PLEA FOR CUSTOMER CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR: MEDIATING ROLE OF CUSTOMER ENGAGEMENT AND CUSTOMER PERCEIVED STRESS

SHAHZAD HASSAN[1], NORAZAH MOHD SUKI[2]

ABSTRACT

We extend our research in two ways by employing a resource conservation theory. First, we postulate that customer engagement is a key mediator in the relationship between transformational leadership behaviour and customer citizenship behaviour. Second, we suggest that customer perceived stress is a disruptive psychological condition that affects the relationship between transformational leadership behaviour and customer citizenship behaviour. A total of 412 manager and respective customer dyads from various hotels were used in this study. Sample was taken from small and mid-sized hotels situated in different tourism places of Pakistan Northern areas. According to the findings of this study, transformational leadership behaviour has a significant impact on customer engagement and Customer perceived stress. Furthermore, the association between transformational leadership behaviour and CCB is mediated by customer perceived stress. Prior studies have focused on the impact of transformational leadership on employee behaviour. This study, on the other hand, is distinctive in that it investigates how transformational leadership behaviour affect customer citizenship behaviour (CCB). The current study's findings have a variety of theoretical and practical implications for marketing researchers, leaders, and decision-makers.

Keywords: Transformational Leadership; Customer Engagement; Stress; Customer Citizenship Behaviour
JEL Codes: L14, D11

I. INTRODUCTION

In both private and public sector enterprises, the relationship between citizenship behavior and leadership has been studied (Miao et al., 2018). The significance of customer citizenship behavior (CCB) is a vital aspect in the hotel industry the significance of customer citizenship behavior (CCB) is a vital aspect in the hotel industry, and there is a need to investigate the impact of leadership behavior on CCB because it has been overlooked in previous studies, and there is a need to investigate the impact of leadership behavior on CCB because it has been overlooked in previous studies. Transformational leadership has been actively argued and examined in academia in recent decades from the standpoint of leadership styles (Burns, 1978). The significance of transformative leadership in improving employee happiness, physical health, and well-being has been explored by a number of scholars (Arnold et al., 2007; Kelloway & Barling, 2010). Transformational leadership has long been seen to be vital in motivating followers (Gouthier & Rhein, 2011; Reitsamer & Brunner-Sperdin, 2017). Furthermore, transformational leadership has been linked to meaningful work, leadership trust, and self-efficacy in studies (Kara Arnold & Connelly., 2013; Liu et al., 2010). This leadership style has been investigated in the academic literature on hotels and tourism in terms of self-efficacy and work value (Breevaart et al., 2014; Wang et al., 2014). The majority of previous research has focused on transformative leadership in the context of employee interaction. On the other hand, this study is unique in that it looks at transformative leadership behavior in the context of customers. The relationship between transformational leadership conduct and customer citizenship behavior (CCB) is also examined using two mediators: engagement and customer stress. There is a significant gap in the literature about the impact of transformational leadership behavior on CCB. To overcome this knowledge gap, the current study uses two opposing psychological factors, such as Customer perceived stress and customer engagement, to investigate the relationship between transformational leadership behavior and CCB (Figure 1).

This research adds to our knowledge of how these two mediators influence the relationship between transformational leadership and CCB. Because customer perceived stress is so widespread, it has an adverse effect not just on commitment and performance (Hobfoll, 2011), but also on OCB. Staff engagement, on the other hand, is a positive state that influences employee morale and productivity (Langelaan et al., 2006). Thus, in order to

---

[1] Corresponding Author: PhD scholar; Othman Yeop Abdullah Graduate School of Business, Universiti Utara Malaysia; shahzad_hassan@oyagsb.uum.edu.my
[2] Professor of Marketing and E-Commerce: Othman Yeop Abdullah Graduate School of Business, Universiti Utara Malaysia, Malaysia

----

better understand the ethical domain of the organization, these mediating variables are used in this study to analyses the relationship between transformational leadership behavior and CCB. Previous research has revealed a link between motivation and transformational leadership, as well as OCB and transformational leadership, implying that transformational leaders can increase staff motivation and ethics (Shrestha & Nepal., 2015; Spreitzer et al., 2005). The focus of this research is to find answers to two key questions. The aim of this research is to find out how motivational characteristics of transformational leadership behavior effect CCB in the hotel industry. The second aim of the research is to evaluate the impact of underlying mechanisms in the hostel sector that link transformational leadership and CCB. The impact of transformational leadership on customer behavior in the hotel sector is investigated in this study, which contributes to the Conservation of Resource (COR) theory. Furthermore, this research adds to our knowledge of two critical variables in the relationship between transformational leadership behavior and CCB in the hospitality industry: customer engagement and Customer perceived stress. These mediators have been investigated in previous studies and confirmed to have a link between leadership and employee behavior. Employee job engagement, for example, was found to have a significant mediating effect in the relationship between leadership and employee commitment (Khan et al., 2020). Furthermore, Customer perceived stress was revealed to be an important mediator in the association between proactive personality and consumption behavior (Park et al., 2021). However, rather than testing the significance of these underlying mechanisms in the context of employees, this study will aim to assess their significance in the context of customers.

