

Co-creation and co-destruction in the media network: understanding the value architecture of the actors

Authors: Prof. Dr. Guido Ellert

Institution: University: Macromedia University of Applied Sciences, Faculty: Media School

E-mails: g.ellert@mhmk.org

Aim of paper – research question

Understanding networks requires system comprehension. Complexity increases and hinders decision-making. Co-Creation helps understanding value creation out of networks. But connecting to the huge amount of complexity there is mostly a Co-Destruction aspect within the network. This research is about a network that arises by broadcasting sport events. It is focused on the interdependencies between media and live advertisements. Question 1: How does the method of split-screening reduce the attention dedicated by the audience to stadium sponsors? Question 2: What are the factors of success of the split screen advertisements? Question 3: Are there possibilities to switch co-destruction into co-creation?

Theoretical background

Chandler and Lusch (2014) outline that value propositions have advanced over the past years, i.e. a value proposition now invites actors to engage and serve one another in service in order to attain value. Marketing shifted away its focus from a traditional view of value as embedded in the manufacturing process. As implied by Vargo, Maglio and Akaka (2008), value is rather perceived to be created collaboratively throughout mutual exchange and complementarity between the parties. Co-Creation is perceived as positive outcome of the collaborative process happening within value network, but one can assume the very same process runs risk of possible negative outcomes (Stieler, Weismann & Germelmann, 2014). Value is co-created in a collective, interactive process, but it is determined individually and strongly linked to a respective party (Vargo & Lusch, 2016). This further implies that the same offering can result in different levels of value for different individuals (Vargo & Lusch, 2016). That is, one value dimension may be relevant and value-enhancing to one person, but at the same time hindering the well-being of another (Stieler, Weismann & Germelmann, 2014). The latter, diminishing side-effect is known as Co-Destruction of value. And it does not only refer to decline in the experienced value, but also to negative deviation from the high expectations regarding some services delivery (Stieler, Weismann & Germelmann, 2014).

Methodology, research design and data analysis

In the qualitative research test, a group of 14-69-year-olds were randomly selected in order to measure levels of their implicit perception (n=147). The research was split into four experimental setups, through which the examinees were exposed to sport and non-sport treatments of different length. The research took place in a laboratory setting, following quasi-experimental and cross-sectional design type. Studies were carried out using Tobii Eye Tracker; the instrument tracked the participants' eye-paths, length of duration and number of fixations. Also, they were required to fill out a pre- and post-questionnaire in order to get information important for their profile identification and to manage the confounding variables in further phases of the

examination process. The results were compared to each other through analytic and descriptive calculations.

Results, discussion and implications

After finding the reference split-screen (L-frame) comparing it to ten other split-screens, it resulted the L-frame influences the attention in a highly significant manner compared to the stadium ad boards. The next testing setup shows that there are moderating variables causing a partly high significant difference concerning the tracked attention. The most relevant factor of attention measuring was caused by a corresponding effect between the split-screen and the content shown in the broadcasting context.

References

- Chandler, J., & Lusch, R. (2014). Service Systems: A Broadened Framework and Research Agenda on Value Propositions, Engagement, and Service Experience. *Journal Of Service Research*, 18(1), 6-22.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1094670514537709>
- Stieler, M., Weismann, F., & Germelmann, C. (2014). Co-destruction of value by spectators: the case of silent protests. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 14(1), 72-86.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/16184742.2013.865249>
- Vargo, S., & Lusch, R. (2016). Institutions and axioms: an extension and update of service-dominant logic. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 44, 5-23.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11747-015-0456-3>
- Vargo, S., Maglio, P., & Akaka, M. (2008). On value and value co-creation: A service systems and service logic perspective. *European Management Journal*, 26(3), 145-152.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2008.04.003>