

## The influence of customer participation and convenience on customer satisfaction: a multiple mediation

A influência da participação e conveniência na satisfação do cliente: uma mediação múltipla

Álan Andrew de Souza<sup>I</sup> , Cláudio Damacena<sup>II</sup>   
Clécio Falcão Araújo<sup>I</sup> , Bianca Pinto Carvalho<sup>I</sup> , Nathália Gris Seibt<sup>III</sup> 

<sup>I</sup> Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, RS, Brazil

<sup>II</sup> Universidade de Santa Cruz do Sul, Santa Cruz do Sul, RS, Brazil

<sup>III</sup> Centro Universitário Metodista do Sul, Porto Alegre, RS, Brazil

### ABSTRACT

**Purpose:** The purpose of this paper is to present a model that connects predictors of customer satisfaction considering Service Domain-Logic assumption and convenience and quality of service as sources that were identified as relevant aspects for customer satisfaction related to financial services.

**Design/methodology/approach:** Survey of a sample of six hundred and eight respondents was obtained. Structural equation modeling was used for data analysis to test research hypotheses.

**Findings:** The predictive effects of convenience, economic value, and quality of service have proved to be significant for customer satisfaction. Perceived service quality was identified as a mediator of the relationship between convenience and customer satisfaction.

**Research limitations:** This sample may have caused a few biases in the results, because it was selected by convenience.

**Practical implications:** The findings have implications for organizations since they demonstrate that improving service value is a means of increasing customer satisfaction. To ensure that the customer finds the interaction with the banking service to be appealing and to offer valuable benefits, the banking service should therefore allow for customer participation to increase the perception of economic value and, more importantly, to facilitate the dissemination of information

**Originality/Value** - This study brings results that show that customer participation impacts positively on the perception of economic value, but it is not the key for customer satisfaction in financial services. This result proves that the effects of customer participation are more complex than others before mentioned.

**Keywords:** Customer satisfaction; Customer participation; Economic value; Convenience; Perceived service quality

## RESUMO

---

**Objetivo:** O objetivo deste artigo é apresentar um modelo vinculando preditores da satisfação do cliente considerando as premissas da Service Domain-Logic e os antecedentes conveniência e qualidade do serviço, que foram identificados como aspectos relevantes na busca da satisfação dos clientes com serviços financeiros utilizados.

**Metodologia:** Realizou-se um survey com uma amostra de seiscentos e oito respondentes. Para testar hipóteses de pesquisa na análise de dados, utilizou-se a modelagem de equações estruturais.

**Resultados:** Os efeitos preditivos de conveniência, valor econômico e qualidade do serviço provaram ser significativos para a satisfação do cliente. A qualidade percebida do serviço foi identificada como um mediador da relação entre conveniência e satisfação do cliente.

**Implicações práticas:** Os resultados têm implicações gerenciais, pois demonstram que melhorar o valor do serviço é um meio de aumentar a satisfação do cliente. Para garantir que o cliente considera a interação com o serviço bancário atraente e que oferece benefícios valiosos, o serviço bancário deve, portanto, permitir a participação do cliente para aumentar a percepção do valor econômico e, mais importante, facilitar a disseminação de informações.

**Limitações:** A amostra pode ter causado alguns vieses nos resultados, pois foi selecionada por conveniência.

**Originalidade:** Este estudo traz resultados que mostram que a participação do cliente impacta positivamente na percepção de valor econômico, mas não é a chave para a satisfação do cliente em serviços financeiros. Este resultado prova que os efeitos da participação do cliente são mais complexos do que outros mencionados anteriormente.

**Palavras-chave:** Satisfação do cliente; Participação do cliente; Valor econômico; Conveniência; Qualidade do serviço

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Recent discussions have showed inconsistencies on studies that describe how the relationship are between consumer participation during the use of a service with other variables. Customer satisfaction is one of the main variables, as well as their participation. For instance, Kellogg, Youngdahl and Bowen (1997), Chan *et al* (2010), Cermak, File and Prince (1994), Balaji, Segunpta and Krishnan (2018) disclose that customers tend to be more satisfied with a service when they participate in its execution. However, the empiric results from Worthington and Durkin (2012), and Nyaadzayo, Leckie, and Johnson (2022) show that active customer participation did not influence satisfaction. As customer satisfaction is primordial, there are many studies seeking to understand how customer participation can influence their satisfaction

(Chan, Yim, & Lam, 2010). Hsieh and Chang (2004) suggest consumer participation behaviors can positively affect consumer satisfaction depending on their economic needs. Jiang, Balaji, and Jha (2019) show a positive chain-effect of customer participation on customer satisfaction by functional value. Ennew and Binks (1999) state that customer participation includes sharing information, responsible behavior, and an obligation to fulfill the responsibilities in the relationship and personal interaction. Responsible behavior in this case means that customers might need to take on duties and responsibilities in possible faults during the process. These inconsistencies open a gap for further investigation about the correlation between customer participation and satisfaction.

On the other hand, the definition of convenience for customers can be defined as anything that helps them to reduce their time and effort during the purchase process, like store accessibility and facilities, operating hours, payment conditions and seller's knowhow. (Berry, Seiders, & Grewal, 2002; Ladeira et al., 2016). Studies conducted by Khalid et al. (2011), Kaura, Prasad and Sharma, (2015), Joshi and Joshi (2019) and Wang and Ching (2019) analyzed customers' behavior in banks located in Pakistan, India and USA respectively also identified convenience as an important index to obtain higher levels of perceived quality of customer satisfaction service. The main aspects related to convenience identified were facilities, decoration, staff kindness, convenient location of agencies, 24/7 ATM machines and parking, Zhang and Jin (2022) show that convenience and satisfactions increase the probability to buy bank financial products. By understanding the needs of customers, organizations can create greater quality perception and higher levels of customer satisfaction (Rao & Sharma, 2010; Roy, Lassar, & Shekhar, 2016).

Considering the above ideas, the objective of this study is to answer the following question: How customer participation and the convenience provided influence in customer satisfaction in financial services? More specifically, this paper aims to understand how the customer participation influences their satisfaction by their

perception of economic value; and how convenience changes the customer satisfaction through their perception of quality.

The current study makes two significant and valuable contributions. First, this study shows that customer participation impacts positively on the perception of economic value but is not the key to customer satisfaction in financial services. Perceived service quality was identified as a mediator of the relationship between convenience and customer satisfaction. Second, the banking companies improve their quality of service, which consequently improves consumer satisfaction (Jiang, Balaji, & Jha, 2019; Zhang & Jin, 2022). To ensure that the customer finds the interaction with the banking service to be appealing and to offer valuable benefits, the banking service should therefore allow for customer participation to increase the perception of economic value and, more importantly, to facilitate the dissemination of information. In conclusion, our findings provide strong support for banking and financial companies that encourage consumer participation and provide convenience as a way to better manage customer satisfaction through service perception.

The following sections reviewed the entire body of literature on customer satisfaction determinants in banking. After that, it is intended as a multiple mediating model built using structural equations modeling technique to increase customer satisfaction. The results will be presented and discussed, based on the analysis of data from a sample of 608 customers. This study will be concluded with a discussion of the results, their implications, limitations, and suggestions for future research.

## **2 ACADEMIC BACKGROUND AND RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS**

### **2.1 Satisfaction**

Customer satisfaction is a central concept in consumer marketing research. Companies and brands usually emphasize its importance in their marketing strategies (Otto, Szymanski, & Varadarajan, 2020). According to Jamal and Naser (2002), satisfaction

is a customer's feeling or behavior related to a specific product or service following their use experience. The customer satisfaction literature is based on Oliver (1981)'s theory that satisfaction level is related to the differences between real and expected performance for a specific service or product. Most of the satisfaction research falls under what authors classify as the disconfirmation paradigm because satisfaction is a result of a comparison between prior expectations and perceived performance (Hohenberg & Taylor, 2022).