Insert Figure 1 here

II. THEORY AND HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT
II.I. TFB AND COR THEORY
This study seeks to evaluate whether and how transformational leadership influences employee OCB using the lens of COR theory (Hobfoll, 1989). COR theory explains the resources available to individuals, such as "mastery, self-esteem, resourcefulness, socioeconomic status, and employment" (Hobfoll, 1989), providing emotional comfort to stress (Averill et al., 2001; LePine et al., 2005), and transformational leaders' tendency to save personal job resources and thus influence their citizenship behaviors. From the perspective of customers buying psychological resources, this study investigates the mediating role of customer engagement and customer perceived stress in the relationship between transformational leadership behavior and CCB, with the aim of implementing resource conservation arguments based on psychological and behavioral aspects. Engagement is a predictor of motivating factor, strengthening an individual's internal determination to achieve his or her goals, and is one of the mediating variables in this study (Khan et al., 2020). Another mediating variable is customer perceived stress, which is a psychological condition that impacts both commitment and civic conduct (Hobman et al., 2009). COR claims that psychological and behavioral factors influence recipients by influencing the acquisition and depletion of internal and psychological resources (Halbesleben et al., 2014). Prior studies have missed the psychological and behavioral resources available to hotel receptionists, particularly in terms of the leader-customer interaction. In order to make hotel employees more productive by producing psychological stress, consider cognitive, emotional, and physical resources (Hobfoll, 2001; Karatepe & Olugbade, 2009). In the realm of neurological studies (Sapolsky, 1996) and psychology studies, this contributes to the description of stresses that may limit internalization ability, process, and information use (Davis & Luthans, 1980). We examined the academic literature for evidence on the impact of psychological and behavioral states on transformational leadership through resource conservation in the public sector. Customer engagement is a motivational state in which a person devotes himself or herself to a certain product or service, encouraging commitment and citizenship behavior (Spreitzer et al., 2012). Stress caused by fatigue, on the other hand, causes deviant behavior (Wright & Cropanzano, 1998), resulting in demotivation. Thus, COR is an effective way to address the conservation of physical, psychological, and emotional resources that are required to persuade and encourage customers to engage in citizenship behavior.

II.II. TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND CCB
The four dimensions of transformational leadership behavior are idealized influence, inspired motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. Idealized influence, inspired motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration are all part of transformational leadership (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Mullen & Tallent-Runnels, 2006). In the hotel industry, idealized influence refers to the characteristics that cause followers to admire leaders' actions and behaviors (Walumbwa & Hartnell, 2011), where ethical and behavioral practices are highly valued. Idealized influence is a term used in marketing to describe the qualities that cause followers to admire a leader's actions and behaviors (Walumbwa & Hartnell, 2011), where ethical and behavioral practices are highly (Luu, 2017; Ravichandran et al., 2007). The term "inspirational motivation" refers to motivation that is based on optimism and intellectual stimulation. Individualized considerations define the level of concern that leaders need to meet followers' demands and worries, whereas this motivation occurs when leaders urge followers to think independently and become more creative rather than stick to long-term assumptions. This study, on the other hand, intends to investigate the influence of transformational leaders in follower practice and

----

their emphasis on employee OCB. The theoretical debate focuses on the impact of transformational leadership inherent intellectual stimulation and high performance expectations (Chiang & Lin, 2016; Seltzer et al., 1989) on employee psychological health and the level of stress (Chiang & Lin, 2016). Because poor psychological and physical conditions have a detrimental impact on customer behavior, hospitality sector may suffer more than other company entities (Slåtten & Mehmetoglu, 2015), as customers are more concerned about citizenship behavior. Transformational leadership, on the other hand, is always concerned about the needs and issues of employees, and is always a resource that protects employees from workplace stress (Arnold et al., 2007). These arguments contend that the transformational leadership behavior well-being is inextricably linked to that of its stakeholders including customers. However, the role of transformational leadership in organizational wellbeing is ambiguous in academic debates. Transformational leadership behavior and customer behavioral outcomes have a good, negative, and sometimes neutral relationship, according to various research perspectives (Nielsen & Daniels, 2012; Skakon et al., 2010). There is a scarcity of theoretical literature describing the impact of transforaminal leadership on CCB, particularly in hospitality sector. To address this gap in the literature, we employ transformational leadership as a structural, contextual resource (Ten Brummelhuis & Bakker, 2012), which should impact followers' behavior and other resource pools available to them in order to encourage CCB (Halbesleben, 2006). This discussion aids us in accepting this idea and establishing a link between transformational leadership and CCB.

H1: Transformational leadership is positively related to CCB in hospitality industry.

II.III. MEDIATING EFFECT OF CUSTOMERS ENGAGEMENT

'Customer Engagement' is very important for marketing engagement research. Van Doorn et al. (2010) look at "customer engagement behaviors," which are motivated by factors such as word-of-mouth, customer-to-customer (C2C) contacts, and/or blogging. The components of proximal work include decision-making discretion, board information exchange, trust, and an enabling atmosphere in order to promote the concept of engagement (Spreitzer et al., 2005). Engagement has been examined in numerous ways in academic literature relating to the hospitality sector. The association between engagement and universal connectivity (Hecht et al., 2014), the relationship between engagement and moral leaders (Zhu et al., 2014), and the relationship between engagement and commitment (Erstad, 2001) are just a few examples. According to these studies, engagement plays a critical function in developing industry business (Ma et al., 2018). In this context, there is an intriguing link between transformational leadership behavior and engagement, as transformational leaders inspire individuals to dream of a meaningful goal by employing unconventional thinking (Seltzer et al., 1989). Learning is also a crucial part of engagement since it allows followers to exercise their OCB through mental stimulation and imagery (Bass, 1985). Transformational leaders inspire individuals including customers in this way by sharing their inspiring vision (Bono et al., 2007). Positive emotions, vitality, and aliveness are required for success, and transformational leaders and individual engagement share these characteristics (Bono et al., 2007). Similarly, individual engagement has prompted individuals to engage in more and more citizenship behaviors in order to draw customers' attention (Ten Brummelhuis & Bakker, 2012). Thus, such theories can be used to describe the relationship between transformational and individual engagement.

