DOI: https://doi.org/10.22156/CS4SMB.2018.8.1.215

# A Study on Organizational Citizenship Behaviors and Service Quality as External Effectiveness of Contact Employees for Deluxe Hotel in Seoul

Jeong-Joon Park
Division of Hotel Culinary Arts, Nambu University

# 특급호텔 서비스종사원의 조직적 시민행동과 역할외적 행위가 고객의 서비스품질에 미치는 영향

박정<del>준</del> 남부대학교 호텔조리학과

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

Key Words: Justice, Orgnizational citizenship, Service quality, Extra behavior, Contact employee, Dulexe hotel

요 약 본 연구는 특급호텔의 종사원의 조직적 시민행동과 역할외적 서비스가 고객이 느끼는 서비스품질과 고객만족에 미치는 영향을 조사하고 분석하여 특급호텔 호텔경영자와 중견 간부들에게 새로운 대 고객서비스를 개발하는데 중요한 역할과 활용을 제시한다. 본 연구 구체적 결과는 고객과 접촉하는 종사원의 조직적 시민행동과 역할외적인 서비스가 고객에게 믿음과 신뢰에 지대한 영향을 미치고 있다는 유의한 의미를 발견하였다. 제시된 가설에 유의미한 긍정적인 결과를 보여주었다. 이러한 연구 결과는 호텔이 대 고객서비스의 고객관계 형성에 종업원의 역할을 이해하는데 기대하며 올바른 서비스 활동을 지원하는데 긍정적인 효과를 가져 오기를 기대한다.

주제어: 공정성, 조직적 시민행동, 서비스품질, 대 고객 접촉종사원, 역할외적 행위, 특급호텔

# 1. Introuction

Customer-contact employees have received considerable attention from both academics and practitioners. As boundary spanners, these employees'

attitude and behaviors toward customers have been argued to significantly influence customers' perceived service quality and satisfaction as well as employees' performance[1]. For these reasons, service marketing has focused on identifying the relationship between

employee behaviors and relevant organizational behavior constructs, such as job satisfaction[2,4]. and organizational climate[5–7], which in turn influence customers' Perceptions of service quality.

While these relationships provide valuable insights, largely neglected is a particular set of neglected is a particular set of customer-contact employee' behaviors in service encounter that can also significantly influence customers' perceptions of service quality, specifically voluntary and/or discretionary behaviors that employees perform for both customers and organizations. These behaviors, called organizational (OCBs). citizenship behaviors are individual contributions in the workplace that go beyond the specified role requirements and are not directly or explicitly recognizes by the formal reward system.[8,9].

Over the past decade, a great deal has been done in the fields of marketing and human resources management on satisfaction[10-12], fairness perseptions[13-15], organizational commitment and the impact of OCBs on manager's performance evaluation[16].

Despite abundant studies on OCBs, still much remains unexplored about possible consequences of OCBs. Most of the research on OCBs has focused on the effects of employee-level variables such as attitudes, perceptions, and personal dispositions[17], but provided relatively little attention to possibly various effects service quality. In particular, most marketing studies limited the effect of OCBs to managerial evaluation of subordinate performance. Based on norms of reciprocity and fairness, schema-triggered affect, and informational distinctiveness, previous studies propose that salespeople's OCBs in personal selling are useful predictors for managers' evaluations of salespeople's performance. This focus, however, has tended to ignore the relationship between OCBs and critical organizational out-comes such as service quality.

OCBs refer to "discretionary behaviors that are not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal system

and that, in the aggregate, promote the effective functioning of the organization" [18]. Also, researchers have suggested that OCBs facilitate organizational effective-ness, efficiency, and success, because OCBs make for more efficient use of resources, allow managers to devote more time to productive activities, and improve the ability of coworkers to perform their jobs[19,20]. In a sense, a main impetus to study OCB lies in the assumption that OCB significantly enhances organizational effectiveness. [21,22]. While the effective functioning of an organization is a desirable outcome, an important empirical question still remains to be answered: "How are OCBs related to customers' perception of service quality?"

