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\textbf{Abstract}

Despite the growing popularity of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) in hospitality, no significant studies have examined OCB through the lens of the theory of planned behavior (TPB). To address this gap, the present study aimed to examine whether norms (hotels' customer orientation) and perceived behavioral control (empowerment practices) can influence hotel employees' OCB toward internal and external customers, and whether culture can moderate the proposed relationships. A quantitative cross-cultural research design was supported with data collected from hotel employees in Australia and the U.S. The results showed that customer orientation (norm) was a universal predictor for all three types of OCBs while empowerment (perceived behavioral control) was only a significant predictor for employees' OCB toward customers. Culture moderated these relationships. The study extended the application of the TPB framework in understanding and predicting employees' behaviors, opening up more opportunities for the application of the TPB to hospitality.
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\section{1 Introduction}

To achieve and maintain business success, organizations must continually satisfy customers' needs (Frambach, Fiss, & Ingenbleek, 2016; Kotler, 1997). This is especially true in service-intensive organizations such as hotels and full-service restaurants, where continued success relies greatly on customer satisfaction and loyalty (Avey,
The popularity and ease of travel make today's customers experienced travelers. Consequently, said customers are more demanding (Torres, 2018). They are looking for more memorable experiences of meaningful activities and events (Kim, Ritchie, & McCormick, 2012). Memorable experiences cannot be achieved by simply relying on “please” and “thank you” or service with a smile (Kimanuka, 2014); rather, service employees must go beyond their job duties and perform organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) to exceed customers' expectations (Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983). According to the expectancy-disconfirmation model (Oliver, 1980), meeting and/or exceeding customers' expectations is the starting point of customer satisfaction and loyalty, and OCBs are necessary components in this process (Smith et al., 1983; Turnipseed, 2005).

OCBs are voluntary individual contributions in the workplace that go above and beyond role requirements and contractually rewarded job achievements (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Smith et al., 1983). OCBs are vital to the successful functioning of organizations (e.g., Nielsen, Hrvnak, & Shaw, 2009; Podsakoff & MacKenzie, 2009) due to their positive influence on employee engagement (Ariani, 2013), retention (e.g., Ma, Qu, Wei, & Hsiao, 2018), workplace climate (Shin, 2012), customer satisfaction (e.g., Castro, Armario, & Ruiz, 2004; Koys, 2006), service recovery (Baker, Kim, & Ma, 2019), and customer loyalty (Wijayasinghe & Dharshani, 2018). However, the fact that OCBs are not recognized by the formal reward system leaves organizations searching for ways to engage employees in various types of OCBs. A significant amount of previous research has examined factors that trigger employees' OCBs, such as social exchanges between leaders and subordinates, coworkers, as well as customers and employees (e.g., Gong, Chang, & Cheung, 2010; Karriker & Williams, 2009; Ma & Qu, 2011); organizational features, such as organizational support (Moorman, Blakely, & Niehoff, 1998), organizational justice (Karriker & Williams, 2009), and organizational culture (Jo & Joo, 2011); leadership styles (e.g., Jha, 2014), and individual traits, such as impression management and personality (e.g., Li, Liang, & Crant, 2010; Rosenfeld, Giacalone, & Riordan, 1994). Researchers have recognized and studied the complex nature of OCBs from different theoretical perspectives (Ma, Wang, Wang, & Liu, 2019), including the social identity theory (e.g., Newman, Nielsen, & Miao, 2014), social exchange theory (e.g., Ma & Qu, 2011), psychological contract theory (e.g., Coyle-Shapiro, 2002), social learning theory (e.g., Wang & Wong, 2011), and conservation of resources theory (e.g., Ng & Feldman, 2012), among others.

As a classical behavioral framework, the theory of planned behavior (Ajzen, 1991) has been widely applied in various tourism and hospitality contexts, such as tourists' green behavior (e.g., Han, 2015; Liu, Ma, Qu, & Ryan, 2020), travel decision making (Lam & Hsu, 2004), green hotel choices (e.g., Chen & Tung, 2014; Han, Hsu, & Sheu, 2010), and technology adoption behaviors (e.g., Wu & Chen, 2005). However, such applications tend to focus on consumer behavior, with limited studies addressing managerial or employee-related issues (Choo, Ahn, & Petrick, 2014; Han, 2015; Hsu, 2012; Meng & Choi, 2019; Olya, Bagheri, & Tumer, 2019). An extensive literature review finds almost no evidence of examining OCBs from the perspective of the TPB (Ma et al., 2020). More specifically, little attempt has been made to apply the TPB to explain hospitality employees' behaviors. Therefore, this study is significant because it opens up opportunities to future research looking to apply the TPB in hospitality contexts and in particular to study employees' behaviors. The TPB proposes that individuals' ultimate decision to engage (or not engage) in certain behaviors is influenced by three groups of factors: attitude toward behaviors, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control (Ajzen, 1991). The TPB framework links to OCBs insofar as the latter are not directly rewarded but require employees' additional time and effort (Organ, 1988). Individual attitudes toward OCBs, perceived resources needed, cost, and benefits should all influence employees' final intention in, and actual performance of, OCBs, fitting conceptually with the TPB framework.
Subjective norms are perceptions of social pressure to perform or not perform a particular behavior (Ajzen, 1991). We suggest that an organization's values, such as customer orientation, are important sources of subjective norms, influencing employees' OCB performance for two reasons. First, subjective norms are formed by multiple sources, ranging from individual background and organizational culture to societal values (Amjad & Wood, 2009), and customer orientation is an important component of organizational culture. Second, a positive work environment can expand the positive influence of customer-orientation culture into customer service actions, including OCBs performed for customers (Dimitrades, 2007). Perceived behavioral control is the perceived ease or difficulty of performing a particular behavior. We suggest that the level of empowerment in hotel contexts significantly influences employees' perceived behavioral control, because empowerment delegates authority and responsibilities to frontline employees and enhances their autonomy of decision making and control of resources (Klidas, 2002). Therefore, empowerment enhances employees' perceived control in the service delivery process (Chiang & Jang, 2008) while mitigating problems and aiding in service failure recovery through actions that are often above and beyond role requirements (Baker et al., 2019).