H2: Transformational leadership is positively related to customer engagement.

H3: Customer engagement is positively mediated the relationship between transformational leadership behavior and CCB.

II.IV. MEDIATING EFFECT OF CUSTOMER PERCEIVED STRESS

Individuals believe that psychological resources and situations are extremely important in determining citizenship behavior (Davis, 2009; Hobfoll, 2001). Personal work abilities and behavioral conditions are negatively impacted when psychological state deteriorates (Pelegrín-Borondo et al., 2017; Schaufeli & Taris, 2005).When individual are under customer perceived stress, their CCB toward customers acts below par psychologically (Lee, J., & Ok, 2015). Employees have so far been unable to pay heed to leadership indications since their psychological resources have been depleted. Earlier research focused on resource conservation (COR), a stress (Hobfoll, 1989) that was used to explain the effects of individual stress on motivation and performance (Halbesleben & Bowler, 2007). According to COR theory, customer perceived stress is caused by a depletion of psychological resources. Individuals attempt to retain residual resources in order to invest in these resources at the appropriate time in order to manage stress (Siegall & McDonald, 2004). In this context, COR, customer perceived stress has an impact on a customer ability to buy (Osher et al., 2016). Customers are hesitant to internalize motivational cues and stimuli as a result (Halbesleben & Bowler, 2007; Hobfoll, 2001).. Individuals who agree and interact the role of transformational leaders in their task performance, on the other hand, conserve resources (Lashley, 2008). The goal of this study is to find out how transformational leadership behavior affects CCB through customer perceived stress. Customers who are emotionally drained unintentionally increase their limited resources (Hobfoll, 2001; Sandiford & Seymour, 2002); they are also less interested in buying products and services (Hobfoll, 2001; Sandiford & Seymour, 2002). Individuals who are emotionally relaxed, on the other hand, have sufficient psychological resources to accomplish their roles and jobs in the hospitality industry (Paek et al., 2015). They also

----

committed to focus their efforts on internalizing the consequences of their revolutionary leadership. Thus, we can make these assumptions about our hypotheses.

H4: Transformational leadership is negatively related to customer perceived stress.

H5: Customer perceived stress is negatively mediated the relationship between transformational leadership and CCB.

III. METHOD
III.I. DATA PROCEDURE
The data for this study was gathered from respondents (supervisor and customers) of several marketing firms in Pakistan's Punjab province. CCB is a trait that is extremely desirable for marketing and customer-oriented jobs, and it assists businesses in gaining customers' confidence. Customers are engaged with executives to increase awareness of company needs, improve communication, and seek leadership support. We created a systematic closed-ended questionnaire with multiple-choice answers to collect data. Employee CCB was rated by respective supervisors in our study, which helped to reduce the common source effect on our study results. The remaining constructs, such as transformational leadership, engagement, and stress, were rated by employees. We used HR personnel to send a questionnaire to 468 employees and 68 managers/supervisors in order to collect a response. We collected data during two time periods. We collected data on transformational leadership from employees, customer engagement, customer perceived stress, from respective customers. Demographic characteristics from all respondents in the first phase. We acquired CCB data from relevant supervisors two months later. We chose a time period, as suggested by Detert & Burris (2007), to allow respondents, particularly supervisors, to observe, assess, decide, and act. Two months is plenty of time for them to develop their comprehension, appraisal, and action. The total sample size of this study was 412 after deleting incomplete and missing questionnaires. Overall response rate was 58 percent, while direct supervisors/managers responded at a rate of 63 percent.

Insert Table 1

III.II. MEASUREMENT
III.II.I. TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP
We employed Global Transformational Leadership (GLT) scale, which is a seven-item measurement scale (Carless et al., 2000). "Communicates a clear and positive vision of the future," and "Gives encouragement and recognition to personnel," were two of the study's sample items. The response was rated using a five-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree).

III.II.II. CUSTOMER ENGAGEMENT
Customer engagement were measured by adapting the scale developed by Kumar & Pansari, (2016). This scale has 16 items to measure customer engagement on five-point Likert scale ranging from 1' strongly disagree to 5' strongly agree However, we omitted 6 items due to issue of factor loading. The sample item of this scale is "My *purchases with this brand make me content*".

III.II.III. CUSTOMER PERCEIVED STRESS
To measure customer perceived stress, we used 7 item sub scale of stress adopted by (Gong et al., 2010). Sample items of the study were "*I found it difficult to relax*". The responses were evaluated using a 5-point scale 5-point Likert scale with values ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

III.II.IV. CCB
We used CCB scale adopted by Yi & Gong (2013) CCB scale to assess four dimensions: feedback, helping, tolerance, and advocacy (13 items), as well as two extra items based on Garma & Bove (2009) and one item based on Garma & Bove (2011). Items were changed to reflect the opinions of service staff. Each item on the CCB measuring scale was given to respondents and they were asked to indicate whether they agreed or disagreed with it (1 strongly disagree and 5 strongly agree).

IV. DATA ANALYSIS
IV.I. STRUCTURAL MODEL
A structural model test was used to verify the measurement validity of the collected data. As indicated in Table 2, all of the results fall within an acceptable value range. As a result, the proposed model's overall fit induces are approved. 2/df is 1.58, RMSEA is 0.038, TLI is.981, and CFI is 0.982, according to the results. These findings show that the model is fit.