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

In this study, we investigate the relationship between OCBs and customers' evaluation of service quality. In addition to job satisfaction, which has been well supported in the literature[23]. we also include trust in manager because trust, on the basis of social exchange theory, is likely to ensure that voluntary behaviors like OCB will be reciprocated in the long run[24]. We develop and test a hypothetical model that specifies the relationship of OCB with service quality,

job satisfaction, and trust. By using both employee and customer data in a single study, we investigate whether employees' OCBs are related to service quality that customers as arbiters of external effectiveness evaluate. We examine the relationship among variables at the individual employee level rather than at the organizational level. Focusing on employees and their dyadic interactions with customers ay the service encounter level, this study examines employees' service quality, as perceived by customers. Particularly, we check whether there exist similar path estimates in the relationships of job satisfaction and trust to multiple facets of OCB (altruism, sportsmanship, and 7ivic virtue).

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

#### Background and hypotheses

#### 2.1 Organizational citizenship behaviors

While there are several alternative types of extra-role behaviors that an employs may exhibit, such as pro-social behavior (Brief and Motowidlo, 1986) and behaviors[25]. noncompliant Organ(1988.1995), classifies OCBs into five categories : altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy, and civic virtue. Altruism is a discretionary behavior that helps other persons with respect to organizationally relevant tasks or problems (e.g., voluntarily helping less skolles or new employees and assisting coworkers who are overloaded or absent; Organ, 1988), Conscientiousness is a discretionary behavior that employee carry out well beyond the minimum required level (e.g., working long days, voluntarily doing things besides duties, keeping the organization rules, and never wasting work time).

Sportsmanship consists of actions that employee refrain from complaining, doing petty grievances, railing against real or imagined slights, and making federal cases out of small potatoes[26]. Courtesy consists of actions that help prevent work-related problems with others or such actions as "touching base" with those parties whose works would be affected by one's decisions or commitments Civic virtue reflects behaviors[28-29], in which an employee responsibly engages, that show concern for the organization and employee initiative in recommending how the organization can improve its operations[30]. However, according to Organ courtesy is not easily distinguishable from altruism. The distinction between the behaviors can be made when one distinguishes between coming to the aid of someone the already has a problem and helping someone prevent a problem from occurring. Also, pointing out the difficulty of recognizing some of these five distinctions, recent research combives several behaviors into a single global behavior or ignores certain behaviors[31-33].

# 2.2 OCBs and service quality

Service quality has been one of the most meaningful constructs for explaining customers' future behavioral intentions and impacts on a firm's financial outcomes even argue that delivering quality service is one of the fundamental strategies for a firm's survival[34-36]. Given the importance of service quality, it is no surprise that many researchers have devoted themselves to understanding the underlying dimensions and antecedents of service quality[37]. Numerous discussions have focused on the conceptual and operational definition of Parasuraman's SERVQUAL scale that has been widely used in various service industries[38,39].

As indicated earlier, our study focuses on employee behaviors at the service encounter and their relationships with service quality, In the service encounter, employees are performers rather than workers, and their behavioral performance is a major

part of service quality that customers perceive. In the relationship marketing perspective, employees' interactions with customers are also important.

Recognizing the importance of social contents such as trust and commitment, suggested that one should be able to apply their relationship marketing concept to the interpersonal services marketing particular[40,41], Emphasizing the customer-firm relationship for ling-term profitability, argue that in service relationships[42], customers' evaluation of service is dependent largely on the specialized skills, techniques, and experience of customer-contact employees interacting with customers emphasizing the customer-firm relationship for long-term profitability[43], argue that in service relationships, customers' evaluation of service is dependent largely on the specialized skills, techniques, and experience of customer-contact employees interacting with customers[44]. In the service organization, employees' behaviors toward customers may influence the future of customer relationships. Also, in the high-contact service encounter, customers physically participate in the service delivery process as co-producers and thus are much more likely to be exposed to employees' voluntary behaviors for coworkers and the organization. Further more, these voluntary behaviors, which customers can observe during physical and social interactions with employees, may affect the customers' evaluation of the service provided. There are several reasons why employees' OCBs could be expected to relate to the customers' perceptions of service. The first reason relates to internal marketing perspective in service business. Based on the internal marketing perspective, each of these behaviors in service encounter can be a meaningful relationship with service excellence, especially for the customer-employee interaction dimension of service quality. The internal marketing perspective suggests that for successful encounter and exchanges with customers.

