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Introduction

- In the service-dominant logic for marketing, firms have to focus on intangible resources, cocreation of value, and relationships (Vargo & Lusch, 2004). Many service firms are involving customers to design products for themselves through customer participation (CP)

- CP is the extent to which customers spend time and effort sharing information, providing suggestions, and becoming involved in decision making during the service production and delivery process

- CP is important as customers are given the opportunities to actively share information, contribute ideas, and spend efforts with a view to cocreating the services as well as shaping the service quality
Main Effect of CP: What Has Been Done

- CP has impact on service evaluation outcomes, including distant outcomes such as customer satisfaction (Chan, Yim & Lam, 2010; Dong et al, 2015) and repurchase intention (Kelley, Donnelly Jr & Skinner, 1990; Bolton & Saxena-Iyer, 2009)

- Customer participation
  - Customer satisfaction
  - Repurchase intention
Main Effect of CP: What Has Not Been Done

- **Customer citizenship behaviour (CCB)** refers to helpful, constructive gestures exhibited by customers that are valued or appreciated by the firm/other customers, but not related directly to enforceable or explicit requirements of the individual’s role.

- CCB includes customers giving more positive word-of-mouth communication, referrals, constructive suggestions in service improvements, carrying recycled bags printed with the company’s logo, etc.
Main Effect of CP: What Has Not Been Done

- CCB is of important value to firms as it would increase a firm’s revenue, profits, brand recognition and reputation (van Doorn et al., 2010)

- CCB is a firm’s competitive advantage and is difficult for competitors to imitate
Main Effect of CP: What Has Been Done

- Limited studies on the mediating effect between CP and service evaluation outcomes: economic value, relational value, and hedonic value (Chan, Yim & Lam, 2010; Bolton & Saxena-Iyer, 2009; Yim, Chan & Lam, 2012)

Customer participation ➔  • Economic value  • Relational value  • Hedonic value ➔  • Customer satisfaction  • Repurchase intention

They are immediate outcomes that are of short term and transactional in nature.
Main Effect of CP: What Has Not Been Done

- CP could possibly increase **interpersonal attraction** given that there are close interactions between customers and employees.
- Interpersonal attraction is a person’s positive affective response to a specific individual.
- It comprises three components: physical, social, and task.
  - **Physical attraction**: Is he/she has an attractive look?
  - **Social attraction**: Can he/she be a friend of mine?
  - **Task attraction**: Can he/she get the task done?
Main Effect of CP: What Has Not Been Done

- The effect of Interpersonal attraction has a more long lasting, enduring and profound impact on customers and firms than economic, relational and hedonic values.
- Attracted customers create a more enduring relational bond with service firms by performing **CCB**.

Diagram:
- Customer participation → Interpersonal attraction → Customer citizenship behaviour
Boundary Conditions of CP: What Has Not Been Done

- Given the close interaction between customer and employee, shared interpersonal similarity has not been studied as the boundary condition in CP literature.

- It includes visible similarity such as demographic diversities of gender and age; and attitude similarity, including values, personality and attitudes between two individuals. It could be one of the key factors that would influence one’s attraction evaluation as a result of CP (Aronson, Wilson & Akert, 2010; Byrne, 1961).

- Visible similarity: captured through matching the customers’ and employees’ gender and age.

- Attitude similarity: based on customers’ perceived attitude similarity toward the employee → more accurate in its prediction than one’s actual similarity.
Boundary Conditions of CP: What Has Not Been Done

- Shared interpersonal similarity as a boundary condition of CP

![Diagram with nodes: Customer participation, Interpersonal attraction, Customer citizenship behaviour, and arrows connecting them. The arrows show the flow from customer participation to interpersonal attraction to customer citizenship behaviour, with an arrow indicating shared interpersonal similarity.]
Boundary Conditions of CP: What Has Not Been Done

