Organizations increasingly are positioning their human resources in work arrangements that create new forms of employment relationships (Cardon, 2003; Connelly & Gallagher, 2004; Lepak, Takeuchi, & Snell, 2003). One of the fastest-growing forms involves the use of external or contracted employees (George, 2003). Contract arrangements are themselves highly variable.
Contingent contract arrangements may entail, for example, self-employed individuals who sell their services to a client organization for a specified time or project, seasonal employment arrangements, or temporary employment through in-house or intermediate agencies where hours may be nonsystematic.

Less contingent, more permanent contract arrangements are rapidly evolving, where a third-party body (e.g., a contractor or professional employer organization) agrees to handle a set of work responsibilities for a client organization at their work location(s) or as assigned (Album & Berkowitz, 2003; Connelly & Gallagher, 2004; Kalleberg, 2000). The contractor supplies the employees and is the legal employer of record. The client organization has, in effect, outsourced some operations to the contractor. Stated differently, the contractor and the client organization have negotiated a shared employer relationship vis-à-vis the contracted employee, creating a triangular system of employment relations (Kalleberg, Reskin, & Hudson, 2000; McKown, 2003). What differentiates this work arrangement from others is the multiple-agency aspect of the work, wherein a worker simultaneously fulfills obligations to more than one employer through the same act or behavior (Gallagher & McLean Parks, 2001).

A second difference between this and other contingent contract arrangements is that this arrangement assumes a longer time horizon and tends to entail more relational exchanges between employees and the client organization (Lepak et al., 2003). Lepak and his associates describe this type of employment relationship as an alliance or partnership (Lepak & Snell, 2002; Lepak et al., 2003). Employees who work under these arrangements, whom we refer to as long-term contracted employees, are the focus of this study.

The popularity of outsourcing as a business practice is reflected in a substantial increase in the size of the contractor industry and growth in the number of long-term contracted employees (Benson, 1999; National Association of Professional Employer Organizations [NAPEO], 2005). NAPEO (2005) estimates that 2–3 million Americans are currently coemployed in long-term contracted arrangements. The growth in contract work has been even stronger in Australia (McKown, 2003; Peel & Boxall, 2005) and Europe, especially in the United Kingdom (Kalleberg, 2000). Despite this expansion, long-term contracted employees have received scant research attention, and little guidance has been provided to practitioners seeking to manage these unique employees. They are quite different from other nonstandard employee groups such as temporary employees or independent contractors because they are embedded in a more secure and permanent employment context.

Moreover, client organizations often regard such employees as front-line service representatives who possess firm-specific knowledge that can build customer loyalty over the long run (Peel & Boxall, 2005). Hence, relying on empirical research comparing standard and various other types of nonstandard employees (e.g., Davis-Blake, Broschak, & George, 2003; George, 2003; McDonald & Makin, 2000; Pearce, 1993; Van Dyne & Ang, 1998) is insightful but not adequate. Clearly, more intense examination of long-term contracted workers is warranted. It would be beneficial to know, for example, if the same underlying psychological processes that govern standard employees’ organizational behavior are replicated among long-term contracted employees. As Liden, Wayne, Kraimer, and Sparrowe (2003) point out, working for two organizations simultaneously makes understanding contracted employees more complex than the study of standard employees.

To this end, this study sets out to explore the extent to which long-term contracted employees develop social exchange relationships with their contracting and client organizations. More specifically, we investigate
how perceived support and felt obligation associated with the two organizations manifest themselves in the expression of commitment attitudinally (affective organizational commitment) and behaviorally (service-oriented organizational citizenship behaviors). The model depicted in Figure 1 outlines expected relations. A second purpose of this study is to compare whether the social exchange processes associated with contractor and client organizations operate similarly in explaining affective organizational commitment and citizenship behaviors. In doing so, this study contributes to the employment relationship literature by exploring the extent to which a social exchange framework is applicable to contracted employees.

Social Exchange Theory

Social exchange theory is one of the most influential conceptual frameworks for understanding attitudes and behavior in organizations (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). Although different views of social exchange exist (Coyle-Shapiro & Conway, 2004; Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005), there is agreement that social exchange involves a series of interdependent interactions that generate an obligation to reciprocate. In essence, social exchange involves the exchange of tangible and intangible resources governed by the norm of reciprocity (Gouldner, 1960). As Gouldner (1960) notes, the norm of reciprocity is a universal principle to guide behavior such that an individual is obligated to return favorable treatment received from a donor, and it is this mechanism that strengthens the relationship over time.