Szymanski and Henard (2001) highlight that customer satisfaction is a cornerstone for customer-oriented business practices in diverse industries. Oliver's (2014) theoretical framework justifies the importance of satisfaction using consumer, firm, industry, and societal perspectives as a result of satisfaction's centrality to vertical and horizontal interactions inside organizations' processes. While the vertical orientation implies micro (individual) and macro (aggregate) dimensions, "horizontal analysis examines the process by which antecedents or determinants cause satisfaction and the subsequent effects of satisfaction on other consumer thoughts and actions" (Oliver, 2014, p. 9). Maybe because of these connections with different touchpoints of the organizational structure, the empirical literature on satisfaction is diverse and sometimes inconclusive.

The meta-analytic and systematic review proposed by Ladeira et al. (2016) found a significant number of studies related to antecedents of satisfaction in banking sectors, such as a bank's atmosphere, special treatment and relational benefits, timesaving features, the dimensions, and perceptions of service quality. The analysis showed that the variables were positively associated with satisfaction in the banking industry over a diverse set of research contexts but did not provide a model to test that relationship. Then, a meta-analysis proposed by Santini et al. (2018) found a positive correlation between service quality and satisfaction in online banking, which reinforces previous assumptions.

The current literature of satisfaction in the banking sector has concentrated on investigating the antecedents of satisfaction in an online context, more specifically mobile banking (Khan, Lima, & Mahmud, 2021; Ivanova & Noh, 2022). These studies

have investigated the feature of platforms having a significant impact on service quality; service quality has a positive impact on satisfaction and loyalty. However, research into the antecedents of satisfaction in physical banking attempts to investigate various routes of service quality and participation. For example, Shetty et al. (2022) assessed the impact of service quality on customer loyalty in Indian public sector banks through a modified SERVQUAL. Jiang, Balaji, and Jha (2019) examine the mediating role of role stressors on the relationship among customer participation, behaviors, and customer satisfaction.

## **2.2 Customer participation**

The customer participation concept used in this study is the same as Chan Yin and Lam (2010) used, defining customer participation as a behavioral construction, being a measurement for customers who give and share information, suggest, and get evolved in the decision making during the service co-creation and the delivery process. The seminal studies about customer participation used the expression “involvement of customers in the execution of services,” suggesting that customers not only act as customers, but also as financial co-producers or part-time employees in the companies (Lovelock and Young, 1979). Moreover, pioneering studies about customer participation (Chase, 1978; Levitt, 1972) ranked services considering the level of customer interaction with the system, referring to the amount of period in which the customer interacts with the system in relation to the total needed for the service to be performed. From this perspective, the author suggests that companies should decrease their interaction with customers to increase their productivity. Levitt (1972) also recommend the restriction of customer participation to avoid losses on their effectiveness. On the other hand, other authors suggest that customers can reassure the quality of the service when they interact with service providers. Ennew (1996) suggests that customer participation provides a more transparent comprehension about their needs to service providers, making them aware about service providers restrictions regarding what can or cannot be delivered during the service execution.

Based on the service-dominant logic, Jiang, Balaji, and Jha (2019) show that consumer involvement and value facilitation via the Airbnb platform define the customer-perceived value, which in turn influences customer satisfaction with the Airbnb value co-creation process. It is plausible that customers tend to be satisfied when they perceive superior value of products and services (Jiang et al., 2016). Therefore, how to create a positive experience in participation that can positively affect customer satisfaction and other consequential outcomes is especially important in practice (Chen & Wang, 2016). The values perceived by customers through customer participation positively affect satisfaction (Chen & Wang, 2016). The authors' findings reinforce an academic contribution proposed by the present study, which is to investigate the influence of the consumer participation in the perception of value and the customer satisfaction in financial services; therefore, it is expected that:

*H1: The customer participation has a positive effect on their satisfaction with banking services provided.*

*H2: The customer participation has a positive effect on economic value perceived with banking services provided.*

### **2.3 The relationship between economic value and customer satisfaction**

Value is known as one of the most important elements in business success (Zeithaml, 1998), and although the value concept is well considered in the literature, there is a wide variety of perspectives. Some marketing researchers define value mainly as monetary (Parasuraman, 1997), while others make a more complex definition, which includes non-monetary benefits and sacrifices, like social relationships, of quality, knowledge, time spent, more competitively and skills (Wilson & Jantrania, 1994, Song et al., 2015). Value concept is defined by Zeithaml (1988) as a result of the comprehensive evaluation of the perceived use of a product or service, based on the comparison between what is expected and what is received. That said, value can be defined as the relationship between perceived benefits and associated costs for receiving these



benefits (Mcdougall & Levesque, 2000; Mulki & Jaramillo, 2011). Value creation is a recurrent theme in academic papers, where connection reports between value creation and customer participation are identified (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2000; Chan, Yim, & Lam, 2010). The current view of concept based on the new logic of dominant service proposed by Vargo and Lusch (2004) reverberated in studies suggesting that companies can only exist if they have the ability to offer any value proposal to their customers.

The present study is based on the principle that economic value is created through customer participation in the best quality of service, personalized service, and more control of customer about the service process (Chan, Yim, & Lam, 2010). Besides that, organizations will be more successful in the market if they are able to offer more value to their customers than their competitors can offer (Junior & Miyake, 2011). The reward will be a higher quality relationship and satisfaction from their customers, and they can also get new ideas about products, process, innovations, incomes, and new market access from them (Walter, Ritter & Gemünden, 2001).

Customers can create more economic value through their participation with personalized services and more control. Customers with active involvement in creating value can help ensure quality increase the likelihood reaching goals. This is based on the agency theory, where service customer monitors the fulfillment of service contract of providers (Mills, 1986). The empiric study made in the financial sector by Surprenant and Solomon (1987) suggests that service institutes compete in providing personalized services (more participation through sharing information and value creation). However, he reports that customers do not always want this kind of service at each meeting. This happens due to the lack of clarity of benefits to the customer and this may vary from the type of personalization, which brings costs both for the service provider and for the customer. Therefore, the added value should be evaluated with caution, and it is only between customer participation and satisfaction. This study results evidenced a positive relation between personalized services (value creation) and satisfaction.



The study of Song et al. (2015) indicates that functional and emotional values positively affect tourist satisfaction with temple stays. Nyadzayo et al (2022) show that customer participation positively influences perceived value. Satisfaction is positively influenced by perceived value, innovativeness, and relative advantage. Yet, customer participation did not influence satisfaction. The study findings support the mediating roles of perceived value.

Finally, according to the service-dominant logic, value can only be created and determined by the user, and the customer is always a value co-creator. Value is inherent to the use of product or services, such as perceived in the customer preferences and to calculation benefits (e.g., more personalized service), fewer costs (e.g., the effort expended), or to get involved in an exchange (Zeithaml, 1988). That said, finance institutions understand that the customer will be more satisfied if they create more value than their concurrence (Jiang, Xu, Cui, Zhang, & Yang, 2019). Besides that, in the financial segment, the results from Chan, Yin, and Lam (2010) show that the customer participation is meaningfully related to the economic creation of value and customer satisfaction, which means that economic value is a predictor of satisfaction. The relation between satisfaction and participation can be measured by economic value. Aligning these considerations, this study emphasizes the importance of economic the value in the satisfaction perception and participation of customers (Chen & Wang, J. P. 2016). Based on this, it is expected that:

*H3: The perceived economic value has a positive effect on customer satisfaction in financial services.*

*H4: The perceived economic value mediates the relationship between customer participation and customer satisfaction in financial services.*

## **2.4 The relationship between convenience and customer satisfaction**

Marketing studies about convenience created the concept of one only aspect time in economy regarding the purchase experience to a multidimensional construct.

The initial concept of convenience refers to time and effort spent by consumers to acquire goods or services instead of a specific feature of a product or service (Chang, Yim, & Lam, 2012). Convenience can be defined as a second order construct consisting of five types of costs of time and effort evolved with experience of services (Berry, Seiders & Grewal 2002; Seiders et al., 2007).

