

## NEXUS OF CUSTOMER VALUE CO CREATION BEHAVIOR WITH CUSTOMER SATISFACTION

Shahnila Yousaf<sup>\*1</sup>, Dr.Naveed<sup>2</sup>, Masuooda Khanam<sup>3</sup>

<sup>\*1</sup>Ph.D Scholar, Qurtuba University Of Science And Information Technology Peshawar, Pakistan

<sup>2</sup>Professor, City University Of Science And Information Technology Peshawar, Pakistan

<sup>3</sup>MS.Scholar, Qurtuba University Of Science And Information Technology Peshawar, Pakistan

<sup>\*1</sup>shahnila189@yahoo.com; <sup>2</sup>naveedtoru97@cusit.edu.pk; <sup>3</sup>nelokhan80@yahoo.com

### ABSTRACT

With the fierce increase in competition, now the marketers of both products and service industry are striving for ways to improve their customer satisfaction. In the current research the researcher found the impact of value co creation on customer satisfaction. The current research study is conducted on hotel industry of KP Pakistan. Researcher calculated 396 sample through G-Power software. For data collection researcher used an adapted questionnaire having 5 point Likert scale. Questionnaires were distributed to 396 customers of hotel industry through convenient sampling technique. Analysis was performed on 269 questionnaire in total as 280 questionnaires were collected and 11 were incomplete. Researcher conducted validity and reliability statistics and concluded that instrument is valid and reliable. Researcher conducted descriptive analysis, Correlation analysis and regression analysis for dependent and independent variables. Through which it was concluded that customer's value co creation is having significant impact on customer satisfaction. Thus it is concluded that service marketers of hotel industry should use customer's value co creation practices to increase customer's satisfaction.

**Keywords:** Customers value co creation, Customer satisfaction, Hotel industry

### INTRODUCTION

Involving customers in the development of new products and services helps businesses create goods and services with better features and functions. It can assist in changing the product's design to reduce expenses or in creating goods or services that cater to the unique needs of clients and significantly address their issues (Windasari et al. 2021; Dwivedi et al. 2020a; Rathore et al. 2016; Alalwan et al. 2017). The idea of customers participating in a company's production and service operations is not new (Bendapudi et al. 1996). In the process of designing products or services, client's input is considered to have played a crucial role. Submissions of designs or concepts to the company regarding issues related to manufacturing or services are examples of inputs. Customers are

more satisfied when they participate in these company activities. This reciprocal exchange is linked to the idea of co-creation. When a business and its clients work together to produce value, Co-creation is involved there (Acharya et al. 2018). An example of engagement in a business-to-consumer setting would be IKEA contacting its clientele on social media to solicit their opinions on a piece of furniture that's newly created by the company. For instance, Procter & Gamble (P&G) frequently contacts Walmart on new product that are being designed in a business-to-business framework. Customers share their thoughts and creative ideas with the seller to convey the present and upcoming demands in light of this interaction (Zhang et al., 2020).

Customers' expectations act as a benchmark, and a company's performance that falls short of the benchmark may cause discontent (Javed et al., 2021). Likewise, clients may establish a benchmark about their anticipated degree of involvement in the value co-creation process and feel unsatisfied if their expectations are not fulfilled. According to one viewpoint, research indicates that customers may suffer from negative mismatch, which occurs when their actually encountered level of value co-creation is far less than the anticipated (Gligor, 2018). Customers are always co-creators of value, according to the SDL (Vargo & Lusch, 2017). Customers' pleasure may therefore suffer if they are not as involved in the process of value co-creation the way they like. Research indicates that both supply chain and end users are demanding more personalized answers that involve their involvement (Kristensson et al., 2008; Carbone et al., 2017; Kohtamäki & Partanen, 2016).

Context is a crucial factor in determining consumer co-creation behaviors. (Neghina, Bloemer, van Birgelen, and Canils 2017). One of many researches, Dong, Sivakumar, Evans, and Zou's (2015), looked at the impact of customer's involvement on their satisfaction being a component of service outcomes in students of American college. Similar to this, Chen, Huang, and Yang (2022) conducted an empirical study at a Chinese real estate agency to examine client engagement, customer happiness, identity, and loyalty. In Taiwan's fitness clubs, Pan, Lee, Hsu, and Lee (2019) investigated the ways in which patron involvement behavior fosters customer satisfaction. Revilla-Camacho, Cosso-Silva, Palacios-Florencio and Vega-Vázquez (2016) looked at the (psychological) attitudinal as well as behavioral perspectives of organizations related to personal care services of Spain while examining value co-creation as well as the impact it has on satisfaction toward the organization.

