



“It's not just food; it's also an experience!”: identifying causes of value co-destruction in restaurants in Brasília

“Não é só comida; é também uma experiência!”: identificando causas da codestruição de valor em restaurantes de Brasília

“¡No es sólo comida; también es una experiencia!”: identificando las causas de la codestrucción de valor en los restaurantes de Brasilia

Autorship

Josivania Silva Farias

Universidade de Brasília (UnB)
 josivania@unb.br
 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1421-3280>

Daniel Alves Oliveira

Universidade de Brasília (UnB)
 daniel.alves.oliver@gmail.com
 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4550-3627>

Renato Calhau Codá

Universidade de Brasília (UnB)
 renato_calhau@hotmail.com
 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9051-6697>

ABSTRACT

Goal: Analyze the causes of value co-destruction (VCD) in restaurants in Brasília based on online customer reviews, which highlight negative service experiences. **Methodology/approach:** 1,000 online customer reviews published on Google Maps were extracted, referring to 20 restaurants established in Brasília. Data analysis was performed with the aid of IRAMUTEQ software. **Originality/relevance:** The study contributes to developing services marketing literature, particularly the value co-destruction approach in Brazil and Latin America, which are still incipiently exploring the VCD construct. **Main findings:** The research highlights 10 reasons that can lead to the value co-destruction (VCD) in the restaurants investigated, and most of the reasons are related to the misalignment between operational resources, that is, intangible aspects of service. **Theoretical contributions:** The study identifies ten factors that lead to VCD in restaurants, including service failures, lack of information, inconsistent marketing, exaggerated expectations, inappropriate behavior by employees and customers, errors, delays, business failures, and contextual rigidity. Most complaints are linked to subjective aspects of service, highlighting an approach that is underexplored in service marketing literature, particularly in Brazil and Latin America. **Management contributions:** The practical implications of this study indicate that service is one of the most critical points for a positive service experience; therefore, the performance of front-line employees is crucial for restaurants.

Keywords: Value co-destruction. Restaurant. Services. Experience. Services Marketing.

RESUMO

Objetivo: Analisar as causas da codestruição de valor (CDV) em restaurantes de Brasília a partir de avaliações online de clientes, que evidenciam experiências de serviço negativas. **Metodologia/abordagem:** Foram extraídas 1.000 avaliações online de clientes publicadas no Google Maps, referentes a 20 restaurantes estabelecidos em Brasília. A análise dos dados foi realizada com o auxílio do software IRAMUTEQ. **Originalidade/relevância:** O estudo contribui para o desenvolvimento da literatura de marketing de serviços, em particular, da abordagem da codestruição de valor no Brasil e na América Latina, que ainda exploram incipientemente o construto CDV. **Principais resultados:** A pesquisa evidencia 10 motivos que podem levar à codestruição de valor nos restaurantes investigados e que a maioria dos motivos está relacionada com o desalinhamento entre recursos operant, isto é, aspectos intangíveis do atendimento. **Contribuições Teóricas:** O estudo identifica dez fatores que levam à CDV em restaurantes, incluindo falhas no serviço, falta de informação, marketing incoerente, expectativas exageradas, comportamento inadequado de funcionários e clientes, erros, atrasos, falhas empresariais e rigidez contextual. A maioria das queixas está ligada a aspectos subjetivos do atendimento, destacando uma abordagem pouco explorada na literatura de marketing de serviços, especialmente no Brasil e América Latina. **Contribuições para a gestão:** As implicações práticas deste estudo apontam que o atendimento é um dos pontos mais importantes para uma experiência de serviço positiva, por isso, a performance dos empregados de linha de frente é crucial para os restaurantes.

Palavras-chave: Codestruição de valor. Restaurante. Serviços. Experiência. Marketing de Serviços.

RESUMEM

Objetivo: Analizar las causas de la codestrucción de valor (CDV) en restaurantes de Brasília a partir de opiniones de clientes online, que resaltan experiencias negativas de servicio. **Metodología/enfoque:** Se extrajeron 1.000 opiniones de clientes online publicadas en Google Maps, referidas a 20 restaurantes establecidos en Brasília. El análisis de los datos se realizó con la ayuda del software IRAMUTEQ. **Originalidad/valor:** El estudio contribuye al desarrollo de la literatura sobre marketing de servicios, en particular, el enfoque de codestrucción de valor en Brasil y América Latina, que todavía están explorando incipientemente el constructo CDV. **Principales resultados:** La investigación destaca 10 razones que pueden llevar a la codestrucción de valor en los restaurantes investigados y la mayoría de las razones están relacionadas con el desajuste entre los recursos operant, es decir, aspectos intangibles del servicio. **Contribuciones teóricas:** El estudio identifica diez factores que llevan a la CDV en restaurantes, como fallas en el servicio, falta de información, marketing inconsistente, expectativas exageradas, comportamiento inapropiado, errores, retrasos, fallas empresariales y rigidez contextual. La mayoría de las quejas se relacionan con aspectos subjetivos del servicio, destacando un enfoque poco explorado en la literatura de marketing de servicios en Brasil y América Latina. **Contribución a la gestión:** Las implicaciones prácticas de este estudio indican que el servicio es uno de los puntos más importantes para una experiencia de servicio positiva, en consecuencia, el desempeño de los empleados de primera línea es crucial para los restaurantes.

Palabras clave: Codestrucción de valor. Restaurante. Servicios. Experiencia. Marketing de Servicios.

■ INTRODUCTION

Food away from home is a segment of the food and beverage sector comprising food away-from-home businesses, such as bars, restaurants, bakeries, and snack bars (Rocha & Viegas, 2023). According to the Brazilian Food Industry Association (ABIA, 2021), the segment was on the rise in the 10 years prior to the Covid-19 pandemic (2009 to 2019), a period in which food away from home grew by 184.2% (ABIA, 2021). The 2017-2018 Family Budget Survey (IBGE, 2019) showed that this segment accounted for 32.8% of Brazilians' food expenditures.

The public health crisis caused by SARS-CoV-2 had a global social and economic impact. As measures were taken to contain the spread of COVID-19, several companies closed their doors, cut costs, and used new tools to survive. The food and beverage sector, specifically the food away from the home segment, which suffered from the lockdown, reduced its revenues from 33% to 24.4% (ABIA, 2021).

Companies had to adapt to the health crisis, using technology as an ally. Delivery, drive-through, and take-away were operating models that spread during the pandemic and accelerated the modernization and digitalization of companies (ABIA, 2021). According to the consulting firm Galunion (2022), about 89% of food outlets outside the home currently operate with delivery, which is considered a profitable model by industry managers.

The advent of Web 2.0 allowed consumers to share their service experiences, whether positive or negative, in public Internet forums, giving rise to the so-called electronic word-of-mouth (e-WoM), an important source of information and recommendations about products and services. Services that support the decision-making of potential customers (Yan et al., 2015). Online reviews are usually conducted voluntarily and spontaneously and are considered by people to be more reliable than the information provided by the companies themselves, as they reflect the impressions and feelings of real customers (Guo et al., 2017). Therefore, these evaluations directly affect the performance, attraction and retention of new customers.

Customer experience is a fundamental factor of competitive advantage in the restaurant industry and can produce outcomes such as satisfaction and loyalty (Mathayomchan & Taecharungroj, 2020). However, business-customer interactions do not always result in positive outcomes and value co-creation (Vargo & Lusch, 2004). In some cases, service encounters result in value co-destruction (VCD) (Plé & Chumpitaz-Cáceres, 2010), in which at least one of the parties involved in the interaction experiences a loss of well-being.