Although social exchange theory can be applied to a range of relationships in organizations, emphasis has been on the individual-organization relationship and, to a lesser extent, on the individual-supervisor relationship (Leader-member exchange; Sparrowe & Liden, 1997; Wayne, Shore, & Liden, 1997). In the context of the employment relationship, employers provide a range of material and nonmaterial rewards in exchange for employee loyalty and effort (Aselage & Eisenberger, 2003). Consistent with the tenets of social exchange theory, when employees are
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**FIGURE 1. Hypothesized Model Predicting Affective Contractor and Client Commitment and Service-Oriented Citizenship Behaviors Among Contracted Employees**
the recipients of favorable treatment from
their employer, they reciprocate by enhanc-
ing their attitudes and behavior toward the
organization (Moorman, Blakely, & Niehoff,
1998; Rhoades, Eisenberger, & Armeli, 2001;
Shore & Wayne, 1993). In particular, empiri-
cal research has focused on organizational
commitment and organizational citizenship
behavior (OCB) as outcomes of social ex-
change relationships. The evidence is sup-
portive of a positive relationship between
perceived organizational support (POS) and
affective commitment (Eisenberger, Fasolo,
& Davis-LaMastro, 1990; Liden et
al., 2003; Shore & Tetrick, 1991;
Wayne et al., 1997) and also be-
tween POS and OCB (Bettencourt,
Gwinner, & Meuter, 2001; Moor-
man et al., 1998; Shore & Wayne,
1993).

Of interest here is the extent
to which social exchange
processes underlie nonstandard,
co-employment
contexts (i.e.,
among contracted
employees working
on behalf of a client
organization).

Organizational citizenship behavior was
first introduced by Organ (1977) to capture
“individual behavior that is discretionary,
not directly or explicitly recognized by the
formal reward system and that in aggregate
promotes the effective functioning of the or-
ganization” (Organ, 1988, p. 4). Since then,
OCB has received significant attention in
terms of its conceptualization, dimension-
ality, and antecedents. Organ’s (1988) concep-
tualization of OCB prompted researchers to
question the boundary between in-role and
extra-role behavior and argue that the cate-
gorization of behavior as in-role or extra-role
may vary across job incumbents and change
over time (Morrison, 1994; Van Dyne, Gra-
ham, & Dienesch, 1994). In response, Van
Dyne et al. (1994) drew upon political phi-
losophy and active citizenship syndrome
and defined OCB as “global behavior at
work.” The authors conceptualized OCB as
having three dimensions—loyalty, obedi-
ence, and participation—that paralleled its
counterpart in political philosophy.

Although this definition overcomes the
problematic issue of delineating between in-
role and extra-role behavior, Bettencourt et
al. (2001) argue that researchers have focused
on citizenship behaviors that are widely ap-
licable across positions and organizations,
and in doing so have ignored calls to extend
the focus of OCB to include service-oriented
behaviors. For example, Borman and Mo-
towidlo (1993) argue “service companies
have special requirements on dimensions re-
lated to dealing with customers and repre-
senting the organization to outsiders” (p.
90). In response, Bettencourt et al. (2001) draw upon prior empirical work (Van Dyne et al., 1994) to adapt and develop a measure of OCB with a service delivery focus appropriate for employees in a service setting.

Employees who deliver a service have a unique role in serving as boundary spanners between their own organization and the recipients of their service (Bettencourt et al., 2001). This type of behavior may be particularly important in the context of contracted employees delivering a service on behalf of a client organization, as contracted employees represent the contact person on behalf of the client organization in interacting with customers (in our study, the public). Bettencourt et al. (2001) argue that it is “essential that contact employees perform service delivery OCBs—behaving in a conscientious manner in activities surrounding service delivery to customers” (p. 30). Therefore, service-oriented citizenship behavior benefits both the employing as well as the client organization. It is in the client’s best interest to have contracted employees engage in service delivery citizenship behavior toward the public. At the same time, it is in the employing organization’s interest to ensure that it provides a high-quality service so as to ensure that its relationship with the client organization continues such that its contract is renewed upon expiry.

We examine the extent to which service-oriented citizenship behavior is based on employees reciprocating treatment received from their employing organization and the client organization.

Hypotheses

Drawing on social exchange, organizational support theory proposes that employees form a general perception concerning the extent to which the organization values their contribution and cares about their well-being, and this perception is based partially on how they feel the organization has treated them (Eisenberger, Armeli, Rexwinkel, Lynch, & Rhoades, 2001). Perceived organizational support among employees is encouraged by the tendency for individuals to ascribe humanlike characteristics to the organization (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986). As such, employees interpret favorable or unfavorable treatment as indicative of the organization’s benevolent or malevolent orientation toward them.

Eisenberger et al. (2001) argue that POS creates a felt obligation on the part of employees to care about the organization and help it achieve its objectives. Organizations can enhance perceptions of support through organizational justice, favorable treatment from organizational agents, and favorable human resource practices that signify an investment in human capital such as job security, autonomy, participation in decision making, and training (Eisenberger, Jones, Aselage, & Sucharski, 2004). As POS provides a broad set of tangible and intangible resources to employees, the norm of reciprocity would produce a felt obligation to help in the organization (Eisenberger et al., 2004). We therefore examine whether perceptions of perceived organizational support from the contracting organization are positively related to employees’ felt obligation toward the client organization.

**H1a:** Employees’ contractor POS will be positively related to their felt obligation to their contractor organization.

Furthermore, we explore whether employees’ perceptions of the external support from the client organization is related to their felt need to care about the welfare of the client organization. However, the basis upon which employees evaluate the treatment of the client organization toward them is likely to differ from the basis upon which they evaluate the treatment they receive from their own organization.