Some of the financial services related to customer participation and convenience are the ATMs, accessibility to use tools like internet banking and phone banking. By understanding customer needs from financial services, better satisfaction levels to customers can be generated when thinking about these convenience resources (Rao & Sharma, 2010). The internet has a high potential for interactivity, including convenience, customization (Yoo, Lee and Park, 2010), and may influence positively the satisfaction of customers through this variable. Besides affecting satisfaction, studies show that convenience affects the perception of quality of services (Berry; Seiders & Grewal, 2002; Kaura, 2013). It is possible to relate these results to the equity theory (Adams, 1965), known as the distributive justice, which relates the fair balance of inputs (like time and effort) and outputs as partners in an exchange. The perception of convenience by customers and their effects on the evaluation of service can be influenced by the amount of time spent and the cost of energy (Bitner et al., 1994). Time and effort are personal resources, which are spent by customers when they purchase or use a service (Berry, Seiders, & Grewal, 2002).

A meta-analysis about online banking propose by Santini et al. (2018) have find a positive and significant correlation between convenience and satisfaction. It is possible to presume that the lesser the amount of physical and mental effort required to carry out a purchase, the more favorable the appraisal of the offered service and, thus, the greater the satisfaction of consumers. Biswas et al (2022) study on private sector banks in the Indian market unveils that service convenience has a strong positive influence on customer satisfaction, which further augments future behavior intention. Therefore, perceptions of serviced convenience affect the global evaluation of consumer service,

including service satisfaction and quality of service perception. There is a positive effect of service convenience in the perceived service quality (Ngoc, 2011). That said, customer perception about quality service is not only based on what is offered to them, as the literature proposes (Parasuraman et al., 1988; Cronin & Taylor, 1992). Customers also analyze how much energy and time they will spend (beyond money) to evaluate the quality of the service process. The convenience has a direct impact on the satisfaction through the mediator role of quality of service perceived (Ngoc, 2011; Kaura & Sharma, 2015; Roy, Lassar, & Shekhar, 2016). Therefore, it is assumed that:

*H5: The convenience in financial services has a positive effect on customer satisfaction in financial services.*

*H6: The convenience in financial services has a positive effect on service quality in financial services.*

## **2.5 The relationship between service quality and customer satisfaction**

Quality of service is defined by Bitner and Hubbert (1994) as the general customer impression about superiority or inferiority of a specific organization or service. Financial services that stand out in quality of service usually have marketing strategies with higher revenue and customer retention, which increases their market share (Bowen and Hedges, 1993). There seems to be consensual among marketing research that quality of service and customer satisfaction are separated constructs, but both share a close relationship (Bitner & Hubbert, 1994; Cronin & Taylor, 1992; Patterson & Johnson, 1993). As previously stated, satisfaction can be defined as a cognitive and affective reaction to a service incident (or sometimes, to a long-term relationship of service). Satisfaction or dissatisfaction are usually the result of the experience with quality of service being compared with what was expected (Oliver, 1981).

Parasuraman, Zeithaml, Berry and Parasuraman (1988) argue that higher levels of service quality result in more consumer satisfaction. Hossain and Leo (2009) states that service quality has been increasingly recognized as a critical factor to the success of any

business (Parasuraman et al., 1988), and in the banking sector, it is considered essential. The quality of service has been widely used as a metric to evaluate banking service performance. Financial business understand that customers are faithful if they receive higher service quality than competitors (Dawes & Swailes, 1999), and, additionally, banks can only obtain high profits if they are able to position themselves better than their competitors in a specific market (Davies et al., 1995). As a result, banks need to focus on quality of service as a central and competitive strategy (Chaoprasert & Elsey, 2004).

Previous studies related the importance of bank service quality in seeking customer satisfaction (Al-Hawary & Ward 2006; Amim & Isa (2008). Ladhari, Ladhari, and Morales (2011) analyzed banking customers in Canada and Turkey, and they found that despite the difference in quality perceptions, that occur due to the disparity in economy, society and cultural involvement that oscillate between countries (the service quality shows positive relationship with customer satisfaction. Al-Hawary and Ward (2006) investigated the relationships among service quality in an Australian bank empirically and found positive evidence in the relation between both variables. The results from Amim and Isa (2008) research performed in Malaysian financial services context match with Al-Hawary and Ward (2006) studies, because their main finding was that the establishment of higher levels of service quality might lead the customer to a higher level of satisfaction.

Levesque and McDougall (1996) consider service quality one of the main reasons for customer satisfaction and the intermediation for their future intentions with retail banking. Jamal and Naser (2002) report in their study that the customer satisfaction in financial services segment is based on central dimensions and relational service quality, what match with Levesque and McDougall (1996) studies, who report the same dimensions of service quality considering them important conductors to determine customer satisfaction with the services provided by banking institutions. More recently, Kaura and Sharma (2015) confirmed the positive impact of service quality on the satisfaction of banking customers in India and Ladeira et al (2016) also confirms positive relationship in their meta-analytical study. Therefore, it is assumed that:

*H7. The perceived service quality has a positive effect on customer satisfaction in financial services.*

*H8. The perceived service quality mediates the relationship between convenience and customer satisfaction in financial services.*

### **3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

A survey was conducted to collect data on the hypothesis test. Several undergraduate students from different universities of the Southernmost state of Brazil were willing to respond a self-managed physical questionnaire. All the students participated in a draw of twenty-five cinema tickets. Anseel et al. (2010) states that the use of incentives in data collection usually make the respondents more interested in the survey. Thereby, the respondents were oriented to only use their own experiences with their main bank as a reference to answer the questions.

#### **3.1 Measures**

The measures used in this study were an adaptation of previously validated measures or were developed based on a literature review. The scales used in this study were the same as used in Chan, Yin and Lam (2010) studies, which already addressed the variables customer participation, satisfaction and economic value that are of interest of this study in the banking service context. Besides that, it was used Lassar et al. (2000) scales to measure the service quality, and Kaura (2013), to measure convenience. The scales were submitted to the reverse translation process (Dillon et al., 1994). The responses were analyzed by using the 7-point Likert Scale that range from (1) 'strongly disagree' to (7) 'strongly agree'.

#### **3.2 Data analysis**

Before doing data analysis, a univariate statistic was done using SPSS 23. An analyze of collinearity was made from measurement models of each construct to

verify if the measures were not harmful to multicollinearity. After that, to test the model by structural equation modeling was made by SPSS AMOS 23. Therefore, it was observed an adherence from items to factor through the factor load values ( $\lambda$ ) and the square of estimates (e.g., communalities,  $\lambda^2$ ). The indicators that showed  $\lambda < 0.70$  and  $\lambda^2 < 0.50$  represented low capacity to measure the respective latent variable (Hair et al. 2009). From these estimates, composite reliability (CR) was calculated, and the average extracted variance (AVE) to test, respectively, the intern consistency and the convergent validity of the model. The discriminant validity was assessed by the criterion Fornell-Larcker (1981).

To test the hypotheses that predicted direct effect among variables, in what the regression importance ( $\beta$ ), its significance ( $p$ ) and the determination coefficient ( $R^2$ ). In all CB-SEM procedures the model settings were considered: the reason between chi-square of model ( $\chi^2$ ) and the degrees of freedom ( $df$ ); normed fit index (NFI); goodness-of-fit index (GFI); adjusted goodness-of-fit index (AGFI); root mean square error approximation (RMSEA); Comparative Fit Index (CFI). In the measurement model, also it was observing an adjustment from the standard deviation.

To test the mediating effect, it was made a three-way procedure suggested by Baron and Kenny (1986): first of all, the regression of the mediator variable in the independent variable; second a regression of independent variable in the dependent variable, and in the end, the mediator variable must affect the dependent variable (Hair et al., 2009; Baron & Kenny, 1986). The meaningfulness of the indirect effect was evaluated by Sobel (1982) procedure.

