2013

Using Personality Traits to Select Customer-Oriented Security Guards

Tracy Marie Shega
Minnesota State University - Mankato

Using Personality Traits to Select Customer-Oriented Security Guards

Tracy M. Shega

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts in Industrial-Organizational Psychology,

Minnesota State University, Mankato

Mankato, Minnesota

December 2013

Using Personality Traits to Select Customer-Oriented Security Guards

Tracy M. Shega

This thesis has been examined and approved by the following members of the student's committee.

Dr. Andrea Lassiter, Associate Professor of Psychology
Advisor

Dr. Lisa Perez, Associate Professor of Psychology
Committee Member

Dr. Kathleen Dale, Associate Professor of Management
Committee Member

Using Personality Traits to Select Customer-Oriented Security Guards

Companies have long been interested in trying to provide excellent customer service for their customers. The financial institution a person chooses to bank at, the hotels people choose to stay in, and the dry cleaner people repeatedly bring their clothes to, are often decisions that are made based upon the level of customer service they receive (Blodgett, Wakefield, & Barnes, 1995; Homburg, Hoyer, & Fassnacht, 2002). Therefore, especially in industries that are competitive and where customers have different options of where to do their business, companies are realizing that having and maintaining a customer base is essential for their company to survive and succeed and that customer service is a critical success factor (Yavas & Babakus, 2009).

Customer service is generally conceptualized as including components such as the level of responsiveness, reliability, friendliness, and promptness of employees (Blodgett et al., 1995). This topic has become more relevant as the process of customers dealing primarily with one sales person or company contact has become rather obsolete. Instead, customers of contemporary service-based organizations often interact with a host of different employees, each providing a different service (Frei & McDaniel, 1998). Thus, it is essential for all employees in an organization that interact with customers to have good customer service skills because it has been found that customers often base their impressions of an organization at large based upon the quality of service they receive from customer contact employees (Farrell & Oczkowski, 2009). To put it simply, customer service is a critical success factor for organizations today, specifically those in the service sectors, such as hotels, restaurants, banks, and clothing stores (Alge, Gresham, Heneman, Fox, & McMasters, 2002; Baydoun, Rose, & Emperado, 2001).

Conceptualizing Customer Service

In the past, people generally thought of customer service as simply responding effectively to customer's expressed needs (Blocker, Flint, Myers, & Slater, 2011). Today, as researchers have studied service more closely and taken a greater interest in discovering what constitutes good "service," effective customer service has broadened to involve knowing the business well enough to proactively address the customers' latent and future needs (Blocker et al., 2011). The ability to take initiative and demonstrate proactive behavior is particularly important for front-line service employees due to the highly diverse and fast-changing needs and expectations of customers (Frese & Fay, 2001; Parker, Williams, & Turner, 2006; Raub & Liao, 2012).

Good vs. Poor Customer Service. Poor customer service is based upon many different factors and the main way companies try to rectify poor customer service and improve it is through selection measures (Alge et al., 2002). The thought process being that it is much more challenging to train people on customer service and have them consistently change their behaviors, so it is more cost-effective to screen for this prior to hiring an employee (Frei & McDaniel, 1998; Sanchez, Fraser, Fernandez, & De La Torre, 1993). Thus, organizations want and need to find ways to identify those potential applicants who will effectively serve the public (Baydoun et al., 2001).

Different conceptualizations of customer service. Another important aspect to recognize is that customer service is often conceptualized in two different ways. Often times, people refer to and research customer service as an outcome. Therefore, they are examining what constitutes good customer service and whether a person exhibits good

customer service (Baydoun et al., 2001). Another way of studying customer service is by looking at it as a predictor, rather than an outcome.

Examining customer service as a predictor provides meaningful information and is the way most industrial-organizational psychologists research customer service (Baydoun et al., 2001). Considering customer service in this way studies how customer service predicts other important outcomes such as performance and subsequent organizational revenue (Baydoun et al., 2001; Zablah, Franke, Brown, & Bartholomew, 2012). A key differentiation is that customer service is the term that is often used when looking at it as an outcome, whereas customer orientation is the term more associated with predicting. Thus, in contexts such as selection settings, where researchers are trying to screen for characteristics that will predict job performance, customer orientation is the fitting construct compared to the more traditional conceptualization of customer service.

Customer Orientation

Customer orientation can be defined as: "the set of behaviors and beliefs that places a priority on customers' interests and continuously creates superior customer value" (Rindfleisch & Moorman, 2003). Saxe and Weitz coined this concept of salesperson customer orientation in 1982 and customer orientation has been a topic of much interest over the last three decades. The reason for the widespread interest in this topic is because it is widely accepted that customer orientation should positively influence important psychological outcomes (e.g. job satisfaction and organizational commitment) (Donovan, Brown, & Mowen 2004; Farrell & Oczkowski, 2009), as well as job-related outcomes (e.g. performance) (Baydoun et al., 2002; Jones, Busch, & Dacin, 2003) among frontline employees.

Customer orientation vs. sales orientation. Customer orientation is often contrasted with sales-oriented selling. The key differences between these two orientations is that whereas customer orientation focuses on assisting customers to satisfy their long-term wants and needs, a sales orientation puts the selling organization and/or salesperson before the customer (Jones, Busch, & Dacin, 2003). Thus, a person with a high customer orientation would avoid actions that could potentially sacrifice customer interest to instead try to make an immediate sale (Saxe & Weitz, 1982). It has been widely documented in the literature that customer orientation leads to greater long-term performance benefits for the salesperson compared to when using a sales orientation (Thakor & Joshi, 2005). However, it should be noted that people often persist in being sales-oriented due to the additional effort that is required to have a customer orientation (Saxe & Weitz, 1982). Thus, it is easier to have a sales-orientation than the more beneficial customer orientation. Others have done substantial research on these two different types of selling orientations; however, for the purpose of this paper, the focus will be on customer orientation due to the many positive outcomes that have been found to be associated with customer orientation.

Customer Orientation and Outcomes

Performance. Researchers note that customer orientation positively impacts customer responses, such that a consumer who receives quality service will be more likely to purchase from that company in the future, whereas dissatisfied customers will shop elsewhere (Baydoun et al., 2002; Jones, Busch, & Dacin, 2003). Additionally, having customer-oriented employees is important because that has been found to likely lead to positive relationships between the customer-oriented employees and customers,

which plays a role in fostering customer loyalty, as well as positive word-of-mouth about

the company (Macintosh, 2007). Thus, employees having high customer orientation can

help the business and the performance of the larger organization.

Satisfaction. Some of the earliest research on customer orientation by Saxe and

Weitz found that employees with increasing levels of job satisfaction also have higher

levels of customer orientation (Farrell & Oczkowski, 2009). More recent research has

found similar connections, but in the opposite direction. Specifically, Donavan et al.

(2004) found that customer orientation leads to job satisfaction. Similarly, it has been

suggested that employees with high customer orientation derive satisfaction from making

their customers happy (Harris, Mowen, & Brown, 2005). Recent findings show that

customer orientation positively influences job satisfaction, commitment to the company,

and organizational citizenship behaviors (Donovan, Brown, & Mowen, 2004), all highly

favorable outcomes.

Job Responses. In addition to customer orientation's impact on performance and

increasing the likelihood that customers will return with their business, it is also

important to recognize that customer orientation has strong effects on several employee

job responses (Donavan, Brown, & Mowen, 2004). A meta-analysis found that customer

orientation is an antecedent to critical job states such as stress and engagement, such that

customer orientation decreases stress perceptions and enhances worker engagement

(Zablah, et al., 2012). Additionally, it has been found that customer orientation positively

influences job satisfaction, commitment, as well as the performance of organizational

citizenship behaviors (Donovan et al., 2004). In addition, Zablah et al. (2003) found that

customer orientation improves job outcomes because it enhances frontline employees'

psychological welfare in additional to being good for business. Clearly, having

customer- oriented employees is beneficial for numerous reasons.

Customer Orientation and the Organization

It is important to note that researchers often study the customer orientation of the

broader firm and company as well, which creates an important distinction between

whether a researcher is referring to the customer orientation of the individual employee

or the overall company (Homburg, Muller, & Klarmann, 2011).   It is widely recognized

that successful organizations need to have customer-oriented business cultures (Brady &

Cronin, 2001; Grizzle, Zablah, Brown, Mowen, & Lee, 2009; Hennig-Thurau & Thurau,

2002). Specifically, McDaniel and Frei (1994) posited that two general factors influence

employees' tendency to provide quality customer service: the organizational climate and

individual personality characteristics (Baydoun et al., 2002).   Similarly, Jones et al.

(2003) found that sales managers influence salesperson customer orientation through

their organizational commitment.   Additionally, it has been found that higher levels of

customer orientation result from favorable perceptions of the organizational climate for

service and from higher levels of motivational direction and organizational commitment

(Kelley, 1992).

