ABSTRACT

In the context of Organizational Behavior Research there has been limited study on relationship between frontline employees and customers. These studies have been restricted to the investigation of employee’s influences on customer’s satisfaction, loyalty, cooperative performance and evaluation of service quality. Since frontline employees are considered as unique sources of competitive advantage, this research takes a step further and investigates how employees’ organizational citizenship behaviors and deviant workplace behaviors influence customers’ value co-creation behavior. Derived from social exchange theory and leader-member exchange relationship, a new approach to the relationship between employees and customers is introduced as Employee-Customer Exchange relationship (ECX).
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INTRODUCTION

Research done in organizational behavior (OB) in terms of employees’ job attitudes, organizational citizenship behavior and deviant workplace behaviors has almost always focused on the antecedents and consequences of these topics within the organization. In fact, there are many studies which investigate what causes employees to feel satisfied, committed or to modify specific behaviors such as a counterproductive behavior or a citizenship behavior within an organization in order to carry out the threats that cause a diminish in organizational effectiveness and performance. Research in this area seems to be highly concerned with what is going on inside the organization rather than what kinds of impact may be produced in interaction with outsiders.

As well OB researchers emphasize on topics such as organizational citizenship behavior to find out how altruism or helping co-workers or supervisors can strengthen the organizational effectiveness or sportsmanship behavior cause individuals within the organization to cope with less ideal situations.

However there is a lack of research when one takes a look at the effects of these behaviors and attitudes on subjects such as buyers or suppliers which are located outside the organization and how employees’ behaviors can influence outsiders' behaviors. Accordingly this study assumes that employees’ behaviors and job attitudes can produce significant effect on organizational performance and effectiveness across the bridge between frontline employees and customers. In fact in service jobs in which employees are supposed to
communicate directly with customers their behaviors and attitudes may directly or indirectly influence customers to modify specific behaviors.

From marketing perspective, customers’ participation in the interaction with organizations and frontline employees is also at issue. Marketing scholars argue that customers participate in a process of exchange while interacting with organizations. Historically, this exchange perspective was known to have a dominant logic based on the exchange of goods (tangible resources). However new perspective toward this exchange model has emerged with emphasize on: intangible resources, the co-creation of value and relationships within a service-dominant logic (Vargo & Lusch, 2004).

Marketing researchers propose that customers are active value creators in the interaction with organizations or in other words customer is always a co-creator of value. Value co-creation process is explained by marketers as the process in which the interaction of customers with organization is a source of competitive advantage for organizations and the more customers are engaged in this interaction, the higher is the competitive advantage. In such perspective even customers are considered as part time employees and can improve the effectiveness of the organization. In essence, “customers co-create value with the firm through involvement in the entire service-value chain” (Yi & Gong, 2013, p. 1279). Accordingly, to robust this process, scholars have developed a scale of customer value co-creation behavior which comprises two dimensions: customer participation behavior and customer citizenship behavior and each one has four dimensions (Yi & Gong, 2013) which will be discussed later in this paper. Increased competition between service providers has forced organizations to pay extra attention to the quality of services they provide for customers. In fact, the customers’ interactions with the service providers shape their perceived quality about the services (Bowen & Schneider, 1988). So the acts of frontline employees as well as their behaviors have become a serious concern of managers. The image employees create for customers and the quality of interactions between employees and customers can influence the organizational effectiveness through attracting or losing more customers or, becoming well-recognized or getting bad names through word of mouth (Morris & Feldman, 1996).

Up to now, management scholars have studied different behavior of employees within the context of organization and very few studies have considered the impacts of employees’ behaviors or job attitudes on outsiders’ behaviors such as clients. In some cases, employees’ behaviors have been studied and investigated in order to find out whether these behaviors can affect customers’ perception or customers’ satisfaction but not their citizenship and participation behaviors.

