

Role of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour on Internal Brand Identification

G. Radha Kiranmayi

Research Scholar, School of Management Studies, University of Hyderabad, Hyderabad, Telangana

Email: radhakiranmayi@gmail.com

P. Jyothi

Dean & Professor, School of Management Studies, University of Hyderabad, Telangana

Abstract

The study Role of Organizational Citizenship Behavior on Employee Brand Identification was conducted to analyze the influence of OCB on Internal or employee brand identification. A survey was conducted administering a questionnaire on a sample of 265 employees of select IT companies in Hyderabad and Bengaluru. The survey has stated certain key findings. The study identified that OCB has a significant impact on employee brand identification and altruism and courtesy play a significant role in this relationship. The study also found that any change in gender, age, educational qualification and location of the workplace has no impact on brand identification while designation or level at which employee is placed influences his brand identification. Therefore, it was implied that, both branding and HR personnel of the organizations to work in harmony to create greater sense of OCB and thus, Brand Identification that can in turn create competitive advantage. Further, the limitations of the study and scope for further research has been discussed.

Keywords: *Internal Brand Management, Internal Brand Identification, Organizational Citizenship Behaviour, Competitive Advantage, Employee Behaviour*

1. Introduction

Internal brand management is an internally focused (Wittke-Kothe, 2001) work force management program (Harquail, 2007) intended to foster a distinctive employee behaviour (Ind, 2001; Miles & Mangold, 2004; Mitchell, 2002) to achieve competitive advantage using the shared understanding, skills (King & Grace, 2010) and knowledge (Balmer et al., 2011) of the workforce, that cannot be replicated easily by its competitors (Balmer et al., 2011; Harquail, 2007; Joseph, 2012; Khanyapuss & Alan, 2011; MacLaverty et al., 2007; Ravens, 2013; Groom et al., 2008; Yeboah et al., 2014). The purpose of internal brand management is to realize ultimate customer

satisfaction (Melewar et al., 2012) by endorsing brand equity (Ravens, 2013), empowering personnel to deliver their best (Groom et al., 2008) and to relate intellectual and emotional values of the workers with the brand (Thomson et al., 1999). As Internal brand management is developing the link between the organization and its employees, the fundamental aim of internal brand management is to achieve brand identification amongst its employees to enable them to reflect the brand. (Balmer et al., 2011; Clegg, 1994; Harquail, 2007; Joseph, 2012; McDonald, 2004; Ravens, 2013).

The concept of employee brand identification emerges from Social identity theory (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Hogg & Abrams, 1988; Lohndorf &

Diamantopoulos, 2014; Maxwell & Knox, 2009; Stets & Burke, 2000; Tajfel, 1979; Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Tajfel, 1978; Trepte, 2006). Brand identification of employees in an organization is a strategy that attempts to create a psychological contact (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Ashforth & Mael, 1996; Harquail, 2007) between the brand and the employees, that empowers the employees to develop belongingness towards the brand and take pride in displaying it in the work behaviour (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993; Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Harquail, 2007).

Employee brand identification fosters a strong feeling of being connected and enables the employee to incorporate the organizational goals, challenges and objectives as his own (Jenewein & Mühlmeier, 2008). It empowers the employees to develop belongingness towards the brand and to take pride in displaying it in their work behaviour (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993; Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Harquail, 2007). The employees internalises the brand (McDonald, 2004) and reflect it in verbal and non-verbal actions providing an unobtrusive and unproblematic work behaviour (Harquail, 2007).

Du Preez et al. (2017), Asha and Jyothi (2013), Melewar et al. (2012) and Morhart et al. (2009) have claimed in literature that internal brand

management is influenced by organizational citizenship behaviour of employees and thus indicated that OCB is an antecedent of employee brand identification.

Bolino et al. (2003) defines organizational citizenship behaviour as practices that are not a part of specialized skills but rather are the additional or extraordinary errands of worker who identify themselves with the organization, put up to build a successful organization. Smith et al., (1983) define organizational citizenship behaviour as an instrument that simplifies the societal machinery and enhances adaptability and identity enabling the firm to face and adapt the unanticipated situations. Literature has both empirically and theoretically proven time and again that organizational citizenship behaviour of employees have always helped organisations to sustain even the worst challenges and situations, tackle competition and build a healthy and strong culture within the organizations (Bolino et al., 2003).

