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Abstract
With the performance of service personnel often constituting a major element of a service per se, the customer orientation of service employees (COSE) is often regarded as a main determinant of service firm's success. The purpose of this study is Understands how customer orientation (CO) of service employees (SE) affects customer satisfaction (CS), customer commitment (CC), customer retention (CR) and increasing service quality (SQ) in Iranian Islamic banking sector. This is based on 300 responses collected from customers using Iranian Islamic bank service in three provinces (Khorasan-e Razavi, Khorasan-e Shomali & Khorasan-e Jonobi), in private and governmental sectors. The results show that customer orientation of service employees (COSE) has no impact in customer retention in Iranian Islamic banking. Therefore, other hypotheses accepted. There are important variables in the service sectors that affect customer quality perception. This paper draws on the conceptualization suggested by Henning-Thurau and Thurau and tests model of COSE dimensions (Technical and Social Skills, Motivation and Decision Making Authority) and customer–sided consequence in Islamic banking in Iran.
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1. Introduction
The financial service industry is changing rapidly. Technology, government regulation, and increase customer sophistication are forcing financial service institutions to re-evaluate the current business practices. Financial institution across the global are re-examining how they are meeting their customer's needs today and developing business plans needed to align them strategically to remain competitive and profitable in the future. SQ in banking has recently become the topic of interest for academicians and researcher alike despite being considered markedly important over the years (Abdullah, et al, 2011). The concept of Islamic banking is gaining momentum in today's market. It has been reported that the establishment of Islamic banks and financial institutions have resulted from new challenges posed by the wave of globalization which has swept all fields of life worldwide (Rahman and Shaikh, 2002). Islamic banking was virtually unknown 30 years ago. Recently, Islamic banks operate in more than 55 countries with estimated deposits of over $100 billion. There are more than 200 Islamic banking institutions in operation around the world and they are one of fastest growing financial service markets in the Islamic world (Venardos, 2005). What makes Islamic banking distinctive is its adherence to the basic Islamic principle that money should only be use to exchange goods and services and for nothing else (Shahonpoor, 2009). When competition intensifies, and when banks start to offer similar products and service, it is the employee CO that can influence the performance of the Islamic bank and determine its competitiveness.
and success. Current research shows basic essential skills that SE must have to succeed in their responsibilities. Specifically, the purposes of this project are:

1. To present a usable conceptual model for understanding why service employees are essential to CS, CC and CR;
2. To define the main skills that is important for increasing SQ of Iranian banking service;
3. Present effective suggestions for management and staff in banking industry to received CS, CC and CR.

1.1 History of Islamic banking in Iran

During the past decades or so, regulatory, structural and technological factors have significantly changed banking environment throughout the world. It is a novel feature of Islamic banking practice in Iran that it has been adopted at state level since the Islamic revolution 1979. In the earliest two decades of Islamic banking practice, the Iranian banking sector was highly centralized and did not share from the pool of knowledge, experience and development in global market or within the Islamic banking world. After the mid 1990s, however, the Iranian government showed inclination towards adopting privatization and deregulation in the financial sector. In 1997, the central bank of Iran, Bank Markaz, issued license to a number of credit cooperatives, interest-free Qardhul Hasan centers and three non-bank credit institutions to launch their operations in Iran. Foreign banks have been working in the designated free trade zones of Iran, since 1999. The private banking sector started to build up in Iran at the beginning of twenty-first century. In December 2001, the first private bank, Bank Karafarin, was granted a license to commence operations in Iran. Two private banks, Bank Eqtesdae-e Novin and Bank Parsian emerged in the Iranian market. The Iranian government denationalized its two banks, Bank Saderat and Bank Rfah-e Kargaran, to enhance the diversity of the private banking sector in the country. Presently, more than 44 applications for establishing private banking and financial institutions in Iran have yet to be decided by the Bank Markaz. The Iranian government has been working on evolving more flexible, competitive and innovative financial systems in the country. The growing global exposure and deregulation of the oil-rich Iranian economy and financial sector may have a far-reaching impact on Islamic banking growth and development in Iran. The Iranian government may achieve greater integration of its Islamic financial sector with global finance as well as the Islamic banking and finance world (Mansoor-Khan and Eshaq-Batti, 2008).

