

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors and Service Quality as the External Effectiveness of Contract Employees in a Deluxe Hotel

Abstract - The purpose of this is to understand critical roles of contact employees' organization citizenship behaviors (OCBs) in customers' evaluation of service quality. This paper examines the relationship of employees' OCBs with job satisfaction, trust in manager, and customer's perceived service quality in travel agencies. The empirical results show that contact employee' job satisfaction and trust in manager are significantly related to OCB and that their active engagement in OCB has a positive relationship with the perception of service quality. Although there exists a significant common method factor possibly influencing the strength of the relationship, this factor did not affect the overall pattern of significant relationship. Another notable finding indicates that, unlike a global OCB measure, path estimates in the relationship of job satisfaction and trust to OCB variable are not similar and suggests that the multiple facets of OCBs provide more detailed information than a global OCB.

Keyword: Organizational citizenship behavior, Service quality; Contact employee

1. Introduction

Customer-contact employees have received considerable attention from both academics and practitioners. As boundary spanners, these employees' attitude and behaviors toward customers have been argued to significantly influence customers' perceived service quality and satisfaction as well as employees' performance (Bowen and Schneider, 1985; Pfeffer, 1994). For these reasons, services marketing has focused on identifying the relationship between employee behaviors and relevant organizational behavior constructs, such as job satisfaction (Hartline and Ferrell, 1996; Schneider and Bowen, 1985; Schneider et al., 1980) and organizational climate (Burke et al., 1992; Schneider et al., 1988), which in turn influence customers' Perceptions of service quality.

While these relationships provide valuable insights, largely neglected is a particular set of neglected is a particular set of customer-contact employee' behaviors in service encounter that can also significantly influence customers' perceptions of service quality, specifically voluntary and/or discretionary behaviors that employees perform for both customers and organizations. These behaviors, called organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs), are individual contributions in the workplace that go beyond the specified role requirements and are not directly or explicitly recognizes by the formal reward system(Organ, 1988; Organ and Ryan, 1995).

Over the past decade, a great deal has been done in the fields of marketing and human resources management



on satisfaction (Bateman and Organ, 1983; MacKenzie et al., 1998; Netemeyer et al., 1997), fairness perceptions (Farh et al., 1990; Konovsky and Pugh, 1994; Moorman, 1991; Netemeyer et al., 1997), organizational commitment (MacKenzie et al., 1998; O'Reillt and Chaiman, 1986; Williams and Anderson, 1991), and the impact of OCBs on manager's performance evaluation (MacKenzie et al., 1997).

Despite abundant studies on OCBs, still much remains unexplored about possible consequences of OCBs. Most of the research on OCBs has focused on the effects of employee-level variables such as attitudes, perceptions, and personal dispositions (Organ and Ryan, 1995) but provided relatively little attention to possibly various effects service quality. In particular, most marketing studies limited the effect of OCBs to managerial evaluation of subordinate performance. Based on norms of reciprocity and fairness, schema-triggered affect, and informational distinctiveness, previous studies propose that salespeople's OCBs in personal selling are useful predictors for managers' evaluations of salespeople's performance (MacKenzie et al., 1993, 1998; Netemeyer et al., 1997; Posdakoff and MacKenzie, 1994). This focus, however, has tended to ignore the relationship between OCBs and critical organizational out-comes such as service quality.

OCBs refer to "discretionary behaviors behaviors that are not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal system and that, in the aggregate, promote the effective functioning of the organization" (Organ, 1988, p. 4). Also, researchers have suggested that OCBs facilitate organizational effective-ness, efficiency, and success, because OCBs make for more efficient use of resources, allow managers to devote more time to productive activities, and improve the ability of coworkers to perform their jobs (Organ, 1988; Posdakoff and MacKenzie, 1994). In a sense, a

main impetus to study OCB lies in the assumption that OCB significantly enhances organizational effectiveness (e.g., MacKenzie et al., 1991; Organ, 1988). While the effective functioning of an organization is a desirable outcome, an important empirical question still remains to be answered: "How are OCBs related to customers' perception of service quality?"

Service is performance in its nature and thus, in contrast to tangible goods, service quality depends heavily on how contact employees work with customers, coworkers, and their organization. In this light, in addition to role-prescribed activities, extra-role activities such as OCBs could be critical factors that determine the level of service quality. For example, various OCBs, such as informal mentoring of new or less skilled contact employees or assisting other contact employees that are temporarily overburdened, may be more likely to contribute to better service. Also, voluntary suggestions from contact employee as boundary spanner might improve service quality. Thus, it is important for service companies to give more attention to discretionary and voluntary behaviors of contact employees, which should lead to the effective working of organizations and, in turn, service excellence.

