WHAT AFFECTS EMPLOYEE CROSS-SELLING BEHAVIOR: THE ROLE OF JOB DEMAND, CUSTOMER INCIVILITY, AND HIGH PERFORMANCE WORK SYSTEMS

A Thesis in
Human Resources and Employment Relations
by
Can Ouyang

© 2014 Can Ouyang

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Science

August 2014
The thesis of Can Ouyang was reviewed and approved* by the following:

Xiangmin Liu
Assistant Professor of Labor and Employment Relations
Thesis Adviser

Paul F. Clark
Professor of Labor and Employment Relations
Director of the School of Labor and Employment Relations

Rick R. Jacobs
Professor of Psychology

*Signatures are on file in the Graduate School
This study sought to establish a multilevel framework to examine the effects job demand, customer incivility, and high performance work system (HPWS) on cross-selling behavior among front-line customer service employees. I hypothesized that job demand and customer incivility negatively influenced employee cross-selling behavior. Furthermore, the use of high performance work system (HPWS) could enhance cross-selling behavior either directly or indirectly by reducing the negative impacts of job demand and customer incivility. To test these hypotheses, I used data from 84 group managers and 366 focal frontline employees in a large Chinese retail company. Results provided partial support for the hypotheses. Consistent with my hypothesis, customer incivility was negatively related to employee cross-selling behavior. However, contradictory to my expectation, the effect of job demand was negative. Finally, HPWS influenced cross-selling behavior by moderating the relationship between customer incivility and behavior.
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Introduction

The product and service markets have become saturated and highly competitive (Kamakura et al. 2003). The connection with customers is critical for the development of enterprises. In order to strengthen and maintain the firm-customer relationship, many companies adopt the customer relationship management (CRM) program, which consists of “acquiring, retaining, and growing or expanding customer relationships with a firm” (Günes et al. 2010). Cross-selling is considered to be an important CRM strategy for establishing strong relationship with customers (Kamakura et al. 1991). It aims to increase the company’s sales revenues by selling additional products or services to the existing customers. Cross-selling is beneficial for the company because it raises the switching cost to customers and creates opportunities for the company to learn about customer needs. A McKinsey report found that companies using cross-selling strategy earned 10% more than those that focused solely on customer retention (Coyles and Gokey 2002).

The extant literature often viewed cross-selling as an intervention strategy or a management tool for revenue generation. The focus of the existing studies was on developing mathematical models to optimize the cross-selling efforts—to effectively identify the customers’ logical steps in product acquisition and the patterns of associations among purchases across customers (Kumar et al. 2008). However, very few studies have examined the role of frontline employees (salespeople and customer service representatives) in the cross-selling activities. As a bridge that connects customers and the company, the frontline employee can make a great impact on the effectiveness of
cross-selling. Therefore, it is important to understand what predicts employee
cross-selling behavior in the service settings.

Previous works on cross-selling behavior have examined the effects of some
environmental characteristics. For example, Jasmand and Blazevic (2012) and Schmitz
(2013) investigated how team-level factors (e.g. team norm strength and team reputation)
influence the cross-selling behavior of frontline employees. These studies underscored the
importance of working environment in shaping employee cross-selling behavior.
However, they focused mainly on team-level factors. The impacts of organization-level
working environment characteristics have rarely been investigated.

Some other studies attempted to research how management practices were related
to cross-selling behavior. Researchers highlighted the significance of selling skill training,
performance-based rewards, and appropriate incentive design (Kamakura, 2008; Günes
and Aksin, 2004; Evans et al. 1999). These studies emphasized on the effects of
individual HR practices. Nevertheless, few of them have studied how HR practices work
as a system to encourage proactive cross-selling behavior. In addition, these studies
focused only on the direct effect of HR practices on employee behavioral outcomes. The
moderating effect of HR practices in the environment-performance relationship has rarely
been investigated. In addition to the main effect, HR practices can also reduce the
negative impacts of environmental constraints.

Most of the existing studies on cross-selling used salespeople as their research
target. Another type of frontline employees, the customer service representatives (CSRs),
has not attracted much attention from the researchers. CSRs are employees who get
involved in a wide range of activities such as providing customers with information about products or services and handling customer complaints. Unlike sales representatives, CSRs are not required to proactively engage in selling products or services to their customers. For example, the CSRs in a retail store are responsible to show customers where to buy a certain product, but they are not obliged to persuade customers to purchase the items. So cross-selling is an extra or voluntary behavior for the CSRs. However, as important contacts that the customers have with the company, the CSRs’ cross-selling efforts can in fact make a great impact on the customers’ cross-buying behavior (Kumar et al. 2008).

The primary purpose of this study was to address these issues. I established a multilevel framework to examine how environmental characteristics and high performance work system affect the cross-selling behavior of CSRs. First, the current study proposed that job demand, customer incivility, and high performance work system can directly influence employee cross-selling behavior. Frontline CSRs will exhibit more proactive cross-selling behaviors when they are exposed to lower job demand, fewer customer mistreatment, and greater use of high performance work system. Second, this research also proposed that high performance work system can buffer the negative relationship between the two environmental factors (job demand and customer incivility) and employee cross-selling behavior.

**Cross-Selling Behavior**

Cross-selling is characterized as the “efforts to increase the number of products or services that a customer uses within a firm” (Kamakura et al. 2003). For example, a life
insurance company may advice its customers to purchase car insurance; a bank will introduce a number of financial products or services to its existing clients; a printing machine seller will suggest the buyers to also purchase paper, ink, and the USB cable. Cross-selling is one of the most widely used strategies to increase their sales volumes. From the companies’ perspective, cross-selling is an important practice in Customer Relationship Management (CRM) (Sun et al. 2006; Li et al. 2005; Winer, 2001).

Cross-selling can benefit both the companies and the customers. For companies, cross-selling reduces the costs involved in the sales activities. The company can save a large amount of money because their employees are dealing with customers that already have relationships with them. It is estimated that to serve an existing customer costs five times less than to acquire a new one (Rothfeder, 2003). Second, cross-selling increases the switching cost for customers. The more products they purchase from a same company, the more difficult for them to switch from one company to another. High switching costs can lead to stronger repurchase intentions and greater customer loyalty (Morgan and Hunt, 1994; Jones et al. 2000; Gremler et al. 2001). Third, cross-selling creates precious learning opportunities for companies. Through intense interactions with customers, CSRs can acquire sufficient knowledge about customer preferences. This knowledge can become an important competitive advantage for the company.

Cross-selling can also benefit the customers. One-stop shopping allows customers to purchase multiple products or services from a same provider. They can save a lot of time and efforts because all the required items are available from the same source (Hoch et al. 1999). Cross-selling makes customers’ lives more convenient. Besides, customers
can often get bonuses or discounts if they purchase multiple items from a same company. One-stop shopping can reduce the total costs of buying (Kumar et al. 2008). In addition, customers can enjoy better services provided by the companies. Cross-selling requires employees to invest great efforts to obtain information about customer demands. Therefore the employees can offer more personalized services to their customers.

Most of the prior research studied cross-selling in the context of Customer Relationship Management (CRM). Cross-selling is often considered to be an intervention strategy or a management toolkit for customer development and revenue generation (Kumar et al. 2008). The extant literature intended to discover and optimize the cross-selling opportunities: how can we identify the logical steps for the customers in their product acquisition? What are the patterns of associations among customers’ purchases? How can cross-selling best fit with other CRM practices? Nevertheless, very few studies have put their focus on the frontline employees.

Frontline employees are the people who have direct contacts with customers. There are two major types of frontline employees: salespeople and customer service representatives (CSRs). Salespeople are responsible to promote and sell products to customers. The CSRs, on the other hand, do not make direct contributions to the increase of sales volumes. Their major responsibility is to provide customers with product- or service-related information and resolve customer complaints. Frontline employees help their companies establish and maintain customer relationships, and reinforce their corporate brand images. Sometimes they are the only connections that the customers have with the companies. Their behaviors can greatly affect organizations’ service quality or
Frontline employees also play important roles in cross-selling activities. Salespeople are often required to proactively engage in selling products or services to their customers. Their selling behavior can greatly influence the organization’s cross-selling performance. Unlike sales representatives, CSRs do not have the obligation to persuade their customers to purchase extra items. But the cross-selling efforts of CSRs can also make a great impact on the customers’ cross-buying intentions (Kumar et al. 2008). CSRs know very well about the companies’ product portfolio and understand the advantages of each product. They can provide relevant information and communicate the advantages of products to their customers. A CSR can easily convert a service inquiry into a cross-sell (Jasmand and Blazevic, 2012). Since customers only possess limited information about products or services, their cross-buying decisions will be greatly influenced by the CSRs.

Jasmand and Blazevic (2012) and Schmitz (2013) are among the first studies that specifically focus on frontline employees’ cross-selling behaviors. Jasmand and Blazevic (2012) used the term “ambidextrous behavior” to describe a CSR’s simultaneous engagement in customer service provision and cross selling. They argued that CSRs who successfully manage these two different behavioral demands could achieve greater sales performance and efficiency. Schmitz’s (2013) cross-level study used a motivation-opportunity-ability (MOA) model to investigate both the personal and team-level antecedents of salespeople’s adoption of the company’s product portfolio.
Results showed that the cross-selling motivation could directly influence people’s adoption behaviors. This relationship was moderated by team norm strength and team reputation. Cross-selling motivation has a stronger influence on the individual behavioral outcome when the team has strong cross-selling norms and a weak reputation.