Negative service experiences are everyday in restaurants due to the direct contact between the service provider and the customer (Yurt & Sağır, 2023). However, according to a consultation in the scientific databases Web of Science and Scopus, most studies examine the reasons that lead to VCD in the hotel industry and not specifically in restaurants. Therefore, faced with a competitive and dynamic sector, there is a need to study VCD in restaurants

to reduce the occurrence of negative service encounters and improve the provision of these services. From this object, the question was formulated: What are the causes and possible solutions for the processes that lead to VCD in restaurants?

The central objective was defined as to analyze the causes of value co-destruction (VCD) in restaurants in Brasília based on online customer reviews that highlight negative service experiences.

This study is anchored in the Service-Dominant Logic (LDS) and contributes to the development of the understanding of Interactive Value Formation (IVF) and, more specifically, of value co-destruction, considering that the topic has not been exhaustively worked on when compared to the co-creation of value. This discrepancy is called “co-creation myopia” (Plé, 2016, p. 154). Most of the research on this topic has been conducted in Europe, with few studies in Brazil and Latin America. It is also worth highlighting that VCD was introduced in the literature in 2010 (Plé & Chumpitaz-Cáceres, 2010) and IVF was conceptualized in 2011 (Echeverri & Skålén, 2011), highlighting a still nascent literature that needs to be developed in different contexts, such as restaurants. In this sense, this work provides important insights for managers seeking to provide memorable service experiences to their customers.

■ THEORETICAL REVIEW

This section is divided into four subsections. First, it presents the Service-Dominant logic, how it differs from the traditional view and the key concepts and axioms associated with the model. The second subsection focuses on interactive value creation, which brings together both the co-creation and co-destruction of value. It then reviews the literature on value co-destruction. Finally, the last subsection focuses on the service experience in restaurants.

Service-Dominant Logic

The traditional view of marketing, known as the dominant good-centered logic (GD logic), stems from the idea of value in exchange (Vargo & Lusch, 2004). In this model, firms and consumers played different roles and were responsible for creating value by producing goods, while consumers only consumed the value created within firms (Vargo, Maglio & Akaka, 2008). Therefore, consumers were not involved in the value-creation process (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2004).

The Service-Dominant Logic (SD logic) is emerging as an alternative to the traditional model and is based on the value in use (Vargo & Lusch, 2008) because “there is no value until an offering is used - experience and perception are essential to determining value” (Vargo & Lusch, 2006, p. 44). The “firm can only make value propositions” (Vargo & Lusch, 2004, p. 7), i.e., value is produced collectively but is subjectively determined by the consumer, contrary to the idea that it is only embedded in production (Vargo & Lusch, 2004). Therefore, it is assumed that value is created when the customer feels better after using a service than before the experience (Grönroos, 2008). In this sense, the antecedents of value co-creation (VCC) most studied in the

literature in tourism and hospitality were interaction, commitment, and innovation in services (Ribeiro *et al.*, 2023).

Service can be defined as “the application of specialized capabilities (operant resources - knowledge and skills) through actions, processes, and performances for one’s benefit or the benefit of another entity” (Vargo & Lusch, 2008, p. 26). Operant resources are understood as those that act on other resources, and it is these resources that SD logic emphasizes. GD logic focuses on so-called operant resources, which are concrete and tangible (Vargo & Lusch, 2004).

After a little more than a decade, the authors Vargo and Lusch (2016) established five axioms of SD logic. Axiom 1 states that all exchange takes place through services. Therefore, tangible goods are like mere devices used to provide services and apply resources (Vargo *et al.*, 2006). Vargo, Maglio, and Akaka (2008) illustrate that a car would have no value if no one knew how to drive it; or if there were no maintenance services. Axiom 2 proposes that value is co-created by several actors, being a multi-actor process with different sources of resource integration (Vargo & Lusch, 2016). Thus, the value creation process involves several other actors in addition to the firm-customer relationship.

Axiom 3 allows us to understand the value co-creation from the perspective of service systems, where all actors are considered integrators of resources, without distinguishing between those who produce and those who consume, since both contribute to improving their well-being and that of others (Vargo, Maglio & Akaka, 2008). Axiom 4 defines that value is determined by the beneficiary, generally identified as a customer or consumer. Finally, Axiom 5 introduces a new extension of the service-dominant logic by including institutions - described as the game’s rules. According to this idea, institutions and institutional arrangements enable and constrain value creation (Vargo & Lusch, 2016).

Interactive Value Formation

Interactive Value Formation (IVF) consists of the process of interaction between suppliers and customers, resulting in value co-creation (when practices are congruent) and value co-destruction (when practices are incongruent) (Echeverri & Skålén, 2011). Just as value can be co-created (VCC), it can also be co-destroyed (VCD) by firms and consumers. After a decade, Echeverri and Skålén (2021) developed a synthesis framework for IVF that combines the practice approach with the resource systems approach, thus proposing the IVF space, defined as “a two-dimensional sphere in which two or more actors interact based on practices and resources to co-create or co-destruct value” (p. 242). Thus, alignment and misalignment of practices are related to VCC and VCD, respectively. The framework suggests that IVF is enabled and constrained by resources.

Zhang *et al.* (2018) studied the VCC and VCD processes induced by customer engagement in online channels and found that VCC occurs when customers are satisfied with the service, feel valued by the company, and perceive the quality of employee service (empathy, availability, receptivity, and education). On the other hand, for Zhang *et al.* (2018), the customer’s desire for revenge after a negative service experience generates VCD to the extent that the company’s reputation is affected. The lack of employees’ soft

skills (behavioral skills - operant resources) can reduce customer retention due to rude behavior and lack of empathy on the part of the employee.

Value Co-Destruction (VCD)

Plé & Chumpitaz-Cáceres (2010) introduced the concept of value co-destruction (VCD), which is the process of interaction between service systems that promotes the decline of at least one of the welfare systems. This reduction in welfare results from the misuse of resources from one or the other system, which can be both accidental and intentional (Plé & Chumpitaz-Cáceres, 2010). In addition, the misalignment of actors' expectations creates value co-destruction.

Kashif *et al.* (2015) point out that bad customer behavior is usually anchored in the idea that “the customer is always right.” This “superiority” allows the customer to abuse service providers for financial gain, ego-boosting, and revenge motives, triggering VCD processes and potentially affecting other customers' experiences. In addition to bad behavior, customers can also make fraudulent complaints, which occur when individuals evaluate the service without basis, reporting untruths and false feedback to gain some benefit from the company (Baptista & Herais, 2020). This becomes a problem because illegitimate criticism encourages changes that are not necessary. After all, the reported problem does not exist.

Järvi, Kähkönen, and Torvinen (2018) studied VCD in seven organizations belonging to the public and private sectors and found the following causes of VCD: lack of information, insufficient level of trust, errors, inability to serve and change, lack of clear expectations, bad customer behavior, and blame.

Laud *et al.* (2019) presented 10 manifestations of resource misalignment that can lead to VCD: 1) lack/unavailability of resources; 2) blocked access/intentional restriction of resources; 3) lack of desire to integrate resources; 4) lack of understanding of how to integrate resources; 5) lack of agreement on the best way to integrate resources; 6) deceptive integration of resources; 7) negligence, intentional lack of attention, or carelessness in integrating resources; 8) inability/disqualification of at least one actor to integrate resources; 9) excessive integration of resources; and 10) coercive integration of resources.

VCD has also been studied in the tourism and hospitality industry. Järvi *et al.* (2020) used the Script Theory to analyze how VCD occurs in the hotel industry, noting that both the service provider and the customer have a cognitive script indicating each actor's roles. When at least one of the actors does not follow the script, VCD occurs. The study presented six antecedents of VCD in the hotel industry: 1) inability to provide a service; 2) contextual rigidity; 3) incoherent marketing communication; 4) excessive expectations; 5) inadequate communication; and 6) inappropriate behavior. The first three refer to the service provider, while the last three refer to the customer.

