

Deakin Research Online

Deakin University's institutional research repository

This is the authors' final peer reviewed version of the item published as:

Ramsey White, Tabitha, Hede, Anne-Marie and Rentschler, Ruth 2009, Lessons from arts experiences for service-dominant logic, *Marketing intelligence and planning*, vol. 27, no. 6, pp. 775-788.

Available from Deakin Research Online:

<http://hdl.handle.net/10536/DRO/DU:30021126>

Reproduced with the specific permission of the copyright owner.

Copyright : 2009, Emerald Group Publishing Limited

Lessons from arts experiences for service-dominant logic

Tabitha Ramsey White, *Centre for Leisure Management Research, Faculty of Business and Law, Deakin University, Burwood, Australia*

Anne-Marie Hede, *Centre for Tourism and Services Research, School of Hospitality, Tourism and Marketing, Faculty of Business and Law, Victoria University, Melbourne, Australia*

Ruth Rentschler, *School of Management and Marketing, Deakin University, Burwood, Australia*

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to acknowledge VicHealth for their support of this project.

Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of this paper is to consider whether art experiences can inform service-dominant logic (SDL) discourse through an exploration of the co-production and co-creation processes of art experiences.

Design/methodology/approach – Empirical knowledge gained about art experiences is analysed to identify emergent themes about co-production and co-creation. Four modes of qualitative data collection are employed: research participant diaries, photo elicitation, in depth interviews and focus groups.

Findings – Key findings are there are three stakeholders involved in the co-creation of art experiences, which all have critical and different roles; co-creation and co-production are both temporally based and evolving and there are points where they interact and intersect; and high levels of engagement in co-production enhance individuals' contribution to the co-creation of positive value and make their participation in future co-production opportunities more likely.

Research limitations/implications – The paper is exploratory and not a general population study. The methodology and sample of participants employed do not allow for the generalisation of the findings to the broader population.

Practical implications – Organisations may benefit from devising strategies to encourage greater dialogue and connection between all stakeholders involved in co-production and co-creation. The higher the level of individuals' co-production of art experiences the greater likelihood of positive value being co-created. Furthermore, the greater the possibility of individuals engaging in other co-production experiences in the future. While individuals are attracted to co-production possibilities, there are factors that are external to an experience that can act as either barriers to or facilitators of co-production, and that consequently impact on co-creation.

Originality/value – There is little extant research that explores the applicability of art experiences to SDL. This paper is significant in that it employs empirical research methods to develop knowledge on the topic. Furthermore, this paper is innovative in that it seeks to see

whether the art experiences can inform generic marketing models, rather than whether generic marketing models can inform arts marketing.

Keyword(s): Arts; Marketing; Marketing models; Relationship marketing.

1 Introduction

Marketing theory is currently experiencing a paradigm shift. Marketing theory is being re-shaped by service-dominant logic (SDL; Vargo and Lusch, 2004). Within this paradigm, consumers are thought to be actively involved in the co-production of their consumption experiences and in the co-creation of the value that can be derived from those experiences (Etgar, 2008; Lusch and Vargo, 2006; Rowley *et al.*, 2007; Saren, 2007; Vargo and Lusch, 2004). Co-creation occurs when consumers contribute to determining the perceived value of an organisation and its offerings. Co-production occurs when consumers actively contribute to the production of goods or services. Consumers and organisations are the beneficiaries of both co-production and co-creation. In addition, SDL recognises that consumption is not only based on a simple exchange related to goods or services on offer, but also it is based on a complex exchange where consumption is experience based. Why and how consumers engage in and experience co-production and how they co-create the value derived from those experiences is a critical issue for organisations (Etgar, 2007). While in some quarters SDL is being commended as a new paradigm for marketing, it is still relatively embryonic in its development, particularly, when compared to other marketing orientations. Thus, further analysis and discussion of SDL is warranted across a range of consumption experiences to explore its relevance to the field of marketing.

Given that art[1] is experience-based (Boorsma, 2006), it is likely that developing an understanding of individuals' perceptions of their art experiences[2] may be beneficial in informing SDL. Thus, this paper explores individuals' perceptions of art experiences with a view to inform SDL theory and practice. This paper focuses on individuals' perceptions of co-production and co-creation and the interactions, intersections and points of difference of the co-production and co-creation of art experiences.

