Tourism Management 73 (2019) 35–45

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Tourism Management

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/tourman

Complaining practices on social media in tourism: A value co-creation and co-destruction perspective

Rebecca Dolan[a,*], Yuri Seo[b], Joya Kemper[b]

[a] Adelaide Business School, The University of Adelaide, Nexus 10 Building, 10 Pulteney Street, Adelaide, Australia
[b] University of Auckland New Zealand, Department of Marketing, Owen G Glenn Building, 12 Grafton Road, Auckland, New Zealand

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:
Value co-creation
Value co-destruction
Complaining
Practice theory
Social media

ABSTRACT

Social media has transformed the way tourism-related information is generated and distributed. While previous studies have focused largely on the benefits of social media for tourism management, there is an emerging recognition of the downside of social media through the enablement of enhanced facilities for consumer complaints. Informed by service-centric research and social practice theory, we theorize that tourist complaining on social media is an interactive process of value formation. We then present an empirical investigation of social media complaints in respect of a large Australian-based airline. The findings reveal three unique practices of tourist complaining and their potential for both value co-creation and co-destruction. Our study offers novel insights into the divergent and interactive nature of the tourist complaining that unfolds on social media, and the importance of adequate organizational responses in order to foster value co-creation – or avoid co-destruction.

1. Introduction: tourist complaining on social media

Social media have become popular tools that consumers use to search for information, engage in collaborative planning, and memorialize travel experiences through various forms of posting, messaging, and media sharing (Leung, Law, Van Hood, & Buhalis, 2013; Xiang & Gretzel, 2010; Zeng & Gerritsen, 2014). An important feature of social media tools is that they facilitate dynamic interactions in a public space between consumers and companies (such as travel agents) and amongst consumers themselves. These interactions foster social and cultural capital by generating information and opinions that exert influence on travel consumption choices (Xiang & Gretzel, 2010; Yoo & Gretzel, 2011). For instance, Sedera, Lokuge, Atapattu, and Gretzel (2017) have illustrated recently how opinions expressed on social media shaped consumers' travel expectations prior to embarking on a trip, as well as their satisfaction after the trip had been completed. Such findings resonate with a broader stream of research on Web 2.0, which asserts that social media empowers consumers to become active collaborators in an interactive value formation process (Hennig-Thurau et al., 2010; Kozinets, De Valck, Wojnicki, & Wilner, 2010; Quach & Thaichon, 2017). In short, social media has transformed the way tourism-related content is (co-)created and distributed, and the way consumers learn about, plan for, and evaluate travel services (Buhalis & Law, 2008; Luo & Zhong, 2015; Shu & Scott, 2014).

Previous research has focused largely on the positive effects of social media on travel consumption (Dijkmans, Kerkhof, & Beukeboom, 2015). For instance, some studies note that a presence on social media exerts favorable influence on the perceived travel destination's attractiveness (e.g., Shu & Scott, 2014). Others have also discussed the ways social media generates positive word-of-mouth (Luo & Zhong, 2015), amplified by online reviews (Sigala, Christou, & Gretzel, 2012). Recent tourism research has emphasized the importance of social media in customer engagement (Harrigan, Evers, Miles, & Daly, 2017; Park & Allen, 2013; Wei, Miao, & Huang, 2013), but studies have failed to address the engagement possibilities of online (positive or negative) reviews adequately. For example, Cabiddu, De Carlo, and Piccoli (2014) acknowledged the detrimental impact of negative consumer created content (i.e., online reviews), and Li, Cui, and Peng (2017) suggest that more frequent and faster responses to reviews increases engagement, but both studies stopped short of offering solutions to manage negative content.

Against this backdrop, there is an emerging recognition of the downside of social media engagement through the development of enhanced facilities enabling consumers to complain (Champoux, Durgee, & McGlynn, 2012). Complaining can be broadly defined "as an action taken by an individual, which involves communicating something negative regarding a product or service" (Jacoby & Jaccard, 1981, p. 6). Beyond discrete negative reviews, online complaints tend to

* Corresponding author. Adelaide Business School, the University of Adelaide, Nexus 10 Building, 10 Pulteney Street, Adelaide, 5005, Australia.
E-mail address: Rebecca.dolan@adelaide.edu.au (R. Dolan).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2019.01.017
Received 4 September 2018; Received in revised form 16 January 2019; Accepted 16 January 2019

reflect a "dialogue that narrates stories about service failures and how they are resolved [or escalated] with the help of other customers" (Xu, Yap, & Hyde, 2016, p. 421). This is because social media eases the process by which consumers are able to communicate their opinions publicly with others; therefore, it can also increase the volume and intensity of public complaints (Pfeffer, Zorbach, & Carley, 2014). In light of this, there have been recent calls for a better understanding of how complaining unfolds on social media (Pfeffer et al., 2014; Wei, Miao, Cai, & Adler, 2012).

The issues pertaining to complaining on social media are of particular concern in the tourism industry, where dissatisfaction occurs more frequently than in other service industries (Lee & Hu, 2005; Witt & Moutinho, 1994). Since travel experiences occur typically when people are transported out of their usual surroundings and comfort zones, travelers tend to display heightened sensitivity to their negative experiences associated with travelling (Cohen, 2004; Pearce, 2005). Accordingly, understanding how to manage service recovery and how best to deal with public complaints on social media is a crucial task for tourism companies (Wei et al., 2012).

Therefore, online complaints have moved from being private matters involving face-to-face, mail and email communication (Bradley, Sparks, & Weber, 2015; Tyrrell & Woods, 2005), to now being public in the online world, such as through forums and social media (Xiang, Du, Ma, & Fan, 2017). Such complaints involve numerous aspects of the travel and hotel experience, but are most commonly about the rooms, the staff or a failure to respond to requests (Ekiz, Khoo-Lattimore, & Memarzadeh, 2012; Lee & Hu, 2005). Responding to complaints is of crucial importance to management, as even the fact that a response has been made can, on its own, elicit a greater sense of trustworthiness and perceived care for customers (Sparks, So, & Bradley, 2016). Consequently, tourism research has examined response styles adopted by hotel management, such as company-focused as opposed to customer-focused styles (Bonfanti, Vigolo, & Negri, 2016), and the adoption of a corporate or a personal identity (Zhang & Vásquez, 2014). Sparks and Bradley (2017) have suggested specific responses based on a "Triple A" typology, encouraging management to acknowledge, hold to account, and take action for service failure. Despite this interest, however, previous research that examined management responses to complaints and negative reviews has failed to provide any strategies for handling different types of complaints (e.g., Park & Allen, 2013; Wei et al., 2013).

A pioneering study by Xu et al. (2016) examine value co-creation between customers in an online airline complaint forum. Their study provides interesting insights into the forms of customer-to-customer (C2C) service recovery actions and the roles of complainers and repliers. In particular, they find five forms of C2C service recovery: information sharing, emotional release, social support, knowledge exchange and learning, and leadership. In this process, those making complaints adopt the roles of help-seeker, instigator, itinerant and storyteller; and repliers – the roles of helper, educator, listener and ironist. While this study offers a rich account of the roles played by complainers and repliers, the specific roles and possible actions of travel companies, themselves, were not expanded upon. Thus, there appears to be a paucity of research that responds to the variations in service recovery and complaint forms, as well as a need to examine different complaint mediums like social media (Gu & Ye, 2014).

To reiterate, extant theory relating to tourist complaining on social media is underdeveloped (Dineva, Breitshohl & Garrod, 2017; Einwiller & Steilen, 2015; Leung, Law, Van Hoof, & Buhalis, 2013; Pfeffer et al., 2014; Xu et al., 2016). We identify three key areas that require particular attention. First, while complaining behavior has received extensive attention from tourism scholars (e.g., Jahandideh, Golmohammadi, Meng, O'Gorman, & Taheri, 2014; Ro & Wong, 2012; Wei et al., 2012), much of this research was conducted prior to the rise of social media and the public interactions that social media enables. That is, previous research has focused largely on exploring complaining behaviors in the context of isolated consumer-provider interactions, and employed individual-level analysis (e.g., investigating what impacts customers' complaint intentions). While informative, such an approach provides limited insights about how complaining is carried out in the broader context of the dynamic interactions that occur on social media, often involving multiple consumers. Second, while scholars agree that complaints on social media must be managed adequately in order to discourage others from joining in and complaints spiraling into 'online firestorms' (Pfeffer et al., 2014), the management strategies that have been proposed to date range from almost disengaged avoidance to proactive bolstering of counterposing comments. The need to develop a more holistic understanding of different types of social media complaints has been mentioned, but under-analyzed. Finally, while complaints are framed largely in terms of negative consequences, several studies in the broader domain of online communities allude to the possibility that some forms of complaints could be beneficial for both consumers and organizations (Dineva, Breitsohl, & Garrod, 2017).