The most standard factors used to quantify organizational citizenship behaviour are the five factor model given by Organ (1988). The five dimensions include Altruism, Courtesy, Conscientiousness, Civic Virtue and Sportsmanship as shown in table 1.

Table 1. Dimensions used to measure OCB

Altruism: being helpful

Courtesy: being polite and courteous; prevent conflict

Conscientiousness: doing more than just the minimum; attention to detail (prevent/ minimize error)

Civic Virtue: showing interest and involvement (e.g. keeping up to date) with the organization; defend organizational policies and practices

Sportsmanship: tolerating less-than-ideal conditions; accepting of changes and performs requests without complaints

(Source: Zhang, 2011)

Though the existing literature has recognised the OCB as an antecedent of internal branding and the literature also suggested the influence of OCB on employee brand identity, empirical investigation on the above relationship was found scarcely. Hence, this study tries to examine the role of organizational citizenship behaviour on internal or employee brand identification.

2. Methodology

2.1. Research Objective

From the understanding of the existing literature and the identified research gap it is evident that, the objective of the study is

- To identify the influence of OCB on employee brand identification.
-

2.2. Research Hypotheses

The following hypotheses can be empirically tested to prove the above research objective:

*H1:*Altruism is positively related to employee brand identification.

*H2:*Courtesy shares a significant positive relationship with the employee brand identification.

*H3:*Conscientiousness has a significant positive association with the employee brand identification.

*H4:*Civic Virtue is positively associated with the brand identification of the employees.

*H5:*Sportsmanship and employee brand identification are positively related to each other.

*H6:*OCB (all five factors together) significantly influences brand identification of the employees.

*H7:*There is a significant difference in internal brand identification with the difference in gender of the employees.

*H8:*There is a significant difference in internal brand identification with the difference in age of the employees.

*H9:*There is a significant difference in internal brand identification with the difference in work place location of the employees.

*H10:*There is a significant difference in internal brand identification with the difference in educational qualification of the employees.

*H11:*There is a significant difference in internal brand identification with the difference in designation or level the employees at work place.

2.3. Measures Used

Organizational citizenship behavior scale having twenty four statement related to five factors of OCB was adapted from Podsakoff et al.(1990) and employee brand identification scale having five items was adapted from J. M. Balmer et al. (2011). Some changes in the measures were made to suit the industry and need of this study. The 29 item questionnaire used a five-point Likert scale style of measurement. Demographic details such as gender, age group, educational qualification, designated level in the organization, and Work Location were also included in the survey form. A detailed description of the purpose of the study and the type of information requested was provided in the cover letter. The cover letter also included a promise of confidentiality and instructions on how to complete the questionnaire.

2.4. Population and Sampling Frame

IT sector was chosen for the study. Select top IT

companies in India by listed NASSCOM for consecutive four years (i.e., from 2011 to 2014), were selected for the study. The study was conducted on those companies in two cities namely Hyderabad and Bengaluru. ("NASSCOM Industry Ranking," 2015). Permanent employees of the selected companies having experience of at least two years in the same company were considered as a sampling unit for the study. A sample was drawn using non-probabilistic purposive sampling technique. A survey based method was adopted to collect the data from the sample which lasted for over ten weeks (i.e., August 2018 to September 2018). The survey form was administered on five

hundred and fifty respondents through both print and electronic media. Two hundred and ninety six forms were collected at end of the ten week period out of which two hundred and sixty five survey forms were found to be complete and usable in all aspects. The response- rate of the survey was 48.10%, which was within the average range of standard response rate in academic and organisational research (Baruch, 1999; Baruch & Holtom, 2008).