2. Literature review

2.1 Service success through customer-oriented employees

2.1.1 Customer orientation of service employees (COSE)

The service encounter is an important component of the SQ construct (Raajpoot, 2004; Imrie et al., 2002) and involves critical moments of truth where customers often develop indelible impressions of the firm (Bitner et al., 2000). Yet, there has been little effort to conceptualize and assess the behavioral aspects of encounters (Malhotra et al., 1994). Previous research seeking to explain customer satisfaction has primarily focused on the customer expectation-disconfirmation paradigm, while for the most part overlooking the interaction between the customer and the provider in determining CS (Bianchi, 2001; Oliver, 1993; Kong and Jogaratnam, 2007). Marketing theorists have long argued that firms that focus on their customers needs are better positioned to achieve long-term success than companies that do not (Deshpande et al, 1993; Kotler, 2000). Indeed, empirical research has demonstrated several positive outcomes of market orientation (MR), enhanced profitability (Narver and Slater, 1990), employee commitment, and esprit de corps (Jaworski and Kohli, 1993). Implementation of this marketing concept in service firms is accomplished through SE and their interaction with customers (Danavan et al, 2004). Banks that excel in service quality can have a distinct marketing edge since improved levels of SQ are related to higher revenues, increase cross-sell ratios, higher customer retention, and expanded marked share (Abdullah et al, 2011). As a result of the intangible and interactive nature of services, customers often rely on the behavior of SE when judging the quality of a service. Consequently, the employee level of CO is considered an important leverage for a service firm's economic success (Bitner et al, 1990; Bove and Johnson, 2002; Bove and Schneider, 1985; Sergeant and Frenkel, 2000; Henning-Thurau, 2004). Despite its important position in the value chain, few studies have addressed the construct of (COSE) and its impact on a service firm's success (Brown et al, 2002). Noteworthy exceptions are the studies by Kelley (1992), Brown et al, (2002), Donavan et al, (2004), and Hening-Thurau (2003). While the first two studies focus on the relationship between COSE and employee characteristics such as personality traits, job satisfaction and organizational commitment, the latter author has suggested, but not empirically tested, a three-dimensional conceptualization of customer orientation of service employees, distinguished between the employees motivation to serve customers, his or her CO skills, and his or
her self-perceived decision-making authority. No study has yet tested the impact of COSE on the way customer assessment of transactions with service employees or their relationship with the service provider as a whole. This paper draws on the concepts suggested by Hennig-Thurau and Thurau (2003) and tests a model of COSE dimensions and customer-sided consequences. Following a review of the available literature on COSE, a four dimensional structure of COSE is proposed and used as the cornerstone of a model of customer side COSE consequence (Henning-Thurau, 2004). Zeithamal et al, (1990) argue that appropriately skilled and trained service workers are essential to service delivery at Gap 3 of their Gap Model as well (Varca, 2004).

2.1.2 Service quality (SQ) in banking sector

In a milieu which becomes increasingly competitive, SQ as a critical measure of organizational performance continues to compel the attention of banking institutions and remains at the forefront of services marketing literature and practice (Lasser et al., 2002). The interest is largely driven by the realization that high SQ results in CS and loyalty, greater willingness to recommend to someone else, reduction in complaints and improved customer retention rates (Levesque and McDougall, 1996). There has been a continued research on the definition, modeling, measurement, data-collection procedure, data analysis, and etc. issues of SQ, leading to development of sound base for the researchers (Sangeetha and Mahalingam, 2011). It is well established that SQ is heavily dependent on the behaviors of customer-contact personnel (Zeithaml et al., 1996; Hartline et al., 2000). Although many customers do take note of brand and reputation in making their initial choice of a service firm, the individual characteristics of known and trusted customer-contact employees have been shown to be of particular importance for repeat customers (Maister, 1993; Teece, 2003). This is especially relevant for the customers of financial services – because such customers are frequently dealing with complex intangible services and an asymmetry of knowledge between customers and providers (Maister, 1993; Nonaka and Teece, 2001; Teece, 2003; Greenwood et al., 2005). SQ has been defined in services marketing literature as an overall assessment of service by the customers. Perceived SQ is believed to be resulting from comparison between customers’ prior expectations about the service and their perceptions after actual experience of service performance (Asubonteng et al., 1996; Parasuraman et al., 1985). SQ has been defined by the practitioners in terms of key dimensions that customers use while evaluating the services (Lewis and Booms, 1983). Conceptualization of SQ should include both the service delivery process (Parasuraman et al., 1985) as well as the service outcomes (Lehtinen and Lehtinen, 1991). Gronroos (1984) offered a SQ model with dimensions of technical quality (what consumer gets), functional quality (how consumer gets the service) and corporate image (how consumers perceive the firm and its services). Similarly, Lehtinen and Lehtinen (1991) offered another model with three dimensions of SQ: physical, interactive and corporate. Physical quality is about the quality of physical products involved in service delivery and consumption. Interactive dimension refers to the interaction between the customers and the service organization employees. Corporate quality refers to the corporate image as perceived by the customers. The SQ literature has also highlighted that SQ can also be treated as a second order construct consisting of interaction, physical environment and outcome quality (Brady and Cronin, 2001; Ganguli and Roy, 2011). Financial service providers thus require employees who are oriented towards achieving both: immediate CS (which is perhaps more important for “low-relational” customers engaged in retail transactions with their service providers); and, long-term CC (which is perhaps more important for “high-relational” customers for whom loyalty and long-term relationships are crucial). (Furtmueller et al, 2011). The SERVQUAL model (Parasuraman et al., 1985, 1988) provides the most accepted and most used conceptualization of SQ (Kong and Jogaratnam, 2007).

