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ABSTRACT

Recently, the customer service literature has trended towards incorporating positive customer behaviors, such as customer citizenship into its study. Although the organizational impact of these citizenship behaviors has been explored, it still remains unclear if customer citizenship is also desirable for service employees. A scale is developed to understand and assess when customers go beyond their required role and engage in citizenship towards service employees. Citizenship towards service employees is predicted to act as a resource to reduce employee stressors and strain and therefore enhance employee well-being; however, not all 'help' from customers may be desired so specific circumstances are explored to understand when and if customer citizenship impacts employee well-being. Two studies are conducted to test these ideas: a validation study of the customer citizenship instrument and repeated measures (daily diary) study that assesses customer citizenship and its corollary employee outcomes over several workdays. In general, it is found that customer citizenship does enhance several different employee well-being indicators, but that the effect is more positive during busy shifts for employees and less effective during shifts where employees have a high rate of aggressive customers. Implications, limitations, and future directions are also discussed.
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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

There has been a recent surge within the field of psychology to focus on positive aspects of human behavior (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000; Seligman Steen, Park & Peterson, 2005). Despite the call to consider factors that allow humans to flourish and thrive, there is still a large focus on negative aspects of the human condition. Within the study of customer service interactions, in particular, there has been a prevalent focus on the negative. Although customers certainly can be rude, entitled, and stress-inducing (Dormann & Zapf, 2004), recent research suggests that they can also be positive. In particular, initial studies (cf. Groth, 2005) show that customers can engage in behaviors that go ‘above and beyond’ (e.g., complimenting the employee on his/her work) what is required of a typical interaction (e.g., providing information needed for the service to be provided). Deemed ‘customer citizenship,’ studies have focused largely on customer citizenship directed at the organization and the positive effect these behaviors have on service organizations (Bettencourt, 1997; Bove, Pervan, Beatty, & Shiu 2009; Groth, 2005; Rosenbaum & Massiah, 2007; Yi, Nataraajan, & Gong, 2011), with rare, if any, attention to the positive ways that customers behave toward employees (Garma & Bove, 2011).

As the focus on customer citizenship is nascent, little is understood about how this group of behaviors differs from similar constructs or how it impacts employees. Specifically, it remains unclear whether certain sets of customer citizenship behaviors are distinct from one another (i.e., behaviors to improve service outcomes or organizations versus those that help employees themselves), when these ‘positive’ customer behaviors
will be interpreted as such by service employees, and under what circumstances the
customer citizenship behaviors may facilitate employee thriving (well-being). Drawing on
conservation of resources theory (Hobfoll, 1989), I suggest that customer citizenship
behaviors directed at service employees may in fact be beneficial by acting as a resource to
buffer against stress to the benefit of physical, psychological, and affective components of
employee well-being (Danna & Griffin, 1999). However, because the interpretation of these
behaviors by employees is critical in determining the behavior’s utility for service
personnel well-being, it is important to consider when customer citizenship behaviors will
be seen as a resource, and when they might be interpreted in a less positive light. For
example, citizenship behaviors could be seen as undermining employees under certain
circumstances.

Accordingly, the aim of this dissertation is to review and refine the extant literature
on customer citizenship behaviors in order to facilitate the field’s understanding of the
nature of these behaviors as well as their role in facilitating the well-being of service
employees. In achieving these goals, this dissertation will provide both theoretical and
empirical contributions to the customer service literature (e.g., customer behavior towards
employees, cf. Bell, & Luddington, 2006; Richins, 1983) as well as the broader occupational
health (e.g., employee well-being, cf. Warr, 1999) and citizenship literatures (cf. Podsakoff,
MacKenzie, Paine & Bachrach, 2000). Theoretical contributions of this manuscript will
inform the understanding of customer citizenship behaviors, clarify different subsets of
customer citizenship behaviors, differentiate these behaviors from neutral or even negative
customer behaviors, as well as provide empirical support for the application of
conservation of resources theory to employee-customer interactions. Empirical
contributions will be made by creating and validating a scale to measure customer
citizenship towards service employees, demonstrating the impact of customer citizenship
behaviors on employee well-being, and testing boundary conditions that determine the
impact of customer citizenship behaviors.

**Customer Citizenship: Defining the Construct**

Anyone who has ever worked in customer service knows that there are
circumstances in which customers may be frustrated or even angry, regardless of service
employees’ behavior. In fact, not only are openly hostile customer interactions stressful
(Grandey, Dickter & Sin, 2004), but so are interactions with entitled customers, disliked
customers, and customers with ambiguous desires (Dorman & Zapf, 2004). It’s no surprise
then that many stereotypes of customers are negative (e.g., “rude” “demanding” “entitled”).
Possibly because of this perception, and in part due to the tendency of psychology to focus
on the negative (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000), there has been a large focus on
understanding these negative interactions and, in particular, their effect on service
employees. The impact, intuitively, is generally negative, evoking stress (Grandey et al.,
2004), burnout, (Dormann & Zapf, 2004) and other negative outcomes (Harris & Reynolds,
2003; Yagil 2008a).

In addition, service employees may experience low task variety due to the
routinization of many aspects of their jobs including service tasks (e.g., making coffee,
cutting hair). In fact, even their interaction style with customers may be dictated by display rules, or rules for emotional expression with customers (Diefendorff & Richard, 2003), and scripts, or the specific verbal communications they should use with customers (Solomon, Surprenant, Czepiel & Gutman, 1985). Due to the quick nature of many service jobs, there is also time pressure to provide fast service and address long lines of customers promptly (Hampson & Junor, 2005), which may lead to role overload, or the feeling of having too much to do in too little time (Coverman, 1989).

These outcomes are all important because they have adverse effects on the core components of employee well-being. As Danna and Griffin (1999) argue in their review, employee well-being consists of physiological health, psychological health, and job-related affect. Physiological health encompasses biological markers, such as heart rate, blood pressure, and stress. Psychological health is typically marked by low levels of anxiety, depression, and burnout, as well as positive markers, such as self-efficacy. Finally, job-related affect includes global and facet job satisfaction, and related attitudes such as engagement. Employee well-being is a broad construct, but thriving in each of the components is essential for optimum employee happiness and performance. It should be noted that this perspective of well-being combines the presence of positive indicators, such as job satisfaction and self-efficacy, as well as the absence of negative indicators, such as strain. There are many job related conditions (e.g., physical environment, social interactions, etc.) that can facilitate or hinder each of the aspects of well-being (cf. Hackman & Oldman, 1976; Humphrey, Nahrgang, & Morgeson, 2007). Well-being is in turn
related to organizational-relevant outcomes, such as profitability (Cooper & Cartwright, 1994), performance, and turnover (Elkin & Rosch, 1990), making it a worthwhile construct to study.

In contrast to the research summarized above, which focuses on the stressors and strain involved in customer service, some scholars have begun to look at instances of positive behaviors customers engage in with service organizations and service employees (Lilius, 2012; Zimmermann, Dormann, & Dollard, 2011). Research on “customer citizenship”, has largely focused on customer behaviors towards the service organization including: recommending the business/service to others, helping other customers (e.g., find products, or instruct on how to use service), or providing helpful feedback and information (e.g., customer satisfaction survey) to the organization and its employees (van Doorn, et al., 2010). Of focus here are instead the behaviors that more directly target service employees, also called customer citizenship, such as complimenting an employee’s service abilities, or defending the employee from aggressive customers (Garma & Bove, 2011). In certain circumstances these customer behaviors may facilitate employee well-being by acting as a resource, or by buffering the negative effects of other service-related stressors, such as time pressure (Lilius, 2012).

**Organizational Citizenship Applied to Customer Service**

Many of the dimensions of customer citizenship mirror the I/O literature on organizational citizenship, which makes sense as customer citizenship stems from the body of literature on organizational citizenship behavior and applies these concepts to the
customer role (Garma & Bove, 2011; Groth, 2005). Table 1 shows some of the similarities between the two literatures. For example, sportsmanship is a dimension within both customer citizenship and organizational citizenship that describes a general tolerance and flexibility for situations that are unexpected or undesired.

Organizational citizenship refers to the extra role behaviors employees engage in, such as assisting coworkers or attending non-required meetings. Citizenship is not formally required as part of the employee’s role/job description; however, these behaviors can increase desirable organizational outcomes such as efficiency, profitability, and customer satisfaction (Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff, & Blume, 2009) and are related to higher performance ratings for individual employees (Podsakoff & McKenzie, 1997). Definitionally, OCBs are behaviors that benefit the organization, but citizenship can be directed at both the organization (OCBO) as well as at other individuals within the organization (OCBI), ultimately benefiting the organization as well, though more indirectly (Williams & Anderson, 1991).

Within the customer service field, the concept of citizenship has been applied to customers’ behavior (Bettencourt, 1997). It is distinguished from in-role customer behavior, or coproduction (Kelley, Donnelly & Skinner, 1990) in that it goes beyond the required participation of customers for service creation. Empirically, several veins of research on customer voluntary performance (Bettencourt, 1997) and customer organizational citizenship behaviors exist (Groth, 2005; Bove et al., 2009; Rosenbaum & Massiah, 2007; Yi & Gong, 2008; Garma & Bove, 2011) and have demonstrated that
customer citizenship is distinct from in-role performance by the customer, or coproduction (Groth, 2005).

As with the traditional organizational citizenship literature, there has been a larger emphasis on behaviors that benefit the organization (customer citizenship behaviors toward the organization, CCBOs), and less so on behaviors that impact other individuals (customer citizenship behavior toward individuals, CCBIs), with two exceptions. First, Rosenbaum and Massiah (2007) have examined citizenship directed at other customers. Second, recent qualitative work by Garma and Bove (2011) explores citizenship directed towards service employees. These behaviors may actually be more important for organizations as the CCBIs may both improve organizational outcomes directly (e.g., increase customer loyalty) and indirectly through improved employee functioning (e.g., increased self-efficacy, lower turnover).

Specifically these customer citizenship behaviors toward individuals (employees) are defined as “helpful, kind, considerate or thoughtful acts voluntarily performed by customers that benefit service personnel in some way” (Garma & Bove, 2011, p. 634) and go above and beyond the normal customer role. Garma and Bove (2011) designate six types of CCBI: assumed employee behavior (e.g., helping clean up, assisting other customers), advocacy (e.g., complimenting the employee, praising employee to his/her manager), consultancy (e.g., suggestions for new or improved service offerings, making potential problems known), sportsmanship (e.g., tolerance for service snafus, flexibility on
service needs), social support (e.g., empathy), and courtesy (e.g., social conversation, polite behavior).

**Distinction and overlap within CCBI construct.** In addition to having some overlap with the identified customer citizenship behaviors towards organizations, the customer citizenship behaviors towards service employees identified by Garma and Bove (2011) have some overlap with one another. When examining all six dimensions together, it seems there are behaviors that are more task-oriented and behaviors that are more interpersonally-oriented. This distinction falls in line with Settoon and Mossholder’s (2002) work on interpersonal citizenship, whereby OCBIs are delineated into those focused on the task and those focused on the person. According to Settoon and Mossholder (2002), task-focused OCBIs are instrumental, generally involve the exchange of resources, and are exemplified by behaviors such as providing advice, problem solving, providing information, and directly assisting a colleague. Person-focused OCBIs are more emotionally supportive, are generally thought to be grounded in social support and friendship, and include behaviors such as listening, demonstrating concern, and reassurance.

Applying this distinction to CCBIs, the behaviors of consultancy (information and feedback aimed at improving service) and assumed employee role (behavior that resembles the employee’s role, such as cleaning up a spill, organizing dirty dishes, or assisting another customer) are directly aimed at the employee’s task and thus task-oriented. Collectively, they aid not only the current transaction (assumed employee role), but may also make the employee more effective in the future (consultancy).
On the other hand, the remaining dimensions are more person-oriented. Sportsmanship (flexibility regarding service failures, slow service, etc.), social support (instrumental and emotional support to help the employee cope with stress), courtesy (general friendliness beyond required interactions), and advocacy (complimenting employee, commitment to employee) are all aimed at helping employees as individuals, but may not necessarily be directly related to facilitating the task at hand.

As Garma and Bove's (2011) initial study was qualitative in nature, and because the behaviors of CCBI their study identified may be reduced to two core groups (task- and person-focused), it is necessary to determine the empirical overlap among the CCBI behaviors if they are to be used separately and if they are to be used to predict employee outcomes. By re-examining the behaviors with a quantitative approach, it can be determined if each of the six behaviors of CCBI function independently, or whether they are more suitably combined into task- and person-focused groups of behaviors. This establishes both the structure and predictive capacity of the construct and its components.

*Research Question 1: What is the structural validity of CCBI (i.e., does CCBI consist of multiple factors)?*

**How are the Behaviors of CCBI Distinct From and Similar to Related Constructs?**

**Distinction and overlap between CCBOs and CCBIs**

Theoretically, citizenship behaviors directed towards the organization and those directed towards individuals encompass distinct sets of behaviors with distinct outcomes. Within the traditional citizenship literature, this differentiation has been empirically
supported through meta-analysis, but very few studies actually compare OCBOs and OCBIs (Podsakoff et al., 2009). Furthermore, the research tends to explore outcomes that are important to the organization, such as performance and turnover. These outcomes may be less relevant for OCBIs, which are meant to impact other employees directly (e.g., reduce job demands as in Pyne, 2007), and the organization indirectly (Williams & Anderson, 1991).

Within the customer service literature, CCBOs are thought to contribute to organizational outcomes, such as return patronage, but much of the focus on the CCBO research has been on predictors of the behaviors. CCBIs are conceptually (Lilius, 2012) and qualitatively (Garma & Bove, 2011) linked to service employee well-being outcomes but have only been addressed in one study to date. Specifically, in that study, the researchers (Garma & Bove, 2011) interviewed retail and restaurant workers to understand instances of customers going above and beyond to positively impact the employees’ well-being. Since the study was qualitative, it cannot be determined whether the behaviors that the employees named would be beneficial to their well-being each and every time the behavior occurred, or only under certain conditions. It is also not clear whether the six dimensions of CCBI all have a similar relationship with employee well-being, or, if all employees respond similarly to the CCBIs (i.e. some employees may find ‘assumed employee role’ to be uplifting, while others may feel it threatens their competence).

Further, as with the traditional OCB literature, there are not many papers (none to date) that explore the relative impact of both CCBIs and CCBOs in the same study.
Therefore, it is unknown whether the current conceptualizations of CCBO and CCBIs are empirically distinct. Specifically, even though they have different targets, some of the behaviors of CCBO and CCBIs are similar in definition (e.g., flexibility and sportsmanship), as shown in Table 2. Because the target of the behavior is inherently important in the definition of CCBIs (i.e., behaviors directed toward service employees that benefit the service employees in some way), it is worthwhile to confirm that service employees view behaviors directed at them differently than they might view behaviors directed towards the organization. If service employees generally do not perceive the behaviors differently, then construct proliferation can be avoided by simply studying ‘customer citizenship’ rather than CCBO and CCBI. Alternatively, it may be that there are multiple dimensions of each, as identified in the OCB literature; for example, OCBI consists of altruism and courtesy while OCBO is thought to include civic virtue and sportsmanship (Podsakoff et al., 2009).

In addition to verifying that service employees themselves differentiate CCBIs from CCBOs, there are outcome implications in separating the two. That is, CCBOs should be more important for organizational outcomes, such as customer satisfaction (Yi & Gong, 2006), whereas CCBIs should be more important for employee outcomes, such as well-being (Garma & Bove, 2011), the focus of this investigation. Note that these are different reasons than those of the OCB literature for differentiating the targets of citizenship into individuals and organizations. In the OCB literature, the two tend to have different predictors; for example, concern for the organization is more strongly related to OCBO than
OCBI (Finkelstein, 2006), and positive affect is more predictive of OCBI than OCBO (Lee & Allen, 2002). However, the outcomes of OCBI and OCBO tend to be similar to one another (Podsakoff et al., 2009). Although CCBI and CCBO may indeed have different predictors, the focus of this study is in determining if CCBIs have an impact on employee well-being.

Research Question 2: How are CCBO and CCBI related to one another?

Distinction between citizenship behavior from colleagues and CCBI

A large portion of the literature on citizenship tends to focus on the predictors and outcome for the individuals engaging in the citizenship behavior. However, research by Bowling and colleagues (2010) has demonstrated that certain individuals are more likely to be the target of similar positive behaviors (social support). As an example, extraverted employees tended to receive more positive behaviors from others than did more introverted employees.

Since there are certain types of individuals who may attract this sort of behavior from others, it is possible that employees who receive CCBIs will also be the recipient of OCBIs from their colleagues at higher rates than individuals who receive lower rates of CCBIs. Furthermore, certain individuals may be more likely to perceive behaviors, such as citizenship from others, based on characteristics, such as trait positive affect. Thus, it is likely that employee reports of CCBIs and OCBIs from colleagues will be correlated. However, due to the different actors involved (customers vs coworkers), it is not expected that the two to overlap substantially, thus providing a test of discriminant validity.
Research Question 3: How is CCBI related to citizenship behavior from colleagues (OCBI)?

Does CCBI function like other citizenship behaviors?

If the customer citizenship behaviors examined here are similar to other citizenship behaviors and helping behaviors, then there may be certain trends that emerge. Specifically, other research indicates that citizenship may be classified as extra-role, that women engage in different types of citizenship than men, and that store and interaction context play a role in influencing helpfulness.

Morrison (1994) has looked at explored citizenship frequency by perceptions of the behaviors being in-role or extra-role. That is, the more individuals report perceiving a specific citizenship behavior to be part of their role (though by definition, citizenship is not role-required), the more frequent the citizenship behavior is to occur. Conversely, citizenship behaviors that are seen to be more extra-role, ‘above and beyond’, are less likely to be performed. Customer citizenship should not be any different, such that behaviors that are seen to be more in-role are likely to be those performed the most frequently.

Gender is another factors that has been explored within the citizenship field. In general, it has been suggested that women are more helpful towards other than are men (Eckel & Grossman, 1998), though the type of ‘helping’ behavior makes a difference. Work by Eagley (2009), for example, has demonstrated that men tend to engage in citizenship that asserts their strengths and capabilities, whereas women engage in citizenship that focuses more on getting along with others. Essentially, one could interpret this as men tend
to provide more instrumental help, whereas women provide more emotional help to others (Moskowitz, Suh, & Desaulniers, 1994).

Within the customer service realm, different types of store environments may stimulate different types of behavior in customers. As an example, customers who are “regular” to a store or employee may act in a more helpful manner to maintain the relationship than those who are not (Gutek, Bhappu, Liao-Troth, & Cherry, 1999). The difference between customers who have mere encounters with employees with those who have long-lasting relationships has been shown in prior research to impact customer and employee outcomes, in particular customer helpfulness (Gutek, et al., 1999).

Research Question 4: Does CCBI have similar correlates as other citizenship behaviors (e.g., gender, in-role vs. extra-role)?