Insert Table 2

IV.II. MEDIATING EFFECT TESTS

We employed the Bootstrap sampling method to assess the mediating effect of employee engagement and stress in the connection between transformational leadership behavior and CCB. We used the MacKinnon et al. (2004) recommended bootstrap sampling approach (bootstrap sample size = 5000).. This method generates asymmetric confidence intervals in order to determine the indirect relationship between the variables given in the study model (CIs). Because this method generates a relatively accurate estimate of the asymmetric confidence intervals (CIs) of the indirect relationship by applying a specific distribution for regression coefficients, the bootstrap sampling method is considered a relatively more reliable method compared to other traditional models, such as the Sobel test (David MacKinnon et al., 2004). Table 3 indicates the effects of the mediators on the link between transformational leadership and CCB, as well as the results of mediating variables such as customer engagement and customer perceived stress. Because the CI did not include zero, the results demonstrate that customer engagement mediated the link between transformational leadership and CCB, as seen in Table 3. Thus, H2 was supported. Similarly, because the CIs did not contain zero, the data suggest that stress mediated the link between transformational leadership and CCB. Thus, H4 was also endorsed.

Insert Table 3

V. DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS AND LIMITATIONS

The goal of this research is to improve existing transformational leadership behavior-based models in order to acquire a better understanding of the process of constructive and motivating leadership and how it affects hotel employees' behavioral advancements. Transformational leadership behavior, according to COR, creates a productive, friendly, and joyful working environment that enhances employees' social and cognitive resources in the workplace. Customer perceived stress, on the other hand, may have an impact on the depletion of this vital cognitive and social resource. Customer behavior and creative performance can be harmed as a result of this depletion (Peters & Weil, 2016). Customer perceived stress fully mediates the association between transformational leadership behavior and CCB, according to the findings of the study. Customer perceived stress significantly mediates the association between transformational leadership and CCB, according to the findings of the study. Stress, according to the COR, has a detrimental impact on the CCB because it depletes employees' resources to conduct extra role behavior (Hobfoll, 1989). Employees with stress, on the other hand, fail to express citizenship behavior even when transformative leadership is present, according to this study. Employee engagement, on the other hand, is regarded a significant variable in academic debate (Hay, 2006); this motivating framework pushes employees to behave like citizens when it comes to customer service (Nadiri & Tanova, 2010). However, the findings of this study diverge slightly from our predictions in terms of employee involvement. Customer engagement plays a partly moderating function in the association between transformational leadership behavior and CCB, according to the study. On the contrary, we had hoped for a full-fledged mediation. Overall, our findings are similar to those of earlier studies that looked into the same variables in various study contexts (Liu, Siu, & Shi, 2010). Customer engagement, for example, totally moderated the association between empowering leadership and organizational citizenship behavior in one study (Li et al., 2016). To summaries our findings, this study provides five hypotheses, four of which are fully supported by our findings, and one hypothesis is partially supported because it presents a partial mediation of the transformational leadership behavior-CCB link.

V.I. THEORETICAL IMPLICATIONS

This research has several theoretical contributions. First, the outcomes of the study describe the motivational benefits of transformational leadership enlarging the CCB domain. Clearly, various researchers have looked into the role of leadership in the context of extra-role behaviors. However, this research is one of a kind in that it examines the impact of transformational leadership on CCB in the Pakistani setting, particularly in the marketing sector. The development of civility and citizenship in the acts and behaviors of followers is dependent on leadership roles (Liu et al., 2015; Nadiri & Tanova, 2010). Second, the outcomes of the study add to our knowledge of COR in the setting of CCB. Exploring thriving, it is clear that it cannot be achieved merely through a captivating leadership style, but it also necessitates the implementation of workplace citizenship best practices (Spreitzer, 2008; Varasteh et al., 2015). Transformational leadership also serves as a motivator for employees to be courteous in their actions and behaviors. Transformational leadership behavior may help customer enhance their resources by obtaining more knowledge resources, benefiting the business both internally and externally, and promoting ethical ideals in their actions and behaviors, which can help with resource conservation. Third, in several prior studies, social exchange theory, transformational leadership theory and many other theories were used to determine the effects of motivation and stress and other relevant construct in the relationship between leadership and citizenship behavior (Nguyen & Pervan, 2020). However, we use COR to distinguish it from other studies by demonstrating the applicability of resource conservation to decrease psychological stress and encourage customers in our proposed research model. Forth, the current study gave new impetus to the scholarly discussion over customer perceived stress's mediating role. Even in the presence of transformational leaders, customer perceived stress is maladaptive to CCB, according to the current study. Many studies, on the other hand, believe that stress

----

is compatible with transformational leadership (Cole et al., 2012; Cropanzano et al., 2003; Arshad and Ali, 2016; Ashraf and Ali, 2018; Audi and Ali, 2017; Audi and Ali, 2017; Audi et al., 2021; Ali and Ali, 2016; Audi et al., 2021; Audi et al., 2021; Audi et al., 2021; Haider and Ali, 2015; Kaseem et al., 2019; Roussel et al., 2021; Senturk and Ali, 2021). Thus, this study emphasizes that scholars can also investigate the circumstances in which customer perceived stress becomes adaptive to CCB in the presence of transformational leadership behavior. Finally, the findings imply that transformational leaders' transactional leadership strategy has a somewhat distinctive impact on customer CCB. Transformational leaders pay greater attention to customer behavior than their inspiration through resource conservation (Dust et al., 2014). These findings are extremely significant for transformational leadership study because they reveal that transformational leaders not only encourage their customers, but also prevent them from engaging in anti-social behavior.