2.1.3 Customer orientation (CO)

Despite the amount of CO research (Brown et al, 2002; Danavan et al, 2004; Knight et al, 2007; Sax and Weitz, 1982), the question of how CO influences perceived organizational performance from the customer's perspective is under review. CO is the sufficient understanding of target buyers to be able to continuously create superior value for them (Awwad and Agti, 2011). CO is viewed as a desire by an employee to help customers meet their needs during the performance of organizational task (Jayawardhena and Farrel, 2011). Brown and colleagues (2002, p. 111) defined CO as an “employee’s tendency or predisposition to meet customer needs in an on-the-job context.” They found that CO was influenced by deeper personality traits and, in turn, influenced worker performance. This perspective is consistent with traditional views of personality. For example, Pervin and John (1997, p. 4) define personality as the “characteristics of the person that account for consistent patterns of feeling, thinking, and behaving (Donavan et al, 2004). McEachern and Warnaby (2005) define CO as a component of MO that focuses on putting the customers at the centre of strategic focus. Kotler (2004) emphasizes the need for organizations to move from the level of studying customer segments to shaping separate offers, services and messages to individual customers. Hence such firms may need to collect information on each customer’s past transactions, demographics, psychographics, and media and distribution preferences. And they would hope to
achieve profitable growth through expenditures by building high customer lifetime value. He further asserts that the ability of a company to deal with customers, one at a time has become practical as a result of advances in factory customization, computers, the internet and database marketing software. Nakata and Zhu (2006) assert that CO encompasses the analysis of customers’ needs, and responsiveness of organization to such needs. But some salient questions have been raised concerning whether CO actually translates to better performance (Ang and Buttle, 2006; Avnet and Higgins, 2006; Asikhia, 2010). Day (1994) defines CO as a concept which transforms marketing into a potent competitive weapon, shifting organizational values, beliefs, assumptions, and premises towards a two-way relationship between customers and the firm. Narver and Slater (1990) say CO is the sufficient understanding of ones target buyers to be able to create superior value for them continuously. CO culture suggests that a firm concentrates on providing products and services that meet customer needs (Day and Wensley, 1983; Dean and Bowen, 1994; Noble, Rajiv and Kumar, 2002). Schneider, Ehrhart, Mayer, Saltz, and Niles-Jolly (2006) argue that CO requires a continuous positive disposition towards meeting customers’ exigencies and therefore a high degree of concern for these customers. While Schneider and Bowen (1993) suggest that CO culture is nurtured through regular supply of customer information about their needs so as to be able to design and deliver good products. CO as a component of MO has its fundamental thrust in pursuit of putting customers at the center of strategic focus (McEachem and Warnaby 2005). A customer-oriented culture involves excellence in customer interactions, market and customer familiarity and an emphasis on cooperation (Deshpande, Farley and Webster, 1993) Nwankwo (1995), and Ang and Buttle (2006) put forward a framework for auditing a CO profile, which achieves definition, sensibility, measurement, and implementation. They define it as a process of putting customers at the heart of an organization that is, having the appropriate vision of customers and their needs; a phenomenon that makes the organization to see itself through the eyes of the customers (Asikhia, 2010).