Relationship Between Customer Citizenship Behaviors Towards Service Employees and Employee Well-being

One of the main reasons it is important to understand CCBIs is their potential association with employee well-being. Although there is some initial qualitative evidence to support that CCBIs are in fact related to employee well-being in a positive manner (Garma & Bove, 2011), it remains unknown how or why they may do so. There are also several important factors related to the service context that need to be considered in predicting when CCBIs positively affect employees and when they may be associated with more neutral or even negative outcomes for employees. Drawing on conservation of resources theory and the literature on customer service, I build a case for why CCBIs may facilitate
service employee well-being and how the effect of CCBIs on employee well-being will be different based on several situational variables.

**Conservation of Resources Theory**

Conceptually, CCBIs should be positively associated with employee well-being. By definition, CCBIs have a positive effect on service employees and Garma and Bove (2011) find initial support for this in their qualitative study. However, to generate the initial list of CCBIs, Garma and Bove (2011) interviewed service employees, asking them specifically for instances when customers helped them in a way that benefitted their well-being. Therefore, it remains unknown whether the CCBIs identified are always positively associated with employee well-being (i.e., certain employees may not like CCBIs or certain circumstances may render CCBIs less effective).

Furthermore, customers may engage in these behaviors with the intention of helping the service employee, but the employee may not always benefit. For instance, if the service employee has many customers waiting in line, suggestions for service improvement (consultancy) may not be appreciated. Or, in the case of consultancy (providing feedback for improvement) is likely to benefit the organization by allowing for service recovery (Hart, Heskett, & Sasser, 1990), but may actually create more work for, and thus negatively influence, service employees themselves (Grandey, Grabarek, & Teague, 2012).

In general though, behaviors such as CCBIs should be beneficial to their target. Other research streams support that these 'uplifting' events should contribute to well-being (Kanner, Coyne, Schaefer, & Lazarus, 1981). In particular, uplifting interpersonal events are
related to life satisfaction, as well as positive affect (Mayberry & Graham, 2001),
corresponding to the affective component of well-being. Similarly, the social support
literature generally, though there are exceptions, supports that helping behaviors (e.g.,
emotional reassurance, instrumental help in accomplishing a goal/task) similar to CCBIs
boost well-being, namely by reducing stress (Cohen & Willis, 1985; Viswesvaran, Sanchez,
& Fisher, 1999), which corresponds to the physical component of well-being.

Conservation of Resources Theory (COR) helps inform why CCBIs may help improve
employee well-being. Although COR is a theory that aims to explain and understand the
experience of stress (Hobfoll, 1989), it can be used to understand not only the physical
aspect of well-being, but the psychological and affective components as well. Briefly, the
theory indicates that individuals strive to maintain resources and that any threat to these
resources (real or perceived) is experienced as stress (Hobfoll, 1989). Resources include
material objects (e.g., house), personal characteristics (e.g., tolerance for ambiguity),
conditions (e.g., seniority), and energies (e.g., time or money). Social relationships and
interactions are also predicted to serve as a resource (Hobfoll, 1989; Hobfoll, Freedy, Lane
& Geller, 1990). COR indicates that people generally seek to minimize resource loss during
times of stress, and maximize resource gain/development in calmer times (Hobfoll, 1989).
If the coping strategies individuals use to face stress and handle resource loss are
inefficient, more resource loss can occur, creating what Hobfoll deems a ‘loss spiral’
whereby the coping either does not attenuate the loss or may even make it worse.
COR is important for understanding CCBIs, because CCBIs may serve as a vital resource to service employees. Under times of strain, CCBIs may stop loss spirals, and thus improve physical well-being. Under less strenuous conditions, they may be put into the employee’s resource ‘bank’, facilitating or contributing to what is called a resource ‘gain spiral’ (Hobfoll, 1989) and thus enhance overall well-being (rather than preventing its deterioration).

In fact, it has even been suggested that specifically within customer/client care positions that special interactions with customers, such as those that foster a quality long-term connection, can lead to resource gain for employees (Lilius, 2012). It is also suggested that accomplishing complex and meaningful customer-related tasks boost resources. CCBIs should operate in a similar manner. As an example, advocacy provides positive feedback and recognition of the employee’s skills and may thus boost both the job affect (Hackman & Oldham, 1976) and psychological (self-efficacy; Gist, 1987) components of employee well-being.

CCBI may be considered a resource and thus effect employee well-being directly by increasing job affect and self-efficacy (psychological well-being), or CCBIs may be indirectly related to well-being by reducing stressors, or factors that diminish physical well-being. Since CCBIs may be associated with both stressors and outcomes, it will be important to test whether or not they predict CCBI beyond other known correlates (i.e., stressors).

Hypothesis 1a: CCBIs are positively associated with employee well-being.

Hypothesis 1b: CCBIs add incremental validity in predicting employee well-being.
Different types of CCBI may hold different relationships to employee well-being. Specifically, CCBIs that are more person-focused may have a stronger positive effect on employee well-being, whereas the CCBIs that are more task-focused may have a weaker impact on employee well-being, in part because they also act to reduce job demands.

**Interpersonally-focused CCBIs.** Since they target the employee, rather than the employee’s tasks, interpersonally-focused CCBIs, such as courtesy, social support, advocacy, and sportsmanship may affect service employee well-being directly by operating as social resources (Hobfoll et al., 1990). Specifically, Hobfoll and colleagues (1990) indicate that individuals generally desire to maintain social resources, “both to meet their needs to preserve particular resources and in order to protect and maintain their identity” (p. 467). That is to say, social resources help create a stable sense of self and are also instrumental in and of themselves a resource, or means for acquiring additional resources.

In the case of CCBIs, job identity factors should be boosted, such as affirmation of skills and self-confidence for performing excellent service (Garma & Bove, 2011). Quantitative research supports that similar concepts, such as organizational based self-esteem (self-perceived competence within a certain organizational role; Pierce, Gardner, Cummings, & Dunham, 1989) act as personal resources for employees and in turn boost their well-being by increasing work engagement and decreasing feelings of exhaustion (Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, 2007).

In addition, the person-focused CCBI behaviors should enhance the affective component of well-being. Specifically, customer’s CCBIs displaying positive emotion should
operate through contagion (Hatfield, Cacioppo & Rapson, 1993) to directly increase employee affective well-being. That is, positive displays are “contagious” and can directly enhance the expressed or felt positive affect in other individuals. Prior research has demonstrated that positive emotional displays (including friendly greetings, smiling, eye contact, and thanking at the end of the transaction) are associated with positive affect in the recipient with a service context (Pugh, 2001). Further, research on the impact of customer positive displays on service employees (Pugh’s research looked at the effect from employee to customer), drawing on contagion, show that the effect is seen when customers are the ones displaying positive emotions towards employees (Kim & Yoon, 2012; Zimmerman et al., 2011). The literature on social support is also aligned with the view that being the recipient of helpful and encouraging behaviors from others increases positivity, in particular, job satisfaction (Viswesvaran et al., 1999), which is an important component of employee affective well-being (Danna & Griffin, 1999).

To the extent that customers display positive emotions during CCBIs, then the CCBIs should enhance employee affective well-being. Considering that many of the CCBIs, especially those that are person-focused, such as courtesy and advocacy contain elements of displayed positive affect designated by Pugh (2001) – friendliness and compliments/thanking – it is likely that this group of CCBIs will have a positive association with employee well-being.

Beyond directly targeting employee affective well-being through contagion, improvement in employee affect as a result of CCBI may also lead to resource gain in other
areas. Under Fredrickson’s (1998; 2001; Fredrickson & Joiner, 2002) Broaden-and-Build perspective of positive affect, positive affect opens up attention to building resources. According to the theory, as individuals open up their thinking, “they build their physical, intellectual, social, and psychological resources,” (Fredrickson & Joiner, 2002, p. 172). In COR terms, positive affect then may begin a gain spiral, whereby resources can be accumulated (Hobfoll, 1989). Additionally, positive affect is also associated with effective coping in regards to stress (Fredrickson & Joiner, 2002). Thus positive affectivity gained through contagion following CCBIs should not only enhance momentary affective well-being, but should also have repercussions for psychological well-being (through resource gain) and physical well-being (increased coping to stress).

**Task-focused CCBIs.** In contrast, the task-focused CCBIs of assumed employee role and consultancy should indirectly impact employee well-being because they do not provide resources to employees, but rather decrease resource demands. Specifically, because assumed employee role is aimed at the task and helps employees by making their tasks easier to complete (e.g., cleaning up a spill for the employee, helping other customers), it will alleviate some of the employee’s workload. Workload, and job demands in general, are negatively associated with employee well-being (Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner, & Schaufeli, 2001). Garma and Bove’s (2011) work supports that employees report experiencing less workload when they describe customers as engaging in assumed employee role.
Consultancy, meanwhile, may act more like a development tool for employees. Indeed, the employees interviewed by Garma and Bove (2011) felt that consultancy helped them develop their skills. By offering suggestions for new products or services or alerting employees to potential problems, consultancy offers opportunity to learn and adapt. Although a value to employees in the long run (Salanova, Agut, & Peiró, 2005), these development opportunities to expand their skills and job tasks may slow employees down in the meantime (Pinder & Schroeder, 1987). However, recent research suggests that even though modifying one's skills and tasks at work may result in short-term decreased task proficiency (with eventual increases after the skill is mastered), it has a positive impact on employee happiness overtime that does not level-off even up to six-months later (Wrzesniewski, Welle, Grant, & Berg, 2013). Thus, while task-focused CCBIs may impact employee affective well-being, psychological well-being (increased self-efficacy through skill mastery; Gist, 1987) may not see an immediate impact.

In regards to physical well-being, within a COR perspective, task-focused CCBIs, such as assumed employee role or consultancy, may not act as a personal resource to be stored and collected, but rather may act as a tool for stopping resource loss spirals (Hobfoll, 1989). That is to say, task-focused CCBIs would not facilitate any immediate net gain in resources, as would person-focused CCBIs, but would rather prevent detriments to employee physical well-being. In this way, CCBIs may prevent the deterioration of physical well-being, but should not enhance it. Collectively, because task-focused CCBIs may only directly and immediately enhance the affective element of employee well-being, they
should have a weaker effect on employee well-being than person-focused CCBIs which will directly enhance all three well-being components.

Hypothesis 2: Person-focused customer citizenship behaviors directed at service employees (i.e. courtesy, social support, advocacy, and sportsmanship) will have a stronger positive relationship with employee well-being than will task-focused customer citizenship behaviors directed at service employee (i.e. assumed employee role and consultancy).

Context Matters: Why the Utility of CCBIs Depends on Perceptual and Situational Factors

Although I argue that CCBIs are generally beneficial to employees by improving their well-being, there are certain instances in which CCBIs may actually be neutral or even harmful for employee well-being. Taking note from similar literatures, there are several factors that qualify when CCBIs may be beneficial for employee well-being, given the unique circumstances of the service environment. I suggest two categories of moderators that dictate when CCBIs are positively related to employee well-being: prior customer behavior (negative emotional context) and ongoing service demands (task context). See Figure 1 for an overview of the moderators.

Ongoing emotional and cognitive demands of the service context should impact when which CCBIs can be noticed and capitalized. Other literatures have set the precedent on when ‘helpful’ behaviors may in fact not be beneficial for their recipient. First, the literature on social support, which tends to show that socially supportive behaviors
positively impact the recipient of social support (Cohen & Willis, 1985; Viswesvaren et al., 1999), finds that there are times when support is not requested or wanted and in such cases the same behaviors actually have a negative effect (Beehr, Bowling & Bennett, 2010) on psychological (emotional exhaustion) and physical health (physical symptoms of strain, such as headache).

Second, social psychology research on altruism and helping suggests that being the recipient of help can damage the receiver’s self-esteem (Fisher, Nadler, Whitcher-Alagna, 1982; Nadler, Altman, & Fisher, 1979) and also suggests that the perceived motives of the helper are important (Weistein & Ryan, 2010). Specifically, when the perception is that the helping behavior is motivated by a desire to control the recipient, then the help negatively impacts the recipient’s affect, self-efficacy, and vitality.

Perception is also essential in COR theory. It’s important to note that just like stress is a perception, so are resources. As Hobfoll and colleagues (1990) describe, resources “...are valued by the individual or that serve as a means of obtaining that which is valued by the individual.” (p. 468) Accordingly, for CCBIs to act as a resource, they must be perceived to have value by the receiving service employee. Although on the face of it, behaviors such as courtesy and consultation seem straightforward in their intent to help service employees, due to the transactional nature of the service environment, they may not always be perceived as such. That is, even though employees are on the payroll of their organizations, in many ways, employees must really answer to customers (Yagil, 2008b). This ‘customer is king’ view can constrain the way employees interact with customers (e.g,
always helpful and friendly even if not truly felt) and make employees more alert and suspicions of unexpected behaviors from customers (Yagil, 2008b). Accordingly, employee perceptions of CCBIs may impact whether the CCBIs are interpreted as a resource and thus impact employee well-being.

**Interpersonal/Emotional Context**

Customers that an employee faces throughout the day may vary. Some may be quite pleasant, while others may be rude or demanding and result in the experience of stress for the service employee (Yagil, 2008a). COR would suggest that employees dealing with a chain of several negative customers, or even a few negative customers but with no break to recover, may be in the midst of a resource loss spiral (Hobfoll, 1989). Research supports that a variety of customer-related interpersonal stressors do indeed correspond to stress outcomes in service employees (Dormann & Zapf, 2004).

As such, employees may be in a place to take particular advantage of a positive encounter as an aid to help stop the loss spiral or even recover resources from previous interpersonal stressors. In fact, event-level research supports that positive events at work have a larger positive impact on employee well-being (fatigue) when in the context of negative events (Gross, Semmer, Meier, Kalin, Jacobshagen, & Tschan, 2011). This is because the positive event may be seen as even more helpful and be more appreciated after a slew of negative events (rude customers, for example). Further, research indicates that positive events (such as watching a happy video) facilitate recovery from negative events (Fredrickson, 1998). The positive event provides a contrast to the preceding negative
events, but the negative events also create a need for resource recovery. When a positive event occurs in the absence of ongoing emotional stressors (e.g., a more neutral context), it is less unique, salient and necessary for well-being improvement, and thus has a smaller impact. Thus, I predict that within a negative emotional context, CCBIs will be more effective at reducing employee stress than in a positive context (see Figure 3 for a plot of the predicted interaction).

_Hypothesis 3: Emotional context will moderate the impact of CCBIs on employee well-being, such that within the more negative the emotional context, CCBIs will more strongly impact employee well-being._

Further, some research suggests that to alleviate stress, the recovery resource must match that of the stressor (de Jonge & Dormann, 2003; 2006). In the case of a high degree of emotional stressors, an interpersonal resource, such as CCBIs, may be more effective than a task-related resource. That is to say, after experiencing several rude or aggressive customers, CCBIs that target the task, will likely to do little to combat the employee’s interpersonal stressor. In fact, they could even send the message that the employee isn’t doing this job well enough or quick enough on his/her own, which in turn would threaten self-esteem (Morse, 1972).

On the other hand, person-focused CCBIs, such as social support, should more directly impact the stressor, and thus improve employee well-being. Indeed, in Garma and Bove’s (2011) interviews, several employees noted that when customers engaged in social support by reassuring them after several rude customers, or helping manage other rude
customers, that their well-being actually increased. Quantitative research also supports that emotional resources, such as support from others at work, provide a better buffer to emotional demands than do other resources, such as cognitive control (de Jonge, Le Blanc, Peeters, & Noordam, 2008). Even further, emotional resources not only buffer against emotional exhaustion, but can actually increase other aspects related to well-being such as motivation. Accordingly, interpersonal CCBIs should be more effective in buffering the effect of emotional stressors on employee well-being than will task-focused CCBIs (see Figure 4 for a plot of the predicted interaction).

Hypothesis 4. Emotional context will strengthen the impact of interpersonally-focused CCBIs more strongly (larger slope) and more often (larger number of significant interactions) than task-focused CCBIs on employee well-being.

Task Context

Despite the utility of an interpersonally positive event against many contrasting negative ones, a series of negative or stressful task events may make it more challenging to detect or interpret a CCBI as a helpful resource. So in contrast to a negative emotional context, which should increase the effectiveness of CCBIs, a negative task context may actually make CCBIs less effective in terms of employee well-being. Several veins of research support this assertion.

First, an episodic study by Zohar and colleagues (2003) find that although positive events (goal enhancing events) are associated with immediate increases in positive affect and decreases in end-of-day fatigue, these effects are diminished under high workload.
That is, when employees are so busy completing their tasks and addressing job demands, they are incapable (lack the attentional resources) of reaping the benefits of positive events at work. In this regard, the negative task context (high workload), detracted from the positive events and their subsequent consequences for employee well-being (increase positive affect, decreased fatigue).

Including COR (Hobfoll, 1989), there are several bodies of research (cf. Baumeister Vohs, & Tice, 2007; Kane & Engle, 2003) that also suggest and support humans are limited in the amount of resources they have (mentally, physically, or emotionally), and depletion of these resources results in the detriment of a variety of behaviors, including attention and memory (Schmeichel, 2007). Specifically, following tasks that demand attentional resources, people tend to have fewer resources remaining to pay attention to subsequent tasks or activities. In a customer service context, ongoing task demands should then reduce employees' ability to notice environmental events, such as CCBIs.

One such task stressor that may make employees unable to recognize or utilize CCBIs as a resource is store busyness, or the extent to which the business is “rapidly paced and crowded with customers” (Rafaelli & Sutton, 1990, p. 624). In previous research, busyness has been found to buffer the degree to which customers are influenced by positive emotional displays (Grandey, Fisk, Mattila, Jansen, & Sideman, 2005) and interactions (Grandey, Goldberg, & Pugh, 2011) with service employees. I argue that the same will be true for customer-to-employee interactions, whereby employees will be less impacted by customers when the store is busy. In such a situation, employees would be less likely to
notice CCBIs, interpret them as helpful, and in turn use them as a resource to reduce stress. Accordingly, store busyness will make CCBIs less effective for stopping employee resource loss spirals and/or regaining resources, and thus will be less stress reducing (see Figure 5 for a plot of the predicted interaction).

Hypothesis 5: Store busyness will moderate the impact of CCBIs on employee wellbeing, such that within a busy context, CCBIs will be more weakly related to employee wellbeing than in a slower context.

Just like interpersonal stressors and context, resource matching should be important to task stressors too (de Jonge & Dormann, 2003; 2006). In the case of a high degree of task stressors, an interpersonal resource, such as CCBIs, may not be as effective as a task-related resource. Again, this is supported by prior research finding that matching cognitive (complex thinking and decisions) demands with cognitive resources (help on the task) and physical (strenuous tasks) demands with physical resources (taking a break, getting assistance) is most effective in reducing strain (Chrisopoulos, Dollard, Windfield & Dormann, 2010; de Jonge & Dormann, 2006). Unfortunately, the research looking at matches between stressors and resources has not considered time pressure, which does not easily fall into their categories of cognitive, physical, or emotional stressors. However, the concept should still apply, such that when experiencing ongoing task stressors, such as store busyness, task assistance from customers, such as bussing their own trays or cleaning their own messes, should have a larger buffering effect on employee well-being than would person-focused CCBIs (see Figure 6 for a plot of the predicted interaction).
Hypothesis 6: Busyness will buffer the impact of interpersonally-focused CCBIs more strongly (smaller slope) and more often (fewer number of significant interactions) than task-focused CCBIs on employee well-being.

