

A Comparison of Attitude, Personality, and Knowledge Predictors of Service-Oriented Organizational Citizenship Behaviors

Lance A. Bettencourt
Indiana University Bloomington

Kevin P. Gwinner
Kansas State University

Matthew L. Meuter
California State University, Chico

Attitude, personality, and customer knowledge antecedents were compared in their predictive ability of 3 service-oriented forms of employee organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs): loyalty, service delivery, and participation. For the 1st study, 236 customer-contact employees provided data concerning their OCBs and the attitude, personality, and knowledge antecedents. The 2nd investigation relied on data provided by 144 contact employees from a network of university libraries. Using hierarchical regression in both studies, the authors found that each of the 3 types of service-oriented OCBs was best predicted by different subsets of the antecedents. Job attitudes accounted for the most unique variance in loyalty OCBs, personality accounted for the most unique variance in service delivery OCBs, and customer knowledge and personality jointly were the best predictors of participation OCBs.

An impressive body of empirical research (cf. Organ & Ryan, 1995) has developed in the past 15 years looking at the antecedents of organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs), especially with regard to employee attitudes (e.g., Moorman, 1991; Organ & Konovsky, 1989). During this time, the meaning and dimensionality of OCBs has continued to be elaborated because of a lack of theoretical boundaries. Recent research by Van Dyne, Graham, and Dienesch (1994) relies on political philosophy and notions of civic citizenship to further broaden our understanding of OCBs and to provide a theoretical foundation for three dimensions of OCBs.

The Van Dyne et al. (1994) OCB conceptualization introduces a new type of citizenship behavior called *loyalty* (referred to as *loyal boosterism* by Moorman, Blakely, & Niehoff, 1998, and *allegiance* by Borman & Motowidlo, 1993). Loyalty OCBs reflect allegiance to the organization through the promotion of its interests and image to outsiders. The Van Dyne et al. conceptualization and other recent citizenship research also explicitly considers employee *participation* (alternatively *civic virtue* behaviors; e.g.,

Moorman, 1991) in the development and governance of the organization (cf. Podsakoff, Ahearne, & MacKenzie, 1997; Van Dyne et al., 1994). Finally, consistent with most citizenship studies, the Van Dyne et al. civic citizenship conceptualization also includes a dimension of OCBs which reflects employee *conscientiousness* in role performance (e.g., Moorman, 1991; Organ & Konovsky, 1989).

Despite recent progress, opportunities still exist for further refinement of the domain of citizenship performance. One common limitation of prior investigations is their focus on OCBs that are widely applicable across different types of organizations and positions (e.g., punctuality and helping other employees). Other researchers, however, have argued that research needs to extend its focus to include customer- and service-oriented citizenship behaviors of customer-contact employees (e.g., Borman & Motowidlo, 1993; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1997). Specifically, Borman and Motowidlo (1993, p. 90) argued that some types of OCBs “are probably more appropriate for certain types of organizations than others. Service companies have special requirements on dimensions related to dealing with customers and representing the organization to outsiders.”

Previous research identifies three fundamental roles of customer-contact employees of service firms that derive from their unique position as boundary spanners of the firm and that correspond to the three citizenship dimensions of Van Dyne et al. (1994). First, these employees act as representatives of the firm to outsiders and can enhance or diminish organizational image (Bowen & Schneider, 1985; Schneider & Bowen, 1993). Thus, it is important for these employees to engage in loyalty OCBs—acting as advocates to outsiders not only of the organization’s products and services but also of its image. Second, customer-contact employees provide a strategic link between the external environment and internal operations by providing information about customer needs and suggested improvements in service

Lance A. Bettencourt, Department of Marketing, Indiana University Bloomington; Kevin P. Gwinner, Department of Marketing and International Business, Kansas State University; Matthew L. Meuter, Department of Finance and Marketing, California State University, Chico.

Preliminary results of Study 1 were presented at the 1998 American Marketing Association Summer Educators’ Conference. Portions of this research took place while Matthew L. Meuter was at Villanova University. We thank the Center for Services Marketing and Management at Arizona State University and the cooperating organizations for their support of the project.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Lance A. Bettencourt, Department of Marketing, Kelley School of Business, Indiana University Bloomington, 1309 East 10th Street, Bloomington, Indiana 47405. Electronic mail may be sent to lbettenc@indiana.edu.

delivery (Schneider & Bowen, 1984; Zeithaml, Berry, & Parasuraman, 1988). Thus, contact employee participation OCBs—taking individual initiative, especially in communications, to improve service delivery by the organization, coworkers, and oneself—are fundamental to the firm's ability to meet the changing needs of its customers. Finally, conscientious role performance is also critical for contact employees, especially concerning behaviors that directly impact customers. Research on service quality reveals the importance of reliable, responsive, and courteous service delivery behaviors of customer-contact employees (George, 1991; Parasuraman, Zeithaml, & Berry, 1988). Thus, it is essential that contact employees perform *service delivery* OCBs—behaving in a conscientious manner in activities surrounding service delivery to customers.

The purpose of this article is to extend prior citizenship research by investigating antecedents of the three dimensions of customer-contact employee service-oriented OCBs. Consistent with recent citizenship research (cf. Konovsky & Organ, 1996; Organ & Lingl, 1995), a primary focus of our two field studies was to investigate how different types of antecedents compare in their ability to explain unique variance in different forms of employee OCBs. Specifically, we compared employee attitudes, personality, and contextual job knowledge about customers in their predictive ability of service-oriented OCBs using hierarchical regression analysis.

Proposed Predictors of Service-Oriented OCBs

A focus on customer-contact employee OCBs provides opportunities for extending prior research on citizenship predictors in unique ways. First, it becomes possible to consider previously studied attitudinal antecedents of a new service-oriented conceptualization of OCBs. Although the recent meta-analysis by Organ and Ryan (1995) revealed generally stronger relationships between employee attitudes and OCBs than more traditional measures of job performance, it did not support any of the employee attitudes as superior predictors of OCBs. Therefore, the present investigations include job satisfaction and perceived organizational support (POS) as representative employee attitudinal antecedents. Both job satisfaction and POS have been studied widely in prior citizenship research and have been shown to positively impact customer-contact employee performance (e.g., Kelley, Longfellow, & Malehorn, 1996; Moorman et al., 1998; Puffer, 1987).

Second, a focus on customer-contact employee citizenship behaviors provides guidance to the selection of relevant personality variables to extend prior OCB research. Two key personality variables considered often in discussions of customer-contact employees and OCBs are service orientation and empathy (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993; Bowen & Schneider, 1985; Brief & Motowidlo, 1986; Hogan, Hogan, & Busch, 1984; Organ, 1990). Like employee attitudes, personality characteristics should be studied as possible antecedents of OCBs because they are expected to be better predictors of employee performance in situations in which expectations are less clearly defined, as with citizenship behaviors (Konovsky & Organ, 1996; Organ & Ryan, 1995). Organ (1994) contended that there is also a basis for believing that the relationship between employee attitudes and OCBs may be accounted for entirely by employee disposition. Thus, it is important to consider both types of variables simultaneously to investigate unique contributions to the explanation of OCBs.

