
Purchasers' Benefits of Co-Creating Marketing Offers Versus Offeror Country of Origin

Submitted 11/03/24, 1st revision 26/04/24, 2nd revision 15/05/24, accepted 06/06/24

Agnieszka Izabela Baruk¹

Abstract:

Purpose: The article attempts to discover the importance of preferred country of origin for the hierarchical system of benefits that final buyers achieve thanks to the co-creation of marketing offers with offerors.

Design/Methodology/Approach: Striving to fill the gaps identified, five research hypotheses were formulated. Their verification required conducting empirical research. The research covered 1,196 adult representatives of Polish final buyers. Primary data collected was subjected to quantitative analysis.

Findings: The main conclusions were drawn: 1/ for the respondents, the most important are benefits that lead to an increase in their intellectual and relational potential, as well as the chance of obtaining an offer that better meets their expectations, 2/ for the majority of respondents, the offeror's country of origin does not matter as far as their readiness to undertake joint actions is concerned, 3/ there are statistically significant dependencies between seven out of thirteen benefits analysed and the preferences related to the country of origin of the offeror.

Practical Implications: These conclusions have a significant cognitive and application value.

Originality/Value: The originality of the approach proposed in this article is evidenced by the fact that so far these aspects have not been studied by other researchers in a similar context.

Keywords: M31, M37, D12, D22.

JEL Classification: Final buyer, offeror, cooperation, benefits, country of origin.

Paper type: Research article.

¹Prof., Lodz University of Technology, Organization and Management, Poland,
agnieszka.baruk@poczta.onet.pl;

1. Introduction

The contemporary market of consumer goods and services is subject to more and more dynamic, even rapid changes. This is due, among other things, to sudden events in the last decade, which have an extremely large impact on the functioning of the entire market and its individual participants. These include, for example, the Covid-19 pandemic (Callaway, Cyranoski, Mallapaty, Stoye and Tollefson, 2020), the energy crisis (*The costs and consequences of Europe's energy crisis are growing*), and the war in Ukraine (Hodgson, 2022).

Each of these events can be identified with a huge challenge that creates a new marketing situational context, strongly determining the market behaviour of each market entity, for example through rapidly growing inflation (Hodgson, 2022). These challenges magnify each other, reinforcing certain behaviours, inducing new behaviours, and reducing the intensity of other manifestations of market activity. This is noticeable both in the case of buyers and offerors who have to flexibly adapt to the changing market situation.

Functioning in such a dynamically changing marketing environment is also determined by consumer trends clearly visible before the emergence of the aforementioned events, which also strongly influenced the formation of these trends (Bond, Widdop, Cockayne and Parnell, 2021). They include the involvement of final buyers in the creation of marketing offers together with other entities, including offerors. Such cooperation is part of one of the key paradigms, i.e., the value co-creation paradigm (Humphreys and Grayson, 2008).

Undertaking joint actions as is the case with prosumption (Andrews and Ritzer, 2018), brings both the buyers and offerors a number of benefits that they could not achieve if they followed their classic separate market roles. Another trend that has been clearly noticeable for a long time is consumer ethnocentrism (Ma, Abdeljelil and Hu, 2019), manifested, among other things, in purchasing behaviours based on the preference of domestic providers and their marketing offers.

The results of the review of the world literature on the subject, which are presented below, indicate that benefits that final buyers achieve thanks to the co-creation of marketing offers with offerors have not been studied so far while taking into account their preferences regarding the offerors' country of origin.

Therefore, this article seeks to solve the following research problem: what benefits does a final buyer gain as a result of undertaking joint actions with offerors when preparing marketing offers, taking into account their preferences for the offerors' country of origin? The article attempts to discover the importance of preferred country of origin for the hierarchical system of benefits that final buyers achieve thanks to the co-creation of marketing offers with offerors.

The article is structured to achieve the aim formulated and verify five research hypotheses. It includes the introduction, literature review, presentation of primary research and its results, academic discussion, summary, and the indication of implications, limitations, and directions of future research.

2. Literature Review

One of the key foundations for the functioning of the contemporary market of consumer goods and services is undertaking joint actions by market participants. It results from the paradigm of value co-creation (Vargo, Maglio and Akaka, 2008), which reflects the way of thinking and acting exposed in contemporary marketing.

Joint marketing activities can be undertaken by entities fulfilling different market roles, in varying configurations, and with varying intensity. The effect of such activities is always relatively better than the effect of activities in which other entities do not participate.

One of the possible and at the same time the most important configurations of cooperation involves offerors and final buyers (Lanier and Hampton, 2018). The resulting relational system integrates marketing partners, each of whom achieves measurable and immeasurable benefits that they would not be able to obtain under the classical system based on the separation of market roles. Penetrating those traditional roles results in a synergy that entails positive effects for each partner.

Other authors, e.g., Chong, Hong and Teck (2022), also draw attention to this fact. The offeror increases their marketing potential (Barbu and Militaru, 2019), and consequently also the competitive potential (Nadeem, Juntunen, Hajli, and Tajvidi, 2021), gaining a competitive advantage (Sahi, Devi, Gupta and Cheng, 2022; Ramirez and Garcia-Penalvo, 2018). The final buyer also achieves a number of benefits, which will be discussed later in the article.

At this point, it is worth clarifying that the final buyer in this article is defined as a person who purchases a product. This term is deliberately used instead of the term 'consumer'. Admittedly, in the literature on the subject, it is the term 'consumer' that is usually used in considerations concerning the joint creation of value, possibly using the term 'customer' as its synonym (inter alia, Saarijärvi, 2012; Xie, Wu, Xiao and Hu, 2016).