Thus, not only is it important for the employee to personally have a customer

orientation but it is important that the broader company climate also supports this type of

orientation, as well. For the purpose of this paper, the focus will be on selecting security

guards who have this propensity towards customer orientation to work with companies

that value customer service. Much of what is important to be successful in the position of

security guard is an understanding that their position is about serving the public. One

main distinction that security guards are taught in their training repeatedly is that they are there to serve, not to act like police officers. Considering these particular positions and organizations, the current study recognizes two foci: customer orientation by an individual and customer service by an organization.

Customer Orientation and Fit

Another reason that building customer orientation into selection systems is beneficial relates to the concept of fit between a person and the broader company. Person and organization fit is defined as the match between an individual's values and an organization's values, or their culture (Farrell & Oczkowski , 2009). Measuring a person's customer orientation could be beneficial to get information about their fit with a particular company and their values. For example, if a company values customer orientation, it is important that their employees have this type of emphasis and thus assessing a person's selling orientation would be beneficial to assess a person's fit with an organization.

Specifically, it has been found that incongruence between an employee's service orientation and the perceived service orientation established by the organization and displayed by management can lead to job dissatisfaction and frustration (Baydoun et al.,2001; Schneider, 1987). Farrell and Oczkowski (2009) found that employees who rate themselves as having a customer orientation, perceived themselves to be a good fit within service-oriented organizations. Thus, it is suggested that a customer-oriented employee would be a better fit in a service setting and thus would be more likely to be committed to the organization (Farrell & Oczkowski, 2009).

Connection Between Customer Orientation and Customer Service

Another similar and related definition of customer service orientation is the following: "a set of basic individual predispositions and an inclination to provide service, to be courteous and helpful in dealing with customers and associates" (Alge et al., 2002, p. 468). The way that customer orientation and customer service are seen as connected in the literature is that the selection of customer service oriented employees is a key factor in establishing customer service (Alge et al., 2002). The research on customer orientation has made clear that selecting on customer service orientation can play an effective role in a company's customer service strategy (Frei & McDaniel, 1998). It is thus important that companies select potential employees that are high in customer service orientation.

Measuring Customer Service/Orientation

Measuring customer service has proved quite challenging for researchers, partly due to the continued debate in the field of industrial/organizational psychology on the use of narrow versus broad measures of personality (Alge et al., 2002). The proponents of broad measures of personality traits argue that they are more predictive of overall job performance (Alge et al., 2002; Ones & Viswesvaran, 1996). Those who believe that narrow measures of personality traits are preferable cite that they provide a better measure of job performance because it specifies the relationship of the personality traits with multiple dimensions of job performance (Alge et al., 2002). Due to this debate and likely for other reasons, there are limited psychometrically sound scales of customer orientation today. Thus, the development of a new psychometrically sound measure of customer orientation would be helpful for the specific purpose of screening whether

security guards make a good fit for a company that values customer service. It also

would likely be very useful for other similar selection purposes.

In this study, two different measures of customer orientation (composed of

personality traits) will be examined and compared to a measure of job satisfaction.

Analyses will assess whether there is a difference between more general personality items

and personality items that are worded more specifically to interactions of security guards

with the public in their jobs.

Hypothesis 1:

It is hypothesized that the broader personality items will better predict job

satisfaction for two reasons.

- First, because a broad measure of job satisfaction will be used, past

    research would suggest that a broad measure of personality will be a better

    predictor. This is because it has been found that the scope of the measures

    makes a difference, such that narrow measures better predict narrow

    outcomes, and broad measures better predict broad outcomes (Jenkins &

    Griffith, 2004).

- Secondly, because the more specific items are more relevant to the job of a

    security guard, they will likely be more transparent. Thus, it is

    hypothesized that the more specific personality-based measure of

    customer orientation will be less predictive of job satisfaction.

Selecting for Customer Orientation

As mentioned above, one of the common ways companies try to prevent poor

customer service, is to build customer orientation measures into their selection systems

(Alge et al., 2002). Employee selection processes are one of the fundamental ways by which organizations acquire human capital, which consists of the knowledge, skills, abilities, and other characteristics (KSAOs) of an organization's workforce (Van Iddekinge, Ferris, Perrewe, Perryman, Blass, & Heetderks, 2009). Many researchers are in agreement that managers should consider customer orientation an important criterion in frontline employee decisions (Zablah et al., 2012), particularly as the service sector continues to grow and companies continually put more emphasis on customer oriented operations (Baydoun et al., 2001).

Additionally, it has been suggested that training programs focused on improving customer service may be more successful for employees who have a predisposition to service orientation upon being hired (Frei & McDaniel, 1998; Sanchez, Fraser, Fernandez, & De La Torre, 1993). Therefore, rather than relying on training materials solely to try to establish a customer orientation in employees, it is more effective to first select employees on customer orientation and then provide training materials to those employees (Periatt, Chakrabarty, & Lemay, 2013).

It should be noted that customer orientation has been found to be an enduring disposition (i.e., consistent over time), thus lending support to why selecting on this surface-level personality trait is feasible (Farrell & Oczkowski, 2009; Grizzle et al., 2009). Farrell and Oczkowski (2009) write: "without a doubt, our results suggest that it is important to hire employees who have a customer orientation" (p. 161). Additionally, using customer service orientation measures in selection should result in very minimal to no adverse impact against minority applicants (Frei & McDaniel, 1998).

Customer Orientation Dimensions

Although not many psychometrically sound measures or scales of customer orientation currently exist, a substantial amount of research has been done on the dimensions that make up this construct of customer orientation. Ones and Viswesvaran (1996) and Frei and McDaniel (1998) have found that customer orientation measures correlate with the Big Five measures of agreeableness, emotional stability, and conscientiousness. Thus, due to the empirical support for these constructs making up the broader construct of customer orientation, these will be the dimensions that are measured in this new scale of customer orientation designed specifically for security guards.

Agreeableness. The Big Five personality factor of agreeableness includes such traits as trusting, cooperative, and good naturedness (Frei & McDaniel, 1998). Customer service has been found to have a correlation of 0.43 with the Big Five measure of agreeableness (Frei & McDaniel). Additionally, agreeableness was also included as one of three dimensions of Hogan, Hogan, and Busch's well-known measure of customer orientation (Brown, Mowen, Donavan, & Licata, 2002). Agreeableness is related to customer orientation because agreeableness leads the employee to engage in friendly, rather than confrontational conversations with customers; something that is clearly valued by organizations that value customer service (Hennig-Thurau & Thurau, 2008). Agreeableness has indeed been found to be a significant predictor of the customer orientation of front-line employees and also predicted their overall job performance (Periatt, Chakrabarty, & Lemay, 2013). In this new measure of customer orientation, the sub-scales of agreeableness that are relevant to customer orientation and will be included in this measure are: morality, altruism, and cooperation.

Emotional stability. Emotional stability refers to the degree to which a person's emotions vary widely (Brown et al., 2002). Individuals who have low emotional stability are often high strung, stress prone, moody, lack self-esteem, and are insecure (Barrick & Mount, 2000); all of which are problematic characteristics for those working as a security guard. It has long been thought and accepted that emotional stability plays a role in a person's customer orientation. Intuitively, a person that is emotionally unstable would have a fluctuating desire to serve customers and meet their needs (Brown et al., 2002). Emotional stability has been found to have a correlation to service orientation of .37. The sub-scales of emotional stability that will be assessed in the Customer Orientation Scale are: anger, vulnerability, and self-consciousness. It should also be noted that emotional stability and conscientiousness have been found to be the best personality predictors of an individual's long-term motivation levels and subsequent work behaviors (Barrick & Mount, 2000). Thus further demonstrating why it would be preferable to include them in a measure of customer orientation.

Conscientiousness. Conscientiousness includes such variables as orderliness and achievement striving (Frei & McDaniel, 1998) and conscientious individuals are hardworking, dependable, responsible, careful, and reliable (Barrick & Mount, 2000). Conscientiousness has been found to predict job performance, regardless of occupational category (Frei & McDaniel, 1998). Thus, this shows the powerful influence that conscientiousness can have on a person's success in their job. Conscientiousness has been found to have a correlation of .42 with customer service (Frei & McDaniel, 1998). One study specifically found that the higher the levels of conscientiousness that logistics employees had, the greater the likelihood they would satisfy the needs of both internal

and external customers (Periatt, Chakrabarty, & Lemay, 2013). The sub-components of

conscientiousness that are relevant to customer orientation and that will be assessed in

this measure include: self-efficacy, dutifulness, cautiousness, and self-discipline. Ones

and Viswesvaran (1996) found that conscientiousness and emotional stability were the

strongest personality correlates of customer service orientation (Brown & Mount, 2000).