In this study, we investigate the relationship between OCBs and customers' evaluation of service quality. In addition to job satisfaction, which has been well supported in the literature (Organ and Ryan, 1995), we also include trust in manager because trust, on the basis of social exchange theory, is likely to ensure that voluntary behaviors like OCB will be reciprocated in the long run (Organ, 1990). We develop and test a hypothetical model that specifies the relationship of OCB with service quality, job satisfaction, and trust. By using both employee and customer data in a single study, we investigate whether employees' OCBs are

related to service quality that customers as arbiters of external effectiveness evaluate. We examine the relationship among variables at the individual employee level rather than at the organizational level. Focusing on employees and their dyadic interactions with customers at the service encounter level, this study examines employees' service quality, as perceived by customers. Particularly, we check whether there exist similar path estimates in the relationships of job satisfaction and trust to multiple facets of OCB (altruism, sportsmanship, and civic virtue).

In the following sections, we first discuss the theoretical background of OCBs. Next, we test the model using data from both contact employees and their walk-in guest in travel agencies and present structural equation results. Finally, we conclude with a discussion, the limitations of our study, and directions for future research.

2. Background and hypotheses

2.1 Organizational citizenship behaviors

While there are several alternative types of extra-role behaviors that an employee may exhibit, such as prosocial behavior (Brief and Motowidlo, 1986) and noncomplaint behaviors (Puffer, 1987), Organ (1988) classifies OCBs into five categories: altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy, and civic virtue. Altruism is a discretionary behavior that helps other persons with respect to organizationally relevant tasks or problems (e.g., voluntarily helping less skilled or new employees and assisting coworkers who are overloaded or absent; Organ, 1988). Conscientiousness is a discretionary behavior that employee carry out well beyond the minimum

required level (e.g., working long days, voluntarily doing things besides duties, keeping the organization rules, and never wasting work time). Sportsmanship consists of actions that employee refrain from complaining, doing petty grievances, railing against real or imagined slights, and making federal cases out of small potatoes (Organ, 1998 p. 11). Courtesy consists of actions that help prevent work-related problems with others or such actions as "touching base" with those parties whose works would be affected by one's decisions or commitments (MacKenzie et al., 1988, p. 89; Organ, 1988, p. 12). Civic virtue reflects behaviors, in which an employee responsibly engages, that show concern for the organization and employee initiative in recommending how the organization can improve its operations (Netemeyer et al., 1997). However, according to Organ (1988), courtesy is not easily distinguishable from altruism. The distinction between the two behaviors can be made when one distinguishes between coming to the aid of someone who already has a problem and helping someone prevent a problem from occurring. Also, pointing out the difficulty of recognizing some of these five distinctions, recent research (MacKenzie et al., 1991, 1993; Podsakoff and MacKenzie, 1994; Podsakoff et al., 1997) combines several behaviors into a single global behavior or ignores certain behaviors.

2.2 OCBs and service quality

Service quality has been one of the most meaningful constructs for explaining customers' future behavioral intentions (Zeithaml et al., 1993) and impacts on a firm's financial outcomes (Rust et al., 1995). Reichheld and Sasser (1990) even argue that delivering quality service is one of the fundamental strategies for a firm's

survival. Given the importance of service quality, it is no surprise that many researchers have devoted themselves to understanding the underlying dimensions and antecedents of service quality (e.g., Parasuraman et al., 1985, 1988). Numerous discussions have focused on the conceptual and operational definition of Parasuraman et al.'s (1988) SERVQUAL scale that has been widely used in various service industries (for a summary, see Buttle, 1996).

As indicated earlier, our study focuses on employee behaviors at the service encounter and their relationships with service quality. In the service encounter, employees are performers rather than workers, and their behavioral performance is a major part of service quality that customers perceive. In the relationship marketing perspective, employees' interactions with customers are also important.

Dwyer et al. (1987) and Morgan and Hunt (1994), recognizing the importance of social contents such as trust and commitment, suggested that one should be able to apply their relationship marketing concept to the interpersonal services marketing context. In particular, Paulin et al. (1990, 2000), emphasizing the customer-firm relationship for long-term profitability, argue that in service relationships, customers' evaluation of service is dependent largely on the specialized skills, techniques, and experience of customer-contact employees interacting with customers (Paulin et al., 2000), emphasizing the customer-firm relationship for long-term profitability, argue that in service relationships, customers' evaluation of service is dependent largely on the specialized skills, techniques, and experience of customer-contact employees interacting with customers (Paulin et al., 2000). In the service organization, employees' behaviors toward customers may influence the future of customer relationships.

