3 “our sense making in relation to value experiences from a phenomenological
4 perspective cannot (and should not) be divorced from the experience of value-creation
5 practice itself. At a conscious and unconscious level, we experience ourselves and
6 indeed others partaking and engaging in value co-creation practices.”

7 A related research stream within C-D logic therefore positions the formation of value into
8 customers’ *social practices* (Cassop Thompson, 2012; Holttinen, 2010; McColl-Kennedy et
9 al., 2015), as discussed in section 2.2.

10

11 *2.2 The practice-based perspective on C2C value co-creation*

12 Sociological literature views social practices as central social phenomena and a reference
13 point for understanding other social entities, such as actors, structures and institutions
14 (Bourdieu, 1977). Traditional practice theory discourses focus on how agent’s actions and
15 interactions produce and reproduce social structures (Giddens, 1984; Goffman, 1959), while
16 also acknowledging the influence of structure on the human body and human activity (e.g. the
17 notions of power and habitus). In contrast, we follow C-D logic’s more applied view of
18 practices as “a context-laden arena for value creation” (Holttinen, 2010, p.102). Therefore,
19 tourists’ social practices and the elements that orchestrate the performance of practices
20 represent units of analysis in the study of C2C co-creation. This approach highlights the
21 importance of contextualised social processes involved in the performance of practice
22 (Warde, 2005) and the sometimes routine yet still important aspects of co-creating that may
23 be invisible to the service organisation.

24 We draw on Schatzki’s (2001, p. 11) definition of social practices as “embodied, materially
25 mediated arrays of human activity centrally organised around shared practical understanding”.
26 Schatzki (1996) distinguishes between *dispersed practices* (customs), which comprise
27 relatively basic actions such as following rules or questioning, and *integrative practices* such
28 as cooking, doing research or indeed, ‘festivalling’ – the practice of attending festivals.
29 Integrative practices differ from dispersed practices in that they comprise a number of practice
30 elements. However, there is little consensus among practice theorists regarding precisely
31 which elements practices actually ‘consist of’.

1 According to Reckwitz (2002, p. 249), practice elements include “forms of bodily activities,
2 forms of mental activities, ‘things’ and their use, and background knowledge in the form of
3 understanding, know-how, states of emotion and motivational knowledge”. Schau, Muñiz &
4 Arnould (2009, p. 31) refer to practices as “a spatially dispersed nexus of behaviours that
5 include practical activities, performances, and representations or talk”. These are linked
6 through the interplay of procedural understandings (i.e. explicit rules, principles and
7 instructions); skills, abilities and consumption projects (i.e. culturally-embedded knowledge
8 of what to say and do or ‘how-to’); and emotional commitments (actors’ ends and purposes
9 expressed through action). Similarly, Korkman (2006) argues that practices are performed in
10 actions, dynamically interlinked with physical spaces, images, actors and the tools and
11 embedded know-how used by actors.

12 In other practice conceptualisations, Warde (2005) notes that practicing individuals have a
13 level of commitment in their use of consumption objects, they possess the capability to
14 manipulate tools, and apply know-how of institutional arrangements characteristic of time,
15 space and social context. Practices according to Holttinen (2010) integrate specific operand
16 and operant resources and their use, mental states and bodily activities, and are encompassed
17 by meaning structures, influenced by socio-cultural, spatial and temporal contexts. Here, we
18 follow Holttinen’s (2010) understanding of practices, based on Schatzki’s (1996)
19 interpretation of practices as directed by *rules* and *teleoaffective structures*, which Holttinen
20 refers to as meaning structures. These govern customers’ behaviours in a practice, insofar as
21 the teleological (goal-oriented purpose, task) and affective (emotions, moods and passions)
22 dimensions may produce different versions of the same practice (Schatzki, 2001).

23 The practice perspective has been previously adopted in tourism settings. Authors have
24 focused mainly on tourism as cultural practice and have explored specific practices through
25 which cultural representations and meanings are constructed (e.g., Crouch, 2004). Pantzar &
26 Shove (2010) and a number of other scholars (Holt, 1995; Korkman, 2006; Lamers &
27 Pashkevich, 2015; Rantala, 2010) have viewed tourism activities such as cruising, forest tour
28 guiding, baseball spectatorship, Nordic walking, scuba-diving and wildlife photography in
29 terms of combined situated social practices, the study of which can provide a more
30 sophisticated starting point for tourism management. For example, Lamers & Pashkevich’s
31 (2015) and Korkman’s (2006) detailed studies of cruise tourism practices have provided
32 insights into how specific practice elements can be altered or enhanced by managers for
33 tourist practices to be performed more successfully.

1 Yet, few studies have emphasised specific practices in tourism settings as a way to provide
2 insights into the social value co-creation process and in particular, to illuminate how social
3 forms of value are co-created in C2C contexts. Section 2.3 therefore briefly explores the
4 relationship between performed practices and value, as evidenced in a number of service and
5 tourism contexts.

6

7 *2.3 Social value-in-practice*

8 Studies focusing on C2C co-creation practices include Korkman's (2006) doctoral research
9 which considered how families co-create in cruise ship contexts. The author identified 21 co-
10 creation practices, categorising these according to the subjects who carry out these practices
11 (i.e. family; parents; children). Practices listed include parents' 'taking time off', family 'fine
12 dining rituals' and children's 'looking for new actions', which result in both individual and
13 shared value. Schau et al.'s (2009) study of consumers' collective value-creating practices
14 across nine brand communities uncovered social networking and community engagement as
15 two important categories generating C2C value. Social networking practices such as
16 'welcoming', 'empathizing' and 'governing' help to create, enhance and sustain social and
17 moral bonds among the brand community members, which often extend outside the brand
18 community itself. The authors found that through practices such as 'staking', 'milestoning',
19 'badging' and 'documenting', community members reinforce their engagement with the brand
20 and thereby help to increase social capital within the community (Schau et al., 2009).

21 The above studies have gone some way towards understanding the interlinking between
22 practices and value outcomes, though there appears to be some confusion as to how and
23 where precisely value emerges in practice. For example, Schatzki (1996) posits that
24 customers' voluntary participation in practices is itself a sign of value co-creation, while C-D
25 logic sources appear to conceive of value as a *product* of certain value-forming practices.
26 Ellway & Dean (2016) draw on Bourdieu's (1977) field-habitus-practice framework to
27 explain the link: through the engagement with resources during a practice, as well as the
28 (conscious) experience of a practice, customers are able to articulate what value they are
29 experiencing by interpreting their experience within their own subjective situation and the
30 wider social context. Value articulation becomes problematic in routine, or unconscious
31 practices, however, as the experience of a practice remains implicit (Ellway & Dean, 2016, p.
32 20):

1 “The boundary of value creation during ‘routinized practice’ becomes blurred because
2 individuals subjectively interpret and [sic] their experience of practice through
3 sensemaking processes, whereby they perceive and evaluate the present based upon
4 the past.”

5 Tourists visiting a tourist attraction or attending festivals may engage in C2C co-creation in a
6 variety of ways, while experiencing more or less consciously a variety of different value
7 outcomes. For some, an all-encompassing sense of social belonging may be co-created
8 through participation in relevant social activities, while for others, a simple day out with the
9 family may generate a stronger family bond that only gains meaning as time passes. It is
10 therefore important to understand what specific types of value may be experienced both in
11 routine practices, and in purposeful, goal-oriented C2C co-creation practices.

12 Several authors draw on Holbrook’s (1999) value typology to categorise value outcomes in
13 social consumption contexts. For instance, Sheth et al. (1991) acknowledge the importance of
14 affective (hedonic or emotional, such as joy and happiness) and social (status- and esteem-
15 based) forms of value stemming from practices related to social group membership. Others
16 point to the functional or practical value, such as cognitive value related to efficiency, or
17 excellence value gained from advice and support offered by other customers in physical and
18 online consumer communities (Prebensen & Foss, 2011; Reichenberger, 2017).
19 Reichenberger (2017) also refers to atmospheric value as another social value type that stems
20 from the cumulative impact of social interactions among tourists on visitor experience. Loane
21 & Webster (2014) use the term ‘network value’ to encompass social value outcomes that are
22 not necessarily related to status (Holbrook, 1999) or other affective or functional value types,
23 but instead stem from customers’ membership of social networks.

24 Loane & Webster (2014) propose two functions of social networks membership that results in
25 network value: perceived cohesion and social capital. Perceived cohesion relates to the
26 concept of neo-tribes, defined as emotional communities that form around a particular
27 interest, brand or consumption activity (Maffesoli, 1996; Schouten & McAlexander, 1995).
28 Another relevant notion is ‘sub-cultural capital’, defined in terms of cultural knowledge and
29 commodities acquired to help differentiate individuals from members of other groups and
30 providing status within defined social worlds (Thornton, 1995). Holbrook’s status and esteem
31 values are comparable to some extent, although in this case value stems from the support and
32 in-group (Tajfel, 1982) membership experiences, as opposed to status gained through
33 consumption of a product or service. Social capital as a resource available to members of

1 social communities and providing benefits such as access to favours and goodwill from other
2 members (Adler & Kwon, 2002; Coleman, 1988) is well documented in tourism and events
3 research; for instance Wilks (2011) draws on Putnam's notions of bridging and bonding social
4 capital to describe the positive impacts of music festivals.