This paper is organised in the following way. The fundamental principles of SDL are presented, followed by a discussion of the position taken in this paper that art is an experience rather than a product. The research question and objectives are then posited and the method used to examine them is detailed. The findings and a discussion of them are then presented, with the theoretical and practical implications noted and the limitations of the study acknowledged. The paper concludes with recommendations for further research.

2 Background

“Organizations, markets, and society are fundamentally concerned with exchange of service – the applications of competences (knowledge and skills) for the benefit of a party” (Lusch and Vargo, 2008, section Home, para 1). This is the premise upon which Vargo and Lusch (2004) have developed their service-dominant logic. While SDL is now more widely acknowledged as being a valid lens through which to view marketing, originally Lusch and Vargo's perspective on marketing had its critics (Schembri, 2006). As “co-creation” and “co-production” were initially used synonymously requests for clarification about SDL, particularly about the differences between co-production and co-creation, were the impetus for debate and further discussions (Etgar, 2008).

Recently, there is a different understanding of co-production and co-creation from that initially proposed by SDL. Co-creation is when consumers contribute to the creation of the value of organisations and their offerings. It begins with the premise that the value of the transaction between suppliers and consumers “can only be created with and determined by the user in the ‘consumption’ process” (Lusch and Vargo, 2006, p. 284). Thus, co-creation of value for suppliers and consumers occurs during consumption; it is mediated by the product that is on offer. This is described as the value-in-use (Lusch and Vargo, 2006). Co-production, however, is a component of co-creation. Lusch and Vargo (2006, p. 284) explain that co-production:

[...] involves the participation in the creation of the core offering itself. In co-production, consumers are actively involved in the production of the organisation's offerings. Co-production can occur through shared inventiveness, co-design, or shared production of related goods, and can occur with customers and any other partners in the value network.

Thus, co-production occurs during the production stage – before the consumption stage (Etgar, 2008).

Co-creation and co-production are both components of relationship marketing (Gummesson, 2008; Rowley *et al.*, 2007) in which organisations view consumers as critical assets and attempt to build strong ongoing relationships with them in order to create value for each other (Rowley *et al.*, 2007; Saren, 2007). In relationship marketing, service is connected to consumers' experiences with the organisation and its offerings (Gummesson, 2008; Prhlahad and Ramaswamy, 2000; Rowley *et al.*, 2007; Schembri, 2006; Vargo and Lusch, 2006). The offering may be tangible or intangible. In this context, consumption is experiential. Holbrook and Hirschman (1982, p. 132) describe this as “phenomenological in spirit [...] a primarily subjective state of consciousness with a variety of symbolic meanings, hedonic responses, and esthetic criteria”. Holbrook and Hirschman's (1982) position, which referred to art experiences, echoes that of Dewey (1958). Dewey (1958) proposed that the consumption of art is an experience, which involves both tangible and intangible components, rather than a product. He posited that artists and recipients of art (hereafter referred to as recipients) have active relationships with works of art that result in the art experience.

Contemporary arts marketing academics have revisited Dewey's work and view art as an experience of artists and/or recipients (Jackson, 1998, p. 282; Sigurjonsson, 2005, p. 283; Fillis, 2004, p. 408; Bamford, 2006, p. 206). Each experience of art is unique due to the unique relationship between each individual (both artist or recipient) and the work of art. This idea is explained by Fillis (2004, p. 127) using the example of an experience with a painting:

Artistic consumption centres around the artist and the product. Each time a painting is “consumed” by a different observer, a different subjective experience occurs. The meaning assigned to the painting changes, although its physical composition remains constant. Ultimately each cultural consumer obtains a unique set of intellectual and emotional reactions from the experience.

Relating her comments to Dewey's proposition, Boorsma (2006, p. 75) argues that as “art production and consumption are essentially communicative acts”, both artists and recipients play a role in the co-production of art experiences and the co-creation of their value. She further argues that the art experience involves both the creation and reception of a product of art, recipients should not be viewed as passive audiences, but as active participants in the co-

production of the art experience. As such both artists and recipients are co-producers of the art experience, but recipients are not necessarily a co-producer of the art product in terms of its form (Boorsma, 2006, p. 85). Thus, Boorsma suggests that SDL is relevant to the marketing of the arts, and while she did not undertake primary research, her review of empirical projects on related topics, indicate that further research is warranted on the synergy between SDL and the consumption of art. We heed this call for further research. The question guiding this study is therefore: Can an examination of individuals' perceptions of their art experiences assist to inform SDL theory? Thus, this paper is not about whether generic marketing models and strategies can be applied to the marketing of art experiences. Rather, it explores whether art experiences can inform generic marketing theory and practice. The research objectives were to:

- Identify the various stakeholders involved in the co-production and co-creation of art experiences and explore their roles.
- Explore the interactions, intersections, and points of difference between co-production and co-creation as they occur in art experiences.
- Explore the implications of individuals' perceptions of co-production and co-creation for art organisations.
- Determine what, if any, lessons can be learnt for the benefit of SDL by obtaining a greater understanding of arts experiences.