However, it should be remembered that a consumer is a person who uses a product, and 'customer' has a much broader meaning than 'consumer' and 'buyer'. This is due to the roles played in the decision-making process. This article is about cooperation between people purchasing products and offerors and about identifying their point of view. The 'offeror' is a term referring to entities offering products on the consumer market, covering three groups: producers, retailers, and service providers.

Of course, cooperation requires much more commitment from both parties, which in the case of buyers is reflected in the terminology used. In the literature, they are defined as: 'active buyer' (Alarcón López, Ruiz de Maya and López López, 2017), 'co-creator of value' (Ranjan and Read, 2016), 'prosumer' (Shen, Zhu, Li and Shah, 2023), 'partner' (Chatterjee, Rana and Dwivedi, 2021), etc.

These terms highlight the difference with the classic buyer, whose activity primarily consisted of making purchases, which is reflected in being referred to as 'passive buyer' (Wilke, Schlaile, Urmetzer, Mueller, Bogner and Pyka, 2021).

An offeror must also show much greater commitment, which is mentioned much less frequently. It is necessary that they create appropriate conditions (Sarasvuo, Rindell and Kovalchuk, 2022) in order to activate final buyers on the one hand, while on the other hand giving them a chance to spontaneously join in marketing activities. From the perspective of buyers, cooperation may be either inspired by offerors, or come about spontaneously.

Regardless of its type, however, cooperation always leads to the achievement of such valuable benefits that they do not only compensate for the tangible and intangible expenditures necessary to establish and strengthen it, but significantly exceed them. These benefits are achieved by both offerors and buyers. Some of them are common (e.g., the chance of obtaining products that better meet buyer expectations), while others directly concern only offerors or buyers – but ultimately, they also affect each other, contributing to strengthening mutual cooperation.

So far, the literature has analysed benefits achieved by buyers in general or detailed perspective. For example, Constantinides, Brünink and Lorenzo-Romero (2015) studied the benefits of online cooperation, without focusing on specifics. In turn, Chong, Hong and Teck (2022) considered e.g. the benefits achieved by Malaysian buyers, also without going into specific manifestations.

When it comes to more detailed studies, specific benefits achieved by active buyers included, among other things: the chance of obtaining products that better meet buyer expectations (Chatterjee *et al.*, 2021; Seyyedamiri and Tajrobehkar, 2020), of experiencing satisfaction (Alarcón López *et al.*, 2017), of sharing one's knowledge (Baima, Santoro, Pellicelli and Mitreğa, 2022), of acquiring new knowledge (Chatterjee *et al.*, 2021), of gaining new skills (Mandolfo, Chen and Noci, 2020), of gaining and/or sharing new experiences (Chen, Drennan, Andrews and Hollebeek, 2018), of achieving social benefits (see Bettiga, Lamberti and Noci, 2018) such as establishing relationships with other entities, and of achieving happiness in the hedonistic dimension (Chagas and Aguiar, 2020).

The joint creation of marketing values together with offerors and the effects of these activities felt by active buyers have been analysed, among other things, in the context of satisfaction and loyalty (Pula, 2022), of gaining experience (Lemon and

Verhoef, 2016), of the relationship between the buyer and the brand (Ammari and Jaziri, 2016), and of the intention to permanently engage in joint activities (Lee and Kim, 2018). However, benefits achieved by final buyers in the context proposed in this article have not been studied so far.

In accordance with the approach adopted by the author, this article focuses on benefits achieved by final buyers from their perspective, analysing them in the context of preferences related to the country of origin of offerors. As the review of the world literature on the subject shows, they have not been studied in the approach proposed here. This means that there are cognitive and research gaps in this area.

The identification of the gaps became the main impulse to undertake research to fill them. The article attempts to discover the importance of preferred country of origin for the hierarchical system of benefits that final buyers achieve thanks to the co-creation of marketing offers with offerors.

Striving to achieve this goal, the following five research hypotheses formulated on the basis of the results of the literature review were tested:

H1 - There is a dependence between tangible benefits that final buyers achieve thanks to the co-creation of marketing offers with offerors and the preferred country of origin of offerors.

H2 - There is a dependence between intangible benefits that final buyers achieve thanks to the co-creation of marketing offers with offerors in the form of meeting social needs, and the preferred country of origin of offerors.

H3 - There is a dependence between intangible benefits that final buyers achieve thanks to the co-creation of marketing offers with offerors in the form of meeting psychological needs, and the preferred country of origin of offerors.

H4 - There is a dependence between intangible benefits that final buyers achieve thanks to the co-creation of marketing offers with offerors in the form of satisfying the need to improve their intellectual potential, and the preferred country of origin of offerors.

H5 - There is a dependence between intangible benefits that final buyers achieve thanks to the co-creation of marketing offers with offerors in the form of obtaining offers better suited to buyer expectations, and the preferred country of origin of offerors.

3. Research Methods

In order to realize the goal of the article and to check the research hypotheses, empirical research was conducted using the online survey method to collect primary data (the CAWI technique was used). The research was carried out in 2022 among 1,196 adult representatives of final buyers in Poland. It had a nationwide geographic scope. Quota sampling was used. The social and demographic characteristics (including education, age, gender, region) were kept in dispersion proportional to the

distribution of the trait in the general population, with a deviation of no more than ten respondents in relation to the proportion for the distribution of the entire population of Poland (based on GUS data and CAPI population studies).