Also, in the high-contact service encounter, customers physically participate in the service delivery process as coproducers and thus are much more likely to be exposed to employees' voluntary behaviors for coworkers and the organization. Furthermore, these voluntary behaviors, which customers can observe during physical and social interactions with employees, may affect the customers' evaluation of the service provided. There are several reasons why employees' OCBs could be expected to relate to the customers' perceptions of service. The first reason relates to the internal marketing perspective in service business. Based on the internal marketing perspective, each of these behaviors in service encounter can be a meaningful relationship with service excellence, especially for the customer-employee interaction dimension of service quality. The internal marketing perspective suggests that for successful encounter and exchanges with customers,

Sportsmanship may also ensure service quality. An employee with a high level of sportsmanship has a positive attitude and avoids unnecessary complaining. In fact, research suggests that customers tend to experience greater service quality when this behavior is exhibited (Morrison, 1996). Sportsmanship behavior creates a positive climate among employees that is likely to be transferred to their interactions with customers (Schneider and Bowen, 1992). In other words, if employees are "good sports" or cooperative with each other, they will be more cooperative in the delivery process of service. In fact, one cannot expect that an employee who often complains within an organization will exhibit customer-oriented behaviors for excellent service to external customers. Second, a positive work climate among employees may have an indirect effect on service quality by creating an overall environment that customers find more pleasant. A lack of sportsmanship is likely to have harmful effects on

group cohesiveness and leave the organizational atmosphere less attractive to coworkers (Posdakoff et al., 1997). More important, this negative work environment can also be uncovered during the delivery process of service. Based on the above discussions, the following hypothesis is developed.

Hypothesis 1: Customers' perceptions of service quality are positively related to OCBs: (a) altruism, (b) civic virtue, and (c) sportsmanship.

2.3 Job satisfaction, trust, and OCBs

According to Blau (1964), there exist two types of exchange relationships between employees and organizations: economic and social relationships. Economic exchange is contractual in nature. Obligations of the parties involved are clearly defined and highly specific (Morrison, 1996), and exchange occurs on a transactional basis.

2.3.1 Job satisfaction and OCBs

Job satisfaction is defined as the pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job as achieving or facilitating the achievement of one's job values (Locke, 1969). According to Churchill et al. (1974), job satisfaction has a broad conceptual domain, because it includes all characteristics of the job itself or the work environment that an employee finds rewarding, fulfilling, satisfying, frustrating, and unsatisfying.

Hypothesis 2: Job satisfaction is positively related to the OCBs. Specifically, job satisfaction is positively related to (1) altruism, (b) civic virtue, and (c) sportsmanship.

2.3.2 Trust in manager

Trust provides the basis for social exchange relationship (Blau, 1964; Clark and Mils, 1979; Rousseau and Parks, 1993). Trust characterizes confidence and beliefs about their exchange partners. Social exchange in an organization implies an informal contract between an employee and an organization, and in this contract, the employee's manager largely represents the organization to the employee (Konovsky and Pugh, 1994).

Hypothesis 3: Trust in manager is positively related to the OCBs. Specially, trust in manager is positively related to (a) altruism, (b) civic virtue, and (c) sportsmanship.

3. Research method

3.1 Sample

The data for the current study came from a sample of contact employees working for travel agencies and their customers in the three largest metropolitan areas in Korea. The market for Korean travel agencies largely consists of three segments with each having its unique characteristics. The first segment can be characterized as a market for domestic or international airline ticket sales. The travel agencies provide a simple process of services for their customers.

3.2 Data collection procedure

Data collection involved two steps. First, we contacted a total of 95 agencies for cooperation and arranged a special instruction session for agency employees from participating agencies. In this session, we provided agency representatives with the details of the survey process, stressing the importance of carefully observing all elements of the survey.

3.4 Measures

The measures used in this study were drawn from previous studies of marketing and organizational behavior. Those items were translated into Korean and then reviewed by employees and experts in travel agencies and several marketing scholars. Some items were restated to be compatible with travel agency services and some others were deleted during the preliminary scale purification process. A complete list of the items used is exhibited in Appendix A.