Sportsmanship may also ensure service quality. An employee with a high level of sportsmanship has a

positive attitude and avoids unnecessary complaining. In fact, research suggests that customers tend to experience greater service quality when this behavior is exhibited[45]. Sportsmanship behavior creates a positive climate among employees that is likely to be transferred to their interactions with customers [46]. In other words, if employees are "good sports" or cooperative with each other, they will be more cooperative in the delivery process of service. In fact, one cannot expect that an employee who often complains within an organization will exhibit customer-oriented behaviors for excellent service to external customers. Second, a positive work climate among employees may have an indirect effect on service quality by creating an overall environment that customers find more pleasant. A lack of sportsmanship is likely to have harmful effects on group cohesiveness and leave the organizational atmosphere less attractive to coworkers[47]. More important, this negative work environment can also be uncovered during the delivery process of service. Based on the above discussions, the following hypothesis is developed.

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

#### 2.3 Job satisfaction, trust, and OCBs

According to Blau there exist two types of exchange relationships between employees and organizations: economic and social relationships. Economic exchange is contractual in nature [48]. Obligations of the parties involved are clearly defined and highly specific and exchange occurs on a transactional basis [49].

#### 2.4 Job satisfaction and OCBs

Job satisfaction is defined as the pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job as achieving or facilitating the achievement of one's job values[50]. According to Churchill job satisfaction has

a broad conceptual domain[51], because it includes all characteristics of the job itself or the work environment that an employee finds rewarding, fulfilling, satisfying, frustrating, and unsatisfying.

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

#### 2.5 Trust in manager

Trust provides the basis for social exchange relationship[52-54]. Trust characterizes confidence and beliefs about their exchange partners. Social exchange in an organization implies an informal contract between an employee and an organization, and in this contract, the employee's manager largely represents the organization to the employee[25].

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

# 3. Research method

#### 3.1 Sample

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

#### 3.2 Data collection procedure

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

#### 3.3 Measures

The measures used in this study were drawn from previous studies of hotel marketing and organizational behavior. Those items were translated into Korean and then reviewed by hotel employees and experts in deluxe hotel and several hotel marketing scholars. Some items were restated to be compatible with deluxe hotel restaurants services and some others were deleted during the preliminary scale purification process. A complete list of the items used is exhibited[55].

#### 3.4 Job satisfaction

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

#### 3.5 Trust

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

#### 3.6 Organizational Citizenship Behaviors

We measured three OCBs with 14 items taken from various sources which included altruism (five item)[54], sportsmanship (four item), and civic virtue (five item).

Unlike most previous research, the OCB measures were acquired from contact employees rather than from their supervisors.

#### 3.7 Hotel Service quality

For measuring customer's perception of service quality, we used a service quality scale that LeBlanc's developed specifically for travel agency services [26]. Customers' perceived service quality has usually been measured by the SERVQUAL scale, which is based on the gap score between customer expectations and perceptions of service that Parasuraman's proposed[39]. However, the SERVQUAL scale has been criticized for the gap scores used and for its lack of general application. This study used LeBlanc's scale with two major modifications[26]. First, we took nine customer-employee interactive items from his scale, since this study is interested only in the customer-employee interactions during the service encounter. Thus, the items we drew from this scale represent employee behavioral attributes that might be involved in a service encounter. Our items were found to represent a uni-dimensional construct (=77.26, df=27; RMR=0.04; GFI=0.92; AGFI=0.86; CFI=0.95). second. following the suggestions by Brown and Peter we asked customer respondents to do comparative evaluations of actual performance to expectations for each service quality item by using a five-point scale ranging from "much less than expected" to "much more than expected."