Farias and Díez-Vial (2022) analyzed the reasons for VCD in the Spanish hotel industry based on customer comments on the Booking.com platform and information gathered from interviews with managers. The research results show that guests' complaints are related to resource misalignment, problems that are generally easy to solve because they relate to the physical structure and the level of service offered. Managers, on the other hand,

emphasize complex and subjective issues, while in practice, dissatisfaction stems from fundamental and objective factors.

Restaurant Service Experience

Restaurants are complex businesses because they typically require interaction between service providers and consumers in the same environment to deliver the service (Lucian *et al.*, 2008). Consumers evaluate restaurants from the time they make a reservation to the time they leave, making judgments not only about the food but also about the overall service experience, which includes intangible aspects. This suggests that successful businesses are those that provide a memorable service experience, not just those that provide quality food (Rossi *et al.*, 2012).

According to Mathayomchan and Taecharungroj (2020), there are four main attributes of restaurants: 1) food; 2) service: reliability, guarantee, empathy, and responsiveness; 3) Atmosphere: physical environment, design; and 4) value: perceived value compared to the price paid for the meal. Rossi *et al.* (2012) define the variables that influence the value perception of restaurant consumers: price, environment, service, food, and cleanliness. In this sense, the consumer's experience in a restaurant will depend on several sensory aspects, such as appropriate cutlery for the type of food; comfortable decor and lighting; and dishes served appropriately, among others (Lucian *et al.*, 2008).

The 7P's model can be used in the context of restaurants to cover intangible aspects of service (Shock *et al.*, 2004): 1) price; 2) product: menu items; 3) promotion: communication with the target group; 4) point of sale, i.e. location; 5) process: how the service is organized; 6) participants: all actors involved in the process, i.e. customers, waiters, cooks, etc.; and 7) physical evidence: restaurant infrastructure, including cleaning.

METHODOLOGICAL PROCEDURES

This multiple case study is exploratory-descriptive and has a qualitative approach. The data were extracted from public internet forums with the help of the web scraping tool called Outscraper.com. Once collected, textual analysis was carried out using the IRAMUTEQ software (<http://www.iramuteq.org/>), and then analysis was carried out in the light of the literature.

Sample characterization

The locus of this research corresponded to 20 restaurants in Brasília-DF, Brazil, with a rating equal to or greater than 4 stars, considering the information registered on Google Maps. According to an analysis by the National Restaurant Association (ANR, 2024), in February 2024, in Brazil, revenues from food services, mainly offered by restaurants and bars, grew by 7.0% in real terms, i.e. already adjusted for inflation. The Federal District (DF) stands out among the regions with the highest growth, with a 10% increase in sales in February 2024.

The establishments studied offer a la carte service, allowing customers to choose from a menu and a home delivery service. These establishments

are considered “expensive,” represented by three-dollar signs (\$\$\$), with the average ticket per person ranging from \$35.00 to \$45.00. The study focused on restaurants of similar size. The establishments are located in the upscale neighborhoods of Asa Sul, Asa Norte, and the Lago Sul and Lago Norte regions, with privileged views of Lake Paranoá.

Data collection procedure

To identify the causes of VCD from the perspective of restaurant customers, a sample of $N = 1,000$ negative reviews/comments from customers who used the restaurant services was extracted from Google Maps, with 50 comments per establishment. The selection criteria were reviews between 1 and 3 stars, posted between 2018 and 2022, with priority given to the lowest scoring and most recent reviews. Due to ethical concerns with the research, the names of the restaurants were kept confidential and numbered from 1 to 20 to protect their identities.

We chose the Google Maps platform because there are many service reviews, and you only need to be a Google user to rate, making the process more democratic and inclusive. Customers can rate their service experience on the website and post comments, criticisms, suggestions, and praise. This work focuses on criticism and dissatisfaction as part of the VCD construct. Therefore, the reviews with the lowest rating (1, 2, and 3 stars) were extracted, as these indicate a service perceived/rated as being of poor quality or not meeting the customer's expectations.

Data analysis

First, a floating reading was performed on the data collected through web scraping, which scans internal links and website content, an activity usually performed by bots programmed in the R software (Bolbol & Barhoom, 2021). These documents were adequately organized and selected for analysis.

Then, processing and coding the raw data began using the IRAMUTEQ software, version 0.7 (Camargo & Justo, 2013). As a result, IRAMUTEQ generated the descending hierarchical classification (DHC), which will be detailed in the results and discussion section. The tool uses the chi-squared test (χ^2) to perform the analyses, requiring a value greater than 3.84 and $p < 0.05$ for significance (Salviati, 2017). The retention rate was 82.89% (classified segments), indicating a good rate of use of raw data and compatibility with that recommended by the manuals, which stipulate a minimum retention rate of 75% of the total text segments (TSs) (Camargo & Justo, 2013).

Descending Hierarchical Classification (DHC) consists of an analysis that makes groupings (clusters) based on text segments (TSs) of a textual corpus (Sousa et al., 2020). Text segments are fragments of text that represent the environment of words, usually consisting of up to three lines (Salviati, 2017). In this sense, this method classifies TSs considering the words used, dividing the corpus according to the frequency of lemmatized words (Camargo & Justo, 2013). The software performs chi-squared tests (χ^2) to measure how much a given term is associated with a lexical class, forming the dendrogram (Sousa et al., 2020).

The dendrogram graphically represents the lexical classes, describing the path and the partitions made in the corpus until the final formation

of the classes. The analysis carried out by DHC resulted in 6 different classes, as shown in Figure 1. For each of the classes formed, a name was assigned that best represents it, according to the words and expressions present in it. It should be noted that the classes formed are closely related to the attributes of restaurants already mentioned in the literature (Mathayomchan & Taecharunroj, 2020).

Finally, the last stage consisted of processing the results, inference, and interpretation, in which the outputs generated by the software were treated and interpreted by observing the literature on VCD and identifying resource misalignments (Vargo, Maglio & Akaka, 2008), as well as analyzing the occurrence of causes of VCD already listed in the literature (Vafeas *et al.*, 2016; Zhang *et al.*, 2018; Järvi *et al.*, 2018; Laud *et al.*, 2019; Järvi *et al.*, 2020) and also discovering new causes. Furthermore, the results have been assimilated and used to propose possible solutions to minimize the occurrence of VCD in restaurants.

Results and discussions

This section is divided into two parts. The first part presents the textual analyses carried out with IRAMUTEQ on the textual corpus consisting of 1,000 comments from customers who had negative service experiences in the restaurants studied and discusses the results considering the literature. The second part classifies and summarizes the antecedents of VCD according to the literature.

Causes of value co-destruction from the customers' perspective

Class 1: Food refers to reports of poor food quality, highlighting factors such as taste, texture, smell, appearance, temperature, variety, etc. Class 2: Atmosphere presents comments on the physical environment, design, decoration, and location of the restaurant. Class 3: Price is related to cost-benefit and includes complaints about discrepancies between the price charged and the service provided. Class 4: Service deals with the relationship between the company and the customer, including reliability, respect, guarantee, empathy, problem-solving ability, etc. Finally, classes 5 and 6 were created, which are closely related. Class 5: The waiter highlights the customer's dissatisfaction with the table service provided by front-line employees. Class 6: Service emphasizes the delay in providing service and the lack of responsiveness.

In the Descending Hierarchical Classification (DHC), Figure 1, it can be inferred that the issues related to the service provided are the most expressive and recurrent since the sum of classes 5 and 6 results in almost 40% of the classified text segments. This confirms the point that the quality of the food alone does not make restaurants successful (Rossi *et al.*, 2012). Other aspects that influence customers' perceived experience are identified: service, price, and atmosphere.