In summary, the construct of CCBI will be explored to determine its structure, its overlap and distinction from similar scales and whether it has a positive association with well-being, above other known predictors. In addition, I propose that task-oriented CCBIs will less strongly impact employee well-being, whereas interpersonally-focused CCBIs will more strongly impact employee well-being. Finally, several moderators will be tested to explore the boundary conditions of when CCBIs will be interpreted as helpful (and thus positive for well-being) by service employees and when they may instead threaten self-esteem or be ignored. A summary of the hypotheses can be seen in Table 3.
Table 1.

*Organizational and customer citizenship behaviors, by actors and target*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor</th>
<th>OCBO</th>
<th>CCBO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Employee Definition. Discretionary employee behavior that benefits the organization</td>
<td>Customer Definition. Discretionary customer behavior that benefits the service organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dimensions. Conscientiousness, civic virtue, sportsmanship, voice</td>
<td>Dimensions. Positive word of mouth, suggestions for service improvement, policing other customers, voice,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Examples. Attend non-mandatory meetings, offer unsolicited feedback and ideas for organizational improvement</td>
<td>Examples. Recommend organization to friends and family, suggesting new products or services to be offered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OCBI</td>
<td>CCBI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Definition. Discretionary employee behavior that benefits the other individuals within the organization</td>
<td>Definition. Discretionary employee behavior that benefits service employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dimensions. Altruism, courtesy Examples. Help colleague handle a large work-load, voluntarily introduce new colleague to others</td>
<td>Dimensions. Assumed employee role, advocacy, consultancy, sportsmanship, social support, courtesy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Examples. Strike up friendly small-talk with employee; compliment service employee in front of his/her supervisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of customer citizenship, by target</th>
<th>Customer Citizenship Behaviors toward the Organization (CCBO)*</th>
<th>Customer Citizenship Behaviors toward Service Employees (CCBI)**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assumed employee role</td>
<td>Assumed employee role – behavior that resembles work of the service personal, such as helping speed up the service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>Flexibility – adapting to unexpected situations within the service context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sportsmanship</td>
<td>Sportsmanship – flexibility or tolerance with regard to the service, such as allowing for extra time, changing product, or accepting service failures with grace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policing and helping other customers</td>
<td>Policing and helping other customers – assisting other customers in their needs and ensuring customers engage in appropriate behavior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Support</td>
<td>Social Support – behavior that helps the employee cope with stress, such as defending against aggressive customers, or expressing sympathy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolent acts of service facilitation</td>
<td>Benevolent acts of service facilitation – tolerance, patience, or politeness within the service exchange</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtesy</td>
<td>Courtesy – general friendliness towards the service provider</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in firm’s activities</td>
<td>Participation in firm’s activities – attending and participating in organizational events and campaigns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displays of relationship affiliation</td>
<td>Displays of relationship affiliation – tangible communication of affiliation with an organization (e.g., wearing a t-shirt from a local coffee shop)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive word of mouth</td>
<td>Positive word of mouth – favorable communication to others about the organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>Advocacy – commitment to service personnel, such as complimenting or speaking favorably of the employee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>Voice – complaining directly to service provider in order to give him/her the chance to correct the error</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestions for Service Improvement</td>
<td>Suggestions for Service Improvement – providing information, feedback, or ideas to improve the service (not out of dissatisfaction)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultancy</td>
<td>Consultancy – information aimed at improving the service, such as suggestions for new or improved offerings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Bove et al., (2009)

**Garma and Bove (2011)
Table 3. Summary of Research Questions and Hypotheses, the Studies in Which they are Explored, and the Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Q/Hypothesis</th>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Question 1</strong>: What is the structural validity of CCBIs (i.e., does CCBI consist of multiple factors?)?</td>
<td>Study 1, Study 2</td>
<td>5 factors found in study 1 and confirmed in study 2; CCBI does not roll up well into task and interpersonal categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Question 2</strong>: How are CCBO and CCBI related to one another?</td>
<td>Study 1, Study 2</td>
<td>Moderate evidence for CCBO and CCBI being distinct, though this varies by dimensions. CCBIs correlated, but not highly with customer aggression, and OCBIs, CCBIs correlated moderately with some individual differences (e.g., extraversion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Question 3</strong>: How is CCBI related to citizenship behavior from colleagues (OCBI)?</td>
<td>Study 1, Study 2</td>
<td>In studies 1 and 2, CCBIs and OCBIs correlate moderately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Question 4</strong>: Are there group differences (e.g., gender, perceptions of in-role vs. extra-role) that influence CCBI frequency and type?</td>
<td>Study 1, Study 2</td>
<td>CCBIs more likely when seen as in-role, females and males engage in CCBI somewhat differently, repeat customers engage in more CCBIs than non-repeat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 1a</strong>: CCBIs are positively related to employee well-being</td>
<td>Study 1, Study 2</td>
<td>Correlation: CCBIs related to some well-being outcomes (job satisfaction strongest) Regression: advocacy and assumed employee role (study 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 1b</strong>: CCBIS explain incremental variance in employee well-being, above other variables known to influence well-being (e.g., stressors)</td>
<td>Study 1, Study 2</td>
<td>Daily Diary: courtesy, advocacy, and initiative; sportsmanship negatively related to well-being (physical symptoms)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Study 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 2:</strong> Person-focused customer citizenship behaviors directed at service employees (i.e. courtesy, social support, advocacy, and sportsmanship) will have a stronger positive relationship (direct effect) with employee well-being than will task-focused customer citizenship behaviors directed at service employee (i.e. assumed employee role and consultancy).</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed. Strongest CCBI correlate of wellbeing is courtesy, and weakest is assumed employee role; the others are all moderately consistent in their relationship with wellbeing. In daily data, there are more direct effects of interpersonally-focused CCBIs on well-being than task-focused, but one of the interpersonally-focused effects is in the opposite direction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H3:</strong> Emotional context will moderate the impact of CCBIs on employee well-being, such that within the more negative the emotional context, CCBIs will more strongly impact employee well-being.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Study 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H4:</strong> Emotional context will moderate the impact of interpersonally-focused CCBIs more strongly (larger slope) and more often (larger number of significant interactions) than task-focused CCBIs on employee well-being.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Study 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H5:</strong> Store busyness will moderate the impact of CCBIs on employee well-being, such that within a busy context, CCBIs will be more weakly related to employee well-being than in a slower context.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Study 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H6:</strong> Busyness will moderate the impact of task-focused CCBIs more strongly (larger slope) and more often (larger number of significant interactions) than interpersonally-focused CCBIs on employee well-being.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Study 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. Summary of predicted relationship between CCBIs on employee well-being
Chapter 2

STUDY 1 METHODS

Item Development

In order to test the study’s hypotheses, a quantitative measure of customer citizenship behaviors towards service employees was developed. Following recommendations by Clark and Watson (1995), Garma and Bove’s (2011) definitions and examples were drawn on to clearly conceptualize the construct domain of CCBI. Since there are theoretically six categories of CCBI behavior, items were generated to assess each of the six categories.

During item writing, efforts were taken to craft items that use simple and clear language (Clark & Watson, 1995). Jargon was avoided and items only refer to one behavior at a time (i.e. are not double-barreled). By writing clear, straightforward items, the chances that the items will be misinterpreted, or interpreted in different manners amongst participants can be decreased (Clark & Watson). In total 4-5 items were written for each of the proposed six subscales. This original group of items can be seen listed in Table 4. Although the goal is that all items measure the construct well, item reduction (Hinkin, 1995) will be explored to create the most valid items possible.

Since the concept of CCBI is relatively new, a frequency scale (7-point) was used to assess the items. The advantages of using a frequency scale are: base-rate of how often different types of CCBIs occur can be established, reports actual behavior, rather than
intended behavior, and Likert-style scales are argued to be more reliable (Meade, 2004) and measure intensity/frequency better than forced-choice items (Craig, 2005).

Again, in an effort to establish baselines, both customer and employee items of the measure were developed. By validating both perspectives of the items, it can be understood whether employees and customers report similar frequencies of CCBIs and whether certain individual characteristics, such as age, gender, and personality, impact either the engaging in or the reception of CCBIs. In order to make the items equivalent across samples, the beginning of the items for customers was written in the first person (“I…”), whereas the first part of the item for employees was written as “A customer…”. For example, the first item aimed to measure assumed employee role reads, “I helped tidy up the service area” for customers and “A customer helped tidy up the service area” for employees.

Sample
334 subjects were recruited from introductory and upper-level psychology classes. The introductory level students were drawn from two semesters (late Fall 2013 and Spring 2014) and were part of the introduction to psychology subject pool. The upper-level students were drawn from an online course of mostly non-traditional students and were given extra credit for their participation (they were also presented with an alternative option for extra credit). The sample was chosen due to the high proportion of college students who have worked or currently work in customer service jobs (Milazzo, 2013). College students are also likely to participate as customers within customer service interactions (e.g., purchasing coffee on the way to class, meeting friend for dinner and/or drinks, and frequenting local salons and barber shops).
The majority of the total sample was under the age of 21 (79.4%), female (72.8%) and Caucasian (78.0%), which is consistent with this sort of sample. For quality purposes, 12 participants with large amounts of missing data (e.g., started the survey and did not complete it) were removed. Additionally, three administrative check questions were placed throughout the survey (Meade & Craig, 2012) and 37 who failed two of the three questions were dropped from analysis as well, yielding a final sample size of 285 (85.3%). Of these final 285, 128 took the customer version of the survey and 157 took the employee version.

Procedure

The survey was administered online to participants using the platform, Qualtrics. After reading the consent form and agreeing to participate in the survey, participants were asked whether or not they had worked in customer service within the previous six months. Participants who indicated that they had were branched into the employee version of the survey and participants who indicated that they had not were branched into the customer version of the survey. Both groups were administered items measuring CCBO and CCBI (in a randomized order), followed by items that assessed which type of organization the encounters took place (e.g., retail, hair/nail care). Both sets of participants also completed measures of Big 5 personality, affect, and demographics. Customers also completed scales on social desirability and altruism, while employees had additional scales measuring stressors and strain. After completing these sets of items, participants were thanked for their time and provided with the researcher’s email, allowing opportunity to ask any follow-up questions. After completed responses were collected, participants were awarded (extra) credit for their time.

Measures used in Customer and Employee Samples
A summary of all measures and their descriptive statistics can be found in Table 4.

**Customer citizenship behaviors towards individuals (CCBIs).** As described above, a new scale of CCBIs was created for this study. In total, 29 items were developed, five items to measure each *assumed employee role, sportsmanship, social support, courtesy,* and *advocacy* facets of CCBI and four to measure *consultancy.* A 7-point frequency scale was used to assess the items. For the customer items, the scale ranged from 1 = Never to 7 = Always (1 = Never (0% of interactions); 2 = Rarely (less than 10% of interactions); 3 = Occasionally (in about 30% of interactions); 4 = Sometimes (in about 50% of interactions); 5 = Frequently (in about 70% of interactions); 6 = Usually (in about 90% of interactions); 7 = Always (in 100% of interactions). Participants were asked to “think about the store where you frequent most often as a customer. Think about the times you have gone to this store in the past six months and what your typical interaction there was like when answering the following questions.” For the employee sample, the frequency scale was anchored at 1 = Never (0% of interactions) and 7 = (100% of interactions). The instructions prompted participants to “consider interactions you have had with customers over the last six months. Use the scale to indicate how frequently the following behaviors occurred.”

To gather additional information about this new construct, customers were also asked to indicate if they had the opportunity to engage in each of the CCBI items (Yes/No) and employees were asked whether the behavior would be considered part of a customer’s

---

1 Customers were asked about the store that they frequented most often so that participants could respond with one organization in mind. This way, information on type of organization, whether the customer had a relationship with the employee, and other characteristics could also be collected. These items would not be accurate if the customer sample responded with more than one organization in mind.
normal role (in-role) or went ‘above and beyond’ (extra-role). More information on the analysis of the scale items are provided below.

**Customer citizenship behaviors towards the organization (CCBO).** CCBO was measured to compare against the CCBI items. As argued earlier, I expect CCBO and CCBI to correlate fairly highly, but to be distinct from one another since they are aimed at different targets (organization vs employee). Measuring CCBO allows this hypothesis to be tested and provides convergent validity (Campbell & Fiske, 1959) evidence for the CCBI scale. Both employees and customers reported on the likelihood of CCBOs.

Items used by Bove and colleagues (2009) were adapted for this study. In total, there were 29 items that assessed the positive word of mouth, suggestions for service improvement, policing of other customers, voice, benevolent acts of service facilitation, flexibility and participation in firm’s activities facets of CCBO. These items were measured using the same response scale (1-7 frequency) and instructions as the CCBI items. As with the CCBI items, this scale was also adapted so that the items read in the first person for the customer version of the survey and the employee version asked about customer behavior (third person).

In the entire sample, the majority of the CCBO dimensions achieved acceptable reliability, with a few exceptions. The positive word of mouth dimension was measured with six items and yielded good reliability ($\alpha = .93, M = 4.67, SD = 1.44$). Suggestions for service improvement ($\alpha = .83, M = 3.12, SD = 1.32$) and voice ($\alpha = .88, M = 4.03, SD = 1.52$) each contained four items and also achieved acceptable reliabilities. Acts of service facilitation
(α = .71, M = 4.69, SD = 1.28), affiliation (α = .81, M = 2.25, SD = 1.46), and participation in firm’s activities (α = .75, M = 2.93, SD = 1.50) were all measured with three items each and demonstrated good reliability. The remaining two dimensions, policing (α = .59) and flexibility (α = .58) yielded poor reliability and were excluded from further analysis.

There were some significant mean differences on the CCBO scales between the customer and employee portions of the sample. Specifically, customers reported engaging in significantly higher positive word of mouth (t = -2.97, p<.01), and service facilitation (t = -5.05, p<.01) than the employee sample reported observing. Conversely, the employee sample reported observing higher frequencies of suggestions for service improvement (t = 3.49, p<.01), voice (t = 8.10, p<.01), affiliation (t = 32.53, p<.01), and participation in firm activities (t = 5.04, p<.01) than the customer sample reported engaging in.

**Individual difference controls.** In addition to administering the CCBI scale with similar and dissimilar scales, several individual difference variables were also collected to explore how consistently the CCBI measure functions across individuals.

**Demographic variables.** First, demographic variables (age, sex, ethnicity) were measured to test for any group difference in the measure. Age was measured as a categorical variable with response points in 10-year increments (under 21; 21-30...80+). As indicated above, the majority of the sample (79.4%), was under 21. Sex was measured as a categorical variable as well (male; female; prefer not to say). Most participants (72.8%) were female. Ethnicity was measured as well (Caucasian, Hispanic, African American,
Asian/Pacific Islander, Native American, Multiple, Other, Prefer not to say) and the majority of participants identified as Caucasian (78.0%).

**Personality.** As citizenship is a behavior that goes above and beyond requirements, there may also be certain individuals (customer sample) that are more or less likely to report engaging in CCBIs. For example, individuals that tend to be helpful in general (e.g., agreeable) are more likely to engage in OCBs than less globally helpful individuals (Borman, Penner, Allen, & Motowidlo, 2001; Donnellan, Oswald, Baird, & Lucas, 2006; Finkelstein & Penner, 2004; Mayfield & Taber, 2010; Organ & Ryan, 1995). To also control for prior research which suggests some individuals (high extraversion, high agreeableness) may more likely to receive helpful behaviors from others (Bowling, Beehr, & Swader, 2005), personality was controlled for to determine the extent to which individual differences may inflate the correlation between receiving OCBI and CCBI.

Accordingly, personality was measured in both the customer sample and the employee sample (as argued above) as well to 1) determine if these individual differences are related to CCBIs as they are OCBs and 2) to determine the generalizability of the CCBI measure to other samples (e.g., CCBIs may be similar across age groups, but may be more prevalent in individuals high in agreeableness; future researchers will need to be aware of this if using the measure in extremely agreeable or less agreeable groups).

Donnellan and colleagues’ (2006) 20-item scale was used to assess big five personality; four items each for each of the five personality constructs (conscientiousness, agreeableness, openness, neuroticism, and extraversion). Participants used a 5-point
accuracy scale (1 = very inaccurate; 5 = very accurate) to rate how well each of the behavioral statements described them. Each of the conscientiousness (α = .71, M = 3.60, SD = .83), agreeableness (α = .74 M = 4.09, SD = .71), and extraversion (α = .81 M = 3.43, SD = .90) scales showed good reliability. The openness (α = .67, M = 3.84, SD = .88) and neuroticism (α = .67 M = 2.66, SD = .83) scales demonstrated slightly lower reliabilities than what is considered ideal (Ferketich, 1991), but were retained since they have demonstrated acceptable psychometrics in other studies (Cooper, Smillie, & Corr, 2010; Donnellan et al., 2006).

The only difference between the employee and customer sample on the Big 5 measures was on conscientiousness; employees were slightly more conscientious (t = 2.2, p<.05) than were customers.

**Measures in Customer Sample Only**

**Social desirability.** Due to the rather positive nature of the CCBI items, social desirability was measured to control for the customer participants’ desire to answer in a way that enhances the way they appear to others. Social desirability was measured using 13-items from Crowne and Marlowe (1960). Participants responded using a 5-point accuracy scale (1 = very inaccurate; 5 = very accurate). The reliability of the scale was acceptable (α = .74, M = 2.80, SD = .59)

**Store characteristics.** To understand any differences that may occur in CCBIs due to organization-type and customer-employee relationship, store-type, frequency of interactions, and relationship status were controlled for. Specifically, customer participants
were asked to indicate the type of store (retail, restaurant/food service, hair/nail care, automotive, or other – with write-in) they had in mind when answering the questions. They also indicated how often they had visited this organization within the last six months (once, less than once a month, once a month, 2-3 times a month, once a week, 2-3 times a week, or daily). Finally they indicated if there was an employee at the store that they preferred to interact with (e.g., ‘my mechanic’, ‘my hairstylist’) when they visited the organization (yes/no; Gutek et al., 1999). The difference between customers who have mere encounters with employees with those who have long-lasting relationships has been shown in prior research to impact customer and employee outcomes, in particular customer helpfulness (Gutek, et al., 1999).