In service jobs frontline employees communicate with customers directly and behaviors such as citizenship behaviors and deviant behaviors may produce impacts on the relationship between employees and customers. Furthermore, the level of different job attitudes such as satisfaction and commitment may strengthen or weaken a relationship with customers and consequently influence the organizational effectiveness. For instance, research done by McKenzie, Podsakoff and Fetter (1991, 1993) identified organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) (Organ, 1988) as one of the important factors that sales managers consider for evaluating the performance of sales personnel.

In contrast it may be inferred that behaviors opposite to OCBs produce a negative effect on the judgment of such sales managers. In fact from sales managers’ perspective, salespersons’ OCBs seem to enhance and promote the effective functioning of an organization and deviant behaviors seem to weaken the effective functioning of an organization. Here one may ask how
employees’ behaviors can effect customers’ behaviors and consequently make changes in the performance of the organization. According to Dalal (2005) job performance is composed of three unique parts and these parts impact the overall job performance including task performance, organizational citizenship behavior and workplace deviance. In this research I have chosen to study 2 of these 3 unique parts that impact overall job performance: organizational citizenship behavior and deviant behaviors.

All in all, the current research aims to investigate how organizational citizenship behavior and deviant workplace behaviors affect customers’ value co-creation behavior’s dimensions defined by Yi and Gong (2013). Moreover two important job attitudes (satisfaction and commitment) will also be included in the model. In fact since job attitudes can affect employees’ behaviors; it is likely that the relationship between job attitudes and customers’ value co-creation behavior can be established either directly (from job attitudes to customers’ behaviors) or indirectly (being mediated by items such as OCB or deviant behaviors).

LITERATURE REVIEW

Within the context of organizational behavior research, there is an imperative need for management to investigate the customer’s role and to consider both employee and customer together when evaluating the effectiveness of the organization since external customers are the final judges of the effectiveness (Yoon & Suh, 2003). Specifically within a service job, employees’ activities connect organization and employees with customers. In this regard, different scholars have different attitudes towards such interaction. Some scholars have investigated the relationship between employees’ job attitudes and customer satisfaction which will influence the organizational effectiveness (Tornow & Wiley, 1991). Some believe that the purpose of such relationship and activities can be to maintain customer loyalty by fulfilling the needs of customers and therefore these activities are considered as vital for the organizational success (Gwinner et al., 1998). Other groups of scholars mainly have focused on the effects of employees behaviors on customer loyalty and corporate performance (e.g. Podsakoff & Mackenzie, 1997; Reynolds & Beatty, 1999).

Castro et al. (2004) investigated the relationship between employee behavior and customer perceptions of the quality of services received. Castro and colleagues (2004) also identified that different attitudinal and behavioral responses of employees can produce positive or negative effects on customers’ perceptions of quality of services. These positive and negative attitudes may include conflict, ambiguity, job satisfaction, commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. Testa (2001) also argued that in service environment employees attitudes can greatly affect the perception of customers and influence the perceived quality of the services greatly. Scholars have empirically tested that employees effort toward customer can strengthen the customer satisfaction and perceptions toward contact employees and firm (Mohr and Bitner, 1995). Reichheld (1996) and Mowday (1999) stated that for organizations loyalty can be considered as a way for creating value and consequently it can be a source of growth, profit and competitive advantage. In fact according to these authors, loyal employees build high quality relationship with buyers and eventually buyers become loyal to organizations in return. Interestingly in terms of job satisfaction and commitment empirical evidence also showed that improvements in employee attitudes toward the organization have a direct impact on customer satisfaction (Rucci, Kirn & Quinn, 1998). Koys (2001) also indicated that employee satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior, and employee turnover influence profitability and customer satisfaction.
Others also investigated how contact employees' organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) affect customers' evaluation of service quality (Yoon & Suh, 2003). As well, Paulin et al. (1999) and Paulin et al. (2000) emphasize the customer–firm relationship for long-term profitability and argue that customer-contact employees who are interacting with customers fundamentally affect the customers' evaluations of the organization and services they receive specifically through voluntary behaviors and dysfunctional behaviors. In fact, by these behaviors which customers can observe during physical and social interactions with employees, customers' evaluation of the service provided (Yoon & Suh, 2003) will be influenced. Moreover, in order to have successful encounters and exchanges with customers, organizations should strengthen their effective internal exchanges among employees and between employees. Only after effective internal exchanges have occurred, can successful external exchanges between employees and customers take place (Kelley & Hoffman, 1997).

