This research aims to verify the effect of Organizational Climate (OC) on service-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB) and explore whether organizational climate generates a moderating effect that affects the relationship between organizational support and service-oriented OCB. A total of 2,869 questionnaires filled by personnel in the service industries were returned. Results indicate that the factor of “organizational support” perceived by the frontline service personnel affects service-oriented OCB, as demonstrated by the surveyed subjects, but no direct effect is found between OC and service-oriented OCB. Nevertheless, OC has a moderating effect on certain variables of “organizational support” and “service-oriented OCB.” Most of the results indicate positive effects on the factors of “employee loyalty” and “service-oriented OCB” under the dimension of “service delivery.” In addition, no moderating effect is found on “service-oriented OCB” under the dimension of “participation.”
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INTRODUCTION

In recent years, service industries have undergone drastic development, and Taiwan’s service industries have grown substantially. They are now contributing to 72% of the Nation’s GDP and over 61% of employment opportunities. Taiwan’s economy has now officially shifted from manufacturing-based industries to service-oriented industries (Lin Yang-Zhu, 2003). Products of the service industries are characterized by intangibility, inseparability, variability, and perishability. This means that each company must develop its own marketing strategies and compete by delivering high-quality customer services. Rising consumerism brought new expectations; consumers nowadays expect more than the quality of the product(s) or labor they purchase but also the quality of the services they receive during transaction. Thus, delivering satisfactory services through their employees has become a key marketing tactic for many companies in order to differentiate themselves from the competitors and create competitive advantages.

In other words, as service products are intangible and variable, consumers tend to rate the quality of services through evaluating the process of service delivery (Schneider and Bowen, 1992). Therefore, performances of the contact employees affect the quality of the services delivered to and the effectiveness of strategy implementation a certain degree (Schneider, 1990). An employee is more likely to receive a positive response and achieve high customer satisfaction rate when empathetic and proactive in offering individualized services during the course of interactivities with customers (Bitner, Booms and Tetreault, 1990). However, the above-mentioned moderating effects of extra-role service behaviors are often not clearly prescribed in the job descriptions or labor contracts and it is also difficult to set a standard for such performances; the management is often unable to systematically regulate employees’ service-oriented behaviors. This highlights the importance of service-oriented OCBs (Bettencourt, Gwinner and Meuter, 2001). And the relationships between transformative leaders/managers and
their subordinates, as well as their personal attributes, also affect employees’ service-oriented OCBs (Hsu, Lin and Chang, 2010; Weng, Lai and Li, 2010). Other factors, such as employee attitudes and personal attributes, are also factors that influence OCB (Bettencourt and Brown, 1997), i.e. organizational support (OS) is one of the antecedent variables of organizational citizenship behaviors (Eisenberger, Fasolo and Davis-LaMastro, 1990).

According to the social exchange perspective, when an employee senses that their contributions to the company are noticed, they may feel obligated to help the organization to achieve the company goals (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison and Sowa, 1986). Driven by this sense of obligation, employees are more likely to perform not only in-role but also extra-role organizational behaviors (Organ, 1988; Settoon, Bennett and Liden, 1996; Ling and Wang, 2007; Peng, 2007). However, very few researches discussing the relationship between OS and OCB are targeted on the effect of employee-perceived “organizational support” on the service-oriented OCB demonstrated by the frontline service employees, yet these employees come into direct contact with customers in high frequency. The above-mentioned frontline service personnel (contact employees) provide instant services and responses to customers, and perception of such services and responses often have direct influence to customers’ overall impression on the organization and their decisions for repeat purchases (Saeed, 1990). Therefore, this research sets its first objective to verify whether perceived OS affects service-oriented OCB, targeting the contact employees in the service industries.

From a different perspective, environmental factors within an organization also have moderating effects on extra-role voluntary behaviors, which should not be overlooked. Though it is rather difficult to regulate OCB through formal organizational management systems, substantial control may be achieved through indirect, unofficial methods, i.e. messages delivered by OC (Schneider, White, and Paul, 1998). Recent studies on customer orientation have also put forward that an organization must first create a work environment that facilitates improvement of employee satisfaction, organizational commitment, and work behaviors before the organization can improve customer satisfaction, quality of service, and customer loyalty (Paulin, Ferguson and Bergeron, 2006; Schneider and Bowen, 1985). The reason is that OC molds the attitudes and behaviors of employees, with which they interact with the peers and customers. It is also possible to change employees' definitions on the scope of job roles. Schneider et al. (2005) indicated that when both the managers’ efforts and the internal service environment are working towards creating an OC, this OC will be developed towards customer-oriented service behaviors. OC conveys how important an organization sees certain service behaviors and forms a frame of reference seen by employees as the unchartered norms expected to be observed voluntarily (Ajzen and Fishbein, 1980); some may even see the extra-role citizenship behaviors as part of their job duties. Therefore, when employees sense that their service behaviors are valued by the organization, a sentiment bearing the context of “repaying the organization” for its support may be formed and an interactive effect of the two factors creates a potential for reinforcement of service-oriented OCB. Based on the above analysis, this research sets its second objective to explore whether organizational climate (OC) reinforces organizational support (OS) and service-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB).

In summary, the following is a list of the objectives pursued in this research.

1. To verify whether OS perceived by the employee affects formation of service-oriented OCB.
2. To verify whether OC affects formation of service-oriented OCBs.
3. To verify whether organizational climate has moderating effects on the relationship between OS as perceived by the employees and service-oriented OCB.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Service-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors under service scenarios

Besides work behavior that may be clearly defined in job descriptions, there are many more rules and norms that are not clearly defined by any regulatory system. Since in-role behaviors are not sufficient to satisfy all the needs of an organization, extra-role behaviors voluntarily performed by employees would be needed in order to fill in the gap in the definitions of roles and help the organization to achieve its goals. Organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) are exactly, as described above, voluntary employee behaviors not officially defined in the employees’ job duties (Organ, 1988). When employees demonstrate more OCBs, the productivity of employees, as well as the effectiveness of management, is increased and unnecessary wastage minimized. Better cross-departmental cooperation and organizational capabilities will also be achieved. Thus, the organization becomes better equipped to respond to changes and challenges in the environment.