The largest portion of the sample reported answering the questions based on their experience with food/beverage service (e.g., restaurant, coffee shop) organizations (44.3%). Respondents varied on how often they visited their focal store with answers of 2-3 times a month (26.7%) and 2-3 times a week (21.4%) receiving the highest levels of endorsement. The sample was split on whether or not they had a preferred employee at the organization in mind, but a slightly higher portion of the sample (51.2%) reported having a preferred employee over not having a preferred employee (48.9%).

**Measures in Employee Sample Only**

**Organizational citizenship behaviors.** For the employee portion of the sample, the frequency of being the target of OCBIs from their colleagues was measured to answer research question 3. Although employees are the target of CCBIs and OCBIs from
colleagues, due to the different actors involved (customers vs coworkers), it is not expected that the two will overlap substantially, thus providing a test of discriminant validity. Seven items from Williams and Anderson's (1991) OCBI scale were adapted to make the participant the target, rather than the actor, of the behavioral statement. For example, “help others who have been absent” becomes “receive help from others when I have been absent.” A 7-point frequency scale (1=Never, 7=Always) was also used for these items, but did not have the percentage (0% of the time) anchors. The measure showed good reliability ($\alpha = .87$, $M = 4.59$, $SD = 1.13$).

**Stressors.** Since strain reactions were an outcome of interest in this study, stressors were also measured. As explained by Shirom and Melamed (2006) strain outcomes, such as burnout, are understood to be an outcome of exposure to work stressors. However, within the context of COR, the perception of stressors is also an indicator of well-being (Hobfoll, 1989). Task-related stressors were measured using an 8-item role conflict measure from Rizzo, House, and Lirtzman (1970) and a 3-item role overload measure by Beehr, Walsh, and Taber (1976). All eleven items were assessed using a 7-point agreement scale (1 = strongly disagree; 7 = strongly agree) where participants were asked to mark how strongly they agreed each statement described their work conditions. The role overload scale demonstrated good reliability ($\alpha = .78$, $M = 3.35$, $SD = 1.43$), as did the role conflict scale ($\alpha = .87$, $M = 3.43$, $SD = 1.20$).

In addition to task-stressors, negative customer behavior was assessed as a measure of interpersonal stress. Strain outcomes (emotional exhaustion) in customer service are
thought to stem largely from customer interactions (Dormann & Dieter, 2004), particularly negative ones (Grandey, et al., 2004). Customer incivility was assessed using Kern and Grandey’s (2009) adaptation of Cortina’s (2001) seven-item scale. Employees used a 7-point frequency scale (1 = never; 7 = always) to indicate how often customers had engaged in the negative behaviors in the previous six months (e.g., “a customer put me down/was condescending to me”). The scale demonstrated good reliability (α = .89, M = 2.27, SD = .89).

**Emotional exhaustion.** To determine, at a general level, if CCBIs are associated with employee well-being outcomes, a measure of emotional exhaustion was used. Specifically, 3-items (“I feel emotionally drained from my work” “I feel ‘burned out’ from my work” “I feel used up at the end of the workday”) were culled based on highest item loadings in previous research (Koeske & Koeske, 1989), as suggested by Stanton, Sinar, Balzer, and Smith (2002). A 7-point scale (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree) was used by participants to mark their agreement with each of the items. The three-item scale demonstrated good reliability (α = .88, M = 3.78, SD = 1.66).

**Work information.** Finally, to account for differences in frequency and length of interaction with customers (which would impact likelihood of CCBIs), several pieces of information about the nature of employee participant’s jobs were collected. Participants were asked how many hours per week they typically worked (0-10; 11-20; 21-30; 31-40; 40+) and were asked to write-in their specific field of customer service (e.g., hair stylist, retail associate). They were also asked to report their tenure in the position (less than 6
months; 6 months – less than 1 year; 1 year – less than 2 years; 2 years – less than 5 years; 5 years – less than 10 years; 10+ years).

The majority of respondents were part time employees (29.0% were at less than 10 hours/week and 39.4% worked for 11-20 hours/week). Tenure was generally under 5 years with the largest portions of the sample reporting tenure between 2 and 5 years (31.0%) and less than 6 months (28.4%).

In addition to these general work questions, employees also reported the portion of their role that was customer facing (increments of 10… 0-10%, 11-20%, etc.), the average length of any single customer interaction (one minute or less; 1-5 minutes; 6-30 minutes, 31-60 minutes; greater than 60 minutes) and the portion of customers who were repeat customers (increments of 10, … 0-10%, 11-20%, etc.).

The sample generally held very customer-centered positions with 50.8% of the sample reporting that 90-100% of their role required customer interaction and only 8.5% of the sample reporting their job required less than 50% of its role interacting with customers. These interactions tended to be relatively short (52.3% of sample reported average interactions lasted 1-5 minutes). The percentage of repeat customers was diverse with the largest portions of the sample indicating a 51-60% and 81-90% (14.1% of respondents in each category) repeat customer rate, though many also responded with lower repeat rates (10.9% responded that 21-30% of customers were repeat) and higher repeat rates (11.7% indicated that 81-90% of customers were repeat).
Table 4. Descriptive Statistics for Studies 1 and 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th># Items</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual Differences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Desirability*</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CCBI</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>5/3</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>7/6</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sportsmanship</td>
<td>4/3</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assume</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtesy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CCBO</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POW</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggest</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policing†</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Facilitation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility‡</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stressors, resources and Wellbeing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCBIs from others</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Conflict</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Overload</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnout; EE***</td>
<td>3/2</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org-based self-esteem</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Aggression</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Self Efficacy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Symptoms</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Included in the customer version only
** Larger item numbers for study 1, smaller item numbers following reduction in baseline study 2
*** Measured with 3 items in study 1 and 2 in the baseline and daily measures
† Omitted in study 1 due to low alpha reliabilities
Chapter 3

STUDY 1 RESULTS

CCBI Scale Evaluation: Research Question 1

The first research question asks about the factor structure of CCBI. Will all six dimensions from Garma and Bove’s (2011) work be replicated, or, perhaps CCBI just consists of task and interpersonally focused factors. Answers to these questions were provided using EFA to determine the best number of factors to explain the data. The results of the EFA will be replicated via CFA in the second study.

EFA. Since the six dimensions of CCBI likely correlate to a high degree, EFA was used to determine a more parsimonious way to present the scale. The results of the EFA can be seen in Table 5. As the table shows, a 5 factor-solution was the ideal fit for this data. Varimax rotation was used to better interpret the factors. Items with loadings of less than .40 were dropped, as were items that had high (> .40) loadings on more than one factor. This results in dropping five items (sportsmanship 3, social support 1 and 4, courtesy 1 and 2). The five factors can be described as advocacy, initiative, assumed employee role, sportsmanship, and courtesy. Aside from the initiative factor, all of the other factors consisted of only items theorized to group together as a dimension.

The initiative factor combines items from the theorized social support and consultancy dimensions. I chose to call this initiative because the items it contains (e.g., standing up for an employee being treated rudely by a customer, made an employee aware

---

22 The entire sample, both customers and employees, was used.
of a potential problem, suggested an idea for service improvement) require foresight and
foresight on the part of the customer.

These dimensions will be re-tested via CFA in study 2.

**Reliability analysis.** As a first look at how the CCBI items functioned, item total
correlations (Guildford, 1953) and alpha reliabilities (Cronbach, 1951) were examined.
Ideally, item-total correlations will be at .30 or higher (Guilford, 1953) and reliabilities will
be at .70 or higher (Ferketich, 1991). All items yielded a corrected item total correlation of
.30 or higher and all of the reliabilities of the five dimensions were at .70 or higher. Thus,
no items were removed at this point. Reliabilities of the CCBI dimensions can be seen in
Table 4.

**Validity Tests of CCBI Scale: Research Question 2**

Research Question 2 asks if CCBI and CCBO are separate constructs. The two scales
were correlated with one another to see if any strong overlap occurred. Also in this section,
CCBI was also correlated to other scales, such as personality, for tests of discriminant
validity.

Overall, the CCBO scales were modestly correlated with the CCBI dimensions, as
expected (see Table 6). Initiative ($r = .36 - .63$) and advocacy ($r = .26 - .56$) were the most
strongly related to the CCBO scales and courtesy had the weakest relationships ($r = -.03 -
.24$). In general, these moderate correlations provide preliminary evidence that CCBI s and
CCBOs are similar, but distinct constructs in the employee sample.
As expected there were some dimensions that correlated more than others. Specifically, initiative and suggestions for service improvement were highly correlated in both the employee and the customer sample. The dimensions, though one from CCBI and one from CCBO, have similar conceptual definitions and behavioral examples. Further, it is likely that when a customer gives feedback to the organization (CCBO), it is channeled through an employee, and thus seems like the feedback is for the employee him/herself (CCBI). Many other dimensions of CCBO and CCBI do not have such substantial overlap and in some cases, the correlations between the two constructs are null (e.g., the CCBI of courtesy and the CCBO of affiliation).

**Correlations with other scales in the customer sample**

**Correlation with personality.** In the customer sample (see Table 6), agreeableness emerges as having the most consistent relationship with CCBI as it is positively associated with sportsmanship ($r = .24, p<.01$), assumed employee role ($r = .25, p<.01$), and courtesy ($r = .41, p<.01$). Extraversion is positively related to assumed employee role ($r = .22, p<.05$), conscientiousness is related to advocacy ($r = .19, p<.05$), and openness is related to sportsmanship ($r = .20, p<.05$) and courtesy ($r = .18, p<.05$). Therefore, it seems customers who score high on extraversion and agreeableness are the most likely to engage in CCBI. This is consistent with other research on personality and frequency of engaging in citizenship behavior (cf., Bowling et al., 2010).

**Social desirability.** Social desirability was not significantly related to the frequency with which customers reported engaging in CCBI, though it was marginally positively
related to the dimension of courtesy ($r = .15, p < .10$). Significant positive correlations between social desirability and CCBI items would indicate that participants may be endorsing the CCBI items to ‘look good.’ The lack of significant correlations eases this concern.

**Correlations with other scales in the employee sample**

**Correlation with CCBOs.** As in the customer sample, initiative and advocacy have the largest correlations with the CCBO dimensions. Courtesy and sportsmanship had the smallest and weakest correlations with the CCBO dimensions. Overall, because the two types of customer citizenship (towards employees and towards the organization) do not correlate highly, concern over their being one, rather than two distinct, constructs is minimized.

**Correlation with personality.** In the employee sample (Table 7), extraversion was the most consistently related to the reception of CCBI as it is significantly positively correlated to each dimension, with the exception of advocacy. Agreeableness is less consistently related to CCBI in the employee sample than it is in the customer sample, only significantly related to assumed employee role ($r = .19, p = .05$). In the employee sample, conscientiousness is positively related to sportsmanship ($r = .18, p < .05$) also. Therefore, based on these data, extraverted employees are the most likely to report receiving CCBI from customers, which is consistent with prior evidence (Bowling et al., 2010).

**Correlation with CCBI: Research question 3.** Similar to how the relationship between CCBOs and CCBI can be used to show that citizenship differs by target, examining the relationship between receiving OCBI from colleagues and CCBI can be used to
demonstrate that the source of citizenship also differentiates citizenship behaviors. Answering research question 3, receiving OCBIs from colleagues was correlated positively and significantly with each of the CCBI scales, though these correlations ($r = .17 - .39$) were generally smaller than the correlations between CCBI and CCBO. These significant, but moderate, correlations show that certain employees may either be more likely to receive citizenship from others, or perceive citizenship from others, on the whole, but the lack of a much stronger correlation argues that CCBIs are distinct from citizenship behaviors from colleagues.

**Correlation with customer aggression.** Finally, sportsmanship and courtesy were negatively associated with customer aggression ($r = -.20, p<.05; r = -.32, p<.01$, respectively) and conversely, initiative was positively associated with customer aggression ($r = .16, p<.05$). The small-moderate size of the correlations and the fact that one of the CCBIs was positively associated with customer aggression indicates that these concepts do not overlap substantially, nor is customer aggression simple the inverse of CCBIs (which would suggest they are measures at different ends of the same scale).

**When and by Whom CCBI occurs: Research Question 4**

Research Question 4 explores whether CCBI functions similar to other citizenship scales with regard to how it is seen as in-role or extra-role, whether men and women engage in the different dimensions of CCBI at different rates, and if repeat customers engage in CCBIs differently than customers who do not have a prior history/relationship with the employee.
Endorsement of opportunity to perform and in-role/extra-role. After ensuring that the items created internally consistent scales, the additional responses were used to determine 1) that customers actually had the opportunity to perform the CCBIs and 2) that employees do indeed perceive CCBIs to be outside of the customer's role. Ideally, customers would have the opportunity to engage in each of the CCBI items. Additionally, understanding the extent to which these behaviors are viewed as in-role or extra-role helps answer research question 4, which seeks to understand how customer citizenship is similar and different from other citizenship and helping behaviors.

In general, it was observed that customers did in fact have a fair chance to engage in each of the CCBI items. 90% or more of the customer sample reported the opportunity to perform some items, such as those within the courtesy subscale. In general, customers reported the greatest opportunity to perform behaviors from the courtesy and sportsmanship subscales and the least opportunity to perform the initiative (66% had the opportunity, on average) and assumed employee role (69.2% average opportunity to perform) behaviors.

In support of research that indicates that the more in-role citizenship behaviors is perceived to be, the more likely its occurrence (Morrison, 1994), the scales that customers reported the greatest opportunity to perform were also the ones that employees were most likely to report as being part of the customer's required role. Specifically, 55.5% of employees claimed that the sportsmanship behaviors were in-role requirements for customers and 66.5% felt that courtesy behaviors were required. These rates are much
higher than the other scales in which 27.1% (assumed employee role) – 29.4% (initiative) of employees reported being required for the customer’s role.

Overall, these findings suggest that customers did generally have the opportunity to engage in CCBIs and employees generally viewed the behaviors as ‘extra-role’ with the exception of the dimensions that most closely resemble general politeness.

**Group differences.** It was explored whether there exists differences between men and women, and by age or ethnicity on the CCBI scales. Although other research suggests that women may be more helpful than men (Eckel & Grossman, 1998), this idea was asked in the form of a research question instead of a hypothesis: do men and women differ on CCBIs?

T-tests were used to explore gender differences and one-way ANOVAs were used to test for ethnicity and age differences. With a few exceptions, there were not, in fact, group differences. The exceptions included customer reports of courtesy and initiative, and employee reports of assumed employee role. Specifically, female customers reported engaging significantly more courtesy behaviors than did males ($t = 2.49, p<.05$), while male customers reported more initiative than females ($t = 2.17, p<.05$). Female employees reported receiving more behaviors from the assumed employee role dimension than did male employees ($t = 2.1, p<.05$). There were no differences by age, gender, or ethnicity at the level of the entire sample.

**Store type differences.**
**Customer store differences.** The customer sample was asked to report on what type of store their CCBI interactions occurred in, how often they frequented said store, and whether or not they had a preferred employee at the store since these qualities may impact CCBIs. Specifically, different types of store environments may stimulate different types of behavior in customers, and customer who are “regular” to a store or employee may act in a more helpful manner to maintain the relationship than those who are not (Gutek et al., 1999). ANOVA tests show that there were no differences for frequency of store interactions; however, several differences emerged by store type and relationship with employee (t-test).

Indeed, customers who reported having a preferred employee were more likely to engage in advocacy \((M_{\text{preferred}} = 4.72, M_{\text{no preferred}} = 3.02, t\text{-value} = 7.23, p < .01)\), initiative \((M_{\text{preferred}} = 3.81, M_{\text{no preferred}} = 2.47, t = 6.18, p < .01)\), and assumed employee role \((M_{\text{preferred}} = 4.64, M_{\text{no preferred}} = 3.49, t = 4.44, p < .01)\) than were customers that did not have a preferred employee. Only one difference by store type was found: customers of hair/nail care organizations were more likely to engage in advocacy than customers of other organizations \((F = 5.31, p < .01)\). Finally, interaction frequency had positive association with assumed employee role frequency such that the more often a customer used the service organization, the more likely they were to report assumed employee role \((r = .19, p < .05)\).

**Employee work condition differences.** As argued above, because different work conditions and interaction qualities may impact customer frequencies of CCBIs, the employees on the other end of these interactions may also report perceiving different
frequencies of CCBIs. On the employee end, employee tenure, hours worked per week, portion of role involving customer interactions, average length of interaction, and portion of customer who are repeat, were measured, as described in the measures section. Since these qualities were all measured on an integer scale, bivariate correlations were explored to determine if there were relationships between these variables and the CCBI scale.

The work factor that was most strongly linked to CCBI frequency was portion of customers who were repeats. The higher the portion of customers that were repeats, the more likely employees were to report advocacy ($r = .46, p<.01$), initiative ($r = .35, p<.01$), and assumed employee role ($r = .27, p<.01$). In addition to being correlated with repeat customers, initiative was also associated with the portion of the role that employees spent facing customers ($r = .17, p<.10$), the average length of interaction ($r = .25, p<.01$), and tenure ($r = .15, p<.01$). Courtesy was related to the portion of the role that is customer facing ($r = .19, p<.05$). Sportsmanship was negatively related to average hours worked per week ($r = -.13, p<.05$) and tenure ($r = -.15, p<.05$).

Overall, CCBI does seem to be similar to other citizenship and helping behavior constructs. It is more frequent when it is perceived to be in-role (Morrison, 1994), women engage in different types of citizenship at different frequencies than men (Eagly, 2009), and customer-employee relationships increase CCBI frequency (Gutek et al., 1999).

**Criterion Validity: Hypothesis 1a, 1b, and 2**

**Correlation with Stressors and Strain.** Correlations between stressors and strain with CCBIs were also explored, as seen in Table 7. It was predicted in hypothesis 1a that
CCBs would correlate (negatively) with strain, and sportsmanship \( (r = -0.19, p < 0.05) \) and courtesy \( (r = -0.20, p < 0.05) \) were in fact negatively associated with emotional exhaustion, providing initial support for this hypothesis. Note that only one of the CCBO dimensions has a significant correlation with emotional exhaustion (service facilitation), which supports the findings of research question 2 that CCBO and CCBI are distinct.

Although there were not any predictions made about the relationship between CCBs and stressors, interestingly, sportsmanship and courtesy were both negatively associated with role overload \( (r = -0.26, p < 0.01; r = -0.23, p < 0.01, \text{respectively}) \) and role conflict \( (r = -0.23, p < 0.01; r = -0.24, p < 0.01) \). Conversely, initiative was positively associated with role overload \( (r = 0.19, p < 0.05) \) and role conflict \( (r = 0.20, p < 0.05) \). It is very likely that CCBs not only reduce the impact of stressors on well-being, but that they act to reduce the perception of stressors as well (Hobfoll, 1989).