Empirical research to date on the unique contributions of attitudes in comparison to personality as OCB predictors does not support Organ's (1994) contention (e.g., Konovsky & Organ, 1996; Organ & Lingl, 1995). In fact, more convincing evidence has been provided that the relationship between disposition and OCBs is accounted for by employee attitudes (Konovsky & Organ, 1996). However, as Organ and Ryan (1995, p. 795) cautioned, "Only a limited set of dispositional variables have been examined, and the extent of research on disposition and OCB has not been as extensive as that on attitudes." Thus, it is important to investigate other combinations of attitudes and personality traits to further explore their unique contributions to explaining employee OCBs.

Finally, a focus on the unique role requirements of customer-contact employees allows consideration of the role of contextual knowledge in influencing performance of OCBs. Job-related knowledge has not been considered previously as an antecedent of employee OCBs. However, job-related knowledge may exhibit an important influence on OCBs because such behaviors often rely on an employee's understanding of the organization's social context and environmental conditions surrounding task performance (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993). This presumption is likely to be especially true of customer-contact employees who act as mediators between the constantly changing demands of customers and the need of the organization to adapt to varying social and environmental conditions. Two dimensions of relevant contextual job knowledge for customer-contact employees are identified on the basis of a research tradition in categorical knowledge (Sujan, Sujan, & Bettman, 1988): trait richness (*knowledge of consumer characteristics*) and strategy richness (*knowledge of consumer interaction strategies*). Both trait and strategy richness among contact employees reflect contextual job knowledge about customers that may facilitate service-oriented OCBs.

Hypotheses

Attitudinal Antecedents

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction refers to the employee's overall affective evaluation of the intrinsic and extrinsic facets of the job. According to reciprocity norms, higher levels of job satisfaction will encourage employees to engage in service-oriented behaviors that are valued by the firm (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Netemeyer, Boles, McKee, & McMurrin, 1997). There is empirical support for the positive path relationship between job satisfaction and various forms of OCBs (e.g., Bateman & Organ, 1983; Netemeyer et al., 1997; Organ & Ryan, 1995; Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983) and between job satisfaction and customer orientation (Hoffman & Ingram, 1992). Extending this research, we expect job satisfaction to be positively related to the service-oriented OCBs of loyalty, service delivery, and participation.

POS

POS refers to employee global beliefs that the firm cares about them personally and values their contributions to the organization (Eisenberger, Fasolo, & Davis-LaMastro, 1990; Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986). Tenets of social exchange theory indicate that employees perceiving the firm is committed to them will feel obligated to reciprocate the firm's supportive ori-

entation with voluntary contributions that benefit the firm (Organ, 1990). Prior studies have found that POS leads to various types of OCBs (e.g., Eisenberger et al., 1990; Moonman et al., 1998) and the exercise of creative and routine discretion by customer-contact employees (Kelley et al., 1996). Considering prior research on other forms of OCBs and customer-contact employee behaviors, we expect POS to be positively related to contact-employee loyalty, service delivery, and participation OCBs.

Personality Antecedents

Personality traits may be arranged hierarchically on the basis of their degree of abstractness (e.g., Allport, 1961; Paunonen, 1998). Service orientation and empathy are less abstract personality traits than the Big Five personality constructs (Hogan et al., 1984; Johnson, Cheek, & Smither, 1983). As such, they are more closely linked to context-based behaviors and are more likely to be shaped by individual history and culture (see Mowen, 2000).

Service Orientation

Service orientation represents an individual's predisposition to provide superior service through responsiveness, courtesy, and a genuine desire to satisfy customer needs (Cran, 1994; Hogan et al., 1984). Because many customer-contact employees are paid a flat wage, regardless of their behavior, there is likely some other factor that encourages these employees to engage in service-oriented behaviors. Given the customer-focused nature of service delivery and participation behaviors, we expect that service orientation will be a positive predictor of these two OCBs (cf. Organ, 1990, 1994). To the extent that loyalty OCBs partially reflect positive statements to customers about the firm's products and services, we also expect a positive relationship between service orientation and loyalty.

Empathy

Bowen and Schneider (1985) argued that empathy is an important trait for boundary spanning employees to possess because it helps them to sense how consumers are experiencing the service encounter. Considerable research from social psychology establishes an empirical link between empathy and helping behaviors (e.g., Barnett, Howard, King, & Dino, 1981). The empathy literature has evolved along two distinct paradigms: a cognitive perspective (i.e., accurate prediction of others' thoughts, feelings, and actions) and an emotional perspective (i.e., emotional reactions and sympathy; Davis, 1980, 1983; Mehrabian & Epstein, 1972). Cognitively empathetic contact employees are more likely to be able to understand and anticipate customers' expectations and subsequently engage in appropriate service delivery behaviors. They may also be expected to offer more service-improvement ideas through participation behaviors because they better understand the customers' viewpoint. Affectively empathetic employees may be driven out of compassion to satisfy current customer needs through superior service delivery and future customers through their participation behaviors (e.g., service-improvement suggestions). No relationship is expected between empathy and loyalty OCBs.

Customer Knowledge

Trait Richness

Trait richness refers to the breadth of contact employee knowledge concerning the characteristics of different customer types (Sujan et al., 1988). Because contact employees interact with different customer segments with varying expectations and needs, it is useful that they consolidate information about customer types into meaningful categories to guide their behaviors (Bettencourt & Gwinner, 1996; Cantor & Mischel, 1979). Contact employees who have a rich understanding of customer traits will be more effective at classifying customers into appropriate categories (Leigh & McGraw, 1989; Szymanski, 1988). We expect, then, that these contact employees will be (a) more effective in promoting the firm and its services (loyalty), (b) more effective at providing customer service (service delivery), and (c) more likely to become involved in developing the service orientation of the firm (participation) on the basis of their rich understanding of customers. Thus, we expect that trait richness will be positively related to contact employee loyalty, service delivery, and participation OCBs.

Strategy Richness

Strategy richness refers to the breadth of contact employee knowledge concerning strategies for dealing with varying customer needs and situations (Sujan et al., 1988). The diversity of customer types and situations that contact employees encounter implies the importance of having multiple customer interaction strategies (Bettencourt & Gwinner, 1996). By definition, contact employees high in strategy richness have developed a rich repertoire of useful ways of interacting with specific customer types (Leong, Busch, & John, 1989). This repertoire should increase the effectiveness of employee interactions with customers (loyalty and service delivery OCBs) and their ability to offer constructive insights into service problems and opportunities (participation OCBs). Therefore, we expect that strategy richness will be positively related to contact employee loyalty, service delivery, and participation OCBs.

General Method

We conducted two studies to investigate the attitude, personality, and knowledge antecedents of service-oriented OCBs. The first context, an inbound service and sales call center, was selected because of the employees' high degree of customer contact, complex nature of interactions with customers, and autonomous working climate. The second context, a network of university libraries, was selected specifically because of important differences from the first context. The customer service role in the second context was less complex, more specialized, and had greater variability in the extensiveness of customer contact in comparison to the first context. Differences in job scope between the two contexts strengthened our ability to draw conclusions about the generalizability of the results from the two studies.

Study 1

Method

Sample and Procedure

Participants of the first study were customer service representatives of a Fortune 100 company whose responsibilities included answering customer

inquiries, responding to customer problems, and selling and recommending services over the phone. Three hundred and twenty-five customer-contact employees agreed to participate in the study in exchange for 1 hr of overtime pay. Surveys were distributed to employees on company premises by a researcher and a company representative. Of the 325 surveys distributed, 236 usable surveys were returned for a response rate of 73% (236/325). Sixty-eight percent of the respondents were female. A large majority of respondents (84%) were between the ages of 20 and 45, and all but 4 had at least a high school education. Over 80% of the respondents had worked as a customer service representative for the participating firm for at least 1 year. Median tenure was 24 months.