In light of these developments, we pose several important questions for managing tourist complaints on social media: Do social media complaints create or destroy value for tourism companies? What theoretical frameworks enable us to study them? And, what specific aspects of tourist complaints are useful in developing successful managerial responses? As social media complaining behaviors become increasingly complex and dynamic, involving multiple simultaneous interactions within the social networks of consumers, it is important that our theorizing follows to offer a more holistic account of what such behaviors and their outcomes entail for the travel industry.

To inform our understanding of social media complaints and their role in tourism management, we deliver a situated account of social media complaints and their underlying interactions between consumers and the organization, and between consumers themselves; for a large Australian-based airline company. We begin with a discussion of value co-creation and co-destruction research from the Service-dominant logic (SD) perspective (Cova, Dalli, & Zwick, 2011; Echeverri & Skålén, 2011; Plé & Chumpitaz Caceresk 2010; Vargo & Lusch, 2004) and the theory of social practices (Reckwitz, 2002; Schatzki, 1996; Shove & Pantzar, 2005). These theoretical perspectives provide a critical lens to investigate the potential of complaints by tourists on social media for both value co-creation and value co-destruction (Plé; Chumpitaz Caceresk 2010), and how such potentialities are embedded within divergent complaint 'practices' (Reckwitz, 2002) that are observable on the social media pages of tourism companies. We then describe the methods used in our study. Next, we present our findings, which identify three distinct practices of tourist complaining and their potential for value co-creation and co-destruction. Our discussion details novel theoretical contributions, in which we highlight the divergent and interactive nature of the complaining by tourists that unfolds on social media and the importance of adequate organizational responses, in order to foster co-creation and avoid co-destruction. Finally, the paper concludes with an overview of future research directions.

2. Theoretical development

2.1. Value Co-Creation and Co-Destruction

The SD logic perspective asserts that the processes of value formation (i.e., how business activities become relevant and important) have 'evolved' from an emphasis on the exchange of operand resources – tangible and inert resources, such as land and intermediary goods – towards an emphasis on operant resources – dynamic relational resources that act upon other resources, such as skills and knowledge (Vargo & Lusch, 2008). This is because the Internet and other contemporary interconnected business practices blur boundaries between customers, organizations and suppliers (Achrol & Kotler, 2012). In these changed conditions, customers are seen as co-creators and the ultimate determiners of value (McColl-Kennedy, Vargo, Dagger, Sweeney & van Kasteren, 2012; Vargo & Lusch, 2008). Customers provide ideas for

organizations (Witell, Gustafsson & Johnson, 2014); shape organizational processes (Jaakkola & Alexander, 2014) and influence other customers (McColl-Kennedy, Cheung, & Ferrier, 2015).).

An emerging body of research examines the co-creation of tourism experiences, for example in the context of festivals (Rihova, Buhalis, Gouthro, & Moital, 2018) and adventure tourism (Prebensen & Xie, 2017). Other research has examined co-creation through collaboration with travel professionals (Mathis, Kim, Uysal, Sirgy, & Prebensen, 2016) and participation in online tourism communities (Hamilton & Alexander, 2013). Xu et al. (2016) focused on C2C interactions and their ability to co-create value in the online context through sharing information, releasing emotional frustration, and providing social support, suggestions and solutions, and opportunities for community leadership. As such, in the tourism context, co-creation research has focused on the ways that technology can foster co-creation (Cabiddu, Lui, & Piccoli, 2013) and how this should be managed (e.g., Park & Allen, 2013; Shaw, Bailey, & Williams, 2011; Wei et al., 2013).

The key implication of this view is that value formation is conceived as "interactively co-created by operant resources acting on operand resources or by operant resources in collaboration, and that value is conceptualized as realized in use" (Echeverri & Skålén, 2011, p. 354). That is, rather than being embedded within the product produced by a company itself, value is produced collaboratively during the interactions between various market actors, such as organizations, intermediaries, platforms, and consumers (Echeverri & Skålén, 2011; Vargo & Lusch, 2008). This implies that the focal level of analysis for investigating how value is produced must move beyond the individual actors' intentions and, instead, focus on the value formation interactions between these actors.

Whilst scholars appear to agree that value is realized through interactions and activities (McColl-Kennedy, Vargo, Dagger, Sweeney, & Kasteren, 2012; Smith & Colgate, 2007), a key consideration remains, regarding the valence of value formed. The lion's share of service-centric research related to interactive value formation and co-creation has been, as discussed above, conducted with an implicit assumption that interactive value formation is a positive process that results in value 'co-creation'. However, recent studies draw attention to the fact that actor-to-actor interactions may also result in negative outcomes, whereby at least one of the actors (e.g., an organization) experiences a decline in the value realized from an interaction with another (e.g., a consumer) (Ple & Caceres, 2010). This latter outcome of an interactive value formation process has been dubbed value 'co-destruction' (Cova et al., 2011; Daunt & Harris, 2017; Echeverri & Skålén, 2011; Ple & Caceres, 2010). Ple and Caceres (2010) argue that value co-destruction occurs when actors accidentally or intentionally misuse resources (their own and/or those of other parties) by acting in an inappropriate or unexpected manner. Echeverri and Skålén (2011) extend this perspective by highlighting that, since value co-creation occurs when market actors draw from congruent elements of value formation practices (Akaka et al., 2014), value co-destruction results from the interactions that involve incongruent elements. For example, Camilleri and Neuhofer (2017) found that guest-host Airbnb practices can result in value co-destruction when hosts are unable to solve problems, but value co-recovery when problems can be rectified. Further, Xu et al. (2016) discuss the dissatisfaction that results when mismatching occurs between the roles of complainers and repliers on an online forum – in instances such as when "help seekers encounter ironists, they cannot achieve their objective of fixing the problem; they may become even more upset when they are mocked for their unfortunate situation" (p.436). Thus, previous studies recognize that coordinated interactions of value formation among market actors prevents value co-destruction and fosters co-creation – but the means to understand and foster such coordinated interaction remains largely unstudied.

Moreover, the concept of value, itself, is kaleidoscopic in nature. This is because value can be conceived as a "benefit realized from integration of resources through activities and interactions with collaborators in the customer's service network" (McColl-Kennedy et al., 2012, p. 375), and such a benefit may take a wide range of forms. Accordingly, in this paper we aim to explore the specific types of customer value that are realized through customer complaint performances. In this endeavor, we are informed by previous frameworks of customer value that identify functional value, conditional value, social value, emotional value, and epistemic value (Sheth, Newman, & Gross, 1991), and also by the sources through which this value is derived (information, the product itself, interactions with staff and service centers, the environment, and through ownership) (Smith & Colgate, 2007). Thus, we aim to explore how online interactions between consumers and a company during complaint performances may serve as a source for a range of types of value formation.

2.2. Value formation in the context of complaining

The service-centric research into value co-creation and co-destruction is useful for studying tourist complaining on social media for two main reasons. First, this perspective emphasizes that the interactions between market actors – such as between consumers and organizations or between consumers – have a double-edged potential for value co-creation and co-destruction. Thus, it enables us to theorize tourist complaining on social media as a particular process of value formation that carries the potential for both positive (value co-creation) and negative (value co-destruction) consequences. Research into customer participation in service recovery demonstrates an improvement in satisfaction with the recovery (Dong, Evans, & Zou, 2008; Grissemann & Stokburger-Sauer, 2012). Thus, not all negative experiences result in co-destruction of value and instead also offer opportunities for value co-creation (Echeverri & Skålén, 2011). This may be especially the case with C2C interactions (Xu et al., 2016).

Second, the service-centric perspective allows exploration of the underpinning types of consumer value embedded within, and formed during, consumer complaining performances. Through this lens, we can theorize how interactive value is realized through differing performances of complaining on social media. Understanding the reasons for engaging in complaining practices and the sources through which the value is derived provides key implications for tourism companies regarding how best to handle complaints and foster value co-creation.

The service-centric research directs us towards adopting specific conceptual tools to study social media complaints as value formation interactions, and the potential for value co-creation and co-destruction that are embodied within these interactions. In particular, the theory of social practices (Reckwitz, 2002; Schatzki, 1996) has emerged as a critical and systematic lens for investigating the ways that market actors realize the potential for value co-creation and avoid co-destruction through their routinized performances of a 'practice' (Akaka et al., 2014; Echeverri & Skålén, 2011). Indeed, practice theory has been attributed as having brought a new perspective to tourism research (Lamers, van der Duim, & Spaargaren, 2017). Informed by these developments, in the following section we discuss how a practice-theoretical approach advances the agenda proposed in this study.

