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Abstract
Customer participation (CP) has received a special interest in service research. It is one of the most important aspects of services which can improve outcomes for customers and service providers. Through their participation, customers play a significant role on the service process and its outcomes. Different studies have investigated CP issues from different angels. Specifically, most of previous studies has focused on the influential factors of CP, the consequential and moderating factors are largely ignored. However, previous studies have yet to explore an integrative framework of customer participation with multiple antecedents, consequences and moderators. In this study, meta-analysis was conducted by collecting data from previous studies using customer participation as its main topic. The results from meta-analysis suggested that customer participation has a positive effect on customer citizenship behaviors (i.e., recommendation, helping customers, and providing feedback), while service-dominant orientation, personality and subjective has positive effect on customer participation. Eleven hypotheses are proposed in this study. It is expected that the results of this research can enable us to get better understanding about antecedents and consequences of customer participation. The results could be very helpful for academicians to further validate the research model and could also be very useful for professionals to design and implement their service strategies.
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1. Introduction
Customer participation (CP) has been received a special interest in service research. CP refers to the degree to which a customer contributes effort, preference, knowledge, or other inputs to service production and delivery (Chan et al., 2010; Dong et al., 2014). It is a basic aspect of services and a source of positive outcomes for customers and service providers (Mustak et al., 2013). Through their participation, customers influence the service process and its outcomes such as customer satisfaction, service quality, etc. (Bittner et al., 1997; Dong et al., 2014); (Aarikka-Stenroos and Jaakkola, 2012). According to the previous literature, CP has become an important tool for firms to improve their performance in terms of efficiency and productivity (Hsieh et al., 2004) and to enhance customer relationships (Chan et al., 2010).

Although previous studies have widely examined antecedents of customer participation (e.g., (Dong et al., 2014; Gallan et al., 2013; Kang et al., 2014; Parrado et al., 2013; Wang et al., 2013; Yen et al., 2011), there is still a lack of studies which examine the multiple antecedents of customer participation at the same time (Mustak et al., 2016).

First, the firm factor that will influence customer participation is service-dominant (S-D) orientation of a firm (Karpen et al., 2012; Karpen et al., 2015). S-D orientation refers to “a co-creation capability, resulting from a firm’s individuated, relational, ethical, empowered, developmental, and concerted interaction capabilities” (Karpen et al., 2012). S-D logic reflects an understanding of meaningful interaction and reciprocal resource integration with customers (Karpen et al., 2015). Service is a value co-creating process (Vargo and Lusch, 2008), therefore, interaction is an important aspect of resource integration effort and value-driving experiences (Prahalad and Ramaswamy, 2004). This study proposes that the higher the S-D orientation that a firm has, the higher will be the likelihood of customer to participate in service delivery process.

Second, the customer factors that will influence customer participation are personality traits and perceived ability. Personality traits are a structure of emotional, rational, behavioral, and mental traits that portrayed an individual character (Nassiri-Mofakham et al., 2009). The Big Five Personality model (Costa and McCrae, 1992) is one of the most widely applied personality instruments in psychology and consumer behavior literature (Marbach et al., 2016). Furthermore, perceived ability refers to the customers’ perceived knowledge and skills that enable them to participate effectively in service delivery (Meuter et al., 2005). Typically, a level of customer participation needs greater knowledge and skills from a customer (Yim et al., 2012). A high CP design will also enable customers with
high ability to leverage their expertise to co-create value (Dong et al., 2014). Therefore, this study proposes that the greater the personality traits and the higher the perceived ability that a customer has, the higher will be the likelihood of customer to participate in service delivery process.

Third, the social factor that will influence customer participation is subjective norms (Ajzen and Fishbein, 1970). Subjective norms reflect the impact of expectations from other people, which are largely based on the need for approval (Bagozzi and Dholakia, 2006). This mode of social influence may also be termed as compliance (Kelman, 1974). Subjective norms are identified as the social pressure that influences the individual behavior intention (Ajzen, 1991). The subjective norms might help individual decision making when individual has little experiences (Aarts et al., 1997; Pahnila and Warsta, 2010). This study proposes that the greater the subjective norms, the higher the likelihood will be the customer to participate in service delivery process.