2.5. Demographic Details of the Sample

The Demographic Details of the respondents are presented in the Table 2

Table 2: Demographic Details Of The Sample

Gender	Male	138
	Female	127
Qualification	Graduate	141
	Post Graduate	124
Age	Below 30	127
	30-40	123
	Above 40	15
Designation Level	First Level	125
	Middle Level	114
	Top Level	26
Location	Hyderabad	123
	Bengaluru	142

3. Results

The results of the hypothesis testing are shown below:

H1: Altruism is positively related to employee brand identification

To test hypothesis (H1), a linear regression analysis was conducted to evaluate the impact of Altruism on Internal Brand Identification, the relationship

between two variables was reflected in an R of +0.33 and adjusted R² of 0.106. Approximately 10.9 % of the variance of Internal Brand Identification was accounted for its linear relationship with Altruism. The overall regression was highly significant with F= 32.162. The tables 3 & 4 shows the details about the regression model.

Table.3: Correlation and regression values of relationship between Altruism and Internal Brand Identification

R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
.330 ^a	0.109	0.106	0.46316

Table 4: Significance of relationship between Altruism and Internal Brand Identification

ANOVA					
Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	6.899	1	6.899	32.162	.000 ^b
Residual	56.419	263	0.215		
Total	63.318	264			

H2: Courtesy shares a significant positive relationship with the employee brand identification.

To test hypothesis (H2), a linear regression analysis was conducted to evaluate the impact of Courtesy on Internal Brand Identification, the relationship

between two variables was reflected in an R of +0.275 and adjusted R² of 0.072. Approximately 7.6% of the variance of Internal Brand Identification was accounted for its linear relationship with Courtesy. The overall regression was highly significant with F= 21.537. The tables 5 & 6 shows the details about the regression model.

Table.5: Correlation and regression values of relationship between Courtesy and Internal Brand Identification

R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
.275 ^a	0.076	0.072	0.47173

Table 6: Significance of relationship between Courtesy and Internal Brand Identification

ANOVA					
Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	4.793	1	4.793	21.537	.000 ^b
Residual	58.526	263	0.223		
Total	63.318	264			

H3: Conscientiousness has a significant positive association with the employee brand identification.

To test hypothesis (H3), a linear regression analysis

was conducted to evaluate the impact of Conscientiousness on Internal Brand Identification, the weak relationship between two variables was reflected in an R of +0.224 and adjusted R² of 0.047. Approximately 5% of the

variance of Internal Brand Identification was accounted for its linear relationship with Conscientiousness. The overall regression was

highly significant with $F= 13.915$. The tables 7 & 8 shows the details about the regression model.

Table.7: Correlation and regression values of relationship between Conscientiousness and Internal Brand Identification

R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
.224 ^a	0.05	0.047	0.47818

Table 8: Significance of relationship between Conscientiousness and Internal Brand Identification

ANOVA					
Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	3.182	1	3.182	13.915	.000 ^b
Residual	60.137	263	0.229		
Total	63.318	264			

H4: Civic Virtue is positively associated with the brand identification of the employees.

was conducted to evaluate the impact of Civic Virtue on Internal Brand Identification, there was no relationship between two variables. The tables 9 & 10 shows the details about the regression model.

To test hypothesis (H4), a linear regression analysis

Table.9: Correlation and regression values of relationship between Civic Virtue and Internal Brand Identification

R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
.144 ^a	0.021	0.017	0.48557

Table 10: Significance of relationship between Civic Virtue and Internal Brand Identification

ANOVA					
Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	1.309	1	1.309	5.551	.019 ^b
Residual	62.01	263	0.236		
Total	63.318	264			

H5: Sportsmanship and employee brand identification are positively related to each other.

was conducted to evaluate the impact of Sportsmanship on Internal Brand Identification, there was no relationship between two variables. The tables 11 & 12 shows the details about the regression model.

To test hypothesis (H5), a linear regression analysis

Table.11: Correlation and regression values of relationship between Sportsmanship and Internal Brand Identification

R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
.113 ^a	0.013	0.009	0.48754

Table 12: Significance of relationship between Sportsmanship and Internal Brand Identification

ANOVA					
Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	0.805	1	0.805	3.388	.067 ^b
Residual	62.513	263	0.238		
Total	63.318	264			

H6: OCB (all five factors together) significantly influences brand identification of the employees.