However, the form of organizational citizenship behaviors varies depending on the type of the organization. Service type organizations must meet customers' individual needs when offering services or building organizational images (Borman and Motowidlo, 1993). Thus, it is necessary for them to explore deeper into the subject of OCBs, especially behaviors demonstrated by the contact employees in the service industries (Podsakoff and MacKenzie, 1997). At the (Moorman, 1991; Van Dyne, Graham and Dienesch, current stage,
current stage, only a few studies touched on this subject (1994; Bettencourt et al., 2001; Hsu et al. 2010; Wen et al., 2010) and the majority of them are focused on the OCBs of employees in the manufacture industries. Very few researches explored the behavioral relationship demonstrated by the increasing population of service personnel. In the service industries, frontline service personnel are subjected to frequent contact with customers, and close relationships are often formed between these two parties (Bowen and Schneider, 1988), despite the varied needs of different customers. Service-oriented OCBs are represented by enthusiasm, courteous demeanor, and the willingness to offer quality services in order to satisfy customers' needs (Cran, 1994; Hogan, Hogan and Busch, 1984). Therefore, the manifestation of service-oriented OCBs not only builds an effective bridge of communication between the organization and customers, but also represents the organization's attitudes towards its customers. Targeting on the role characteristics of the frontline contact employees, Bettencourt et al. (2001) proposed three service-oriented OCBs- loyalty, service delivery, and participation.

1. **Loyalty:** Frontline contact employees not only provide services to customers; they must project the image as advocates of the organization who proactively guard the rights and make all attempts to improve the organization's corporate image (Schneider and Bowen, 1985, 1993). Therefore, it is important that frontline contact employees demonstrate loyal citizenship behaviors.

2. **Service delivery:** Frontline service personnel must demonstrate reliability, trustworthiness and courteous demeanors during service delivery. Their service behaviors directly affect customers' intent to purchase and the level of satisfaction. Therefore, dutiful and dedicated role performance is also very important. (George, 1991; Parasuraman, Zeithaml and Berry, 1988).

3. **Participation:** To effectively link the external environment to the internal process, frontline service personnel must proactively supply customers the information they need, as well as propose suggestions to the management for improvement on the services (Schneider and Bowen, 1984; Parasuraman et al., 1988).

In summary, frontline contact employees serve as a link between the external customers and the internal management operations. Therefore, the organization expects contact employees to respond to customers' requests with courteous manners and give customers a sense of trustworthiness. Compared with other category-ization relating to OCBs, the dimensions of loyalty, service delivery, and participation best reflect customers' perceptions on the quality of the services and level of satisfaction (Huang Hong-Ming, 2006). This research aims to verify that organizational support to frontline service personnel affects the organizational citizenship behaviors demonstrated by the contact employees, targeting the service industries, including hypermarket chains, department stores, hotels, and banks. Therefore, categorization of service-oriented organizational behaviors proposed by Bettencourt et al. (2001) is adapted in this research.

**Organizational support and service-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors**

According to the definition set forth by Eisenberger et al. (1986), organization support (OS) perceived by employees refers to how much an organization cares about the welfare of its employees and how much it values its employees' contributions. Blau (1964) interpreted the relationship between an organization and its employees based on the social exchange theories. He stated that when employees sensed that their organization trusts and values them, a sense of obligation accumulates, and a mental state of “obligation” drives employees to work hard towards the organization's goals, in a sense that they want to repay the organization's recognition on their values. Organizational support satisfies employees' social emotional needs. When employees feel respected, cared for, and accepted, teamwork is improved and role identification reinforced. “I will be rewarded for working hard.” This belief is reinforced and in consequence stimulates higher organizational performance, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment, and reduces employee turnover (Rhoades and Eisenberger, 2002).

In addition to employees' work attitude and behaviors (Eisenberger et al., 1986, 1990; Rhoades and Eisenberger, 2002; Shore and Wayne, 1993; Yoon and Suh, 2004), OS may also affect employees' voluntary citizenship behaviors because the basis of social exchange lies in the trust and goodwill built up in between the two parties of exchange. The two parties also expect to receive corresponding returns for the trust and goodwill in the future so that a mutually beneficent relationship of rights and obligations will be developed, and this relationship of rights and obligations often exceeds the scope of the contract terms. From the perspective of employer-employee relationship, when a positive relationship exists between the employer and employees, OS not only motivates employees to take their work seriously but also induces formation of an emotional identification towards the organization; in some cases, employees may even voluntarily engage in activities that are beneficial to the organization without asking for tangible rewards (Eisenberger et al., 1990). Many researchers have also proved that there are positive correlations between OS and OCBs (Eisenberger et al., 1990; Moorman et al., 1998; Shore and Wayne, 1993; Wayne et al., 1997). For example, Wayne et al. (1997) conducted a study on the effects of employee perception on work attitudes and behaviors, targeting large corporations in the US. Results show that when employees feel valued by their organization, they develop trust towards their organization and are more willing to put forward concrete suggestions
voluntarily. They wish to help the organization to grow and these voluntary behaviors are exactly manifestation of OCBs. Study of Moorman et al. (1998) pointed out that OS also has positive correlations with several dimensions of OCBs, including interpersonal helping, personal industry, and loyal booster-ism. To frontline contact personnel of a service-based company, OS reinforces their acceptance and internal/external adaptation of the organizational values (that is, customer first) (Van Dyne et al., 1994). Because of which, frontline contact employees may become even more devoted in the performance of in-role and extra-role work behaviors to improve customer services as well as the organizations' over all image. Therefore, in addition to the general organizational citizenship behaviors, OS may also affect the service-oriented OCBs demonstrated by frontline contact employees in the service industries (Yoon and Suh, 2004).