# 4. Analysis and Results

# 4.1 Measurement results

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

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

Despite the relatively large number of indicators, the results for the measurement model were fairly adequate (=816.83, df=512; GFI=0.80; AGFI=0.77; CFI=0.89). As exhibited in Appendix A, all measures were found to be reasonably reliable with coefficient a greater than 0.70, except for sportsmanship (0.52). Specifically, construct reliabilities ranged from 0.92 (customer's perceived service quality) to 0.55 (sportsmanship). All indicator loadings for constructs were significant (P<0.01), and their standardized estimates ranged from 0.54 to 0.76 fro altruism, from 0.61 to 0.71 for civic virtue, from 0.38 to 0.69 for sportsmanship, and from 0.69 to 0.82 from customers' perceived service quality. Accordingly, based on the significant loading estimates and high construct reliabilities, we found support for convergent validity[1,2].

Discriminant validity exists when the proportion of variance extracted in each construct (AVE) exceeds the square of the coefficient  $(\Phi)$  representing its correlation with other constructs (Fornell and Larcker, 1981). In comparing the correlations among the latent constructs and AVE, although the squared correlations in the three pairs (job satisfaction and trust, job satisfaction and sportsmanship, and trust and sportsmanship) were higher than AVE in both or either construct, the differences were not significant. As another criterion for discriminant validity, two-standard error interval estimate of each coefficient  $(\Phi)$  was calculated in order to examine whether one (1)is within the interval. measurement interval estimates for any coefficients did not include 1, providing evidence for discriminant validity as well.

#### 4.2 Structural Model Results

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

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

# 4.3 Controlling the Effects of Common Method Factor

In our study, the data for OCBs, job satisfaction, and trust were obtained from the same source (employee). Thus, the OCBs are likely to share common method (source) variance with their antecedents (i.e., job satisfaction and trust), which may have inflated or deflated the strength of the observed relationships among these employee variables. On the other hand, service quality does not share this common method variance

because it was reported by customers. To controlling for the effects of method bias on the structural relationships, we re-estimated the proposed model by adding a "common-source," first-order factor to the indicators of all employee constructs called "common method model".

As shown in Table 1, when the effect of common method factor was controlled, the fit index of the hypothesized model is =578.77, df=271, P<0.01; GFI=0.83; AGFI=0.77; CFI=0.83. The difference in fit between this model and the previous model was significant (=76.44, \Delta df=20, P<0.01), which indicates that a common source factor was evident. Fifteen factor loadings on the common source factor were significant at the 0.05 level. The standardized parameter estimates for structural paths are shown in the last two column of Table 1. Table 2 shows several interesting findings. First, despite significance in model comparisons, we found that the overall pattern of significant relationships was not affected by common method variance.

All of the paths that were significant when the common method factor was not controlled remained significant at 0.05 level even when the effects of common method variance were controlled. Second, the inclusion of the same-source factor in the model changed the path estimates. As expected, there was almost no change in the magnitudes of standardized estimates of OCBs on service quality. However, we found little change in parameter estimates of relationships among employee variables. Nevertheless, they did not affect the overall pattern of significant relationships in the model that did not partial out the effect of common method variance. Third, the introduction

of the same-source factor did not change the proportion of variance of service quality accounted for by OCB variables (9%); it caused altruism and civic virtue to drop  $(12 \rightarrow 10\% \text{ and } 21 \rightarrow 14\%, \text{ respectively})$ but sportsmanship to increase (46  $\rightarrow$  55%). The proportion of variance accounted for in sportsmanship was still substantial.

#### 4.4 Testing Equality of Path Estimates

We examined whether there are similarities in path estimates of job satisfaction and/or trust to OCBs and path estimates of OCBs to service quality.