5 The above concepts converge to some extent with C-D logic's notion of customers co-
6 creating value (affective, functional, social, and network value) with each other by integrating
7 their resources in order to achieve some desired goals, such as increasing their social capital
8 and perceived togetherness. However, this process does not always take place with specific
9 goals in mind and tourists may not be able to articulate what specific value outcomes are
10 being experienced. This study therefore seeks to also consider mundane practices and
11 encounters, such as cooking a campsite meal to be shared with family and friends, as well as
12 seemingly insignificant social practices that involve fleeting stranger encounters within
13 physical tourism contexts.

14

15 3. STUDY METHODS

16 The study was guided by the pragmatist paradigm (Rorty, 1991), which views research as a
17 tool that can help individuals cope with the world and to facilitate human problem-solving.
18 The pragmatist paradigm emphasises methodologies and explanations that best produce
19 desired outcomes (Pansiri, 2005), and therefore has been adopted in much of the multi- and
20 mixed-methods-based tourism research. In the context of this study, the multi-method
21 approach involved a combination of qualitative observations and interviews. The qualitative
22 methodology is in line with previous research on co-creation practices, both in wider systemic
23 contexts (Vargo, Maglio, & Akaka, 2008), and in explorations of the role of practices in
24 customers' value co-creation (Ellway & Dean, 2016; Tynan et al., 2014). This approach
25 allows for a purposeful identification of insights that would be useful not only to tourism
26 managers and marketers, but also to co-creating tourists themselves, as more knowledge of
27 their value co-creation process may lead to more positive value outcomes. As such, the
28 qualitative methods were applied with specific goals in mind, rather than using a purely
29 inductive, social constructionist perspective, which is common in practice-based research
30 (Echeverri & Skålén, 2011; Korkman, 2006).

31 Fieldwork was undertaken at five UK-based outdoor festivals selected purposively based on a
32 number of criteria detailed below. Festivals were considered a suitable research context for

1 the exploration of C2C co-creation practices as they represent a socially dense setting and
2 potentially a rich and complex social value landscape. They are public occasions organised
3 for different purposes and to celebrate different genres or themes, such as folk music,
4 performing arts, literature and storytelling or visual arts (Getz, 2007). Given the variety of
5 tourists' objectives and motivations, festival attendance often involves casual socialising
6 (Begg, 2011); the sharing of interest in a specific genre (Kyle & Chick, 2002; Matheson,
7 2005); ritualistic celebration of a particular sub-cultural element (Goulding & Shankar, 2011;
8 Kim & Jamal, 2007); and, escaping into hedonistic, transgressive spaces that allow for
9 alternative forms of identity to emerge (Bakhtin, 1968; Turner, 1995).

10 It was important to access a variety of festivals to allow for observations of a range of social
11 practices, including both goal-oriented and routine practices. A purposeful intensity sampling
12 approach was adopted, which prioritises rich examples of the explored phenomenon but does
13 not necessarily include extreme or highly unusual cases (Patton, 2002). Those festival types
14 and genres were therefore considered that offered plenty of opportunities for interactions,
15 socialising and 'sociable merry-making' (Kim & Jamal, 2007), as opposed to passive
16 spectatorship only. Potential research sites were identified by screening festival portals (e.g.,
17 efestivals.co.uk) and reading their promotional materials, and subsequently evaluated in terms
18 of their target audience (as such, family-friendly festivals within different price ranges were
19 sought out, as they are accessible to audiences with a variety of demographic attributes);
20 location and site layout (to allow for a variety of physical spaces in which social encounters
21 could be observed); and, scale and accommodation options (accounting for both day visitors
22 and more immersed campers, as well as social density variance). To ensure ease of access for
23 both the researcher and participants, only spatially-bound festivals that took place between the
24 end of April and end of August in England and Wales were considered. The five festivals in
25 the final sample varied in terms of the above criteria and had a different main content and
26 genre focus, as reflected in the following pseudonyms: CampervanFest; WorldMusicFest;
27 StorytellingFest; Music&ArtsFest; and, FolkMusicFest (see Table 1).

28 As Lamers et al. (2017, p. 58) suggests, analysis of social practices involves "taking a closer
29 look, [...] getting engaged and experiencing first-hand what it is like to be a participant to the
30 practice." The lead author therefore arrived at the festival field sites "dressed in festival garb"
31 (Kim & Jamal, 2007, p. 186), and immersed herself in the research settings by staying at the
32 campsite alongside regular festival tourists. As a result of this deeper immersion, the
33 researcher participated in some of the same actions and practices as those observed and

1 reported by the tourists. During fieldwork, the researcher’s background as a young, Central-
 2 European female, her relative lack of knowledge of UK festival sub-cultures and a lack of
 3 previous festival going experience allowed for a somewhat distanced and naive view of what
 4 was happening. Theorising emergent C2C co-creation practices was therefore done based on
 5 interpretations of tourists’ knowledge of cultural meanings and symbols, made explicit in
 6 their own voices, observations and reflections, as opposed to the researcher’s preconceived
 7 ideas.

	<i>CampervanFest</i>	<i>WorldMusic-Fest</i>	<i>Storytelling-Fest</i>	<i>Music&Arts-Fest</i>	<i>FolkMusicFest</i>
Festival type and genre focus	Commercial camping and entertainment event with a food & drink exhibition element	Grassroots music festival with a charitable focus (psychedelic techno and ‘space rock’, folk, world music)	Public sector-supported cultural and storytelling festival (storytelling; theatre, poetry, folk and world music)	Commercial music and arts festival (folk and popular music genres, arts, comedy)	Grassroots folk music festival
Duration and scale	4 days duration; approx. 500 campsite residents + 5000 day visitors	3 days duration; up to 1500 campsite residents and day visitors	3 days duration; up to 2500 campsite residents and day visitors	5 days duration; up to 2000 campers + 3000 visitors per day	3 days duration; up to 1500 campsite residents and day visitors
Location	Greenfield site within an urban location in West Midlands	Rural location in the East Midlands region	Remote coastal location in the South of Wales	Rural location in the South-West region	Rural coastal location in the South-West region
Target audience	Predominantly middle-class local day visitors, motorhome owners, campers, Volkswagen van owners	Predominantly working-class, families and more mature audiences	Predominantly middle-class families and older couples	Large proportion of predominantly middle class day-visitors; younger audiences and families	Predominantly local middle-class, older audiences and families

8 **Table 1 – Festival sample overview**

9 A total of 52 semi-structured individual and group interviews were undertaken (16 interviews
 10 with individuals, 22 with couples/pairs, 13 with groups of 3-5, and 1 with a group of 6 and
 11 more festival goers), lasting between 25-60 minutes. Interviews with naturally occurring
 12 tourist and day visitor groups represented a realistic reflection of co-creation practices at the
 13 festivals and they often followed on from brief casual conversations with tourists that took

1 place in routine social situations, such as waiting in queues, sitting down with a meal or
 2 relaxing at the campsite. A small number of festival volunteers were also interviewed, as their
 3 practices differed little from other tourists' practices during periods when they were not
 4 providing voluntary service. The individual voices totalled 135, which was deemed sufficient
 5 to achieve theoretical saturation, as no new insights were being provided beyond this point.
 6 Interviewee sample characteristics, including gender, researcher-estimated age categories,
 7 visitor and accommodation type, level of genre specialisation, and size of social unit, are
 8 detailed in Table 2.

Category	%	Category	%	Category	%
Female	51	Visited - first time	38	Genre novice	20
Male	49	Visited - been before	27	Genre experienced	39
Age - teens to early 20s	7	Visited - regular visitors	35	Genre committed	41
Age – mid-20s to mid-30s	18	Camping – ‘Glamping’	3	Single visitor	13
Age – late 30s to mid-40s	27	Camping - Motorhome/Van	22	Couple/pair	32
Age - late 40s to mid-50s	33	Camping - Tent	65	Family	20
Age - late 50s to mid-60s	15	Day visitors	10	Friends	35

9 **Table 2 – Interviewee sample characteristics**

10 Holttinen's (2010) conceptualisation of practice elements was used as an organising
 11 framework to determine the scope of data collection. To uncover specific actions,
 12 operant/operand resources and their use, and teleoaffective structures, interviews focussed on
 13 festival goers' social encounters/ interactions, the skills, knowledge and other resources that
 14 influence the ways in which they co-create, and their understanding of any implicit or explicit
 15 norms present in social situations at the festivals. In order to gain deeper understanding of
 16 rules and the cultural, spatial and temporal contexts of practices, the research furthermore
 17 drew on over 200 photographs and hand-written notes of ideas, reflections and observations
 18 of interacting actors, types and patterns of visible actions and interactions, enacted social
 19 rules, and features of the physical space. This combined qualitative approach allowed for
 20 holistic explorations of “things being taken for granted” (Lamers et al., 2017, p. 59), as well
 21 as the emotions involved in the shifting of practice performance in the physical space of the
 22 festivals.