2.1.4 Customer satisfaction (CS)

CS has been studied extensively in the field of marketing (Anderson et al., 2004; Fornell, 1992; Oliver, 1980). The role of satisfaction in predicting behavioral intentions is well established in the literature (Anderson et al., 1994; Cronin and Taylor, 1992; Zeithaml et al., 1996), with the majority of studies assuming that previous experience of transactional customer relationships is a primary determinant of repeated purchasing behavior. Ganesan (1994) found that long-term orientation is affected by the extent to which customers and vendors trust their “channel partners” (Appiah-Gyimah et al., 2011). It is one of the most commonly used customer-oriented metrics by managers because of its generic nature and its universal measurability for all the types of products and services (Gupta and Zeithaml, 2006). In the traditional sense, satisfaction was considered to be transaction-specific construct which resulted from immediate post purchase judgment or affective reaction (Oliver, 1993). Customer satisfaction is also considered from a cumulative satisfaction perspective and is defined as customer’s overall experience to date with a product or service provider (Johnson et al., 2001; Krepapa et al., 2003). Most of the CS studies are now using this cumulative satisfaction concept (Gupta and Zeithaml, 2006; Ganguli and Roy, 2011). The degree of overall pleasure or contentment felt by the customer, resulting from the ability of the service provider to fulfill the customer's desire, expectations and needs in relation to the service. CS is a complex construct and has been defined in various ways (Besterfield, 1994; Barsky, 1995; Kanji and Moura, 2002; Fecikova, 2004; Dimitriades, 2006; Ganguli and Roy, 2011). Recently, researchers have argued that there is a distinction between CS as related to tangible products and as related to service experience. In service markets, CS is often measured as the difference between service expectation and experience (Trasorras et al., 2009; Mysen et al., 2011). Rust and Oliver stated that satisfaction reflects whether a consumer believes that the possession and/or use of a service evokes positive feelings (Jayawardhena and Farrel, 2011). Fornell et al. (1996) found that service firms have significantly lower CS scores than manufacturing firms. Their study also revealed that satisfaction is more quality-driven than price-driven in service markets. Expectations play a significant role in CS. Jones et al. (2003, p. 11) stressed that, “when expectations are met or exceeded, customers report higher levels of satisfaction. Therefore, an important step in managing customer expectations is creating realistic expectations.” Ranaweera and Prabhu (2003, p. 82) add that “it is a held belief that the more satisfied the customers are, the greater is their retention.” Fecikova (2004) believes that the key to organizational survival is the retention of satisfied internal and external customers. She proposes measuring satisfaction to manage it effectively. Fornell and Wernerfelt (1987) stated that there will always be some customer dissatisfaction due to a variety of causes (including, at least for certain types of products, customer desire for variety). According to Zahorik and Rust (1992), satisfaction has long been recognized as an important construct in models of buyer behavior and models of CR to service design often incorporate it as a variable (Trasorras et al, 2009).
2.1.5 Customer retention (CR)

According to Gutek et al., (1999), service relationships occur when customers have repeated contact with same service provider. Service relationships refer to instance where service providers know their customer personally and expect to see them again in future (Guchait et al, 2011). Yet, CR in banking depends on trust and confidence (Tsoukatos and Mastrojianni, 2010). The individual judgment about buying a designated service from the same company again, taking into account his/her current situation and likely circumstances. Levitt (1983) examines value and CR via the buyer–seller relationship. Levitt (1983, p. 2) said that, “the relationship between a seller and a buyer seldom ends when a sale is made.” Increasingly, the relationship intensifies after the sale and helps determine the buyer’s choice the next time around. According to Levitt (1983), it is expectations and not things. How this relationship is managed is critical to its continuation. He warns that in the absence of sound management, the relationship will deteriorate. The failure of the service provider to address what may be causing the dissension will no doubt alter the relationship. Hellier (1995) tested a CR model in the insurance services sector and found relationships among perceived value (largely expressed through quality), CS, loyalty and switching costs and repurchase intent (retention). Product and brand preference were intervening factors. Retention can also be measured based on customer profitability. Pfieifer et al, 2005, p.11) stated that "some customer are more equal than others, and firms can prosper by learning to identify and capitalize on customer differences". They quote a study by Reichheld and Sasser (1990) which reported that a 5 percent increase in retention would increase profits by 75 percent (Trasorras et al, 2009).