**Regression.** To demonstrate incremental validity, regression was used to test the relationship of CCBs on emotional exhaustion, controlling for the effects of customer aggression and OCBIs from colleagues. Customer aggression was used to control for stressors and OCB was used to determine if CCBI is related to employee well-being beyond similar positive behaviors. When entered together, the CCBs do not provide any additional variance explained beyond customer aggression and OCBIs \( (\Delta R^2 = 0.04, p = \text{n.s.}) \). When entered individually, the CCBs are not related to emotional exhaustion nor do they provide any incremental variance explained, which does not support hypothesis 1b. Since none of the CCBs were related to the outcome, emotional exhaustion, it is not possible to answer
hypothesis 2, which predicts that interpersonally-focused CCBIs will have a stronger positive relationship with employee well-being than task-focused CCBIs.

Since CCBIs might also impact the perception of stressors, the regression was re-tested with role overload and role conflict as outcomes. For role overload, the CCBI step provides additional variance explained beyond OCBIs from colleagues and customer aggression ($\Delta R^2 = .07, p<.05$) and the coefficient for initiative ($B=.32, p<.05$) reaches significance. For role conflict, the step does not reach significance ($\Delta R^2 = .04, p=n.s.$).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Wordings</th>
<th>Advocacy</th>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Assume employee role</th>
<th>Sportsmanship</th>
<th>Courtesy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assume 1</td>
<td>I helped tidy up the service area (straightened magazines, tucked my chair in, threw my trash away)</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assume 2</td>
<td>I helped other customers (e.g., translated for them, gave them information)</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assume 3</td>
<td>they needed about the organization)</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assume 4</td>
<td>I helped expedite the service</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assume 5</td>
<td>I helped solve a problem for an employee</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sportsmanship 1</td>
<td>I was tolerant of slow service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sportsmanship 2</td>
<td>I tolerated a product/service being unavailable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sportsmanship 3</td>
<td>* I made a sacrifice to help others gave up my spot in line</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sportsmanship 4**</td>
<td>* I didn’t complain when the service was slow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sportsmanship 5</td>
<td>I forgave employee for a service failure (wrong product, slow service)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Support 1*</td>
<td>I gave a small token of appreciation to an employee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Support 2</td>
<td>paid an employee a non-work related compliment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Support 3**</td>
<td>* I greased an employee by name</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Support 4*</td>
<td>* I expressed empathy towards an employee having a bad day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Support 5</td>
<td>I stood up for an employee who was being treated rudely by another</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultancy 1</td>
<td>* I thanked an employee for his/her time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultancy 2</td>
<td>I engaged in casual conversation with an employee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultancy 3</td>
<td>I behaved in a friendly manner towards an employee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultancy 4</td>
<td>* I was polite when interacting with an employee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy 1**</td>
<td>* I came back to see an employee more than once</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy 2</td>
<td>* I gave an employee a compliment on his/her service</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy 3**</td>
<td>* I told management about how great an employee was</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy 4</td>
<td>I told an employee that I appreciated his/her work</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy 5</td>
<td>* I gave an employee positive feedback on his/her work</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultancy 1</td>
<td>I suggested an idea for service improvement to an employee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultancy 2</td>
<td>I made an employee aware of a potential problem at the store</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultancy 3</td>
<td>I provided constructive feedback to an employee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultancy 4</td>
<td>I told an employee about a new service offering his/her company should</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*removed in study 1  **removed in study 2
Table 6.
Correlations in Employee Sample, Study 1

| Variable                        | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9   | 10  | 11  | 12  | 13  | 14  | 15  | 16  | 17  | 18  | 19  | 20  |
|---------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| CCBIs                           |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 1. Advocacy                     | .50 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 2. Initiative                   | .18 | .16 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 3. Sportsmanship                 | .30 | .57 | .47 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 4. Arumne                       | .15 | .19 | .44 | .21 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 5. Courtesy                     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Big 5                           |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 6. Conscientousness             | -.08| -.11| .18 | .06 | .01 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 8. Openness                     | .09 | .07 | .07 | .06 | .13 | .01 | .21**|     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 9. Neuroticism                  | .01 | .07 | .10 | .01 | .09 | .20 | .07 | .20*|     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 10. Extraversion                | .08 | .23 | .16 | .22 | .26 | .12 | .24**| .16 | .15 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| CCBRn                           |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 11. Positive word of mouth      | .44 | .46 | .27 | .46 | .42 | .14 | .22**| .16 | .06 | .17 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 12. Suggestions for service    | .32 | .64 | .26 | .11 | .12 | .20 | .09 | .06 | .35**|     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 13. Voice                       | .25 | .42 | -.01 | .19 | .01 | .10 | .08 | .01 | .24**| .18 | .53**|     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 14. Service Facilitation       | .34 | .52 | .52**| .52**| .45**| .05 | .15 | .11 | .24**| .67**| .38**| .22**|     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 15. Affiliation                 | .29 | .37 | .13 | .38**| .12 | .08 | .17 | .04 | .12 | .28**| .12 | .34**|     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 16. Activities                 | .32 | .44 | .30 | .42**| .23**| .08 | .15 | .16**| -.12| .10 | .49**| .32**| .16**| .17**| .52**|     |     |
| Stressors, strain               |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 17. Role Overload               | .14 | .19 | .25**| -.07 | .23**| .06 | .09 | .26**| -.14 | -.02 | .18**| .09 | .09 | .05 | .03 |     |     |     |
| 18. Role Conflict               | .13 | .20 | .23**| -.01 | .24**| -.05 | .01 | .33**| -.08 | -.08 | .27**| .14 | -.05 | .07 | .09 | .64**|     |     |
| 19. Emotional Exhaustion        | .01 | .03 | .10 | .06 | .19**| -.11 | -.20 | -.02 | .02 | .55**| -.20 | -.07 | .11 | .08 | .20**| .01 | .61 | .33**|     |
| 20. OCB from others             | .17 | .25**| .53**| .53**| .53**| .06 | .55**| .22**| -.12 | .16**| .55**| .13 | .18 | .36**| .13 | .30**| .21**| .09 | .14 | .42**|
| 21. Customer aggression         | .11 | .15 | -.20 | -.02 | .33**| -.15 | -.15 | .31**| -.10 | -.11 | .27**| .13 | -.05 | .20 | .45 | .52**| .31**| -.17 |     |

**p<.01, *p<.05, tp<.10
Table 7. Correlations in Customer Sample, Study 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Advocacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Initiative</td>
<td>.72**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sportsmanship</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Assume</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Courtesy</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Conscientious</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Agreeableness</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Openness</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Neuroticism</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Extraversion</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Social desirability</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Positive word of mouth</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Suggestion for service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Voice</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Service Facilitation</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Affiliation</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Activities</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.69**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>.03</th>
<th>.31*</th>
<th>.16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sportsmanship</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumed employee role</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtesy</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\Delta R^2$ 0.04

.07* .04*

**p<.01, *p<.05, †p<.10
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STUDY 1 DISCUSSION

In conclusion, this study was able to provide evidence that addresses Research Questions 1, 2, and 3 as well as hypotheses 1a and 1b. Research Question 1 aimed to determine the factor structure of the CCBI construct. In the overall sample, EFA suggests that CCBI consists of five subscales, with four of the five subscales loading as predicted. The EFA was used to reduce five items from the original 29-item scale and results in the dimensions of: assumed employee role, advocacy, sportsmanship, courtesy, and initiative. These factors will be confirmed in study 2.

Research question 2 sought to answer how CCBI was related to other constructs, especially CCBO. In the correlation results, the evidence suggests that while there is moderate correlation between the dimensions of each type of customer citizenship, these correlations are not so high as to suggest the concepts are one and the same. This comes with the exception of the link between initiative of the CCBI scale and suggestions for service improvement of the CCBO scale ($r = .64, p<.01$ in overall sample), which yield a strong correlation, which makes sense given their large conceptual overlap too (see Table 2). There are also different patterns of correlation between the personality variables and CCBI vs CCBO. For example, in the employee sample, extraversion was the most strongly related to the reception/perception of CCBI, but openness was the most consistently related to the reception/perception of CCBOs.
The findings regarding extraversion confirm Bowling and colleagues’ (2005) research on personality and reception of helpful behavior from colleagues; in this study too extraverts receive more help from others at work. For customers, agreeableness is the most consistently related to CCBIs. Other research has also found that agreeableness is related to engaging in citizenship behaviors (cf. Borman et al., 2001). Further, in the customer sample, reporting CCBIs is not a matter of trying to 'look good' since CCBIs were unrelated to social desirability.

CCBIs were also related to OCBIIs from colleagues (employee sample) and customer aggression (employee sample). The relationships in both cases were small enough so as to suggest that while these types of citizenship and negative customer behavior are related, they do not conceptually overlap to a significant degree, nor are they opposite ends of a similar scale (in the case of customer aggression). Research question 3 is answered by showing that CCBI and OCBI are moderately related.

To answer research question 4, which suggests CCBIs may be similar to other citizenship and helping behaviors, female customers report more courtesy CCBIs than males, and male customers report more initiative than females. Female employees report their customers engage in more frequent assumed employee role behaviors than male employees. These gender differences are fairly consistent with Eagly and Crowley (1986)'s research using social-role theory to explore sex differences in helping strangers. In their research, men tend to be more helpful overall than women and women tend to receive more help than men. Further, men help in 'heroic' ways, whereas women tend to help in
more nurturing ways. Female employees receiving more CCBIs (assumed employee role) than males, and female customers engaging in more courtesy behaviors than male customers is consistent with this research. It could be debated whether or not initiative is ‘heroic’, but it probably would not be considered ‘nurturing.’

Some trends emerged too regarding type of service interaction and environment in relation to CCBI. Specifically, customers who reported having a preferred employee were more likely to engage in CCBIs, suggesting some benefit to return patronage and customer-employee relationships (Gutek, et al., 1999), in terms of CCBI. Similarly, employees who reported higher portions of repeat customers also reported higher CCBI frequency. These trends are consistent to research on customer-employee relationships, whereby employees and customers tend to act in more helpful and friendly ways towards one another when they maintain a relationship over time, as compared to if the interaction is purely transactional (Gutek et al., 1999).

Similar to Morrison’s (1994) work, it was also found that CCBIs that were rated to be less extra-role and more in-role were presented the most opportunity for customers to perform. Thus, just like employee citizenship, when customers believe that the citizenship behaviors are actually required and not voluntary, they are more likely to engage in them. Different types of citizenship behaviors were seen as in-role and extra-role though. Perhaps out of the indoctrination of their own display rule requirements, employees were more likely to see the CCBIs that resemble generally politeness and friendliness as required of customers, just as they are more likely to perceive these behaviors to be required of them.
(Diefendorff et al. 2006). With the exception of advocacy, CCBIs that were more task-oriented (initiative and assumed employee role), were seen to be the least in-role (most extra-role).

Finally it is worth noting that customers generally report engaging in higher frequencies of CCBIs than employees report perceiving. Since the ratings were not dyadic (i.e., employees matched to customers), it is hard to determine if these mean differences are due to general perceptions of helpfulness, or whether the customer sample just truly happened to be more helpful than the employee sample experienced with their customers. When the samples are matched though, it has been found that small differences exist between self-ratings of citizenship behavior and other ratings (Carpenter, Berry, & Houston, 2013). This gives credence to the idea that actors (customers) may perceive themselves as more helpful than recipients/perceivers (employees).

In terms of predictive validity (hypothesis 1b), CCBIs did not demonstrate significant utility in explaining employee well-being. Although courtesy was significantly related to emotional exhaustion (in support of hypothesis 1) in the correlation table, none of the CCBIs predicted emotional exhaustion in regression, when controlling for citizenship from colleagues and customer aggression. The moderators suggested in hypotheses 3-6, which will be tested in the next study, may help untangle when, and if, CCBIs are related to employee well-being.

However, CCBIs were related to employee perceptions of task stressors (role conflict and role overload). One explanation of why sportsmanship and courtesy overlap with stressors is that these CCBIs may not only may reduce impact of stressors on strain,
but they may actually reduce the stressors themselves, or the perception of said stressors. Initiative, on the other hand, may have the opposite effect. Potentially, the additional feedback and service ideas inherent in initiative may create more work for employees (Grandey et al., 2012) and act as negative performance feedback, creating additional performance areas to focus on (Ilgen & Davis, 2000). This in turn would be cognitively taxing and stressful for employees. Alternatively, it could also be that employees who report more stressors are more likely to receive initiative behaviors from customers who perceive the employee stress and provide assistance.

Since there are limitations in using a single-source, single-time point measurement, as well as drawing from student samples (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003; Spector, 1994; Wintre, North, & Sugar, 2001), a second study was conducted to reduce these limitations. Specifically, study 2 uses an adult working sample to collect information on stressors and customer citizenship over several (5) working days.
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STUDY 2: RECRUITMENT AND SAMPLE

To further test and re-test the results of study 1, a second study was conducted. The goals of this study were to confirm that factor structure of the CCBI scale found in study 1, and further test how the CCBI scale is related to other measures. A survey similar to study 1 is used to test these first questions, but with an adult employee sample, recruited online. The participants were asked back to take several more daily level surveys to provide more robust testing of the relationship between CCBI and employee well-being. The daily portion of the study is also used to test the hypotheses.

Sample

A sample of customer service workers was recruited through Amazon’s MTurk. MTurk has been found to be a reliable source of participants in other psychological research and many studies conducted on other samples have been replicated using MTurk workers (Berinksy, Huber, & Lenz, 2012). In addition, MTurk has shown effective in recruiting panel/longitudinal research studies whereby participants are called back to answer several surveys (Christenson & Glick, 2013). Furthermore, precautions can be taken to ensure that the data collected is of high quality and that participants represent the desired sample population (e.g., customer service employees).3

To ensure quality and appropriateness of the sample, first, a prescreen was administered to ensure that the workers were in fact currently employed in customer service.

---

3 SIOP has also reviewed the appropriateness of MTurk for I/O research and found it to be a quality recruitment source. [http://www.siop.org/tip/oct11/03barger.aspx](http://www.siop.org/tip/oct11/03barger.aspx)
service. Details on the questions asked can be found below. In total, 335 participants took the prescreen and the majority met the requirements (see below) to move forward in the survey process (309). Of these 309, 196 (63.4%) took the next survey, which measured baseline CCBIs, stressors, and strain along with individual differences. Again, the majority of these individuals were invited to start the daily measures, aside from five individuals who elected to opt out of future surveys (leaving 191 in the pool). Of these 191, 137 individuals took the first daily measure (71.7%), 105 continued to the second daily measure, 89 to the third, 81 to the fourth, and 77 completed all of the surveys. These 77 employees represent 24.9% of the total 309 individuals who were eligible to complete the series, though the dropout rate between each individual survey was smaller.

The 77 participants who completed the entire series were mostly male (61%), between 21-30 years of age (48.4%) and Caucasian (75.3%). They did not differ significantly on these demographic variables from the participants who started, but did not complete, the series. The 77 participants worked mostly in retail (31.8%) and inbound call centers (27.3%), tended to work full time (31-40 hours/week – 37.7%; 40+ hours/week – 35.1%) and had been employed with their organization for more than 1 year (81.8%). Again, the participants who completed all surveys did not differ significantly from those who dropped out on these work characteristics variables.

Procedure

First, a ‘job’ for the prescreen was created and listed on Amazon’s Mturk. The posting required participants to be located in the United States, have a prior approval rate
of 80% or higher on their previous work, and have completed at least 100 jobs in the past. Similar standards are recommended by Barger and colleagues (n.d.) and Berkinsky and colleagues (2012) to ensure quality data. In the directions, it was also specified that workers be employed in customer service. Since there is no official way to enforce this qualification, the prescreen was used to ensure that participants really were employed in customer service by asking them information about their current employment, industry, portion of role that interfaces with customers, and directly, whether they perceive their role to be one of customer service. As indicated above, 26 workers were filtered out based on the information collected in the prescreen (e.g., marked that they did not consider their job to be customer service). The prescreen also measured Big 5 personality, trait affect, and demographics. These were collected in the prescreen to help determine if participants that dropped out or did not qualify were different in their person variables than those who continued on with the survey process.

Participants who passed the prescreen were sent an email invitation to complete the next measure, which collected baseline information on CCBIs, CCBOs, stressors, well-being, and interest in completing additional studies. All but five participants, who voluntarily opted out of the study (they were asked whether they wanted to take more surveys or not), were sent email invitations to begin the daily measures portion of the study.

The daily waves collected information on frequency of CCBIs, stressors, and well-being during the participant’s last shift at work. The daily measures also collected shift

---

4 Location and prior MTurk work history are tracked and recorded by Amazon to be used as filters for ‘employers’ posting jobs to the site.
information, such as general busyness and length. When participants were emailed invitations to take the first daily measure, they were asked to take the survey as shortly after their last shift as possible to decrease memory errors and biases. Most of participants complied, taking the survey within 4 hours (46.5%) or 8 hours (58.2%, cumulative) of their prior shift. After participants completed the first daily measure, they were sent the invitation to the second, and so on until they had completed each of the measures. If participants went longer than seven days without completing the next measure in the series, they were sent an additional reminder to move forward in the study.

Participants were paid for their time. Pay was commensurate with the length and commitment required for each survey. Specifically, the short prescreen survey paid $.25, the longer baseline $.75, and the daily measures were $.20, $.25, $.30, $.35, and $.40, respectively. Participants were also paid a $.25 bonus for completing all of the surveys (which was advertised in each of the invitation emails). In total, participants completing all of the surveys were paid $2.70 for their time. The average hourly wage for Mturk work is $1.40 (Jacquet, 2011), so $2.70 for 35 minutes work ($4.63/hour) is above average for Mturk. Berinsky’s (2012) research on Mturk use notes that higher pay rates lead to faster survey completion (i.e., more people take the survey in a shorter amount of time, meaning you can complete the survey in a few days vs. a few weeks). Further, Mturk has been touted by researchers for providing qualitatively similar data to in-person studies, but doing so at much smaller costs (Berinsky et al., 2012; Jacquet, 2011).
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METHODS: VALIDATION PORTION OF STUDY 2

A summary of all measure descriptive statistics can be found in Table 4.

Prescreen

The information collected in the prescreen survey consisted of work details, personality, and demographics. Participants reported on the industry in which they worked (retail, food/beverage, hair/nail, automotive, inbound call center, healthcare, childcare, or other), whether they considered their job to be customer service or not (Yes/No), work hours, portion of role that is customer facing, average length of interaction, portion of customers who are repeat, and tenure (all measured on the same scale as the work variables in study 1). As indicated above, most participants worked in retail and inbound call centers, were full time, and had been with their organizations for greater than one year. More than half reported working in roles where 80% or more of their time was customer-facing (55.9%). Average interaction times with customers were mostly 1-5 minutes (41.6%) and 6-30 minutes (41.6%). There was substantial variability in the portion of repeat customers, with 41-50% repeat (16.9%) and 21-30% repeat (15.6%) receiving the highest endorsements. There were not significant differences on these work characteristics between the portion of the sample that completed the entire series and those who dropped out.

The prescreen also measured positive and negative affect; the scale developed by Watson and colleagues (1988) was used. The scale has 10-items for each PA and NA (20-
items total). Participants were instructed to use the 5-point extent scale (1 = very slightly or not at all; 5 = extremely) to rate the items according to how they generally feel to assess trait, rather than state, affect.