Employees’ perceptions of client perceived support may be influenced by a num-
ber of factors. The first is the terms of the contract negotiated with the client organization regarding the delivery of the service and the extent to which the terms are advantageous to employees. The second is the degree to which the client organization’s human resource management policies are extended to contracted employees—for instance, whether they are provided with in-house training opportunities or are covered by performance management systems. The third relates to management style and whether managers are inclusive, communicating with contracted employees by passing on messages and involving them in team meetings. We hypothesize that client perceived organizational support is positively related to employees’ felt obligation to care about the client organization and help it achieve its goals.

**H1b:** Employees’ client POS will be positively related to their felt obligation toward the client organization.

There is empirical evidence supporting a positive relationship between POS and affective commitment (Eisenberger et al., 1990; Shore & Tetrick, 1991; Wayne et al., 1997). Using longitudinal data, Rhoades et al. (2001) found that POS was positively related to changes in affective commitment but that affective commitment was not related to changes in POS, suggesting a unidirectional relationship between the two. In addition, McElroy et al. (2001) explicitly theorize that favorable perceptions of client (external) POS should engender feelings of affective commitment toward the client organization. Liden et al. (2003) provide empirical support for the relationship between agency employees’ perceived support from the client organization and their affective commitment to the client organization.

With the exception of Eisenberger et al. (2001), most empirical studies assume that the positive consequences of POS on outcomes is suggestive of the underlying norm of reciprocity, but this is not explicitly tested. The norm of reciprocity (Gouldner, 1960) underpins social exchange relationships in which the conferring of benefits to one party obliges them to reciprocate. As Eisenberger et al. (2004) argue, “[B]ecause POS provides a broad and valued set of socio-emotional and impersonal resources to employees, the norm of reciprocity should in turn produce a general felt obligation to help the organization achieve its goals” (p. 212). To examine the extent to which reciprocity underlies the relationship between POS and affective commitment, we assess the degree to which POS enhances employees’ felt obligation that in turn influences their affective commitment. In addition, we investigate whether the same process holds true for the relationship between client POS and client affective commitment.

**H2a:** Employees’ felt obligation to the contractor will mediate the effects of contractor POS on their affective commitment to the contract organization.

**H2b:** Employees’ felt obligation to the client will mediate the effects of client POS on their affective commitment to the client organization.

Prior empirical work supports a positive relationship between POS and OCB (Beiten-court et al., 2001; Coyle-Shapiro & Conway, 2005; Eisenberger et al., 1990; Kaufman, Stamper, & Tesluk, 1999; Moorman et al., 1998; Wayne et al., 1997), suggesting that individuals reciprocate benefits received by engaging in positive behaviors that assist the organization in achieving its goals. In the context of this study, displaying citizenship behavior may be particularly important in terms of enhancing the image of the service provider. Exhibiting citizenship behaviors demonstrates having firsthand knowledge about service delivery, which provides the basis for service improvement. In addition, taking the initiative in communicating with others to improve service delivery enhances the organization’s ability to adapt to changes advantageous to the client.

In social exchange theory, individuals seek to reciprocate in ways that maximize
the likelihood that the exchange partner will notice (Blau, 1964). Here, service-oriented citizenship behavior is likely to be viewed as a valuable commodity for exchange, given that the relationship between the contractor and client organization is based on contractually specified service delivery. Consistent with the tenets of social exchange, we examine the extent to which employees’ felt obligation influences their service-oriented citizenship behavior.

**H3a: Employees’ felt obligation to the contractor will mediate the effects of contractor POS on their service-oriented citizenship behavior**

**H3b: Employees’ felt obligation to the client will mediate the effects of client POS on their service-oriented citizenship behavior**

**Method**

**Client Organization**

The British public services provide a particularly interesting and significant site for the study of long-term contracted employees. The use of such workers is well established in this sector, as public policies have mandated local governments to put out to tender an increasing range of their services (Colling, 1999).

One local authority in London took up this public policy initiative with particular alacrity. It is the site of this research and is identified here as the Council. The Council is responsible for providing a wide range of public services to a population of around 190,000 dispersed across an area of almost 22 square kilometers. These services are delivered by three main directorates—Education, Social and Community Service, and Environment and Leisure—employing a workforce of around 5,000 employees. We focus on the services provided on behalf of the Environment and Leisure directorate by four private contractors.

**Private Contracting Organizations**

Four separate contracting companies provided services on behalf of the Council. The refuse and street cleaning service is provided by a foreign-owned multinational company that entered the U.K. waste management market in 1990. It held this first contract with the council for eight years in total—seven years plus a one-year extension. The current contract was signed in September 2003 and is again a seven-year contract. The contract, which involves a considerable degree of self-monitoring and a once-a-year audit by the Council to ensure that the specifications are being met, employs around 900 workers.