“It’s not just food; it’s also an experience!”: identifying causes of value co-destruction in restaurants in Brasília

Figure 1.

Descending Hierarchical Classification (DHC) of the textual corpus

Class 4: Service 19,1%			Class 6: Service 21,3%			Class 5: Waiter 18,4%			Class 1: Food 14%			Class 3: Price 14,1%			Class 2: Atmosphere 13%		
	f (st)	χ^2		f (st)	χ^2		f (st)	χ^2		f (st)	χ^2		f (st)	χ^2		f (st)	χ^2
percent	38	86.2	terrible	119	161.4	waiter	124	116.6	shrimp	55	264.5	price	84	230.1	environment	45	159.4
customer	59	68.9	service	156	151.6	table	103	101.5	taste	41	165.1	expensive	64	164.9	food	104	123.5
establishment	29	54.4	wait	98	129.3	carry	36	92.5	plate	106	140.1	real	54	123.2	desire	34	102.0
form	19	46.5	answer	60	62.2	ask	31	81.6	stiff	21	116.1	value	45	114.0	beautiful	16	80.1
owner	12	45.3	waiting line	34	62.1	appear	19	64.1	fish	22	115.8	kilo	19	102.5	pleasant	21	61.2
treat	15	44.4	minute	69	58.9	talk	36	61.7	rice	28	111.2	charge	42	92.4	place	45	58.1
respect	20	42.0	delay	65	54.4	arrive	83	58.8	steak	23	110.2	hold good	32	63.7	pretty	13	52.0
service charge	16	41.3	table	97	53.1	order	56	57.4	crude	19	103.6	better	36	52.8	let	36	51.7
problem	20	39.6	front	16	49.5	say	45	51.4	risotto	27	101.5	high	24	47.2	yummy	12	46.2
occur	13	36.5	educated	18	48.6	minute	60	50.5	come	68	83.4	steakhouse	14	45.2	decoration	11	44.2
mistake	13	36.5	enter	24	45.1	hand	14	46.8	ask	92	72.6	justify	11	39.9	compensate	7	39.3
review	8	33.9	experience	58	42.9	lift	16	43.8	seem	33	68.7	competitor	10	31.3	service	79	38.4
application	9	32.6	organization	9	28.3	look	18	35.2	spice	16	68.5	pay	40	31.2	comfortable	6	32.7
account	8	28.4	sit	19	28.1	clean	9	34.3	stew	15	58.4	cent	5	30.6	median	7	28.8
website	8	28.4	lunch	14	26.0	request	18	33.1	sauce	18	56.8	high	7	30.3	lake	6	27.2

According to the DHC, each class’s empirical evidence (EE) is presented in Tables 1 to 6. The text segments with the highest score were selected using the absolute scoring system. The score is obtained by adding the χ^2 of each word of the TSs classified in the class. Therefore, the higher the score value of a given TS, the stronger its association with the class. It is worth noting that each class grouping presents its variation in score indices (Camargo & Justo, 2013; Salviati, 2017). The “R” column in the above tables represents restaurants from 1 to 20.

Food

Class 1: Food (Table 1) refers to restaurants’ core business: providing customer meals. However, evaluations indicated dissatisfaction regarding the low quality of the food, which may be a problem related to the misalignment of both *operating* and *operating resources* (Vargo & Lusch, 2004). This is because the quality of food depends on tangible resources of the production process (quality of ingredients, machines, and equipment) and the *performance* of cooks (knowledge and skills). Therefore, if these resources are not used properly, the result will be low-quality food, leading to VCD.

“It’s not just food; it’s also an experience!”: identifying causes of value co-destruction in restaurants in Brasília**Table 1.**

Empirical Evidence for Class 1: Food

Class 1: Food	Score	R
Very bad food. Salty fish, hard and burnt shrimp, no spice dessert, yay. Cold banana, chocolate powder on top, no taste at all. Ambience rated 10. Disappointing.	847.07	2
The shrimp risotto was tough and lacked salt (they managed to make the leeks tasteless). The filet was good, but nothing exceptional, with a negative point for a supposed selection of vegetables that had only hard hearts of palm.	842.34	7
The doneness of the rice was not correct, there was no meat or shrimp in the fillet risotto and the shrimp risotto, with the exception of a shrimp that was on my plate.	788.72	11
I went at night with a group of friends, and the self-service that we used as our entrance was very limited in options. We opted for the very salty and extremely oily crispy prawns, and the main course should have been grilled fish fillet (...)	750.71	9
Very nice place with excellent service from the waiters. Good quality shrimp and fish. Unfortunately, the food was terrible. I had a mixed stew that I can't even define the taste of the sauce or what they call 'pirão' (cassava porridge), but it looked like 'soup'.	745.65	15
We ordered three dishes. Shrimp in cheese sauce, which was very salty. Blue 'Picanha', the stove was not lit, and the vinaigrette came after a while, after a complaint. Shrimp à la Greek, the menu details shrimp with breaded cheese (...)	740.42	7
The dinner menu is a joke. Cold, rustic cod fritters with potato flavor. The main dishes with bland shrimp, creamy rice, without comment, rice mixed with cream.	735.41	4
Nice place, but it seems that the waiters were airy. They got our orders wrong. I asked for lemon juice with strawberry, and they got lemon; my friend asked for still water, and they got sparkling water; we ordered crispy shrimp with almond risotto for the main course, and they got shrimp fettuccine.	735.33	13
Shrimp was raw, rice was raw and hard, and potatoes were soaked in oil. The salad was salty, with lots of leaves. We complained, but they didn't care. We left the place, I felt sick, and I threw up what little I could eat.	719.60	7
It's not extraordinary food to charge so much for so little shrimp. The 'moqueca' dish is simple: rice, farofa, fish broth, and 8 shrimps. Total 115.00 reais. (US\$21.00)	716.64	15

When consumers visit a restaurant, they usually have expectations about the service and the dining experience. However, the food does not always meet the customer's preferences, and when this happens, it is said that the restaurant failed to provide the service or integrate the resources (Laud et al., 2019; Järvi et al., 2020). In some cases, it may also happen that customer preferences are not clear (Järvi et al., 2018), which makes it a challenge for restaurants to satisfy their customers when it comes to, for example, the meat and the number of condiments used, because there is a misunderstanding about how to integrate resources (Laud et al., 2019). Finally, it is noted that VCD can also arise due to excessive expectations (Järvi et al., 2020) on the part of customers after visiting other restaurants in the chain or that have the same offer/size.

Atmosphere

Class 2: Atmosphere (Table 2) describes comments related to the physical environment, including design, decoration, furniture, lighting, and restaurant location. In general, the restaurant environment was highly praised by diners. However, some ratings highlighted criticisms such as poor table location; disorganization of the environment for special celebrations; lack of air conditioning; maximum capacity of people exceeded; lack of cleaning; and old furniture

Table 2.