V.II. PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

The current study, like others, has a variety of practical implications. First, this research customer the potential ethical benefits of identifying, supporting, and developing transformational leaders in the hospitality business. The marketing sector should support industry leaders who not only motivate energetic and capable personnel, but also have a high level of CCB, in order to generate transformational skills. Second, the research helps by encouraging executives to pay attention to customer behavior and psychological well-being. The findings of the study suggest that customer perceived stress is a significant factor influencing customer behavior. According to the study, stress is a significant detriment to CCB. Hotel managers should pay particular attention to customers engagement in hotel services and other concerns that may impair customers' psychological resources. If leaders notice or witness any signs of psychological strain or stress in their staff, they should assist them in reducing customer perceived stress by assisting them with resource conservation and enhancing their social interaction and learning skills. Thus, hotel managers should pay particular attention to customers engagement and other concerns that may impair customer psychological resources. If leaders found or witness any signs of psychological strain or customer perceived stress in their customers, they should assist them in reducing customer perceived stress by assisting them with resource conservation and enhancing their social interaction and learning skills. Leaders, for example, can use tailoring strategies (Tims & Bakker, 2010). Customer reactions to buying demands and resources are used to deliver individualized feedback. Third, businesses in the marketing field might organize training courses for their staff to help them manage with psychological stress. Mindfulness training sessions can be arranged to improve emotionally focused self-regulatory capacities in particular (Glomb et al., 2011). These activities aim to earn customers' trust and motivate employees to work together to provide better buying service behavior. Finally, marketing firms should place a strong emphasis on citizenship and devote sufficient resources to improving customer citizenship in the marketplace. By implementing incentive-based measures for all employees who treat customers, coworkers, and management with respect, as well as promoting a citizenship culture within the company.

V.III. STUDY LIMITATION AND FUTURE RESEARCH

This study, like other academic studies, has some limitations. First, the study only looked at one industry, such as hospitality sector, and one country, Pakistan. Thus, the study's generalizability is limited. Second, the research was carried out in Pakistan's south, and therefore has a distinct cultural character. Studies conducted in other sections of Pakistan or in other countries are likely to yield different outcomes. Third, we are conducting this research in a time lag approach. This method is distinct from the case study method. There is a low risk of data contamination or common method bias because the data was collected at different times and from different sources at different time intervals. Cross-sectional designs using comparable or different data sources can be used in future studies. Forth, we gathered information customers and supervisors through the help of marketing department of the hotels. This method of data collection takes longer and requires more work. Future researchers can collect responses using the Google Internet Survey Form, an online survey tool. Fifth, the study was done without respect for control variables, considering both internal and external influences that could affect the study's outcomes. In future study, influencing factors could be used as control variables to improve the effectiveness and reliability of research findings. Finally, the input variable (i.e. transformational leadership behavior) and outcome variable (i.e. CCB) employed in this research were both positive. Future study, on the other hand, could be conducted utilizing some contrasting variables in the same or different situations.

VI. CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study is to see how transformational leadership affects employee CCB. Thus, we created two mediators: engagement and stress. In addition, this research examines the impact of transformational leadership theory on CCB, particularly in the hospitality sector, using resource conservation theory. Our findings not only emphasize the importance of leader–customers interactions, but they also point to new avenues for empirical research and theory development in the hospitality industry.

REFERENCES

Arnold, K. A., Turner, N., Barling, J., Kelloway, E. K., & McKee, M. C. (2007). Transformational leadership and psychological well-being: The mediating role of meaningful work. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *12*, 193–203.

Arnold, K., Turner, N., Barling, J., Kelloway, E., & McKee, M. (2007). Transformational leadership and psychological well-being: The mediating role of meaningful work. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *12*, 193–203.

Arnold, Kara A., & Connelly., C. E. (2013). *Transformational Leadership and Psychological Well-being: Effects on Followers and Leaders*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Averill, J. R., Chon, K. K., & Hahn, D. W. (2001). Emotions and Creativity, East and West. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, *4*, 165–183.

Arshad, S., & Ali, A. (2016). Trade-off between Inflation, Interest and Unemployment Rate of Pakistan: Revisited. *Bulletin of Business and Economics (BBE)*, *5*(4), 193-209.

Ashraf, I., & Ali, A. (2018). Socio-Economic Well-Being and Women Status in Pakistan: An Empirical Analysis. *Bulletin of Business and Economics (BBE)*, 7(2), 46-58.

Audi, M & Ali, A. (2017). Socio-Economic Status and Life Expectancy in Lebanon: An Empirical Analysis. *Archives of Business Research*, 5(11), 159-170

Audi, M. & Ali, A. (2017). Environmental Degradation, Energy consumption, Population Density and Economic Development in Lebanon: A time series Analysis (1971-2014). *Journal of International Finance and Economics*, 17(1), 7-20.

Audi, M. Sadiq, A. Ali, A. and Roussel, Y. (2021). Performance Evaluation of Islamic and Non-Islamic Equity and Bonds Indices: Evidence from Selected Emerging and Developed Countries. *Journal of Applied Economic Sciences*, 16(73), 251– 269.

Audi, M., & Ali, A. (2016). A Causality and Co-integration Analysis of Some Selected Socio-Economic Determinants of Fertility: Empirics from Tunisia. *Bulletin of Business and Economics (BBE)*, 5(1), 20-36.

Audi, M., Ali, A., & Roussel, Y. (2021). Aggregate and Disaggregate Natural Resources Agglomeration and Foreign Direct Investment in France. *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues*, *11*(1), 147-156.

Audi, M., Ali, A., & Roussel, Y. (2021). Measuring the Tax Buoyancy: Empirics from South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC). *Empirical Economics Letters*, 20(12).

Audi, M., Ali, A., & Roussel, Y. (2021). The Advancement in Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) and Economic Development: A Panel Analysis. *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*, 15(4), 1013-1039.

Haider, A., & Ali, A. (2015). Socio-economic determinants of crimes: a cross-sectional study of Punjab districts. *International Journal of Economics and Empirical Research*, 3(11), 550-560.