2.3. A practice-theoretical perspective

Social practice theory, or simply practice theory (Reckwitz, 2002), has been applied previously by business scholars to study various aspects of value formation, including markets, organizations, consumption, symbolism, brands, and value co-creation or co-destruction (Akaka et al., 2014; Araujo, Kjellber & Spencer, 2008; Echeverri & Skålén, 2011; Schau, Muñiz, & Arnould, 2009). However, rather than being a single unified body of theory *per se*, practice theory consists of multiple theoretical positions that share a common orientation towards social research (Reckwitz, 2002; Schatzki, 1996; Warde, 2005). Since we employ practice theory as an enabling theory (Figueredo, Gopaldas & Fischer, 2017), the main purpose of this section is not to account for

different theories and applications of social practices, but rather to highlight the key tenets within a practice-based approach that inform the research agenda on tourist complaining on social media proposed in this study.

The first tenet underpinning a practice-theoretical perspective is an ontological position that social interactions and emergent meanings can be understood as 'practices' that are performed by actors within a given social context (Schatzki, 1996; Warde, 2005). Here, practices refer to "doings and sayings" – "[the] routinized way(s) in which bodies are moved, objects are handled, subjects are treated, things are described and the world is understood" (Reckwitz, 2002, p. 25). For instance, previous studies have shown that various Airbnb guest-host interactions can be studied as practices that result in value (de)formations, such as welcoming, expressing feelings, evaluating location and accommodation, helping and interacting, recommending and thanking (Camilleri & Neuhofer, 2017).

Extant theory offers various conceptualizations to break practices down into further constituent parts. For instance, Shove and Pantzar (2005) suggest studying practices as interrelated nexuses of meanings, bodily competencies, and materialities; whereas Schau et al. (2009) and Warde (2005) identify the procedures (rules, principles and instructions), understandings (skills and know-how), and engagements (emotionally charged purpose and ends) of practices. Despite these subtle differences, however, there is a general consensus that practices involve both discursive elements such as symbols, meanings, and material, performative elements – things, technology – that constitute a relatively structured template of social action (Cruz, Seo, & Rex, 2018). For example, in investigating sustainable tourism mobility, the holiday practice is the objective of a study, not the tourist, or sustainable innovations such as electric cars or taxation policy (Verbeek & Mommaas, 2008). Practices are also viewed as being "fundamentally processual and tend to see the world as an ongoing routinized and recurrent accomplishment" (Nicolini, 2013, p. 3). Practices are also further separated from the entity of practice (in this case, complaining) to performances of practices (different forms or ways of complaining), whereby practices differ based on their configuration of their elements (Lamers et al., 2017; Seo & Buchanan-Oliver, 2017; Shove & Pantzar, 2005). Informed by this research, our study adopts an approach akin to emergent theorizing (Figueiredo, Gopaldas, & Fischer, 2017), whereby we allow the relevant elements of practices to emerge from an analysis of tourist complaining performances on social media and their potential for value co-creation and co-destruction.

The second important tenet of practice theory is concerned with the role of 'actors' in relation to practices. Unlike mentalism-oriented approaches that put individuals at the centre of their analysis, the focus of practice theory is the practice itself (Reckwitz, 2002). As Hargreaves (2011, p. 83) notes, a practice-based research process "diverts attention from moments of individual decision making, and towards the 'doings' of various social practices and the inconspicuous consumption they entail". For example, Lamers and Pashkevich (2018) investigated the assemblage of practices in cruise tourism, such as arriving in port, being transported or having a meal, each involved with its own particular configuration of materials, meanings and competences. Individual actors and their choices for social action are conceived first and foremost in terms of their ability to *perform* practices. That is, as actors perform practices, they produce a dual structure-agency effect. On the one hand, they are able to understand the social context and their own roles within this context by conveying individualized states of emotion and using know-how and motivational knowledge through their performances (Reckwitz, 2002). On the other hand – through these individualized, yet routinized and scripted performances – the actors play a fundamental role in materializing practices and, therefore, in reinforcing the social order. In other words, even though performing practices requires actors to demonstrate competencies and, thereby, allows them to convey their personal motives through adroit performances (Schau et al., 2009); any practice is inherently 'social' in nature because it must be understandable not only to the actor who performs the practice, but also to potential observers in the given social context. Simply put, within a practice-based view, social practices and actors are dialectically interrelated, whereby practices enable and constrain the actors' individualized performances; and in turn, the actors' performances also materialize and routinize the practices.

The two tenets described above have several important implications for studying tourist complaints on social media. In developing insights about how tourist complaints reflect potential for value co-creation and co-destruction, they guide us to focus on the analysis of practices and their performances. That is, we are less interested in what may initially have triggered consumers to complain on social media; instead we focus on how 'complaining' unfolds dynamically in terms of what consumers actually 'do' and 'say' on social media (e.g., what language they use, how they draw attention to complaints, what role the public plays etc.). Further, since social media involves interactions between multiple actors (e.g., an organization and members of the public), we are interested in the adroit performances of these actors, and how such performances shape the potential of a practice to foster co-creation or co-destruction (Echeverri & Skålén, 2011).

This approach is particularly appropriate for understanding interactive phenomena on social media because, while a consumer may have some predetermined individual motivations for engaging in various behaviors on social media, such motivations may not necessarily translate into what they actually 'do' and 'say'. This is because the interactive nature of social media and the performances of other actors can alter the ways in which consumers perform a particular practice such as complaining. For instance, after experiencing a negative service encounter with an airline company, a consumer may decide to post complaints on social media with the intention of gaining financial retribution. However, when he or she views others' positive comments on the airline's social media page, the decision may be made not to complain because of peer pressure (Valenzuela, Park, & Kee, 2009). Thus, in order to provide a more holistic understanding of how consumers' complaints manifest on social media, and how such manifestations reflect value co-creation or co-destruction through the interactions with other actors, it is important to explore how complaining unfolds through the various interactive performances between actors on social media *in situ*.

Further, while recent research has mentioned different strategies for managing social media complaints, such as non-engaging, censoring, bolstering, informing and pacifying (see Dineva et al., 2017), considerably less is known about the underlying conditions that make such strategies more or less effective. A pioneering step toward answering this question would be to develop a holistic perspective as to whether there are divergent forms of social media complaining that require different approaches in order to avoid co-destruction or to foster co-creation. A practice-based approach can offer hospitality managers the tools to comprehend different underlying practices of tourist complaining and the ways they are embedded within the social media posts. In short, a practice theory provides a critical lens to study value co-creative and co-destructive interactive formation in the context of tourist complaints on social media.

3. Methodology

In this study, we explore tourist complaining practices on social media and their potential for value co-creation and co-destruction, in a naturalistic context. In doing so, we consider whether each complaint practice could be characterized by a distinct type of customer value (Sheth et al., 1991; Smith & Colgate, 2007) which may form during the performances of complaining on social media. Our investigation focuses on the dynamic interactions between consumers and the organization, and between consumers themselves, that are observable on the Facebook pages of a large Australian-based airline company *Qantas,* and its low-cost airline subsidiary *Jetstar*. The Qantas Group is the largest

airline in Oceania ranked by the number of passengers transported (53.5 million in 2016/2017 FY). The *Qantas* Facebook page had 828,933 fans when this research was conducted, growing on average by 8232 new fans per month. The *Jetstar* Australia Facebook page had 630,911 fans, growing steadily with an average of 1877 new fans joining the page per week. Each of these Facebook pages offers *visitor posts*, a feature whereby consumers can post freely on the public forum. Consequently, these pages are a common space for consumers to express their complaints (Cakmak & Isaac, 2012), which makes these social media pages an appropriate research site for our study.

Data collection was conducted using online archival methods of the Facebook posts that appeared from January to June 2017. Consistent with previous studies (Mariani, Di Felice, & Mura, 2016; Mariani, Mura, & Di Felice, 2018), this study focuses on Facebook, as it is the most-used social media platform among national tourism organizations (Mariani et al., 2018) and individuals, with more than 2.23 billion monthly active users (Statista, 2018). The 'visitor posts' were extracted using NCapture software, a web browser extension designed to capture online content, such as social media posts. The extracted content was then imported to NVivo for further analysis. During this six month period, there were 915 original visitor posts on *Qantas* and 1098 original visitor posts on the *Jetstar* pages respectively. Of these posts, over three-quarters reflected some form of complaint. The total data downloaded amounted to more than 292 single-spaced pages of 12-point-font text, representing approximately 130,348 words, as well as significant visual data in the form of uploaded photos. The total number of postings in which a complaint behavior was observed was approximately 1509.