Although the available literature about the interaction of employees and customers has not focused on such relationships between employees and customers while talking about customers' participation behavior and customers' citizenship behaviors, it can be inferred from the literature reviewed that such relationships are likely to exist. In fact, as long as it is relevant to talk about how employees' behaviors and attitudes affect constructs such as customer satisfaction, customer loyalty, customer cooperative performance and customers' evaluation of services received, it is also probable to find similar relationships between employees' behavior/attitudes and customers' behaviors. Research shows evidence for the relationship between customers' participation behaviors and customers' satisfaction and discusses that participation can result in satisfaction of customers (e.g. Grissemann & Stokburger-Sauer, 2012). Considering these two streams of research it is probable that the relationship between employees' attitudes/behaviors and customer satisfaction is mediated by customer's participation behaviors and eventually it can be proposed that employees' behaviors are the antecedents of customers' participation. Before explaining the theoretical framework of the study in a much more detailed way, in following I will give a detailed explanation of the constructs discussed up to this point in order to ease the theorizing process of the propositions.

**Job Satisfaction**

Locke (1976, p. 1300) described job satisfaction as "a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences." As well, Churchill et al. (1974) argued about the conceptual domain of the job satisfaction and defined it as all characteristics of the job and the work environment which an employee find rewarding, fulfilling, and satisfying, or frustrating and unsatisfying. Up to data, a large number of constructs have been introduced as the antecedents and consequences of job satisfaction such as work outcomes, individual differences, role perceptions, supervisory behaviors and job/task characteristics (Brown & Peterson, 1993). Brown and Peterson (1993) indicated that job satisfaction includes satisfaction with the supervisor, work, pay, advancement opportunities, coworkers and customers. In a service industry in which frontline employees are interacting directly with the customers, satisfaction can be an antecedent of a good interaction with customers or a consequence of this relationship. So, the conclusion can be drawn that satisfaction matters in the relationship with customers.

**Commitment**

Organizational commitment is a psychological state that causes individuals within the organization to decide to stay or leave the organization and characterizes the relationship between employee and organization (Meyer & Allen, 1991). This construct refers to an
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An exchange-based relationship in which the individual and organization are separate entities psychologically (Van Knippenberg & Sleebos, 2006). Meyer & Allen (1991) also delineated commitment in terms of three general themes: affective commitment or “the employees' emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization”, continuous commitment or “an awareness of the costs associated with leaving the organization” and normative commitment which “reflects a feeling of obligation to continue employment”. These three types can result in different types of behaviors in employees for instance by affective commitment employees are more likely to perceive pleasure and arrive at higher levels of job satisfaction whereas normative commitment may be accompanied by either satisfaction or dissatisfaction.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB)

Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) describes employees’ voluntary behaviors to go beyond role expectations and the success of the organization is assumed to be partially related to these behaviors. Organ (1988) who originally coined this concept indicates that employees that exhibit these behaviors can be considered as “good soldiers” for the organization and can be considered as good actors if they try to impress other individuals by these behaviors. In addition the positive contribution of OCB to organizational performance is broadly proved by different scholars (Podsakoff & Mackenzie, 1994). Extra-role behaviors firstly, were introduced by Katz's (1964) and later on Organ (1988) defined the concept more properly. OCB, also known as extra-role behavior (Van Dyne & LePine, 1998), prosocial organizational behavior (Brief & Motowidlo, 1984), contextual performance (Motowidlo & Van Scotter, 1994) and beyond the job performance, is the “individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization” (Organ, 1988, p.4).