Empirical Evidence for Class 2: Atmosphere

Class 2: Atmosphere	Score	R
Very well decorated, pleasant atmosphere, and very attentive service, but the food leaves something to be desired, soft drinks were a little warm, the burger sauce had a strange taste, prices were a little high for the dishes.	588.43	12
Very nice and cozy atmosphere. However, I didn't have a good experience as promised. I bought a romantic dinner and asked for a quieter place, but they put us at the entrance. The service left a lot to be desired.	546.62	11
Nice atmosphere, but the food the waiter suggested and gave us left a lot to be desired. Little food (even single portions), tasteless, and very expensive. And to think we were celebrating our wedding anniversary. I don't recommend it.	535.52	20
The place has a nice view, but the food leaves something to be desired, the food has no taste and poor presentation, and the very small portion size for two people is only bad for one, I didn't like it. The waiters are friendly.	506.03	4
The food left a lot to be desired, considering the cost and they didn't even inform us about the promotion that the mothers were getting as souvenirs. A smell of an old fryer in the whole room. I didn't even see a benefit.	490.27	15
The place is nice, but the food left a lot to be desired. I ordered a caprese risotto, and it was very mediocre. It's not worth the price.	469.56	16
The food is delicious, but the service leaves a lot to be desired. Paying such a high price for poor service is frustrating. Such a shame. Good thing there's the sea one to make up for it, I won't be going back to this unit.	436.31	3
Excellent meat and nothing else. Buffet was so-so, bad atmosphere, small, no air conditioning and crowded, very high price (95 reais per kilo) (US\$18.00). The service leaves a lot to be desired for the price.	407.50	6
The place caught my attention for its ambience and food, but I left super frustrated with every detail. From the cleaning of the couches (poor) to the employees who did not maintain an adequate standard of presentation and hygiene even outside of a pandemic.	379.30	13
Eccentric atmosphere. Despite the intention, the place is very dark, and the decoration is exaggerated. It's not my taste, but some people like it. Very high prices.	316.42	20

The aspects covered in this class refer to the service landscape (Akaka & Vargo, 2015), that is, the physical and social environment in which services are exchanged between actors. The problems mentioned by customers are related to the operational resources (decoration, physical structure, cleaning, etc.). When these resources are misaligned, VCD are generated, indicating the unavailability of resources (Laud *et al.*, 2019) or the inability of the restaurant to provide the service (Järvi *et al.*, 2020).

Price

Class 3: Price (Table 3) brings together customer reviews that question the value-for-money restaurants offer. Consumers claim that the service experience received does not justify the high price charged by the restaurants evaluated due to the service failures observed.

Table 3.

Empirical Evidence for Class 3: Price

Class 3: Price	Score	R
Exorbitantly expensive for slow table service and tasteless cold food, the buffet has nothing special and costs 83.90 reais (US\$15.30) per kilo; it is only worth going during happy hour to have a draught beer for 5.50 (US\$ 1)(...).	765.67	2
Prices: It is absurd to pay 8.00 reais (US\$1.46) for a 300 ml bottle of water. Drinks and food are also expensive, several restaurants in Brasília offer the same food for much cheaper prices.	726.29	20
Extremely expensive, the price per kilo is 86 reais (US\$15.70). The buffet was not good, quality and variety left something to be desired.	716.24	6
Slow service at the table, you have to be insistent to place an order, bathroom very messy and dirty. The food is good, but not worth the price! For the price charged, they should be better, as it is only expensive when the service is bad, among those mentioned above.	634.67	2
The food was okay, nothing special. I expected a lot more for the price. Note: On the day we went there was a cover charge of 15.00 reais per person (US\$2.74), this was not announced in advance.	602.89	11
When we entered, there was a singer with a guitar, but from the table we were at we couldn't hear or understand any music, but they charged us a cover charge. The <i>moqueca</i> is delicious but not worth the price. We found the restaurant to be very expensive for what it offers.	579.81	17
Most of the trays were empty, and no food was replaced. How can you justify paying a price of 70 reais (US\$12.78) per kilo for the buffet if all the options were not available?	571.05	2
Very good food and decoration, great, but at absurdly expensive prices, I think it goes beyond the ridiculous. It was worth visiting, but there are places where we pay fairer prices.	569.10	20
Absurdly high (prices). Even considering the rise in prices resulting from the pandemic, in my opinion, it doesn't justify charging 120 reais (US\$22) for a relatively simple dish. The menu is quite confusing.	563.55	20
The price is high, but I'm not going to complain exactly about the value, because I believe the combination isn't expensive. The problem is when the company fails to comply with the agreement: sending a smaller quantity than described on the menu.	556.30	18

Plé (2017) states that value is the balance between the benefits and the costs, both monetary and non-monetary, used to obtain them. Therefore, this outcome is expected to be at least balanced because if they are unbalanced, customers will be dissatisfied, and the service encounter will result in CDV. In addition, as these are considered "premium" restaurants, customers will have excessive expectations of service, which providers will not always be able to meet (Järvi et al., 2020).

Complaints regarding the clarification of the cover charge and the information included in the menu stem from the lack of information among the actors (Järvi et al., 2018; Vafeas et al., 2016), which leads to doubts and confusion. Some reports indicate incoherent marketing communication (Järvi et al., 2020).

Service

Class 4: Service (Table 4) represents the relationship between the company and the customer. The responsiveness of restaurants in solving problems is often questioned by customers, from responding to a simple request such as: breaking a sandwich in half to more complex cases such as: contesting the form of consumption. Among the complaints, tipping stands out. Delivery also appeared in this class due to conflicts between employees and delivery people in the exchange of information.

Table 4.

Empirical Evidence for Class 4: Service

Class 4: Service	Score	R
(...) Despite this behavior (when he refuses to break a sandwich in half), he feels entitled to charge a 15 percent service fee. As a result, they lost a customer of over 7 years who frequented, liked, and advertised the establishment.	292.87	13
I also hated the air polluted by the gas burning (anyone who has or wants to avoid respiratory problems should avoid this place) for the level the restaurant wants to reach, it leaves a lot to be desired, after all, cleanliness is basic and tips are optional, and in their case, they get 10 percent It's already a lot for the bad service.	278.68	16
I had a problem with the same employee, I complained to the person in charge, I reported what happened to the customer who was waiting for his delivery, and I recommended that the establishment guide her, because like her, we are there to serve our customers well.	259.05	19
(...) and when talking to the manager, an air of mockery, belittling those whom they should treat well, with quality and respect to guarantee the prosperity of the place. Conclusion: We all pay extra on the bill. The manager is happy to have made another block of customers out of suckers.	256.34	7
I suggest that restaurant managers instruct their employees that tipping is optional and not to treat customers well, that treating customers well is an employee's obligation, and that if the customer does not pay the service charge, it is optional to continue treating them with education.	254.65	3
Such a lack of respect, where the network should organize itself better and not allow this type of occurrence to be visible, especially when it creates discomfort and dissatisfaction for the customer. I will never return to this unit. Extremely high price for terrible service.	249.46	10
The attitude of the employees surprised me because I have been a customer for many years, I have been to the units in Natal and João Pessoa, and I have never had a problem with the service, on the contrary, I have always been served in a cordial and friendly manner by all the employees.	246.62	9
A self-respecting company would go after the customer and make amends for what happened, not counter with untruths. I have made it a point to share information about my experience in detail through the comment and response below. Your attitude is unfortunate.	234.11	13
I haven't been to a restaurant in years. The waiters didn't provide good service because, as I discovered, the owners didn't give them the 10 percent.	225.61	7
Well, my low rating is due to the trickery of the owners. They force us to pay 12 percent instead of 10 percent to the waiters. I think what they provide is weak. I think it is the weakest of all the units in Brasília.	224.74	5

The inability to solve problems cited by customers (Camilleri & Neuhofer, 2017) is a factor leading to VCD, which often occurs due to a lack of agreement on the best way to integrate resources (Laud et al., 2019) or even due to the contextual rigidity of restaurants (Järvi et al., 2020), which limits procedures through the internal rules of the establishments.

The forced collection of tips can be understood as a forced integration of resources (Laud et al., 2019). Another point was the dishonesty of the

establishment in not sharing tips with employees, an attitude described in the literature as a deceptive company behavior (Zhang *et al.*, 2018), and a deceptive integration of resources (Laud *et al.*, 2019).

Finally, the lack of soft skills (Zhang *et al.*, 2018) affects not only the relationship between employees and customers but also between employees and their work teams, affecting the delivery of services to customers.