Both of the scales showed good reliability. In the customer sample, NA had a reliability of .94 (M = 1.69, SD = .78) and PA had a reliability of .92 (M = 3.33, SD = .82). The portion of the sample that did not complete all of the studies scored significantly higher on NA than did the sample that completed all measures (t = 2.38, p < .05). There were no group differences on PA.

Finally, demographics (age, gender, ethnicity) were collected using the same scales as study one. As described above, the sample was mostly 21-30 years of age, male, and Caucasian.

Baseline

The baseline study, as the name indicates, collected baseline or ‘in general’ information on CCBIs, OCBIs, stressors, and well-being.

CCBs. First, participants were presented with the CCBI items from study 1. Since five items were dropped using EFA in study 1, those items were not repeated on this study, leaving 24 items to measure CCBI. The same 7-point frequency scale (1 = Never “0% of interactions; 7 = Always “100% of interactions”) was used as in the first study. Since part of the goal of this study is to confirm the factors found in study 1, reliabilities and descriptives will be reported after the CFA analysis.
Citizenship from colleagues (OCBI). As in study 1, frequency of receiving citizenship behaviors from colleagues was collected to examine research question 3. The same seven items from Williams and Anderson’s (1991) OCBI scale were used and participants marked frequency using a 7-point frequency scale (1= Never, 7= Always). The measure showed good reliability (α = .87, M = 4.04, SD = 1.17) and differed by sample. Participants who dropped out of the study reported significantly higher rates of OCBIs from others than did participants who completed the entire series (t = 2.65, p<.01).

Stressors. Task-related stressors were measured using an 8-item role conflict measure from Rizzo, House, and Lirtzman (1970) and a 3-item role overload measure by Beehr, Walsh, and Taber (1976), as used in study 1. All eleven items were assessed using a 7-point agreement scale (1 = strongly disagree; 7 = strongly agree) where participants were asked to mark how strongly they agreed each statement described their work conditions. The role conflict scale demonstrated good reliability (α = .89, M = 3.64, SD = 1.45), but the reliability of the role overload scale was slightly less reliable than ideal (α = .63, M = 3.68, SD = 1.42).

Emotional Exhaustion. The same two items used to measure emotional exhaustion in study 1 were used again here (Teuchmann 1999). A 7-point scale (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree) was used by participants to mark their agreement with each of the items. The emotional exhaustion scale demonstrated good reliability (α = .91, M = 2.77, SD = 1.34) and there were no differences between participants who completed all of the surveys and those who did not.
**Organization-based self-esteem.** A second well-being indicator, organizational-based self-esteem was measured using nine items from Pierce and colleagues (1989) scale. A 7-point agreement scale (1 = strongly disagree; 7 = strongly agree) was used by participants to mark how much they dis/agreed the statements described them (e.g., "I am important around here"). The OBSE scale demonstrated good reliability ($\alpha = .93$, $M = 5.41$, $SD = 1.07$) and did not yield any differences between those who completed all surveys and those who dropped out.

**Job satisfaction.** The third and final well-being indicator measured was job satisfaction. Job satisfaction was measured with three items (Price & Mueller, 1981) on the same 7-point agreement scale used for OBSE. The scale was reliable ($\alpha = .94$, $M = 4.46$, $SD = 1.60$) and did not yield differences between participants who dropped out and those who did not.
RESULTS: VALIDATION PORTION OF STUDY 2

CFA of CCBI items: Research Question 1

The factor solution obtained by EFA in study 1 was tested using CFA. Due to its size ($N = 196$), the baseline sample was used for the CFA. The first model tested was one in which all of the CCBI items loaded onto one common (method) factor. This model showed poor fit to the data and modification indices also indicated that the items advocacy 1 and 3, social support 3, and sportsmanship 4 had high error covariances. These items were dropped and the model was re-fit. Again, the one factor model showed poor fit ($\chi^2 = 949.39$, $RMSEA = .15$, $CFI = .55$, $TLI = .50$). A second nested model was fit next, where the ‘task-oriented’ CCBI items of initiative and assumed employee role loaded onto one factor and the ‘interpersonally-oriented’ factors loaded onto a second. These factors were allowed to correlate. The model showed much better fit to the data, but was still not desirable ($\Delta \chi^2 = 336.43(1)$, $RMSEA = .12$, $CFI = .75$, $TLI = .71$). Finally, a third model (nested) was fit where each of the CCBI items loaded onto their predicted dimensions and these dimension factors were allowed to correlate. The model showed much better fit ($\Delta \chi^2 = 312.25(9)$, $RMSEA = .07$, $CFI = .92$, $TLI = .90$). Although these fit indices are lower than recommended (Marsh, Balla, & McDonald, 1988), modification indices suggest that fit would only be improved by adding theoretically unpredicted paths (e.g., item error covariances), thus this will be accepted as the best fitting model.

Construct Validity Analysis: Research Question 2
Upon the modifications suggested in the CFA the properties of the five CCBI scales were explored. The advocacy ($\alpha = .87, M = 4.32, SD = 1.24$), initiative ($\alpha = .79, M = 3.22, SD = .98$), sportsmanship ($\alpha = .73, M = 3.82, SD = 1.07$), assumed employee role ($\alpha = .82, M = 2.90, SD = 1.07$), and courtesy ($\alpha = .82, M = 5.03, SD = 1.13$) scales demonstrated good reliability after the item reduction from the CFA.

First, CCBI dimensions were correlated with the prescreen (affect) measures. PA was positively correlated with advocacy ($r = .44, p<.01$), initiative ($r = .29, p<.01$) and courtesy ($r = .28, p<.01$). NA was positively related to initiative ($r = .17, p<.05$) and assumed employee role ($r = .21, p<.01$) and negatively related to courtesy ($r = -.18, p<.05$). It is possible that employees with high PA/NA are more likely to perceive certain customer behaviors, or, that customers engage in CCBIs differently towards employees that have high PA or high NA.

**Construct Validity Analysis: Research Question 3**

Research question 3 explores the relationship between CCBI and OCBI from colleagues. As in study 1, there were moderate correlations between the CCBI scales and OCBIs from others ($r = .27-.35$), confirming that while sources of citizenship are related, they are not the same. As in study 1, research question 3 is answered by concluding that CCBI and OCBI are moderately related.

**Similarity to other Citizenship and Helping Behaviors: Research Question 4**

Differences were explored by sex and ethnicity. No ethnicity differences were found, but male employees reported more frequent initiative behaviors ($t = 2.40, p<.05$) and
assumed employee role ($t = 2.65, p<.01$) than did female employees. Female employees reported more courtesy behaviors though ($t = -3.13, p<.01$). In the first study, it was male customers and female customers that reported higher initiative and courtesy, respectively. Female employees in the first study reported more assumed employee role, which is the opposite of what is found here.

Correlations were explored for age, average hours, portion of role that is customer facing, average length of interaction, portion of customers who are repeat and tenure. Age and tenure were positively correlated with both advocacy ($r = .27, p<.01; r = .29, p<.01$, respectively) and courtesy ($r = .20, p<.01, r = .19, p<.01$, respectively). These results are both unique from study 1. Portion of repeat customers was positively associated with initiative ($r = .17, p<.05$), assumed employee role ($r = .21, p<.01$), and courtesy ($r = .19, p<.01$). Both initiative and assumed employee role were associated with repeat patronage in study 1. Finally, hours worked per week was negatively associated with sportsmanship ($r = -.21, p<.01$) and portion of role customer facing was positively associated with courtesy ($r = .15, p<.05$). Both of these results replicate the findings in study 1.

**Predictive/Criterion Validity Analysis: Hypotheses 1a, 1b, and 2**

Next, correlations between CCBIs and stressors and well-being were explored (as seen in Table 9). Initiative was moderately correlated with role conflict ($r = .25, p<.01$) and role overload ($r = .15, p<.05$), which is consistent with the first study. Unlike the first study though, sportsmanship and courtesy did not have negative correlations with the stressors, indicating sample differences in this regard.
As in study 1, sportsmanship ($r = -.17, p<.05$) and courtesy ($r = -.30, p<.01$) were negatively related to emotional exhaustion. In study 2, advocacy ($r = -.25, p<.01$) was also negatively associated with emotional exhaustion. Of the three remaining well-being indicators new to study 2, courtesy and advocacy had the strongest relationships, while assumed employee role had the weakest. Specifically, courtesy and advocacy were positively related to organization-based self-esteem ($r = .48, p<.01; r = .36, p<.01$, respectively) and job satisfaction ($r = .42, p<.05; r = .2, p<.01$, respectively). Assumed employee role was only significantly related (positively) to job satisfaction ($r = .35, p<.01$). This shows preliminary evidence for the link between CCBIs and employee well-being, but further testing was done using regression.

Using regression, control variables (OCBIs from colleagues, NA) were entered in the first step. Then, CCBIs were entered as a second step. These models were run with emotional exhaustion, organizational-based self-esteem, and job satisfaction as outcomes.

For emotional exhaustion, the overall step was significant ($\Delta R^2 = .04, p<.05$) and assumed employee role was marginally negatively related to exhaustion ($B = -.20, p<.10$), as seen in Table 9. For organization-based self-esteem, the CCBI step did not add incremental variance explained. Finally, for job satisfaction, the CCBI step was significant ($\Delta R^2 = .09, p<.01$) and assumed employee role was again related to the outcome ($B = .35, p<.05$).

As in study 1, role overload and role conflict were also used as outcomes. For role overload, CCBIs added incremental variance explained ($\Delta R^2 = .06, p<.05$) and initiative was
significantly positively related to role overload ($B = .35$, $p<.05$). For role conflict, the CCBI step was again significant ($\Delta R^2 = .06$, $p<.05$) and initiative was again significantly positively related to the outcome ($B = .45$, $p<.01$). These are similar to the regression results of study 1, which also found initiative to increase the perception of role stressors. Overall, there is some support that CCBIs add incremental validity to other well-being predictors, particularly the CCBI of assumed employee role.
Table 10.
Regression of CCBIs on Employee Well-being in Study 2 Baseline Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Variable</th>
<th>Model Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Adj R^2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>OCBI from others</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhaustion</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>-.70*</td>
<td>-.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sportsmanship</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>-.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assume</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Courtesy</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stressors, well-being, and OCBI from Colleagues</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OCBI from others</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role Conflict</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role Overload</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emotional Exhaust</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OrgSE</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TJ</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.
Correlations in baseline sample, study 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCBIs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Advocacy</td>
<td></td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Initiative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sportsmanship</td>
<td></td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Assume</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Courtesy</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. OCBI from others</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Role Conflict</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Role Overload</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Emotional Exhaust</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. OrgSE</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. TJ</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>.62**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<.01, *p<.05, †p<.10
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assumed employee role</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>.35*</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Courtesy</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.09**</td>
<td>.06*</td>
<td>.06*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<.01, *p<.05, †p<.10
Chapter 8

MEASURES: DIARY PORTION OF STUDY 2

Similar, but shorter measures were used for the five daily measures, as summarized in Table 4. Information was collected from participants on the characteristics of their prior work shift, CCBIs, stressors (workload, customer aggression), and well-being outcomes (physical stress symptoms, emotional exhaustion, work self-efficacy, and job satisfaction).

**Shift Characteristics**

Participants reported how busy (slow, relatively slow, average, relatively busy, or busy) and long (ranging from less than 4 hours to more than 10 hours) their last shift was. Across all measures, shifts were reported to be of average busyness and between 7-8 hours in length.

**CCBIs**

The same CCBI scale on the baseline measure was used, except the directions were modified to ask about their occurrence within the last shift ("consider interactions you have had with customers during your last shift"). The same 7-point frequency scale (1 = never, 7 = always) was used as before.

**Stressors**

The stressors measured at the daily level were workload and customer aggression. Workload was measured using 8 items from Jansen (2001). Participants used a 7-point agreement scale to mark how much they had experienced each item (e.g., "I had to work too fast") during their last shift. Across shifts, the workload scale demonstrated good reliability.
(\(\alpha = .94, M = 3.27, SD = 1.46\)). Customer aggression used the same measure from study 1, on the same 7-point frequency scale. Across shifts, it yielded good reliability (\(\alpha = .90, M = 1.95, SD = 1.03\)).

**Well-being Outcomes**

First, physical symptoms of stress were measured using a scale developed by Larson and Kasimatis (1991) and used in other research (Almedia, Wethington, & Kessler, 2002). The 15-items were rated on a 5-point frequency scale (1 = none, 5 = all of the time), allowing participants to mark how often they experienced each symptom on their previous shift. The scale assesses different types of stress symptoms: depression, aches and pains, gastrointestinal disturbances, and upper respiratory ailments. Although these symptoms should yield different factors, an EFA indicates that all of the 15 items best fit onto one dimension. That single dimension, physical symptoms, demonstrated good reliability (\(\alpha = .92, M = 1.55, SD = .63\)).

As recommended by Teuchmann (1999), two-items were used from Mashlach and Jackson’s (1981) emotional exhaustion scale to assess strain (“I felt emotionally drained from my work” and “I felt burned out from my work”). Participants used a 7-point agreement scale to mark how true they felt each statement was after completing their last shift. The scale had good reliability (\(\alpha = .91, M = 3.49, SD = 1.73\)).

Work self-efficacy was measured using three items from Wang (2002) on a 7-point agreement scale. Participants rated items such as, “I felt very capable at providing
customer service," based on their feelings during the prior shift. The scale demonstrated acceptable reliability ($\alpha = .93, M = 5.88, SD = .97$).

Finally, job satisfaction was measured with the same three items (Price & Mueller, 1981) on the same 7-point agreement scale used in the baseline measure. For the daily measure though the instructors were changed such that participants rated the items in accordance to how they felt about their job, after completing their last shift. The scale was reliable ($\alpha = .93, M = 4.36, SD = 1.48$) and did not yield differences between participants who dropped out and those who did not.
Chapter 9

RESULTS: DIARY PORTION OF STUDY 2

A correlation table of the between-person correlations of each of the study variables is given in Table 11. The data collected from the daily portion of the study will be used to answer research questions 1-6, exploring how and when CCBI is related to employee well-being. Testing these hypotheses using daily data allows for changes over time to be tracked, baseline measures to be accounted for, and individuals serve as their own controls, reducing the need to capture a variety of individual differences, such as personality, to help rule out individual quirks explaining the results of the analyses (Bolger, Davis, & Rafaeli, 2003).

Since the daily measures are nested within person, multi-level mixed modeling in Stata was used to account for the lack of independence in the data. To determine the extent to which the daily well-being outcomes varied based on the higher order level (individual employees), null models were used to calculate ICCs. 50.2% of the variance in emotional exhaustion, 59.45% of the variance in self-efficacy, 71.2% of the variance in job satisfaction, and 82.9% of the variance in physical symptoms was explained by the person-level, justifying the use of multi-level modeling to analyze the data. Next, each of the daily measures used were centered around the group-mean. That is, each daily scale was centered around the mean of all measurements for said scale, per individual, as suggested by Rabe-Hesketh and Skrondal (2006).

5 By entering just the outcome and specifying the higher order level (person), the variance accounted for by said higher order level can be partitioned from the overall variance.
Next, control variables were entered into the model for each dependent variable (employee well-being). The controls at both the person-level and daily-level were entered in each model. Person-level controls consisted of OCBIS from others and baseline measure of the dependent variable (e.g., baseline emotional exhaustion for emotional exhaustion, baseline organization-based self-esteem for work self-efficacy). Controlling for baseline measures of the dependent variables allows for a more robust test of the daily level within person changes in well-being that occur as a result of daily CCBIs and is common in other daily design studies (Ouweneel, Le Blanc, Schaufeli, & van Wijhe, 2012; Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Heuven, Demerouti & Schaufeli, 2008). Daily controls included busyness, customer aggression, workload, and shift length. Next, CCBIs were entered, one at a time to avoid issues of collinearity, and finally, interactions between CCBIs and customer aggression, as well as CCBIs and busyness, were entered to test hypotheses 3-6. Each step was also tested for log likelihood change, which is a fit statistic that helps determine the significance of the overall step. Due the number of models, only significant results will be reported. A summary of the significant interactions found can be seen in Table 12.

Hypothesis 1a, 1b, and 2

---

6 These variables were picked for a combination of statistical and theoretical reasons. Statistically, control variables with the strongest significant relationship to the outcome were picked. Theoretically, baseline measures of the daily measures in the model were controlled for, as well as busyness and customer aggression since these will be entered as interactions later in the process.

7 When all CCBIs are entered in one step, courtesy is the only significant predictor of emotional exhaustion and work self-efficacy, courtesy and initiative predict job satisfaction, and no CCBIs have a direct effect on physical symptoms.

8 Eleven of the possible forty interactions (Five CCBIs x 2 moderators x 4 outcomes) were found to be statistically significant.
Both portions of the first hypothesis and the second hypothesis predict direct relationships between the CCBI dimensions and employee well-being. The second hypothesis states in particular though, that interpersonally-focused CCBI (advocacy, courtesy, and sportsmanship) will have stronger positive relationships with employee well-being than will task-focused CCBI. In total, there were 7 direct effects between CCBI and employee well-being: courtesy on emotional exhaustion (coefficient = -.21, p<.01, log likelihood $\Delta \chi^2 = 11.23(1)$, $p<.01$), work self-efficacy (coefficient = .12, $p<.01$, log likelihood $\Delta \chi^2 = 8.82$, $p<.01$), and job satisfaction (coefficient = .11, $p<.05$, log likelihood $\Delta \chi^2 = 5.30$, $p<.05$), advocacy on work self-efficacy (coefficient = .10, $p<.01$, log likelihood $\Delta \chi^2 = 7.42(1)$, $p<.01$), initiative on work self-efficacy (coefficient = .14, $p<.05$, log likelihood $\Delta \chi^2 = 6.29(1)$, $p<.05$), and job satisfaction (coefficient = .20, $p<.01$, log likelihood $\Delta \chi^2 = 7.64$, $p<.01$), and sportsmanship on physical symptoms (coefficient = .03, $p<.05$, log likelihood $\Delta \chi^2 = 4.25$, $p<.05$). A table of the model testing the effect of courtesy on emotional exhaustion is given as an example (see Table 13)\(^9\). Overall, the results provide support that CCBI are related to well-being and significantly so above other predictors (supports hypothesis 1a and 1b).

Of these direct effects, five were from the interpersonally-focused CCBI (three courtesy, one advocacy, one sportsmanship) and two were from the task-focused CCBI bucket (both initiative). That there were more direct effects for the interpersonally categorized CCBI supports hypothesis 2 in that there were more positive effects for the interpersonally-focused CCBI. However, the effect of sportsmanship on physical

---

\(^9\) Only this table is included in the tables section, as an example. All other tables are available upon request. Crucial information from each table will be reported in text.
symptoms is actually positive, meaning sportsmanship is detrimental to well-being in this regard. So all though, there were more effects found for the interpersonally-focused CCBIs, not all of these effects were in the predicted direction. Thus, hypothesis 2 receives mixed support.