In the aspect of loyalty citizenship behaviors, OS represents certain socio-economic rewards and such rewards induce employees to demonstrate loyalty behaviors (Graham, 1991). Therefore, the more OS felt by frontline contact employees, the more likely they would make the effort to sell the products or services to customers as well as advocate positive image for the company (Bowen and Schneider, 1988). With the mindset to repay the organization's support, which arises from a mutual-benefiting relationship, employees tend to proactively participate in management and development of the organization (Rhoades and Eisenberger, 2002). Frontline contact employees often convey information to the management relating to customers' needs, as well as relevant suggestions for improvements, based on their everyday experience with customers (Bettencourt et al., 2001). In the aspect of service delivery citizenship behaviors, employees often input more effort into their work in order to repay the organization when they sense that the organization notices and values them (Fasolo, 1995). Thus, when employees receive the message that their work abilities are trusted by the organization, they have higher willingness to quickly respond to customers' needs with a courteous service attitude. Based on the above discussions, we can deduce that a positive correlation exists between organizational support (OS) as perceived by frontline contact employees and their service-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs). Based on which, this research proposes its first hypothesis, as shown below:

$H_1$: Organizational support perceived by employees has a positive effect on service-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors.

$H_{1a}$: Organizational support perceived by employees has a positive effect on loyalty-related service-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors.

$H_{1b}$: Organizational support perceived by employees has a positive effect on service delivery-related service-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors.

Organizational climate and service-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors

Organizational climate refers to an organization's policies, procedures, and practices commonly perceived by the members of the organization (Schneider, 1990). That is, employees form a subjective awareness based on collective experiences in the organization and this subjective awareness is referred to as the “climate” of the organization (Schneider and Bowen, 1995). Organizational climate of the service industries refers to the organization's support for employees' activities, work procedures, and behaviors as sensed by employees in all aspects of customer services (Schneider et al., 1998). When employees sense that they will be rewarded for providing quality services to customers, and the organization implements service activities to support them, the organizational climate is thus formed (Schneider and Bowen, 1985).

Other than employees, customers are also able to feel the organization's organizational climate through interactivities with the frontline contact employees (Schneider, 1980, 1990), and customers' awareness of the organizational climate further affects their opinions and level of satisfaction to the quality of the services (Bitner et al., 1990; Parasuraman, 1987; Kao, 2008). And Schneider et al. (2005) further pointed out that when both the managers' efforts and the internal service environment are working to create an OC, this OC will be developed towards customer-oriented service behaviors. Therefore, an organization must create and maintain a certain organizational climate that suits the attributes of the services it offers if the organization wishes to achieve the image of service excellence (Schneider and Bowen, 1992). Organizational climate creates a cyclical system of positive feedback. Employees in a high organizational climate environment care highly about customers' opinions on their services and tend to think about how to improve their services and maximize customer Satisfaction. These employees have higher tendency to accumulate positive service/work experiences. And customers benefited by such positive experiences also tend to give employees positive opinions. This positive feedback, in turn, encourages employees to strive for even better services in the next opportunity to service a customer (Katz and Kahn, 1978). Hsu et al. (2010) dinted out in an empirical study, that the OC of an international airline company had positive effects on the service-oriented OCBs of the flight service crews. Dimitriadis (2007) also found in his empirical study: organizational climate sensed by frontline contact
employees of the service industries has positive effect on customer-oriented OCBs. Based on which, this research proposes the following hypothesis:

**H₂**: Organizational climate has a positive effect on employees' service-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors.

**H₂a**: Organizational climate has a positive effect on employees' loyalty-related service-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors.

**H₂b**: Organizational climate has a positive effect on employees' service delivery-related service-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors.

**H₂c**: Organizational climate has a positive effect on employees' participation-related service-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors.

### The moderating effect of organizational climate

Though many studies have proven that organizational support (OS) has a positive effect on organizational behaviors (Eisenberger et al., 1986, 1990; Moorman et al., 1998; Shore and Wayne, 1993; Wayne et al., 1997), different from in-role performance, organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) are voluntary behaviors that are usually not rewarded or compensated by any tangible means, so employees are less likely to be strongly motivated to conduct extra-role behaviors (Yan Xi-Xu Ru, Lin Yu-Li and Dai Shu-Xian, 2004). Therefore, in addition to caring for the employees through the employee benefit system, an organization must also think about how to encourage organizational citizenship behaviors through building an organizational culture or other management mechanisms.

According to the theories of role definition, employees’ perceived job breadth is closely related to demonstration of OCBs. When employees have a broader definition of their job roles, they are more likely to accept extra work that is not clearly stated in their job descriptions into the scope of their personal duties and have a higher tendency to perform OCBs (Morrison, 1994). Therefore, expanding employees’ perceived job breadth increases occurrence of extra-role behaviors and this may serve as a good strategy for management. Role definition is a cognitive categorization of behaviors. The line between in-role and extra-role behaviors is often ambiguous. In other words, the work-role definition does not have to be rigid construed; it may be altered. Work experiences under the socialized structure and the social cues conveyed by the socio-interpersonal environment also have certain influence on employees’ definition of work role and OCBs (Morrison, 1994). Organizational climate also represents organizational values sensed by employees (Schneider, 1990) and the messages are sent from the environment of the organization to the perception of each individual member. These messages convey the organizations’ expectations for employees’ behaviors and imply the possible consequences linked to these behaviors. Therefore, employees of an organization develop self-expected work behaviors based on this information. Schneider, Ehrhart, Mayer, Saltz, and Niles-Jolly (2005) support the above theory. They believe that employees detect how much the organization values services based on organizational strategies and relevant information they received, and when employees identify to the value of “service first”, they are more likely to perform service-oriented OCBs. Other researchers have also verified that a safety climate in an organization balances the relationship between leader-member exchange and safety citizenship behaviors (Hofmann, Morgan, and Gerras, 2003). Hsu et al. (2010) also pointed out in an empirical study that the OC of an international airline company has moderating effects on transformative leadership and service-oriented OCBs.