From the perspective of the TPB framework, empowerment may enhance perceived behavioral control while an organization's customer orientation can serve as a guiding norm and influence individual attitudes toward OCBs. Therefore, the purpose of the study is to assess, through the lens of TPB, whether customer orientation and empowerment are essential factors of influence on employees' OCBs. Specifically, the study has three objectives. First, to test how perceived customer orientations might influence employees' OCBs performed toward internal and external customers. Second, to test how perceived empowerment might influence employees' OCBs performed toward internal and external customers. Third, to test whether culture moderates the proposed relationships. The study is expected to make important theoretical and empirical contributions, serving as a preliminary attempt at examining the psychological mechanisms of OCBs through the lens of the TPB. This study can potentially contribute to and broaden applicability of the TPB, particularly in the study of hospitality employees' contextual behaviors. Furthermore, the study examines how to inspire hotel employees' OCBs in a cross-cultural setting. Given that most leading hotel brands are operating in multiple countries and cultures, the findings of the study can help hoteliers better understand the mechanism of employees' OCBs, identity which strategies are better than others, and ultimately become more effective at inspiring good soldiers cross-culturally.

2 Literature review

2.1 OCB and research progress in hospitality

Organizational citizenship behavior refers to individual contributions in the workplace that go above and beyond role requirements and contractually rewarded job achievements (Smith et al., 1983; Turnipseed, 2005). OCBs are discretionary in nature, and their performance is not an enforceable requirement but a personal choice. Moreover, OCBs are neither directly nor explicitly rewarded within the formal reward structure, even though they are important for the successful functioning of an organization. OCB encompasses a spectrum of behaviors and has therefore been shown to be a multi-dimensional construct. OCB was originally differentiated along five dimensions: altruism or “helping” behaviors; conscientiousness or being responsible; sportsmanship in terms of choosing to refrain from engaging in negative activities; courtesy as reflected in preventing or mitigating problems (Organ, 1988), and civic virtue or involvement in organizational governance (Organ, Podsakoff, & MacKenzie, 2006).

Researchers have observed variations in the number of OCB dimensions, particularly when applied in different industry sectors and in cross-cultural studies (e.g., Farh, Zhong, & Organ, 2004; Wang & Wong, 2010). The
latter approach to distinguishing OCB dimensions (Williams & Anderson, 1991) has gained popularity, suggesting that OCBs should include OCBs to the organization (OCB–O) and OCBs to coworkers (OCB–I). This approach is popular in hospitality contexts, where targets of OCBs differ between internal and external customers.

Building on Williams and Anderson's (1991) approach, as well as the service-oriented OCB construct proposed by Bettencourt, Gwinner, and Meuter (2001), researchers in hospitality contexts have proposed a three-dimensional framework containing both OCBs within an organization (OCB–O, OCB–I) and OCBs toward external customers (OCB–C), thus capturing the full spectrum of hospitality employees' OCB (Ma, Qu, Wilson, & Eastman, 2013). OCB research in hospitality began in late 1990s and early 2000s, with prior studies focused mainly on restaurants, travel, and resorts. Since then, an increasing number of studies have been performed in hotel contexts. Service-oriented OCBs seem to have received much more attention in hospitality contexts (e.g., Chen, 2016; Choo, 2016; Ma et al., 2013; Tang & Tang, 2012) than in general business contexts. This is to be expected, given the service-intensive nature of hospitality and tourism organizations. Table 1 summarizes recent OCB research published in leading hospitality journals. Social exchange theory, social identity theory, and leadership are the three major guiding frameworks of OCB research in hospitality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Author/Year</th>
<th>Study context (e.g., restaurants, hotels etc)</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Antecedent variables (e.g, empowerment, trust etc)</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Theoretical framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kang, Kim, Choi, &amp; Li, 2020</td>
<td>Five-star hotels</td>
<td>Seoul, South Korea</td>
<td>Role clarity, perceived organizational support, psychological empowerment</td>
<td>Role clarity and psychological empowerment have a direct influence on prosocial service behavior.</td>
<td>Conceptual model of prosocial social behavior of customer-contact employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nadeem, Riaz, &amp; Danish, 2019</td>
<td>Service sector – banking, insurance, telecommunications, airline and hospitality</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Employee resilience, high-performance work systems</td>
<td>HPWS was positively linked with service performance and OCB. Employee resilience partially mediated both the direct relationships between HPWS and employee outcomes.</td>
<td>Employee level high-performance work systems (HPWS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>He, Zhang, &amp; Morrison, 2020</td>
<td>Hospitality sector</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Corporate social responsibility</td>
<td>CSR has a positive effect on social</td>
<td>Social identity theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Sector</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hospitality sector</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>Transformational and transactional leadership styles, job involvement</td>
<td>Transformational and transactional leadership styles influenced employees' OCB positively, while job involvement mediated between transformational leadership and OCB but not between transactional leadership and OCB.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hotel employees</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Authentic leadership</td>
<td>Authentic leadership and customer-oriented OCB was partially mediated by trust in leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hotel employees</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Negative workplace gossip, organizational identification</td>
<td>Negative workplace gossip impairs hospitality employees' service performance and customer-oriented OCB through undermining their organizational identification.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Front-line employees in the hospitality sector</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Job crafting, mindfulness and trust</td>
<td>JC strengthens OCB and also found that trust and mindfulness act as moderators for JC and OCB relationship. JC will help employees to manage their resources efficiently and this process of seeking resources and challenges at work is likely to increase OCB.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Front-line employees in a resort</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>PE fit dimensions (person-job, person-organizational and person-</td>
<td>Three PE fit dimensions positively influenced employee engagement. In addition, the three PE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Predictor(s)</td>
<td>OCB Effects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>(Estiri, Amiri, Khajheian, &amp; Rayej, 2018)</td>
<td>Public hotels</td>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>Technology fit on employees engagement</td>
<td>Fit dimensions had significant indirect effects on the three OCB dimensions via engagement, except for the relationship between PT fit and participation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>(S.-H. Kim et al., 2018)</td>
<td>Hotel employees</td>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>Leader member exchange (LMX) and gender</td>
<td>LMX and gender have a significant and positive effect on OCBs. However, gender plays no moderating role in the relationship between OCB and LMX in hospitality organizations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ocampo et al. (2018)</td>
<td>Expert decision-makers from top hotels and restaurants</td>
<td>Phillipines</td>
<td>Self-efficacy, reciprocity and culture</td>
<td>Self-efficacy and culture significantly influences OCB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ma et al. (2018)</td>
<td>Hotel employees</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Job satisfaction, employee engagement and job embeddedness, organizational commitment, human resource practices, self-efficacy, transformational leadership, culture</td>
<td>Human resource practices are the most influential antecedent on OCB, followed by job satisfaction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>(López-</td>
<td>Employees in public</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Impression management, leader-member exchange, coworkers exchange, customer employee exchange, conscientiousness, empathy</td>
<td>OCB can be stimulated by both altruistic and egoistic motivation. Managers should facilitate positive social exchange in the hotel by providing constructive feedback regarding the desired performance and encourage employees to engage more often in OCB directed toward the organization.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Altruistic-egoistic continuum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>Theory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>(Xiong, So, Wu, &amp; King, 2018) Hotel and restaurant employees USA</td>
<td>Perceived control, investment of the self, perceived brand knowledge, psychological brand ownership and voice behavior</td>
<td>Employees are more likely to initiate voice when they develop a sense of ownership toward the brand, invest ideas, time and effort into building the brand, as well as possess sufficient knowledge and skills to deliver brand-aligned performance.</td>
<td>Job characteristics theory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>(Xiong et al., 2018) Hotel employees USA</td>
<td>Role stressors, depersonalization, social capital</td>
<td>Depersonalization is found to be a critical mediator that modifies the implications of both role ambiguity and role conflict for service-oriented OCB. Furthermore, the negative effect of role conflict on depersonalization is buffered by social capital.</td>
<td>Advanced job demand-resource theory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>(Detnakarin &amp; Rurkkhum, 2019) Frontline employees Thailand</td>
<td>Perceived organizational support and human resource development practices</td>
<td>The relationship between human resource development practices and organizational citizenship behavior was stronger for employees with the high level of perceived organizational support, compared to employees with the low level of perceived organizational support.</td>
<td>Social exchange theory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Despite more apparent attention on antecedents and the motivational side of OCB, as opposed to consequences, no attempt has been observed using the TPB framework to study OCB. Most studies have been conducted in the U.S., followed by China, yet there is minimal research on the influence of culture on different types of OCB, suggesting an important research gap that needs to be addressed.