We adopted a two-stage iterative process to analyze the data: in the first stage, we conducted an open-ended exploration of the conversations that appeared on the social media pages with the purpose of understanding the context of such conversations and of particular complaints that they reflected. The inductive analysis of these conversations was guided by an emergent theorizing process, where the key concepts about tourism complaints were first understood in the context of their respective posts and then compared and categorized in order to elicit higher order abstractions based on their perceived commonalities and linkages (Spiggle, 1994). At this stage, we also developed provisional categories and conceptual connections by using the constant comparative method, where we would go back and forth dialogically between the emergent themes from the posts and the elements of practices from the literature (Schau et al., 2009; Shove & Pantzar, 2005). This iterative process heightened our sensitivity to the context of investigation, and aided subsequent induction of the broader underlying themes about tourist complaining practices, and their embodied performances (Reckwitz, 2002) on social media.

At the second stage, we revisited our preliminary theme of tourist complaining practices with the purpose of understanding how the specific interactive performances by actors (i.e., consumers and organizations) resulted in either co-creative or co-destructive value formation (Echeverri & Skålén, 2011). In particular, we analyzed how value formation unfolded dynamically within the interactions observable on social media for each complaining practice, paying particular attention to the specific aspects of the actors' performances (e.g., language, observable intentions, specific tactics, etc.) that contributed to co-creation or co-destruction. Such an approach enabled us to identify common patterns of interactive performances that fostered co-creation or co-destruction, thereby extending our analysis to account for the potential of tourist complaint practices to foster these two dimensions of value formation (Echeverri & Skålén, 2011). This second and final iteration formed the basis for refining our themes in their final form, which are presented in the findings. Trustworthiness was ensured through regular discussions of emerging interpretations between the authors to allow for multiple interpretations, while adhering to the principle of suspicion (Klein & Myers, 1999). In addition, a summary of findings was offered to a colleague (assistant professor level) for comments, and these were used to amend the article.

4. Findings

Three distinct tourist complaining practices have emerged from our findings: (1) solution seeking, (2) support seeking, and (3) social engagement. Complaining is not the same for all customers and the elements of practice, including tone, objective and values sought (including its sources) from the practice of complaining differ.

The engagement between the complainer, the organization and other customers produces and reproduces the conventions of complaining. Our analysis reveals that each of these practices is characterized by a distinct type of customer value (Sheth et al., 1991; Smith & Colgate, 2007) that forms during the performances of complaining on social media. Warde (2005, p.137) understood consumption as a process of engagement in appropriation and appreciation, "whether for utilitarian, expressive or contemplative purposes, of goods, services, performances, information or ambience". Solution-seeking is associated with the 'utilitarian' value, whereby complaining satisfies practical needs and solves the consumers' current and anticipated problems. Support-seeking is guided by the 'emotional' value, conveyed through the feelings or affective states that complaining produces. Finally, social engagement is associated with the 'relational' value, whereby it serves to strengthen ties among consumers.

We found that each of these complaint practices conveys the potential both to co-create and to co-destroy value for hospitality companies, depending upon the performances of other consumers and the company itself. The summary of our research findings is presented in Table 1. In the remainder of this section, we outline the three tourist-related complaining practices using illustrative examples, and demonstrate how each of these practices conveys the potential to lead either to value co-creation or value co-destruction, depending on the interactive performances between consumers and tourism organizations. In the following section, we draw the threads together in order to present a more holistic account of tourism complaints on social media, and the broader theoretical and managerial implications that can be drawn from this account.

4.1. Solution-seeking

Following a breakdown in services, consumers tend to form normative expectations that they will receive an explanation (McColl-Kennedy & Sparks, 2003). The practice of solution-seeking within the social media pages of tourism companies reflects the elements of concerted pursuit of explanation and resolution directly from the company. The practice demonstrates consumers' active desire to speak directly with a firm regarding their unsatisfactory experiences. As such, it reflects largely a utilitarian or functional value, which is concerned with the extent to which a product has the desired characteristics, is useful, and performs as expected (Smith & Colgate, 2007). Here, value is derived from information and interactions with staff (Smith & Colgate, 2007). Therefore, solution-seeking practice encompasses the expression of an unsatisfactory service experience (by the consumer), showing a desire to seek explanation and immediate resolution from the organization (the producer). Thus, both the customer and organization are involved in establishing and reproducing (Shove & Pantzar, 2005) the solution-seeking practice and co-creating value.

The practice's performance by consumers on social media typically involves a detailed and descriptive recount of the specific failed tourism experience caused directly by the company, including rationalized justification and specification of the financial outlay and perceived injustices. Complainers express their performance by asking assertive questions, clearly specifying their demands and desires regarding the resolution. Complaints are addressed directly to the firm or representative using personal pronouns, such as 'you' or 'your company'.

4.1.1. Co-creation

In the context of this complaining practice, consumers who reach a

Table 1
A summary of research findings.

Practice	Definition	Type of Value	Value co-creation	Value co-destruction
Solution-Seeking	Solution-seeking reflects the concerted pursuit of explanation and resolution directly from the tourism company.	Utilitarian	Consumers who reach a resolution with the tourism organization demonstrate that value is co-created as an outcome of this value formation process. Value co-creation occurs through the interactional process, leading to an improvement in at least one of the actor's well-beings.	When the practice results in failure to respond (non-engaging) or an unsuitable/incongruent response from the firm, ongoing performance of complainant practices ensue.
Support-Seeking	Support-seeking reflects the desire of consumers to seek emotional support, agreement, and sympathy from others. These practices are performed through elaborate storytelling, sharing of personal information, and dramatization of tourism experiences.	Emotional	Value is co-created when the consumers have received adequate support, recognition, and sympathy following their complaint.	When social support is not received from others, or the support offered is incongruent with the consumer's expectations, the complainant continues to share negative feelings.
Social Engagement-Seeking	Social engagement-seeking reflects the desire of consumers to warn other consumers. The practice involves the use of knowledge, experience, and convincing language to convey a well-educated warning message to other consumers.	Relational	Social engagement-seeking practices result in co-creation of value when the complainant has successfully and adequately shared his or her messages of warning. Recognition, thanks, or appreciation for the message is shown by others.	Social engagement-seeking practices result in the co-destruction of value when the company attempts to respond and correct, or resolve the initial warning provided by the consumer. Incongruent corporate responses lead to the co-destruction of value, as the complaining consumers do not successfully achieve their goals of warning other consumers.

successful resolution with the service provider may co-create value as an outcome of this social media interaction. The practice of solution-seeking is associated with the achievement of utilitarian value, developed through successful service interactions which result in desired outcomes for the customer (Smith & Colgate, 2007). Value co-creation occurs through the interactional performative process between the actors (consumers and the tourism organization), which leads to an improvement in the actor's well-being. The solution-seeking complaint practice shows the pursuit of immediate communication and resolution, directly from the company. Companies that respond accordingly through the conflict management strategy of 'informing', reach a resolution quickly, leaving the complainer satisfied. Informing is where the company posts corporate or product information which will rectify the consumer's complaint. In this case, the complaining practice results in utilitarian value creation. Information is a source of value (Smith & Colgate, 2007), in this case created by the company representative – which in turn provides utilitarian value by educating customers appropriately. In the case outlined below, the *Jetstar* representative Leslie showed understanding of the complaining practice (demonstrating congruency) (Echeverri & Skålén, 2011) and offered an immediate solution to (dissatisfied customer) Nadine. Nadine concluded the conversation on a positive note, thanking the company representative, Leslie.

> ***Nadine:*** *Jetstar's new charge of $0.99 per minute to speak to a customer service agent is a joke. My friend needed to change her ticket and had to call twice after being disconnected towards the end of the first call. The 2nd time she called she asked the agent to call back, but was told this wasn't possible. So another 38 mins on the tel, being constantly put on hold and the line dropped out again. A coincidence? I think not. This appalling greed has put me off ever booking with Jetstar again*
>
> ***Jetstar:*** *Hi Nadine, Thanks for your post. I understand that you're writing on behalf of your friend and that you were disappointed with the service received from our Contact Centre. If you can get your friend contact us directly about her experience, we will assist her the best way we can. Regards –Leslie*
>
> ***Nadine****: Thanks Leslie. What is the best way to contact you? I hope you are not going to suggest we need to call the customer service centre again!*
>
> ***Jetstar****: Hey Nadine, Thanks for your reply. You can send us a private message or you may also speak with our Live Chat team here:* http://www.jetstar.com/au/en/contact-us
>
> ***Nadine****: Thank you Leslie, most appreciated.*