The subject of the article covered the following variables: benefits that final buyers achieve thanks to the co-creation of marketing offers with offerors as well as preferences regarding the country of origin of the offeror with whom final buyers would prefer to cooperate with.

During the research, the respondents had to specify their preferences regarding the country of origin of the offeror (from the own country, from the other country, the country does not matter). They were also presented with a set of thirteen benefits that final buyers can achieve thanks to cooperation with offerors.

These were distinguished on the basis of the results of a literature analysis (inter alia, Chatterjee *et al.*, 2021; Mandolfo *et al.*, 2020) and the results of unstructured interviews that had been conducted prior to the surveys. They included two tangible benefits, ten intangible ones, and a benefit combining both dimensions, i.e. the chance of obtaining a marketing offer that better meets buyer expectations.

Each benefit from cooperation with offerors was to be assessed by the respondents using an Odd Likert Scale, which is one of the most frequently used psychometric tools in the social sciences (Joshi, Kale, Chandel and Pal, 2015). The applying of this scale is a prerequisite for using the average grade analysis method as well as factor analysis (Watkins, 2018).

The primary data collected was subjected to quantitative analysis using the average grade analysis, comparative analysis, Pearson's chi-square test of independence, V-Cramer contingency coefficient analysis, and exploratory factor analysis. The chi-square test was used to determine whether there are statistically significant dependencies between the variables analysed, and V-Cramer coefficient was used to determine the strength of the dependencies between the variables.

It is used when at least one variable takes more than two values (King, Rosopa and Minium, 2018). In turn, factor analysis was applied to discover the internal structure of the variables. Statistical analysis of the primary data collected was made using the IBM SPSS Statistics Ver. 25.

4. Research Results

As shown in Table 1, in the case of seven out of thirteen benefits analysed, the value of the average score exceeded 4.00. These were mainly intangible benefits, with the benefits related to improving one's intellectual and relational potential and the benefit of creating an offer with features that better meet buyer expectations at the forefront. The benefit related to the chance of filling excess free time was of the least

importance, which may be due to the fact that the respondents do not have much of it. It was the only benefit that less than 20% of respondents definitely agreed with achieving, and more than one-third of the respondents denied its achievement. Both tangible benefits, i.e. the chance of obtaining material or monetary rewards, occupied relatively lower positions.

Nevertheless, they were higher than those of the aforementioned benefit and the benefits related to satisfying psychological needs in the form of impressing other people or gaining their respect.

Table 1. Benefits listed by respondents that a final buyer achieves thanks to co-creation of marketing offers with offerors.

Benefits	Indications (%)					Average score	Position	Stand. Dev.
	5	4	3	2	1			
The impression of having a genuine influence on the offer and/or offeror	54.6	34.7	7.0	2.8	0.9	4.39	6	0.810
The impression of being needed	37.9	35.6	17.1	6.9	2.6	3.99	8	1.028
The chance of testing the usefulness of one's ideas	44.6	41.0	10.0	3.2	1.3	4.25	7	0.853
The chance of obtaining a marketing offer that better meets buyer expectations	56.8	34.2	6.5	2.0	0.5	4.44	3	0.747
The chance of obtaining a material prize	20.7	27.9	29.8	14.5	7.1	3.41	10	1.072
The chance of obtaining a cash prize	23.1	27.6	27.8	14.4	7.1	3.45	9	1.103
The chance of gaining new experience	56.3	33.8	6.3	3.0	0.7	4.42	5	0.794
The chance of gaining new knowledge	59.9	30.9	6.2	2.2	0.8	4.47	1	0.777
The chance of gaining new skills	59.6	30.1	6.7	2.8	0.8	4.45	2	0.802
The chance of establishing relationships with other people	57.8	31.3	7.1	3.2	0.7	4.43	4	0.811
The chance of impressing other people with one's activity	23.2	24.0	28.5	14.9	9.4	3.37	11	1.049
Filling up excess free	16.5	23.2	26.7	18.1	15.5	3.07	13	1.009

time								
The chance of gaining respect of other people	20.2	24.1	28.2	16.6	11.0	3.26	12	1.012

Note: 5 – definitely yes; 4 – rather yes; 3 – neither yes nor not; 2 – rather not; 1 – definitely not.

Source: Own study.

It should be added that for each of the benefits analysed, the value of the standard deviation did not exceed one-third of the average value. It follows that the values of average scores properly reflect the hierarchy of the benefits established on their basis (*Variance and standard deviation*).

In accordance with the research approach adopted, buyers' perspectives regarding the benefits they achieve thanks to the co-creation of marketing offers with offerors was analysed in the context of their preferences related to the offerors' country of origin. It turns out that almost one-third of the respondents would like to undertake joint actions with offerors from Poland, whereas in the case of offerors from other countries, the percentage was only 3.2% (Table 2). However, by far the largest part of the respondents stated that the country of origin of the offeror is not important.

Table 2. Respondents' preferences concerning the offerors they would prefer to co-create a marketing offer with (%).

Offerors from the point of view of their country of origin	Indications %
from the own country	30.7
from the other country	3.2
offeror's country of origin does not matter	66.1

Source: Own study.