The research mentioned above have all helped to deepen our understanding of many fields and nations. The findings of any research study of one industry or country need to be adjusted in a different context because different industries and nations are made up differently. To provide a thorough grasp of customer viewpoints on value

co-creation, perhaps further studies from other businesses and nations with particular characteristics are needed.

The current study is focusing on hotel industry of Pakistan as in the modern era of innovation and digitalization businesses are under pressure to adapt to the market in an innovative way as their environment grows more complicated which is made feasible by customer value co-creation (Vila & Kuster (2007); Jichao 2010). Customers' satisfaction is the study's primary criterion, making it extremely useful in the hotel industry. Therefore, there is an urgent need to investigate how value co-creation affects customer satisfaction from the viewpoint of the customer in order to determine the long-term benefits that customers can derive from these value co-creation initiatives.

## Literature Review

### Value co creation Behavior

The SDL (service-dominant logic), as supported by the pioneering study of Vargo and Lusch (2004), extends the process of value creation to incorporate the way customer views or personalizes the value while consuming services and products. So, In order to improve and maintain customer satisfaction and also gain competitive edge, organizations are increasingly taking steps to involve customers in this value creation phenomenon also being known as value co-creation. However, value co-creation as a concept is known as a key for satisfaction of customers (Ozcan & Ramaswamy, 2018). The umbrella term of co-creation of value states that consumers are very much involved in co-creation of value, not only for the company but also for employees and other customers (Read & Ranjan, 2016).

The SDL (service-dominant logic) defines value as a dynamic, context-dependent, and meaning-rich concept that arises when customers engage with, experience, or personalize marketers' value propositions within the framework of their own unique experiences. (Vargo and Lusch, 2016, Rihova et al., 2018). Three dimensions are put out by Ranjan and Read (2014): personalization, relationship, and experience. Customers' psychical, cognitive, and affective preferences for the product or service artefact are correlated with their experience (Edvardsson, Gustafsson, & Roos,

2005). When cooperation, engagement, and reciprocity—qualities that are dependent on individual traits and relationships—appear, personalization takes place (Read and Ranjan, 2021; Neuhofer et al., 2015).

The term "value-in-use" has moved toward the value-in-context paradigm, however it is nevertheless utilized in this study in line with the Read and Ranjan (2014) scale. Both theoretical and practical arguments highlight the need of value co-creation in these organizations of tourism and hospitality sectors (Yang & Campos, 2024; Cabiddu, Lui, & Piccoli, 2016; Sfandla & Björk, 2013, Rihova et al., 2015, 2018). Value co-creation is thought to have a significant and intricate role in the tourist and hospitality industries (Rihova et al., 2019); because co-creation of value—which involves social interaction—occurs at all the stages of the trip from start to end (Prebensen et al., 2013). According to Saxena, Ross, Deutz and Correia (2017), using archeological heritage to produce unique creative tourism experiences requires a co-creation attitude. Other studies (Murphy, Alexander and Bryce 2023; Szmigin, Bengry-Howell, Griffin, & Riley, 2017; Rihova et al., 2015, 2018) concentrate on significance of co-creation of value in tourism experiences as well as the role it plays in the validity of music festivals and also heritage spots (Tan, Kung, & Luh, 2013).

Benefits include improved customer-provider interactions that allow for the co-creation of a unique experience that increases employee and customer satisfaction Grisseman & Stokburger-Sauer, (2012), positive effects on operational benefits (Zaborek & Mazur, 2019), and increased customer self-efficacy as a result of their

participation in value co-creation (Im & Qu, 2017, 2021).

### Customers Satisfaction

According to Opatá et al. (2021), the client compares the performance level to the predetermined expectations. We define satisfaction as the perceived discrepancy between expectations and actual performance after consuming a good or service (Yang et al., 2017; Jiang et al., 2019). Customer happiness can be reliably predicted by visitor reviews (Gu & Ye, 2014; Hargreaves, 2012; Schuckert et al., 2015). Customer satisfaction equates to raising customer loyalty, which in turn raises awareness and information, which in turn raises cognitive loyalty, customer loyalty, and positive sentiments (Xuecheng 2012, Ofosu et al., 2020). A good emotional state resulting from a client's overall evaluation of their provider is known as customer satisfaction (Russo et al., 2018).