23 Analysis involved repeated familiarisation with and immersion in the data following each
 24 period of festival data collection. Data were manually analysed before each subsequent
 25 festival visit, allowing for a more focused fieldwork approach. Upon fieldwork completion,
 26 interviews and observation notes were digitally transcribed, and QSR NVivo 9 (released in
 27 2010) was used to manage the data and aid coding. Five-step qualitative thematic analysis

1 (Bazeley, 2007) was then undertaken. In the first stages a contextual broad-brush coding
2 approach was used following each festival, with the codes later distilled, re-labelled and
3 merged to comprise a thematic framework for further analysis. Four main descriptive and
4 more abstract categories emerged, including contextual and personal factors in co-creation
5 (e.g. campsite, weather, perceived class differences), social atmosphere (e.g. relaxed, safe),
6 and practices (e.g., dancing, camping, sharing food).

7 In the third step, in-depth “coding-on” was undertaken, which expanded and further divided
8 each category to form a relatively complex hierarchy with four levels of sub-codes. Next,
9 summary memos were written on each code and sub-theme by drawing on practice-theoretical
10 concepts, which then aided data reduction and cross-case analysis in the fifth step. The
11 resulting coding structure was re-organised into three main themes: C2C co-creation practices
12 that encompassed the 18 ‘Integrative practices’ outlined in section 5, and the teleological and
13 affective structures that shaped practices. NVivo’s data-query function (looking for indicative
14 patterns in the data using cross-tabulation) was helpful in discovering patterns within the data
15 with respect to identifying links between specific C2C co-creation practices and other practice
16 elements, as well as between practices and observable value outcomes.

17

18 4. STUDY RESULTS

19 *4.1 C2C Co-creation practices at festivals*

20 This section provides an overview and description of tentative findings relating to the C2C
21 co-creation at festivals, constituted in 18 integrative practices. These are clustered in groups
22 of three, starting from less socially immersive practices that focus on in-groups (Tajfel, 1982)
23 and what Rihova et al. (2013) term ‘social bubbles’, to more socially immersive co-creation
24 that appears to result in the emergence of network value. Illustrative data excerpts are
25 presented in Table 3. A discussion of how the practices link to specific value outcomes
26 follows in section 4.2.

27 *4.1.1 Insulating, territorial and non-conforming practices*

28 Physical spaces such as separate dining areas and secluded cul-de-sacs within the festival
29 landscape afforded small groups an opportunity to distance themselves from the hubbub of
30 the festival, while allowing for the performance of insulating and territorial practices. These
31 were performed predominantly by individuals and couples but also by larger family and
32 friendship groups at the more commercially-oriented Music&ArtsFest. The notion of ‘in-

1 groups' (Tajfel, 1982) from social psychology resonates well; these are defined as reference
2 groups that an individual identifies with, while out-group members are often excluded (ibid).
3 Together with insulating and territoriality, non-conforming practices highlighted the need for
4 autonomous social goals, needs and desires, which were not always aligned with the expected
5 'code' of the event.

6 *Insulating* was especially apparent where large groups congregated to find a private area in
7 which they could relax or socialise undisturbed. This was observed at the CampervanFest,
8 where a large group of approx. 60 members of a semi-organised motorhome club purposefully
9 parked their motorhomes in a remote section of the campsite. Some tourists appeared to
10 insulate themselves by keeping a physical distance, while still absorbing the social
11 atmosphere at the festival. Small groups of tourists were often observed sitting close together
12 in dining areas to deter strangers from penetrating their own 'social bubble' (Rihova et al.,
13 2013), with stranger interactions limited to short exchanges of pleasantries. *Territorial*
14 practice took insulating even further by creating physical barriers to discourage outsiders from
15 intruding. Windbreakers, tarpaulin sheets, gazebos and temporary picket fences, often
16 decorated with fairy lights, flags and colourful bunting, demarcated personal territory around
17 a campsite pitch and prevented others from coming too close. In the festival arena such
18 private spaces were created by laying down picnic rugs and occupying seating areas with an
19 almost selfish desire to take the best spot.

20 Some tourists were also found to engage in *non-conforming* practice, which appeared to break
21 expected social norms, both with respect to generally accepted norms (e.g. expectation of
22 politeness) and specific sub-cultural rules (e.g. accepted dress-code). Graham talked about
23 'pushing and shoving' he experienced when queuing for children's workshops at the
24 Music&ArtsFest. He perceived the practice as impolite and out of line with the generally
25 'chilled-out atmosphere' he had come to expect at the festival. Younger audiences (15-20-
26 year-old) were observed wearing clothes more akin to the current 'festival chic' high-street-
27 style fashion trend, as opposed to the generally accepted laid-back or 'hippie' clothing style.
28 Fitting within the norm structures of their own peer groups (i.e. 'outside' the festival),
29 appeared to lead to a level of detachment from the rest of the festival community.

30 *4.1.2 Communicating, collaborating and sharing practices*

31 Communicating, sharing and collaborating practices often took place in private spaces at
32 festivals, such as tourists' tents and campsite areas, which served as focal points for family
33 and friendship group reunions. As a number of authors point out, group travel and shared

1 experiences enhance family functioning and re-enforce friendship ties within pre-existing
2 social units by establishing traditions and generating memories (Kyle & Chick, 2002; Lehto et
3 al., 2009) and there was evidence at the festivals of such functions being fulfilled. The
4 physical environment and the social unit make-up played an important role; CampervanFest
5 and Music&ArtsFest included designated family campsite areas and family- or group-oriented
6 activities in their programming, which appeared to facilitate the performance of these
7 practices.

8 Families and friends were found to spend a lot of their time at the festival *communicating*
9 with each other – catching up on news, sharing opinions and insights, reminiscing about past
10 events, and joking together. In so doing, families and friendship groups reinforced and
11 invigorated their personal relationships and felt closer to each other. Such bonding function
12 was also fulfilled through *collaborating*, in which groups delegated tasks, revised family
13 roles, and worked together to achieve some common goal. Tourists collaboratively organised
14 their 'duties' when camping, and decided on a schedule of their time and activities at the
15 festival. Many couples and groups were for instance observed pitching tents and loudly
16 debating about what to do, both at the campsite and within the festival arenas. While
17 arguments were likely particularly in family situations, an increased willingness to be more
18 accommodating for the good of all was evident.

19 *Sharing* practice involved the sharing of objects and consumables but also active sharing of
20 experiences among family and friendship groups, resulting again in perceptions of stronger
21 interpersonal bonds. A typical field note entry from all of the festival sites described families
22 sitting at the campsite under gazebos with their BBQs and picnic sets, partying by campfires
23 outside their tents or sharing a meal at tables in catering areas. Experiences of dancing,
24 playing games, partying and getting drunk were also actively shared. This helped to create a
25 sense of ongoing closeness and intimacy; groups of friends talked of re-connecting with each
26 other after the festival and recounting stories of object-centred sharing actions, such as
27 listening and dancing together to a specific music performance.

28 *4.1.3 Acknowledging, advising and conversing practices*

29 Acknowledging, advising and conversing practices were evident across all five festival
30 contexts, though were more commonly observed at campsites where a more holiday-like
31 atmosphere prevailed. These practices represent relatively superficial, less socially immersive
32 co-creation oriented at tourists-strangers and performed mainly by individual tourists, but also
33 by tourist dyads and groups, the majority of whom were day visitors and therefore less

1 immersed in the festival environment. These co-creation practices appeared to be rather
2 limited in that they rarely developed into deeper, long-lasting social connections and
3 relationships. Nevertheless, acknowledging, advising and conversing appeared to create a
4 friendly atmosphere at the festivals, which has been shown to contribute to positive
5 evaluations of the service experience as a whole (Prebensen & Foss, 2011).

6 In *acknowledging* practice tourists recognised the social presence of others through nodding,
7 smiling and greeting. A welcoming, open body language with plenty of eye contact, grins and
8 cheerful nods was observed as tourists walked past each other on their way to festival venues,
9 eateries or toilets. As tourists walked around campsite pitches or the festival arena, they also
10 performed *advising* practice, engaging in non-committal, brief conversations about
11 consumption objects, characteristics or possessions that were not necessarily related to any
12 special interest genre. Specifically, advising pertained to offering practical information
13 relating to the festival site and customs; e.g. where to get water; which food vendor to choose
14 or what festival performance to go to. In a similar vein, *conversing* practice involving
15 autotelic and relatively superficial verbal exchanges with strangers was reported by tourists.
16 Conversing revolved around everyday topics, such as the weather, where tourists or day
17 visitors came from or what their tastes, likes and dislikes were, both at the festival and outside
18 it. Many informants referred to small talk or polite chitchat, in which opinions were shared
19 and a sense of general friendliness was established, though little effort was made to take such
20 interactions much further.

21 *4.1.4 Helping, relating and confiding practices*

22 Consumer behaviour studies suggest that service contexts which draw together customers
23 with a perceived common set of values and attitudes can become ‘social villages’ (Oliver,
24 1999), where social alliances emerge that contribute to a sense of camaraderie among
25 customers. At the Music&ArtsFest and the CampervanFest for example, the more overtly
26 commercial nature of the event led to a perceived sense of a holiday-like care-free zone,
27 which contributed to the formation of a social village. Helping, relating and confiding
28 practices were evident in all of the festivals, and could be observed in relatively short-lived
29 but often intense collaborative inter-group and dyadic practices of festival tourists and day
30 visitors.