**Hypothesis 3**

Hypothesis 3 predicted that under high customer aggression, CCBIs would have a stronger positive relationship to employee well-being than under low aggression. Customer aggression was found to moderate the effect of the following CCBIs on the following outcomes: assumed employee role on self-efficacy (coefficient = -.45, p<.01, log likelihood Δχ² for step = 14.03(2), p<.01), job satisfaction (coefficient = .40, p<.05, log likelihood Δχ² = 9.4(2), p<.01), and physical symptoms (coefficient = .15, p<.05, log likelihood Δχ² = 7.13(2), p<.05), courtesy on self-efficacy (coefficient = -.34, p<.01, log likelihood Δχ² = 12.28(2), p<.01), advocacy on job satisfaction (coefficient = .23, p<.05, log likelihood Δχ² = 13.09(2), p<.01), and initiative on job satisfaction (coefficient = .43, p<.01; log likelihood Δχ² = 7.62(2), p<.05). The interactions were plotted using Preacher and colleagues’ (2006) online tool, which not only plots the interaction, but tests for slope significance as well.

In contrast to hypothesis 3, the relationship between assumed employee role and work self-efficacy is negative when customer aggression is high (B = -.20, t = -2.29, p<.05), and positive when it is low (B = .16, t = 2.19, p<.05), as seen in Figure 2. This is the opposite of the hypothesis which predicts that the effect would be more positive under high
customer aggression, not low. The relationship between assumed employee role and job satisfaction is positive when aggression is high ($B = .22$, $t = 2.13$, $p < .05$), and null when it is low, as seen in Figure 3. This result supports hypothesis 3 which predicts a more positive effect of CCBI on well-being under high customer aggression. Finally, although the relationship between assumed employee role and physical symptoms is stronger under high customer aggression, as predicted, the effect is positive, ($B = .10$, $t = 2.87$, $p < .01$), whereas it was expected that the CCBI would decrease physical symptoms (since a decrease in symptoms means less of a negative impact on well-being). The impact of assumed employee role is null under low aggression, as seen in Figure 4.

Courtesies has a positive main effect on work self-efficacy (coefficient = .12, $p < .01$, log likelihood $\Delta \chi^2 = 8.81(1)$, $p < .01$), that is qualified by an interaction with customer aggression (coefficient = -.34, $p < .01$, log likelihood $\Delta \chi^2 = 12.28(2)$, $p < .01$). As seen in Figure 5, there is a significant positive relationship between courtesy and work self-efficacy when customer aggression is low ($B = .25$, $t = 4.523$, $p < .01$), that is dampened (null) when customer aggression is high. This is in contrast to hypothesis 3, which predicts the opposite.

Although no main effect for daily advocacy (coefficient = .04, $p = n.s.$) was found, it interacted with customer aggression in predicting daily job satisfaction. There is a significant positive effect of advocacy on job satisfaction ($B = .15$, $t = 2.26$, $p < .05$) when customer aggression is high, and a null effect when it is low as seen in Figure 6. This
supports the hypothesis (H3) because the effect is more positive under high aggression than low.

Finally, initiative has a positive main effect on employee job satisfaction (coefficient = .20, \(p < .01\), log likelihood \(\Delta \chi^2 = 7.64(1), p < .01\), which is qualified by an interaction with customer aggression. The relationship is positive under high customer aggression (\(B = .37, \ t = 3.91, p < .01\)), and null under low customer aggression, as seen in Figure 7 and in support of hypothesis 3.

In total, half of the interactions found supported the hypothesis, and half were in the opposite direction.

**Hypothesis 4**

The fourth hypothesis predicts that the moderating effects of emotional context (customer aggression) will be more stronger (larger slope) and more frequent (larger number of significant interactions) for interpersonally-focused CCBIs (sportsmanship, advocacy, and courtesy) than task-focused CCBIs (initiative and assumed employee role) because there will be a closer match between the resource and the stressor (de Jonge & Dormann, 2003; 2006). Of the interactions that supported the hypothesis (more positive relationship between CCBI and well-being under high aggression), two where task-focused CCBIs (initiative and assumed employee role) and one was interpersonally-focused (advocacy), which is in contrast to the resource-matching prediction.

**Hypothesis 5**
Hypothesis 5 predicts that busyness will moderate the effect of CCBIs on employee well-being such that high busyness will be distracting (Baumeister et al., 2007) and thus dampen the positive effect of CCBIs on well-being. There were five cases where busyness was found to be a moderator of the effect of CCBI on well-being: courtesy on emotional exhaustion (coefficient = -.25, p<.01, log likelihood ∆χ² = 7.36, p<.05), job satisfaction (coefficient = .34, p<.01, log likelihood ∆χ² = 24.98(2), p<.01), and physical symptoms (coefficient = -.07, p<.01 log likelihood ∆χ² = 10.13(2), p<.01), assumed employee role on work self-efficacy (coefficient = .16, p<.05, log likelihood ∆χ² = 14.03(2), p<.01), and advocacy on job satisfaction (coefficient = .20, p<.01, log likelihood ∆χ² = 13.09(2), p<.01).

Daily-level courtesy was negatively related to daily-level exhaustion and the step also showed improvement in model fit statistics (log likelihood ∆χ²= 11.13, p<.01). In model 3, it can be seen that the interaction between busyness and courtesy is significant, as is the overall step (log likelihood ∆χ² = 7.36, p<.05). In contrast to hypothesis 5, which predicts a stronger negative relationship between CCBI and emotional exhaustion during low busyness as compared to high, the relationship between courtesy and emotional exhaustion is null (B = -.008, t = -.07, p = n.s.) when busyness is low and negative when busyness is high (B = -.41, t = -4.36, p<.01), as seen in Figure 8.

Courtesy also has a significant positive main effect on job satisfaction (coefficient = .11, p<.05, log likelihood ∆χ²= 5.30(1), p<.05) that is qualified by an interaction with busyness. As seen in Figure 9, the relationship between courtesy and job satisfaction is
negative, but nonsignificant when busyness is low and significantly positive when it is high
\((B = .37, t = 1.98, p<.05)\). This is the opposite of what hypothesis 5 predicts.

Additionally, courtesy has a positive effect on physical symptoms when busyness is
low \((B = .07, t = 2.63, p<.01)\) and a negative effect when busyness is high \((B = -.05, t = -2.42, p<.05, \log \text{likelihood } \Delta \chi^2 = 10.13(2), p<.01)\), in contrast to hypothesis 5. This interaction can
be seen in Figure 10.

Assumed employee role interacted with busyness in predicting work self-efficacy
but it did not have a direct effect on work self-efficacy\(^{10}\). In contrast to hypothesis 5 (which
predicts a weaker positive effect on well-being when the store is busy), the relationship
between assumed employee role and self-efficacy is negative under low busyness \((B = -.15, t = -1.75, p<.10); the positive slope for high busyness does not reach significance \((B = .11, t = 1.38, p = \text{n.s.})\) as seen in Figure 11.

Similarly, no main effect for daily advocacy (coefficient = .04, \(p=\text{n.s.}\)) was found on
job satisfaction, but it also interacted with busyness (coefficient = .20, \(p<.01)\)\(^{11}\) in
predicting daily job satisfaction. Figure 12 shows that advocacy is positively related to job
satisfaction when busyness is high \((B = .22, t = 3.16, p<.01)\), and the negative slope does not
reach significance when it is low. This is again in contrast to hypothesis 5, which predicts a
weaker (less positive) effect for high busyness.

\(^{10}\) Since advocacy also interacted with customer aggression in predicting work self-efficacy, The
three-way interaction between assumed employee role, busyness, and customer aggression was
tested. It was found to be nonsignificant.

\(^{11}\) Assumed employee role also had interactions with both moderators in predicting work self-
efficacy. Again, the three way interaction is nonsignificant.
Hypothesis 6

The final hypothesis predicted that there would be stronger and more frequent moderating effects found between busyness and task-focused CCBIs on employee well-being than person-focused CCBIs. Since the nature of the interactions was opposite of what predicted, it is hard to actually test the hypothesis. When comparing the quantity of interactions found, even though in the opposite direction, there were four moderating effects found between busyness and interpersonally-focused CCBIs (three for courtesy, one for advocacy) and only one (assumed employee role) for the task-focused CCBIs. This is the opposite of what is predicted by hypothesis 6, so this hypothesis is not supported.
Table 11

Correlations between daily measures (between individuals)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workload</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Aggression</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Symptoms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.01, *p<.05, *p<.10
Table 12. Summary of significant interactions found in diary study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCBI</th>
<th>Moderator</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Support H3?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assumed employee role</td>
<td>Customer aggression</td>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumed employee role</td>
<td>Customer aggression</td>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer role</td>
<td>Customer aggression</td>
<td>Physical Symptoms</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>Customer aggression</td>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>Customer aggression</td>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtesy</td>
<td>Busyness</td>
<td>Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtesy</td>
<td>Busyness</td>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtesy</td>
<td>Busyness</td>
<td>Physical Symptoms</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumed employee role</td>
<td>Busyness</td>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>Busyness</td>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13. Multi-level model results for the effect of customer courtesy on employee emotional exhaustion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 0</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coeff.   SE</td>
<td>Coeff.   SE</td>
<td>Coeff.   SE</td>
<td>Coeff.   SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>3.47 .12</td>
<td>1.08 .48</td>
<td>1.03 .47</td>
<td>1.04 .47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employee Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCBIS from others</td>
<td>.09 .08</td>
<td>.09 .08</td>
<td>.08 .08</td>
<td>.08 .08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline EE</td>
<td>.75** .07</td>
<td>.76** .07</td>
<td>.76** .07</td>
<td>.76** .07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busyness</td>
<td>.05 .07</td>
<td>.05 .07</td>
<td>.06 .07</td>
<td>.06 .07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload</td>
<td>.53** .07</td>
<td>.52** .07</td>
<td>.51** .07</td>
<td>.51** .07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shift length</td>
<td>.16** .05</td>
<td>.15** .05</td>
<td>.15** .05</td>
<td>.15** .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtesy daily</td>
<td>-2.3** .07</td>
<td>-2.1** .07</td>
<td>-2.1** .07</td>
<td>-2.1** .07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busyness*Courtesy</td>
<td>.25** .09</td>
<td>.25** .09</td>
<td>.25** .09</td>
<td>.25** .09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fit Statistics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviance</td>
<td>1743.02</td>
<td>1564.16</td>
<td>1512.46</td>
<td>1505.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIC</td>
<td>1749.00</td>
<td>1582.16</td>
<td>1532.45</td>
<td>1529.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIC</td>
<td>1761.5</td>
<td>1619.73</td>
<td>1573.89</td>
<td>1578.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LL Δχ²</td>
<td>11.23(1)**</td>
<td>7.37(2)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<.01, *p<.05
Figure 2. Daily customer aggression moderates the effect of daily assumed employee role on daily work self-efficacy\textsuperscript{12}

Figure 3. Daily customer aggression moderates the effect of daily assumed employee role on daily job satisfaction\textsuperscript{13}

\textsuperscript{12} Measured on a 1-7 scale. All work self-efficacy graphs depicted from 5-7.

\textsuperscript{13} Measured on a 1-7 scale. All job satisfaction graphs depicted from 3-5.
Figure 4. Daily customer aggression moderates the effect of daily assumed employee role on daily physical symptoms.

Figure 5. Daily customer aggression moderates the effect of daily courtesy on daily self-efficacy.

14 Measured on a 1-5 scale. All physical symptoms graphs depicted from 1-2.5.
Figure 6. Daily customer aggression moderates the effect of daily advocacy on daily job satisfaction

Figure 7. Daily customer aggression moderates the effect of daily initiative on daily job satisfaction
Figure 8. Daily busyness moderates the effect of daily courtesy on daily emotional exhaustion.

Figure 9. Daily busyness moderates the effect of daily courtesy on daily job satisfaction.

15 Measured on a 1-7 scale. All emotional exhaustion graphs depicted from 2-5.
Figure 10. Daily busyness moderates the effect of daily courtesy on daily physical symptoms

Figure 11. Daily busyness moderates the effect of daily assumed employee role on daily self-efficacy
Figure 12. Daily busyness moderates the effect of daily advocacy on daily job satisfaction
Validity Portion of Study 2

Study 2 provided additional validity evidence for the CCBI measure created in study 1. Specifically, the factors from study 1 were confirmed in study 2, with some slight modification, and the CCBI scale was found to have fairly consistent relationships with individual differences, work factors, OCBIs from colleagues, and stressors. In addition, CCBIs were found to add incremental variance explained to two of the five well-being dimensions measured in the baseline.

Overall, the analysis of the baseline data provides similar answers to research questions 1, 2, and 3 as study 1. Replicating validity results with a different sample is one of the strengths of this study (Pedhauzer & Schmelkin, 1991). Specifically, the five factors of CCBO found in study 1 were replicated in study 2, with some slight item reduction; however, these five dimensions do not appear to function as higher order task- and person-focused CCBIs as predicted.

CCBIs were again found to correlate with personality (affect) and citizenship from colleagues (OCBIs), but not at extremely high rates so as to hint that they are overlapping constructs. Additionally, CCBIs were found to function across gender and customer relationship status in ways similar to study 1.

Additionally, advocacy and courtesy had strong and consistent correlations with the well-being measures (burnout, organizational-based self-esteem, and job satisfaction), supporting hypothesis 1. Each of the CCBI dimensions though had at least one significant correlation with employee well-being. Incremental validity of CCBIs in predicting well-
being was also demonstrated through regression (hypothesis 1b, though this was tested more extensively in the diary portion of the study.

**Daily Diary Portion of Study**

Courtesy was the single best CCBI predictor of employee well-being in the daily portion of the study as it had main effects on emotional exhaustion, self-efficacy, and job satisfaction. Advocacy and sportsmanship were the least predictive of employee well-being with only one main effect each (advocacy on self-efficacy and sportsmanship on physical symptoms) and one interaction each.

In regards to the hypotheses, hypothesis 1b predicted CCBIs would add incremental validity in explaining employee well-being, which was demonstrated more clearly and effectively in this portion of study 2 than in the other analyses. Hypothesis 2 predicted that CCBIs with more of a person-focus (courtesy, social support, advocacy, and sportsmanship) would be more strongly related to CCBIIs than would the task-focused group (consultancy and assumed employee role). Consultancy and social support were combined into the dimension, 'initiative,' which will be classified as 'task-focused' for the purpose of this analysis (since it contained more consultancy items than social support). With that modification, there is mixed support for hypothesis 2.

Although assumed employee role had no direct effects on employee well-being and courtesy had 3, the task-focused dimension of initiative had 2 main effects, and the person-focused dimensions of advocacy and sportsmanship only had one. So although the
strongest link between CCBIs and well-being was indeed for a person-focused CCBI and the weakest was for a task-focused CCBI, the rest of the dimensions don’t quite follow in line.

Retrospectively, the task vs. interpersonally-focused distinction may not make the most sense in describing the categories of CCBI. It’s possible that because courtesy was rated as one of the most in-role CCBIs (along with sportsmanship) that its effects are different than the more extra-role CCBIs (advocacy, assumed employee role, and initiative). In fact, of the direct effects, courtesy (in-role) had the most and the extra-role CCBIs (advocacy, assumed employee role, initiative) had the least. Courtesy, along with assumed employee role, also had the most interactive effects on well-being. Unlike assumed employee role (most interactions with customer aggression), the interactions that were significant for courtesy tended to be mostly with busyness.

In hypothesis 3, customer aggression was predicted to strengthen the positive relationship between CCBIs and employee well-being because it would create a ‘need’ for stress relief by restoring depleted resources. Based on prior evidence and COR (Gross et al, 2011, Hobfoll, 1989), it was thought that negative customers would create loss spiral of resources in service employees, and that CCBIs would create ‘relief’ to stop and even replenish said loss spiral. Fredrickson’s (1998) work too on positive events shows that positive events do indeed facilitate the recovery of resources from negative events. This hypothesis was partially supported by the data; half the cases found more a more positive relationship between CCBI and well-being under high aggression (assumed employee role on job satisfaction, advocacy on job satisfaction, and initiative on job satisfaction), the other
half found more positive associations under low customer aggression (assumed employee role on self-efficacy, assumed employee role on physical symptoms, and courtesy on self-efficacy). Of the interactions that worked as predicted (stronger relationship under high customer aggression), the outcome was always job satisfaction.

Although predictions were made drawing from COR theory, one explanation in why this theory did not perfectly predict the results is that the assumption was made that CCBIs would be perceived and utilized as a resource. As the prior evidence shows, when this is the case, positive events do have a positive impact on wellbeing, even in the context of negative events (Fredrickson, 1998); however, COR also provides information on why half of the interactions were the opposite of what was predicted. Specifically, in his 2001 paper, Hobfoll, explains that preliminary evidence suggests individuals who lack or are losing resources tend to react defensively to prevent further deterioration. There are only a few studies (cf. Wells, Hobfoll, & Lavin, 1999) that find this effect, but it is possible that the findings here corroborate their evidence. It’s unclear though what ‘defensive’ reactions would look like in this context, and the theory does not specify what defensive actions are, rather they have only been defined operationally in specific research studies (e.g., after losing a close relationship, not looking for a new relationship to prevent further potential hurt and loss).

Perhaps more easily applicable is the catch-22 of individuals who have few resources also tend to be more prone to loss spirals (Hobfoll, 2001). Again, despite evidence that does show resources can be regained following positive events (Fredrickson,
1998), perhaps the ‘positive events’ of CCBIs are simply too minor to stop a loss spiral. It’s also possible that amidst a loss spiral, employees feeling a threat to their resources and well-being would simply not pay attention to or interpret CCBIs as a ‘positive event’ (Baumeister et al., 2007).

Beyond COR, other paradigms suggest that customer mistreatment, as a specific stressor, may have long term implications. For example, Wang and colleagues (Wang, Liu, Liao, Gong, Kammery-Mueller, & Shi, 2013; Zhan, Wang, & Shi, 2013) recently found that customer mistreatment enhances rumination, which in turn increases negative affect on the day following high mistreatment. Given the information on rumination, it is possible that being preoccupied with prior mistreatment creates a long term effect and loss of resources, which is not easily regained by a few positive events. The rumination approach also explains why employees may be ‘distracted’ from positive customer behaviors following negative ones and either ignore, or misinterpret them. Indeed, research has supported the negative effects of customer mistreatment on cognition and perception (Rafaeli, Erez, Ravid, Derfler-Rozin, Treister, & Scheyer, 2012).

Hypothesis 4 predicted that of the interactions between CCBIs and customer aggression, the interactions for the interpersonally-focused CCBIs would be stronger and more frequent than those between customer aggression and task-focused CCBIs, due to resource matching (de Jong & Dormann, 2003; 2006). It was found that there were more interactions between task-focused CCBIs and customer aggression though. This suggests that at least under the specific circumstance of customers engaging in citizenship towards
employees, when employees have been exposed to other negative customers, that the type of resources (task vs. interpersonal), may not matter greatly. These results are only based on three interactions though, so it’s extremely hard to say whether resource matching is important or not without further study.