Value co-creation has been linked in the literature to a number of benefits, such as increased profitability, market share, sales, and quality (Santos-Vijande et al., 2016). Furthermore, studies have looked at how co-creation affects customer's satisfaction and performance, as well as efficiency, innovation, and the speed at which new services are developed (Tseng & Chiang, 2016; Chan et al., 2010; Di Gangi et al., 2010). However, in this study, we concentrate on outcomes related to customers that record the customer's assessment of their interaction. Accordingly, research indicates that co-creation initiatives improve end-customer satisfaction (Santos-Vijande et al., 2016).

The researcher proposed following conceptual frame work based on the above literature.



**H<sub>0</sub>:** Customer value co creation behavior has no impact on customer satisfaction.

**H<sub>1</sub>:** Customer value co creation behavior has a significant impact on customer satisfaction.

**Research Methodology**

Research design is conceptualized in a way that aligns with the study's framework and extrapolates the investigation's findings. This view is a road-map that directs a research project by outlining the research approach, sampling technique, research setting, sample size selected for conducting research, tools and techniques for data collection, and data analysis to answer research questions and test study hypotheses (Huntington-Klein, N.2021). It also specifies how, when, and where information will be gathered and examined.

The most often used research philosophy in the social sciences and consumer behavior studies is positivism. In order to obtain and produce precise facts and figures, this study utilized a positivist research philosophy in accordance with the aforementioned suggestions. The research approach used in this study is deductive which is a systematic and rational approach of testing and validating preexisting theories or hypotheses; specific observations and data are then gathered to either corroborate or disprove the initial claim. A quantitative-research technique is the best option where data collecting from a large number of respondents is necessary so this study employed a quantitative approach. The researcher has used Cross sectional data, one time data from hotel customers.

The population of the current study consists of patrons of KP's hotel sector. The hotel industry was picked because adaptation to new developments brought about by technical innovation, competitive marketplaces in the form of new ideas, and an innovative organizational atmosphere are all necessary for firms to succeed in this industry (Hu, C.2023). The hotels were selected on the basis of convenience. Convenient sampling is opted to identify and select the respondents.

**4.1.1 Gender Wise Frequency Distribution**

Gender	Freq	Percentage (%)	Valid Percentage (%)	Cumulative percentage (%)
Male	248	92	92	92
Female	21	8	8	100
Total	269	100	100	

The gender-wise frequency distribution of the respondents is detailed in the above table. According to the above data, there are 248 male respondents, or 92% of the total, and 21 female respondents, or 8% of the total.

G power software is used which is a statistical power analysis software that aids the researchers to define the requisite sample size for their studies which came out 396 for the current study. Out of 396 questionnaires distributed only 280 questionnaires were received but 11 were removed which were not properly filled so 269 questionnaires were taken for further study .By looking this into account the response rate was 69% (Rafiq & Naveed, 2020).

The participants in this study belongs to cities in KP these customers have used the services of those particular hotels. Research instrument that was used in this study was adapted questionnaire (Questionnaire attached in the appendix )having Five-point Likert Scale

After data collection SPSS software was used for data analysis .Techniques used are descriptive statistics, Reliability analysis, Validity analysis, Correlation and Regression analysis.

**4. ANALYSIS**

This chapter goes into great detail on the results of econometric tests and how to interpret them. First, instrument reliability was weighed by Cronbach's alpha approach. The validity of the measures was then assessed using exploratory factor analysis. To gain a thorough understanding of the study participants, a frequency distribution test was used. Regression and correlation analyses were used to test the study hypotheses. Below is a detailed discussion of each respondent's description.

**4.1 Frequency Distribution**

The frequency distribution for the current study's gender, age, and qualification scales is displayed in the following tables.

#### 4.1.2 Qualification

Qualification	Freq	Percentage (%)	Valid (%)	Cumulative (%)
Intermediate	14	5.2	5.2	5.2
Bachelor	59	22.2	22.2	27.3
Masters	186	69.0	69.0	96.4
Other	10	3.6	3.6	100
Total	269	100.0	100.0	

The above table provides a detailed description of the study's respondent frequency distribution according to their qualifications. The sample includes 14 individuals with intermediate qualifications (percentage 5.2), 59 individuals with

Bachelors qualifications (22.2%), 186 individuals with masters qualifications (percentage 69.0), and 10 individuals with other qualifications (percentage 3.6).