The contract for running the council’s four indoor leisure centers and two outside facilities from the outset has been held by another company. This is again a multinational company established in 1980 that manages leisure facilities in a number of European countries under several brand names. It has held the contract with the council since the late 1980s and it is now into the third round of contracts. The nature of the contracts has, however, changed somewhat in that they have become longer and increasingly operated along “partnership” lines. Initially, the contracts with the council ran for three to six years. The current contract was signed in 1999, employs 320 full-time equivalent employees, and runs for 15 years—until 2014.

The parks patrol and grounds maintenance contracts are held by two companies, with each company providing some patrol and grounds maintenance activities depending on geographical location. The companies are, however, very different in character. One is a Dutch-owned company formed in 1989 that maintains contracts with private- and public-sector organizations in a range of European countries. The company has a total workforce of 800 and claims to “invest” heavily in its workers, guaranteeing that...
they are “fully experienced” and helping to ensure “quality assurance.” The other company is much smaller. It is U.K.-owned and was formed in 1999. Its work is concentrated on public- and private-sector contracts in London and southeast England. It has a compact workforce of only 75, most of whom have more than 10 years of industry experience, and also has quality assurance accreditation. The current contracts with these companies were signed in April 2000 and last for five years, with the opportunity for both companies to re-tender.

Sample
A survey was distributed to a total of 392 employees (those involved in delivering the contracted service) in the four contracting organizations with a cover letter indicating that completion was voluntary and responses would be kept confidential. In the refuse and street cleaning organization, only one-third of employees were sampled due to employees with poor English language proficiency. In the other organizations, all employees were surveyed.

Overall, 131 surveys were returned (an overall response rate of 30%), although missing data (fewer than 50% questions answered) reduced this number to 99 fully completed surveys. Indeed, many such eliminated surveys had only a page or two completed. We felt that when a respondent provided only limited information, it was most appropriate to remove the case from further consideration. A total of 170 surveys were sent to employees in the leisure centers (70 returned, yielding a response rate of 40%), 131 were sent to refuse collection employees (31 returned, response rate of 24%), 50 surveys were sent to the Dutch-owned parks patrol/grounds contractor (22 returned, response rate of 44%), and 37 were sent to the U.K. parks patrol/grounds contractor (8 returned, response rate of 22%). The overall sample consisted of 64% males, with a mean job tenure of 6.6 years. Ninety percent of respondents interacted directly with end service users, 85% of respondents were on a permanent contract, 10% on a fixed-term contract, and 5% held a temporary contract with their employing organization.

Measures
Service-Oriented Citizenship Behavior
Service-oriented citizenship behavior was measured with 15 items from a 16-item scale developed by Bettencourt et al. (2001). Respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which they engaged in citizenship behaviors along a seven-point scale anchored with “never” and “very frequently.” One item relating to generating favorable goodwill for the organization was inappropriate, as individuals cannot purchase the services offered (i.e., garbage pickup, maintenance of public parks) and, hence, was omitted.

Given the recent development of the measure, we factor-analyzed (principal components, varimax rotation) the 15 items to assess whether the items yielded the same factor-analytic results as those found by Bettencourt et al. (2001). One service delivery item relating to performing duties with unusually few mistakes exhibited high cross-factor loadings and was eliminated. As shown in Appendix A, the 14 items factor-analyzed into three clear factors with at least .20 difference among the loadings. The loyalty, service delivery, and participation dimensions had alpha coefficients of .89, .88, and .92, respectively.

Each of the remaining measures was assessed relative to the contracting and the client organization by changing the referent in each question. Separate sections in the surveys were used so that respondents focused on only one referent at a time.

Affective Commitment to Contracting and Client Organization
Five items developed by Meyer, Allen, and Smith (1993) to measure affective commitment were used. The wording of one item
was slightly modified for the client affective commitment measure in which “working for” was replaced with “working on behalf of.” The alpha coefficient for this five point Likert scale was .91 for both organizations.

Perceived Organizational and Client Support

We selected six high-loading items (see Table III) from the Survey of Perceived Organizational Support developed by Eisenberger et al. (1986). Prior studies have shown evidence for the reliability and validity of the short POS scale (Eisenberger et al., 2001; Shore & Wayne, 1993). The alpha coefficient for this six-point Likert scale was .92 for both the contract and client organization.

Felt Obligation Toward Contractor and Client Organizations

This scale was developed by Eisenberger et al. (2001) to capture a “prescriptive belief regarding whether one should care about the organization’s well-being and should help the organization reach its goals” (p. 42). We selected three items from the seven-item scale that included, for example, “I have an obligation to ____ to ensure that I produce high quality work” and “I owe it to ____ to do what I can to ensure that service users are well served.” Respondents indicated the extent of their agreement along a seven-point scale ranging from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree.” The alpha coefficient was .86 for the contract organization and .92 for the client organization.

Results

Descriptive statistics for all study variables are reported in Table I. None of the variables were marked by excessive restriction in range, and the Cronbach’s alphas for all multi-item scales exceeded .7. We factor-analyzed items (principal components, varimax rotation) capturing contractor POS, affective commitment, and felt obligation, and the results (Table II) support the factorial independence of the three constructs. Table III presents the results of the factor analysis of client POS, felt obligation, and affective commitment, supporting the independence of the three constructs.