Based on Jasmand and Blazevic (2012) and Schmitz’s (2013) work, the current research typically focused on the CSRs and adopted a behavioral perspective to study cross-selling. I define cross-selling behavior as the CSR’s proactive action to persuade a customer who has purchased previously to buy additional products or services from the same provider. This definition has two important implications. First, the current study focused on individual behaviors, not management practices. Some prior studies in the context of CRM viewed employees simply as passive receivers of management practices. They ignored the proactivity of these people (e.g. Sun et al. 2006; Li et al. 2005). This paper took a behavioral perspective and specifically examined the antecedents of individual cross-selling behavior. Second, cross-selling behavior is a customer-oriented proactive behavior. The CSRs who exhibit cross-selling behaviors are self-initiated and change-oriented (Bateman and Crant, 1993; Morrison and Phelps, 1999). They make their efforts to encourage customers to purchase more because they have great motivation to contribute to the success of their teams and organizations. Third, cross-selling behavior is more than persuasion. It also includes other service related activities, such as searching for customer preferences, generating knowledge, and creating opportunities (Jasmand and Blazevic, 2012).

Jasmand and Blazevic (2012) and Schmitz’s (2013) studies typically examined
how team-level factors (e.g. team identification, team reputation, and team norm strength) affect the individual behavioral outcome. Nevertheless, the effects of other working environment characteristics and managerial practices have not been tested. First, working environment can have a great impact on individual outcomes. People who suffer from job-related demand (e.g. time pressure and high workload) are more likely to become emotionally exhausted and exhibit fewer positive behaviors (Deery, Iverson, and Walsh, 2002). In addition to these job-related factors, the CSRs are also influenced by customers. In the service setting, frontline CSRs are boundary spanners that connect the organizations and customers. Their work attitudes and behaviors are shaped by their interactions with customers. The way that customers react can affect how the employees behave. For example, customer mistreatment can result in higher job stress and more employee incivility (Walker, van Jaarsveld, and Skarlicki, 2014). Second, management practices, especially HR practices, can also influence the individual outcomes. The commitment-oriented HR practices motivate the CSRs to improve their serving performance and increase their proactive behaviors, while the control-oriented HR practices may cause high job strain and lead to negative behavioral outcomes (Kinnie, Hutchinson, and Purcell, 2000).

The current study attempted to investigate how work environment affects CSR cross-selling behavior. Specifically, this study examined the effects of two working environment characteristics (job demands and customer incivility) on the individual behavioral outcome. This study also proposed that the high performance work system (HPWS) could influence individual cross-selling behaviors both directly, and indirectly
by buffering the relationship of job demands and customer incivility to cross-selling behavior. Figure 1 was the theoretical framework that depicts the influence of job demands, customer incivility, and high performance work system on employee cross-selling behavior.

**Figure 1: Theoretical Framework of This Study**

### Job Demand and CSR Cross-Selling Behavior

The Job Demands-Resources (JDR) model is often used to describe how specific work characteristics are related to job stress. Job demand is an important component of this model. It is defined as the aspects of job that require sustained efforts and are therefore associated with certain physiological and psychological costs (Demerouti et. al, 2001). Examples of job demands include work overload, emotional demand, physical demand and work-home interference. Another critical component of the JDR model is job resource. It can be broadly defined as a kind of energetic reservoir that an individual taps when he or she has to cope with job stressors (Hobfoll, 1989, 2002).

Job demand has a negative impact on employees’ cross-selling behavior. First, high job demand can lead to a number of stress outcomes, such as job burnout and job
strain (e.g. Demerouti et al. 2001; Bakker and Demerouti, 2007). The JDR model indicates a health impairment process that explains how sustained efforts to manage job demands exhaust employees’ resources (Schaufeli and Bakker, 2004). According to Conservation of Resources (COR) theory, people strive to acquire and maintain resources (objects, personal characteristics, conditions, or energies) they value. Stress occurs when these resources are threatened or lost (Hobfoll, 1989, 2002). Job demand requires physical and mental efforts, which result in the threats of resource loss (Alarcon, 2011). So individuals are more likely to experience job stress when facing high levels of demands. Stress can in turn influence the proactive behaviors and work performance of employees (e.g., Jex, 1998; Beehr et al. 2000). Motowidlo et al. (1986) investigated the relationship between subjective strain and work performance. They found that strain could negatively affect the supervisors’ ratings on several aspects of employee job performance (e.g., quality and interpersonal effectiveness). Bakker et al. (2004) used the JDR model to predict in-role and extra-role performance. The results showed that higher job demands led to greater emotional exhaustion, which thus exerted a negative influence on employee in-role performance.

For CSRs, job demands such as work overload and emotional demand can exhaust their job resources and result in some specific types of job stress. Emotional exhaustion, which is characterized as a lack of energy and a feeling that one's emotional resources are used up (Cordes and Dougherty, 1993), is a typical stress outcome caused by interpersonal interactions in the service settings. Emotional exhaustion has a negative relationship with individual behavioral outcomes such as service performance and
employee mistreatment against customers (Halbesleben and Buckley, 2004; Maslach, Schaufeli, and Leiter, 2001). CSRs who experience emotional exhaustion are less likely to display positive emotions and proactively cross-sell products to their customers. They are reluctant to spend a great deal of efforts searching for relevant information about customer needs and persuading their clients to purchase an extra item.

Second, job demand can reduce the motivation level of CSRs. According to the JDR model, job resource evolves a motivational process that indicates the motivational potential of job resources to contribute to positive outcomes (Bakker and Demerouti, 2007). Job resources can stimulate high engagement both intrinsically (by fostering employee growth and learning) and extrinsically (by helping employees attain their goals) (Bakker et al. 2010). High motivation can lead to more proactive behaviors. Previous studies have found that forms of work motivations such as job self-efficacy, role breadth self-efficacy, intrinsic work motivation, and role orientation are strongly related to employee proactive behavior (e.g., Ohly and Fritz, 2007; Crant, 2000; Parker and Collins, 2008). Job demand signals a threat of resource loss. In order to deal with the intense job demands, employees need to invest both physical and mental efforts. When the job resources are used up, employees will feel less motivated. Lower motivation will thus result in fewer proactive behaviors.

Motivation is an important source of cross-selling behavior (Schmitz, 2013). Highly motivated CSRs are more likely to exhibit proactive selling behaviors towards their customers. They have strong passion to search for information about customer demands and spend efforts persuading their customers to purchase more items from their
company. Job demand is negatively related to employee motivation. By distracting the CSR’s attention, the intense job demand can exhaust the emotional resources of CSRs. When employees’ motivation level decreases, they have less energy to engage themselves in the cross-selling activities. So I proposed that job demand is negatively related to employee cross-selling behavior.

\[ H1: \text{Job demand is negatively related to CSR cross-selling behavior. The more job demand the employee experiences, the less likely that he/she will exhibit cross-selling behavior.} \]

**Customer Incivility and CSR Cross-Selling Behavior**

Customer incivility is defined as “an employee’s perception that the customer is treating the employee in an uncivil manner” (van Jaarsveld et al. 2010). It is a specific type of workplace incivility that targets against the employees.

In the service setting, the CSRs sometimes need to deal with angry or aggressive customers. These customers are abusive and irritating (Deery et al. 2002). They make unreasonable demands, raise their voices, and speak in a rude or even insulting manner (Andersson and Pearson, 1999; Cortina et al. 2001). The exposure to angry customers can lead to a number of detrimental effects. For example, employees who are treated in an uncivil manner are likely to have lower level of job involvement, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment (Cortina et al. 2002; Pearson and Porath, 2004). CSRs become less engaged in their works and devoted less effort to perform their work task. Moreover, customer incivility can also cause stress outcomes such as job strain and emotional exhaustion (Deery et al. 2002; Grandey et al. 2004; Kern and Grandey, 2009).
Deery et al. (2002) did a comprehensive study to summarize the potential stressors in call centers. They found that customer incivility was a significant predictor of employee emotional exhaustion. The intense interaction with angry or aggressive customers would exhaust the CSR’s emotional resources and lead to high level of job stress.

These negative impacts will in turn lead to fewer proactive cross-selling behaviors in the workplace. Prior studies indicated that the mistreatment against employees would create a “spiral of incivility” (Andersson & Pearson, 1999). This “spiral of incivility” indicates that recipient of mistreatment will reciprocate incivility against the initiator by behaving in an uncivil manner (van Jaarsveld et al. 2010). With the feeling of anger and injustice, the CSRs will display rude and aggressive behaviors against their customers. They do not have the patience to listen to their customer needs, analyze the purchase patterns of their customers, and introduce the details of an extra item to the potential buyers. Instead, to avoid further conflict, the CSRs tend to end the conversation as soon as possible. Therefore I argued that customer incivility would negatively affect employees’ cross-selling behavior.