The question remains whether there are any dependencies between the benefits which, according to the respondents, final buyers achieve from cooperation with offerors and the country of origin of the latter. Looking for the answer, it was found that such dependencies exist in the case of seven benefits (Table 3). The relatively strongest dependence was found for 'the chance of gaining new knowledge', although no dependence was actually strong. This is evidenced by the values of the V-Cramer coefficient, which did not exceed the limit of 0.3 for any of them.

Table 3. Benefits listed by the respondents that a final buyer achieves as a result of co-creating marketing offers with offerors, and the preferred group of offerors from the point of view of their country of origin.

Benefits	According to the preferred group of offerors		
	chi2 test	V-Cramer coefficient	'p'
The impression of having a genuine influence on the offer and/or offeror	14.950	0.079	0.600
The impression of being needed	7.772	0.057	0.456

The chance of testing the usefulness of one's ideas	20.396	0.092	0.009
The chance of obtaining a marketing offer that better meets buyer expectations	24.543	0.101	0.002
The chance of obtaining a material prize	12.368	0.072	0.136
The chance of obtaining a cash prize	15.369	0.080	0.052
The chance of gaining new experience	48.353	0.142	0.000
The chance of gaining new knowledge	77.678	0.180	0.000
The chance of gaining new skills	45.683	0.138	0.000
The chance of establishing relationships with other people	18.681	0.088	0.017
The chance of impressing other people with one's activity	4.223	0.042	0.836
Filling up excess free time	11.422	0.069	0.179
The chance of gaining respect of other people	21.741	0.095	0.005

Note: 'p' – level of significance.

Source: Own study.

The results obtained made it possible to check the research hypotheses (Table 4).

Table 4. Results of verifying research hypotheses formulated.

Research hypothesis	Results of verifying research hypotheses
H1	Invalid
H2	Valid
H3	Valid for 'the chance of gaining respect of other people' and 'the chance of testing the usefulness of one's ideas'
H4	Valid
H5	Valid

Source: Own study.

In the next stage of the analysis, efforts were made to identify the internal structure of the aspect studied and to compare the structure discovered for each group of people analysed. For this purpose, exploratory factor analysis was conducted for the total of respondents and for the three groups of respondents identified according to their preferences regarding the country of origin of offerors they would prefer to take joint action with.

The value of Cronbach's alpha test for the total of respondents was 0.886. For the respondents who prefer cooperation with offerors from Poland, it was 0.804, for those who prefer cooperation with offerors from other countries, the value was 0.812. For those who believe that the country of origin of the offeror is irrelevant, it was 0.815. This shows that in each case the level of reliability was high.

On the basis of the Kaiser criterion, for each of the four groups of respondents analysed, four factors with eigenvalues greater than 1 were distinguished. In each case, they explain over 76% of the total variability of the aspect studied (Table 5). For each group of respondents, the first factor includes four or five variables (Table

6), for which the value of the factor loading is at least 0.7, i.e., it meets the condition adopted when factor analysis is used in the social sciences (Watkins, 2018).

It is worth noting that these variables are the same for the total of respondents, for respondents who prefer cooperating with Polish offerors, and for those who do not attach importance to the offeror's country of origin. These variables reflect benefits related to the improvement of one's intellectual and social potential, i.e. those that gained relative leading positions in the hierarchy of benefits.

On the other hand, in the case of respondents who prefer to deal with offerors from other countries, the first factor consists of five variables reflecting the following benefits: psychological, filling excess free time, and tangible; these are benefits that occupied the last five positions in the hierarchy discovered.

Also, the second factor identified for respondents who prefer to undertake joint actions with offerors from other countries includes different variables than the analogous factor identified in the case of the other three groups of people. It includes three variables concerning benefits related to the improvement of one's intellectual potential, while in the case of the other three groups of respondents it consists of three variables reflecting the benefits related to satisfying psychological needs and a desire to fill excess free time.

It is worth noting that much smaller differences between the four groups of people surveyed occur in the case of the third factor. In the case of the fourth factor, there is no variable with a factor loading greater than 0.7 for those who prefer to cooperate with offerors from other countries, and the structure of this factor for the other three groups is identical.

Table 5. Hierarchy of factors according to their eigenvalues determined on the basis of the Kaiser criterion (depending on the group of offerors preferred by respondents)

Factor	Eigenvalue				Cumulated eigenvalue				% of total eigenvalues (variation)				Cumulated % of eigenvalues			
	Tot *	Pol#	Oth^	Irr~	Tot	Pol	Oth	Irr	Tot	Pol	Oth	Irr	Tot	Pol	Oth	Irr
1	3.291	3.236	3.829	3.288	3.291	3.236	3.829	3.288	25.318	24.894	29.455	25.295	25.318	24.894	29.455	25.295
2	2.429	2.566	3.691	2.365	5.720	5.802	7.520	5.653	18.681	19.742	28.392	18.193	43.999	44.636	57.847	43.488
3	2.387	2.416	2.319	2.358	8.107	8.218	9.839	8.011	18.364	18.585	17.835	18.136	62.363	63.221	75.682	61.624
4	1.883	1.889	1.009	1.902	9.990	10.107	10.848	9.913	14.483	14.527	7.223	14.628	76.846	77.748	82.905	76.252

Notes: * Adequacy measure of the of the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) sampling is 0.861, which is greater than 0.5 (Watkins, 2018); Bartlett's sphericity test is significant (the variables are statistically significantly related); chi2 is 10144,404; p = 0.000; # KMO = 0.864; Bartlett's sphericity test is significant; chi2 is 3245,660; p = 0.000; ^ KMO = 0.806; Bartlett's sphericity test is significant; chi2 is 392,875; p = 0.000; - KMO = 0.845; Bartlett's sphericity test is significant; chi2 is 6569,718; p = 0.000

Tot – total of respondents; *Pol* – people who prefer cooperation with Polish offerors; *Oth* – people who prefer cooperation with offerors from other countries; *Irr* – people who believe that country of origin of the offeror does not matter.