Similarly, to the service industries, when the frontline contact employees sense the company’s value in pursuing service excellence, such a message may change employees’ cognitive categorization; that is, changes in the definitions and expectations of personal roles. And such changes expand beyond the official role definition to include extra-role behaviors that facilitate achievement of customer satisfaction. Employees who have a stronger sense of OS often build an open exchange to give official feedback for the work and have a higher tendency to perform service-oriented citizenship behaviors as a means to repay the support from the organization (Morrison, 1994). Therefore, when an organization has a stronger organizational climate, the effect of OS, as sensed by employees, on service-oriented OCBs would also be reinforced. Based on the above, this research proposes the following hypothesis:

**H₃**: Organizational climate has a positive effect on organizational support and organizational citizenship behaviors.

**H₃a**: Organizational climate has a positive effect on organizational support and loyalty-related organizational citizenship behaviors.

**H₃b**: Organizational climate has a positive effect on organizational support and service delivery-related organizational citizenship behaviors.

**H₃c**: Organizational climate has a positive effect on organizational support and participation-related organizational citizenship behaviors.

### METHODOLOGY

**Subjects and sampling**

To reach the target of this research, subjects involved in high frequency customer service activities from organizations that tend to have more easily observable organizational climate are selected for this study, including employees from highly competitive service industries, such as hypermarket chains, department stores, hotels,
and banks. To avoid same source bias, two separate questionnaires are designed and answered by the management and the service personnel respectively. The management personnel answer questions for measurement of organizational climate and the service personnel answer questions for survey of organizational support (OS), service-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs), and the control variables at the personal level. Since all personal data is filled in by the surveyed subjects, the time-slot isolation method is used to prevent common method variance (Peng Tai-Guang, Gao Hui-Ci and Lin Zheng-Chen, 2006). With a time longitudinal design, the first stage was targeted on frontline employees of the branches of publicly listed corporations in China. With a purposive sampling method, targeting the managers and frontline contact employees of the branches of publicly listed corporations in the above-mentioned service industries.

In the first stage, the managers filled out the survey for organizational climate, and the service personnel answered the survey for organizational support and personal data. The survey was conducted over a period of three weeks and several research assistants handed out and collected the questionnaires in person at the branches. A total of 260 copies were sent out to the branch managers and 3300 copies to service employees. A total of 253 samples were returned from the managers. The questionnaire return rate is 97.3%. And 3104 copies of questionnaires were returned from service employees. After deducting 87 copies of incomplete questionnaires, a total of 3,140 valid questionnaires were returned. The first stage return rate of valid questionnaires is 94.1%. Six months later, the second stage survey was conducted and a questionnaire, targeting on the service-oriented OCBs, was sent out to the above 3,104 service employees. A survey of the second stage was also completed over a period of three weeks and the questionnaires were also handed out and collected by the research assistant in person at the branches. Due to the high turnover rate of frontline contact employees in the service industries, some employees left or were transferred to other posts. Therefore, after deducting these employees and incomplete questionnaires, a total of 2,869 copies were returned and the return rate of valid questionnaires is 86.9%. The samples have the following attributes. In the area of personal attributes, male subjects take up 34.1 and 75.3% of the surveyed subjects are unmarried. The average age is 29.6 with a standard error of 3.81. The majority have college education (45.8%), followed by high school (38.6%) and postgraduate (15.6%). The average years of service comes to 5.3 years with a standard error of 2.87, and full-time employees take up 74.6% of all subjects surveyed.

Definitions and measurement of questionnaire variables

This research uses questionnaire survey as the main measurement tool. The questionnaires are designed based on the Likert 5-point scale for enquiry of the level of agreement, excluding the section of personal data. The questionnaires used for this survey are designed based on the theories proposed in the past studies, targeted to achieve the objectives and verify the hypotheses proposed in this research. All scales used in this research are subject to the procedure of validation and improvement, and the operational definitions of the variables and sources of the questions are discussed in the following sections.

Organizational climate (OC)

This research adopts the organizational climate scale proposed by Schneider (1990), which is further amended for applicability to the environment of the service industries. The questionnaires, designed with seven questions, was first answered by six branch managers to measure the level of focus (importance) on "service" at each of the branches, as well as the efforts and support provided by the organization. The Cronbach’s α comes to 0.93, which indicates that the survey reaches the acceptable level. Since the ratings of OC behaviors are derived from the branch managers’ perceptions, the scores must be totaled and averaged. Therefore, before the hierarchical data from each branch is generated, the consistency of the answers made by the branch managers must be verified (Roussseau, 1985). This study uses two methods to verify the average score of the personal data, in order to verify the validity of the hierarchical data of the branches. In the first step, the branches are set as factors in the One-way ANOVA analysis for OC (Amason, 1996). Result of this analysis reaches the level of significance (F=1.95, p<0.01). This indicates that inter-branch variation is significantly higher than in-branch variation, meaning that the answers made by branch managers are highly consistent. The second step involves verification of RWG (the second interrater reliability); an RWG value higher than 0.70 indicates that consistency exists in the answers made by the branch managers (George, 1990). The RWG value derived from the survey for organizational support answered by the selected branch managers comes to 0.98, which indicates that the answers have high consistency. This result shows that, for the OC variables, the total average method is suitable for conversion of personal data into the hierarchical data of the branches.

Organizational support (OS)

With reference to the organizational support scale developed by Eisenberger et al. (1986), this research developed a scale to measure the level of organization’s focus (importance) on employees’ contribution and welfare as perceived by each individual employee. A total of seven questionnaire items were developed, including one reverse question. Before the elimination of any of the questionnaire items, the Cronbach’s α value comes to 0.87, which indicates that the questionnaire reaches the acceptable level.

Service-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs)

According to Bettencourt et al. (2001), service-oriented organizational behaviors are seen as extensions of organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs). When frontline contact employees offer services to customers, they may exhibit behaviors such as enthusiasm, in order to satisfy customers’ needs. Such service-oriented OCB is also a type of service-oriented behavior. This research aims to verify whether OS sensed by employees affect the occurrence of OCBs. Therefore, a questionnaire relevant to the subject was sent out to and answered by employees at the above-mentioned branches and service units.