#### 4.1.3 Age

Age	Freq	Percent (%)	Valid (%)	Cumulative (%)
21--30	40	14.8	14.8	14.8
31--40	86	31.91	31.91	46.71
41--50	88	32.7	32.7	79.41
51--60	55	20.4	20.4	100.0
Total	269	100.0	100.0	

Frequency distribution of the present study participants according to age is displayed in the above table. For example, respondents between the ages of 21 and 30 made up 40 with a valid percentage of 14.8, those between the ages of 31

and 40 made up 86 with a valid percentage of 31.91, those between the ages of 41 and 50 made up 88 with a valid percentage of 32.7, and those between the ages of 51 and 60 made up 55 with a valid percentage of 20.4.

#### 4.1.4 Descriptive Statistics

	N	Mini.	Max.	Mean.	Std.Dev.	Skewness.	Kurtosis.
CVCC	269	2	5	3.50	1.015	-.370 .175	-1.290 .347
CS	269	2	5	3.54	.812	-.195 .175	-.521 .347

The present study's descriptive statistics, which include scales, Mean, Min, Max, Standard Deviation, Skewness, and Kurtosis values, are detailed in the table above.

The present research study's factors are all explained. Take into account that all study variables have a minimum value of two and a maximum value of five. Based on the above-highlighted standard deviation figure, which shows a minor departure from the mean value but no substantial divergence. The key factors are skewness and kurtosis value. Skewness and kurtosis values must fall between  $\pm 1.96$  and  $\pm 2.85$  if the study's sample size is 50 or below.

Skewness and kurtosis values must be adjusted from  $\pm 1.96$  to  $\pm 2.58$  if the study's sample size is 200 (Ghasemi and Zahedias, 2012). Therefore, it can be concluded that there is no specific requirement for a larger study sample size for the values of the kurtosis and skewness statistics. Skewness statistics and kurtosis statistics are negatively impacted when the study's sample size is 200 or more, according to Khattak et al. (2018) and Hair et al. (2013). Therefore, the values of skewness and kurtosis are within range according to the previously mentioned criterion. The preceding table's descriptive statistics all show that the data were regularly distributed.

#### 4.2 Reliability Statistics

Variable	No. of Item	Alpha Value
Customer value co creation	16	.905
Customer Satisfaction	11	.885

The study's dependent and independent variables' reliability statistics are highlighted in the above table. The scale's reliability utilized in the research study is indicated when the Cronbach's alpha score is greater than 0.6. Thus, the reliability of the scale utilized in the study is indicated by the fact that all of the variables are over 0.6. Using a 16-item scale, the alpha value of customer value co-creation is .905. Using an 11-item scale, customer satisfaction has an alpha value of .885.

#### 4.3 Validity Statistics

Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was used to guarantee the validity of the current study instrument. As previously stated, the instrument is modified in the current study, which is why EFA was used rather than CFA. The EFA specifics for each of the study's instruments are displayed in the following tables.

##### 4.3.1 KMO and Bartlett's Test of CVCC

KMO		.869
BTS	Approx. Chi-Square	922.439
	df	29
	Sig	.000

The KMO and Bartlett's test results for customer's value co-creation are displayed in the above table. 0.6 Or above is the crucial and recognized KMO value. The KMO value, as shown, is .869. This number is greater than the critical limit of 0.6. Additionally, the BTS value of .000 in the above table is noteworthy. Therefore, the research study's sample is sufficient.

##### 4.3.2 Component Matrix of CVCC

CVCC1	.792
CVCC2	.803
CVCC3	.857
CVCC4	.708
CVCC5	.725
CVCC6	.774
CVCC7	.775
CVCC8	.778
CVCC9	.762
CVCC10	.792
CVCC11	.748
CVCC12	.824
CVCC13	.894
CVCC14	.739
CVCC15	.836
CVCC16	.778

The accompanying table displays the scale for every item used in the Customer Value Co Creation (CVCC) research study. For the study's items to remain on the scale, they must be greater than 0.5. Every item in the

CVCC questionnaire is kept in the CVCC as every item used in the research study is more than 0.5. Field (2009) states that a good and accepted example is indicated by a factor loading value close to 1.