To test hypothesis (H6), a linear regression analysis was conducted to evaluate the impact of OCB (all five factors together) on Internal Brand Identification, the relationship between two

variables was reflected in an R of +0.365 and adjusted R² of 0.117. Approximately 13.3% of the variance of Internal Brand Identification was accounted for its linear relationship with Courtesy. The overall regression was highly significant with F= 7.964. The tables 13 & 14 shows the details about the regression model.

Table.13: Correlation and regression values of relationship between OCB and Internal Brand Identification

R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
.365 ^a	0.133	0.117	0.46032

Table 14: Significance of relationship between OCB and Internal Brand Identification

ANOVA					
Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	8.438	5	1.688	7.964	.000 ^b
Residual	54.88	259	0.212		
Total	63.318	264			

H7: There is a significant difference in internal brand identification with the difference in gender of the employees.

To test hypothesis (H7), a 2 X 2 contingency table

analysis was conducted to determine whether there was an association between internal brand identification and gender of the employee. A non-significant relationship was present with chi square = 16.126, p = .024. The hypothesis that there is a

significant variance in internal brand identification with the difference in gender of the employees is

rejected. The results of the analysis are shown in table 15.

Table 15: Chi-Square Test for internal brand identification and gender

Chi-Square Test			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	16.126 ^a	7	0.024
N of Valid Cases	265		

H8: There is a significant difference in internal brand identification with the difference in age of the employees.

To test hypothesis (H8), a 2 X 2 contingency table analysis was conducted to determine whether there was an association between internal brand

identification and age of the employee. A non-significant relationship was present with chi square = 18.540, df = 14, p = 0.183. The hypothesis that there is a significant variance in internal brand identification with the difference in age of the employees is rejected. The results of the analysis are shown in table 16.

Table 16: Chi-Square Test for internal brand identification and age

Chi-Square Test			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	18.540 ^a	14	0.183
N of Valid Cases	265		

H9: There is a significant difference in internal brand identification with the difference in work place location of the employees.

To test hypothesis (H9), a 2 X 2 contingency table analysis was conducted to determine whether there was an association between internal brand

identification and work place location of the employee. A non-significant relationship was present with chi square = 16.400, df = 7, p = 0.022. The hypothesis that there is a significant variance in internal brand identification with the difference in work place location of the employees is rejected. The results of the analysis are shown in table 17.

Table 17: Chi-Square Test for internal brand identification and work place location

Chi-Square Test			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	16.400 ^a	7	0.022
N of Valid Cases	265		

H10: There is a significant difference in internal brand identification with the difference in educational qualification of the employees.

To test hypothesis (H10), a 2 X 2 contingency table analysis was conducted to determine whether there was an association between internal brand identification and educational qualification of the

employee. A non-significant relationship was present with chi square = 17.354, df = 7, p = 0.015. The hypothesis that there is a significant variance in internal brand identification with the difference in educational qualification of the employees is rejected. The results of the analysis are shown in table 18

Table 18: Chi-Square Test for internal brand identification and work place location

Chi-Square Test			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	17.354 ^a	7	0.015
N of Valid Cases	265		

H11: There is a significant difference in internal brand identification with the difference in designation or level the employees at work place.

To test hypothesis (H11), a 2 X 2 contingency table analysis was conducted to determine whether there was an association between internal brand identification and designation or level of the employee. A significant relationship was present with chi square = 37.820, df = 14, p = 0.001. The hypothesis that there is a significant variance in

internal brand identification between different designation or levels of the employees is retained. The results of the analysis are shown in table 19.

This shows that designation or level of the employees has an effect on the internal branding practices. Hence it can be concluded that as designation or level increases, the levels of maturity increases aiding the employee brand identification.

Table 19: Chi-Square Test for internal brand identification and employee designation or level

Chi-Square Test			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	37.820 ^a	14	0.001
N of Valid Cases	265		

4. Discussion

The results of the analysis highlighted certain significant details. The results demonstrated that altruism and courtesy had a significant impact on employee brand identification while

conscientiousness had a very weak relationship. Civic virtue and sportsmanship were not found to create any impact on brand identification as per the results of the study.