The model that controlled common method factor was used to make more exact comparisons. First, we estimated five constrained models by imposing equality constraints on the path estimates: job satisfaction  $\rightarrow$  OCBs, trust  $\rightarrow$  OCBs, job satisfaction and trust  $\rightarrow$  OCBs, and OCBs  $\rightarrow$  service quality. Then, using differences, we compared each of these constrained models with the unconstrained/hypothetical model, computing the difference in fit between the two models. As shown in Table 2, the differences between the constrained model and the unconstrained model were

significant at the 0.01 level in the path estimates of job satisfaction to OCBs but not significant at 0.05 level in the path of trust to OCBs. That is, while the path estimates from trust to OCBs were equal to one another, paths from job satisfaction to OCBs were not equal. However, when both job satisfaction and trust were considered simultaneously, the equality for path estimates was not supported at 0.01 level. Meanwhile, we found that there existed equality in the paths of

Table 1, Measurement correlations, means, and standard deviations

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

<sup>\*</sup>P>.10, all except this correlation were significant at 0.01 level.

Table 2, Hypothesized model results of standardized structural parameter estimates(n=196)

Path	Not controlling for co	mmon method factor	Controlling for common						
Palli	Coefficient	t value	Coefficient	t value					
Job satisfaction → Altruism	0.04	0.43	-0.05	-0.54					
Job satisfaction → Divic virtue	0.45	4.26	0.36	3.41					
Jobs satisfaction → Sportsmanship	0.43	3.34	0.46	3.42					
Trust → Altruism	0.35	3.60	0.31	3.22					
Trust → Divic virtue	0.02	0.27	0.08	0.87					
Trust → Sportsmanship	0.52	3.98	0.58	4.18					
Altruism → Service quality	0.15	1.70	0.14	1.58					
Civic virtue → Service quality	0.02	0.22	0.01	0.15					
Sportsmanship → Service quality	0.23	2.13	0.25	2.39					
(Altruism)	0.12		0.10						
	.21		.14						
	.46		.55						
	.09		.09						
Goodness-of-fit statistics :	(291)=655.2	21,GFI=0.81	(271)=578.77, GFI=0.83,						
	CFI=0.80, PNFI=0.62		CFI=0.83,	CFI=0.83, PNFI=0.61					
Model comparison	76.44(20)	P=.000	CFI=0.83	PNFI=0.61					
Equality constraints									
Job satisfaction → OCBs				12.14(2)=0.00					
Trust → OCBs				5.26(2)=0.07					
Job satisfaction and trust → OCBs				16.16(4)=0.00					
OCBs →s ervice quality				3.50(2)=0.17					
Job satisfaction and trust→C	22.93(6)=0.00								
Consider quality used automated item code. Factor leading of code was fixed at the actuary year of construct reliability and recognizement every									

a. Service quality used summed-item scale. Factor loading of scale was fixed at the square root of construct reliability and measurement error at (1-constant reliability).

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

b. Same-source(employee) factor was controlled.

c. Hypothesized model that controls common method(source) variance was compared with the model that does not.

d. Paths were constrained to having equal estimates. The constrained models were estimated and then compared to the unconstrained (freely estimated) model in terms of difference.

OCB variables to service quality, because the difference between the constrained and the unconstrained models was not significant at 0.05 level (P=0.17). finally, we found no support for coefficient equality when we considered simultaneously the relationship of both satisfaction and trust on OCBs and the relationship OCBs and service quality (P<0.01).