H2: Customer incivility is negatively related to CSR cross-selling behavior. The more customer incivility the employee experiences, the less likely that he/she will display cross-selling behavior.

High Performance Work System (HPWS) and CSR Cross-Selling Behavior

The fierce market competition and the fast development of technology have urged the companies to put great investment in recruiting, developing, and retaining their talents.
Human capital is now considered to be a critical competitive advantage. High performance work system (HPWS), which is defined as “a group of separate but interconnected HR management practices that are designed to enhance employee and firm performance outcomes through improving workforce competence, attitudes, and motivation” (Huselid, 1995), is often used by companies as an important means to improve their human capitals (Guthrie, 2001).

The traditional human resource management studies focused on the effects of individual HR practices. The strategic human resource management (SHRM) differs from the traditional views in that it adopts a system view to examine how a bundle of human resource practices affect organizational and individual outcomes (Wright & McMahan, 1992). From the SHRM perspective, the researchers argued that HPWS should be a coherent system that achieves internal fits between different HR practices (Schuler and Jackson, 1987). That is to say, HR practices within HPWS should work together and become mutually reinforcing (Ramsay et al. 2000; Huselid, 1995; Delery, 1998). The effects of HPWP as a system should outweigh the additive sum of the independent effect of each HR practice (Batt, 1999; MacDuffie, 1995; Dunlop and Weil, 1996).

There are some debates about what specific HR practices should be included in the high performance system. But researchers do agree that staffing, training, reward, appraisal, and some other human resource practices should be important components of HPWS (e.g. Becker and Gerhart, 1996; Collins and Smith, 2006; Cappelli & Neumark, 2001). Sun, Aryee, and Law (2007) developed a measure to assess the integrated high performance human resource practices. This measure fits well into the service setting and
has been proved to be theoretically and empirically associated with service performance. Based on their framework, the current study proposed that the HPWP should include practices of selective staffing, extensive training, internal mobility, clear job description, results-oriented appraisal, incentive reward, and participation.

**The Impact of HPWS on Individual attitudinal and behavioral outcomes**

Previous studies have documented the impact of HPWS on employee attitudes and behaviors. Some of the researchers took a macro perspective. They aggregated the individual attitudes and behaviors to obtain collective measures and investigated how these collective measures mediate the relationship between HPWS and organizational outcomes (Sun et al. 2007; Gong et al. 2010; Gong et al. 2009; Aryee et al. 2012; Takeuchi et al. 2007). For example, Sun, Aryee and Law’s (2007) study in Chinese hotels found that collective service-oriented organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) partially mediated the relationship between HPWS and two performance indicators (productivity and turnover). Gong, Chang, and Cheung (2010) included two collective measures (collective affective commitment and collective OCB) in their research. They indicated that the two collective measures differed from the individual-level construct in that they captured “social influence processes and the normative elements” that were absent in the individual level. The results showed that HPWS was positively linked to collective service-oriented OCB through collective affective commitment.

Some other researchers investigated the impacts of HPWS from a micro perspective. Their research focus was on how employees’ perceptions of the organization’s adoption of HPWS influence individual attitudes and behaviors
(Zacharatos et al. 2005; Kehoe and Wright, 2010; Liao et al. 2009). They argued that employees’ perceptions of HR practices could differ from the management’s understandings of HR practices in use. The employees’ attribution of these practices could determine their attitudinal and behavioral outcomes (Liao et al. 2009; Nishii and Wright, 2008). For instance, Kehoe and Wright (2008) examined the relationship between employees’ perceptions of HPWS at the job group level and their organizational citizenship behavior. Results supported their argument and indicated that affective commitment could mediate this relationship. Liao et al. (2009) conducted their research in a service setting. They found that employees’ perception of HPWS could influence employee individual service performance through employee human capital, psychological empowerment, and perceived organizational support.

Recently, some researchers attempted to conduct cross-level studies and investigated how organization- or establishment-level HPWS affects individual attitudes and behaviors (Takeuchi et al. 2009; Liao and Chuang, 2004; Bal et al. 2013; Snape and Redman, 2010; Whitener, 2001; Wu and Chaturvedi, 2009). Takeuchi, Chen, and Lepak (2009) pointed out that organizational climate could serve as an important mechanism that connects organizational policies and individual outcomes. Concern for employee climate, a specific organizational climate that represents employees’ shared perceptions of management support, could mediate the relationship between HPWS and two employee attitudes (job satisfaction and affective commitment). Snape and Redman (2010) collected data from both managers and employees from 28 workplaces in England. Employing the job characteristics theory and social exchange theory, they found that
perceived job discretion could mediate the relationship between HRM practices and organizational citizenship behavior.

Liao and Chuang (2004) was one of the very first studies that typically link HPWS with employee service performance. This study highlighted the importance of managerial practices in determining employees’ behaviors. They proposed that the three human resource practices (employee involvement, service training, and performance incentive) could directly affect employee service performance. In addition, based on the theory of situational strength, human resource practices could also moderate the relationship between personality and service performance. This study has provided great implications for future research concerning the relationship between higher-level HPWS and individual behavior in a service setting. The results showed that HPWS could influence individual behavioral outcomes both directly and indirectly by serving as a moderator.

**The Direct Effect of HPWS on Cross-Selling Behavior**

Some recent marketing studies have considered the role of HR practices in cross-selling activities. These studies argued that effective cross-selling required companies to provide their employees with not only sufficient training in selling skills, but also adequate rewards and incentives (Kamakura, 2008). The incentive programs could be used to encourage engagement in cross-selling activities and motivate CSRs to share customer-related information. Appropriate incentive design plays an important role in matching the companies’ desire and the employees’ actual performance (Günes and Aksin, 2004; Evans et al. 1999). Staffing is another critical practice that influences the
cross-selling activities. Armony and Gurvich (2006) suggested that companies need to adjust their staffing level in order to balance staffing costs and cross-selling revenues, and to maintain a service level that can satisfy customer needs. These studies highlighted the importance of HR practices in the cross-selling process. However, the major purpose of these researches was to develop mathematical models to optimize the effects of HR practices. They often considered CSRs as passive receivers of the management practices. Still little is known about how the CSRs can proactively contribute to the organizational cross-selling performance, and how these proactive cross-selling behaviors are shaped by the external environment. In addition, the existing studies focused on the effects of individual HR practices in the cross-selling activities. Few of them have attempted to examine the impacts of HR system on employee behavioral outcomes.

The current study used an ability-motivation-opportunity (AMO) model to explain the relationship between HPWS and CSRs cross-selling behavior. The AMO theory provides an explanation about how work and employment practices influence performance on multiple levels (Lepak et al., 2006; Boxall and Purcell, 2008). This theory argues that HPWS improve employee performance and in turn organizational performance through three interrelated routes: abilities (A), motivation (M), and opportunity (O) (Boxall and Purcell, 2003). HR practices exert influences on individual behavior by improving employee skills and knowledge, enhancing their willingness to contribute efforts, and creating opportunities for them to better use their talents.

On the basis of the AMO model, the current study suggested that HPWS could affect employee cross-selling behavior by improving selling skills and capacities of the
CSRs, increasing the employees’ job satisfaction and job commitment, and providing employees with opportunities to make full use of their skills. First, HPWS helps to strengthen CSRs’ abilities to perform cross-selling tasks. Cross-selling is more than simply suggesting or persuading customers to purchase more products from a same provider. It has now become a complicated process that aims to “sell the right product to the right customer at the right time” (Kamakura, 2007). The cross-selling process involves searching for customer needs, analyzing customers’ patterns of purchase, acquiring sufficient knowledge about product portfolio, understanding advantages and disadvantages of various products, and effectively communicating with customers (Schmitz, 2013; Kamakura, 2007). To effectively perform the cross-selling tasks, the CSRs need to possess sufficient knowledge and skills.

HPWS includes HR practices that could improve employees’ capacities to cross-sell products. For example, extensive training provides CSRs with precious opportunities to learn about product information and technology systems. It also helps the frontline employees to hone their customer-related skills (Frenkel et al. 1998). These trainings enable the CSRs to more effectively utilize the technology and better communicate with their customers. They become more sophisticated at dealing with customer demands and communicating relevant information to their customers. With the help of these customer-related skills, the CSRs are more likely to exhibit proactive cross-selling behavior. Selective staffing is an important HR practice that determines the nature of the organization’s workforce (Delaney & Huselid, 1996; Huselid, 1995). It aims to find the person who best fit his/her work environment. So employers can use selective
staffing to make sure that the CSRs hired are capable to perform their cross-selling work tasks.

Second, effective HPWS practices can enhance employees’ job satisfaction and job commitment. Even though cross-selling can benefit the organization in several different ways, it does have some drawbacks. For example, when CSRs overuse the cross-selling strategy, customers will probably feel annoyed and even display aggressive behaviors against their employees. In this case, cross-selling can endanger the employee-customer relationship. Besides, customer aggression can negatively affect employee well being. As a result, customer representatives are not always willing to participate in the cross-selling activities even if they are required to do so. Resistance from CSRs can have a negative impact on the effectiveness of the cross-selling activities. So companies should develop HR practices to encourage their CSRs to put greater efforts in the cross-selling process.