3.4.1. Job satisfaction

We measured employee's job satisfaction with 20 items taken from Churchill et al's (1976) scale. The scale assessed major facets of job satisfaction that include pay, opportunity, work, recognition, coworker, and supervisor. All 20 items were rated on five-point scales ranging from "very satisfied" to "very dissatisfied" and were aggregated (averaged) according to the facets.

3.4.2 Trust

Nine items from Nyhan and Marlowe's (1993) scale were used to measure employee's trust in supervisor on a Likert five-point scale ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree."

3.4.3 Organizational citizenship behaviors

We measured three OCBs with 14 items taken from various sources (e.g., Mackenzie et al., 1991, 1993; Netemeyer et al., 1997; Posdakoff et al., 1997; Posdakoff and Mackenzie, 1994), which included altruism (five item), sportsmanship (four item), and civic virtue (five item).

Unlike most previous research, the OCB measures were acquired from contact employees

rather than from their supervisors.

3.4.4. Service quality

For measuring customer's perception of service quality, we used a service quality scale that LeBlanc (1992) developed specifically for travel agency services. Customers' perceived service quality has usually been measured by the SERVQUAL scale, which is based on the gap score between customer expectations and perceptions of service that Parasuraman et al. (1988, 1991) proposed. However, the SERVQUAL scale has been criticized for the gap scores used and for its lack of general application. This study used LeBlanc's (1992) scale with two major modifications. First, we took nine customer-employee interactive items from his scale, since this study is interested only in the customer-employee interactions during the service encounter. Thus, the items we drew from this scale represent employee behavioral attributes that might be involved in a service encounter. Our items were found to represent a unidimensional construct ($\chi^2=77.26$, $df=27$; $RMR=0.04$; $GFI=0.92$; $AGFI=0.86$; $CFI=0.95$). second, following the suggestions by Brown et al. (1993) and Peter et al. (1993), we asked customer respondents to do comparative evaluations of actual performance to expectations for each service quality item by using a five-point scale ranging from "much less than expected" to "much more than expected."

4. Analysis and results

4.1 Measurement results

Following Anderson and Gerbing's (1988) two-step approach, we estimated a measurement model prior to the structural model. We specified a six-construct measurement model as was shown in Appendix A, including six composite indicators of job

satisfaction, nine items for trust, four items for altruism, three items for civic virtue, three items for sportsmanship, and nine items for service quality scale. We estimated the measurement model using LISREL 8.13.

Despite the relatively large number of indicators, the results for the measurement model were fairly adequate ($\chi^2=816.83$, $df=512$; $GFI=0.80$; $AGFI=0.77$; $CFI=0.89$). As exhibited in Appendix A, all measures were found to be reasonably reliable with coefficient α greater than 0.70, except for sportsmanship (0.52). Specifically, construct reliabilities ranged from 0.92 (customer's perceived service quality) to 0.55 (sportsmanship). All indicator loadings for constructs were significant ($P<0.01$), and their standardized estimates ranged from 0.54 to 0.76 for altruism, from 0.61 to 0.71 for civic virtue, from 0.38 to 0.69 for sportsmanship, and from 0.69 to 0.82 for customer's perceived service quality. Accordingly, based on the significant loading estimates and high construct reliabilities, we found support for convergent validity (Anderson and Gerbing, 1988; Bagozzi and Yi, 1988).

Discriminant validity exists when the proportion of variance extracted in each construct (AVE) exceeds the square of the coefficient (Φ) representing its correlation with other constructs (Fornell and Larcker, 1981). In comparing the correlations among the latent constructs and AVE, although the squared correlations in the three pairs (job satisfaction and trust, job satisfaction and sportsmanship, and trust and sportsmanship) were higher than AVE in both or either construct, the differences were not significant (see both Table 1 and

Appendix A). As another criterion for discriminant validity, two-standard error interval estimate of each coefficient (Φ) was calculated in order to examine whether one (1) is within the interval. As shown in Table 1, interval estimates for any coefficients did not include 1, providing evidence for discriminant validity as well.

4.2 Structural model results

In table 2, we present the structural model results for the model with the OCB constructs, as depicted in Fig. 1. In estimating the structural relationships, we used item indicators for altruism, civic virtue, and sportsmanship and composite indicators for job satisfaction. In this model, however, nine items were averaged for customer's perceived service quality scale. Then, the scale's factor loading (λ) was fixed at the square root of construct reliability and measurement error (θ_δ) at (1-construct reliability). While this was done to resolve identification problems, correction for measurement error had no serious effect on the statistical significance of the estimates and standardized estimates.