3 Method

This paper emphasises the perspective of the research participants (hereafter referred to as participants) with regard to how they understand their art experiences and the ways they engaged in these experiences. In this way we gained in depth *a posteriori* knowledge about art experiences. Participants were artists and recipients and the knowledge gained is based on both of these perspectives. As such, participants were not staff of art organisations. Multiple methods of data collection were employed to facilitate the trustworthiness of the data through triangulation (Bryman, 2004; Hussey and Hussey, 1997; Yin, 1984). Four methods of qualitative data collection were used:

1. Photos to elicit participant responses regarding experiences, meaning, perception and significance about the research topic (Pullman and Robson, 2006; Hurworth, 2003; Hurworth *et al.*, 2005). Two forms of photos were used in this research: photo elicitation (participants taking photos responding to a theme, in this case art experiences) and reflexive photography (photos used to develop questions for in depth interviews; Harper, 2002; Hurworth, 2003; Oliffe and Bottorff, 2007).
2. Diaries to record what individuals do, think and feel. Two forms of the diary were used in this research: diaries where participants keep descriptive records of their lives and diary-interviews where participants keep a diary, responding to specific themes, for a limited time frame from which questions that meet the research needs are developed for in depth interviews (Plummer in Hussey and Hussey, 1997, p. 154). Participants kept diaries for two weeks writing entries about how they engaged with art and the impact of those experiences.
3. In depth interviews to encourage participants to speak freely and spontaneously about their experiences and about what is significant for them regarding the topic being researched (Esterberg, 2002; Mishler, 1986). In depth interviews were conducted based on questions developed from the diaries and photos.

4. Focus groups to “produce qualitative data that provide insight into the attitudes, perceptions, and opinions of participants” (Krueger, 1994, p. 19) on a particular pre-determined topic. Three focus groups were conducted, each comprising six to eight participants, which explored ideas that were raised in the in depth interviews.

The resulting data were analysed using the two key components of the SDL paradigm – that is, co-production and co-creation. We sought to explore these components with regard to the research objectives.

4 Findings and discussion

There are three key findings of this study, each of which responds to the afore-mentioned research objectives. The three findings all relate to how stakeholders' contributions to co-production and co-creation allow for synergies to develop between co-production and co-creation, which in turn enhance the possibility of future stakeholder participation. The three findings are:

1. There are three stakeholders involved in the co-creation of art experiences which all have critical and different roles.
2. Co-creation and co-production are both temporally based and evolving and there are points where they interact and intersect.
3. High levels of engagement in co-production enhance individuals' contribution to the co-creation of positive value and make their participation in future co-production opportunities more likely.

Each of the findings is now discussed in detail.

4.1 Finding one: there are three stakeholders involved in the co-creation of art experiences which all have critical and different roles

In this study, participants perceived that there were three key stakeholders that contributed to the co-production and co-creation of art experiences, namely artists, recipients and art organisations. The contribution of all the stakeholders was seen as unique but critical in the co-production of positive art experiences. Positive art experiences were necessary in order for the co-creation of positive value to occur. The three stakeholders were perceived as contributing as follows:

Artists contribute to art experiences as both suppliers and consumers. They supply tangible art products that initiate the co-production of art experiences. They were also perceived as being consumers of art experiences. Their participation involves a series of conceptual and practical processes to explore or express a concept or idea. One participant explained this as starting with:

[...] the decision-making process that an artist is engaged with. Each decision that you take has significance. Each has a different meaning than every other decision. Those meanings are you speaking (May, in depth interview).

Recipients contribute to art experiences as a consumer by receiving the experience. They also contribute to the supply by interpreting or discussing the art product which is part of co-producing art experiences. This involves the conceptual processes of ascribing their own

meaning and understanding to a work of art. One participant described this in a diary entry stating that:

[...] I think the recipient should work a little. An artwork should arrest and engage the recipient's attention. Art does require thought and an inquiring mind to be fully appreciated. It should not fully explain itself (Cameron, diary entry).