What Customer Orientation Is Not

There are a few constructs that are commonly referred to in the fields of business

that may be commonly thought to be a part of customer dimension but that research does

not support. It is important to address these constructs and the lack of research support in

order to have an understanding of why they are not included. Additionally, by

understanding what research has found to not be a part of customer orientation is

important because it provides people with a better understanding of exactly what

customer orientation is, as well as what it is not.

Extraversion. One of the main personality constructs that people often infer is a

part of customer orientation and that is frequently measured is extraversion. However,

the research on extraversion and customer orientation is quite mixed. Studies indicate

that while there is indeed a significant relationship between extraversion and customer

orientation for top executives, extraversion does not seem to have an important impact on

the customer orientation of those not in executive leadership positions (Periatt et al.,

2013). In fact, some studies have even found a negative relationship between

extraversion and performance in front-line customer service occupations (Stewart &

Carson, 1995).

Cognitive ability. Additionally, it is important to recognize that cognitive ability does not seem to have much of a connection with customer orientation. Research has repeatedly found low correlations between customer orientation inventories and cognitive ability (Frei & McDaniel, 1998; Ones & Viswesvran, 1996). Specifically, individual studies have found low correlations between cognitive ability and customer orientation and in fact, a meta-analysis indicates that across a wide range of studies, these same low correlations persist (Frei & McDaniel, 1998).

Social desirability. Lastly, social desirability is an especially interesting factor to consider in relation to customer orientation. While it may seem intuitive that social desirability, the wanting to portray oneself in a positive light, would predict customer service skills; because service people are often expected to respond courteously even when they are upset or in a bad mood, this does not appear to be the case (Frei & McDaniel, 1998). Crosby (1990) argues that people that are high in social desirability are sensitive to social situations and have a high need for approval from others. Because service people and sales people are frequently faced with rejection, it is important that these people are able to handle rejection without blaming themselves.

Hypotheses

- **Hypothesis 2**: Factor Analysis will result in personality items loading on to three different domains for both measures of customer orientation:

    1. Agreeableness

    2. Conscientiousness

    3. Emotional Stability

- **Hypothesis 3**: Customer orientation will predict job satisfaction, such that higher scores on customer orientation will be related to higher levels of job satisfaction

- **Hypothesis 4:** Customer orientation will predict perceived job-ability fit, such that higher scores on customer orientation will be related to higher levels of perceived job-ability fit

Method

Sample

The participants in this study were current security guards working for a large firm based in Atlanta, Georgia. 174 security guards entered the survey with 134 participants completing the survey in its entirety. Thus, 77% of those who entered the survey actually went through and answered the questions. Of the 134 participants who completed the survey, 39 identified as female (29.1%) and 94 as male (70.1%). One participant chose not to provide demographic information. Participants' ages ranged from 16-20 years to 71-75 years. The breakdown of how many participants fell into each of the different age ranges is displayed in Table 1.

In addition to having a diverse sample of participant ages, the sample also had a wide variability in terms of participants' tenure as security guards. Participants worked as security guards from a minimum of less than 6 months, to over 20 years. Table 2 provides a breakdown of how long participants had been working as security guards. Provided in Table 3 is information about the self-disclosed race of survey participants. It should be noted that several participants chose not to provide information about their race/ethnicity, as this information was optional.

Scale Development

The newly created measure, the Customer Orientation Scale, is based upon the

International Personality Item Pool (IPIP), which is a measure of the Big Five personality

constructs (Goldberg, 1999). As outlined above, the newly created items were based on

the IPIP items that are relevant to the dimensions of customer orientation (e.g.

conscientiousness, agreeableness, and emotional stability). However, the main

distinction in this newly created scale is that the items are more specific and catered to

the work of security guards, rather than in the very general format as in the IPIP. This is

an important differentiation as the development of this scale was client-driven; the

purpose was to develop a customer orientation specifically for the classification of

security guards. Specifically, the client wants to differentiate between the customer

orientation of security guards that have already been selected and trained to assess which

of these guards have the highest customer orientation and would make the best fit for a

grocery organization that puts a high value and emphasis on customer orientation. To see

an example of these types of differences, Appendix A and B can be referenced.

Content Validity

The content validity of the Customer Orientation Scale was assessed through 20

subject matter experts (SMEs) rating whether the 54 items were essential, useful but not

essential, or not useful both in regards to the personality facet it was supposed to be a part

of, as well as in regards to customer orientation. Fifty percent of the SMEs had to state

that the item was either essential or useful for it to be considered a good measure of the

construct. One item was eliminated from the scale because it was a poor representation

of the personality construct and was worded poorly. All other items were retained

because over 50% of SMEs rated the item as either essential or useful. This is as would

be expected because the items are based on the IPIP, which is a well-validated measure of

personality and is indicative of customer orientation.

Measures

      Customer Orientation Scale. The Customer Orientation Scale is the newly

created measure outlined above. It measures customer orientation on three different

dimensions: agreeableness, emotional stability, and conscientiousness. There are 53

questions in total; 16 questions for agreeableness, 14 questions for emotional stability,

and 23 questions for conscientiousness. The full list of the items that make up the

Customer Orientation Scale is displayed in Appendix B.

      IPIP (Conscientiousness, Agreeableness, and Emotional Stability

Dimensions). IPIP items related to conscientiousness, agreeableness, and emotional

stability were presented to survey participants, as these are the personality constructs that

have proven to be relevant to customer orientation. These items can be used to measure

the convergent validity of the proposed measure as it is hypothesized that that these IPIP

items will positively and significantly correlate with the Customer Orientation Scale

developed in this study. In total, 62 IPIP items were given to participants: 17 for

emotional stability, 19 for agreeableness, and 26 for conscientiousness. The full list of

IPIP items are displayed in Appendix A.

      Job Satisfaction Measure. The Job Satisfaction measure that was used is a

broad and global measure of job satisfaction by Cammann, Fichmann, Jenkins, and Klesh

(1983). It measures an employee's subjective response to working in their job within the

broader organization. This measure is composed of only three items that are ranked on a

seven point Likert-type scale from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree. The items

that are a part of the Job Satisfaction Measure are provided in Appendix C.

Perceived Ability-Job Fit. This five-item measure developed by Abdel-Halim

(1981) measures employees' perceptions of the fit between their abilities and their job.

In an ideal setting, the measures of customer orientation outlined above would be

compared with a measure of job performance. However, because the company under

study currently does not track performance records of their security guards, perceived

ability-job fit will serve as the outcome variable, as the items in in this measure touch on

their perceived performance. For example, items in this measure include: "I feel

competent and fully able to handle my job," as well as: "I feel I have adequate

preparation for the job I now hold." Coefficient alpha values range from .73 to .74 for

the items in this measure. A full list of the items that make up this scale can be found in

Appendix D.

Procedure

An online survey was created that consisted of demographic questions, the

Customer Orientation Scale, the IPIP items relevant to customer orientation, a measure of

job satisfaction, as well as perceived job-ability fit. This survey was put on Qualtrics,

which is an online survey website. Security guards were recruited through a security

staffing firm and were provided with the link to this survey on Qualtrics. Participation in

this study was voluntary and security guards were assured that their responses would be

entirely confidential and would not have any impact on their relationship with the

security guard staffing company. The time commitment for this survey was

approximately 20 to 30 minutes.

Results

The means, standard deviations, and minimum and maximum scores were computed for each item for all of the different measures. These descriptive statistics are provided in Tables 4 through 7. It should be noted that for most of the items, the means were on the extremes of the distribution; thus there were many means that were in the 1 range, as well as many means that were in the 4 and above range for these customer orientation items, which were on a 5-point Likert scale. There are many potential reasons for these extreme answers and these will be addressed in the discussion section. Most items did have answers however, which utilized the full scale of responding, thus with a minimum score of 1 and a maximum of 5. There were however, a few items that would range from 2-5, or 1-4, with the trend being towards items that would be viewed very negatively, such as: "I lose my temper when interacting with people on the job," eliciting these types of responses that did not utilize the full scale. Table 12 and table 13 display the correlation matrixes to show how all of the study variables are related to one another. Most of the variables have fairly strong correlations with one another, likely due to the very limited range of responses in this study.

Internal consistencies of scales and dimensions were analyzed using Cronbach's alpha. These internal consistencies are displayed in tables 8 through 11. Cronbach's alpha for the Customer Orientation scale indicates that the entire measure is internally consistent ($\alpha = .908$). In addition, the subscales of Customer Orientation all met the standards of internal consistency reliability, as well: emotional stability ($\alpha = .770$), agreeableness ($\alpha = .725$), and conscientiousness ($\alpha = .845$). Cronbach's alpha for the sum of all the IPIP items relevant to customer orientation also indicates that this measure

is internally consistent (α = .935). Additionally, the subscales of the IPIP all met the

standards of internal consistently reliability as well: emotional stability (α = .826),

agreeableness (α = .785), and conscientiousness (α = .881). The Cronbach's alphas for

each of the outcome measures also met the standards of internal consistency reliability as

well: Job Satisfaction Scale (α = .902) and Perceived Job Ability Fit (α = .771).