Measures

We subjected all construct measures to a measure purification process using confirmatory factor analysis, item-to-total correlations, and improvement in the Cronbach's alpha statistic. Missing values on single items were replaced with the mean of the other indicators of a given construct. The following discussion reflects the purified measures that are presented in Appendixes A and B.

Antecedents. The job-satisfaction measure incorporated seven items tapping a variety of extrinsic and intrinsic work-related aspects and one global job-satisfaction item ($\alpha = .82$). We measured POS using seven items ($\alpha = .89$) from the scale developed by Eisenberger et al. (1986). We developed a five-item measure of service orientation for this study ($\alpha = .77$) based on dimensions described by Hogan et al. (1984), Cran (1994), and Muchinsky (1993). We used seven items adapted from Davis's (1980, 1983) empathy scale in which reliabilities between .70 and .78 were reported to measure cognitive (four items; $\alpha = .74$) and affective empathy (three items; $\alpha = .84$). We used conceptual definitions provided by Sujan et al. (1988) to develop items to measure trait richness (two items; $\alpha = .78$) and strategy richness (three items; $\alpha = .71$). Although lower than desired,

the reliabilities of the two knowledge-richness measures are above acceptable standards ($>.70$) for new measures.

OCBs. We used prior citizenship and service-quality studies as the basis for adapting and developing a 16-item measure of service-oriented OCBs (cf. MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Fetter, 1993; Moorman & Blakely, 1995; Parasuraman et al., 1988; Van Dyne et al., 1994). The citizenship items for the present study and accompanying indicators from prior research are provided in Appendix B. We used self-reports because many of the OCBs investigated would not be readily evident to an alternative rating source such as the employee's supervisor (cf. Organ & Konovsky, 1989). Results of factor analyzing the 16 service-oriented OCB items are presented in Table 1. As expected, three clear factors emerged reflecting loyalty (five items; $\alpha = .87$), service delivery (six items; $\alpha = .80$), and participation OCBs (five items; $\alpha = .82$).

Analysis Approach

Three groups of predictors were considered as antecedents of customer-contact employee OCBs: attitudes, personality, and customer knowledge. We ran hierarchical regression analyses to allow the simultaneous investigation of (a) the unique contribution that each group (alternatively, *subset*) of predictor variables adds to explanation of each of the three OCB dimensions and (b) the individual parameter estimates of the attitude, personality, and knowledge variables. Hierarchical regression analysis allows partitioning of the total variance explained by a set of predictor variables into unique portions explained by discrete subsets of the antecedents (cf. Organ & Konovsky, 1989). One approach to hierarchical regression analysis, called *usefulness analysis*, is to vary the order of entry of different groupings of predictor variables so that a subset of predictors' "contribution to unique variance in a criterion beyond another predictor's contribution" may be examined (Organ & Konovsky, 1989, p. 161).

Table 1
Varimax Factor Loadings for Service-Oriented Organizational Citizenship Behaviors

Indicator ^a	Study 1 (N = 236)			Study 2 (N = 144)		
	Loyalty	Service delivery	Participation	Loyalty	Service delivery	Participation
1. Tells outsiders this is a good place to work.	.81	.04	.14	.86	.11	-.04
2. Says good things about organization to others.	.79	.22	.10	.70	.13	.13
3. Generates favorable goodwill for the company.	.77	.27	.19	.83	.38	.21
4. Encourages friends and family to use firm's products and services.	.65	.34	.21			
5. Actively promotes the firm's products and services.	.45	.41	.17			
6. Follows customer-service guidelines with extreme care.	.18	.77	.13	.37	.66	.27
7. Conscientiously follows guidelines for customer promotions.	.15	.71	.11			
8. Follows up in a timely manner to customer requests and problems.	.14	.57	.14	.09	.73	.22
9. Performs duties with unusually few mistakes.	.03	.52	.21	.07	.59	.30
10. Always has a positive attitude at work.	.35	.48	.22	.35	.64	.21
11. Regardless of circumstances, exceptionally courteous and respectful to customers.	.28	.44	.15	.19	.77	.17
12. Encourages co-workers to contribute ideas and suggestions for service improvement.	.24	.14	.75	.21	.33	.74
13. Contributes many ideas for customer promotions and communications.	.14	.13	.73	.07	.17	.71
14. Makes constructive suggestions for service improvement.	.09	.33	.70	.07	.47	.63
15. Frequently presents to others creative solutions to customer problems.	.10	.32	.69	.03	.16	.84
16. Takes home brochures to read up on products and services.	.36	.01	.40	.17	.44	.45
Percentage of variance explained	70	19	13	70	22	10

Note. Indicator loadings defining factors are italicized. Reported sample sizes vary from other tables because of missing data.

^a Minor changes in indicator wording were made to reflect the different context of Study 2. Three citizenship indicators have no data in Study 2 because they were not considered applicable to Study 2's context.

Table 2
 Study 1: Means, Standard Deviations, Reliabilities, and Correlations Among Variables

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Service orientation	6.08	0.75	.77									
2. Cognitive empathy	5.47	0.94	.44**	.74								
3. Affective empathy	5.65	1.17	.27**	.14*	.84							
4. Job satisfaction	4.61	1.02	.25**	.13*	.15*	.82						
5. Organizational support	3.61	1.18	.18**	.10	.02	.70**	.89					
6. Trait richness	5.64	1.03	.26**	.27**	.14*	.22**	.09	.78				
7. Strategy richness	5.18	1.03	.44**	.36**	.03	.21**	.15*	.50**	.71			
8. Loyalty	5.40	1.04	.40**	.28**	.05	.45**	.40**	.31**	.44**	.87		
9. Service delivery	5.67	0.76	.53**	.36**	.25**	.31**	.24**	.36**	.38**	.52**	.80	
10. Participation	4.66	1.10	.37**	.31**	.11	.25**	.21**	.27**	.40**	.46**	.45**	.82

Note. Coefficient alphas are reported along the diagonal. Sample sizes for the table range from 234–236 because of missing data. Means and standard deviations are reported on the basis of a 7-point scale. (See Appendixes A and B for endpoints.)

* $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$.

For our study, hierarchical regression analysis was conducted in four steps. First, four demographic control variables (i.e., gender, age, education, and organizational tenure) were regressed on each of the three OCB dimensions. Second, each subset of predictor variables was regressed separately on each of the three OCB dimensions with the significant demographic control variables from Step 1 also included. Third, each of the two remaining subsets of predictor variables was added separately to the equations of the second step, and the change in R^2 was investigated for significance. Fourth, the remaining subset of predictor variables was added to each of the three possible two-way combinations of predictor variables from the third step, and the change in R^2 was again investigated for significance. An alpha level of .05 was used for determination of statistical significance of all results.