31 In *helping* practice, tourists shared resources with each other, offering physical assistance or
32 advice to tourists-strangers, which then often led to further interactions and a temporary sense
33 of neighbourliness. For instance, experienced camper Sarah found herself showing strangers

1 at the StorytellingFest campsite how to operate their new gas stove. Within the festival arena,
2 tourists would often keep an eye on a stranger's blanket while they went to get a drink, offer
3 to take a photograph, or share lifts from the festival. *Relating* practice pertained to creating a
4 more intense, if only a short-lived, sense of connection in shared moments or circumstances.
5 Andrea and John from the Music&ArtsFest, for example, engaged in a social interaction with
6 a stranger based on a negative service incident. Perceived similarity, or homophily
7 (McPherson, Smith-Lovin, & Cook, 2001), also appeared to serve as a medium through which
8 people sought to establish contact with others perceived as similar. For instance, relating took
9 place on the basis of shared attributes, such as age or social group composition, which then
10 led to tourists camping next to and befriending a group of alike strangers.

11 Lastly, another practice that appeared to contribute to a 'social village' sense was *confiding*.
12 Some tourists used encounters with strangers as an opportunity to share their life-story and
13 off-load their personal problems, and this often led to a perceived sense of relief or joy and an
14 intense personal connection. As Marcus from StorytellingFest noted, "pouring one's life story
15 at complete strangers before you realise what you've done" was relatively commonplace at
16 the festival, though rarely led to a long-lasting friendship.

17 *4.1.5 Conforming, trading and initiating practices*

18 In conforming, trading and initiating practices festival tourists enacted and expressed their
19 membership of various sub-cultures or neo-tribes. Particular tribal structures emerged around
20 consumption objects at some of the festivals; these included folk music at the FolkMusicFest,
21 storytelling at StorytellingFest, campervans at CampervanFest, but also 'Hawkwind', an
22 iconic music band headlining at the WorldMusicFest. As Holt (1995) notes, customers-
23 tourists often use such objects to co-create value by classifying themselves and the meanings
24 associated with particular objects of consumption. In the case of the festivals, the specific
25 genre, band or sub-cultural focus constituted a set of images that shaped tourists' C2C co-
26 creation practices.

27 Tourists were observed *conforming* to the rules and norms accepted by their respective sub-
28 cultural communities. Many FolkMusicFest and StorytellingFest attendees wore 'folksy'
29 clothing and brandished pewter tankards from which ale and cider were consumed. The use of
30 particular discourse was observed; at the CampervanFest, members of the motorhome tribe
31 referred to the festival as 'a meet', whereas the Volkswagen campervan enthusiasts talked of
32 similar events as 'shows'. Genre-specific know-how, experiences, advice and skills were
33 *traded* by tourists. At the CampervanFest, tourists often stopped to appreciate and ask

1 questions about customised ‘buses’ put on display by other festival attendees. At the
2 StorytellingFest, ‘chill-out’ spaces at the campsite and informal organiser-facilitated sessions
3 were used to hone tourists’ storytelling skills and to collect new stories. Lastly, many first
4 time tourists were spouses, children or friends of existing members of the sub-cultural groups,
5 invited along to be *initiated* into the tribe’s festivalling tradition. At the FolkMusicFest, for
6 instance, strangers who were attending for the first time talked of the folkies ‘showing them
7 the ropes’. Such practices contributed to a stronger sense of sub-cultural community and tribal
8 membership.

9 *4.1.6 Trusting, embracing, fun-making and rekindling practices*

10 The last group of C2C co-creation practices reflects strongly the nature of festivals as
11 liminoid spaces (e.g., Gardner, 2004; Gibson & Connell, 2005). These represent a temporary
12 state in which usual social rules and constraints of everyday life are transcended or inverted
13 (Turner, 1995) and a ‘code of conduct’ marked by laughter, respectfulness, egalitarian sharing
14 and helpfulness often emerges (Falassi, 1987). A number of tourism studies (Arnould & Price,
15 1993; Kim & Jamal, 2007) describe how the liminoid state leads to ‘communitas’; a
16 spontaneous, unstructured sense of community or ‘we-ness’ (Turner, 1995). The liminoid rule
17 structure was particularly evident at the smaller, more grassroots WorldMusicFest and
18 StorytellingFest, where embracing, fun-making and rekindling practices were performed.

19 The emerging sense of communitas was particularly evident in the dissolving and blurring of
20 social boundaries. Social and physical differences, such as sexual orientation, age and social
21 class, were actively ignored with tourists accepting strangers as equals in *embracing* practice.
22 Additionally, the escapist nature of festivals was encompassed in tourists’ *fun-making*.

23 Playful, ludic and at times transgressive behaviours were evidenced particularly at the
24 WorldMusicFest and the Music&ArtsFest, and included dressing up in costumes, nudity,
25 romantic or sensual encounters, and indulging in alcohol and recreational drugs. As everyday
26 social rules were cast off upon arrival, new ‘festival identities’ were adopted. ‘Going crazy’,
27 as Andy from WorldMusicFest put it, contributed to an immersive atmosphere of merriment,
28 laughter and festivity, and also represented a venting mechanism for tourists’ desire to escape
29 the mundane, orderly nature of everyday life (Bakhtin, 1968).

	Practices	Illustrative examples
1	Insulating	Janet, CampervanFest: “[...] we, you know, we wanted to have like a little area, so our vans and awnings around, so that there’s an area in the middle, so that we can communicate... ‘coz, you know, if the weather’s alright, we’ll sit outside, you know, into the night, tonight we’ll be in one of the awning, won’t we, it’s just a bit cold.”
2	Territoriality	Nolan, WorldMusicFest: “[...] then someone came along yesterday and they put their tent sort of right opposite ours with their guy rope sort of [in front of our tent], when there is plenty of space. And we were all quite miffed by this, we sort of thought, ‘ah, what the...they are sort of encroaching on our space this is our territory!”
3	Non-conforming	Ally and Estell, Music&ArtsFest: (Ally) “If it’s a big group of [...] boys and girls not actually with one of them and you’re trying to impress...” (Estell) “Because if you’re with the group of friends that you’re with all the time, I don’t think you escape your normal social restrains. Because if you’re a young teenager with other young teenagers, there’s always gonna be bloke politics and things like that going on, just because you’re now in a field listening to some music that doesn’t take that away.”
4	Communicating	Jackie, CampervanFest: “and it’s nice, ‘cause you can just catch up with people, ‘cause we don’t see each other all the time, because everybody’s lives are so busy. But when it comes to an event like this you just sit together and catch up.”
5	Sharing	StorytellingFest (observation notes): I watched a mum and daughter just in front of me, with the mum lying down with her head in the daughter’s lap, and the daughter playing and braiding her hair while they were both listening to the stories and music.
6	Collaborating	Nolan, StorytellingFest: “[...] my other half is very much, ‘what are you doing, we don’t have to get up early’, like the other people we are with...ehm, I think sort of, I think I need, when I go to these events, I’ll be a bit selfish and go, ‘I don’t like that thing, I wanna do this, this, this, this.’ So we, we sort of go on and do our own things and agree to come together and eat at such –and-such time and all the rest of it.”
7	Acknowledging	Gary, FolkMusicFest: “People come and say, ‘hi’, but you know, it’s all very much small talk, like some, you know, one sentence and that’s it. Which is fine, because I don’t know why you’d have to sort of sit down and have a big conversation with everybody. People just, they’re happy just to walk through and say hi, I like to just, ‘Hello!’, you know”
8	Advising	Emily, StorytellingFest: “I’d be like ‘oh, are you waiting for this’ and then we would talk about what we’ve seen during the day and what our favourites were, exchange...what’s the word that you’d say, oh, this is a good thing to see...and they’d say, oh, this is a good thing to see.”
9	Conversing	Laura, CampervanFest: “[...] you sort of just make conversation, like the girls are doing a food, cookery thing round in there (cooking workshops area) and there’s mums and that, standing outside, you just get sort of chatting, don’t you with different people, making conversation.”
10	Helping	Ben, Music&ArtsFest: “[...] the group that we pitched up next to, one of them was having a bit of trouble with their tent. And then, they were taking picture of us a couple of times and given us sausages and burgers yesterday... yeah, everyone’s very generous with