#### 4.3.3 KMO and Bartlett's Test of CS

KMO		.765
BTS	Approx. Chi-Square	217.720
	df	7
	Sig	.000

The results of the Bartlett's and KMO tests of customer satisfaction (CS) are displayed in the above table. A KMO value of 0.6 or above is allowed. Consequently, the KMO value is higher

than 0.6 at 0.765. Additionally, the BTS value is 0.000, which is noteworthy. Consequently, it demonstrates that the current study's sample is sufficient.

#### 4.3.4 Component Matrix of CS

CS1	.854
CS2	.789
CS3	.857
CS4	.808
CS5	.759
CS6	.862
CS7	.768
CS8	.845
CS9	.894
CS10	.765
CS11	.832

The table displays the scale items used in the customer satisfaction (CS) research study. For the study's items to remain on the scale, they must be greater than 0.5. Since the research study's used

items score higher than 0.5, all 11 items are kept on the CS scale. According to Field (2009), a good and legitimate case is indicated by a factor loading value close to 1.

#### 4.4 Correlation Analysis

	Customer Value	Creation behavior	Customer Satisfaction
Customer Value	Correlation		1
Co-Creation	Sig.		
	N	269	
Customer Satisfaction	Correlation	.623**	1
	Sig.	.000	
	N	269	

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level

The association among customer satisfaction and customer value co creation has a P-value of 0.000 and a Pearson's correlation of 0.623. Consequently,

there is a positive and statistically significant correlation among customer satisfaction and customer value co-creation.

## 4.5 Regression Analysis

### 4.5.1 Model Summary

R	R <sup>2</sup>	Std. Error	D.W
.712	.483	.662	1.622

Predictor: CVCC  
DV: CS

The regression model analysis is displayed in the table above. Customer satisfaction (CS) is the criterion variable in the model, while customer value co-creation (CVCC) is a predictor. Nearly

equal to 1.5, the DW value is 1.6222. As is well known, the ideal range for the DW value is 1.5 to 2.5. Therefore, the DW value confirms that autocorrelation does not exist.

**Table 4.5.2 Coefficient**

	Unstandardized Coefficient		Standardized Beta.	t	p
	B	Std. Error			
Constant.	1.421	1.67		8.283	.000
CVCC	.631	.045	.70	13.652	.000

DV: CS

The model summary and coefficient for customer satisfaction (CS) and customer value co-creation (CVCC) are displayed in the above table. The t and p values above demonstrate the independent variable's positive and substantial impact on the dependent variable.

## CONCLUSION

The validity of the scale utilized in this study is found by the exploratory factor analysis (EFA) results presented in the previous chapter. Following validation of the validity and reliability of the scale, the correlation, cause-and-effect relationship as stated in the previous chapter, reliability was verified using the Cronbach's alpha approach. As was previously mentioned, all of the variables' alpha values are higher than 0.6, which is the accepted value according to recommendations from earlier academics. Similarly, the validity of the scale was guaranteed. Correlation analysis was used to guarantee that the variables were related.

The research objective for this specific research question was: To analyze the effect of customer's value co creation behavior on customer satisfaction and the hypothesis for the aforementioned was: Customer value co creation behavior has a significant impact on customer's satisfaction. By looking at the regression analysis it's concluded that this particular hypothesis is supported as the significance value is less than 0.05. So our hypothesis is accepted which proves that customer's value co creation is having a significant impact on customer's satisfaction. The researcher found out that there is significant association among Customer's value co creation and customer's satisfaction. Based on the current study conclusions it is determined that Hotel sector should be using ways that will increase customer value co creation by which customer satisfaction can be enhanced.