Results

Table 2 presents the scale means, standard deviations, reliabilities, and correlations for the study variables. Table 3 shows the results of the hierarchical regression analyses and the standardized beta estimates for the full regression model (with the exception of the demographic control variables) for the first study. The hierarchical regression analyses (Step 3) revealed that each of the three groupings of predictor variables explained unique variance in loyalty, service delivery, and participation OCBs when controlling for only one other subset of predictors and the demographic controls.¹ The results were different when controlling for both of the other two subsets of predictor variables. In this case (Step 4), the analyses revealed that attitudes only explained unique variance in loyalty ($\Delta R^2 = .10, p < .01$) and service-delivery OCBs ($\Delta R^2 = .03, p < .01$) when controlling for personality, customer-knowledge, and demographic variables. The three personality constructs (service orientation and two dimensions of empathy) contributed uniquely to the explanation of both service-delivery ($\Delta R^2 = .12, p < .01$) and participation OCBs ($\Delta R^2 = .04, p < .01$) but not loyalty, when controlling for attitudes, knowledge, and demographic variables. Finally, the two customer-knowledge predictors explained unique variance in each OCB dimension even after controlling for attitudes, personality, and demographic variables (loyalty: $\Delta R^2 = .07, p < .01$; service delivery: $\Delta R^2 = .04, p < .01$; participation: $\Delta R^2 = .05, p < .01$). A pattern was evident from the results of the hierarchical regression analyses. Job attitudes were the dominant predictor subset of loyalty OCBs, whereas the personality variables were the dominant unique pre-

dictors of service-delivery behaviors. The customer-knowledge predictors contributed roughly equally to each type of service-oriented OCB.

The standardized betas revealed that job satisfaction and POS were both significant, positive predictors of loyalty OCBs. However, neither was significantly related to either service-delivery or participation OCBs beyond the variance accounted for by the demographic controls and other predictor variables. The standardized betas also indicated that service orientation was a positive predictor of each of the three service-oriented OCBs. As hypothesized, cognitive empathy was also a positive predictor of participation OCBs. Affective empathy, in contrast, was a positive predictor of service-delivery OCBs beyond the other antecedents and demographic control variables. As expected, neither empathy dimension was significantly related to loyalty OCBs in the regression analyses. The hierarchical regression analyses revealed that the customer-knowledge variables were predictors of each OCB dimension. Whereas strategy richness was significantly related to both loyalty and participation OCBs, trait richness was the significant, positive predictor of service-delivery OCBs.

Study 2

Method

Sample and Procedure

Participants for the second study were staff and part-time employees of five libraries in a university library system who had customer contact as part of their daily responsibilities. Respondents represented several departments that have customer contact including circulation, document reserves, and government publications. Two hundred and ninety-nine surveys were

¹ Significant demographic control variables for a particular OCB dimension based on t values greater than or equal to ± 1.645 ($p \leq .05$) were retained after the first hierarchical regression step. For the first study, the following significant relationships were identified between demographic control variables and each of the three service-oriented OCBs. Age was positively related, level of education was negatively related, and organizational tenure was negatively related to loyalty OCBs. Age was positively related to service-delivery OCBs. There were no significant demographic predictors of participation OCBs.

Table 3
Study 1: Alternative Hierarchical Regressions of Service-Oriented Organizational Citizenship Behaviors on Attitudes, Personality, and Customer Knowledge

Regression	Loyalty	Service delivery	Participation
Step 1			
Demographic control variables only R^2	.07**	.02*	.00
Step 2			
Job attitudes ΔR^2	.19**	.11**	.06**
Personality ΔR^2	.15**	.29**	.16**
Customer knowledge ΔR^2	.21**	.19**	.17**
Step 3			
Attitudes beyond knowledge ΔR^2	.12**	.05**	.03*
Attitudes beyond personality ΔR^2	.13**	.04**	.03*
Personality beyond attitudes ΔR^2	.09**	.22**	.12**
Personality beyond knowledge ΔR^2	.04**	.15**	.05**
Knowledge beyond attitudes ΔR^2	.13**	.13**	.13**
Knowledge beyond personality ΔR^2	.09**	.05**	.06**
Step 4			
Attitudes beyond personality and knowledge ΔR^2	.10**	.03**	.02
Personality beyond attitudes and knowledge ΔR^2	.02	.12**	.04**
Knowledge beyond attitudes and personality ΔR^2	.07**	.04**	.05**
Attitudes			
Job satisfaction β	.223**	.091	.071
Perceived organizational support β	.143*	.098	.075
Personality			
Service orientation β	.155**	.321**	.163**
Cognitive empathy β	.039	.092	.109*
Affective empathy β	-.066	.098*	.028
Knowledge			
Trait richness β	.093	.163**	.063
Strategy richness β	.247**	.092	.231**

Note. $N = 230$. Reported sample size varies from other tables because of missing data. Discrepancies in some R^2 values across analyses are due to rounding. Significance of standardized betas is based on one-tailed t tests. Steps 2–4 and the standardized betas reflect the presence of significant demographic control variables from Step 1.

* $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$.

distributed to employees (150 full-time staff and 149 part-time employees). Usable surveys were received from 144 of the employees for a response rate of 48%. Sixty-nine percent of the respondents were female. Thirty-four percent of the respondents were over age 45; 39% were below age 30. The sample for this study was highly educated with 71% having a college degree or higher. Over 80% of the respondents had worked as an employee of the library at least one year. The median tenure of respondents was 43 months.

Measures

We used the purified antecedent measures of Study 1 in the second study and made minor modifications to make a few items relevant to the library context (e.g., changing “company” to “library”). Working with a representative of the library, we slightly modified 13 of the 16 OCB items from the first study. Three OCB items (two loyalty items and one service delivery item) from the first study were not considered relevant for the library context of the second study and were dropped (see Table 1). We again used self-report ratings for all measures.

Results

Table 4 presents the scale means, standard deviations, reliabilities, and correlations of the second investigation for the study variables. Table 5 shows the results of the hierarchical regression analyses and the standardized beta estimates for the full regression model (with the exception of the demographic control variables)

for the second study. We used the same approach to hierarchical regression analysis from the first study to investigate predictor relationships of the second study. Like the first study, the hierarchical regression analyses (Step 3) revealed that each of the three groupings of predictor variables explained unique variance in loyalty, service-delivery, and participation OCBs in the majority of cases (14 of 18) when controlling for only one other subset of predictors and significant demographic control variables.²

The pattern of results from the hierarchical regression analyses from Step 4 for the second study was virtually identical to the pattern of results of the first study. In this case, the analyses revealed that attitudes again explained unique variance in both loyalty and service-delivery OCBs when controlling for personality, customer knowledge, and demographic control variables (loyalty: $\Delta R^2 = .21$, $p < .01$; service delivery: $\Delta R^2 = .03$, $p < .01$). Consistent with Study 1, the unique contribution of attitudes to service-delivery OCBs was modest in comparison to the role these variables played in explaining unique variance in loyalty behav-

² For the second study, the following significant relationships were identified between demographic control variables and each of the three service-oriented OCBs. Age was positively related to loyalty OCBs. There were no significant demographic predictors of service-delivery OCBs. Level of education was positively related to participation OCBs.