Although the above three antecedents have been investigated extensively, their composite effects on customer participation has never been studies. Therefore, this study focuses on the composite effects of CP and tries to find out the relative importance of these antecedent variables. Furthermore, although customer citizenship behaviors have been widely discussed in organizational behaviors, it is rarely been discussed in CP. This study proposes that customer citizenship behaviors which consist of recommendation, helping customers, and providing feedback are the consequences of customer participation. Customer citizenship behavior refers to the voluntary behavior which is essential to successful production or useful to the whole service organization (Groth, 2005).

Based on the above research background, since customer participation has become an important service practices and a comprehensive research framework is yet to be established, the objectives of this study are as follows:

1. To develop a comprehensive research framework that encompasses antecedents, consequences and moderators of customer participation.
2. To examine the effects of firm factor, customer factors, and social factor on customer participation.
3. To examine the effect of customer participation on customer citizenship behaviors (i.e., recommendation, helping customers, and providing feedback).

2. Literature Review

2.1. Service-Dominant Orientation

In this study, service-dominant (S-D) orientation is regarded as one of important antecedents of customer participation. S-D orientation was first developed by Karpen, Bove, and Lukas in 2012. It represents a set of strategic capabilities from service-dominant logic perspective. Based on S-D logic, strategy is about choosing the best way to facilitate and enhance value co-creation with network partners (e.g., customers, suppliers, etc.) for mutual and long-term benefit (Karpen et al., 2012; Karpen et al., 2015). Specifically, S-D orientation refers to “a co-creation capability, resulting from a firm’s individuated, relational, ethical, empowered, developmental, and concerted interaction capabilities” (Karpen et al., 2012). S-D orientation enables a company to co-create value in service exchanges with customers. Value co-creation can be defined as assisting customers to co-construct and engage in superior experiences (Vargo and Lusch, 2008).

According (Karpen et al., 2012), S-D orientation consists of six strategic themes such as value-in-context, relation focus, values focus, co-production focus, operant resource focus, and process flow focus. A definition and measurement of each of these themes will be discussed in Methodology Section. It reflects an understanding meaningful interaction and reciprocal resource integration with customers (Karpen et al., 2015). Service is a value co-creating process (Vargo and Lusch, 2008), therefore, interaction is an important aspect of resource integration effort and value-driving experiences (Prahalad and Ramaswamy, 2004). Interaction requires that all co-creative processes be enabled and supported by interaction capabilities (Karpen et al., 2012; Ramaswamy, 2009).

2.2. Personality Traits

Srivastava et al. (2008), had noted that the term “Big Five” was coined by Lewis Goldberg in 1976 and was originally associated with studies of personality traits used in natural language. While, the term “Five-Factor Model” has been more commonly associated with studies of traits using personality questionnaires. The two research traditions yielded largely consonant models (in fact, this is one of the strengths of the Big Five/Five-Factor Model as a common taxonomy of personality traits), and in current practice the terms are often used interchangeably. Roccas et al. (2002), stated in their introduction that this five factor personality model is a dominant approach for representing the human trait structure today. Similarly, empirical evidences by Digman (1990), Goldberg (1993), McCrae and Costa Jr (1997), and O’Connor (2002) have all supported that the Big Five Personality Dimensions represents the taxonomy to describe human personality in a very orderly manner.

The Big Five personality dimensions implies that personality consists of five separate dimensions that altogether provide a comprehensive taxonomy for the study of human behavior. According to this emerging consensus, the Big Five personality dimensions consists of extraversion, emotional stability/neuroticism, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness to experience (Costa and McCrae, 1985; Mount and Barrick, 1995). Extraversion is a broad dimension which encompasses traits such as being active, gregarious, sociable, assertive, talkative and energetic. People who are high in extraversion are usually very jovial, vocal and interactive people. They naturally seem to have a good deal of social interaction. Emotional stability is the tendency to experience positive emotional states. People who are high in emotional stability would feel secure, relaxed, calm and confident. Agreeableness has the characteristics of being courteous, tolerant, forgiving, soft-hearted and caring. Being high in agreeableness would
mean that they are the kind of people who can get along easily with others on any occasion (Neuman and Wright, 1999). Conscientiousness includes the characteristics of being persevering, organized, responsible, dependable, thorough and industrious. Individuals with this dimension are naturally hard working, result oriented, and ambitious. No doubt this dimension is highly valued by all organizations. Openness to experience reflects the extent to which a person has broad interest and the urge to take risks in dealings. Some of its traits include broad-mindedness, being imaginative, intelligent, curious and flexible.