## 4 RESULTS

From the final sample ( $N = 608$ ), 314 (52%) of respondents were female. The mode for this age range was between 18 to 22 years old (37%); 73% have another profession beyond the academic activities; 79% were single. The mode of this annual income range was U\$ 6,936.00 to U\$29,880.00 (53%). The main banking services used

for this sample were checking account and savings (47%), followed by the exclusive use of checking account (44%). About the time of account in the main bank, 30% have checking account for more de five years. So, only 12% of the sample does not use checking account service, and only 13% have the checking account for less than one year in the bank which they elected as their main financial services provider.

#### 4.1 Measurement model

It started from collinearity analysis. It was identified that, in the first moment, the collinearity analysis seven presented variables with values of tolerance lower than 0.20 and VIF values higher than 5.0. Therefore, the 4 variables were eliminated, because they presented shallow values. After these adjust, it was not identified new cases of multicollinearity. After some item's elimination, it started the analysis in CB-SEM. It was decided that customer participation would be sufficiently considered in content value if measured only through its 2 observable variables. Thus, nine positive correlations were inserted between the same construct variable. The estimated of measurement model are presented in table 1.

**Table 1** – Estimated of measurement model

						To be continued ...	
Latent Variable	Variable	Non-stand. $\beta$	Stand. Error	<i>z-value</i>	$\lambda$	$\lambda^2$	
<b>Customer Participation</b>	CP4	1.195	.126	9.459	.788	.621	
	CP5	1.000	*	*	.822	.675	
<b>Customer satisfaction</b>	CS6	1.000	*	*	.894	.799	
	CS7	.954	.032	29.845	.858	.736	
	CS8	1.006	.028	35.672	.937	.878	
<b>Economic Value</b>	EV10	1.126	.043	25.961	.893	.798	
	EV11	1.170	.043	26.941	.923	.852	
	EV12	1.128	.042	27.070	.920	.847	
	EV14	1.000	*	*	.795	.632	



**Table 1** – Estimated of measurement model

conclusion

Latent Variable	Variable	Non-stand. $\beta$	Stand. Error	<i>z-value</i>	$\lambda$	$\lambda^2$
<b>Service Quality</b>						
<b>SQT</b>	SQT15	1.000	*	*	.892	.795
	SQT16	.972	.046	21.344	.884	.781
<b>SQC</b>	SQC19	1.000	*	*	.762	.581
	SQC20	1.163	.050	23.488	.860	.740
	SQC21	1.097	.049	22.533	.832	.692
	SQC22	1.041	.037	28.084	.820	.672
	SQC23	1.003	.047	21.453	.799	.638
<b>SQR</b>	SQR24	1.145	.050	22.759	.841	.707
	SQR25	1.167	.052	22.293	.828	.686
	SQR26	1.185	.049	24.086	.883	.780
	SQR27	1.106	.051	21.659	.809	.655
<b>SQS</b>	SQS28	1.099	.047	23.228	.857	.734
	SQS30	1.025	.050	20.433	.773	.597
	SQS31	.987	.045	21.828	.815	.664
<b>SQE</b>	SQE32	1.131	.050	22.751	.843	.711
	SQE34	1.081	.048	22.469	.835	.698
	SQE35	1.102	.049	22.538	.837	.701
	SQE36	1.069	.047	22.894	.849	.721
<b>Convenience</b>						
<b>CD</b>	CD37	1.000	*	*	.763	.582
	CD38	.957	.036	26.297	.712	.506
	CD39	1.042	.038	27.195	.787	.619
	CD40	1.143	.061	18.696	.714	.510
<b>CA</b>	CA41	1.215	.057	21.298	.803	.644
<b>CT</b>	CT46	1.043	.048	21.644	.813	.661
	CT47	1.085	.049	22.199	.830	.688
<b>CB</b>	CB48	1.027	.050	20.650	.786	.617
	CB49	1.043	.047	22.374	.838	.702
	CB50	1.001	.047	21.494	.808	.652
<b>CPB</b>	CPB51	4.571	1.561	72.203	.888	.652
	CPB52	1.125	.046	24.207	.890	.793
	CPB53	1.131	.047	23.983	.884	.782

Note: \* standardized coefficient

The standard residues of the covariates of observable variables of models presented at Table 1 showed magnitudes less than  $|2.58|$ , which indicate that the specification of the model can be considered adequate (Hair et al., 2009). After adjustment of indicators, the measurement index presented adequate to acceptable standards ( $\chi^2/df = 2.664$ , GFI = .856, AGFI = .835, NFI = .926, CFI = .952, RMSEA = .052) for a reasonably good fit (Hair et al., 2009). Therefore, it was possible to compute the composite reliability, average variance extracted, which presented generally accepted standards, by Hair et al. (2009) and Marôco (2010). After obtained these indexes, it was made Fornell and Larcker (1981) test to obtain the discriminated validity, see table 2.

**Table 2** – Discriminant Validity – Fornell-Larcker’s test

Variable	CR	AVE	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Participation	.787	.648	<b>.804</b>					
2. Satisfaction	.925	.804	.102	<b>.896</b>				
3. Economic Value	.935	.782	.413	.433	<b>.884</b>			
4. Tangibles	.882	.789	.106	.524	.312	<b>.888</b>		
5. Relationship	.972	.686	.129	.729	.387	.638	<b>.828</b>	
6. Convenience	.956	.647	.185	.745	.448	.545	.853	<b>.804</b>

Note: Off-diagonal entries are correlations among constructs. On the diagonal is the square root of the AVEs

Fornell and Larcker (1981) criterion, presented in table 2, identified that is a positive correlation between the construct convenience and the dimension relationship of the construct of second order service quality. Therefore, it was needing the application of the Bagozzi and Phillips’ test (1982), where it was used the values of fix chi-square (4508.276), and the free chi-square (1792.343) and the test resulted in  $p < .000$  values, giving the evidence that can measure the constructs, even with high correlation, because the superposition is not affecting the estimative quality.

## 4.2 Structural Model

We test all the relationship between constructs and considered an acceptable standard of significance for being less than .050 (Hair et al., 2009). The first index


analysis of adjusting presented the indicators NFI, GFI and AGFI out-of standard indices generically accepted.

Seeking an improvement in the structural model through adjusts nine positive correlations. All of those were suggested by software AMOS 19.0 and the variables are from the same construct. After all these adjustments, the model structural shows all the criteria of recommended level ( $\chi^2/df = 2.775$ , GFI = .850, AGFI = .829, NFI = .921, CFI = .948, RMSEA = .072) for a reasonably good fit (Hair et al., 2009; Marôco, 2010), Figure 1 and table 3 shows the intensity of case/effect among model variables.

The hypothesis H1 was not supported ( $\beta = -.089$ ;  $p < .05$ ), we found a negative effect between customer participation and customer satisfaction. The findings are contra intuitive the proposal of Jiang, Balaji, and Jha (2022) and Jiang et al. (2016) as the effect was significant but negative. It is perceived that customer participation is significantly related to economic value ( $\beta = .438$ ;  $p < .001$ ), which confirmed the hypothesis H2. However, customer participation presented a negative correlation with satisfaction, and the economic value perception is also related to customer satisfaction ( $\beta = .168$ ), and the hypothesis H3 was also supported.

The results indicate that convenience has significant effect on satisfaction ( $\beta = .388$ ,  $p < .001$ ), supporting H5 hypothesis. Our finding was supported by previous meta-analysis about online banking (Santini et al. 2018) have find a positive and significant correlation between convenience and satisfaction. Besides that, convenience also has a significant standardized effect on service quality ( $\beta = .863$ ,  $p < .001$ ), which supports the H6 hypothesis. This finding confirms previous supposition (Ngoc, 2011). Likewise, service quality has a significant standard effect in satisfaction ( $\beta = .388$ ,  $p < .001$ ) supporting H7 hypothesis this finds are reinforce by literature (Ngoc, 2011; Kaura & Sharma, 2015; Roy, Lassar, & Shekhar, 2016).