- **Coproduction task outcome**, the final product or service that resulted from the customer coproduction process, was examined as a boundary condition for the effectiveness of CP in experimental studies (Bendapudi and Leone, 2003; Troye & Supphellen, 2012)

The coproduction task outcome could be:

- Better than expected
- Worse than expected
Boundary Conditions of CP: What Has Not Been Done

How does the moderating effect of shared interpersonal similarity work when the coproduction task outcome is better or worse than expected?
Conceptual Framework

Control Variables
Gender \( a, b \)
Customers’ prior experience using interior design services \( a \)
Designers’ organisational tenure \( b \)

\( a \) Responses recorded from customers
\( b \) Responses recorded from designers
Research Context

- Collected data from customers and employees (i.e., interior designers) of the interior design consultancy industry
Conceptual Framework

Stage 1 data collection

Customer participation at time $t^a$

Shared interpersonal similarity with the designer at time $t_{+1}^b$

H2(+)

H3a (+) & H3b(-)

Coproduction task outcome at time $t_{+1}^a$

Interpersonal attraction toward the designer at time $t_{+1}^a$

H1a(+)

H1b(+)

Customer citizenship behaviour at time $t_{+1}^a$

Control Variables
Gender $a, b$
Customers’ prior experience using interior design services $a$
Designers’ organisational tenure $b$

a Responses recorded from customers
b Responses recorded from designers
Conceptual Framework

Customer participation at time $t^a$

Shared interpersonal similarity with the designer at time $t+1^b$

H2(+) → H3a (+) & H3b(-)

Coproduct task outcome at time $t+1^a$

Interpersonal attraction toward the designer at time $t+1^a$

H1a(+) → H1b(+) → Customer citizenship behaviour at time $t+1^a$

Control Variables
- Gender $^a,b$
- Customers' prior experience using interior design services $^a$
- Designers' organisational tenure $^b$

a Responses recorded from customers
b Responses recorded from designers
Control Variables
- Gender $^{a,b}$
- Customers’ prior experience using interior design services $^a$
- Designers’ organisational tenure $^b$

a Responses recorded from customers
b Responses recorded from designers
**Conceptual Framework**

- **Shared interpersonal similarity with the designer at time $t+1^b$**
- **Interpersonal attraction toward the designer at time $t+1^a$**
- **Coproduction task outcome at time $t+1^a$**
- **Customer citizenship behaviour at time $t+1^a$**

- **H1a(+)**
- **H1b(+)**
- **H1c**
- **H2(+)**
- **H3a (+) & H3b(-)**

**Control Variables**

- Gender $^a,^b$
- Customers’ prior experience using interior design services $^a$
- Designers’ organisational tenure $^b$

$^a$ Responses recorded from customers
$^b$ Responses recorded from designers

**to minimise common method bias by avoiding provision of all responses by the same rater**
Theoretical Background and Hypotheses Development
Hypothesis 1a

**Control Variables**
- Gender $^{a,b}$
- Customers' prior experience using interior design services $^a$
- Designers’ organisational tenure $^b$

---

Responses recorded from customers

Responses recorded from designers
Hypothesis 1a

H1a: CP has a positive effect on a customer’s perceived interpersonal attraction toward a designer.

- According to interpersonal communication literature, CP as a form of interaction behaviour is a *key prerequisite* of interpersonal attraction as it facilitates better communication and understanding between two individuals (McCroskey & McCain, 1974; McCroskey, McCroskey & Richmond, 2006)

- CP increases the number of interactions which will enhance *familiarity* between the customer and designer

- CP reduces the degree of *uncertainty* regarding the complexity of the coproduced task
Hypothesis 1b

Control Variables
Gender $^{a,b}$
Customers' prior experience using interior design services $^a$
Designers' organisational tenure $^b$

$a$ Responses recorded from customers
$b$ Responses recorded from designers
Hypothesis 1b

H1b: A customer’s perceived interpersonal attraction toward a designer has a positive effect on CCB.