Waiter

Class 5: Waiters (Table 5) records the main dissatisfactions with the service provided by front-line employees - waiters. The comments mention, among other things, errors in the requested orders and the delay in their correction.

Table 5.

Empirical Evidence for Class 5: Waiter

Class 5: Waiter	Score	R
Horrible. The second time I go the service from the waiters is bad. They brought my friend's burger without the fries, they said they would bring them in 2 minutes, and everyone at the table finished eating, and the fries didn't arrive, I had to call the manager.	534.90	5
We stayed 20 minutes after my friends arrived and called the waiters and they looked and didn't come to our table. I got up and went straight to the manager and explained what happened from the time I walked in until I talked to her.	503.12	5
(...) the water we ordered arrived after 30 minutes of asking for it, the waiter had difficulty giving us individual orders, water started falling from the air conditioner next to our table, making it look like it was raining (...).	496.58	1
(The receptionist) didn't ask us if we wanted a change, nor did she call a waiter to serve us. We waited there, looking around, not knowing what to do. Until we had to stop a waiter and ask how it worked and if we could get up from the table and serve ourselves.	477.33	8
The food we had ordered was out and it never arrived. I yelled wildly at the waiters, who looked and pretended not to see. When I got up to leave, another girl who wasn't the manager came in and asked what was going on and didn't solve anything.	459.72	5
We arrived and ordered wine and water. After 20 minutes I got up (because no one came to the table) and questioned the delay. 5 minutes later the waiter came and although he knew we had already complained, he served another table first, slowly.	457.97	19
When I sat down at the table, the waiter came over and asked, "Have you chosen what you want to drink? I said no, that I was waiting for my friends who would be arriving soon. Soon another waiter came and started to put the dishes on the table. And to my surprise, he put the plate down very forcefully and rudely (...).	443.79	5
My first experience in the restaurant was not good. I went with my friend, and we sat at the table for 30 minutes and no one served us. Waiters came by, we raised our hand to call, and we still weren't served. We got up and left.	427.64	13
Terrible service. We arrived at the restaurant, I waited at the table for 15 minutes, I had to get up 3 times to ask for a waiter at the counter, and I just wasn't served. I left because of the poor service.	427.49	19
Table service doesn't even give customers the opportunity to read the menu and ask what drink and appetizer they can bring. When I mentioned that it was my first time at the restaurant, the waiter frowned. There's a totem outside the door with a QR code that doesn't work.	411.92	12

The lack of attention from waiters, as reported by customers, makes service unfeasible. According to Laud *et al.* (2019), negligence in the integration of resources, anchored in the lack of deliberate attention, can be expressed through the non-receptivity and apathy of employees when they must inte-

grate resources. Still, from this perspective, it is noted that the lack of communication (Vafeas *et al.*, 2016; Järvi *et al.*, 2018) of waiters when presenting the menu, services offered, and recommendations to customers, generates VCD, as customers do not receive the information necessary for the proper integration of resources.

The lack of behavioral skills - soft skills (Zhang *et al.*, 2018) is a problem related to the misalignment of operational resources, manifested by rude conduct and negative facial expressions on the part of waiters. The employees' rigid behavior is due to the rules and regulations imposed by the restaurants. In this way, contextual rigidity (Järvi *et al.*, 2020) limits the quality of service the team offers customers. Finally, errors (Järvi *et al.*, 2018) occur when a customer places an order and does not receive what was requested, leading to further customer dissatisfaction. Zhang *et al.* (2018) described this delay in service delivery as a cause of VCD.

Service

Class 6: Service (Table 6) summarizes criticisms of service delays in two main situations. The first relates to the time to register the order and prepare and deliver the meals. The second situation is related to long queues, highlighting the lack of coordination, which creates injustice and dissatisfaction among those waiting to enter the establishment. There are also complaints about opening hours.

Table 6.

Empirical Evidence for Class 6: Service

Class 6: Service	Score	R
Terrible service. One star for not having the option of zero. It takes a long time to set the table and does not deliver orders. Waiters look as if waiting half an hour for a potato or 20 minutes for a soft drink is normal.	736.23	3
Terrible service. There's no point in being polite when everything takes too long (more than 40 minutes to serve the appetizer). I gave up waiting for a table when I saw so many people complaining about the delay for the main course.	686.71	15
Seven minutes waiting in line, then another 7 minutes at the table, and no one answered. Terrible service.	678.77	10
Terrible service. I got to the restaurant at 8:50, and they said I could still be served. I sat for 15 minutes waiting for the drink menu (which they didn't take), and then they told me I had to leave the restaurant at that time.	631.08	18
Terrible service. I went on Mother's Day, I arrived at 11:30, and it was already full, but there were only a few people in front of me. 2 hours later, you were still waiting, they didn't give you any information, they were very rude, they called people who arrived much later to come in.	590.02	2
Terrible service, endless line, and people never stop arriving. Rating 10 negative, my experience was horrible. A mess.	578.35	1
Terrible, I waited a long time, and when a table opened up, someone who wasn't in line took my place. And they didn't do anything to get the ferrets out, it's a shame. Rating 0 for service.	578.10	7
Terrible experience for a change. Full life. Although empty tables do not occupy. After the long wait. The terrible service. They don't seem to learn. Despite numerous complaints. I'm not going back. I'm going to the competition.	577.91	10
I've been to this restaurant twice, and the experience was terrible both times. The service is terrible, waiters run from side to side, and no one serves. Everything takes forever to arrive, even a soda.	564.70	8
Terrible service. I made a reservation for 10 people, arrived at 6 pm, and 40 minutes later, no table was ready. There was an empty table in front of the lake, and they gave priority to people who weren't there even though they had a reservation and requested a table in front of the lake.	531.43	7

Delays in service delivery (Zhang *et al.*, 2018) are responsible for negative customer experiences and contribute significantly to VCD. Long waiting lines cause confusion and dissatisfaction among the public and demonstrate the inability to provide service (Järvi *et al.*, 2020) of the restaurants studied, as it is a slow process that causes many people to lose the desire to enter the establishment.

Regarding the organization of the waiting line, it is noted that customers who “jump” the queue exhibit inappropriate behavior (Järvi *et al.*, 2018, 2020), which generates VCD. A company that allows injustices to occur and does not adequately punish customers' incivility creates discomfort for other customers, a behavior that fits the notion of deceptive behavior on the part of the company (Zhang *et al.*, 2018) and deceptive integration of resources (Zhang *et al.*, 2018) and deceptive integration of resources (Laud *et al.*, 2019). Finally, problems with opening hours have been reported, mainly due to a lack of information (Vafeas *et al.*, 2016; Järvi *et al.*, 2018).

Summary of the causes of CDV from the customers' perspective

Figura 2 summarizes 10 causes of VCD in the restaurants studied, based on the empirical evidence obtained in the research. The inability to provide service (Järvi *et al.*, 2020) occurs when the restaurant is unable to provide adequate and tasty food to its customers or when it is unable to create an adequate service atmosphere with a clean, pleasant, and organized environment or even when it is unable to provide memorable service experiences to its customers.

Lack of information (Vafeas *et al.*, 2016; Järvi *et al.*, 2018) also generates VCD when the restaurant is unable to establish an adequate flow of communication with its customers. Incoherent marketing communication (Järvi *et al.*, 2020) occurs when the restaurant fails to deliver what was promised, whether through poorly managed promotions, advertising, or an inconsistent and unrealistic menu. Excessive expectations (Järvi *et al.*, 2018; 2020) refer to customers' high expectations based on previous service experiences, whether in the same chain or a restaurant of the same size.