**Figure 1** – Intensity of cause and effect among the model variable



Notes: \*  $p < .001$ ., \*\*  $p < .05$

**Table 3** – Test results of direct hypothesis

Direct Relations Hypothesis				$\beta$	B	S.E.	z-value	p	Test
H1	Satisfaction	←	Customer participation	-.089	-.110	.520	-2.309	**	Rejected
H2	Economic Value	←	Customer participation	.438	.621	.071	8.701	*	Accepted
H3	Satisfaction	←	Economic value	.168	.160	.036	4.465	*	Accepted
H5	Satisfaction	←	Convenience	.388	.456	.100	4.575	*	Accepted
H6	Service quality	←	Convenience	.863	.599	.047	12.716	*	Accepted
H7	Satisfaction	←	Service quality	.388	.659	.142	4.628	*	Accepted

**Notes:** (\*) significance level in  $p < 0.001$ ; (\*\*) significance level in  $p = 0.05$   $\beta$  stand. = beta standard; B = beta nonstandard; SE = *standardized error*.

### 4.3 Mediation hypothesis test

According to Baron and Kenny (1986) suggestion, there were used three regressions to do the mediation test: first of the independent variables (convenience and customer participation) over mediators (service quality and economic value). Second: from independent variables (convenience and customer participation) over dependent variables. Third, the independent variables (convenience and customer

participation) both for mediator variable (service quality and economic value) and dependent variable (satisfaction). The results obtained from these regressions are in table 4.

**Table 4** – Mediation hypothesis test results

Direct relation hypothesis			$\beta$	B	S.E.	z-value	$p$	Test
H4 - 1 <sup>st</sup> Regression	Econ. value	← Cust. particip.	.438	.623	.071	8.715	**	Accepted
H4 - 2 <sup>nd</sup> Regression	Satisfac.	← Cust. particip.	-.019	-.033	.005	-.653	.514	Rejected
H4 - 3 <sup>rd</sup> Regression	Satisfac.	← Cust. particip.	-.089	-.110	.520	-2.309	**	Accepted
H4 - 3 <sup>rd</sup> Regression	Econ. value	← Cust. particip.	.438	.621	.071	8.701	**	Accepted
H4 - 3 <sup>rd</sup> Regression	Satisfac.	← Econ. value	.168	.160	.036	4.465	**	Accepted
H8 - 1 <sup>st</sup> Regression	Serv. quality	← Convenience	.853	.585	.048	12.250	**	Accepted
H8 - 2 <sup>nd</sup> Regression	Satisfac.	← Convenience	.721	.853	.053	16.052	**	Accepted
H8 - 3 <sup>rd</sup> Regression	Satisfac.	← Convenience	.388	.456	.100	4.575	**	Accepted
H8 - 3 <sup>rd</sup> Regression	Serv. quality	← Convenience	.863	.599	.047	12.716	**	Accepted
H8 - 3 <sup>rd</sup> Regression	Satisfac.	← Service quality	.388	.659	.142	4.628	**	Accepted

**Notes:** (\*\*) significance level in  $p=0.05$ ;  $\beta$  stand. = Beta standardized; SE = standardized error

In the H4 test, the independent variable (customer participation) affected the mediator variable (economic value) in the first regression ( $\beta = .438$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Second, the independent variable effect did not present significance on the dependent variable ( $\beta = -.019$ ,  $p = .514$ ). Third, the mediator variable affected the dependent variable in the third regression ( $\beta = .168$ ,  $p < .001$ ), it means that not all criteria of Baron and Kenny (1986) was met. Sobel's test presented that indirect effect ( $a \times b$ ), of .074, presented  $z = 3.721$ . It means significance in  $p < .050$  level; therefore, the mediator effect exists, supporting H4, which establishes the mediation effect of economic value between customer participation and satisfaction. In line with previous research by Chen and Wang (2016) and Özkan et al (2019), who found that the customer participation through economic value perceived positively affect satisfaction. However, despite the existence of the mediating effect supporting H4, since the direct causal relationship was not evidenced, there is an inconsistent mediation (MacKinnon; Fairchild and Fritz, 2007), which matches to results from Rocha, Mota, and Matos (2011).

Finally, in H8 test, Sobel test showed that indirect effect ( $a \times b$ ), from .335,  $z = 2.702$ . So, it showed significance in  $p < .050$ . The mediator effect existed, supporting H8, which establishes the effect of partial measurement of service quality among the relation of convenience and satisfaction. It can also be stated that H8 was supported because of four other conditions imposed by Baron and Kenny (1986) to prove the mediator effect. First, the independent variable (convenience) affected mediator variable (service quality) in the first regression ( $\beta = .853, p < .001$ ) in the second regression. Second, the independent variable affected dependent variable ( $\beta = .721, p < .001$ ) in the second regression. Third, the mediator variable affected the dependent variable in the third regression ( $\beta = .388, p < .001$ ). The last condition refers to the need of effect that the independent variable causes over the dependent variable to be smaller in the third regression than in the second one, what also happened ( $\beta = .388 < \beta = .853$ ). However, as the independent variable effect was not null in the third regression ( $\beta = .388, p < .001$ ), it is confirmed the partial mediation effect, because a total measurement occurs, when the insertion cancels the independent variable on the dependent. Our findings suggest that convenience has a direct impact on the satisfaction through the mediator role of quality of service perceived (Ngoc, 2011; Kaura & Sharma, 2015; Roy, Lassar, & Shekhar, 2016).

## 5 CONCLUSION

Despite the growing number of discussions about customer participation in services, mainly about the contemporary market scenario, where the customer is seen as the main actor in the value creation process (Grönroos, 2008; Payne *et al.*, 2007; 2009; Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2002; 2004 Vargo & Lush, 2004; 2008; Williams & Aitken, 2011, Luo *et al.*, 2019; Yang *et al.*, 2019), there is still not much information about the effects that the shared value creation between consumer and organizations cause in customer perceptions about the service provided. Expanding the scope to financial services segment, the lack of this knowledge is even more significant (Chan *et al.*, 2010).

Considering findings and weights from searches cited in this study, it was proposed a theoretical model in which relations between customer satisfaction, customer participation, and economic value, considering the investigated constructs as an important background of customer satisfaction in financial services were established. In its theory, the constructed model presupposes relations based on empiric evidence and some theories, as the role theory and the disconfirmation theory. The model relations suppose that the customer participation through sharing information, and more economic value perception are independent variables and predictor of the customer satisfaction dependent variable in financial services. Therefore, the results from second hypothesis match with the results from Surprenant and Solomon (1987), Zeithaml (1998), Oh (1999), Dawes and Swailes (1999), McDougall and Levesque (2000), Bell and Eisingerich (2006), showing that economic value has the ability to influence satisfaction and to be the mediator variable in its relationship with customer satisfaction, agreeing with Chan, Yin, and Lam (2010) and Prebensen and Xie (2017) studies.