Art organisations contribute to the supply of art experiences by collecting, curating and presenting works of art. Notably, participants felt that art organisations could add to and/or detract from their motivation to co-produce art experiences. Participants also felt that art organisations contributed to the co-creation of the value of their own organisation and the experiences it offers. This was explained by one participant who said:

I think when it's [art is] in a formal setting that there's a perception that there's a value put on it almost immediately [...] it's been accepted into a dedicated museum or a gallery that it's perceived to be somehow intrinsically be more profound or whatever. But, I know when I went to the Tate Modern, 90% of the stuff there I thought was crap (Jon, focus group participant).

A participant summed up the involvement of all three stakeholders in an art experience using the following example:

I will be performing at the Palais. This should be very exciting. I hope my songs will be appreciated in style, lyrical content and song structure. Performance is really essential. An audience is the completion to the experience of song writing. The live element is the chemistry that can't be manufactured. I want to move people and I want to be moved and inspired. (Cameron, diary entry).

All three stakeholders' positive contribution was perceived as essential for positive value to be co-created by the art experiences. The art organisation was recognised as being essential for providing the context in which the artist and recipients could have the art experience. The quotation illustrates the interrelated nature of co-production and co-creation between artists, recipients and organisations. Notably, another participant acknowledged that the other stakeholders' contribution could influence an artist when making a work of art:

When I'm doing [art] work, I'm doing it for people to look at and I have no qualms about admitting that I play to the gallery. I want people to like my work and I want to engage them as well. I do spend a lot of time thinking about putting myself in other people's shoes, trying to put myself in as a virtual audience member to my work (Leroy, focus group participant).

These examples point toward an expansion of traditional understandings of co-production and co-creation, which view them as occurring between two stakeholders only: consumers and organisations (Etgar, 2007; Lusch and Vargo, 2006; Vargo and Lusch, 2004). In terms of art experiences, SDL does not account for the co-production and co-creation that occur between artist and recipients, which were viewed by participants as an inherent part of all art experiences. Furthermore, artists and recipients were seen as contributing to the supply and consumption of art experiences, whereas SDL is premised on individuals holding only the role of consumer. Those engaged with art often inhabit a dual role of both supplier and consumer of art experiences. One participant described this in their interview as:

Art [experiences are] the result of an artist saying what they think [...] it starts as a process of communication in visual form, and continues when the recipient encounters it and decides what they think it means [...] As an artist, I would want to produce something that has a meaning but that the recipient can also do with that meaning what they find relevant (May, diary entry).

Another participant echoed this sentiment stating:

For me it [an art experience] is about making something for an audience, putting it there on show and an audience seeing it and reforming it. There is a whole kind of two way process (Sarah, in depth interview).

Another participant concurred with this view commenting “[...] In many ways art is static and only comes alive at the willingness of its observer” (Cameron, diary entry). As described earlier, scholars (Boorsma, 2006; Dewey, 1958; Fillis, 2006) have either explicitly or implicitly argued that co-production and co-creation occur between artists and recipients, however the influential role of the art organisation in this exchange has not been teased out in detail. This study found that the dynamics of the relationships between artists, recipients and art organisations is a key factor in determining the extent to which co-production and co-creation exist in art experiences.

4.2 Finding two: co-creation and co-production are both temporally based and evolving and there are points where they interact and intersect

While, Lusch and Vargo's (2006) view is that co-production is one component of co-creation, we found that there are points where co-production and co-creation in art experiences both interact and intersect. This interaction can be found in the key dimensions of the co-production of an art experience, which were also perceived by participants as comprising the value (co-creation) of that experience for individuals. The co-production of art experiences on the part of artists or recipients is comprised of one or more of these dimensions. When these dimensions were manifest in a positive way, the value that was co-created was also positive. Therefore, these dimensions directly related to both the co-production of the art experience and the co-creation of the value of that experience. This is the point of intersection and interaction between co-creation and co-production. The dimensions are:

- Connection refers to relationships between people (such as between artists and recipients or between recipients). A participant described this a diary entry as:

My best friends are people that share a similar life perspective that has been affected by art and arts related activities and interests [...] my life [is] truly enriched by art related associations (Isabelle, diary entry).