The overall fit of the structural model was reasonable: $\chi^2=655.21$, $df=291$; $GFI=0.81$; $AGFI=0.77$; $CFI=0.80$. Five of the nine hypothetical relationships, Hypotheses 1(c), 2(b and c), and 3(a and c), were significant at 0.51 level, and one hypothesis, Hypothesis 1(a) was significant at 0.10 level. We found that both job satisfaction and trust explained almost half (46%) of the variance of sportsmanship behavior, 21% civic virtue, and 12% altruism, while 9% of variance of service quality was explained by OCBs.

Table 1 Measurement correlations, means, and standard deviations

Measure	Mean	S.D	Correlations among latent constructs					
			Job satisfaction	Trust	Altruism	Civic virtue	Sportsmanship	Service quality
Job satisfaction	2.98	0.56	1.00					
Trust	3.44	0.60	.74	1.00				
Altruism	3.67	0.45	.22	.37	1.00			
Civic virtue	3.46	0.56	.44	.28	.50	1.00		
Sportsmanship	3.27	0.57	.65	.69	.33	.48	1.00	
Service quality	3.15	0.42	.32	.27	.22	.14*	.22	1.00

a Correlation coefficients are Φ estimates from LISREL. All of two-standard error interval estimates did not include 1. Measurement model fit: $\chi^2=816.83$, $df=512$, $GFI=0.80$; $AGFI=0.77$; $CFI=0.89$.

* $P>.10$, all except this correlation were significant at 0.01 level.

Table 2 Hypothesized model results of OCBs^a; standardized structural parameter estimates(n=196)

Path	Not controlling for common method factor		Controlling for common factor ^b	
	Coefficient	t value	Coefficient	t value
Job satisfaction → altruism	0.04	0.43	-0.05	-0.54
Job satisfaction → civic virtue	0.45	4.26	0.36	3.41
Jobs satisfaction → sportsmanship	0.43	3.34	0.46	3.42
Trust → altruism	0.35	3.60	0.31	3.22
Trust → civic virtue	0.02	0.27	0.08	0.87
Trust →sportsmanship	0.52	3.98	0.58	4.18
Altruism →service quality	0.15	1.70	0.14	1.58
Civic virtue → service quality	0.02	0.22	0.01	0.15
Sportsmanship →service quality	0.23	2.13	0.25	2.39
r^2 (Altruism)	0.12		0.10	
r^2 (civic virtue)	.21		.14	
r^2 (sportsmanship)	.46		.55	
r^2 (service quality)	.09		.09	
Goodness-of-fit statistics:	$\chi^2(291)=655.21$, $GFI=0.81$ CFI=0.80, PNFI=0.62		$\chi^2(271)=578.77$, $GFI=0.83$, CFI=0.83, PNFI=0.61	

Model comparison [$\Delta x^2(\Delta df)$] ^c	76.44(20)	P=.000	CFI=0.83	PNFI=0.61
Equality constraints ^d				
Job satisfaction → OCBs				12.14(2)=0.00
Trust → OCBs				5.26(2)=0.07
Job satisfaction and trust → OCBs				16.16(4)=0.00
OCBs → service quality				3.50(2)=0.17
Job satisfaction and trust → OCBs, OCBs → service quality				22.93(6)=0.00

- Service quality used summed-item scale. Factor loading of scale was fixed at the square root of construct reliability and measurement error (θ_{δ}) at (1-constant reliability)
- Same-source(employee) factor was controlled.
- Hypothesized model that controls common method(source) variance was compared with the model that does not.
- Paths were constrained to having equal estimates. The constrained models were estimated and then compared to the unconstrained (freely estimated) model in terms of x^2 difference [$\Delta x^2(\Delta df)$]^c

4.3 Controlling the effects of common method factor

In our study, the data for OCBs, job satisfaction, and trust were obtained from the same source (employee). Thus, the OCBs are likely to share common method (source) variance with their antecedents (i.e., job satisfaction and trust), which may have inflated or deflated the strength of the observed relationships among these employee variables. On the other hand, service quality does not share this common method variance because it was reported by customers. To controlling for the effects of method bias on the structural relationships, we reestimated the proposed model by adding a “common-source,” first-order factor to the indicators of all employee constructs (MacKenzie et al., 1991, 1993; Podsakoff et al., 1990), called “common method model” (Netemeyer et al., 1997).