However, the unexpected results from the first hypothesis verified in this study were conflicting with studies of Jiang, Balaji, and Jha (2022) and Jiang et al. (2016) as the negative way was presented in the relationship between customer participation and satisfaction ( $\beta = -.089, p = 0.002$ ). This result contrasts with a set of evidence pointed out by studies which presuppose that greater customer participation may create higher levels of satisfaction (Auh et al., 2007; Bendapudi & Leone, 2003; Chan et al., 2010; Gallan et al., 2012; Cheng, et al., 2017). It shows a lack of congruence between findings and the theory of roles (Goffman, 1976), which reports the performance of the individual and their role (which happens because of their participation) influencing positively in their satisfaction. A possible explanation for this result may be related to the behavior setting theory (Garling, 1998), because each person is in a different self-regulating system with particular social rules, which are related to the social context where each one is. Therefore, each consumer assumes different responsibilities and activities, seeking for satisfying service. Thus, the non-confirmation of a positive



relationship between customer participation and their satisfaction may be justified by the low average (1.49 to 1.63) presented in the observable variables of PC construct. This might mean that customers participated a little or did not participate during the utilization of bank services. Also, they may not believe that their participation was a necessary effort to make, as they could not see relevant benefits to justify their participation. These findings can be supported by some empiric studies which identified customer participation as not benefic in seeking for better satisfaction levels in bank services (Worthington and Durkin, 2012; Bloemer et al., 2002). This study brings results that show that customer participation impacts positively on the perception of economic value, but it is not the key for customer satisfaction in financial services. This conclusion proves that the effects of customer participation are more complex than others before mentioned.

### **5.1 Managerial implications**

These findings contribute managerially, since it agrees with other authors who see ungraduated students as potential customers to financial institutions, especially in emerging economies like Brazil, where retail financial institutions often create advertisements and marketing strategies focusing in this market segment. This is explained because ungraduated students are identified as a niche of the customer with strong potential of high incoming after graduation, comparing to those customers with lower education levels (Yao & Matthews, 2007), and they are considered to be a profitable market for financial institutions (Chigamba & Fatoki, 2011). Our results corroborate with Jia and Wang (2016), because show that managing participation is more important than encouraging participation. Moreover, the simulation results confirm that the high actual value of a firm's service leads to superior satisfaction. Therefore, for firms, a basic way of facing fierce market competition and generating customer satisfaction involves increasing service value. Service providers should continuously improve service quality.

It is the manager's responsibility to seek solutions to get efficient management of customers' portfolios. This management should provide interaction through customer participation, which can provide more perception of economic value, and mainly, facilitate the sharing of information, so that the client perceives this interaction with the banking service as attractive and also, that can provide interesting benefits. Therefore, the customer may feel more motivated to promote this value co-creation and identify the best options to promote this interaction with other customers. These actions should prevent any negative perceptions of customer about their participation during the process of service providing and avoid that the customer sees their participation as a task, which only provides a way of shifting the workload from the bank to the client (Auh et al., 2007). This practice may become a strategy when seeking customer satisfaction. Briefly, proper communication programs should be designed and executed to make customers able to share information and perceive in a positive and correct way the quality of service provide (Ladeira et al. 2016), as well as of economic value and specially their participation, which in fact was presented as the construct of conflict results to the other two studies related to its influence to customer satisfaction.

## **5.2 Future studies and limitations**

Although the present study was constructed with scientific accuracy, it is suggested to replicate it in another context different than banking sector, but of similar nature (e.g., medical, statutory), to determine the generalization of results. Considering the composition of the sample, it was found a limitation in this study, even with the offered incentive to students willing to participate in the survey, and the fact they are a group who represents a market segment with extremely importance to financial institutions, this sample may have caused a number of biases in the results, because it was selected by convenience. It is important to emphasize the application of a theoretical model in different realities and samples because this practice can overcome

this limitation. Then, this mode can get strength in the search for generalization of results in a context where there are significant cultural differences. Therefore, these findings should be appreciated over the investigated sample, and the generalization of the results for different sample contexts can also be a limitation in this study.

Due to the conflicting results regarding the effect of customer participation on their satisfaction, the need of establishment of a more precise understanding of the phenomenon stands out. The investigation of customer participation is not recent, but the different results presented reinforce the need of new studies directed to this phenomenon. Longitudinal studies may help to clarify the impacts caused by customer participation, and this can be verified with the implementation of strategies that incentive customer participation during the service process. Additionally, it could be verified if the economic value perception would persist in the long term. The approach through a meta-analysis may also be suitable to establish a clearer comprehension of the effects of investigated variables from this study.

To conclude, future studies should verify possible moderating variables in the sample analysis, like the comparison of findings between customers from private and public banking institutions. It is possible that the inclusion of these moderating variables explains the non-confirmation of the hypothesis H1, in addition to complementing knowledge related to the investigated phenomenon.

## REFERENCES

- Anseel, F., Lievens, F., Schollaert, E., & Choragwicka, B. (2010). Response rates in organizational science, 1995–2008: A meta-analytic review and guidelines for survey researchers. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 25(3), 335-349. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-010-9157-6>
- Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 267-299). Academic Press.
- Al-Hawari, M., & Ward, T. (2006). The effect of automated service quality on Australian banks' financial performance and the mediating role of customer satisfaction. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 24(2), 127-147.

- Amin, M., & Isa, Z. (2008). An examination of the relationship between service quality perception and customer satisfaction: A SEM approach towards Malaysian Islamic banking. *International Journal of Islamic and Middle Eastern Finance and Management*.
- Anseel, F., Lievens, F., Schollaert, E., & Choragwicka, B. (2010). Response rates in organizational science, 1995–2008: A meta-analytic review and guidelines for survey researchers. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 25(3), 335-349. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-010-9157-6>
- Auh, S., Bell, S. J., McLeod, C. S., & Shih, E. (2007). Co-production and customer loyalty in financial services. *Journal of Retailing*, 83(3), 359-370. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretai.2007.03.001>
- Bagozzi, R. P., & Phillips, L. W. (1982). Representing and testing organizational theories: A holistic construal. *Administrative science quarterly*, 459-489.
- Balaji, M. S., Jha, S., Sengupta, A. S., & Krishnan, B. C. (2018). Are cynical customers satisfied differently? Role of negative inferred motive and customer participation in service recovery. *Journal of Business Research*, 86, 109-118.
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator–mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51(6), 1173. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.51.6.1173>
- Berry, L. L., Seiders, K., & Grewal, D. (2002). Understanding service convenience. *Journal of marketing*, 66(3), 1-17.
- Bell, S. J. & Eisingerich, A. B. (2006). Relationship marketing in the financial services industry: The importance of customer education, participation and problem management for customer loyalty. *Journal of Financial Services Marketing*, 10(4), 86-97. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.fsm.4760022>
- Bendapudi, N., & Leone, R. P. (2003). Psychological implications of customer participation in co-production. *Journal of Marketing*, 67(1), 14-28. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.67.1.14.18592>
- Biswas, A., Jaiswal, D., & Kant, R. (2022). Determinants and consequences of customer satisfaction in Indian retail banks: moderation of bank reputation. *Vision*, 1-6. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0972262922110849>
- Bitner, M. J., Booms, B. H., & Mohr, L. A. (1994). Critical service encounters: The employee's viewpoint. *Journal of marketing*, 58(4), 95-106.
- Bloemer, J., Brijs, T., Swinnen, G., & Vanhoof, K. (2002). Identifying latently dissatisfied customers and measures for dissatisfaction management. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 20(1), 27-37. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02652320210415962>