Source: Own study.

Table 6. Results of factor analysis of benefits that final buyers achieve as a result of co-creating marketing offers with offerors, taking into account preferences related to offeror's country of origin.

Variables	Factors															
	1				2				3				4			
	Tot	Pol	Oth	Irr	Tot	Pol	Oth	Irr	Tot	Pol	Oth	Irr	Tot	Pol	Oth	Irr
The chance of gaining new knowledge	.910	.893	.305	.920	.111	.121	.872	.100	.232	.263	.214	.217	.090	.086	.011	.079
The chance of gaining new skills	.898	.899	.236	.905	.089	.100	.838	.080	.204	.200	.206	.193	.096	.078	.201	.095
The chance of gaining new experience	.865	.851	.219	.868	.130	.170	.900	.109	.199	.228	-.013	.192	.136	.155	.169	.129
The chance of establishing relationships with other people	.750	.732	.402	.761	.226	.159	.586	.246	.221	.259	.532	.196	.005	.051	-.242	-.029
The chance of gaining respect of other people	.188	.181	.795	.186	.849	.872	.212	.839	.195	.176	.085	.204	.149	.168	.397	.133
Filling up excess free time	.096	.099	.830	.079	.822	.824	.239	.822	.096	.133	.111	.079	.220	.245	.140	.202
The chance of impressing other people with one's activity	.165	.161	.781	.172	.793	.803	.217	.789	.192	.181	.242	.189	.258	.261	.122	.259
The impression of having a genuine influence on the offer and/or offeror	.116	.154	.077	.093	.116	.158	.294	.109	.823	.815	.837	.812	.002	-.009	.289	.002
The impression of being needed	.151	.231	.298	.128	.318	.363	.097	.299	.714	.669	.865	.719	.172	.195	.038	.171
The chance of testing the usefulness of one's ideas	.308	.299	.204	.302	.212	.248	.442	.195	.706	.727	.422	.697	.122	.055	.697	.161

The chance of obtaining a marketing offer that better meets buyer expectations	.341	.322	.156	.294	-.024	-.056	.697	-.011	.637	.664	.415	.650	.080	.134	.164	.044
The chance of obtaining a cash prize	.128	.119	.790	.109	.264	.279	.376	.253	.110	.111	.066	.106	.914	.911	-.136	.920
The chance of obtaining a material prize	.093	.129	.869	.073	.292	.323	.090	.267	.131	.100	.255	.136	.907	.896	-.064	.916

Note: Indications as in Table 5.

Source: Own study.

Table 7. Groups of respondents identified.

Preferred country of origin of an offeror	Groups			
	1	2	3	4
Total	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The chance of gaining new knowledge - The chance of gaining new skills - The chance of gaining new experience - The chance of establishing relationships with other people 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The chance of gaining respect of other people - Filling up excess free time - The chance of impressing other people with one's activity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The impression of having a genuine influence on the offer and/or offeror - The impression of being needed - The chance of testing the usefulness of one's ideas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The chance of obtaining a cash prize - The chance of obtaining a material prize
From the own country	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The chance of gaining new knowledge - The chance of gaining new skills - The chance of gaining new experience - The chance of establishing relationships with other people 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The chance of gaining respect of other people - Filling up excess free time - The chance of impressing other people with one's activity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The impression of having a genuine influence on the offer and/or offeror - The chance of testing the usefulness of one's ideas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The chance of obtaining a cash prize - The chance of obtaining a material prize
From the other country	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The chance of gaining respect of other people - Filling up excess free time - The chance of impressing other people with one's activity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The chance of gaining new knowledge - The chance of gaining new skills - The chance of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The impression of having a genuine influence on the offer and/or offeror - The impression of being needed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -

	- The chance of obtaining a cash prize - The chance of obtaining a material prize	gaining new experience		
Country of origin does not matter	- The chance of gaining new knowledge - The chance of gaining new skills - The chance of gaining new experience - The chance of establishing relationships with other people	- The chance of gaining respect of other people - Filling up excess free time - The chance of impressing other people with one's activity	- The impression of having a genuine influence on the offer and/or offeror - The impression of being needed	- The chance of obtaining a cash prize - The chance of obtaining a material prize

Source: Own study.

The factors can be identified with segments whose representatives show analogous attitudes and/or behaviours within a specific segment, while showing different attitudes and/or behaviours compared to representatives of other segments (Zhang, 2019; Singh Minhas and Jacobs, 1996).

Based on the results of the factor analysis, it is possible to group the respondents into homogeneous groups of people (Table 7). This makes it possible to prepare and apply ways of influence much better suited to the expectations of representatives of each group identified.

5. Discussion

As the review of the literature shows, the approach adopted in this article is original. The benefits that active buyers achieve by taking joint actions with offerors have not been studied so far through the prism of the importance of offerors' country of origin. Therefore, it is difficult to make a comparative analysis of the results obtained with the results of other researchers, because the subject and object of the research conducted by them was different, as was the research approach used.