Table 4
Study 2: Means, Standard Deviations, Reliabilities, and Correlations Among Variables

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Service orientation	5.86	1.12	.88									
2. Cognitive empathy	5.43	1.07	.53**	.76								
3. Affective empathy	4.79	1.69	.60**	.40**	.93							
4. Job satisfaction	5.08	1.03	.30**	.20*	.20*	.84						
5. Organizational support	4.37	1.41	.31**	.24**	.30**	.65**	.94					
6. Trait richness	5.58	1.03	.32**	.35**	.19*	.23**	.06	.82				
7. Strategy richness	5.21	1.06	.26**	.32**	.14	.10	.15	.50**	.73			
8. Loyalty	5.19	1.19	.37**	.33**	.36**	.64**	.56**	.24**	.16*	.86		
9. Service delivery	5.67	0.91	.63**	.57**	.44**	.35**	.31**	.49**	.35**	.48**	.86	
10. Participation	5.21	1.08	.44**	.42**	.26**	.22**	.13	.49**	.41**	.30**	.61**	.86

Note. Coefficient alphas are reported along the diagonal. Sample sizes for the table range from 143–144 because of missing data. Means and standard deviations are reported on the basis of a 7-point scale. (See Appendixes A and B for endpoints.)
* $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$.

iors. The three personality constructs contributed uniquely to the explanation of loyalty ($\Delta R^2 = .04, p < .05$), service-delivery ($\Delta R^2 = .20, p < .01$), and participation OCBs ($\Delta R^2 = .08, p < .01$), after controlling for the attitude and knowledge predictors and the demographic control variables. Thus, unlike the first study, the personality variables did explain unique variance in loyalty OCBs beyond the other antecedents. The unique contribution of the personality predictors to loyalty and participation OCBs re-

mained quite modest, however, in comparison to their unique contribution to service-delivery OCBs. This finding was consistent with the results of Study 1. Finally, the two customer-knowledge antecedents explained unique variance in both service delivery ($\Delta R^2 = .04, p < .01$) and participation OCBs ($\Delta R^2 = .07, p < .01$) but not loyalty behaviors, after controlling for all other variables. The results of the second study revealed that the customer-knowledge predictors have a larger unique contribution with par-

Table 5
Study 2: Alternative Hierarchical Regressions of Service-Oriented Organizational Citizenship Behaviors on Attitudes, Personality, and Customer Knowledge

Regression	Loyalty	Service delivery	Participation
Step 1			
Demographic control variables only R^2	.09**	.00	.09**
Step 2			
Job attitudes ΔR^2	.37**	.23**	.08**
Personality ΔR^2	.20**	.48**	.23**
Customer knowledge ΔR^2	.07**	.24**	.21**
Step 3			
Attitudes beyond knowledge ΔR^2	.32**	.13**	.03
Attitudes beyond personality ΔR^2	.22**	.05**	.01
Personality beyond attitudes ΔR^2	.05**	.30**	.16**
Personality beyond knowledge ΔR^2	.15**	.30**	.11**
Knowledge beyond attitudes ΔR^2	.02	.14**	.15**
Knowledge beyond personality ΔR^2	.01	.06**	.08**
Step 4			
Attitudes beyond personality and knowledge ΔR^2	.21**	.03**	.00
Personality beyond attitudes and knowledge ΔR^2	.04*	.20**	.08**
Knowledge beyond attitudes and personality ΔR^2	.00	.04**	.07**
Attitudes			
Job satisfaction β	.320**	.160*	.073
Perceived organizational support β	.247**	.052	-.021
Personality			
Service orientation β	.016	.324**	.237**
Cognitive empathy β	.095	.239**	.129
Affective empathy β	.166*	.050	.021
Knowledge			
Trait richness β	.076	.226**	.233**
Strategy richness β	-.011	.015	.121

Note. $N = 138$. Reported sample size varies from other tables because of missing data. Discrepancies in some R^2 values across analyses are due to rounding. Significance of standardized betas is based on one-tailed t tests. Steps 2–4 and the standardized betas reflect the presence of significant demographic control variables from Step 1.
* $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$.

ticipation behaviors than with the other two OCB dimensions. Thus, the pattern of results of the hierarchical regression analyses in the second study suggested that each subset of predictor variables was a dominant unique contributor of one of the three forms of service-oriented OCBs.

Similar to Study 1, the standardized betas indicated that job satisfaction and perceived organizational support were both significant, positive predictors of loyalty OCBs. In the case of Study 2, job satisfaction also had a significant positive relationship with service-delivery OCBs consistent with the small unique contribution of the attitude predictors in Step 4. The standardized betas also revealed that service orientation and cognitive empathy were the primary positive predictors of service-delivery OCBs. Service orientation was also a significant, positive predictor of participation behaviors, and neither service orientation nor cognitive empathy was a significant predictor of loyalty OCBs after controlling for the other variables. The unexpected unique contribution of the personality predictors to explaining loyalty behaviors appears to be the result of a modest relationship between affective empathy and loyalty. Affective empathy did not explain unique variance in either service-delivery or participation OCBs beyond the other antecedents and demographic control variables. Finally, the standardized beta estimates revealed that trait richness, but not strategy richness, was uniquely related to service-delivery and participation OCBs in the second study.

General Discussion

Overall, despite differences in the two contexts and the two groups of customer-contact employee respondents, the results of the two investigations were encouragingly similar. Importantly, key predictors of each of the three service-oriented OCB dimensions were virtually identical across the two studies. Job satisfaction and POS were key predictors of loyalty OCBs across both studies. Service orientation, empathy (either cognitive or affective), and trait richness were key predictors of service-delivery OCBs across both studies. Finally, customer knowledge (either trait or strategy richness) and service orientation were key predictors of participation OCBs across both studies.

Of significance, the results show that each form of service-oriented OCB is not motivated by the same type of antecedent. The consistent findings of differential effects of the three predictor subsets on employee OCBs are interesting in relation to past citizenship research. The initial motivation for research on employee OCBs stemmed from a belief that these behaviors might be motivated by different factors than role-prescribed performance (cf. Organ & Konovsky, 1989). However, limited attention has been given to the possibility that different types of OCBs may be influenced by different types of antecedents. Much of the discussion surrounding the possibility of unique contributions of attitude versus disposition variables seems to approach the issue as one with an either/or outcome. However, the findings of our studies suggest that it may be most appropriate to consider whether attitudes are most influential for some forms of OCBs, whereas disposition and knowledge variables are more predictive of others.

Attitude Variables as Antecedents

Across both studies, we find that the employee attitudes of job satisfaction and POS are the best predictors of loyalty OCBs. Thus,

job attitudes seem to be the primary driver of employee willingness to represent the organization favorably to outsiders. This finding is consistent with Graham's (1991) contention that employee loyalty behaviors will be primarily driven by employees' evaluation of socioeconomic benefits (e.g., salaries, benefits, and training) provided by the organization. Although our attitude findings do support the possibility that different job attitudes reflect a general condition of favorable "morale" in their relationship with OCBs, as suggested by Organ and Ryan (1995), it remains possible that other employee attitudes such as fairness would have explained unique variance in service-delivery and participation OCBs. Bettencourt and Brown (1997), for example, provided evidence that fairness perceptions explain unique variance in customer-service behaviors beyond job satisfaction but that the opposite is not true.