Customer Orientation Measures and Job Satisfaction. Hypothesis 1 sought to

examine which of the customer orientation scales (e.g. Customer Orientation Scale

(narrower) and IPIP (broader)) better predict job satisfaction and perceived job-ability fit.

To test hypothesis 1, multiple regression was used to examine whether the Customer

Orientation Scale significantly predicted job satisfaction. Results indicate that the

subscales of morality (β =.339, p = .000), self efficacy (β = -.251, p = .004) and

dutifulness (β =.283, p = .004) are all significant predictors of job satisfaction. In fact,

approximately 24% of differences in job satisfaction are explained by differences in

morality, self-efficacy, and dutifulness questions of the Customer Orientation Scale.

To continue to test hypothesis 1, another multiple regression was conducted to

examine whether the IPIP items significantly predicted job satisfaction. Results indicate

that dutifulness is the only subscale that significantly predicts job satisfaction (β = .333, p

= .000). Dutifulness was the only variable that remained significant after removing all of

the nonsignificant ones individually. Specifically, approximately 7% of differences in

job satisfaction are explained by differences in responding to dutifulness questions.

Customer Orientation Measures and Perceived Job-Ability Fit. In regards to

perceived-job ability fit, another multiple regression was conducted to examine whether

the Customer Orientation Scale also significantly predicted perceived job-ability fit as it

did for job satisfaction. Results indicate that the subscales of morality ($\beta = .203$, $p = .024$) and dutifulness ($\beta = .385$, $p = .000$) are significant predictors of perceived job-ability fit. Approximately 27% of differences in perceived job ability fit are explained by differences in responding to the morality and dutifulness questions of the Customer Orientation Scale.

For the final step of hypothesis 1, a multiple regression was conducted to examine whether the IPIP items significantly predicted perceived job-ability fit. Results indicate that the subscale of self-discipline ($\beta = .395$, $p = .000$) is the only significant predictor of perceived job ability fit. Approximately 15.6% of differences in perceived job ability fit are explained by differences in responding to the self-discipline questions of the IPIP.

Thus, hypothesis 1 that the IPIP items would be a better predictor of job satisfaction compared to the Customer Orientation Scale due to its broad nature was not supported. Rather, findings suggest that the Customer Orientation Scale is a better predictor of job satisfaction. The initial concern about the Customer Orientation Scale perhaps being too transparent seems to be unwarranted and the scope of the measure does not appear to have an impact. Thus, although past research would suggest that a broad measure (e.g. the IPIP) would be a better predictor because the outcomes (e.g. job satisfaction and perceived job ability fit) are measured broadly, this does not appear to be having an impact as the more narrow Customer Orientation Scale explains more of the variance in job satisfaction and perceived job-ability fit. Therefore, although this hypothesis is not supported, it does provide positive support for the Customer Orientation Scale.

        To test hypothesis 2, a principal components factor analysis with varimax rotation

was run for both the Customer Orientation scale as well as the IPIP. Results indicated

that for both scales, only two factors were extracted, as there were only two eigen values

over 1. Thus, hypothesis 2 was not supported. A likely reason for only two factors being

found again relates to the limited range of responses from security guards and the small

sample size. As is displayed in Tables 14 and 15, there were no clear findings in regards

to the different factors.

        For the Customer Orientation Scale, the first factor had an eigen value of 4.86 and

consisted of the following sub-scales: self-efficacy, self-consciousness, vulnerability,

self-discipline, and cautiousness. For the second factor, the eigen value was 1.11 and the

subscales that were a part of this factor include: morality, dutifulness, altruism, anger,

and cooperation. In regards to comparing the two factors, the minimum value for Factor

1 is .546 and the maximum value for Factor 2 is .764. Thus, the breakdown of the two

components does not appear to be meaningful since the breakdown between the two

factors is not extreme and does not cluster according to the domains of conscientiousness,

emotional stability, and agreeableness as would be expected. Details of the factor analysis

on the Customer Orientation Scale are displayed in Table 14.

        For the IPIP items, the first factor had an eigen value of 5.65 and consisted of the

following sub-scales: self-efficacy, self-consciousness, vulnerability, self-discipline,

cautiousness, and anger. For the second factor, the eigen value was 1.11 and consisted of

cooperation, morality, dutifulness, and altruism. Again, the breakdown of the factors

does not seem to be very meaningful as the minimum value for Factor 1 is .633 and the

maximum value for factor 2 is .852. Table 15 provides further statistics from this factor

analysis on the IPIP items. Given these findings, hypothesis 2 is not supported.

Hypothesis 3

To test hypothesis 3, a simple regression was conducted to examine whether

higher scores on customer orientation predicted higher scores on job satisfaction. This

hypothesis was tested for both the IPIP as well as the Customer Orientation Scale. In

regards to the Customer Orientation Scale, hypothesis 3 was supported and results

indicate that customer orientation does significantly predict job satisfaction ($\beta = .266$, $p = $

.002). Specifically, approximately 7% of differences in job satisfaction scores are

explained by differences in Customer Orientation scores. In regards to the IPIP items,

hypothesis 3 was supported for this scale as well because customer orientation scores

based on the IPIP also predicts job satisfaction ($\beta = .227$, $p = .008$). Approximately 5.2%

of differences in job satisfaction are explained by differences in IPIP scores. Thus for

both scales, higher scores on for customer orientation were related to higher scores on job

satisfaction but with the Customer Orientation Scale accounting for slightly more

variance in the prediction of job satisfaction. This provides support for hypothesis 3.

Hypothesis 4

To test hypothesis 4, a simple regression was conducted to examine whether

higher scores on customer orientation predicted higher scores on perceived job-ability fit.

This hypothesis was tested for both the IPIP as well as the Customer Orientation Scale.

For the Customer Orientation Scale, hypothesis 4 was supported and results indicate that

Customer Orientation does significantly predict perceived job ability fit ($\beta = .417$, $p = $

.000). Approximately 17% of differences in perceived job-ability fit are explained by

differences in Customer Orientation scores. In regards to the IPIP items, this was

supported as well and results indicate that the IPIP items relevant to customer orientation

do significantly predict perceived job ability fit ($\beta = .319$, $p = .000$). Approximately 10%

of differences in perceived job-ability fit are explained by differences in IPIP scores.

Discussion

Overall, results are promising for the Customer Orientation Scale as this measure

predicts more of the variance in the outcome measures of job satisfaction and perceived

job-ability fit than do the items on the IPIP relevant to customer orientation. This is

favorable as the dimensions of agreeableness, conscientiousness, and emotional stability

of the IPIP are widely used and popular measures for customer orientation. The only

hypothesis that was not supported that is not ideal is that factor analysis did not result in

items loading on to three factors. However, this was the case for both the Customer

Orientation Scale, as well as the IPIP items – which are extremely well documented as

typically loading on to three factors. This would suggest that perhaps the reason that the

factor analysis did not load onto three factors for either of the customer orientation scales

may be due to the lack of variability in responses and the small sample size as opposed to

a problem with there not being three different content areas for these measures.

Based on the above results, it would be advised that using the Customer

Orientation Scale would be preferable to the IPIP when selecting which of the current

security guards would make a particularly good fit for a client that values customer

orientation. The rationale for this is that the Customer Orientation Scale is a better

predictor of the job satisfaction and perceived job-ability fit outcomes than the IPIP.

Additionally, the new Customer Orientation Scale correlated highly with the IPIP, which is already a well-validated measure of the construct of customer orientation.

Additionally, practitioners can benefit from this type of research study because it provides justification for more customized measures versus more generic, off-the-shelf tools. Further, this study provides support that a more customized and tailored survey is manageable to create and validate, in addition to being more valid for the client and having better predictive validity. It is also preferable that this type of measure is more specific to the job and thus more relevant to the employee's experience, creating better face validity.

Limitations and Future Directions

Social Desirability. One of the largest limitations of the current study is the range restriction, which is likely due in large part to social desirability. Thus, what we found in the study is that for items that were framed more positively for customer orientation, the mean would be in the 4 and above range (agree-strongly agree) with the large majority of respondents answering this way. The counter was also true; so for more negative items, most respondents were answering in the very low range for strongly disagree. While it may be the case that this is indeed how respondents feel, it is also likely that social desirability played quite a role. Although participants were assured that their answers would in no way impact their job, they may have felt as though they should respond in a positive light to these items related to customer orientation rather than responding according to how they really feel.