- According to social exchange theory (Blau, 1964), customers who like a designer are obliged to reciprocate through the behaviour they exhibit in social exchanges, as they feel they have benefited from that designer.

- Interpersonal attraction is enduring, non-economical and non-transactional in nature → it generates greater reciprocal reinforcement through social exchanges rather than economic exchanges.
Hypothesis 1c

Control Variables

Gender $^a,^b$
Customers’ prior experience using interior design services $^a$
Designers’ organisational tenure $^b$

$^a$ Responses recorded from customers
$^b$ Responses recorded from designers
Hypothesis 2

Control Variables
Gender $^{a,b}$
Customers’ prior experience using interior design services $^a$
Designers’ organisational tenure $^b$
Hypothesis 2

H2: A customer’s shared interpersonal similarity with a designer moderates the effect of CP on the customer’s perceived interpersonal attraction toward the designer such that the positive effect of CP on interpersonal attraction is strengthened when the degree of similarity is high.

- Drawing on the reinforcement theory, a similar other is a rewarding stimuli that arouses positive feelings. In contrast, a dissimilar other could bring anxiety, fear, confusion and distrust belief (Byrne, 1971)

- A high level of similarity would elicit a positive response and lead to the development of positive interpersonal relationships from one’s participation, which is a rewarding and positive reinforcement
Hypothesis 3

Control Variables
Gender a,b
Customers' prior experience using interior design services a
Designers' organisational tenure b

a Responses recorded from customers
b Responses recorded from designers
Hypothesis 3a

- When outcome differs from one’s expectation, attribution exists (Bendapudi & Leone, 2003)

- **Self-serving bias theory** refers to individuals’ tendency to claim themselves with more responsibility for success and less responsibility for failure in a situation in which an outcome is produced jointly (Bendapudi & Leone, 2003; Pronin, Lin, & Ross, 2002)
Hypothesis 3a

When the outcome is **better** than expected:

- Attribute the positive outcome to the self
- High similarity $\rightarrow$ in-group /extended self
- Designer will share part of the success

H3a: CP has a **positive** effect on a customer’s perceived interpersonal attraction toward a designer when the customer has a **high degree of shared interpersonal similarity** with the designer and the **coproduction task outcome is better** than expected.
Hypothesis 3b

When the outcome is worse than expected:

- Attribute the negative outcome to others
- Low similarity → out-group / not part of the extended self
- Designer will bear the full responsibility for failure

H3b: CP has a negative effect on a customer’s perceived interpersonal attraction toward a designer when the customer has a low degree of shared interpersonal similarity with the designer and the coproduction task outcome is worse than expected.

How about the other two scenarios:

- high similarity and worse than expected outcome
- low similarity and better than expected outcome
Sample size: 400 designers and their corresponding customers
Returned surveys: 222 sets (54% response rate)

2 sets of surveys:
(1) Designer survey & (2) Customer survey
Examples of Measurement Items

Five-point Likert scale, 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree)

Established scales from prior literature were adopted directly. The English measures had be professionally translated into Chinese.

1. Customer Participation (5 items)
   - I have a high level of participation in the service process.
   - I put a lot of effort into expressing my personal needs to the designer during the service process.

2. Shared Interpersonal Similarity (7 items)
   Perceived attitude similarity
   - My customer thinks like me.
   - My customer and I think alike in terms of coming up with a similar solution for a design problem.

3. Coproduction Task Outcome (3 items)
   (five-point continuum scale, 1 (worse than expected) to 5 (better than expected)
   - I think the interior design outcome is...
Examples of Measurement Items

Five-point Likert scale, 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree)

4. Interpersonal Attraction (7 items)

Physical attraction

- He/she really looks like a designer.

Social attraction

- I think my designer could be a friend of mine.

Task attraction

- I think my designer is typically smart in his/her job performance.

5. CCB (8 items)

- If the designer gave me some recycled bags printed with the company’s logo, I would be glad to carry them in public.