Among the benefits achieved by prosumers while engaging in the creation of products, the literature on the subject includes the intangible effects of the feeling of contentment and satisfaction from creating something. This view is shared, among others, by Veen, Dagevos and Jansma (2021).

It should be noted, however, that they adopted an assumption that prosumption includes the creation of products intended for satisfying one's own needs (self-consumption). In the case of such an interpretation of prosumption, no relationships are established with other entities, including offerors, which, in the author's opinion,

does not allow them to be classified as prosumption understood as joint activities undertaken by active buyers and other entities.

The benefits in the form of satisfaction felt by active buyers are also mentioned, *inter alia*, by Masucci, Megaro and Sirianni (2021). The subject of their research was joint activities with offerors, yet only in the case of one group of intangible products, i.e. health services. It is true that the benefit of a sense of being needed, analysed in this article, can be at least to some extent equated with satisfaction, but these effects are not identical.

Moreover, the above-mentioned researchers did not analyse satisfaction in the context proposed here. Fan and Luo (2020), in addition to satisfaction and loyalty, mention gaining experience as the third key benefit achieved by buyers. This benefit ranked fifth in the hierarchy identified in the research presented here. Fan and Luo did not examine other benefits, nor relate them to the country of origin of the offeror.

In turn, Lee and Kim (2018) studied the influence of benefits that buyers achieve thanks to cooperation with offerors by measuring the willingness to continue such behaviour; yet, these studies concerned only cooperation on social media. They found that this influence is significant, with the strength depending on the type of activity undertaken (e.g. design, support, etc.).

They divided the benefits into three groups: cognitive, social and hedonistic. This division corresponds to the benefits analysed in this article, although it is more general. However, they did not study benefits achieved by active buyers in the approach proposed herein.

The importance of the country of origin of offerors has so far been analysed primarily in the case of purchasing behaviour and intentions to do so. It has not been studied in relation to prosumer behaviour and the benefits derived from it. For example, the relationships between online shopping behaviour of buyers in Chile and the level of their consumer ethnocentrism in the era of the Covid-19 pandemic was studied (Camacho, Ramírez-Correa and Salazar-Concha, 2022). It was found that there is no relationship between these variables.

On the other hand, the research results presented in this article indicate that there are dependencies between the benefits that active buyers achieve thanks to cooperating with offerors and the preferences regarding offerors' country of origin.

Thøgersen, Pedersen, Paternoga, Schwendel and Aschemann-Witzel (2017) studied the readiness to buy organic food products depending on the country of origin of their producers, stating that this variable is significant as the level of such readiness is higher in the case of domestic suppliers.

Sevanandee and Damar-Lakadoo (2018) studied dependencies between the country of origin and the intention to buy mobile phones, discovering that such dependencies exist. When it comes to aspects related to the active cooperation between buyers and offerors, previous single studies concerned the readiness for such behaviour depending on the level of buyers' ethnocentrism (Baruk, 2019).

Based on the results, it was found that there is a group of buyers who are clearly more prone to prosumer behaviour in relation to domestic products and family offerors. As can be seen, the subject scope of these studies was different.

On the other hand, Menet and Szarucki (2020) conducted research on the importance of the country of origin in the context of value co-creation and the satisfaction felt by buyers and offerors. However, their approach was about the country of origin of buyers, not offerors.

6. Conclusions

The results of the research allow us to conclude that the respondents attributed relatively the greatest importance to intangible benefits related to increasing their intellectual and relational potential. They occupied key places in the identified hierarchy of benefits achieved through cooperation with offerors.

Among the most valuable benefits, there was also the benefit of being able to create an offer that better meets buyer expectations, which was ranked third. For more than two-third of respondents, the country of origin of the offeror that they would like to co-create marketing offers with was not important, although among the remaining respondents, a much larger percentage of people preferred to undertake joint activities with offerors from Poland than from other countries.

It was found that there are statistically significant dependencies between the preferences regarding the country of origin of the offeror and seven benefits achieved by active buyers.

This made it possible to verify the research hypotheses formulated. It was also possible to identify segments of respondents based on the benefits achieved by final buyers as a result of co-creating marketing offers with offerors and the preferences regarding offerors' country of origin.

7. Implications, Limitations, Directions of Future Research

The results of the research conducted and the conclusions drawn on their basis are characterized by cognitive and application value. They contribute to the theory of marketing and market behaviour, filling the cognitive gap identified on the basis of the results of the literature review.

They allowed for discovering:

- 1/ the hierarchy of benefits that final buyers achieve thanks to the co-creation of marketing offers together with offerors,
- 2/ the importance of the offeror's country of origin in the context of the preferences related to buyers' readiness to co-create marketing offers with them,
- 3/ the dependence between benefits that buyers achieve as a result of co-creating marketing offers together with offerors and the preferences regarding the offerors' country of origin,
- 4/ the internal structure of benefits that final buyers achieve thanks to the co-creation of marketing offers together with offerors, and
- 5/ segments of respondents based on their opinions on the benefits of cooperation with offerors and the preferences regarding the country of origin of offerors they would prefer to cooperate with.

The results obtained are also of great practical value, constituting important guidelines for managers both employed in Polish and foreign enterprises. The implementation of the research would allow for proper targeting of decisions and market activities thanks to their better adjustment to the expectations of active buyers.

The knowledge of these expectations makes it possible to shape the conditions for cooperation conducive to the achievement of the desired benefits by buyers, which would strengthen the potential of the community of offerors and cooperating buyers.