The questions are designed with reference to the service-oriented organizational behavior scale developed by Bettencourt et al. (2001), which covers three dimensions of loyalty, service delivery, and participation with 16 questions:

1. Loyalty-related service-oriented OCBs: Employees strive to maintain the company’s image, proactively participate in the company’s events and meetings, and proactively put forth constructive proposals. There are five questions in this dimension and the Cronbach's α value comes to 0.86.
2. Service delivery-related service-oriented OCBs: Employees are happy to help out the peers, proactively service the customers, and strive to satisfy customers’ needs. There are six questions in this dimension and the Cronbach's α value is 0.91.
3. Participation-related service-oriented OCBs: Employees are
dedicated to their work, follow the company’s rules, and voluntarily offers suggestions beyond the standard requirements of the organization. There are five questions in this dimension and the Cronbach’s \( \alpha \) value is 0.88.

This research uses confirmatory factor analysis to verify the construct validity of the scale. Results of the analysis (\( \chi^2 = 119.60, df = 11; \text{RMR} = 0.026; \text{GFI} = 0.92; \text{CFI} = 0.95; \text{NFI} = 0.97 \)) indicate that the applicability of the overall model meets the general standard. For verification of discriminate validity, this research configures the correlation between paired factors as 1.00 to test whether the confidence interval, plus and minus two standard error zones, includes 1.00. When the confidence level includes 1.00, this means that the two factors tested are the same factor and when the confidence interval excludes 1.00, this means that the factors are two different factors (Anderson and Gerbing, 1988; Jöreskog and Sörbom, 1989). Results of the analysis on service-oriented OCBs show that the confidence intervals of the paired dimensions of OCBs exclude the value of 1.00. This indicates that the factors are discriminate and the scale of service-oriented OCBs is verified to have discriminate validity.

In addition to service-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors, this research has also tested the discriminate validity among the variables of OC, OS, and the three dimensions of service-oriented OCBs. Results show that all confidence levels, plus and minus two standard error zones, derived from the paired variables exclude the value of 1.00. This means that discriminate validity exist between variables.

**Control variables**

With reference to the previous researches relating to organizational support (OS), organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs), and organizational climate (OC) (Hofmann et al., 2003; Van Dyne and Ang, 1998), this research sets the following personal attributes as the control variables: gender, age, education, years of service, marital status, and employment status. During analysis, “gender” is configured as a dummy variable; the value for male is 0 and 1 for female. Marital status is also set as a dummy variable; 0 for married and 1 for unmarried. Employment status means “part-time” or “full-time”; 1 is configured for full-time and 0 for part-time. The level of education is divided into three categories, postgraduate, college, and high school, which are represented by three dummy variables.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

This research explores the relationships between variables from the personal and branch levels. Table 1 shows the average, standard error, and relevant analysis results of the variables at the personal level. Positive correlations are found between organizational support (OS) and service-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) in all three dimensions—loyalty, service delivery, and participation, and all results reach the significant level of 0.01. This shows that employee perception of OS is correlated to service-oriented OCBs and this result corresponds to the prediction of the hypotheses proposed in this research. Among the control variables, negative correlation is found between all variables, including employees’ years of service, age, OS, loyalty-related service-oriented OCBs, service delivery-related service-oriented OCBs, participation-related service-oriented OCBs. This shows that employees at the branches do not perceive OS or exhibit service-oriented OCBs because of longer service years or higher age.

**Hierarchical linear modeling**

This research adopts the hierarchical linear modeling (HLM) developed by Bryk and Raudenbush (1992) to verify the hypotheses. HLM is chosen because it provides the means to clearly differentiate that members of certain groups are more similar to members of other groups, which means that members of a group can be seen as a specified cluster for effective elimination of the errors that may occur in other methods, whereas a sample is seen as an independent sample when comparing the data of the personal level to the data of the group level. Furthermore, HLM is capable of measuring the unit variances in the lower and higher levels from the results and simultaneously maintain the goodness-of-fit for model analysis. In other words, HLM is capable of measuring the effect of the forecast variables at the personal and group level on the outcome variables of the personal level and, at the same time, calculates the effect of the explained variances of cross-level outcome variables on personal level outcome variables. In addition, HLM also eliminates the errors of regression analysis in the past studies when data of different levels are compared at the same level (Hofmann, 1997).

The branch-level data used in this research is derived from the branch managers of hypermarket chain stores, and personal data is collected from branch employees who answered the OS and service-oriented OCBs surveys in the two stages. Table 2 is a summary of analysis results derived from verification test for the effect of OS on service-oriented OCBs. Table 3 shows the results of verification test for the direct and moderating effects of organizational climate.

**The effect of organizational support on service-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors**

1. Personal loyalty-related service-oriented OCBs: With reference to Hofmann (1997), this research uses a null model to verify whether loyalty-related service-oriented OCBs vary from branch to branch. The result shows significant differences in the loyalty-related service-oriented OCBs, as demonstrated by employees of different branches. Control variables of the personal and branch levels are then input into the analysis to avoid overestimation of the explain ability of the independent variables in the follow-up regression analysis. Results show that most of the control variables have a significant effect, as forecasted. To verify whether OS has a direct effect on loyalty-related service-oriented OCBs, this research employed the random coefficients regression model; personal variables and OS variables, are inputted in the formula of regression analysis to verify the relationship between the two factor categories. As shown in Model 1
### Table 1. Average, standard error, and relevant analysis of the personal level variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>SE</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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OS</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty-related service-oriented OCBs</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.82**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service delivery-related service-oriented OCBs</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.78**</td>
<td>0.79**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation-related service-oriented OCBs</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.77**</td>
<td>0.75**</td>
<td>0.84**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.09**</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>28.81</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>-0.09**</td>
<td>0.14**</td>
<td>-0.07**</td>
<td>-0.05**</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of service</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>-0.45**</td>
<td>-0.37**</td>
<td>-0.52**</td>
<td>-0.38**</td>
<td>0.21**</td>
<td>0.57**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>-0.12**</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.11**</td>
<td>-0.15**</td>
<td>0.07**</td>
<td>0.43**</td>
<td>0.31**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.13**</td>
<td>0.21**</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.15**</td>
<td>0.57**</td>
<td>0.44**</td>
<td>0.32**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>-0.18**</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.16**</td>
<td>-0.21**</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.58**</td>
<td>0.32**</td>
<td>0.75**</td>
<td>0.26**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<0.05, ** p<0.01