		their time and their stuff.”
11	Relating	Lee, WorldMusicFest: “[...] we were basically looking for some other people who were vaguely our age so that we could kind of [...] 'Cause otherwise, there's a lot of kind of families, and a lot of older guys here. And we figured that we need to kind of chill with some people that are more near our age. So we kind of had a little scuttle round, saw some people here, just pitch up a tent over these and just met these guys, so....”
12	Confiding	StorytellingFest (observation notes): Neville told me about his future plans and how he felt about life in general. It was a relatively deep, spiritual conversation, despite the fact that we would probably never see each other again. Back at the campsite we said our goodbyes – he asked me if I was ‘googlable’, I replied that he could find me on Facebook, and he said that he was not on it. “Never mind”, he said, “nice to meet you and have a good life!”
13	Conforming	Heather, CampervanFest: “Caravanners tend to have a rally, motorhomers tend to have meets. We don’t really call it a rally, I don’t know why...I don’t know whether the phrase rally conjures up lots and lots and sort of rows, quite regimental, whereas at [name of motorhome club] we are quite relaxed, so long you don’t park on top of somebody.”
14	Trading	Diana, FolkMusicFest: “Sometimes at a festival we, you know, at the end of the night we come back, be around the campfire playing and other musicians will come and join you that you never met before...[and] they’ll join in and you could be there for hours on end. And it’s lovely, because you learn things from each other. People say, oh what was that tune you played and that’s good as well, so...it’s learning and as well listening to what other people do.”
15	Initiating	Dylan, StorytellingFest: “Some people have come just as a family and some as a group, [...] and maybe they do it every year and they love doing it. And partly I think it’s an induction of children into the, into this tribe, into this [storytelling] community.”
16	Embracing	Shaun, WorldMusicFest: “[...] another one of the lads who we were walking around with at that festival was a dustbin collector from Glasgow, but it meant nothing. We all had a beer, we all had a laugh and sat there, we all stayed up we all looked at the stars, everybody was equal in the same way. It doesn’t matter what you do.”
17	Fun-making	FolkMusicFest (observation notes): Suddenly the lights in the main bar area went out and the crowd of about 200 people all went Oaaaaw! in a disappointed, slightly shocked tone of voice. When the light came back on 10 seconds later, the whole crowd exclaimed, Yeeey! Then the lights went out again 20 second later and came back on again repeatedly, about 5 times, with the crowd reacting more and more enthusiastically with each Oaaaaw! and Yeeey!, obviously relishing the collective moans and cheers.
18	Rekindling	Melvin, Music&ArtsFest: “Every year you come back and there’ll be people that you recognise form last year. Like, I’m always stopping and saying, ‘hey mate, how are you doing? Can’t believe it’s been a year, I haven’t see you for a year’...’case sometimes you meet up outside of the festival, and other times you won’t meet, lives are busy [...] and it’s like an extended family I think, isn’t it.”

1 **Table 3 – Illustrative examples of C2C co-creation practices**

1 Another co-creation practice that was performed within the liminoid zone but appeared to
2 have temporal implication by going far beyond the festival was *rekindling*. Fifty-year-old
3 Shaun from the WorldMusicFest talked about the deep friendships that he developed through
4 festival attendance and that were more important to him than those in his everyday life. For a
5 group of tourist volunteers from WorldMusicFest, rekindling at festivals facilitated the
6 development of a sense of kinship among ‘known strangers’ at festivals. Turner (1995)
7 distinguishes between unstructured, spontaneous *communitas* that emerge in liminoid
8 contexts and what he calls ‘normative *communitas*’ – *communitas* that have over time
9 developed into more structured social systems. Rekindling resembles the latter, in that festival
10 friendships firmed up over time through more structured volunteering.

11

12 *4.2 Value outcomes in C2C co-creation*

13 The findings presented in section 4.1 suggest that many positive social outcomes, such as an
14 emerging sense of friendliness or temporary/ongoing *communitas*, are often the result not
15 only of tourists’ resource integration but also relatively mundane, routine social practices,
16 such as greeting passing strangers, conforming to tribal norms or embracing those who are in
17 the everyday consumer society perceived as ‘different’. In such cases, experiences of value
18 may remain implicit and only become evident as tourists’ bodily actions, emotional
19 engagement and performance of practice is captured through observational research methods
20 (Ellway & Dean, 2016). The findings show that social value outcomes differ, based on two
21 main aspects of co-creation practices.

22 First, the types of emerged value depend on the degree to which C2C co-creation
23 encompasses purposeful vs. autotelic integration of resources to achieve some goal. This
24 corresponds with Schatzki’s (1996) teleological practice dimension, insofar as festival
25 tourists’ goal- or purpose-oriented co-creation became more explicit as practicing tourists
26 needed to actively acknowledge relevant rule and role structures, as well as use consumption
27 objects, apply know-how or skills and adopt certain bodily activities to carry out the practice
28 (Holttinen, 2010). Second, Schatzki’s affective practice dimension is reflected in the
29 emotional and meaning-based aspects of tourists’ social lives and contexts. In some practices,
30 tourists’ C2C value outcomes related to perceived membership in some social groups; for
31 instance, where activities at the festival focused on reinforcing status and identity within pre-
32 existing neo-tribal or sub-cultural structures (Schouten & McAlexander, 1995; Thornton,
33 1995), or where temporary *communitas* (Turner, 1995) at festivals led to perceived cohesion

1 and the building of social capital. In other cases, a higher degree of individualism led to the
 2 casting away of out-groups (Tajfel, 1982), and focusing instead on known-others - families
 3 and friends, but also those perceived temporarily as members of the tourist's in-group in what
 4 Belk (2010) terms pseudo-kinship.

5 This principle is conceptualised in Figure 1, which presents C2C co-creation value outcomes
 6 in a matrix that places them on a continuum of Autotelic ⇔ Instrumental practices on one
 7 hand, and Private ⇔ Public practices on the other hand. The autotelic dimension comprises
 8 more routine, run-of-the-mill practices which have an end in themselves and often only gain
 9 meaning with the passing of time, while instrumental practices are performed with specific
 10 goals in mind. Social-affective structures in the private dimension then orient co-creation
 11 toward familial, in-group meanings, while practices within the public dimension focus
 12 outward - toward an emerging sense of we-ness at the festival, or a particular tribe or sub-
 13 culture tourists identify themselves with. It is important to note that there is a degree of
 14 blurring of boundaries between the practices, as these do not necessarily represent clear-cut
 15 categories. Nevertheless, exploring the value outcomes which were more or less explicitly
 16 formulated by research participants or observed in the performed practices, four main
 17 categories are observed: *Affective, Social, Functional and Network value*.

18

	← Autotelic Instrumental →	
Private	Communicating – Affective, Social Sharing – Affective, Social Confiding – Affective	Insulating – Affective, Social Territoriality – Affective, Social Non-conforming – Affective, Social, Functional Collaborating – Affective, Social, Functional
Public	Conforming – Social, Network Acknowledging – Network Conversing – Network Relating – Affective, Network Initiating – Affective, Network Fun-making – Affective, Network Rekindling - Network	Advising – Functional, Network Helping – Affective, Functional, Network Trading – Functional, Network

19 **Figure 1: C2C co-creation value outcomes**

20 *Autotelic C2C co-creation on a private level* tended to lead to Affective and Social value
 21 outcomes. Affective value relates to personal satisfaction, personal growth and a sense of joy
 22 and pleasure, such as was seen in the ways in which tourists engaged in and talked about
 23 interacting mainly with known others (i.e. other family or friendship group members) but also

1 with temporarily known strangers. Confiding, for example, benefitted tourists in terms of
2 providing a form of emotional support, which has been previously described in the case of
3 conversations among patrons in hospitality establishments (Rosenbaum, 2006). Social value
4 outcomes in the private domain tended to be formulated in terms of what Holbrook (1999)
5 calls self-oriented value dimension, in that the benefits appeared to emphasise oneself, or in
6 this case, those in the tourists' immediate 'social bubble' (Rihova et al., 2013). For instance,
7 families and friends visibly bonded through communicating and sharing practices; something
8 that has been evidenced in other tourism studies that note that through bonding value, the
9 tourism landscape becomes embedded with rich personal meanings that may help to build
10 family histories (Kyle & Chick, 2002).

11 *Autotelic C2C co-creation within the public domain* was oriented less toward the tourist-self
12 and more toward the 'common good' of the emerging festival community, with
13 predominantly Affective and Network value in evidence. Affective value outcomes could,
14 again, be observed in the emotional reactions of joy and happiness as tourists performed fun-
15 making practices, though affective outcomes such as a sense of personal satisfaction were also
16 in evidence. Network value outcomes were experienced in relating and acknowledging
17 practice; for example, greeting strangers and engaging them in conversations helped to create
18 a sense of a social village (Oliver, 1999), where social alliances emerge in commercial
19 contexts and provide a sense of camaraderie. This, together with tourists and day visitors
20 effectively playing a care-giving role, lends itself to more favourable perceptions of the
21 tourism experience (Prebensen & Foss, 2011). Social value was seen in conforming practices,
22 as participants displayed symbols of the tribe, thus potentially gaining status by 'flagging up'
23 their membership to other members. Through initiating, the 'in-the-know' members of a sub-
24 culture (Thornton, 1995) would be able to communicate such images and social identities to
25 potential new members, thus experiencing social value outcomes relating to increased sub-
26 cultural capital.

27 *Instrumental C2C co-creation on a private level* resulted mainly in Affective and Social value
28 outcomes. But unlike autotelic practices in the private domain, instrumental co-creation often
29 had a clear sense of goals and purpose, the achievement of which resulted in Functional value.
30 Practices such as insulating, territoriality, non-conforming and collaborating often involved a
31 resource-integrating process (Vargo & Lusch, 2008) through which group members pool their
32 resources (i.e., mental capabilities and skills, such as organisational skills or skills linked with
33 specific family or gender roles) to achieve some outcome (e.g. to pitch a tent, to secure the

1 best spot at the campsite). While the formation of cliques and other territorial and non-
2 conforming practices may isolate tourists from others in the setting, they also appeared to
3 contribute to reinforcing social ties or a sense of social identity and status among practicing
4 actors (Social value) and embed the tourism context with kinship meanings. Affective
5 outcomes (sense of satisfaction) were also evident for instance in parents' non-conforming to
6 the generally accepted rules of engagement at festivals by pushing ahead of a queue in order
7 to get their children into an over-subscribed arts-and-crafts workshop.