The research conducted, of course, has some limitations. They are related to the scope of the research, i.e. the subject (the research covered only adults), object (the research covered benefits that final buyers achieve thanks to cooperation with offerors in the context of the offeror's country of origin), and geographical scope (the research covered representatives of Polish final buyers).

Recognizing these limitations will guide future research: the analysis will also cover minors, and attempts will be made to analyse benefits that final buyers achieve from cooperation with offerors according to other variables, including demographic, behavioural and geographical ones.

References:

- Alarcón López, R., Ruiz de Maya, S., López López, I. 2017. Sharing co-creation experiences contributes to consumer satisfaction. *Online Information Review*, 41(7), 969-984. <https://doi.org/10.1108/OIR-09-2016-0267>.
- Ammari, N.B., Jaziri, E. 2016. How Co-creating Enhances the Quality of a Brand-consumer Relationship, using the U&G Approach: The Coca-Cola Case. *Journal of Marketing Research and Case Studies*, 609295. <https://doi.org/10.5171/2016.609295>.
- Andrews, D.L., Ritzer, G. 2018. Sport and prosumption. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 18 (2), 356-373. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1469540517747093>.
- Baima, G., Santoro, G., Pellicelli, A.C., Mitređa, M. 2022. Testing the antecedents of customer knowledge sharing on social media: a quantitative analysis on Italian

- consumers. *International Marketing Review*, Vol. 39, No. 3, pp. 682-705. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IMR-03-2021-0122>
- Barbu, A., Militaru, G. 2019. Value Co-Creation between Manufacturing Companies and Customers. The Role of Information Technology Competency. *Procedia Manufacturing*, 32, 1069-1076. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.promfg.2019.02.323>.
- Baruk, A.I. 2019. The effect of consumers' ethnocentric attitudes on their willingness for presumption. *Heliyon*, 5(7), e02015. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2019.e02015>.
- Bettiga, D., Lamberti, L., Noci, G. 2018. Investigating social motivations, opportunity and ability to participate in communities of virtual co-creation. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 42(1), 155-163. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijcs.12409>.
- Bond, A.J., Widdop, P., Cockayne, D., Parnell, D. 2021. Prosumption, Networks and Value during a Global Pandemic: Lockdown Leisure and COVID-19. *Leisure Sciences An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 43(1-2), 70-77. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01490400.2020.1773985>.
- Callaway, E., Cyranoski, D., Mallapaty, S., Stoye, E., Tollefson, J. 2020. The coronavirus pandemic in five powerful charts. *Nature*, 579(7800), 482-483. <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-020-00758-2>.
- Camacho, L.J., Ramírez-Correa, P.E., Salazar-Concha, C. 2022. Consumer Ethnocentrism and Country of Origin: Effects on Online Consumer Purchase Behavior in Times of a Pandemic. *Sustainability*, 14, 348. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14010348>.
- Chagas, G.M.O., Aguiar, E.C. 2020. The role of utility and hedonic motivations in value co-creation and their relationship with AIRBNB experience. *Revista Brasileira de Pesquisa em Turismo*, 14(3), 158-175. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7784/rbtur.v14i3.1922>.
- Chatterjee, S., Rana, N.P., Dwivedi, Y.K. 2021. Assessing Consumers' Co-production and Future Participation on Value Co-creation and Business Benefit: an F-P-C-B Model Perspective. *Information Systems Frontiers*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10796-021-10104-0>.
- Chen, T., Drennan, J., Andrews, L., Hollebeek, L.D. 2018. User experience sharing: understanding customer initiation of value co-creation in online communities. *European Journal of Marketing*, 52(5-6), 1154-1184. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJM-05-2016-0298>.
- Chong, W.Y., Hong, P.H.K., Teck, T.S. 2022. Co-Creation, the Next Frontier for Small Medium Enterprise in Malaysia, a Literature Review. *Journal of Positive School Psychology*, 6(5), 8656-8673.
- Constantinides, E., Brünink, L.A., Lorenzo-Romero, C. 2015. Customer Motives and Benefits for Participating in Online Co-Creation Activities. *International Journal of Internet Marketing and Advertising*, 9(1), 21-48. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJIMA.2015.068346>.
- Fan, X., Luo, Y. 2020. Value Co-Creation: A Literature Review. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 08(02). <https://doi.org/10.4236/jss.2020.82008>.
- Hodgson, A. 2022. Cost-of-Living Crisis: How Does It Impact Companies and Consumers? Euromonitor International Report. <https://www.euromonitor.com/article/cost-of-living-crisis-how-does-it-impact-companies-and-consumers>.
- Humphreys, A., Grayson, K. 2008. The intersecting roles of consumer and producer: A critical perspective on co-production, co-creation and presumption. *Sociology Compass*, 2(3), 963-980. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9020.2008.00112.x>.
- Joshi, A., Kale, S., Chandel, S., Pal, D.K. 2015. Likert Scale: Explored and Explained. *British Journal of Applied Science & Technology*, 7(4), 396-403.