- Discourse refers to art as form of exchange between people. A participant explained, “Music teaches you a lot about things, just world concepts and things that are going and so does visual art. So it's a very strong way of communicating new ideas” (Jade, focus group participant).
- Meaning-making refers to how people make meaning of their lives and their world. One participant explained that:

The life experience that you have you certainly use [when making art]. I spend a lot of time thinking. But if I didn't then I wouldn't come up with the artwork. So, I do spend a lot of time thinking about the experiences I've had in life and the way I experience people and that becomes really important to then make some kind of visual or musical statement. Not because I think people need to hear it or see it, just that it's something for me I need to do (Cameron, in depth interview).

- Perception refers to how people view themselves and their world. A participant explained that art can:

[...] bring into focus something that you might never have thought about, and it might give you an insight into somebody else's way of life, the way a different community functions, or the way a different religion, that you may never have any conception of (Jon, focus group participant).

- Sensation refers to impact on the senses. A participant commented:

The most important thing is that either the artist or the artwork itself expresses, an emotional point of view of the world, because otherwise I can't see why there would be any other point (Rusty, in depth interview).

- Wellbeing refers to a general sense of contentment with one's self, one's life and the world. One participant wrote in a diary entry:

Art directs the obsessiveness of my thoughts. Without art in my life, I would be emptier and a boiling pot of angst. It is a slow release of internal discoveries (Cameron, diary entry).

This study identified that the co-production and co-creation of art experiences are not static. Indeed, we found they are evolving processes of constant supply and demand as each moment of engagement with an art product simultaneously supplies the art experience and allows the individual to consume it. The art experience is not only co-produced when artists or recipients initially engage with the work of art, but also recurs when they physically or conceptually engage with it in the future. A participant described this, explaining:

There's loads of stuff produced that's aesthetically pleasing, but what makes something enduring? What makes you want to look at it now and in 10 or 15 or 20 years time? If I like a film I'll watch it ten or 15 times. I'm not going to watch a Hollywood blockbuster that's a cutting edge of technology or technique, but is hollow, doesn't say anything, doesn't have a narrative I can identify with. For me it needs to say something to you. If it doesn't say anything then it's just nice to look at (Jon, focus group participant).

Our research indicates that the more intense the co-production, the greater the co-creation of positive value of that experience. Consequently, co-production and co-creation are both temporal (occurring at any moment of initial or recurrent engagement with the work of art) and evolving (each action of co-production influences future actions of co-production and influences co-creation).

4.3 Finding three: high levels of engagement in co-production enhance individuals' contribution to the co-creation of positive value and make their participation in future co-production opportunities more likely

Co-production emerged when participants felt intensely engaged with art and became empowered to create their own experiences around the art product. One participant described the intensity of co-producing an art experience stating:

There is certain sort of thing that really is a pure kind of joy [...] it is like that spark that opens the door to certain ideas that you might not have seen before, or dreamt before. That is amazing [...] That can be so incredibly energetic, full of energy, because you have an idea that you are trying to flush out [...] It really embodies the whole person' (Anthea, in depth interview).

These comments confirm Etgar's (2007) proposition that there is increased demand from consumers for experiences and that there is also recognition by organisations that creativity (such as that derived from co-production, co-creation and art experiences) is important to consumers. In addition to this, this study found the greater the resonance the work of art had with a participant, the more the participant was involved in the co-production of the experience surrounding it: that is, the more they were involved in the tangible (artists) or conceptual processes (artists or recipients) of creating the art experience. One participant explained this by saying:

It [a work of art] would have to sort of connect with me somehow for me to even think about whether I am connecting with it. If it didn't speak to me, then yeah, I'm not particularly interested in it and it doesn't have a big impact on me. If it doesn't speak to you than you don't pay any attention to it at all' (Susan, focus group participant).

Participants exercised autonomy in the co-production of art experiences and in the co-creation of the value that results from those experiences. When art experiences that were perceived as having potential for co-production were not provided by an art organisation, participants engaged in other art experiences. As Boorsma (2006, p. 85) concluded, "Arts marketing should aim to support the artistic experience as a core customer value." When this is deficient participants sought experiences offered by other art organisations or to produce their own art experiences beyond those offered by art organisations. For example, in this study many participants took photos of street art and graffiti explaining that this was how they enjoyed art most frequently due to physical and financial accessibility and intellectual resonance. One participant explained this in an interview stating that:

I reckon there's certain art that I've viewed which I find inspiring and also some that makes me feel shit: like high art, like art galleries and stuff like that, if I go and see an art exhibition, I'm less aware of the art I'm seeing and more aware of the annoying people around me and all the cramped space [...] Obviously the art isn't strong enough to be able to carry me. You can walk down an alleyway and just see art [...] street art was one of the strongest impacts because it is around you all the time' (Rusty, in depth interview).