As shown in Table 2, when the effect of common

method factor was controlled, the fit index of the hypothesized model is $x^2=578.77$, $df=271$, $P<0.01$; $GFI=0.83$; $AGFI=0.77$; $CFI=0.83$. The difference in fit between this model and the previous model was significant ($\Delta x^2 = 76.44$, $\Delta df=20$, $P<0.01$), which indicates that a common source factor was evident. Fifteen factor loadings on the common source factor were significant at the 0.05 level. The standardized parameter estimates for structural paths are shown in the last two column of Table 2.

Table 2 shows several interesting findings. First, despite significance in model comparisons, we found that the overall pattern of significant relationships was not affected by common method variance. All of the paths that were significant when the common method factor was not controlled remained significant at 0.05 level even when the effects of common method variance were controlled. Second, the inclusion of the same-source factor in the model changed the path estimates. As expected, there was almost no change in

the magnitudes of standardized estimates of OCBs on service quality. However, we found little change in parameter estimates of relationships among employee variables. Nevertheless, they did not affect the overall pattern of significant relationships in the model that did not partial out the effect of common method variance. Third, the introduction of the same-source factor did not change the proportion of variance of service quality accounted for by OCB variables (9%); it caused altruism and civic virtue to drop (12 → 10% and 21 → 14%, respectively) but sportsmanship to increase (46 → 55%). The proportion of variance accounted for in sportsmanship was still substantial.

4.4 Testing equality of path estimates

We examined whether there are similarities in path estimates of job satisfaction and/or trust to OCBs and path estimates of OCBs to service quality. The model that controlled common method factor was used to make more exact comparisons. First, we estimated five constrained models by imposing equality constraints on the path estimates: job satisfaction →

OCBs, trust → OCBs, job satisfaction and trust → OCBs, and OCBs → service quality. Then, using χ^2 differences, we compared each of these constrained models with the unconstrained/hypothetical model, computing the difference in fit between the two models. As shown in Table 2, the differences between the constrained model and the unconstrained model were significant at the 0.01 level in the path estimates of job satisfaction to OCBs but not significant at 0.05 level in the path of trust to OCBs. That is, while the path estimates from trust to OCBs were equal to one another, paths from job satisfaction to OCBs were not equal. However, when both job satisfaction and trust were considered simultaneously, the equality for path estimates was not supported at 0.01 level. Meanwhile, we found that there existed equality in the paths of OCB variables to service quality, because the difference between the constrained and the unconstrained models was not significant at 0.05 level ($P=0.17$). finally, we found no support for coefficient equality when we considered simultaneously the relationship of both satisfaction and trust on OCBs and the relationship OCBs and service quality ($P<0.01$).

Appendix A. Measurement properties of constructs

Constructs/items	Standardized loading	T value	Construct Reliability	AVE	Cronbach's
Job satisfaction ^a			0.38	0.45	0.83
Pay ($\alpha = 0.84$)	0.54	7.48			
The extent to which I am fairly Paid for what I contribute					
The amount of compensation I receive					
The kind of benefit plans that go with my job					

Opportunities ($\alpha = 0.78$)	0.74	11.23		
The opportunity for acquiring higher skills				
The opportunity in my job to achieve Excellence in my work				
The chance of future of promotion I have in my job				
Work ($\alpha=0.71$)	0.70	10.44		
The working conditions at my job				
The nature of work I do in my job				
The kind of company policies/practices That govern my job				
Recognition ($\alpha = 0.89$)	0.70	10.44		
The amount of recognition/respect that I receive for my job				
The respect I receive for my work				
The degree to which my work is perceived To be important to the company				
Supervisor ($\alpha = 0.88$)	0.76	11.61		
The technical competence of my Immediate supervisor				
The considerate/sympathetic nature of Immediate supervisor				
My supervisor's ability to lead me and my colleagues				
The way my supervisor helps me achieve my goals				
Coworkers ($\alpha = 0.82$)	0.54	7.56		
The attitude of my fellow workers toward me				
The supportive attitude of my colleagues at work				
The opportunity I have in my job to work with people I like				
Trust ^a			0.88	0.45
I have confidence that my supervisor is technically Confident at the critical elements of his/her job.	0.77	12.02		0.88
I have confidence that my supervisor will make well-thought Decisions about his/her job.				
My supervisor follows through on assignments.	0.68	10.26		
When my supervisor tells me something, I can rely on what s/he tells me.	0.72	11.02		
My supervisor does his/her job without causing conflicts.	0.66	9.83		
My supervisor will back me up in a pinch.	0.74	11.41		
I feel that I can tell my supervisor anything about my job.	0.52	7.36		
If I do a good job, my supervisor will support and Reward me.	0.59	8.53		
I have confidence that my supervisor always treat me fairly.	0.65	9.59		
Altruism ^a			0.72	0.40
I help orient new staffs even though it is not required.	0.56	7.22		0.70
I help other staffs who have heavy workload.	0.72	9.56		
I willingly help other staffs who have work-related Problems.	0.68	8.98		
I am always ready to help or lend a helping hand To other staffs around me	0.54	6.89		
I help others who have been absent. (D)				
Civic virtue ^a			0.71	0.45
				0.71