A number of HR practices within HPWS can help to motivate CSRs to display proactive cross-selling behavior. For instance, selective staffing is used to screen potential CSRs who have proactive personality, which is a critical antecedent of employee proactive behavior (e.g., Parker, Williams, and Turner, 2006; Crant, 2000). Extensive training is the organization’s investment on employees. Internal mobility offers CSRs opportunities to get promoted or work in other positions. These two practices signify that the company values the employees’ contributions, believes in their ability to perform more complex work tasks, and cares about their long-term development. The CSRs who receive extensive training or get promotion opportunities will perceive their organizations
to be more supportive (Sun, Aryee, and Law, 2007). The perception of organizational support can thus lead to greater employee motivation (e.g., Cropanzano et al. 1997; Rhoades and Eisenberger, 2002). Result-oriented appraisal indicates that organizations emphasized on motivating and developing employees (Burke et al. 1992). To obtain higher scores during the appraisal process, employees are motivated to more proactively participate in the cross-selling activities. On the basis of the result-oriented appraisal, incentive reward practices directly link employees’ contribution to their payment. This merit-based pay scheme requires CSRs to increase their efforts in the cross-selling activities.

Third, HPWS can create opportunities for CSRs to make full use of their capacities for the cross-selling activities. Opportunity captures a situation that is conducive to enable action (Rothschild 1999; Siemsen et al. 2008). To create opportunities for the employees, companies need to remove the barriers that impede the employee actions (Siemsen et al. 2008). For CSRs, there are two major barriers that prevent them from effectively performing their cross-selling work tasks: a lack of discretion in decision making and role ambiguity.

Cross-selling is a complicated process that involves intense interaction between CSRs and customers. The CSRs need to proactively search for customer needs. On the basis of the unique demands of each customer, the CSRs use different cross-selling strategies to persuade their target customers to purchase more items. That is to say, in order to achieve greater success in the cross-selling activities, the CSRs need more discretion over their work task. Participation program is an effective HR practice that
offers employees discretion over the decision making process. In service settings, CSRs participate in specific work groups (e.g. problem-solving groups, quality circles, and self-directed groups) to discuss with their supervisors methods to improve sales performance and service quality (Batt, 1999). These work groups can create a supportive environment for CSRs by offering opportunities to voice their opinions and strengthening their relationship to the management. The CSRs will perceive higher control over their work tasks and greater support from the organization.

Role ambiguity is another barrier that impedes the employee action. It refers to the uncertainty about the expectations surrounding a specific role (Ilgen & Hollenbeck, 1991). Role ambiguity has been found to be a critical stressor that leads to negative psychological or physiological health consequences such as job strain and emotional exhaustion (e.g., Cordes and Dougherty, 1993; Alarcon, 2011). A clear job description, which illustrates the responsibilities and obligations that an employee needs to fulfill, can reduce role ambiguity. A clear job description helps the CSRs to develop a better understanding about what the company expects them to do. With more clear goals, the CSRs will proactively participate in the cross-selling activities.

\[ H3: \text{The use of high performance work systems will positively influence CSR cross-selling behavior.} \]

**The Moderating Effect of HPWS on Cross-Selling Behavior**

The Job Demand-Resource (JDR) model suggests two psychological processes: the health impairment process and the motivational process. In addition to these main effects, the JDR model also indicates an interaction effect of job demand and job
resources. Job resources can buffer the relationship between job demands and stress outcomes. Job resources signify greater control over their work tasks and more social support from the organization. So employees with more job resources have higher level of motivation and become more capable to handle their job demand (Bakker et al. 2005).

HPWS can not only exert positive influence on organizational outcomes, but also contribute to the improvement of employee well being. It is considered to be an important job resource for both the company and the individuals. Based on the JDR model, the current study proposed that the use of high performance work system could weaken the negative effects of job demand on cross-selling behavior by enhancing employee motivation. Extensive training helps CSRs acquire and strengthen their knowledge and skills. Internal mobility allows employees to move to other positions and take up different work tasks. These valuable developmental opportunities enhance employee job satisfaction and encourage them to fully engage in cross-selling activities. Through participation programs, employees can get involved in the decision making process and voice their opinions to the management. These programs strengthen employees’ perceptions of personal control and remove the obstacles for effective performance (Jackson, 1983). Due to these positive effects, the participation program can reduce employee stress and contribute to higher motivation. Result-oriented appraisal and incentive reward establish a direct link between employee cross-selling performance and payment. In order to encourage greater cross-selling efforts from CSRs, the employers can offer the CSRs incentives and rewards based on the number of products they cross-sell. Driven by evaluation procedures and the merit-based pay scheme, the CSRs
become highly motivated and devote themselves to the cross-selling activities. Overall, as an important job resource for individual workers, HPWS buffers the negative relationship between job demand and employee cross-selling behavior. When the company adopts high performance work practices, CSRs tend to become highly motivated. The negative effects of job demand on cross-selling behavior will thus diminish.

\[ H4: \text{When the company adopts the high performance work system, the negative relationship between job demand and CSR cross-selling behavior will become weaker.} \]

Customer incivility is a specific type of workplace mistreatment that originates from the interaction between CSRs and customers. Customer incivility can arouse a number of negative effects such as anger, job strain, and emotional exhaustion. Working in the stressful environment, the employees will exhibit fewer proactive cross-selling behaviors. I proposed that HPWS could reduce the negative effect of customer incivility on employee cross-selling behavior by enhancing employee skills and creating work environments where employees perceive greater support from coworkers, supervisors, and organization.

First, HPWS can strengthen employee skills and knowledge. Customer-related skills are critical for the CSR to deal with rude and aggressive behaviors initiated by the customers. For example, employees with better sales skills know how to persuade their target customers to purchase a product or a service, and how to close a sale adequately without offending the customers. Communication skills help the CSRs more effectively resolve their conflict with the customers. Stress coping skills enable the CSRs to change
their perceptions of the stressful situation, regulate their emotions, and successfully handle the customer incivility that they confronted. When the CSRs acquire these useful skills and knowledge, they are more capable to deal with customer incivility. The negative effects of customer incivility will thus diminish.

HPWS is an important means to enhance employee skills and knowledge. Extensive training develops and upgrades the CSR’s customer-related skills. It enables the CSRs to more effectively communicate with customers and handle their complaints. Some companies also provide their employees with stress management training. This specific type of training teaches arousal reduction techniques and change employees’ perceptions of work stressors using cognitive restructuring (Meichenbaum, 1977). CSRs can learn to regulate their emotions and develop the capacity to deal with stress-related situations (Dewe, 1989). Result-oriented appraisal allows employees to gain timely feedbacks about their performance. Through these useful feedbacks, the CSRs can recognize their strengths and weaknesses. So they can make greater efforts to strengthen their weaknesses and hone their skills. Participation program creates opportunities for ongoing learning (Batt, 2002). CSRs who participate in workgroups discuss potential improvements in their cross-selling processes. The CSRs benefit from the discussion and develop better approaches to handle customer incivility. These HR practices can work together to improve the CSRs’ capacity to deal with their conflict with the customer. The CSRs will proactively participate in cross-selling activities even if they come across customer mistreatment.

Second, HPWS could increase employees’ perceptions of supervisor and
organizational support. The adoption of extensive training and internal mobility conveys a message to the employees that the organization values their contribution and emphasizes on their long-term development. The result-oriented appraisal provides employees with precious feedback to develop their skills and improve their performance. Employees who possess more developmental and growth opportunities view their organizations to be more supportive (Eisenberger, Rhoades, & Cameron, 1999; Wayne et al. 1997; Allen, Shore, and Griffeth, 2003). Participation program indicates the organization’s trust in employees’ abilities to make the right decisions. The recognition and trust will enhance employees’ perceptions of organizational support. Also, these participation programs allow CSRs to work together with their supervisors. Supervisors provide guidance to the employees, and collaborate with them to solve organizational problems. The communications involved in these programs shortens the distance between supervisors and employees, and therefore increases employees’ perceptions of supervisor support. When the CSRs perceive their supervisor and their organization to be supportive, they can better handle customer incivility and display more proactive cross-selling behaviors. The effect of customer incivility on emotional exhaustion will decrease. In summary, the current study argues that HPWS can buffer the relationship between customer incivility and employee cross-selling behavior.

*H5: When the company adopts the high performance work system, the negative relationship between customer incivility and CSR cross-selling behavior will be weaker.*
Method

Sample and Procedures

The current study tested the five hypotheses using data from a large Chinese retail company. This company specializes in producing and distributing clothing for children under the age of 14. Up to 2013, the company hired around 2,000 employees. It had 40 stores that were located in 20 cities in east China. Each store has several different groups that specialize in different types of products. There is one group manager and a number of CSRs within each group. The major responsibility of the group is to offer customers relevant information and help them select the right products.

Data was collected from two different sources (group manager and frontline CSRs). I examined HPWS at the group management level for the following two reasons. First, HR systems vary from one employee group to another (Lepak and Snell, 2002). Each group in this study is relatively independent from other groups in the same store. It decides its own goals and has some freedom to make adjustment to the organizational human resource practices. Second, the group manager is the person who connects the higher management with the frontline employees (Gong, Chang, and Cheung, 2010). They maintain direct contacts with both the higher management and the frontline employees. Their contacts with the higher management allows them to tell what specific HR practices are designed for their groups. Besides, through the interaction with frontline employees, group managers are able to tell how the HR practices are actually implemented in their work groups.