8 Last, *instrumental C2C co-creation on a public level* led to value outcomes similar to those
9 seen in the case of autotelic practices in the public domain, in that they helped to reinforce a
10 social atmosphere of friendliness that could be transferable to a variety of other tourism
11 contexts, such as hotel stays, camping or various leisure outings. Though as was the case with
12 instrumental co-creation in the private domain, here Functional value outcomes in the form of
13 information/ skills or tangible resources attained from others were observed more often. In
14 performing advising and helping practices, tourists-strangers can be seen to supplement the
15 role of the tourism service organisation through information provision and resource sharing.
16 In addition to Functional value outcomes, trading practices contributed to Network value via
17 reinforcing a sense of social identity among the members of a tribal or subcultural
18 community. As Mackellar (2009) suggests, the meetings of serious participants become
19 places to parade and celebrate a valued social identity, though learning and exchanging/
20 trading sub-cultural symbols with each other.

21

22 5. CONCLUSION

23 5.1 Theoretical implications

24 S-D logic's resource integration perspective assumes that customers possess some value-
25 pursuing goals that marketers should aim to reveal in order to co-create value with them more
26 effectively (Vargo & Lusch, 2008). Tourists' value co-creation is then often presented as
27 something that organisations should manage to ensure greater service satisfaction and brand
28 loyalty (Grissmann & Stokburger-Sauer, 2012). Even though recent S-D logic debates
29 increasingly acknowledge the autonomous nature of resource-integration as embedded in a
30 systemic context affected by institutional logics and symbols, this perspective does not
31 necessarily account for C2C value co-creation that may be invisible to the organisation and
32 therefore outside of its scope of influence (Medberg & Heinonen, 2014). Recent customer-

1 centric developments in service marketing research, and in particular the contributions of the
2 Customer-Dominant logic, have not yet been fully incorporated in tourism literature. This
3 paper therefore provides a novel perspective on tourists' social practices by conceptualising
4 these as C2C value co-creation, using the more recent C-D logic perspective.

5 The prominence of social practices in tourism is echoed by a number of authors; Lamers et al.
6 (2017) note that practice theories can be successfully applied in tourism research as an
7 alternative to the dominant economics-driven perspectives, particularly with regards to
8 tourism policy. The authors caution that some tourism practices may lead to societally
9 undesirable outcomes, but on the other hand, practice theory can aid in identifying more
10 desirable practices that may be facilitated by policy and management. As discussed in section
11 4.2, specific C2C co-creation practices may increase tourists' social value in various ways;
12 the tourism context can become embedded with kinship meanings, bring about the emergence
13 of collaborative commercial friendships, or represent a platform for the enactment of tribal
14 rituals. This may be particularly important for increasing the well-being of communities or the
15 improvement of host-guest relationships within destinations.

16 Tourists' C2C co-creation practices are not always necessarily linked directly to the tourism
17 service offering, but the tourist landscape is likely to be embedded with one or more of the
18 social elements that play an important role in the performance of practices. The tourism
19 organisation is merely one element of the customer value ecosystem (Heinonen & Strandvik,
20 2015), and consequently, it is important to define potential situations in which tourism
21 businesses can be more present in customers' co-creation practices. The findings presented in
22 section 4.1 and 4.2 serve to indicate the importance of C2C co-creation practices for tourists,
23 and highlight a few implications for the planning of tourism spaces.

24

25 *5.2 Managerial implications*

26 This paper goes towards defining potential situations in which tourism businesses can be
27 more present in customers' life worlds by focusing on customer-to-customer (as opposed to
28 business-to-customer) co-creation, and help facilitate the emergence of positive Affective,
29 Social, Functional and Network value outcomes by identifying specific practices that are
30 likely to generate such outcomes. It is therefore important to actively seek opportunities to
31 reveal tourists' perspectives on value by employing research methods that enable such access.
32 Thick descriptions and first-hand participant experiences of what it is like to participate in a

1 practice can be gained through ethnographic methods, such as in-depth interviews and
2 participant observation.

3 By ‘zooming-in’ on tourists’ C2C co-creation in such way, tourism organisations are able to
4 gain practical understanding and insider knowledge and skills in relation to the rules and
5 resources required (Lamers et al., 2017). This is important, as practices are dynamic in that
6 they can change or be changed by re-adjusting and reconfiguring some of the elements that
7 underpin them (Kemnis, 2010). This dynamism represents interesting opportunities for
8 tourism management. Holttinen (2010) suggests that value improvement opportunities may be
9 identified by understanding the meaning structures and resources used in practices. By
10 changing or improving some of the practice elements through positive interventions, it may
11 therefore be possible to make practices more valuable (Echeverri & Skålén, 2011; Korkman,
12 2006).

13 Obviously tourism service providers need to facilitate access to resources. For instance, by
14 encouraging the display of symbolic objects and artefacts (e.g. particular types of clothing and
15 memorabilia displays) in the tourism setting, organisations may be able to facilitate the
16 emergence of Network value and other positive Affective and Social outcomes, such as
17 perceived higher status and strengthened social identity. Tourism providers may also
18 encourage an explicit rule structure that allows for connections to be made more easily in an
19 otherwise privately-oriented tourism setting. Technological platforms and social media can
20 prove useful, as seen for example in Melia Hotels’ use of Twitter to help ‘break the ice’
21 among strangers visiting the same hotel resort. Online contact can facilitate immediate C2C
22 co-creation and encourage the emergence of a social village that is more conducive to
23 Functional and Network value outcomes. In a similar vein, UK-based festivals facilitate
24 embracing practices and the sense of we-ness among festival goers by organising carnival
25 days or training staff and volunteers to introduce themselves and start friendly conversations
26 with strangers and thus nudge attendees toward more open, out-group-facing practices.

27

28 *5.3 Future research*

29 This paper set out to frame empirical explorations of C2C value co-creation as captured in the
30 somewhat limited context of UK-based, multi-day, family-friendly festivals. While there are
31 certainly similarities with other tourism, leisure and hospitality settings in the ways in which
32 groups of friends, families or strangers interact with each other in social practices, it is

1 recognised that this methodological homogeneity has limited our ability to move beyond the
2 current conceptualisation of the C2C co-creation construct. Nevertheless, we argue that the
3 pragmatist approach utilised in this study is aligned well with tourism management's focus on
4 practical solutions and understandings, while acknowledging the social reality that is based on
5 tourists' socially constructed practices and beliefs (Pansiri, 2005, p. 194). In this sense, C2C
6 co-creation research should not be weighed down by positivistic striving for an absolute truth
7 or pre-determined models of behaviour, nor should it see reality as existing purely in the
8 mind. Instead, practical applications and solutions to particular research problems should be
9 favoured.

10 In our case, the methodology used to study practices has been a qualitative one, with
11 triangulation of a variety of qualitative data deemed to produce the best results. A more
12 pluralistic approach to the research design and a focus on different tourism contexts may be
13 utilised to provide holistic perspectives, richer insights and perhaps go towards more concrete
14 implications for specific tourism contexts. We establish four social value outcome categories
15 that stem from 18 different types of C2C co-creation practices. The framework could be used
16 as a theoretical basis for empirical research in a number of similar C2C co-creation-rich
17 tourism settings, such as hotel and leisure resorts, campsites, wildlife and adventure holidays,
18 cultural, religious and ethnic festivals, cruise experiences and more structured cultural
19 holidays in urban contexts. Further insights should also be provided by exploring in depth the
20 impact on social value outcomes of different provider-facilitated resources and tourist-specific
21 teleological structures (goals, motivations and other personal characteristics) that guide the
22 performance of practices. Such research endeavours would contribute to the increasingly
23 important focus on tourists as value co-creators.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

REFERENCES

Adler, P. S., & Kwon, S.-W. (2002). Social capital: prospects for a new concept. *Academy of Management Review*, 27(1), 17–40. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2002.5922314>

Altinay, L., Sigala, M., & Waligo, V. (2016). Social value creation through tourism enterprise. *Tourism Management*, 54, 401–417. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2015.12.011>

Anker, T. B., Sparks, L., Moutinho, L., & Grönroos, C. (2015). Consumer dominant value creation. *European Journal of Marketing*, 49(3/4), 532–560. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1108/EJM-09-2013-0518>

Arnould, E. J., & Price, L. L. (1993). River magic: extraordinary experience and the extended service encounter. *The Journal of Consumer Research*, 20(1), 24–45. <https://doi.org/10.1086/209331>

Bakhtin, M. M. (1968). *Rabelais and his world (translated by Helene Iswolsky)*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Baron, S., & Harris, K. (2008). Consumers as resource integrators. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 24(1), 113–130. <https://doi.org/10.1362/026725708X273948>

Bazeley, P. (2007). *Qualitative data analysis with NVivo*. London: SAGE Publications.

Begg, R. (2011). Culturing commitment: serious leisure and the folk festival experience. In C. Gibson & J. Connell (Eds.), *Festival places: revitalising rural Australia* (pp. 248–264). Bristol: Channel View Publications.