- If other people had interior design service needs, I would pass this company’s contact information on to them

Total: 5 constructs and 30 measurement items
Control Variables

Included as control variables to account for extraneous sources of variation in the dependent variable:

- Gender
- Customers’ prior experience using interior design service
- Designer organisational tenure

Consider to include other control variables:

- Satisfaction, commitment and affect → CCB
- Reward → interpersonal attraction
Results
Confirmatory Factor Analysis

EFA and CFA were conducted and all results were satisfactory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fit indices</th>
<th>CFA</th>
<th>Desired level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Chi-square ($\chi^2$) significance</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
<td>&lt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Chi-square ($\chi^2$)</td>
<td>718.05</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Degree of freedom (df)</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Chi-square ($\chi^2$)/df</td>
<td>1.818</td>
<td>&lt; 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Comparative fit index (CFI)</td>
<td>0.929</td>
<td>&gt; 0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Incremental fit index (IFI)</td>
<td>0.929</td>
<td>&gt; 0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Tucker-Lewis index (TLI)</td>
<td>0.919</td>
<td>&gt; 0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA)</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>&lt; 0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Confirmatory Factor Analysis

The reliability and validity of all variables were supported.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Factor loading (&gt;0.6)</th>
<th>Composite reliability (&gt;0.7)</th>
<th>Average variance extracted (&gt;0.5)</th>
<th>Highest shared variance with other constructs (&lt;AVE)</th>
<th>Cronbach’s α (&gt;0.7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>0.604 -- 0.774</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal attraction</td>
<td>0.680 -- 0.827</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCB</td>
<td>0.693 -- 0.878</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared interpersonal similarity</td>
<td>0.614 -- 0.869</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coproduction task outcome</td>
<td>0.841 -- 0.958</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Hypothesis Testing Results: H1a, 1b & 1c

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Interpersonal attraction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (customer)</td>
<td>-0.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (designer)</td>
<td>0.143**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customers’ prior experience using interior design services</td>
<td>0.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designers’ organisational tenure</td>
<td>0.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal attraction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td><strong>0.208</strong>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $R^2$</td>
<td><strong>0.067</strong>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$. 

H1a: Supported
## Hypothesis Testing Results: H1a, 1b & 1c

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Interpersonal attraction</th>
<th>CCB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (customer)</td>
<td>-0.091</td>
<td>0.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (designer)</td>
<td>0.143**</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customers’ prior experience using interior design services</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designers’ organisational tenure</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal attraction</td>
<td>H1b: Supported</td>
<td>0.645***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>0.208***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $R^2$</td>
<td>0.067**</td>
<td>0.425***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$. 

\[\text{Interpersonal attraction} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{Gender (customer)} + \beta_2 \text{Gender (designer)} + \beta_3 \text{Customers’ prior experience using interior design services} + \beta_4 \text{Designers’ organisational tenure} + \epsilon\]

\[\hat{y} = 0.645 + 0.208X_{\text{Interpersonal attraction}} + 0.067X_{\text{Total } R^2} + 0.425X_{\text{CCB}}\]
## Hypothesis Testing Results: H1a, 1b & 1c

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Interpersonal attraction</th>
<th>CCB</th>
<th>CCB</th>
<th>CCB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (customer)</td>
<td>-0.091</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (designer)</td>
<td>0.143**</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customers’ prior experience using interior design services</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designers’ organisational tenure</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal attraction</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.645***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>0.208***</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.214***</td>
<td>0.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $R^2$</td>
<td>0.067**</td>
<td>0.425***</td>
<td>0.064**</td>
<td>0.431***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.
## Hypothesis Testing Results: H2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Interpersonal attraction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1: Control variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (customer)</td>
<td>-0.102*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (designer)</td>
<td>0.105*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customers’ prior experience using interior design services</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designers’ organisational tenure</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2: Independent variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>0.111*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared interpersonal similarity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3: Two-way interaction terms</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP x Shared interpersonal similarity</td>
<td>H2: Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $R^2$</td>
<td>0.362***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R^2$ at last step</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.1, **p < 0.05, ***p < 0.01.
Hypothesis Testing Results: H2