#### REFERENCES

- [1] J. C. Anderson & D. W. Gerbing. (1988). Structural Equation Modeling in Practice: A Review and Recommended Two-Step Approach. Psychological Bulletin. 103(3), 411-423.
  - DOI: 10.1037//0033-2909.103.3.411
- [2] P. Bagozzi & Y. Y. Richard. (1988). On the evaluation of structural equation models. Journal of the academy of marketing science, 16(1), 74-94.
- [3] T. Bateman & D. W. Organ. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: the relationship between affect and employee citizenship. Academy of management Journal, 26(4), 587-595.
  - DOI: 10.2307/255908
- [4] P. Blau. (1964). Exchange and Power in Social Life. USA: Transaction Publishers.
- [5] D. E. Bowen Schneider. Boundary-spanning role employees and the service encounter: some guidelines for management and research. Taiwn Citation Index=Humanities and Social Sciences.
  - http://tci.ncl.edu.tw/cgi-bin/gs32/gsweb.cgi?o=dnclret& s=id=%22RF10003820986%22.&searchmode=basic&tcihss page=tcisearch\_opt2\_search
- [6] A. P. Brief & S. J. Motowidlo. (1986). Prosocial organizational behaviors. Academy of management Review, 11(4), 710-725.
  - DOI: 10.5465/amr.1986.4283909
- [7] T. J. Brown & G. A. Churchill, J. P. Peter. (1993). Improvig the measurement of service quality. Journal Retailing. 69(1), 127-39.
- [8] J. M. Burke, C. C. Borucki & A. E. Hurley. (1992). Reconceptualizing psychological climate in a retail service environment, multiple-stakeholder perspective. Journal of Applied Psychology, 77(5), 717.
  - DOI: 10.1037//0021-9010.77.5.717

- [9] F. Buttle. (1996). SERVQUAL: review, critique, Research Agenda. European Journal of marketing, *30(1)*, 8-32.
  - DOI: 10.1108/03090569610105762
- [10] G. A. Churchill, N. M. Ford & O. C. Walker. (1974). Measuring the job satisfaction of industrial salesmen. Journal of Marketing Research, 254-260.
- [11] N. K. Chadha. (1988). Organizational climate and job satisfaction. Psychologia: An International Journal of Psychology in the Orient.
- [12] M. S. Clark & J. Mills. (1979). Interpersonal attraction in exchange and communal relationships. Journal of personality and social psychology, 37(1), 12. 10.1037//0022-3514.37.1.12
- [13] E. G. Clary & M. Snyder. (1991). A functional analysis of altruism and prosocial behavior: The case of volunteerism. ResearchGate. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/232572127\_A\_ functional\_analysis\_of\_altruism\_and\_prosocial\_behavior\_
- [14] F. Dansereau & G. Graen. (1975). A vertical dvad linkage approach to leadership within formal organizations: A longitudinal investigation of the role making process. Organizational behavior and human performance, 13(1), 46-78.

The\_case\_of\_volunteerism

- [15] R. F. Dwyer, P. H. Schurr & S. Oh. (1987). Developing buyer-seller relationship. The Journal of marketing, 11-27.
- [16] J. L. Farth, P. M. Posdakoff & D. W. Organ. (1990). Accounting for organizational citizenship behavior: leader fairness and task scope versus satisfaction. Journal of management, 16(4), 705–721. DOI: 10.1177/014920639001600404
- [17] C. Fornell & D. F. Larcker. (1981). Evaluating structural models with unobservable variables and measurement error. Journal of marketing research, 18(1), 39-50.
  - DOI: 10.2307/3151312
- [18] J. M. George. (1991). State or trait: effects of positive mood on prosocial behaviors at work. Journal of applied Psychology, 76(2), 299-307.
  - DOI: 10.1037//0021-9010.76.2.299
- [19] J. M. George & K. B. Hausen. (1990). Understanding prosocial behavior, sales performance, and turnover a group-level analysis in a service context. Journal of applied psychology, 75(6), 698-709.
  - DOI: 10.1037//0021-9010.75.6.698
- [20] J. M. George & A. P. Brief. (1992). Feeling good-doing good a conceptual analysis of the mood at

work-organizational spontaneity relationship. *Psychological bulletin, 112(2), 310–329.* 

DOI: 10.1037//0033-2909.112.2.310

- [21] J. W. Graham. (1991). An essay on organizational citizenship behavior. Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 4(4), 249–270.
- [22] M. D. Hartline & O. C. Ferrell. (1996). The management of customer-contact service employees, an empirical investigation. *The Journal of Marketing*, 52–70. DOI: 10.2307/1251901
- [23] L. R. James, R. G. Demaree & G. Wolf. (1984). Estimating within-group interrater reliability with and without response bias. *Journal of applied psychology*, 69(1), 85-98.