Kassem, M. Ali, A. & Audi, M. (2019). Unemployment Rate, Population Density and Crime Rate in Punjab (Pakistan): An Empirical Analysis. *Bulletin of Business and Economics (BBE),* 8(2), 92-104.

Roussel, Y., Ali, A., & Audi, M. (2021). Measuring the Money Demand in Pakistan: A Time Series Analysis. *Bulletin of Business and Economics (BBE)*, *10*(1), 27-41.

Sajid, A. & Ali, A. (2018). Inclusive Growth and Macroeconomic Situations in South Asia: An Empirical Analysis. *Bulletin of Business and Economics (BBE),* 7(3), 97-109.

Şentürk, İ., & Ali, A. (2021). Socioeconomic Determinants of Gender Specific Life Expectancy in Turkey: A Time Series Analysis. *Sosyoekonomi*, 29(49), 85-111.

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations.* Free Press.

Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership*. Psychology press.

Bono, J. E., Foldes, H. J., Vinson, G., & Muros, J. P. (2007). Workplace emotions: The role of supervision and leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92*, 1357–1367.

Breevaart, K., Bakker, A., Hetland, J., Demerouti, E., Olsen, O. K., & Espevik, R. (2014). Daily transactional and transformational leadership and daily employee engagement. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *87*(1), 138–157.

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. Harper & Row.

Carless, S. A., Wearing, A. J., & Mann, L. (2000). A Short Measure of Transformational Leadership. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *14*(3), 389–405.

Chiang, C. F., & Lin, M. Y. (2016). Motivating organizational commitment in hotels: The relationship between leaders and employees. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*, *15*(4), 462–484.

Cole, M., Walter, F., Bedeian, A., & O'Boyle, E. (2012). Job burnout and employee engagement: A meta-analytic examination of construct proliferation. *Journal of Management*, *38*, 1550–1581.

Cropanzano, R., Rupp, D. E., & Byrne, Z. S. (2003). The relationship of emotional exhaustion to work attitudes, job performance, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *88*, 160–

169.

Davis, M. A. (2009). Understanding the relationship between mood and creativity: A meta-analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *108*(1), 25–38. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2008.04.001

Davis, T. R., & Luthans, F. (1980). A social learning approach to organizational behavior. *Academy of Management Review*, *5*(2), 281–290.

Detert, J. R., & Burris, E. R. (2007). Leadership behavior and employee voice: Is the door really open? *Academy of Management Journal*, *50*, 869–884. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2007.26279183

Dust, S. B., Resick, C. J., & Mawritz, M. B. (2014). Transformational leadership, psychological empowerment, and the moderating role of mechanistic–organic contexts. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *35*(3), 413–433.

Erstad, M. (2001). Commitment to excellence at the Forte Hotel Group. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, *13*(7), 347–351.

Garma, R., & Bove, L. (2009). Customer citizenship behaviours directed at service personnel: what the experts have to say. In *Australian and New Zealand Marketing Academy Conference, 30 November-2 December 2009, Crown Promenade*. Melbourne, Victoria. Australian and New Zealand Marketing Academy (ANZMAC).

Garma, R., & Bove, L. L. (2011). Contributing to well-being: customer citizenship behaviors directed to service personnel. *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, *19*(7), 633–649.

Glomb, T. M., Duffy, M. K., Bono, J. E., & Yang, T. (2011). In Research in personnel and human resources management. In *Mindfulness at work* (pp. 115–157). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Gong, X., Xie, X. Y., Xu, R., & Luo, Y. J. (2010). Psychometric properties of the Chinese versions of DASS-21 in Chinese college students. *Chinese Journal of Clinical Psychology*, *103*, 13–20.

Gouthier, M. H., & Rhein, M. (2011). Organizational pride and its positive effects on employee behavior. *Journal of Service Management*, *22*(5), 633–649.

Halbesleben, J. R., & Bowler, W. M. (2007). Emotional exhaustion and job performance: the mediating role of motivation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92*(1), 93.

Halbesleben, J. R., Neveu, J. P., Paustian-Underdahl, S. C., & Westman, M. (2014). Getting to the "COR" understanding the role of resources in conservation of resources theory. *Journal of Management*, *40*(5), 1334-1364.

Hay, I. (2006). Transformational leadership: Characteristics and criticisms. *E-Journal of Organizational Learning and Leadership*, *5*(2).

Hecht, H., Mayier, M., & Perakslis, C. (2014). Pervasive connectivity: The thriving hotel of the future. *International Conference on Pervasive Computing and Communication Workshops*, 357–363.

Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist*, *44*, 513–524.

Hobfoll, S. E. (2001). The influence of culture, community, and the nested self in the stress process: Advancing conservation of resources theory. *Applied Psychology*, *50*(3), 337–421.

Hobfoll, S. E. (2011). *Conservation of resources theory: Its implication for stress, health, and resilience.* The Oxford handbook of stress, health, and coping.

Hobman, E. V., Restubog, S. L. D., Bordia, P., & Tang, R. L. (2009). Abusive supervision in advising relationships: Investigating the role of social support. *Applied Psychology*, *58*(2), 233–256. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2008.00330.x

Karatepe, O. M., & Olugbade, O. A. (2009). The effects of job and personal resources on hotel employees' work engagement. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *28*(4), 504–512.

Kelloway, E. K., & Barling, J. (2010). Leadership development as an intervention in occupational health psychology. *Work and Stress*, *24*, 260–279.

Khan, A. N., Khan, N. A., Bodla, A. A., & Gul, S. (2020). Impact of psychopathy on employee creativity via work engagement and negative socioemotional behavior in public health sector. *Personnel Review*, *49*(8), 1655–1675.