We tested the remaining hypotheses using hierarchical multiple regression controlling for job tenure and organization. We controlled for job tenure since many factors that predict organizational commitment vary with length of service (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982). As the four contractors have different contracts with the client organization that vary in length and entail a variety of jobs, we controlled for the contractor in our analyses. Dummy variables were created for the contractor organizations and entered with job tenure in Step 1 of all equations. We controlled for client POS in the regressions predicting contractor felt obligation and affective commitment; conversely, we controlled for contractor POS in the regressions predicting client felt obligation and affective commitment. Finally, alternate forms of POS and felt obligation were controlled in analyses predicting service-oriented citizenship behaviors.

Hypothesis 1a predicted that contractor POS would be positively related to employees’ felt obligation to the contract organization. As shown in Table IV, controlling for client POS, contractor POS ($\beta = .37, p < .01$) is positively related, thus supporting Hypothesis 1a. Hypothesis 1b, which asserted that employees’ client POS would be positively related to their felt obligation to the client organization, also was supported. Controlling for contractor POS, employees’ perceptions of client support were positively related to perceived felt obligation toward the client organization ($\beta = .69, p < .01$; Table IV).

Hypothesis 2a predicted that felt obligation to the contractor would mediate the effects of contractor POS on affective commitment to the organization. This hypothesis was tested following the procedures recom-
### TABLE I  Descriptive Statistics and Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Job tenure</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>8.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Contractor POS</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>-1.12</td>
<td>(.92)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Contractor felt obligation</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>(.86)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Contractor affective commitment</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>(.91)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Client POS</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>(.92)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Client felt obligation</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>(.92)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Client affective commitment</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>(.91)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. OCB: service delivery</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>(.88)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. OCB: loyalty</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>(.89)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. OCB: participation</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>(.92)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlations > .25 are statistically significant at p < .01. Correlations > .17 are statistically significant at p < .05.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>___ cares about my opinions</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ really cares about my well-being</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ is willing to help me when I need a special favor</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ cares about my general satisfaction at work</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ strongly considers my goals and values</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ shows very little concern for me R</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel like “part of the family” at ___</td>
<td></td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working for ___ has a great deal of personal meaning for me</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that ___’s problems are my own</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel “emotionally attached” to ___</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel a strong sense of belonging to ___</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have an obligation to ___ to ensure that I produce high-quality work</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I owe it to ___ to give 100% of my energy to achieving ___’s goals while I am at work</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I owe it to ___ to do what I can to ensure that service users are well served</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eigenvalue                  7.01  2.03  1.52
Percent of variance        50.10 14.51 10.92

R = reverse scored.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>__ cares about my opinions</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>__ really cares about my well-being</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>__ cares about my general satisfaction at work</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>__ shows very little concern for me R</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>__ is willing to help me when I need a special favor</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>__ strongly considers my goals and values</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel like “part of the family” at __</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that __’s problems are my own</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel a strong sense of belonging, working on behalf of __</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel “emotionally attached” to __</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working on behalf of __ has a great deal of personal meaning for me</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I owe it to __ to give 100% of my energy to achieving __’s goals while I am at work</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have an obligation to __ to ensure that I produce high quality work</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I owe it to __ to do what I can to ensure that service users are well served</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Eigenvalue | 8.39 | 1.63 | 1.13 |
| Percent of variance | 59.94 | 11.69 | 8.07 |

R = reverse scored.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Contractor Felt Obligation</th>
<th>Contractor Affective Commitment</th>
<th>Client Felt Obligation</th>
<th>Client Affective Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1: Demographics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor organization</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC2</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC3</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job tenure</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor POS</td>
<td></td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client POS</td>
<td></td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.69**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change in $F$</strong></td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>14.23</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>21.25**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change in $R^2$</strong></td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>15.95**</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>8.62**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p ≤ .05

**p ≤ .01
mended by Baron and Kenny (1986) and Kenny (2006) to test mediation. First, the mediator (contractor felt obligation) is regressed on the independent variable (contractor POS); second, the dependent variable (contractor affective commitment) is regressed on the independent variable (contractor POS); and third, the dependent variable (contractor affective commitment) is regressed simultaneously on the independent (contractor POS) and mediator (contractor felt obligation) variables. The same procedure was followed for Hypothesis 2b using the client focused variables.

Mediation is present if the following conditions hold true: the independent variable affects the mediator in the first equation; the independent variable affects the dependent variable in the second equation; and the mediator affects the dependent variable in the third equation. The effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable must be less in the third equation than in the second. Full mediation occurs if the independent variable has no significant effect when the mediator is in the equation, and partial mediation occurs if the effect of the independent variable is smaller but significant when the mediator is in the equation. Kenny (2006) recommends the Sobel test to determine whether a significant reduction has occurred in the independent variable when the mediator is in the equation and, thus, whether significant mediation has occurred.