2.1.6 Customer commitment (CC)

Although the commitment of financial consultants varies in accordance with product, customer type, and geography (N’Goala, 2007), it is well-known (and not at all surprising) that financial consultants are especially concerned to manage the long-term financial affairs of customers who have larger investments and bank accounts; indeed financial consultants are often required by their employers to develop more intensive contact and offer varied product packages to particular customers, depending on their financial status. In this regard, the service management literature has demonstrated that high commitment on the part of the consultant is likely to result in loyalty and CR (Morgan and Hunt, 1994; Beaton and Beaton, 1995; Garbarino and Johnson, 1999). Commitment is important to the study of relationship because it not only signals enduring stability at the conceptual level, but also serves as a reliable surrogate measure of long-term relationship at the operational and empirical level (Han, 1992; Mavondo and Rodrigo, 2001). Commitment has served as the dependent variable in several relationship marketing models including those describing buyer-seller relationships, e.g. (Hunt, 1992) and channel behavior (Kumar et al, 1995). Communication is a good indicator of long-term relationships (Morgan and Hunt, 1994; Shamdasani and Sheth, 1987; Farrelly and Quester, 2003). Commitment has been shown to be an important factor in developing cooperative and relationships between providers and customers (Morgan and Hunt, 1994; Garbarino and Johnson, 1999), and such relationships are more likely to be characterized by higher levels of SQ and long-term profitability (Zeithaml et al., 1996; Gronroos, 1997). These findings are in accordance with the so-called “Commitment–Trust Theory of Relationship Marketing” (Morgan and Hunt, 1994), which states that commitment leads directly to the cooperative behaviors that are vital for long-term, mutually beneficial relationships. According to Meyer and Allen (1991, 1997), most conceptions of organizational commitment incorporate three attitudinal dimensions:

1. Affective commitment (employees who are committed to their organization because they want to be);
2. Continuance commitment (employees who are committed to their organization because they need to be; that is, they have few alternatives); and
3. Normative commitment (employees who are committed to their organization because they feel they ought to be). (Furtmueller et al, 2011).

3. Hypotheses and model

Several empirical studies show that it is impossible to maintain a satisfied and committed customer base without satisfied and committed employees. More than 90 years ago, Strong (1925) emphasized that personal selling strategies should be directed toward securing CS as well as purchase orders (Sax and Weitz, 1982). The links between customer and employee variable have also been depicted by Hesket et al, (1997) within a framework termed "the service profit chain" or "employee-customer profit chain" (Vilares and Coelho, 2003). Research focused on the customer–organization interface invariably incorporates the service provider as a key component (e.g. Czepiel, 1990; Czepiel et al, 1985; Hartline and Ferrell, 1996; Klaus, 1995; Price et al, 1995; Zeithaml et al, 1988; Vzrca, 2004). Spector (1997) said that employee satisfaction is important factor for increasing job satisfaction and service quality (Antonic and Antonic, 2011). Any employee who comes in direct or indirect
contact with a customer influences CS, customer perceived quality and revenues (Solnet, 2006). We offer the following hypotheses:

H1. The customer orientation of service employees has a positive influence on customer satisfaction.

In the case of services, such an emotional commitment is based predominantly on the customer's personal familiarity with and affinity to single service employees, consequently, we pressure that the employees handling of interactions with customers strongly influences the level of commitment a customer developed toward a service provider. At the same time, it is assumed that the level of satisfaction the customer experiences with the service provided also contributes to the CC of the service firm, as friendship requires at least a minimum of reliability and fulfillment (Henning-Thurau et al, 2002).

H2. The customer orientation of service employee has a positive influence on emotional commitment.