- King, B.M., Rosopa, P.J., Minium, E.W. 2018. *Statistical Reasoning in the Behavioral Sciences*. Wiley, Hoboken, New Jersey.
- Lanier, C., Hampton, R. 2018. Consumer Participation and Experiential Marketing: Understanding the Relationship between Co-Creation and the Fantasy Life Cycle. *Advance in a Consumer Research*, 35, 44-48.
- Lee, A.R., Kim, K.K. 2018. Customer benefits and value co-creation activities in corporate social networking services. *Behaviour and Information Technology*, 37(7), 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0144929X.2018.1474252>.
- Lemon, K.N., Verhoef, P.C. 2016. Understanding Customer Experience Throughout the Customer Journey. *Journal of Marketing*, 80(6), 69-96. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jm.15.0420>.
- Ma, Q., Abdeljelil, H.M., Hu, L. 2019. The Influence of the Consumer Ethnocentrism and Cultural Familiarity on Brand Preference: Evidence of Event-Related Potential (ERP). *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2019.00220>.
- Mandolfo, M., Chen, S., Noci, G. 2020. Co-creation in new product development: Which drivers of consumer participation? *International Journal of Engineering Business Management*, 12, 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1847979020913>.
- Masucci, A., Megaro, A., Sirianni, C.A. 2021. The Role of New Technologies in Value Co-Creation Processes: Healthcare Management and the National Health System as a System of Services. *Journal of Service Science and Management*, 14(2). <https://doi.org/10.4236/jssm.2021.142012>.
- Menet, G., Szarucki, M. 2020. Impact of Value Co-Creation on International Customer Satisfaction in the Airsoft Industry: Does Country of Origin Matter? *Journal of Risk Financial Management*, 13(10), 223. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jrfm13100223>.
- Nadeem, W., Juntunen, M., Hajli, N., Tajvidi, M. 2021. The Role of Ethical Perceptions in Consumers' Participation and Value Co-creation on Sharing Economy Platforms. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 169, 421-441. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-019-04314-5>.
- Pula, F. 2022. Co-creating value and its impact on customer satisfaction and customer loyalty: A banking sector perspective. *Journal of Governance & Regulation*, 11(4), 179-190. <https://doi.org/10.22495/jgrv11i4art17>.
- Ramirez, M.S., Garcia-Penalvo, F.J. 2018. Co-Creation and Open Innovation: Systematic Literature Review. *Comunicar*, 54, 9-18. <https://doi.org/10.3916/C54-2018-01>.
- Ranjan, K.R., Read, S. 2016. Value co-creation: concept and measurement. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 44, 290-315. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-014-0397-2>.
- Saarijärvi, H. 2012. The mechanisms of value co-creation. *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 20(5), 381-391. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0965254X.2012.671339>.
- Sarasvuo, S., Rindell, A., Kovalchuk, M. 2022. Toward a conceptual understanding of co-creation in branding. *Journal of Business Research*, 139, 543-563. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.09.051>.
- Sahi, G.K., Devi, R., Gupta, M.C., Cheng, T.C.E. 2022. Assessing co-creation based competitive advantage through consumers' need for differentiation. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 66, 102911. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2022.102911>.
- Sevanandee, B., Damar-Lakadoo, A. 2018. Country-of-Origin Effects on Consumer Buying Behaviours. A Case of Mobile Phones. *Studies in Business & Economics*, 13(2), 179-201. <https://doi.org/10.2478/sbe-2018-0029>.

- Seyyedamiri, N., Tajrobehkar, L. 2020. Social content marketing, social media and product development process effectiveness in high-tech companies. *International Journal of Emerging Markets*, 16(1), 75-91. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOEM-06-2018-0323>.
- Shen, L., Zhu, Y., Li, C. Shah, S.H.H. 2023. How users' perceived prosumption activities influence co-creation experiences and co-creation intentions?, *Kybernetes*, Vol. 52 No. 4, pp. 1223-1244. <https://doi.org/10.1108/K-07-2021-0556>
- Singh Minhas, R., Jacobs, E.M. 1996. Benefit segmentation by factor analysis: an improved method of targeting customers for financial services. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 14(3), 3-13. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02652329610113126>.
- The costs and consequences of Europe's energy crisis are growing. *The Economist*, November 24 2022. <https://www.economist.com/briefing/2022/11/24/the-costs-and-consequences-of-europes-energy-crisis-are-growing>.
- Thøgersen, J., Pedersen, S., Paternoga, M., Schwendel, E., Aschemann-Witzel, J. 2017. How important is country-of-origin for organic food consumers? A review of the literature and suggestions for future research. *British Food Journal*, 119(3), 542-557. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-09-2016-0406>.
- Variance and standard deviation. <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/edu/power-pouvoir/ch12/5214891-eng.htm>.
- Veen, E.J., Dagevos, H., Jansma, J.E. 2021. Pragmatic Prosumption: Searching for Food Prosumers in the Netherlands. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 61(1), 255-277. <https://doi.org/10.1111/soru.12323>.
- 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, 145-152. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2008.04.003>.
- Watkins, M.W. 2018. Exploratory Factor Analysis: A Guide to Best Practice. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 44(3), 219-246. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0095798418771807>.
- Wilke, U., Schlaile, M.P., Urmetzer, S., Mueller, M., Bogner, K., Pyka, A. 2021. Time to Say 'Good Buy' to the Passive Consumer? A Conceptual Review of the Consumer in the Bioeconomy. *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics*, 34, 20. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10806-021-09861-4>.
- Xie, K., Wu, Y., Xiao, J., Hu, Q. 2016. Value co-creation between firms and customers: The role of big data-based cooperative assets. *Information & Management*, 53(8), 1034-1048. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2016.06.003>.
- Zhang, Q. 2019. Customers Segmentation Based on Factor Analysis and Cluster. *E-Commerce Letters*, 8(2), 53-62. <https://doi.org/10.12677/ECL.2018.82007>.