The results indicate that contractor felt obligation partially mediated the effect of contractor POS on contractor affective commitment. The effect of contractor felt obligation is in the equation than when it is not. The results indicate that contractor felt obligation partially mediated the effect of contractor POS on contractor affective commitment. The Sobel test suggests that the reduction of the beta coefficient of contractor POS from .44 to .31 when contractor felt obligation is entered into the equation is significant ($z = 2.637$, $p < .008$). Thus, Hypothesis 2a is partially supported.

Hypothesis 2b is also partially supported, as shown in Table IV. Client POS ($\beta = .69$, $p < .01$) is positively related to felt obligation to the client organization. Client POS is positively related to affective commitment to the client organization ($\beta = .74$, $p < .01$), and the beta coefficient significantly reduces to .44 when client felt obligation is in the equation ($z = 3.732$, $p < .0001$).

Hypothesis 3a predicted that contractor felt obligation would mediate the effects of contractor POS on service-oriented citizenship behavior. From the previous results, condition 1 is met. The second condition, whereby POS is significantly related to service-oriented citizenship behavior, is also met. As shown in Table V, POS is positively related to the loyalty dimension of citizenship behavior ($\beta = .53$, $p < .01$) but not to service delivery ($\beta = -.01$ ns) or participation ($\beta = .21$ ns). Felt obligation partially mediates the effect of POS on loyalty ($\beta$ reduces from .53 to .45, $z = 1.98$, $p < .0475$). Therefore, Hypothesis 3a is partially supported for loyalty. As shown from Table V, perceived contractor felt obligation is positively related to service delivery ($\beta = .33$, $p < .01$) but does mediate the effects of contractor POS.

Hypothesis 3b predicted that client felt obligation would mediate the effects of client POS on service-oriented citizenship behavior. From the previous results, condition 1 is met. The second condition, whereby client POS is significantly related to service-oriented citizenship behavior, is met in relation to the participation dimension of service-oriented citizenship behavior ($\beta = .24$, $p < .05$). Client felt obligation fully mediates the effect of client POS on participation ($\beta$ reduces from .24, $p < .05$ to -.05 ns, $z = 2.31$, $p < .0206$). However, client felt obliga-
### TABLE V
Results of Hierarchical Regression Analyses Predicting Service Oriented Citizenship Behavior Using Contractor and Client Antecedents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Loyalty</th>
<th>Service Delivery</th>
<th>Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracting organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC2</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC3</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>-.37**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC4</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job tenure</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor POS</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.53**</td>
<td>.28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client POS</td>
<td></td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor felt obligation</td>
<td></td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.33**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client felt obligation</td>
<td></td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change in F</strong></td>
<td>3.40*</td>
<td>49.62**</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change in R²</strong></td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F</strong></td>
<td>3.40*</td>
<td>21.23**</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjusted R²</strong></td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p ≤ .05; ** p ≤ .01
tion did not mediate the effects of client POS on loyalty or service delivery. Therefore, Hypothesis 3b is supported in relation to participation only.

In summary, perceived organizational supportiveness is positively related to employees’ felt obligation toward the target of the support. Second, employees’ felt obligation toward their contract organization partially mediated the effect of contractor POS on contractor affective commitment and on loyalty citizenship behaviors. Third, employees’ felt obligation toward the client partially mediated the effect of client POS on client affective commitment and fully mediated the effect of client POS on participation citizenship behaviors.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to determine whether social exchange theory formed the basis for understanding long-term contracted employee attitudes and behaviors in the context of their contracting and client organization. In addition, we set out to examine whether the processes underlying social exchange were similar in terms of how employees responded to supportiveness from the two organizations. Our findings suggest employees distinguish between sources of support, and this distinction forms the basis of their attachment to the foci organization. Therefore, social exchange theory seems to provide a basis to understanding the employment relationship of contracted employees in explaining their affective commitment to different foci. Finally, our findings highlight the differential effect of contractor and client felt obligation on dimensions of service-oriented citizenship behavior.

Specifically, the study confirms and extends prior research on the relationship between POS and affective commitment. Our findings are consistent with empirical research demonstrating a positive relationship between conventional POS and affective commitment (Rhoades et al., 2001) and also between client POS and client affective commitment (Liden et al., 2003). We extend research by incorporating felt obligation as the underlying explanation for how long-term contracted employees respond to perceived support from their employer and client organization. In other words, our findings illustrate how the norm of reciprocity, by giving rise to felt obligation, serves as an important mechanism for understanding how employees develop an attachment to their client organization. In light of the increasing trend toward nontraditional employment relationships, this study highlights the value of examining commitment to an external entity. It would seem that the nomological net associated with client organizational commitment appears to be similar to that of conventional organizational commitment (i.e., the antecedents to affective commitment were observed to be common across foci of commitment), thus supporting social exchange as a theoretical foundation for understanding the employment relationship of contracted employees.