From the above, it can be started that employees

who are high in altruism are always helpful to others at work. They feel a sense of responsibility towards others and towards the organizational success, making them relate their achievements and successes to success of the organization and its brand. Thus it can be stated that, employees with high altruism have a strong sense of brand identification.

Employees who are courteous are more polite and considerate. Their gallant and polite behavior prevent conflicts at work place. They retain harmony at work place and respect the organizational values as their own values. Thus courteous employees are care and understand the organization and its brand and identify themselves with it.

The analysis also showed that, OCB- with all the five factors together had a significant impact on employee brand identification demonstrating the fact that an employee can work an extra mile for the organization and its brand when he can own the brand and identify himself with it.

The study of the demographic details of the employees showed that gender, age, work place location and educational qualification have no impact on the employee brand identification, while designation of the employee was found to have a significant association with employee brand identification.

Designation of the employee was found to have a significant association with employee brand identification stating that as the employee moves above the hierarchal structure of the organization, he assumes more responsibility to display the values of the organizational brand to his customers and also his peer group enabling him to identify himself more with the brand and its values, thus developing higher brand identification.

5. Conclusion

The study, Role of OCB on Employee brand identification has stated certain key findings. The study identified that OCB has a significant impact on employee brand identification and altruism and courtesy play a significant role in this relationship. The study also found that any change in gender, age, educational qualification and location of the workplace has no impact on brand identification while designation or level at which employee is placed creates a difference. The reason could be due to the increasing responsibility of an employee to foster the organizational brand and its values as he moves higher in the organizational structure enables him to develop higher amount of brand identification.

HR and Branding managers should understand the importance of OCB and Internal brand identification and also recognise the link between them to develop better internal branding practices in organizations.

6. Limitations and Scope for Future Research

To extend the work further, researchers can consider the following points – There is a need for additional research in the area of individual employee perspective of internal brand management, the OCB on other factors of internal branding can be further understood to develop a better understanding. It can be further stated that this work has collected data at a particular point of time (cross-sectional data), so longitudinal studies can be conducted on this model using a larger sampling frame.

References

Asha, C., & Jyothi, P. (2013). Internal Branding: A Determining Element of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. *Journal of Contemporary Management Research*, 7(1), 37-57.