I used self-reported data to examine employee cross-selling behavior. Many
previous studies used supervisor-reported data to measure employee performance. However, I argued that the supervisor ratings could be biased. Some researchers have pointed out that the supervisor-rated data of employee performance can be greatly influenced by their personal impressions. Besides, supervisors may not have enough chances to observe their employees working (Liao and Chuang, 2004). Their ratings may not accurately reflect the cross-selling efforts of CSRs. In contrary, the CSRs are the people who know best about how hard they work and how much cross-selling behaviors they exhibit in their interaction with customers. It is true that self-reported data may cause social desirability bias (Liao and Chuang, 2004). The CSRs may over-rate their cross-selling behavior. Nevertheless, this bias can be minimized by ensuring the anonymity of the research (Snape and Redman, 2010). The group manager and CSRs completed the surveys at different times. The HR staff directly distributed the surveys among frontline CSRs. Employees were ensured that their answers would not be viewed by their supervisors. In addition, the current research concerned about the variance of cross-selling behaviors across individuals. A systematic over-rating of employee behavior would not affect the analysis.

I investigated job demand and customer incivility using self-reported data. It is true that using self-reported data for both the independent and dependent variables can cause common method bias. Nevertheless, conceptually speaking, it is necessary to have employees report job demand and customer incivility measures. The CSRs are the people who know best about their jobs. They are the ones who can accurately point out how much job demand they experience and how many angry or aggressive customers they
encounter every day.

Since the study was conducted in China, I translated the measures that were originally in English into Chinese. I collaborated with the HR department in this retail company to send out surveys to both group managers and employees. I labeled each survey “group manager” and “employee” respectively. To ensure the anonymity of the CSRs’ responses, I asked HR staff in each store to distribute the surveys to the group managers and frontline CSRs at different times. Group managers completed their surveys during the weekly meetings with the higher store management team, whereas employees got their surveys in their lunch break. I instructed the HR staff to directly give the surveys to each employee and collect the surveys back right after they finished them.

I received 84 group manager surveys and 366 employee surveys. The response rate was approximately 100%. The number of frontline employees in each team ranged from 2 to 26. 311 of the respondents were females, and the average job tenure was 1.49 years.

**Measure**

The current study included measures of CSR cross-selling behavior, job demand, customer incivility, and high performance work system. All the multi-item scales had an alpha of at least 0.70 except for rewards. More detailed descriptions of the measures could be found in Appendix C.

**CSR Cross-selling behavior.** CSR Cross-selling behavior was assessed using the cross-/up-selling measure from Jasmand, Blazevic, de Ruyter (2012). There were six items in all. Example items were “I usually explore potential matches between the
customers’ needs and the features of a product which they do not currently own”, “I usually gather as much customer information as possible to offer a suitable product to customers”, and “I usually try to identify good ways of familiarizing customers with another product that can satisfy their needs”. Frontline CSRs were asked “During conversation with customers, how likely will you exhibit the following behaviors”. Each item was coded from 1 to 5 (1 = never did this, 5 = did it every day). The coefficient alpha was 0.90 for this scale.

**Job demand.** This study measured job demand using van Jaarsveld, Walker, Skarlicki’s (2010) job demand measure. There were seven items in total. Employees were required to point out “how accurate the following statements are”. Example items included “my job requires me to work fast”, “my job requires a great deal of work to be done”, “there is not enough time for me to do my job”, and “there is excessive work in my job”. Each item was coded from 1 to 5 (1 = not accurate at all, 5 = very accurate). The coefficient alpha for the scale was 0.72.

**Customer incivility.** The customer incivility measure came from the study of Wang, et al. (2011). This measure included seven items in total. Frontline employees were asked to rate “how often did you come across the following customer mistreatments in your past work”. Example items were “complained without reason”, “yelled at you or poke aggressively to you”, “got angry at you even over minor matters”, and “refused to listen to you”. Each item was coded from 1 to 5 (1=never, 3=sometimes, 5=very often). The coefficient alpha was 0.89 for this scale.

**High performance work systems.** The measure of high performance work systems
came from the study of Sun, Aryee and Law (2007). This measure was based on extensive
literature review and in-depth interviews with HR managers. Besides, this measure for
high performance work system has been theoretically and empirically proved to be
applicable for the service setting and the Chinese context. So I decided to use this
measure to assess the effects of HPWS on employee cross-selling behavior. I made some
minor modifications to the measure by excluding the employment security scale. A highly
stable job may discourage the CSRs to spend extra efforts and take proactive actions to
cross-sell products to the customers. High performance work system in the current study
should include selective staffing, extensive training, internal mobility, clear job
description, results-oriented appraisal, incentive reward, and participation.

Group managers were asked to indicate the extent to which they agree that the
following statements can accurately describe the practices employed by the group to
manage customer-contact employees. There were 27 items in total. Sample items included
the following: “great effort is taken to select the right person” and “long-term employee
potential is emphasized” for selective staffing; “extensive training programs are provided
for individuals in customer contact or front-line jobs” and “employees in customer
contact jobs will normally go through training programs every few years” for extensive
training; “Employees have few opportunities for upward mobility” and “Employees do
not have any future in this organization” for internal mobility; “The duties in this job are
clearly defined” and “This job has an up-to-date description” for clear job description;
“Performance is more often measured with objective quantifiable results” and
“Performance appraisals are based on objective quantifiable results” for result-oriented
appraisal; “Individuals in this job receive bonuses based on the profit of the organization” for incentive reward; “Employees in this job are often asked by their supervisor to participate in decisions” and “Individuals in this job are allowed to make decisions” for participation. Each item was coded from 1 to 5 (1=not agree at all, 5=totally agree).

I employed an additive method to create a unitary index for HPWS. This approach was commonly used in the strategic human resource management studies. As Becker and Huselid (1998) suggested, a unitary human resource system is an important strategic asset for the organizations. It is the human resource system, rather than single HR practices, that should become the target of analysis. Based on the prior studies, the current research aimed to examine the effect of the specific HR system on CSR cross-selling behavior. The coefficient alpha for the HPWS scale was 0.93, which indicated that items were in consistence with each other. Besides, as shown in Table 1, the seven HR practices within the system were highly correlated. All the p values were below 0.01, and most of the correlations were above 0.40. The high alpha value and correlations indicated that it was appropriate to use a unitary index to measure high performance work system.

Table 1 Correlations among HR practices within the high performance work system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Selective staffing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Extensive training</td>
<td>0.58**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Internal mobility</td>
<td>0.60**</td>
<td>0.55**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Clear job description</td>
<td>0.52**</td>
<td>0.55**</td>
<td>0.53**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Results-oriented appraisal</td>
<td>0.32**</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
<td>0.36**</td>
<td>0.66**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Incentive reward</td>
<td>0.38**</td>
<td>0.35**</td>
<td>0.34**</td>
<td>0.43**</td>
<td>0.61**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Cross-selling Behavior</td>
<td>0.51**</td>
<td>0.47**</td>
<td>0.60**</td>
<td>0.58**</td>
<td>0.61**</td>
<td>0.46**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. N = 366. +p < .10, *p < .05, **p< .01

Control variable. This research has controlled for the effect of group size. Large
groups have more “free riders” who try to benefit from the efforts of their coworkers. In small groups, people know exactly well about the amount of efforts that each group member devotes to their cross-selling activities. However, as the group size increases, it is more difficult to monitor the behavior of each group member. The “free riders” have more opportunities to take advantage of their colleagues. Therefore we argue that frontline employees in large groups may display fewer proactive cross-selling behaviors. This study also controlled for age. Senior CSRs who receive greater training and accumulate more work experience would probably possess more customer-related skills. They are more capable to deal with job demand and customer incivility. So the effects of these two environmental factors would become weaker. CSRs were asked to tell “what age range do you fall into”. The item was coded from 1 to 4 (1=24 or younger, 2= 25 to 29, 3=30 to 34, 4=35 or above). The third control variable was employee gender. In the Chinese culture, males are more proactive and aggressive than females. Females are often expected to be passive and quiet. So I suggested that male CSRs were more likely to exhibit cross-selling behaviors than their female coworkers. I used a dummy variable to test the effect of employee gender. Males were coded as 1, and females were coded as 0.

**Data Analysis**

The current study used hierarchical regression analyses to test the five hypotheses. The predictor variables were entered into the model in three steps. In step 1, size of the group, age, and employee gender were introduced as control variables. Then main effects were entered in step 2. In this step, I added job demand, customer incivility, and HPWS into the model. Step 3 was designed to test the interaction effects. I centered job demand,
customer incivility, and high performance work system. Then I used these centered variables to create two interaction terms (HPWS * job demand and HPWS * customer incivility). These two interaction terms were then entered into the model.