Personality Variables as Antecedents

The results also reveal that the employee-disposition variables of service orientation and empathy are the best predictors of contact-employee service-delivery OCBs. Service orientation, in particular, appears to be a critical personality antecedent of service-delivery OCBs. Although personality variables have been shown to contribute uniquely to explaining some forms of OCBs beyond attitudes (e.g., Konovsky & Organ, 1996), employee disposition has not been shown previously to account for the relationship between attitudes and OCBs as postulated by Organ (1994). In our second study, however, the personality variables entirely account for the relationship between attitudes and participation OCBs (see Step 3 results of Table 5). Our findings may be due to the fit between the personality variables studied and the conceptualization of OCBs. Organ (1994) has argued that general personality factors, such as those of the Big Five, are more based on temperament than motives and lack focus with regard to predicting specific behaviors in the work context. In contrast, service orientation and empathy fit well with the types of OCBs being predicted and have a motive- and behavior-based foundation. Our empathy results also suggest that service-oriented OCBs among customer-service employees may be simultaneously (a) cognitively oriented behaviors as suggested by Organ and Konovsky (1989) and (b) expressive emotional behaviors as argued by George (1991).

Job-Knowledge Variables as Antecedents

The results also indicate that the customer-knowledge variables of trait richness and strategy richness are key predictors of service-oriented participation OCBs along with the personality variables—especially service orientation. Thus, a rich understanding of customer types and interaction strategies in combination with a service-oriented personality appears to provide a platform for making constructive and original suggestions for improving service delivery. Overall, the results reveal that the customer-knowledge variables contribute uniquely beyond both attitude and personality predictors to explaining all three OCB dimensions in the first study and two of the three dimensions in the second study.

Differences Between Contexts

Despite the overall similarities between our two studies, some important distinctions also emerge. One important difference in

findings was the increased importance of strategy richness in comparison to trait richness in the first study versus the second. It may be that the complex nature of customer interactions in the first context increased the importance of strategy richness. Customer service employees of the first study served primarily in a problem-solving capacity in addition to recommending sales solutions to customers. The wide variety of customer situations in addition to the wide variety of services offered by the firm likely increased the importance of strategy richness for recommending products and services (loyalty) and for identifying solutions to service-delivery problems (participation). Still, trait richness was the key knowledge predictor of service-delivery behaviors in both contexts. The importance of trait richness may have to do with the fact that our measure of service-delivery behaviors emphasized quality interpersonal interactions, not the problem-solving ability of the customer-service provider.

Another interesting difference in findings has to do with which empathy dimension is a significant predictor of service-delivery behaviors in each study. Initially, it seems curious that affective empathy was the significant predictor of service-delivery behaviors in the more complex environment of the first study. However, the problem-solving focus of the first context (often with angry customers) may have increased the importance of affective empathy for personal sensitivity in service delivery. The emotional demands of constantly being on stage solving customer problems likely increased the importance of affective empathy in the first study context (cf. Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993). Still, cognitive empathy was a significant predictor of participation behaviors—a more behind-the-scenes service behavior—in the first study.

Finally, a slight difference in the operationalization of loyalty OCBs between the two studies may explain why strategy richness and service orientation were positively related to loyalty OCBs only in the first study and why affective empathy was a positive predictor of loyalty OCBs only in the second study. Specifically, the loyalty behaviors of the first study included an element of promoting the organization's products and services that was not relevant in the second study's context.

Limitations

The studies suffer from common limitations of cross-sectional field research, including the inability to make causal inferences. One limitation of our two studies warrants special consideration. Despite the appropriateness of using self-report OCB measures, this approach introduces potential problems with common-method bias because the predictor measures were gathered from the same source. It must be kept in mind, however, that there is substantial evidence that the relationship between employee attitudes and OCBs is not a function of common-method variance (e.g., Organ & Ryan, 1995). Thus, the ability of the personality and knowledge variables not only to explain unique variance beyond employee attitudes but also to account for the relationship between attitudes and service-delivery and participation OCBs suggests that the personality and knowledge findings are not simply the product of common-method variance.

To statistically investigate the impact of common-method variance on our findings, we compared three nested latent-variable structural models in which a same-source factor is estimated with loadings to the indicators of all model constructs, as recommended by Williams and Anderson (1994).³ First, a saturated structural

model is estimated with all of the same-source factor loadings constrained to zero (i.e., the *constrained-method effects model*). Second, the same model is estimated without constraining the same-source factor loadings to zero (i.e., the *unconstrained-method effects model*). Finally, a restricted structural model is estimated in which “the values of substantively important parameters have been restricted to be equal to the estimates from the model without method effects” (Williams & Anderson, 1994, p. 326).⁴ Statistical comparison of the first two nested models provides a test of the presence of common-method variance. Statistical comparison of the latter two models provides a test of the impact of common-method variance on key structural parameters of interest.

For both of our studies, we found a significant difference between the constrained and unconstrained models, but we found a nonsignificant difference between the unconstrained and restricted structural models.⁵ Thus, the results of the model comparisons indicate that although common-method variance is present in both of our studies, this variance does not bias the structural parameters of interest, a possibility suggested by Williams and Anderson (1994). In addition, our reanalysis indicates that even in the presence of the same-source factor, all indicator loadings of the theoretical constructs remained significant ($p < .001$) with little attenuation.

Managerial Implications

In conclusion, we offer implications for managers on the basis of the results of our two studies—especially given the realities of

³ We first randomly combined the items of each construct, using item means, so that each would be represented by no more than three indicators (29 indicators total because trait richness had only two indicators; cf. Williams & Anderson, 1994). For job satisfaction, we combined the indicators by grouping extrinsic, intrinsic, and global items together.

⁴ In our two studies, the parameters of substantive importance were the 21 structural paths linking the antecedents to the OCB dimensions and the three error terms of the citizenship equations.

⁵ For Study 1, the fit indices for the constrained method effects model were $\chi^2(339, N = 234) = 602.04, p < .01$; comparative fit index (CFI) = .92; Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI) = .90. The fit indices for the unconstrained method effects model were $\chi^2(310, N = 234) = 501.15, p < .01$; CFI = .94; TLI = .92. The difference in fit between these two models ($\chi^2 = 100.89, df_{diff} = 29, p < .01$) was significant, which suggests that a same-source factor is evident in the data. The fit indices for the restricted structural model were $\chi^2(334, N = 234) = 509.91, p < .01$; CFI = .95; TLI = .93. The difference in fit between the restricted structural model and the unconstrained-method effects model ($\chi^2 = 8.76, df_{diff} = 24, p > .10$) was not significant, indicating that the common-method effects do not significantly affect the structural parameters of interest.

For the second study, the fit indices for the constrained method effects model were $\chi^2(339, N = 143) = 676.96, p < .01$; CFI = .88; TLI = .86. The fit indices for the unconstrained method effects model were $\chi^2(310, N = 143) = 571.09, p < .01$; CFI = .91; TLI = .88. The difference in fit between these two models ($\chi^2 = 105.87, df_{diff} = 29, p < .01$) was significant, which suggests that a same-source factor is evident in the data. The fit indices for the restricted structural model of Study 2 were $\chi^2(334, N = 143) = 576.38, p < .01$; CFI = .91; TLI = .90. The difference in fit between the restricted structural model and the unconstrained-method effects model ($\chi^2 = 5.29, df_{diff} = 24, p > .10$) was not significant. Thus, the same-source effects of Study 2 again do not significantly affect the structural parameters of interest.

customer service in today's competitive environment. One dynamic evident in today's service economy involves companies expanding the responsibilities and strategic importance of frontline employees as a source of differentiation. For example, Lexus, renowned for its customer service, does not employ salespeople—they are sales consultants. Mechanics at Lexus are service technicians. Even receptionists at Lexus dealerships attend regional and national training meetings to learn about cars and customers. As customer-service employees become a greater source of competitive differentiation, the need for a workforce that not only provides exceptional personal service but also acts as advocates for the organization to outsiders and contributes to the ability of the firm to respond to changing external realities will increase. Our findings suggest the importance of managers taking a broad view of the characteristics of an effective customer-service provider as their responsibilities and strategic importance increases.