- Bowen, J. W., & Hedges, R. B. (1993). Increasing service quality in retail banking. *Journal of Retail Banking, 15*(3), 21-29.
- Cermak, D. S., File, K. M., & Prince, R. A. (1994). Customer participation in service specification and delivery. *Journal of Applied Business Research (JABR), 10*(2), 90-97.
- Chan, K. W., Yim, C. K., & Lam, S. S. (2010). Is customer participation in value creation a double-edged sword? Evidence from professional financial services across cultures. *Journal of Marketing, 74*(3), 48-64. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.74.3.048>
- Chaoprasert, C., & Elsey, B. (2004). Service quality improvement in Thai retail banking and its management implications. *ABAC Journal, 24*(1).
- Chase, R. B. (1978). Where does the customer fit in a service operation? *Harvard Business Review, 56*(6), 137-142. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4419-1628-0\_2
- Chen, C. F., & Wang, J. P. (2016). Customer participation, value co-creation and customer loyalty—A case of airline online check-in system. *Computers in Human Behavior, 62*, 346-352. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.04.010>
- Cheng, J. C., Chen, C. Y., Yen, C. H., & Teng, H. Y. (2017). Building customer satisfaction with tour leaders: The roles of customer trust, justice perception, and cooperation in group package tours. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research, 22*(4), 395-407.
- Chigamba, C., & Fatoki, O. (2011). Factors influencing the choice of commercial banks by university students in South Africa. *International Journal of Business and Management, 6*(6), 66.
- Cronin Jr, J. J., & Taylor, S. A. (1992). Measuring service quality: a reexamination and extension. *Journal of marketing, 56*(3), 55-68.
- Dawes, J., & Swailes, S. (1999). Retention sans frontiers: issues for financial service retailers. *International Journal of Bank Marketing, 17*(1), 36-43. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02652329910254037>
- Dillon, W. R.; Madden, T. J.; Firtle, N.H. (1994). *Marketing research in a marketing environment*. St. Louis: Times Mirror.
- Ennew, C. T. (1996). Good and bad customers: the benefits of participating in the banking relationship. *International Journal of Bank Marketing, 14*(2), 5-13. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02652329610106872>
- Ennew, C. T., & Binks, M. R. (1999). Impact of participative service relationships on quality, satisfaction and retention: an exploratory study. *Journal of Business Research, 46*(2), 121-132. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963\(98\)00016-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963(98)00016-2)
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research, 18*(1), 39-50. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224378101800104>

- Gallan, A. S.; Jarvis, C. B.; Brown, S. W.; Bitner, M. J. (2012). Customer positivity and participation in services: an empirical test in a health care context. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, (41) 3, 338-356. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-012-0307-4>
- Garling, T. (1998). *Introduction - Conceptualizations of Human Environments*. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 18 (1), 69-73. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jevpe.1998.0087>
- Goffman, E. (1976). *Interaction Ritual*, New York: Doubleday Anchor.
- Grönroos, C. (2008). Service logic revisited: who creates value? And who co-creates? *European Business Review*, 20 (4), 298-314. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09555340810886585>
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E., & Tatham, R. L. (2009). *Análise multivariada de dados*. Bookman Editora.
- Hohenberg, S. & Taylor, W. (2022). Measuring customer satisfaction and customer loyalty. In: Christian Homburg, Martin Klarmann, & Arnd Vomberg (Eds.). *Handbook of Market Research*, Springer, 909-938. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-57413-4\_30
- Hossain, M., & Leo, S. (2009). Customer perception on service quality in retail banking in Middle East: the case of Qatar. *International Journal of Islamic and Middle Eastern Finance and Management*.
- Hsieh, A. T. & Chang, W.T. (2004). The Effect of Consumer Participation on Price Sensitivity. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 38 (2), 282-296. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6606.2004.tb00869.x>
- Ivanova, A., & Noh, G. (2022). The Impact of Service Quality and Loyalty on Adoption and Use of Mobile Banking Services: Empirical Evidence from Central Asian Context. *The Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, 9(5), 75-86. <https://doi.org/10.13106/JAFEB.2022.VOL9.NO5.0075>
- Jamal, A. & Naser, K. (2002), Customer satisfaction and retail banking: an assessment of some of the key antecedents of customer satisfaction in retail banking. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 20(4),146-160. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02652320210432936>
- Jiang, Y., Balaji, M. S., & Jha, S. (2019). Together we tango: Value facilitation and customer participation in Airbnb. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 82(2019), 169-180.<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2019.05.004>
- Jiang, Y., Ramkissoon, H., & Mavondo, F. (2016). Destination marketing and visitor experiences: The development of a conceptual framework. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 25(6), 653-675. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19368623.2016.1087358>
- Jiang, Y., Xu, L., Cui, N., Zhang, H., & Yang, Z. (2019). How does customer participation in service influence customer satisfaction? The mediating effects of role stressors. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*. 37(3), 691-710. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJBM-12-2017-0261>



- Jia, J., & Wang, J. (2016). Do customer participation and cognitive ability influence satisfaction? *The Service Industries Journal*, 36(9-10), 416-43. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02642069.2016.1248418>
- Joshi VK., & Joshi VD. (2019). Technology-Based Banking Services – An Empirical Analysis of Customer Service Perception on Selected Public Sector Banks in India. *Research Journal of Social Sciences*. 10(5)
- Junior, N. T. & Miyake, D. I. (2011). A Participação do Cliente em Processos de Serviço e as Implicações dos Possíveis Papéis do Cliente na Criação de Valor. *Produto e Produção*, 12 (1), 91-120. <https://doi.org/10.22456/1983-8026.8290>
- Kaura, V. (2013). Antecedents of customer satisfaction: a study of Indian public and private sector banks. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*.
- Kaura, V., Prasad, C. S. D., & Sharma, S. (2015). Service quality, service convenience, price and fairness, customer loyalty, and the mediating role of customer satisfaction. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*. 33 (4), 404-422. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJBM-04-2014-0048>
- Khalid, S., Mahmood, B., Abbas, M., & Hussain, S. (2011). Customer satisfaction with service quality in conventional banking in Pakistan: The case of Faisalabad. *International Journal of Marketing Studies*, 3(4), 165. DOI:10.5539/ijms.v3n4p165
- Khan, A. G., Lima, R. P., & Mahmud, M. S. (2021). Understanding the service quality and customer satisfaction of mobile banking in Bangladesh: Using a structural equation model. *Global Business Review*, 22(1), 85-100. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0972150918795551>
- Kellogg, D. L., Youngdahl, W. E. & Bowen, D. E. (1997). Customer participation and satisfaction: two frameworks. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 8(3), 206-219. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09564239710185406>
- Ladhari, R., Ladhari, I., & Morales, M. (2011). Bank service quality: comparing Canadian and Tunisian customer perceptions. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 29(3), 224-246.
- Ladeira, W. J., Santini, F. D. O., Sampaio, C. H., Perin, M. G., & Araújo, C. F. A (2016). meta-analysis of satisfaction in the banking sector. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 34, (6), 798-820. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJBM-10-2015-0166>
- Lassar, W. M., Manolis, C., & Winsor, R. D. (2000). Service quality perspectives and satisfaction in private banking. *Journal of services marketing*.
- Levesque, T. & Mcdougall, G. H. (1996). Determinants of customer satisfaction in retail banking. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 14(7), 12-20. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02652329610151340>
- Levitt, T. (1972). Production-line approach to service. *Harvard Business Review*, 13(6), 41-53.



- Lovelock, C. H. & Young, F. R. (1979). Look to Consumers to Increase Productivity. *Harvard Business Review*, 57, 168–78.
- Luo, J. G., Wong, I. A., King, B., Liu, M. T. and Huang, G. (2019), Co-creation and co-destruction of service quality through customer-to-customer interactions: Why prior experience matters. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 31(3), 1309–1329. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-12-2017-0792>
- Mackinnon, D. P. & Fairchild, A. J.; Fritz, M. S. (2007), Mediation Analysis *Annu Rev Psycho*; 58: 593. DOI: 10.1146/annurev.psych.58.110405.085542
- Marôco, J. (2010). Análise estatística com o PASW Statistics (ex-SPSS). *Pêro Pinheiro: ReportNumber*.
- Mcdougall, G. H. G. & Levesque, T. (2000). Customer satisfaction with services: putting perceived value into the equation. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 14 (5), 392-410. <https://doi.org/10.1108/08876040010340937>
- Mills, P. K. & Morris, J. H. (1986). Clients as “Partial” Employees of Service Organizations: Role Development in Client Participation. *Academy of Management Review*, 11(4), 726-735. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1986.4283916>
- Mulki, J. P. & Jaramillo, F. (2011). Ethical reputation and value received: customer perceptions. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 29(5), 358-372. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02652321111152891>
- Ngoc Thuy, P. (2011). Using service convenience to reduce perceived cost. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 29(5), 473-487.
- Nyadzayo, M.W., Leckie, C. and Johnson, L.W. (2022). Customer participation, innovative aspects of services and outcomes, *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, ahead-of-print <https://doi.org/10.1108/MIP-03-2022-0090>
- Oh, O. (1999). Service quality, customer satisfaction, and customer value: A holistic perspective. *Hospitality Management*, 18, 67-82. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0278-4319\(98\)00047-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0278-4319(98)00047-4)
- Oliver, R. L. (1981). Measuring and evaluation of satisfaction process in retail setting. *Journal of Retailing*, 57(3), 25-48.
- Oliver, R. L. (2014). *Satisfaction: A behavioral perspective on the consumer*. Routledge.
- Otto, A. S., Szymanski, D. M., & Varadarajan, R. (2020). Customer satisfaction and firm performance: insights from over a quarter century of empirical research. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 48, 543-564. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-019-00657-7>