**Results**

Table 2 represented the descriptive statistics and correlations among variables in the current study. Before reporting the results of hypotheses testing, I made some brief comments on the correlations shown in the following table. As shown in Table 1, customer incivility was negatively related to employee cross-selling behavior ($r = -0.10, p = 0.06$). Beyond my expectation, the relationship between job demand and employee cross-selling behavior was significant but positive ($r = 0.12, p = 0.02$). Another independent variable, the high performance work system, was not significantly related to employee cross-selling behavior. Besides, I also found that the three control variables have strong associations with employee cross-selling behavior ($r = -0.20, p < 0.01$ for group size; $r = 0.16, p < 0.01$ for age; $r = 0.13, p = 0.01$ for employee gender). In the following discussion, I addressed these relationships and examined the statistical tests of the five hypotheses in more detail.

Table 2: Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>s.d.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Size of the group</td>
<td>7.59</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Age</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>-0.09+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Employee gender</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>-0.14*</td>
<td>-0.15*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Job Demand</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.09+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Customer Incivility</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.10*</td>
<td>-0.21**</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.14*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. HPWS</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.14*</td>
<td>0.12*</td>
<td>0.14*</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Cross-selling Behavior</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>-0.20**</td>
<td>0.16*</td>
<td>0.13*</td>
<td>0.12*</td>
<td>-0.10+</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes. N = 366. +p < 0.10, *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01*
Table 3 displayed the main effects and interaction effects of job demand, customer incivility, and high performance work system on CSR cross-selling behavior. Model 1 in Table 3 was the baseline model that contains only the three control variables (size of the group, age, and employee gender). The result was consistent with the correlation analysis. Size of the group was negatively related to cross-selling behavior in such a way that frontline employees in larger groups were less likely to exhibit cross-selling behavior (β = - .02, p < 0.01). Age was positively associated with the behavioral outcome. The senior workers had more experience interacting with customers. Compared to the younger workers, they were more likely to exhibit cross-selling behavior (β = 0.12, p < 0.05). Employee gender was also a significant predictor of employee cross-selling behavior. Males were more proactive than their female coworkers and were more likely to get involved in cross-selling activities (β = 0.26, p < 0.05).

Table 3 Hierarchical Regression of Employee Cross-Selling Behavior on Job Demand, Customer Incivility, and High Performance Work System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>CSR cross-selling behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Size of the group</td>
<td>-0.02**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Age</td>
<td>0.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Employee gender</td>
<td>0.26*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Job Demand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Customer Incivility</td>
<td>-0.09+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. HPWS</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. HPWS × Job Demand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. HPWS × Customer Incivility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² (adjusted R²)</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. N = 366. +p < .10, *p < .05, **p < .01; Coefficient Betas were reported in the table except R² (adjusted R²) and ΔR²

I added the job demand, customer incivility, and high performance work system to
model 2. This model indicated a significant positive relationship between job demand and cross-selling behavior ($\beta = 0.21, p < .05$). In contrary to the hypothesis, the results showed that employees would display more cross-selling behavior when they experience a high level of job demand. So I concluded that hypothesis 1 was not supported by the analysis. As I expected, customer incivility was negatively related to the employee behavioral outcome. But the significance level was relatively low ($\beta = -0.09, p < .10$).

Hypothesis 2 received partial support from the model. The relationship between high performance work system and employee cross-selling behavior was not significant ($p > .10$). Hypothesis 3 was not supported. The adoption of high performance work system could not lead to more proactive cross-selling behaviors.

Model 3 in Table 3 was used to examine the moderating influence of high performance work system on the relationship between the two working environment characteristics and employee cross-selling behavior. Based on the second model, I added two interaction terms (HPWS * job demand and HPWS * customer incivility) to model 3 and tested the moderating effects of HPWS. I did not find a significant interaction effect of HPWS and job demand ($\beta = .01, p > .10$). Hypothesis 4 was not supported. HPWS could not buffer the negative effects of job demand on employee cross-selling behavior. However, as shown in the table, there was a significant interaction effect of HPWS and customer incivility ($\beta = .19, p = .06$). HPWS could buffer the negative impact of customer incivility on CSR cross-selling behavior. Hypothesis 5 was supported by the analysis. Figure 2 depicted the interaction effect and showed that when the HPWS score was low, customer incivility could negatively influence cross-selling behavior. Under
high level of customer incivility, CSRs were less likely to exhibit cross-selling behavior. When HPWS score was high (one standard deviation above the mean), the negative effect of customer incivility would be weakened.

*Figure 2: Effects of Interaction between HPWS and Customer Incivility on CSR Cross-Selling Behavior*

Discussion

Cross-selling is an important customer management strategy that is widely used by different types of companies. This study emphasized on the role of customer service representatives (CSRs) in the cross-selling activities and examined the effects of job demand, customer incivility, and high performance work system on employee cross-selling behavior. I proposed that the two environment characteristics (job demand and customer incivility) could negatively influence employee cross-selling behavior.
High performance work system could affect the behavioral outcome both directly, and indirectly by reducing the negative effects of job demand and customer incivility.

Data in this study was collected from two different sources (group manager and frontline CSRs). The results of the study have provided partial support to the hypotheses. Beyond my expectation, the self-reported job demand was positively associated with employee cross-selling behavior, which indicated that employees were more likely to exhibit cross-selling behavior when they experience high level of job demand. There is no doubt that job demand can reduce employee motivation level and lead to a number of negative outcomes such as job strain and emotional exhaustion. However, some recent studies suggested that there were two major dimensions of job demand: hindrance and challenge (Demerouti and Bakker, 2011). The hindrance job demands such as work overload and time pressure are associated with resource threat. This type of job demand can result in high level of stress and low performance. The challenge job demands, on the other hand, signal challenge and opportunities. This type of job demand can actually lead to higher motivation and greater job performance (e.g. Beehr et al. 2000; Jex, 1998). Also, it is possible that the relationship between job demand and cross-selling behavior is not linear. When there is only a small amount of job demand experienced by the CSR, the effect of the stressor can be positive. However, as the amount of job demand increases, the CSRs may feel stressful and are less likely to exhibit cross-selling behavior.

As predicted, customer incivility was negatively related to employee cross-selling behavior. But the significance level is relatively low (p < .10). Customer incivility can lead to a number of negative outcomes such as job strain and decreased job satisfaction.
(e.g. Cortina et al. 2002; Deery et al. 2002). Customers’ mistreatment against employees would create a "spiral of incivility" (Andersson & Pearson, 1999). Employees would try to reciprocate the mistreatment and treat the customers in an uncivil way. The low significance level can be due to the low level of customer incivility experienced by the CSRs. As shown in Table 1, the average scores for customer incivility was 1.96. And the standard deviation for the measure was 0.68, which means that very few people in the retail stores have actually experienced rude or aggressive customers. Therefore the effect of customer incivility may become weaker.

The results did not support the direct association between high performance work system and CSR cross-selling behavior. One possible reason is that the effect of high performance work system on CSR cross-selling behavior is not direct. It is possible that some factors could mediate the relationship between HPWS and the individual outcomes. Prior studies indicated that HPWS could influence individual attitudinal and behavioral outcome through an effect on concern for employees climate (Takeuchi et al. 2009), perceived job discretion (Snape and Redman, 2010), perceived procedural justice (Wu and Chaturvedi, 2009), and trust in management (Zacharatos et al. 2005). I suggested that some specific type of organizational climate could serve as a mediator in the relationship between HPWS and individual outcomes. For example, service climate, which refers to employees’ shared perceptions of organizational practices that are developed in support of customer service (Schneider et al. 1998), can possibly link the higher level HR system with the individual level cross-selling behavior. The adoption of HPWS can convey a message to the employees that encourage them to devote more efforts in customer
services. This shared belief can in turn positively influence employees’ cross-selling behavior. In addition, some other factors such as perceived organizational support and empowerment can also mediate the relationship between HPWS and employee cross-selling behavior.

The interaction effect of high performance work system and customer incivility received support from the data analysis. HPWS can moderate the negative relationship between customer incivility and CSR cross-selling behavior. Specific practices within HPWS such as extensive training, result-oriented appraisal, and participation program can help to strengthen the customer-related skills and communication skills of employees. CSRs with greater skills are more capable to deal with rude and aggressive customers. Besides, HPWS can also increase the employees’ perception of supervisor and organizational support. The adoption of HPWS sends a message to the CSRs that the company values their contribution and emphasizes on their long-term development. Perceiving greater support from both the supervisors and organization, the CSRs can better handle the mistreatments initiated by the customers. HPWS can buffer the negative impacts of customer incivility on CSR cross-selling behavior.

In addition to the main effects and the moderating effects, I also found that the three control variables (size of the group, age, and employee gender) were significantly related to employee cross-selling behavior. The size of group can negatively affect the employee behavioral outcome. When the group is small, the CSRs know very well about their coworkers’ work. It is easy to distinguish the free-riders from other workers. So employees need to proactively engage in the cross-selling activities. As the group size
increases, the CSRs will find it more and more difficult to keep track of every coworkers’ work. The free riders may have greater opportunities to take advantages of their colleagues. Age has a positive impact on employee cross-selling behavior. Senior workers receive more skill trainings and have more experience dealing with customers. They know what the customers want and have higher chances to successfully close a sale. So they will more proactively engage in the cross-selling activities. Gender can also influence the use of cross-selling behavior. The Chinese culture expects men to be more aggressive and ambitious. So males are more likely to proactively make interactions with customers and exhibit cross-selling behaviors.