The definition of OCB shows that this behavior is related to personal choice of individuals in an organization which is not part of the job description and is beyond the enforceable requirements of the job description. Further in this terminology, five dimensions of OCB have been defined as follows. First one is altruism which denotes the set of contributions which take the form of assistance to specific persons, such as colleagues, associates, clients, or the boss. Second dimension is generalized compliance which emphasizes on employee conscientiousness that goes beyond enforceable job requirements. The third dimension is sportsmanship which can be defined as employees' willingness to tolerate less-than-ideal organizational circumstances. Organ, Podsakoff, and MacKenzie (2006) further define sportsmanship as an employee’s “ability to roll with the punches” even if they do not like the changes occurring within the organization. Civic virtue as the next dimension refers to the behaviors that show the employee's deep concerns and active interest in the organizational life and the last one, courtesy, means to prevent work-related conflicts with other individuals (Law, Wong, & Chen, 2005).

Previous research on OCB clearly indicates that global job satisfaction and organizational commitment has a positive influence on OCB or in other words OCB can be considered as an outcome of the mentioned job attitudes (e.g., Van Scotter, 2000; Ngunia et al., 2006; Zeinabadi, 2010; Salehi & Gholtash, 2011). Organ and Ryan's (1995) meta-analysis of 55 studies showed that the employees' job attitudes; especially job satisfaction and organizational commitment can predict OCB better than dispositional variables. These studies indicate that employees with high levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment generally reciprocate with positive behavior, including OCBs. In addition, a number of meta-analyses have demonstrated that positive job attitudes such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment will result in better
work outcomes (e.g. Riketta, 2002; Meyer et al., 2002). These two most frequently investigated job attitudes—job satisfaction and organizational commitment—(Riketta, 2008) are likely to indirectly influence the interaction between frontline employees and customers through behaviors such as employees’ citizenship behaviors and deviant behaviors toward customers. In order to have a better understanding of the constructs discussed as job attitudes, a brief definition of each has been provided in following.

Considering the definitions give and the literature reviewed, job satisfaction and affective commitment are categorized as antecedents of OCB. However, researchers have noted that organizational citizenship behavior contains several types of behaviors and individuals may selectively choose between these different types instead of engaging in all of them (e.g. Motowidlo, 2000; Organ, 1997). It has been discussed that types of OCB can be categorized based on its target. For instance it can be directed toward other individuals in a workplace or in a more general term, immediate others (Settoon & Mossholder, 2002). Settoon and Mossholder (2002) introduced interpersonal citizenship behavior (ICB) as one of the most important components of OCB and they also referred to it as altruism (Moorman, 1993), helping (Lepine & Van Dyne, 2001), or OCB-I (Williams & Anderson, 1991).

According to Organ (1997) OCB is also defined as a whole set of behaviors which across time and across individuals, contribute to organizational performance and effectiveness. In fact it is assumed that employees who offer help to their workmates (participating in ICB) will contribute to organizational effectiveness. Organ (1988) proposed that citizenship plays a crucial role in organizational functioning. Other scholars indicated that citizenship behavior boosts organizational performance by: fulfilling the need to scarce resources, improving the interrelationships among coworkers and building attractive places to work (Bolino, 1999; Podsakoff, Ahearne, & MacKenzie, 1997). Further a number of studies investigated the relationship between OCB and effectiveness and found out that these investigations are consistently supportive (e.g. Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 1994; Walz & Niehoff, 1996). However, these studies focused mainly on citizenship behavior within the context of the organization and towards co-workers rather than considering these behaviors while communicating with outsiders. In other words, I believe that, OCB or in more specific term, ICB can be defined towards customers of an organization as well. We are eligible to ask whether employees go extra mile for customers while they are not supposed to do so, or while they face unpleasant situations with customers. So in this study, I focus specifically on employee ICB that is targeted at customers rather than focusing on OCB in general.