"It's not just food; it's also an experience!": identifying causes of value co-destruction in restaurants in Brasília**Figure 2.**

Summary of the causes of value co-destruction in restaurants

Empirical evidence (EE)	Themes	Aggregate dimensions
Low quality of food offered	Inability to provide adequate and tasty food	
A small amount of food in portions		
Self-service with few varieties		
Disorganization of the environment	Inadequate service atmosphere	Inability to provide the service (Järvi et al., 2020)
Lack of air conditioning or adequate ventilation		
Lack of cleaning and maintenance of the physical structure and furniture		
Inadequate lighting		
Crowded environment with long waiting lines	Lack of communication with customers	Absence of information (Vafeas et al., 2016; Järvi et al., 2018)
Customers are not notified in advance of fees being charged		
Customers do not receive clear information regarding closing times		
Lack of presentation of the menu, services offered, and recommendations	Inability to deliver what was promised	Incoherent marketing communication (Järvi et al., 2020)
Difference between the meal presented on the menu and the one delivered to the consumer		
Problems with advertisements and promotions published by the restaurant and partner websites	Lack of clear expectations (Järvi et al., 2018)	Excessive or inaccurate expectations (Järvi et al., 2018; 2020)
Customer preferences for food aspects are unclear		
Customers imagine a level of service equal to or greater than that of restaurants of the same chain or of the same size that they have previously visited	Expectations based on past experiences	
Rudeness and negative facial expressions by employees	Lack of employee soft skills (Zhang et al., 2018)	Inappropriate employee behavior
Conflict between employees in their work teams		
Lack of attention from waiters - unresponsiveness and apathy	Negligence in resource integration (Laud et al., 2019)	
The customer places an order, and it is not delivered as requested	Error in order delivery	Errors (Järvi et al., 2018)
The waiter makes a mistake and changes orders		
It takes time to register the order, prepare and deliver the meals	Delays in meal delivery	Delays in service delivery (Zhang et al., 2018)
Customers 'jump' the queue	Deceptive feature integration (Laud et al., 2019)	Inappropriate customer behavior (Kashif et al., 2015)
The restaurant does not pass on tips to waiters	Deceptive feature integration (Laud et al., 2019)	Inappropriate company behavior
The company allows injustice and does not punish customer incivility		
Forced tip collection (service charge)	Coercive Integration of Resources (Laud et al., 2019)	
Rigid behavior of employees when resolving problems	Inability to solve problems (Camilleri et al., 2017)	Contextual Rigidity (Järvi et al., 2020)

Based on Script Theory (Järvi *et al.*, 2020), it is noted that any of the actors can contribute to VCD if they do not follow cognitive scripts. Employees may be rude to customers and colleagues due to a lack of soft skills (Zhang *et al.*, 2018). Customers may misbehave (Kashif *et al.*, 2015), reducing their service well-being and harming the company or even the experience of other customers. Finally, companies may engage in deceptive resource integration (Laud *et al.*, 2019) when they act dishonestly or coercively by charging non-voluntary service fees. Another identified factor is the delay in service delivery (Zhang *et al.*, 2018), represented by the delay in meal registration, processing, and delivery. Finally, contextual rigidity is identified (Järvi *et al.*, 2020), where rigid rules and regulations of establishments hinder the ability of staff to resolve simple problems and requests from customers.

■ FINAL REMARKS

This study analyzed the causes of value co-destruction in restaurants located in Brasília-DF, Brazil, based on online customer reviews highlighting negative service experiences. The textual analysis of customer dissatisfaction made it possible to understand the main problems that reduce the level of service offered by establishments, providing insights for value co-destruction and improvement of service experiences.

Theoretical contributions

Drawing on existing literature (Vafeas *et al.*, 2016; Zhang *et al.*, 2018; Järvi *et al.*, 2018; Laud *et al.*, 2019; Järvi *et al.*, 2020), the study identifies 10 reasons that can lead to value destruction (VDC) in restaurants. These reasons include inability to provide the service, lack of information, incoherent marketing communication, excessive or inaccurate expectations, inappropriate employee behavior, errors, delays in service delivery, inappropriate customer or company behavior, and contextual rigidity. The research highlights that most complaints are related to the misalignment of operational resources (Vargo & Lusch, 2004), that is, the subjective and intangible aspects that makeup customer service, in contrast to previous studies that focused more on tangible aspects (operational resources). Furthermore, the study contributes to developing the service marketing literature, especially in the Brazilian and Latin American context, where the value co-destruction approach is still little explored.

Managerial contributions

The study highlights the importance of customer service as one of the most critical aspects of a positive service experience. To promote value co-creation rather than value co-destruction, it is necessary to ensure that professionals are courteous, responsive, and empathetic to customers. To improve customer service, training, development, and education (TD&E) must be promoted so that professionals develop customer service skills, as they are the protagonists of the service experience in restaurants and catalysts for value co-creation. Organizations must create value co-creation strategies (Echeverri & Skålén,

2011), inviting customers to participate in the service improvement. In addition to requesting feedback, consumers must realize that their opinions have been considered and used to formulate improvements (Zhang *et al.*, 2018). Finally, organizations must be aware of mismatched expectations and inappropriate behavior from customers and employees and take steps to mitigate these contributing factors to VCD.

Study limitations and future avenues

The main limitation of this research is that it does not examine the interface between the service provider and the employees. Since the approach is VCD, it is assumed that each actor can be responsible for decreasing their well-being or that of third parties. Therefore, customers can also contribute to VCD, which makes it necessary to investigate the other interface, that is, the actors that make up the organizations, such as managers and front-line employees. Therefore, it is recommended that future research investigate how customer behavior can affect the level of service, seeking to understand the reasons that lead to VCD from the perspective of organizational members. Another limitation is that the study examines a specific group of restaurants and data from only one platform. This inhibits the generalization of the causes of VCD to the entire food service sector. Therefore, it is necessary to develop research that includes other types of restaurants and uses data from other online review forums to understand the VCD phenomenon more broadly.



REFERENCES

- Associação Nacional de Restaurantes – ANR. (2024). Crescimento de 7% nas vendas de restaurantes em fevereiro de 2024, aponta análise da Future Tank. São Paulo, 2024. <https://anrbrasil.org.br/crescimento-de-7-nas-vendas-de-restaurantes-em-fevereiro-de-2024-aponta-analise-da-future-tank/>
- Akaka, M. A.; Vargo, S. L. (2015). Extending the context of service: from encounters to ecosystems. *Journal of Services Marketing*. 29(6/7), 453-462. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JSM-03-2015-0126>
- Associação Brasileira da Indústria de Alimentos – ABIA. (2021). Serviços de alimentação estimam crescimento para 2021. São Paulo, 2021. Disponível em: <https://www.abia.org.br/releases/servicos-de-alimentacao-estimam-crescimento-para-2021>. Acesso em: 15 Abr. 2022.
- Baptista, T. F.; Hemais, M. W. (2020). Reclamações fraudulentas a partir de características da cultura brasileira: um estudo qualitativo utilizando a técnica projetiva. *Revista Eletrônica de Administração*. 26(1), 81-113. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1413-2311.275.94047>
- Bolbol, N.; Barhoom, T. (2021). Mitigating Web Scrapers using Markup Randomization. *2021 Palestinian International Conference on Information and Communication Technology (PICICT)*. 157-162. <https://doi.org/10.1109/PICICT53635.2021.00038>
- Camargo, B. V.; Justo, A. M. (2013). IRAMUTEQ: Um software gratuito para análise de dados textuais. *Temas Em Psicologia*. 21(2), 513–518. <https://dx.doi.org/10.9788/TP2013.2-16>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-09-2016-0492>
- Echeverri, P.; Skålen, P. (2011). Co-creation and co-destruction: A practice-theory based study of interactive value formation. *Marketing Theory*. 11(3), 351–373. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1470593111408181>
- Farias, J.S.; Díez-Vial, I. D. (2022). “¡Nunca volveré a este hotel!”: Investigando causas de La Value Co-Destruction (VCD) en comentarios de huéspedes y la perspectiva de directivos de hoteles. *Investigaciones Turísticas*. (23), 290-313. <https://doi.org/10.14198/INTURI2022.23.13>
- Galunion. Alimentação na Pandemia: A Visão dos Operadores de Food service. 1ª. Edição. Mar-Abr 2022. Disponível em: <https://www.galunion.com.br/materiais/>. Acesso em: 15 Jul. 2022.