DOI: 10.1037//0021-9010.69.1.85

- [24] S. W. Kelley & K. D. Hoffman. (1993). An investigation of positive affect, scores in consumer research. *Journal Consum Reserch*, 19, 655–62.
- [25] M. A. Konovsky & S. D. Pugh. (1994). Citizenship behavior and social exchange. Academy of management journal, 37(3), 656-669. DOI: 10.2307/256704
- [26] G. LeBlanc. (1992). Factors affecting customer evaluation of service quality in travel agencies: an investigation of customer perceptions. *Journal of Travel Research*, 30(4), 10-16.

DOI: 10.1177/004728759203000402

- [27] E. A. Locke. (1969). What is job satisfaction? Organizational behavior and human performance, 4(4), 309–336
- [28] S. B. Mackenzie, P. M. Posdakoff & R. Fetter. (1996). Organizational citizenship behavior and objective productivity as determinants of managerial evaluations of salesperson's performance. Organizational behavior and human decision processes, 50(1), 123–150.
- [39] S. B. Mackenzie, P. M. Posdakoff & R. Fetter. (1993). The impact of organizational citizenship behavior on evaluations of salesperson performance. The Journal of Marketing, 70.

DOI: 10.2307/1252058

[30] S. B. Mackenzie, P. M. Posdakoff & M. Aheame. (1998). Some possible antecedents and consequences of in-role and extra-roel salesperson performance. The Journal of Marketing, 87-98.

DOI: 10.2307/1251745

[31] S. B. Mackenzie. P. M. Posdakoff & J. B. Paine. (2000). Do citizenship behaviors matter more for managers than for salesperson? *Journal of the Academy of Marketing* 

- Science, 27(4), 396-410. DOI: 10.1177/0092070399274001
- [32] R. H. Moorman. (1991). Organizational justice and organizational citizenship bahaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? Psychological Bulletin, 76, 845–55.
- [33] R. H. Morgan & S. D. Hunt. (1996). The commitment-trust theory of relationship marketing. *The journal of marketing*, 58(3), 20.

DOI: 10.2307/1252308

[34] E. W. Morrison. (1996). Role definitions and organizational citizenship behavior: the importance of the employee's perspective. Academy of management journal, 37(6), 1543–1567.

DOI: 10.2307/256798

- [35] R. G. Netemeyer, J. S. Boles, D. O. Mckee & R. Mcmurrian. (1997). An investigation into the antecedents of organizational citizenship behaviors in a personal selling context. *The Journal of Marketing*, 85–98.
  DOI: 10.2307/1251791
- [36] R. C. Nyhan & H. A. Malowe. (1999). Organizational effectiveness enhancement under total quality management (TQM) in a non-Manufacturing. Industrial Engineering and Management Press, p. 294-303.
- [37] D. W. Organ & K. Ryan. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel* psychology, 48(4), 775–802.
  - DOI: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.1995.tb01781.x
- [38] C. A. O'Reilly & J. Chatman. (1986). Organizational commitment and psychological attachment: The effects of compliance, identification, and internalization on prosocial behavior. *Journal of applied psychology*, 71(3), 492–499.