2.2 Empowerment and OCB

On the one hand, customers expect a seamless service process, which often requires collaboration among employees from different departments and activities beyond standard job descriptions (National Customer Rage Study, 2017). For example, a front office employee often needs to pass along a customer's needs to housekeeping, or must resolve a customer complaint about room facilities without directing the customer to a different department. On other hand, each position in the hotel has its defined role and responsibilities. Thus, the path to service excellence and satisfaction often depends on management's ability to empower employees (Hoisington, 2018).

Empowerment is defined as delegation of decision-making authority and responsibility to frontline employees for the control and enhancement of service quality and customer satisfaction during service delivery (Klidas, 2002). In the hotel industry, employee empowerment decentralizes decision making, allowing managers to give more discretion and autonomy to frontline employees (Chiang & Jang, 2008). The importance of empowerment to the effective functioning of organizations has been well documented (Lampton, 2003; Laschinger, Finegan, Shamian, & Wilk, 2004). Previous research has suggested that empowered employees can take initiative and make quicker decisions, contributing to faster service delivery (Bowen & Lawler, 1995), improved service quality (He, Murmann, & Perdue, 2010; Ocampo, Tan, & Sia, 2018), and service recovery (Carson, Carson, Eden, & Roe, 1998). Empowerment has been called the backbone of service recovery, as hotel employees often need to make exceptions to recover service (Hocutt & Stone, 1998).

Closely related to the concept of organizational citizenship behavior is the affect theory of social exchange, which suggests that social exchange produces joint activities that can generate positive or negative emotions (Lawler & Thye, 1999). When social exchanges occur successfully, actors experience an emotional uplift, whereas when exchanges do not occur successfully, actors experience emotional “downs” (Lawler & Yoon, 1993). Emotional uplift can help generate collectively oriented behaviors, such as OCBs. Empowerment, as an important practice of building trust and respect (Lamar, 2010), can reduce the feeling of uncertainty in the social exchange process and help generate emotional uplift for fellow employees (Lawler, 2001).

Delegating power and decision-making rights to employees while also providing necessary resources for support shows trust in employees. Organizational support theory suggests that any sense of responsibility and obligation felt toward the organization on the part of the employees will vary depending on said employees' perception of their supervisors (Shoss, Eisenberger, Restubog, & Zagenczyk, 2013). Organizational support and trust are associated with a number of positive outcomes, including OCB and innovation (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986). Research has indicated that employees perceiving trust and support from the organization would intrinsically reciprocate by adopting positive work performance behaviors, such as OCBs (Krishnan, 2012; Taylor, 2013; Zhang & Bartol, 2010). For instance, a strong relationship has been found
Dai, Hou, Chen, and Zhuang (2018) found that perceived organizational support plays an important role for hotels looking to increase OCB. When employees perceive their organization's practices as meaningful, credible, and trustworthy, they are more likely to be committed to the organization, improve their judgement of the organization, and invest more of themselves in the company (Yoon, Jang, & Lee, 2016). Therefore, we suggest that perceived level of empowerment positively influences three types of OCBs:

H1 Empowerment has a positive impact on employees' OCBs toward customers (OCB–C);
H2 Empowerment has a positive impact on employees' OCBs toward coworkers (OCB–I);
H3 Empowerment has a positive impact on employees' OCBs toward organizations (OCB–O).

2.3 Customer orientation and OCB

Customer orientation was first defined as a focus on the satisfaction of customers' needs (Saxe & Weitz, 1982). It is rooted in the concept of marketing orientation, which contains three behavioral components: customer orientation with a focus on the customer; competitor orientation with a focus on competitors; and inter-functional coordination with an internal focus on the organization itself (Narver & Slater, 1990). Given the importance of services and customers to hospitality organizations, the customer orientation component has a stronger conceptual link with the industry. Having a customer orientation can positively influence customer satisfaction (Reynierse & Harker, 1992) and loyalty by contributing to the development of long-term relationships with customers (Kelley, 1992). Customer orientation also helps improve employees' job satisfaction and pride (Hoffman & Ingram, 1991), as well as commitment to the organization (Pettijohn, Pettijohn, & Taylor, 2002). It is widely accepted that happy employees lead to happy customers, as put forth in the service-profit chain model (e.g., Kamakura, Mittal, Rosa, & Mazzon, 2002). Customers' satisfaction and emotions can also contribute to employees' satisfaction and well-being according to the affect theory of social exchange (Lawler, 2001; Ma, Qu, & Wilson, 2016). A happy and satisfied employee is more likely to engage in positive job performance and go above and beyond job requirements. Hospitality researchers have proposed that employees' interpersonal relationships with customers enable employees to perceive their jobs as meaningful and important, which in turn motivates their prosocial service behavior (Ozturk, Hancer, & Im, 2014). It is suggested, then, that employees' customer-oriented attitude would lead to behaviors (e.g., attempting to help customers achieve their targets) that foster or support customers (Stock & Hoyer, 2005). In this regard, employees with customer orientation tend to show customer service behaviors within and beyond their role requirements—in other words, OCB–C (Kim & Qu, 2020). Thus, customer orientation has a positive impact on employees' job satisfaction, commitment, and OCBs toward customers (Donavan, Brown, & Mowen, 2004). Therefore, we propose:

H4 Customer orientation has a positive impact on employees' OCBs toward customers (OCB–C). In addition to the reciprocal nature of social exchanges, employees' OCB can spill over from one target to another (Ma & Qu, 2011). In the context of hospitality, employees do not work independently and the creation of high-quality service relies heavily on the teamwork and interaction between hotel employees. The spillover effects of OCBs determine employees who perform OCBs to customers would be more likely to perform OCBs to coworkers and leaders (Sierra & McQuitty, 2005). Further, customer orientation facilitates improved service delivery and enhances customer satisfaction, which in turn increases employees' job satisfaction (Wu & Liao, 2016). Employees with higher job satisfaction tend to reciprocate it by displaying more OCBs, such as positively
helping co-workers (i.e., OCB-I), and demonstrating a high probability of “devotional action” for the organization (i.e., OCB-O) (Jung & Yoon, 2015; Ocampo et al., 2018). Therefore, we propose:

**H5** Customer orientation has a positive impact on employees' OCBs toward coworkers (OCB–I);

**H6** Customer orientation has a positive impact on employees' OCBs toward organizations (OCB–O).

### 2.4 Cultural influences

Culture has become a common subject in international business research and such an emphasis is deemed appropriate with the increasing globalization and mobility of the worldwide workforce (Sledge, Miles, & Coppage, 2008). Consistently, findings suggest that culture plays an important role in the motivational mechanism of OCB (Farh, Earley, & Lin, 1997; Ma et al., 2018). Culture can be “one of the two or three most complicated words in the English language” (Williams, 1983, p. 87), as the concept of culture means different things to different people. One of the earliest definitions of culture is that of British anthropologist Edward B. Tylor, who defined culture as “that complex whole which included knowledge, beliefs, arts, laws, morals, customs and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society” (Eliot, 2010, p. 1). In addition, culture is “a particular way of life, whether of a people, a period, a group or humanity in general” (Williams, 1983, p. 90). Therefore, culture is viewed as involving the spiritual, material, and non-material aspects of human life that give people a sense of direction and a unique and distinct position within a particular society, while also differentiating societies from each other (Clifford, 1988).

As the hospitality industry workforce has become increasingly diverse, there is a call to address cultural differences in the process of employees' OCB formation (Ravichandra, Gilmore, & Stroebhn, 2007). Although definitions vary, culture is generally acknowledged to be multi-dimensional. The most recognized construct is a five-dimensional framework consisting of uncertainty avoidance, power distance, long-versus short-term orientation, individualism-collectivism orientation, and masculinity-femininity orientation (Hofstede, 2001). Uncertainty avoidance refers to a society's tolerance for ambiguity, and societies characterized by high uncertainty avoidance try to avoid unknown, surprising, and unusual situations. Power distance refers to the extent to which the less powerful members of organizations accept that power is distributed unequally. A long-versus short-term orientation refers to the tendency to focus on present needs versus future interests. An individualism-collectivism orientation refers to the degree to which individuals are integrated into groups. In collectivist cultures, ties between people are strong, whereas in individualistic cultures, ties are loose. Finally, a masculinity-femininity orientation refers to the distribution of emotional roles between genders (Hofstede, 2001).

Hofstede's cultural framework provides a more concrete way for researchers to understand people's thoughts and behaviors in different cultural contexts. Culture can influence employees' perception, attitude, and behaviors. For example, frontline employees who possess strong collectivist values are more likely to be motivated to perform OCBs toward solving customers' problems, because they believe that customer service is based on mutually beneficial relationships (Mathies, Lee, & Wong, 2018), including relationships between customers and employees. Research has found leader-member exchange to be more significant for Chinese employees, owing to China's high level of power distance and China's collectivism-oriented culture (Kim, Choi, Knutson, & Borchgrevink, 2017). Culture has been revealed to moderate the relationship between OCB and a number of individual employee level consequences, and performing OCB-O may have a greater influence on U.S. employees than on Chinese employees (Ma et al., 2018).

Within the hospitality industry, there have been prior studies on the influence of culture on hotel employees' performance. For example, a comparative study of the U.S. and China by Kim et al. (2017) examined the
relationships among leader-member exchange, team member exchange, and hotel employees' job satisfaction, voice behavior, and commitment. The study found that leader-management exchange was more significant for Chinese employees because China is still a hierarchical and collectivist culture. In addition, employees from an individualistic culture like the U.S. would expect less support and social exchange from team members. Therefore, practical implications suggest the need for firms to encourage their American employees to build a strong team environment through teambuilding trips. In addition, Ambardar (2013) suggested that cross-cultural training was an effective way of increasing affectivity of service workers in the hotel industry toward different cultural behaviors, thus reducing stereotypical thinking and biases. Sledge et al. (2008) found that cultural differences may be an important antecedent to job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior. Nazarian, Atkinson, and Foroudi (2017) also suggested that national culture affected organizational culture and subsequently affected organizational performance in the hotel industry. Therefore, it was suggested that empowering employees to be involved in decision making can be one way of successfully enhancing organizational performance. This is particularly true in cultures that value individualism and uncertainty avoidance, and where power distance is relatively low.