**Deviant Workplace Behaviors**

There is argument that lack of satisfaction and commitment can result in deviant behaviors by employees. Robinson and Bennett (1995, p.556) defined employee deviance behavior as “voluntary behavior that violates significant organizational norms and in so doing threatens the well-being of an organization, its members, or both”. Hollinger and Clark (1982) introduced two categories of deviance workplace behaviors as follows: property deviance and production deviance. The former refers to damaging property belonging to one’s employer (e.g. stealing from the company, sabotaging equipment); and the latter refers to the process in which an individual violates organizational norms regarding quantity and quality of work performed (e.g. leaving early, taking excessive breaks, intentionally working slow and wasting resource). Later Robinson and Bennett (1995) added two other dimensions of deviant behavior by considering the fact that these behaviors may account for interpersonal relationships as well as those towards the organization. They also pointed out that these behaviors can range from minor to serious. Robinson and Bennett (1995)’s introduced two more types of deviant
behaviors named as: political deviance and personal aggression. Personal aggression refers to behaving in an aggressive or hostile manner toward other individuals and political deviance is to engage in social interactions that put other individuals at a personal or political disadvantage. Among these four categories of deviant behaviors the second two are considered for this research since they can contribute to the relationship between employees and outsiders in positive or negative ways.

There are two opposite approaches to these behaviors; while one group posit that these behaviors are negatively correlated with job performance (e.g. Hollinger & Clark, 1982) others discuss that some deviant workplace behaviors such as taking longer breaks may be a reaction to workplace stress or job stressors such as organizational constraints, interpersonal conflicts and perception of injustice (e.g. Fox, Spector & Miles, 2001) and not only these behaviors are not negatively correlated with organizational performance, but they also are helpful hence the individual can balance his or her emotions by doing so and can reduce his/her stress and arrive at an equilibrium level. Krischer, Penney and Hunter (2010) noted that withdrawal (e.g. taking longer breaks than allowed) and production deviance (intentionally working slowly) can be employees’ strategy or coping behavior to get along with stress at work and conclude that these behaviors can help an individual’s performance in workplace, but does this conclusion remain the same while discussing the relationship between employees and customers? What if the source of stress relates to customer participation?

In addition, deviant behavior is also discussed in the frame of incivility in the workplace and its spiraling effect (Andersson & Pearson, 1999). Incivility spiral model given by Andersson and Pearson (1999) describes the process in which individual perceptions about a norm which has been violated, serves as a stimulus for an upward spiral that leads to reciprocation if one party does not leave the conversation. Some social scientists discuss that the need for civility increases when the complexity and frequency of interactions increase among people (e.g. Carter, 1998; Chen & Eastman, 1997), so civility and incivility can be discussed within the employee-customer relationship hence their interactions increase on a daily basis in situations in which there is a need for participation of employees and customers in a direct relationship; and although it is a matter of reciprocation from both employee and customer views, by finding out the threats from employees which may result in an incivility spiral, organizations can strengthen their performance by building up a more professionally organized relationship among employees and customers. In terms of deviant workplace behaviors, Ambrose, Seabright and Schminke (2002, p. 954) indicated that although the target of deviant behavior could vary and could be organization, co-workers and so on, “however, in the end, the harm to the customer may be even greater than the harm to the company”. Considering all these facts together, in this research I used the phrase “deviant behavior” targeted at customers rather than at other employees or organization or in other words it can be referred as interpersonal deviant behavior.