2.3. Perceived Ability
Perceived ability refers to the customers’ perceived knowledge and skills that enable them to participate effectively in service delivery (Meuter et al., 2005). Typically, a level of customer participation needs greater knowledge and skills from a customer (Yim et al., 2012). A high CP design also enables customers with high ability to leverage their expertise to co-create value (Dong et al., 2014). According to Auh et al. (2007), high level of customers’ ability is likely to increase their participation in service delivery because first, as customers gain more knowledge and skills, they are better in assessing where they might make a contribution and they are better in evaluating various attributes of different service offerings, second, customers with better knowledge and skills typically perceive lower decision-making risk. Third, they likely have a greater need for control in the service delivery process.

2.4. Subjective Norms
According to Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB), there is one type of social determinant of intentions and behaviors which is subjective norms (Ajzen, 1991). Subjective norms reflect the impact of expectations from other people, which are largely based on the need for approval (Bagozzi and Dholakia, 2006). This mode of social influence may also be termed as compliance (Kelman, 1974). This is only one type of social influence that is relevant for consumer participation (Bagozzi and Dholakia, 2006) since the operation of subjective norms in many situations may be problematic because it describes norms in terms of the context to which people perceive that others want them to perform the behavior, yet for behaviors that do not influence other people or behaviors that are not so directly associated with outcomes, such pressures may be latent and may not be perceived (Terry and Hogg, 1996).

2.5. Customer Participation
The definitions of customer participation employ many forms and degrees, from firm production to joint production to customer production (Meuter and Bitner, 1998). Because our purpose is to understand the value creation process when customers participate and interact with employees in services, we do not consider firm and customer production (e.g., self-service technologies). This study defined CP as a behavioral construct that measures the extent to which customers provide or share information, make suggestions, and become involved in decision making during the service co-creation and delivery process (Auh et al., 2007; Bettencourt, 1997; Bolton and Saxena-Iyer, 2009; Hsieh et al., 2004).

Researchers identified different roles that customers could assume in the service process, for example, partial employee (Johnston, 1989), co-producer (Kelley et al., 1990), decision maker (Bitner et al., 1997), and quality evaluator (Ennew and Binks, 1999). Customer participation was considered to comprise various behaviors, such as preparation, relationship building, information exchange, quality assurance, and assessment behaviors (Kellogg et al., 1997; Youngdahl et al., 2003). Several authors suggested that customer participation actually extends beyond the service process, involving customers’ inclination to learn and experiment, and to engage in active dialogue, collaboration, and codevelopment with sellers (Prahalad and Ramaswany, 2004; Wikström, 1996). The concept of participation was gradually extended to apply to both product and service offerings (Vargo and Lusch, 2004; Wikström, 1996), and to cover a broader scope of activities, such as customer interactions with providers or other actors (Tether and Tajari, 2008), as well as participation in product development (Wikström, 1996) or innovation (Magnusson et al., 2003; Von, 2001).

2.6. Customer Citizenship Behaviors
Customer citizenship behaviors have been increasingly discussed in management and marketing literature (e.g., Ahearne et al., 2005; Bettencourt, 1997; Groth, 2005; Lengnick-Hall et al., 2000). Bowen (1986) argues that customers seldom get involved in the process of production. However, in service organizations, both customers and employees are regarded as human resources. Customers take part in service delivery activities; it is therefore possible that customers replace employees in service-based organizations (Halbesleben and Buckley, 2004). Previous studies suggest that service based organizations should, in some cases, consider customers at least as organizational members or even as employees (Kelley et al., 1990). Based on these descriptions, it can be claimed that service customers may display citizenship behavior the same way as employees themselves do. Thus, we can apply findings of citizenship behavior studies to the customers.