I attend functions that are not required but help My company image.	0.70	9.17			
I read and keep up with my company's announcements, Memos, and so on.	0.71	9.36			
I try to keep abreast of changes in my company.	0.61	7.90			
I attend and participate in meetings that are not Mandatory but are considered important. (D)					
Sportsmanship ^a			0.55	0.30	0.52
I do not find fault with fellow workers or my company.	0.52	6.42			
I focus on what is wrong rather than the positive side. (R)	0.38	4.52			
I do not consume time on complaining trivial matters.					
I tend to make "mountains out of molehills." (D)	0.69	8.30			
service quality ^b			0.92	0.55	0.92

Rate the actual level of employee service that you just received on each of the following items. Please note that the employee's actual service performance should be compared with your expectation of excellence service performance.

In-depth knowledge of variable products	0.76	11.99
Offering brochures on different destinations	0.82	13.40
Informing customers of new products and services	0.78	12.48
Having direct and immediate access to information	0.75	11.80
Speed of service	0.77	12.11
Competent staff	0.72	11.00
Friendly and courteous staff	0.69	10.43
Special attention given by staff	0.70	10.72
Being greeted on arrival	0.70	10.64

(D) deleted item, (R) reverse-scored item.

a. Employee data (n=196)

b. Customer data (n=548), which were aggregated by the employees.

References

- [1] Albrecht K, Zemke R. *Service America: doing business in the new economy*. Homewood, IL: Dow Jones-Irwin, 1985.
- [2] Anderson JC, Gerbing DW. Structural equation modeling in practice: a review and recommended two-step approach. *Psychol Bull* 1988; 103(3): 411-23.
- [3] Bagozzi RP, Yi Y. On the evaluation of structural equation models. *J Acad Mark Sci* 1988; 16:74-94 (Spring).
- [4] Bateman Ts, Organ DW. Job satisfaction and the good soldier: the relationship between affect and employee citizenship. *Acad Manage J* 1983;26(4):586-95.
- [5] Blau P. *Exchange and power in social life*. New York: Wiley, 1964.
- [6] Bowen DE, Schneider B. Boundary-spanning role employees and the service encounter: some guidelines for management and research. In: Czepl JA, Solomon MR, Surprenant CF, editors. *The service encounter*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1985. p. 127 - 47.
- [7] Brief AP, Motowidlo SJ. Prosocial organizational behaviors. *Acad Manage Rev* 1986; 11(4):710-25.
- [8] Brown TJ, Churchill GA, Peter JP. Improving the measurement of service quality. *J Retailing* 1993;69(1):127-39.
- [9] Burke JM, Borucki CC, Hurley AE. Reconceptualizing psychological climate in a retail service environment: a multiple-stakeholder perspective. *J Appl Psychol* 1992;77(5):717-29.
- [10] Buttle F. SERVQUAL: review, critique, research agenda. *Eur J Mark* 1996; 30(1):8-32.
- [11] Churchill GA, Ford NM, Walker OC. Measuring the job satisfaction of industrial salesmen. *J Mark Res* 1974;11:254-60.
- [12] Churchill GA, Ford NM, Walker Oc. Organizational climate and job satisfaction. *J Mark Res* 1976;13:323-32(November).
- [13] Clark MS, Mills J. Interpersonal attraction in exchange and communal relationships. *J Pers Sco Psychol* 1979;37:12-24.
- [14] Clary EG, Snyder M. A functional analysis of altruism and prosocial behavior: the case of volunteerism. In: Clark MS, editor. *Prosocial behavior*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, 1991. P.119-48.
- [15] Dansereau F, Graen G. A vertical dyad linkage approach to leadership within formal organizations. *Organ Behav Hum Perform* 1975;13:46-78.
- [16] Dwyer RF, Schurr PH, Oh S. Developing buyer-seller relationship. *J Mark* 1987;51:11-27.
- [17] Farth JL, Posdakoff PM, Organ DW. Accounting for organizational citizenship behavior: leader fairness and task scope versus satisfaction. *J Manage* 1990;16:705-21 (December).