Customer Value Co-Creation Behavior

Recently marketing scholars have suggested that customers should be seen as co-creators of value rather than just consumers of goods (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2002, 2004). According to Lusch and Vrango (2004) in service-dominant logic of marketing, service has become the fundamental basis of exchange and marketing has switched from a good-dominant (G-D) logic to the new concept of service-dominant (S-D) logic in which the customer is the co-creator of value in the interaction with the organization.
With regard to service-dominant logic, scholars investigated the customer behaviors and arrived at the conclusion that similar to the traditional management literature on the distinction between employee in-role (task performance) and extra-role (contextual performance) behaviors, customer value co-creation behavior has two dimensions: customer participation behavior and customer citizenship behavior. The former refers to “the required (in-role) behavior necessary for successful value co-creation” and the latter refers to “voluntary or extra-role behavior that provides extraordinary value to the firm but is not necessarily required for value co-creation” (Yi & Gong, 2013, pp. 1279-1280). According to the study of Yi and Gong (2013) customer participation behavior comprises four components: information seeking, information sharing, responsible behavior, and personal interaction. Similarly, customer citizenship behavior contains the following dimensions: feedback, advocacy, helping, and tolerance. In terms of customer participation behavior, customers seek information which results in facing less uncertainty and mastering their role as value co-creators, subsequently, customers provide employees with essential information in order to receive the most appropriate service. If customers fail to provide accurate information, the quality of value co-creation may decline. Arriving at this point if customers recognize their duties and responsibilities and accept directions from employees, more value co-creation occurs and personal interactions will be developed between customer and the employee. According to (Lengnick-Hall et al., 2000) the more pleasant, congenial, and positive the social environment in which the interactions take place is the more likely the customers will be to engage in value co-creation. The mentioned steps are related to the hierarchy of customer participation behaviors and these steps are essential in order to value being created. On the other hand customers may also participate in doing extra-role tasks which will encourage value co-creation to occur. These extra-role behaviors comprise giving feedback to employees to improve the services. Moreover, customers can participate in value co-creation by recommending the business, firm and employees to others (advocacy), for instance through positive word-of-mouth, advocacy contributes to the development of firm’s reputation, customer base size and promotion of firms’ services. Moreover customers start to help other customers and will recall their own difficult experiences and display a sense of social responsibility to help other customers experiencing similar difficulties. Customers with strong citizenship behaviors also tolerate the situations in which service delivery does not meet their expectations.

THEORETICAL DEVELOPMENT

For developing propositions, this research relies highly on social exchange theory as a social psychological and sociological perspective that explains social change and stability is a process of negotiated exchanges between parties. Social exchange theory posits that human relationships are formed by the use of a subjective cost-benefit analysis and the comparison of alternatives (Emerson, 1976). Unlike economic exchange, the elements of social exchange are quite varied and cannot be reduced to a single quantitative exchange rate. According to Stafford (2008), social exchanges involve a connection with another person; involve trust and not legal obligations; are more flexible; and rarely involve explicit bargaining. So based on this theory, this research supposes that the relationship between frontline employees and customers is highly dependent on social exchanges among the two parties. Interestingly such relationship is discussed between leaders and followers as Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) relationship and it is assumed that both parties in such relationship can impact on the quality of the relationship and affect the processes (Dienesch & Liden, 1986). Engle and Lord (1997) noted that both members of a dyad form perceptions of their dyadic counterpart, which in turn influence parties’ reactions to the relationship. These mutual dependencies in social exchange relationships are referred to as reciprocal interdependence (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). In spite of LMX relationship, a relationship in which dependency of followers to the relationship seems to be greater than that of leaders, employee-customer exchange relationship is more likely to be a
mutual dependency. Moreover reciprocity behavior among employees and customers seems to affect the performance of both members of the exchange relationship. From this point of view one can propose that employees’ behaviors in terms of organizational citizenship behavior (extra-role performance) and deviant behaviors and general job attitudes (satisfaction and commitment) can affect buyers’ value co-creation behavior. Since I am arguing how “Behaviors and Attitudes” of employees affect the “Behaviors” of customers, social learning theory also is relevant. According to Bandura (1977) individuals can learn appropriate behaviors of others and employees increase their moral identity through observing and mimicking others prosocial behaviors. This view shows how behaviors can spread among employees and customers.