## References

- Acharya, A., Singh, S. K., Pereira, V., & Singh, P. (2018). Big data, knowledge co-creation and decision making in fashion industry. *International Journal of Information Management*, 42, 90-101.
- Bendapudi, N., Singh, S. N., & Bendapudi, V. (1996). Enhancing helping behavior: An integrative framework for promotion planning. *Journal of marketing*, 60(3), 33-49.
- Cabiddu, F., Lui, T. W., & Piccoli, G. (2016). IT-Enabled value co-creation in a tourism context: the portale Sardegna case. *Open Tourism: Open Innovation, Crowdsourcing and Co-Creation Challenging the Tourism Industry*, 47-60.
- Cabiddu, F., Moreno, F., & Sebastiano, L. (2019). Toxic collaborations: Co-destroying value in the B2B context. *Journal of Service Research*, 22(3), 241-255.
- Carbone, V., Rouquet, A., & Roussat, C. (2017). The rise of crowd logistics: a new way to co-create logistics value. *Journal of Business Logistics*, 38(4), 238-252.
- Chen, H., Yang, Y., Yang, M., & Huang, H. (2022). The impact of environmental regulation on China's industrial green development and its heterogeneity. *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution*, 10, 967550.
- Cossío-Silva, F. J., Revilla-Camacho, M. Á., Vega-Vázquez, M., & Palacios-Florencio, B. (2016). Value co-creation and customer loyalty. *Journal of business research*, 69(5), 1621-1625
- Di Gangi, P. M. (2010). *The co-creation of value: Exploring engagement behaviors in user-generated content websites*. The Florida State University.
- Dong, B., Sivakumar, K., Evans, K. R., & Zou, S. (2015). Effect of customer participation on service outcomes: The moderating role of participation readiness. *Journal of service research*, 18(2), 160-176.
- Dwivedi, Y. K., Ismagilova, E., Hughes, D. L., Carlson, J., Filieri, R., Jacobson, J., & Wang, Y. (2021). Setting the future of digital and social media marketing research: Perspectives and research propositions. *International journal of information management*, 59, 102168.
- Edvardsson, B., Gustafsson, A., & Roos, I. (2005). Service portraits in service research: a critical review. *International journal of service industry management*, 16(1), 107-121.
- Gligor, D. (2018). Performance implications of the fit between suppliers' flexibility and their customers' expected flexibility: A dyadic examination. *Journal of Operations Management*, 58, 73-8
- Gligor, D. M., & Maloni, M. J. (2022). More is not always better: The impact of value co-creation fit on B2B and B2C customer satisfaction. *Journal of Business Logistics*, 43(2), 209-237.
- Grisseemann, U. S., & Stokburger-Sauer, N. E. (2012). Customer co-creation of travel services: The role of company support and customer satisfaction with the co-creation performance. *Tourism management*, 33(6), 1483-1492
- Gu, B & Di Gangi, P. M. (2010). *The co-creation of value: Exploring engagement behaviors in user-generated content websites*. The Florida State University.
- Hargreaves, A., & Fink, D. (2012). *Sustainable leadership*. John Wiley & Sons
- Hu, C. (2023). Study on the relationship between Innovation atmosphere and innovation behavior. *Journal of Innovation and Development*, 2(2), 119-124
- Hu, Y., & McLoughlin, D. (2012). Creating co created market for industrial services in nascent fields. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 26(5), 322-331
- Huntington-Klein, N. (2021). *The effect: An introduction to research design and causality*. Chapman and Hall/CRC.