4.1.2. Co-destruction

If the practice of solution-seeking results in unsuitable or incongruent responses from the firm, consumers tend to continue performing an ongoing complaint. In such instances, the utilitarian value characterizing solution-seeking is co-destroyed, as the firm fails to provide or enhance the desired outcome through the interaction and information provided (Smith & Colgate, 2007). Some of the unsuitable responses for solution-seeking include '*non-engaging*' (where the company does not take any action to moderate a conflict). The non-engaging strategy involves disregarding the complaint and remaining silent (Dineva et al., 2017). In failing to respond, the company avoids resolving the solution-seeking conflict by having incongruent expectations and understandings of the practice (Echeverri & Skålén, 2011). Thus, from the point of view of the complainer (customer/actor), when the organization does not engage appropriately in the complaining practice, the complainer remains unsatisfied, resulting in unrealized utilitarian value. Value is co-destroyed, as there is a decline in the well-being of at least one of the actors. Further, companies may add to co-destruction of solution-seeking by adopting 'censoring', whereby the company permanently removes complaint content (Dineva et al., 2017). In this instance, the practice is essentially eliminated and the

possibilities of further enhancement of value (service recovery) is destroyed. In the example below, the focal company, *Qantas*, adopts a 'non-engaging' response strategy, leading to further complaints from the consumer, Belinda:

> ***Belinda**: Could not be more disappointed with Qantas service!! Where is the support service? 2hrs waiting on the phone only to be hung up on … Where is the contact support email??*
>
> ***Qantas**: Sorry we've kept you waiting Belinda. Please PM us your booking reference and we'll follow this up. Solomon*
>
> ***Belinda**: I did that 5 hrs ago and have still had no response! You are pathetic!*

In another example below, value co-destruction is escalated further. Other consumers (Taka) are able to join in the practice to reinforce the solution-seeking complaint from the initiating consumer (Nicole). This example (below) suggests that choosing not to engage with the solution-seeking consumer by the company can amplify value co-destruction on social media by engaging other consumers:

> ***Nicole (first poster):** After receiving an email advising that our flight details have changed (quite substantially), and hence cannot make our connecting flight, it was indicated we should contact Qantas ….have now been on hold for more than 2 1/2 hours … really??!!*
>
> ***Qantas:** Sorry we've kept you waiting and holding Nicole. Please PM us your booking reference, passenger names and flight info. We're here to help. Solomon*
>
> ***Nicole:** Now 3 hrs 25 mins, tried messenger, still no reply.*
>
> ***Taka**: I know, me too! It's hard to talk to them on the phone, so frustrating!!!*
>
> ***Nicole**: update, I hung up after **waiting 4 hours and 51 minutes on hold**. It got to the point where I didn't want to hang up and waste all the time I had been sitting on hold, ridiculous. My blood pressure has suffered enough today thanks to Qantas' complete lack of service*
>
> ***Taka**: ridiculous [angry face emoji], I had a similar experience with Qantas, not only once!*

4.2. Support-seeking

The practice of support-seeking on social media reflects the desire of consumers to seek emotional support, agreement, and sympathy from others. Accordingly, the performance of this practice expresses emotional value – conveyed through appropriate experiences, feelings, and emotions (Smith & Colgate, 2007) that complaining on social media is able to create for the consumer. Support-seeking is salient for tourist encounters, as these encounters are associated with a heightened sensitivity to negative experiences (Cohen, 2004; Pearce, 2005). The performance of support-seeking tends to use the elements of elaborate storytelling, sharing of personal information about consumers, and the dramatization of tourism experiences. Such complainers often do not demand a specific resolution or response from the company; instead, this practice appears to use social media pages to 'vent' about their experiences and gain support from others. Value is derived not from the interactions with staff and service centers but instead through other customer-to-customer interactions (Smith & Colgate, 2007).

When consumers engage in support-seeking practices, service attributes such as staff politeness, friendliness, or empathy, can create emotional and epistemic experiences for consumers (Smith & Colgate, 2007), reinforcing the emotional value created for the consumer through the interaction. Responses including friendliness, support, politeness and empathy may also be derived from other community members, because of the highly networked and public environment in which the complaining practice is performed. This can create value between current, previous and future customers.

4.2.1. Co-creation

Value can be co-created following support-seeking practice through feeling adequate emotional support, recognition, and sympathy following the complaint. The value of the practice is usually created with other consumers. In this case, consumers receive the support they were seeking and thus experience an increase in their well-being, characterized by emotional value formation. In the example below, Claudette shares a detailed and emotive recount of her experience with *Jetstar*. She then receives support from community members Robert and Doug, and thanks them for their support. Contrary to the case of solution-seeking, adopting a non-engaging management style in this case of support-seeking, facilitates value co-creation by allowing the complaint to resolve on its own terms:

> ***Claudette:** OMG NEVER FLYING WITH JETSTAR AGAIN!!!!! After waiting 1 and a half hours for service, my husband ordered 2 beers for himself. paid for them and was told he can have 1 now and then ask for the other as soon as he finishes the first one. no worries he said and was happy to do so. BUT when he politely asked the male attendant for his second he was told NO and to wait until all rubbish was collected in a very rude and loud voice. my husband asked him what his problem was? He then told my husband he was cut off from drinking all alcoholic beverages now. WOW? We then said we will make a formal complaint about his conduct. Then he said that's it I'm now notifying the federal police and did so. all passengers around us were in disbelief and as shocked as we were. Upon arrival he had 8 federal officers escort him off the plane and was detained. HOW EMBARRASSING!! And on top of it our daughter was traumatized. WTF a bitter end to a beautiful holiday*
>
> ***Robert:** Then what about the times where Jetstar have continued to serve alcohol to drunken idiots*
>
> ***Claudette:** My point is the male was very rude my husband was not drunk and was polite next time they need to call police when there is a reason like terror, violence, not asking for a second beer please!!!!!!!!!!!!*
>
> ***Robert:** I wouldn't recommend Jetstar for your family anymore. Just stick with Virgin like myself who left Jetstar 18 months ago.*
>
> ***Doug:** That's good old Jetstar for ya. I'll never fly with them while my clacka points towards the ground. Pigs do fly and they are known as Jetstar staff.*
>
> ***Claudette:** Totally agree!!!!thank you*

4.2.2. Co-destruction

Support-seeking consumers are very emotional when they perform the practice. When social support is not received, consumers continue to have unresolved negative feelings. Such negative feelings have a detrimental impact on well-being, inducing the co-destruction of value. In the example below, Linda shares a recount of her experience with *Jetstar*. When she receives no replies from others, she posts again. *Jetstar* responds with an informing strategy, and does not offer emotional support to Linda. Linda remains unsatisfied despite having received a detailed justification from the company. The co-destruction of value occurs because the management style is not congruent with the complaining performance, which in the case of support-seeking, should express emotional value conveyed through appropriate experiences, feelings, and emotions (Smith & Colgate, 2007).

> ***Linda (1**st **Post)**: I was on the JQ565 flight at 1:30pm on 22 august. I was asked to place my hand bag (smaller than A4) on the scale!?!? Which had a large bottle of water and food I was going to eat on the plane as your airline food doesn't cater for everyone! I purchased the food items from the airport. I wasn't aware that food, water and handbags were weighed too! 2 ladies in front of me got their luggage weighed but not their handbags, the guy behind me was told he didn't need his*

backpack weighed. They were picking and choosing who to weigh and who not too! I'm happy to pay if I'm over but I didn't think that a small handbags was to be weighed and especially food and drinks that are purchased at the airport!!! They told me that I either had to throw out my personal belongings or pay $60! I ended up paying $60 which INFURIATED me, not because of the money but because of the fact that they were picking and choosing whose handbags and luggage they were going to weigh! It felt like the guy was on a massive power trip!

***Linda (2**nd **Post):** this isn't the first time this has happened! Last time (April) I weighed my luggage at home and was told I was over and charged $60 as well! I only carry hand luggage and I always weigh my bag before heading to the airport! I honestly think your scales are off because according to your scales my handbag weighed nearly 5kgs!!!! Highly highly unlikely!*

***Jetstar**: Hi Linda, Thanks for getting in touch. We advise our carry-on baggage allowance on your itinerary and also include size restrictions. If you arrive at the airport and have exceeded these, you will incur additional fees at the airport. If at any time before the flight departs, our staff note thatthe combined weight of your items may be more than your allowance; your bag will be weighed and if you have exceeded your 7 kg carry-on baggage allowances, you will be required to check the baggage in.*

***Linda**: WOW! I honestly don't even know why I bother complaining! Thanks for stating the obvious! You have missed the point completely! [angry face emoji]*

4.3. Social engagement-seeking

The practice of social engagement-seeking within social media pages of tourism companies reflects the desire of consumers to show their knowledge by warning, advising, and cautioning fellow community members. Value is derived from interactions with other customers (Smith & Colgate, 2007). Through the conducting of social-engagement practices consumers are able to strengthen their bonds with other consumers. Customer bonds reflect relational value, whereby complaining produces network benefits, such as bonding and connectedness, personal interaction, developing trust or commitment, and responsiveness (Smith & Colgate, 2007). The online content generation process gives individuals the opportunity to be recognised and to publicize their expertise (Leung, 2009). Accordingly, social engagement-seeking practice involves the use of knowledge, experience, and convincing language to convey an informative warning message to other consumers with the intention of helping those other consumers. Complainers do not seek a specific solution, nor emotional support. Social engagement-seeking complaining practice may be exhibited by consumers who have a high level of altruism, and who are likely to help other consumers by providing information that could influence their future decisions (Price, Arnould, & Deibler, 1995).