Propositions

Past research suggests that job satisfaction positively predicts OCB and negatively predicts deviant work behavior. In fact employees who are more satisfied and committed are more likely to contribute to extra-role tasks rather than those who are not satisfied and committed. In other words Job satisfaction and organizational commitment have a positive influence on OCB or in other words OCB can be considered as an outcome of these job attitudes (Van Scotter, 2000; Ngunia et al., 2006; Zeinabadi, 2010; Salehi & Gholtash, 2011; Organ & Ryan, 1995).

Employees with high levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment generally reciprocate with positive behavior, including OCBs. On the other hand, dissatisfaction and lack of commitment can result in negative reciprocation (Organ & Ryan, 1995). In terms of incivility, scholars discussed that for instance when the employees have a perception of injustice of their supervisors, their level of satisfaction will diminish and due to the existence of power difference they reciprocate their perceptions by adopting deviant behaviors toward others in the organization (Andersson & Pearson, 1999). Also among different kinds of commitment affective commitment which is the focus of this research is likely to cause employees to perceive more pleasure toward their organization and arrive at higher levels of job satisfaction and both of these attitudes may result in higher tendency to do extra work to strengthen the organizational effectiveness and to adopt less deviant behaviors that may be destructive within the organization whereas normative commitment may be accompanied by either satisfaction or dissatisfaction. So I argue that these attitudes can indirectly and through employees behaviors affect customer behaviors. Eventually following propositions can be mentioned.

Proposition 1: Job satisfaction is positively associated with organizational citizenship behavior.
Proposition 2: Job satisfaction is negatively associated with deviant behaviors.
Proposition 3: Organizational commitment is positively associated with organizational citizenship behavior.
Proposition 4: Organizational commitment is negatively associated with deviant behaviors.

Focal performance is an inevitable construct of an employee-customer relationship without which the service delivery will not be complete (Organ, 1977). Following focal performance, if individuals go far beyond the job tasks, citizenship behaviors are shaped. In this paper employees’ interpersonal citizenship behavior is an indicator that shows whether employees will go the extra mile for customers or not, although it is discussed as a behavior toward coworkers and other persons at work, this behavior can be also discussed toward clients (Organ, 1988). According to the theory and literature reviewed earlier, here, I argue that the more the employees participate in doing extra work for customers the more customers will display participation and citizenship behaviors. For support of this hypothesis one can study the norm of reciprocity introduced by Perugini et al. (2003, p. 252) that states “the norm prescribes that one should help those who have helped him/her and retaliate against those who have been detrimental to his/her interests”. In fact interpersonal perceptions, cooperation, intergroup
interactions are affected by reciprocity behaviors (Perugini et al., 2003). Miller and Kean (1997) also posed that consumer participation is also affected by reciprocity behavior. So I propose that,

Proposition 5: Employees’ interpersonal citizenship behavior is positively associated with buyer’s participation behavior.

Proposition 6: Employees’ interpersonal citizenship behavior is positively associated with buyer’s citizenship behavior.

In contrast to the assumed positive effect of employees’ ICB on customers’ value co-creation behavior, employees’ deviant behaviors can inversely affect the customers’ value co-creation behavior. Among deviant behaviors categorized by Robinson and Bennett (1995), production deviance, political deviance and personal aggression can negatively affect customers’ co-creation behaviors by reducing the quantity and quality of the task they are supposed to do; behaving in an aggressive or hostile manner towards the customer or by engaging in social interactions that put other individuals at a personal or political disadvantage. Here one can again recall the conceptualization of reciprocity behavior by which one may retaliate against those who have been detrimental to his/her interests (Perugini et al., 2003). So while facing unpleasant behavior of an employee, customers are likely to stop participating in this relationship, in fact they are more likely to terminate the interaction and they will not continue information sharing or seeking and will not consider themselves as responsible as before. Moreover they may tend to provide organization with highly negative feedbacks rather than constructive feedbacks and will be less likely to tolerate unpleasant situations. So, it can be argued that interpersonal citizenship behavior of employees and deviant workplace of employees toward customers can influence customers’ participation and citizenship behavior. So following propositions can be stated,

Proposition 7: Employee’s deviant behavior is negatively associated with buyer’s participation behavior.