Another reality of many service-delivery positions is that they rely heavily on what has been called *emotional labor* (i.e., employees are required to display appropriate emotions; Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993). Emotional labor will only tend to increase as companies demand more of their customer-service providers. This prospect is especially likely of customer-service positions that involve a heavy problem-solving component or that involve regular interaction with customers who are angry at the organization. Comparison of the results across our two studies highlights the increased importance of affective empathy in comparison to cognitive empathy as interactions with customers become more involved and demanding. In addition, service orientation, which was positively related to service-delivery behaviors in both of our studies, is only likely to increase in importance as emotional labor in service positions increases. Our findings also indicate that knowledge of customer types is important for exceptional service delivery across service contexts. Companies that wish to provide their frontline employees with a better understanding of customers may want to consider role-playing scenarios with different customer types and situations. CD-ROM technology has provided a means of standardizing such scenarios so that even the lowest-paid employees in the organization can benefit from such training at low cost.

Finally, it is important to consider the impact of our findings on management of service operations that often involve remote service delivery away from the corporate office (e.g., retail banking). Remote service delivery places considerable importance on middle management being effective leaders. They must be provided with the recruiting and training resources that will enable them to hire the right personality fit for the customer-service position (i.e., service-oriented and empathetic) and develop the service capabilities of employees that are hired (i.e., trait and strategy richness). Middle managers must also be provided with leadership training so that they can develop a supportive and satisfying work climate for customer-service providers and so that they can serve as effective coaches in developing each service provider's knowledge of customer types and interaction strategies.

References

- Allport, G. W. (1961). *Pattern and growth in personality*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Ashforth, B. E., & Humphrey, R. H. (1993). Emotional labor in service roles: The influence of identity. *Academy of Management Review*, 18, 88–115.
- Barnett, M. A., Howard, J. A., King, L. M., & Dino, G. A. (1981). Helping behavior and the transfer of empathy. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 115, 125–132.
- Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee "citizenship." *Academy of Management Journal*, 26, 587–595.
- Bettencourt, L. A., & Brown, S. W. (1997). Contact employees: Relationships among workplace fairness, job satisfaction and prosocial service behaviors. *Journal of Retailing*, 73, 39–61.
- Bettencourt, L. A., & Gwinner, K. (1996). Customization of the service experience: The role of the frontline employee. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 7, 3–20.
- Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In N. Schmitt & W. C. Borman (Eds.), *Personnel selection in organizations* (pp. 71–98). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bowen, D. E., & Schneider, B. (1985). Boundary-spanning-role employees and the service encounter: Some guidelines for future management and research. In J. Czepiel, M. R. Solomon, & C. F. Surprenant (Eds.), *The service encounter* (pp. 127–147). New York: Lexington Books.
- Brief, A. P., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1986). Prosocial organizational behaviors. *Academy of Management Review*, 11, 710–725.
- Cantor, N., & Mischel, W. (1979). Prototypes in person perception. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (pp. 3–52). New York: Academic Press.
- Cran, D. J. (1994). Towards validation of the service orientation construct. *The Service Industries Journal*, 14, 34–44.
- Davis, M. H. (1980). A multidimensional approach to individual differences in empathy. *JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology*, 10, 85.
- Davis, M. H. (1983). Measuring individual difference in empathy: Evidence for a multidimensional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44, 113–126.
- Eisenberger, R., Fasolo, P., & Davis-LaMastro, V. (1990). Perceived organizational support and employee diligence, commitment, and innovation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 51–59.
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 500–507.
- George, J. M. (1991). State or trait: Effects of positive mood on prosocial behaviors at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 299–307.
- Graham, J. W. (1991). An essay on organizational citizenship behavior. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 4, 249–270.
- Hoffman, K. D., & Ingram, T. N. (1992). Service provider job satisfaction and customer-oriented performance. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 6, 68–78.
- Hogan, J., Hogan, R., & Busch, C. M. (1984). How to measure service orientation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69, 167–173.
- Johnson, J. A., Cheek, J. M., & Smither, R. (1983). The structure of empathy. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45, 1299–1312.
- Kelley, S. W., Longfellow, T., & Malehorn, J. (1996). Organizational determinants of employees' exercise of routine, creative and deviant discretion. *Journal of Retailing*, 72, 135–157.
- Konovsky, M. A., & Organ, D. W. (1996). Dispositional and contextual determinants of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 17, 253–266.
- Leigh, T. W., & McGraw, P. F. (1989). Mapping the procedural knowledge of industrial sales personnel: A script-theoretic investigation. *Journal of Marketing*, 53, 16–34.
- Leong, S. M., Busch, P. S., & John, D. R. (1989). Knowledge bases and salesperson effectiveness: A script-theoretic analysis. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 26, 164–178.
- MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., & Fetter, R. (1993). The impact of organizational citizenship behavior on evaluations of salesperson performance. *Journal of Marketing*, 57, 70–80.

- Mehrabian, A., & Epstein, N. (1972). A measure of emotional empathy. *Journal of Personality, 40*, 525–543.
- Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76*, 845–855.
- Moorman, R. H., & Blakely, G. L. (1995). Individualism-collectivism as an individual difference predictor of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 16*, 127–142.
- Moorman, R. H., Blakely, G. L., & Niehoff, B. P. (1998). Does perceived organizational support mediate the relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behavior? *Academy of Management Journal, 41*, 351–357.
- Mowen, J. C. (2000). *The 3M model of motivation and personality: Theory and empirical applications to consumer behavior*. Boston: Kluwer Academic.
- Muchinsky, P. M. (1993). Validation of personality constructs for the selection of insurance industry employees. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 7*, 475–482.
- Netemeyer, R. G., Boles, J. S., McKee, D. O., & McMurrian, R. (1997). An investigation into the antecedents of organizational citizenship behaviors in a personal selling context. *Journal of Marketing, 61*, 85–98.
- Organ, D. W. (1990). The motivational basis of organizational citizenship behavior. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 12, pp. 43–72). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Organ, D. W. (1994). Personality and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Management, 20*, 465–478.
- Organ, D. W., & Konovsky, M. (1989). Cognitive versus affective determinants of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74*, 157–164.
- Organ, D. W., & Lingl, A. (1995). Personality, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behavior. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 135*, 339–350.
- Organ, D. W., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology, 48*, 775–802.
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1988). SERVQUAL: A multiple-item scale for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality. *Journal of Retailing, 64*, 12–40.
- Paunonen, S. V. (1998). Hierarchical organization of personality and prediction of behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*, 538–556.
- Podsakoff, P. M., Ahearne, M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior and the quantity and quality of work group performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*, 262–270.
- Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1997). The impact of organizational citizenship behavior on organizational performance: A review and suggestions for future research. *Human Performance, 10*, 133–151.
- Puffer, S. M. (1987). Prosocial behavior, noncompliant behavior, and work performance among commission salespeople. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 72*, 615–621.
- Schneider, B., & Bowen, D. E. (1984). New services design, development and implementation and the employee. In W. R. George & C. E. Marshall (Eds.), *Developing new services* (pp. 82–101). Chicago: American Marketing Association.
- Schneider, B., & Bowen, D. E. (1993). The service organization: Human resources management is crucial. *Organizational Dynamics, 21*, 39–52.
- Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 68*, 653–663.
- Sujan, H., Sujan, M., & Bettman, J. R. (1988). Knowledge structure differences between more effective and less effective salespeople. *Journal of Marketing Research, 25*, 81–86.
- Szymanski, D. M. (1988). Determinants of selling effectiveness: The importance of declarative knowledge to the personal selling concept. *Journal of Marketing, 52*, 64–77.
- Van Dyne, L., Graham, J. W., & Dienesch, R. M. (1994). Organizational citizenship behavior: Construct redefinition, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal, 37*, 765–802.
- Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1994). An alternative approach to method effects by using latent-variable models: Applications in organizational behavior research. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*, 323–331.
- Zeithaml, V. A., Berry, L. L., & Parasuraman, A. (1988). Communication and control processes in the delivery of service quality. *Journal of Marketing, 52*, 35–48.