Another participant expressed a similar sentiment stating:

If you were to say, "How many times have I gone to the theatre? How many times have I gone to the cinema? How many times have I gone to the art gallery?" It would probably be "sometimes". But there are all these other aspects, like listening to the radio, reading books, looking at magazines, going into people's houses, seeing what they've got on the walls, walking past things and just looking at them. Then there's probably not a time when I'm not involved in it [art] (Sascha, focus group participant).

In addition to that, this study found that there were factors extraneous to art experiences, but specific to each participant, which significantly influenced the ability to participate in co-production and consequent co-creation of an experience. Notable factors that emerged were:

- The unique circumstances and history of the individual experiencing the art. This included the cultural background; early exposure to art; and personal tastes and interests. An interview participant explained:

I think there are reasons why it [art] hasn't been valued. One, people don't understand it and two, they haven't seen it imparted by people who are passionate about it. It's no wonder kids are turned off [art] who become adults who turn their children off it (Jon, focus group participant).

- Geographic and intellectual access to art. The following focus group participants' statement encapsulates this factor: "When it's [arts] in a formal setting it just puts up barriers for people, where other places are more accessible" (Fiona, focus group participant).
- The individuals' economic means comparative to the cost of having an art experience. One participant explained:

I thought that my kids would go and see heaps at the theatre and dance. But the reality is that it just doesn't happen nearly as much as I would like it to because by the time we all go its two hundred dollars It's really frustrating (Sascha, focus group participant).

- The time the individual was able to allocate to an art experience. A participant commented:

Currently my art practice is very limited partially because I am a stay-at-home mom with two young children. Finding private time is difficult. Finding quality private time to make [art] work is extremely difficult. I used to stay up all night making work if I felt like it – no more (Isabelle, diary entry).

- The extent to which a particular art experience resonated with an individual. This was a concept that was found repeated across all forms of data collected. One participant explained how the concept is manifest for them, stating:

What I respond to regardless of whether it's something that I sympathise with or not, is honesty in a work [of art]. If something strikes me as contrived, then it will just leave me cold, I may as well not be there (Jon, focus group participant).

These factors were perceived by participants as being enablers or barriers to co-production, which in turn influence co-creation. Boorsma (2004) comments that it is essential for art consumers to be willing to co-produce and co-create experiences. The findings of this study validate this comment (the potential art experience needed to resonate with the participant), and expand on it: consumers not only need to be willing to co-produce or co-create, but also must be able to in terms of cost, time and access.

Etgar (2007) noted that the primary motive for co-production is the desire on the part of individuals to customise experiences to suit to their needs. Within art experiences this is very pertinent. An exchange between two focus group participants demonstrated how individuals

customise art experiences to heighten the positive impact of those experiences. The participants were discussing how galleries could be overcrowded or noisy and how this may detract from the art experience:

Francine: Sometimes that's the only way you can view the art. So when you're in a gallery, sometimes you're never going to see that picture otherwise. I've found sometimes that if you can take music with you and listen to music, then you don't notice what's going on around you.

Celeste: You're actively changing your environment so that you can engage with the art in a different way. That's interesting.

5 Contributions, implications and recommendations

There are three significant contributions that this study makes to the SDL paradigm, namely:

First, this study highlights that, within the context of the art experiences, co-production and co-creation involve three key stakeholders: artists, recipients and art organisations. SDL however emphasises only two: organisations and consumers. Organisations would be remiss in not considering all potential stakeholders of the co-production and co-creation of an experience when designing and marketing experiences. Notably this study also identified that in relation to art experiences, individuals (as artists and recipients) can play roles of supplier and consumer in one experience. Further research in relation to stakeholders and also in relation to the dual role is recommended to determine whether a refinement of SDL is warranted. Furthermore, the study found that the dynamic between stakeholders is a critical factor in the success of consumption experiences. Organisations may benefit from devising strategies to encourage greater dialogue and connection between all stakeholders involved in co-production and co-creation. A recommendation for further research is to explore ways to nurture beneficial relationships and dialogue between stakeholders of experiences with the intention of encouraging co-production. Furthermore, as stated earlier in the paper, the study focussed on the perspectives of individuals (that is artists and recipients) and no data was obtained directly from art organisations. This is a limitation to the knowledge gained and obtaining these perspectives is a recommendation for further research.