Proposition 8: Employee’s deviant behavior is negatively associated with buyer’s citizenship behavior.

Model

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS
This study shows that in service jobs, employees play a crucial role in terms of strengthening the organization effectiveness. In fact their behaviors are so influential on outcomes of an organization and cannot be considered just within the organization and toward co-workers and supervisors. They also should be investigated and controlled toward customers. Moreover, based on this study one can assume that OCB and DWB can be considered as the mediators of the relationship between employees' job attitudes and customer co-creation behavior. However I think it would be interesting to study whether job attitudes can directly affect customers' behaviors or not.

In this study I also recommend that emotions and moods of employees and customers can be the moderators of the relationship between these two groups since these moderators seem to have significant effect on this relationship. In fact, affective events theory (AET), a model developed by organizational psychologists: Weiss and Cropanzano (1996), explains how emotions and moods influence job performance and job attitudes. Their model explains the linkages between employees' internal influences such as cognitions and emotions and their reactions to incidents that happen in their workplace that produce an impact on their performance, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction.

In addition, employees' perceptions of customer positive and negative affective and also customers' perceived feeling about employees' positive and negative affective displays during interaction of customers with employees can affect employees performance and behaviors. For instance, George (1991) found that positive moods and emotions in salespeople let to greater customer-helping behaviors. George and Brief (1992) also suggested that positive mood will lead to more extra-role behaviors. Moreover research on feelings experienced and expressed by organizational members emphasizes that emotions could be indicators of well-being and happiness as well as being part of the work role (Rafaeli & Sutton, 1987). A cheerful “Good Morning” and a sincere “Thank You” cause customers to leave the company with a friendly feeling and a desire to return. Many organizations provide internal training about feeling rules. In short, emotions are being transmitted as a sequence of communication between senders and receivers. It means that we are facing a reciprocal process between employees and customers. In other words a target person which is a customer in my case, reacts toward expressed emotions flowed from an employee. According to Rafaeli and Sutton (1987) expressing emotions can produce positive or negative impacts on organizational performance, for instance they identified three outcomes of organization which are accompanied by emotion expression: immediate gains, encore gains and contagion gains. The first one, results in an immediate impact on receivers especially in sales jobs for selling for the first time, the second one is gained when customers come back for next purchases and the last outcome, contagion gains, happens through word of mouth.

Further based on moral licensing perspective, it is also possible that OCB results in DWB, but in this paper it is not considered. In fact how these behaviors can affect each other should be considered in future research. Also the relationship between employees and customers is a bilateral relationship rather than a unilateral. So co-creation behaviors of customers may produce a negative effect on OCB by employees.

This study can be considered as a bridge between management and marketing fields of research and shows how highly these areas are correlated. This bridge can significantly improve the effectiveness of an organization and points out that, managers should be more aware of employees’ behaviors and attitudes toward customers within a service job, similar to leader-member exchange relationship; this study introduced a new approach towards the relationship between employees and customers and labels it as Employee-Customer Exchange
relationship (ECX). This relationship can strengthen the effectiveness of an organization, improve the quality of services customers receive and finally can create value for both organization and customers. Moreover the study of emotions and moods as moderators of the relationship between employees and customers is recommended. Also future research should consider whether there is any other kinds of moderators or mediators for this relationship. This study also recommends future research to test empirically the discussed relationships and also to empirically test whether moral licensing occurs for employees with interpersonal citizenship behavior and consequently causes them to participate in CWB to arrive at equilibrium level again. In fact ICB of employees may be perceived as focal performance of an employee by customers and higher expectations which may flow from customers’ perceptions of employees’ tasks may result in counterproductive work behavior by employees who feel being exhausted. Finally this process is likely to diminish organizational performance and effectiveness because of the existence of unsatisfied customers. So future research should continue to address other similar gaps existed within the relationship between employees and customers.
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