### Table 2. The effect of organizational support on service-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Equation</th>
<th>Parameter estimation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Level 1: ( \text{SOCB} = \beta_0 j + \beta_1 j (\text{OS}) + r_{ij} )</td>
<td>( \gamma_{00} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Level 2: ( \beta_0 j = \gamma_{00} + U_{00} )</td>
<td>-0.55**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Level 2: ( \beta_1 j = \gamma_{10} + U_{11} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>Level 1: ( \text{SOCB} = \beta_0 j + \beta_1 j (\text{OS}) + r_{ij} )</td>
<td>( \gamma_{00} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Level 2: ( \beta_0 j = \gamma_{00} + U_{00} )</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Level 2: ( \beta_1 j = \gamma_{10} + U_{11} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 3</td>
<td>Level 1: ( \text{SOCB} = \beta_0 j + \beta_1 j (\text{OS}) + r_{ij} )</td>
<td>( \gamma_{00} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Level 2: ( \beta_0 j = \gamma_{00} + U_{00} )</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Level 2: ( \beta_1 j = \gamma_{10} + U_{11} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<0.05, ** p<0.01. SOCB1: loyalty related service-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors. SOCB2: service delivery related service-oriented organizational citizenship behaviours. SOCB3: Participation-related service-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors. OS: organizational support.
Table 3. The effect of organizational climate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter estimation</th>
<th>( \beta_{0j} )</th>
<th>( \beta_{1j} )</th>
<th>( \gamma_{00} )</th>
<th>( \gamma_{01} )</th>
<th>( \gamma_{10} )</th>
<th>( \gamma_{11} )</th>
<th>( \sigma^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \beta_{0j} = \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{01}(OC) + U_{00} )</td>
<td>( 0.91^{**} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \beta_{1j} = \gamma_{10} + U_{11} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \beta_{0j} = \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{01}(OC) + U_{00} )</td>
<td>( -1.41^{*} )</td>
<td>( 0.91^{**} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( 0.08 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \beta_{1j} = \gamma_{10} + U_{11} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \beta_{0j} = \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{01}(OC) + U_{00} )</td>
<td>( -0.08 )</td>
<td>( -0.01 )</td>
<td>( 0.72^{**} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( 0.07 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \beta_{1j} = \gamma_{10} + U_{11} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \beta_{0j} = \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{01}(OC) + U_{00} )</td>
<td>( -0.08 )</td>
<td>( 0.91^{**} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( 0.12 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \beta_{1j} = \gamma_{10} + U_{11} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \beta_{0j} = \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{01}(OC) + U_{00} )</td>
<td>( -0.08 )</td>
<td>( -0.01 )</td>
<td>( 0.72^{**} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( 0.07 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \beta_{1j} = \gamma_{10} + U_{11} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \beta_{0j} = \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{01}(OC) + U_{00} )</td>
<td>( -0.08 )</td>
<td>( 0.91^{**} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( 0.12 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \beta_{1j} = \gamma_{10} + U_{11} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* \( p<0.05 \), ** \( p<0.01 \). SOCB1: loyalty related service-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors. SOCB2: service delivery-related service-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors. SOCB3: participation-related service-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors. OS: organizational support. OC: organizational climate.

of Table 2, the intercept coefficient of OS is 0.78, which reaches the level of significance (p<0.01). This indicates that OS is explanatory to loyalty related service-oriented OOCBs. Therefore, \( H_{1a} \) is supported.

2. Service delivery-related service-oriented OCBs: in the dimension of service delivery-related service-oriented OCBs, significant differences are found in between the service delivery-related service-oriented OCBs of different branches and most personal level control variables reach the level of significance as forecasted. From the analysis results of the random coefficients regression model in Model 2 of Table 2, we find that the intercept coefficient of OS is 0.70, which reaches the level of significance (p<0.01). This shows that OS is explanatory to service delivery-related service-oriented OCBs. Hypothesis 1b is supported.

3. Participation-related service-oriented OCBs: in the dimension of participation-related service-oriented OCBs, significant differences are found in the participation related service-oriented OCBs of employees of different branches and most personal level control variables are found to have significant effects as forecasted. From the results of random coefficients regression model shown in model 3 of Table 2, the intercept coefficient of OS is 0.71
and reaches the level of significance \( p < 0.01 \). This shows that OS is explanatory to participation-related service-oriented OCBs. Hypothesis 1c is supported.

**The moderating effect of organizational climate (OC)**

Table 3 is a summary of the results of analysis implemented to verify the direct effect of OC on service-oriented OCBs, as well as the results of the cross-level analysis on the moderating effects of OC. Analysis in this section is conducted in two stages. The intercepts-as-outcomes model is used to forecast the predictive power of OC to the variables of service-oriented OCBs when OS is under control. This analysis aims to verify Hypothesis 2 of this research. The slopes-as-outcomes model is then used to analyze whether OC has moderating effects on the relationship between OS and service-oriented OCBs.

Results of the intercepts-as-outcomes model analysis show that when the personal and branch level variables are under control, OC does not have a significant predictive power on service-oriented OCBs. In other words, OC does not have a direct effect on service-oriented OCBs. Hypothesis 2 is not supported. Results of the slopes-as-outcomes model analysis indicate that the moderating effect of OC on the relationship between OS and loyalty-related service-oriented OCBs reaches the level of significance \( \gamma_{11} = 0.17 \), \( p < 0.01 \), as shown in the lower half of Model 1 in Table 3. This result indicates that OC affects the relationship between OS and loyalty-related service-oriented OCBs. Hypothesis 3a is supported. Similarly, as shown in the lower half of Model 2 in Table 3, the moderating effect of OC on the relationship between OS and service delivery-related service-oriented OCBs reaches the level of significance \( \gamma_{11} = 0.08 \), \( p < 0.01 \). This result indicates that OC affects the relationship between OS and service delivery related service-oriented OCBs. Hypothesis 3b is supported. However, Model 3 shows that OC does not have a moderating effect on the relationship between OS and participation-related service-oriented OCBs. This indicates that the effect of OS sensed by employees on participation-related service-oriented OCBs is not affected by OC. \( H_{3c} \) is not supported.