Second, this study indicates that with regard to art experiences there are synergies between the processes and dimensions of co-production and the processes and dimensions of co-creation. This suggests that, with regard to art experiences, co-production may not simply be one component of co-creation as the most recent definitions used within SDL posit, but rather that there are intersections and interactions between the two. The attempt by scholars to determine distinct definitions of the two may have in fact resulted in their synergies being overlooked. The higher the level of individuals' co-production of art experiences the greater likelihood of positive value being co-created. Furthermore, the greater the possibility of individuals engaging in other co-production experiences in the future. Understanding the relationship between the two components of SDL is important knowledge for organisations. Further research is warranted into this nexus between co-production and co-creation and into the influence of the nexus on individuals' future involvement in co-production experiences.

Third, this research found that while individuals are attracted to co-production possibilities there are factors that are external to an experience that can act as either barriers to or facilitators of co-production, and that consequently impact on co-creation. Greater

consideration of the influence of external factors on co-production and co-creation may be of use to SDL development. A recommendation for future research is explore potential facilitators of and barriers to co-production.

6 Conclusion

This exploratory study has made a contribution to knowledge about the co-creation and co-production processes of SDL, particularly in regard to art experiences. For art organisations, it is clear that to not consider co-production and co-creation in programming and marketing strategies is a great risk as individuals have both the desire and capacity to produce their own art experiences that they believe will be of value. It is because the consumption of art is an extraordinary consumption experience that it offered the opportunity to explore co-creation and co-production in an in depth manner. Exploration of the case of art experiences exposes areas of future research toward the development of SDL. It must, however, be acknowledged that while this study provides insights into co-creation and co-production and information for SDL, the findings are based on a small sample of participants. The use of multiple forms of data and that the fact that an *a posteriori* lens was used to explore these concepts goes some way in overcoming this deficiency. As such is hoped that the findings of this study will be looked upon with trust and that they will inform proponents of SDL and those seeking to develop this theory for more widespread application.

Notes

1. The definition of art employed in this research is: any creative endeavour or expression undertaken, identified and defined as such by the participants in the research. This includes institutionalised art (art that is connected to subsidised art institutions, most commonly fine art or high art institutions, including visual art, performing art and literature); populist art (art that is not connected to subsidised art institutions and includes popular art (such as the movies), alternative or outsider art (such as comics or graffiti), self-orientated art (art for personal satisfaction and expression), embedded art (such as graphics and design), recorded art, or art in the everyday).
2. There are art experiences that occur outside of art organisations and therefore the co-production and co-creation would only involve artists and recipient. However, they are beyond the scope of this paper, which focuses on experiences within art organisations. There are also art experiences that are self-orientated and never involve a recipient or organisation (for example playing a musical instrument alone or writing creatively without the intention of another person reading it). Again, these experiences are considered beyond the scope of this paper.

References

- Bamford, A. (2006), "The arts as floating signifier: the challenges of defining the arts and their impact in a global world", paper presented at the 4th International Conference on Cultural Policy Research, 12-16 July, .
- Boorsma, M. (2006), "A strategic logic for arts marketing: integrating customer value and artistic objectives", *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, Vol. 12 No.1, pp.73-92.
- Bryman, A. (2004), *Social Research Methods*, 2nd ed., Oxford University Press, Oxford, .