Most cross-cultural studies have been performed in two or more cultures with distinct differences (e.g., Western vs. Eastern cultures). Specifically, it has been argued that employees from Eastern cultures differ significantly compared with their Western counterparts in terms of cultural characteristics (Hofstede, 2011). For instance, Qiu, Alizadeh, Dooley, and Zhang (2019) suggested that leadership and management styles in China are profoundly shaped by Confucianism. Thus, leaders' values, motives, and actions are often in alignment with Confucian values. There is limited research on the subtle differences between cultures traditionally considered to belong to the same category, such as Australia and the U.S. Both share similar cultural characteristics, such as valuing individual achievement, self-worth, and personal freedom (Kim et al., 2017). Both are further shaped by multicultural immigrants, although from different origins (Hofstede, 2003). Yet the U.S. is perceived as being stronger in power distance than Australia, Australia is higher in uncertainty avoidance (Hofstede, 2001). Power distance and uncertainty avoidance are important aspects of the workgroup context, and are particularly relevant to empowerment in the workplace. High power distance reduces the influence of perceived organizational support: employees high in power distance expect deference to authorities and are less likely to be exposed to empowerment. Culture might also influence empowerment, thereby affecting the nurturing of significant OCB antecedents such as job satisfaction, employee engagement, and job embeddedness in the hospitality industry (Anand, Vidyarthi, & Rolnicki, 2018; Ocampo et al., 2018). Thus, culture is supposed to moderate the relationship between empowerment and OCBs. Moreover, attention-seeking behaviors are not as common in Australia as in the U.S., and Americans value showmanship while Australians value humor. That Australians are in general more relaxed than Americans influences expectations of services (e.g., waiting time and service style). Australians believe firmly in “mateship,” which is characterized as loyalty to family, friends, and colleagues, and Australians may be more loyal to team members than employers (Bryant, 2018). These differences are far from subtle and could greatly influence social exchanges, workplace relationships, and work performance. For example, Brunetto et al. (2015) found that U.S. employees' engagement was perceived to be much higher than that of Australian employees. Hospitality research-supported evidence (Cain, Tanford, & Shulga, 2018; Johnson, Park, & Bartlett, 2018) identified frontline employees' engagement levels as compatible with customers' expectations, which in turn increases customer satisfaction, loyalty, and employees' OCBs. It seems that employees with high levels of engagement are more likely to provide superior service to customers, which might affect important facets of OCBs in a different cultural context (Rurkhum & Bartlett, 2018). Given that employees' attitudes and behaviors are sensitive to variations in their cultural socialization, perceived cultural values normally complicate the implementation of hospitality employees' OCBs (Kim, Kim, Holland, & Han,
In summary, differences in culture and values between the U.S. and Australia yield different policies and working attitudes in the form of empowerment and customer orientation, thereby motivating employees to reciprocate with OCBs. Said differences set the tone for employees' devotion in the workgroup and thus exert cross-level influence on the relationships between empowerment/customer orientation and OCBs. Yet limited studies have investigated the differences in employees’ behaviors between the U.S. and Australia. To fill this gap, we propose:

- M1 Culture moderates the relationship between empowerment and OCBs toward customers (OCB–C);
- M2 Culture moderates the relationship between empowerment and OCBs toward coworkers (OCB–I);
- M3 Culture moderates the relationship between empowerment and OCBs toward organizations (OCB–O);
- M4 Culture moderates the relationship between customer orientation and OCBs toward customers (OCB–C);
- M5 Culture moderates the relationship between customer orientation and OCBs toward coworkers (OCB–I);
- M6 Culture moderates the relationship between customer orientation and OCBs toward organizations (OCB–O).

### 3 Research method

#### 3.1 Instrument

A questionnaire was developed based on previously established measurements and contained two sections. Section One measured employees' perceived customer orientation of the organization, empowerment, and OCB performance. Section Two collected employees' work-related information such as job title, organizational tenure, income, and demographic information (nationality, age group, and gender).

Customer orientation was measured using five statements developed by Deshpandé, Farley, and Webster (1993). The Cronbach's alpha of the scale is 0.884 and sample statements include “Our hotel constantly monitors our orientation to serve customers” and “Our hotel's strategy is based on understanding customer needs.”

Empowerment was measured using three items from Spreitzer (1997). The scale has a Cronbach's alpha value of 0.756 and sample statements are “I have significant autonomy in deciding how to do my job” and “I can decide my own how to do work.”

Employees' OCBs were measured using the three-component framework of OCB-O, OCB-I, and OCB-C from Ma et al. (2013). OCB-O was measured using eight statements with a Cronbach's alpha value of 0.870. Sample statements include “I give advance notice if I cannot come to work” and “My attendance at work is above the required level.” OCB-I was measured using six statements with a Cronbach's alpha value of 0.889. Sample statements include “I go out of my way to help new coworkers” and “I pass along notices and news to coworkers.” OCB-C was measured using eight statements with a Cronbach's alpha value of 0.915. Sample statements include “I conscientiously promote products and services to customers” and “I contribute many ideas for customer promotions and communications.” All constructs were measured using a seven-point Likert-type scale, with 1 = strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree.

#### 3.2 Data collection and analysis

Data in this cross-cultural study were collected in the Fall of 2018 in both Australia and the U.S. using a convenience sampling method. In Australia, questionnaires were distributed to frontline employees of five
participating hotels (two 5-star hotels and three 4-star hotels) located in a major city in Queensland based on the research team's existing social connections. A total of 400 questionnaires were distributed to these hotels. Each questionnaire was accompanied by a sealable envelope, and a drop box was placed in each hotel's staff room to ensure the confidentiality of the information. In the U.S., online surveys were performed using Qualtric's panel data service, which helped collect data from the hotel employees at a cost. The total sample size was 357, including 180 Australian hotel frontline employees and 177 U.S. employees.

3.3 Common variance bias remedies

Since this study used cross-sectional self-reported data, several remedies were performed to control for common-method variance. In the questionnaire development stage, scales were adapted from multiple studies and specified complicated regression models (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003). After data collection, a post-hoc Harman one-factor analysis was performed (Andersson & Bateman, 1997) and the results returned multiple factors, suggesting that common method variance was not distorting the data set. Data were analyzed using SPSS 25. Descriptive statistics were obtained on the demographics as well as work-related profiles of the employees. Factor analysis, multiple regressions, and hierarchical regressions were used to assess the relationships among customer orientation, empowerment, three types of OCBs, and cultures.

4 Results

4.1 Participants' profiles

Table 2 shows the demographic and work-related profiles of participants. Notably, of the 357 participants, 180 (50.4%) participants were from Australia and 177 (49.6%) participants were from the U.S. The majority of participants were female (59.4%), between 18 and 29 years (30%), and had an undergraduate degree (38.4%). A total of 58.5% were full-time employees, and 74.5% were working at entry-level positions ranging from the front office (20.7%) and housekeeping (20.7%) to the food and beverage (26.1%) departments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic attributes</th>
<th>Overall frequency (%)</th>
<th>U.S. frequency (%)</th>
<th>Australia frequency (%)</th>
<th>Work-related attributes</th>
<th>Overall frequency (%)</th>
<th>U.S. frequency (%)</th>
<th>Australia frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>145 (40.6)</td>
<td>73 (41.2)</td>
<td>72 (40.0)</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>209 (58.5)</td>
<td>109 (61.6)</td>
<td>100 (55.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>212 (59.4)</td>
<td>104 (58.8)</td>
<td>108 (60)</td>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>148 (41.5)</td>
<td>68 (38.4)</td>
<td>80 (44.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>357 (100)</td>
<td>177 (100)</td>
<td>180 (100)</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>357 (100)</td>
<td>177 (100)</td>
<td>180 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry level</td>
<td>266 (74.5)</td>
<td>125 (70.6)</td>
<td>141 (78.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Principal component analysis