- Im, J., & Qu, H. (2017). Drivers and resources of customer co-creation: A scenario-based case in the restaurant industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 64, 31-40.
- Im, J., Qu, H., & Beck, J. A. (2021). Antecedents and the underlying mechanism of customer intention of co-creating a dining experience. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 92, 102715.
- Imran rafiq & Naveed (2020) Does Self-Awareness help in reducing Work Stress Caused by Work Overload and Role Conflict?. *Journal of Managerial Sciences* 14 (2)
- Javed, S., Rashidin, M. S., & Jian, W. (2021). Predictors and outcome of customer satisfaction: moderating effect of social trust. *Decision*, 48(1), 27-48
- Kohtamäki, M., & Partanen, J. (2016). Co-creating value from knowledge-intensive business services in manufacturing firms: The moderating role of relationship learning in supplier–customer interactions. *Journal of business research*, 69(7), 2498-2506.
- Kohtamäki, M., & Rajala, R. (2016). Theory and practice of value co-creation in B2B systems. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 56, 4-13.
- Kristensson, P., Matthing, J., & Johansson, N. (2008). Key strategies for the successful involvement of customers in the co-creation of new technology-based services. *International journal of service industry management*, 19(4), 474-49
- Lee, H. C., Pan, H. L., & Chung, C. C. (2019). The study of destination image, service quality, satisfaction and behavioral intention—an example of Dapeng Bay National Scenic Area. *International Journal of Organizational Innovation (Online)*, 11(3), 25.
- Neghina, C., Caniëls, M. C., Bloemer, J. M., & Van Birgelen, M. J. (2017). Value cocreation in service interactions: Dimensions and antecedents. *Marketing theory*, 15(2), 221-242.
- Neuhofer, B. (2016). Value co-creation and co-destruction in connected tourist experiences. In *Information and Communication Technologies in Tourism 2016: Proceedings of the International Conference in Bilbao, Spain, February 2-5, 2016* (pp. 779-792). Springer International Publishing.
- Neuhofer, B., Buhalis, D., & Ladkin, A. (2015). Smart technologies for personalized experiences: a case study in the hospitality domain. *Electronic Markets*, 25, 243-254.
- Ofosu-Boateng, I., & Acquaye, P. (2020). Effects of service quality and customer satisfaction on customers' loyalty in the hospitality industry of Ghana. *European Journal of Business and Management Research*, 5(5).
- Opata, C. N., Xiao, W., Nusenu, A. A., Tetteh, S., & Asante Boadi, E. (2021). The impact of value co-creation on satisfaction and loyalty: The moderating effect of price fairness (empirical study of automobile customers in Ghana). *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 32(11-12), 1167-1181
- 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.
- Prebensen, N. K., Vittersø, J., & Dahl, T. I. (2013). Value co-creation significance of tourist resources. *Annals of tourism Research*, 42, 240-261
- Ramaswamy, V., & Ozcan, K. (2018). What is co-creation? An interactional creation framework and its implications for value creation. *Journal of business research*, 84, 196-205.
- Ramsaran-Fowdar, R. R. (2007). Developing a service quality questionnaire for the hotel industry in Mauritius. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 13(1), 19-27.
- Ranjan, K. R., & Read, S. (2016). Value co-creation: concept and measurement. *Journal of the academy of marketing science*, 44, 290-315.

- Ranjan, K. R., & Read, S. (2021). An ecosystem perspective synthesis of co-creation research. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 99, 79-96.
- Rathore, A. K., Ilavarasan, P. V., & Dwivedi, Y. K. (2016). Social media content and product co-creation: an emerging paradigm. *Journal of Enterprise Information Management*, 29(1), 7-18.
- Rihova, I., Buhalis, D., Gouthro, M. B., & Moital, M. (2018). Customer-to-customer co-creation practices in tourism: Lessons from Customer-Dominant logic. *Tourism Management*, 67, 362-375.
- Rihova, I., Buhalis, D., Moital, M., & Gouthro, M. B. (2015). Conceptualising customer-to-customer value co-creation in tourism. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 17(4), 356-363.
- Rihova, I., Moital, M., Buhalis, D., & Gouthro, M. B. (2019). Practice-based segmentation: taxonomy of C2C co-creation practice segments. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 31(9), 3799-3818.
- Ross, D., Saxena, G., Correia, F., & Deutz, P. (2017). Archaeological tourism: A creative approach. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 67, 37-47.
- Russo, I., Confente, I., & Borghesi, A. (2018). Consumer satisfaction and loyalty in digital markets: Exploring the impact of their antecedents. In *Digital Technology and Organizational Change*.
- Santos-Vijande, M. L., López-Sánchez, J. Á., & Rudd, J. (2016). Frontline employees' collaboration in industrial service innovation: routes of co-creation's effects on new service performance. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 44, 350-375.
- Schuckert, M., Liu, X., & Law, R. (2015). Hospitality and tourism online reviews: Recent trends and future directions. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 32(5), 608-621.
- Sfandla, C., & Björk, P. (2013). Tourism experience network: Co-creation of experiences in interactive processes. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 15(5), 495-506.
- Szmigin, I., Bengry-Howell, A., Morey, Y., Griffin, C., & Riley, S. (2017). Socio-spatial authenticity at co-created music festivals. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 63, 1-11.
- Tan, S. K., Kung, S. F., & Luh, D. B. (2013). A model of 'creative experience' in creative tourism. *Annals of tourism research*, 41, 153-174
- Tseng, F. M., & Chiang, L. L. L. (2016). Why does customer co-creation improve new travel product performance? *Journal of Business Research*, 69(6), 2309-2317.
- Vargo, S. L., & Lusch, R. F. (2016). Institutions and axioms: an extension and update of service-dominant logic. *Journal of the Academy of marketing Science*, 44, 5-23.
- Vargo, S. L., Lusch, R. F., Akaka, M. A., & He, Y. (2017). Service-dominant logic: A review and assessment. *Review of marketing research*, 125-167.
- Vila, N., & Kuster, I. (2007). The importance of innovation in international textile firms. *European journal of marketing*, 41(1/2), 17-36.
- Windasari, N. A., Lin, F. R., & Kato-Lin, Y. C. (2021). Continued use of wearable fitness technology: A value co-creation perspective. *International Journal of Information Management*, 57, 102292.
- Yang, F. X. (2017). Effects of restaurant satisfaction and knowledge sharing motivation on eWOM intentions: the moderating role of technology acceptance factors. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 41(1), 93-127.
- Yang, J., Campos, A. C., Liu, B., Moyle, B., Kralj, A., & Le, T. H. (2024). Experience Co-Creation: Attention and Involvement. In *Cognitive Psychology and Tourism* (pp. 197-209). Emerald Publishing Limited