Khan, N. A., Khan, A. N., Moin, M. F., & Pitafi, A. H. (2020). A trail of chaos: How psychopathic leadership influence employee satisfaction and turnover intention via self-efficacy in tourism enterprises. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1080/00222216.2020.1785359

Kumar, V., & Pansari, A. (2016). Competitive advantage through engagement. *Journal of Marketing Research,* *53*(4), 497–514.

Langelaan, Saar, B., A., Bakker, Doornen, L. J. Van, & Schaufeli., W. B. (2006). "Burnout and work engagement: Do individual differences make a difference?." *Personality and Individual Differences*, *40*(3), 521-532.

Lashley, C. (2008). Studying hospitality: insights from social sciences. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, *8*(1), 69–84.

Lee, J., & Ok, C. (2015). Examination of factors affecting hotel employees' service orientation: An emotional labor perspective. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, *39*(4), 437–468.

LePine et al. (2005). A meta-analytic test of the challenge stressor–hindrance stressor framework: An explanation for inconsistent relationships among stressors and performance. *Academy of Management Journa*, *48*(5), 764–775.

Li, M., Liu, W., Han, Y., & Zhang, P. (2016). Linking empowering leadership and change-oriented organizational citizenship behavior: The role of thriving at work and autonomy orientation. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, *29*(5), 732–750.

Liu, J., Siu, O. L., & Shi, K. (2010). Transformational leadership and employee well-being: The mediating role of trust in the leader and self-efficacy. *Applied Psychology*, *89*, 454–479.

Liu, J., Siu, O.-L., & Shi, K. (2010). Transformational leadership and employee well-being: The mediating role of trust in the leader and self-efficacy. *Applied Psychology*, *59*, 454–479.

Liu, X., Li, J. J., & Yang, Y. (2015). Travel arrangement as a moderator in image–satisfaction–behavior relations: An investigation of Chinese outbound travelers. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, *21*(3), 225–236.

Luu, T. T. (2017). CSR and organizational citizenship behavior for the environment in hotel industry: The moderating roles of corporate entrepreneurship and employee attachment style. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, *29*(11), 2867–2900.

Ma, E., Qu, H., Wei, X., & Hsiao, A. (2018). Conceptualization and Operationalization of an Altruistic and Egoistic Continuum of Organizational Citizenship Behavior Motivations. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, *42*(5), 740–771.

MacKinnon, D. P., Lockwood, C. M., & Williams, J. (2004). Confidence limits for the indirect effect: Distribution of the product and resampling methods. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, *39*(1), 99–128.

MacKinnon, David P., Lockwood, C. M., & Williams, J. (2004). Confidence limits for the indirect effect: distribution of the product and resampling methods. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, *39*(1), 99–128. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327906mbr3901_4

Miao, C., Humphrey, R. H., & Qian, S. (2018). A cross-cultural meta-analysis of how leader emotional intelligence influences subordinate task performance and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of World Business*, *53*(4), 463–474.

Mullen, G. E., & Tallent-Runnels, M. K. (2006). Student outcomes and perceptions of instructors' demands and support in online and traditional classrooms. *The Internet and Higher Education, 9*(4), 257-266.

Nadiri, H., & Tanova, C. (2010). An investigation of the role of justice in turnover intentions, job satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behavior in hospitality industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *29*(1), 33–41.

Nguyen, N., & Pervan, S. (2020). Retailer corporate social responsibility and consumer citizenship behavior: The mediating roles of perceived consumer effectiveness and consumer trust. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, *55*, 102082.

Nielsen, K., & Daniels, K. (2012). Does shared and differentiated leadership predict followers' working conditions and well-being? *The Leadership Quarterly*, *23*, 383–397.

Osher, D., Kidron, Y., Brackett, M., Dymnicki, A., Jones, S., & Weissberg, R. P. (2016). Advancing the science and practice of social and emotional learning: Looking back and moving forward. *Review of Research in Education*, *40*(1), 644–681.

Paek, S., Schuckert, M., Kim, T. T., & Lee, G. (2015). Why is hospitality employees' psychological capital important? The effects of psychological capital on work engagement and employee morale. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *50*, 9–26.

Park, J., Han, S. J., Kim, J., & Kim, W. (2021). Structural relationships among transformational leadership, affective organizational commitment, and job performance: the mediating role of employee engagement. *European Journal of Training and Development*.

Pelegrín-Borondo, J., Arias-Oliva, M., & Olarte-Pascual, C. (2017). Emotions, price and quality expectations in hotel services. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, *23*(4), 322–338.

Peters, J. F., & Weil, M. (2016). A critical assessment of the resource depletion potential of current and future lithium-ion batteries. *Resources*, *5*, 46.

Ravichandran, S., Gilmore, S. A., & Strohbehn, C. (2007). Organizational citizenship behavior research in hospitality: Current status and future research directions. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*, *6*(2), 59–78.

Reitsamer, B. F., & Brunner-Sperdin, A. (2017). Tourist destination perception and well-being: What makes a destination attractive? *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, *23*(1), 55–72.

Sandiford, P. J., & Seymour, D. (2002). Emotional labor in public houses: reflections on a pilot study. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, *26*(1), 54–70.

Sapolsky, R. M. (1996). Why stress is bad for your brain. *Science*, *273*, 749–750.

Schaufeli, W. B., & Taris, T. W. (2005). The conceptualization and measurement of burnout: Common ground and

----

worlds apart. *Work and Stress*, *19*(3), 256–262.

Seltzer, J., Numerof, R., & Bass, B. (1989). Transformational leadership: Is it a source of more burnout and stress? *Journal of Health and Human Resources Administration*, *12*, 174–185.