- Ashforth, B. E., & Humphrey, R. H. (1993). Emotional labor in service roles: The influence of identity. *Academy of Management Review*, 18(1), 88-115.
- Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(1), 20-39.
- Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. A. (1996). Organizational Identity and Strategy as a Context for the Individual. *Advances in strategic management*, 13, 19-64.
- Balmer, J. M., Powell, S. M., Punjaisri, K., & Wilson, A. (2011). Internal branding process: key mechanisms, outcomes and moderating factors. *European Journal of Marketing*, 45(9/10), 1521-1537.
- Baruch, Y. (1999). Response rate in academic studies-A comparative analysis. *Human relations*, 52(4), 421-438.
- Baruch, Y., & Holtom, B. C. (2008). Survey response rate levels and trends in organizational research. *Human relations*, 61(8), 1139-1160.
- Bolino, M. C., & Turnley, W. H., and Averett, T. (2003). Going the extra mile: Cultivating and managing employee citizenship behavior. *The Academy of Management Executive*, 17(3), 60-71.
- Clegg, S. (1994). Power relations and the constitution of the resistant subject. *Resistance and power in organizations*, 274-325.
- Du Preez, R., Bendixen, M., & Abratt, R. (2017). The behavioral consequences of internal brand management among frontline employees. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 26(3), 251-261.
- Groom, S., MacLavery, N., McQuillan, P., and Oddie, H. (2008). *Internal Branding: A Human Resources Perspective*. Canada: Canadian Marketing Association.
- Harquail, C. V. (2007). Employee Branding: Enterprising selves in the service of the brand. *Journal of Management*, 23(4), 925-942.
- Hogg, M. A., & Abrams, D. (1988). *Social identifications: A social psychology of intergroup relations and group processes*. Florence, KY, US: Taylor & Francis/Routledge.
- Ind, N. (2001). *Living the brand*. London: Kogan Page
- Jenewein, W., & Mühlmeier, S. (2008). *Brand-oriented leadership*. Paper presented at the the 7th International Congress Marketing Trends. Venice.
- Joseph, J. (2012). *Internal Branding: Growing Your Brand from Within*. Brand Theatre.
- Khanyapuss, P., & Alan, W. (2011). Internal branding process: key mechanisms, outcomes and moderating factors. *European Journal of Marketing*, 45(9/10), 1521-1537.
- King, C., & Grace, D. (2010). Building and measuring employee-based brand equity. *European Journal of Marketing*, 44(7/8), 938-971.
- Lohndorf, B., & Diamantopoulos, A. (2014). Internal branding social identity and social exchange perspectives on turning employees into brand champions. *Journal of Service Research*, 17(3), 310-325.
- MacLavery, N., McQuillan, P., and Oddie, H. (2007). Internal Branding Best Practices Study. In C. M. A. Executive Counsel (Ed.). Ozcelik, G., & Findikli, M. A. (2014). The Relationship between Internal Branding and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour: The Mediating Role of Person-organization Fit. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 150, 1120-1128.
- Maxwell, R., & Knox, S. (2009). Motivating employees to "live the brand": a comparative case study of employer brand attractiveness within the firm. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 25(9-10), 893-907.
- McDonald, R. (2004). Individual identity and organisational control: empowerment and modernisation in a primary care trust. *Sociology of health & illness*, 26(7), 925-950.
- Melewar, T., Gotsi, M., Andriopoulos, C., Chang, A., Chiang, H.-H., & Han, T.-S. (2012). A multilevel investigation of relationships among brand-centered HRM, brand psychological ownership, brand citizenship behaviors, and customer satisfaction. *European Journal of Marketing*, 46(5), 626-662.
- Miles, S. J., & Mangold, G. (2004). A conceptualization of the employee branding process. *Journal of relationship marketing*, 3(2-3), 65-87.
- Mitchell, C. (2002). Selling the brand inside. *Harvard Business Review*, 80(1), 99-101, 103-105, 126.

- Morhart, F. M., Herzog, W., & Tomczak, T. (2009). Brand-specific leadership: Turning employees into brand champions. *Journal of Marketing*, 73(5), 122-142.
- NASSCOM Industry Ranking. (2015). Retrieved 10 July, 2015, from <http://www.nasscom.in/industry-ranking>
- Organ, D.W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington Books.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 1(2), 107-142.
- Ravens, C. (2013). *Internal Brand Management in an International Context* (Vol. 47). Germany: Springer Science & Business Media.
- Smith, C., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68(4), 653.
- Stets, J. E., & Burke, P. J. (2000). Identity theory and social identity theory. *Social psychology quarterly*, 63(3), 224-237.
- Tajfel, H. (1979). Individuals and groups in social psychology. *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 18(2), 183-190.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. *The social psychology of intergroup relations*, 74, 33-47.
- Tajfel, H. E. (1978). *Differentiation between social groups: Studies in the social psychology of intergroup relations*. London: Academic Press.
- Thomson, K., de Chernatony, L., Arganbright, L., & Khan, S. (1999). The buy-in benchmark: How staff understanding and commitment impact brand and business performance. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 15(8), 819-835.
- Trepte, S. (2006). Social Identity Theory. In J. Bryant & P. Vorderer (Eds.), *Psychology of entertainment* (pp. 255-271). Mahwah, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Wittke-Kothe, C. (2001). *Interne Markenführung*. Springer
- Yeboah, J., Ewur, G. D., Adigbo, E. D., & Asirifi, E. K. (2014). Internal Branding in a Service Industry- The Case of Banks in Ghana. *European Scientific Journal*, 10(7). 218-238.
- Zhang, D. (2011). Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *White Paper*, 3.