A sizable number of researcher hold that trust, commitment and satisfaction are important in developing strong relationships between manufacturers and suppliers (Barry et al, 2008; Caceres and Paparoidamis, 2007; Morgan and Hunt, 1994; Palmatier et al, 2006; Rayruen and Miller, 2007; Skarmeas et al, 2008; Mysen et al, 2011). Most research presents trust and commitment as unique concepts (Morgan and Hunt, 1994). In addition, Geyskens et al, (1999) show satisfaction as a distinct concept from trust and commitment. For example, some studies position satisfaction, commitment and trust, as dimensions of a higher order concept of relationship quality (Rayruen and Miller, 2007; Skarmeas and Robson, 2008; Skarmeas et al, 2008). Other studies indicate satisfaction leads to trust and commitment (Geyskens and Steenkamp, 2000; Moliner et al, 2007), is caused by commitment (Farrelly and Quester, 2005), or is a mediator between trust and commitment and other outcomes (Garbarino and Johnson, 1999; Mysen et al, 2011).

H3. Customer satisfaction has a positive influence on emotional commitment.

There is abundant evidence that, in assessing service delivery, customers attach importance to their personal interactions with service employees. The role of emotions in service delivery has been examined in sufficient detail (Lin and Lin, 2011). The study by Brown et al (2002) and Homburg et al, (2002), show that COSE has an important role in determining the quality of retail customer service evaluation (Jayawardhena and Farrel, 2011).

In some research, the concept of the "part-time marketer" (Gummesson, 1991, p60) suggest that because of the nature of service encounter, all customer–contact employees are, in fact marketers (Solnet, 2006).

H4. The customer orientation of service employees has a positive direct influence on customer retention.

For many years CS has been a major goal of business organizations, since it has been deemed to affect CR and a company's market share (Hansemking and Albinsson, 2004). McNaughton et al, (2001, p.991) stated, "MR theory, no matter the sector in which it is applied, focused on the process whereby MR created value". Value created through MR and relationship enablers can facilitate an atmosphere that causes customer to stay (Trasorras et al, 2009). Ranaweera and Prabhu (2003, p.82) added, "It is a held belief that the more satisfied the customers are, the greater is their retention". Fekikova (2004) believes that the key to organizational survival is the retention of satisfied internal and external customers. She proposed measuring satisfaction to manage it effectively (Trasorras et al, 2009). Similarly, Anderson and Sullivan (1993) found that stated repurchase intentions are strongly related to stated satisfaction across product and service category. Researchers in the professional services tend to remain with the same provider if continually satisfied (Chumpitaz and Paparoidamis, 2004).

H5. Customer satisfaction has a positive direct influence on customer retention.

Commitment is considered to be of critical importance in organizational buying behavior and, it leads to important outcomes, and higher motivation among. Commitment is positively related to loyalty and repeated purchases (Chumpitaz and Paparoidamis, 2004). A customer is committed to a service provider, for example, because the provider has proven to be trustworthy and able to offer solutions, that successfully support the value generating process of the customer. Thus, to achieve CC, a company strategy must be customer centered, long-term, and be based on mutual benefits. Long-term business should increase between two parties (Kassim and Abdulla, 2006). For reasons of completeness, a positive direct impact on CR is also postulated for CS and emotional commitment. In the case of satisfaction, it is argued that a service encounter which fulfills the customer's expectations positively influences the customer's evaluation of the firm. The customer expects similarly beneficial treatment the next time he or she makes use of the respective service (Crosby et al, 1990). Similarly, a consumer values interaction with a partner that they feel is committed. Consumers tend to prefer such a partner over an alternative to whom they feel no affective commitment (Morgan and Hunt, 1994).

H6. Emotional commitment has a positive direct influence on customer retention.
4. An empirical test of the COSE consequence model

4.1 Methodology

To test the model of COSE consequences empirically, a customer perspective about Islamic banking was taken with all constructs in the model being assessed by service customers. The selection of respondents was based on a quota sample of age and gender as quota criteria (Table 1). A total of 1800 questionnaire were sent by post office in three provinces of Iran (Khorasan-e Razavi, Khorasan-e Shomali & Khorasan-e Jonobi). A total of 296 questionnaires were completed and remained in the analysis.

The model was tested in the banking sector. This service industry was chosen because of strong interaction intensity and frequently of use by Iranian consumers. It was important that the respondents were able to evaluate a service provider in this context for ensuring a sufficient response rate. When banking service customers completed the questionnaire, they were first asked to name of the bank which they had visited most recently. Using dramatically programmed software, all further questions were then related to the service provider mentioned by the respondent. This procedure was chosen because it provided a systematic distortion of the sample toward highly loyal and satisfied customers and a small number of service providers. Moreover, as intended, the sample was not restricted to loyal customers, but covered a variety of customer-service provider relationships.