**The effect of organizational support (OS) to service-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs)**

According to the results of hypothesis 1, results of this research support the social exchange theory: when employees feel respected, cared for, and accepted, the psychological feedback derived from a mutually beneficial relationship drives employees to perform in-role and extra-role behaviors that are beneficial to the operations of the organization as a gesture for repayment. Service personnel are apt to encounter emergencies or unexpected situations when providing services to customers; therefore, voluntary service behaviors are especially important to these frontline contact employees (Stamper and Van Dyne, 2001). However, except Bettencourt et al. (2001) who have explored the relationship between OS and service-oriented OCBs targeting on the employees working at customer service centers and college libraries, very few researches have focused on this area. This research aims to verify the relationship between these two factors, targeting frontline contact employees of the service industries, including hypermarket chains, department stores, hotels, and banks. Results of this research not only corresponds to the results of the previous studies but also preliminarily verified the theory: employees of the service industries changes their service behaviors based on the perception of how much the organization values their contributions and concerns for their welfare.

**The effect of organizational climate (OC) on service-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs)**

Contrary to the expectation for Hypothesis 2, this research found that OC does not yield a positive direct effect on employees’ service-oriented OCBs. This result is inconsistent with the results previously verified through empirical studies (e.g., Dimitriades, 2007). This indicates that a positive work environment may not bring direct spillover effects to the interactive relationship between employees and customers. This may be due to the fact that previous studies related to OC concentrated on verification of the effect of employee-perceived OC on OCBs, without taking into consideration other influences or factors involved in the formation of OCBs, or saw OC as part of the supportive climate in OS (e.g., Shadur, Kienzle, and Rodwell, 1999). In such cases, the direct effects of OC on employees’ attitudes or behaviors are overestimated. This research uses multi-level analysis to derive the results by controlling the variables of OS before the process of verifying the effect of OC on service-oriented OCBs.

**The moderating effect of organizational climate (OC)**

Results of the above analysis show that OC does not have direct effect on service-oriented OCBs. Though OC is a key moderating variable explanatory to the relationship between OS and service-oriented OCBs, it is verified in Hypothesis 3 of this research that it only has moderating effects on loyalty-related service-oriented OCBs and service delivery-related service-oriented OCBs. No moderating effect is found on participation-related service-oriented OCBs. This result is inconsistent with the previous studies that support the theory that employees sense the organization’s level of focus (importance) on service from organizational strategies and
relevant messages (Schneider et al., 2005). Therefore, further discussion is called for to verify the divergent results.

The hypothesis of this research argues that under a certain OC, employees who perceived OS have the tendency to exhibit customer-oriented OCBs as a gesture to repay the organization’s support (Morrison, 1994). However, in an empirical study on a large retailer in the Northwest region of the USA conducted by Bell and Menguc (2002), researchers found that, under an OC that emphasizes service quality, employee-perceived OS does not have a significant effect on OCBs. Many researchers indeed have different theories, and this research found that, in the relationship between OS and OCBs, supportive OC only induces performance of loyalty and service delivery-related service-oriented OCBs and no moderating effect is found on participation-related service-oriented OCBs. This may be due to the reason that an organization’s management policies may emphasize the responsibilities of proactively offering information to customers as well as suggestions to the management (Schneider and Bowen, 1984; Parasuraman et al., 1988). That is, participation-related service-oriented OCBs are not performed voluntarily; therefore, neither direct relationship nor moderating effect is found between OC and participation-related OCBs.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Many studies on service industries have emphasized the importance of frontline service employees, since these employees come into frequent contact with customers. Researchers have also found that employees’ beliefs and perceptions affect their service attitude and behaviors. Nonetheless, some scholars have also noticed the unique attribute in the service industries; that is, in the service scenarios, organizations not only demand frontline contact employees to conduct service activities with strict bidding to their job descriptions but also expect employees to proactively exhibit actions that satisfy customers’ individual needs, and these actions are known as positive service-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors (e.g. Schneider et al., 2005). In recent years, many scholars have proposed research relevant to service-oriented OCBs (Hsu et al., 2010; Weng et al., 2010). Hsu et al. (2010) conducted a research study on an international airline company and the results indicate that a significant positive correlation exists between OC and transformative leadership; moreover, the OC also has a moderating effect on the relationships between transformative leadership and service-oriented OCBs, as well as the sub-dimensions of service delivery, loyalty and active participation. However, some factors, including OC, OS, and service-oriented OCB, have not yet been studied. In addition, previous studies found that employee-perceived organizational support is highly explanatory to employees’ extra-role behaviors. However, according to the logics of role definition, organizational climate changes employees’ definition on whether organizational citizenship behaviors have moderating effects, and these changes further affect exhibition of the relationship between perceived organizational support and service-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors. This effect has not yet been studied and this research makes an attempt to verify this theory.