Belk, R. W. (2010). Sharing. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 36(5), 715–734. <https://doi.org/10.1086/612649>

Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Buonincontri, P., Morvillo, A., Okumus, F., & Van Niekerk, M. (2017). Managing the experience co-creation process in tourism destinations: Empirical findings from Naples. *Tourism Management*, 62, 264–277. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2017.04.014>

Cabiddu, F., Lui, T.-W., & Piccoli, G. (2013). Managing value co-creation in the tourism industry. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 42, 86–107. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2013.01.001>

Cassop Thompson, M. (2012). *Customers value seeking practices in public sector health and fitness clubs*. University of Sunderland.

Cheng, M. (2016). Sharing economy: A review and agenda for future research. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 57, 60–70. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2016.06.003>

Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 94, 95–120.

Crouch, D. (2004). Tourist practices and performances. In A. A. Lew, C. M. Hall, & A. M. Williams (Eds.), *Companion to Tourism* (pp. 85–96). Oxford: Blackwell.

Duman, T., & Mattila, A. S. (2005). The role of affective factors on perceived cruise vacation value. *Tourism Management*, 26(3), 311–323. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2003.11.014>

- 1 Echeverri, P., & Skålén, P. (2011). Co-creation and co-destruction: a practice-theory based
2 study of interactive value formation. *Marketing Theory*, 11(3), 351–373.
3 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1470593111408181>
- 4 Ellway, B. P. W., & Dean, A. M. (2016). The reciprocal intertwining of practice and
5 experience in value creation. *Marketing Theory*, 16(3), 299–324.
6 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1470593116636088>
- 7 Falassi, A. (1987). *Time out of time: essays on the festival*. Albuquerque, NM: University of
8 New Mexico Press.
- 9 Finsterwalder, J., & Kuppelwieser, V. G. (2011). Co-creation by engaging beyond oneself:
10 the influence of task contribution on perceived customer-to-customer social interaction
11 during a group service encounter. *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 19(7), 607–618.
12 <http://doi.org/10.1080/0965254x.2011.599494>
- 13 Gallarza, M. G., & Saura, I. G. (2006). Value dimensions, perceived value, satisfaction and
14 loyalty: an investigation of university students' travel behavior. *Tourism Management*,
15 27(3), 437–452. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2004.12.002>
- 16 Gallarza, M. G., Saura, I. G., & Holbrook, M. B. (2011). The value of value: further
17 excursions on the meaning and role of customer value. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*,
18 10(4), 179–191. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cb.328>
- 19 Gardner, R. O. (2004). The portable community: mobility and modernization in bluegrass
20 festival life. *Symbolic Interaction*, 27(2), 155–178.
- 21 Germann Molz, J. (2013). Social networking technologies and the moral economy of
22 alternative tourism: the case of Couchsurfing.org. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 43(0),
23 210–230. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2013.08.001>
- 24 Getz, D. (2007). *Event studies: theory, research and policy for planned events*. *Events*
25 *Management Series*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- 26 Gibson, C., & Connell, J. (2005). *Music and tourism: on the road again*. Clevedon: Channel
27 View Publications.
- 28 Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- 29 Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Reading: Cox & Wyman.
- 30 Goulding, C., & Shankar, A. (2011). Club culture, neotribalism and ritualised behaviour.
31 *Annals of Tourism Research*, 38(4), 1435–1453.
32 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2011.03.013>
- 33 Grisseman, U. S., & Stokburger-Sauer, N. E. (2012). Customer co-creation of travel
34 services: the role of company support and customer satisfaction with the co-creation
35 performance. *Tourism Management*, 33(6), 1483–1492.
36 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2012.02.002>
- 37 Grönroos, C. (2011). Value co-creation in service logic: a critical analysis. *Marketing Theory*,
38 10(3), 279–301. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1470593111408177>
- 39 Grönroos, C., & Gummerus, J. (2014). The service revolution and its marketing implications:
40 service logic vs service-dominant logic. *Managing Service Quality*, 24(3), 206–229.
41 <https://doi.org/10.1108/MSQ-03-2014-0042>
- 42 Gruen, T., Osmonbekov, T., & Czaplewski, A. (2007). Customer-to-customer exchange: its
43 MOA antecedents and its impact on value creation and loyalty. *Journal of the Academy*
44 *of Marketing Science*, 35(4), 537–549. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-006-0012-2>

- 1 Hamilton, K., & Alexander, M. (2013). Organic community tourism: a cocreated approach.
2 *Annals of Tourism Research*, 42(0), 169–190.
3 <https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2013.01.015>
- 4 Heinonen, K., & Strandvik, T. (2015). Customer-dominant logic: foundations and
5 implications. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 29(6/7), 472–484.
6 <https://doi.org/10.1108/JSM-02-2015-0096>
- 7 Heinonen, K., Strandvik, T., & Voima, P. (2013). Customer dominant value formation in
8 service. *European Business Review*, 25(2), 104–123.
9 <https://doi.org/10.1108/09555341311302639>
- 10 Helkkula, A., Kelleher, C., & Pihlström, M. (2012a). Characterizing value as an experience:
11 implications for service researchers and managers. *Journal of Service Research*, 15(1),
12 59–75. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1094670511426897>
- 13 Helkkula, A., Kelleher, C., & Pihlström, M. (2012b). Practices and experiences: challenges
14 and opportunities for value research. *Journal of Service Management*, 23(4), 554–570.
15 <https://doi.org/10.1108/09564231211260413>
- 16 Holbrook, M. B. (1999). Introduction. In M. B. Holbrook (Ed.), *Consumer value: a*
17 *framework for analysis and research* (pp. 1–28). London: Routledge.
- 18 Holt, D. B. (1995). How consumers consume: a typology of consumption practices. *Journal*
19 *of Consumer Research*, 22(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1086/209431>
- 20 Holttinen, H. (2010). Social practices as units of value creation: theoretical underpinnings and
21 implications. *International Journal of Quality and Service Sciences*, 2(1), 95–112.
22 <https://doi.org/10.1108/17566691011026621>
- 23 Holttinen, H. (2014). Contextualizing value propositions: Examining how consumers
24 experience value propositions in their practices. *Australasian Marketing Journal*, 22(2),
25 103–110. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ausmj.2013.10.001>
- 26 Huang, J., & Hsu, C. H. C. (2010). The impact of customer-to-customer interaction on cruise
27 experience and vacation satisfaction. *Journal of Travel Research*, 49(1), 79–92.
28 <http://doi.org/10.1177/0047287509336466>
- 29 Kemnis, S. (2010). What is professional practice? Recognising and respecting diversity in
30 understandings of practice. In C. Kanes (Ed.), *Elaborating professionalism: studies in*
31 *practice and theory* (pp. 139–165). London: Springer.
- 32 Kim, H., & Jamal, T. (2007). Touristic quest for existential authenticity. *Annals of Tourism*
33 *Research*, 34(1), 181–201. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2006.07.009>
- 34 Kim, N., & Lee, M. (2012). Other customers in a service encounter: examining the effect in a
35 restaurant setting. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 26(1), 27–40.
36 <https://doi.org/10.1108/08876041211199706>
- 37 Korkman, O. (2006). *Customer value formation in practice: a practice–theoretical approach*.
38 Hanken Swedish School of Economics, Finland, Helsinki. Retrieved from
39 <https://helda.helsinki.fi/bitstream/handle/10227/66/155-951-555-905-7.pdf?sequence=1>
- 40 Kyle, G., & Chick, G. (2002). The social nature of leisure involvement. *Journal of Leisure*
41 *Research*, 34(4), 426–448. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00222216.2002.11949980>
- 42 Lamers, M., & Pashkevich, A. (2015). Short-circuiting cruise tourism practices along the
43 Russian Barents Sea coast? The case of Arkhangelsk. *Current Issues in Tourism*.
44 <http://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2015.1092947>
- 45 Lamers, M., van der Duimb, R., & Spaargarena, G. (2017). The relevance of practice theories