Although it appears customer aggression may be cognitively taxing and distracting some of the time, it was actually predicted that busyness would have this effect. Specifically, along with COR and other research showing the limited capacity of cognitive and attentional resources (Baumeister et al., 2007, Kane & Engle, 2003) and empirical evidence by Zohar and colleagues (2003) where positive events were less effective in enhancing wellbeing under conditions of high task demands, it was thought that busyness would be the cognitively taxing stressor and thus distract employees from perceiving and recognizing CCBIs as helpful. Indeed, in prior customer service research, busyness has led to decreased positive displays on the part of the employee (Grandey et al., 2006; Pugh, 2001; Rafaeli & Sutton, 1990), possibly due to distraction and limited resources to attend to task demands and emotional demands simultaneously. Thus, hypothesis 5 predicted that store busyness would dampen the positive effect of CCBIs on employee well-being.

The opposite was found in the interactions in this data whereby busyness actually made more positive the effect of CCBIs on employee well-being. Rather, it appears that the arguments made for customer aggression enhancing the effect of CCBIs on well-being would have been more appropriate for busyness (creates a need for resource recovery). The results for busyness are surprising in the context of the research on individuals’ ability to
notice events in their environment when experiencing stressors or depletion (Baumeister et al., 2007; Hobfoll, 1989; Kane & Engle, 2003). There are also consistent findings in the customer service literature concerning the negative impact of busyness, though this has largely focused on customer outcomes, such as customer satisfaction and service ratings (Grandey, et al., 2011), or an employee’s emotional display performance (Pugh, 2001; Rafaeli & Sutton, 1990).

All this considered, there is actually not a lot known about the potential benefits of store busyness for service employees. There is an assumption that busyness makes the emotional demands of their jobs more challenging, but it is possible that busyness can act as a challenge stressor (Podsakoff, LePine, & LePine, 2007). Since busyness may increase pressure to complete tasks, urgency, and/or workload, it would certainly qualify as a challenge stressor. In support of Podsakoff and colleagues’ (2007) work on challenge stressors and job attitudes, busyness was positively related to job satisfaction in the diary study, supporting its classification as a challenge stressor. If looked at this way then, busyness may actually enhance the impact of CCBI because the challenge stressor motivates engagement and performance, and citizenship from customers is a potential source of positive feedback that employees are rising to meet the challenge of their job demands (e.g., advocacy-type citizenship involves praising an employee’s good performance).

Busyness may also ascribe meaning to customer citizenship; it gives a contextual answer to why a customer would behave in a positive and helpful manner toward the
employee. Citizenship under high busyness must mean the employee is doing a good job and the customer notices. Under low busyness, context does not explain why customers are engaging in said positive and helpful behaviors and employees are left to find cause in the individual, potentially suspecting the customer’s motives. The social psychological phenomena of assigning situational or individual attributes of another’s behavior (cf. Kelley & Michela, 1980) would explain this understanding of why busyness may enhance the effect of CCBIs on employee well-being.

Thus, although some perspectives would argue that busyness is a hindrance stressor because it uses up resources (Baumeister et al., 2007; Hobfoll, 1989; Kane & Engle, 2003), it is also likely that busyness is a challenge stressor that promotes positive employee outcomes. Busyness may also help give meaning to CCBIs, such that under busyness, CCBIs may signal positive performance feedback, and thus enhance well-being, but under low busyness, may be less salient and/or useful.

Hypothesis 6 predicted that, based on resource-matching (de Jonge & Dormann, 2003; 2006), task-oriented CCBIs would have a consistently positive effect on employee well-being, and thus be less buffered (reduced effect) by busyness than interpersonally-focused CCBIs. There was not found to be any buffering of busyness on the effect of CCBIs on employee well-being since busyness actually increased the positive effect of CCBIs. Thus, it can’t really be tested whether task-focused CCBIs hold up better under high busyness than interpersonally-focused CCBIs. In regards to resource matching, again, it seemed that the type of stressor (task) and resource (more often interpersonal CCBIs than
task CCBIs) did not need to align for employees to see an improvement in well-being. Since the interactions were the opposite of predicted and the differences between resource matching interactions (2) and those that did not match (3) was small, conclusions regarding the validity of the resource-matching hypothesis cannot be made with confidence.
Chapter 11

OVERALL DISCUSSION

Together, study 1 and study 2 provide answers to questions about the emerging construct, customer citizenship towards individuals (service employees). Study 1 provided basic validity evidence for the new scale on CCBI and examined both the employee and customer perspective on CCBI and study 2 replicated these results and further tested the relationship between CCBI and employee well-being by asking employees to report on daily interactions with customers (both customer citizenship and negative - aggressive - customer behaviors) and their own personal daily well-being outcomes.

Both studies provide several pieces of information on who tends to engage in or receive CCBI and how often. First, customers tend to report higher frequencies of CCBI than do employees (study 1). Since the data was unmatched there are several reasons this may be: 1) the customer sample may have been truly more likely to engage in citizenship than the employee sample was likely to receive citizenship; 2) out of a desire to look good, the customer sample reported engaging in more CCBI than they actually do; and 3) employees do not notice every instance of customer citizenship, and thus report lower frequencies. It’s also likely that some combination of the three explains the different frequencies among the samples. Additionally, customers’ social desirability was measured and was not found to correlate with any CCBI frequencies, which reduces the viability of explanation number two. Without conducting dyadic research, it can’t be known for sure how well employees detect customer CCBI. Future research at the dyad level should be able to more fully explain and answer the question of why customers and employees report different frequencies.
Second, certain personality characteristics are associated with CCBI frequency. On the customer side, agreeable customers are more likely to engage in CCBIs than less agreeable individuals. On the employee front, extraversion was the biggest personality correlate of receiving/perceiving CCBI; extraversion was positively associated with CCBI. In study two, affect was also related to employee reception of CCBI. The more PA employees reported, the more frequent their reception/perception of customer advocacy, courtesy, and initiative. NA was positively related to initiative as well, positively related to assumed employee role and negatively related to courtesy. Since affect colors how individuals perceive the world (Bodenhausen, Sheppard, & Kramer, 1994), it’s possible that affect may only impact the perception of CCBI. It’s also possible that employees’ affect effects the way that customers respond to the employee (Kelley & Hoffman, 1997), with employees high in positive affect potentially garnering more CCBIs, for example. Aside from personality and affect though, there were not many significant person variables that were associated with frequency of CCBI, meaning that the phenomena was consistent across age, gender, and ethnicity.

CCBI was also significantly and consistently related to a variety of other citizenship scales. First, employee reports of citizenship from customers (CCBI) was moderately correlated with employee reports of colleague citizenship (OCBI) in both study 1 and study 2. The moderately sized correlations indicate that certain employees may be more likely to receive citizenship from different sources (customers and colleagues), but the correlations are small enough (~r=.30) to minimize concern that the constructs are one and the same.

On the other hand, there was more overlap between customer citizenship towards service employees (CCBI) and customer citizenship towards the organization (CCBO). The
CCBI dimension of initiative and the CCBO dimension of suggestions for service improvement showed particularly high correlations across the customer and employee samples in study 1.

There was apriori concern that CCBOs and CCBI would be highly related to the point of making CCBI redundant with the already established CCBO construct. Essentially, if these two constructs overlap extensively, then construct proliferation can be avoided by just focusing on one (Organ, 1997). In regards to customer citizenship behaviors that focus on service improvements, new products that could be offered, and general feedback, the target (employee vs organization) really does not seem to make a difference. On the other hand, CCBI dimensions such as sportsmanship and courtesy were nearly unrelated to the CCBO dimensions, demonstrating their distinctiveness.

One of the other questions this study sought to resolve was whether or not CCBI provided any utility in predicting employee outcomes beyond other well-being predictors. In the first study, the regression results did not demonstrate that any of the CCBI dimensions were significantly related to employee well-being (emotional exhaustion). Study 1 then does not demonstrate customer citizenship (CCBI) has much value.

In study 2, the results were more encouraging. All of the CCBI dimensions were positively related to job satisfaction, all but assumed employee role were positively correlated with organizational-based self-esteem, and three of the five dimensions were negatively correlated with emotional exhaustion in the baseline measures. Using the diary measures and controlling for baseline well-being, there were seven direct effects found between CCBI dimensions and well-being outcomes; however, this is of a possible 20 direct effects (five CCBI by four outcomes), so less than half of the potential direct effects were
found. Further, one of the direct effects was in the opposite direction (the CCBI of sportsmanship had a positive relationship to physical symptoms).

There is a slight trend then demonstrating CCBI as a correlate of employee well-being. As anticipated, employees may not always welcome or even notice CCBIs, or according to COR, CCBIs would be more strongly and positively related to employee well-being. Other perspectives would argue that CCBIs create more work for employees (Grandey et al., 2012), which seemed to be the case for initiative as it was associated with increased task stressors. It may also be the case that CCBIs could threaten employee self-esteem and autonomy, though this is less likely since none of the CCBIs had a direct negative effect on work self-efficacy, a similar concept that was measured in this study. As mentioned before, even COR itself notes that resources cannot always overcome loss spirals (Hobfoll, 2001), which is another explanation for the lack of overwhelming positive results regarding CCBI.

Additionally, in both studies, CCBIs were found to be related to perceptions of role conflict and role overload. In study 1, sportsmanship and courtesy were negatively related to the stressors, while initiative was actually positively related to stressors. The positive effect for initiative was also found in the regression analyses of study 1 and study 2. As suggested in Grandey and colleagues (2012), some forms of customer behavior that are meant to be positive and are valued by organizations actually create more work for employees. Thus regardless of the intent behind customer citizenship, they may simply not always be positive for employees.

There are certain circumstances under which CCBIs are more and less effective too. Under busy contexts, the positive relationship between CCBI and employee well-being was
amplified. In other words, CCBI has a more positive relationship with well-being outcomes under conditions of high busyness, as compared to low busyness. This may be because busyness provides contextual meaning for the CCBIs. Even though the form of the interactions were opposite of predicted, the results still show that CCBIs are important for customer service employees and perhaps even more so under stressful conditions. Coupled with the results of the interactions between customer aggression and CCBIs, it appears too that the source of the stressor matters: CCBIs can overturn the potentially negative effect of task stressors (busyness) on employee well-being, but they are less strongly related to employee well-being when the source of stress is other customers.

Under emotionally stressful contexts (customer aggression), the results were mixed. Customer aggression sometimes amplifies the positive relationship between CCBI and well-being and other times it dampens it. The trend found was that for the outcome of job satisfaction, customer aggression has an amplifying effect on the relationship between CCBI and well-being (more positive under high aggression than low), and for other outcomes (work self-efficacy and physical symptoms), customer aggression buffered (made less positive) the effect of CCBI on well-being. It is possible that CCBIs have a more positive impact on affective outcomes (such as daily job satisfaction), but that cognitive/evaluative (work self-efficacy) and physical indicators are less prone to change due to the minutia of interactions over the course of a day.

Implications for Conservation of Resources Theory

In the context of COR, these studies provide mixed support for the theory. It was predicted that overall, CCBIs would act as a resource to help enhance employee well-being and reduce potential loss spirals from the stresses of customer service work. In some cases,
CCBIs do indeed function as a resource and act to positively influence employee well-being (e.g., CCBIs are positively related to job satisfaction; there are several main effects of CCBIs on well-being in the daily portion of the study). At other times though, CCBIs have a negative effect on well-being (e.g., sportsmanship on physical symptoms; assumed employee role on self-efficacy, under high customer aggression).

COR though is a theory about perception (Hobfoll, 1989); what individuals perceive to be stressors and threats to their well-being. Because of this, it might be said that in the cases where CCBIs had a negative relationship with employee well-being that the CCBIs were simply not perceived to be a resource. It is important to keep in mind that COR is a fairly complex and, at times, paradoxical theory (Hobfoll, 2001). For example, resources may have a smaller impact on those with limited resources to start and a higher impact on those who already have abundant resources, creating a ‘rich get richer, poor get poorer’ sort of effect. Future research on COR should help understand when resources can have a significant effect on well-being, and when they may only be ‘another drop in the bucket.’

**Limitations**

Study 1 has several limitations of which to be aware. First, the sample was drawn from an introductory psychology subject pool and hence the participants may differ in meaningful ways from full-time adult customer service employees (Wintre, North, & Sugar, 2001). Nonetheless, the participants were appropriate for the study as many college students work in customer service and participate in service interactions as customers. Additionally, the results from study 1 were consistent with those in the adult working population (study 2), minimizing concerns about the sample selection. In addition, administrative checks (Meade & Craig, 2012) were placed throughout the survey to help
ensure participants were paying attention to the survey, and were sorted out if they answered these questions incorrectly.

Study 1 was also a cross-sectional self-report study, which is not without critique due to its single source (common method variance) and lack of ability to draw causal inferences (Spector, 1994). Precautions were taken to minimize the common method variance concern (since study 1 was not designed to measure multiple time points and the cross-sectional concern is reduced in study 2 with multiple time points are collected). For example, different scale responses were used (5-point vs. 7-point, agreement vs. frequency), and CFAs were used on some of the measures to rule out a single common method factor (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003). An additional concern with self-report data is that individuals may misrepresent themselves in order to look good. In study 1, social desirability was measured in the customer sample, and did not significantly correlate with the variables of interest, indicating support for the notion that participants were likely answering the survey questions honestly and not in a socially desirable way.

Although customers and employees in sample 1 were not matched, and thus conclusions cannot be drawn about customer-employee dyads, information can still be gleaned about how similarly or different customers and employees, in general, perceive and engage in citizenship behavior. Again, even though the different perspectives were not matched and each was self-reported, the fact that similar relationships were found between the scales (e.g., CCBI dimensions and CCBO dimensions) helps reduce, the issues that come along with single-source data collection.

In study 2, only the employee perspective was collected, so again, even though the nature of CCBIs is dyadic, the interaction was only measured from one side, which is a
drawback of the study design (Malloy & Albright, 2001). Given that the goals of this study were to provide preliminary evidence for the relationship between being a target of CCBIs and well-being, this approach fits the needs of the research question. The next steps of studying these types of customer-employee enhances would be to explore the interaction dyadically.

Finally, study 2 used online recruitment of a variety of customer service employees. Several concerns have been posed about the representativeness, seriousness and anonymity of internet samples that may lead to different findings as compared to samples recruited in person. Across studies comparing internet samples to other types of recruitment methods though, it has been found that study results are strikingly similar across recruitment methods and that internet subjects are diverse and respond in ways that indicate they take the surveys seriously (Berkinsky, et al., 2012; Gosling, Vazire, Srivastava, & John, 2004).

**Practical Applications**

Since the results of this study show that CCBI may be a path to improving employee well-being, customer service employees and their managers may be interested in increasing their understanding of CCBI. For example, since perception is an important part of whether CCBI is interpreted as a resource or not, employees could be trained on how to recognize CCBI and that these citizenship behaviors from customers are meant to be helpful, not threatening. Focusing on how employees interpret CCBI may be particularly important in the context of aggressive customers and busy stores. Specifically, in some cases, CCBIs were actually negatively associated with well-being in the context of customer aggression (assumed employee role on physical symptoms) or low busyness (the effect of
courtesy on physical symptoms). The goal then would be to recognize CCBIs as helpful even when stores are busy, or when other customers are aggressive.

In addition to perception of CCBIs, the rate of CCBIs may also be impacted. There really is not any research to date on the customer predictors of CCBI, though this study did find that certain characteristics (e.g., agreeableness) were positively associated with CCBI. It’s not really possible to ‘select’ agreeable customers in order to enhance CCBIs, but it may be possible to shape the servicescape to promote citizenship (cf., Lin, 2004). For example, creating ambient conditions and aesthetically pleasing service environments puts customers in a pleasant mood (Kim & Moon, 2009), which has the potential to in turn enhance their CCBIs. It is also possible for organizations to try to establish a repeat customer base (which is certainly in their own interest), since this also makes CCBIs more likely (from repeat customers). It is also possible to reward customers for their citizenship towards employees, particularly during busy time. Although in doing so, this takes away from the ‘extra-role’ nature of the behavior. Nonetheless, the potential benefits employees may receive would make this an avenue worth investigating in future research.

**Future Directions**

As noted earlier, one of the most significant next steps in the research of CCBI is to examine customer citizenship towards service employees at the dyadic level. Matching customer behaviors during specific encounters to employee outcome reports can more accurately test the hypothesis that CCBIs facilitate employee well-being because it may take away some of the perceptual concerns of employee self-report of CCBI and may replace with customer reports (cf. Groth, Hennig-Thurau, & Walsh, 2009) or even observations (cf. Barger & Grandey, 2006).
Along with collecting information from the customer-employee dyad, more information, in general, should be collected on the customer perspective, as their view was only a small focus of this study. For example, future research may probe for why (e.g., helping others, getting free product) and when (when customers are in a good mood; when customers have extra time) customers engage in citizenship. Importantly, research on the antecedents of CCBI may help employees and customer service managers promote these behaviors in order to enhance employee well-being. Furthermore, studying CCBI in context can help shed light on the extent to which customers may engage in citizenship as a reaction to other customers. If the previous customer was rude, for example, does that make the next customer motivated to ‘make up’ for this violation of polite behavior?

From a performance perspective, manager viewpoint should also be collected. Managers may welcome customer citizenship if they perceive it to foster a good culture (‘our customers are great’). It is also possible that managers may see citizenship, or certain types of citizenship (e.g., assumed employee role), as negative performance feedback for their employees (‘our customers have to do the work for employees’). In general, applying a performance feedback perspective (Kluger & DeNisi, 1996) to citizenship may help understand how employees understand the customer behaviors – are the behaviors positive feedback (e.g., advocacy), or might they send the message the employee is not performing well (e.g., assumed employee role)? Applying the performance feedback perspective may also help explain any discrepancies and customer and employee perspective differences since the feedback giver and receiver can have very different experiences from the same conversation (Ilgen, Peterson, Martin, & Boeschen, 1981).
Although the validity evidence from study 1 was generally replicated in study 2, future research should look to replicate the results found in study 2 (employee reports of CCBI matching up with employee reports of well-being, across work days), particularly since the interactions between CCBI and customer aggression and CCBI and busyness were in the opposite direction as predicted.

**Conclusion**

In summary, this paper provides validity evidence for the new scale of customer citizenship towards employees (CCBI) through two separate studies. COR theory is used to make predictions regarding the relationship between CCBI and employee well-being and initial evidence suggests that CCBI may act as a resource to reduce loss spiral and even enhance employee well-being. The effects are not entirely consistent across CCBI dimension, well-being outcome type, or context (store busyness, demands from aggressive customers) though, indicating the utility of CCBI should be further explored and replicated in future research.
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