- Grönroos, C. (2008). Service logic revisited: Who creates value? And who co-creates? *European Business Review*, 20(4), 298–314. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09555340810886585>
- Guo, Y.; Barnes, S. J.; Jia, Q. (2017). Mining meaning from online ratings and reviews: Tourist satisfaction analysis using latent dirichlet allocation. *Tourism Management*. 59, 467-483. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2016.09.009>
- Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística – IBGE (2019). Pesquisa de Orçamentos Familiares 2017-2018. Rio de Janeiro. Disponível em: <https://biblioteca.ibge.gov.br/visualizacao/livros/liv101742.pdf>
- Järvi, H.; Kähkönen, A. K.; Torvinen, H. (2018). When value co-creation fails: Reasons that lead to value co-destruction. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*. 34(1), 63-77. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scaman.2018.01.002>
- Järvi, H.; Keränen, J.; Ritala, P.; Vilko, J. (2020). Value co-destruction in hotel services: Exploring the misalignment of cognitive scripts among customers and providers. *Tourism Management*. 77, 104030. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2019.104030>
- Kashif, M; Zarkada, A. (2015). Value co-destruction between customers and frontline employees: A social system perspective. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 33(6), 672-691. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJBM-09-2014-0121>
- Laud, G.; Bove, L.; Ranaweera, C.; Leo, W.; Sweeney, J.; Smith, S. (2019). Value co-destruction: a typology of resource misintegration manifestations. *Journal of Services Marketing*. 33(7), 866-889. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JSM-01-2019-0022>
- Mathayomchan, B.; Taecharungroj, V. (2020). “How was your meal?” Examining customer experience using Google maps reviews. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*. 90, 102641. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2020.102641>
- Plé, L. (2016). Studying customers’ resource integration by service employees in interactional value co-creation. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 30(2), 152–164. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JSM-02-2015-0065>
- Plé, L. (2017). Why Do We Need Research on Value Co-destruction? *Journal of Creating Value*. 3(2), 162–169. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2394964317726451>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1108/08876041011072546>
- Prahalad, C. K.; Ramaswamy, V. (2004). Co-creation experiences: the next practice in value creation. *Journal of interactive marketing*. 18(3), 5-14. <https://doi.org/10.1002/dir.20015>

- Ratinaud, P. (2009). IRAMUTEQ: Interface de R pour les Analyses Multidimensionnelles de Textes et de Questionnaires [Computer software]. Disponível em: <http://www.iramuteq.org>
- Ribeiro, T. L. S.; Costa, B. K.; Ferreira, M. P.; Freire, O. B. L. (2023). Value co-creation in tourism and hospitality: A systematic literature review, *European Management Journal*, 41(6), 985-999. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2022.12.001>
- Rocha, A.; Viegas, C. (2023). Challenges of Food Service towards Sustainability Beyond Food Waste. *Highlights of Sustainability*, 2(1), 10–15. <https://doi.org/10.54175/hsustain2010002>
- Rossi, G. B.; Silva, D.; Debessa, F. N.; Garcia, M. N. (2012). Percepção de valor dos consumidores de serviços de restaurantes: um estudo com modelagem de equações estruturais. *Revista Brasileira de Marketing*, São Paulo, 11(3), 27-52. <https://doi.org/10.5585/remark.v11i3.2291>
- Lucian, R.; Farias, S. A.; Salazar, V. S. (2008). Emoção, ambiente e sabores: a influência do ambiente de serviços na satisfação de consumidores de restaurantes gastronômicos. *Observatório de Inovação do Turismo – Revista Acadêmica*, 3(4). <https://doi.org/10.12660/oit.v3n4.5728>
- Salviati, M. E. (2017). *Manual do Aplicativo IRAMUTEQ (versão 0.7 Alpha 2 e R Versão 3.2.3)*. Compilação, organização e notas de Maria Elisabeth Salviati. Disponível em: <http://www.iramuteq.org/documentation/fichiers/manual-do-aplicativo-iramuteq-par-maria-elisabeth-salviati>
- Shock, P. J.; Bowen, J. T.; Stefanelli, J. M. (2004). *Restaurant Marketing for Owners and Managers*. New Jersey: Wiley.
- Sousa, Y. S. O.; Gondim, S. M. G.; Carias, I. A.; Batista, J. S.; Machado D. C. M. (2020). O uso do software Iramuteq na análise de dados de entrevistas. *Pesquisas e Práticas Psicossociais*.15(2), 1-19.
- Vafeas, M.; Hughes, T.; Hilton, T. (2016). Antecedents to value diminution: A dyadic perspective. *Marketing Theory*, 16(4), 469-491. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1470593116652005>
- Vargo, S. L.; Lusch, R. F. (2004). Evolving to a New Dominant Logic for Marketing. *Journal of Marketing*. 68(1), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.68.1.1.24036>
- Vargo, S. L.; Lusch, R. F. (2006). Service-dominant logic: What it is, What it is not, What it might be. The service dominant logic of marketing: Dialog debate and directions. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*. 6. 281-288.
- Vargo, S. L.; Lusch, R. F. (2008). Service-dominant logic: Continuing the evolution. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 36(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-007-0069-6>

- Vargo, S. L.; Lusch, R. F. (2016). Institutions and axioms: An extension and update of service-dominant logic. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 44(1) 5-23. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-015-0456-3>
- Vargo, S. L.; Maglio, P. P.; Akaka, M. A. (2008). On value and value co-creation: A service systems and service logic perspective. *European management journal*. 26(3), 145-152. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2008.04.003>
- Yan, X.; Wang, J.; Chau, M. (2015). Customer revisit intention to restaurants: Evidence from online reviews. *Inf Syst Front*. 17(3), 645–657. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10796-013-9446-5>
- Yurt, I.; Sağır, Y. E. (2023). Yiyecek içecek işletmelerindeki personel davranışlarının müşterinin yeme içme deneyimine etkisi. *Gastroia: journal of gastronomy and travel research*, 7(2), 448-460. doi: 10.32958/gastoria.1360913
- Zhang, T.; Lu, C.; Torres, E.; Chen, P. (2018). Engaging customers in value co-creation or co-destruction online. *Journal of Services Marketing*. 32(1), 57–69. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JSM-01-2017-0027>



NOTES

Usage License

The authors grant **Revista de Ciências da Administração** exclusive rights for first publication, with the work simultaneously licensed under the **Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) 4.0 International license**. This license allows third parties to remix, adapt, and create from the published work, provided proper credit is given to the author and the initial publication in this journal. Authors are authorized to enter into additional agreements for non-exclusive distribution of the version of the work published in this journal (e.g., publishing in an institutional repository, on a personal website, as a translation, or as a book chapter), with recognition of authorship and initial publication in this journal.

Publisher

Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina. Departamento de Ciências da Administração. Published on the **Portal de Periódicos UFSC**. The ideas expressed in this article are the responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily represent the opinions of the editors or the university.

Publishers

- Rosalia Aldraci Barbosa Lavarda
- Leandro Dorneles dos Santos

History

Received:	17-11-2023
Approved:	20-08-2024
Published:	23-10-2024