To assess the underlying dimensions of each construct and prepare for more advanced analysis, a principal component analysis using varimax rotation was performed on each construct. Table 3 summarizes the results of this analyses. Only factors with an eigenvalue equal to or greater than 1 were retained (Hair, Black, Babin, & Tatham, 2005). Since all measures were adapted from established studies and were consistent with previous findings, each construct also revealed a single-factor solution, suggesting the high level of validity and reliability of these measures (Hensien, 2001).
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### Principle components analysis of variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Customer orientation</th>
<th>Empowerment</th>
<th>OCBC</th>
<th>OCBI</th>
<th>OCBO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach Alpha KMO values</td>
<td>.884</td>
<td>.756</td>
<td>.915</td>
<td>.889</td>
<td>.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett's test of sphericity</td>
<td>1194.367, df = 10,</td>
<td>847.561, df = 3,</td>
<td>2053.369, df = 28,</td>
<td>1392.576, df = 15,</td>
<td>1410.079, df = 28,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. = .000</td>
<td>Sig. = .000</td>
<td>Sig. = .000</td>
<td>Sig. = .000</td>
<td>Sig. = .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loadings</td>
<td>Our hotel constantly monitors our orientation to serve customers. .807</td>
<td>I always have a positive attitude. .570</td>
<td>I give advance notice if I can't come to work. .646</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Our hotel business objectives are driven primarily by customer satisfaction. .804</td>
<td>I am always exceptionally courteous and respectful to customers. .778</td>
<td>My attendance at work is above the required level of the hotel. .564</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Our hotel's strategy is based on understanding customer needs. .805</td>
<td>I follow customer service guidelines with extreme care. .767</td>
<td>I take fewer breaks than I deserve. .514</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Our hotel measures customer satisfaction systematically. .674</td>
<td>I respond to customer requests and problems in a timely manner. .774</td>
<td>I do not complain about unimportant things at work. .593</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Our hotel believes that we should create greater value for customers. .617</td>
<td>I perform duties with very few mistakes. .666</td>
<td>I follow informal rules at hotel in order to maintain order. .681</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I conscientiously promote products and services to customers. .682</td>
<td>I protect our hotel's property .654</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I contribute many ideas for customer promotions &amp; communications. .599</td>
<td>I say good things about our hotel when talking with outsiders. .624</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I make constructive suggestions for service improvement. .613</td>
<td>I promote the hotel's products and services actively. .580</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I help my coworkers when their workload is heavy. .734</td>
<td>I help my coworkers who have been absent to finish their work. .653</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I take time to listen to my coworkers' problems and worries. .806</td>
<td>I go out of my way to help new coworkers. .719</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I go out of my way to help new coworkers. .719</td>
<td>I take personal interest in my coworkers. .721</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I pass along notices and news to coworkers. .651</td>
<td>I pass along notices and news to coworkers. .651</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I protect our hotel's property .654</td>
<td>I protect our hotel's property .654</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I say good things about our hotel when talking with outsiders. .624</td>
<td>I say good things about our hotel when talking with outsiders. .624</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I promote the hotel's products and services actively. .580</td>
<td>I promote the hotel's products and services actively. .580</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The customer orientation factor had an eigenvalue of 3.707 and explained 74.145% of the total variance. The communality of each item ranged from 0.617 to 0.807, exceeding the suggested cut-off value of 0.5 (Hair et al., 2005). The Cronbach's alpha for the customer orientation factor was 0.911, exceeding the suggested cut-off value of 0.7 (Santos, 1999).

The empowerment factor had an eigenvalue of 2.624 and explained 87.469% of the total variance. The communality of each item ranged from 0.843 to 0.896, all exceeding the 0.5 cut-off value (Hair et al., 2005). The Cronbach's alpha for the customer orientation factor was 0.928, exceeding the cut-off value of 0.7 (Santos, 1999).

The OCB-C factor had an eigenvalue of 5.448 and explained 68.104% of the total variance. The communality of each item ranged from 0.570 to 0.778, exceeding the 0.5 cut-off value (Hair et al., 2005). The Cronbach's alpha for the customer orientation factor was 0.929, exceeding the suggested cut-off value of 0.7 (Santos, 1999).

The OCB-I factor had an eigenvalue of 4.283 and explained 71.385% of the total variance. The communality of each item ranged from 0.651 to 0.806, exceeding the 0.5 cut-off value (Hair et al., 2005). The Cronbach's alpha for the customer orientation factor was 0.918, exceeding the cut-off value of 0.7 (Santos, 1999).

The OCB-O factor had an eigenvalue of 4.605 and explained 57.557% of the total variance. The communality of each item ranged from 0.564 to 0.681, exceeding the 0.5 cut-off value (Hair et al., 2005). The Cronbach's alpha for the customer orientation factor was 0.886, exceeding the cut-off value of 0.7 (Santos, 1999).

### 4.3 Regressions

To test whether customer orientation and empowerment influence three types of OCBs, a number of regressions were performed. We also controlled for position, duration of employment, and gender and found no significant influence of these variables. The first regression used customer orientation and empowerment as independent variables and OCB-C as the dependent variable. As shown in Table 4, the $R^2 = 0.364$, suggesting that organizations' customer orientation and empowerment as perceived by employees explained over 36.4% of the variance in employees' OCB-C. Customer orientation is a significant predictor of employees' OCB-C ($\beta = 0.517$, sig. = 0.000). Empowerment is also a significant predictor of employees' OCB-C ($\beta = 0.120$, sig. = 0.047). Therefore, the regression equation is:

$$\text{OCB-C'} = -0.004 + 0.519 \text{ Customer Orientation} + 0.122 \text{ Empowerment}$$
The second regression used customer orientation and empowerment as independent variables and OCB-I as the dependent variable. As shown in Table 3, the $R^2 = 0.283$, suggesting that organizations' customer orientation and empowerment as perceived by employees explained over 28.3% of the variance in employees' OCB-I. However, the relationship between empowerment and OCB-I was not significant ($\beta = .116$, sig. = 0.063). Customer orientation is a significant predictor of employees' OCB-I ($\beta = 0.449$, sig. = 0.000). Therefore, the regression equation is:

$$OCB-I = -.017 + .452 \text{ Customer Orientation}$$

The third regression used customer orientation and empowerment as independent variables and OCB-O as the dependent variable. As shown in Table 4, the $R^2 = 0.314$, suggesting that organizations' customer orientation and empowerment as perceived by employees explained over 31.4% of the variance in employees' OCB-O. However, the relationship between empowerment and OCB-O was not significant ($\beta = .099$, sig. = 0.109). Customer orientation is a significant predictor of employees' OCB-O ($\beta = 0.490$, sig. = 0.000). Therefore, the regression equation is:

$$OCB-O' = -.004 + .490 \text{ Customer Orientation}$$

To summarize, $H_1$, $H_4$, $H_5$ and $H_6$ were supported while $H_2$ and $H_3$ were not supported. Specifically, empowerment was a significant predictor for OCBs performed toward customers but not a significant predictor for OCBs performed toward coworkers and organizations. On the other hand, customer orientation was a significant predictor for all three types of OCBs performed toward customers, coworkers, and organizations. The results of the hypotheses testing are summarized in Table 7 in the following section.
4.4 Moderating effects of culture

To test the moderating effects of culture on the proposed relationships, hierarchical regressions were performed (Aguinis, 2004). Culture was converted to a dummy variable (0 = U.S.; 1 = Australia). Centered factor scores for each independent variable and the cross-product of culture and each independent variable were created.