4.3.1. Co-creation

Social engagement-seeking practices result in the co-creation of value when the complainer has successfully and adequately shared his or her message of warning with the community. Recognition, thanking, or appreciation for the message is shown by community members, and the focal brand does not respond. In the example below, Danielle uses the *Jetstar* Facebook page to perform a social engagement complaining practice by warning other consumers about baggage fees. While both the practice of social engagement-seeking and support-seeking pursue support from other customers or actors, the elements of the practice differ in the content of messages. The message in social engagement-seeking seeks to inform, warn or advice other customers, while support-seeking is an anecdote of a personal experience (venting). Another consumer, John, appreciates this and responds to Danielle:

***Danielle:** For everyone's information - if you are trying to book a Jetstar flight out of Adelaide to Bali, if the flight goes via anywhere, be aware that when you are doing the booking and book the baggage each way, it charges you double baggage fee, the full baggage charge for every sector. So the baggage fee for 20kg is over $100. It doesn't come up clearly until you pay. When you telephone themand try to get some help, you get no help or service at all. It is very misleading and disappointing*

***John:** Good to know – thanks for sharing! Sounds like another money-making scam to me!*

***Danielle:** Yep, I agree!*

4.3.2. Co-destruction

Social engagement-seeking practices result in the co-destruction of value when the company attempts to respond and correct, or resolve the initial warning provided by the consumer. This managerial response can be referred to as informing (posting of corporate/product information to rectify an incorrect consumer comment) (Quach & Thaichon, 2017), or pacifying, where the company asks the consumer to adjust their communication as it may have involved incorrect advice or information. Both informing and pacifying corporate responses may lead to the co-destruction of value, as the consumer does not successfully and adequately achieve the goal of warning other consumers in their performance. To illustrate, in the passage below, Samantha uses *Jetstar's* Facebook page to discourage consumers from booking with the company. She provides evidence in the form of a photo (of her meal) to add to her warning message, and *Jetstar r*espond with an informing response strategy, leading to further disappointment from Samantha and hence the co-destruction of value.

***Samantha:** To all current/future or deciding customers. After numerous failed attempts at bringing to their (Jetstar) attention the substandard food they serve on their international flights which I would not even grade adequate for human consumption. I have decided to use social media as my forum. This is not something I have ever done so I hope I've done it correctly, this is what you will be served. I would recommend purchasing food from a cafe or food outlet prior to boarding. (Includes picture of meal)*

***Jetstar:** Hi Samantha, I'm again sorry for any disappointment. We sincerely understand and appreciate your concerns. You can submit a formal feedback via the link given and our Customer Care team will review this further. Kind Regards, Sassa*

***Samantha:** I'm not sure if it was even cooked properly. The bread was half frozen and stale, the portion size w you.as insufficient. Qantas has been booked for all my next trips, never again Jetstar! Sassa – you have my complaint as above, so why should I have to go and find and fill out another form? There is more than enough information for …,*

5. Discussion and conclusion

Our findings offer important contributions to the literature on social media complaints in tourism. First, we reveal that social media complaints in tourism are multifaceted, characterized by different types of value that they can potentially create or destroy. Specifically, we have identified three unique social practices of complaining on social media – namely, solution-seeking, support-seeking, and social engagement-seeking. Each practice is not only characterized by a particular type of value that it forms, but it can be also distinguished through the practical elements that complainers use within their skillful performances. Solution-seeking involves descriptive recounting of the specific failed tourist experiences caused directly by the company. Support-seeking is characterized by elaborate and emotive storytelling, whereas social engagement-seeking reflects a complainer's attempt to convey informative warning messages to other consumers. Thus, tourist

complaints on social media vary considerably in nature in the elements of their practice, specifically in their meanings and performances (i.e., tone, objective, value sought). Our analysis demonstrates that providers and customers draw on both congruent (value co-creation) and incongruent (value co-destruction) elements of complaining practices (Echeverri & Skålén, 2011), however, other customers also impact upon the value creation process.

Second, our study extends previous studies in the tourism domain that have explored the relationship between value co-creation and tourism complaints (Xu et al., 2016). In particular, beyond co-creation, we take a holistic perspective of value formation (both co-creation and co-destruction). In this endeavor, given that complaining on social media is as an interactive process, underpinned by specific practices, we note that each instance of complaining can result in either co-creation or co-destruction – depending on the salient complaining practice and the interactions between complainers, the company, and other consumers. Thus, there is a need to go beyond the roles assumed by complainers and respondents (Xu et al., 2016), and instead, examine the subsequent practices which can be employed by managers to match customer and C2C practices.

In relation to this, consistent with recent studies on value co-creation and co-destruction in the service-dominant logic discourse (Cova et al., 2011; Echeverri & Skålén, 2011; Plé & Chumpitaz Caceresk 2010; Vargo & Lusch, 2004), we assert that tourist complaints on social media do not always result in negative consequences. That is, rather than being static and predetermined, complaint practices are processual, dynamically unfolding, and interactive. Organizations can participate actively in complaining practices to create value for both parties. However, the type of complaining practice itself must be first identified, through examination of practice elements, and participated in appropriately. This is because the specific performances that are required from tourism organizations to foster co-creation or avoid co-destruction are different for each practice. While offering pragmatic resolutions may lead to the co-creation of value in the context of solution-seeking because this practice is underpinned by utilitarian value, such an approach may lead to co-destruction in the context of support-seeking that conveys emotional value, and social engagement-seeking that reflects relational value. In the same vein, non-engagement could be an appropriate strategy to deal with the practice of social engagement-seeking, as it empowers complainants to satisfy their goal of warning other people about issues. Conversely, non-engagement with support-seeking practice may result in ongoing complaints. Thus, managerial responses to complaint practices must be considered in relation to the practical performances of their initiating complainers and of other consumers.

Our study offers fruitful avenues for future research. First, this study conducted a practice-based analysis in order to understand tourism-related complaining practices on social media. As the study is exploratory in nature, we acknowledge that the three practices discussed (solution-seeking, support-seeking, and social engagement-seeking) are limited to illustrative examples rather than exhaustive representations of complaint behavior. In addition, further research aimed at understanding complaining practices, perhaps in other contexts (e.g., brand communities) or social media platforms (e.g., Twitter) could complement our findings.

Moreover, as support-seeking and social engagement-seeking both require co-creation with other customers, future research should examine the ways in which organizations can foster engagement on social media (Dolan, Conduit, Fahy, & Goodman, 2016), specifically in the complaining context, helping to expand Xu et al.'s (2016) research on C2C interactions. Moreover, while practice theory is a useful lens to explore structure and agency dynamics, lived experiences are better analyzed through other enabling theories, such as phenomenology. For example, in-depth interviews may be useful to understand the complaining *experiences* further.

Complaining practices on social media are highly likely to differ between complaining practices in non-public settings such as email or face-to-face. Support-seeking and social engagement-seeking practices are co-created with other customers. Since these practices are performed on social media – a public, highly visible platform – this provides some explanation as to why actors seek emotional and relational value – neither of which are satisfied entirely by the organization itself. Many motivations exist for the use of social media and include connecting with others, gaining a sense of belonging, and seeking (social) support (Muntinga, Moorman, & Smit, 2011). Future research should examine the differing complaining practices in public and non-public spheres. Furthermore, studies have shown that social media are used in a variety of ways at different stages of a tourist's journey. Consumers are influenced by social media comments before, during, and after a travel experience (Sedera et al., 2017). Our study focused on comments posted post-consumption experience, after a service failure, and future research may benefit from examining comments at various stages of the customer journey.

Finally, in this study, we focused specifically on complaining practices; however further inquiry with a similar practice-based theoretical approach could investigate antisocial and deviant online behaviors, and their potential for value co-creation or value co-destruction. Such behaviors may include fake online reviews, so-called 'trolling', and malicious activity online (Yoo & Gretzel, 2009; Schuckert, Liu, & Law, 2016). This would permit further insight into the conceptualization of value co-destruction and value co-creation as two sides of value formation, the potential for which can exist simultaneously (Heidenreich, Wittkowski, Handrich, & Falk, 2014).

Declarations of interest

None.

Note of contribution

Dr. Rebecca Dolan and Dr. Yuri Seo contributed an equal effort to the researching and writing of this paper, specifically concerning the research idea, design, analysis, and manuscript writing. Dr. Joya Kemper was instrumental in contributing to the positioning, writing, structure, and direction of this paper.