Sample Size. In addition to range restriction, another limitation of this study is the sample size of 134 security guards. As with any scale development study, the more

participation, the better. It would be interesting to see with an increased number of participants whether the variability in responses would have increased. This is an area of opportunity for future studies with this scale.

Security Guard Position Status. Another likely reason for why this study had range restriction is that it was given to a somewhat selected sample. Thus, those who took the survey were security guards that had already been hired by the placement company and gone through training. This may have an impact for several reasons. First, it is likely that the people that choose to work as security guards may have some similarities; thus, they may enjoy working and helping people. Another potential reason for the lack of variability in responses is that those that would tend to respond more negatively to the customer orientation items may have already self-selected out of this job. Thus, because being successful in the job of a security guard does require some level of customer orientation, those people that do not have this may have either been screened out by the initial hiring selection process, self-selected out of the job, or been fired.

Conscientiousness. An additional consideration is the conscientiousness levels of those that took the survey. It is hypothesized that people that tend to score higher on conscientiousness measures were more likely to take and complete this survey, as participation in this study was again, voluntary.

Performance Measure. As touched on prior, one of the limitations of this study is that the company from which the security guard population was pulled, does not currently track the performance of its employees. In an ideal setting, the scores on the customer orientation could be compared with the performance measures to see if customer orientation is predictive of security guard performance. This is perhaps an area

for future direction and/or replication of this study with a company that does track this

type of information.

Additional Convergent Measure. Another limitation of this study and an area of

opportunity would be to have given participants another measure of customer orientation

other than the Customer Orientation Scale and the IPIP items relevant to customer

orientation. This additional measure of customer orientation would be beneficial to serve

as an additional measure of convergent validity; to demonstrate that multiple measures of

the construct of customer orientation are similar and are indeed measuring a similar

construct. One potential concern with this current study was the length of the survey. By

providing participants with the Customer Orientation Scale, IPIP items, job satisfaction

measure, and perceived job-ability fit, the survey had already become quite lengthy for

participants so this is a potential consideration. Additionally, because the Big Five

constructs of emotional stability, neuroticism, and agreeableness are already well-

validated components of customer orientation, the IPIP items were able to serve as a

convergent measure to the Customer Orientation Scale.

Social Desirability Scale.

In addition to replicating this study with a new population another area for future

direction would be the addition of a social desirability scale. This would allow for a

more concrete way to assess the level of influence that social desirability is having on the

way participants respond.

References

Alge, B. J., Gresham, M. T., Heneman, R. L., Fox, J., & McMasters, R. (2002).

Measuring customer service orientation using a measure of interpersonal skills: A

preliminary test in a public service organization. *Journal of Business and*

Psychology, 16(3), 467-476.

Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (2000). Select on conscientiousness and emotional

stability. *Handbook of principles of organizational behavior*, *15*, 28.

Baydoun, R., Rose, D., & Emperado, T. (2001). Measuring customer service orientation:

An examination of the validity of the customer service profile. *Journal of*

Business and Psychology, 15(4), 605-620

Blocker, C. P., Flint, D. J., Myers, M. B., & Slater, S. F. (2011). Proactive customer

orientation and its role for creating customer value in global markets. *J. of the*

Acad. Mark. Sci, 39, 216-233. Doi: 10.1007/s11747-010-0202-9

Blodgett, J. G., Wakefield, K. L., & Barnes, J. H. (1995). The effects of customer service

on consumer complaining behavior. *The Journal of Services Marketing, 9*(4), 31 –

42.

Brady, M. K., & Cronin, J. J. (2001). Customer orientation: Effects on customer service

perceptions and outcome behaviors. *Journal of Service Research, 3*(3), 241-251.

Brown, T. J., Mowen, J. C., Donavan, T., & Licata, J. W. (2002). The customer

orientation of service workers: Personality trait effects on self-and supervisor

performance ratings. *Journal of Marketing Research, 39*(1), 110-119

Crosby, M. M. (1990, April). *Social desirability and biodata: Predicting sales success.* Paper presented at the annual conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Miami Beach, FL.

Donavan, T. D., Brown, T. J., & Mowen, J. C. (2004). Internal benefits of service-worker customer orientation: Job satisfaction, commitment, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Marketing, 68*(1), 128-146.

Farrell, M. A., & Oczkowski, E. (2009). Service worker customer orientation, organization/job fit and perceived organizational support. *Journal of Strategic Marketing, 17*(2), 149-167. doi: 10.1080/09652540902879276

Frei, R. L., & McDaniel, M. A. (1998). Validity of customer service measures in personnel selection: A review of criterion and construct evidence. *Human Performance, 11*(1), 1-27.

Frese, M., & Fay, D. (2001). Personal initiative: An active performance concept for work in the 21st century. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 23,* 133-187.

Goldberg, L. R. (1999). A broad-bandwidth, public domain personality inventory measuring the lower-level facets of several five-factor models. In I Mervielde, I. Deary, F. De Fruyt, & F. Ostendorf (Eds.), *Personality psychology in Europe*, 7*, 7-28.* Tillburg, The Netherlands: Tillburg University Press

Grizzle, J. W., Zablah, A. R., Brown, T. J., Mowen, J. C. & Lee, J. M. (2009). Employee customer orientation in context: How the environment moderates the influence of customer orientation on performance outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*(5), 1227-1242. doi:10.1037/a0016404

Harris, J. G., Mowen, J. C., & Brown, T. J. (2005). Re-examining salesperson goal

orientations: Personality influencers, customer orientation, and work satisfaction.

Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 33(1), 19-35.

Hennig- Thurau, T., & Thurau, C. (2002). Customer orientation of service employees:

Toward a conceptual framework of a key relationship marketing construct.

Journal of Relationship Marketing, 1(3).

Homburg, C., Hoyer, W. D., & Fassnacht, M. (2002). Service orientation of a retailer's

business strategy: Dimensions, antecedents, and performance outcomes. *Journal

of Marketing, 66*(4), 86-101.

Homburg, C., Muller, M., & Klarmann, M. (2011). When should the customer really be

king? On the optimum level of salesperson customer orientation in sales

encounters. *Journal of Marketing, 75*, 55-74.

Jenkins, M., & Griffith, R. (2004). Using personality constructs to predict performance:

Narrow or broad bandwidth. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 19*(2).

Jones, E., Busch, P., & Dacin, P. (2003). Firm market orientation and salesperson

customer orientation: interpersonal and intrapersonal influences on customer

service and retention in business-to-business buyer-seller relationships. *Journal of

Business Research,* 56, 323-340.

Kelley, S. W. (1992). Developing customer orientation among service employees.

Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 20(1), 27-36. doi:

10.1177/009207039202000103

Macintosh, G. (2007). Customer orientation, relationship quality, and relational benefits

    to the firm. *Journal of Services Marketing, 21*(3), 150-150.

    doi:10.1108/08876040710746516

McDaniel, M. A., & Frei, R. L. (1994). Validity of customer service measures in

    personnel selection: A meta-analysis. Paper presented at the ninth annual

    conference at the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Inc:

    Nashville.

Olivia, R. A., & Lancioni, R. (1996). Identifying key traits of good industrial service

    reps. *Marketing Management, 4,* 44-51.

Ones, D. S., & Viswesvaran, C. (1996). Bandwidth- fidelity dilemma in personality

    measurement for personnel section. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 17*, 609-

    626.

Parker, S. K., Williams, H.M., & Turner, N. (2006). Modeling the antecedents of

    proactive behavior at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91,* 636-652.

Periatt, J. A., Chakrabarty, S., & Lemay, S. A. (2013). Using personality traits to select

    customer-oriented logistics personnel. *Transportation Journal, 46*(1), 22-37.

Raub, S., & Liao, H. (2012). Doing the right thing without being told: Joint effects of

    initiative climate and general self-efficacy on employee proactive customer

    service performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology.*

Rindfleisch, A., & Moorman, C. (2003). Interfirm cooperation and customer orientation.

    Journal of Marketing Research, XL, 421-436.

Sanchez, J., Fraser, S., Fernandez, D., & De La Torre, P. (1993). Development and

    validation of the customer service skills inventory. Presented at the annual

meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, San

Francisco.

Saxe, R., & Weitz, B. (1982). The SOCO scale: A measure of the customer orientation

of sales people. *Journal of Marketing Research, 19*, 345-351.

Schneider, B. (1987). The people make the place. *Personnel Psychology, 40,* 437-453.

Stewart, G. L., & Carson, K. P. (1995). Personality dimensions and domains of service

performance: A field investigation. *Journal of Business & Psychology, 9*, 365-

378.

Thakor, M. V., & Joshi, A. W. (2005). Motivating salesperson customer orientation:

insights from the job characteristics model. *Journal of Business Research, 58*,

5840592.