- 1 for tourism research. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 62, 54–63.
2 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2016.12.002>
- 3 Lehto, X. Y., Choi, S., Lin, Y.-C., & MacDermid, S. M. (2009). Vacation and family
4 functioning. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 36(3), 459–479.
5 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2009.04.003>
- 6 Levy, S. E., Getz, D., & Hudson, S. (2011). A field experimental investigation of
7 managerially facilitated consumer-to-consumer interaction. *Journal of Travel & Tourism*
8 *Marketing*, 28(6), 656–674. <http://doi.org/10.1080/10548408.2011.603633>
- 9 Loane, S. S., & Webster, C. M. (2014). Consumer-to-consumer value within social networks.
10 *The Marketing Review*, 14(4), 444–459.
11 <https://doi.org/10.1362/146934714X14185702841442>
- 12 Löbler, H., & Hahn, M. (2013). Measuring value-in-context from a Service-Dominant logic's
13 perspective. In N. K. Malhotra (Ed.), *Review of Marketing Research* (Vol. 10, pp. 255–
14 282). Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing.
- 15 Lusch, R. F., & Vargo, S. L. (2014). *Service-Dominant Logic: Premises, Perspectives,*
16 *Possibilities*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 17 Mackellar, J. (2009). An examination of serious participants at the Australian Wintersun
18 Festival. *Leisure Studies*, 28(1), 85–104. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02614360802613879>
- 19 Maffesoli, M. (1996). *The time of the tribes: the decline of individualism in mass society*.
20 London: Sage.
- 21 Martin, C. L. (1996). Consumer-to-consumer relationships: satisfaction with other consumers'
22 public behavior. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 30(1), 146. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6606.1996.tb00729.x>
- 24 Matheson, C. M. (2005). Festivity and sociability: a study of a Celtic music festival. *Tourism*
25 *Culture & Communication*, 5(3), 149–163.
26 <https://doi.org/10.3727/109830405774545035>
- 27 Mathis, E. F., Kim, H. L., Uysal, M., Sirgy, J. M., & Prebensen, N. K. (2016). The effect of
28 co-creation experience on outcome variable. *Annals of Tourism Research of Tourism*, 57,
29 62–75. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2015.11.023>
- 30 McColl-Kennedy, J. R., Cheung, L., & Ferrier, E. (2015). Co-creating service experience
31 practices. *Journal of Service Management*, 26(2), 249–275.
32 <https://doi.org/10.1108/JOSM-08-2014-0204>
- 33 McPherson, M., Smith-Lovin, L., & Cook, J. M. (2001). Birds of a feather: homophily in
34 social networks. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 27(1), 415–444.
35 <http://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.27.1.415>
- 36 Medberg, G., & Heinonen, K. (2014). Invisible value formation: a netnography in retail
37 banking. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 32(6), 590–607.
38 <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJBM-03-2014-0041>
- 39 Nicholls, R. (2010). New directions for customer-to-customer interaction research. *Journal of*
40 *Services Marketing*, 24(1), 87–97. <https://doi.org/10.1108/08876041011017916>
- 41 Oliver, R. L. (1999). Whence consumer loyalty? *The Journal of Marketing*, 63(Special Issue
42 1999), 33–44. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1252099>
- 43 Pansiri, J. (2005). Pragmatism: A methodological approach to researching strategic alliances
44 in tourism. *Tourism and Hospitality Planning & Development*, 2(3), 191–206.
45 <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790530500399333>

- 1 Pantzar, M., & Shove, E. (2010). Understanding innovation in practice: a discussion of the
2 production and re-production of Nordic Walking. *Technology Analysis & Strategic*
3 *Management*, 22(4), 447–461. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09537321003714402>
- 4 Papathanassis, A. (2012). Guest-to-guest interaction on board cruise ships: exploring social
5 dynamics and the role of situational factors. *Tourism Management*, 33(5), 1148–1158.
6 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2011.11.016>
- 7 Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks,
8 CA: Sage Publications.
- 9 Payne, A. F., Storbacka, K., & Frow, P. (2008). Managing the co-creation of value. *Journal of*
10 *the Academy of Marketing Science*, 36(1), 83–96. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-007-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-007-0070-0)
11 [0070-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-007-0070-0)
- 12 Peñaloza, L., & Mish, J. (2011). The nature and processes of market co-creation in triple
13 bottom line firms: leveraging insights from consumer culture theory and service
14 dominant logic. *Marketing Theory*, 11(1), 9–34.
15 <http://doi.org/10.1177/1470593110393710>
- 16 Prebensen, N. K., & Foss, L. (2011). Coping and co-creating in tourist experiences.
17 *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 13(1), 54–67. <http://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.799>
- 18 Prebensen, N. K., Vittersø, J., & Dahl, T. I. (2013). Value co-creation significance of tourist
19 resources. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 42(0), 240–261.
20 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2013.01.012>
- 21 Prebensen, N. K., & Xie, J. (2017). Efficacy of co-creation and mastering on perceived value
22 and satisfaction in tourists' consumption. *Tourism Management*, 60, 166–176.
23 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2016.12.001>
- 24 Rantala, O. (2010). Tourist practices in the forest. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 37(1), 249–
25 264. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2009.09.003>
- 26 Reckwitz, A. (2002). Toward a theory of social practices: a development in culturalist
27 theorizing. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 2(2), 243–263.
28 <https://doi.org/10.1177/13684310222225432>
- 29 Reichenberger, I. (2017). C2C value co-creation through social interactions in tourism.
30 *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 19(6), 629–638.
31 <http://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.2135>
- 32 Rihova, I., Buhalis, D., Moital, M., & Gouthro, M. B. (2013). Social layers of customer-to-
33 customer value co-creation. *Journal of Service Management*, 24(5), 553–566.
34 <https://doi.org/10.1108/JOSM-04-2013-0092>
- 35 Rorty, R. (1991). *Objectivity, relativism and truth: Philosophical papers (Series–*
36 *Philosophical Papers, Vol. 1)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 37 Rosenbaum, M. S. (2006). Exploring the social supportive role of third places in consumers'
38 lives. *Journal of Service Research*, 9(1), 59–72.
39 <http://doi.org/10.1177/1094670506289530>
- 40 Rowley, J., Kupiec-Teahan, B., & Leeming, E. (2007). Customer community and co-creation:
41 a case study. *Marketing Intelligence and Planning*, 25(2), 136–146. [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1108/02634500710737924)
42 [10.1108/02634500710737924](https://doi.org/10.1108/02634500710737924)
- 43 Sanchez, J., Callarisa, L., Rodriguez, R. M., & Moliner, M. A. (2006). Perceived value of the
44 purchase of a tourism product. *Tourism Management*, 27(3), 394–409.
45 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2004.11.007>

- 1 Schatzki, T. R. (1996). *Social practices: a Wittgensteinian approach to human activity and*
2 *the social*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 3 Schatzki, T. R. (2001). Introduction: practice theory. In T. R. Schatzki, K. K. Cetina, & E.
4 von Savigny (Eds.), *The practice turn in contemporary theory* (pp. 10–23). New York,
5 NJ: Routledge.
- 6 Schau, H. J., Muñoz Jr, A. M., & Arnould, E. J. (2009). How brand community practices
7 create value. *Journal of Marketing*, 73(5), 30–51. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.73.5.30>
- 8 Schouten, J. W., & McAlexander, J. H. (1995). Subcultures of consumption: an ethnography
9 of the new bikers. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 22(1), 43–61.
10 <https://doi.org/10.1086/209434>
- 11 Shaw, G., Bailey, A., & Williams, A. (2011). Aspects of service-dominant logic and its
12 implications for tourism management: examples from the hotel industry. *Tourism*
13 *Management*, 32(2), 207–214. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2010.05.020>
- 14 Sheth, J. N., Newman, B. I., & Gross, B. L. (1991). Why we buy what we buy: a theory of
15 consumption values. *Journal of Business Research*, 22(2), 159–170.
16 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0148-2963\(91\)90050-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0148-2963(91)90050-8)
- 17 Sigala, M. (2017). Collaborative commerce in tourism: Implications for research and industry.
18 *Current Issues in Tourism*, 20(4), 346–355.
19 <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2014.982522>
- 20 Tajfel, H. (1982). *Social identity and intergroup relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University
21 Press.
- 22 Thornton, S. (1995). *Club cultures: music, media and subcultural capital*. Cambridge: Polity.
- 23 Turner, V. (1995). *The ritual process: structure and anti-structure (with a foreword by Roger*
24 *D. Abrahams)*. *The Lewis Henry Morgan Lectures*. New York, NJ: Aldine de Gruyter.
- 25 Tynan, C., McKechnie, S., & Hartley, S. (2014). Interpreting value in the customer service
26 experience using customer-dominant logic. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 30(9–
27 10), 1058–1081. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0267257x.2014.934269>
- 28 Urich, S. (2014). Exploring customer-to-customer value co-creation platforms and practices
29 in team sports. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 14(1), 25–49.
30 <https://doi.org/10.1080/16184742.2013.865248>
- 31 Vargo, S. L., & Lusch, R. L. (2008). Service-dominant logic: continuing the evolution.
32 *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 36(1), 1–10.
33 <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-007-0069-6>
- 34 Vargo, S. L., Maglio, P. P., & Akaka, M. A. (2008). On value and value co-creation: a service
35 systems and service logic perspective. *European Management Journal*, 26(3), 145–152.
36 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2008.04.003>
- 37 Warde, A. (2005). Consumption and theories of practice. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 5(2),
38 131–153. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1469540505053090>
- 39 Wei, W., Lu, Y., Miao, L., Cai, L. A., & Wang, C. (2017). Customer-customer interactions
40 (CCIs) at conferences: An identity approach. *Tourism Management*, 59, 154–170.
41 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2016.08.002>
- 42 Wilks, L. (2011). Bridging and bonding: social capital at music festivals. *Journal of Policy*
43 *Research in Tourism, Leisure and Events*, 3(3), 281–297.
44 <https://doi.org/10.1080/19407963.2011.576870>

- 1 Williams, P., & Soutar, G. N. (2009). Value, satisfaction and behavioral intentions in an
2 adventure tourism context. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 36(3), 413–438.
3 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2009.02.002>
- 4 Wu, C. H.-J. (2007). The impact of customer-to-customer interaction and customer
5 homogeneity on customer satisfaction in tourism service: the service encounter
6 prospective. *Tourism Management*, 28(6), 1518–1528.
7 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2007.02.002>