Shrestha, A. K., & Nepal., 1Kathmandu. (2015). Interactive Effects of Public Service Motivation and Organizational Politics on Nepali Civil Service Employees' Organizational Commitment. *Business Perspectives and Research*, *3*(1).

Siegall, M., & McDonald, T. (2004). Person-organization value congruence, burnout and diversion of resources. *Personnel Review*, *33*(3), 291–301.

Skakon, J., Nielsen, K., Borg, V., & Guzman, J. (2010). Are leaders' well-being, behaviours and style associated with the affective well-being of their employees? A systematic review of three decades of research. *Work and Stress*, *24*, 107–139.

Slåtten, T., & Mehmetoglu, M. (2015). The effects of transformational leadership and perceived creativity on innovation behavior in the hospitality industry. *Ournal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*, *14*(2), 195–219.

Spreitzer, G. M. (2008). Taking stock: A review of more than twenty years of research on empowerment at work. *Handbook of Organizational Behavior*, *2*, 54–72.

Spreitzer, G. M., Sutcliffe, K., Dutton, J. E., Sonenshein, S., & Grant M., A. (2005). A socially embedded model of thriving at work. *Organization Science*, *35*(16), 537–550.

Spreitzer, G., Porath, C. L., & Gibson, C. B. (2012). Toward human sustainability: How to enable more thriving at work. *Organizational Dynamics*, *41*(2), 155–162.

Ten Brummelhuis, L. L., & Bakker, A. B. (2012). A resource perspective on the work-home interface: The work-home resources model. *American Psychologist*, *67*, 545–556.

Tims, M., & Bakker, A. B. (2010). Job crafting: Towards a new model of individual job redesign. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, *36*(2), 1–9.

Van Doorn, J., Lemon, K. N., Mittal, V., Nass, S., Pick, D., Pirner, P., & Verhoef, P. C. (2010). Customer engagement behavior: Theoretical foundations and research directions. *Journal of Service Research*, *13*(3), 253–266.

Varasteh, H., Marzuki, A., & Rasoolimanesh, S. M. (2015). Factors affecting international students' travel behavior. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, *21*(2), 131–149.

Walumbwa, F. O., & Hartnell, C. A. (2011). Understanding transformational leadership–employee performance links: The role of relational identification and self-efficacy. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *84*(1), 153–172.

Wang, C. J., Tsai, H. T., & Tsai, M. T. (2014). Linking transformational leadership and employee creativity in the hospitality industry: The influences of creative role identity, creative self-efficacy, and job complexity. *Tourism Management*, *40*, 79–89.

Wright, T. A., & Cropanzano, R. (1998). Emotional exhaustion as a predictor of job performance and voluntary turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *83*(3), 486–493.

Yi, Y., & Gong, T. (2013). Customer value co-creation behavior: Scale development and validation. *Journal of Business Research*, *66*(9), 1279–1284.

Zhu, Y., Sun, L. Y., & Leung, A. S. (2014). Corporate social responsibility, firm reputation, and firm performance: The role of ethical leadership. *Asia Pacific Journal of Managemen*, *31*(4), 925–947.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics and correlation matrix

	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1- Age	2.48	1.02	-							
2- Gender	.57	.49	.045	-						
3-Qualification	2.52	.84	.19**	.17**	-					
4-Experience	3.81	1.16	.40**	.12*	.37**	-				
5- TFL	3.02	1.30	.10	-.09	-.03	.09	(.97)			
6- Eng	3.65	1.36	.03	.01	-.06	.06	.10*	(.94)		
7- Stress	2.51	.99	-.12	-.01	.04	.01	-.28**	-.40***	(.96)	
8- OCB	3.55	1.25	.06	.02	.07	.02	.16**	.32**	-.33**	(.95)

Note: TLB= Transformational Leadership Behavior; Eng= Engagement; PS= Perceived Stress; CCB= Customer Citizenship Behavior, Cronbach α values appear in parentheses on the diagonal, **p < .01 *p < .05 (two-tailed); N = 412

Table 2 Results of confirmatory factor analyses

Models	χ2 (df)	χ2_diff (df_diff)	χ2/df	TLI	CFI	RMSEA
Four Factors Model	672 (427)	-	1.58	.981	.982	.038
Three Factors Model TLB and Engagment combined	3315(430)	2641 (3***)	7.68	.761	.780	.13
Three Factors Model TLB and PS combined	5153 (431)	4479 (3***)	11.95	.610	.639	.17
Two Factors Model TLB, PS and Engagement combined	7745(433)	7073 (5***)	17.89	.399	.441	.21
Single Factor Model	9662(434)	8990 (6***)	22.26	.244	.294	.24

Note: TLB= Transformational Leadership Behavior; TLI Tucker-Lewis index; CFI Comparative fit index; RMSEA Root-mean-square error of approximation.

Table 3 Results of Mediation through Bootstrapping Method

IV	MV	DV	Effect of IV on M (a)	Effect of M on DV (b)	Indirect effect (a*b)	Total effects (c')	Total effects (c)	95% CI	Supported
TLB	CE	CCB	0.12*	0.27***	0.32***	0.12**	0.15**	(-0.0015, 0.0707)	NO
TLB	PS	CCB	-0.21***	-0.38***	0.07**	0.07	0.17*	(0.068,0.296)	YES

Note: IV= TLB, DV= CCB, MV= CE, PS. * p <0.05;** p <0.01

TLB= Transformational Leadership Behavior; CE= Customer Engagement; PS= Perceived Stress; CCB=Customer Citizenship Behavior IV= Independent Variable; MV=Mediating Variable; DV=Dependent Variable

Figure 1: Study Model