- Dewey, J. (1958), *Art as Experience*, Capricorn Books, New York, NY, .
- Esterberg, K.G. (2002), *Qualitative Methods in Social Research*, McGraw-Hill, Boston, MA, .
- Etgar, M. (2007), "A descriptive model of the consumer co-production process", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 36 pp.97-108.
- Etgar, M. (2008), "A descriptive model of the consumer co-production process", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol. 36 pp.97-108.
- Fillis, I. (2004), "The theory and practice of visual arts marketing", in Kerrigan, F., Fraser, P., Ozbilgin, M. (Eds), *Arts Marketing*, Elsevier, Oxford, pp.119-38.
- Fillis, I. (2006), "Art for art's sake or art for business sake: an exploration of artistic product orientation", *The Marketing Review*, Vol. 6 No.1, pp.29-40.
- Gummesson, E. (2008), *Total Relationship Marketing*, 3rd ed., Elsevier, Oxford, .
- Harper, D. (2002), "Talking about pictures: a case for photo elicitation", *Visual Studies*, Vol. 17 No.1, pp.13-26.
- Holbrook, M.B., Hirschman, E.C. (1982), "The experiential aspects of consumption: consumer fantasies, feelings and fun", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 9 No.2, pp.132-40.
- Hurworth, R. (2003), *Photo-Interviewing for Research*, available at: <http://sru.soc.surrey.ac.uk/SRU40.html>, .
- Hussey, J., Hussey, R. (1997), *Business Research: A Practical Guide for Undergraduate and Postgraduate Students*, Macmillan, London, .
- Hurworth, R., Clark, E., Martin, J., Thomsen, S. (2005), "The use of photo-interviewing: three examples from health evaluation and research", *Evaluation Journal of Australasia*, Vol. 4 No.1/2, pp.52-62.
- Jackson, P.W. (1998), *John Dewey and the Lessons of Art*, Yale University Press, New Haven, CT, .
- Krueger, R.A. (1994), *Focus Groups: A Practical Guide for Applied Research*, 2nd ed., Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, .
- Lusch, R., Vargo, S. (2006), "Service-dominant logic: reactions, reflections and refinements", *Marketing Theory*, Vol. 6 No.3, pp.281-8.
- Lusch, R., Vargo, S. (2008), "Service-dominant logic", available at: www.sdlogic.net/index.html (accessed 17 October 2008), .
- Mishler, E.G. (1986), *Research Interviewing: Context and Narrative*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, .

Oliffe, J.L., Bottorff, J.L. (2007), "Further than the eye can see? Photo elicitation and research with men", *Qualitative Health Journal*, Vol. 17 pp.850-67.

Prhlahad, C.K., Ramaswamy, V. (2000), "Co-opting customer competence", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 78 No.1, pp.79-81.

Pullman, M., Robson, S. (2006), *A Picture is Worth a Thousand Words: Using Photo Elicitation to Solicit Hotel Guests Feedback*, The Center for Hospitality Research, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, School of Hotel Administration, CHR Tool No. 7, .

Rowley, J., Kupiec-Teahan, B., Leeming, E. (2007), "Customer community and co-creation: a case study", *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, Vol. 25 No.2, pp.136-46.

Saren, M. (2007), "Marketing is everything: the view from the street", *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, Vol. 25 No.1, pp.11-16.

Schembri, S. (2006), "Rationaizing service logic, or understanding services as experience?", *Marketing Theory*, Vol. 6 No.3, pp.381-92.

Sigurjonsson, N. (2005), *Young Audience Development and Aesthetics: John Dewey's Pragmatist Philosophy and its Implications for Orchestra Management*, paper presented at 8th International Conference on Arts and Cultural Management, Montréal, Canada, 3-6 July, .

Vargo, S., Lusch, R. (2004), "Evolving to a new dominant logic for marketing", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 68 pp.1-17.

Vargo, S., Lusch, R. (2006), "Service-dominant logic: what it is, what it is not, what it might be", in Lusch, R., Vargo, S. (Eds), *The Service-dominant Logic of Marketing*, M.E. Sharpe, Armonk, NY, pp.406-20.

Yin, R.K. (1984), *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, .

About the authors

Tabitha Ramsey White has recently submitted her doctoral dissertation that explores individuals perceptions of the impact of art. She has worked on various arts and culture related research projects at Deakin University and lectured in the Arts Management Programs at Deakin University and the University of Melbourne. She has also worked in the visual art sector in Australia and the USA including curatorial, public program and research roles. She has an MA (with merit) in Museum Studies from the University of Sydney. Tabitha Ramsey White is the corresponding author and can be contacted at: tabithawhite@paulwhiteart.com

Anne-Marie Hede is an Associate Professor of Marketing in the School of Hospitality Tourism and Marketing at Victoria University. Prior to this, she worked at Deakin University. She has been involved in a number of research projects that have focused on cultural events, destinations and attractions. She is co-supervisor of Tabitha's doctoral research.

Ruth Rentschler is an Interim Head, Bowater School of Management and Marketing, Deakin University. She has published widely in the cultural field including the *Cultural Industries Handbook*, *Shaping Culture*, *Innovative Arts Marketing*, *The Entrepreneurial Arts Leader*

and Museum Marketing. She has a special interest in arts governance and arts marketing. She is Deputy Chair of the board of Multicultural Arts Victoria and a member of the Stonnington Arts Reference Group.