This study attempted to extend the research on high performance work system. Prior studies on HPWS took either a macro perspective or a micro perspective. There is a lack of research integrating between the macro-level HPWS and the micro-level employee outcomes (Lepak et al. 2006; Wright and Boswell, 2002). The current study aimed to extend the existing literature by connecting HPWS at the macro level and CSR cross-selling behavior at the micro level. Results did not support the direct relationship between HPWS and the employee behavioral outcome. However, I did find an interaction effect of HPWS and customer incivility. HPWS could buffer the negative impacts of customer incivility on CSR cross-selling behavior. The results of this study indicated that HPWS could affect individual behavior by influencing the relationship between working environment and behavior.

The current study also contributed to the research on cross-selling. The major focus of prior studies was on establishing mathematical models to optimize cross-selling
efforts. The role of CSRs in the cross-selling activities has rarely been examined. With an emphasis on employee proactive cross-selling behavior, this study typically examined the effects of two working environment characteristics on the employee behavioral outcome. Results showed that job demand had a positive impact on employee cross-selling behavior, while the effect of customer incivility was negative. In addition to the working environment, the present study also investigated how managerial practices affect employee cross-selling behavior. I found that under high performance work system, CSRs were less likely to be influenced by customer incivility. HPWS could moderate the negative relationship between customer incivility and employee cross-selling behavior.

**Limitation and Future Directions**

The present study should be considered in light of several limitations. A first limitation is the generalizability of the research findings. Since the analyses were conducted using data collected from China, there may be some concerns about the generalizability of the results to other cultural contexts. However, the conceptual arguments used to support the hypotheses were not specific to any culture. Prior studies conducted in different cultural context have proved that HR practices and environmental factors could have a great impact on individual attitudes and behavior.

Second, all of the samples came from one large Chinese retail company. All the groups in this company need to follow some basic rules and regulations. The company has designed selection, appraisal, internal mobility, and incentive practices that are widely used in each store. So it is possible that all the groups in this company are exposed to similar HR practices. The variance of HR practices between different groups can be
relatively small. However, I argued that each group in this company has its own goals and is relatively independent to other groups. It has the freedom to make adjustments to the HR practices based on their own needs. For example, some group managers like to involve their subordinates in the group decision making process and encourage them to make suggestions, while other managers prefer to make decisions by themselves. As Lepak and Snell (2002) suggested, HR systems can vary from one employee group to another. Future studies can include more companies that use different types of HR systems and investigate how these human resource practices influence employee cross-selling behavior.

Third, the present study used cross-sectional research design, which means that I could not establish causality among high performance work system, job demand, customer incivility, and CSR cross-selling behavior. It is possible that CSR cross-selling behavior can influence employees’ perceptions of job demand and customer incivility. Future studies might use a longitudinal design. Researchers could attempt to measure the independent variables and dependent variables at different points of times.

Fourth, relying on self-reported data may raise common method variance concerns. CSRs were asked to report both the environment characteristics and their cross-selling behavior at the same time. The self-reported data may lead to common method bias. Conceptually speaking, it is necessary to have employees report job demand and customer incivility. As the person who knows best about his/her job, the CSR can provide accurate information about the job demand and customer incivility that they experience. Besides, based on the prior studies such as Liao and Chuang (2004) and Snape and
Redman (2010), I argued that the self-reported data can accurately reflect the cross-selling efforts of CSRs. One possible way to reduce the common method bias is to measure job demand and customer incivility using coworker’s ratings. Future research can randomly select some coworkers in each group and use their ratings to assess the job demand and customer incivility that the focal CSR experiences. Coworkers are working in the same environment, taking similar jobs, and interacting with customers who have similar demands. Therefore the coworkers’ ratings can somehow reflect the job demand and customer incivility that the target CSR comes across.

In addition, the research focuses only on the effects of two environmental characteristics (job demand and customer incivility) on employee cross-selling behavior. Future studies can include some other work-related environmental factors, such as time pressure, team conflict, and technology support. For example, technology support can have a great impact on cross-selling behavior because frontline CSRs rely on advanced technology in searching for customer needs and analyzing patterns of purchase. When the employees lack sufficient technical support, they are less likely to exhibit proactive cross-selling behaviors. Besides, researchers can also investigate the relationship between employee personalities and cross-selling behavior and examine the moderating effect of HPWS. The theory of situational strength suggests that the strength of situation is a moderator of personality-behavior relationship (e.g., Barrick & Mount, 1993). The HPWS can create a strong situation that constraint the effects of personalities (Liao and Chuang, 2004; Beaty, Cleveland, and Murphy, 2001). Future studies can examine whether HPWS can moderate the relationship between personalities and cross-selling behavior.
Conclusion

In summary, this research contributed to the existing literature on high performance work system by connecting macro-level high performance work system and individual behavioral outcome. It also extended the cross-selling studies by focusing on the customer service representatives and stressing the impacts of two working environment characteristics and HPWS on CSR cross-selling behavior. The results confirmed the negative relationship between customer incivility and CSR cross-selling behavior. However, in contrary to my expectation, job demand had a negative impact on the employee behavioral outcome. HPWS influenced CSR cross-selling behavior by moderating the relationship between customer incivility and CSR cross-selling behavior.

Future research can further investigate the mechanism through which HPWS influence individual attitudinal and behavioral outcomes. Besides, more research should be conducted to examine both the personal and environmental antecedents of employee cross-selling behavior.
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### Appendix A