Van Iddekinge, C. H., Ferris, G. R., Perrewe, P. L., Perryman, A. A., Blass, F. R., &

Heetderks, T. D. (2009). Effects of selection and training on unit-level

performance over time: A latent growth modeling approach. *Journal of Applied

Psychology, 94*(4), 829-843. doi:10.1037/a0014453

Yavas, U., & Babakus, E. (2009). Relationships between organizational support,

customer orientation, and work outcomes: A study of frontline bank employees.

International Journal of Bank Marketing, 28(3), 222-238.

doi:10.11.08/02652321011036477

Zablah, A., Franke, G., Brown, T., & Bartholomew, D. E. (2012). How and when does

customer orientation influence frontline employee job outcomes? A meta-analytic

evaluation. *Journal of Marketing, 76,* 21-40.

Tables

Table 1. *Ages of Participants*

Age Category	Frequency	Percent
16-20	4	3.0%
21-25	8	6.0%
26-30	14	10.4%
31-35	17	12.7%
36-40	5	3.7%
41-45	14	10.4%
46-50	21	15.7%
51-55	17	12.7%
56-60	16	11.9%
61-65	8	6.0%
66-70	6	4.5%
71-75	3	2.2%

Note. N = 133.

Table 2. *Tenure of Security Guard Participants*

Period of Time Working as a Security Guard	Frequency	Percent
Less than 6 months	3	2.2%
7 months – 1 year	10	7.5%
1-3 years	29	21.6%
4-6 years	29	21.6%
7-9 years	15	11.2%
10-15 years	22	16.4%
16-20 years	10	7.5%
More than 20 years	15	11.2%

Note. N = 133.

Table 3. *Race of Survey Participants*

Race & Ethnic Background	Frequency	Percent
Hispanic or Latino	21	15.7%
White	88	65.7%
Black or African American	28	20.9%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	2	1.5%
Asian	0	0%
American Indian or Alaska Native	5	3.7%

Note. N = 144.

Table 4. *Item Statistics for the Customer Orientation Scale*

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Emotional Stability				
Sub-scale of Emotional Stability: Anger				
I get angry when interacting with other people on the job.	1.27	.683	1	5
Dealing with the general public puts me in a bad mood.	1.29	.643	1	4
I lose my temper when interacting with people on the job.	1.15	.431	1	4
I stay relatively calm when enforcing rules.	4.66	.563	1	5
The people I have to deal with at work, don't usually aggravate me.	4.17	1.011	1	5
Sub-scale of Emotional Stability: Vulnerability				
When crises arise at work, I panic	1.14	.387	1	3
I become overwhelmed by the situations I deal with at work.	1.37	.686	1	5
I can keep my emotions in check at work.	4.44	.959	1	5
I often feel like I'm unable to handle situations that arise on the job.	1.23	.598	1	5
Although crises may come up on the job, I remain calm.	4.55	.687	1	5
Sub-scale of Emotional Stability: Self-Consciousness				
The people I have to approach at work often intimidate me.	1.23	.557	1	4
I feel comfortable dealing with slightly new problems at work.	4.35	.904	1	5
I feel confident even when I have to get involved in challenging social situations while at work.	4.39	.781	1	5
I have no problem standing up for myself, and policies, when challenged.	4.54	.926	1	5
Agreeableness				
Sub-scale of Agreeableness: Morality				
I would never ignore the rules while at work.	4.37	1.091	1	5
I always follow the rules and regulations I was taught in my security guard training when at work.	4.63	.644	1	5
I can change the rules because I am an authority figure	1.38	8.12	1	5
Part of what I enjoy about my job is I get to intimidate others	1.12	.456	1	4
I take advantage of people at work because I'm	1.09	.412	1	5

in a position of power.

Sub-scale of Agreeableness: Altruism

I like to make people feel comfortable when entering the facility I'm working in	4.66	.871	1	5
I offer my help to people when I'm at work, even if they don't ask for it.	4.19	1.00	1	5
One of my favorite parts of my job is helping others.	4.59	.628	2	5
I genuinely care about the people I interact with while on the job.	4.61	.670	1	5
I don't care how people feel when I'm enforcing rules.	2.51	1.259	1	5
When the public approaches me for assistance, I take the time to help them.	4.74	.611	1	5

Sub-scale of Agreeableness: Cooperation

I try to be respectful when enforcing the rules; instead of pushy.	4.65	.724	1	5
I could probably talk more politely with the people I deal with at work.	2.26	1.191	1	5
Sometimes I try to rile people up because I enjoy arguing with them at work.	1.10	.438	1	5
I often yell at people at work	1.14	.389	1	3
Sometimes I insult people when interacting with them on the job.	1.18	.484	1	4

Conscientiousness

Sub-scale of Conscientiousness: Self-Efficacy

I handle difficult interactions at work smoothly.	4.34	.902	1	5
I am confident when enforcing rules and policies even when challenged by the public.	4.58	.822	1	5
I generally know how to solve problems on the job	4.63	.620	1	5
I often interpret situations incorrectly at work	1.37	.709	1	5
I am often confused about what's happening while at work.	1.23	.544	1	4
Sometimes I don't think through the results my actions will have.	1.53	.905	1	5

Sub-scale of Conscientiousness: Dutifulness

I follow the rules and regulations I am given at work very closely.	4.55	.770	1	5
I am often late to work; it's a part of life.	1.20	.596	1	5
I recount details of interactions at work exactly how they happened when I am documenting them.	4.54	.770	1	5
Sometimes I don't enforce the rules I am supposed to while on the job.	1.45	.826	1	4
If there is another security guard on duty with	1.60	.948	1	5

me, I try to let them handle most of the
problems and I take a more back-seat position

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Sometimes I follow the rules, but other times, I do the opposite.	1.41	.862	1	5
Sometimes I don't report everything that happened when writing my documentation reports, especially if it would make me look bad.	1.20	.644	1	5
Sub-scale of Conscientiousness: Cautiousness				
I try to be very careful in my work actions to avoid doing something wrong	4.46	.898	1	5
I try to always use respectful words when speaking with the public.	4.80	.632	1	5
I follow-through with doing things I say I am going to do in regards to my work.	4.61	.713	1	5
In situations where I have time to think things through, I often still am hasty in making decisions.	1.58	.936	1	5
I enjoy causing a scene at work.	1.07	3.16	1	3
Sub-scale of Conscientiousness: Self-Discipline				
When I have many things at work to get done, I start right away.	4.64	.729	1	5
I am always prepared for work when I show up for my shift.	4.64	.764	1	5
It's hard to focus on the job.	1.31	.717	1	5
I find myself thinking about things that don't deal with work when I should be helping people	1.37	.718	1	4
It's hard for me to do my work without being told to.	1.15	.485	1	4

Table 5. *Item Statistics for IPIP Items*

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Emotional Stability				
Sub-scale of Emotional Stability: Anger				
Get angry easily.	1.68	.963	1	5
Am often in a bad mood.	1.57	.975	1	5
Lose my temper.	1.55	.818	1	4
Keep my cool.	4.35	.947	1	5
Rarely get irritated.	3.58	1.203	1	5
Sub-scale of Emotional Stability: Vulnerability				
Panic easily.	1.36	.716	1	5
Become overwhelmed by events.	1.64	.878	1	4

Get overwhelmed by emotions.	1.68	.935	1	5
Feel that I'm unable to deal with things.	1.51	.963	1	5
Remain calm under pressure.	4.38	.855	1	5
Sub-scale of Emotional Stability: Self-Consciousness				
Am easily intimidated.	1.45	.878	1	5
Find it difficult to approach others.	1.54	.794	1	5
Am comfortable in unfamiliar situations.	3.75	1.014	1	5
Am not bothered by difficult social situations.	3.70	1.259	1	5
Am able to stand up for myself.	4.62	.768	1	5
Agreeableness				
Sub-scale of Agreeableness: Morality				
Would never cheat on my taxes.	4.28	1.343	1	5
Stick to the rules.	4.43	.963	1	5
Know how to get around the rules.	2.19	1.090	1	5
Put people under pressure.	1.94	.991	1	4
Take advantage of others.	1.27	.692	1	4
Sub-scale of Agreeableness: Altruism				
Make people feel welcome.	4.59	.761	1	5
Anticipate the needs of others.	4.02	.989	1	5
Love to help others	4.48	.821	1	5
Am concerned about others	4.50	.826	1	5
Am indifferent to the feelings of others.	1.79	.952	1	5
Take no time for others.	1.48	.917	1	5
Turn my back on others.	1.30	.688	1	5
Sub-scale of Agreeableness: Cooperation				
Hate to seem pushy.	3.62	1.110	1	5
Have a sharp tongue.	2.27	1.117	1	5
Love a good fight.	1.98	1.142	1	5
Yell at people.	1.58	.938	1	5
Insult people.	1.27	.673	1	4
Conscientiousness				
Sub-scale of Conscientiousness: Self-Efficacy				
Handle tasks smoothly.	4.47	.782	1	5
Am sure of my ground.	4.34	.962	1	5
Know how to get things done.	4.49	.851	1	5
Misjudge situations.	1.72	.926	1	5
Don't understand things.	1.53	.746	1	4
Don't see the consequences of things.	1.49	.928	1	5
Sub-scale of Conscientiousness: Dutifulness				
Try to follow the rules.	4.65	.796	1	5
Pay my bills on time.	4.25	.909	1	5
Tell the truth.	4.71	.694	1	5
Break the rules.	1.42	.786	1	4
Get others to do my duties.	1.40	.813	1	5
Do the opposite of what is asked.	1.30	.828	1	5