Second, our study highlights that employees’ felt obligation provides the basis for understanding why they engage in service citizenship behavior. In doing so, it explicitly captures the felt obligation created by the provision of benefits in the form of organizational support. Thus, our study echoes previous findings highlighting the value of social exchange theory to understanding employee behavior (Coyle-Shapiro & Conway, 2005; Eisenberger et al., 2001). However, we depart from previous research by raising the issue of with whom does the employee develop a social exchange relationship? The thrust of prior research has focused on the employing organization and similarly, from the research on OCB, researchers have focused on the organization or individuals within the organization as beneficiaries.
of this form of reciprocation. In the context of contracted employees delivering a service, it appears that the client organization is in a position to influence the degree to which those employees have a felt obligation to reciprocate benefits received (i.e., perceived supportiveness). In terms of conceptualizing the beneficiaries of OCB, we suggest that additional stakeholders could be incorporated as a way to reflect the blurring of traditional boundaries between organizations and the associated rise of “different” employment relationships.

Consistent with Bettencourt et al. (2001) and Coyle-Shapiro (2002), we find different antecedents to different dimensions of service-oriented citizenship behavior. In particular, these dimensions are differentially affected by contractor- and client-based social exchange relationships; the former having greater predictive power in explaining loyalty and service delivery, while the latter is a more important predictor of participation. It is not surprising that contractor POS and felt obligation explain loyalty behaviors, as these behaviors are clearly directed at the contracting organization. Employees’ felt obligation toward their employing organization is important in explaining participation behaviors (i.e., behaviors aimed at enhancing community relations). Therefore, the degree to which employees feel that the client organization is supportive results in a felt obligation toward the client that in turn affects the degree to which employees engage in behaviors to improve the service they deliver on behalf of the client organization.

Finally, our findings support the utility of a social exchange framework to understand the contributions of long-term contracted employees to their employing and client organizations. In particular, this study supports the norm of reciprocity underlying organizational support theory. Thus, it appears that the essence of social exchange theory in terms of the conferring of benefits creating an obligation to reciprocate has merit beyond the traditional employee-employer relationship. Contracted employees, in delivering a service on behalf of the client organization, formulate an evaluative judgment regarding the supportiveness of the client organization. This judgment, in turn, influences their felt obligation toward the client organization.

However, the partial mediating role of felt obligation suggests that the norm of reciprocity may not provide a complete explanation for employees’ contribution (i.e., affective commitment) to the relationship. A complementary norm—a communal norm—may coexist with an exchange norm as the basis for employee contributions. Communal norms operate when individuals provide benefits to another on the basis of a concern for the other’s welfare, and the receipt of benefits does not create an obligation to reciprocate (Mills & Clark, 1994). If organizational supportiveness signals to employees that the organization is concerned about meeting their needs, employees may respond by sharing a concern for the needs of the employer. Some empirical evidence suggests that communal norms have explanatory power beyond exchange norms in predicting employees’ OCB (Blader & Tyler, 2000; Coyle-Shapiro & Kessler, 2004). Particularly in the context of this study, where private contracted employees are delivering a public service, they may be motivated to contribute out of a concern for the welfare of their own organization and that of the client in addition to reciprocating benefits received.

**Practical Implications**

Managers responsible for boundary-spanning employees and those concerned with managing potential dual allegiances of expatriate employees (e.g., Black & Gregersen, 1992) have long recognized the practical impor-
tance of external commitment. Historically, relatively few employees worked off-site, and thus there was little pressure to ascertain how best to approach these employees. The growth in co-employment relationships has now stimulated interest in this type of employee, and this research provides some preliminary insights into how these employees might be managed more effectively.

Specifically, our findings indicate that favorable commitment attitudes toward contractor and client organizations are simultaneously possible and can, respectively, be influenced by enhanced perceptions of organizational support that instill a felt obligation. These findings also are consistent with those who note that the performance of contingent workers is correlated more closely with their job attitudes than is the performance of employees in traditional employment relationships (Cardon, 2003). In essence, however, these findings provide practitioners with confidence that the same human resource practices that invoke favorable responses from traditional employees will generate similar reactions among contracted employees. Specifically, prudent contracting organizations would do well to work on maintaining favorable POS perceptions from their employees who work on-site for clients, as these results infer that an “out of sight, out of mind” orientation would quickly destroy contractor organizational commitment.

A delicate balancing act is required here, particularly as in this case a private-sector contractor is supplying services to a public-sector provider. The contractor must ensure that the values and messages sent to its employees do not create any tensions for the employee working in the client organization. Where difficulties emerge in this respect, contracted employees may feel unsupported by their employer. Similarly, client organizations, while not the employer of record, would find it in their best interests to promote a supportive environment for contracted employees, as there are benefits to be gained in terms of service delivery. Again, this is no easy task.

Our findings also suggest that some attention must be given to the nature of the relationship between the client and contracting organizations. As noted, the industrial relations literature (e.g., Beauvais et al., 1991) indicates that dual commitment is more likely where relations between management and unions are positive and constructive, reducing the need for the employee to choose between them when it comes to expressions of loyalty. In this case, the fact that the Council and its contractors had developed a partnership approach based on cooperation and shared benefits may help explain why contracted employees were able to develop a commitment to both their employing and client organization, thereby enhancing their service-oriented citizenship behavior. If organizations wish to gain these mutual benefits, they would do well to establish cooperative rather than adversarial contract relations.