In Table 5, the moderating effect of culture on the relationship between customer orientation and OCB-C was the first to be tested. Using SPSS's hierarchical regression function, OCB-C was entered as the dependent variable. Customer orientation and culture were entered as independent variables in the first block, while the cross-product of culture and customer orientation was entered in the second block. The change of $R^2$ was selected as the output option. Following the same procedure, the moderating effect was tested on the relationship between customer orientation and OCB-C, customer orientation and OCB-I, and customer orientation and OCB-O, as well as empowerment on three types of OCBs.

---

Hierarchical regressions customer orientation, culture, and OCB.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variable</td>
<td>OCBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Variables</td>
<td>Customer Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Culture*Customer Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change of $R^2$</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance of Change of $R^2$</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.819</td>
<td>.413</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Orientation</td>
<td>.690</td>
<td>.687</td>
<td>8.817</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>-.209</td>
<td>-.104</td>
<td>-2.124</td>
<td>.034*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture*Customer Orientation</td>
<td>-.232</td>
<td>-.169</td>
<td>-2.307</td>
<td>.022*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variable</td>
<td>OCBI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Variables</td>
<td>Customer Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 shows that the interaction effects of Model 1 and Model 3 were significant, whereas for Model 2 they were not. In Model 1, addition of the cross-product term of culture and customer orientation resulted in an $R^2$ change of 0.010, suggesting that the moderating effect of culture explains 1% of variance in overall satisfaction in OCB-C. Therefore, the regression equation is:

$$\text{OCB-C'} = .060 + .690 \text{ Customer Orientation} - .209 \text{ Culture} - .232 \text{ Customer Orientation} \times \text{ Culture}$$

U.S. employees were coded as Culture = 0, and the regression is:

$$\text{OCB-C'} = .060 + .690 \text{ Customer Orientation}$$

Australian employees were coded as Culture = 1, and the regression equation is:

$$\text{OCB-C'} = -.149 + .458 \text{ Customer Orientation}$$
As shown in Fig. 1, customer orientation seems to have a stronger influence on the OCB-C performance of U.S. employees than on that of Australian employees.

In Model 3, the addition of the cross-product term of culture and customer orientation resulted in an $R^2$ change of 0.012, suggesting that the moderating effect of culture explains 1.2% of variance in overall satisfaction in OCB-O. Therefore, the regression equation is:

$$OCB-O' = .019 + .665 \text{ Customer Orientation} - .147 \text{ Culture} - .248 \text{ Customer Orientation} \times \text{ Culture}$$

U.S. employees were coded as Culture = 0, and the regression is:

$$OCB-O' = .019 + .665 \text{ Customer Orientation}$$

Australian employees were coded as Culture = 1, and the regression equation is:

$$OCB-O' = -.128 + .417 \text{ Customer Orientation}$$

As shown in Fig. 1, customer orientation seems to have a stronger influence on the OCB-O performance of U.S. employees than on that of Australian employees.

As shown in Table 6, the relationships between empowerment and OCBs reveal that the interaction effects of all three models (Models 4, 5, and 6) were not significant, suggesting that the moderating effect of culture was not significant. Therefore, hypotheses M1 and M3 were supported (Table 7).
Hierarchical regressions empowerment, culture and OCB.

### Model 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>OCBC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture*Empowerment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change of R^2</strong></td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Significance of Change of R^2</strong></td>
<td>.334</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.097</td>
<td>.002**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>.445</td>
<td>.441</td>
<td>6.136</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>-.457</td>
<td>-.228</td>
<td>-4.524</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture*Empowerment</td>
<td>-.098</td>
<td>-.068</td>
<td>-.967</td>
<td>.334</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Model 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>OCBI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture* Empowerment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change of R^2</strong></td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Significance of Change of R^2</strong></td>
<td>.564</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.420</td>
<td>.016*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>.388</td>
<td>.383</td>
<td>5.333</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>-.363</td>
<td>-.181</td>
<td>-3.489</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture* Empowerment</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>-.577</td>
<td>.564</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Model 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>OCBO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture* Empowerment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change of R^2</strong></td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Guided by the theory of planned behavior, this study examined how customer orientation and empowerment influence hotel employees' OCB in cross-cultural contexts. Customer orientation is treated as an important source of employees' norms and attitudes while empowerment is considered an important indicator of perceived
behavioral control. The major findings of this study showed that: (1) Empowerment positively influences employees' OCB-C and but not employees' OCB-I and OCB-O; (2) Customer orientation positively influences employees' OCB-C, OCB-I, and OCB-O; (3) Culture moderates the relationship between empowerment and OCB-C and OCB-O; (4) Culture does not moderate the relationship between customer orientation and OCB-C, OCB-I, and OCB-O. Thus, the study generated several interesting findings of theoretical importance, as addressed in the discussion below.

5.1 Theoretical contributions

This study is one of the first to examine hotel employees' OCBs through the lens of the theory of planned behavior (TPB). Past research has mostly focused on the behavior of tourists and customers (Choo et al., 2014; Han, 2015; Hsu, 2012; Meng & Choi, 2019; Olya, Bagheri, & Turner, 2019). Recently, a systematic literature review paper by Ulker-Demeirel (2020) also found that although TPB has been extended to different contexts in tourism, leisure, and hospitality management literature, the theory mainly covers consumer behavior with limited studies addressing managerial or employee-related issues. The findings of the study revealed that organizations' customer orientation is an important predictor of employees' OCBs toward customers, coworkers, and organizations. The study also supported empowerment's role in enabling service employees' OCBs, particularly for OCBs performed toward customers. As customer orientation is an important source of employees' normative beliefs (Amjad & Wood, 2009), and empowerment is directly linked with perceived behavioral control (Chiang & Jang, 2008), this study provided preliminary support for use of the TPB model to examine the psychological mechanisms behind employees' OCBs. Building on that, the study opens up opportunities for future research to apply the TPB framework in the study of hospitality employee behaviors, such as service innovation (e.g., Chen, 2011; Tang, Wang, & Tang, 2015), preventive and promotive voice behaviors (e.g., Lin & Johnson, 2015), impression management, and deviance (e.g., Bolin & Heathery, 2001; Yilmaz, 2014). Although first proposed in psychology as a theoretical framework to understand people's behavioral mechanisms (Ajzen, 1991), when applied in hospitality and tourism disciplines, the TPB has been extensively used to describe travelers and customers' behaviors, yet has been scarcely applied to employees' behaviors (Ma et al., 2019). Future research in this direction would certainly help broaden and deepen the theory (Bagozzi, 1992).