- Yang, J., Campos, A. C., Liu, B., Moyle, B., Kralj, A., & Le, T. H. (2024). Experience Co-Creation: Attention and Involvement. In *Cognitive Psychology and Tourism* (pp. 197-209). Emerald Publishing Limited
- Zaborek, P., & Mazur, J. (2019). Enabling value co-creation with consumers as a driver of business performance: A dual perspective of Polish manufacturing and service SMEs. *Journal of Business Research*, 104, 541-551.
- Zhang, M., Zhao, X., Voss, C., & Zhu, G. (2016). Innovating through services, co-creation and supplier integration: Cases from China. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 171, 289-300.
- Zhang, P., Gerdes Jr, J. H., & Meng, F. (2020). The impact of national culture on hotel guest evaluation—A big data approach. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 22(5), 582-592.
- Zhang, T., Lu, C., Torres, E., & Chen, P. J. (2018). Engaging customers in value co-creation or co-destruction online. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 32(1), 57-69.
- Zhang, X., & Chen, R. (2008). Examining the mechanism of the value co-creation with customers. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 116(2), 242-250.

**Appendix 01:**

**Questionnaire of Customer value co creation behaviour and Customer satisfaction**

**Section 1: Demographics**

<b>Demographics</b>	<b>Responses</b>
Gender	I. Male II. Female
Age (years)	I. 21-30 II. 31-40 III. 41-50 IV. 51-60
Qualification	I. Intermediate II. Bachelors III. Masters IV. Other

<b>1. Customer value co creation behaviour (Shamim et al., 2017)</b>						
		<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
CVCC1	I have asked others for information on what this hotel offers.					
CVCC2	I provided necessary information so that the employee could perform his or her duties.					
CVCC3	I answered all the employee's service-related questions.					
CVCC4	I clearly explained what I wanted the employee to do.					
CVCC5	I didn't act rudely to the employees					
CVCC6	The service provider considered my role to be as important as its own in the process					
CVCC7	During the process I could conveniently express my specific requirements.					
CVCC8	In order to get maximum benefit from the service, I had to play proactive role during my interaction (application of my skills, knowledge and time etc)					
CVCC9	When I receive good service from the employee, I comment about it.					
CVCC10	When I experience a problem, I let the employee know about it.					
CVCC11	I assist other customers if they need my help.					
CVCC12	If the employee makes a mistake during service delivery, I would be willing to show patience.					
CVCC13	I have paid attention to how others behave to use this hotel service well.					
CVCC14	I have searched for information on where this hotel is located.					
CVCC15	If I have a useful idea on how to improve service, I let the employee know.					
CVCC16	I will say positive things about this service provider and the employee to others.					
<b>2. Customer Satisfaction (McMullan and O'Neill 2010)</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
CS1	Destination is a safe place to visit.					
CS2	Staff here are friendly, responsive and hospitable.					
CS3	Timings are organized.					
CS4	Visitor attractions are available.					
CS5	Tourism information centers / welcome centers are available.					
CS6	Physical condition of location/site is attractive.					
CS7	Restroom cleanliness & availability is appropriate.					
CS8	Signage & information services are available.					
CS9	24/7 hours of operation is available.					
CS10	Safety at location/site is present.					
CS11	Overall I am satisfied from the experience.					