Misrepresent the facts.	1.31	.702	1	5
Sub-scale of Conscientiousness: Cautiousness				
Avoid mistakes.	4.08	1.070	1	5
Choose my words with care.	4.24	.911	1	5
Stick to my chosen path.	3.95	.999	1	5
Make rash decisions.	1.60	.901	1	5
Do crazy things.	1.75	1.034	1	5
Sub-scale of Conscientiousness: Self-Discipline				
Get chores done right away.	4.13	.988	1	5
Am always prepared.	4.21	.824	1	5
Find it difficult to get down to work.	1.40	.845	1	5
Waste my time.	1.57	.929	1	5
Need a push to get started.	1.62	.953	1	5

Table 6. *Item Statistics for Job Satisfaction.*

Item	**Mean**	**Standard Deviation**	**Minimum**	**Maximum**
All in all, I am satisfied with my job.	6.02	1.204	1	7
In general, I don't like my job.	1.76	1.316	1	7
In general, I like working here.	6.20	1.200	1	**7**

Note. N = 134.

Table 7. *Item Statistics for Perceived Job-Ability Fit.*

Item	**Mean**	**Standard Deviation**	**Minimum**	**Maximum**
I feel that my work utilizes my full abilities.	3.60	1.263	1	5
I feel competent and fully able to handle my job.	4.76	.508	3	5
My job gives me a chance to do the things I feel I do best.	3.99	1.073	1	5
I feel that my job and I are well matched.	4.08	1.062	1	5
I feel I have adequate preparation for the job I now hold.	4.51	.680	2	5

Note. N = 134.

Table 8. *Reliability Evidence for the Customer Orientation Scale*

Part of the Measure	Scale Statistics		Internal Consistency Reliability
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Cronbach's Alpha
Emotional Stability	4,61	.35	.770
Agreeableness	4.56	.33	.725
Conscientiousness	4.63	.35	.845
Entire Measure	4.60	.30	.908

Table 9. *Reliability Evidence for the IPIP Items*

Part of the Measure	Scale Statistics		Internal Consistency Reliability
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Cronbach's Alpha
Emotional Stability	4.29	.51	.826
Agreeableness	4.25	.46	.785
Conscientiousness	4.39	.47	.881
Entire Measure	4.31	.43	.935

Table 10. *Reliability Evidence for the Job Satisfaction Scale*

	Scale Statistics		Internal Consistency Reliability
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Cronbach's Alpha
Entire Measure	6.15	1.13	.902

Table 11. *Reliability Evidence for the Perceived Job-Ability Fit Scale*

	Scale Statistics		Internal Consistency Reliability
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Cronbach's Alpha
Entire Measure	4.19	.69	.771

Table 12. *Correlation Matrix of Customer Orientation Measures & Outcome Variables*

SubScale	Composite Job Satisfaction	Composite Job Ability
IPIP Anger (Emotional Stability)	.125	.165
IPIP Vulnerability (Emotional Stability	.075	.217*
IPIP Self Consciousness (Emotional Stability)	.047	.175*
IPIP Morality (Agreeableness)	.177*	.216*
IPIP Altruism (Agreeableness)	.203*	.278**
IPIP Cooperation (Agreeableness)	.218*	.137
IPIP Self Efficacy (Conscientiousness)	.094	.231**
IPIP Dutifulness (Conscientiousness)	.333**	.320**
IPIP Cautiousness (Conscientiousness)	.176*	.249**
IPIP Self Discipline (Conscientiousness)	.259**	.395**
Customer Orientation Anger (Emotional Stability)	.159	.262**
Customer Orientation Vulnerability (Emotional Stability)	.094	.205**
Customer Orientation Self Consciousness (Emotional Stability)	.092	.287**
Customer Orientation Morality (Agreeableness)	.403**	.412**
Customer Orientation Altruism (Agreeableness)	.215*	.214*
Customer Orientation Cooperation (Agreeableness)	.222**	.174*
Customer Orientation Self Efficacy (Conscientiousness)	-.007	.232**
Customer Orientation Dutifulness (Conscientiousness)	.359**	.495**
Customer Orientation Cautiousness (Conscientiousness)	.131	.218*
Customer Orientation Self Discipline (Conscientiousness)	.202*	.398*

Note. * = Significant at the .05 level. ** = Significant at the .01 level

Table 13. *Correlation Matrix of Both Measures of Customer Orientation*

Scale	IPIP Anger (ES)	IPIP Vulnera bility (ES)	IPIP Self Consci ousnes s (ES)	IPIP Mora lity (A)	IPIP Altru ism (A)	IPIP Coop eratio n (A))	IPIP Self Effic acy (C)	IPIP Dutifu lness (C)	IPIP Cautiou sness (C)	IPIP Self Disci pline (C)	CO An ger (ES)	CO Vulnera bility (ES)	CO Self Consc iousne ss (ES)	CO Moralit y (A)	CO Altru ism (A)	CO Cooper ation (A)	CO Self Effic acy (C)	CO Duti fuln ess (C)	CO Cautio usness (C)	CO Self Discipli ne (C)
IPIP Anger (Emotional Stability)	-																			
IPIP Vulnerability (Emotional Stability)	.583**	-																		
IPIP Self Consciousness (Emotional Stability)	.454**	.538**	-																	
IPIP Morality (Agreeableness)	.533**	.366**	,378**	-																
IPIP Altruism (Agreeableness)	.508**	.476**	.406**	.575*	-															
IPIP Cooperation (Agreeableness)	.410**	.254**	.142	.515*	.406*	-														
IPIP Self Efficacy (Conscientiousness)	.644**	.624**	.576**	.431*	.610*	.277*	-													
IPIP Dutifulness (Conscientiousness)	.587**	.502**	.414**	.674*	.632*	.461*	.562	-												
IPIP Cautiousness (Conscientiousness)	.609**	.532**	.493**	.509*	.600*	.464*	.682	.637**	-											
IPIP Self Discipline (Conscientiousness)	.561**	.527**	.440**	.518*	.504*	.312*	.669	.634**	.629**	-										
CO Anger (Emotional Stability)	.568**	.464**	.374**	.455*	.551*	.400*	.457	.582**	.469**	.513*	-									
CO Vulnerability (Emotional Stability)	.524**	.719**	.479**	.280*	.395*	.234*	.499	.382**	.427**	.424*	.533**									
CO Self Consciousness (Emotional Stability)	.382**	.422**	.586**	.261*	.416*	.212*	.537	.349**	.490**	.349*	.414**	.446**								
CO Morality (Agreeableness)	.344**	.200**	.200**	.491*	.331*	.423*	.250	..555*	.331**	.390*	.476**	.199*	.260*							
CO Altruism (Agreeableness)	.361**	.183*	..291*	.387*	.486*	.357*	.394	.392**	.376**	.315*	.508**	.279**	.306*	.402**						
CO Cooperation (Agreeableness)	.401**	.230**	.167*	.321*	.446*	.437*	.428	.412**	.473**	.281*	.424**	.361**	.279**	.313**	.480**					
CO Self Efficacy (Conscienti	.471**	.507**	.584**	.332*	.381*	.236*	.633	.404**	.475**	.454*	.46	.575**	.628*	.357**	.371	.382**				

ousness) * * * ** * 9** * **

CO   .440** .343** .355**.478*.460* .354* .498 .566** .528** .650* .53 .382** .269* .543** .438 .404** .431
Dutifulness
(Conscienti   * * * ** * 2** * ** **
ousness)
CO   .405** .330** .424**.423*.350*.331* .418 .433** .486** .444* .32 .384** .456* .384** .427 .421** .564 .466
Cautiousnes
s   * * * ** * 9** * ** ** **
(Conscienti
ousness)
CO Self   .525** .485** .443**.461*.417*.282* .539 .585** .509** .645* .59 .532** .463* .422** .306 .306** .560 .571 .492**
Discipline
(Conscienti   * * * ** * 0** * ** ** **
ousness)