- Özkan, P., Süer, S., Keser, İ.K. & Kocakoç, İ.D. (2019). The effect of service quality and customer satisfaction on customer loyalty: The mediation of perceived value of services, corporate image, and corporate reputation, *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 38(2), 384-405. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJBM-03-2019-0096>
- Parasuraman, A. (1997). Reflections on gaining competitive advantage through customer value. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 25(2), 154-161. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02894351>
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1988). SERVQUAL A Multiple-Item Scale for Measuring Consumer Perceptions of Service Quality. *Journal of Retailing*, 64(1), 12.
- Patterson, P. G., & Johnson, L. W. (1993). Disconfirmation of expectations and the gap model of service quality: an integrated paradigm. *The Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, 6, 90-99.
- Payne, A. F., Storbacka, K., & Frow, P. (2008). Managing the co-creation of value. *Journal of the academy of marketing science*, 36, 83-96.
- Prahalad, C. K. & Ramaswamy, V. (2000). Co-opting customer competence. *Harvard Business Review*, 78(1), 79.
- Prebensen, N. K., & Xie, J. (2017). Efficacy of co-creation and mastering on perceived value and satisfaction in tourists' consumption. *Tourism Management*, 60, 166-176. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2016.12.001>
- Rao, S., & Sharma, D. R. (2010). Bank selection criteria employed by MBA students in Delhi: An empirical analysis. *Journal of business studies Quarterly*, 1(2), 56-69.
- Roy, S. K., Lassar, W. M., & Shekhar, V. (2016). Convenience and satisfaction: mediation of fairness and quality. *The Service Industries Journal*, 36(5-6), 239-260. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02642069.2016.1186657>
- Santini, F. D. O., Ladeira, W. J., Sampaio, C. H., & da Silva Costa, G. (2017). Student satisfaction in higher education: A meta-analytic study. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 27(1), 1-18.
- Seiders, K., Voss, G. B., Godfrey, A. L., & Grewal, D. (2007). SERVCON: development and validation of a multidimensional service convenience scale. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 35, 144-156.
- Shetty, D. K., Perule, N., Potti, S. R., Jain, M., Malarout, N., Devesh, S., ... & Naik, N. (2022). A study of service quality in Indian public sector banks using modified SERVQUAL model. *Cogent Business & Management*, 9(1), 2152539. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2022.2152539>
- Szymanski, D. M., & Henard, D. H. (2001). Customer satisfaction: A meta-analysis of the empirical evidence. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 29(1), 16-35.

- Sobel, M. E. (1982). Asymptotic confidence intervals for indirect effects in structural equation models. *Sociological Methodology*, 13, 290-312. <https://doi.org/10.2307/270723>
- Song, H. J., Lee, C. K., Park, J. A., Hwang, Y. H., & Reisinger, Y. (2015). The influence of tourist experience on perceived value and satisfaction with temple stays: The experience economy theory. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 32(4), 401-415. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10548408.2014.898606>
- Surprenant, C. F. & Solomon, M. R. (1987). Predictability and Personalization in the Service Encounter. *Journal of Marketing*, 51, 86-96. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00222429870510020>
- Vargo, S. L. & Lusch, R. F. (2004). Evolving to a New Dominant Logic for Marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, v. 68, n. 1, p. 1-17, 2004. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.68.1.1.2403>
- Walter, A., Ritter, T., & Gemünden, H. G. (2001). Value creation in buyer-seller relationships: Theoretical considerations and empirical results from a supplier's perspective. *Industrial marketing management*, 30(4), 365-377.
- Wang, H., & Ching, A. T. (2019). Consumer valuation of network convenience: Evidence from the banking industry. Available at SSRN 1738084. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1738084>
- Williams, J., & Aitken, R. (2011). The service-dominant logic of marketing and marketing ethics. *Journal of business ethics*, 102, 439-454.
- Wilson, D. T. & Jantrania, S. (1994). Understanding the value of a relationship. *Asia-Aust Journal*, 2(1), p. 55-66. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1320-1646\(94\)70278-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1320-1646(94)70278-1)
- Worthington, S. & Durkin, M. (2012). Co-destruction of value in context: Cases from retail banking. *The Marketing Review*, 12(3), 291-307. <https://doi.org/10.1362/146934712X13420906885476>
- Zhang, J., & Jin, B. (2022). The Promotion and Optimization of Bank Financial Products Using Consumers' Psychological Perception. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13. <http://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.926271>
- Zeithaml, V. A. (1988). Consumer Perceptions of price, quality and value: a means-end model and synthesis of evidence. *Journal of Marketing*, 52 (3), 2-22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224298805200302>
- Zeithaml, V. A., Berry, L. L., & Parasuraman, A. (1988). Communication and control processes in the delivery of service quality. *Journal of marketing*, 52(2), 35-48.
- Yang, A. J. F., Huang, Y. C., & Chen, Y. J. (2019). The importance of customer participation for high-contact services: evidence from a real estate agency. *Total quality management & business excellence*, 30(7-8), 831-847. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14783363.2017.1341814>
- Yao, X. Y. & Matthews, C. (2007). Price bundling in the student banking Market. *Journal of Service Research*, 10(2), 111-122.

## Authors

### 1 – Alan Andrew de Souza

Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande do Sul - PUCRS  
Porto Alegre, Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil  
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8263-3001>  
E-mail: alan.andrew.caxias@hotmail.com

### 2 – Claudio Damacena

Universidade de Santa Cruz do Sul - UNISC  
Santa Cruz do Sul, Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil  
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8331-9302>  
E-mail: claudiodamacena@unisc.br

### 3 – Clécio Falcão Araújo

Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande do Sul - PUCRS  
Porto Alegre, Rio Grande do Sul, Brasil  
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8753-5184>  
E-mail: clecio.araujo@pucls.br

### 4 – Bianca Pinto Carvalho

Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande do Sul - PUCRS  
Porto Alegre, Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil  
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9218-4307>  
E-mail: bianca.alirs@gmail.com

### 5 – Nathália Gris Seibt

Centro Universitário Metodista do Sul - IPARS  
Porto Alegre, Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil  
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9431-4593>  
E-mail: nathy.seibt@hotmail.com

## Contribution of authors

Contribution	[Author 1]	[Author 2]	[Author 3]	[Author 4]	[Author 5]
1. Definition of research problem	√	√			
2. Development of hypotheses or research questions (empirical studies)	√	√			
3. Development of theoretical propositions (theoretical work)	√	√			
4. Theoretical foundation / Literature review	√		√	√	
5. Definition of methodological procedures	√				
6. Data collection	√				
7. Statistical analysis	√	√	√		
8. Analysis and interpretation of data	√	√	√	√	
9. Critical revision of the manuscript			√	√	√
10. Manuscript writing	√		√	√	√

### **Conflict of Interest**

*The authors have stated that there is no conflict of interest.*

### **Copyrights**

*ReA/UFSM owns the copyright to this content.*

### **Plagiarism Check**

*The ReA/UFSM maintains the practice of submitting all documents approved for publication to the plagiarism check, using specific tools, e.g.: Turnitin.*