For measuring the model constructs, validated scales were used when available. Specifically for CC, CR, and CS, we took scales from Morgan and Hunt (1994), Zeithaml et al, (1996), and Hennig-Thurau et al, (2002), respectively, and slightly reworded them by adding the name of the bank the customer has visited recently. Each of three constructs was measured with four items. As data collection took place in the Iranian banking service industry, items were translated into Persian (see the Appendix for a list of items). Initially, three items were formulated for each COSE dimension based on the definition given above. All items were measured on five-point agreement scales, with five indicating maximum agreement and one indicating no agreement.

These scales were pre-tested against a sample of 35 users of the Islamic banking industry who were asked to fill out the questionnaires regarding several bank branches. Reliability was good for all constructs and the COSE dimensions, with alpha values of 0.86 for CS, 0.91 for CC, 0.75 for CR, 0.65 for technical skills, 0.80 for social skills, 0.64 for motivation, and 0.63 and for decision making authority.

4.2 Testing the dimensionality of COSE

The reliability of the COSE dimension scales was excellent in the main study as well, with the alpha values of 0.87 and higher for the four COSE dimensions (see Table 2 for details on alpha values, descriptive statistics and correlations). A confirmatory factor analysis (maximum likelihood algorithm and LISREL 8.5) supported the postulated four-dimensional structure of COSE (Technical skills, Social skills, Motivation and Decision making Authority). Specifically, both the $\chi^2$ difference test and the Fornell-Larcher criterion showed that discriminate validity exists between the four COSE dimensions. In the case of the $\chi^2$ difference test, discriminate validity is assumed if the increase of the models $\chi^2$ values result from setting the correlation between two factors to one (i.e. indicating uni-dimensionality) which is $\chi^2$ distributed with a single degree of freedom. The correlation also needs to exceed the theoretical $\chi^2$ distribution at $\rho = 0.05$, which is true for all pairs of COSE dimensions.

5. Final results

Table 3 reports the path coefficients, the degree of explained variances and the fit index for conceptual model for the total sample of banking industry. As with confirmatory factor analysis, model testing was done with the LISREL 8.5 software using the maximum likelihood algorithm. The overall fit statistics, as shown in Table 3, indicate an acceptable level of fit between the hypothesized model and the data.

As predicted, COSE has a direct positive relationship on CS (P<0.05, T=11.27), thus confirming H1. Results also show that COSE had significant impact on CC (P<0.05, T=1.20), supporting H2. As shown in the results, CS has a direct and positive impact on CC (P<0.05, T=2/53), thereby confirming H3. However, the path from COSE on CR (P<0.05, T= -0/35), can be seen as only partially supported by the data. Finally, the impact of CS on CR (P>0.05, T=3/04) and CC on CR (P<0.05, T=4/27), strongly supported, H5 and H6.

6. Discussion

Scholars in service marketing and organizational behavior are giving increasing attention to the personal interaction between customers and the employees on frontline of service business (Bettencourt and Gwinnner, 1996)
This study had two objectives. First, understand the role and effect of COSE dimension on CS, CR and CC. And, second, set out to investigate the impact and measure the effect of this variable in the Islamic banking of Iran. It is important to note that Islamic banking in Iran is the biggest of Islamic banking institutions in the world and it has the primary effect in the mind of customers. Overall, results of this study generally confirm earlier work by Henning-Thurau, (2004) who worked this model in the travel and book, CD and DVD industries. This study found that all dimensions of COSE have impact on CS and CC, supporting earlier work (Henning-Thurau, 2002). These results highlight the importance of four dimensions in both variables (CS & CC) in Iranian Islamic banking, and we recommend that top managers, first, consider the main role of this dimension, and then apply this understanding in all stages of recruitment, selection and training programs for service employees. It is also advisable that managers in the Islamic banking industry test or educate service employees in these areas. The study of Sax and Weitz, (1982), and Jayawardhena and Farrell, (2011), point out that customer and service orientation behaviors impact service quality, value and satisfaction among customers. Hiring employees who are more likely to have COSE dimensions should be an important consideration for managers. Previous work found this relationship to be significant. Garbarino and Johnson, (1999), Gwinner et al, (1998), Price and Arnold, (1999), Henning-Thurau, (2004), show the direct impact of CS and CC on CR. This study also demonstrates how CS and CC effect CR in Iranian Islamic banking and that CS and CC are major variables. Managers must set goals to achieve higher levels of CR and CC to receive CR, because in marketing theory, CR is an easier and have lower cost strategy in comparison with advertising to obtain new customers.