DOI: 10.1037//0021-9010.71.3.492

- [39] A. Parasuraman, V. A. Zeithmal & L. L. Berry. (1988). Servqual: A multiple-item scale for measuring consumer perc. *Journal of retailing*, 64(1), 12.
- [40] M. Paulin, J. Perrien & R. J. Ferguson. (1997). Relational contract norms and the effectiveness of commercial banking relationships. *International Journal* of Service Industry Management, 8(5), 435–452. DOI: 10.1108/09564239710189844
- [41] M. Paulin, R. J. Ferguson & M. Payaud. (2000). Business effectiveness and professional service personnel: Relational or transactional managers? European Journal of Marketing, 34(3/4), 453-472. DOI: 10.1108/03090560010311966

- [42] P. M. Posdakoff & S. B. Mackenzie. (1994). Organizational citizenship behaviors and sales unit effectiveness. Journal of marketing research, 351-363. DOI: 10.2307/3152222
- [43] P. M. Posdakoff, S. B. Mackenzie, R. H. Moorman & R. Fetter. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. The leadership quarterly, 1(2), 107-142.

DOI: 10.1016/1048-9843(90)90009-7

[44] P. M. Posdakoff, M. Ahearne & S. B. Mackenzie. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior and the quantity and quality of work group performance. Journal of applied psychology, 82(2), 262-269.

DOI: 10.1037//0021-9010.82.2.262

[45] S. M. Pfeffer. (1987). Prosocial behavior, noncompliant behavior, and work performance among commission salespeople. Journal of applied psychology, 72(4), 615-621.

DOI: 10.1037/0021-9010.72.4.615

- [46] F. Reichheld & W. E. Sasser. (1990). Zero defections: Quality comes to services. Harvard business review, 68(5), 105-111.
- [47] D. M. Rousseau & J. M. Parks. (1993). The Contract of Organizations. Individuals and *IResearch* organizational behavior, 15, 1-1.
- [48] R. T. Rust, A. J. Zahorik & T. L. K. Ham. (1995). Return on quality (ROQ): Making service quality financially accountable. The Journal of Marketing, 58-70.

DOI: 10.2307/1252073

[49] B. Schneider, J. J. Parkington & V. M. Buxton. (1980). Employee and customer perceptions of service in banks. Administrative Science Quarterly, 25(2), 252.

DOI: 10.2307/2392454

[50] B. Schneider, S. White & M. C. Paul. (1992). Linking service climate and customer perceptions of service quality: Tests of a causal model. Journal of applied Psychology, 83(2), 150.

DOI: 10.1037//0021-9010.83.2.150

- [51] C. A. Smith, D. W. Organ & J. P. Near. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. Journal of applied psychology, 68(4), 653.
- [52] L. Van Dyne, J. W. Graham & R. M. Dienesch. (1994). Organizational citizenship behavior : Construct redefinition, measurement, and validation. Academy of management Journal, 37(4), 765-802.

DOI: 10.2307/256600

[53] S. Walz & B. P. Niehoff. (1996). Organizational citizenship behaviors and their effect on organizational effectiveness in limited-menu restaurants. In Academy of management proceedings, 1, 307-311.

DOI: 10.5465/ambpp.1996.4980770

[54] L. J. Williams & S. E. Anderson. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. Journal of management, 17(3), 601-617.

DOI: 10.1177/014920639101700305

[55] V. A. Zeithmal, L. L. Berry & A. Parasuraman. (1993). The nature and determinants of customer expectations of service. Journal of the academy of Marketing Science, 21(1), 1-12.

DOI: 10.1177/0092070393211001

# 박 정 준(Park, Jeong Joon)

[정회원]

■ 1986년 2월 : 경원대학교 영어영문 학과(영문학사)

■ 1989년 2월 : 경희대학교 호텔경 영학(경영학 석사)

▶ 1998년 2월 : 대구대학교 호텔관 광경영학(경영학 박사)

• 1990년 3월 : 대구산업정보대 조리과 조교수

• 2004년 2월 : 대구미래대학 호텔조리과 부교수

■ 2004년 3월 ~ 현재 : 남부대학교 호텔조리학과 교수

■ 관심분야: 호텔조리학, 호텔경영학, 외식경영학, 서비 스마케팅, 레스토랑경영 및 창업, 메뉴관리론, 호텔영어

• E-Mail: pjj4312@hanmail.net