Note. * = Significant at the .05 level. ** = Significant at the .01 level

Table 14. *Varimax Rotated Components Loadings for Customer Orientation Scale*

Component	1	2
CO Self Efficacy (Conscientiousness)	.809	.284
CO Self Consciousness (Emotional Stability)	.800	.114
CO Vulnerability (Emotional Stability)	.765	.193
CO Self Discipline (Conscientiousness)	.652	.430
CO Cautiousness (Conscientiousness)	.546	.455
CO Morality (Agreeableness)	.115	.764
CO Dutifulness (Conscientiousness)	.287	.746
CO Altruism (Agreeableness)	.176	.732
CO Anger (Emotional Stability)	.463	.619
CO Cooperation (Agreeableness)	.259	.614
Eigenvalues	4.86	1.11
Percentage of total variance	48.58	11.12

Table 15. *Varimax Rotated Components Loadings for IPIP*

Component	1	2
Self Efficacy (Conscientiousness)	.829	.292
Self Consciousness (Emotional Stability)	.792	.055
Vulnerability (Emotional Stability)	.787	.187
Self Discipline (Conscientiousness)	.668	.423
Cautiousness (Conscientiousness)	.636	.533
Anger (Emotional Stability)	.633	.477
Cooperation (Agreeableness)	.001	.852
Morality (Agreeableness)	.304	.773
Dutifulness (Conscientiousness)	.486	.707
Altruism (Agreeableness)	.509	.591
Eigen Values	5.65	1.12
Percentage of Total Variance	56.48	11.08

Appendices

Appendix A. *IPIP Items*

Directions: For each statement, please rate yourself as you generally are now. Indicate for each statement whether it is 1) very inaccurate, 2) moderately inaccurate, 3) neither accurate nor inaccurate, 4) moderately accurate, or 5) very accurate as a description of you.

Dimension of Emotional Stability
- Sub-Scale: **Anger**
  - Get angry easily (R)
  - Am often in a bad mood (R)
  - Lose my temper (R)
  - Keep my cool
  - Rarely get irritated
- Sub-Scale: **Vulnerability**
  - Panic easily (R)
  - Become overwhelmed by events (R)
  - Get overwhelmed by emotions (R)
  - Feel that I'm unable to deal with things (R)
  - Remain calm under pressure
- Sub-Scale: **Self-Consciousness**
  - Am easily intimidated (R)
  - Find it difficult to approach others (R)
  - Am comfortable in unfamiliar situations
  - Am not bothered by difficult social situations
  - Am able to stand up for myself

Dimension of Agreeableness
- Sub-Scale: **Morality**
  - Would never cheat on my taxes
  - Stick to the rules
  - Know how to get around the rules (R)
  - Put people under pressure (R)
  - Take advantage of others (R)
- Sub-Scale: **Altruism**
  - Make people feel welcome
  - Anticipate the needs of others
  - Love to help others
  - Am concerned about others
  - Am indifferent to the feelings of others (R)
  - Take no time for others (R)
  - Turn my back on others (R)
- Sub-Scale: **Cooperation**
  - Hate to seem pushy
  - Have a sharp tongue (R)
  - Love a good fight (R)

- o Yell at people (R)
- o Insult people (R)

Dimension of Conscientiousness
- Sub-Scale of: **Self-Efficacy**
  - o Handle tasks smoothly
  - o Am sure of my ground
  - o Know how to get things done
  - o Misjudge situations (R)
  - o Don't understand things (R)
  - o Don't see the consequences of things (R)
- Sub-Scale: **Dutifulness**
  - o Try to follow the rules
  - o Pay my bills on time
  - o Tell the truth
  - o Break rules (R)
  - o Get others to do my duties (R)
  - o Do the opposite of what is asked (R)
  - o Misrepresent the facts (R)
- Sub-Scale: **Cautiousness**
  - o Avoid mistakes
  - o Choose my words with care
  - o Stick to my chosen path
  - o Make rash decisions (R)
  - o Do crazy things (R)
- Sub-Scale: **Self-Discipline**
  - o Get chores done right away
  - o Am always prepared
  - o Find it difficult to get down to work (R)
  - o Waste my time (R)
  - o Need a push to get started (R)

Note. (R) refers to items that are reverse coded.

Appendix B. *Customer Orientation Scale Items*

Directions: For each statement, please rate yourself as you generally are now. Indicate for each statement whether it is 1) very inaccurate, 2) moderately inaccurate, 3) neither accurate nor inaccurate, 4) moderately accurate, or 5) very accurate as a description of you.

Dimension of Emotional Stability
- Sub-Scale: **Anger**
  - I get angry when interacting with other people on the job (R)
  - Dealing with the general public puts me in a bad mood (R)
  - I lose my temper when interacting with people on the job (R)
  - I stay relatively calm when enforcing rules
  - The people I have to deal with at work don't usually aggravate me
- Sub-Scale: **Vulnerability**
  - When crises arise at work, I panic (R)
  - I become overwhelmed by the situations I deal with at work (R)
  - I can keep my emotions in check at work
  - I often feel like I'm unable to handle situations that arise on the job (R)
  - Although crises may come up on the job, I remain calm
- Sub-Scale: **Self-Consciousness**
  - The people I have to approach at work often intimidate me (R)
  - I feel comfortable dealing with slightly new problems at work
  - I feel confident even when I have to get involved in challenging social situations while at work
  - I have no problem standing up for myself, and policies, when challenged

Dimension of Agreeableness
- Sub-Scale: **Morality**
  - I would never ignore the rules while at work
  - I always follow the rules and regulations I was taught in my security guard training when at work
  - I can change the rules because I am an authority figure (R)
  - Part of what I enjoy about my job, is I get to intimidate others (R)
  - I take advantage of people at work because I'm in a position of power (R)
- Sub-Scale: **Altruism**
  - I like to make people feel comfortable when entering the facility I'm working in
  - I offer my help to people when I'm at work, even if they don't ask for it
  - One of my favorite parts of my job is helping others
  - I genuinely care about the people I interact with while on the job
  - I don't care how people feel when I'm enforcing rules (R)
  - When the public approach me for assistance, I take the time to help them
- Sub-Scale: **Cooperation**
  - I try to be respectful when enforcing the rules, instead of pushy
  - I could probably talk more politely with the people I deal with at work (R)
  - Sometimes I try to rile people up, because I enjoy arguing with them at work (R)
  - I often yell at people at work (R)

      o   Sometimes I insult people when interacting with them on the job (R)

Dimension of Conscientiousness
- Sub-Scale: **Self Efficacy**
  - I handle difficult interactions at work smoothly
  - I am confident when enforcing rules and policies even when challenged by the public
  - I generally know how to solve problems on the job
  - I often interpret situations incorrectly at work (R)
  - I am often confused about what's happening while at work (R)
  - Sometimes I don't think through the results my actions will have (R)
- Sub-Scale: **Dutifulness**
  - I follow the rules and regulations I am given at work very closely
  - I am often late to work; it's a part of life (R)
  - I recount details of interactions at work exactly how they happened when I am documenting them
  - Sometimes I don't enforce the rules I am supposed to while on the job (R)
  - If there is another security guard on duty with me, I try to let them handle most of the problems and I take a more back-seat position (R)
  - Sometimes I follow the rules, but other times, I do the opposite (R)
  - Sometimes I don't report everything that happened when writing my documentation reports, especially if it would make me look bad (R)
- Sub-Scale: **Cautiousness**
  - I try to be very careful in my work actions to avoid doing something wrong
  - I try to always use respectful words when speaking with the public
  - I follow-through with doings things I say I am going to do in regards to my work
  - In situations where I have time to think things through, I often still am hasty in making decisions (R)
  - I enjoy causing a scene at work (R)
- Sub-Scale: **Self-Discipline**
  - When I have many things at work to get done, I start right away
  - I am always prepared for work when I show up for my shift
  - It's hard to focus on the job (R)
  - I find myself thinking about things that don't deal with work when I should be helping people (R)
  - It's hard for me to do my work without being told to (R)

Appendix C. *Job Satisfaction Measure* (Cammann, Fichmann, Jenkins, & Klesh, 1983)

Directions: Responses are obtained using a 7-poing Likert-type scale where 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = slightly disagree, 4 = neither agree nor disagree, 5 = slightly agree, 6 = agree, and 7= strongly agree.

- All in all, I am satisfied with my job
- In general, I don't like my job (R)
- In general, I like working here

Appendix D. *Perceived Ability-Job Fit* (Abdel-Halim, 1981)

Directions: Responses are obtained on a 5-point Likert-type scale where 1= strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree.
- I feel that my work utilizes my full abilities
- I feel competent and fully able to handle my job
- My job gives me a chance to do the things I feel I do best
- I feel that my job and I are well matched
- I feel I have adequate preparation for the job I now hold