**Summary of Studies on the Relationship between High Performance Work System and Employee Attitudinal and Behavioral Outcomes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Theoretical rationale</th>
<th>Type of Business/occupations</th>
<th>HR Measures</th>
<th>Attitudinal or Behavioral Outcomes</th>
<th>Main findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Sun et al. (2007)       | Social exchange theory                                      | 86 human resource managers and 430 supervisors from 86 hotels in China                     | ➢ Human resource manager reported  
➢ Composition: selective staffing, extensive training, internal mobility, employment security, clear job description, results-oriented appraisal, incentive reward, participation  
➢ Perception | ➢ Collective Service oriented organizational citizenship behavior (supervisor reported) | Service oriented organizational citizenship behavior partially mediates the relationship between high performance HR practices and organizational outcomes (productivity and turnover) |
| Gong et al. (2009)      | Social exchange theory and resource-based theory             | 463 presidents or vice-presidents, 580 HR managers, and 1,105 middle managers from 463 Chinese firms in different industries | ➢ Human resource manager reported  
➢ Composition: employment security, reduction of status distinctions, selective hiring, participation in decision making through teams, performance appraisal, comparatively high pay contingent on performance, extensive training, career planning and advancement | ➢ Affective commitment (middle manager reported)  
➢ Continuance commitment (middle manager reported) | ➢ The relationship between performance-oriented HR system and firm performance is mediated by affective commitment  
➢ Continuance commitment does not mediate the relationship between maintenance-oriented HR system and firm performance |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>Sample Description</th>
<th>Middle Manager Reported</th>
<th>Collective Affective Commitment (Senior Manager Reported)</th>
<th>Collective OCB (Middle Manager Reported)</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gong et al. (2010)</td>
<td>Social exchange theory</td>
<td>Middle managers from 454 Chinese firms in different industries</td>
<td>Middle manager reported</td>
<td>Collective affective commitment (senior manager reported)</td>
<td>Collective OCB (middle manager reported)</td>
<td>The high performance work system is positively related to collective OCB through collective affective commitment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takeuchi et al. (2007)</td>
<td>Social exchange theory</td>
<td>324 managers and 525 employees from 76 Japanese establishments in different industries</td>
<td>Manager reported</td>
<td>Degree of establishment social exchange (employee reported)</td>
<td></td>
<td>The degree of social exchange mediates the relationship between HPWS and organization’s overall performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aryee et al. (2012)</td>
<td>Empowerment theory</td>
<td>37 branch managers and 258 customer service employees in 37 branches of two banks in Ghana</td>
<td>Branch-level HPWS (branch manager reported) and Employee-experienced HPWS (employee reported)</td>
<td>Service performance (employee reported)</td>
<td>Branch-level HPWS influences branch-level market performance through cross-level and individual-level influences on service performance that emerges at the branch level as aggregated service performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study / Theory</td>
<td>Employee / HR Practices</td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Employee Reported</td>
<td>Mediation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kehoe and Wright (2010)</td>
<td>Social exchange theory</td>
<td>Employees who work in each of 56 self-contained business units which consisted of up to 10 job categories</td>
<td>Employee reported</td>
<td>Affective commitment (Employee reported)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Composition: 15 items (e.g. participation, compensation practices, and merit-based pay)</td>
<td>Organizational citizenship behavior (Employee reported)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Intent to remain with the organization (Employee reported)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Affective organizational commitment partially mediated the relationship between HR practice perceptions and organizational citizenship behavior and fully mediated the relationship between HR practice perceptions and intent to remain with the organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bal et al. (2013)</td>
<td>Selection, optimization and compensation (SOC) theory</td>
<td>1058 employees in 17 healthcare units in the Netherlands</td>
<td>Employee reported</td>
<td>Work engagement (employee reported)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accommodative HR practices: additional leave, exemption from overtime working, long career breaks, and partial retirement. Developmental HR practices: development on the job, internal promotion, job enrichment, lateral job movement or job rotation, and second career</td>
<td>Affective commitment (employee reported)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Developmental HRM relates to employee outcomes by rebalancing the psychological contract between the employee and organization into a less transactional to a more relational contract. Accommodative HRM relates to outcomes only when fulfilling specific needs of employees, associated with their selecting, optimizing, and compensating strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liao et al. (2009)</td>
<td>Social exchange theory and</td>
<td>292 managers, 830 employees, and</td>
<td>Employee reported</td>
<td>General service performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Composition: extensive service</td>
<td>Employee perspective of HPWSs was positively related</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Theory</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cognitive evaluation</td>
<td>theory</td>
<td>1,772</td>
<td>training, information sharing, self-managed</td>
<td>Perceived organizational support and was positively related to individual knowledge-intensive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>customers</td>
<td>teams and participation, compensation</td>
<td>service performance through the mediation of employee human capital and psychological</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of 91 bank</td>
<td>contingent on service performance, job design,</td>
<td>empowerment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>branches in Japan</td>
<td>service-quality-based</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>performance appraisal, internal service, and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>service discretion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wu and Chaturvedi</td>
<td>Social exchange theory</td>
<td>2,050</td>
<td>Employee reported</td>
<td>HPWS is strongly related to employee attitudes. This relationship is mediated by procedural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>from 23</td>
<td>training, internal career opportunities,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>companies</td>
<td>formal appraisals, empowerment, and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in different</td>
<td>performance-related pay.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>industries</td>
<td>Perception</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in Beijing,</td>
<td>Affective commitment (employee reported)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Job satisfaction (employee reported)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and Taiwan</td>
<td>HPWS is strongly related to employee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>attitudes. This relationship is mediated by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>procedural justice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takeuchi et al. (2009)</td>
<td>Social information processing</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>Manager reported</td>
<td>The relationship between HPWS and employee job satisfaction and affective commitment were</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>theory</td>
<td>managers</td>
<td>composition: personnel selection, performance</td>
<td>fully mediated by concern for employees climate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and 522</td>
<td>appraisal, incentive compensation, job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>employees</td>
<td>design, grievance procedures, information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>from 76</td>
<td>sharing, attitude assessment, labor-management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>participation, selection ratio, average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>business</td>
<td>number of hours of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>establishments in different industries</td>
<td>training, information sharing, self-managed teams and participation, compensation contingent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theory</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liao and Chuang (2004)</td>
<td>Situational strength theory</td>
<td>257 employees, 44 managers, and 1,993 customers from 25 franchised restaurants in the US</td>
<td>Manager reported: Perceived employee involvement, service training, and performance incentives</td>
<td>Employee involvement was significantly related to employee service performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snape and Redman (2010)</td>
<td>Job characteristic theory and social exchange theory</td>
<td>28 managers and 519 employees from 28 workplaces in different industries in England</td>
<td>Manager reported: Perceived employee involvement, service training, developmental appraisal, externally equitable reward systems, internally equitable reward</td>
<td>There is a positive impact of HRM practices on organizational citizenship behavior, through an effect on perceived job influence/discretion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitener (2001)</td>
<td>Social exchange theory</td>
<td>182 human resource managers and 1,689 employees in 180 US credit units</td>
<td>Human resource manager reported: Perceived employee involvement, service training, developmental appraisal, externally equitable reward systems, internally equitable reward</td>
<td>High commitment HR practices moderate the relationship between perceived organizational support and organizational commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zacharatos et al. (2005)</td>
<td>Study 1: HPWS (human resource and safety)</td>
<td>Study 1: 138 human resource and safety</td>
<td>Study 1: Safety incidents (objective measure)</td>
<td>Study 1: Perceived safety climate were found to mediate the relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>directors in 138 organizations in Ontario Study 2: 189 employees of two Canadian organizations from the petroleum and telecommunication industries</td>
<td>practices items per practice) Study 2: Employees’ perception of the adoption of HPWS (Employee reported): 63 items (6-7 practices items per practice) Perception</td>
<td>Study 2: Personal safety orientation (employee reported)</td>
<td>between an HPWS and safety performance measured in terms of safety incidents Study 2: Trust in management mediates the relationship between employees’ perception of high-performance work system and personal safety orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix B
### Summary of Studies on Employee Cross-selling Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Theoretical rationale</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Independent variables (construct and operationalization)</th>
<th>Dependent variables (construct and operationalization)</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jasmand et al.</td>
<td>Ambidexterity theory and regulatory mode theory</td>
<td>119 CSRs from 25 teams in call centers</td>
<td>➢ Team identification ➢ Bounded discretion ➢ Ambidextrous behaviors: customer service provision and cross-/up- selling</td>
<td>➢ Customer satisfaction ➢ Sales performance ➢ Efficiency</td>
<td>Ambidextrous behavior increases customer satisfaction and sales performance but decreases efficiency Team identification and bounded discretion impair the moderating effect of assessment orientation</td>
<td>The small size of the sample limit the generalizability of the research findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2012)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmitz (2013)</td>
<td>Social norm theory and reputation theory</td>
<td>231 industrial salespeople working in 55 teams in a company</td>
<td>➢ Team norm strength ➢ Team reputation ➢ Team cross-selling ability</td>
<td>➢ Salesperson adoption behavior ➢ Cross-selling performance</td>
<td>Individual cross-selling motivation has a stronger effect when a selling team has strong cross-selling norms and lower level of reputation Cross-selling ability can reduce an individual</td>
<td>The research was conducted in only one company Did not examine antecedents of a salesperson’s cross-selling motivation The research did not examine some boundary conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>salesperson’s reputational concerns and hence reinforce individual cross-selling behavior.</td>
<td>that influence individual cross-selling motivation and behavior. The research did not distinguish between desired and undesired cross-selling outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix C

### Description of Measures in the study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Definition/Description</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employee Cross-Selling Behavior</strong></td>
<td>Definition: the CSR’s proactive action to persuade a customer who has purchased previously to buy additional products or services from the same provider</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I usually explore potential matches between the customers’ needs and the features of a product which they do not currently own.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I usually gather as much customer information as possible to offer a suitable product to customers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I usually try to identify good ways of familiarizing customers with another product that can satisfy their needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I usually ask questions to assess whether the customers would be willing to buy an additional product.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I hardly neglect a good opportunity to advise customers of a product which they could benefit from.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I usually offer an additional product which meets the customers’ needs best.</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Demand</strong></td>
<td>Definition: physical, social, or organizational aspects of the job that require sustained efforts and are therefore associated with certain physiological and psychological costs (Demerouti et. al, 2001)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>My job requires me to work fast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>My job requires that I work hard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>My job requires a great deal of work to be done</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>There is not enough time for me to do my job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>There is excessive work in my job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I feel there is not enough time for me to finish my work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I am faced with conflicting demands on my job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Customer Incivility</strong></td>
<td>Definition: an employee’s perception that the customer is treating the employee in an uncivil manner (van Jaarsveld et al. 2010)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Did not understand that you had to comply with certain rules.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Complained without reason</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Performance Work System</td>
<td>Definition: a group of separate but interconnected HR management practices that are designed to enhance employee and firm performance outcomes through improving workforce competence, attitudes, and motivation (Huselid, 1995)</td>
<td>3.83 0.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective staffing</td>
<td>1. Great effort is taken to select the right person.</td>
<td>3.92 0.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Long-term employee potential is emphasized.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Considerable importance is placed on the staffing process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Very extensive efforts are made in selection.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive Training</td>
<td>1. Extensive training programs are provided for individuals in customer contact or front-line jobs.</td>
<td>3.99 0.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Employees in customer contact jobs will normally go through training programs every few years.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. There are formal training programs to teach new hires the skills they need to perform their job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Formal training programs are offered to employees in order to increase their promotability in this organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Mobility</td>
<td>1. Employees have few opportunities for upward mobility (reverse-coded).</td>
<td>3.71 0.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Employees do not have any future in this organization (reverse-coded).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Promotion in this organization is based on seniority (reverse-coded).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Employees have clear career paths in this organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Employees in customer contact jobs who desire promotion have more than one potential position they could be promoted to.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Job Description</td>
<td>1. The duties in this job are clearly defined.</td>
<td>3.79 0.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. This job has an up-to-date description.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. The job description for a position accurately describes all of the duties performed by individual employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results-Oriented Appraisal</td>
<td>1. Performance is more often measured with objective quantifiable results.</td>
<td>3.92 0.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Performance appraisals are based on objective quantifiable results.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Employee appraisals emphasize long</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentive Reward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Individuals in this job receive bonuses based on the profit of the organization.</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Close tie or matching of pay to individual/group performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Employees in this job are often asked by their supervisor to participate in decisions.</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Individuals in this job are allowed to make decisions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Employees are provided the opportunity to suggest improvements in the way things are done.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Supervisors keep open communications with employees in this job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>