H2 is supported. The positive effect of CP on interpersonal attraction was stronger for customers with a high degree of shared interpersonal similarity with designers than for customers with a low degree of similarity.
## Hypothesis Testing Results: H3

### Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Interpersonal attraction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1: Control variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (customer)</td>
<td>-0.102*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (designer)</td>
<td>0.105*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customers’ prior experience using interior design services</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designers’ organisational tenure</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2: Independent variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>0.111*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared interpersonal similarity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coproduction task outcome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3: Two-way interaction terms</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP x Shared interpersonal similarity (H2)</td>
<td>0.166**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP x Coproduction task outcome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared interpersonal similarity x Coproduction task outcome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 4: Three-way interaction terms</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP x Shared interpersonal similarity x Coproduction task outcome</td>
<td>The 3-way interaction was significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total $R^2$</td>
<td>0.362***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R^2$ at last step</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$. 
Hypothesis Testing Results: H3a
When the Outcome is **Better** Than Expected

H3a is supported. A high degree of similarity strengthened the positive effect of CP on interpersonal attraction when the coproduction task outcome was better than expected.
Hypothsis Testing Results: H3b
When the Outcome is **Worse** Than Expected

H3b is not supported. (CP did not have a **negative** effect on customers’ perceived interpersonal attraction toward a designer when the customers have a low degree of shared interpersonal similarity with the designer and the coproduction task outcome is worse than expected.)
## Summary of Hypothesis Tests and Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effects</th>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Linkage</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main effect of CP</td>
<td>H1a</td>
<td>CP → Interpersonal attraction</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main effect of interpersonal attraction</td>
<td>H1b</td>
<td>Interpersonal attraction → CCB</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediating role of interpersonal attraction</td>
<td>H1c</td>
<td>CP → Interpersonal attraction → CCB</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderating role of shared interpersonal similarity</td>
<td>H2</td>
<td>Shared interpersonal similarity moderates the impact of CP on interpersonal attraction</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderating role of shared interpersonal similarity and coproduction task outcome</td>
<td>H3a</td>
<td>CP has a <em>positive</em> effect on interpersonal attraction when a customer has a <em>high</em> degree of shared interpersonal similarity and the coproduction task outcome is <em>better</em> than expected</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H3b</td>
<td>CP has a <em>negative</em> effect on interpersonal attraction when a customer has a <em>low</em> degree of shared interpersonal similarity and the coproduction task outcome is <em>worse</em> than expected</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion
Contributions to the Theoretical Development of Services Marketing

1. Reveal interpersonal attraction as an immediate evaluation outcome arising from CP
2. Explore the effect of interpersonal attraction on CCB
3. Examine the link between CP and CCB through the mediation of interpersonal attraction
4. Propose the boundary conditions of CP, i.e., shared interpersonal similarity and the coproduction task outcome
5. Examine CP in the context of interior design consultancy industry
Managerial Implications

Firms can better manage their relationships with customers by:

● Providing opportunities for CP

● Establishing interpersonal attraction and evaluating its effect on CCB

● Delivering a better-than-expected coproduction task outcome

● High shared interpersonal similarity is even important → matching and assigning employees to serve customers

● Managing customer expectation when the coproduction task outcome is worse than expected
Limitations and Directions for Future Research

- Conduct research on other service contexts to ascertain the generalisability of the findings
- Use a longitudinal study to investigate the dynamic nature and sustainability of the relationship, and impact of CP on interpersonal attraction
- Investigate other customer behavioural outcomes arising from CP, such as switching intentions and dysfunctional customer behaviour
- Examine the employee behavioural outcomes arising from CP from employee perspective
- Examine other boundary conditions including personality and cultural value orientation
- End -
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