To inspire hotel employees' OCBs, it seems that norms (customer orientation) are more powerful than perceived behavioral control (empowerment). Our findings confirmed the importance of customer-orientation in shaping three types of OCBs, suggesting that hotels should value customer orientation and communicate the message clearly to employees to foster employees' engagement in OCBs (Chen, 2016; Hadjali & Salimi, 2012). However, empowering employees is essential to enabling their OCB performance toward customers. This further supports the notion that higher levels of psychological empowerment can enhance employees' trust, leading to improved OCBs (Shahab, Sobari, & Udin, 2019). It also suggests that engaging in OCBs toward internal customers does not necessarily need special empowerment, yet having proper empowerment policies and procedures is necessary for employees to perform OCBs toward external customers. Our findings echo and extend previous research on the importance of empowerment in delivering quality customer services and creating customer satisfaction (Chiang & Jang, 2008).

This study examined whether differences exist between cultures that conventionally belong to the same category (e.g., Western cultures), using Australia and the U.S. as examples. The findings suggest that relationships between empowerment and OCB were not moderated by culture. However, culture did moderate the relationships between customer orientation and OCB-C and customer orientation and OCB-O. In both cases, the relationships were stronger in the U.S. than in Australia. Likewise, within the hospitality context, it has been
found that culture moderated the relationship between empowerment and OCB for hospitality employees in South Korea (Kim et al., 2018). Magnini, Hyun, Kim, and Uysal (2013) also found that hospitality workers in a collectivistic nation demonstrate more OCB and possess lower comfort levels with empowerment compared to hospitality workers in an individualistic nation. Furthermore, Tajeddini and Trueman (2012) found that cultural dimensions were positively associated with customer orientation and company performance in the Swiss hotel industry. From the TPB perspective, this finding suggests that in the U.S. norms play a more influential role in shaping employees' behaviors than in Australia. Although Australia and the U.S. are similar in orientation toward individualism and masculinity, they are quite different in power distance and uncertainty avoidance (Hofstede, 2001). The U.S. is stronger in power distance than Australia, and weaker in uncertainty avoidance, which explains why customer orientation has a stronger influence on OCB-C and OCB-O in the U.S. than in Australia. The Australian value of “mateship,” combined with its being a more relaxed culture, may also explain why customer orientation's influence on OCBs was not as strong as that in the U.S. These findings support scholars' assertion that power distance affects the communication and information sharing among employees and has implications for the effectiveness of leadership. Thus, distance exists in different forms, leading to varied consequence (Anand et al., 2018; Antonakis & Atwater, 2002; Napier & Ferris, 1993). The findings are also in line with the expectation that those who have lower levels of uncertainty avoidance are likely to perform OCBs (Cohen, 2006).

5.2 Empirical contributions

This study has several important implications for managerial practices. First, hotel managers should commit to the development of empowerment policy if they have not done so, or to the enhancement of an existing one. The general agreement is that the successful implementation of empowerment policies and practices needs top leadership's commitment and employees' involvement (Han, Seo, Yoon, & Yoon, 2016). Hotels should provide necessary support to familiarize employees with the policies and procedures of empowerment. Some specific actions, such as offering on-site trainings on empowerment, are recommended. In the case of employees from high power distance cultures, using role-play during the training process can enhance employees' confidence and competency while encouraging them go above and beyond with the support of empowerment policies. For example, Chia and Chu (2017) recommended that hotel management staff should consider the provision of resilience-related training programs to enable employees to handle their presenteeism behavior arising from the increased level of empowerment. Empowerment polices should also be made specific and relevant to individual employees' job content, as merely talking about empowerment may be too general and intangible to employees. Trainings that include specific empowerment examples at different jobs and demonstrate options to resolve problems could be highly relevant and helpful for employees to practice at the workplace. Managers should also link rewards with good performance that is above and beyond work expectations and solves customers' problems with the support of hotels' empowerment polices.

Second, our study found that culture moderated the relationship between customer orientation and employees' OCB-O and OCB-C, with stronger relationships observed in both cultures. Given that large hotel groups operate in multicultural environments, yet require affiliated hotels to follow unified polices and service procedures as dictated by corporate companies, and given that affiliated hotels in international destinations are often managed by expatriates, it is important for managers of such multinational hotel groups to understand the cultural differences of their employees. Therefore, when implementing corporate polices, they must make necessary adaptations to local culture. According to Min, Magnini, and Singal (2013), multi-national hotel groups should not only invest in expatriate training but should also communicate to their expatriates the vitality of investment in training to foster a positive learning climate for their employees.
6 Limitations and future research

This study has some limitations. First, as an early attempt of investigation OCBs through the lens of the theory of planned behavior, only one source of subjective norms (as well as attitude) and one source of perceived behavioral control were included in the study. There are surely other sources of organizational variables of individual traits that may serve well as sources for subjective norms, attitudes, and perceived behavioral control. Future research aiming to identity and test these factors is highly desired. As a well-known research framework in psychology and tourism, the TPB deserves more research attention from hospitality researchers with regard to employees' behaviors. Second, convenience sampling was used, and as this is a single study using cross-sectional data, such sampling limits the generalizability of the study. Also, the study looked at organizations' customer orientation as perceived by employees. As previous studies suggest, customer orientation may also be looked at from the individual employee level. Future studies might investigate how individual employees' customer orientation influences their job attitude, commitment, customer engagement, and in- and extra-role performance. There is also the consideration to control variables such as reason for employment, tenure, amount of time spent with supervisor and co-workers, gender, ethnic/cultural background, experience in the hospitality sector, and nature of the task.

Further, the study compared culture's moderating effect using two typical Western countries with micro-level differences. Culture was measured using macro-level differences. Although interesting findings resulted, future research might consider measuring cultural differences at the individual level, which may generate more noteworthy findings. Future studies could also investigate proposed relationships in more distinctly different cultures.
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