References

Achrol, R. S., & Kotler, P. (2012). Frontiers of the marketing paradigm in the third millennium. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 40*(1), 35–52.

Akaka, M. A., Corsaro, D., Kelleher, C., Maglio, P. P., Seo, Y., Lusch, R. F., et al. (2014). The role of symbols in value cocreation. *Marketing Theory, 14*(3), 311–326.

Araujo, L., Kjellberg, H., & Spencer, R. (2008). Market practices and forms: Introduction to the special issue. *Marketing Theory, 8*(1), 5–14.

Bonfanti, A., Vigolo, V., & Negri, F. (2016). Hotel responses to guests' online reviews: An exploratory study on communication styles. In A. Inversini, & R. Schegg (Eds.). *Information and communication technologies in tourism 2016* (pp. 397–409). Cham: Springer.

Bradley, G. L., Sparks, B. A., & Weber, K. (2015). The stress of anonymous online reviews: A conceptual model and research agenda. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 27*(5), 739–755.

Buhalis, D., & Law, R. (2008). Progress in information technology and tourism management: 20 years on and 10 years after the internet—the state of eTourism research. *Tourism Management, 29*(4), 609–623.

Cabiddu, F., De Carlo, M., & Piccoli, G. (2014). Social media affordances: Enabling customer engagement. *Annals of Tourism Research, 48*, 175–192.

Cabiddu, F., Lui, T. W., & Piccoli, G. (2013). Managing value co-creation in the tourism industry. *Annals of Tourism Research, 42*, 86–107.

Cakmak, E., & Isaac, R. K. (2012). What destination marketers can learn from their visitors' blogs: An image analysis of Bethlehem, Palestine. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management, 1*(1), 124–133.

Camilleri, J., & Neuhofer, B. (2017). Value co-creation and co-destruction in the Airbnb sharing economy. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 29*(9), 2322–2340.

Champoux, V., Durgee, J., & McGlynn, L. (2012). Corporate Facebook pages: When "fans" attack. *Journal of Business Strategy, 33*(2), 22–30.

Cohen, E. (2004). *Contemporary tourism: Diversity and change.* Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Cova, B., Dalli, D., & Zwick, D. (2011). Critical perspectives on consumers' role as 'producers': Broadening the debate on value co-creation in marketing processes.

Marketing Theory, 11(3), 231–241.
Cruz, A. G. B., Seo, Y., & Rex, M. (2018). Trolling in online communities: A practice-based theoretical perspective. *The Information Society, 34*(1), 15–26.
Daunt, K. L., & Harris, L. C. (2017). Consumer showrooming: Value co-destruction. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services, 38*, 166–176.
Dijkmans, C., Kerkhof, P., & Beukeboom, C. J. (2015). A stage to engage: Social media use and corporate reputation. *Tourism Management, 47*, 58–67.
Dineva, D. P., Breitsohl, J. C., & Garrod, B. (2017). Corporate conflict management on social media brand fan pages. *Journal of Marketing Management,* 1–20.
Dolan, R., Conduit, J., Fahy, J., & Goodman, S. (2016). Social media engagement behaviour: A uses and gratifications perspective. *Journal of Strategic Marketing, 24*(3–4), 261–277.
Dong, B., Evans, K. R., & Zou, S. (2008). The effects of customer participation in co-created service recovery. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 36*(1), 123–137.
Echeverri, P., & Skålén, P. (2011). Co-creation and co-destruction: A practice-theory based study of interactive value formation. *Marketing Theory, 11*(3), 351–373.
Einwiller, S. A., & Steilen, S. (2015). Handling complaints on social network sites–An analysis of complaints and complaint responses on Facebook and Twitter pages of large US companies. *Public Relations Review, 41*(2), 195–204.
Ekiz, E., Khoo-Lattimore, C., & Memarzadeh, F. (2012). Air the anger: Investigating online complaints on luxury hotels. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Technology, 3*(2), 96–106.
Figueiredo, B., Gopaldas, A., & Fischer, E. (2017). The construction of qualitative research articles: A conversation with Eileen Fischer. *Consumption, Markets and Culture, 20*(4), 297–305.
Grissemann, U. S., & Stokburger-Sauer, N. E. (2012). Customer co-creation of travel services: The role of company support and customer satisfaction with the co-creation performance. *Tourism Management, 33*(6), 1483–1492.
Gu, B., & Ye, Q. (2014). First step in social media: Measuring the influence of online management responses on customer satisfaction. *Production and Operations Management, 23*(4), 570–582.
Hamilton, K., & Alexander, M. (2013). Organic community tourism: A cocreated approach. *Annals of Tourism Research, 42*, 169–190.
Hargreaves, T. (2011). Practice-ing behaviour change: Applying social practice theory to pro-environmental behaviour change. *Journal of Consumer Culture, 11*(1), 79–99.
Harrigan, P., Evers, U., Miles, M., & Daly, T. (2017). Customer engagement with tourism social media brands. *Tourism Management, 59*, 597–609.
Heidenreich, S., Wittkowski, K., Handrich, M., & Falk, T. (2014). The dark side of customer industrial marketing: Past, present, and future. *Industrial Marketing Management, 41*(1), 207–214.
Hennig-Thurau, T., Malthouse, E. C., Friege, C., Gensler, S., Lobschat, L., Rangaswamy, A., et al. (2010). The impact of new media on customer relationships. *Journal of Service Research, 13*(3), 311–330.
Jaakkola, E., & Alexander, M. (2014). The role of customer engagement behavior in value co-creation: A service system perspective. *Journal of Service Research, 17*(3), 247–261.
Jacoby, J., & Jaccard, J. (1981). The sources, meaning, and validity of consumer complaint behavior: A psychological analysis. *Journal of Retailing, 57*(1), 4–25.
Jahandideh, B., Golmohammadi, A., Meng, F., O'Gorman, K. D., & Taheri, B. (2014). Cross-cultural comparison of Chinese and Arab consumer complaint behavior in the hotel context. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 41*, 67–76.
Klein, H. K., & Myers, M. D. (1999). A set of principles for conducting and evaluating interpretive field studies in information systems. *MIS Quarterly, 23*(1), 67–93.
Kozinets, R. V., De Valck, K., Wojnicki, A. C., & Wilner, S. J. (2010). Networked narratives: Understanding word-of-mouth marketing in online communities. *Journal of Marketing, 74*(2), 71–89.
Lamers, M., & Pashkevich, A. (2018). Short-circuiting cruise tourism practices along the Russian barents sea coast? The case of Arkhangelsk. *Current Issues in Tourism, 21*(4), 440–454.
Lamers, M., van der Duim, R., & Spaargaren, G. (2017). The relevance of practice theories for tourism research. *Annals of Tourism Research, 62*, 54–63.
Lee, C. C., & Hu, C. (2005). Analyzing hotel customers' E-complaints from an internet complaint forum. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing, 17*(2–3), 167–181.
Leung, L. (2009). User-generated content on the internet: An examination of gratifications, civic engagement and psychological empowerment. *New Media & Society, 11*, 1327–1347.
Leung, D., Law, R., Van Hoof, H., & Buhalis, D. (2013). Social media in tourism and hospitality: A literature review. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing, 30*(1–2), 3–22.
Li, C., Cui, G., & Peng, L. (2017). The signaling effect of management response in engaging customers: A study of the hotel industry. *Tourism Management, 62*, 42–53.
Luo, Q., & Zhong, D. (2015). Using social network analysis to explain communication characteristics of travel-related electronic word-of-mouth on social networking sites. *Tourism Management, 46*, 274–282.
Mariani, M. M., Di Felice, M., & Mura, M. (2016). Facebook as a destination marketing tool: Evidence from Italian regional destination management organizations. *Tourism Management, 54*, 321–343.
Mariani, M. M., Mura, M., & Di Felice, M. (2018). The determinants of Facebook social engagement for national tourism organizations' Facebook pages: A quantitative approach. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management, 8*, 312–325.
Mathis, E. F., Kim, H. L., Uysal, M., Sirgy, J. M., & Prebensen, N. K. (2016). The effect of co-creation experience on outcome variable. *Annals of Tourism Research, 57*, 62–75.
McColl-Kennedy, J. R., Cheung, L., & Ferrier, E. (2015). Co-creating service experience practices. *Journal of Service Management, 26*(2), 249–275.
McColl-Kennedy, J. R., & Sparks, B. A. (2003). Application of fairness theory to service failures and service recovery. *Journal of Service Research, 5*(3), 251–266.
McColl-Kennedy, J. R., Vargo, S. L., Dagger, T. S., Sweeney, J. C., & Kasteren, Y. V. (2012). Health care customer value cocreation practice styles. *Journal of Service Research, 15*(4), 370–389.
Muntinga, D. G., Moorman, M., & Smit, E. G. (2011). Introducing COBRAs: Exploring motivations for brand-related social media use. *International Journal of Advertising, 30*, 13–46.
Nicolini, D. (2013). *Practice theory, work, and organization: An introduction.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
Park, S. Y., & Allen, J. P. (2013). Responding to online reviews: Problem solving and engagement in hotels. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly, 54*(1), 64–73.
Pearce, P. L. (2005). *Tourist behaviour: Themes and conceptual schemes. Cleavedon: Channel view*.
Pfeffer, J., Zorbach, T., & Carley, K. M. (2014). Understanding online firestorms: Negative word-of-mouth dynamics in social media networks. *Journal of Marketing Communications, 20*(1–2), 117–128.
Plé, L., & Chumpitaz Cáceres, R. (2010). Not always co-creation: Introducing interactional co-destruction of value in service-dominant logic. *Journal of Services Marketing, 24*(6), 430–437.
Prebensen, N. K., & Xie, J. (2017). Efficacy of co-creation and mastering on perceived value and satisfaction in tourists' consumption. *Tourism Management, 60*, 166–176.
Price, L. L., Arnould, E. J., & Deibler, S. L. (1995). Consumers' emotional responses to service encounters: The influence of the service provider. *International Journal of Service Industry Management, 6*(3), 34–63.
Quach, S., & Thaichon, P. (2017). From connoisseur luxury to mass luxury: Value co-creation and co-destruction in the online environment. *Journal of Business Research, 81*, 163–172.
Reckwitz, A. (2002). Toward a theory of social practices: A development in culturalist theorizing. *European Journal of Social Theory, 5*(2), 243–263.
Rihova, I., Buhalis, D., Gouthro, M. B., & Moital, M. (2018). Customer-to-customer co-creation practices in tourism: Lessons from Customer-Dominant logic. *Tourism Management, 67*, 362–375.
Ro, H., & Wong, J. (2012). Customer opportunistic complaints management: A critical incident approach. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 31*(2), 419–427.
Schatzki, T. R. (1996). *Social practices: A wittgensteinian approach to human activity and the social.* Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
Schau, H. J., Muñiz, A. M., Jr., & Arnould, E. J. (2009). How brand community practices create value. *Journal of Marketing, 73*(5), 30–51.
Schuckert, M., Liu, X., & Law, R. (2016). Insights into suspicious online ratings: Direct evidence from TripAdvisor. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research, 21*(3), 259–272.
Sedera, D., Lokuge, S., Atapattu, M., & Gretzel, U. (2017). Likes—the key to my happiness: The moderating effect of social influence on travel experience. *Information & Management, 54*(6), 825–836.
Seo, Y., & Buchanan-Oliver, M. (2017). Constructing a typology of luxury brand consumption practices. *Journal of Business Research* DOI: 1016/j.jbusres.2017.09.019.
Shaw, G., Bailey, A., & Williams, A. (2011). Aspects of service-dominant logic and its implications for tourism management: Examples from the hotel industry. *Tourism Management, 32*(2), 207–214.
Sheth, J. N., Newman, B. I., & Gross, B. L. (1991). Why we buy what we buy: A theory of consumption values. *Journal of Business Research, 22*(2), 159–170.
Shove, E., & Pantzar, M. (2005). Consumers, producers and practices: Understanding the invention and reinvention of Nordic walking. *Journal of Consumer Culture, 5*(1), 43–64.
Shu, M., & Scott, N. (2014). Influence of social media on Chinese students' choice of an overseas study destination: An information adoption model perspective. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing, 31*(2), 286–302.
Sigala, M., Christou, E., & Gretzel, U. (2012). *Social media in travel, tourism and hospitality: Theory, practice and cases.* Fanham: Ashgate Publishing.
Smith, J. B., & Colgate, M. (2007). Customer value creation: A practical framework. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice, 15*(1), 7–23.
Sparks, B. A., & Bradley, G. L. (2017). A "Triple A" typology of responding to negative consumer-generated online reviews. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research, 41*(6), 719–745.
Sparks, B. A., So, K. K. F., & Bradley, G. L. (2016). Responding to negative online reviews: The effects of hotel responses on customer inferences of trust and concern. *Tourism Management, 53*, 74–85.
Spiggle, S. (1994). Analysis and interpretation of qualitative data in consumer research. *Journal of Consumer Research, 21*(3), 491–503.
Statista (2018). Number of monthly active Facebook users worldwide as of 2nd quarter 2018 (in millions). Retrieved from https://www.statista.com/statistics/264810/number-of-monthly-active-facebook-users-worldwide/.
Tyrrell, B., & Woods, R. (2005). E-complaint: Lessons to be learned from the service recovery literature. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing, 17*(2–3), 183–190.
Valenzuela, S., Park, N., & Kee, K. F. (2009). Is there social capital in a social network site?: Facebook use and college students' life satisfaction, trust, and participation. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 14*(4), 875–901.
Vargo, S. L., & Lusch, R. F. (2004). Evolving to a new dominant logic for marketing. *Journal of Marketing, 68*(1), 1–17.
Vargo, S. L., & Lusch, R. F. (2008). Service-dominant logic: Continuing the evolution. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 36*(1), 1–10.
Verbeek, D., & Mommaas, H. (2008). Transitions to sustainable tourism mobility: The social practices approach. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 16*(6), 629–644.
Warde, A. (2005). Consumption and theories of practice. *Journal of Consumer Culture, 5*(2), 131–153.
Wei, W., Miao, L., Cai, L. A., & Adler, H. (2012). The influence of self-construal and co-consumption others on consumer complaining behavior. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 31*(3), 764–771.
Wei, W., Miao, L., & Huang, Z. J. (2013). Customer engagement behaviors and hotel responses. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 33*, 316–330.