In management literature, customer citizenship behavior is formally defined as “the voluntary individual behavior which is not explicitly or directly recognized by means of formal reward system and generally strengthens the effective efficiency of the organization” (Organ, 1988). Similarly, customer citizenship behavior is defined as “the voluntary behavior which is not essential to successful production or to introduction of services but totally useful to the whole service organization” (Groth, 2005). Several terms can be used to explain customer citizenship behavior among which the following are considerable: customer voluntary behavior, customer's voluntarily
performance, and “extra-role” behaviors of customer. Groth (2005), has identified three aspects of customer citizenship behavior: 1) introducing feedbacks to the organization which means the presentation of applicant’s information to the organizations with an aim to help them improve their service providing process; 2) helping other customers parallel to the philanthropy aspect in organizational citizenship behavior; and 3) giving commercial recommendations to friends or family members. In addition, Ford (1995) suggests that customers who display citizenship behavior may show their commitment to the service organization and report potential protective issues to the employees. Keh and Teo (2001), have claimed that the customer’s resistance against the failure of a service is another aspect of customer citizenship behavior. They state the case as a customer's tendency to accompany the services they encounter while these services are not executed as expected. Such an attitude results in permanent customization and does not publish negative word-of-mouth marketing (advertisements).

3. Research Design and Research Methodology
3.1 Meta-Analysis Procedure
To have a thorough literature review on each the research hypotheses, meta-analysis is adopted. This meta-analysis searched the empirical studies from different scientific database. The data was collected electronic in management, psychology, social science, business, marketing, health, and organizational behavior. First of all, this research looked for the coefficient correlations of the most important determinants of service dominant orientation, personality traits, perceived ability, subjective norms, customer participation and customer citizenship behaviors by using ProQuest, JSTOR, SAGE, Emerald, ScienceDirect, and Google Scholar. This research used them with multiple keywords to identify relevant journals, thesis, and dissertations. Correlations of each research hypothesis were collected for further analysis. After completing the research process, it obtained 42 studies which were usable for this meta-analysis. These results are showed in the last part of this meta-analysis research. Furthermore, in the reference part, the meta-analysis’ data sources are showed below.

3.2 Selection of Studies
Table 1 shows the studies included in the meta-analysis. This meta-analysis evaluated all previous studies for measuring the relationships between antecedents and customer participation and its consequences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Studies Alphabetically by Source and Codes for Hypotheses</th>
<th>Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anaza &amp; Zhao, 17, (CP-F; CP-R; CP-H), 2013</td>
<td>Han &amp; Kim, 6, (PA-CP; SN-CP), 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaza, 22, (A-CP; E-CP; CP-F; CP-R; CP-H) 2014</td>
<td>Han &amp; Yoon, 6 (PA-CP; SN-CP), 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anh &amp; Thuy, 25, (SD-CP) 2017</td>
<td>Han et al, (PA-CP; SN-CP), 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auh et al, 15, (SD-CP), 2007</td>
<td>He et al, (A-CP; O-CP), 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bagozzi &amp; Dholakia, 8, (SN-CP), 2006</td>
<td>Hsa et al, (PA-CP; SN-CP), 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banerjee, 1, (A-CP; C-CP; O-CP), 2016</td>
<td>Ida, (CP-F; CP-H), 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barratia et al, 3, (PA-CP), 2016</td>
<td>Iwasaki &amp; Fry, (SD-CP), 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buonocenti et al, 27, (SD-CP), 2017</td>
<td>Joshi &amp; Rahman, (PA-CP; SN-CP), 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalabaey et al, 23, (PA-CP), 2009</td>
<td>Kadic-Maglajlic et al, (SD-CP), 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen &amp; Tung, 6, (SN-CP), 2014</td>
<td>Kude et al, (A-CP, E-CP, C-CP, O-CP), 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chii et al, 14, (CP-F; CP-R; CP-H), 2015</td>
<td>Kumar et al, (PA-CP), 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cho &amp; Auger, 24, (A-CP, E-CP; C-CP; ES-CP; O-CP), 2017</td>
<td>Mechida &amp; Patterson, (A-CP, E-CP, C-CP, ES-CP, O-CP), 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cossio-Silva et al, 9, (SD-CP), 2016</td>
<td>Merz et al, (PA-CP), 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curth et al, 17, (CP-F; CP-R; CP-H) 2014</td>
<td>Mishra &amp; Vaitilumanathan, (SD-CP; E-CP; C-CP; ES-P), 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custiers &amp; Van den Bulck, 21, (PA-CP), 2011</td>
<td>Niehoff, (E-CP; C-CP; E-CP), 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freiberger et al, 19, (PA-CP), 2012</td>
<td>Orji et al, (A-CP, C-CP; ES-CP; O-CP), 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greaves et al, 12, (PA-CP; SN-CP), 2013</td>
<td>Paul et al, (PA-CP), 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grissemann &amp; Stokburger-Sauer, 27, (SD-CP), 2012</td>
<td>Tews et al, (E-CP; C-CP; PA-CP), 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groth, 13, (CP-F; CP-R), 2005</td>
<td>Ul Islam et al, (A-CP, E-CP; O-CP; ES-CP; C-CP), 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Han, 27, (PA-CP, SN-CP), 2015</td>
<td>Yadav &amp; Pathak (PA-CP, SN-CP), 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Han &amp; Hwang, 6, (PA-CP, SN-CP), 2016</td>
<td>Zhu et al, (CP-F; CP-R; CP-H), 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Codes in parentheses: CP= Customer Participation, SD= Service-Dominant Orientation, A= Agreeableness; E= Extraversion; C= Conscientiousness; ES= Emotional Stability; O= Openness to experience; PA= Perceived Ability; SN= Subjective Norm; R= Recommendation; H= Helping customers; F= Providing feedback