Limitations and Future Research

As with all cross-sectional studies, not only were we unable to rule out relationships based on reverse causality, we were also unable to empirically demonstrate our causal inferences. However, longitudinal evidence supports POS as an antecedent of affective commitment and OCB (Coyle-Shapiro & Conway, 2005; Rhoades et al., 2001). Other possible limitations entail our sample size of 99, low response rate, and limited ability to assess nonresponse bias. The respondents did not differ significantly from the overall sample in terms of gender or average organizational tenure. Future studies should seek to replicate the findings reported here among contracted workers holding higher-level and/or more professional jobs and who are native language speakers.

Another possible limitation of this study is that all the variables were measured with
self-report survey measures. Consequently, the observed relationships may have been artificially inflated as a result of respondents’ tendencies to respond in a consistent manner. However, more recent meta-analytic research on the percept-percept inflation issue indicates that while this problem continues to be commonly cited, the magnitude of the inflation of relationships may be overestimated (Crampston & Wagner, 1994). As for our reliance on self-ratings of OCB, Putka and Vancouver (2000) note that the use of supervisory ratings may present a different problem regarding the extent to which supervisors have accurate knowledge of subordinates’ actual behavior. Furthermore, there is more evidence of a halo effect in supervisory ratings than self-ratings (Lance, LaPointe, & Stewart, 1994).

A final limitation of our study concerns the measurement of a number of constructs. We omitted one item from the affective commitment scale and modified an additional item from “working for” to “working on behalf of” in adapting this measure to client affective commitment. For felt obligation, we selected three items from a seven-item scale developed by Eisenberger et al. (2001). Although the reliabilities of these scales are above the acceptable levels, greater work is needed on developing scales with stronger psychometric properties for use in nontraditional employment contexts.

A number of avenues could be explored with future research. First, considerable empirical work exists that examines the antecedents of POS in the conventional employee-organization context. However, little is known about the factors that influence the development of external or client perceived organizational support. We would hypothesize that the creation of client perceived organizational support may be influenced by the terms of the contract such as the benefits and working conditions provided to employees (i.e., are contracted employees treated comparably to client employees?). Additionally, given that the delivery of service is monitored, how the contracting organization views the monitoring activity may influence how they react to events in the service delivery process. Finally, how management in the contracting organization communicates information about the recipient organization may positively or negatively shape employee perceptions of support from the client organization. In contrast to traditional POS, where employees develop perceptions based on their own, direct experiences, client POS may be subject to greater indirect influences (i.e., social information-processing effects).

Second, our sample consisted of private-sector contracted employees delivering a public service, and future research could examine the extent to which these employees identify with the public service and whether this attachment influences the willingness of employees to go beyond the call of duty in engaging in citizenship behavior to benefit the community along with the extent to which communal norms may underpin their employment relationship. In addition, the broader concern of how employees come to define themselves in the face of multiple organizational attachments (i.e., organizational identification) is worthy of further study.

This study indicates that greater integration of the social exchange and commitment literatures is strongly needed. Our research considered affective, but not continuance or normative, bases of organizational commitment. The exchange basis for continuance commitment has a long tradition of inquiry, but normative commitment (i.e., an employee’s feelings of obligation to remain with an organization; Meyer & Allen, 1997) has lagged. We would hypothesize, for example, that strong feelings of obligation would be even more predictive of normative commitment than affective commitment.

Finally, future research is needed to verify that scales developed in conventional organizational contexts are generalizable to less traditional settings (i.e., exhibit standard psychometric properties without deleting...
items). Moreover, given the rise of nontraditional employment relationships, additional research is required to confirm that all constructs linked to an organizational referent are empirically distinguishable when employed concurrently.

Managing long-term contracted employees effectively has the potential to create “win-win” scenarios for contractors and client organizations alike. Since increasing numbers of businesses are predicated on long-term relationships, as in the case with this city government and its contractors, a fuller understanding of these new coemployment relationships is needed. We hope this study begins to fill this void.
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### APPENDIX A

**Results of Factor Analysis of Service-Oriented Citizenship Behavior**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partic: Make constructive suggestions for service improvement</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partic: Give others creative solutions reported by the community</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partic: Contribute ideas for improving communications with the community</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partic: Encourage colleagues to contribute ideas and suggestions for service improvement</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partic: Review information on ___’s services</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD: Follow service guidelines with extreme care</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD: Conscientiously follow guidelines for interacting with the community</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD: Follow up requests from the community in a timely manner</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD: Demonstrate exceptional courtesy and respect to the community, regardless of circumstances</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD: Have a positive attitude at work</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loy: Say good things about ___ to others</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loy: Tell family and friends how good ___’s services are</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loy: Tell outsiders that ___ is a good place to work</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loy: Actively promote ___’s services</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalue</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of variance</td>
<td>51.98</td>
<td>14.35</td>
<td>8.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Partic = participation, SD = service delivery, and Loy = loyalty.*