- [18] Gronross C. Internal marketing: theory and practice. In: Block TM, Upah Gd, Zeithmal VA, editors. *Services marketing in a changing environment*. Chicago, IL:American Marketing Association, 1985.p41-7.
- [19] Gronross C. Service management: a management focus for service competition. In: Lovelock CH, editor. *Managing services: marketing, operations and human resources*. 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ:Prentice-Hall, 1992. P.9-16.
- [20] Grusec JE. The socialization of altruism. In: Clark MS, editor. *Prosocial behavior*. Newbury Park, CA:Sage Publications,1991. p.9-33.
- [21] Hartline MD, Ferrell OC. The management of customer-contact service employees: an empirical investigation. *J Mark* 1996;60:52-70(October).
- [22] James LR, Demaree RG, Wolf G. Estimating within-group interrater reliability with and without response bias. *J Appl Psychol* 1985;69:85-98.
- [23] Hartline MD, Ferrell OC. The management of customer-contact service employees: an empirical investigation. *J Mark* 1996;60:52-70(October).
- [24] James LR, Demaree RG, Wolf G. Estimating within-group interrater reliability with and without response bias. *J Appl Psychol* 1985;69:85-98.
- [25] Kelley SW, Hoffman KD. An investigation of positive affect, scores in consumer research. *J Consum Res* 1993;19:655-62.
- [26] Pfeffer J. *competitive advantage through people: unleashing the power of the work force*. Boston, MA:Harvard School Press, 1994.
- [27] Posdakoff PM, Mackenzie SB. Organizational citizenship behaviors and sales unit effectiveness. *J Mark Res* 1994;31:351-63.
- [28] Posdakoff PM, Mackenzie SB, Moorman RH, Fetter R. Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadership Q* 1990;1(2):1097-142.
- [29] Posdakoff PM, Ahearne M, Mackenzie SB. Organizational citizenship behavior and the quality of work group performance. *J Appl Psychol* 1997;82(2):262-70.
- [30] Puffer SM. Prosocial behavior, noncompliant behavior, and work performance among commission salespeople. *J Appl Psychol* 1987;72(4):615-21.
- [31] Reichheld F, Sasser WE. Zero defections: quality comes to services. *Harv Bus Rev* 1990;68:105-11(September/October).
- [32] Rousseau DM, Parks JM. The contracts of individuals and organizations. In: Staw BM, Cummings LL, editors. *Research in organizational behavior*, vo. 15 Greenwich, CT:JAI Press, 1993. P. 1-43.
- [33] Rust RT, Zahorik AJ, Keining ham TL. Return on quality (ROQ): making service quality financially accountable. *J Mark* 1995;59:58-70.
- [34] Schneider B. Organizational climate: an essay. *Pers Psychol* 1975;28: 447-79.
- [35] Schneider B. Work climates: an interactionist perspective. In: Feimer NW, Geller ES, editors. *Environment psychology: directions and perspectives*. New York:Praeger, 1983. P. 106-28.
- [36] prosocial behaviors and service quality. *J Retailing* 1997;73(3):407-27.
- [37] Konovsky MA, Pugh SD. Citizenship behavior and social exchange. *Acad Manage J* 1994;37(3):656-69.
- [38] LeBlanc G. Factors affecting customer evaluation of service quality in travel agencies: an investigation of customer perceptions. *J Travel Res* 1992; 32(4):13-9.
- [39] Locke EA. What is job satisfaction? *Organ Behav Hum Perform* 1969; 4:309-36.
- [40] Mackenzie SB, Posdakoff PM, Fetter R. Organizational citizenship behavior and objective productivity as determinants of managerial evaluations of salesperson's performance. *Organ Behav Hum Decis Processes* 1991;50:123-50.
- [41] Mackenzie SB, Posdakoff PM, Fetter R. The impact of organizational citizenship behavior on evaluations of salesperson performance. *J Mark* 1993;57:70
- [42] Mackenzie SB, Posdakoff PM, Ahearne M. Some possible antecedents and consequences of in-role and extra-roel salesperson performance. *J Mark* 1998;62:87-98(July).
- [43] Mackenzie SB, Posdakoff PM, Paine JB. Do citizenship behaviors matter more for managers than for salesperson? *J Acad Mark Sci* 2000;27(4):396-410.
- [44] Moorman RH. Organizational justice and organizational citizenship bahaviors:do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *J Appl Psychol* 1991;76:845-55.
- [45] Morgan RM, Hunt SD. The commitment-trust theory of relationship marketing. *J Mark* 1994;58:20-38.