(Appendixes follow)

Appendix A

Attitude, Personality, and Knowledge Antecedents and Their Indicators

Construct	Indicators
Job satisfaction	
How satisfied are you with . . .	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The amount of job security you have. 2. The fringe benefits you have. 3. The amount of personal growth and development you get in your job. 4. The people you work with on the job. 5. The feeling of worthwhile accomplishment you get from doing your job. 6. The amount of support and guidance you receive from your supervisor. 7. The amount of independent thought and action you can exercise on the job. 8. Considering everything, how would you rate your overall satisfaction with XYZ at the present time?
Perceived organizational support	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The organization values my contribution to the company. 2. The organization really cares about my well-being. 3. The organization cares about my general satisfaction. 4. The organization shows very little concern for me. (R) 5. The organization cares about my opinions. 6. The organization takes pride in my accomplishments. 7. The organization tries to make my job as interesting as possible.
Service orientation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I enjoy helping others. 2. The best job I can imagine would involve assisting others in solving their problems. 3. I can get along with most anyone. 4. I pride myself in providing courteous service. 5. It is natural for me to be considerate of others' needs.
Cognitive empathy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I believe that there are two sides to every question and try to look at them both. 2. I try to look at everybody's side of a disagreement before I make a decision. 3. I sometimes find it difficult to see things from the "other guy's" point of view. (R) 4. I sometimes try to understand my friends better by imagining how things look from their perspective.
Affective empathy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Seeing warm, emotional scenes melts my heart and makes me teary-eyed. 2. When I watch a sad, "tear-jerker" movie, I almost always have warm, compassionate feelings for the characters. 3. I would describe myself as a pretty soft-hearted person.
Trait richness	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. My knowledge of different types of customers is very broad. 2. Because I know a lot about customers, it is easy for me to identify different customer types.
Strategy richness	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I can use a different approach for dealing with almost every customer service situation. 2. I only use one or two strategies to meet customer needs. (R) 3. I have a number of strategies for dealing with different customers and situations.

Note. Minor changes were made in indicator wording across studies. Job satisfaction was measured on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (*extremely dissatisfied*) to 7 (*extremely satisfied*). All other antecedents were measured on 7-point scales ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). (R) = reverse coded. The items for the perceived organizational support construct are from "Perceived Organizational Support," by R. Eisenberger, R. Huntington, S. Hutchison, and D. Sowa, 1986, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, p. 502. Copyright 1986 by the American Psychological Association. Reprinted with permission of the author. The items for the empathy constructs are from "A Multidimensional Approach to Individual Differences in Empathy," by M. H. Davis, 1980, *JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology*, 10, p. 85. Copyright 1980 by Select Press. Reprinted with permission.

Appendix B

Service-Oriented Citizenship Indicators and Their Foundation in Prior Citizenship Research

Service-oriented citizenship constructs and indicators	Related citizenship and service quality indicators of prior studies
<p>Loyalty</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Tells outsiders this is a good place to work. 2. Says good things about organization to others. 3. Generates favorable goodwill for the company. 4. Encourages friends and family to use firm's products and services. 5. Actively promotes the firm's products and services. 	<p>Loyalty (Van Dyne et al., 1994)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does not tell outsiders this is a good place to work. (R) 2. Actively promotes organization's products and services. 3. Represents organization favorably to outsiders. <p>Loyal boosterism (Moorman & Blakely, 1995)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Encourages friends and family to utilize organization products. 2. Shows pride when representing the organization in public.
<p>Service delivery</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Follows customer service guidelines with extreme care. 2. Conscientiously follows guidelines for customer promotions. 3. Follows up in a timely manner to customer requests and problems. 4. Performs duties with unusually few mistakes. 5. Always has a positive attitude at work. 6. Regardless of circumstances, exceptionally courteous and respectful to customers. 	<p>Obedience (Van Dyne et al., 1994)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Follows work rules and instructions with extreme care. 2. Regardless of circumstances, produces highest quality work. <p>Personal industry (Moorman & Blakely, 1995)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Performs duties with unusually few errors. 2. Performs job duties with extra special care. <p>Conscientiousness (MacKenzie et al., 1993)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Conscientiously follows company regulations and procedures. 2. Returns phone calls and responds to other messages and requests for information promptly. <p>Service quality (Parasuraman et al., 1988)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. You do not receive prompt service from XYZ's employees. (R) 2. Employees of XYZ are polite.
<p>Participation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Encourages co-workers to contribute ideas and suggestions for service improvement. 2. Contributes many ideas for customer promotions and communications. 3. Makes constructive suggestions for service improvement. 4. Frequently presents to others creative solutions to customer problems. 5. Takes home brochures to read up on products and services. 	<p>Participation (Van Dyne et al., 1994)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Shares ideas for new projects or improvements widely. 2. Frequently makes creative suggestions to co-workers. 3. Keeps well-informed where opinion might benefit organization. <p>Individual initiative (Moorman & Blakely, 1995)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Often motivates others to express their ideas and opinions. 2. Frequently communicates to co-workers suggestions on how the group can improve.

Note. Organizational citizenship behaviors were measured on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (*not at all characteristic of me*) to 7 (*extremely characteristic of me*). (R) = reverse coded. Items for loyalty, obedience, and participation are from "Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Construct Redefinition, Measurement, and Validation," by L. Van Dyne, J. W. Graham, and R. M. Dienesch, 1994, *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, p. 781. Copyright 1994 by the Academy of Management. Reprinted with permission. Items for loyal boosterism, personal industry, and individual initiative are from "Individualism-Collectivism as an Individual Difference Predictor of Organizational Citizenship Behavior," by R. H. Moorman and G. L. Blakely, 1995, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16, p. 132. Copyright 1995 by John Wiley & Sons Limited. Reproduced with permission. Items for conscientiousness are reprinted with permission from *Journal of Marketing*, published by the American Marketing Association, S. B. MacKenzie, P. M. Podsakoff, and R. Fetter, 1993, 57, p. 74. Items for service quality are from "SERVQUAL: A Multiple-Item Scale for Measuring Consumer Perceptions of Service Quality," by A. Parasuraman, V. A. Zeithaml, and L. L. Berry, 1988, *Journal of Retailing*, 64, p. 39. Copyright 1988 by New York University. Reprinted with permission.

Received March 8, 1999

Revision received January 26, 2000

Accepted January 26, 2000 ■