The following 11 research hypotheses were identified in this meta-analysis.
H1: S-D orientation has a positive effect on customer participation
H2a: Agreeableness has a positive effect on customer participation
H2b: Extraversion has a positive effect on customer participation
H2c: Conscientiousness has a positive effect on customer participation
H2d: Emotional stability has a positive effect on customer participation
H2e: Openness to experience has a positive effect on custom participation
H3: Perceived ability has a positive effect on customer participation
H4: Subjective norm has a positive effect on customer participation
H5a: Customer participation has a positive effect on recommendation
H5b: Customer participation has a positive effect on helping customer
H5c: Customer participation has a positive effect on providing feedback

Two criterions were used for the inclusion of this meta-analysis: (1) correlation studies had to present the correlation coefficient (r) or the standardized regression coefficient for each of the research hypotheses, (2) studies of group contrasts had to present the related statistic (t-test, F-ratio with one df in the numerator) for the above research hypotheses (De Matos et al., 2007). Then, all of the criteria should convert to r coefficients using CMA software. Since O’Connor (2002), Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al. (2005) and Hechanova et al. (2003) have explained that correlation coefficient r was easier to interpret and most of data-analytical review user as a criteria, this research used it for the further analysis. All identified studies were then examined in term of following relevant variables: authors, year, journals, total sample size, variable and effect size. Furthermore, based on Lipsey and Wilson (2001) study, the magnitude of effect size (r) can be categorized as small (r<0.1), medium (r>0.25) and high (r>0.4).

After integrating the correlation coefficient (r) of each study, a confidence interval is presented for each effect size and its significant. Rosenthal (1979), stated that when the mean effect size is significant, a fail N is calculated. Then, it estimates the number of non-significant and unavailable studies that would be necessary to bring the cumulative effect size to a non-significant value (known as the “file drawer” problems). This statistic analysis is an indication of the difficulty of the result. Confidence interval were also analysis. The criterion of 95% confidence interval was adopted to prove whether the hypothesis is accepted.

Moreover, Lipsey and Wilson (2001) explained about another Q-statistic which is an analysis of homogeneity of the effect size distribution. It is distributed as a Chi-square with degree of freedom = n-1, where n= number of studies. This test has assumed that all of the effect sizes are estimating the same population mean is a reasonable assumption. The criterion for Q-statistic is Q-value should be higher than Chi-square. It means the null hypothesis of homogeneity is accepted. Then, the variability across effect size does not exceed what would be expected based on sampling. If the null hypothesis of homogeneity is rejected, differences in effect size maybe attributed to factor other than sampling, therefore, the heterogeneity between the variance is exist.