7. Limitations and future research

Like any other empirical study, the study reported here includes various limitations. The main limitations include that, numerous questionnaires sent to our population weren’t returned. It also took a long time to obtain about 296 completed questionnaires. Other limitations included sparse information provided by some respondents about various services.

Future research should make several extensions of the current study. We suggest using this model in the other service industries including hospitality, restaurants and any other industry in which employees have direct contact with customers. Next, researchers suggest that others studies should use this model in two service industries to compare them together, similar to the study of Henning-Thoreau. The focus of the study was limited to a few concepts, which are important for COSE; it did not include other factors that may also be important for employee growth. In conclusion, we suggest that other research consider the viewpoints of two parties, customer and employee. Employees have a good idea for implementing customer service and other aspects of this study. If managers consider this idea, they may increase employee satisfaction.
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Appendix

List of items in the final questionnaire

Technical Skills
1. The employees of $ have a high level of knowledge.
2. $s employees are experts in their job.
3. The employees of $ are highly competent.

Social Skills
1. The employees of $ have extensive social skills.
2. The employees of $ are able to consider their customers perspective.
3. The employees of $ know how to treat a customer well.

Motivation
1. The employees of $ show strong commitment to their job.
2. The employees of $ do their best to fulfill their customers needs.
3. The employees of $ are always highly motivated.

Decision-Making Authority
1. The employees of $ show strong commitment to their job.
2. The employees of $ have appropriate room for maneuver in solving customer problems.
3. In the case of customer requests, $s employees do not need to ask their superior for permission.

Customer Satisfaction
1. I am fully satisfied with $.
2. $ Always fulfills my expectations.
3. $ has never disappointed me so far.
4. My experiences with $ are excellent.

Emotional Commitment
1. I feel committed to $.
2. My relationship with $ is important for me.
3. If $ were no longer to exist, this would be a significant loss for me.
4. I would turn a blind eye to a minor of $.

Customer Retention
1. In future I will buy most service at $.
2. I am a loyal customer of $.
3. My next service purchase will take place at $.
4. $ is my first choice when it comes to buying service.

Note: $ was replaced in the questionnaire by the service provider most recently visited by the customer.

Table 1. Profile of respondent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>no</th>
<th>percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender (n=296)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing value</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (n=296)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before diploma</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma &amp; after</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensee</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH D.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Education</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Value</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment (n=296)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss value</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank (n=294)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saderat</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melli</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sepah</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tejarat</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mellat</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maskan</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keshavarzi</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsian</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refah</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saman</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mehr</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Descriptive statistics and correlations & R2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std dev.</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Customer Satisfaction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.67</td>
<td>3.612</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Commitment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.68</td>
<td>3.236</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Retention</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.92</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical skill</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.109</td>
<td>2.210</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social skill</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.614</td>
<td>2.826</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.880</td>
<td>2.637</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision making Authority</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.041</td>
<td>4.404</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R2

- COSE → Customer Satisfaction: 0.83
- COSE → Customer Commitment: 0.61
- COSE → Customer Retention: 0.68
- Technical skills → COSE: 0.57
- Social skills → COSE: 0.59
- Motivation → COSE: 0.67
- Making Decision Authority → COSE: 0.16

Note: Significant at p<0.05

Table 3. The results of hypotheses testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Relationship of construct</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>T-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>COSE → CS</td>
<td>supported</td>
<td>11.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>COSE → CC</td>
<td>supported</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>CS → CC</td>
<td>supported</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>COSE → CR</td>
<td>partly</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>CS → CR</td>
<td>supported</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td>CC → CR</td>
<td>supported</td>
<td>261.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ² 261.90
Df 98
CFI 0.96
NFI 0.93
NNFI 0.95
RMSEA 0.085

Note: Significant at p<0.05

Figure 1. A model of COSE dimensions and consequences