This research is an empirical study conducted through multiple-level analysis. Subjects of this research are branch managers and employees of publicly listed hypermarket chains, department stores, hotels, and banks. Results of this research found that organizational climate may be explanatory to the moderating variables in the relationship between employee-perceived organizational support and service-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors. In other words, under a certain organizational climate, when employees sense that they are valued and cared for by the organization, they may exhibit more service-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors. This result shows that organizational climate or other cultural factors play a key moderating role in the occurrence of voluntary organizational citizenship behaviors. From the results, we can see that $H_1$ is supported by the empirical results. Employee-perceived organizational support indeed has a positive effect on service-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors. This result is consistent to the findings of previous studies (Van Dyne, Jehn and Cummings, 2002). This shows that when employees sense that they are valued and supported by the organization, they think they have a duty and obligation to act for achievement of the organization’s goal, as a gesture to repay the organization’s support (Wayne et al., 1997). Furthermore, $H_2$ is not supported by the results. This indicates that organizational climate may not have direct effect on employees’ service behaviors. That is, a work environment characterized by positive organizational climate does not bring direct spill-over effect to the interactive relationships between the employees and the customers. Finally, from the results of the multi-level comparison, we found that organizational climate only has moderating effects on the relationships between organizational support and loyalty/service delivery-related service-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors. No moderating effect is found in the relationship between organizational support and participation-related service-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors. Therefore, $H_3$ is only partially supported. This also means that employees’ demonstration of loyalty related service-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors helps to maintain an organization’s image. And service-delivery related service-oriented organizational behaviors is often manifested in the willingness to help others, as well as proactive actions taken to service the customers and satisfy customers’ needs. Nonetheless, the results indicated in the category of participation related service-oriented
organizational citizenship behaviors also show that employees are not capable of performing behaviors exceeding the basic requirements of their organizations such as providing suggestions. From the results, we may infer that organizational climate does not have direct effect on employees’ service-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors and it is possible that it is impossible to affect employees’ service behaviors even indirectly through the interactive relationship between organizational climate and organizational support. Therefore, if organizations in the service industries expect frontline contact employees to put in extra effort in customer service, it is necessary to care more for employees' welfare and value employees' contributions beyond the basic needs and assistance. When organizational climate is formed in an organization, the management should consider how to reinforce employees’ voluntary participation in the organization’s service activities on top of building employee loyalty and encouraging performance of service delivery-related service-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors.

Reinforce employees’ perception on organizational support

The conventional motivation system encourages employees to perform in-role behaviors, but extra-role organizational citizenship behaviors can only be motivated through management policies and reinforcement in employee-perceived organizational support. For examples, timely confirmation on employees’ work performance, high focus on employees' welfare, attention to employees' health and family, and timely assistances are all practices that help to create a perception of “giving”, which in turn motivates employees to repay the organization for its care and empathy through extra-role behaviors. Moreover, open and regular announcements of benefit or assistance policies, i.e. offering a complete plan of career path, professional service training, or open channel of promotion, are also effective in conveying the organization’s determination to support its employees. This in turn builds employees' trust in and identification to the organization.

Design management policies that merge into the organizational climate

Well coordinated management policies also promote performance of customer service behaviors; especially, organizational support is highly effective in organizations that have service-oriented organizational climate. To the service industries, management policies, such as reward systems that effectively reflect service performance (i.e. Employee of the Month), timely assistance from the direct supervisors, supply of peripheral tools that help employees perform services, and regular collection of customer feedback on the services, convey messages to employees that demonstrate how much the organization values customer service and express the organization's expectation on loyalty, service delivery, and participation-related service-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors. Also, a linkage of organizational climate to the evaluation and remuneration system will reinforce employees’ identification to the scope of in-role behaviors. When employees sense the support from the organization, they will also exhibit customer service related loyalty, service delivery, and participation service-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors.

Intensity the effect of OC to OS and employees’ service-oriented OCBs

Since OC does not affect employees’ service-oriented OCBs directly, the quality of employees’ services to the customers would not be directly affected by the sense of “being supported” by the activities, procedures and behaviors of the organization. Nonetheless, OC has effects on OS and employees’ loyalty/service delivery (service-oriented OCBs).
OCBs). That is, employees would exhibit loyalty by proactively guarding the rights of the organization, promoting a positive image for the organization and exhibiting an attitude of dedication during the course of service delivery. However, OC does not affect OS and employees' active participation (service-oriented OCB). That is, employees do not proactively provide information to customers; neither do they actively propose suggestions for improvement of services. Therefore, intensifying OC is, indeed, a very important strategy in the practice of management; it is essential for an organization to care, motivate and respect its employees, as well as to boost employees' confidence and make them feel there is a supportive organizational climate. The organization can further implement organizational activities, training courses, a reward system and customer service feedback strategies to intensify the effect of OC and induce employees to willingly exhibit the loyalty and service delivery (service-oriented OCB) expected by the organization. Another goal is to further encourage employees to actively propose suggestions for improvement of customer services and willingly exhibit active participation (service-oriented OCB) through achieving better service efficiency, higher customer satisfaction rates and maximum revenues.

LIMITATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FOLLOW-UP STUDIES

Though we have made the best effort to design a well-rounded research, there are still limitations to this study, as described in this section, which may provide as a reference for follow-up studies. First of all, this research uses employee self-evaluation to measure personal perception in the dimensions of organizational support and service-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors. This was designed with consideration to the fact that the level of organizational support comes from personal perception and only employees themselves are able to determine how much they are valued. And some of the service-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors that take place away from workplace cannot be evaluated by the direct supervisors (that is, advocate the organization to friends). Thus, this research chose to conduct the survey on these two dimensions through self-evaluation. However, in such case, common method variance is likely to occur and cause a bias in the correlations between variables. Therefore, this research adopts the time-longitudinal method to conduct the survey, in an attempt to minimize the problem of common method variance (two surveys were conducted in two separate time slots that are six months apart). The values of the correlation coefficients between the variables of organizational support and service-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors are relatively high; therefore, with reference to Podsakoff and Organ's (1986) study, this research carried out a factor analysis, to verify the question items designed for the variables of organizational support and service-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors. The results are subjected under a rotation test with the varimax method, which show that factors with eigen values greater than 1 are explanatory to as high as 75.66% of the variances. Thus, the problem of common method variable is not considered as serious. Furthermore, for convenience and time/cost efficiency, the questionnaires were handed over to the branch managers for further distribution; therefore, it is hard to achieve objective random sampling. In addition, the researchers were not present when the questionnaires were answered; therefore, it was uncertain whether employees were clearly on the wordings used in the questionnaire survey, so bias may have been caused. The above are limitations to this research, provided as a reference for future studies.
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