4. Results

4.1. The Effects of Antecedents on Customer Participation

The table 4-1 shows the meta-analysis results for the influence of antecedents on customer participation. Using the mean value of correlation coefficients among previous studies, the results show that variables of service dominant orientation have positive influence on customer participation (r = 0.522). Based on the criteria as stated Lipsey and Wilson (2001), the relationship has high effect size. These results are also supported by 95% confidence interval with non-zero values. Therefore, hypothesis 1 is supported. Furthermore, the Q-value is higher than Chi-Square value, it means that the effect is heterogeneous.

In term of the relationship between personality traits and customer participation. Using the mean value of correlation coefficients among previous studies, the results that the variable of agreeableness (r=0.341), extraversion (r=0.204), conscientiousness (r=0.193), emotional stability (r=0.128), and openness to experience (r= 0.279) have positive influence on customer participation. Based on the criteria as stated Lipsey and Wilson (2001), the relationships have medium effect size. These results are also supported by (5% confidence interval with non-zero values. Therefore, hypotheses H2a, H2b, H2c, H2d, H2d are supported. Furthermore, the Q-value is higher than Chi-Square value, it means that the effect is heterogeneous.

For the influence of perceived ability on customer participation. Using the mean value of correlation coefficients among previous studies, the results show that the variable of perceived ability value has positive influence on customer participation (r= 0.336). Based on the criteria as stated Lipsey and Wilson (2001), the relationship has medium effect size. These results are also supported by 95% confidence interval with non-zero values. Therefore, hypothesis 3 is supported. Furthermore, the Q-value is higher than Chi-Square value, it means that the effect is heterogeneous.

Finally, for the influence of subjective norm on customer participation. Using the mean value of correlation coefficients among previous studies, the results show that variable of subjective norm value has positive influence on customer participation (r= 0.316). Based on the criteria as stated Lipsey and Wilson (2001), the relationship has high effect size. These results are also supported by 95% confidence interval with non-zero values. Therefore, hypothesis 4 is supported. Furthermore, the Q-value is higher than Chi-Square value, it means that the effect is heterogeneous.
4.2. The effect of Customer Participation on Customer Citizenship Behaviors

The table 4-2 shows the relationship between customer participation and its consequences. Using the mean value of correlation coefficients among previous studies, the results show that variables of customer participation have positive influence on recommendation ($r=0.394$). Moreover, the results also show that customer participation have positive influence on helping customer($r=0.484$) and providing feedback ($r=0.415$). Based on the criteria as stated Lipsey and Wilson (2001), the relationships have medium effect size. This result is supported by 95% confidence interval with non-zero values. Therefore, hypothesis H5a, H5b and H5c are supported. Furthermore, the Q-value is higher than Chi-Square value, it means that the effect is significantly heterogeneous.

5. Conclusion and Suggestion

This study intends to contribute to the current literatures from the following three aspects. First, this study examines multiple antecedents of customer participation at the same time which has yet to be done by previous studies. Those antecedents consist of firm factor (i.e., service-dominant orientation), customer factors (i.e., personality traits and perceived ability), and social factor (i.e., subjective norm).

Second, this study identifies customer citizenship behaviors such as recommendation, helping customers, and providing feedback as the consequences of customer participation. Third, this study identifies role identification as the moderator of the relationship between customer participation and its antecedents. Finally, this study also identifies perceived benefit of participation as the moderator of the relationship between customer participation and its consequences.

Since a comprehensive research model to identify the antecedents, consequences, and moderators of customer participation is yet to be developed, this study tried to fill this research gap and adopt meta-analysis approach to identify more insightful information of the research issue. Although a plenty of studies have conducted to understand of customer participation, none of the previous studies have integrated those antecedents, consequences, and moderators into a more comprehensive framework like this study. It is expected that the results of this study can be provided as an important reference for academicians to conduct further empirical validations on the research of customer participation; the results can also be very useful for professionals to identify their strategies of customer participation management and to enhance the profitability of the firm.
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