Witell, L., Gustafsson, A., & D. Johnson, M. (2014). The effect of customer information during new product development on profits from goods and services. *European Journal of Marketing, 48*(9/10), 1709–1730.
Witt, S., & Moutinho, L. (1994). *Tourism marketing and management handbook.* New York: Prentice Hall.
Xiang, Z., Du, Q., Ma, Y., & Fan, W. (2017). A comparative analysis of major online review platforms: Implications for social media analytics in hospitality and tourism. *Tourism Management, 58*, 51–65.
Xiang, Z., & Gretzel, U. (2010). Role of social media in online travel information search. *Tourism Management, 31*(2), 179–188.
Xu, Y., Yap, S. F. C., & Hyde, K. F. (2016). Who is talking, who is listening? Service recovery through online customer-to-customer interactions. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning, 34*(3), 421–443.
Yoo, K. H., & Gretzel, U. (2009). Comparison of deceptive and truthful travel reviews. *Information and communication technologies in tourism, 2009*, 37–47.
Yoo, K. H., & Gretzel, U. (2011). Influence of personality on travel-related consumer-generated media creation. *Computers in Human Behavior, 27*(2), 609–621.
Zeng, B., & Gerritsen, R. (2014). What do we know about social media in tourism? A review. *Tourism Management Perspectives, 10*, 27–36.
Zhang, Y., & Vásquez, C. (2014). Hotels' responses to online reviews: Managing consumer dissatisfaction. *Discourse, Context & Media, 6*, 54–64.

Dr. Rebecca Dolan is a Lecturer in Marketing at The University of Adelaide School of Business. Rebecca's research focusses on contemporary issues in marketing such as digital disruption, social media, and engagement. She has a particular interest in deriving insights from Big Data, particularly investigating patterns of online consumer behavior through digital and social analytics. Rebecca's research has largely focussed on the Australian wine industry. She has published in the Journal of Strategic Marketing, Australasian Marketing Journal, the International Journal of Wine Business Research, the British Journal of Educational Technology, and the Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management, among others.

Dr Yuri Seo is a Senior Lecturer in Marketing at the University of Auckland Business School, and Director of Korea Studies Centre at the New Zealand Asia Institute. His research queries how consumer behaviours, mindsets, and choices both shape and are shaped by surrounding cultural and social structures. Currently, this encompasses three streams of research: (1) digital media consumption, (2) luxury consumption, and (3) global consumer culture. Yuri's research has been published in Journal of Advertising, Journal of Business Research, Marketing Letters, Journal of Consumer Culture, and Journal of Travel Research among others.

Dr. Joya Kemper is a Lecturer in Marketing at the University of Auckland Business School. Her research focuses on how to transition to a sustainable and healthy society through individual and institutional change. Joya's interests include the broad areas of sustainability marketing, healthy and sustainable eating, social marketing, ethical and sustainable issues surrounding business activities, and marketing education, utilizing theories such as institutional theory and social practice theory. She has published in the Journal of Macromarketing, Journal of Social Marketing and Tobacco Control.